Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2004-03 - 2004-06

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2004-03-01 through 2004-06-30

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 5,612

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 2

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 00:49:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Z-WdnUKnD5orFd_dRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88065

Hey Jim!

Have you ever been to one of those family functions where there was an obnoxious 5 year old that would constantly interrupt the adults with irrelevancies while thay were trying to have a conversation?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 01:00:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <7MCdnZ2dJeexFt_dRVn-jQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88066

Helmut wrote:

> Hey, Mike, its funny, isn't it?

Actually it is!

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:x6ydncjFVdj0rt_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
> | Helmut wrote:
> |
> | > [trans] didn't you notice , that ALMOST all posters are idiots here in
> this
> | > group, did you?[trans end]
> |
> |
> | For what it's worth, Helmut, I translated it as *All* the posters are
> | idiots in this group.
>
> Sometimes, one word miss is all miss. And as the word "fast" [almost] is
> also an english word, it is even more difficult.
>
> |
> | Of course your German is much better than mine! ;^)
>
> I've tried to learn now for almost 52 years, and never will be perfect.
>
> | For that matter your English may be also,
>
> I try hard not to misspell.
>
> | but the difference does make a big difference
> | in how we react.
> |
> | After all when you say "almost all", that leaves everyone to thik that
> | "ahh, he doesn't think *I'm* an idiot! 8^)
>
> I never would dare to accuse the whole holy amateur radio newsgroup

Actually, most all the people in here are okay IMO. Some of us have an unusual take on things, and we're all kind of fiesty, but I would enjoy meeting any of them over a beer. That's the spectrum from Len to Larry.

>
> Mike, for a non-native german speaker it is not easy, to catch the "little"
> differences. German is accused to be one of the most difficult languages to
> learn, at least here in Europe.

I believe it. My xyl makes fun of the way I even try to pronounce the language (very, very poorly and apparently amusing). So I seldom try.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 01:59:01 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Ssydnb1Jbt5ABt_dRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88068

Barry OGrady wrote:

>
> It's not a service at all. It is a hobby. All amateur radio operators can do in
> times of emergency is get in the way. Leave the professionals to get on
> with their job and go back to playing two way radios.
>

Really? Maybe you should talk to the emergency officals in NYC about
hams and 9/11.

4. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:10:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402291810.30651b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88067

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402281331.cf84a5d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040225190012.22081.00004298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > > In article <Xns949A999F2DB03elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >The authorities in South Africa reacted to the demise of the ITU code
> > > >test requirement in a truly bizarre way, by suggesting a third class of
> > > >licence with a ZT call, with a 5wpm code test and limited HF privileges.
> > >
> > > Why was this a "truly bizarre way"?
> >
> > TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
> > licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
> > coded license. Bizarre.
>
> Question, Brain...

Brain?

> I have never seen Jim Miccolis refer to you as anything but
> "Brian"...

How is it that you misspell my name in one fragment sentence, and
spell it correctly in another?

> So WHY do YOU inisist on following the insulting and demeaning
> example of a known pathological liar and antagonist in engaging in any
> interaction with him...?!?!

Stebe, you misunderstand (what's new?).

I am the ONE who has tagged N2EY with the title "TAFKA Rev. Jim" after
his dishonesty in altering Kim's posts. He previously put forth the
image of being as pure as the driven snow. But after that little
stunt, he can no longer be referred to as Reverend Jim. So, "formerly
known as" sounded good to me.

You got a problem with it?

> Are you, after all, as shallow and immature as I thought you
> really are?

No. Perhaps even more so. Perhaps almost as much as you are.

> Please give some specific example of how Jim has belittled or
> demeaned YOU in a like manner...

Why? Shallow and immature people don't have to follow your orders.

> > > >This has been shelved, due to what they say were a large number of
> > > >comments.
> > >
> > > Democracy in action.
> >
> > You almost got it right. Should be "Democracy inaction."
>
> As the otehr post suggested...You can either get to the higher
> class license by progressing up a Code ladder or a theory ladder.
>
> Why is that "inaction"...?!?!
>
> > > Sounds like a very reasonable compromise.
> >
> > Then why did they initially suggest a third coded license? Why did
> > that generate a "large number of comments?"
>
> To introduce a pathway to the higher license. Shall I draw you a
> map?
>
> > > >If South Africa does
> > > >implement it, they will be the first and probably only country to do so.
> > >
> > > Why? Perhaps it could be a way out of the constant arguments. It wasn't
> > > possible before, due to the treaty.
> >
> > TAFKA Rev Jim, the constant arguments can be gotten out of by letting
> > go.
>
> Ahhhhh...so, if we all just agree with you, then we don't need to
> "discuss" anything any more, eh?
>
> How Lenniesque.
>
> > > >They are also proposing to give the same limited HF privileges that they
> > > >would have given to the new licence, to the existing restricted licence
> > > >instead, without any addtional testing.
> > >
> > > How many has in South Africa, anyway?
> >
> > huh?
>
> Even a gradeschooler can see he just dropped the "m" out of
> "hams", BRAIN...
>
> I can see how you'll wind up a loser if you ever got on "Wheel of
> Fortune"...

>
> OOOOOOPS! YOU'RE ALREADY A LOSER!
>
> EXXXXXXXXXCCCCCUUUUUUUUUSSSSSSSSSEEEEEEEEE MEEEEEEEEEEEE ! ! !
> ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe, take a chill pill or whatever meds you forgot to take.

5. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:48:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htv5m40.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 88069

On Fri, 27 Feb 2004 02:25:21 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>Heck, Phil. You could've at least answered the chap's question on the off
>chance it's legit. If the guy's system is legal, can the ISP bring and win
>an interference based suit?

Bring, yes. Win, no. He needs to get a competent lawyer to explain
it to all concerned.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

6. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:48:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htv6of1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 88070

On 27 Feb 2004 12:30:29 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>No need to. Everybody who cares knows what it means. Do they advertise that
>ketchup has tomatoes in it?

IIRC both the name brands that we use and the generic ones (probably
bottled on the same line as one of the name brands) use the words
"Tomato Ketchup".

Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).

Go to the Campbell's Soup shelves. Vegetarian Vegetable Soup -
Kosher. Vegetable Soup with Beef - Not Kosher. Tomato Soup - Kosher.
Chicken Noodle Soup - Not Kosher. Bean with Bacon Soup - Not Kosher.

Prime example of "pushing" the manufacturer? The vast majority of
their soups are not kosher. Nobody is picketing the Campbell Soup
Company over that - either way.

All this talk about kosher food is making me hungry.... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

7. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:48:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htv8322.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 88073

On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>BTW, you might also want to avoid "pareve" marked foods also. Not
>*necessarily* Kosher, but do you want to take the chance?

"Pareve" is a subcategory of "kosher" and indicates that there are
no meat products OR dairy products involved. Totally vegetarian,
but not necessarily vegan.

Products which are inherently unprocessed vegetarian - fresh fruits,
grains, vegetables - do not need specific certifcation.

>Perhaps this is the chance for you to make some money here. You could
>start a food chain called "Stewart's Non-Kosher Foods"! 8^)

Why not - Jimmy Dean and Oscar Meyer made a fortune doing just
that..... <ggg>

And that famous (now absorbed into a major chain) supermarket chain
in Southern California - Iowa Pork Shops. They carried quite a few
"K"-labelled foods, too <ggg>

>btw, gefilte fish is really really good. It is an "inverse" food - its taste is
>inversely proportional to how it looks. I ate some on a dare and then I
>couldn't get enough of the stuff.

Gotta have prepared horseradish with it - one famous brand (from
Missouri, IIRC) was "Atomic" -- aptly named. About the same
sinus-clearing properties as good daikon.

Chinese ethnic kitchens (in big city Chinatowns, that is, not local
"chinese" take-out restaurants) make an identical dish usually sold
as "fish balls". Slightly different taste.....in the showcase right
next to the boiled chicken feet.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

8. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:48:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htv8ko3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 88071

On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
>pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
>water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
>they were telling the truth or would do this or that.

IIRC every jurisdiction in this country is obliged (sometimes very
grudgingly) to allow a witness or affiant to "affirm" rather than
"swear" - no bible, no "so help me God". Gotta' ask for it, though.

>What is surreal about the whole issue is that it was usually one flavor of
>Christian telling another flavor of Christian what to do, and often doing it in
>the name of the One they supposedly follow.

Every religion has this problem. Consider the strife between the
Shiite Muslims and the Sunni Muslims, the internal differences between
the traditional, centrist, and liberal movements of Judaism, or the
Catholic versus Protestant strife in various parts of the world.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

9. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 02:48:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.htv9gm4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 88072

On Sat, 28 Feb 2004 10:31:03 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
> Hardly an urban legend, Jim. From the Kof-K Kosher Supervision website
>(www.gokosher.net/Requirements.htm)...
>
> "What are the requirements to certify a
> product Kosher?" (snip)
>
> "The animal must be slaughtered by a
> certified, trained Rabbi using a knife
> that has been specially sharpened and
> honed."

Maybe that particular group insists that their slaughterers be ordained rabbis, but there is nothing in religious law that requires it. I served on a committee that examined the specific qualifications of slaughterers and supervisors and with several exceptions, the individuals were not ordained rabbis even though most had the experience to so qualify.

As distinct from other religions, there is no religious function that requires the presence or services of a rabbi. The function of a rabbi is to teach and mediate between parties on issues of religious law. A lay person can conduct services and serve as a witness for religious ceremonies and certifications.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

10. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 03:26:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <z4ednZ5riLLrMN_dRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88074

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>BTW, you might also want to avoid "pareve" marked foods also. Not
>>*necessarily* Kosher, but do you want to take the chance?
>
>
> "Pareve" is a subcategory of "kosher" and indicates that there are
> no meat products OR dairy products involved. Totally vegetarian,
> but not necessarily vegan.
>
> Products which are inherently unprocessed vegetarian - fresh fruits,
> grains, vegetables - do not need specific certifcation.
>
>
>>Perhaps this is the chance for you to make some money here. You could
>>start a food chain called "Stewart's Non-Kosher Foods"! 8^)
>
>
> Why not - Jimmy Dean and Oscar Meyer made a fortune doing just
> that..... <ggg>
>
> And that famous (now absorbed into a major chain) supermarket chain
> in Southern California - Iowa Pork Shops. They carried quite a few
> "K"-labelled foods, too <ggg>
>
>>btw, gefilte fish is really really good. It is an "inverse" food - its taste is
>>inversely proportional to how it looks. I ate some on a dare and then I
>>couldn't get enough of the stuff.
>
>
> Gotta have prepared horseradish with it - one famous brand (from
> Missouri, IIRC) was "Atomic" -- aptly named. About the same
> sinus-clearing properties as good daikon.
>
> Chinese ethnic kitchens (in big city Chinatowns, that is, not local
> "chinese" take-out restaurants) make an identical dish usually sold
> as "fish balls". Slightly different taste.....in the showcase right
> next to the boiled chicken feet.

Oops, Phil, that was my posting, not Jim's, all but the gefilte fish!

- Mike KB3EIA -

11. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 03:40:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2qqdncftlPddLd_dRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88075

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
>>pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
>>water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
>>they were telling the truth or would do this or that.
>
>
> IIRC every jurisdiction in this country is obliged (sometimes very
> grudgingly) to allow a witness or affiant to "affirm" rather than
> "swear" - no bible, no "so help me God". Gotta' ask for it, though.

SOP for Quakers.

>>What is surreal about the whole issue is that it was usually one flavor of
>>Christian telling another flavor of Christian what to do, and often doing it in
>>the name of the One they supposedly follow.

Kind of like the people that initiated the football prayer issue in
Texas. THey were not Moslem, atheists, agnostics or Wicca for that
matter. They were Catholic. The difference between the Catholic and
Protestant version of the Lord's prayer, you know. And I'll wager that
the Catholic players on the team had to use the Protestant version, or else.

What I know about human nature tells me that if there were only two
religions in the world that were identical with each other except for
one word in their scriptures, there would be many that would be happy to
destroy all the followers of the other religion for that one word.

>
> Every religion has this problem. Consider the strife between the
> Shiite Muslims and the Sunni Muslims, the internal differences between
> the traditional, centrist, and liberal movements of Judaism, or the
> Catholic versus Protestant strife in various parts of the world.

I call it Coke vs Pepsi syndrome. The closer the product, the more
intense the competition, and more intense the animosity.

- Mike KB3EIA -

12. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 03:53:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0402291953.70e2fe22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88076

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402291230.5da279ce@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>
> > What belittlements, Stebe?
>
> You really need to ask? The you ARE the idiot I have surmised all along.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Such as your incessant use of "Brain" instead of using my name?

And now you want to call me on the carpet for using TAFKA Rev. Jim???

You just renewed your membership in the KMA Club.

13. Wurlitzer P-10 lighting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 04:05:11 UTC
From: BH <radiobill#@#gbronline.com>
Message-ID: <2dKdnWX1c6joId_dRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88077

I am restoring the above jukebox and have a question about the lighting.
There are four Mazda GE Lumiline 40 watt lamps mounted behind the
speaker grill. The wood strips holding the lamp sockets and wiring do
not look to be original. Can anyone tell me if these lamps were
orginally mounted between the speaker and the grill, or somewhere else,
like in the record compartment on the back wall maybe?

Thanks,
BH

14. Re: Austria: Codetest out, BPL in

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 06:55:11 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1umof$65q$04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88079

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:7MCdnZ2dJeexFt_dRVn-jQ@adelphia.com...
| Helmut wrote:
|
| > Hey, Mike, its funny, isn't it?
|
| Actually it is!
|
| > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
| > news:x6ydncjFVdj0rt_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
| > | Helmut wrote:
| > |
| > | > [trans] didn't you notice , that ALMOST all posters are idiots here
in
| > this
| > | > group, did you?[trans end]
| > |
| > |
| > | For what it's worth, Helmut, I translated it as *All* the posters are
| > | idiots in this group.
| >
| > Sometimes, one word miss is all miss. And as the word "fast" [almost] is
| > also an english word, it is even more difficult.
| >
| > |
| > | Of course your German is much better than mine! ;^)
| >
| > I've tried to learn now for almost 52 years, and never will be perfect.
| >
| > | For that matter your English may be also,
| >
| > I try hard not to misspell.
| >
| > | but the difference does make a big difference
| > | in how we react.
| > |
| > | After all when you say "almost all", that leaves everyone to thik that
| > | "ahh, he doesn't think *I'm* an idiot! 8^)
| >
| > I never would dare to accuse the whole holy amateur radio newsgroup
|
| Actually, most all the people in here are okay IMO. Some of us have an
| unusual take on things, and we're all kind of fiesty, but I would enjoy
| meeting any of them over a beer. That's the spectrum from Len to Larry.
```

|

Is this what they call SPREAD SPECTRUM?

| >
| > Mike, for a non-native german speaker it is not easy, to catch the
"little"
| > differences. German is accused to be one of the most difficult languages
to
| > learn, at least here in Europe.
|
| I believe it. My xyl makes fun of the way I even try to pronounce the
| language (very, very poorly and apparently amusing). So I seldom try.
|
| - Mike KB3EIA -
|

15. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 06:57:04 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010645090.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88078

On Mon, 23 Feb 2004, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> >
> > Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is
> > usually in "left-field" as compared to
> > the rest of the appellate circuits, so I
> > understand from their ruling history -
> > even when they do get something
> > technically correct (e.g. "under God"
> > in the PoA being unconstitutional by
> > violating "freedom of religion"). (snip)
>
>
> I disagree. Freedom of religion (or, more specificially, "the free
> exercise thereof" - the actual words of the Constitution) would not make the
> words "under God" unconstitutional. Instead, such a ruling would place
> limits on the free exercise of religion and on freedom of speech. The First
> Amendment says:
>
> "Congress shall make no law respecting an
> establishment of religion, or prohibiting the
> free exercise thereof..."
>
> Notice there are not just words about the "establishment of religion," but
> also words about the free exercise of religion. Those opposed to religion
> love to point to the "establishment" clause while carefully ignoring the
> "free exercise" clause. However, they do so at the detriment of our Rights.
>
> The words "under God" do not establish a religion. Since many religions
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
Wrong. Although I shall agree that it does not establish any specific religion,
it leaves out those religions that either have no supreme being or multiple ones
and those who have NO religious belief at all. It's still an endorsement of
[some kind of] monothestic religion by the U.S. Government even if not specific
to any that currently exist. The presence of the phrase itself is a violation
of the separation of Church and State - and the court was correct in finding so.
ANY endorsement of religion, whether specific to a particular belief system or
in general, is a violation of the separation.

> believe in a God, no religion is established. Specific government
> recognition of religions which don't believe in a God, while placing
> "speech" limits on religions which do, would violate the "establishment"
> clause in the first case and the "free exercise" clause in the second.
> Government enforced removal of all mention of religion would also violate

> the "free exercise" clause (and the "free speech" clause).
>
> The Constitution should never be used to ban any mention of religion in
> this country or this government - not if the "free exercise" clause is truly
> respected.

It's not banning any religion. It does ban government ENDORSEMENT of religion.

16. Re: Retests at VE sessions - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:16:24 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010714100.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88080

On Mon, 23 Feb 2004, William wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5b2_b.14376$W74.7886@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > I believe you don't need any reason to not allow
> > retests. There is no "right" to an immediate retest
> > for anyone regardless of how long the test session
> > may actually be.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Depends, Bill. If they've offered instant retests before it will be
> hard to jerk them back. I'm going to guess that most of the VE's have
> offered instant restests.

As a volunteer examiner, I can say that our group generally offers retests (a maximum of three attempts at any one session permitted - and we do have MORE than three versions of each test) but we sometimes limit it to when someone is "close" to the minimum passing grade (where we think that the candidate might pass). For written tests, about 3 wrong (5 for element 4) beyond the minimum score is what we seem to judge on. Very rarely do we find someone who is that close fail a total of three times (but it did happen in a session about 4 months ago when one guy consistently had 25 of 35 [26 is passing] on element 2).

17. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:24:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010725360.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88081

On Wed, 25 Feb 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> >>Some good points Dwight. The "under
> >>God" part, which was added in the
> >>early 1950's bears inspection though.
> >>What was the intent of those who
> >>added this part? Is there a reason that
> >>they chose the word "God" instead
> >>of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?
> >
> > I suspect the reason is that most in this country who expressed a
> > religious belief at the time believed in a god, not a Vishnu or (you take
> > your pick). If a belief in some other religious deity dominated at the time,
> > very obviously that would have been selected instead. The intent, as I
> > understand it, was to restore some basic standard of values to this country.
>
> Then it is a religious thing.
>
> >>And there is the crux of the matter. I
> >>would hazard a guess that the same
> >>people that find the removal of the
> >>words "Under God" a bad thing, would
> >>be equally as distressed if they had to
> >>say "Under Vishnu" in their place.
> >
> > I'm not so sure of that. From what I've seen, most in this country who
> > believe in a god are extremely tolerant. Just look at how some of those
> > religions have been trashed in this country - from the word "Christ" being
> > crossed out of a most sacred holiday ("X"mas) to religious symbols being
> > stripped from public places to movies and TV shows that are downright
> > insulting - all without a huge outcry. If that happened to certain other
> > groups, I suspect some would be getting ready for a fight in the streets.
>
> Ahh, not a fight in the streets perhaps, but I don't know if you
> remember the "No Pray no Play brouhaha in Texas? Thoroughly angered by a
> religion/state ruling by the Supremes, a number of Religious figures
> and parents came up with a plan to have "spontaneous" recitations of the
> Lord's prayer before football games in Texas. People were supposed to
> just show up and break into prayer before the games. It was kind of a in
> your face defiance of the ruling as it were.
>
> It was planned that the first time this was going to happen was for

> 10,000 people to show up at a stadium that seated 5,000. A great
> demonstration of piety would ensue as people both inside and outside the
> stadium publicly expressed their prayer.

Unless the stadium were paid for by taxpayer money, such a display wouldn't
matter. It's not society's endorsement of religion that is a problem (such is
not); it's the government's endorsement that is.

> It didn't happen. Seems the 10,000 people didn't materialize. That's a
> good thing in my book. Even though this seems to argue for your point,
> it was good to see that there were enough people that saw trough this
> politicizing of faith. But it also means that we should not cave to
> those who would.
>
> The greatest irony of the whole thing is the choice of "The Lord's
> Prayer". Here was a planned public recitation of a portion of the Sermon
> on the Mount. The part of the Sermon on the Mount immediately preceding
> the prayer is an admonishment to avoid doing the exact thing the "No
> Pray - No Play" people were doing.
>
> You have to take your pick, is the reference to God in the POA a
> religious thing or can other words be substituted without a problem.
>
> i personally think that a pledge or affirmation to the country is a
> fine thing, and support it wholeheartedly. However, to insert something
> that you are saying is *not* a pledge into a pledge is awkward at best,
> and besides, I don't believe that.
>
> Perhaps more people should go back and read the sermon on the mount.

If the "mount" is either private land or non-government public land, not a
problem.....

18. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:38:51 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010732060.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88082

On Wed, 25 Feb 2004, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sun, 22 Feb 2004 08:13:42 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >Doesn't surprise me. The 9th circuit is usually in "left-field" as compared to
> >the rest of the appellate circuits, so I understand from their ruling history -
> >even when they do get something technically correct (e.g. "under God" in the PoA
> >being unconstitutional by violating "freedom of religion"). Most of the cases
> >that I have seen to come to that conclusion are in the tax area.
>
> I can't knock the Ninth Circuit too much. I was involved in two
> pirate broadcast enforcement cases that went up there, and they
> ruled in our favor.
>
> Not to be confused with a very recent Federal District of Oregon
> holding that even though the Telecomm Act of 1996 provides
> otherwise, a local government can deny a permit for erection
> of a cellphone tower based solely on aesthetic and NIMBY-whining
> grounds. Much as we sideline-watchers wanted them to appeal, the
> cellphone company decided not to appeal, picked up their marbles
> and started looking elsewhere. It would have been a slam-dunk
> reversal, even at the Ninth Circuit.
>
> If you haven't noticed, Judge Alex Kozinski of the Ninth Circuit is
> an electronic gadget freak, and insists on getting his hands on a
> working model of anything electronic whenever one is involved in a
> case before him. I've often wondered why he never got a ham
> license.

Sorry. Only been there once (pulling Sneed, Trott, and I forget the third), and I had someone else handle the appeal. In general, I don't pay attention to the way that individual judges rule - but to the court as a whole.

One thing that I have heard from alot of practicing trial attorneys: The [federal] court judges seem to be making (what these attorneys call) more "bad" rulings. I've seen a case or two where a judge decides to assume a fact not in evidence that is contradicted by facts that are. I've never seen that at the state/local court level, not even from "county commissioners" filling temporarily vacated court seats (which is allowed in my state). I have to wonder if the fact that federal judges are appointed vs. their state/local counterparts which are elected has something to do with it.

19. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:42:13 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010744450.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88083

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004, Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> > "Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing
> > without impinging on the rights of others.
>
> ...except in U.S. amateur radio where one MUST test for morse even
> though morse operation isn't a lawful mandate.

Huh? Morse code IS a lawful mandate. It's just not an INTERNATIONAL mandate anymore - which means that it CAN be removed as a [national] mandate; whether or not it should be is the question that all the petitions argue and seek the answer of.

20. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:45:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010747280.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88084

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > > The Constitution should never be used
> > > to ban any mention of religion in this
> > > country or this government - not if the
> > > "free exercise" clause is truly respected.
> >
> >
> > Does this include jamming one form of
> > religious practice down the throats of others
> > who believe and practice a different form of
> > religious practice? I think not. (snip)
>
>
> Don't be silly, Phil. Having to say the word "God" occasionally is hardly
> "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others." This is
> especially so in your case since you supposedly worship the same God.
>
> > Some of us who believe in a Higher Being
> > (called God, or HaShem, or Allah, or
> > Vishnu, or anything else) also believe that
> > it is wrong to throw it in the face of others.
>
>
> Well, you're certainly right that it is just "some of" you - a darn few
> "some of" you. Want to take a look at your religion as an example? A good
> place to start might be the efforts to push American food makers to produce
> food products in compliance with Jewish dietary law (the tiny "K" symbol
> found on most canned and other food products), especially since very few
> other religions would have the utter audacity (hutzpa) to tamper with the
> food of a nation without first fully informing the people.

What does the actions of private companies have anything to do with this?

Although now off topic (but a related one), it is the action of the U.S.
Government, or any political subdivision, that is the issue - the ONLY issue.

21. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:52:22 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010753070.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88085

On Wed, 25 Feb 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
>...
> Would pulling the words "Under God" out of the POA be a violation of
> Fundamentalist Christians free speech?
>
> Is the POA a pledge or what? When I say it I reaffirm my loayalty to my
> country.

And by the inclusion of "under God," you identify that country as supporting of ONLY monotheistic religion(s), which is simply not true. The First Amendment does not limit the practice of religion to only monotheisic ones.

> Do you support forcing patriotic agnostics, atheists, and members of
> other religions, and those christions that actually pay attention to the
> sermon on the mount to pledge to something else while they are pledging
> to their country?

22. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 07:58:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010800510.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88086

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:
> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
> letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
> know if what they are threatening me with is legal?

Wrong group. Try "rec.radio.cb".

Regardless, only the FCC has the ULTIMATE authority over radio services. There has been a recent change in the law authorizing state/local law enforcement some actionable authority, but if you are completely within the rules, then only the FCC's action matters.

23. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 08:01:54 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010804490.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88087

On Fri, 27 Feb 2004, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> > I am serious, Dwight! I notice you
> > snipped the part about the kid in
> > my school and his problems with
> > the POA. (snip)
>
>
> I snipped it because I have no time to respond to personal anecdotes that
> can't be verified. If that's your story, fine. Enough said.
>
>
> > If the effort to remove those words is
> > an effort to "force people not to say
> > them" then conversely the effort to put
> > them into the POA was an effort to
> > force people *to* say them.
>
>
> If an act is completely voluntary (no demand, coercion, or gain), the
> person cannot, by definition, be forced. The pledge today is entirely
> voluntary - nobody is forced to say it or any part of it.

It's not its voluntary element that matters. It's the fact that it is a
government-related pledge that creates the problem with the words "under God"
being present therein.

24. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 08:13:34 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010809010.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88088

On Fri, 27 Feb 2004, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > Of course! most Christians I know
> > actually pay attention to the sermon
> > on the mount, which tells the faithful
> > not to either have "Public prayer"
> > and specifically forbids oaths to God.
>
> The words "...one nation, under God..." is neither a public prayer nor an
> oath to God (it isn't even an oath). The Pledge of Allegiance it is a pledge
> to one's own self. Therefore, it violates nothing in Jesus' Sermon on the
> Mount, Mike.

That's got to be the lamest thing I have ever read; however, considering who wrote it, not totally unexpected.

Pledging one's self to anything is basically the same thing as taking an oath. [Granted: My dictionary defines an oath as a promise to fulfill a pledge, but for our purposes here, there is no significant difference.]

One is pledging one's allegiance to the USA - an act of government support by its citizens - and in that same oath, recognizing monotheism. That's certainly not separating "church" from "state."

25. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 08:17:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010818590.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88089

```
On Fri, 27 Feb 2004, N2EY wrote:
> In article <wbE%b.22920$W74.14390@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
>
> >> I'm a Christian and I find it very offensive.
> >> I know many other Christians (several
> >> dozen at least) who find the taking of His
> >> name in oaths and pledges to be offensive
> >> as well.
>
> > Then you're truly the first, and only Christian, I've talked to who finds
> >the words "...one nation, under God..." offensive.
> >As for the others you
> >speak about, your experience is vastly different than mine.
>
> With all due respect, Dwight, you should meet a wider variety of Christians.
> And check out Matthew 4:33-37.
> >
> >> I'd estimate that over 95% of the adults I
> >> know around here know what "kosher"
> >> means. Most of them are not Jews, and
> >> most of the Jews do not keep kosher, but
> >> they know what it means.
> >
> > Don't twist the subject, Jim.
>
> It's not twisted at all. They know what it means and it doesn't bother them a
> bit.
>
> >Did that same 95% of the adults you know
> >also know that much of the food in our grocery stores, the foods we eat
> >everyday, is prepared according to dietary laws of the Jewish religion?
>
> Yes! And they have no problem with it. Not an issue.
>
> >Were
> >they aware of that tiny "K" symbol on many of those same food products?
>
> Yes! And they have no problem with it. Not an issue.
>
> >These are the things I talked about, not the meaning of a word.
>
```

> They all go together. Most children I know, Jews and non-Jews, also understand
> the basic meanings of the words and symbols. We may not all know all the
> rituals and requirements, but we've got the basic idea. And it's not an issue.
> >
> >> And the problem is?
> >
> > You don't have a problem with the fact that a religious group is
> >manipulating much of the foods we eat?
>
> "Manipulating?" How? Which of the kosher rules do you find objectionable?
> Will eating something that satisfies a Jewish requirement somehow make me less
> of a Christian, or less of an American? Oy!
>
> >There are very few things in this
> >world as intrusive as that.
>
> Then you'd better become a subsistence farmer, because all sorts of things are
> done to your food. And I hope you don't think that government food inspectors
> can do it all.
>
> >Given a choice between this and the word "God"
> >in a pledge, I'll choose the latter any day of the week.
>
> Then let's do it this way:
>
> On Sunday, we say "under God" for Christians
> On Monday, we leave the word out, for atheists and agnostics
> On Tuesday, we say "under Vishnu" for Hindus
> On Wednesday, we say "under the gods" for pagans
> On Thursday, we say "under He Who Is" for those who don't like to use His Name
> directly.
> On Friday, we say (insert appropriate Arabic phrase here) for Muslims
> On Saturday, we say (insert appropriate Hebrew phrase here) for Jews

And then we have the Buddists (and/or any other religious group like
"Scientology") who was left out sue the Government for recognition of all
religions except theirs, and as a result, we add more days to the week! :-)

> They all mean the same thing (except for Monday) so why not?

Varying the religion does not make it "religion neutral."

26. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 08:29:29 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010830510.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88090

On Mon, 1 Mar 2004, Phil Kane wrote:
> On 27 Feb 2004 12:30:29 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >No need to. Everybody who cares knows what it means. Do they advertise that
> >ketchup has tomatoes in it?
>
> IIRC both the name brands that we use and the generic ones (probably
> bottled on the same line as one of the name brands) use the words
> "Tomato Ketchup".
>
> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).

Shhhhhhhh! Don't let the terrorists know, else there will be a run on ketchup
and none of us will have any for our steaks and fries.....

> Go to the Campbell's Soup shelves. Vegetarian Vegetable Soup -
> Kosher. Vegetable Soup with Beef - Not Kosher. Tomato Soup - Kosher.
> Chicken Noodle Soup - Not Kosher. Bean with Bacon Soup - Not Kosher.
>
> Prime example of "pushing" the manufacturer? The vast majority of
> their soups are not kosher. Nobody is picketing the Campbell Soup
> Company over that - either way.
>
> All this talk about kosher food is making me hungry.... <ggg>

...And NONE of it is packaged directly by the U.S. Government. Some food may be
inspected, but that's not an endorsement of any religious connection; just
suitability for consumption.

27. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 08:39:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010834230.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 88091

On Mon, 1 Mar 2004, Phil Kane wrote:
> On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
> >pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
> >water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
> >they were telling the truth or would do this or that.
>
> IIRC every jurisdiction in this country is obliged (sometimes very
> grudgingly) to allow a witness or affiant to "affirm" rather than
> "swear" - no bible, no "so help me God". Gotta' ask for it, though.

Which smacks of unconstitutionality just as much as including "that" phrase in the PoA, just because of the final word. The last (and only) time I was before the Tax Court (while sitting in a state appealable to the 9th Cir.) since the appelate ruling, I thought about objecting to the witness' oath but decided not to since the Court had no provision for an alternative oath and I needed the testimony. However, just because I didn't object doesn't mean that I didn't have grounds to - it's just that I didn't find it material to the case.

>...

28. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 14:34:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%RH0c.27954$W74.9507@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88092

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> So what you are saying is that you
> believe that one of the rights that
> these people have is to hijack MY
> pledge of allegiance to insert a
> prayer into it - and even though
> they think it is a prayer it doesn't
> matter because removing it would
> violate their rights to pursuit of
> their religion - and my recourse
> is to not say it? Wow, that is a
> tough one. Apparently one of the
> rights some people enjoy is to
> deprive others of their rights.

No, what I'm saying is that they're free to believe what they want. That's always a good test for great words - that many can see different things in those words. If some want to believe it's a prayer, more power to them. But that doesn't mean your or I have to see it that way. The same with the word "God." There are many different gods. Some might argue about the word "republic." Others might argue over what constitutes "liberty." The same with the word "justice." Hopefully, we don't start wiping out words simply because some argue over them. If we did that, we would soon have no words left to say.

> Maybe we've beat this subject to death? 8^)

We've have both certainly made our points by now, which means it's probably a good time to end it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

29. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 14:38:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6WH0c.27959$W74.13740@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88093

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Mike is now a regular in here. Regulars
> seem to be PCTAs and all MUST think as
> they do, express the same opinions, and
> generally march in the same ranks as their
> "service" men. (snip)

Are you trying hard enough to move the debates back to the code issue,
Len? ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

30. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 15:02:36 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc46k93.7fc.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 88094

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htv6of1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, Phil Kane wrote:
>
> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).
>
One of my favorite sauces ---

I think that this thread should be nominated for greatest amount of topic
drift ever.

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

31. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater -weooh, OT!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 16:32:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40436580.3070405@psu.edu>
Source record: 88095

D. Stussy wrote:
> On Wed, 25 Feb 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Some good points Dwight. The "under
>>>>God" part, which was added in the
>>>>early 1950's bears inspection though.
>>>>What was the intent of those who
>>>>added this part? Is there a reason that
>>>>they chose the word "God" instead
>>>>of "Vishnu" or (take your pick)?
>>>
>>> I suspect the reason is that most in this country who expressed a
>>>religious belief at the time believed in a god, not a Vishnu or (you take
>>>your pick). If a belief in some other religious deity dominated at the time,
>>>very obviously that would have been selected instead. The intent, as I
>>>understand it, was to restore some basic standard of values to this country.
>>
>> Then it is a religious thing.
>>
>>
>>>>And there is the crux of the matter. I
>>>>would hazard a guess that the same
>>>>people that find the removal of the
>>>>words "Under God" a bad thing, would
>>>>be equally as distressed if they had to
>>>>say "Under Vishnu" in their place.
>>>
>>> I'm not so sure of that. From what I've seen, most in this country who
>>>believe in a god are extremely tolerant. Just look at how some of those
>>>religions have been trashed in this country - from the word "Christ" being
>>>crossed out of a most sacred holiday ("X"mas) to religious symbols being
>>>stripped from public places to movies and TV shows that are downright
>>>insulting - all without a huge outcry. If that happened to certain other
>>>groups, I suspect some would be getting ready for a fight in the streets.
>>
>> Ahh, not a fight in the streets perhaps, but I don't know if you
>>remember the "No Pray no Play brouhaha in Texas? Thoroughly angered by a
>> religion/state ruling by the Supremes, a number of Religious figures
>>and parents came up with a plan to have "spontaneous" recitations of the

>>Lord's prayer before football games in Texas. People were supposed to
>>just show up and break into prayer before the games. It was kind of a in
>>your face defiance of the ruling as it were.
>>
>> It was planned that the first time this was going to happen was for
>>10,000 people to show up at a stadium that seated 5,000. A great
>>demonstration of piety would ensue as people both inside and outside the
>>stadium publicly expressed their prayer.
>
>
> Unless the stadium were paid for by taxpayer money, such a display wouldn't
> matter. It's not society's endorsement of religion that is a problem (such is
> not); it's the government's endorsement that is.

True. Even if it is funded that way, which all the school stadiums are
to my knowledge, there is no government prohibition to spontaneous
prayer. If a group of people suddenly decide to say The Lord's prayer,
than they are free to do it.

In this case, when people were being canvassed to descend upon the
stadium from all over the state, it becomes pretty hard to call it
spontaneous.

I don't really have a problem with spontaneous prayer. I do have a
problem with a group of people who profess to be of good moral character
purposefully descending on a stadium to have a "spontaneous" prayer.
Were the ten commandments suspended that day, and it was okay to lie?

>
>> It didn't happen. Seems the 10,000 people didn't materialize. That's a
>>good thing in my book. Even though this seems to argue for your point,
>>it was good to see that there were enough people that saw trough this
>>politicizing of faith. But it also means that we should not cave to
>>those who would.
>>
>> The greatest irony of the whole thing is the choice of "The Lord's
>>Prayer". Here was a planned public recitation of a portion of the Sermon
>>on the Mount. The part of the Sermon on the Mount immediately preceding
>>the prayer is an admonishment to avoid doing the exact thing the "No
>>Pray - No Play" people were doing.
>>
>> You have to take your pick, is the reference to God in the POA a
>>religious thing or can other words be substituted without a problem.
>>
>> i personally think that a pledge or affirmation to the country is a
>>fine thing, and support it wholeheartedly. However, to insert something
>>that you are saying is *not* a pledge into a pledge is awkward at best,
>>and besides, I don't believe that.
>>
>> Perhaps more people should go back and read the sermon on the mount.
>

>
> If the "mount" is either private land or non-government public land, not a
> problem.....

No argument there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

32. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 16:37:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404366D6.3080706@psu.edu>
Source record: 88096

Alex Flinsch wrote:
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.htv6of1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
>> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
>> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
>> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).
>>
>
> One of my favorite sauces ---
>
> I think that this thread should be nominated for greatest amount of topic
> drift ever.

Proud to have been a part of it!!! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

33. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 17:45:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qFK0c.27940$hm4.18852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88097

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> That's too bad, Dwight. I was kind
> of looking forward to taking you on
> over some of your absurd comments
> myself.

Be my guest. Of course, don't necessarily expect a response. I also hope you offer more than the few exceptions others have offered (bacon for breakfast hardly replaces the roast pork or ham dinners available in most resturants just a few decades ago). Likewise, an exception here and there is not going to change the overall picture I've painted (those who've been around long enough to remember the amount of pork available years ago will know exactly what I'm talking about).

> This isn't the first time you've
> provided us with statements which
> indicate that you're a racial and
> religeous bigot.

You know, this all started with Phil talking about a religion other than his own "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others." Nobody called him "a racial and and religious bigot." In response, this (Kosher food) was offered as an example of what some in his own religion were doing to jam their religous practices "down the throats of others." Given the context, I think it was a perfectly ligitimate response.

As for your claim that I'm a bigot, I suggest you look up the word "bigot" (a person intolerant of any opinions differing from his own). Only a true bigot could possibly call another person a bigot.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

34. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 17:53:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tMK0c.415$Yh7.153@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 88098

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:CDn0c.7126$t16.4657281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> And I sure that FEMA, the Red Cross, and other groups who consider ham
> operators vital would agree with you. NOT!!
>
> Trolls just never go away.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee,

Something that many folks do *not* understand is that cell-phones are not the do-all, end-all for everything. There are areas not served by them (or poorly served). That infrastructure can come down in a hurry as well. Even here in Rochester, a friend of mine has a cell-phone only. He uses that rather than a wired phone. In parts of his house, communications die. When he is on the street (all of this - his house and his walking), his phone often looses communications. I hate it when he calls as 1/3 of the time or more, we get cut off and he has to move around and try again. I could be right next to him and have my choice of over a dozen repeaters on 440 alone, phone access included LOL.

BTW, there are repeaters in the area that are *not* tied to the power company. One is solar powered; another wind-mill powered. Besides, many have battery backup or generators available as well.

You're right, the trolls don't want to go away; they'd rather have an amateur license included free in a box of cracker jax - and then complain about having to buy the cracker jax :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.602 / Virus Database: 383 - Release Date: 3/1/04

35. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 17:55:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <jOK0c.416$w%6.326@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 88099

Dave,

I *like* your idea. Makes more sense than code vs no-code arguements. Do so many hours per year or you loose the ticket. After so many years of having the ticket, you get a free pass once you are 65 years of age ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:r82dnSzmJ940Yt3dRVn-gg@crocker.com...
>
> being a 'service' also has its advantages. would golfers be listened to at
> all if BPL were going to take away their 'right' to play golf? would
> hobbyists be asked to help in time of emergency, or be ordered off the air?
> if big business wanted one of our bands and all we did was hunt dx and
> ragchew and didn't have a history of service to the country would the
> government think twice about taking their money for it? as long as we
> remain a service and at least some of us do what we can to help then all
> reap the rewards... I move we get rid of the freeloaders, if you don't do so
> many hours of 'service' every year you lose your license! how about them
> apples! Of course that won't happen as the administration of it would be
> expensive and complicated. so crawl back in your hole and accept the paper
> title of the 'service' and just do what you want anyway.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.602 / Virus Database: 383 - Release Date: 3/1/04

36. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 18:23:06 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c1vv23$n0n$06$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88100

Hi, Mike, Dwight, ... dont recallall the others so lets say:

Hello newsgroup!

I am ANGRY with you all. Disapointed, frustrated, you all are guilty of that.

When I clicked on the post first, I expected a decend discussion about SEX.

Can you Imagine me sitting in front of the screen, the drivel foaming out of my wide open mouth.

Called my significant other and told her to sit down beside me, to see what exciting stuff will be written in this great newsgroup.

What a disgrace!

At the beginning: just a little thing about homophilian marriage, thats all. That was the SEX?

I opened every post on this thread, and what came: No Bum, No Boobs, No cute guys (for the YL's), no Athletic girls and guys whatsoever.

Instead, Koscher food, pledges for religious societies or other groups of people, Ketchup bottles and Cans of Beans. Pledges for Pork (I could go with that) Beef, Turkey(no, not the country) and all of course slaughtered by a rabbi or a slaughterer.

The more I write, the more I am getting more angry.

YOU all promised a decent SEX discussion, and now everyone can satisfy his desires with lots of food or prayers.

Be ashamed!

Stand in the corner!

Be ashamed!

Knee down!

Pray:

I will never do it again!

Promised!

Huuuh-I cant believe that.

See you all on the next totally oftopic thread.
Nobody cares, if there is any connection of all the above said to amateur radio.

I LIKE IT

HAPPY POSTING

Helmut

37. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 22:07:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403011407.71c9ff01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88151

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of February 29, 2004:

Novice - 32,487 (decrease of 16,842)
Technician - 261,050 (increase of 55,656)
Technician Plus - 61,644 (decrease of 67,216)
General - 141,144 (increase of 28,467)
Advanced - 81,455 (decrease of 18,327)
Extra - 105,075 (increase of 26,325)
Total - 682,855 (increase of 8,063)

73 de Jim, N2EY

38. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 23:00:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040301180053.12631.00005298@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88152

In article <qFK0c.27940$hm4.18852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>I also hope
>you offer more than the few exceptions others have offered (bacon for
>breakfast hardly replaces the roast pork or ham dinners available in most
>resturants just a few decades ago).

Please show us some real evidence that the avaialbility of roast pork and ham dinners has decreased over the past several decades. If you can, then please show us how that alleged decline was due to "pushing" by a religious group, rather than changes in tastes and economics.

You've blamed an entire group of people with no proof at all, Dwight.

>Likewise, an exception here and there is
>not going to change the overall picture I've painted (those who've been
>around long enough to remember the amount of pork available years ago will
>know exactly what I'm talking about).

I just don't see the alleged decline, Dwight. Nor any hard evidence from you.
>
>> This isn't the first time you've
>> provided us with statements which
>> indicate that you're a racial and
>> religeous bigot.
>
> You know, this all started with Phil talking about a religion other than
>his own "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others."
>Nobody called him "a racial and and religious bigot."

Because he wasn't. He pointed out a specific action (certain words in the POA).

>In response, this
>(Kosher food) was offered as an example of what some in his own religion
>were doing to jam their religous practices "down the throats of others."

Apples and oranges. A person who doesn't want to eat kosher-certified foods can avoid them easily. Avoiding the POA is more difficult, particularly if you're a kid in certain public schools.

>Given the context, I think it was a perfectly ligitimate response.

Two completely different things. And no evidence on your part.

39. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 23:08:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301180851.01692.00000873@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 88153

In article <tMK0c.415$Yh7.153@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:CDn0c.7126$t16.4657281@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> And I sure that FEMA, the Red Cross, and other groups who consider ham
>> operators vital would agree with you. NOT!!
>>
>> Trolls just never go away.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Dee,
>
>Something that many folks do *not* understand is that cell-phones are not
>the do-all, end-all for everything. There are areas not served by them (or
>poorly served). That infrastructure can come down in a hurry as well. Even
>here in Rochester, a friend of mine has a cell-phone only. He uses that
>rather than a wired phone. In parts of his house, communications die. When
>he is on the street (all of this - his house and his walking), his phone
>often looses communications. I hate it when he calls as 1/3 of the time or
>more, we get cut off and he has to move around and try again. I could be
>right next to him and have my choice of over a dozen repeaters on 440 alone,
>phone access included LOL.

Let's journey back in time to 17 January 1994 and the Northridge
Earthquake. ALL the primary electrical power to about 10 million
was shut off by a single falling MHV tower at a little after 0430..

That's as close to a "terrorist act" as is possible without being caused
by terrorists.

Did the LAPD or any other police department in the affected area
become inoperative? No. Their communications facilities at fixed
or 'home' bases had emergency power...patrol cars could talk to one
another.

Did the LAFD or any other fire department in the affected area get
cut off? No. Their alert and alarm signalling to fire stations is
independent of communications carriers and their dispatch stations
had emergency power. Individual fire engines could talk to one
another.

I was able to look down into the now-black eastern San Fernando
Valley and see a house fire start. A local LAFD fire station's engines
answered and doused it. They were alerted through the independent

alert and alarm system (learned that later) and that station was not able to see the fire about two miles away. The fire was quickly extinguished.

Did the hospitals or ambulance services in the affected area get cut off? No. They too had, and still have, emergency electrical power.

Did the utility companies get cut off? No. They had emergency power and utility vehicles could talk to one another.

Major taxicab services and large businesses with mobile communications had emergency electrical power.

Was there any amateur radio operating during the first few hours of total primary electrical power outage? I don't know, was too busy to monitor. Nothing was reported in any of the newspapers or many broadcast stations then or in the following three days. There are several amateur radio repeater sites in this general area, including to long-running Condor Net on the 220 band (totally independent).

There's a curious mythology sprung up saying that "all the CELL phones will go down" during a major emergency. While that is universally true going INTO a cell, it isn't always true GOING OUT from a cell. Most individual pagers are separate from the telephone infrastructure here and most of those transmitters had emergency power. The landline telephone in most urban areas of the USA isn't locked totally into the switching centers' dialing routing...those CAN be entered through other paths known only to the telephone companies so that an official can alert individuals in residences to report in. That was done.

The possible routes of common communications in any urban area in the USA are quite complex and don't depend solely on either cell phones or the automatic dial switching centers. There exist ways to communicate between areas that aren't in common use such as the many business data linkages using microwave radio or leased, fixed landlines. Those in the emergency planning and operations in this area know about those facilities. They also plan and execute drills and procedures for handling emergencies of many kinds, including the worst-case scenarios of "terrorist acts."

>BTW, there are repeaters in the area that are *not* tied to the power
>company. One is solar powered; another wind-mill powered. Besides, many
>have battery backup or generators available as well.

Most of the Condor Net was that way a decade ago. [it stretches over most of the length of California - considerable - with links to two other states] But, repeaters are no good if no one accesses them.

>You're right, the trolls don't want to go away; they'd rather have an
>amateur license included free in a box of cracker jax - and then complain
>about having to buy the cracker jax :))

That's another myth...that one has to work and slave at amateurism in order to be a "proficient communicator"...treating it like the profession is is NOT.

A half century ago, I and other GIs were doing professional-level HF, VHF, UHF, and microwave communicating on a much larger scale than any amateur radio effort...all without having to take any license tests in order to receive a personal callsign. In the time since, tens of thousands of signalmen in all branches have done the same.

All of us no-code-test-advocates want is some sense and sensibility in the federal regulations regarding amateur radio licensing. Amateur radio is NOT a profession, NOT a guild, NOT a union, and NOT any sort of "emergency communications service." NO ONE NEEDS to work and slave and show dedication to "fellow servicemen" for any sort of hobby radio activity.

If you and other PCTAs want to demand adherence to old, outdated standards and practices, fine, do so. But, stop and think about what you all are doing...all that is is just trying to force all to meet the standards that you all had to meet long ago. If you call all the NCTAs for "trolls," then I call all the PCTAs for elitist, selfish, egotistical, anal-retentive, ignorant amateurs who are trying to make their little part of the EM spectrum a private playground for their own dreams of imaginary glory.

LHA / WMD

40. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 23:08:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301180852.01692.00000874@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 88154

In article <6WH0c.27959$W74.13740@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Are you trying hard enough to move the debates back to the code issue, >Len? ;-)

Not hard enough. Need Internet viagra for that. :-)

Way back a few days ago, the thread seemed to be on-track with outrage over sex discussions...then it morphed into terrible tawks on religion, what is and is not kosher, finally fine points of American law...with everyone seemingly outraged and mad as heck. Now it mutated once again into an argument over sauces!

Helmut is right! :-)

LHA / WMD

41. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-01 23:35:22 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <rfWdnW5KzYDVV97dRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88155

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Let's journey back in time to 17 January 1994 and the Northridge
> Earthquake. ALL the primary electrical power to about 10 million
> was shut off by a single falling MHV tower at a little after 0430..

Rest of lenny's senile drivel deleted:

So based on this one incident you declare that hams have no use in emergency communications. Lenny, you are dumber than a bag of hammers.

Journey back to the quake of 1985, when there was no, none, nada, phone service into or out of SF for a period of time, and only sparodic service locally and see what service the hams were providing not only for local emergency agencies but also handling traffic into and out of the area via HF.

Now go take your meds and and hassle the little old ladies in your rest home.

42. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 00:20:07 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <XqQ0c.23177$5M6.5011923@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 88156

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4041DF7D.29138A9A@earthlink.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?
> >
> > No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of time before people like
Steven
> > Adell, and to a lesser extent you with your "you prefer to name a
minority
> > religious group as the boogieman," would turn this into an attack on me
> > personally instead of discussing the issue or into me versus Jews in
spite
> > of the fact that I have clearly, and repeatedly, said I would object to
this
> > no matter which religious group did it. This is the typical response
> > whenever anyone questions, or objects to, anything done by Jews in this
> > country. Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and much more. Since
I
> > don't want this to happen to my family, I have ended my participation in
the
> > discussion (and do so with this message).
>
> That's too bad, Dwight. I was kind of looking forward to taking you on
> over some of your absurd comments myself. This isn't the first time
> you've provided us with statements which indicate that you're a racial
> and religeous bigot.
>
> Dave K8MN

But seriously, Dave...tell us how you REALLY feel. <hihi>

Vy 73 de Bert
WA2SI

43. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 00:21:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301192149.23307.00007047@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88157

In article <20040301180053.12631.00005298@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <qFK0c.27940$hm4.18852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>I also hope
>>you offer more than the few exceptions others have offered (bacon for
>>breakfast hardly replaces the roast pork or ham dinners available in most
>>resturants just a few decades ago).
>
>Please show us some real evidence that the avaialbility of roast pork and ham
>dinners has decreased over the past several decades. If you can, then please
>show us how that alleged decline was due to "pushing" by a religious group,
>rather than changes in tastes and economics.
>
>You've blamed an entire group of people with no proof at all, Dwight.

Go for it, TAFKARJ. Since you are the self-appointed newgroupies'
posting cop, try explaining how kosher food relates to amateur
radio use worldwide or nationally.

"Ham" radio. Remember? :-)

LHA / WMD

44. It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 01:00:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88158

Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
Inflation starts anew!

- Mike KB3EIA -

45. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 01:05:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301200527.21642.00004700@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 88159

In article <rfWdnW5KzYDVV97dRVn-tw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Let's journey back in time to 17 January 1994 and the Northridge
>> Earthquake. ALL the primary electrical power to about 10 million
>> was shut off by a single falling MHV tower at a little after 0430..
>
>Rest of lenny's senile drivel deleted:

Poor baby...don't like actual facts, ey? :-)

>So based on this one incident you declare that hams have no use in
>emergency communications.

No, but it is one of MANY in which radio amateurs have NOT
helped in the glorious, noble, and heroic services claimed by the
mythmakers and amateur propagandists.

The Northridge Earthquake was a mere 10 years and 2 months ago.
It affected about 10 million people from the TOTAL absence of
primary electrical power.

>Lenny, you are dumber than a bag of hammers.

Poor baby, using a mixed alliteration. That would prove you are
an illiterate alliterator. :-)

>Journey back to the quake of 1985, when there was no, none, nada, phone
>service into or out of SF for a period of time, and only sparodic
>service locally and see what service the hams were providing not only
>for local emergency agencies but also handling traffic into and out of
>the area via HF.

Of course they were...in your mind.

The Loma Prieta quake was 19 years ago. More severe in Richter
Scale numbers than Northridge, like the Northridge quake it affected
only certain portions of the Bay Area. It was NOT a total collapse
of the infrastructure by any means. While parts of the Bay Area were
without electrical power, the Area was still connected to the Pacific
Intertie.

Unlike Loma Prieta, the entire Los Angeles area was cut off from the
Intertie at a bit past 0430 hours. The Greater Los Angeles area
went BLACK. No lights, nothing, nada, nyet, nicht except were the
emergency generators could supply local lighting. The Loma Prieta

quake started during daylight.

If the infrastructure was so "immobilized" by Loma Prieta, then
explain all the television coverage from the ground as well as the air.
Saw quite a bit of damage in rather widely-scattered areas down
here. Not only that, I called to the area using POTS and got through
normally a few hours after it started.

While you desperately desire to keep the Myth of telephone service
collapsing entirely alive, that isn't true either. While IN an affected
area, the limitations of switching centers don't allow free calling all
around. However, one can call in from OUTSIDE the area. Obviously
the infrastructure was NOT helpless or "down."

During the Northridge quake, I got a call from a relative in Florida
during the afternoon, once again proving one can call in from the
outside even if the switching centers are swamped to calls WITHIN
an affected area.

Throughout both earthquakes the public safety and utility and
construction-wrecking companies were in constant communications
with each other and the various local governments. Their only
overload was dealing with the WORK of rescue and clean-up. They
had no real problem of communications.

>Now go take your meds and and hassle the little old ladies in your rest
>home.

I take my 0.5% Timulol Maleate regularly in the morning and after
supper. As prescribed.

I don't live in "the med" nor in any "rest home."

You dwell in anonymity, without the courage to identify yourself.

Are you hiding that alleged callsign because you have NO
amateur radio license? Certainly appears that way to everyone.

You are an UNKNOWN as well as cowardly troll, too ignorant of the
world and fearful of that world finding out your true incompetence.
But, your imagination must think you are a Great Hero, a Noble
Communicator Serving Your Nation for having a radio hobby. :-)

Now, go back to dreaming of your glory of selfless dedication to
your community. You don't have it but you can't admit it...

LHA / WMD

46. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 02:06:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <VKidnZKXsKsRc97dRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88160

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> No, but it is one of MANY in which radio amateurs have NOT
> helped in the glorious, noble, and heroic services claimed by the
> mythmakers and amateur propagandists.

> While you desperately desire to keep the Myth of telephone service
> collapsing entirely alive, that isn't true either. While IN an affected
> area, the limitations of switching centers don't allow free calling all
> around. However, one can call in from OUTSIDE the area. Obviously
> the infrastructure was NOT helpless or "down."

For a period of several hours, there was no phone service going IN or
OUT of the area.

Blah, blah, blah, more lennie blabber deleted:

It really chaps your butt that hams have for decades been able to
provide all kinds of ememgency communications when other means fail,
much to the satisfaction to emergency officials who still rely on hams
in emergencies, doesn't it lennie? And you can't be a part of it because
you have no license and can't pass the test to get one. The Office of
Homeland Security thinks enough of hams being able to handle emergency
communications that they are including ham radio in their emergency plans.

Now go back to the rec room of your rest home and see what the other
residents are doing, maybe you can get into a game of strip checkers or
something to take you mind off of your inability to get a ham license.

47. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 02:44:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4043F527.C65EA9F6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88161

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > That's too bad, Dwight. I was kind
> > of looking forward to taking you on
> > over some of your absurd comments
> > myself.
>
> Be my guest. Of course, don't necessarily expect a response. I also hope
> you offer more than the few exceptions others have offered (bacon for
> breakfast hardly replaces the roast pork or ham dinners available in most
> resturants just a few decades ago). Likewise, an exception here and there is
> not going to change the overall picture I've painted (those who've been
> around long enough to remember the amount of pork available years ago will
> know exactly what I'm talking about).

Roast pork and ham not available on restaurant menus? Have you lost
your minds, Dwight? You've painted a picture but it is a surrealistic
work.

> > This isn't the first time you've
> > provided us with statements which
> > indicate that you're a racial and
> > religeous bigot.
>
> You know, this all started with Phil talking about a religion other than
> his own "jamming one form of religious practice down the throats of others."
> Nobody called him "a racial and and religious bigot." In response, this
> (Kosher food) was offered as an example of what some in his own religion
> were doing to jam their religous practices "down the throats of others."
> Given the context, I think it was a perfectly ligitimate response.

It might be, if you're the kind of person who sees a conspiracy around
every corner. You've not demonstrated anything at all which proves that
kosher food is being....ummmm....jammed down your throat.

> As for your claim that I'm a bigot, I suggest you look up the word "bigot"
> (a person intolerant of any opinions differing from his own). Only a true
> bigot could possibly call another person a bigot.

Your statement lacks a certain something--like common sense.

Dave K8MN

48. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 02:56:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_JS0c.7785$t16.4969966@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88162

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010744450.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004, Len Over 21 wrote:
> > In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil
Kane"
> > <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
> >
> > > "Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing
> > > without impinging on the rights of others.
> >
> > ...except in U.S. amateur radio where one MUST test for morse even
> > though morse operation isn't a lawful mandate.
>
> Huh? Morse code IS a lawful mandate. It's just not an INTERNATIONAL
mandate
> anymore - which means that it CAN be removed as a [national] mandate;
whether or
> not it should be is the question that all the petitions argue and seek the
> answer of.

If you haven't yet noticed, Len Over 21 constantly and persistantly makes
sarcastic and inane comments on code testing and code use. I highly
recommend killfiling his posts.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

49. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 03:19:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zYWdnWvo5dysnNndRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88163

Old man lennie blabbered:
>
>> If all could be summed up that easily, it would be "perfectly legal"
>> for you to hold a 5 W HT up to the abdomen of a pacemaker wearer
>> and thumb the PTT switch. Are you licensed by the FCC to
>> deliberately interfere with anything? I don't think so. We can toss a
>> coin to see if the pacemaker wearer has an infarc.

And Steve Robeson, K4CAP responded:
>
> "Infarct", Lennie...
>
> Besides...A pacer is not the therapy of choice for a myocardial
> infarction. A pacer is placed due to an SA node or other pacer
> failure...An ELECTRICAL failure of the heart which may or mayNOT be
> due to an MI. An MI is actual damage done to the myocardium, or heart
> muscle, usually due to cardiovascular disease or a thrombus of other
> etiology, even trauma.

It is very difficult to interfere with today's pacers, and interference to one isn't going to cause a myocardial infarction. A story about pacemakers and hams.

A ham friend lived across the street from a person who wore a pacemaker. The ham had been on the air, on HF and VHF, for some years without even knowing the across the street neighbor wore the device. The ham had never had a complaint of any kind of TVI or any other type of interference from any neighbors. The neighbor purchased a cheap TV and one day noticed interference, someone told him it might be the ham across the street. He went to see the ham, the ham took his own portable TV over to the neighbors and ask the neighbor to use his set for a few days to see if there was any interference. The ham operated on all HF bands and his usual VHF frequencies for a couple of days and no inteference occured to the hams TV but did on the neighbors. The neighbor was convinced it was his TV and returned it to the store. End of story right? Not quite. The neighbor, on a visit to his cardiologist, happened to mention the ham and the inteference problem. The doctor got all excited and told the patient that that ham's signals could interfer with his pacemaker and possibly kill him. Now the ham had been operating for years and there had never been a hint of a problem, but now his signals may suddenly kill this guy.
On advice of the doctor, the neighbor called the FCC. The FCC got envolved and came out and made checks and measurements of the hams stations and gave it a clean bill of health. The neighbor, knowing he was going to die if the ham operated, was not satisfied and demanded the

FCC put the ham off the air. The FCC refused, so an engineer from the pacemaker manufacturer was called in. They took an indentical pacemaker, laid it next to the hams station, strung the leads out, operated the station at power levels from very low to full legal limit, and was never able to observe any interference to the pacer from the signals. They repeated the same test at the neighbors location and no matter what they tried they could not get the hams signals to interfer with the pacemaker.

That was over 25 years ago. Pacemaker technology has improved vastly since then. My wife wears a pacemaker and shortly after it was installed I had a conversation with one of the St. Jude (the manufacturer) engineers on the subject of interference. He said it would be very difficult for my ham transmissions to interfere. I ask what would be the consquencies it it did. His answer was that when the pacer detected any interference it would simply stop pacing until the interference went away. The effect on the wearer would be the heart would slow down to whatever its own pacing rate was (in my wife's case between 30-40 beats per min), and she would probably feel dizzy, lightheaded, out of breath, or if her rhythm were slow enough, maybe pass out, but once the interference is gone, the pacer would pick up and pace her at 70 the rate it is set for.

So lennieboy, get your facts straight, some ham or any other transmitter near a pacemaker wearer isn't going to cause them to suffer a heart attack, as much as you would like to think it would so you could blame all those nasty hams for killing people. If it were so, then pacemaker users would be dropping all over the place everytime a police car went by with the officer on the radio, or when they passed a high power broadcasting tower or any number of scenarios. They don't even tell pacer users to beware of microwave ovens anymore.

Now back to you room lennie and let some other resident of the home use the computer, the nurse is waiting to give you your meds.

50. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 04:04:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <404407DB.19B19227@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88164

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040301180053.12631.00005298@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >In article <qFK0c.27940$hm4.18852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> >Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
> > >
> > >>I also hope
> > >>you offer more than the few exceptions others have offered (bacon for
> > >>breakfast hardly replaces the roast pork or ham dinners available in most
> > >>resturants just a few decades ago).
> > >
> > >Please show us some real evidence that the avaialbility of roast pork and ham
> > >dinners has decreased over the past several decades. If you can, then please
> > >show us how that alleged decline was due to "pushing" by a religious group,
> > >rather than changes in tastes and economics.
> > >
> > >You've blamed an entire group of people with no proof at all, Dwight.
>
> Go for it, TAFKARJ. Since you are the self-appointed newgroupies'
> posting cop, try explaining how kosher food relates to amateur
> radio use worldwide or nationally.
>
> "Ham" radio. Remember? :-)

Before we get to that part, maybe you could fill us in on just how you
relate to amateur radio, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

51. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 04:47:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301234719.05539.00004579@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88166

In article <zYWdnWvo5dysnNndRVn-vw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Old man lennie blabbered:
>>
>And Steve Robeson, K4CAP responded:
>>
>> "Infarct", Lennie...

The familiar, shortened form of the word doesn't pronounce the T.

Doctor Killgore, the gunnery nurse, still can't sign "MD" behind
her name. She isn't licensed to practice medicine without a
real physician in charge. She will object strenuously to that in
more tuff tawk, but that is to be expected.

The gunnery nurse still can't legally put "MD" behind her name.

>It is very difficult to interfere with today's pacers, and interference
>to one isn't going to cause a myocardial infarction. A story about
>pacemakers and hams.

That is irrelevant coming from a NOBODY, an ANONYMOUS
troll who doesn't have the guts or the heart to identify herself.

Go ahead, make our day, put a pacemaker wearer right next to
a mismatched 1 KW transmitter connected to an antenna with
open-wire lines. Do you want to "experiment" with something
that might kill a person? Would the gunnery nurse do that?

You both would, of course, at least in messages. You guys are
TUFF, strong, noble, good, and true, know everything (and know
hardly anything). :-)

>So lennieboy, get your facts straight, some ham or any other transmitter
>near a pacemaker wearer isn't going to cause them to suffer a heart
>attack, as much as you would like to think it would so you could blame
>all those nasty hams for killing people.

I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." :-) Just the PHONIES
with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
nurse candidates in search of a real self. :-)

>Now back to you room lennie and let some other resident of the home use
>the computer, the nurse is waiting to give you your meds.

Only in your fevered imagination ANONYMOUS ONE. :-)

My home IS restfull but only my wife and I (and three cats) live here.
Nice 2000 square foot place in the hills. No "nurse" in attendance.
That's just the southern house, the one in California, the same postal
address in all those Ham Radio magazine bylines. The northern
house on the Puget Sound is even more restful...same size but nice
pines all around...only two pines down here but 14 tall cypresses.

Good health here, no heart problems. :-)

I only counterattack the FAKERS, the ANONYMOUS trolls, the
PRETENDERS, the GUTLESS ones who imagine they are radio
amateurs of great toughness and resolve and superior to all others
yet HIDE behind a pseudonym, AFRAID of truth.

YOU fit all those categories, "JJ."

Now be good, little "JJ" or Mama Dee will spank you and take away
your computer privileges until grade school is over for the summer.

LHA / WMD

52. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 04:47:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301234720.05539.00004580@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88167

In article <VKidnZKXsKsRc97dRVn-tw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> No, but it is one of MANY in which radio amateurs have NOT
>> helped in the glorious, noble, and heroic services claimed by the
>> mythmakers and amateur propagandists.
>
>> While you desperately desire to keep the Myth of telephone service
>> collapsing entirely alive, that isn't true either. While IN an affected
>> area, the limitations of switching centers don't allow free calling all
>> around. However, one can call in from OUTSIDE the area. Obviously
>> the infrastructure was NOT helpless or "down."
>
>For a period of several hours, there was no phone service going IN or
>OUT of the area.

Your sentence is incorrect.

Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.

>Blah, blah, blah, more lennie blabber deleted:
>
>It really chaps your butt that hams have for decades been able to
>provide all kinds of ememgency communications when other means fail,
>much to the satisfaction to emergency officials who still rely on hams
>in emergencies, doesn't it lennie?

Not at all. That hasn't been proven to the general statement you
make.

You desperately WANT your statement to be true but it isn't.
Therefore you act tuff and try to bluff others.

First of all, you don't give any amateur radio license callsign,
therefore all must assume you are BOGUS. A fake. Charlatan.
Poseur. A nobody trying to be a somebody. No body at all.

>And you can't be a part of it because
>you have no license and can't pass the test to get one.

Irrelevant to "Ham Radio Is A Hobby Not A Service."

I have a commercial license. Had it since 1956. An amateur radio
license - which you DO NOT VERIFY AS YOUR OWN - takes less
knowledge to pass than the old First Class Radiotelephone
(Commercial). You seem to forget that the Question Pool is open
to inspection to the public.

>The Office of
>Homeland Security thinks enough of hams being able to handle emergency
>communications that they are including ham radio in their emergency plans.

Oh, my! OFFICIAL recognition? :-)

Has Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R. been changed since that agency was
created AFTER 11 September? :-)

Is U.S. amateur radio primarily an emergency communications service
under Homeland Security? No? Why not? All you noblemen seem
to think you all deserve medals for having fun in a HOBBY.

>Now go back to the rec room of your rest home and see what the other
>residents are doing, maybe you can get into a game of strip checkers or
>something to take you mind off of your inability to get a ham license.

"JJ," quit trying to tawk tuff. Your fake testosterone is showing.

You keep HIDING your identity. Afraid to show who you really are?

You don't really have any sort of license, do you? Yet you PRETEND
to have one with all the tuff tawk and nastygrams in messages.

Pretense and pseudo patriotism is all you have shown so far.

You are ANONYMOUS. A NOBODY. A ZERO. An Unidentified
Spitting Object (USO) entertaining only yourself in "the service."

Get on the mailing list for "Ham Radio For Dummies" to be
published soon. Study it. Learn from it. You could be somebody
instead of the nobody you are in here.

LHA / WMD

53. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 04:47:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040301234721.05539.00004581@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88165

In article <_JS0c.7785$t16.4969966@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010744450.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004, Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
>> > <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>> >
>> > > "Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing
>> > > without impinging on the rights of others.
>> >
>> > ...except in U.S. amateur radio where one MUST test for morse even
>> > though morse operation isn't a lawful mandate.
>>
>> Huh? Morse code IS a lawful mandate. It's just not an INTERNATIONAL
mandate
>> anymore - which means that it CAN be removed as a [national] mandate;
whether or
>> not it should be is the question that all the petitions argue and seek the
answer of.
>
>If you haven't yet noticed, Len Over 21 constantly and persistantly makes
>sarcastic and inane comments on code testing and code use. I highly
>recommend killfiling his posts.

Feel free to do so. Nobody is stopping you.

Hide your head in the sand, stop up your eyes so you won't see the
annoying and distasteful commentary against your personal desire.
Make all in the future do as you had to do by LAW..

Close your mind to controversy. The law will remain constant and you
will be content. Insure that others be as one-sided as yourself. That is
nirvana, to hold the standards and practices of the 1930s forever.

You have all the answers that all others should have. In your opinion.

LHA / WMD

54. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 05:10:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88169

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <VKidnZKXsKsRc97dRVn-tw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>> No, but it is one of MANY in which radio amateurs have NOT
>>> helped in the glorious, noble, and heroic services claimed by the
>>> mythmakers and amateur propagandists.
>>
>>> While you desperately desire to keep the Myth of telephone service
>>> collapsing entirely alive, that isn't true either. While IN an affected
>>> area, the limitations of switching centers don't allow free calling all
>>> around. However, one can call in from OUTSIDE the area. Obviously
>>> the infrastructure was NOT helpless or "down."
>>
>>For a period of several hours, there was no phone service going IN or
>>OUT of the area.
>
>
> Your sentence is incorrect.
>
> Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.

Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
goat doesn't it?

>
>
>>Blah, blah, blah, more lennie blabber deleted:
>>
>>It really chaps your butt that hams have for decades been able to
>>provide all kinds of ememgency communications when other means fail,
>>much to the satisfaction to emergency officials who still rely on hams
>>in emergencies, doesn't it lennie?
>
>
> Not at all. That hasn't been proven to the general statement you
> make.

>
> You desperately WANT your statement to be true but it isn't.
> Therefore you act tuff and try to bluff others.

You so desperately WANT to convince others that ham radio serves no
purpose other than a hobby, therefor you act tough and try to bluff others.

>
> First of all, you don't give any amateur radio license callsign,
> therefore all must assume you are BOGUS. A fake. Charlatan.
> Poseur. A nobody trying to be a somebody. No body at all.

Don't worry lennyboy, I do have an Advanced class, lack of display of my
callsign is of no revelance to "Ham Radio Is A Hobby Not A Service".
You don't hold a ham license therefore you are irrelevant to any
discusson on ham radio. How do I know you are really who you say you
are? I think you are a fake, just someone with a bogus id, not who you
say you are at all.

>
>
>>And you can't be a part of it because
>>you have no license and can't pass the test to get one.
>
>
> Irrelevant to "Ham Radio Is A Hobby Not A Service."
>
> I have a commercial license. Had it since 1956. An amateur radio
> license - which you DO NOT VERIFY AS YOUR OWN - takes less
> knowledge to pass than the old First Class Radiotelephone
> (Commercial). You seem to forget that the Question Pool is open
> to inspection to the public.

A commercial license that isn't worth the paper it is printed on now. I
held a Second Class, got it in 1961, since expired, so what does that
prove? I also hold an amateur radio operators license...you don't.
>
>
>>The Office of
>>Homeland Security thinks enough of hams being able to handle emergency
>>communications that they are including ham radio in their emergency plans.
>
>
> Oh, my! OFFICIAL recognition? :-)
>
> Has Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R. been changed since that agency was
> created AFTER 11 September? :-)
>
> Is U.S. amateur radio primarily an emergency communications service
> under Homeland Security?

If other means are not available it will be.

> No? Why not? All you noblemen seem
> to think you all deserve medals for having fun in a HOBBY.

Yea, ham radio operators have received lots recognition for their service in emergency communication, from local officials all the way to the Whitehouse. I don't ever remember seeing anyone standing in line for a medal. Grinds your hemroids dosen't it? You can't be a part of it because you can't or too lazy to pass the test, so you devote your time to attempting to tear down amateur radio. Stop wasting you time, it doesn't fly. You really have a hard on for those of us who took the time, have the ability to learn, and obtain a license don't you?

> You are ANONYMOUS. A NOBODY. A ZERO. An Unidentified
> Spitting Object (USO) entertaining only yourself in "the service."

And as a non-ham on this group, you are a NOBODY, NADA, NOTHING, ZERO, ZIP, ZILCH.
>
> Get on the mailing list for "Ham Radio For Dummies" to be
> published soon.

I spoke to the author of that book and told me he wrote it just for you, but I told him he wasted his time, he wouldn't be able to make it simple enough for you to understand. Now help up that little old lady you pushed over to rush back to the computer to post your drivel and go back to your room for you meds, the nurse is waiting for you, old man.

55. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 05:22:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QSU0c.29283$hm4.27852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88168

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) A person who doesn't want to
> eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
> them easily. (snip)

Don't be a hypocrite, Jim. You know darn well if this was a Christian group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the foods you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be screaming bloody murder. The only question remaining is why you're not doing so in regards to this religion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

56. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 05:41:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <I8V0c.29291$hm4.12686@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88170

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Way back a few days ago, the thread
> seemed to be on-track with outrage
> over sex discussions...then it morphed
> into terrible tawks on religion, what is
> and is not kosher, finally fine points of
> American law...with everyone seemingly
> outraged and mad as heck. Now it
> mutated once again into an argument
> over sauces!
>
> Helmut is right! :-)

Ah, a little diversity of opinion is good for this group every now and then. At least half here are acting like this is the first time they've ever heard negative comments about the push for Kosher foods in grocery stores and resturants. Another chunk started out by claiming it wasn't happening and now claim they have no problem with it happening (some are still denying it is even happening). And, finally, another chunk could only think of calling me names instead. Regardless, you can bet your bottom dollar that if this was a Christian group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to make the foods the people arguing with me routinely eat comply with the beliefs of that religion, these very same people would be screaming bloody murder.

But, in the end, you and Helmut are probably right -sex discussions are more entertaining and far less controversial.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

57. Hamfest any good for a pirate to go to?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 07:38:56 UTC
From: twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <c21dmg$ro9$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 88171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate

"DJboutit" Recordking@Hotmail.com wrote:
I am thinking about going to a few hamfest in the
next few months. Would a hamfest be worth it to
go for a pirate radio operator? I live in Tx and
their are like good hamfests here like once a
month. I am thinking about the to this hamfest http://www.hamcom.org/ m
an that looking a
super sized one. I am looking for anybody that
has been to one of these hamfest, just wanted
to know what to expect and one of these events
so I will know if it will be worth it or not to go to
one.
AO=AO=AO

-
Most hammies are cool with the pirate thing
but watch out for the frequency police types,,
such as the no code lids who perpetuate
their comunication deficit and purport to claim
"rules" in the CB room KC8LDO, N8WWM, N3CVJ
WA3MOJ,,,,

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Tue Mar 2 08:38:56 2004 depuis l'IP : aca2bbfa.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

58. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 09:09:24 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c21j04$f9n$07$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88172

Hey,Dwight!

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:l8V0c.29291$hm4.12686@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...

| But, in the end, you and Helmut are probably right -sex discussions are
| more entertaining and far less controversial.
|

I guess, you did not get the kick off out of my previous, overdrawing and
even sarcastic, youmaycallithowyouwantto post. The point is now clearly and
distinctively said:

Dont discuss RELIGION, POLITICS, SEX ....!

IN THIS GROUP!!!!!

I was told by one of the longer members, discussion should be about amateur
radio (policy). At least two words of twenty lines may please relate to
Amteur Radio.

Why dont you stay put to your own rules?

I realy dont care, how you fight one against each other, it's everyones
feelings, they are hurt. And, yes, ofcourse you can debate kosher food or
muslim hiding of face or christian feastening or budhistic reincarnation OR
WHAT THE HELL you think is appropriate for a decent amateur radio policy
discussion.

I do what DEE is sugesting in her next post: deleting posts to this (or
another) thread.

And, Dwight: Try reading between the lines somtimes, it does not always look
like what it is written.

Cheers for now

73 de Helmut

|
| Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
|
| http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
|

59. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 11:00:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040302060056.12501.00006536@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 88173

In article <QSU0c.29283$hm4.27852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) A person who doesn't want to
>> eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
>> them easily. (snip)
>
> Don't be a hypocrite, Jim.

I'm not the one making unsubstantiated claims about a religious group, Dwight.

>You know darn well if this was a Christian
>group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the foods
>you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be
>screaming bloody murder.

There you go again, assuming your own conclusion.

You have repeatedly claimed that a particular religious group is "pushing" and "manipulating" the foods "mainstream" Americans eat. But you have not produced a single bit of evidence to back up such a wild claim.

Now, you're claiming to know how others would behave if a different group were allegedly doing the same alleged things.

Do you have a crystal ball, Dwight? Are you omniscient?

>The only question remaining is why you're not doing
>so in regards to this religion.

You mean your wild and unproven claims about "the Jews"?

I'll explain it again, Dwight:

You've repeatedly made claims here of 'pushing" and "manipulation" of "mainstream" America food here, and blamed "the Jews" for all of it, without a shred of proof that it even exists. You refuse to answer simple questions on your claims and deny conflicting evidence. Then you attack those of us who point out that Emperor Dwight has no logical clothes.

Do you really believe all the guff you've posted here on the subject, Dwight, or is this just some sort of really bad joke or troll? I mean - blaming a religious group for bad hot dogs!

60. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 11:00:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040302060057.12501.00006537@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 88174

In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
>Inflation starts anew!

Mike,

Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with Japan?

73 de Jim, N2EY

61. That QRM called CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 11:14:08 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <170d16d3d5ba33fe07169a5cabbf95ef@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 88175

As a SWL, I heard some QRM on the
lower frequencies of the ham bands.
There were short and long beeps but with
irregular lengths (I checked that on an
oscilloscope). Finally I found an old
military gay drunkard operator that told
me that QRM was called CW and was
supposed to be a digital communication
mode.
I asked him how this can be a digital
communication mode with a so slow speed
and no error control, amazing in the
21st century.
He said that CW was invented at a time
where people were not so clever to
invent microprocessors, so operators
with small brains could use CW. These
operators are not yet all dead today
unfortunately, so some CW fossil signals
remain on the bands although new
digital modes are far better, because
the CW operators cannot use computers
(they do not know neither how works a
microprocessor nor how to format a
hard disk under Linux or setting up a
Wi-fi network).
It becomes evident that there are 2
classes of ham operators. Those born
with CW and those born with SSB.
Those born with CW bring nothing to
amateur radio today, they are unable to
use new technologies. So it will be
reasonable to allow CW operators
above 1 GHz only to limit the QRM with
CW and called them "Dinosaur class" and
the others called "Pioneer class" on
all bands.
When you see the new ICOM IC-7800 that
has the PSK31 mode included, you
understand that the new way for
ham-radio is not CW. Happy death CW !

62. Re: That QRM called CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 11:27:20 UTC
From: Charles Brabham <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <sc_0c.7089$fu4.2250@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88176

Another "anonymous" moron with an anti-ham message to post on a ham radio newsgroup.

Like most SPAM, there was zero intelligence involved in making it up, and zero character involved in posting it here. - A nothing - from a nobody.

(Yawn)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message news:170d16d3d5ba33fe07169a5cabbf95ef@remailer.metacolo.com...
>
> As a SWL, I heard some QRM on the
> lower frequencies of the ham bands.
> There were short and long beeps but with
> irregular lengths (I checked that on an
> oscilloscope). Finally I found an old
> military gay drunkard operator that told
> me that QRM was called CW and was
> supposed to be a digital communication
> mode.
> I asked him how this can be a digital
> communication mode with a so slow speed
> and no error control, amazing in the
> 21st century.
> He said that CW was invented at a time
> where people were not so clever to
> invent microprocessors, so operators
> with small brains could use CW. These
> operators are not yet all dead today
> unfortunately, so some CW fossil signals
> remain on the bands although new
> digital modes are far better, because
> the CW operators cannot use computers
> (they do not know neither how works a
> microprocessor nor how to format a
> hard disk under Linux or setting up a
> Wi-fi network).
> It becomes evident that there are 2
> classes of ham operators. Those born
> with CW and those born with SSB.
> Those born with CW bring nothing to
> amateur radio today, they are unable to
> use new technologies. So it will be

> reasonable to allow CW operators
> above 1 GHz only to limit the QRM with
> CW and called them "Dinosaur class" and
> the others called "Pioneer class" on
> all bands.
> When you see the new ICOM IC-7800 that
> has the PSK31 mode included, you
> understand that the new way for
> ham-radio is not CW. Happy death CW !
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

63. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 12:52:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Bs%0c.28452$W74.20907@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88177

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:QSU0c.29283$hm4.27852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) A person who doesn't want to
> > eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
> > them easily. (snip)
>
> Don't be a hypocrite, Jim. You know darn well if this was a Christian
> group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the
foods
> you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be
> screaming bloody murder. The only question remaining is why you're not
doing
> so in regards to this religion.
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight,
I live and grew up in probably the northeast which probably
has a population segment that is Jewish in far higher percentages
than most anywhere else. I see NO such claims that Jews
or anyone else are forcing, pushing or otherwise causing any
changes in availability of pork products. If I wanted to
totaly avoid Kosher labeled products I'd have NO problem
doing so. In fact, I can't even think of an area restaurant
that claims to be Kosher.

My local A&P and other supermarkets carry a wide array
of pork and shellfish products (did you know most shelfish
aren't Kosher?) I have NO problem in restaurants ordering
a ham and cheese sandwish anywhere...or bacon and eggs,
or sausage and pepers, or shrimp...etc. The fact is, around
here, restaurants would be nuts to try and limit there menu's
to be Kosher only. Are there some truly Kosher restaurants?
Absolutely...just as there are other specialty restaurants that
cater to specific ethinics foods (Italian, Chineese, Japanesse,
Thai, German, French, etc.)

You claim you can't order pork products anymore where
you live...or in many places...well one explanation for seeing
a reduction of pork products might also be the fact that
more people, Jews and Gentiles alike, just don't eat as
much pork. Jews for obvious Kosher reasons and Gentiles
because of the cholesterol concerns. As an aside, I have met
more than a handful of Jews who have no problem eating

non-kosher foods, including pork products.

One last point, you (Dwight) raise the question of "if this was a Christian group" doing the same aleged influencing of food availability? Well, to my Christian upbringing and personal religion to this day, I can think of NO dietary constraints that are a part of Christianity.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

64. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 13:38:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88178

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
>
> Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> goat doesn't it?
>

Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?

65. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 15:09:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4044A395.7010501@psu.edu>
Source record: 88179

Helmut wrote:
> Hi, Mike, Dwight, ... dont recallall the others so lets say:
>
> Hello newsgroup!
>
> I am ANGRY with you all. Disapointed, frustrated, you all are guilty of
> that.
>
> When I clicked on the post first, I expected a decend discussion about SEX.
>
> Can you Imagine me sitting in front of the screen, the drivel foaming out of
> my wide open mouth.
>
> Called my significant other and told her to sit down beside me, to see what
> exciting stuff will be written in this great newsgroup.
>
> What a disgrace!

Lesse what I can do here.......

oohh baby, ooohh baby.....oohhh baby....!

Sorry, but that's the best I can do. ;^)

- mike KB3EIA -

66. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 15:11:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4044A424.9060402@psu.edu>
Source record: 88180

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010744450.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>
>>On Thu, 26 Feb 2004, Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <xnfcneeyarg.htnfck3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil
>>
> Kane"
>
>>><Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>> "Liberty and justice for all" means we each get to do our own thing
>>>> without impinging on the rights of others.
>>>
>>> ...except in U.S. amateur radio where one MUST test for morse even
>>> though morse operation isn't a lawful mandate.
>>
>>Huh? Morse code IS a lawful mandate. It's just not an INTERNATIONAL
>
> mandate
>
>>anymore - which means that it CAN be removed as a [national] mandate;
>
> whether or
>
>>not it should be is the question that all the petitions argue and seek the
>>answer of.
>
>
> If you haven't yet noticed, Len Over 21 constantly and persistantly makes
> sarcastic and inane comments on code testing and code use. I highly
> recommend killfiling his posts.

I read and evaluate every post he makes, and comment on those worthy of
comment.

- Mike KB3EIA -

67. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 15:27:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4044A7CE.1040901@psu.edu>
Source record: 88181

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>(snip) A person who doesn't want to
>>eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
>>them easily. (snip)
>
>
>
> Don't be a hypocrite, Jim. You know darn well if this was a Christian
> group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the foods
> you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be
> screaming bloody murder.

How on earth do you "know" that?

If there were guidelines for "Christian" food, you can bet I would be
happy to manufacture food to their preparation requirements.

It's economics, not religion.

The only question remaining is why you're not doing
> so in regards to this religion.

It's economics, not religion.

The strange thing here is that you do not see something that was
deliberately and demonstrably included in the POA as a prayer as such,
but you see food voluntarily prepared to guidelines that allow one group
to purchase those foods - and are looked at by many others a a product
with a certain level of quality - as a religious thing.

Which is why I'm beginning to think that you are just having a joke on
us too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

68. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 15:33:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4044A954.4070108@psu.edu>
Source record: 88182

N2EY wrote:
> In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
>>Inflation starts anew!
>
>
> Mike,
>
> Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with Japan?

The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same, which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.

Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business will start charging more to offset the price rise......

69. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 17:06:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <O76dnfd747_AXdndRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88184

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
>>> error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
>>> amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
>>
>>Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
>>That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
>>goat doesn't it?
>>
>
>
> Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?

One a daily basis such as reporting traffic accidents, calling for an
ambulance, and other minor emergencies, probably, but in a major
disaster cell networks tend to become overloaded and useless. Ask the
emergency officals in NYC about 9/11. The cell phone networks were so
overloaded they were practically useless for any emergency efforts. That
is why the hams were called in. Your point is?

70. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 17:08:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sc31c.29697$hm4.13118@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88183

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> >
> > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > goat doesn't it?
>
> Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?

What's your point? The same can be said of many things.
Ham radio is still a service and considered by the FCC to
be of sufficient value as a service to warrant keeping it around.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

71. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 19:39:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Lp51c.9091$ny7.7373@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 88185

Yep,

Also note that this is why OPEC is cutting oil production. Their price is benchmarked to the US dollar and they have stated that the dollar is sinking so they have to raise prices. Given time, you may see more radios manufactured in the USA. Of course, few in the US will be able to afford them since we will be the cheap labor of the world. Give it about 10 or 15 more years.

Stay tuned to this one and see who blames whom for the mess that is likely to result.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4044A954.4070108@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> > >>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
> > >>Inflation starts anew!
> >
> >
> > Mike,
> >
> > Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with
Japan?
>
> The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the
> dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other
> countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same,
> which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.
>
> Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business
> will start charging more to offset the price rise......
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.605 / Virus Database: 385 - Release Date: 3/1/04

72. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 19:44:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403021144.46af1114@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88186

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A954.4070108@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
> >>Inflation starts anew!
> >
> >
> > Mike,
> >
> > Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with Japan?
>
> The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the
> dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other
> countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same,
> which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.
>
> Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business
> will start charging more to offset the price rise......

Makes ya wonder who REALLY won the war, doesn't it...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

73. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 19:54:40 UTC
From: Incognito <BLB@sero.net>
Message-ID: <4E51c.12472$id3.10366@fed1read01>
Source record: 88187

Where in Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regs -- do you see the word "Hobby" ?
(answer nowhere)

and where do you see the word "Service" ?
Quote Title " PART 97 AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE"

Now am I to believe you or the FCC ??

Here in San Diego, a ham hiker overdid it and was grossly dehydrated- his
cell phone was not able to make a connection

But a Ham repeater that covers all of San Diego county worked just fine SD
County is 4,261 square miles.

A helicopter was sent in and after several hours in a hospital the dry ham
recovered
Now would you call that a hobby or a service ??

This has happened time after time in disaster situations and as Walter
Cronkite stated "Amateur Radio is probably the only fail-safe communications
in the world"

It is of no importance as to the ratio of cell phone calls to ham radio 911
calls.
What is important and vital is that we have both - wouldn't you say ?

--
Incognito By Necessity (:-(

If you can't convince them, confuse them.
- - -Harry S Truman

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:sc31c.29697$hm4.13118@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com...
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy
that
> > > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> > >
> > > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.

> > > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets
your
> > > goat doesn't it?
> >
> > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
>
> What's your point? The same can be said of many things.
> Ham radio is still a service and considered by the FCC to
> be of sufficient value as a service to warrant keeping it around.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

74. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 19:56:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403021156.6e2d080e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88188

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> >
> > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > goat doesn't it?
> >
>
> Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?

Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
his way of skewing the results in his favor.

The FACT is that Amateur Radio DOES still offer that "...when the
chips are down" fall back, and judging by the support lent by so many
civil and governmental agencies, I dare the scumbag to deny it.

In THIS century, amidst the Internet, cellphones, spread spectrum
ad nauseum, Amateur Radio >>HAS<< helped to "save the day"...

Amateur Radio enjoys the same "reputation" that the Armed Forces
does today...for no matter how amazing our "shock and awe" weapons
are, we still depend on the basic infantryman to get the dirty work
done.

Well...Technology has it's flaws and vunerabilites, and more than
once in RECENT events Amateur Radio HAS been called upon to fill the
gaps until all that wizz-bangery can be returned to operational
status.

In short...it doesn't matter how many times that Amateur Radio has
"saved the day", the point is that it CONTINUES to do so, even in the
21st Century...

Sorry that the FACTS hike Lennie's skirt up. Of course when it
did, we found BurkieBoy UNDER Lennie's skirt!

As for you, Burke...Well...What can I say...?!?! You like
playing follow-the-loser, and I can see from your "comments" that you

do it well. I guess being an idiot is a learned trait...I just didn't think anyone would go out of thier way to do it!

Bully for you. A person has to do SOMETHING well, and I guess you've found your niche...

Steve, K4YZ

75. Re: Michael Powell in a bra - really

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 20:02:45 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <4044e84b.13250906@news.individual.de>
Source record: 88189

Thanks to a telecom poster, also from Puddletown:

http://www.wweek.com/story.php?story=4858

On 28 Feb 2004 02:36:44 -0800, johnbartley@email.com (John Bartley I solved my XP problems w/ Service Pack Linux) wrote:

>Yes, Michael Powell in a bra.
>
>Some telecom or computer magazine I've read within the past week had a
>B&W pic of the Chair of the FCC in a bra. I'd heard he wore it at
>some stag event, and wasn't surprised when I saw it; just trashed the
>magazine, and forgot about it.
>
>Now, I've read the Notice of Rulemaking for BPL (internet service over
>power lines), and need that picture, because there's nothing like
>sophomoric humor on the part of Powell to illustrate the cavalier way
>the FCC is approaching the issue.
>
>What issue?
>
>Go set your tune your hi-fi to AM, pick a spot between local stations,
>and turn up the vpolume about half way. Then, try to have a phone
>conversation over a bad cellular connection with your ear six inches
>from the speakers, and you will still have an easier time
>communicating than hams will when we experience the 16 db over S9
>interference already demonstrated by BPL.
>
>That interference explains why Austria and Japan already tried, then
>abandoned, BPL. However, this is 'the best government which lobbyist
>money can buy', so we get the FCC telling us in the Notice they expect
>power companies to fix the problems, the same power companies who
>already take *months* to resolve RFI (radio frequency interference)
>problems with existing tech.
>
>The burden of proof of the problem will be on the *ham*. How easy is
>it to talk to your power company? Hams know it gets much harder when
>interference problems arise.
>
>Hams have to buy all of our own gear to equip ourselves to be able to
>communicate in emergencies, and we're a part of just about every
>emergency plan there is.
>
>How many hams will learn the special skills needed for shortwave and
>longwave and make the investment of $$$$ to buy the gear, if all we

>get is static from BPL? You have to practice just like it's for real
>to be competent in something so demanding as passing radio traffic,
>and longwave & shortwave require very different skills than the VHF
>and UHF short-range frequencies which are unaffected by BPL.
>
>Folks, I need this pic to help me prove my point. Anyone remember
>what magazine that picture was in?
>
>Thanks, 73s and best regards,

--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

76. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 20:06:59 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <4044e8a1.13336656@news.individual.de>
Source record: 88190

Suggest you find your local ham radio store & local ham radio clubs.
Ask them all for attorneys who are hams.
Talk with those attorneys, who are your best choices.
All will know that, as long as your rig will stand inspection (i.e., no linears, legal output), that a letter to the power company will make this problem go away.

But, where are you, and which power comany is this? Are you in the Commonwealth?

Would appreciate you posting the entire letter here (redacting your address, of course).

On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 15:36:25 -0800, tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:

> Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
>have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
>letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
>operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
>know if what they are threatening me with is legal?
>

--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

77. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 20:09:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3qOdnVBHEdqUcdnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88191

Incognito wrote:
> Where in Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regs -- do you see the word "Hobby" ?
> (answer nowhere)
>
> and where do you see the word "Service" ?
> Quote Title " PART 97 AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE"
>
> Now am I to believe you or the FCC ??
>
> Here in San Diego, a ham hiker overdid it and was grossly dehydrated- his
> cell phone was not able to make a connection
>
> But a Ham repeater that covers all of San Diego county worked just fine SD
> County is 4,261 square miles.
>
> A helicopter was sent in and after several hours in a hospital the dry ham
> recovered
> Now would you call that a hobby or a service ??
>
> This has happened time after time in disaster situations and as Walter
> Cronkite stated "Amateur Radio is probably the only fail-safe communications
> in the world"
>
> It is of no importance as to the ratio of cell phone calls to ham radio 911
> calls.
> What is important and vital is that we have both - wouldn't you say ?
>
> --
> Incognito By Necessity (:-(
>
> If you can't convince them, confuse them.
> - - -Harry S Truman

We have to understand that there are those who envy ham radio and it's
long tradition to public servicea and it's ability to come to aid in
times of emergency, often being the only means of reliable
communications. These envious people are too lacking in knowledge or are
too lazy to do what is necessary to qualify for a ham license
themselves, so the best they can to is attempt to tear down an
institution that they cannot be, but desperatly want to be, a part of.

78. Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 20:34:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403021234.412f9f8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88192

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040301234719.05539.00004579@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <zYWdnWvo5dysnNndRVn-vw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Old man lennie blabbered:
> >>
> And Steve Robeson, K4CAP responded:
> >>
> >> "Infarct", Lennie...
>
> The familiar, shortened form of the word doesn't pronounce the T.

"Shortened form of the word"...?!?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
! ! ! !

Geeezus, Lennie! Do you REALLY think that that little two-step
hid the fact that you stepped on your wang AGAIN...?!?!

BBBWWWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
! ! !

You need a Taber's or Stedman's before you try to engage me on
any more medically related posts, ya dingbat!

> Doctor Killgore, the gunnery nurse, still can't sign "MD" behind
> her name. She isn't licensed to practice medicine without a
> real physician in charge. She will object strenuously to that in
> more tuff tawk, but that is to be expected.

"Tuff tawk"...?!?!

I don't need 12 years of doctoral level education to know you
made an idiot out of yourself AGAIN, and that you've COMPOUNDED the
error by trying to dance your way around having got your nose rubbed
in it!

> The gunnery nurse still can't legally put "MD" behind her name.

I don't need 12 years of doctoral level education to know you
made an idiot out of yourself AGAIN, and that you've COMPOUNDED the
error by trying to dance your way around having got your nose rubbed
in it!

> >It is very difficult to interfere with today's pacers, and interference
> >to one isn't going to cause a myocardial infarction. A story about

> >pacemakers and hams.
>
> That is irrelevant coming from a NOBODY, an ANONYMOUS
> troll who doesn't have the guts or the heart to identify herself.

The fact is they are correct.

The fact is that pacers are not necessarily placed for an MI.
There are numerous cardiac disease processes which may dictate a pacer
placement. See "sick sinus syndrome" as one example.

> Go ahead, make our day, put a pacemaker wearer right next to
> a mismatched 1 KW transmitter connected to an antenna with
> open-wire lines. Do you want to "experiment" with something
> that might kill a person? Would the gunnery nurse do that?

Heck no...But I know better...And I KNOW that an INFARCT is not
the only etiology that may mandate a pacer placement.

> You both would, of course, at least in messages. You guys are
> TUFF, strong, noble, good, and true, know everything (and know
> hardly anything).

In this case I certainly know more than you, Sir Scumbag!

> >So lennieboy, get your facts straight, some ham or any other transmitter
> >near a pacemaker wearer isn't going to cause them to suffer a heart
> >attack, as much as you would like to think it would so you could blame
> >all those nasty hams for killing people.
>
> I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." Just the PHONIES
> with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
> nurse candidates in search of a real self.

"Federal merit badges"...?!?!

You keep using that term, but other than being led back to YOUR
RRAP posts using it, I can't find ANY reference to it in ANY search
engine...

> >Now back to you room lennie and let some other resident of the home use
> >the computer, the nurse is waiting to give you your meds.
>
> Only in your fevered imagination ANONYMOUS ONE.

It doesn't take an MD to see that Lennie clearly ISN'T taking any
medications for his problems.

> My home IS restfull but only my wife and I (and three cats) live here.

Again we notice no reference to all those loving offspring that
you MUST have raised in order to have created an INFORMED opinion on
setting a mimimum age limit for Amateur Radio licensure.

> Nice 2000 square foot place in the hills. No "nurse" in attendance.

No doubt that no one wants the job...Not anyone with a penchant
for sanity, anyway...

> That's just the southern house, the one in California, the same postal
> address in all those Ham Radio magazine bylines. The northern
> house on the Puget Sound is even more restful...same size but nice
> pines all around...only two pines down here but 14 tall cypresses.
>
> Good health here, no heart problems.

A lack of a heart would negate any heart problems...In any case,
YOUR problems are clearly NOT cardiac in nature.

> I only counterattack the FAKERS, the ANONYMOUS trolls, the
> PRETENDERS, the GUTLESS ones who imagine they are radio
> amateurs of great toughness and resolve and superior to all others
> yet HIDE behind a pseudonym, AFRAID of truth.

WoooooBoy!

Leonard H. Anderson, well known PATHOLOGICAL LIAR and NEWSGROUP
ANTAGONIST ranting about "counterattack(ing) the FAKERS, the ANAYMOUS
trolls, the PRETENDERS, the GUTLESS ones...etc etc"

THIS from a PUTZ who has been caught MORE THAN ONCE generating
new screen names in this forum in order to make it appear as though he
has a wider support base than the few hanger's on who HAVE "supported"
him.

Let's look into that...We have Brain Burke...He's alleged to have
been "DX", yet can't/won't provide any evidence of the validity of his
claims...NOT ONE QSL card...Not one callsign of someone he "worked"
while "over there".

Of course Brain has also "proudly" claimed to be Lennie's padawan
learner, stating that Lennie's his "mentor"...Some mentor. Known liar
and cheat.

And Brain has further tried the "anonymous" poster trick, only to
follow in Lennie's shoes and slip up and put his "real" name to the
ending of one post, hence ending THAT charade. That's what happens
when ego overdrives common sense.

Then we had Vipul Shah...Vipul claimed to be an "electronics
engineer" who then quit when his family pressured him since being an
engineer is apparently a social failure...He's now disappeared into
the woodwork, having taken some obscure job that HE says his boss told
him would make him a pariah amongst his co-workers. I guess THAT is
"OK" in his culture...

Vipul too came here as an anonymous poster at first, but since he
generally followed Lennie's coattails, Lennie had NO problem with
accepting Vipul's "input" to the group.

He also came to the group shamefully hiding his Amateur Radio credentials since that too was obviously some social bugaboo...Hidden, of course, until I "outted" him.

Yeah...That's some circle that Lennie and Brain run in...

> YOU fit all those categories, "JJ."

It's too bad he won't identify himself, but it's even more a shame since I can't personally thank him (save for this forum) for so skillfully squashing Lennie's nads...Not that doing so requires a lot of effort! Lennie DOES make it sooooooooo easy to do!

> Now be good, little "JJ" or Mama Dee will spank you and take away
> your computer privileges until grade school is over for the summer.

Likewise, you lying, disgusting little wimp of a human...

You screwed up...You got caught, and rather than just shut up and move on, you tried to dig yourself out by making even MORE excuses. You made a fool of yourself and even further cemented your reputation as "Master Newsgroup Antagonist" in the process.

WHAT an IDIOT!

Steve, K4YZ

79. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 20:57:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aYmdnbVBmrA2Zdnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88193

Len Over 21 wrote:

> That is irrelevant coming from a NOBODY, an ANONYMOUS
> troll who doesn't have the guts or the heart to identify herself.

Herself? Boy, the senility is really setting in lennyboy. Now back to
the rec room for some fun with chair excersizes.

80. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 21:02:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <5ZudnRrK4qGZZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88194

Len Over 21 wrote:

elf.
>
> Go ahead, make our day, put a pacemaker wearer right next to
> a mismatched 1 KW transmitter connected to an antenna with
> open-wire lines. Do you want to "experiment" with something
> that might kill a person? Would the gunnery nurse do that?

Go re-read my post again about the ham and the pacemaker incident. A
pacemaker was placed next to the operating position of the hams station
and operated at the full legal limit. Nothing happened to the pacemaker.
Senility is really affecting your reading comprehension lennyboy.
Now go back to the front desk and ask the kind nurse to point you the
way to your room so you can lay down and get your afternoon nappie in.

81. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 21:05:05 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <5ZudnRXK4qFXZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88195

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." :-) Just the PHONIES
> with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
> nurse candidates in search of a real self. :-)

Your aren't even a ham, can't pass the test, have nothing to do with ham radio, so why would you even care?
Show me one ham with a federal merit badge.

82. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 21:46:30 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <c22vbm$lo4$1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 88196

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:
> On Thu, 26 Feb 2004 tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:
> > Hi, The local utility here has a ISP service via the power lines and I
> > have a CB station that I like to talk on at night. Yesterday I received a
> > letter from a law firm threatening to sue me if I don't cease my CB
> > operations in ten days. I don't run illegal amps or anything. Does anyone
> > know if what they are threatening me with is legal?

> Wrong group. Try "rec.radio.cb".

> Regardless, only the FCC has the ULTIMATE authority over radio services. There
> has been a recent change in the law authorizing state/local law enforcement some
> actionable authority, but if you are completely within the rules, then only the
> FCC's action matters.

Not really.

You're confusing laws with civil lawsuits.

If you want a real life example, the FAA is the ultimate authority over
what flies in the US.

In a lawsuit filed in Massachusetts, a group of homeowners are suing
some pilots who are operating within FAA requlations for damages due to
noise.

How this turns out should be of interest to hams as well as pilots.

It isn't much of a stretch to envision homeowners suing legally operating
hams for damages due to loss of view or some such thing.

For the story:

http://www.aopa.org/whatsnew/newsitems/2004/04-1-108x.html

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

83. Re: That QRM called CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 23:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040302181626.05957.00000815@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 88197

In article <170d16d3d5ba33fe07169a5cabbf95ef@remailer.metacolo.com>, Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> writes:

>When you see the new ICOM IC-7800 that
>has the PSK31 mode included, you
>understand that the new way for
>ham-radio is not CW. Happy death CW !

PSK-31? Hmmm, yet ANOTHER fossilized mode invented in the last century! Man, you really need to get out more!

Troll-O-Meter:

-20 -10 0 3 5 7 9 +10 +20 +40
||||||||||||||||||

73 de Larry, K3LT

84. Re: That QRM called CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 23:47:22 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <e291c.25502$ko6.221204@attbi_s02>
Source record: 88198

"Anonymous Sender"

AKA spineless ...

> As a SWL,

Spineless weasel leech .....

I heard some QRM on the
> lower frequencies of the ham bands.

Can your CB set go that far away from 11 meters ...

> There were short and long beeps but with
> irregular lengths (I checked that on an
> oscilloscope).

Is it the same one in your living room that you watch Bevis and Butthead
videos on ????

Finally I found an old
> military gay drunkard operator that

Saved your sorry ass many times over .....

told
> me that QRM was called CW and was
> supposed to be a digital communication
> mode.
> I asked him how this can be a digital
> communication mode with a so slow speed
> and no error control,

The only error control that you need was to read this simple post before it
went online.

amazing in the
> 21st century.
> He said that CW was invented at a time
> where people were not so clever to
> invent microprocessors, so operators
> with small brains could use CW.

Yep ...look what clever microprocessors got us .....postings like this ....

These
> operators are not yet all dead today
> unfortunately, so some
CW fossil signals

Ya know fun is fun but wishing the death of a group of people is sick and really shows the intellegence here.

> remain on the bands although new
> digital modes are far better, because
> the CW operators cannot use computers
> (they do not know neither how works a
> microprocessor nor how to format a
> hard disk under Linux or setting up a
> Wi-fi network).

I would suggest you get back and retake 6th grade English. The only reformatting that is needed here is to turn off the web porno ....get out of that dark room, move out of your mother's house and get a job ....then you may get an idea of what life really is about.

> It becomes evident that there are 2
> classes of ham operators. Those born
> with CW and those born with SSB.

Huh ??? And those wannabes who are too lazy to learn a 5 WPM pass .....

> Those born with CW bring nothing to
> amateur radio today, they are unable to
> use new technologies.

Just like you are unable to present an interesting argument save displaying your gross ignorance both in intellegence and social skills.

So it will be
> reasonable to allow CW operators
> above 1 GHz only to limit the QRM with
> CW and called them "Dinosaur class" and
> the others called "Pioneer class" on
> all bands.

If ham radio was turned over to the likes of your Pioneer class then I would be glad to spend my remaining ham life above 1 gig on CW.

> When you see the new ICOM IC-7800 that
> has the PSK31 mode included, you
> understand that the new way for
> ham-radio is not CW. Happy death CW !

Look SWLer .....either post in your native language or go reformat that hard drive. Again get in touch with your 6th grade teacher for some sentence structure work. There again is that "Happy Death CW" stuff. I really think that you need to remove those nose and tongue studs, get rid of those Gothic clothes and see a counseler about your death fixation. I use this newsgroup for a few minutes of diversion .... please the next time you post put a little more thought and effort in to things.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa .... and wishing you a happy and more fulfilled life than apparently you now have.

85. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 23:49:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <M391c.8035$t16.5113074@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88199

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040302060056.12501.00006536@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <QSU0c.29283$hm4.27852@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >>
> >> (snip) A person who doesn't want to
> >> eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
> >> them easily. (snip)
> >
> > Don't be a hypocrite, Jim.
>
> I'm not the one making unsubstantiated claims about a religious group,
Dwight.
>
> >You know darn well if this was a Christian
> >group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the
foods
> >you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would
be
> >screaming bloody murder.
>
> There you go again, assuming your own conclusion.
>
> You have repeatedly claimed that a particular religious group is "pushing"
and
> "manipulating" the foods "mainstream" Americans eat. But you have not
produced
> a single bit of evidence to back up such a wild claim.
>
> Now, you're claiming to know how others would behave if a different group
were
> allegedly doing the same alleged things.
>
> Do you have a crystal ball, Dwight? Are you omniscient?
>
> >The only question remaining is why you're not doing
> >so in regards to this religion.
>
> You mean your wild and unproven claims about "the Jews"?
>
> I'll explain it again, Dwight:

>
> You've repeatedly made claims here of 'pushing" and "manipulation" of
> "mainstream" America food here, and blamed "the Jews" for all of it,
without a
> shred of proof that it even exists. You refuse to answer simple questions
on
> your claims and deny conflicting evidence. Then you attack those of us who
> point out that Emperor Dwight has no logical clothes.
>
> Do you really believe all the guff you've posted here on the subject,
Dwight,
> or is this just some sort of really bad joke or troll? I mean - blaming a
> religious group for bad hot dogs!
>

I find Dwight's statements hard to believe also. Around here you have to go to a special isle to find the Kosher foods for the most part although a few are on the shelves next to the standard stuff and they are clearly labeled. None of the restaurants that I happen to go to even have Kosher items on the menu.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

86. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 23:53:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <z791c.8039$t16.5113624@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88200

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> >
> > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > goat doesn't it?
> >
>
> Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?

It doesn't matter if it is more or less. Both have been used and both are
valuable. We need to keep as many forms of communication as possible so
that there will be at least one, preferably more than one, mode available in
times of need.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

87. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-02 23:54:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88201

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4044A954.4070108@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
> >>Inflation starts anew!
> >
> >
> > Mike,
> >
> > Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with
Japan?
>
> The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the
> dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other
> countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same,
> which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.
>
> Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business
> will start charging more to offset the price rise......
>

And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return to
the US over time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

88. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 00:59:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040302195942.12631.00005311@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88202

In article <Bs%0c.28452$W74.20907@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I live and grew up in probably the northeast which probably
>has a population segment that is Jewish in far higher percentages
>than most anywhere else.

Same here, Bill, although New York City probably has the highest concentration.

>I see NO such claims that Jews
>or anyone else are forcing, pushing or otherwise causing any
>changes in availability of pork products.

Did you mean "evidence", Bill? Dwight is making the claim, but provides us with no evidence.

>If I wanted to
>totaly avoid Kosher labeled products I'd have NO problem
>doing so. In fact, I can't even think of an area restaurant
>that claims to be Kosher.

Nor can I.
>
>My local A&P and other supermarkets carry a wide array
>of pork and shellfish products (did you know most shelfish
>aren't Kosher?)

Yup - and a lot of other things cannot be certified kosher. Yet they're available.

>I have NO problem in restaurants ordering
>a ham and cheese sandwish anywhere...or bacon and eggs,
>or sausage and pepers, or shrimp...etc.

You're making me hungry, Bill!

>The fact is, around
>here, restaurants would be nuts to try and limit there menu's
>to be Kosher only. Are there some truly Kosher restaurants?
>Absolutely...just as there are other specialty restaurants that
>cater to specific ethinics foods (Italian, Chineese, Japanesse,
>Thai, German, French, etc.)

Don't forget Vietnamese, Korean, Portugese........

I could really go for some kim-chi about now...
>
>You claim you can't order pork products anymore where

>you live...or in many places...

But no solid evidence that things have really changed.

>well one explanation for seeing
>a reduction of pork products might also be the fact that
>more people, Jews and Gentiles alike, just don't eat as
>much pork. Jews for obvious Kosher reasons and Gentiles
>because of the cholesterol concerns.

IF per-capita pork consumption is down, that's one possible reason. Another is competition from other food products. When I was a kid, turkey was something you had at Thanksgiving and maybe Christmas. Now things like turkey sausage, turkeyburgers, and ground turkey are all over the place. Same with chicken.

I don't think Frank Perdue is Jewish, either.

>As an aside, I have met
>more than a handful of Jews who have no problem eating
>non-kosher foods, including pork products.

Of the many Jewish people I know, those who keep strictly kosher are a small minority.

>One last point, you (Dwight) raise the question of "if this
>was a Christian group" doing the same aleged influencing of
>food availability? Well, to my Christian upbringing and
>personal religion to this day, I can think of NO dietary
>constraints that are a part of Christianity.

Roman Catholics and meatless Fridays. Did they "push" fish on the rest of us?

73 de Jim, N2EY

89. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 02:24:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040302212404.00545.00004639@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 88203

In article <4044A7CE.1040901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) A person who doesn't want to
>>>eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
>>>them easily. (snip)

>> Don't be a hypocrite, Jim. You know darn well if this was a Christian
>> group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the
>> foods
>> you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be
>> screaming bloody murder.
>
> How on earth do you "know" that?

Same way he "knows" about the "pushing" and "manipulating"....

> If there were guidelines for "Christian" food, you can bet I would be
>happy to manufacture food to their preparation requirements.

No meat on Fridays?

> It's economics, not religion.

Bingo! (oh wait - isn't that a Catholic game?)
>
> The only question remaining is why you're not doing
>> so in regards to this religion.
>
> It's economics, not religion.

Businesspeople see a potential market, make products to serve that market,
people in that market buy the products, businesses make money in the process.

Watta concept, huh?
>
> The strange thing here is that you do not see something that was
>deliberately and demonstrably included in the POA as a prayer as such,
>but you see food voluntarily prepared to guidelines that allow one group
>to purchase those foods - and are looked at by many others a a product
>with a certain level of quality - as a religious thing.

And yet present no proof or evidence.
>
> Which is why I'm beginning to think that you are just having a joke on

>us too!
>
Except it's not at all funny.

73 de Jim, N2EY

90. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 02:45:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403021845.4b369c52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88204

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402210444.359c8bfb@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<403679E3.60A09E32@earthlink.net>...

> I did,
> > however, ask you how a licensed service can intentionally interfere with
> > a non-licensed producer of RF. You've not yet come up with a response.
>
> The same way you can communicate with French who had no license to
> operate where they were operating.

Hey Dave...here's MY interpretation of Brain's non-answer:

"I have no valid answer. I know that common sense precludes my
being able to render any effective response without further
demonstrating my ignorance and arrogance, hence I'll just make some
inappropriate insinuations and hope no one notices how foolish I
REALLY am. My sole purpose in this forum is to disrupt any meaningful
use of this forum, and to emulate my mentor, Lennie Anderson, a known
and documented pathological liar."

Hey Brain...did that pretty well sum it up?

Steve, K4YZ

91. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:00:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021900.46538513@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88205

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<O76dnfd747_AXdndRVn-hA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:

> > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
>
> One a daily basis such as reporting traffic accidents, calling for an
> ambulance, and other minor emergencies, probably, but in a major
> disaster cell networks tend to become overloaded and useless. Ask the
> emergency officals in NYC about 9/11. The cell phone networks were so
> overloaded they were practically useless for any emergency efforts. That
> is why the hams were called in. Your point is?

Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
news.

Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.

92. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:08:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021908.b72bff3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88206

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403021156.6e2d080e@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com>...
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> > >
> > > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > > goat doesn't it?
> > >
> >
> > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
>
> Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
> his way of skewing the results in his favor.

Oh, contraire!

Larry Roll has set up many a scenario where not only is amateur radio
the ONLY means to save the day, but only ONE particular mode is
suitable to save the day.

He's done it again and again.

Are we Not to believe Roll?

93. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:14:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021914.27de1f22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88207

"Helmut" <MyCallSign@QSL.net> wrote in message news:<c1t42d$3o5$02$1@news.t-online.com>...
> Billy,
>
> was he treated nicely before by "the world"? Maybe it's only a return favor.
>
> 73 de Helmut
> OE8SOQ

Helmut, only as nice as comments such as the below would bring:

1) ...welfare mothers of color with their hand out.

2) ...my favorite Black on the bus is the Driver. He's the only one with a job.

3) ...knuckle dragging trailer trash with a Southern accent.

94. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:16:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021916.7c6ff7f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88208

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402281708.7b98b291@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<LbS%b.25044$hm4.22211@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0402271219.2fdfbba2@posting.google.com...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0402251829.32a33ffc@posting.google.com>...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<7H5%b.21312$hm4.7983@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > Real hams. Not these wanabees we have today.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > Not real hams. Amateur Radio was suspended at the time, unless you
> > > > consider a real ham to be one without operating priveleges.
> > > >
> > > > And hopefully they weren't operating WAR using W3GRF, W0DX,
> > > > W9BRD/VA3ZBB, W0US, or other callsigns.
> > >
> > > Hey Dan, tell me about these wannabees we have today. C'mon Dan, tell
> > > me about them.
> > >
> > > If you unzip very slowly you might get your tie out w/o too much
> > > damage, hihi.
> > >
> >
> > Hey look everybody....another CBPlusser.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> DAn, I never held a license that said "plus" on it. You'll just have
> to do better than that.

Hey Dan, put on a fresh tie and try it again.

95. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:18:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88209

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
>
> Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay undr her nose to
> smotehr the stench?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?

96. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 03:20:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403021920.4223bd75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88210

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251839.1fb50c7c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402241901.64fa03b1@posting.google.com>...
> > "Flip-flop", Brain?
> >
> > How do you get that from the post (requoted in it's entirety
> > here)...???
>
> Posted with enough information that you just might get it.
>
> > The "disincentive" to which he refers is to taking a test for
> > which there is no REGULATORY requirement...
>
> The Morse Exam has been a regulatory requirement since 1912. TAFKA
> Rev Jim has fought to keep it a regulatory requirement while many
> others have called it a disincentive (obstacle, hurdle, etc). Now
> that you propose that the Morse Exam be kept for access to the lowest
> 100 KHz of each band, he says it's a disincentive.
>
> > Where's the "flip-flop", other than the ones you wear in the
> > shower?
>
> You stay out of my shower.
>
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Read it again, Steve.
>
> bb

Selective reading?

97. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 04:25:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <l8mdnWRoV7kA-djdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88211

William wrote:

>
> Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
> their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
> news.
>
> Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.

That is why the cell network was no good for any emergency assistance communications, it was people overloading the network to call someone to say they got out alive, calling everyone they knew to turn on the TV, ect. The cell network can't be counted on for emergency aid in such a crisis as everyone wants to use their phone for non emergency aid type calls. That is what I meant when I said in my post that cell networks tend to become overloaded so that they are practically useless for emergency aid, so of course there were many, many, many people making calls, that is why the network was overloaded - DUH. And the skyrocketing sales of cellular phones after 9/11 will assure that in the event of another such disaster, the network will be even more overloaded.

98. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 05:21:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <BXd1c.31162$hm4.19539@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88212

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040302195942.12631.00005311@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Bs%0c.28452$W74.20907@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I live and grew up in probably the northeast which probably
> >has a population segment that is Jewish in far higher percentages
> >than most anywhere else.
>
> Same here, Bill, although New York City probably has the highest
concentration.
>
> >I see NO such claims that Jews
> >or anyone else are forcing, pushing or otherwise causing any
> >changes in availability of pork products.
>
> Did you mean "evidence", Bill? Dwight is making the claim, but provides us
with
> no evidence.

Yep, should have said evidence. What was I thinking?

> >If I wanted to
> >totaly avoid Kosher labeled products I'd have NO problem
> >doing so. In fact, I can't even think of an area restaurant
> >that claims to be Kosher.
>
> Nor can I.
> >
> >My local A&P and other supermarkets carry a wide array
> >of pork and shellfish products (did you know most shelfish
> >aren't Kosher?)
>
> Yup - and a lot of other things cannot be certified kosher. Yet they're
> available.
>
> >I have NO problem in restaurants ordering
> >a ham and cheese sandwish anywhere...or bacon and eggs,
> >or sausage and pepers, or shrimp...etc.
>
> You're making me hungry, Bill!
>
> >The fact is, around
> >here, restaurants would be nuts to try and limit there menu's
> >to be Kosher only. Are there some truly Kosher restaurants?

> >Absolutely...just as there are other specialty restaurants that
> >cater to specific ethinics foods (Italian, Chineese, Japanesse,
> >Thai, German, French, etc.)
>
> Don't forget Vietnamese, Korean, Portugese........
>
> I could really go for some kim-chi about now...

My wife likes kim-chi but I can't get beyond the smell.

> >You claim you can't order pork products anymore where
> >you live...or in many places...
>
> But no solid evidence that things have really changed.

Exactly.

> >well one explanation for seeing
> >a reduction of pork products might also be the fact that
> >more people, Jews and Gentiles alike, just don't eat as
> >much pork. Jews for obvious Kosher reasons and Gentiles
> >because of the cholesterol concerns.
>
> *IF* per-capita pork consumption is down, that's one possible reason.
Another
> is competition from other food products. When I was a kid, turkey was
something
> you had at Thanksgiving and maybe Christmas. Now things like turkey
sausage,
> turkeyburgers, and ground turkey are all over the place. Same with
chicken.
>
> I don't think Frank Perdue is Jewish, either.
>
> >As an aside, I have met
> >more than a handful of Jews who have no problem eating
> >non-kosher foods, including pork products.
>
> Of the many Jewish people I know, those who keep strictly kosher are a
small
> minority.
>
> >One last point, you (Dwight) raise the question of "if this
> >was a Christian group" doing the same aleged influencing of
> >food availability? Well, to my Christian upbringing and
> >personal religion to this day, I can think of NO dietary
> >constraints that are a part of Christianity.
>
> Roman Catholics and meatless Fridays. Did they "push" fish on the rest of
us?

As a dietary law, meatless Fridays have pretty much gone by the wayside. meatless Fridays would also be analogous to only eating Kosher one day a week.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

99. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 05:25:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403022125.53018d22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88213

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<5ZudnRXK4qFXZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
> > I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." :-) Just the PHONIES
> > with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
> > nurse candidates in search of a real self. :-)
>
> Your aren't even a ham, can't pass the test, have nothing to do with ham
> radio, so why would you even care?
> Show me one ham with a federal merit badge.

TSBAKAL believes that his one and only appearance before an FCC
examiner in 1950-something was all that he should have ever had to
do...He passed THAT test, ergo he "knows it all" and should be exempt
from the laws that pertain to every other citizen.

What a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

100. Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 09:54:47 UTC
From: tom@wsd.SPAM
Message-ID: <104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 88214
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
of defending myself in a lawsuit.
I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

Tom

101. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 10:06:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <E6i1c.31298$hm4.3347@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88215

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> You have repeatedly claimed that
> a particular religious group is
> "pushing" and "manipulating" the
> foods "mainstream" Americans eat.
> But you have not produced a
> single bit of evidence to back up
> such a wild claim.

Of course I have, Jim. Are you going to sit there and claim no group whatsoever is pushing, urging, or whatever you want to call it, companies to make their products Kosher? Given that I've already listed one web site of a group doing exactly that, your claim would be absurd. And there are dozens of similar web sites (and probably more groups without web sites). The web site I listed talks about what is necessary to certify a product Kosher. That includes changes to or manipulation of both the preparation and handling of those food products. Given that this web sites claims 75,000 food products are now certified Kosher, are you going to deny that exists? As I stated earlier, no further evidence is needed from me - those reading can look in their own kitchen shelves for the small "K" on the product labels to discover which of the products they eat are certified Kosher. They can also decide for themselves if those products are limited to just "Jewish" foods like you claim or the mainsteam products we all eat.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

102. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 10:31:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%ti1c.31305$hm4.3939@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88216

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> I find Dwight's statements hard to
> believe also. Around here you
> have to go to a special isle to find
> the Kosher foods for the most part
> although a few are on the shelves
> next to the standard stuff and they
> are clearly labeled. (snip)

Actually, few products are clearly labeled, Dee. Go to your kitchen and look at the cans of soup, tomatoe sauce, tomatoe paste, and so on, for a very tiny "K" on the product label. Then go to one of the Kosher web sites to discover what that tiny "K" means (the same with the tiny "U," "P," "D," and similar symbols, on other products). Also note that we, the consumers, are paying for that Kosher certification and product labeling.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

103. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 11:30:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403030330.7c1545e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88217

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<l8mdnWRoV7kA-djdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> > Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
> > their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
> > news.
> >
> > Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.
>
> That is why the cell network was no good for any emergency assistance
> communications, it was people overloading the network to call someone to
> say they got out alive, calling everyone they knew to turn on the TV,
> ect. The cell network can't be counted on for emergency aid in such a
> crisis as everyone wants to use their phone for non emergency aid type
> calls. That is what I meant when I said in my post that cell networks
> tend to become overloaded so that they are practically useless for
> emergency aid, so of course there were many, many, many people making
> calls, that is why the network was overloaded - DUH. And the
> skyrocketing sales of cellular phones after 9/11 will assure that in the
> event of another such disaster, the network will be even more overloaded.

The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
using cellular telephones.

Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!

104. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 11:38:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040303063822.00545.00004644@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 88218

In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return to >the US over time.

I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more choosy about what they buy.

The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last week they seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of hamburger assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be classified as "manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's assembly, isn't it?

"No Millionaire Left Behind"

73 de Jim, N2EY

105. Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 12:52:54 UTC
From: Don Parker <parker287@no.spam>
Message-ID: <87017DP833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 88219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

A 1 Mb/sec feed in each direction for only $29.95 per month? That's what the press releases claim that Cinergy Electric can deliver right now.

BPL is a juggernaut that will not be stopped by the ARRL or anyone else. There's simply too much money in it.

And notice that this isn't rural service either. Probably not too surprising, since the claim of rural services is simply a pretense anyway. It's large cities like Cincinnati that the BPL proponents intended to service all along.

Goodbye to radio station WKRP, by the way. Nobody will be able to listen any more.

106. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 13:16:05 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88220
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it you're in the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer required a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a license when the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to Part 95 - which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air and talk. Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people who have no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to research that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or trying to defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on that issue. I can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't have money to pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your elected officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC website if you don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page of it, which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while you're at it. Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let them bull doze you over. CL

<tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
after
> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because
I
> do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
cost
> of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
last
> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities
> that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
>
> Tom
>

107. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 13:48:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <vml1c.31431$hm4.14786@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88221

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:%ti1c.31305$hm4.3939@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > I find Dwight's statements hard to
> > believe also. Around here you
> > have to go to a special isle to find
> > the Kosher foods for the most part
> > although a few are on the shelves
> > next to the standard stuff and they
> > are clearly labeled. (snip)
>
> Actually, few products are clearly labeled, Dee. Go to your kitchen and
> look at the cans of soup, tomatoe sauce, tomatoe paste, and so on, for a
> very tiny "K" on the product label. Then go to one of the Kosher web sites
> to discover what that tiny "K" means (the same with the tiny "U," "P,"
"D,"
> and similar symbols, on other products). Also note that we, the consumers,
> are paying for that Kosher certification and product labeling.

Are you suggesting that they ONLY can purchase Kosher products?
Is there someone holding you hostage such that you MUST buy the
particular brand of hot dogs that are Kosher?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

108. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 13:49:18 UTC
From: Jim Leder <k8cxm@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4045e25c$0$52150$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>
Source record: 88222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Unfortunately I agree. There is simply too much money backing BPL. The best we can hope for is to slow it down or at least apply enough pressure that the industry finds a way to clean it up. As it stands now, amateur radio as we know it is in grave danger.

"Don Parker" <parker287@no.spam> wrote in message news:87017DP833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> A 1 Mb/sec feed in each direction for only $29.95 per month? That's
> what the press releases claim that Cinergy Electric can deliver right
> now.
>
> BPL is a juggernaut that will not be stopped by the ARRL or anyone
> else. There's simply too much money in it.
>
> And notice that this isn't rural service either. Probably not too
> surprising, since the claim of rural services is simply a pretense
> anyway. It's large cities like Cincinnati that the BPL proponents
> intended to service all along.
>
> Goodbye to radio station WKRP, by the way. Nobody will be able to
> listen any more.

109. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 13:54:39 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <jlnb40pnhc32j58496dqeempf5l4eqpma5@4ax.com>
Source record: 88224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com>, tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:

> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
>here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
>looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
>do not have a FCC license.

If you are operating within the law then you are operating under FCC authorization. A ham license is another form of authorization, but a legal CB station is no less legal just because it doesn't require a license. However, you need to be more specific -- under what law (USC, CFR, state or local law) does he claim is being violated?

> I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
>house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
>of defending myself in a lawsuit.

Here in Spokane, Gonzaga provides legal help for people in pickles like your's, and many of these students are real go-getters. You might have a similar program at a law school near you.

> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
>week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
>Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
>that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

They can't shut down all the CBers in the city. Either you are kicking out too much RFI (and you may not know it), or there are a lot of other CBers in your area that are just as pissed off as you. If the latter is the case, you might think about contacting them and pooling your defensive efforts.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

110. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 13:55:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ftl1c.31434$hm4.6117@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88223

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:E6i1c.31298$hm4.3347@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > You have repeatedly claimed that
> > a particular religious group is
> > "pushing" and "manipulating" the
> > foods "mainstream" Americans eat.
> > But you have not produced a
> > single bit of evidence to back up
> > such a wild claim.
>
> Of course I have, Jim. Are you going to sit there and claim no group
> whatsoever is pushing, urging, or whatever you want to call it, companies
to
> make their products Kosher?

So what. No one forces any of those companies to listen or to
produce Kosher products just because a group wants it so.
The final arbiter of making a product Kosher is the marketplace...which
is as it should be.

> Given that I've already listed one web site of
> a group doing exactly that, your claim would be absurd. And there are
dozens
> of similar web sites (and probably more groups without web sites). The web
> site I listed talks about what is necessary to certify a product Kosher.

And just what about that web site bothers you? Should it
be prohibeted, banned, or otherwise outlawed? If yes, please
explain why?

> That includes changes to or manipulation of both the preparation and
> handling of those food products. Given that this web sites claims 75,000
> food products are now certified Kosher, are you going to deny that exists?

Who, other than you gives a hoot? What is it that really troubles
you? If you don't like products identified as Kosher certified, then
don't buy them.

> As I stated earlier, no further evidence is needed from me - those reading
> can look in their own kitchen shelves for the small "K" on the product
> labels to discover which of the products they eat are certified Kosher.

Again, so what. There's nothing illegal, immoral or unethical about
a company gaining Kosher certification if the company wants to

do so.

> They
> can also decide for themselves if those products are limited to just
> "Jewish" foods like you claim or the mainsteam products we all eat.

Many basic food staples can be certified Kosher as I understand it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

111. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 14:02:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88225

William wrote:

> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> using cellular telephones.

Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
latest peculiar theory?

> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!

How does a cellphone contest work?

Dave K8MN

112. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 14:04:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cCI1c.31439$hm4.7910@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88226

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040303063822.00545.00004644@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return
to
> >the US over time.
>
> I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more
choosy
> about what they buy.
>
> The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last week
they
> seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of hamburger
> assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be
classified as
> "manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's
assembly,
> isn't it?
>
> "No Millionaire Left Behind"

The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a global economy and that isn't going to change. The drastic reduction in costs of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't going to change in the short run. In the long run, those currently cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards. In the short run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.

In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

113. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 14:45:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030645.4cdd2b3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88227

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403021908.b72bff3@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403021156.6e2d080e@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com>...
> > > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> > > >
> > > > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > > > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > > > goat doesn't it?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> > > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
> >
> > Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
> > his way of skewing the results in his favor.
>
> Oh, contraire!
>
> Larry Roll has set up many a scenario where not only is amateur radio
> the ONLY means to save the day, but only ONE particular mode is
> suitable to save the day.
>
> He's done it again and again.
>
> Are we Not to believe Roll?

Sorry, Brain...

The post >>I<< responded to was from your douchebag friend.
Exact same is quoted verbatim above.

Don't divert the post in order to divert attention from YOUR
foolishness...THAT is already public information and beyond YOUR
control.

My post addressed NO ONE except your chief string puller and documented liar, Lennie the Loser. His post did EXACTLY what I claimed it to...to try ans skew results in such a way as to make him appear corect. He's not.

Try again, Puppet Boy.

Steve, K4YZ

114. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 14:50:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030650.81551cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88228

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<403FB731.5EFB1488@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:

> > So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.
>
> I submit that you don't know one end of a bat (baseball-type or the
> mammal) from the other.

Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
trying to score some points...And failing...

73

Steve, K4YZ

115. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 14:53:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030653.48e3d5ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88229

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay under her nose to
> > smother the stench?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?

I didn't set the parameters of the discussion, PuppetBoy.

This is all Lennie understands...It's all he wants...I am just
satisfying his need to be humiliated. Consider it a Good Samaritan
act.

Steve, K4YZ

116. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 15:04:21 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com>
Source record: 88230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
last
> >week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> >Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities
> >that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

Have you actually received one of these?
Has anyone you know received one?
If so, could you post a scan?

I'm very concerned about this, I'm in Muncie Indiana, not all that far from
you, and apparently we're next. I'm a ham, but I agree legal CB stations
have every right to be protected from interference coming from part 15
devices.

Like it or not, CB and Ham radio are both in the same pot this time, and
it's getting warmer.

This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference to
low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.

117. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 15:10:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030710.31ac4c5e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88231

"Helmut" <MyCallSign@QSL.net> wrote in message news:<c1t42d$3o5$02$1@news.t-online.com>...

> Billy...(SNIP)

His name is "Brian", Helmut, not Billy. Amateur call N0IMD.

This is just another screen name of his to keep folks guessing
which of his personalities is posting today!

73

Steve, K4YZ

118. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 15:23:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030723.106fdbe7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88232

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402291953.70e2fe22@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402291230.5da279ce@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >
> > > What belittlements, Stebe?
> >
> > You really need to ask? The you ARE the idiot I have surmised all along.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Such as your incessant use of "Brain" instead of using my name?
>
> And now you want to call me on the carpet for using TAFKA Rev. Jim???
>
> You just renewed your membership in the KMA Club.

I am not the one who sets the rules, Brain.

You make a fool out of yourself in a public forum...I
sarcastically call you "Brain" since you keep on doing it over and
over.

As for the "KMA" club, thanks...Sure is embarrassing having a
membership that much junior to YOURS, though....

Steve, K4YZ

119. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 15:25:02 UTC
From: Arnold <pigs@pink.floyd>
Message-ID: <iNm1c.41738$%d3.3921097@twister.southeast.rr.com>
Source record: 88233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, in rec.radio.amateur.policy,
tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> last week ...

Yeah but it's typical on USENET. A cease and desist letter WRT BPL is something new and everybody's troll alarm goes off. As another poster suggested, a scan of the letter would be interesting to see as we're all going to have to deal with this sooner or later, at least from the way things look now. No announcements of BPL roll-out for me yet, but the same company (Progress Energy) is doing trial runs in another city nearby so it's only a matter of time.

Good luck.

120. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 15:50:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88234

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402291810.30651b9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402281331.cf84a5d@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>...

> > > TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
> > > licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
> > > coded license. Bizarre.
> >
> > Question, Brain...
>
> Brain?
>
> > I have never seen Jim Miccolis refer to you as anything but
> > "Brian"...
>
> How is it that you misspell my name in one fragment sentence, and
> spell it correctly in another?

Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...It's about
why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
>>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?

That scumbag you run with likes to do that. Jim has never
refered to him as anything but "Len", yet "Len" finds countless ways
to belittle him.

Lennie does that because he cannot "argue" or "debate" Jim
otherwise. He has to make Jim appear less-than-adequate in order to
promote himself. The weak minded and the foolish HAVE to do
that...It's a defense mechanism.

Are YOU that weak minded and foolish?

He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
etc etc, when I had not so addressed him. He is treated and addressed
in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.

Is that how you feel? Do >>YOU<< need to belittle Jim in order
to effectively express yourself when discussing things with/about him?

Please do not humiliate yourself by trying to misdirect this
question by asking >>ME<< about how I address Lennie...I've already
answered that.

Stay focused...you were asked a direct, specific question.

You CAN answer direct, specific questions, can't you?

> > So WHY do YOU inisist on following the insulting and demeaning
> > example of a known pathological liar and antagonist in engaging in any
> > interaction with him...?!?!
>
> Stebe, you misunderstand (what's new?).
>
> I am the ONE who has tagged N2EY with the title "TAFKA Rev. Jim" after
> his dishonesty in altering Kim's posts. He previously put forth the
> image of being as pure as the driven snow. But after that little
> stunt, he can no longer be referred to as Reverend Jim. So, "formerly
> known as" sounded good to me.
>
> You got a problem with it?

I have a problem with you lying.

I have a problem with you following in the footsteps of a person
who is a known pathological liar and antagonist. It's embarrassing to
see a contemporary Veteran and Amateur licensee resorting to Lennie's
tactics.

As for what "sounded good to (you)"...My question STILL
remains...Did Jim refer to you by any name, title or endearment OTHER
than "Brian"...?!?!

If not, why do YOU find it necessary to do so...?!?!

> > Are you, after all, as shallow and immature as I thought you
> > really are?
>
> No. Perhaps even more so. Perhaps almost as much as you are.

Brain, you will NEVER be as much as I am...good OR bad.

> > Please give some specific example of how Jim has belittled or
> > demeaned YOU in a like manner...
>
> Why? Shallow and immature people don't have to follow your orders.

What "order", Brain...?!?!

I SAID "please"...And to have fulfilled my request would have only
served to explain why YOU find it necessary to be demeaning and
rude...>>OR<< have proven why you were right and I was wrong.

Instead, you choose to be even MORE argumentitive and demeaning,
even further cementing your reputation.

> Stebe, take a chill pill or whatever meds you forgot to take.

Uh huh....Just after you take your distemper shot, Brain, and
answer the question put to you. WHY do you find it necessary to be

rude and demeaning when no such epithets were addressed to you...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

PS: I will assume any answer to the question that attempts to redirect or obfuscate the response to be "I am unwilling to directly answer the question as I know the truth to be other than what I stated". Simple enough?

121. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:00:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030800.9a893a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88235

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dB80c.25757$W74.11044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1aaaab7e8d45f99e98968a@news.west.earthlink.net...
> > In article <eEY%b.25457$hm4.1309@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > >
> > >
> > > What I object to, Jim, is a religion, ANY religion, pushing to modify
> what
> > > we eat in this country to comform to their own religious beliefs and
> doing
> > > so in a somewhat less than forthright manner. I do not wish to live
> under
> > > the dietary rules of the Jewish religion, or the dietary rules of any
> other
> > > religion. But that is must certainly happening today. Jews refuse to eat
> > > pork. As a result, pork hot dogs, a tradition in this country for many
> > > decades, is being replaced with foul tasting "turkey" or "beef" hot
> dogs.
> > > Pork chops, another staple in this country for many years, have
> virtually
> > > disappeared from resturant menus. Ham, another favorite for many years,
> has
> > > also virtually disappeared from those same resturant menus. Based on the
> > > efforts to establish Kosher as the standard on grocery stores shelves,
> only
> > > a fool would think the decline in availability of all this food and the
> > > Jewish refusal to eat pork were just a mere coincidence.
> >
> >
> >
> > It's funny, but because of RedNecks similar in thought to people such as
> > yourself, there's not grits being served in resturants. I know they
> > aren't available in supermarkets, even in the Red Neck Cracker aisle
> >
> >
> > Funny how at Christmas time Chinese resturaunts are full, selling ham
> > and pork and Seafood. Why in act Dwight there are 20 Chinese resturants
> > along the Strip in Myrtle Beach alone. Funny how rants are always prven
> > wrong
>
> How about Italian Sausage & Pepper Heros?
> How about McDonald's Bacon (or sausage), Egg & Cheese McMuffin
>

> Cheers, and oops, I said I'd only weigh in once on this subject.

I certainly don't follow any special diets, although I find it interesting that those Jews held hostage in Entebbe, Uganda, that kept Kosher, did not suffer many of the ailments that other passengers did.

Many "religious" rites involving foods or drink usually have some valid historical basis behind them. In Biblical times, the knowledge (and certainly the means) to properly store and prepare pork products was not there...hence people who ate pork products routinely became ill, even died.

The drinking of wine in Christian and Jewish faiths also has historical basis...Drinking water was often brackish or otherwise unfit...Wine and beer, however, had been fermented, and many of the offending bateria had been unwittingly purged from the brew in the process...

'mazen, ain't it...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

122. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:03:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030803.d7c237b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88236

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040227152211.11022.00004414@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <403E1E16.5A19BD3A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Lots of us have long noted your civil behavior and your gracious manner
> >:-) :-) :-)
>
> ...and yours.

Oh NO, Lennie...on THIS stage the bows are ALL YOURS!

Steve and the Boys

123. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:11:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403030811.783d0439@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88237

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251850.160d4e3d@posting.google.com>...
> "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>...

> > Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
> > manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
> > vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
>
> They only dump the showboats on the USA because Bill Clinton/Algore
> forgot to renew the EPA Fleet Miles Per Gallon requirements. They
> were [expletive deleted] idiots. So much for "Earth in the Balance!"

And if they HAD signed it, we'd just have more expensive BMW's
and Mercedes here since the cost of the additional engineering would
be passed on to the consumer...And American's WOULD pay it...

People once said that Americans would stop smoking once the price
of cigs went over $2.00/pk...well, it's been that way for a long time,
save for a few cheap "generic" brands, and the "name brands" don't
seem to be in any distress.

Americans like what they like, and will pay to get what they
like. That's a "consumer driven" market.

73

Steve, K4YZ

124. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:56:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40460E44.5010200@psu.edu>
Source record: 88238

N2EY wrote:
> In article <4044A7CE.1040901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>(snip) A person who doesn't want to
>>>>eat kosher-certified foods can avoid
>>>>them easily. (snip)
>>>
>
>
>>> Don't be a hypocrite, Jim. You know darn well if this was a Christian
>>>group, or some other religion, pushing for manufacturers to change the
>>>foods
>>>you routinely eat to comply with their own religious beliefs, you would be
>>>screaming bloody murder.
>>
>> How on earth do you "know" that?
>
>
> Same way he "knows" about the "pushing" and "manipulating"....
>
>
>> If there were guidelines for "Christian" food, you can bet I would be
>>happy to manufacture food to their preparation requirements.
>
>
> No meat on Fridays?

Welll... if I can find a way to manufacture that!!!!!! ;^)

>> It's economics, not religion.
>
>
> Bingo! (oh wait - isn't that a Catholic game?)

And voulunteer fire companies!

>> The only question remaining is why you're not doing
>>
>>>so in regards to this religion.
>>
>> It's economics, not religion.

>
>
> Businesspeople see a potential market, make products to serve that market,
> people in that market buy the products, businesses make money in the process.
>
> Watta concept, huh?

Kinda the American way!

>
>> The strange thing here is that you do not see something that was
>>deliberately and demonstrably included in the POA as a prayer as such,
>>but you see food voluntarily prepared to guidelines that allow one group
>>to purchase those foods - and are looked at by many others a a product
>>with a certain level of quality - as a religious thing.
>
>
> And yet present no proof or evidence.
>
>> Which is why I'm beginning to think that you are just having a joke on
>>us too!
>>>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

No, no it isn't.

- mike KB3EIA -

125. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:58:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40460EAC.9070303@psu.edu>
Source record: 88241

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message

> My wife likes kim-chi but I can't get beyond the smell.

Ahh, there's the problem Bill. You have to get in front of the smell!
It is kind of nasty stuff, isn't it?

- Mike KB3EIA -

126. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:59:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040303115944.05539.00004590@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88240

In article <%ti1c.31305$hm4.3939@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>Actually, few products are clearly labeled, Dee. Go to your kitchen and
>look at the cans of soup, tomatoe sauce, tomatoe paste, and so on, for a
>very tiny "K" on the product label.

That's perfectly clear. I knew what it meant more than 40 years ago.

Would you prefer the word "KOSHER" in big letters?

>Then go to one of the Kosher web sites
>to discover what that tiny "K" means (the same with the tiny "U," "P," "D,"
>and similar symbols, on other products). Also note that we, the consumers,
>are paying for that Kosher certification and product labeling.

Then explain to me why the Empire kosher ground turkey I bought last week was *less expensive* (by 70 cents a pound) and *fresher* (later expiration date) than the Perdue ground turkey in the same size package in the same store.

How much do you think it costs the manufacturer to get a jar of Miracle Whip certified?

127. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 16:59:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040303115945.05539.00004591@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88239

In article <E6i1c.31298$hm4.3347@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> You have repeatedly claimed that
>> a particular religious group is
>> "pushing" and "manipulating" the
>> foods "mainstream" Americans eat.
>> But you have not produced a
>> single bit of evidence to back up
>> such a wild claim.

> Of course I have, Jim.

Where? All I see are your claims that certain foods are not as available today as they were 30 or 40 years ago. Others don't have any trouble finding the foods you say are disappearing.

>Are you going to sit there and claim no group
>whatsoever is pushing, urging, or whatever you want to call it, companies to
>make their products Kosher?

YOU used the words "pushing", "manipulating" and "literally shoving down the throats".

>Given that I've already listed one web site of
>a group doing exactly that, your claim would be absurd.

The group outlines what is necessary for certification. That's not "pushing" or "manipulating".

>And there are dozens
>of similar web sites (and probably more groups without web sites). The web
>site I listed talks about what is necessary to certify a product Kosher.

Sure. It simply says "if you want to be certified kosher, here's what you need to do".

>That includes changes to or manipulation of both the preparation and
>handling of those food products.

Now you're being absurd.

>Given that this web sites claims 75,000
>food products are now certified Kosher, are you going to deny that exists?

I don't see the "pushing".

>As I stated earlier, no further evidence is needed from me - those reading
>can look in their own kitchen shelves for the small "K" on the product
>labels to discover which of the products they eat are certified Kosher.

What's the problem with that? They can also find products that are not
certified.

> They
>can also decide for themselves if those products are limited to just
>"Jewish" foods like you claim or the mainsteam products we all eat.
>
WHOA!

Where did I claim that the certification is limited to "Jewish" foods?

btw, here in the USA, being Jewish is "mainstream". Just like a lot of other
religions and ethnicities.

This bad joke of yours is not funny, Dwight. Never was.

128. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:09:00 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c253fc$646$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 88242

JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc) writes:
> William wrote:
>
>>
>> Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
>> their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
>> news.
>>
>> Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.
>
> That is why the cell network was no good for any emergency assistance
> communications, it was people overloading the network to call someone to
> say they got out alive, calling everyone they knew to turn on the TV,
> ect. The cell network can't be counted on for emergency aid in such a
> crisis as everyone wants to use their phone for non emergency aid type
> calls. That is what I meant when I said in my post that cell networks
> tend to become overloaded so that they are practically useless for
> emergency aid, so of course there were many, many, many people making
> calls, that is why the network was overloaded - DUH. And the
> skyrocketing sales of cellular phones after 9/11 will assure that in the
> event of another such disaster, the network will be even more overloaded.
>
That holds for virtually any "service".

Electric companies do not want to invest in too much equipment that will
sit idle most of the time, so they can have problems when there is a sudden
temporary surge in useage. But such surges are uncommon, so it would be a
waste to have capacity at all times to deal with them.

The phone companies do pretty well most of the time, but on peak days,
like holidays, they may suffere a lack of bandwidth. Again, it's not worth
having that much bandwidth available at all times when it would usually sit
unused.

Many ISPs offer "unlimited" hours, but if everyone tried to get on for
all those hours, it would break down. Likewise, they will not have a phone
line for every single user. It works because not everyone uses as much
time as others, and not everyone wants to call in at the same time.

And that's where amateur radio comes in. Emergency preparedness is
always a gamble. Do we spend money on something that will see little
or no use, just in case of an emergency, or do we spend the money on
necessities, and risk not being able to handle emergencies?

If there is an "auxiliary" who have their own radios (saves money)
and has some ability in using those radios (saves staff) then that

money does not have to be spent "just in case". If there is never an emergency, hams will go on because their interest is not primarily in providing emergency communication. It is a hobby, which means they should get more practical use with the radios than if they took a training weekend once a year. They want the radios for their hobby, so they gladly pay for the equipment.

But just as an electric company can usually buy power from another company on the grid when there is a surge in demand, amateur radio is there to draw on when an emergency comes up that cannot be handled with regular equipment and staff.

Michael VE2BVW

129. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:11:14 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 88243

Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> William wrote:
>
>> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
>> using cellular telephones.
>
> Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> latest peculiar theory?
>
>> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
>
> How does a cellphone contest work?
>
> Dave K8MN

This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone lines.

I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.

Michael

130. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:31:29 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <cEo1c.7344$5M.247412@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88244
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote in message
news:P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com...

<snipped>

> This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference to
> low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.
>

Our Fire Departments here in this county, all operate on the VHF LOW band. A few counties around us also operating on the low band albeit a different frequency were recently with in the last couple years, either bumped up to 800 MHz or are working on it. To some extent they do still operate on low band, but more so the 800 MHz. Now our county is looking at 800 MHz. I have to wonder since no real reason is ever offered, if it is because we're being "pushed" to 800 MHz to allow the BPL to come in so as not to interfere with any current users of Low Band. Also, with everyone being pushed to 800 MHz, sooner or later, it is going to get really crowded. I read one article from a reputable source stating it is already a problem due to get worse. Geee, how about that. What they also don't consider is many of the "volunteer" departments are hurting now. To have to buy new equipment, is not always cheap. In this case, we're talking going from low band to 800 MHz. So, we'll need a base, x amount of mobiles, portables and perhaps pagers. LOTS OF CASH! While our department isn't too bad off financially, the one up the road from us will die instantly with that kind of a crushing blow. Our radios and pagers are all within 4 years old. They're still using a base radio from the 50s. I know, I"ve seen it myself. These people in the upper echelons need to stop and think about the havoc they're playing with many issues, not just one. CL

131. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:42:30 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <c255e6hgk1@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 88245

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@noearthlinkspam.net> wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > I find Dwight's statements hard to
> > believe also. Around here you
> > have to go to a special isle to find
> > the Kosher foods for the most part
> > although a few are on the shelves
> > next to the standard stuff and they
> > are clearly labeled. (snip)

> Actually, few products are clearly labeled, Dee. Go to your kitchen and
> look at the cans of soup, tomatoe sauce, tomatoe paste, and so on, for a
> very tiny "K" on the product label. Then go to one of the Kosher web sites
> to discover what that tiny "K" means (the same with the tiny "U," "P," "D,"
> and similar symbols, on other products). Also note that we, the consumers,
> are paying for that Kosher certification and product labeling.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Since I have no dietary restrictions, religious or medical, I have never
bothered to look for the presence of such labels though I have always
known they exist.

I buy on quality and price only.

An inspection of the goods in the cupboard reveals a mix of labeled and
non labeled items, even among like items such as tomatoe sauce.

I cook a lot of Italian and have a LOT of tomatoe stuff on hand.

Conclusions:

Kosher certification has little, if any, effect on the cost of food.

There are plenty of non certified products available for the rabid
conspiracy loonies to buy.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

132. Re: Lennie Steps In Steve Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:47:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403030947.4e231b92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88246

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403021234.412f9f8e@posting.google.com>...

> And Brain has further tried the "anonymous" poster trick, only to
> follow in Lennie's shoes and slip up and put his "real" name to the
> ending of one post, hence ending THAT charade. That's what happens
> when ego overdrives common sense.

Steve, is this what you call rational discussion???

Anonymous posting is no charade. Since using my throwaway e-mail account (billybeeper), my regular e-mail account is down about 70 spam messages a day.

And my name is BrIan. Here's a little trick to help you remember: I before A except after Y.

133. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:50:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403030950.60f20be1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88247

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A424.9060402@psu.edu>...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:

I highly
> > recommend killfiling his posts.
>
> I read and evaluate every post he makes, and comment on those worthy of
> comment.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, freethinking will get you nowhere. Killfile him NOW or western
civilization will end.

;^)

bb

134. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:52:02 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403030952.56ecb0e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote:
>From: tom@wsd.SPAM
>=A0=A0I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
>here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
>after looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
>because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
>from the house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
>of the cost of defending myself in a lawsuit.
>=A0=A0I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
>here last week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
>experience. Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
>against the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out
>cease and desist letters
>Tom
>_
>Get your entry level hammie license,

ike you did, twistydave?

> then the utility company has to fix
>their interference to you. It's the best fix and the cheapest. Even if
>you never use the license, it's good insurance.

Yes a ham license good insurance for a freebander and amp user like you twistydave.

135. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 17:54:20 UTC
From: jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com
Message-ID: <c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com>
Source record: 88249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
> do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
> of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
> that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

> Tom

I still think this is a troll, but...

If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about telecommunications
law.

The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for anything.

That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard by
a court.

If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be interested.
Send the FCC a copy.

--
Jim Pennino

Remove -spam-sux to reply.

136. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140641.25517.00004576@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88103

In article <1e4e3692.0403030950.60f20be1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A424.9060402@psu.edu>...
>> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> I highly
>> > recommend killfiling his posts.
>>
>> I read and evaluate every post he makes, and comment on those worthy of
>> comment.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>Mike, freethinking will get you nowhere. Killfile him NOW or western
>civilization will end.

Right! Keep the low level of Independent Thought...do not let it
interfere with the strong signals of consistent tradition that keeps
the standards and practices of the 1930s forever set in concrete
in this new millennium.

CW (Conventional Wisdom) forever! :-)

LHA / WMD

137. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140641.25517.00004577@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88250

In article <ftl1c.31434$hm4.6117@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> They
>> can also decide for themselves if those products are limited to just
>> "Jewish" foods like you claim or the mainsteam products we all eat.
>
>Many basic food staples can be certified Kosher as I understand it.

Is that in the Morris Kosher Kode? :-)

Oy gevalt!

LHA / WMD

138. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140642.25517.00004579@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88101

In article <BXd1c.31162$hm4.19539@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>As a dietary law, meatless Fridays have pretty much gone by the
>wayside. meatless Fridays would also be analogous to only
>eating Kosher one day a week.

Unorthodox! :-)

139. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140642.25517.00004578@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88102

In article <1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay undr her nose to
>> smotehr the stench?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?

The worst part is he can't even hold hisself together long enough to
type properly... :-)

["undr"..."smotehr"...typical rage symptoms shown many times]

LHA / WMD

140. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140643.25517.00004580@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88105

In article <5ZudnRrK4qGZZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:

>Go re-read my post again about the ham and the pacemaker incident. A
>pacemaker was placed next to the operating position of the hams station
>and operated at the full legal limit. Nothing happened to the pacemaker.

Anonymous source of unreferenceable news, anonymous none?

You really shouldn't make up those stories. They aren't believable
and they have no references for anyone to check validity.

>Senility is really affecting your reading comprehension lennyboy.

Now, now, Anonymous None, be careful or you will lose fantasy
and imagination privileges... :-)

LHA / WMD

141. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 19:06:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303140644.25517.00004581@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88104

In article <1e4e3692.0403021900.46538513@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<O76dnfd747_AXdndRVn-hA@gbronline.com>...
>> William wrote:
>
>> > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
>> > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
>>
>> One a daily basis such as reporting traffic accidents, calling for an
>> ambulance, and other minor emergencies, probably, but in a major
>> disaster cell networks tend to become overloaded and useless. Ask the
>> emergency officals in NYC about 9/11. The cell phone networks were so
>> overloaded they were practically useless for any emergency efforts. That
>> is why the hams were called in. Your point is?
>
>Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
>their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
>news.
>
>Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.

Go easy on the Anonymous Advanced...

He isn't fully checked into the Witness Protection Program... :-)

LHA / WMD

142. Re: Hamfest any good for a pirate to go to?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:03:50 UTC
From: mooninpappa <mich@mooninpappa.com>
Message-ID: <c25dn2oso1@news8.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 88106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate

If you like radio in any guise you will love the hamfest days out!
Loads of junk and stuff. I came across an FM exciter tx with home brew 35 watt PA for £5
If there is any gear there the hams ain't interested so it's usually cheap!
Plus in the UK, in theory any court/ RA/ seized gear, is sold to hams for dismantling and experimental use at such events, worth keeping an eye out.

143. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:17:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40463D74.7080404@psu.edu>
Source record: 88107

Dave Heil wrote:
> William wrote:
>
>
>>The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
>>using cellular telephones.
>
>
> Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> latest peculiar theory?
>
>
>>Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
>
>
> How does a cellphone contest work?

The first annual cell phone contest:

March 6-7, 2004

The object of the contest is to demonstrate as many cell phone activities as possible during the 24 hour period of the contest.

The exchange is "I am (give location), I am going to (give location(, and I will be there in (give estimated time) minutes. Buh-bye!" Of course, all the contacts must start with "can you hear me?...Can you hear me now?

Points are scored by number of contacts, but what really pumps the score up is the multipliers:

X2 multiplier for operating while driving.

X2 Multiplier for driving at least 15 mph over the speed limit while driving

A multiplier is achieved for each red light you drive through while talking.

Accidents you cause while talking achieve a X5 multiplier!

If you use your cell phone to send pix of the accident you caused while on the phone, you get an X10 multiplier!!!

No artificial aids are allowed. This means no headsets. Use you phone like God meant you to Right up to the ear.

Anyone found using a voice dialer is instantly disqualified. Besides, those artificial aids interfere with you collecting the really big mult's!

144. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:30:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40464083.8060604@psu.edu>
Source record: 88108

N2EY wrote:
> In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>
>>And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return to
>>the US over time.
>
>
> I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more choosy
> about what they buy.
>
> The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last week they
> seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of hamburger
> assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be classified as
> "manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's assembly,
> isn't it?

http://www.connpost.com/Stories/0,1413,96~3754~1987510,00.html

It's worth a read!

- Mike KB3EIA -

145. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:34:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4046415D.3080803@psu.edu>
Source record: 88109

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:4044A954.4070108@psu.edu...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
>>>>Inflation starts anew!
>>>
>>>
>>>Mike,
>>>
>>>Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with
>>
> Japan?
>
>>The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the
>>dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other
>>countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same,
>>which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.
>>
>>Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business
>>will start charging more to offset the price rise......
>>
>
>
> And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return to
> the US over time.

I would sure hope so. I fear for our country as we send our
manufacturing and skilled jobs overseas, and retain our burger flippers
and money shuffling jobs here.

No disrespect towards burger flipping - it's just that that is more and
more becoming one of the choices for people trained in other fields.

- Mike KB3EIA -

146. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:57:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404646A8.6020802@psu.edu>
Source record: 88110

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>
> I certainly don't follow any special diets, although I find it
> interesting that those Jews held hostage in Entebbe, Uganda, that kept
> Kosher, did not suffer many of the ailments that other passengers did.
>
> Many "religious" rites involving foods or drink usually have some
> valid historical basis behind them. In Biblical times, the knowledge
> (and certainly the means) to properly store and prepare pork products
> was not there...hence people who ate pork products routinely became
> ill, even died.

100 percent correct. If you look at the similarities between
the Kosher and Moslem food preparation and forbidden food guidelines,
you can see that it is more of a regional thing than a religion issue.

All the forbidden items are potential problems, with things like
trichinosis or shellfish toxins for instance. So it is more a social
thing, AFAIAC.
And the food preparation for the most part is common sense, or at least
a sort of rough guideline for sanitation/keeping incompatible things
from each other.

I dunno about the business of meat and milk tho'.

>
> The drinking of wine in Christian and Jewish faiths also has
> historical basis...Drinking water was often brackish or otherwise
> unfit...Wine and beer, however, had been fermented, and many of the
> offending bateria had been unwittingly purged from the brew in the
> process...
>
> 'mazen, ain't it...?!?!

"Beer is proof that God loves you and wants you to be happy."

Benjamin Franklin

- Mike KB3EIA -

147. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 20:58:47 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ZsOdnY-z0MPI1dvdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88111

William wrote:

>
> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> using cellular telephones.
>
> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!

The NYC emergency officials sure were not relying on individuals with
cell phones and the cell network to handle emergency communications,
that is why they called the hams to assist.

148. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 21:17:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303161720.13960.00001023@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 88112

In article <5c01b95b.0403030803.d7c237b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

[signature -]

>Steve and the Boys

A new rock group? Gay men's association? What?

Oh, of course! An animus "warning!" :-)

The Kode Klux Klan is out to take Action against the evil heretics against their beloved Kode!

It's a Ride! All can hear the roaring of their mighty motor mouths down the Internet highway!

Mighty white men, their pudgy bodies encased in leather of self-righteousness, glower fiercely through their shade blinders as they gun their motor mouth throttles into high RPMs (Rage Per Message)!

Roar! Roar! Hog heaven for Koded Hams!

Ho hum... :-)

LHA / WMD

149. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 21:17:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303161722.13960.00001024@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 88113

In article <c253fc$646$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>, et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) writes:

>JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc) writes:
>> William wrote:
>>
>>> Many, many, many, many, many people claimed to have successfully used
>>> their cellular telephones fleeing from the Twin Towers. It was in the
>>> news.
>>>
>>> Post 9/11, sales of cellular phones skyrocketted. It was in the news.
>>
>> That is why the cell network was no good for any emergency assistance
>> communications, it was people overloading the network to call someone to
>> say they got out alive, calling everyone they knew to turn on the TV,
>> ect. The cell network can't be counted on for emergency aid in such a
>> crisis as everyone wants to use their phone for non emergency aid type
>> calls. That is what I meant when I said in my post that cell networks
>> tend to become overloaded so that they are practically useless for
>> emergency aid, so of course there were many, many, many people making
>> calls, that is why the network was overloaded - DUH. And the
>> skyrocketing sales of cellular phones after 9/11 will assure that in the
>> event of another such disaster, the network will be even more overloaded.
>>
>That holds for virtually any "service".
>
>Electric companies do not want to invest in too much equipment that will
>sit idle most of the time, so they can have problems when there is a sudden
>temporary surge in useage. But such surges are uncommon, so it would be a
>waste to have capacity at all times to deal with them.
>
>The phone companies do pretty well most of the time, but on peak days,
>like holidays, they may suffere a lack of bandwidth. Again, it's not worth
>having that much bandwidth available at all times when it would usually sit
>unused.
>
>Many ISPs offer "unlimited" hours, but if everyone tried to get on for
>all those hours, it would break down. Likewise, they will not have a phone
>line for every single user. It works because not everyone uses as much
>time as others, and not everyone wants to call in at the same time.
>
>And that's where amateur radio comes in. Emergency preparedness is
>always a gamble. Do we spend money on something that will see little
>or no use, just in case of an emergency, or do we spend the money on

>necessities, and risk not being able to handle emergencies?

The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment
to individual training.

Mobile installations have only to start a vehicle to restore electric
power to radios installed therein. However, if a fire or mudslide
destroys that vehicle, then it is useless for the intended emergency.
A "shack" in the residence is only as good as the building or
external electric service allows...amateur radio equipment is largely
"consumer grade" electronics that cannot withstand a wide range
of environments possible in a natural disaster.

>If there is an "auxiliary" who have their own radios (saves money)
>and has some ability in using those radios (saves staff) then that
>money does not have to be spent "just in case".

The California state Auxilliary Communications Service is organized
to use ALL available communications facilities, landline or radio. It
has proven itself well over the last decade through several natural
disaster emergencies. The California ACS does not require members
to hold amateur radio licenses.

Disaster planning need not spend millions to install new equipment
everywhere. The number of utilizeable means of communications
are many and varied: Public service, medical, utility, business radio
services already have millions of two-way radios installed and in use
covering VHF to UHF; telephone infrastructure exchange linking is
done by both landlines (wire and/or fiber) and microwave, the landlines
often doubled-up over dual routes; in California alone there are
thousands of leased lines that never go through switches, such as the
various public safety alert circuits for fire departments, all of which can
be utilized in extreme emergencies; the U.S. government already has
a thousand different HF stations operating in SHARES, not affiliated
with the U.S. military and that is branching off to work directly with
the new Department of Homeland Security; the U.S. military has an
enormous reservoir of communications equipment and facilities in
both the states' National Guards and active military, such equipment
covering the spectrum from LF to microwaves, radio relay to tropo-
scatter to communications satellite relay in addition to conventional
radio propagation means; there is a moderate reservoir of "private"
land mobile radio services that covers business radios to private boat
owners which can be pressed into use during extreme emergencies;
millions of no-license-required two-way radios such as CB or FRS
types can also be utilized in extreme emergencies.

Few amateur radio licensees are aware of anything but the last.
The general thinking is that all communications was set in the
1950s style with the exception of cellular telephony which they claim
"always fails in every emergency."

>If there is never
>an emergency, hams will go on because their interest is not primarily
>in providing emergency communication. It is a hobby, which means they
>should get more practical use with the radios than if they took a training
>weekend once a year. They want the radios for their hobby, so they gladly
>pay for the equipment.

Imagination, fantasy, and wishful thinking are all free and those items
are in great operational use as hams rationalize their expenditures
and boast of their "emergency preparedness" and "homeland security"
"service" as if all they do IS emergency service ALL the time. :-)

>But just as an electric company can usually buy power from another company
>on the grid when there is a surge in demand, amateur radio is there to
>draw on when an emergency comes up that cannot be handled with regular
>equipment and staff.

So it is with the tremendous variety of existing communications facilities
in use every day throughout the United States, public safety and utility
radio services operating 24/7.

The Greater Los Angeles Emergency Communications Center got its
"baptism of fire" (so to speak) during the Northridge Earthquake in
January, 1994. It is a central command post as well as a network
coordinator tying together over 70 cities and communities in a portion
of southern California. They use EXISTING radio services, those that
can be coordinated and trained on a periodic basis. Those are working
radio services, not the "let's pretend" of some hobby activities. The
Center has had several emergency incidents since the quake of a
decade ago and handled all of them.

In a TRUE emergency, ANYTHING can be used for communications,
anything from simple HTs to notes hand-carried by messengers on
foot. Yes, amateur radio can be a part of that "anything" but such is
practically worthless unless teamwork can be done through organization
and periodic drills of simulated emergencies, training activities that
prove out existing procedures or are good for showing needed changes.

Amateur radio activity is generally very personal and few amateurs are
willing to work in groups or even be directed by another amateur;
certainly not by an outside agency that they claim "doesn't know the
first things about ham radio!" :-) Such individualism, parochialism
doesn't work well in a real emergency situation that doesn't make room
for boastful claims which are unproven.

There should be nothing wrong with being just a hobby. Hobbies are
excellent for recreation. What is wrong is trying to extend the hobby
into the realm of the supernatural by using political statements of a
very general nature to justify their existance.

LHA / WMD

150. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 21:20:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <SJKdncyROJKY09vdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88114

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Anonymous source of unreferenceable news, anonymous none?
>
> You really shouldn't make up those stories. They aren't believable
> and they have no references for anyone to check validity.

Check with the Dallas, Tx FCC office, they can verify it.

And here is another, get some 6 year old to read it and explaine to you
so you will understand.

****
HAM RADIO AND PACEMAKERS
This is from Angela, VE7ANGï¿½s Newsletter.
Richard/VE7SRB has had a pacemaker installed recently. At first he
thought he might not be able to continue Ham Radio, but after some
research he came up with the following. Perhaps it will be of interest
to others.

We have researched the literature concerning the effects of amateur
radio broadcasts and their potential effects on implanted pulse
generators. Most articles concerning the effects of electromagnetic
interference (EMI) on pulse generators touch very briefly on the effects
of radio frequencies.

We have done testing on types of interference most likely to be
encountered by pacemakers patients. One category of interference we
tested was radio frequency. This covers the HF and VHF bands from 1 MHz
to 200 Mhz. Amateur radio, broadcast AM and FM, TV two way
communications, short-wave diathermy and CB radios are in this range.
Many transmitters have large power capability. Radio amateurs are
allowed a one kilowatt input in eight bands, commercial short-wave goes
to 250 KW, broadcast to 50 KW, two way radio in emergency short-wave
regularly uses 150 watts in mobile installations. Implantable pulse
generators may be affected depending on the details of shielding and
filtering in the device and modulation of interference signal.

Testing was performed on 106 pacemakers comprising 20 different models
from various manufacturers. Testing was conducted at interference
frequencies of 3.4, 7, 14, 21 and 28.6 Mhz. No effects on pacemaker
operation were observed in the presence of field strengths less than 200
volts/meter. Field strengths of this magnitude are unlikely except in
the immediate vicinity of a high power transmitting antenna.

Overall, our testing indicates that pacemaker patients are very unlikely
to encounter problems with radio frequency fields. Certainly we would

recommend avoiding direct contact with transmitting antenna.
****

Now go ask the nurse for another blood pressure pill lennyboy so you
don't have a stroke.

151. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 21:44:35 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <TeKdncio5b1QzNvdRVn-gw@crocker.com>
Source record: 88115
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
after
> > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
because I
> > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
cost
> > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
last
> > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities
> > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
>
> > Tom
>
> I still think this is a troll, but...
>
> If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
telecommunications
> law.
>
> The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
anything.
>
> That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard by
> a court.
>
> If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be interested.
> Send the FCC a copy.
>

this could be a good thing... just think, if the bpl people have the
resources and time to track down one single supposedly legally operating cb
station and shut it down, just think what will happen when they move into
neighborhoods with the illegal power over processed splattering monster amps
dueling with each other! let the bpl people track them down and sue them

off the air! the fcc doesn't have the time or money, but maybe the bpl people do.

now, if you believe that they could pinpoint one cb station as the cause of bpl problems, and that they have the resources to start lawsuits over every one of them, you have been succesfully trolled in my opinion.

152. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 21:58:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403031358.76cd82bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88116

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030800.9a893a3@posting.google.com>...
>
> Many "religious" rites involving foods or drink usually have some
> valid historical basis behind them. In Biblical times, the knowledge
> (and certainly the means) to properly store and prepare pork products
> was not there...hence people who ate pork products routinely became
> ill, even died.

That's one part of it, but there's more. The most popular doemsticated
animals back then were sheep, goats, cows and pigs. All except pigs
give usable milk, which can be used fresh or made into cheese that
will store well without refrigeration. Sheep and some breeds of goat
give wool. All you can get from a living pig is bristles for a paint
brush.

Pigs require the most water per pound and aren't exactly the easiest
to herd. The meat can be eaten safely if thoroughly cooked, which
requires lots of fuel.

So if you're in a warm dry climate with few trees, which domestic
animals make the most sense?
>
> The drinking of wine in Christian and Jewish faiths also has
> historical basis...Drinking water was often brackish or otherwise
> unfit...Wine and beer, however, had been fermented, and many of the
> offending bateria had been unwittingly purged from the brew in the
> process...

And this situation continued well into the 18th and even 19th
centuries.
>
> 'mazen, ain't it...?!?!
>
Not once you know the whole story!

73 de Jim, N2EY

153. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 22:17:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403031417.4499550b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Leder" <k8cxm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<4045e25c$0$52150$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>...

> Unfortunately I agree. There is simply too much money backing BPL. The best
> we can hope for is to slow it down or at least apply enough pressure that
> the industry finds a way to clean it up. As it stands now, amateur radio as
> we know it is in grave danger.

Guys...the trick here is to get organized clubs to start placing
informational ads in local papers and other media to INFORM the public
of exactly what harm BPL will bring. Yeah...it's gonna cost some
bucks, but what's it worth to you to keep this crap at bay...?!?!

They ALSO need to be informed that since this is a Part 15
program they are afforded NO PROTECTION from interferene from ANY
licensed radiator.

Lastly, we need to get the ARRL to start lobbying Congress to
mandate an informational insert in any BPL-accessing device informing
the consumer of exactly what Part 15 means and what the consumer can
expect.

73

Steve, K4YZ

154. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 22:33:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it you're in
> the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer
required
> a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a license when
> the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to Part 95 -
> which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air and
talk.
> Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people who have
> no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to research
> that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or trying
to
> defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on that issue.
I
> can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't have money
to
> pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your elected
> officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC website if
you
> don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page of it,
> which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while you're at
it.
> Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let them bull
> doze you over. CL
>
>
> <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> after
> > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
because
> I
> > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
> cost
> > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> last
> > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> utilities

> > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
> >
> > Tom
> >
>
>
One less CBer. Who cares?

Dan/W4NTI

155. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 22:44:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
after
> > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
because I
> > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
cost
> > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
last
> > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities
> > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
>
> > Tom
>
> I still think this is a troll, but...
>
> If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
telecommunications
> law.
>
> The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
anything.
>
> That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard by
> a court.
>
> If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be interested.
> Send the FCC a copy.
>
> --
> Jim Pennino
>
> Remove -spam-sux to reply.

This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing is sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?

Dan/W4NTI

156. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 22:50:59 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88120
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> One less CBer. Who cares?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.

157. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:10:50 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <1OSdndANSrqZ-9vdRVn-sA@crocker.com>
Source record: 88121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> after
> > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> because I
> > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from
the
> > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
> cost
> > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> last
> > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
experience.
> > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> utilities
> > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
letters
> >
> > > Tom
> >
> > I still think this is a troll, but...
> >
> > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> telecommunications
> > law.
> >
> > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
> anything.
> >
> > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard
by
> > a court.
> >
> > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
interested.

> > Send the FCC a copy.
> >
> > --
> > Jim Pennino
> >
> > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
>
> This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing is
> sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

yeah, but bpl was/is legal under part 15 as it stands the way i understand it. the nprm was supposed to be to make it easier for bpl to satisfy part 15 by raising the radiation limits and maybe some other stuff... but apparently some areas are going ahead either with their temporary experimental license or just under the existing rules.

158. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:11:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031511.7a4f016c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88122

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
>
> > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > using cellular telephones.
>
> Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> latest peculiar theory?

David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.

> > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
>
> How does a cellphone contest work?
>
> Dave K8MN

David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?

159. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:16:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031516.caa4f3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88123

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> > William wrote:
> >
> >> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> >> using cellular telephones.
> >
> > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > latest peculiar theory?
> >
> >> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> >
> > How does a cellphone contest work?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted
> to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment
> to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone
> lines.
>
> I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I
> can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.
>
> Michael

Michael, thank you. Now David's curiousity has an answer.

If he were even slightly interested in amateur radio contests, he
could seek out the publication "CQ," not defunct.

160. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:16:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <YdKdndsvOfHx9Nvd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88126

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
> and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
> preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment
> to individual training.

Lennyboy you are so far off base it isn't even funny.

161. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:22:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031522.6357898d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88124

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030645.4cdd2b3f@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403021908.b72bff3@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403021156.6e2d080e@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403020538.656a0640@posting.google.com>...
> > > > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<YJqdnc6YkNHjgNnd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > Anonymous one who has no amateur call, you cannot admit your
> > > > > > error. To do so would be against your mythology, the fantasy that
> > > > > > amateur radio always jumps in to save the day.
> > > > >
> > > > > Not always, but always when needed and has saved the day many times.
> > > > > That you can't be a part of it to get your recognition really gets your
> > > > > goat doesn't it?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Would you estimate that in the last decade more cellular telephones
> > > > have saved the day than all of amateur radio in the last century?
> > >
> > > Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
> > > his way of skewing the results in his favor.
> >
> > Oh, contraire!
> >
> > Larry Roll has set up many a scenario where not only is amateur radio
> > the ONLY means to save the day, but only ONE particular mode is
> > suitable to save the day.
> >
> > He's done it again and again.
> >
> > Are we Not to believe Roll?
>
> Sorry, Brain...
>
> The post >>I<< responded to was from your douchebag friend.
> Exact same is quoted verbatim above.

Stebe, I have no douche bag friends, unless you believe yourself to be
my friend.

So, has Roll not claimed that Ham Radio always saves the day?

> Don't divert the post in order to divert attention from YOUR
> foolishness...THAT is already public information and beyond YOUR
> control.

My personal opinion is that your posts call enough attention to your foolishness.

> My post addressed NO ONE except your chief string puller and
> documented liar, Lennie the Loser. His post did EXACTLY what I
> claimed it to...to try ans skew results in such a way as to make him
> appear corect. He's not.

But I am free to comment on -whatever- you post in a public forum. If you don't like it, you and Len can take it to private e-mail. I'll know that you have done this by a lack of public postings on your part.

> Try again, Puppet Boy.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What exactly am I to try again?

162. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:24:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031524.47fcd0c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88125

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303140641.25517.00004576@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403030950.60f20be1@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A424.9060402@psu.edu>...
> >> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >>
> > I highly
> >> > recommend killfiling his posts.
> >>
> >> I read and evaluate every post he makes, and comment on those worthy of
> >> comment.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >Mike, freethinking will get you nowhere. Killfile him NOW or western
> >civilization will end.
>
> Right! Keep the low level of Independent Thought...do not let it
> interfere with the strong signals of consistent tradition that keeps
> the standards and practices of the 1930s forever set in concrete
> in this new millennium.
>
> CW (Conventional Wisdom) forever! :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Concrete? CONCRETE???

Pah-leeze! Newington uses granite!

163. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:28:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88127

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030650.81551cf@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<403FB731.5EFB1488@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
>
> > > So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.
> >
> > I submit that you don't know one end of a bat (baseball-type or the
> > mammal) from the other.
>
> Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
> and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
> headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
> trying to score some points...And failing...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, my only goal is to keep you talking (and thereby convincing
any/every one who accidently stumbles on to one of your rants that
you're completely insane - most probably a future employer).

164. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:32:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031532.32a95cce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88128

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403021845.4b369c52@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402210444.359c8bfb@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<403679E3.60A09E32@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I did,
> > > however, ask you how a licensed service can intentionally interfere with
> > > a non-licensed producer of RF. You've not yet come up with a response.
> >
> > The same way you can communicate with French who had no license to
> > operate where they were operating.
>
> Hey Dave...here's MY interpretation of Brain's non-answer:
>
> "I have no valid answer. I know that common sense precludes my
> being able to render any effective response without further
> demonstrating my ignorance and arrogance, hence I'll just make some
> inappropriate insinuations and hope no one notices how foolish I
> REALLY am. My sole purpose in this forum is to disrupt any meaningful
> use of this forum, and to emulate my mentor, Lennie Anderson, a known
> and documented pathological liar."
>
> Hey Brain...did that pretty well sum it up?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I'm sure that when the French start calling you on a CAP frequency
that you'll ask them to include a green stamp to QSL.

Best of Luck.

165. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:35:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031535.e94214e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88129

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403022125.53018d22@posting.google.com>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<5ZudnRXK4qFXZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >
> > > I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." :-) Just the PHONIES
> > > with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
> > > nurse candidates in search of a real self. :-)
> >
> > Your aren't even a ham, can't pass the test, have nothing to do with ham
> > radio, so why would you even care?
> > Show me one ham with a federal merit badge.
>
> TSBAKAL believes that his one and only appearance before an FCC
> examiner in 1950-something was all that he should have ever had to
> do...He passed THAT test, ergo he "knows it all" and should be exempt
> from the laws that pertain to every other citizen.
>
> What a putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

TSBAKAL? Poor, poor Stebe. Ripping off my style? Go get your own life!

166. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:38:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031538.4532affb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88130

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030653.48e3d5ce@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay under her nose to
> > > smother the stench?
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?
>
> I didn't set the parameters of the discussion, PuppetBoy.

So how low will you go?

> This is all Lennie understands...It's all he wants...I am just
> satisfying his need to be humiliated. Consider it a Good Samaritan
> act.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You're out of control. Just ask anyone.

167. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:39:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031539.2ecdfc44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88131

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303140642.25517.00004578@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay undr her nose to
> >> smotehr the stench?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?
>
> The worst part is he can't even hold hisself together long enough to
> type properly... :-)
>
> ["undr"..."smotehr"...typical rage symptoms shown many times]
>
> LHA / WMD

He's out of control. Again.

168. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:41:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031541.b9d18e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88132

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402290359.2022b11b@posting.google.com>...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040229000800.13960.00000967@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > In article <20040225150426.07155.00000932@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > > The core of network messaging in the military of WW2 was the
> > > teleprinter, principally the militarized models from the Teletype
> > > Corporation headquartered in Chicago...as were Hallicrafters and
> > > Motorola. Teleprinters were ideal for integrated communications,
> > > operating well over both wirelines and radio, capable of 60 words
> > > per minute continuously, needing only to be fed paper and ribbons
> > > and some occasional oil.
> > >
> > > The image of the lone morseman with headphones and hunched
> > > over his code key saving the nation was only that...an image...no
> > > relation to reality. That image is UNreal.
>
> Some Snippage
>
> > Your credibility is zero. You claim that Morse/CW was essentially
> > unheard of as a primary military communications mode, when, in fact, all
> > of the evidence is that exactly the opposite is true.
>
> Leonard H. Anderson has never had a problem with misrepresenting
> the truth even when the evidence to the contrary was plentiful and
> well known to all concerned.
>
> That he feels compelled to continue to make a mockery of his
> "character" and humiliate his family name so readily in a public forum
> should be adequate evidence that this old man is NOT dealing with a
> full deck.
>
> He's ill. That's all there is to it.
>
> > OK. You hate CW. We get it. There's no need to make a barefaced
> > liar out of yourself to prove your point.
>
> Oooooooops! Too late!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, now that you and Larry are tailending each other, why not ask him about his mode always saving the day. He has multiple scenarios, so you won't get bored.

169. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:44:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031544.df67fda@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88133
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com>...
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
> > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
> > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
> > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
> > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
> > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
>
> > Tom
>
> I still think this is a troll, but...
>
> If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about telecommunications
> law.
>
> The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for anything.

Which is why we have so many attorneys.

170. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:47:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031547.1909730d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88134

"Helmut" <MyCallSign@QSL.net> wrote in message news:<c1vv23$n0n$06$1@news.t-online.com>...
> Hi, Mike, Dwight, ... dont recallall the others so lets say:
>
> Hello newsgroup!
>
> I am ANGRY with you all. Disapointed, frustrated, you all are guilty of
> that.
>
> When I clicked on the post first, I expected a decend discussion about SEX.

Helmut, I prescribe one DXpedition to Amsterdam. Leave the radios at
home. Just bring your wallet and some latex. Then post again.

171. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:49:32 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab0395c8e14fa359897ce@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88135
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <1e4e3692.0403031544.df67fda@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com says...
> jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote in message news:<c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com>...
> > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
> > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
> > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
> > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
> > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
> > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
> >
> > > Tom
> >
> > I still think this is a troll, but...
> >
> > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about telecommunications
> > law.
> >
> > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for anything.
>
> Which is why we have so many attorneys.

Hey, don't knock it. I make money off attorneys all the time. If you
ever want to do I.T. work, do it for attorneys. They're used to being
billed top dollar.

172. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:54:07 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <40466f2c.25919031@news.individual.de>
Source record: 88136
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:

> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
>here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney

Is your attorney a ham?
If not, you picked the wrong attorney.

>and after
>looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
>do not have a FCC license.

This is blatant and complete malpractice UNLESS you neglected to tell us
something, such as
a) you're operating outside of CB frequencies
b) you're operating with more than permitted power for your CB frequency

> I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
>house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
>of defending myself in a lawsuit.

Ask your local hams for support. They, like me, would be outraged at a
power company bullying you around. They, like me, will PayPal financial
support to you IF you are using legal power on legal frequencies.

> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
>week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
>Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities
>that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

There are people with money willing to contibute to a competent defense.
If you get an attorney who's not a ham, you have incompetent defense. If
you want to stand in the middle of the road and let the truck run over you,
well, that becomes a personal preference, which is something I will not
interfere with.

--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard
Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

173. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-03 23:57:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031557.4568891d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88137

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030811.783d0439@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402251850.160d4e3d@posting.google.com>...
> > "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com> wrote in message
news:<c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>...
>
> > > Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
> > > manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
> > > vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
> >
> > They only dump the showboats on the USA because Bill Clinton/Algore
> > forgot to renew the EPA Fleet Miles Per Gallon requirements. They
> > were [expletive deleted] idiots. So much for "Earth in the Balance!"
>
> And if they HAD signed it, we'd just have more expensive BMW's
> and Mercedes here since the cost of the additional engineering would
> be passed on to the consumer...And American's WOULD pay it...

Idjit! Do you recall the tiny little POS with the Mercedes hood
ornament on it?

Mercedes had to meet the FLEET Mileage requirements (when that law was
alive).

> People once said that Americans would stop smoking once the price
> of cigs went over $2.00/pk...well, it's been that way for a long time,
> save for a few cheap "generic" brands, and the "name brands" don't
> seem to be in any distress.

Are you going thru nicotine withdrawal?

If you're going to post off-topic, at least stay on your off-topic
rahter than jumping around so much.

> Americans like what they like, and will pay to get what they
> like. That's a "consumer driven" market.

Drugs. #2 problem in America.

174. Re: New ARRL Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 00:02:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031602.29bc8f7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88138

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030803.d7c237b@posting.google.com>...
>
> Steve and the Boys

Eeeew!

175. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 00:09:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031609.128d4b6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88139

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403030800.9a893a3@posting.google.com>...

> I certainly don't follow any special diets, although I find it
> interesting that those Jews held hostage in Entebbe, Uganda, that kept
> Kosher, did not suffer many of the ailments that other passengers did.

I'm sure that the rebels in Entebbe sent out to Schlottskies' deli for Kosher sandwiches for their guests.

176. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 00:34:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031634.27eb72e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88140

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402291810.30651b9@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402281331.cf84a5d@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402260351.6cfdab18@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > TAFKA Rev Jim, I'll explain it to you. SA has two existing coded HF
> > > > licenses. ITU says you can drop code, so they come out with a third
> > > > coded license. Bizarre.
> > >
> > > Question, Brain...
> >
> > Brain?
> >
> > > I have never seen Jim Miccolis refer to you as anything but
> > > "Brian"...
> >
> > How is it that you misspell my name in one fragment sentence, and
> > spell it correctly in another?
>
> Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...

I say it is. Until you behave yourself, its TAFKARJ!!!

It's about
> why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
> >>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?

Tuff. I'm holding TAFKARJ metaphorically hostage until you straighten
your insane a$$ out. My regrets to Jim. I'll send out for
Schlottskey's deli.

> That scumbag you run with likes to do that. Jim has never
> refered to him as anything but "Len", yet "Len" finds countless ways
> to belittle him.

That would be between the scumbag that I run with and TAFKARJ.

Do you often get involved with other people's issues?

> Lennie does that because he cannot "argue" or "debate" Jim
> otherwise.

He can. He has. And to a reasonable person, effectively. But
TAFKARJ remains in another world. A Ham in a Bubble.

He has to make Jim appear less-than-adequate in order to
> promote himself. The weak minded and the foolish HAVE to do
> that...It's a defense mechanism.

Perhaps. But TAFKARJ has made himself less-than-adequate by altering
posts. It is a cross that he must bear (Mel, forgive me).

> Are YOU that weak minded and foolish?

Don't know.

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most weak-minded and foolish,
how high would you rate me?

> He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
> of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
> etc etc, when I had not so addressed him. He is treated and addressed
> in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.

Ahem. I hate to be the one to break it to you, Steve, but you are
just a wee little bit over the top. Ask ANYone!

> Is that how you feel? Do >>YOU<< need to belittle Jim in order
> to effectively express yourself when discussing things with/about him?

Do you need to belittle me in order to express yourself?

Rhetorical question. I already know the answer.

And, no, I don't need to belittle TAFKARJ. Have I done so?

> Please do not humiliate yourself by trying to misdirect this
> question by asking >>ME<< about how I address Lennie...I've already
> answered that.

See above. Why do you need to try to belittle >>ME<<?

> Stay focused...you were asked a direct, specific question.

Which was?

> You CAN answer direct, specific questions, can't you?

If I can recall them.

> > > So WHY do YOU inisist on following the insulting and demeaning
> > > example of a known pathological liar and antagonist in engaging in any
> > > interaction with him...?!?!
> >
> > Stebe, you misunderstand (what's new?).
> >
> > I am the ONE who has tagged N2EY with the title "TAFKA Rev. Jim" after
> > his dishonesty in altering Kim's posts. He previously put forth the
> > image of being as pure as the driven snow. But after that little

> > stunt, he can no longer be referred to as Reverend Jim. So, "formerly
> > known as" sounded good to me.
> >
> > You got a problem with it?
>
> I have a problem with you lying.

I have a problem with your lies, and your insane behavior.

> I have a problem with you following in the footsteps of a person
> who is a known pathological liar and antagonist. It's embarrassing to
> see a contemporary Veteran and Amateur licensee resorting to Lennie's
> tactics.

Len is also a Veteran and a Radioman.

> As for what "sounded good to (you)"...My question STILL
> remains...Did Jim refer to you by any name, title or endearment OTHER
> than "Brian"...?!?!

No. He no longer refers to me at all. He keeps tripping over his own
tie, and won't acknowledge or explain his most recent irrational
policy positions WRT amateur radio.

> If not, why do YOU find it necessary to do so...?!?!

Jim has tainted himself by altering posts. I can no longer revere
him, thusly, he is no longer Reverend.

> > > Are you, after all, as shallow and immature as I thought you
> > > really are?
> >
> > No. Perhaps even more so. Perhaps almost as much as you are.
>
> Brain, you will NEVER be as much as I am...good OR bad.

True. You're manic. Go see the definition.

> > > Please give some specific example of how Jim has belittled or
> > > demeaned YOU in a like manner...
> >
> > Why? Shallow and immature people don't have to follow your orders.
>
> What "order", Brain...?!?!
>
> I SAID "please"...And to have fulfilled my request would have only
> served to explain why YOU find it necessary to be demeaning and
> rude...>>OR<< have proven why you were right and I was wrong.
>
> Instead, you choose to be even MORE argumentitive and demeaning,
> even further cementing your reputation.

Jim has been found guilty of altering posts.

> > Stebe, take a chill pill or whatever meds you forgot to take.
>
> Uh huh....Just after you take your distemper shot, Brain, and
> answer the question put to you. WHY do you find it necessary to be
> rude and demeaning when no such epithets were addressed to you...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
> PS: I will assume any answer to the question that attempts to
> redirect or obfuscate the response to be "I am unwilling to directly
> answer the question as I know the truth to be other than what I
> stated". Simple enough?

See above. Questions answered. Now what?

177. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 01:24:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040303202422.00545.00004648@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 88141

In article <1e4e3692.0403021908.b72bff3@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
>> his way of skewing the results in his favor.
>
>Oh, contraire!
>
>Larry Roll has set up many a scenario where not only is amateur radio
>the ONLY means to save the day, but only ONE particular mode is
>suitable to save the day.
>
>He's done it again and again.
>
>Are we Not to believe Roll?

Billy:

My "scenarios" are always built around a simple premise: That there is, in
fact,
a licensed (and CW-capable) radio amateur at the scene of my "scenario," that
he has functional radio equipment at his disposal, and prevailing operating
conditions preclude the use of voice modes such as FM or SSB. I don't recall
making any inference that CW is the "only" mode that can "save the day" ...just
that unless you know the code, you can't use it when you may need it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

178. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211142.23307.00007082@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88142

In article <1e4e3692.0403031511.7a4f016c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> How does a cellphone contest work?
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?

Obtuse? I think he's tangential. Maybe a sign...

Careful or he'll trig another spate of personal attacks.

LHA / WMD

179. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211142.23307.00007081@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88144

In article <1e4e3692.0403031609.128d4b6d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403030800.9a893a3@posting.google.com>...
>
>> I certainly don't follow any special diets, although I find it
>> interesting that those Jews held hostage in Entebbe, Uganda, that kept
>> Kosher, did not suffer many of the ailments that other passengers did.
>
>I'm sure that the rebels in Entebbe sent out to Schlottskies' deli for
>Kosher sandwiches for their guests.

Those were air-delivered by Blackhawk helicopters.

The gunnery nurse probably did maintenance on them... :-)

In his Twilight Zone imagination, that is...despite Israel doing the
rescue fighting in the real world.

Getting difficult to tell where the gunnery nurse's thoughts are
these days!

LHA / WMD

180. Re: BPL NPRM Approved

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211143.23307.00007083@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88143

In article <1e4e3692.0403031535.e94214e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403022125.53018d22@posting.google.com>...
>> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<5ZudnRXK4qFXZ9ndRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > > I'm not blaming "all those nasty hams." :-) Just the PHONIES
>> > > with federal merit badges in here who think they are all gunnery
>> > > nurse candidates in search of a real self. :-)
>> >
>> > Your aren't even a ham, can't pass the test, have nothing to do with ham
>> > radio, so why would you even care?
>> > Show me one ham with a federal merit badge.
>>
>> TSBAKAL believes that his one and only appearance before an FCC
>> examiner in 1950-something was all that he should have ever had to
>> do...He passed THAT test, ergo he "knows it all" and should be exempt
>> from the laws that pertain to every other citizen.
>>
>> What a putz.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>TSBAKAL? Poor, poor Stebe. Ripping off my style? Go get your own life!

He doesn't seem to have any sort of original life. He freely rips off
others'
phrases and word use and claims them as "his own" later on.

No independent thought. He uses spoon-feeding from the league as
his guide, demanding all do as he did or get called names. Tsk, tsk.

Then he makes all those repeated LYING statements such as
attributing false, very false "motivations" to me. Tsk, tsk squared.

I'm just advocating an end to morse code testing for all radio operator
license examinations...but the gunnery nurse cannot possibly allow
such terrible thoughts against the proud, heroic, noble traditions of
the corps...er, I mean, the Amateur Community! [hard to tell the two
apart in his messages]

It's truly remarkable all that Rage and Frustration demonstrated by the
PCTA in here just for others wanting an end to morse code testing! :-)

LHA / WMD

181. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211144.23307.00007085@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88145

In article <1e4e3692.0403031524.47fcd0c0@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Right! Keep the low level of Independent Thought...do not let it
>> interfere with the strong signals of consistent tradition that keeps
>> the standards and practices of the 1930s forever set in concrete
>> in this new millennium.
>>
>> CW (Conventional Wisdom) forever! :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Concrete? CONCRETE???
>
>Pah-leeze! Newington uses granite!

I tender my apologies and admit the error. Membership monies in
action for upgrading to granite? Quarried in Maine and transported
south?

Remember the Maine! :-)

LHA / WMD

182. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211144.23307.00007084@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88146

In article <1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
>> and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
>> headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
>> trying to score some points...And failing...
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, my only goal is to keep you talking (and thereby convincing
>any/every one who accidently stumbles on to one of your rants that
>you're completely insane - most probably a future employer).

He seems to move around a lot and change jobs often... :-)

He only worked a few months as a purchasing agent in a mid-sized
electronics place that made set-top boxes. Must have learned all
about electronic engineering there! He said something to that effect.

He CAN quote from the Physicians' Desk Reference, though. That's
as useful in amateur radio as Kosher dietary laws, religions (outside
of the Church of St. Hiram), and s*x discussions. :-)

Wait! -

Maybe someone HAS put forth a petition in amateur radio similar to
Kosher...establishment of the Orthodox and Mode Laws to be
observed! [Thou shalt use CW on all Orthodox holidays or something
like that...]

Yeah, that's it. Kosher Kode!

Would Morris approve?

LHA / WMD

183. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:11:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040303211146.23307.00007086@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88147

In article <1e4e3692.0403031539.2ecdfc44@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040303140642.25517.00004578@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...
>> >>
>> >> Scumbag. Your wife still sleeping with Ben-Gay undr her nose to
>> >> smotehr the stench?
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Steve, is this what you call rational discussion?
>>
>> The worst part is he can't even hold hisself together long enough to
>> type properly... :-)
>>
>> ["undr"..."smotehr"...typical rage symptoms shown many times]
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>He's out of control. Again.

For the nth time in here.

Notice that the gunnery nurse will slowly crib my phrases and words,
just like he does with yours, then claim them to be his own. :-)

For example, he said that Washington Army Radio has "played host
to amateurs many times" without mentioning when and where. He
really doesn't know but it comes out of his imagination. He's never
had any occasion to communicate with Washington Army Radio,
hasn't been there, doesn't know where it is (if it still exists), or a
single detail of the place.

Washington Army Radio (WAR) doesn't exist as it did a half century
ago. Back then it was a technical tryout area for automatic TTY
relay, techniques that were incorporated into AUTODIN. AUTODIN was
later replaced by the DSN or Digital Switched Network, "the
government's own Internet" and now used by the entire U.S. military.

Messaging over HF does exist but in a much reduced, secondary role, using higher-rate data modes that possible even with the old 100 WPM teleprinters. In the U.S. Army, Signal Brigades world-wide have the capability and do periodic test exercises to make sure they are ready. What my old Signal Battalion became a half century later (78th, under the 516th SigBde located at Fort Shafter) has is an "HF Radio Department." Probably called that for lack of any other descriptive title. :-) That's on the 78th SigBn website. Not much information there.

There's no website for "Washington Army Radio." It was dissolved long before the Internet became public a dozen-plus years ago. Yet, there are hundreds of military websites available at link lists for all the U.S. military branch home pages, including every Army MOS and the headquarters for Military Intelligence (where morse code cognition is taught from computers for M.I. intercepts).

Has the gunnery nurse ever been to WAR, not "hostile actions?" I doubt either. :-) Those are shadowlands in his imagination and fantasies. A twilight zone he can never experience in reality.

But, the gunnery nurse has an Amateur Extra license! So does a seven-year-old. Emotionally they are the same, probably the nod to the seven-year-old as being more mature. :-)

LHA / WMD

184. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:40:07 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <kh3d40lc3g737d098kmsfv7nd04o82mmj7@4ax.com>
Source record: 88148

On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 16:16:28 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>>
>> The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
>> and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
>> preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment
>> to individual training.
>
>Lennyboy you are so far off base it isn't even funny.

How so, JJ? I'd say that Len was quite correct on this one.

With few exceptions, all of the hams that I know are ragchewers, contesters or experimenters. There are only a couple who actively participate in the local ARES group, and they are the only ones with the rudimentary training to handle an emergency situation without hindering or interfering with it.

In fact, this appears to be the norm in the hobby, from my perspective anyway - only a small percentage are actively involved in this area - the rest, like me, are just in it for the hobby. Why not?

Of course, in an emergency situation, any of us would be willing to pitch in and do whatever we could to help - but the vast majority of us lack the organization, equipment and training that the professional services have. For example, if an earthquake hit your area right now, what would you do? Who would you contact, and on what frequency? Who are the alternates, if he / she is not reachable? Who coordinates what with the various professional agencies? Do you have a preassigned role and duties that you have been trained and have rehearsed for? How about radio equipment - do you have sufficient spare batteries to keep operating during a prolonged power outage (and are they charged and fully tested?), or a generator to keep a base station on the air? Do you have back-up radio equipment in the event that yours fails? If not, how much could you be counted on to be there if needed throughout the entire emergency?

YMM, of course, V.....

73, Leo

185. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:46:48 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88149
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on your ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as linears, extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per part 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't helping the war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I don't do CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent CBers.
CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it you're in
> > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer
> required
> > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a license when
> > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to Part 95 -
> > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air and
> talk.
> > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people who have
> > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to research
> > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or trying
> to
> > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on that issue.
> I
> > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't have money
> to
> > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your elected
> > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC website if
> you
> > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page of it,
> > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while you're at
> it.

> > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let them
bull
> > doze you over. CL
> >
> >
> > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> > after
> > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> because
> > I
> > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from
the
> > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
> > cost
> > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> > last
> > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
experience.
> > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> > utilities
> > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
letters
> > >
> > > Tom
> > >
> >
> >
> One less CBer. Who cares?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

186. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 02:48:06 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to get the ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider information!
CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> after
> > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> because I
> > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from
the
> > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
> cost
> > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> last
> > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
experience.
> > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> utilities
> > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
letters
> >
> > > Tom
> >
> > I still think this is a troll, but...
> >
> > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> telecommunications
> > law.
> >
> > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
> anything.
> >
> > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard
by

> > a court.
> >
> > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
interested.
> > Send the FCC a copy.
> >
> > --
> > Jim Pennino
> >
> > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
>
> This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing is
> sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

187. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 03:34:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403031934.5d0a5555@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88301

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030710.31ac4c5e@posting.google.com>...
> "Helmut" <MyCallSign@QSL.net> wrote in message
news:<c1t42d$3o5$02$1@news.t-online.com>...
>
> > Billy...(SNIP)
>
> His name is "Brian", Helmut, not Billy. Amateur call N0IMD.
>
> This is just another screen name of his to keep folks guessing
> which of his personalities is posting today!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe, sorry to bust your rant, but I've previously shared my call
with Helmut. You're a day late and a Midol short.

188. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 04:06:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qsOdnXVk_NygNtvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88302

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Yep,
>
> Also note that this is why OPEC is cutting oil production. Their price is
> benchmarked to the US dollar and they have stated that the dollar is sinking
> so they have to raise prices. Given time, you may see more radios
> manufactured in the USA. Of course, few in the US will be able to afford
> them since we will be the cheap labor of the world. Give it about 10 or 15
> more years.
>
> Stay tuned to this one and see who blames whom for the mess that is likely
> to result.

The same people they've blamed for every problem on the face of the
planet for years, Jim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

189. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 04:36:19 UTC
From: "M. uberputz" <varedfarle@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3dac2$4046b24c$d1cc571f$7320@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 88303
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0403031417.4499550b@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Leder" <k8cxm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<4045e25c$0$52150$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>...
>
> They ALSO need to be informed that since this is a Part 15
> program they are afforded NO PROTECTION from interferene from ANY
> licensed radiator.

That's right. Hopefully somebody will find a
way to generate and send "BPLI" (BPL Interference)
via some kind of a handy device right back up
the power line and into the distribution network
out on the pole. If they send it down the power
line then there must be a way to send it right back
up the same, creating standing waves, and fudging
their datastream. You hackers out there need
to get to work on this.

Related story:

http://www.computerworld.com/industrytopics/energy/story/0,10801,90700,00.h
tml

http://www.isoc.org/briefings/013/

...and finally, the BPL Industry Big-Wigs will be having
a Conference and Industry Trade Show in Herndon
Virginia on April 21-22, 2004 at the Dulles Hyatt Hotel.

Show Link: http://www.plca.net/newsandevents.asp

You hams in the Va/DC/Md area need to
get out there and "meet with" these people.

> Lastly, we need to get the ARRL to start lobbying Congress to
> mandate an informational insert in any BPL-accessing device informing
> the consumer of exactly what Part 15 means and what the consumer can
> expect.

see: http://www.plca.net/FCC-04-29A1.pdf

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

190. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 05:45:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4046C277.52A8509E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88304

N2EY wrote:

> Pigs require the most water per pound and aren't exactly the easiest
> to herd. The meat can be eaten safely if thoroughly cooked, which
> requires lots of fuel.

Cats don't require as much water as pigs but, Oh Mama, are they ever
tough to herd!

Dave K8MN

191. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 05:51:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4046C3D4.68807F16@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88305

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> >
> > > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > using cellular telephones.
> >
> > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > latest peculiar theory?
>
> David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.

Actually, that isn't quite correct. You've made this latest statement
in response to another's statement. It appears that your goal is to
attempt demonstrating that amateur radio is not something which would be
useful in an emergency. Personally I'd want some amateur gear and a
cellular phone.

> > > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> >
> > How does a cellphone contest work?

> David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?

Not at all, William/Brian. I simply responded to what you wrote. If
you had a more complex thought, you didn't express it.

Dave K8MN

192. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 05:53:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4046C445.B839AB87@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88306

William wrote:
>
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> > Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> > > William wrote:
> > >
> > >> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > >> using cellular telephones.
> > >
> > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > latest peculiar theory?
> > >
> > >> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > >
> > > How does a cellphone contest work?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted
> > to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment
> > to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone
> > lines.
> >
> > I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I
> > can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.
> >
> > Michael
>
> Michael, thank you. Now David's curiousity has an answer.
>
> If he were even slightly interested in amateur radio contests, he
> could seek out the publication "CQ," not defunct.

You wrote nothing of amateur radio contests, Brian. I subscribe to CQ
though they are not the only sponsor of amateur radio contests. Do you
know something about amateur radio contesting? Is your contest
knowledge equal to your knowledge of DXing?

Dave K8MN

193. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 09:47:49 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <9XC1c.1879$Kb7.548506@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 88307
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

<tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
after
> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because
I
> do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
cost
> of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
last
> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities
> that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters
>
> Tom

Tom,

Buy or borrow a current Element 2 study guide, then go out and find a VE session and take the 35 question Technician class exam.

Are you covered by the blanket "authorization?" (ilo a licence) Yeah, probably...but with $10 and about two days worth of Q&A review, you're covered. Any questions, please use my e-mail address. (Remove NOSPAM) Take care and good luck.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

194. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 11:29:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403040329.11263dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88308

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4046C445.B839AB87@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> > > Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> > > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > >> using cellular telephones.
> > > >
> > > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > > latest peculiar theory?
> > > >
> > > >> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > > >
> > > > How does a cellphone contest work?
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted
> > > to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment
> > > to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone
> > > lines.
> > >
> > > I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I
> > > can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.
> > >
> > > Michael
> >
> > Michael, thank you. Now David's curiousity has an answer.
> >
> > If he were even slightly interested in amateur radio contests, he
> > could seek out the publication "CQ," not defunct.
>
> You wrote nothing of amateur radio contests, Brian. I subscribe to CQ
> though they are not the only sponsor of amateur radio contests. Do you
> know something about amateur radio contesting? Is your contest
> knowledge equal to your knowledge of DXing?
>
> Dave K8MN

David, I know enough to not use a cellular telephone in an amateur
radio contest. Wherever did you get that idea?

195. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 11:35:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403040335.1f36dc7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88309

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4046C3D4.68807F16@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > >
> > > > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > > using cellular telephones.
> > >
> > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > latest peculiar theory?
> >
> > David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.
>
> Actually, that isn't quite correct. You've made this latest statement
> in response to another's statement. It appears that your goal is to
> attempt demonstrating that amateur radio is not something which would be
> useful in an emergency.

That would be your theory, not mine.

Personally I'd want some amateur gear and a
> cellular phone.

Personally, I try to avoid placing myself in a situation which becomes
an emergency. The next best thing is a cellular telephone, followed
by amateur radio.

Do you see evil in this?

> > > > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > >
> > > How does a cellphone contest work?
>
> > David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?
>
> Not at all, William/Brian. I simply responded to what you wrote. If
> you had a more complex thought, you didn't express it.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, it is you who lacks complex thought. I enjoyed your little
escapade of bringing a cellular telephone to an amateur radio
contest. Maybe even France will call you. You're still good for a
few laughs.

196. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 11:43:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88310

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303211146.23307.00007086@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>
> Has the gunnery nurse ever been to WAR, not "hostile actions?"
> I doubt either. :-) Those are shadowlands in his imagination and
> fantasies. A twilight zone he can never experience in reality.
>
> But, the gunnery nurse has an Amateur Extra license! So does a
> seven-year-old. Emotionally they are the same, probably the nod to
> the seven-year-old as being more mature. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?

197. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 12:14:10 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <j27e40h6vjlqq07mlq6uplq2pej1h4o9va@4ax.com>
Source record: 88311

On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 15:25:02 GMT, Arnold <pigs@pink.floyd> wrote:

>On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, in rec.radio.amateur.policy,
>tom@wsd.spam wrote:
>> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
>> last week ...
>
>Yeah but it's typical on USENET. A cease and desist letter WRT BPL is
>something new and everybody's troll alarm goes off. As another poster
>suggested, a scan of the letter would be interesting to see as we're all
>going to have to deal with this sooner or later, at least from the way
>things look now. No announcements of BPL roll-out for me yet, but the
>same company (Progress Energy) is doing trial runs in another city nearby
>so it's only a matter of time.
>
>Good luck.

I find it interesting as well, especially from the perspective that preliminary tests of BPL had concluded that it was way too prone to outside interference (as well as generating it), and the unpredictable nature of that interference rendered BPL unreliable as a practical service.

Evidently, if this case is true, it would seem that the "BPL Pushers" are trying to strong arm radio stations off the air. While CB'ers do not require a license, they are authorized by rule, and if they are in compliance with Part 95, they have every right to operate as if they were any other licensed service.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

198. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 12:42:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A24E580C0Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88312

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403040335.1f36dc7@posting.google.com:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<4046C3D4.68807F16@earthlink.net>...
>> William wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> > news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
>> > > William wrote:
>> > >
>> > > > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got
>> > > > through using cellular telephones.
>> > >
>> > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for
>> > > your latest peculiar theory?
>> >
>> > David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.
>>
>> Actually, that isn't quite correct. You've made this latest statement
>> in response to another's statement. It appears that your goal is to
>> attempt demonstrating that amateur radio is not something which would
>> be useful in an emergency.
>
> That would be your theory, not mine.
>
> Personally I'd want some amateur gear and a
>> cellular phone.
>
> Personally, I try to avoid placing myself in a situation which becomes
> an emergency. The next best thing is a cellular telephone, followed
> by amateur radio.
>
> Do you see evil in this?
>
>> > > > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
>> > >
>> > > How does a cellphone contest work?
>>
>> > David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?
>>
>> Not at all, William/Brian. I simply responded to what you wrote. If
>> you had a more complex thought, you didn't express it.
>>

>> Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, it is you who lacks complex thought. I enjoyed your little
> escapade of bringing a cellular telephone to an amateur radio
> contest. Maybe even France will call you. You're still good for a
> few laughs.
>

Cellular phone relies on a lot of infrastructure. Sure, if all the towers are still up and there's power, then it will work. The same applies to our repeaters, but we don't just have repeaters, we can still communicate without them. If the whole area is levelled it will still be possible to use ham radio.

Personally, I don't have a cell phone, so if I lost wired phone service I would only have ham radio to fall back on. Oddly enough, cell phones have not yet spread to every man, woman and child, but I don't know anyone who doesn't have a phone number.

199. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 12:46:01 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A24EF5DEFF7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88313
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:9XC1c.1879$Kb7.548506@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
>> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility here
>> in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
>> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
>> because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
>> antenna from the house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility
>> is because of the cost of defending myself in a lawsuit.
>> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
>> last
>> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
>> experience. Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
>> against the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out
>> cease and desist letters
>>
>> Tom
>
> Tom,
>
> Buy or borrow a current Element 2 study guide, then go out and find a
> VE session and take the 35 question Technician class exam.
>
> Are you covered by the blanket "authorization?" (ilo a licence) Yeah,
> probably...but with $10 and about two days worth of Q&A review, you're
> covered. Any questions, please use my e-mail address. (Remove NOSPAM)
> Take care and good luck.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Well, I'm not a lawyer, but it appears to me that the lawyer is wrong. BPL
operates under part 15, which means it must accept all interference.

200. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:09:23 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0403040509.1b508a8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

yeltrabnhoj@email.com wrote in message news:<40466f2c.25919031@news.individual.de>...
> On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:
> Is your attorney a ham?
> If not, you picked the wrong attorney.

Agreed, HOWEVER, you must still use your best judgement re. the retention of said attorney. Make sure you enlist the services of a competent communications attorney who is both knowledgeable AND willing to challenge the FCC rather than pander to them.

> >and after
> >looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because I
> >do not have a FCC license.

Like I said previously, this can be remedied by a day or two with an Element 2 Q&A study guide, (I'll gladly mail you mine.) $10, and a visit to your local VE team. Good luck, although you'll likely not need it. Your ham antenna can also be your CB antenna. My Imax-2000 is used for both 10, 12 & 11. (Some even use it for 20m) Remember, you're anticipating the removal of Element 1 (Morse code) for the Technician class license.

> This is blatant and complete malpractice UNLESS you neglected to tell us
> something, such as
> a) you're operating outside of CB frequencies
> b) you're operating with more than permitted power for your CB frequency

Agreed. Stay straight and fly right and you have a leg to stand on.

> > I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> >house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
> >of defending myself in a lawsuit.

Don't do it. That's just what the large utility companies love. The FCC also loves the large utility comapany's dollars so reread what I wrote above re. your choice of a communications attorney.

> Ask your local hams for support. They, like me, would be outraged at a
> power company bullying you around. They, like me, will PayPal financial
> support to you IF you are using legal power on legal frequencies.

Ditto.

> > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
> >week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> >Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the utilities

> >that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist letters

Some here are understandably skeptical because this newsgroup is commonly sowed with troll posts. Unfortunately you've reaped the results. Even if this were a troll, the only thing lost is a little time and some typing effort. If not, then I hope you heed the good advice that's been offered and prevail.

> There are people with money willing to contibute to a competent defense.
> If you get an attorney who's not a ham,

I cannot impress upon you enough...do NOT hire a ham who is intimidated by the FCC. Hire a competent communications attorney (Who may also be a ham.) who can direct you in the most prudent course of action.

> you have incompetent defense. If
> you want to stand in the middle of the road and let the truck run over you,
> well, that becomes a personal preference, which is something I will not
> interfere with.

True.

73 es GL de WA2SI, Bert

201. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:15:25 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9_F1c.7381$5M.248680@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A24EF5DEFF7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:9XC1c.1879$Kb7.548506@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> >> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility here
> >> in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
> >> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> >> because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> >> antenna from the house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility
> >> is because of the cost of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> >> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> >> last
> >> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> >> experience. Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> >> against the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out
> >> cease and desist letters
> >>
> >> Tom
> >
> > Tom,
> >
> > Buy or borrow a current Element 2 study guide, then go out and find a
> > VE session and take the 35 question Technician class exam.
> >
> > Are you covered by the blanket "authorization?" (ilo a licence) Yeah,
> > probably...but with $10 and about two days worth of Q&A review, you're
> > covered. Any questions, please use my e-mail address. (Remove NOSPAM)
> > Take care and good luck.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> Well, I'm not a lawyer, but it appears to me that the lawyer is wrong. BPL
> operates under part 15, which means it must accept all interference.

I had stated in an earlier post, that so long as he was Part 95 compliant,
he had nothing to worry about.... IF they insist on taking him to court, let
them. He will win in the end "with" the FCC in his corner. They have to

uphold their own R&Rs. Part 95 is one of them, regardless whether a license is needed or not, which by the way - "they" - did away with the requirement of. IF he ends up in court with those people, he could have a nice stock holding when it is all said and done. Suing for legal fees, damages, emotional distress - just for starters. Yep, the lawyer gave bad advice. See someone who knows radio. I'm sure there are many people who would stack up in your corner if this hits the fan. CB or Ham, it affects us all. This is one time we need to stand together. There is no room for separation. United we stand, divided we fall. CL

202. Re: Local Utility Threatens me with Lawsuit for CB Internet Interference.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:26:55 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0403040526.5a5d1c37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88316

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.htv5m40.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Fri, 27 Feb 2004 02:25:21 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >Heck, Phil. You could've at least answered the chap's question on the off
> >chance it's legit. If the guy's system is legal, can the ISP bring and win
> >an interference based suit?
>
> Bring, yes. Win, no.

That's good to hear, sort of. Sadly, it appears that it has become
standard (accepted) business practice to "win the war" by allowing the
smaller individual plaintiff to wage a battle that the larger
defendent will just draw out indefinitely while said plaintiff
literally "dies on the vine." I have seen this up close and personal
and lemme tell ya...it ain't pretty. Justice and truth get thrown
right out the window.

> He needs to get a competent lawyer to explain
> it to all concerned.

I agree and would add that it should be a competent communications
attorney. Grab a Tech ticket, join the league, and ask their legal
department for some guidance. BPL is a pretty hot issue nowadays so I
bet you'll get a serious and concerned response.

73 es GL de Bert, WA2SI

203. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:46:57 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <IrG1c.7382$5M.248451@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0403040509.1b508a8a@posting.google.com...
> yeltrabnhoj@email.com wrote in message
news:<40466f2c.25919031@news.individual.de>...
> > On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, tom@wsd.SPAM wrote:
> > Is your attorney a ham?
> > If not, you picked the wrong attorney.
>
> Agreed, HOWEVER, you must still use your best judgement re. the
> retention of said attorney. Make sure you enlist the services of a
> competent communications attorney who is both knowledgeable AND
> willing to challenge the FCC rather than pander to them.
>

I'm not so sure it is the FCC he is going to have to worry about since it was "supposed to be" the Utility company doing the threatening. As for the FCC, so long as the guy is Part 95 compliant, I'd find it really difficult for them to go against their own Rules and Regulations to satisfy someone else. That isn't to say it isn't possible, but it would sure put a lot of mud in their face. Definitely, a "communications" attorney is in need here. IF they shut down a "legal" operation according to their own R&Rs - man I'd have a field day with that in the media. I'd be contacting the local Congressman and anyone else I could muster. But again, I don't think the FCC is the enemy, since (if memory serves me correct) it was not them who made the threat.
I think they too would be interested to hear about this. I mentioned damages in my prior post that he could go after. Sitting here thinking, I'm wondering if the Power Company would go so low as to try to claim he never paid his bill's, or had some problem with the wiring and shut off his service to get even. Man, I'd really ream them out with that, if they forced him into the dark. You may have a real fight on your hands, but so long as you're Part 95 compliant - you should prevail in the end. CL

204. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:55:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <LzG1c.32564$hm4.24684@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88318

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > (snip) Also note that we, the consumers,
> > are paying for that Kosher certification
> > and product labeling.
>
>
> (snip) How much do you think it costs
> the manufacturer to get a jar of Miracle
> Whip certified?

I don't care if it is only five dollars (though I suspect the licensing of those tiny Kosher symbols cost very much more). And I don't care if that breaks down to only one half of one cent for each jar of Miracle Whip. That's money coming from me, and every other American who buys Kosher products, to directly finance the activities of a religion. Several, including you, have said I can instead buy products which are not Kosher certified. Instead, perhaps you or someone else can explain to me why I should even have to concern myself with the activities of a "minority" religion (your word) when I purchase food in this country. Since they're collecting money from the general public, is that religion prepared to publicly account for where and on what that money is being spent? Of course not. Are Americans allowed to opt out of this donation scheme when purchasing products? Not unless they want to give up their favorite foods - something no person should have to do in a country supposedly free of religious dominance.

And that's my final word on this issue. Again, if you don't see the problem with all this, you're not looking and I can't make you see what you don't want to see. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

205. The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:57:31 UTC
From: "George Z. Bush" <gzb@jerkslefties.org>
Message-ID: <c27ci0$2fk$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88319
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

> The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook
>
> 1. You have to believe that the AIDS virus is spread by a lack of
> federal funding.
>
> 2. You have to believe that the same teacher who can't teach 4th
> graders how to read is somehow qualified to teach those same kids
> about sex.
>
> 3. You have to believe that guns in the hands of law-abiding Americans
> are more of a threat than U.S. nuclear weapons technology in the hands
> of Chinese and North Korean communists.
>
> 4. You have to believe that there was no art before Federal funding.
>
> 5. You have to believe that global temperatures are less affected by
> cyclical, documented changes in the earth's climate, and more affected
> by soccer moms driving SUVs.
>
> 6. You have to believe that gender roles are artificial, but being
> homosexual is natural.
>
> 7. You have to be against capital punishment for criminals, even
> murderers, but support abortion on demand.
>
> 8. You have to believe that businesses create oppression, and
> governments create prosperity.
>
> 9. You have to believe that hunters don't care about nature, but loony
> activists who have never been outside of San Francisco do.
>
> 10. You have to believe that self-esteem is more important than
> actually doing something to earn it.
>
> 11. You have to believe that the military, not politicians, start
> wars.
>
> 12. You have to believe the NRA is bad, because it supports certain
> parts of the Constitution, while the ACLU is good because it supports
> certain parts of the Constitution.
>
> 13. You have to believe that taxes are too low, but ATM fees are too
> high.

>
> 14. You have to believe that Margaret Sanger and Gloria Steinem are
> more important to American history than Thomas Jefferson, Gen. Robert
> E.Lee and Thomas Edison.
>
> 15. You have to believe that standardized tests are racist, but racial
> quotas and set-asides are not.
>
> 16. You have to believe that Hillary Clinton is normal, and really a
> very nice person.
>
> 17. You have to believe that the only reason socialism hasn't worked
> anywhere it's been tried, is because the right people haven't been in
> charge.
>
> 18. You have to believe conservatives telling the truth belong in
> jail, but a draft-dodging liar and sex offender belonged in the White
> House.
>
> 19. You have to believe that homosexual parades displaying drag,
> transvestites and bestiality should be constitutionally protected, and
> manger scenes at Christmas should be illegal.
>
> 20. You have to believe that illegal Democratic Party funding by the
> Chinese government is somehow in the best interests of the United
> States.
>
> 21. You have to refuse to discuss the issues in a rational manner and
> whenever someone attempts to do so, throw a 3 ring tantrum, rant and
> rave, go into a lunatic rage and outshout them (preferably with
> profanity and name-calling) and stick to personal slurs, smear
> tactics, slander and building strawmen so you can knock down the
> strawmen (oops, sorry, strawpersons) and hopefully sidetrack the
> conversation away from your lack of ability to support your position.
>
> 22. You must always ignore the message and attack the messenger. When
> stuck, remember the tactic that won't reveal your inability to think
> or say anything original: smugly change a couple of your adversaries
> words' and repeat their comments back to them verbatim and even if it
> isn't true, by all means always
> be sure to accuse your opponents of using the very tactics the
> Leftwing Liberals try to hide, remembering all the while that Lenin
> would be proud.
>
> 23. No matter how credible a source may be - always do your Leftwing
> Liberal duty and rabidly claim it's been debunked and discredited and
> call anyone who believes it "mean spirited", crazy, a Nazi or any
> other of the monikers from the Leftwing Liberal grab bag of infantile
> epithets and sarcastic sobriquets.
>

> 24. Whenever demonstrated facts don't agree with your agenda, twist
> them and mangle them until you can make them fit into your prejudices,
> the media will assist you greatly.
>
> 25. Once you've told a lie or slandered someone, be sure to repeat it
> as often as possible until it becomes true. "Members and front
> organizations must continually embarrass, discredit and degrade our
> critics. When obstructionists become too irritating, label them as
> fascist, or Nazi or anti-Semitic .... The association will, after
> enough repetition, become "fact" in the public mind." [~ Communist
> Party, Moscow Central Committee, 1943]
>
> 26. You have to believe that all spirituality and all religions except
> Islam are bad.
>
> 27. You have to use the following buzzwords as often as possible:
> "Nazi", "Hitler", "Gestapo", "police state", "totalitarian state",
> "imperialism", "imperialist", "greedy corporations", "shrub",
> "fascist", "paranoid", "goose-stepping", "ruling-class",
> "class-strife", "class warfare", "stolen election", "racist",
> "entitlements", "hate", "bourgeois" or better yet, "petty bourgeois",
> "counter-revolutionary", "progressive", "red-baiter",
> "anti-Communist", "deviationist", "revisionist", "reactionary",
> "multiculturalism", "oppressed", "victims of Yankee oppression",
> "plight of the [fill in the blank] people", "mean-spirited",
> "McCarthyism", "jingoism", "flag-wavers", "neocons" and, of course,
> overuse of the indispensable "F"
> word.
>
> 28. You have to believe that there were never any weapons of mass
> destruction in Iraq, even though they were used against Iran, the
> Kurds and the the Iraqi people and even though the many Democrats
> warned us about WMD before the Iraqi invasion: William Jefferson
> Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Sandy Berger, Madeline Albright, Senators
> Carl Levin, Tom Daschle, Robert Byrd, Jay Rockefeller, John Kerry, Bob
> Graham, Ted Kennedy, Representatives Nancy Pelosi and Henry Waxman and
> vice-president Al Gore to name only the most vociferous.
>
> 29. You have to be a purveyor of perennial pessimism and a dispatcher
> of doomsday gloom and hyperbolic hysteria whenever you can work some
> scare tactics into the foreboding warnings of eventual catastrophe at
> the hands of your adversaries, i.e. people who disagree with you.
>
> 30. Whenever possible, if you hear or read something that seems quite
> logical and might influence someone against the Leftwing Liberal
> viewpoint, be sure to pounce on the exception or some tiny,
> inconsequential irrelevancy, such as the misspelling, poor punctuation
> or mispronunciation of a word, unusual facial expression, article of
> clothing or some morsel of arcane trivia or irrelevant minutia in an
> attempt to derail the conversation into petty bickering replete with

> name-calling and personal slurs. [Use of the "F" word
> is particularly effective, especially when combined with prepubescent
> profanity and puerile posturing.]
>
> 31. Always have unkind and accusatory slurs cocked and ready to use
> regarding any armed forces personnel, especially military people in
> harm's way other than your own candidates, sell-outs, turncoats,
> traitors and those who are guilty of or advocate treason.
>
> 32. When your adversary presents a particularly damning discovery,
> pervert it, twist it around, fabricate something out of thin air and
> accuse him of something he didn't say, falsely attribute your
> invention to him and then proceed to argue against your own creation
> with the hope nobody will notice. This is best done by beginning your
> remarks with "in other words" or "so what you are suggesting" or "are
> you saying that..." followed by the most implausible, irrelevant non
> sequitur you can fantasize.
>
> 33. You have to remember that nobody but your adversaries, real or
> imagined are ever to blame for anything and no one should ever be
> accountable or held responsible for their words or actions - they're
> just misunderstood.
>
> 34. You have to be a victim of as many forms of melodrama as possible
> and be ever vigilant to promote victimization of almost anything and
> anyone although that's very difficult to reconcile with the assertion
> that nobody's to blame for anything, except the people who don't agree
> with you.
>
> 35. You must always have Double Standards, a higher standard that you
> demand of corporations as well as people you don't like and people who
> don't agree with you and another set for yourself and your Leftwing
> Liberal confederates which is preferably no standards at all.
>
> 36. You must with all your heart and soul hate America and Americans
> and bash them at every opportunity, while claiming you love America
> though you contend that American patriots are really traitors.
>
> 37. You must always remember that you are a member of the grown up 4-H
> and it is incumbent on you to always display their watchwords:
> hallucinations, hyperbole, hysteria and hate.
>
> 38. You have to believe that just because your candidate lost an
> election (by all means shriek "election fraud" or "stolen election")
> or an unacceptable law was passed there's always the possibility of
> going to court to get your way in spite of the electorate and their
> congressional delegates.
>
> 39. You are always to belittle and deride concepts such as optimism,
> patriotism, honor, honesty, faithfulness, fidelity, loyalty, courage,

> bravery, principles, trust, trustworthiness, reliability,
> responsibility,
> respect, common-courtesy, common decency, kindness, Good Samaritanism,
> sacrifice, patience, fortitude, values, integrity and character as
> being naive and passe. Call anyone who uses those words, "judgmental"
> and "intolerant".
>
> 40. You are encouraged to lionize, venerate, yea, worship sloth, lust,
> self-centeredness, selfishness, instant gratification, slander,
> criminal behavior, drug addiction, degenerate behavior, promiscuous
> sex, lewd remarks and behavior, rudeness, crudeness, crassness, smutty
> language, vulgarity of all kinds, disrespect for authority, laws, law
> enforcement and military while showing respect for prostitution, drug
> dealing, gang-bangers, organized crime, pornography and generally
> everything that would aid in tearing down the social fabric of the
> United States of America and all she stands for.
>
> 41. Be sure to exhibit incessant anger at America and Americans in
> general and rage at conservatives, centrists and anyone who doesn't
> agree with your ideas.
>
> 42. You must be "politically correct" when it suits your purpose and
> point out that political correctness is a form of freedom rather than
> more mind-control, but, it's more important to demand that others be
> politically correct" than actually follow those demands yourself.
>
> 43. You must always offer praise and/or excuses for all of America's
> enemies, especially terrorists who aren't really murdering cowards,
> but, rather multiculturally misunderstood.
>
> 44. Remember to claim that the flag is only a piece of cloth and
> stands for nothing while you explain how you love America and that's
> why hurl hateful epithets regarding America and Americans, especially
> those who disagree with you.
>
> 45. Whenever someone says something that rubs your prejudgments the
> wrong way, ignore the contents of the remarks and vilify, defame,
> malign and slander that person while claiming everything that person
> has ever said or will ever utter is wrong. You are encouraged to take
> cheap shots and engage in name-calling and ad hominem attacks, but,
> above all, if you're a true standard-bearer for the Leftwing Liberals,
> avoid discussing issues you can't debate - which are, of course, all
> of them.
>
> 46. Honor multiculturalism and know it's "truths": "Multiculturalism,
> n. The doctrine that persons of European ancestry are morally
> inferior to all other human beings." ~ John Derbyshire, inspired by
> Ambrose Bierce and his _Devil's Dictionary_
>
> 47. When confronted with something that is critical of Leftwing

> Liberals, read or listen to one or two lines and jump to conclusions
> (it's the best exercise many Leftwing Liberals get) that the beginning
> was awful (meaning it might ask a Leftwing Liberal to actually think
> or to look at Leftwing Liberals in an uncomplimentary light) - and
> claim you didn't bother to read the rest or listen to the remainder
> all the while claiming to be open-minded.
>
> 48. You must take it as your sworn duty to do your utmost to prevent
> people from printing, voicing, writing or otherwise disseminating any
> communication which is either unfavorable to or not in agreement with
> Leftwing Liberal dogma and you must also strictly enforce Political
> Correctness, while at the same time doing your best to muzzle and
> silence those who don't agree with you. Tell adversaries to "Do as I
> say, and I'll do as I please!" This is not censorship, hypocrisy or
> Double Standards, but rather, "Freedom of Speech" an important
> Constitutional Amendment written to give Leftwing Liberals their
> God-given rights, even if they renounce and don't believe in God.
>
> 49. If you don't agree with the points of others, under no
> circumstances should you present a rational counter argument or
> discuss the issue itself when it is much more effective to call people
> liars and cast aspersions on their veracity. This is also effective if
> a person makes a mistake, don't overlook or excuse the error or admit
> there was a possibility of a mistake - call them liars ferociously,
> unless it's a petty sideline mistake that will help you construct
> smoke and mirrors, in that case see Article #30 above.
>
> 50. Conservatives suggest that people should "hate the sin, love the
> sinner". Remember, as a Leftwing Liberal you must always hate the
> sinner [person or corporation who doesn't agree with you] and love the
> sin as all sins are "relative" and finding anything wrong with them is
> "judgmental". This may be difficult to grasp at first glance since
> Leftwing Liberals don't believe in "sin" [unless it's being applied
> via Double Standard, see Article #35, toward corporations or people
> who don't agree with us] except for hypocrisy which is the only sin,
> when applied to our opponents and one of the most effective slurs in
> our arsenal. See Article #54
>
> 51. You must never be willing to take the consequences of your own
> actions or words or expect your confederates to do the same as long as
> you can unjustly lay the blame on someone else. But, of course, it is
> critical that you demand that people who don't agree with your ideas
> be held to strict adherence of taking the consequences of their
> actions: See Article #35 above regarding nurturing our trademark:
> Double Standards.
>
> 52. When asked to give citations, sources or support for your
> propaganda, you can do one of 4 things: Use secondary sources
> [McClatchy] which give "expert" Leftwing Liberal opinion on the
> primary sources when they're not ignoring them, taking phrases out of

> context, twisting their words or perverting their meaning; make an
> official-looking, bogus website with the fake "facts" you've
> presented; refer them to a propaganda site that may or may not support
> your claims or the third and preferred solution is to give them the
> URL of an official or universally accepted website and claim
> vehemently that the so-called information you've invented, created or
> faked is from that website though anyone who looks won't find it
> there.
>
> 53. Remember, "A liberal is someone who feels a great debt to his
> fellow man, which debt he proposes to pay off with your money." ~ G.
> Gordon Liddy
>
> 54. You have to support and promote socialized medicine as "Socialized
> medicine is based on the belief that, while individual bankruptcy by
> medical bills is tragic and wicked, bankrupting the entire country is
> beneficial and noble." ~ Nicolas Martin ["If you think health care is
> expensive now, wait 'til you see how much it costs when it's free."] ~
> P. J. O'Rourke
>
> 55. When your adversaries make statements that ring true, seem logical
> or appear to have merit, ask them completely irrelevant non sequitur
> questions in an attempt to evade the issue and derail the
> conversation. If that doesn't work, announce with all due grandiosity
> that your opponents refuse to answer your questions or give cites,
> therefore, they cannot support their assertions. This ploy of course
> won't work with people who can think, but, it will bring Leftwing
> Liberals and the lunatic fringe out of the woodwork to jump on your
> bellicose, bungling bandwagon.
>
> 56. You must always point out vociferously and incessantly that the
> reason any conservative's failing is always major news is that it
> allows liberals to engage in their very favorite taunt: "Hypocrisy!"
> Hypocrisy is the only sin that really inflames us Leftwing Liberals
> and, of course, only applies to others because Liberals can always
> invoke the time-honored Double Standard. Inasmuch as Leftwing Liberals
> have no moral principles, we can sit back, march, or otherwise create
> a ruckus as we criticize other people for failing to meet the
> standards that liberals simply renounce. It's an intriguing strategy.
> By openly admitting to being philanderers, draft dodgers, liars,
> weasels and cowards, liberals avoid ever being hypocrites. Remember,
> admission that morals and ethics are passe always gets you off the
> hook - but, do not hesitate to point out the immorality or unethical
> behavior of people who don't agree with Leftwing Liberals.
>
> 57. Remember, as a cheerleader for decadence, when any despot,
> criminal or maniac is treated in any way differently from the way he
> treated others, it's your sworn duty to shriek to the heavens that he
> isn't being treated with dignity and is being embarrassed in spite of
> the fact he may have raped, tortured, maimed and slaughtered others;

> as a Leftwing Liberal you must remain silent about the victims of
> despots, criminals and maniacs. The victims got what they deserved and
> despots, criminals and maniacs are to be honored, lionized, venerated
> and if they're bad enough, worshipped.
>
> 58. As a Leftwing Liberal, you must believe that all America foreign
> policy must have the unanimous approval of France, Russia, Syria,
> Cuba, Communist China and the United Nations. KM
>
> 59. You must learn to be agile at pulling the old Leftwing Liberal
> Switcheroo. Naturally in normal discourse, you must incessantly and
> nauseatingly bash your country, slur and slander the founding fathers,
> calling them terrorists and murderers, disparage all religions except
> Islam, denounce all military institutions and personnel, chide all
> people who have moral convictions and on and on [See articles 1-58];
> but, remember, when trying to win a petty bickering match, employ the
> Leftwing Liberal Switcheroo - which means dropping your old mantras
> and immediately feigning to embrace your opponents' views momentarily
> and don the mask of reverence for those you hate, but know you
> adversary admires. If you are successful
> enough in public discourse and exhibit it with enough frequency, you
> may be eligible to win a toaster from The Leftwing Liberal Liberty
> Lobby.
>
> 60. You, as a Leftwing Liberal, have to believe that all of the above
> is part of a vast right wing conspiracy.

206. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 13:59:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40473654.7040009@psu.edu>
Source record: 88320

William wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A424.9060402@psu.edu>...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>
> I highly
>
>>>recommend killfiling his posts.
>>
>>I read and evaluate every post he makes, and comment on those worthy of
>>comment.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike, freethinking will get you nowhere. Killfile him NOW or western
> civilization will end.

oops! too late! ;^)

- mike KB3EIA -

207. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 14:24:02 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A25F938C9DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
news:9_F1c.7381$5M.248680@dfw-read.news.verio.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94A24EF5DEFF7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:9XC1c.1879$Kb7.548506@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
>> > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
>> >> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
>> >> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney
>> >> and after looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
>> >> sue me for because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking
>> >> down my CB antenna from the house. The main reason I am not
>> >> fighting the utility is because of the cost of defending myself in
>> >> a lawsuit.
>> >> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
>> >> here last
>> >> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
>> >> experience. Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
>> >> against the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending
>> >> out cease and desist letters
>> >>
>> >> Tom
>> >
>> > Tom,
>> >
>> > Buy or borrow a current Element 2 study guide, then go out and find
>> > a VE session and take the 35 question Technician class exam.
>> >
>> > Are you covered by the blanket "authorization?" (ilo a licence)
>> > Yeah, probably...but with $10 and about two days worth of Q&A
>> > review, you're covered. Any questions, please use my e-mail address.
>> > (Remove NOSPAM) Take care and good luck.
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Well, I'm not a lawyer, but it appears to me that the lawyer is wrong.
```

>> BPL operates under part 15, which means it must accept all
>> interference.
>
> I had stated in an earlier post, that so long as he was Part 95
> compliant, he had nothing to worry about.... IF they insist on taking
> him to court, let them. He will win in the end "with" the FCC in his
> corner. They have to uphold their own R&Rs. Part 95 is one of them,
> regardless whether a license is needed or not, which by the way -
> "they" - did away with the requirement of. IF he ends up in court with
> those people, he could have a nice stock holding when it is all said
> and done. Suing for legal fees, damages, emotional distress - just for
> starters. Yep, the lawyer gave bad advice. See someone who knows radio.
> I'm sure there are many people who would stack up in your corner if
> this hits the fan. CB or Ham, it affects us all. This is one time we
> need to stand together. There is no room for separation. United we
> stand, divided we fall. CL
>
>
>

We do need to stick together in this against a common enemy. CBers have as much right as we do to radiate a signal.

I'm sure that the ARRL doesn't require you to be a ham to join, and they can find a good attorney who will help, maybe even pro bono (free). It won't hurt to ask them.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

208. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 14:58:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403040658.3814c13d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88322

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303140642.25517.00004578@mb-m15.aol.com>...

> The worst part is he can't even hold hisself together long enough to
> type properly... :-)
>
> ["undr"..."smotehr"...typical rage symptoms shown many times]

Lennie, are you REALLY so foolish as to start another rant on
typos? If so, We (yes, the ROYAL "we") can start a whole thread on
YOUR mistakes in ths forum, including those "shortened" words you
alledge...

Steve, K4YZ

209. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:02:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403040702.6d11141d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88323

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message news:<1e4e3692.0403031538.4532affb@posting.google.com>...

> You're out of control. Just ask anyone.

"They" are free to comment or editorialize as they see fit.

"...out of control"...?!?! Hardly.

A bit too tenacious for YOUR tastes...?!?! I am sure.

Want it to stop? Then YOU stop lying. Stop calling people names. Stop making claims that you can't or won't substantiate with facts.

In otherwords...act like a man, get TREATED like a man. It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

210. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:04:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403040704.51a89f25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88324

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>...

> I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?

Why? Figure you may have found somone who you can actually
communicate with on a peer-level, Brain? Or are 7-year olds just your
style?

Steve, K4YZ

211. Re: Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:32:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403040732.51e3e639@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88325

From yet another thread, Lennie AGAIN sticks the "main vein" out in
public then proceeds to Riverdance on his own "manhood"...

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303211146.23307.00007086@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403031539.2ecdfc44@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040303140642.25517.00004578@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0403021918.6da07634@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<5c01b95b.0402280701.7ca26232@posting.google.com>...

> >He's out of control. Again.
>
> For the nth time in here.
>
> Notice that the gunnery nurse will slowly crib my phrases and words,
> just like he does with yours, then claim them to be his own.

OK, Lennie...

We already have adequate suspicion that a lot of YOUR alleged
work is plagerized, but now you spread it around...

YOU get to provide some relevent examples of "phrases" I have
"crib(ed)" from you. Go ahead...we'll wait right here...

> For example, he said that Washington Army Radio has "played host
> to amateurs many times" without mentioning when and where. He
> really doesn't know but it comes out of his imagination. He's never
> had any occasion to communicate with Washington Army Radio,
> hasn't been there, doesn't know where it is (if it still exists), or a
> single detail of the place.

What do >>I<< need to provide, Lennie, that wasn't documented
THOUROUGHLY in "QST", "CQ", "73", "Worldradio", etc etc etc...?!?!

And yes, I've copied the annual message from WAR >>AND<< recieved
QSL cards from them for having made TWO-WAY contact with them.
(LICENSED operators can do that, ya know...)...It's called the Armed
Forces Day Cross Band Event.

Ya might have heard about it...At least if you were an ACTIVE, participating Amateur Radio licensee, that is...

> Washington Army Radio (WAR) doesn't exist as it did a half century
> ago...(SNIP)

Who cares?

> Messaging over HF does exist...(SNIP AGAIN)

More irrelevent historical meanderings. I am sure that it would make a great "Radio Trivial Pursuit", but I can't imagine any other applications.

Why don't you submit it to the QPC and see if they won't make an Amateur exam of strictly irrelevent trivial tidbits so you too can qualify for a license...?!?!

> There's no website for "Washington Army Radio." It was dissolved
> long before the Internet became public a dozen-plus years ago.

And I was lucky enough to have "put them in the log" on several occassions in my 32 years of licensed operations, Lennie...

No website needed. Just my radio, and adequate antenna, and valid license.

> Has the gunnery nurse ever been to WAR, not "hostile actions?"
> I doubt either.

You would. At least my "record" doesn't include cowardly attempts to embellish my service record with associations with soldiers who died three years before I was in-theater...Such as YOU did...

> Those are shadowlands in his imagination and
> fantasies. A twilight zone he can never experience in reality.

Ahhhh, but Lennie...I WAS there...on the radio...as LICENSED operators can be...

> But, the gunnery nurse has an Amateur Extra license! So does a
> seven-year-old. Emotionally they are the same, probably the nod to
> the seven-year-old as being more mature.

I am sure you'd think so...

Please remind us of your experience in raising children of ANY age...

And please remind us of how many times YOU operated a radio at, with, for or to WAR, Lennie...?!?!

(Geeze...this scumbag makes it easier every time....)

Stepped in it again, Lennie...

Ya wanna try to dodge this one based upon some typos again...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

212. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:32:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40474BD3.705F50C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88326

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4046C445.B839AB87@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> > > > Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> > > > > William wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > > >> using cellular telephones.
> > > > >
> > > > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > > > latest peculiar theory?
> > > > >
> > > > >> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > > > >
> > > > > How does a cellphone contest work?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted
> > > > to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment
> > > > to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone
> > > > lines.
> > > >
> > > > I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I
> > > > can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.
> > > >
> > > > Michael
> > >
> > > Michael, thank you. Now David's curiousity has an answer.
> > >
> > > If he were even slightly interested in amateur radio contests, he
> > > could seek out the publication "CQ," not defunct.
> >
> > You wrote nothing of amateur radio contests, Brian. I subscribe to CQ
> > though they are not the only sponsor of amateur radio contests. Do you
> > know something about amateur radio contesting? Is your contest
> > knowledge equal to your knowledge of DXing?
> >
> > Dave K8MN

>
> David, I know enough to not use a cellular telephone in an amateur
> radio contest. Wherever did you get that idea?

I never had that idea, William/Brian. You wrote nothing about an
amateur radio contest.

Dave K8MN

213. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:39:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40474D7A.B024AA65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88327

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4046C3D4.68807F16@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > > > using cellular telephones.
> > > >
> > > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > > latest peculiar theory?
> > >
> > > David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.
> >
> > Actually, that isn't quite correct. You've made this latest statement
> > in response to another's statement. It appears that your goal is to
> > attempt demonstrating that amateur radio is not something which would be
> > useful in an emergency.
>
> That would be your theory, not mine.

That is simply incorrect, William/Brian. I made no attempt to disparage
amateur radio's role in an emergency. I leave that to the tag team of
"Len or Lenda".

> Personally I'd want some amateur gear and a
> > cellular phone.
>
> Personally, I try to avoid placing myself in a situation which becomes
> an emergency. The next best thing is a cellular telephone, followed
> by amateur radio.
>
> Do you see evil in this?

Evil? Spring can't come early enough for you, can it?

> > > > > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > > >
> > > > How does a cellphone contest work?
> >
> > > David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?

> >
> > Not at all, William/Brian. I simply responded to what you wrote. If
> > you had a more complex thought, you didn't express it.

>
> Dave, it is you who lacks complex thought. I enjoyed your little
> escapade of bringing a cellular telephone to an amateur radio
> contest.

Please point out the portion of your original statement which contains
anything about an amateur radio contest.

> Maybe even France will call you.

I've often received calls from France, both on the amateur bands and on
the telephone.

> You're still good for a
> few laughs.

The laughs, as usual, appear to be on you. I'd love to hear more of
your amateur radio contesting exploits. I'd probably pick up a tip or
too.
Your insight into DXing was extremely valueable.

Dave K8MN

214. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 15:49:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40474FD5.E41F517F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88328

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > (snip) Also note that we, the consumers,
> > > are paying for that Kosher certification
> > > and product labeling.
> >
> >
> > (snip) How much do you think it costs
> > the manufacturer to get a jar of Miracle
> > Whip certified?
>
> I don't care if it is only five dollars (though I suspect the licensing of
> those tiny Kosher symbols cost very much more). And I don't care if that
> breaks down to only one half of one cent for each jar of Miracle Whip.
> That's money coming from me, and every other American who buys Kosher
> products, to directly finance the activities of a religion. Several,
> including you, have said I can instead buy products which are not Kosher
> certified. Instead, perhaps you or someone else can explain to me why I
> should even have to concern myself with the activities of a "minority"
> religion (your word) when I purchase food in this country. Since they're
> collecting money from the general public, is that religion prepared to
> publicly account for where and on what that money is being spent? Of course
> not. Are Americans allowed to opt out of this donation scheme when
> purchasing products? Not unless they want to give up their favorite foods -
> something no person should have to do in a country supposedly free of
> religious dominance.
>
> And that's my final word on this issue. Again, if you don't see the
> problem with all this, you're not looking and I can't make you see what you
> don't want to see. Take care.

Dwight,

I wish you could see your statements for what they are: pure, simple
religious prejudice. Good luck on picking through foods at the
supermarket in an effort to choose only those products not tainted with
that "kosher" symbol.

You might want to avoid films and newspapers and TV networks too. You
know who controls Hollywood, TV and the news media, don't you? I'm sure
that you're somehow paying extra for those too. Jews likely get a
discount on newspaper subscriptions, cable TV bills and on theater

tickets. The rest of us just pay and pay and pay.

If you can't cover your house in aluminum foil, at least wrap your Christian-type food in it.

Now back to the interfaith morse code wars.

Dave K8MN

215. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 17:15:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88329

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...
>
> Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...It's about
> why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
> >>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?

Steve,

Isn't the reason obvious?
>
> That scumbag you run with likes to do that. Jim has never
> refered to him as anything but "Len", yet "Len" finds countless ways
> to belittle him.

I have also used the term "Mr. Anderson".
>
> He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
> of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
> etc etc, when I had not so addressed him.

Don't forget "nursie" and being addressed by the wrong gender.

> He is treated and addressed
> in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.

And you have provided the exact response desired.

By responding in kind, you have lowered yourself to the level of the
very people you oppose, and (in their minds) given them the OK to
continue to behave that way.
>
> I have a problem with you lying.

Do you think that such lies will ever be admitted? For example, I have
been
accused of altering Kim's posts - which is not what happened at all.
>
> I have a problem with you following in the footsteps of a person
> who is a known pathological liar and antagonist. It's embarrassing to
> see a contemporary Veteran and Amateur licensee resorting to Lennie's
> tactics.

And by responding in kind......

> Instead, you choose to be even MORE argumentitive and demeaning,
> even further cementing your reputation.

Then why bother, Steve? Haven't you seen enough examples to know what the
responses will be? Don't you already know that your questions will not be answered?

There's a reason for killfiles and filters. I find my
rrap experience to be much better for the use of them.

You've got kids, Steve. Haven't you had the situation where a kid argues with you about bedtime - at bedtime? By arguing with the kid, bedtime effectively becomes later because the kid isn't in bed when s/he's arguing. But if you refuse to argue, you get less of a hassle.

Dee's (or was it Dave's?) metaphor of the landfill and the fence is very appropriate.

"[their] hobby is wasting time. Your time."

Free speech doesn't mean you have to listen to what everyone says.

73 de Jim, N2EY

216. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 17:16:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403040916.4970ad23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88330

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4046C277.52A8509E@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Pigs require the most water per pound and aren't exactly the easiest
> > to herd. The meat can be eaten safely if thoroughly cooked, which
> > requires lots of fuel.
>
> Cats don't require as much water as pigs but, Oh Mama, are they ever
> tough to herd!

Yup. But who knows what they taste like?

73 de Jim, N2EY

217. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 17:23:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403040923.588891ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88331

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<404646A8.6020802@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> > Many "religious" rites involving foods or drink usually have some
> > valid historical basis behind them. In Biblical times, the knowledge
> > (and certainly the means) to properly store and prepare pork products
> > was not there...hence people who ate pork products routinely became
> > ill, even died.
>
> 100 percent correct. If you look at the similarities between
> the Kosher and Moslem food preparation and forbidden food guidelines,
> you can see that it is more of a regional thing than a religion issue.

Quite possible.
>
> All the forbidden items are potential problems, with things like
> trichinosis or shellfish toxins for instance. So it is more a social
> thing, AFAIAC.
> And the food preparation for the most part is common sense, or at least
> a sort of rough guideline for sanitation/keeping incompatible things
> from each other.
>
> I dunno about the business of meat and milk tho'.
>
It may have to do with cross-contamination. There is a line in the
Bible which says "thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"
from which much of the meat-dairy separation evolved. "Kid" expanded
to mean any meat, "milk" to mean any dairy product, and "seethe" to
mean any cooking, and eventually any food combination.

> > The drinking of wine in Christian and Jewish faiths also has
> > historical basis...Drinking water was often brackish or otherwise
> > unfit...Wine and beer, however, had been fermented, and many of the
> > offending bateria had been unwittingly purged from the brew in the
> > process...
> >
> > 'mazen, ain't it...?!?!
>
> "Beer is proof that God loves you and wants you to be happy."
>
> Benjamin Franklin
>
A true genius, ol' Ben. Although originally from Boston, he spent most
of his life right here in Philadelphia. Founded my alma mater
(University of Pennsylvania), the first true hospital in the colonies

(Pennsylvania Hospital, still in operation as part of a larger group of hospitals) and was the first electrical engineer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

218. ARRL Responds to WSJ Article on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 17:28:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403040928.23c43aea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88332

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/03/104/?nc=1

73 de Jim, N2EY

219. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 17:37:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88333

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040303063822.00545.00004644@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return
> to
> > >the US over time.
> >
> > I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more
> choosy
> > about what they buy.
> >
> > The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last week
> they
> > seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of hamburger
> > assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be
> classified as
> > "manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's
> assembly,
> > isn't it?
> >
> > "No Millionaire Left Behind"
>
> The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a global
> economy and that isn't going to change.

That's true to a point. But we don't have to simply accept everything
that comes down the pike as inevitable.

> The drastic reduction in costs
> of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as
> similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture
> and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't
> going to change in the short run.

Only if it doesn't affect buyer behavior. If buyers protest with their
dollars, things will change.

> In the long run, those currently
> cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.

Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?

> In the short
> run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
> either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
> manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.

OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
lower prices?

> In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
> job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
> may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>
That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
meantime?

I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
alone.

73 de Jim, N2EY

220. Re: A follow up to Dwights rants

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 18:09:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404770F7.3000401@psu.edu>
Source record: 88334

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<404646A8.6020802@psu.edu>...
>
>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
>
>>> Many "religious" rites involving foods or drink usually have some
>>>valid historical basis behind them. In Biblical times, the knowledge
>>>(and certainly the means) to properly store and prepare pork products
>>>was not there...hence people who ate pork products routinely became
>>>ill, even died.
>>
>> 100 percent correct. If you look at the similarities between
>>the Kosher and Moslem food preparation and forbidden food guidelines,
>>you can see that it is more of a regional thing than a religion issue.
>
>
> Quite possible.
>
>> All the forbidden items are potential problems, with things like
>>trichinosis or shellfish toxins for instance. So it is more a social
>>thing, AFAIAC.
>> And the food preparation for the most part is common sense, or at least
>>a sort of rough guideline for sanitation/keeping incompatible things
>>from each other.
>>
>>I dunno about the business of meat and milk tho'.
>>
>
> It may have to do with cross-contamination. There is a line in the
> Bible which says "thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"
> from which much of the meat-dairy separation evolved. "Kid" expanded
> to mean any meat, "milk" to mean any dairy product, and "seethe" to
> mean any cooking, and eventually any food combination.

If it were up to my interpretation, and it isn't, I would have though
that more of an admonition of what would be a mentally cruel thing to
do, as opposed to what it turned out to be interpreted as, which is a
double or triple interpretation.

>>> The drinking of wine in Christian and Jewish faiths also has
>>>historical basis...Drinking water was often brackish or otherwise
>>>unfit...Wine and beer, however, had been fermented, and many of the
>>>offending bateria had been unwittingly purged from the brew in the
>>>process...

>>>
>>> 'mazen, ain't it...?!?!
>>
>> "Beer is proof that God loves you and wants you to be happy."
>>
>> Benjamin Franklin
>>
>
> A true genius, ol' Ben. Although originally from Boston, he spent most
> of his life right here in Philadelphia. Founded my alma mater
> (University of Pennsylvania), the first true hospital in the colonies
> (Pennsylvania Hospital, still in operation as part of a larger group
> of hospitals) and was the first electrical engineer.

the Pub's wouldn't like him tho'. He had too much of a sexual appetite
for their tastes....

- Mike KB3EIA -

221. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 18:32:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88335
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A utility company can not just experiment when and where they want.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to get the
> ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider information!
> CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> > after
> > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> > because I
> > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from
> the
> > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the
> > cost
> > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> > last
> > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> experience.
> > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> > utilities
> > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> letters
> > >
> > > > Tom
> > >
> > > I still think this is a troll, but...

> > >
> > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > telecommunications
> > > law.
> > >
> > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
> > anything.
> > >
> > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be heard
> by
> > > a court.
> > >
> > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> interested.
> > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > >
> > > --
> > > Jim Pennino
> > >
> > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> >
> > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing is
> > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

222. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 18:34:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mFK1c.29846$W74.16346@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.

Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company will
have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.

I am a licensed station....any other questions?

Dan/W4NTI

223. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 18:43:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88337
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on your
> ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as linears,
> extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per part
> 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't helping
the
> war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I don't
do
> CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent CBers.
> CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it you're
> in
> > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer
> > required
> > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a license
> when
> > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to Part
> 95 -
> > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air and
> > talk.
> > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people who
> have
> > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to
> research
> > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or
> trying
> > to
> > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on that
> issue.
> > I
> > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't have
> money
> > to

> > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your
elected
> > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC website
if
> > you
> > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page of
> it,
> > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while you're
at
> > it.
> > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let them
> bull
> > > doze you over. CL
> > >
> > >
> > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney
and
> > > after
> > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> > because
> > > I
> > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from
> the
> > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of
the
> > > cost
> > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
here
> > > last
> > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> experience.
> > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> > > utilities
> > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> letters
> > > >
> > > > Tom
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>

>

224. Re: Help identifying frequency of French space surveillance system

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 18:59:16 UTC
From: Mark Mueller <mm@mailerrax.net>
Message-ID: <c27u7n$d4v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Allen Thomson" <thomsona@flash.net> wrote in message
news:501f9880.0403040820.5942e795@posting.google.com...
> I'm trying to identify the frequency of a new(ish) French space
> surveillance radar. It may be in the 100 - 400 MHz range, but that's
> uncertain.
>

Look in the 380 mHz range, but it is not always there, nor in the
100 - 400 mHz range. There is an additonal frequency range
being used sporadically.

Mark Mueller, P.E., M.B.A., Ph.D.
Chief of Research
HY Soyts, LTD

225. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 19:28:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4047836D.1060606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88339
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Don Parker wrote:

>A 1 Mb/sec feed in each direction for only $29.95 per month? That's
>what the press releases claim that Cinergy Electric can deliver right
>now.
>
>
>
There's a version of BPL that uses the microwave spectrum. Hopefully
this is that.
Bad news for our microwave hams, but not so bad for HF users, if true.
1Mb over
HF seems unlikely.

226. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 19:54:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40478965.9080001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88340
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

M. uberputz wrote:

>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:5c01b95b.0403031417.4499550b@posting.google.com...
>
>
>>"Jim Leder" <k8cxm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>
>>
>news:<4045e25c$0$52150$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>...
>
>
>> They ALSO need to be informed that since this is a Part 15
>>program they are afforded NO PROTECTION from interferene from ANY
>>licensed radiator.
>>
>>
>
>That's right. Hopefully somebody will find a
>way to generate and send "BPLI" (BPL Interference)
>via some kind of a handy device right back up
>the power line and into the distribution network
>out on the pole. If they send it down the power
>line then there must be a way to send it right back
>up the same, creating standing waves, and fudging
>their datastream. You hackers out there need
>to get to work on this.
>
>
>
New mode: International DX "BPL" style digital protocol communications.
Be sure to use your kilowatt linear to maintain desired QSOs.

227. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 20:19:11 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab1599a520274ea9897d7@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88341

In article <j27e40h6vjlqq07mlq6uplq2pej1h4o9va@4ax.com>,
nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net says...
> On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 15:25:02 GMT, Arnold <pigs@pink.floyd> wrote:
>
> >On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, in rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> >tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> >> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> >> last week ...
> >
> >Yeah but it's typical on USENET. A cease and desist letter WRT BPL is
> >something new and everybody's troll alarm goes off. As another poster
> >suggested, a scan of the letter would be interesting to see as we're all
> >going to have to deal with this sooner or later, at least from the way
> >things look now. No announcements of BPL roll-out for me yet, but the
> >same company (Progress Energy) is doing trial runs in another city nearby
> >so it's only a matter of time.
> >
> >Good luck.
>
>
> I find it interesting as well, especially from the perspective that
> preliminary tests of BPL had concluded that it was way too prone to
> outside interference (as well as generating it), and the unpredictable
> nature of that interference rendered BPL unreliable as a practical
> service.
>
> Evidently, if this case is true, it would seem that the "BPL Pushers"
> are trying to strong arm radio stations off the air. While CB'ers do
> not require a license, they are authorized by rule, and if they are in
> compliance with Part 95, they have every right to operate as if they
> were any other licensed service.

BPL will eventually suffer from the same problem common to shared medium
systems. Just ask the cable companies - they know.

228. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 20:30:48 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>> DUHHHHHH..... But
THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
utility
> company can not just experiment when and where they want.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to get
> the
> > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> information!
> > CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney
> and
> > > after
> > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> > > because I
> > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
from
> > the
> > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of
> the
> > > cost
> > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
> here
> > > last
> > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > experience.

> > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> > > utilities
> > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > letters
> > > >
> > > > > Tom
> > > >
> > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > >
> > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an FCC
> > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > telecommunications
> > > > law.
> > > >
> > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue for
> > > anything.
> > > >
> > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
heard
> > by
> > > > a court.
> > > >
> > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > interested.
> > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Jim Pennino
> > > >
> > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > >
> > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing
is
> > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

229. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 20:32:00 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on
your
> > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as linears,
> > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per
part
> > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't helping
> the
> > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I
don't
> do
> > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent CBers.
> > CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it
you're
> > in
> > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer
> > > required
> > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a license
> > when
> > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to Part
> > 95 -
> > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air
and
> > > talk.
> > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people
who
> > have

> > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to
> > research
> > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or
> > trying
> > > > to
> > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on that
> > issue.
> > > > I
> > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't have
> > money
> > > > to
> > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your
> elected
> > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC
website
> if
> > > you
> > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page
of
> > it,
> > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while you're
> at
> > > it.
> > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let
them
> > bull
> > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney
> and
> > > > after
> > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> > > because
> > > > > > I
> > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
from
> > the
> > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of
> the
> > > > cost
> > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
> here
> > > > last
> > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > experience.

> > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> > > > utilities
> > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > letters
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Tom
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

230. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 21:00:20 UTC
From: Don Parker <parker287@no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701HF7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 88344
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Thu, 04 Mar 2004 19:28:47 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> 1Mb over
> HF seems unlikely.

For quite a few years, the phoneline networking standard has been
delivering up to 10 Mb/sec by using a residential telephone line
(http://www.homepna.org/products) to carry a fraction of the HF
spectrum.

1 Mb/sec seems to be *easily* achievable at HF. It's already
been done.

231. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 21:22:14 UTC
From: Glenn <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net>
Message-ID: <104f7g7rtkdv7de@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88345

You just brought back some memories, Bill. Way back in the early '60s I had a couple of those Ameco Study Guides.

I took some of those early tests (the ones before 1984) but I find it hard to remember their level of difficulty sufficiently to make a reasonable comparison. I took the first of them as a pre-teen, a few in the mid-70s, and then re-took the whole smear in 1988.

While I remember that the tests for Novice and General were of the multiple guess kind in the '60s (albeit at an FCC Field Office), I could swear that I remember that drawn circuit diagrams were required at least for the Extra written exam, if not the Advanced. This from the study guides that I had for the tests.

Of course, it's absolutely true that a test can be made harder by the depth that the test goes into, but breadth can also make for a hard test. What I remember of the tests I went through back in the 60s was flying through them all, acing the Novice and missing 2 questions on the General.

Code has never been a problem for me. The only problem I would have with a 5 wpm test is that it's too slow. For me, the 13 wpm is too slow. I find 15 wpm a slow minimum comfortable speed, with 25 at optimum. This is for me, and I realize that others don't find it so and never will.

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:GuIQb.26667$zj7.856@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| Since the actual tests used before 1984 are not available, who is to
>>say if
>>| they were "harder" or "easier"?
>>|
>>
>>Those of us who took them.
>>
>>The material today is somewhat more difficult, since it covers a much
>>broader range of technology than the 1960's stuff.
>
>
> Hans is correct. The late 50's Tech was the same as General.

> Additionally, there were plenty of smaple tests around via AMECO
> and other study guides even before Bash.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

--
73 from Glenn - KG5UC

232. Amateur Radio Newslin(tm) Report 1385 – February 27, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 21:53:11 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304165311.22662.00000904@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 88346

Amateur Radio Newslin(tm) Report 1385 – February 27, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1385 with a release date of Friday, February 27, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Another proposal on restructuring and more on the fight against B-P-L highlight Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1385 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: A COUNTER PROPOSAL TO THE ARRL

Just as we all thought it was quieting down, restructuring of the United States Amateur Radio Service is front and center once again. This, as a small group that opposes the quantity over quality approach takes a massive counter proposal to the FCC. The group is headquarted in Florence, Alabama and Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, is at our South-East Bureau in near-by Birmingham, with more:

--

Robin Gist, K4VU, listened to the ARRL’s plan to restructure amateur radio and didn't like it.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

Gist and five other hams who make up a group called the Radio Amateur Foundation, drew up their own plans for restructuring ham radio. Their 59-pages of suggestions are now in the hands of the FCC. Gist calls the Foundation's petition a comprehensive plan for progressive and thoughtful restructuring. The group suggests taking the Technician class license, making a few changes, and turning it into amateur radio's entry level license. Gist is not pleased with the League's plans for the Technician license:

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

The group suggests giving Technician class hams restricted HF privileges. And it strongly advocates keeping the code--5-word-per-minute Morse code proficiency would be maintained for General and Extra class licenses. Keeping Code, Gist says, is important to help amateurs provide emergency communications.

Under the foundation's proposal, the Novice and Advanced licenses would no longer exist. Current Novice and Advanced license holders would automatically be upgraded to the next category--a novice would become a Technician and an Advanced class ham would become an Extra.

Another big change comes in amateur radio testing under the Foundation's plans.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

The Foundation suggests not releasing question pool questions to the public.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

Gist believes hams should have to wait at least 10 days before taking a failed amateur radio license test again.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

Gist says amateur radio should be quality over quantity. A service of radio operators who have a sense of value and appreciation for amateur radio. That is what Gist says the Foundation's goals are really all about.

From the Southeastern Bureau in Birmingham , Alabama, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, for The Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

While there are well over a dozen restructuring proposals already before the FCC only one has really gotten any major attention of the ham radio community. That’s the plan offered up by the A-R-R-L and referred to by Gist. As we go to air, no Rule Making designation has been assigned by the FCC to the Foundations regulatory change request. (QRZ.COM, ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: WHAT HAMS CAN DO

Meantime, the story that refuses to go away has yet some new twists. Of coarse we are referring to the imminent introduction of Broadband Over Powerline Internet access, and the massive interference that ham radio operators believe it will create. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mark Abramovicz, NT3V, is here with the latest:

--

Now that the FCC has released the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Broadband Over Powerlines issue, it's time for amateurs to look it over, digest it and begin composing a well-reasoned letter or e-mail.

So says Jim Haynie W5JBP the American Radio League's president. Here are some things in the filing you might consider.

"Noise levels, potential interference both ingress and egress. Those are things that need to be addressed, " Haynie says. "Public relations: What's going to happen when you get on the air on 20 meters and you knock 10 of your neighbors off line all of sudden? They call the local power company, it's a public relations nightmare."

Haynie says once you decide to write that letter, keep in mind it has to be supported with facts.

"I don't see much water being drawn if somebody writes a letter and says, 'Well, this is good for this and it's good for that and it's going to interfere with my ham radio hobby and stuff.' I never, ever use the word hobby to anybody in the Washington. It's the Amateur Radio Service," Haynie says.

"And what you've got to do is use a little bit more fact, a little bit more of concrete-type evidence that you can conclude on your own. And that's pretty simple to do. It's got to be well-reasoned arguments. It can't be emotional argument."

And, once you've finished the letter or e-mail, Haynie says make a copy or print a copy of what you've prepared.

"Put it in an envelope with your QSL card and send it into your local representative at his district office, not in Washington but his district office," Haynie advises. "I'm just amazed how much power that letter has to your local congressman and your local senator when you mail it to one of his local district offices."

Haynie continues to express disappointment the FCC failed to wait for a report from the National Telecommunications Information Agency. The agency oversees radio spectrum use by government agencies and services, including the military. He says its technicians have been busy at BPL trial sites across the country.

"We know that they've done over 18,000 measurements over the last four months in the various (BPL) test areas," Haynie says. "We have gotten actually photographs of their trucks, we've seen them working hard at it. And that's what surprised me that the commission rolled this out before the information was made available.

"We were told by NTIA that it would be available the first part of this year. Now in government-speak, I don't know what that means. I know we got, the League's got petitions sitting up in the commission now since I took office as president in 2000. It is 2004 and they're still sittting on somebody's desk.

"So, FCC and NTIA, I'm sure, have their own timetables and they're not going to worry about what the ARRL or what some ham radio operators think about it. They're going to do their own work in the own way in their own time."

Haynie hopes the NTIA finishes its work soon and gets its report to the FCC pronto. He says it's clear BPL is targeted for special FCC attention.

"I think they'll put this on the fastest of fast tracks and get something going," Haynie says. "Typically, the window, the comment window will be 45-60 days. I'd be really surprised if they gave it 90 days.

"And, once that's done they start the wheels in motion and they'll (FCC) be under tremendous pressure from industry to get this thing out the door."

Haynie says the amateur radio service has allies in this fight and he's confident they will submit comments or speak to their congressmen or senators. Haynie says he's both cautious and optimistic about the outcome.

"I'm very concerned because I've seen the speed at which this thing has happened," Haynie says. "And I've seen the comments that the commission has made and I've seen the denials that the industry has made.

"And it just doesn't make sense. There's something more behind this. And I know people are going to say it's the almighty dollar. And that's true, it probably is. You're looking at millions and millions and millions of dollars of investment here.

"But there's something that just doesn't smell right, I guess, is what I'm trying to say. So, until I get a better handle and the League - our staff people get a better handle on where this is going and trust me we're on top of it every day - I'm just going to be to on the little plus side of a little cautious."

And finally, Haynie says to those who think the ARRL and other hams are overreacting like Chicken Little who cried out: The sky is falling! The sky is falling! He has these sobering thoughts.

"Just because we want, doesn't mean that we get our way. And I'm concerned about that," Haynie says. "And I'm concerned about another possibility that's probably the horror of all horrors.

"And that is if the (BPL) rollout is so big and you get tens of hundreds of thousands of people on, suddenly amateur radio relegates down to the same level as Part 15. That would be the most horrible thing that could happen to amateur radio."

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia

--

To read or download the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking from the FCC on Broadband over Powerlines, you can find it on the FCC's website: www-dot-fcc-dot gov. And, to learn more more about the ARRL's position, go to www.arrl.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Flint Area Independent Repeaters serving the city of Flint Michigan.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: A WIN IN 4X4-LAND

Even though the BPL outlook looks a bit grim here in the United States, there has been a big win over in Israel. Hagal International says that equipment for the networking of computers over the A C power mains being sold in the country was found to be causing interference to High Frequency spectrum users. As a result, Israel’s Ministry of Communications requested an explanation from the distributor of this equipment on how to remedy the problem. The distributor did one better. The company replied that it had discontinued the sales of the interfering devices. (Hagal International)

**

RADIO HONORS: W. VA GOVERNORS FATHER WA8AYP REMEMBERED

Here in West Virginia, Governor Bob Wise strolled into his reception hall last week to present a check to Kanawha County officials. Little did he know that those officials – and some amateur radio operators – had a very special surprise for him.

The money, fifty thousand dollars, was awarded to the county for the purchase of amateur radio equipment for the metro area’s new emergency operations center, and a new mobile command post.

As he usually does when speaking about amateur radio, Governor Wise began to reminisce about his father. He recalled hearing the sounds of CW from his father’s Hallicrafters receiver wafting into his bedroom at night. He even remembered his father’s amateur callsign, WA8AYP. At that moment, his attention was directed to a nearby FT-847 to receive a message.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

That’s control operator Bill Hunter, K8BS, telling the governor via amateur radio that his father’s callsign is now the club callsign of the Kanawha

County ARES/RACES group. The announcement was not only a complete surprise, the governor appeared clearly touched. After a moment, he quipped, “Hey, do I get a QSL card for this?” He was quickly presented with a specially designed QSL card. After the ceremony, the governor signed copies of those cards, and posed for pictures with the estimated 75 ham operators in attendance.

The surprise was the brainchild of Kanawha County Commission President Kent Carper, W8CHS, who appears to be one politician who can keep a secret.

Robert Wise, Senior became a silent key in 1986. He was active in emergency communications during the 1960’s and 70’s. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO HONORS: FCC NAMED TO RECEIVE NCAI LEADERSHIP AWARD

The FCC has been named by the National Congress of American Indians to be the 2004 recipient of it’s prestigious NCAI Leadership Award. The regulatory agency was selected based on its outstanding leadership and ongoing commitment and support to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

The National Congress of American Indians gives only three of these awards annually. One goes to Congress, one goes to the Administration, and one goes to another deserving entity. This year's recipients are House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo of California, the US Commission on Civil Rights, and the FCC. (FCC)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING: QPC WITHDRAWS A GENERAL TEST QUESTION

The Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examination Coordinators has announced the withdrawal Question G5B11 from the Element 3 General class question pool. The QPC says that the question deleted asked what would be the RMS voltage if you combined two or more sine wave voltages?

According to QPC Chairman Scotty Newstadter, W4WW, the withdrawal refers to question G5B11 in the new, December 1, 2003, released General pool. It is not referring to the same numbered question in the pool that expires at midnight, June 30, 2004. (QPC, W4WW)

**

ENFORCEMENT: JACK GERRITSEN, EX-KG6IRO IN JAIL

Californian Jack Gerritsen, the ex-KG6IRO, will be spending time in jail, but not for his alleged interference to ham radio repeaters in the Los Angeles area.

On Monday, February 23rd, Federal Court Judge Carolyn Turchin sentenced Gerritsen to 30 days in jail and ordered him to pay a $2500 fine on a tresspassing charge. In passing sentence, judge Turchin explained that she could not place Gerritsen on formal probation as the U-S Attorney asked, because he was going to spend his entire sentence in jail with no time left for

probation. The Judge told Gerritsen that he has until May 15th to pay the fine or a lien will be placed on his home in the city of Bell.

Gerritsen’s alleged harassment of area repeaters had brought numerous letters to the court asking that it bar him from operating any sort of radio transmitter. In a statement to the court Judge Turchin noted that she had read many of the notes sent to her by the amateur community but that she would not be able to take them into consideration for this case. This was because the charges were brought because Gerritsen failed to obey a sign in the Courthouse and entered a door to the roof of the building.

Judge Turchin did say that she she would forward all the letters to the Federal Probation Department to be put in Gerritsen’s file. The ex-KG6IRO was then taken into custody by U.S. Marshals and escorted away. (ARNewsline(tm))

**
WITH THE ARRL: LEAGUE LOOKING FOR COMMENTS ON VHF+ CONTESTING

The ARRL is looking for input from VHF and UHF contesters to help improve the radiosporting events they take part in. According to a posting top the VHF Reflector by New England Division Director Tom Frenaye, K1KI, for the last year or so the League has been studying ways to increase interest and participation in VHF and above contests and awards. Now its ready to go further and it is inviting the ham community to take part. We have more in this report:

--

Tom Frenaye, K1KI, heads up the ARRL's VHF-UHF Contest and Awards Subcommittee. He says that changes to the contest rules and awards programs should be designed to do three things. First, to encourage more people to work more other people. Second, to bolster the number of QSO’s made over longer distances. And lastly, to encourage more people to just join in and participate.

Because of this, there are now some recommendations coming from those in the ARRL who have studied the situation. These incclude making changes in the QSO points and rover rules. Also under consideration is limiting the June VHF QSO Party to the bands from 50 to 1296 MHz only, expanding the Microwave contest based on 10 GHz Cumulative and dropping the current UHF contest. Added would be new contest categories in January, June and September.

Frenaye notes that these major recommendations, and a number of minor ones, are still just that -- recommendations. He says that the ARRL feels it is now very important to have further input from the VHF and above contest community before proceeding. He asks all contesters interested in these bands to take an in-depth look at the preoposed changes and then to respond. He hopes that a lot of you will.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP, reporting.

--

You can e-mail your ideas and comments on or before March 7th to vhf-contest-proposal@arrl.org. (K1KI via VHF Reflector)

**

CW SAVVY: A MORSE CODE SYMBOL FOR THE "AT SIGN"

Computer fanatics who also like operating C-W listen up. Radio Currents Online for February 16th says that the International Morse Code is being updated to include a new character for the "at sign". In December, the International Telecommunications Union voted to create the character which will be known as a commat. The commat is made up of dot-dash for the letter A and dash-dot-dash-dot which we all know is the letter C. The two characters are combined with no space between them giving Morse code web surfers an easy way to send an e-mail address or the location of a webpage. (CGC)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAPPENINGS: THE QCWA 2004 HAMVENTON DINNER

On the convention scene, word that the Quarter Century Wireless Association will hold its 2004 Hamvention Banquet at 7:30 p.m. on Friday, May 14th. Hosted by hosted by South West Ohio Chapter 9 the location this year is Alex's Continental Restaurant near the Dayton suburb of Miamisburg. Cost per person is $ 17.00 and advance reservations are required. Send requests and payment to Jerry Ragland, 409 Park Avenue, Franklin, Ohio, 45005. (QCWA)

**

ARRL SM ELECTIONS: THE RESULTS ARE IN

Turning to names in the news, word that Patrick Bunsold, WA6MHZ, has elected as the ARRL San Diego Section Manager in the only contested election this winter. Bunsold received 378 votes and his opponent, Stephen Early, AD6VI, garnered only 258 votes.

Election ballots were counted February 24 at ARRL Headquarters. Bunsold's two-year term of office begins on April 1st. All other Section Managers standing for re-election ran unopposed. (ARRL)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE CONTROL ROOM GLASS

And Amateur Radio Newsline President and Producer, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is now the author of a new column dealing with ham radio operators working in the broadcasting profession appearing on the famed HalEisner.Com website.

Bill’s calls his commentary “The Other Side of the Control Room Glass.” It tells the stories of famous and no-so-famous people in the broadcast profession who share a common interest in Amateur Radio and the way in which being a ham has affected their careers.

The column began on Sunday, February 22nd with the first of a 4-part tribute to the late Roy Neal, K6DUE. This series will include a retrospective on Neal’s successful effort to put a manned Amateur Radio station into space.

“The Other Side of the Control Room Glass” becomes a monthly feature of the website in April. You can read it on-line at www.haleisner.com

(ARNewsline(tm))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMS HELPING HAMS: THE MIKE NEWBOLD, K0YO FUND

A fund to help 6 meter rover operator Mike Newbold, K0YO. It was set up by a group of hams who value Newbold's contributions by putting his life on-the-line to get rare grid squares on the air. And late last year it almost cost him his life. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the rest of the story:

--

According to a posting on QRZ.com made for Phil Krichbaum, N0KE , Mike Newbold, K0YO, was vacationing in Baja Mexico just before Christmas 2003. He was savagely beaten with a pipe, robbed and left for dead. The same thugs also killed two Canadian surfers who were camping about 100 yards away from Newbold and threw their bodies and those of their dogs over a cliff.

Kirchbaum says that Newbold crawled 3 kilometers on his hands and knees through cactus and over rocks to a road where he had a better chance of being located. Some surfers from Los Angeles found him the next day. They took him to a medical facility and contacted the police. They then transported Newbold back to California for further medical treatment. Newbold then went back to Steamboat Springs, Colorado, where his son took him for additional medical care and then home for a Christmas eve dinner. Kirchbaum says he has since visited Newbold brought him a 2 meter F-M radio donated by Bob Ludtke, K9MWM. Thats where he learned that the value of items lost and stolen in Baja easily exceeds $10,000.

To help defray the cost of replacing Newbold's pick-up truck, camper and ham radio gear that he and Gary Yantis, W0TM have established he Mike Newbold Fund. If anyone would care to make a donation to help get Newbold back on the road to rare grids, please contact W0TM or N0KE. Their respective e-mail addresses are gyantis@midtec.com and pfkski@vail.net.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

You can read more about Mike Newbold, K0YO, and what happened to him on-line on line on the newspages at www.qrz.com (QRZ.COM)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SUCCESSFUL OHIO ISS CONTACT

Friday, February 20th was a great day for youngsters at Ohio's Glenwood Elementary School. That's when International Space Station Commander Mike Foale, KB5UAC successfully answered questions from a number of students. Better yet, Bill Chalkin, KA8VIT, in nearby South Euclid was listening and recording. Take a listen to a ham radio from space:

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

In all, sixteen students got to question KB5UAC about life on-orbit. According to the AMSAT News Service preliminary reports indicate the space station side of the conversation was heard as far East as Boston and Baltimore. (AMSAT, ARNewsline(tm) with audio from KA8VIT)

**

INTERNATIONAL - WORLDWIDE: NO RECIPROCAL 5 MHZ OPERATIONS

Turning to international news, a reminder that holders of United Kingdom 5 MHz operating permits are reminded that CEPT international operating rules does not apply to 5 Mhz. The only countries currently allowing 5 MHz operation by individual stations are the United Kingdom and the United States. Only club stations are presently being allowed to use 5 MHz in Finland and operations by stations in Norway and New Zealand are for internal emergency communications purposes only. Stations in Canada may use 5 MHz frequencies at agreed specified times but activity from Germany is not currently permitted. (GB2RS)

**

ON THE AIR: FIELD DAY 2004 - JUNE 26-27

Turning to operating events, the ARRL Letter says that rules and entry packets for the 2004 running of ARRL Field Day now are available on the League's Website. The ARRL Letter notes that Field Day is always the fourth full weekend of June. This year it's June 26th and 27th with activity beginning at 1800 UTC Saturday and ends at 2100 UTC Sunday.

There are no rules changes from 2003. Participation in Field Day now is open to all amateurs within IARU Region 2. Field Day stations may contact stations in other regions for point credit, but stations outside Region 2 are not eligible to submit entries for this event.

More information is on-line at www.arrl.org (ARRL)

**

DX

In D-X, I2YSB, I2MOV, IK1AOD and IK2DIA, have been on the air from Tokelau signing slash ZK3. They now say that they plan to be active portable 5 W from

Samoa on all bands and modes between the 29th of February and 8th of March. Look for them on the usual D-X frequencies. (GB2RS)

Also, K4ISV and K4CN will be active slash VP5 from North Caicos Islands through the 17th of March. They will also participate in the CQ 160-Metre SSB contest as VP5B. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

And a Galapagos Islands "HC8/HD8 DX Diploma" is now being issued by the DX-TA-SEA DX Club. This multicolored certificate is awarded to Amateur Radio operators and short wave Listeners for confirming a minimum of 3 different HC8 or HD8 stations in the Galapagos Islands. All contacts or SWL reports made after November 20, 1945 are eligable. Submissions and information requests go to Dr. Rick Dorsch, NE8Z, P.O. BOX 616, Hamburg, Michigan 48139 -0616 (NE8Z)

‘**

RADIOSPORTS: HES OFF AND WALKING

He’s on the road again. We are talking about Tony Whitaker, G3RKL, who is off on his latest trek. Amateur Radio Newslie’s Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, has the details:

--

His short walk has begun!:

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

That’s the voice of Tony Whitaker, G3RKL, as he begins his pre-announced trek from Invercargill to Blenheim. What’s amazing is that recording comes to you from the other side of the world. From the United Kingdom, where it was recorded by Ian Abel, G3ZHI, in Yorkshire England. How? Through the magic of Internet linked repeaters that will allow the world of Amateur Radio to follow Tony’s almost every step of the way:

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

During his stroll Whitaker will be on the air using the special callsign ZL6SHS. And -- you will literally find him operating everywhere including HF, VHF and UHF. And when access to an IRLP or Echolink equipped repeater is available, he just might pop up in your back yard, eager to say hello.

So, keep an ear open for Tony Whitaker, G3RKL, as ZL6SHS as he jauntily saunters the length of New Zealands South Island. He might be coming to an Internet linked repeater in your hometown and right to your H T.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org on the MP3 audio file of this newscast.

--

With thanks to Ian Abel, G3ZHI, for the audio of Tony’s first few minutes on the road, I’m Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, reporting from Auckland, New Zealand for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

With access to Echolink and IRLP now quite common you can expect to hear more from G3RKL here on Newsline in the coming weeks. (ARNewsline(tm) with audio supplied by G3ZHI)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the newly created Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project is up and operating. We already have signed up over two dozen hams who are willing to assist others. If you can help, or if you need assistance please drop a note with your name, address, hone number and area of expertise to mentor@arnewsline.org and we will get back to you as fast as we can.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Damron, N8TMW, and I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

233. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 22:32:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403041432.5e994ee9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88347

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<LzG1c.32564$hm4.24684@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > > (snip) Also note that we, the consumers,
> > > are paying for that Kosher certification
> > > and product labeling.
> >
> >
> > (snip) How much do you think it costs
> > the manufacturer to get a jar of Miracle
> > Whip certified?
>
>
> I don't care if it is only five dollars (though I suspect the licensing of
> those tiny Kosher symbols cost very much more).

Why do you suspect that?

> And I don't care if that
> breaks down to only one half of one cent for each jar of Miracle Whip.

Well, let's see...

SWAG:

10,000,000 jars of MW per year

$10,000 annual certification cost

Works out to a tenth of a cent per jar.

> That's money coming from me, and every other American who buys Kosher
> products, to directly finance the activities of a religion.

No, it isn't.

It's money to directly finance a *choice* made by the food
manufacturer. Just like your money goes to pay for their *choice* in
advertising, label design, jar size, etc., etc.

> Several,
> including you, have said I can instead buy products which are not Kosher
> certified.

Are you saying you cannot find such products? I find that very hard to
believe.

If it bothers you so much, why not just buy the noncertified products?

> Instead, perhaps you or someone else can explain to me why I
> should even have to concern myself with the activities of a "minority"
> religion (your word) when I purchase food in this country.

First off, all religions in this country are "minority". (Christianity isn't a religion per se; it's a whole bunch of religions that have certain things in common).

Second, the reason you have to concern yourself with such things is because we have at least a partially free market in the USA. Producers put various products on the market, and customers choose which ones to buy. The govt. has certain labeling standards to insure that customers can make informed decisions, and in the case of food certain standards for health reasons. The rest is left up to the marketplace.

If a manufacturer *chooses* to go after various additional certifications, (kosher, organic, low-fat, Atkins, etc.) it's totally voluntary.

> Since they're
> collecting money from the general public, is that religion prepared to
> publicly account for where and on what that money is being spent?

The religion is not collecting any money from the general public. The manufacturers are selling their products, and in turn paying a fee. "The general public" can choose to buy or not buy any product on the shelves.

> Of course
> not. Are Americans allowed to opt out of this donation scheme when
> purchasing products? Not unless they want to give up their favorite foods -
> something no person should have to do in a country supposedly free of
> religious dominance.

You're simply way off base on this, Dwight. The market decides such issues, and you are not enough of the market to force a change. Most of the market accepts the tenth of a cent per jar. I personally *welcome* the certification, because it means there's another level of inspection going on.

I'm trying to figure out exactly how you want things to work. It seems to me that what really bothers you is all those kosher products occupying the same shelves as noncertified products.

Here's what I see as your solution:

If Dwight had his way, most products would *not* be kosher certified. No Ks or Us or pareves on the "mainstream" products in the supermarket.

There could, however, be a special aisle for the kosher stuff. It would be marked "KOSHER" in big letters so that nobody would accidentally or unintentionally buy something kosher.

Exactly how all of this would be forced upon the food industry is unclear. It would probably take government intervention to make Dwight's wishes come true.

Of course, all of this would mean that many products would be made in two versions. There would be kosher Miracle Whip and "regular" Miracle Whip. The kosher versions would cost more, of course, because of the added cost of certification and maintaining a separate manufacturing line, labeling, distribution, etc.

The Law of Unexpected Consequences, however, dictates that such a setup will also cause the price of *uncertified* Miracle Whip to rise, too, because the volume would be split and the higher costs would have to be passed on.

Marketing/Econ 101 dictates that if it were cheaper or more profitable to make separate products, outfits like the makers of Miracle Whip would do so. That they choose to get the whole production certified rather than make two varieties proves the point.
>
> And that's my final word on this issue.

We've heard that one before.

> Again, if you don't see the
> problem with all this, you're not looking and I can't make you see what you
> don't want to see.

I *am* looking, Dwight. I just don't see what your problem is. It seems that you want to force separation of church and food in a supposedly free marketplace. You want to force private companies (food manufacturers) to *not* certify foods as kosher in order to satisy *you*. Not the government - private companies.

The solution is really simple: If you don't want to buy kosher certified foods, just don't buy them. They're all labeled for your convenience.

But please don't try to sell the rest of us a load of stuff about "pushing" and "manipulating". And please get used to the fact that the various flavors of Judaism are "mainstream" religions in the USA - just like most of the various flavors of Christianity.

I don't know if it's still true, but some time back when airlines actually fed coach passengers meals on the airplanes, I recall that passengers could request special meals ahead of time. Low salt, diabetic certified, vegetarian, and (you guessed it) kosher. And in at least some cases this was done for no extra charge.

234. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 22:46:45 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403041446.4e9a244c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88348
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
>
>"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > One less CBer. Who cares?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
>
>Cry about what? The NPRM from the
>FCC says that the utility company will
>have to take steps to stop any
>interference to licensed stations.
>
>I am a licensed station....any other questions?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an unlicensed
freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which is why hes
so touchy

==========

From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2002-01-05

I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?

~/Moparholic\~

==========

From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine... ï¿½
View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2002-02-03

"WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
>Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
>running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to

>make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
>emissions?

That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.

==========

235. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:28:16 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
>
> Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company will
> have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
>
The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
we're watching go down.
>
> I am a licensed station....any other questions?
>
Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?

Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I know, -fool-.

236. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:36:06 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88350
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.

Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> utility company can not just experiment when and where they want.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to get
> the
> > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> information!
> > CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney
> and
> > > after
> > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
> > > > > for
> > > because I
> > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> > > > > from
> > the
> > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
> > > > > of
> the
> > > cost
> > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my question
> here
> > > last

> > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > experience.
> > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
> > > > > the
> > > utilities
> > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > letters
> > > >
> > > > > Tom
> > > >
> > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > >
> > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
> > > > FCC license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > telecommunications
> > > > law.
> > > >
> > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
> > > > for
> > > anything.
> > > >
> > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> > > > heard
> > by
> > > > a court.
> > > >
> > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > interested.
> > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Jim Pennino
> > > >
> > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > >
> > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM. Nothing
> > > is sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

237. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:37:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040304183706.29660.00003291@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 88251

In article <LzG1c.32564$hm4.24684@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>That's money coming from me, and every other American who buys Kosher
>products, to directly finance the activities of a religion. Several,
>including you, have said I can instead buy products which are not Kosher
>certified. Instead, perhaps you or someone else can explain to me why I
>should even have to concern myself with the activities of a "minority"
>religion (your word) when I purchase food in this country. Since they're
>collecting money from the general public, is that religion prepared to
>publicly account for where and on what that money is being spent?

After writing my response to the above, another thought came to mind.

Consider the following example:

Actor/director/producer Mel Gibson is a Roman Catholic - not only that, he's a very conservative one. It's a pretty safe bet that he's a generous contributor to his church. Of course there's nothing wrong with that - it's *his* money!

And it's a safe bet that certain percentage of the price of ticket to one of his movies, or a recording of same, will wind up in Mr. Gibson's pocket. Again, there's nothing wrong with that - it's part of his contract.

But that means that anyone who goes to Mr. Gibson's movies is indirectly funding the Roman Catholic Church. Buying a copy of Mad Max on DVD means that a few pennies may wind up in the Vatican coffers.

Mr. Gibson is not unique in this regard by any means, of course, I just use him as an obvious example. There are many others. And I think there's nothing wrong with any of it, even if I don't believe in their religions.

But if you follow Dwight's argument on this, I should somehow be upset.

238. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:44:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403041544.55220ea7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88252

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>...

> "[their] hobby is wasting time. Your time."
>
> Free speech doesn't mean you have to listen to what everyone says.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

If you want to witness a true waste of time, read a Heil post.

239. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:45:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403041545.5c784ac0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88253

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030723.106fdbe7@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0402291953.70e2fe22@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0402291230.5da279ce@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> > >
> > > > What belittlements, Stebe?
> > >
> > > You really need to ask? The you ARE the idiot I have surmised all along.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Such as your incessant use of "Brain" instead of using my name?
> >
> > And now you want to call me on the carpet for using TAFKA Rev. Jim???
> >
> > You just renewed your membership in the KMA Club.
>
> I am not the one who sets the rules, Brain.

You set your own rules.

240. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-04 23:53:35 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> >
> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> >
> >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> >FCC says that the utility company will
> >have to take steps to stop any
> >interference to licensed stations.
> >
> >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an unlicensed
> freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which is why hes
> so touchy
>
> ==========
>
> From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 2002-01-05
>
> I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
>
> ~/Moparholic\~
>
> ==========
>
> From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine... &#65533;
> View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb

> Date: 2002-02-03
>
> "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> >emissions?
>
> That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
>
> ============
>
I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.

I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.

You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
are you stupid?

241. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 00:10:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403041610.4a1f6a39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88255

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40474D7A.B024AA65@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4046C3D4.68807F16@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4045E57B.FE0D9BBD@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > William wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > > > > using cellular telephones.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > > > > latest peculiar theory?
> > > > >
> > > > > David, there is no theory. I merely stated a fact.
> > > >
> > > > Actually, that isn't quite correct. You've made this latest statement
> > > > in response to another's statement. It appears that your goal is to
> > > > attempt demonstrating that amateur radio is not something which would be
> > > > useful in an emergency.
> > >
> > > That would be your theory, not mine.
> >
> > That is simply incorrect, William/Brian.

Then where did it come from? I did not state such a theory.

I made no attempt to disparage
> amateur radio's role in an emergency.

Nor have I.

I leave that to the tag team of
> "Len or Lenda".

Who are they?

> > Personally I'd want some amateur gear and a
> > > cellular phone.
> >
> > Personally, I try to avoid placing myself in a situation which becomes
> > an emergency. The next best thing is a cellular telephone, followed
> > by amateur radio.

> >
> > Do you see evil in this?
>
> Evil? Spring can't come early enough for you, can it?

Vernal Equinox?

> > > > > > Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How does a cellphone contest work?
>
> > > > > David, now you're being obtuse. What's new?
> > > >
> > > > Not at all, William/Brian.

Yes, you are.

> I simply responded to what you wrote.

Impossible. You responded with a theory. I presented no theory.

If
> > > you had a more complex thought, you didn't express it.

Correct. You made an assumption. Not my problem.

> > Dave, it is you who lacks complex thought. I enjoyed your little
> > escapade of bringing a cellular telephone to an amateur radio
> > contest.
>
> Please point out the portion of your original statement which contains
> anything about an amateur radio contest.

David, David, David. This is an amateur radio forum. Did you forget?

> > Maybe even France will call you.
>
> I've often received calls from France, both on the amateur bands and on
> the telephone.

David, we know this all too well. Try to keep it under control.

> > You're still good for a
> > few laughs.
>
> The laughs, as usual, appear to be on you.

Not at all. You get your exercise jumping to conclusions. You ought
to go back to being sedentary and obtuse.

I'd love to hear more of
> your amateur radio contesting exploits. I'd probably pick up a tip or
> too.
> Your insight into DXing was extremely valueable.
>

> Dave K8MN

Ditto your suggestion to contest with cell phones. You Go, Dave.

242. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 00:11:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403041611.29fc04b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88256

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40474BD3.705F50C8@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4046C445.B839AB87@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<c253ji$6en$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> > > > > Dave Heil (k8mn@earthlink.net) writes:
> > > > > > William wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> The fact remains that many emergency calls were placed and got through
> > > > > >> using cellular telephones.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Does that upset you or do you find it some sort of validation for your
> > > > > > latest peculiar theory?
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> Heaven forbid an emergency happens during a contest weekend!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How does a cellphone contest work?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > This was discussed in CQ in the mid-sixties. The phone company wanted
> > > > > to set up an alternative to amateur radio, including sending equipment
> > > > > to rare countries for DXpeditions. But it would be all done over phone
> > > > > lines.
> > > > >
> > > > > I can't remember which year, 1965 or 1968 somehow ring a bell, but I
> > > > > can definitely tell you it was in the April issue.
> > > > >
> > > > > Michael
> > > >
> > > > Michael, thank you. Now David's curiousity has an answer.
> > > >
> > > > If he were even slightly interested in amateur radio contests, he
> > > > could seek out the publication "CQ," not defunct.
> > >
> > > You wrote nothing of amateur radio contests, Brian. I subscribe to CQ
> > > though they are not the only sponsor of amateur radio contests. Do you
> > > know something about amateur radio contesting? Is your contest
> > > knowledge equal to your knowledge of DXing?
> > >

> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > David, I know enough to not use a cellular telephone in an amateur
> > radio contest. Wherever did you get that idea?
>
> I never had that idea, William/Brian. You wrote nothing about an
> amateur radio contest.
>
> Dave K8MN

You continue to be obtuse. Enjoi.

243. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 00:12:03 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304191203.891$Sw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I almost forgot to add, I'll be one of the last guys to have
to contend with bpl, we don't even have sewer out here yet,
but we have fiber optic cable and dsl. Yuppie land will suffer
first. (back on topic now)

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>> I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
>
> I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
>
> You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> are you stupid?

244. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 00:15:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4047C663.4A7BD8A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88258

William wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>...
>
> > "[their] hobby is wasting time. Your time."
> >
> > Free speech doesn't mean you have to listen to what everyone says.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> If you want to witness a true waste of time, read a Heil post.

Just because it takes you an inordinate amount of time, does not mean
that others are having the same difficulty, William/Brian.

Dave K8MN

245. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 00:22:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403041622.6de88fbe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88259

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403040704.51a89f25@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?
>
> Why? Figure you may have found somone who you can actually
> communicate with on a peer-level, Brain? Or are 7-year olds just your
> style?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You're sick. Get help.

I just guessed that the seven year old doesn't have as much emotional
baggage as you appear to have.

246. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:10:32 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403041710.6b3a7b55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88260
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
>> >
>> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
>> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
>> >> >
>> >> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >> >
>> >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
>> >
>> >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
>> >FCC says that the utility company will
>> >have to take steps to stop any
>> >interference to licensed stations.
>> >
>> >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an unlicensed
>> freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which is why hes
>> so touchy
>>
>> ====================
>>
>> From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
>> Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
>> Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
>> Date: 2002-01-05
>>
>> I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
>> thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
>>
>> ~/Moparholic\~
>>
>> ================
>>
>> From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
>> Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine... ï¿½
>> View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
```

>> Date: 2002-02-03
>>
>> "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
>> >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
>> >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
>> >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
>> >emissions?
>>
>> That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
>> I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
>>
>> ============
>>
>I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
>never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
>antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
>
>I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
>complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
>watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
>
>You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
>are you stupid?

Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and breaking the law.

247. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:13:26 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304201326.585$Q6@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88261
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >
> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> >
> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> >are you stupid?
>
> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and breaking
> the law.
>
You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.

248. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:14:14 UTC
From: Randy <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <GvQ1c.35763$qo.1279@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com...
> Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
> they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
> in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.
>
> Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'
>

Dan's proven himself an idiot time and time again.

249. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:18:21 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <XzQ1c.7413$5M.249373@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88264
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Randy" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:GvQ1c.35763$qo.1279@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com...
> > Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
> > they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
> > in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.
> >
> > Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'
> >
>
> Dan's proven himself an idiot time and time again.
>
>

I read in the past, he was.... I gave him the benefit of a doubt. He has
since removed it. CL.
```

250. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:19:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <86udncgTsbUTSNrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88263

N2EY wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>news:20040303063822.00545.00004644@mb-m02.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>
>> Flint"
>>
>>>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to return
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>the US over time.
>>>
>>>I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more
>>
>> choosy
>>
>>>about what they buy.
>>>
>>>The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last week
>>
>> they
>>
>>>seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of hamburger
>>>assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be
>>
>> classified as
>>
>>>"manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's
>>
>> assembly,
>>
>>>isn't it?
>>>
>>>"No Millionaire Left Behind"
>>
>>The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a global

>>economy and that isn't going to change.
>
>
> That's true to a point. But we don't have to simply accept everything
> that comes down the pike as inevitable.

It will probably stabilize when one of the programmers from India
writes a good program to replace CEO's! ;^)

>
>>The drastic reduction in costs
>>of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as
>>similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture
>>and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't
>>going to change in the short run.
>
>
> Only if it doesn't affect buyer behavior. If buyers protest with their
> dollars, things will change.

>
>>In the long run, those currently
>>cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>
>
> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?

Correct! I have alway though that the best argument for what is going
on is the elevation of a population's living standard. A country has a
low standard of living, and the workforce is available for next to
nothing, wage wise. So like Pizza take-out's in a college town, everyone
ant their brother migrate there for the cheap labor. AS the standard of
living goes up, the cheap labor starts to demand more in salary and/or
benefits. This works for a while, but eventually another poor country
looks attractive to employers. So they move on to the next poor country.

Examples are what has happened to Japan. Korea is the present hot spot,
but is slowing. China is ascendant now, but the inevitible will happen
there. Mexico is now experiencing import concerns too.

What happens when the cycle is complete, and the last third world
nation is brought up to modern standards will be the interesting thing.

>>In the short
>>run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>>either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
>>manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>
>
> OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
> lower prices?

You see, the big trick is to have all this happen without ourselves turning into a third world country. See below.

>
>>In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
>>job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
>>may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>>
>
> That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
> person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
> meantime?
>
> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
> alone.

Countries that are service based economies are the *servants* of other countries.

We can "reality" each other all day long, but if economies chase the almighty profit without any moral guidance - that is if they are not in business for the sole purpose of making a buck, then disaster is the result.

- Mike KB3EIA -

251. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:23:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZDQ1c.30102$W74.23969@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88265

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040303063822.00545.00004644@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > > In article <U891c.8040$t16.5113848@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee
D.
> > Flint"
> > > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >And if we get lucky it will perhaps cause some of that business to
return
> > to
> > > >the US over time.
> > >
> > > I wouldn't count on it, Dee. Unless the American people get a lot more
> > choosy
> > > about what they buy.
> > >
> > > The Bush Administration is so desperate for good numbers that last
week
> > they
> > > seriously investigated the possibility of redefining the work of
hamburger
> > > assembly. IOW, they asked why jobs at Burger Meister couldn't be
> > classified as
> > > "manufacturing". Whether it's a Big Mojo Burger or a minivan, it's
> > assembly,
> > > isn't it?
> > >
> > > "No Millionaire Left Behind"
> >
> > The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a
global
> > economy and that isn't going to change.
>
> That's true to a point. But we don't have to simply accept everything
> that comes down the pike as inevitable.
>
> > The drastic reduction in costs
> > of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as
> > similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture
> > and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't

> > going to change in the short run.
>
> Only if it doesn't affect buyer behavior. If buyers protest with their
> dollars, things will change.

There's no sign that any sufficient number of folks in
the USA are going to boycott non-USA made products
or spend N dollars more to get a product "made in the USA'
as opposed to buying a cheaper imported product.

> > In the long run, those currently
> > cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>
> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?

Like I said, global economy.

> > In the short
> > run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
> > either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
> > manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>
> OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
> lower prices?
>
> > In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
> > job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
> > may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
> >
> That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
> person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
> meantime?

You retrain whenever it becomes necessary. There's nothing
mystical about it. If your job skill goes wanting, you'd
better find another skill set.

> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
> alone.

We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
done with more and more automation resulting in less
and less need for skilled labor.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

252. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:23:14 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403041723.3e16566a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88266
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
>iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
but
>> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
what
>> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
>> >
>> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
ever
>> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
>> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
>> >
>> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
>> >are you stupid?
>>
>> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
>> dishonest and breaking the law.
>>
>You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.

No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of cber
that gives all of CB a bad name.

253. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:27:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304202702.856$PN@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88267
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
>
But if you win, you'll set a standard that even us mud-duck
Cber's will be happy about.

What is your opinion of bpl, Dan? How much stock do you have
in the power company?!?

Sell out!!

254. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:29:00 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304202900.344$LK@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88268
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
> but
> >> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
> what
> >> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >> >
> >> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
> ever
> >> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> >> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> >> >
> >> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> >> >are you stupid?
> >>
> >> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
> >> dishonest and breaking the law.
> >>
> >You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.
>
> No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of cber
> that gives all of CB a bad name.
>
Maybe someday when you grow up, you can have a station as nice
as mine.

255. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:32:00 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304203200.639$PW@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> "Randy" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:GvQ1c.35763$qo.1279@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com...
> > > Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
> > > they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
> > > in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.
> > >
> > > Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'
> > >
> >
> > Dan's proven himself an idiot time and time again.
> >
> >
>
> I read in the past, he was.... I gave him the benefit of a doubt. He has
> since removed it. CL.
>
IIRC Dan already has a plan to jam the bpl. Correct me if I'm
wrong Dan.
```

256. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:33:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YN-dnf0mcP1TRdrdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88270

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" writes:
>>
>>>(snip) Also note that we, the consumers,
>>>are paying for that Kosher certification
>>>and product labeling.
>>
>>
>>(snip) How much do you think it costs
>>the manufacturer to get a jar of Miracle
>>Whip certified?
>
>
>
> I don't care if it is only five dollars (though I suspect the licensing of
> those tiny Kosher symbols cost very much more). And I don't care if that
> breaks down to only one half of one cent for each jar of Miracle Whip.
> That's money coming from me, and every other American who buys Kosher
> products, to directly finance the activities of a religion.

Good grief no! It doesn't finance a religion. Did you ever see the
"Reg. Penna Dept Agriculture" on labels? It is a standard, nothing else.
You want to sell it in PA? Make it to our standards. You want to sell it
to Kosher Jews? Make it to their standards. The irony in all this is
just how few completely Kosher Jews there are. But many people look for
the standard because it is a good standard. I do and I am neither Jewish
nor religious.

> Several,
> including you, have said I can instead buy products which are not Kosher
> certified. Instead, perhaps you or someone else can explain to me why I
> should even have to concern myself with the activities of a "minority"
> religion (your word) when I purchase food in this country.

For the same reason you should concern yourself with products
acceptable with the State of Pennsylvania when you live in South
Carolina. For the same reason you would want to buy USDA certified beef.
They set a standard of quality.

> Since they're
> collecting money from the general public, is that religion prepared to
> publicly account for where and on what that money is being spent? Of course
> not. Are Americans allowed to opt out of this donation scheme when

> purchasing products? Not unless they want to give up their favorite foods -
> something no person should have to do in a country supposedly free of
> religious dominance.

What money goes back to the Jewish religion and who gets it?

> And that's my final word on this issue. Again, if you don't see the
> problem with all this, you're not looking and I can't make you see what you
> don't want to see. Take care.

Maybe all the standards should be thrown away. That way you won't have
the government on your back, ala the USDA, and you won't be supporting
those people in pennsylvania either! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

257. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205155.02537.00003326@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88278

In article <c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...It's about
>> why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
>> >>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?
>
>Steve,
>
>Isn't the reason obvious?
>>
>> That scumbag you run with likes to do that. Jim has never
>> refered to him as anything but "Len", yet "Len" finds countless ways
>> to belittle him.
>
>I have also used the term "Mr. Anderson".

...but not for very long. :-)

>> He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
>> of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
>> etc etc, when I had not so addressed him.
>
>Don't forget "nursie" and being addressed by the wrong gender.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, a gunnery nurse is of high rank.

How do we know "his" gender? There is no physical exam for an amateur radio license rank.

>> He is treated and addressed
>> in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.
>
>And you have provided the exact response desired.

Right...so, when are YOU going to insult my wife, my occupation, my experience, and everything else like you consider "acceptible amateur behavior?" :-)

Rhetorical question. The answer is obvious: Whenever I agree with any of your opinions I will be in a most-favored category and all who oppose me are "unacceptibles." :-)

>By responding in kind, you have lowered yourself to the level of the
>very people you oppose, and (in their minds) given them the OK to
>continue to behave that way.

:-)

>> I have a problem with you lying.
>
>Do you think that such lies will ever be admitted? For example, I have
>been accused of altering Kim's posts - which is not what happened at all.

Prima facie evidence in Google proves you ALTERED things. :-)

>> I have a problem with you following in the footsteps of a person
>> who is a known pathological liar and antagonist. It's embarrassing to
>> see a contemporary Veteran and Amateur licensee resorting to Lennie's
>> tactics.
>
>And by responding in kind......

Poor baby. :-)

All those "hurt" feelings allowing insulting behavior towards others
is somehow "justified?" :-)

Good old Amateur Extra Double Standard!

>> Instead, you choose to be even MORE argumentitive and demeaning,
>> even further cementing your reputation.
>
>Then why bother, Steve? Haven't you seen enough examples to know what the
>responses will be? Don't you already know that your questions will not
>be answered?

What "questions?" :-)

The gunnery nurse wastes my time. :-)

>There's a reason for killfiles and filters. I find my
>rrap experience to be much better for the use of them.

DENIAL. Ostrich syndrome. Mama Dee does the same.

Living in an imaginary world where everyone thinks as nobly and
purely as yourself? The "yourself" who always has the "correct"
answer?

>You've got kids, Steve. Haven't you had the situation where a kid
>argues with you about bedtime - at bedtime? By arguing with the kid,
>bedtime effectively becomes later because the kid isn't in bed when
>s/he's arguing. But if you refuse to argue, you get less of a hassle.

Poor baby. :-)

Seven-year-old-Extras seem to be all about, aren't they?

Go to bed, Jimmie.

You waste everyone's time with your puerile behavior.

Upgrade. Become an eight-year-old extra.

LHA / WMD

258. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205156.02537.00003327@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88271

In article <8701HF7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>, "Don Parker"
<parker287@no.spam> writes:

>On Thu, 04 Mar 2004 19:28:47 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>> 1Mb over
>> HF seems unlikely.
>
>For quite a few years, the phoneline networking standard has been
>delivering up to 10 Mb/sec by using a residential telephone line
>(http://www.homepna.org/products) to carry a fraction of the HF
>spectrum.
>
>1 Mb/sec seems to be *easily* achievable at HF. It's already
>been done.

Sorry. One Megabit data rates over "residential telephone lines"
that INCLUDE already-installed telephone cables and switching
centers in the transmission path is NOT a given everywhere.

Higher-than-1-Megabit rates are possible with "category" cable
and special terminal transceivers for IN-Home networking. That
is NOT the same as the BPL under discussion.

LHA / WMD

259. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205156.02537.00003328@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88272

In article <ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

The FCC has "opinions" which "stand" longer and stronger than yours,
Dan. See Hollingsworth, Riley letters.

LHA / WMD

260. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205156.02537.00003329@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88275

In article <HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A utility
>company can not just experiment when and where they want.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Radio amateurs cannot "just experiment when and where they want."
The amateur radio regulations of Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R. clearly
outline the technical requirements for legal operation.

The much beloved amateur license is NOT an "authorization" to do
anything the amateur wants. See the FCC Enforcement letters for
examples.

LHA / WMD

261. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205157.02537.00003330@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88273

In article <Xns94A25F938C9DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>We do need to stick together in this against a common enemy. CBers have as
>much right as we do to radiate a signal.

...as do radio amateurs, PROVIDED that such radiation and use is
within the bounds of the applicable U.S. radio regulation.

>I'm sure that the ARRL doesn't require you to be a ham to join, and they
>can find a good attorney who will help, maybe even pro bono (free). It
>won't hurt to ask them.

VOTING membership in the ARRL requires a valid amateur radio
license. "Membership" in the ARRL is little more than a subscription
to QST membership magazine. A few libraries are "members" of the
ARRL in order to put QST on their shelves.

Contacting the ARRL for legal help is essentially a non-starter action
without any valid amateur radio license. All it will generate is a form
letter refusal plus some literature about buying ARRL publications to
study for a license test. :-)

LHA / WMD

262. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205158.02537.00003331@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88274

In article <b7d1465c.0403040509.1b508a8a@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Like I said previously, this can be remedied by a day or two with an
>Element 2 Q&A study guide, (I'll gladly mail you mine.) $10, and a
>visit to your local VE team. Good luck, although you'll likely not
>need it. Your ham antenna can also be your CB antenna. My Imax-2000 is
>used for both 10, 12 & 11. (Some even use it for 20m) Remember, you're
>anticipating the removal of Element 1 (Morse code) for the Technician
>class license.

Bert, that does NOT "remedy" anything. CB users operating within the regulations of Part 95 have every legal right to continue operating. Achieving an amateur radio license grant is NO "authorization" to interfere with any other radio service or electronic device.

If any utility desires to legally harrass you over alleged interference from your amateur radio equipment, you are still as stuck with legal action to prove your innocence as any CB user. The beloved amateur radio license is not some "shield" against legal threats or legal actions.

You are mixing far more than metaphors in saying "just study a Q&A and visit a VE team."

LHA / WMD

263. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:51:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205159.02537.00003332@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88277

In article <SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
<does_it_matter@noreply.com> writes:

>What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on your
>ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as linears,
>extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per part
>95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't helping the
>war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I don't do
>CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent CBers.
>CL
>
>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...

CL, you have to ignore Dan. He is extremely polarized into olde-tyme
hamme raddio and has yet to leave the early 1900s in technology or
radio law. Think of him deli-style: Ham on rye. [liquid form]

At present, the existing rules on unintentional RF radiators is still that
of Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R. and Citizens Band Radio Service is still
governed by Part 95, Title 47 C.F.R. Any CB user that meets the
regulations of Part 95 has every right to use that CB as he or she
wishes.

Radio amateurs are governed under Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R., and may
NOT do "as they wish" but are required by law to operate within the
technical requirements of Part 97. Their beloved amateur license is
NOT a carte blanche "protection from prosecution" as some imply.
A radio amateur's "authorization" STOPS when they exceed any part
of Part 97.

The NPRM (Notice of Preliminary Rule Making) concerning changes to
Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R., to include Broadband over Power Lines (BPL)
is FCC docket number 04-29. There are already 4 documents filed in
the FCC ECFS (Electronic Comment Filing System) under 04-29.

For some reason as yet not explained to me (inquiry sent electronically
about 4 PM EST this date, 4 Mar 04), the 04-29 docket NPRM was
given as docket 04-37 in the ECFS. 04-37 has 19 documents in it, the
first one being the NPRM (04-29) on BPL, released 12 Feb 04. It is
unusual to find a double ECFS listing on the same docket.

To access all comments, simply go to the FCC website (www.fcc.gov)
and click on either "ECFS" or "hot button topics" buttons. When the
form appears, just enter "04-29" in the top left blank space and press
Enter. The form also appears after "Retrieve ECFS documents" blue

lettering (to the right) on the ECFS main page. All documents are stored and retrieved in PDF; free PDF (Portable Document Format) readers are available from Adobe.

Letters threatening law suits can be considered little more than legal harrassment of the recipient. By themselves they have no real power but are sometimes used to dissuade the recipient, to make them do as the sender desires. Unless the recipient of such legal harrassment is an attorney or has legal services available free, consultation with another attorney involves some cost and time off of normal duties; that is an inducement to have the recipient do as the sender desires.

Those who are obeying the existing law are still legal. Unfortunately, such legality is "challenged" via the threat letters which is, as one put it in here slightly differently, "tossing rights in the dumpster."

Leonard H. Anderson

264. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:52:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205200.02537.00003333@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88276

In article <Xns94A24E580C0Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Personally, I don't have a cell phone, so if I lost wired phone service I
>would only have ham radio to fall back on. Oddly enough, cell phones have
>not yet spread to every man, woman and child, but I don't know anyone who
>doesn't have a phone number.

Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are
100 million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about
one for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say. :-)

If every licensed amateur in the USA had one useable radio, then the
number of amateur radios would be one per about 430 citizens. Not
as big a "spread."

LHA / WMD

265. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 01:52:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040304205201.02537.00003334@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88279

In article <1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040303211146.23307.00007086@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>> Has the gunnery nurse ever been to WAR, not "hostile actions?"
>> I doubt either. :-) Those are shadowlands in his imagination and
>> fantasies. A twilight zone he can never experience in reality.
>>
>> But, the gunnery nurse has an Amateur Extra license! So does a
>> seven-year-old. Emotionally they are the same, probably the nod to
>> the seven-year-old as being more mature. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?

Which 7-year-old? :-)

LHA / WMD

266. Re: ARRL Responds to WSJ Article on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 02:21:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <rZqdnRe-YJQGeNrdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88280

Keith wrote:
> On 4 Mar 2004 09:28:09 -0800,
> N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/03/104/?nc=1
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> At this point the ARRL is pissing into a hurricane wind.
> When BPL is deployed across America hams will find themselves
> at the end of civil litigation lawsuits for intentional
> interference to a computer system.
> You can all rant about part 97, but civil litigation has
> nothing to do with FCC rules. To defend yourself you
> will need to pay an attorney a $50,000 retainer and years
> of court fights.
> Who has the money to spend on lawyers? Hams with home owner
> insurance policies will find out their insurance will pay
> off any lawsuit and if the ham refuses to stop operating
> a ham station at the home they will lose their home owner
> insurance.
>
> The future for Ham Radio is a black hole.
>

Just get a number of hams in an area with mobile units, have them drive around BPL areas engaging in legal HF contacts. That will knock out BPL first here, then there, then over here, then over there. It will be very difficult to pin it down to any one ham or even prove hams are doing it, yet if they keep knocking users off often enough the users will get tired of BPL and go back to whatever they were using before. Fight fire with fire.

267. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 02:47:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <P8-dnfEcHqqMcdrdRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88282
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I Am Not George wrote:

>
> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and breaking the law.

At least he knows good quality equipment.

268. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 02:49:19 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403041849.6710a23b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
>iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
>> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>> >> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
>> but
>> >> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told
you
>> what
>> >> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
>> >> >
>> >> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
>> ever
>> >> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I
can
>> >> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins
rocks.
>> >> >
>> >> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
>> >> >are you stupid?
>> >>
>> >> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
>> >> dishonest and breaking the law.
>> >>
>> >You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.
>>
>> No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of
cber
>> that gives all of CB a bad name.
>>
>Maybe someday when you grow up, you can have a station as nice
>as mine.

right its all about your big radio LOL you are a keyclown thu and thru
steveo you are unfit to lick Dan's shoe. Why should BPL give a shit
about CBers when they see losers like you who are proud to break
federal laws. assclown.

269. Re: ARRL Responds to WSJ Article on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 02:58:31 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab1b730f93630759897d9@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88283

In article <rZqdnRe-YJQGeNrdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>, radiobuff0
@mailcity.moc says...
> Keith wrote:
> > On 4 Mar 2004 09:28:09 -0800,
> > N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >
> >>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/03/104/?nc=1
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> > At this point the ARRL is pissing into a hurricane wind.
> > When BPL is deployed across America hams will find themselves
> > at the end of civil litigation lawsuits for intentional
> > interference to a computer system.
> > You can all rant about part 97, but civil litigation has
> > nothing to do with FCC rules. To defend yourself you
> > will need to pay an attorney a $50,000 retainer and years
> > of court fights.
> > Who has the money to spend on lawyers? Hams with home owner
> > insurance policies will find out their insurance will pay
> > off any lawsuit and if the ham refuses to stop operating
> > a ham station at the home they will lose their home owner
> > insurance.
> >
> > The future for Ham Radio is a black hole.
> >
>
> Just get a number of hams in an area with mobile units, have them drive
> around BPL areas engaging in legal HF contacts. That will knock out BPL
> first here, then there, then over here, then over there. It will be very
> difficult to pin it down to any one ham or even prove hams are doing it,
> yet if they keep knocking users off often enough the users will get
> tired of BPL and go back to whatever they were using before. Fight fire
> with fire.

Well think of it this way. It wouldn't be too expensive to design simple
RF devices that radiated in the band of say 14 to 27 MHz now would it? A
continuous wave at say, a couple watts and tossed in various points of
the city. Once the batteries died out they'd go crazy. Then of course
you could retrieve said devices (Very carefully mind you!) and it would
make the engineers go crazy.

But the mobile solution is nice too. Good luck finding the problem when
it's transient.

270. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:00:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040304220003.00545.00004686@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 88284

In article <Lp51c.9091$ny7.7373@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Also note that this is why OPEC is cutting oil production. Their price is
>benchmarked to the US dollar and they have stated that the dollar is sinking
>so they have to raise prices.

That's certainly one factor, but here's another: With the liberation of Iraq, embargoes on Iraqi oil are gone and when the damage can be repaired the oil will flow like mad in order to get the money flowing again. This will depress the world price and further divide OPEC.

So the time for the Saudis and others to make money on their oil is now, while the Iraqi infrastructure is still a mess. Can anyone really blame them?

>Given time, you may see more radios
>manufactured in the USA. Of course, few in the US will be able to afford
>them since we will be the cheap labor of the world. Give it about 10 or 15
>more years.

All of my ham gear is US manufactured. Most of it I "manufactured" myself, either from scratch or from kits.

73 de Jim, N2EY

271. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:01:32 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab1b7e81391905e9897da@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <c034bd2.0403041849.6710a23b@posting.google.com>,
iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com says...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> >> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >> >> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
> >> but
> >> >> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told
> you
> >> what
> >> >> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
> >> ever
> >> >> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I
> can
> >> >> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins
> rocks.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> >> >> >are you stupid?
> >> >>
> >> >> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
> >> >> dishonest and breaking the law.
> >> >>
> >> >You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.
> >>
> >> No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of
> cber
> >> that gives all of CB a bad name.
> >>
> >Maybe someday when you grow up, you can have a station as nice
> >as mine.
>
> right its all about your big radio LOL you are a keyclown thu and thru
> steveo you are unfit to lick Dan's shoe. Why should BPL give a shit
> about CBers when they see losers like you who are proud to break
> federal laws. assclown.
>

Unitl they come knocking on the doors of amateurs too. Lets face it, there isn't too much difference between the 11m and 10m bands as far as frequencies go. And amateurs usually run lots more power than the average CB'er. And the 10m band isn't the only one that will wreak havoc with BPL. The 20m band has as much a chance of disrupting that Part 15 service and people routinely run 100W or more while rag chewing via voice or pounding out code.

272. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:19:30 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304221930.596$f5@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> >> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >> >> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
> >> but
> >> >> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told
> you
> >> what
> >> >> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
> >> ever
> >> >> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I
> can
> >> >> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins
> rocks.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> >> >> >are you stupid?
> >> >>
> >> >> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
> >> >> dishonest and breaking the law.
> >> >>
> >> >You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.
> >>
> >> No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of
> cber
> >> that gives all of CB a bad name.
> >>
> >Maybe someday when you grow up, you can have a station as nice
> >as mine.
>
> right its all about your big radio LOL
>
Nervous laughter.
>
>you are a keyclown thu and thru
>
```

Wouldn't want to be a half-way thru keyclown, kung fu you.
>

> steveo you are unfit to lick Dan's shoe.
>
Yore the boot licker on this island, sailor.
>
> Why should BPL give a shit
> about CBers
>
Why should they give a shit about hams?
>
>when they see losers like you who are proud to break
> federal laws. assclown.
>
More name calling from the mental midget. I'm gonna tell
your dad you're giving his call a bad way to go.

273. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:20:27 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304222027.222$6g@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88287
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> I Am Not George wrote:
>
> >
> > > Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and
> > > breaking the law.
>
> At least he knows good quality equipment.
>
There ya go, JJ is a Collins guy from way back.

274. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:27:30 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403041927.5513140a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88288
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>...
JJ wrote:
> I Am Not George wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > >Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and
> > > >breaking the law.
>
> >At least he knows good quality equipment.
>
>There ya go, JJ is a Collins guy from way back.

big difference, JJ isnt an outlaw

a

s

s

c

l

o

w

n

275. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:33:19 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88289
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steve:

So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal. Examples of this are when "cb'ers" jump above 28 Mhz into the 10M band.. Perfectly legal to start calling CQ in CW right over the top of them. Same goes for BPL, if it's interfering. When it does, it's operating illegally (it's under Part 15), so when it does bleep out datacomms, if HAMs transmit through it and cause it to stop transmitting data, so be it. No laws broken there.

So what's the problem?

-SSB

Steveo wrote:
> IIRC Dan already has a plan to jam the bpl. Correct me if I'm
> wrong Dan.

276. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:38:51 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304223851.947$Bw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88290
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>... JJ wrote:
> > I Am Not George wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > >Just wanted to establish that your proud of being dishonest and
> > > > >breaking the law.
> > >
> > > >At least he knows good quality equipment.
> > >
> > >There ya go, JJ is a Collins guy from way back.
> >
> > big difference, JJ isnt an outlaw
> >
> > a
> >
> > s
> >
> > s
> >
> > c
> >
> > l
> >
> > o
> >
> > w
> >
> > n
> >
Look at that will ya?

,-------------.
| Yo, Geo.
| C'mon man, let |
| me in. Let's |
| settle this |
| like adults. / +-----------------+
`------------.( | |
`\ ,,,,, |
.===. #( -( |
( (-(- '\_o/ |
```

277. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:42:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304224254.183$0m@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88291
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Were not talking about Cber's transmitting on 10 meters, so
knock yourself out.

Jam that bpl line, and you too can battle them.

No problems.
>

>
sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
> Steve:
>
> So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal. Examples
> of this are when "cb'ers" jump above 28 Mhz into the 10M band..
> Perfectly legal to start calling CQ in CW right over the top of them.
> Same goes for BPL, if it's interfering. When it does, it's operating
> illegally (it's under Part 15), so when it does bleep out datacomms,
> if HAMs transmit through it and cause it to stop transmitting data, so
> be it. No laws broken there.
>
> So what's the problem?
>
> -SSB
>
> Steveo wrote:
> > IIRC Dan already has a plan to jam the bpl. Correct me if I'm
> > wrong Dan.

278. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:45:49 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <3stf40lq70dku80vfb6j0nrmhj9ok5u7ik@4ax.com>
Source record: 88292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
<AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:

>Steve:
>
>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......

I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license to test the
BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service hasn't yet been
established. Something to check.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

279. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 03:46:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <DrWdnWmxqZ4eZtrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
> <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Steve:
>>
>>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
>
>
>
> I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license to test the
> BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service hasn't yet been
> established. Something to check.

Since BPL falls under part 15 of the regs, they don't need a license.

280. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:09:52 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304230952.053$9R@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
> In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
> <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>
> >Steve:
> >
> >So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
>
> I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license to test
> the BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service hasn't yet
> been established. Something to check.
>
I'd bet they don't always wait for the permit, just like cement guys. ;)
They need to find out how bad it is, and they control the power lines,
so experimenting would be fairly easy..just wait and see how many
complaints you get, or how many relay stations don't key up.

Simple scary math. Them boys are up to no good, I'm tellin' ya!

281. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:16:15 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304231615.256$KX@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88295
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
> > In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
> > <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> >>Steve:
> >>
> >>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
> >
> >
> >
> > I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license to
> > test the BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service
> > hasn't yet been established. Something to check.
>
> Since BPL falls under part 15 of the regs, they don't need a license.
>
Really? I didn't know that. Damn..gloom and doom on the horizon
fellow radio operators.

282. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:39:39 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403042039.6cdf470c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>...
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> > In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
>> > <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> >>Steve:
>> >>
>> >>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license
to
>> > test the BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service
>> > hasn't yet been established. Something to check.
>>
>> Since BPL falls under part 15 of the regs, they don't need a
license.
>>
>Really? I didn't know that. Damn..gloom and doom on the horizon
>fellow radio operators.

Steveo, your a pirate freebander. the only radio operators that are
your fellows are other lawbreakers

283. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:42:18 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040304234218.403$n1@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>...
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >> Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >> > In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
> >> > <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>Steve:
> >> >>
> >> >>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license
> to
> >> > test the BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service
> >> > hasn't yet been established. Something to check.
> >>
> >> Since BPL falls under part 15 of the regs, they don't need a
> license.
> >>
> >Really? I didn't know that. Damn..gloom and doom on the horizon
> >fellow radio operators.
>
> Steveo, your a pirate freebander. the only radio operators that are
> your fellows are other lawbreakers
>
Well..and you. You reply to every one of my posts with some
negative bullshit. Gettin' tired yet?

284. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:42:55 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403042042.5c411b7b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>...
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> > In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
>> > <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> >>Steve:
>> >>
>> >>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license
to
>> > test the BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service
>> > hasn't yet been established. Something to check.
>>
>> Since BPL falls under part 15 of the regs, they don't need a
license.
>>
>Really? I didn't know that. Damn..gloom and doom on the horizon
>fellow radio operators.

Steveo, your a pirate freebander. the only radio operators that are
your fellows are other lawbreakers

285. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 04:45:33 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403042045.55a8349e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com>...

LOL whats that suposed to be, you coming to my door in a dress?

```
,-------------.
| Yo, Geo.
| C'mon man, let |
| me in. Let's |
| settle this |
| like adults. / +-----------------+
`------------.( | |
`\ ,,,,, |
.===. #( -( |
( (-(- '\_o/ |
"\__/ ,;`-(_ _ |
_) `,. / : (,) |
(/_,/ / ,' |V / |
( ( .( / |_/ |
) \\ \____.' _ |
;____/ ;.\\-[o] (_)|
[_] _/ / ( -' :) : |
; :`\_/) : A| |
/ Y / | [ ] |
/ | / | | | |
\ \ / : | | |
```

286. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 06:28:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403042228.4ea3beae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Don Parker" <parker287@no.spam> wrote in message
news:<8701HF7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>...
> On Thu, 04 Mar 2004 19:28:47 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> > 1Mb over
> > HF seems unlikely.
>
> For quite a few years, the phoneline networking standard has been
> delivering up to 10 Mb/sec by using a residential telephone line
> (http://www.homepna.org/products) to carry a fraction of the HF
> spectrum.

I couldn't find any modems or other devices in that site which involve
Internet access or even WAN netorking via the power utilities'
existing infrastuctures. Or they went over my head. Kindly clarify if
you will.

> 1 Mb/sec seems to be *easily* achievable at HF. It's already
> been done.

Where? By what means?

The way I understand the matter real-world commercial tests of BPL
have demonstrated (so far) that, for all practical purposes, Internet
access via BPL is delivering only around half the speed common DSL
does for a bunch more dollars per month for a connection.

The $29.95/month cost is just another bait & switch scam, the cost
goes up to around $50/month after a few months for half the speed of
DSL for $30-40/month.

w3rv

287. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 07:01:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403042301.134a607@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<4047836D.1060606@ix.netcom.com>...
> Don Parker wrote:
>
> >A 1 Mb/sec feed in each direction for only $29.95 per month? That's
> >what the press releases claim that Cinergy Electric can deliver right
> >now.
> >
> >
> >
> There's a version of BPL that uses the microwave spectrum.
> Hopefully
> this is that.
> Bad news for our microwave hams, but not so bad for HF users, if true.

There are a number of approaches for using the microwave bands to
provide Internet access under discussion and development. Commonly
referred to as "802 dot something" (take yer pick and buy their
stock).

But those are not BPL which is defined as Internet access over the
elecrtic utilities' power lines which operate in the 2-80 Mhz portion
of the radio spectrum. I've personally tuned the HF spectrum in a BPL
pilot area and no, it's not just "so bad" it's bad enough to kill HF
ham radio anywhere the crap is deployed.

> 1Mb over
> HF seems unlikely.

Probably.

w3rv

288. Re: ARRL Responds to WSJ Article on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 10:18:56 UTC
From: Keith <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net-SPAM>
Message-ID: <104gl1m9qkf64c0@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 88502

On Thu, 04 Mar 2004 19:21:24 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>Just get a number of hams in an area with mobile units, have them drive
>around BPL areas engaging in legal HF contacts.

I'm sure the legal counsel for the utilities will use posts like this to
prove to the Congress that renegade ham radio operators are intentionally
interfering with BPL, business and home computer systems. Another nail
in the coffin of ham radio.

--
Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/ NW Oregon Radio Page
Hobby Radio Group http://groups.yahoo.com/group/hobby_radio_users
AOL IM: kilowattradio

289. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 10:49:39 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <7XY1c.8703$t16.5511732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank:

Experimental licensees still may not interfere with radio comms on bands and/or frequencies for which they are not the primary license holder. HAMs are the primary users of the bands BPL is supposed to be interfering with. Still a non-issue.

The power companies will find out soon enough that their cash cow is poor when they get all the complaints of dropped file transfers, pages not loading, etc... and when they turn up the "power" levels and interfere with HAMs some more to make their customers happy, they'll be fined by the FCC for interference. Riley won't let 'em get away with it, and I certainly won't in my area either.

If it becomes a problem on 20M, or 40M, or 80M, or even 160M, I'm a holder of a license that gives me PRIMARY user privileges on those bands, and I'll transmit right through it to make my contacts, with whatever power levels are necessary to make the contact (up to legal limit), and if the power company complains, that'll just be too damned bad.

Just my two cents.

-SSB
Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <3yS1c.8633$t16.5475251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, sideband
> <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Steve:
>>
>>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal......
>
>
>
> I agree, but the utility company may have an experimental license to test the
> BPL system, making the signals legal even if the service hasn't yet been
> established. Something to check.
>
>
>
>
>
>

> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

290. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 10:59:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040305055957.29660.00003293@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 88505

In article <Z-WdnUKnD5orFd_dRVn-vA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Hey Jim!
>
>Have you ever been to one of those family functions where there was an
>obnoxious 5 year old that would constantly interrupt the adults with
>irrelevancies while thay were trying to have a conversation?
>
Sure - hasn't everyone?

Of course the "obnoxious 5 year old" has an excuse, being only 5 years old.

73 de Jim, N2EY

291. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 10:59:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040305055958.29660.00003294@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 88504

In article <5c01b95b.0403021144.46af1114@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4044A954.4070108@psu.edu>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > In article <NLSdndkzZOoKQd7dRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>> >
>> >
>> >>Just got a AES flyer today. Prices are going to be going up in April.
>> >>Inflation starts anew!
>> >
>> >
>> > Mike,
>> >
>> > Is it really inflation, or perhaps changes in the exchange rate with
>Japan?
>>
>> The exchange rate is what is going to kick-start inflation. since the
>> dollar has been falling against other currencies recently, the other
>> countries either have to raise their prices, or keep them the same,
>> which is actually a price cut due to the exchange rate.
>>
>> Since we import so many things, those prices will go up and business
>> will start charging more to offset the price rise......
>
> Makes ya wonder who REALLY won the war, doesn't it...?!?!
>

Which war, Steve?

73 de Jim, N2EY

292. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 12:14:30 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <HI2dnY_KXsGs8tXdRVn-jw@crocker.com>
Source record: 88506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040304202900.344$LK@newsreader.com...
> iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:<20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com>...
> > >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > >> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> > >> >I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
> > but
> > >> >never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
> > what
> > >> >antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > >> >
> > >> >I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
> > ever
> > >> >complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > >> >watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > >> >
> > >> >You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > >> >are you stupid?
> > >>
> > >> Just wanted to establish that your proud of being
> > >> dishonest and breaking the law.
> > >>
> > >You just want me to reply to you, and I did. My bad.
> >
> > No I want you to STFU. You are proud to be illegal, the kind of cber
> > that gives all of CB a bad name.
> >
> Maybe someday when you grow up, you can have a station as nice
> as mine.

maybe some day you will grow up and realize what a waste all that illegal
activity has been and then you can have a station as nice as mine. Watch
ARRL Dx contest live at http://www.k1ttt.net/webcam (camera 1 will be on for
the contest)

293. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 12:39:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403050439.590b81cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88507

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403040702.6d11141d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031538.4532affb@posting.google.com>...
>
> > You're out of control. Just ask anyone.
>
> "They" are free to comment or editorialize as they see fit.

No they aren't. They are bound by the PCTA Double Standard, same as
you.

Look how long it took for TAFKARJ to declare that Pro-Code Bruce was
an idiot - years and years of prodding.

294. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 12:42:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403050442.32096ea3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88508

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040303202422.00545.00004648@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403021908.b72bff3@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Lennie's insistance that Amateur Radio "always" saves the day is
> >> his way of skewing the results in his favor.
> >
> >Oh, contraire!
> >
> >Larry Roll has set up many a scenario where not only is amateur radio
> >the ONLY means to save the day, but only ONE particular mode is
> >suitable to save the day.
> >
> >He's done it again and again.
> >
> >Are we Not to believe Roll?
>
> Billy:
>
> My "scenarios" are always built around a simple premise: That there is, in
> fact,
> a licensed (and CW-capable) radio amateur at the scene of my "scenario," that
> he has functional radio equipment at his disposal, and prevailing operating
> conditions preclude the use of voice modes such as FM or SSB. I don't recall
> making any inference that CW is the "only" mode that can "save the day" ...just
> that unless you know the code, you can't use it when you may need it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

"...operating conditions preclude the use of voice modes such as FM or SSB."

Every time.

295. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 14:21:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403050621.629ce3c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88509

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403041622.6de88fbe@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403040704.51a89f25@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?
> >
> > Why? Figure you may have found somone who you can actually
> > communicate with on a peer-level, Brain? Or are 7-year olds just your
> > style?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> You're sick. Get help.

>>I'M SICK...?!?!<<

YOU, you sick twerp, were the one suggesting a 7 year old has
been married...!!!

> I just guessed that the seven year old doesn't have as much emotional
> baggage as you appear to have.

Again, YOU are the one making some very sick suggestions,
Brain...

Or would "Brainless" be more appropriate...?!?!

Sheesh! What a PUTZ! (Not surprising, though...considering your
running company...)

Steve, K4YZ

296. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 14:35:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403050635.140e53eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88510

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040304205155.02537.00003326@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...

> >I have also used the term "Mr. Anderson".
>
> ...but not for very long.

Even once makes it 100% more than the "courtesy" you ahve
extended him, Putz.

> >Don't forget "nursie" and being addressed by the wrong gender.

> How do we know "his" gender? There is no physical exam for an
> amateur radio license rank.

You mean other than the fact that my picture is on the net in
several places...?!!?

> >> He is treated and addressed
> >> in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.
> >
> >And you have provided the exact response desired.
>
> Right...so, when are YOU going to insult my wife, my occupation,
> my experience, and everything else like you consider "acceptible
> amateur behavior?"

This forum, as YOU ahve pointed out, Your Scumminess, is NOT
Amateur Radio, is NOT moderated, nor is it under the auspices of FCC
control.

> Rhetorical question. The answer is obvious: Whenever I agree
> with any of your opinions I will be in a most-favored category
> and all who oppose me are "unacceptibles."

No one expects everyone to agree all the time.

I certainly ahve my disagreements with many here, and they with
I, but the only ones who I feel compelled to "reply in kind" to are
you and your puppet-in-training, Brain.

> >By responding in kind, you have lowered yourself to the level of the
> >very people you oppose, and (in their minds) given them the OK to

> >continue to behave that way.
>
> :-)
>
> >> I have a problem with you lying.
> >
> >Do you think that such lies will ever be admitted? For example, I have
> >been accused of altering Kim's posts - which is not what happened at all.
>
> Prima facie evidence in Google proves you ALTERED things.

I read the posts.

He altered nothing.

> >> I have a problem with you following in the footsteps of a person
> >> who is a known pathological liar and antagonist. It's embarrassing to
> >> see a contemporary Veteran and Amateur licensee resorting to Lennie's
> >> tactics.
> >
> >And by responding in kind......
>
> Poor baby.
>
> All those "hurt" feelings allowing insulting behavior towards others
> is somehow "justified?"

Jim's not the problem...He has not "justified" anything, and if
you read any of his posts for anything OTHER than something you
thought you could lash onto and make a rant out of, you'd notice he's
expressed his disdain for the frequent spankings I've given you for
YOUR conduct.

> Good old Amateur Extra Double Standard!

Good old Lennie not paying attention.

> >> Instead, you choose to be even MORE argumentitive and demeaning,
> >> even further cementing your reputation.
> >
> >Then why bother, Steve? Haven't you seen enough examples to know what the
> >responses will be? Don't you already know that your questions will not
> >be answered?
>
> What "questions?"

We'd expect nothing less...Not that you could DO less, Lennie.

> The gunnery nurse wastes my time.

You waste your own time...Lying...antagonizing, trying to "argue"
about topics you clearlya re ignorant in...But hey...It's your
"retirement"...

> >There's a reason for killfiles and filters. I find my
> >rrap experience to be much better for the use of them.
>
> DENIAL. Ostrich syndrome. Mama Dee does the same.

Lennie's expression of gratitude for being publically humiliated
on numerous occassions...

> Living in an imaginary world where everyone thinks as nobly and
> purely as yourself? The "yourself" who always has the "correct"
> answer?

More evidence of Lennie not paying attention...again...

> >You've got kids, Steve. Haven't you had the situation where a kid
> >argues with you about bedtime - at bedtime? By arguing with the kid,
> >bedtime effectively becomes later because the kid isn't in bed when
> >s/he's arguing. But if you refuse to argue, you get less of a hassle.
>
> Poor baby.
>
> Seven-year-old-Extras seem to be all about, aren't they?
>
> Go to bed, Jimmie.
>
> You waste everyone's time with your puerile behavior.
>
> Upgrade. Become an eight-year-old extra.

Thanks, Lennie, for proving my point.

Thanks also for proving me right...Again...I'd say I "owe you
one", but so far most of what you've said about ANYTHING is so far off
base as to be laughable, or just plain false.

I'll try to find SOMETHING in one of your posts I can
"corroborate" for you...But don't hold your breath.

Steve, K4YZ

297. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 14:57:03 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <d85h405fok9iv8lfbi5bocgppv109kugvu@4ax.com>
Source record: 88511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 05 Mar 2004 03:33:19 GMT, sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:

>Steve:
>
>So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal. Examples
>of this are when "cb'ers" jump above 28 Mhz into the 10M band..
>Perfectly legal to start calling CQ in CW right over the top of them.
>Same goes for BPL, if it's interfering. When it does, it's operating
>illegally (it's under Part 15), so when it does bleep out datacomms,
>if HAMs transmit through it and cause it to stop transmitting data, so
>be it. No laws broken there.
>
>So what's the problem?
>
>-SSB

They really don't need a license. If your "legal" transmitter
causes them problems, by part 15:

Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.

(a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to
consider the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed
radio stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-
geostationary mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S.
Government radio stations, which could include high-powered radar
systems, when choosing operating frequencies during the design of
their
equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful
interference. Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be
obtained by consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in Sec.
2.106 of this chapter.

It is their responsibity to minimize the problem, moving to a
different frequency if needed. I haven't been able to find records of
a "legal" station being ordered to cease transmiiting and then losing
the case in court. There is one that I know of in the Dallas area, but
it hasn't went to court yet.

Having an Amateur license certainly wouldn't hurt your case.

298. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 14:58:06 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A36544BD95Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88512

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040304205157.02537.00003330@mb-m23.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A25F938C9DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>We do need to stick together in this against a common enemy. CBers have
>>as much right as we do to radiate a signal.
>
> ...as do radio amateurs, PROVIDED that such radiation and use is
> within the bounds of the applicable U.S. radio regulation.
>
>>I'm sure that the ARRL doesn't require you to be a ham to join, and
>>they can find a good attorney who will help, maybe even pro bono
>>(free). It won't hurt to ask them.
>
> VOTING membership in the ARRL requires a valid amateur radio
> license. "Membership" in the ARRL is little more than a
> subscription to QST membership magazine. A few libraries are
> "members" of the ARRL in order to put QST on their shelves.
>
> Contacting the ARRL for legal help is essentially a non-starter
> action without any valid amateur radio license. All it will
> generate is a form letter refusal plus some literature about buying
> ARRL publications to study for a license test. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>

I'm not so sure. I think that they league is very serious about BPL. I
agree that legal help for a non-ham is unprecedented, but this could be the
exception.

299. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:00:09 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <ra5h4097c7mfa5hec8eaqrksqkpncem0bq@4ax.com>
Source record: 88513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 05 Mar 2004 07:20:47 -0600, Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com>
wrote:

>sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote in
>news:7XY1c.8703$t16.5511732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>> Frank:
>>
>> Experimental licensees still may not interfere with radio comms on
>> bands and/or frequencies for which they are not the primary license
>> holder. HAMs are the primary users of the bands BPL is supposed to be
>> interfering with. Still a non-issue.
>>
>> The power companies will find out soon enough that their cash cow is
>> poor when they get all the complaints of dropped file transfers, pages
>> not loading, etc... and when they turn up the "power" levels and
>> interfere with HAMs some more to make their customers happy, they'll
>> be fined by the FCC for interference. Riley won't let 'em get away
>> with it, and I certainly won't in my area either.
>>
>> If it becomes a problem on 20M, or 40M, or 80M, or even 160M, I'm a
>> holder of a license that gives me PRIMARY user privileges on those
>> bands, and I'll transmit right through it to make my contacts, with
>> whatever power levels are necessary to make the contact (up to legal
>> limit), and if the power company complains, that'll just be too damned
>> bad.
>>
>> Just my two cents.
>>
>> -SSB
>
>The interference you will recieve from the bpl will render your reciever
>useless. Next try finding out who to complain to and that bpl is actually
>the cause of the interference is the next hurdle. How long will you have
>to wait for someone to check the interference ? It all sounds ike a
>problem to me. I have noise already that is across the whole hf spectrum
>it may be bpl or not how do you figure out who to complain to ? To many
>un answered questions and to many variables.

Even worse, the utilities companies are petioning the F.C.C. to
change the part 15 specs to allow more "bleed" than what is presently
allowed by part 15. Its going to be a real problem for every radio
operater swl, cb and amateur.

300. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:00:10 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A365A07A1CFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
news:20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com:

> Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
> they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
> in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.
>
> Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
>> utility company can not just experiment when and where they want.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
>> > get the ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some
>> > insider information! CL
>> >
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
>> > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
>> > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
>> > > > > utility here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
>> > > > > consulted a attorney and after
>> > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
>> > > > > for because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down
>> > > > > my CB antenna from the house. The main reason I am not
>> > > > > fighting the utility is because of the cost of defending
>> > > > > myself in a lawsuit.
>> > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
>> > > > > question here last week, but I know it is important for
>> > > > > others to know about my experience.
>> > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
>> > > > > the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out
>> > > > > cease and desist letters
>> > > >
>> > > > Tom

>> > > >
>> > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
>> > > >
>> > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
>> > > > FCC license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
>> > > > telecommunications law.
>> > > >
>> > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
>> > > > for anything.
>> > > >
>> > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
>> > > > heard by a court.
>> > > >
>> > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
>> > > > interested. Send the FCC a copy.
>> > > >
>> > > > --
>> > > > Jim Pennino
>> > > >
>> > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
>> > >
>> > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
>> > > Nothing is sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> >
>

If they are suing a CBer, why won't they be stupid enough to sue us?

301. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:01:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403050701.679e737a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88515

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031634.27eb72e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...

> > Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...
>
> I say it is. Until you behave yourself, its TAFKARJ!!!

Then I'd say you've pretty well proven that I am right about your
general lack of character.

About what I'd expect from someone who expresses public
admiration for a known liar and antagonist.

> It's about
> > why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
> > >>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?
>
> Tuff. I'm holding TAFKARJ metaphorically hostage until you straighten
> your insane a$$ out. My regrets to Jim. I'll send out for
> Schlottskey's deli.

Still haven't answered the question, which in itself I'd say puts
you in the "coward" category, but the INSISTENCE on being insulting
where no insult was offered puts you solidly in the "scumbag"
category, too.

> Do you often get involved with other people's issues?

Only when I see creepy scumbags acting like bullies towards
people who have treated them with nothing but respect.

You'd be that bully, ergo you'd be that scumbag.

I am sure you family line is proud of you.

> He can. He has. And to a reasonable person, effectively. But
> TAFKARJ remains in another world. A Ham in a Bubble.

So far everything he's said, other than that that he clearly
states as opinion, is true.

You and Lennie the Liar do not have that reputation.

> > Are YOU that weak minded and foolish?
>
> Don't know.

I do....

> On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most weak-minded and foolish,
> how high would you rate me?

Ummmm.... a solid 8.5. You ahve the potential to be redeemed,
but I doubt it. You occassionally manage to express a vaild opinion
without being insulting or dememaning, but your inability to
substantiate your claims leaves you wanting pretty badly.

> > He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
> > of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
> > etc etc, when I had not so addressed him. He is treated and addressed
> > in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.
>
> Ahem. I hate to be the one to break it to you, Steve, but you are
> just a wee little bit over the top. Ask ANYone!

Perhaps I am...But I refuse to be talked down to, pushed, or
otherwise be bullied by cowards and creeps like you and Lennie.

Sorry if that hurts your feelings. Perhaps asking yourself how
you came to this juncture would be warranted?

> > Is that how you feel? Do >>YOU<< need to belittle Jim in order
> > to effectively express yourself when discussing things with/about him?
>
> Do you need to belittle me in order to express yourself?

Nope. You belittle yourself just fine. But since you deem it
necessary to address people the way you do, I just assume that this is
the manner in which you find it most effective to communicate.

> Rhetorical question. I already know the answer.

No you don't. You ASSUME that you know an answer.

> And, no, I don't need to belittle TAFKARJ. Have I done so?

THAT was a rhetorical question, Brain.

> > Please do not humiliate yourself by trying to misdirect this
> > question by asking >>ME<< about how I address Lennie...I've already
> > answered that.
>
> See above. Why do you need to try to belittle >>ME<<?

Because it seems to be the form of communication that you
understand.

> > Stay focused...you were asked a direct, specific question.
>
> Which was?

Which was obviously not important enough for you to answer like a
man.

> > You CAN answer direct, specific questions, can't you?
>
> If I can recall them.

Obviously you ARE Gene Pool Deficient...

Cut and snip to...

> > PS: I will assume any answer to the question that attempts to
> > redirect or obfuscate the response to be "I am unwilling to directly
> > answer the question as I know the truth to be other than what I
> > stated". Simple enough?
>
> See above. Questions answered. Now what?

No, they weren't...but I am sure that you think that you danced
your way around the point.

THE POINT is that Brian Burke is not a person of reputable
character. Not that we'd expect anything less from a person who
publically expresses admiration for a known pathological liar and
antagonist.

Thanks, Brain...You DO make this easy...You have now admitted to
publically lying...not that "we" didn't already know that.

Steve, K4YZ

302. Re: general class exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:05:05 UTC
From: Incognito <BLB@sero.net>
Message-ID: <BG02c.13357$id3.5076@fed1read01>
Source record: 88516

See ARRL page for General question pool after July 2004
URL:
http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/pools.html

--
Incognito By Necessity (:-(

If you can't convince them, confuse them.
- - -Harry S Truman

"Willian Irving Zumwalt" <wizumwalt@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:dd8fee65.0403042307.102fad74@posting.google.com...
> Several popular exam books I've looked at expire in June of 2004 for
> the General class license. How long before we start seeing the new
> editions come out. Reason I ask is because I'd like to start studying
> but don't think I'll be ready by June and if there are changes, I'd
> just rather wait for the new edition.
>
> Any help much appreciated.

303. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:09:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403050709.6787a2fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88517

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031522.6357898d@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030645.4cdd2b3f@posting.google.com>...

> > The post >>I<< responded to was from your douchebag friend.
> > Exact same is quoted verbatim above.
>
> Stebe, I have no douche bag friends, unless you believe yourself to be
> my friend.

Sure you do.

You have publically proclaimed your admiration for Lennie Anderson
on several occassions.

Lennie has been documented in countless lies and acts of
antagonism and misrepresentation.

That, in my book, makes Lennie a douchebag.

> So, has Roll not claimed that Ham Radio always saves the day?

He has claimed it has "saved the day"...

I have never seen him say "always".

You or Sir Putzalot will have to provide me a cite of a post
wherein he did.

FACTS have proven that Amateur Radio HAS "saved the day" on
occassions too numerous to count.

> What exactly am I to try again?

Acting like a man...It may be hard, but you'd not be the first
puppet to experience it...

Sgteve, K4YZ

304. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:24:56 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88518

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040304205200.02537.00003333@mb-m23.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A24E580C0Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Personally, I don't have a cell phone, so if I lost wired phone service
>>I would only have ham radio to fall back on. Oddly enough, cell phones
>>have not yet spread to every man, woman and child, but I don't know
>>anyone who doesn't have a phone number.
>
> Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are
> 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's
> about one for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say.
> :-)
>
> If every licensed amateur in the USA had one useable radio, then the
> number of amateur radios would be one per about 430 citizens. Not
> as big a "spread."
>
> LHA / WMD
>

And your point is...?

I'm not really sure what you're getting at, but my point was that it is reasonable to assume that everyone has a TV and a phone, for example, but we're not yet at that point with cellphones. Close, but not there yet. Of course, I would say that, as I don't have one.

The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help out in an emergency.

305. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 15:35:46 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <m712c.8758$t16.5546441@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Easy.. COmplain to Riley. He's the guy to talk to. rholling@fcc.gov.

-SSB

Duke Of Windsor wrote:

> sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote in
> news:7XY1c.8703$t16.5511732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>
>>Frank:
>>
>>Experimental licensees still may not interfere with radio comms on
>>bands and/or frequencies for which they are not the primary license
>>holder. HAMs are the primary users of the bands BPL is supposed to be
>>interfering with. Still a non-issue.
>>
>>The power companies will find out soon enough that their cash cow is
>>poor when they get all the complaints of dropped file transfers, pages
>>not loading, etc... and when they turn up the "power" levels and
>>interfere with HAMs some more to make their customers happy, they'll
>>be fined by the FCC for interference. Riley won't let 'em get away
>>with it, and I certainly won't in my area either.
>>
>>If it becomes a problem on 20M, or 40M, or 80M, or even 160M, I'm a
>>holder of a license that gives me PRIMARY user privileges on those
>>bands, and I'll transmit right through it to make my contacts, with
>>whatever power levels are necessary to make the contact (up to legal
>>limit), and if the power company complains, that'll just be too damned
>>bad.
>>
>>Just my two cents.
>>
>>-SSB
>
>
> The interference you will recieve from the bpl will render your reciever
> useless. Next try finding out who to complain to and that bpl is actually
> the cause of the interference is the next hurdle. How long will you have
> to wait for someone to check the interference ? It all sounds ike a
> problem to me. I have noise already that is across the whole hf spectrum
> it may be bpl or not how do you figure out who to complain to ? To many
> un answered questions and to many variables.

306. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 16:34:58 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403050834.3e955f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88520

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910

>
> > In the long run, those currently
> > cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>
> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?

It's already happened.

Among others big-name Jap manufacturers like Sony, Honda, Toshiba,
etc. have been shoveling jobs into southeast Asia at a huge rate for
years and now they're moving into China at an astonishing rate too.
The Japanese unemployment rates are much worse than ours as a result.
It's even more of a kick in the butt for them because it's happening
in a society in which full employement has historically been a major
component of their culture.

Fifteen years ago moving manufacturing to Singapore was the hot
ticket. So everybody did. The singaporean economy skyrocketed, their
per capita wealth became the global model. Now the hot ticket is
getting the hell outta Singapore because manufacturing there costs too
much.

>
> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
> alone.

That's because there is no such thing as a "service economy", the term
and the concept are oxymorons. Economics 101: There are only three
ways a nation can generate wealth: (1) Dig valuable minerals out of
it's ground (2) Grow, catch or raise crops and critters (3) Enhance
the value of the outputs from (1) and (2) via manufacturing. Anything
else is just passing the same bucks around in circles until they peter
out. As exemplified by our balance of trade deficit.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

307. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 16:37:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403050837.3c5b01e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88521

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4047C663.4A7BD8A2@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403040915.5942f809@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > "[their] hobby is wasting time. Your time."
> > >
> > > Free speech doesn't mean you have to listen to what everyone says.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > If you want to witness a true waste of time, read a Heil post.
>
> Just because it takes you an inordinate amount of time, does not mean
> that others are having the same difficulty, William/Brian.
>
> Dave K8MN

David, the reading of it takes no time at all since there is so little
content. It's the contemplation, wonderment, and disappointment
afterwards that you are supposed to be some kind of hotshot in the
amateur radio world, yet none of it comes through in the way you
express yourself here. Simply amazing.

308. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 16:40:51 UTC
From: RCM <williamsmith208@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <104hbd7klr34d9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88522
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In Rambo Dan's case, ITs DUHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH, SINCE hes pretty much shown himself over the years to be a retard

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>> DUHHHHHH.....
But
> THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> utility
> > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
get
> > the
> > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > information!
> > > CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
attorney
> > and
> > > > > after
> > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
for
> > > > because I
> > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> from
> > > the

> > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
of
> > the
> > > > cost
> > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
question
> > here
> > > > last
> > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > experience.
> > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
the
> > > > utilities
> > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > > letters
> > > > >
> > > > > > Tom
> > > > >
> > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > >
> > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
FCC
> > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > telecommunications
> > > > > law.
> > > > >
> > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
for
> > > > anything.
> > > > >
> > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> heard
> > > by
> > > > > a court.
> > > > >
> > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > > interested.
> > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > >
> > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > >
> > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
Nothing
> is
> > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > >

> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

309. Re: ARRL Responds to WSJ Article on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:29:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hG32c.6627$6G6.6180@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 88523

All you would need is a couple of cases and I'd bet the ARRL would get into the action with some rather deep pockets.

First, local courts have no jurisdiction. Go to the feds. The FCC isn't going to be happy, but they'll have to side with the amateur station. Meanwhile, a counter suit could be filed. Now, drop the suit or who might loose what? Hey, you might make more money than the woman who spilled hot coffee on herself and sued the fast food chain LOL.

Besides that, not all hams are poor. Of course, it will help immensly if the ham has great internet service whilest he/she is operating (courtesy of DSL or cable) :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@earthlink.net.SPAM-28723> wrote in message news:104f6j6k7tekr2c@news.supernews.com...
> On 4 Mar 2004 09:28:09 -0800,
> N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/03/104/?nc=1
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> At this point the ARRL is pissing into a hurricane wind.
> When BPL is deployed across America hams will find themselves
> at the end of civil litigation lawsuits for intentional
> interference to a computer system.
> You can all rant about part 97, but civil litigation has
> nothing to do with FCC rules. To defend yourself you
> will need to pay an attorney a $50,000 retainer and years
> of court fights.
> Who has the money to spend on lawyers? Hams with home owner
> insurance policies will find out their insurance will pay
> off any lawsuit and if the ham refuses to stop operating
> a ham station at the home they will lose their home owner
> insurance.
>
> The future for Ham Radio is a black hole.
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> http://linux.com http://freebsd.org http://apple.com
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.614 / Virus Database: 393 - Release Date: 3/5/04

310. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:31:32 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <BI32c.7443$5M.250188@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A354E9314F71234567890@216.196.97.136...
> sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote in
> news:7XY1c.8703$t16.5511732@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> > Frank:
> >
> > Experimental licensees still may not interfere with radio comms on
> > bands and/or frequencies for which they are not the primary license
> > holder. HAMs are the primary users of the bands BPL is supposed to be
> > interfering with. Still a non-issue.
> >
> > The power companies will find out soon enough that their cash cow is
> > poor when they get all the complaints of dropped file transfers, pages
> > not loading, etc... and when they turn up the "power" levels and
> > interfere with HAMs some more to make their customers happy, they'll
> > be fined by the FCC for interference. Riley won't let 'em get away
> > with it, and I certainly won't in my area either.
> >
> > If it becomes a problem on 20M, or 40M, or 80M, or even 160M, I'm a
> > holder of a license that gives me PRIMARY user privileges on those
> > bands, and I'll transmit right through it to make my contacts, with
> > whatever power levels are necessary to make the contact (up to legal
> > limit), and if the power company complains, that'll just be too damned
> > bad.
> >
> > Just my two cents.
> >
> > -SSB
>
> The interference you will recieve from the bpl will render your reciever
> useless. Next try finding out who to complain to and that bpl is actually
> the cause of the interference is the next hurdle. How long will you have
> to wait for someone to check the interference ? It all sounds ike a
> problem to me. I have noise already that is across the whole hf spectrum
> it may be bpl or not how do you figure out who to complain to ? To many
> un answered questions and to many variables.

Just a thought..... Electrical interference from power lines <not
considering BPL> is usually able to be tracked down with out too much
equipment. So, my question is - at the points of the "leaks" of the
electrical interference - it seems to me, would be the same locations BPL
would be "most" noticeable. Any other opinions? CL.

311. Re: Outcome of CB/UtDazility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:34:49 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <GL32c.7444$5M.250179@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Lancer" <lancer@rock..com> wrote in message
news:d85h405fok9iv8lfbi5bocgppv109kugvu@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 05 Mar 2004 03:33:19 GMT, sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
>
> >Steve:
> >
> >So far as I know, it's not illegal to jam an illegal signal. Examples
> >of this are when "cb'ers" jump above 28 Mhz into the 10M band..
> >Perfectly legal to start calling CQ in CW right over the top of them.
> >Same goes for BPL, if it's interfering. When it does, it's operating
> >illegally (it's under Part 15), so when it does bleep out datacomms,
> >if HAMs transmit through it and cause it to stop transmitting data, so
> >be it. No laws broken there.
> >
> >So what's the problem?
> >
> >-SSB
>
> They really don't need a license. If your "legal" transmitter
> causes them problems, by part 15:
>
> Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
>
> (a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to
> consider the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed
> radio stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-
> geostationary mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S.
> Government radio stations, which could include high-powered radar
> systems, when choosing operating frequencies during the design of
> their
> equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful
> interference. Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be
> obtained by consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in Sec.
> 2.106 of this chapter.
>
> It is their responsibity to minimize the problem, moving to a
> different frequency if needed. I haven't been able to find records of
> a "legal" station being ordered to cease transmiiting and then losing
> the case in court. There is one that I know of in the Dallas area, but
> it hasn't went to court yet.
>
> Having an Amateur license certainly wouldn't hurt your case.

An Amateur license could and maybe would help, but again....IF he is operating a Part 95 station..... such that they have no faults against him, then they have little choice than to abide by their own Rules and Regulations. If they go against that which "they" have set forth, that wouldn't hold much water either. CL

312. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:36:41 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <qN32c.7445$5M.250181@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A365A07A1CFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> news:20040304183606.300$FN@newsreader.com:
>
> > Utility company experimenting? -SHOCKING-! How do you think
> > they will test bpl? Major dollars are at stake. If you live
> > in an urban area you could find yourself in the same battle.
> >
> > Think before you run your pie hole about 'just another Cber.'
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> >> utility company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
> >> > get the ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some
> >> > insider information! CL
> >> >
> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > >
> >> > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> >> > > news:c2564c$hgk$2@mail.specsol.com...
> >> > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> >> > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> >> > > > > utility here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
> >> > > > > consulted a attorney and after
> >> > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
> >> > > > > for because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down
> >> > > > > my CB antenna from the house. The main reason I am not
> >> > > > > fighting the utility is because of the cost of defending
> >> > > > > myself in a lawsuit.
> >> > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> >> > > > > question here last week, but I know it is important for
> >> > > > > others to know about my experience.
> >> > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
> >> > > > > the utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out
> >> > > > > cease and desist letters
```

> >> > > >
> >> > > > > Tom
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
> >> > > > FCC license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> >> > > > telecommunications law.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
> >> > > > for anything.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> >> > > > heard by a court.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> >> > > > interested. Send the FCC a copy.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > --
> >> > > > Jim Pennino
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> >> > > >
> >> > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> >> > > Nothing is sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> >> > > >
> >> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > >
> >> >
> > >
> > If they are suing a CBer, why won't they be stupid enough to sue us?

Agreed..... they may try to do it case by case, you know, pick us off one by one. The sniper approach. WE ALL must stand our grounds. CB OR HAM. CL

313. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:39:30 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <3Q32c.7446$5M.250183@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

As I stated a day or so ago, I once read that claim of him, but gave him the benefit of doubt of his behavior. He has removed all doubt or any benefit.
CL

"RCM" <williamsmith208@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:104hbd7klr34d9a@corp.supernews.com...
> In Rambo Dan's case, ITs DUHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH, SINCE hes pretty much
> shown himself over the years to be a retard
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>> DUHHHHHH.....
> But
> > THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> > utility
> > > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
> get
> > > the
> > > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > > information!
> > > > CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
utility
> > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> attorney
> > > and

> > > > > after
> > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
> for
> > > > > because I
> > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> > from
> > > > the
> > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
because
> of
> > > the
> > > > > cost
> > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> question
> > > here
> > > > > last
> > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > > experience.
> > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
> the
> > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
desist
> > > letters
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
> FCC
> > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > telecommunications
> > > > > > law.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
> for
> > > > anything.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> > heard
> > > > by
> > > > > > a court.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > > > interested.
> > > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > --

> > > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> Nothing
> > is
> > > > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>

314. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 18:52:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1042c.6632$rU6.2193@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 88528

Jim,

We are about to find out ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com...
> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
> alone.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.614 / Virus Database: 393 - Release Date: 3/5/04

315. Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 19:01:36 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0403051101.6884e785@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88529
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/03/02/HNbroadbandservice_1.html

316. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1386 March 5, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 19:29:27 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040305142927.20136.00000902@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 88530

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1386 ï¿½ March 5, 2004

The following is an advisory. Ladies and gentlemen, with a list of thank-you's for supporting us, heres our Treasurer and Support Fund Administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--

Still playing "catch-up" for our supporters, in the month of June last year we heard from:

Monthly contributor Benton Bonney, W4PE of Orlando; Joseph Bartzi, Jr., KC8DKF of Columbus, OH; mnthly contributor Frank Hemko of Harrods Creek KY; te Hualapai (Walla-pie) ARC of Kingman, AZ; monthly contributor William Walters, WA2IBM, of San Jose; monthly contributor Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, also in San Jose and an "Aloha" from Corky Kirk, Jr., W6ORS of Hilo, HI.

Thank you to everyone, and we promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. That address will be repeated at the end of the newscast. I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thank you Andy. And now, Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1386 with a release date of Friday, March 5th, 2004 follows in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Help from down-under in the fight to save Amsat Oscar 40 and lots more on the fight to stop B-P-L. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1386 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HELP FROM DOWN-UNDER IN REVIVING AO-40

The AMSAT Oscar 40 ham radio satellite is still missing in action, but more international help in bringing it back to life is coming almost every day. The latest is from down-under as Brett Dawson, VK2CBD and the team of Australia's Parkes Observatory lend their support to AMSAT Germany in the recovery effort. Q-News Trevor

Teague, VK4BAT, reports:

A 4 MHz wide spectrum with centre frequency of 1097 MHz was scanned with high level technique in order to find the LO frequency of the AO-40 L1 receiver. The fact that nothing was heard of the L1 receiver's LO does not lead to the conclusion that AO-40 is completely dead. The receivers of Parkes are not really fitted for frequencies below 1.25 GHz, and naturally one does not know how good the L1 receiver's LO is shielded or how much of the signal would go through the antenna to the outside world.

As previously reported, the main battery pack that powers AO 40 is believed to have short circuited keeping the auxiliary battery from powering the bird. As this newscast goes to air the rescue effort continuing. (Q-News)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC SEEKING INFORMATION ON ALLEGED FELON HAMS

Back here in the United States, our FCC wants to know if several people on a list it has are felons convicted of an array of very serious crimes. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W, explains:

--

Duckworth: Seven inquiry letters were sent to individuals thought to be licensees who are incarcerated on felony convictions listed on sex offender registration lists or (who) recently served prison sentences for felony convictions. In these cases, the names match our license records and preliminary information is that the subject is the same person listed in our database.

These inquiries seek first to establish whether that is the case, and, second, to determine what affect the offense has on the qualifications to retain a Commission license.

This has been Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, reporting.

--

The FCC did not provide names but it did give conviction information and the locations and offenses. The list includes hams believed to have been convicted of offenses ranging from sexual abuse to child molestation and even murder. (FCC, RAIN)

**

RADIO LAW: JUDGE ORDERS TECHNICAL TESTIMONY IN ALLEGED JAMMING CASE

A Wisconsin federal judge has refused to close the courtroom for testimony by employees of Motorola during the trial of a defendant who allegedly tried to jam police and fire communications. on several occasions last year. In denying Motorola's motion, Judge John Shabaz said on February 27th that the right of Rajib Mitra to a fair trial outweighs Motorola's right to protect its trade secrets.

According to the Madison Capital Times, attorneys for Motorola had argued national and local security concerns as reasons that it did not want public disclosure on how its radio equipment was allegedly jammed by Mitra. The government planed to call five Motorola employees to explain how its Smartnet II radio equipment can be disrupted. Motorola claimed this not only exposed its trade secrets but also placed at risk the lives of law enforcement officers that depend on the proper functioning of their radio communications systems.

But assistant U.S. Attorney Tim O'Shea opposed Motorola's motion, as did Mitra's attorney. Christopher Van Wagner argued that removing the public during his client's testimony would prejudice the defendant. Judge Shabaz agreed with the prosecution and defense. He overruled the Motorola request and ordered the employees to testify noting that no one in the public is coming to his court to find the formula to jam radio frequencies. He noted that this kind of technical testimony can be removed from trial transcripts when they are produced.

Mitra's trial was to began on Monday, March 1st. He faces two charges of using a computer to interfere with police communications. If convicted on both counts he faces up to 20 years in prison. (Capital Times)

**

RESCUE RADIO: EMERGENCY COMM GENERATOR STOLEN

I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, with a late breaking story. Dateline San Antonio, Texas where, last Saturday night, February 29th, the San Antonio Radio Club had one of its trailer and generator systems stolen.

Paul Guido, N5IUT, reports over the Public Relations remailer that it was a 12.5 Kilowatt Onan unit. The club's biggest and best generator.

A police report has been filed that includes some very good pictures of the trailer with the generator on it. If you have any information on its where-abouts, please contact Paul by e-mail to Pguido2003a@broadwaybank.com or call the San Antonio police.

The San Antonio Radio Club has been a Bexar County, Texas, emergency communication resource since way back in 1919. (N5IUT)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K2CIB repeater of the Rockland Repeater Association, serving New City New York.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: THE 11 METER CB ANGLE

Over the past several months we have been hearing about the potential interference to Amateur Radio that's expected if the FCC proceeds with the rollout of Broadband over Powerline Internet access. But ham radio is not the only service in the 2 through 80 MHz spectrum where B-P-L will operate. Shortwave broadcasters are concerned that their audiences will disappear if they cannot be heard over B-P-L generated noise. Also, a number of emergency communications networks have told the FCC that their vital communications will negatively impacted as well.

The one service that nobody has talked about is 11 meter Class D CB radio. An unlicensed service at 27 MHz with millions of radios crammed into 40 overcrowded channels with many operators running far more power than legally allowed. This week, Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, looks at CB, B-P-L and the collision between the two that may not be to far away.

--

If those who want to bring us Broadband Over Powerline thought amateur radio operators were going to be a nuisance to their plans, they may have an even bigger headache on the horizon. Citizens Band radio operators could prove to be the biggest threat to B-P-L.

The FCC defines CB as a private radio service that doesn't require users to have a license. It hasn't for years. The FCC pretty much gave up regulating the spectrum. It asks users to enjoy their radios but to stay within the five-watt power limit of most of the radios.

But since the FCC gave up trying to keep track of those operating on 27 Mhz, problems have mushroomed. A class of CB operator has emerged who likes to use high-power amplifiers to talk with people several states away.

How powerful? If you check out some of the CB websites, you'll find amplifiers being sold that push the envelope well beyond the legal limit - say 500 watts, 1,000 watts, even 5,000 watts and higher.

Many contemporary electronic appliances, because of poor RF shielding, are susceptible to interference caused by overmodulated CB signals.

The FCC could find itself in a real quandry if the B-P-L industry demands help in going after those who push the limit and disrupt

their systems. Imagine the complaints.

Because the FCC can't go to a database to help it find abusers or offenders, it's going to be a difficult if not impossible - task to track these illegal operators.

Will the industry end up funding the FCC's enforcement effort? That would be unprecedented.

Let's be clear: Not all CB operators are outlaws.

Many use their 11 meter radios for personal communications on trips, on hikes, on fishing expeditions. And, yes, the truckers are still big users of the spectrum.

But if you search the worldwide web, you will find CB sites with postings from folks who boast of their radio exploits and their amplifiers and contests.

The websites, of course, take no responsibility for the information or material posted in forums or message boards. They describe them as strictly for entertainment or educational purposes.

Some education the B-P-L industry is sure to get; perhaps a crash or will that be clash course in CB radio.

For now, we'll have to watch and wait.

CBers say they're watching, too. And some of them are vowing no one will stop them from operating as they please.

Stay tuned. For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia

--

To get an idea as to the power that some of the highly illegal competition grade C-B stations run, take your web browser to www.bigradios.com and follow the numerous links from there. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: CINCINNATI WATCH OUT

Meantime, Cincinnati Ohio may be among the first to have Broadband over Powerlines across the entire area. This, as a division of Cinergy Corporation announces plans to offer high-speed Internet service over its power lines.

According a March 2nd release, Cinergy Broadband is pairing with the Maryland based Current Communications Group to offer the service in parts of Cincinnati this year. Plans also call for an expansion into Kentucky and Indiana as the regional system grows.

Cinergy says that it hopes to initially market the service to 55,000 of its 1.5 million customers. A second venture will bring the technology to smaller municipal and cooperatively owned power companies, covering 24 million customers across the United States. The companies are committing more than $70 million to the effort. (ZD Net via Media Network)

**

ENFORCEMENT: CONGRESSIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS HIGHER FINES FOR INDECENCY

A congressional subcommittee has acted to substantially increase the fines assessed broadcasters who break indecency rules. Some legislators also say that repeat offenders should lose their licenses.

FCC officials have maintained for years that the current maximum fine of $27,500 is too small to serve as a deterrent for large broadcasters who view the fines as a cost of doing business. Now, under a bill recently passed by the House Internet and Telecommunications subcommittee, monetary forfeitures issued by the FCC would be increased by a factor of ten to $275,000 per violation. The cap on the fines would go to a maximum of $3 million.

There is yet another possibility being floated among legislators and one that could come up when and if the bill hits the House floor. That would be to hold performers and others appearing in the electronic media directly responsible for their own words, much the same way as is done in other radio services including ham radio.

But one law maker has cautioned to enlarge the scope of the proposed legislation to far. Representative Fred Upton cautioned that lawmakers should be careful not to expand the bill to the point where it might run afoul of free-speech rights guaranteed by the Constitution. If that happens, Upton says that it could very well buckle under its own weight. (Published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC SAYS IT TIME FOR LOW POWER BROADCAST RADIO

The FCC says that Congress should lift the restrictions it has placed on the introduction of low power FM broadcast stations. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, is here with the rest of the story:

--

In a February 20th statement, the FCC said that its inquiry shows that low power FM stations serving highly specific audiences in small areas do not interfere with the operations of large broadcasters. Also, that they will not keep audiences from hearing the higher power commercial stations as the industry claims.

When the FCC first suggested creating the low power or community radio option. commercial broadcasters and public radio stations complained. The argued that low power stations would interfere with reception of their signals Congress responded by setting what amounted to an R-F no-man's land between the low power stations and existing broadcasters. This severely limited the number of tiny stations that the Commission could license.

Lawmakers also told the FCC to study the potential for interference. The agency spent several years doing just that. It has now concluded that stations running between 10 and 100 watts pose little risk to commercial stations whose power levels can be upward of 100,000 watts effective radiated.

Currently, there are about 300 low powered F-M stations on the air. Most are licensed to churches, school districts, youth organizations, highway departments, environmentalists and the like. By comparison, the nation's largest commercial broadcast radio chain, Clear Channel Communications owns 1,200 stations so far.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

A spokesman for the National Association of Broadcasters termed the FCC report as flawed. (FCC)

**

ON THE AIR: WYOMING STATION DX TEST MARCH 14

Meantime, a full power radio station is in the news and its a good news for hams and S-W-L's who like listening for rare ones on the A-M band. On Sunday, March 14th, radio station KEVA, 1240 kilohertz in Evanston, Wyoming will conduct a D-X test to find out how far its signal can be heard.

According to Lynn Holman reporting over the Broadcast Employees remailer, the test will take place from 12:00 - 1 a.m. Mountain Standard Time and will consist of numerous Morse code I-D's emanating from a C-D created by Doug Smith, W9WI.

For a conformation card please send your reception reports with return postage to Michael Richard, KEVA-AM, P.O. Box 190, Evanston, Wyoming. The zipcode is 82931. (B.E.A.N.)

**

CONFERENCES: EASTERN VHF-UHF IN CT. IN APRIL

Turning to ham radio meetings of note, the 30th annual Eastern VHF UHF Conference will take place next month, April 16th through the 18th at the Radisson Hotel in Enfield Connecticut. Among the program to be presented will be a special update on the "Status of

VHF UHF Contesting & Awards Programs" will be Dan Henderson, N1ND of the ARRL. Also on hand will be Gerry Rodski, K3MKZ of SSB Electronic USA to manage the Preamp Noise Figure Measurement workshop and Chris Fagas, WB2VVV to oversee the antenna gain measurement range.

The conference is sponsored by the Eastern VHF UHF Society and the North East Weak Signal Groups. More information is available from Conference Chairman and Proceedings Editor Bruce Wood, N2LIV. E-mail him bdwood@erols.com or visit http://newsvhf.com on the World-Wide-Web. (VHF Reflector)

**

CONFRENCES: SVHFS IN GEORGIA IN APRIL

And the 8th Annual Southeastern VHF Society Conference takes place in Marietta, Georgia on April 23 and 24th. Marietta is not far from, Atlanta and this years program highlights include sessions on pre-amp noise figure and gain measurement, antenna gain measurements, a back scratcher antenna competition and judging for the Mini-Circuits Annual Award for Design Achievement. Also expect a flea market, manufacturer exhibits, the annual auction, and card checking for VUCC. For more information on this one please take your web browser to www.svhfs.org (VHF Reflector)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: BAND LEADER ALVINO REY, W6UK - S.K.

Ham radio's changing of the guard continues. This with the sad news that Alvino Rey, W-6-U-K, has passed away.

Ray was 95 when he became a Silent Key from pneumonia in Sandy, Utah on Tuesday, February 24th. Best known as a swing-band leader of the '30s and '40s he was also an inventor and tinkerer who pioneered development of the pedal steel guitar. This instrument, and his ability to make it sound like it was talking became his musical trademark.

Born Alvin McBurney, in California he grew up in Cleveland Ohio. After beginning his music career in New York he changed his name to Rey in 1929 to capitalize on the then popular Latin music craze.

Rey and his orchestra gained national fame with the 1942 hit, "Deep in the Heart of Texas." Nearly 25 years later, Rey was again in the national spotlight when he was featured for several seasons on ABC Television's "The King Family Show."

Ham radio wise, Ray loved to operate all modes, and, according to posts on the V-H-F reflector, was particularly fond of 6 meters. He was also active on all of the the high frequency bands over his many years in the hobby. (K6LAE, published news reports)

**

WORLDBEAT - USA: BIG ANTI-PIRACY WIN

A federal judge in San Francisco has ruled that a software program that copies Digital Video Discs infringes on the copyrights of Hollywood studios. Judge Susan Illston ruled that software made by 321 Studios of Chesterfield, Missouri violates the 1998 Digital Millennium Copyright Act. This law prohibits the circumvention of anti-piracy measures such as the Content Scramble System protecting movies on DVDs. Judge Illston ordered the company to stop making or distributing such software within seven days of her February 20th order. (News reports)

**

WORLDBEAT - BELGIUM: HACKER GAL ARRESTED

Meantime, a Belgian computer hacker who has made an international name for herself as a woman in a male-dominated activity is facing criminal charges. Belgian police have arrested the 19-year-old technology student, confiscated her five computers and shut down her Web site.

A Belgian newspaper says that the woman, identified only by her nickname, Gigabyte was charged with computer data sabotage. Police tell the paper she was preparing to publish new viruses on her Website when she was taken into custody. If convicted, Gigabyte faces up to three years in prison and 127-thousand dollars in fines. (Computing)

**

WORLDBEAT - UK: IOTA IN OCTOBER

And while its a long ways off, the dates of the Radio Society of Great Britain's International High Frequency and Islands on the Air Convention has just been announced. This year, the gathering will take place the weekend of Friday October 22nd to Sunday the 24th. Further announcements as to venue and the program will follow later on www.rsgb.org and the GB2RS news service from the U-K. (RSGB)

**

NEW HAM PRODUCTS: THE JWM 1152 PHASE LOCKED OSCILLATOR

Looking at products of interest to ham radio experimenters, word that JWM Engineering Group has announced availability of a new phase locked oscillator. One designed to improve frequency control to microwave receivers and transmitters using crystal oscillator local oscillator chains.

According to Jerry Mulchin, N7EME, President of the JWM Engineering Group, the Model 1152 eliminates the frequency uncertainty of most microwave transverter systems. Mulchin adds that Precise frequency control and stability eliminates at least one variable in establishing successful and enjoyable microwave communications. More information is on the web at http://jwmeng.com. (JWM Engineering Group)

**

CONTESTS: WB6ACU AND K9EID ON FROM W1AW

On the radiosport page, the ARRL phone contest on March 6th and 7th will have had some well known hams operating from the League's W1AW flagship station this year. According to a note from Bob Heil, K9EID, he and famed rock guitarist Joe Walsh, WB6ACU of the Eagles will be on the air from League headquarters during contest. A special picture QSL will be sent to those who work Joe or Bob. QSL to their respective call directory addresses. (K9EID)

**

DX

In DX, PA5M has been active as 9U5M from Burundi since the 17th of February and will stay in the country until the 17th of March. He operates in his spare time, typically after 1600 UTC, on 10 to 40 meters CW and SSB.

And W7EJ is in Morocco until the end of March. He plans to be active as CN2R in the CQ 160-Meter SSB, ARRL DX SSB and CQ WPX SSB contests.

Also, DJ4SO is active portable V-51 from Namibia through the 15th. He plans to operate on 160 to 6 meters mainly CW, RTTY and PSK 31 with some SSB.

Lastly, ZS6Y reports he is active with the special callsign ZS10RSA until mid-May. This, to celebrate 10 years of democracy in that nation. For all of these operations, QSL as directed on the air.

(This weeks DX news courtesy of GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE ORIGIN OF ELECTRONIC SPAM

And finally this week, a brief lesson on something we dread every time we check our e-mail. You know what it is. Unwanted junk e-mail

that people have come to call Spam. Ever wonder why? Here's Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, with some details that probably very few people know:

--

We all know that Spam is the trade name of a canned meat product. At least I suspect that most of you do. But have you ever wondered where the phrase "spam" in relation to unsolicited junk e-mail came from. Well, blame it on the computer nerds who were fans of one of the worlds greatest comedy ensembles.

It seems that the term began being applied to junk electronic mail in the early 1990's by computer geeks. It was based on a 1970 Monty Python skit in which an exasperated restaurant customer is urged to order the meat until she screams: ''Stop it already. I don't want any Spam!''

And that was it. And now you do know the rest of the story.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline. I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in the City of Angels.

--

To which Ill add the rhetorical question: How many of us open our e-mail boxes each day and want yell the same thing? (Tnx to Q-News, CGC, others who sent this item along.)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

317. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 20:21:29 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
Message-ID: <4048E15D.5030500@get.lost>
Source record: 88531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Hans K0HB wrote:

> http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/03/02/HNbroadbandservice_1.html

Yep, sadly it's becoming a reality.

Personally, I'm looking forward to the day when I program my electronic keyer into a CQ loop, fire up the amp and leave on a vacation. Of course, the next logical step is the FCC protecting the BPL by placing amateur radio in part 15.

WA7AA

--

Anti-spam measure: look me up on qrz.com if you need to reply directly

318. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 20:42:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403051242.6dbf0875@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88532

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050621.629ce3c3@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403041622.6de88fbe@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403040704.51a89f25@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403040343.f1030e5@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > I wonder. Has the 7 year old Extra been married numerous times?
> > >
> > > Why? Figure you may have found somone who you can actually
> > > communicate with on a peer-level, Brain? Or are 7-year olds just your
> > > style?
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > You're sick. Get help.
>
> >>I'M SICK...?!?!<<
>
> YOU, you sick twerp, were the one suggesting a 7 year old has
> been married...!!!

They are in some countries. That doesn't mean they have marital relations.

> > I just guessed that the seven year old doesn't have as much emotional
> > baggage as you appear to have.
>
> Again, YOU are the one making some very sick suggestions,
> Brain...

No. I just figured that the seven year old wasn't messed up like you.

Now I'm sure of it.

319. Re: general class exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:18:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MU72c.8848$t16.5603702@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88533

"Willian Irving Zumwalt" <wizumwalt@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:dd8fee65.0403042307.102fad74@posting.google.com...
> Several popular exam books I've looked at expire in June of 2004 for
> the General class license. How long before we start seeing the new
> editions come out. Reason I ask is because I'd like to start studying
> but don't think I'll be ready by June and if there are changes, I'd
> just rather wait for the new edition.
>
> Any help much appreciated.

Check at www.arrl.com and at the W5YI site.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

320. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:23:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403051523.75bc15b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88534

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050701.679e737a@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031634.27eb72e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Because, BRAIN, it's not about how >>I<< address YOU...
> >
> > I say it is. Until you behave yourself, its TAFKARJ!!!
>
> Then I'd say you've pretty well proven that I am right about your
> general lack of character.
>
> About what I'd expect from someone who expresses public
> admiration for a known liar and antagonist.
>
> > It's about
> > > why do YOU address Jim Miccolis with belittling endearments when
> > > >>HE<< has never addressed YOU as anything except your proper name?
> >
> > Tuff. I'm holding TAFKARJ metaphorically hostage until you straighten
> > your insane a$$ out. My regrets to Jim. I'll send out for
> > Schlottskey's deli.
>
> Still haven't answered the question, which in itself I'd say puts
> you in the "coward" category, but the INSISTENCE on being insulting
> where no insult was offered puts you solidly in the "scumbag"
> category, too.
>
> > Do you often get involved with other people's issues?
>
> Only when I see creepy scumbags acting like bullies towards
> people who have treated them with nothing but respect.
>
> You'd be that bully, ergo you'd be that scumbag.
>
> I am sure you family line is proud of you.
>
> > He can. He has. And to a reasonable person, effectively. But
> > TAFKARJ remains in another world. A Ham in a Bubble.
>
> So far everything he's said, other than that that he clearly
> states as opinion, is true.

>
> You and Lennie the Liar do not have that reputation.
>
> > > Are YOU that weak minded and foolish?
> >
> > Don't know.
>
> I do....
>
> > On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most weak-minded and foolish,
> > how high would you rate me?
>
> Ummmm.... a solid 8.5. You ahve the potential to be redeemed,
> but I doubt it. You occassionally manage to express a vaild opinion
> without being insulting or dememaning, but your inability to
> substantiate your claims leaves you wanting pretty badly.
>
> > > He did the same thing with me when he launched into allegations
> > > of being a "jack booted thug", "Nazi", "elitist", "Dill Sergeant", etc
> > > etc etc, when I had not so addressed him. He is treated and addressed
> > > in the same tone and with the same viciousness as he unleashed.
> > >
> > Ahem. I hate to be the one to break it to you, Steve, but you are
> > just a wee little bit over the top. Ask ANYone!
>
> Perhaps I am...But I refuse to be talked down to, pushed, or
> otherwise be bullied by cowards and creeps like you and Lennie.
>
> Sorry if that hurts your feelings. Perhaps asking yourself how
> you came to this juncture would be warranted?
>
> > > Is that how you feel? Do >>YOU<< need to belittle Jim in order
> > > to effectively express yourself when discussing things with/about him?
> > >
> > Do you need to belittle me in order to express yourself?
>
> Nope. You belittle yourself just fine. But since you deem it
> necessary to address people the way you do, I just assume that this is
> the manner in which you find it most effective to communicate.
>
> > Rhetorical question. I already know the answer.
>
> No you don't. You ASSUME that you know an answer.
>
> > And, no, I don't need to belittle TAFKARJ. Have I done so?
>
> THAT was a rhetorical question, Brain.
>
> > > Please do not humiliate yourself by trying to misdirect this
> > > question by asking >>ME<< about how I address Lennie...I've already

> > > answered that.
> >
> > See above. Why do you need to try to belittle >>ME<<?
>
> Because it seems to be the form of communication that you
> understand.
>
> > > Stay focused...you were asked a direct, specific question.
> >
> > Which was?
>
> Which was obviously not important enough for you to answer like a
> man.
>
> > > You CAN answer direct, specific questions, can't you?
> >
> > If I can recall them.
>
> Obviously you ARE Gene Pool Deficient...
>
> Cut and snip to...
>
> > > PS: I will assume any answer to the question that attempts to
> > > redirect or obfuscate the response to be "I am unwilling to directly
> > > answer the question as I know the truth to be other than what I
> > > stated". Simple enough?
> >
> > See above. Questions answered. Now what?
>
> No, they weren't...but I am sure that you think that you danced
> your way around the point.
>
> THE POINT is that Brian Burke is not a person of reputable
> character. Not that we'd expect anything less from a person who
> publically expresses admiration for a known pathological liar and
> antagonist.
>
> Thanks, Brain...You DO make this easy...You have now admitted to
> publically lying...not that "we" didn't already know that.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, in your own eyes-rolled-back kind of way, I'm sure you really
believe what you say.

But I don't.

I think you're nuts.

321. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:28:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403051528.6a526630@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88535

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> And your point is...?
>
> I'm not really sure what you're getting at, but my point was that it is
> reasonable to assume that everyone has a TV and a phone, for example, but
> we're not yet at that point with cellphones. Close, but not there yet. Of
> course, I would say that, as I don't have one.
>
> The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the
> discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help out in an
> emergency.

OK, Alun, lets look at it another way.

We agree that cellular phones can be useful in an emergency.

We agree that not everyone has a cellular phone, maybe only 1/3 of the
US population.

We know that there are very, very, very few amateur radio operators
per capita in the US population.

We can conclude that most people have better access to cellular phones
in an emergency than they have access to amateur radio.

322. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:36:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403051536.616e43f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88536

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050709.6787a2fa@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031522.6357898d@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030645.4cdd2b3f@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > The post >>I<< responded to was from your douchebag friend.
> > > Exact same is quoted verbatim above.
> >
> > Stebe, I have no douche bag friends, unless you believe yourself to be
> > my friend.
>
> Sure you do.
>
> You have publically proclaimed your admiration for Lennie Anderson
> on several occassions.

I have admired Len's ability to get to the truth in spite of the
overwhelming personal attacks on his character.

> Lennie has been documented in countless lies and acts of
> antagonism and misrepresentation.

Now we have TAFKARJ editing posts. What's next?

> That, in my book, makes Lennie a douchebag.

Hmmm. You must be the run-off.

> > So, has Roll not claimed that Ham Radio always saves the day?
>
> He has claimed it has "saved the day"...
>
> I have never seen him say "always".

He always sets up his scenario where only amateur radio can save the
day. That makes it "always."

> You or Sir Putzalot will have to provide me a cite of a post
> wherein he did.

Cite yourself.

> FACTS have proven that Amateur Radio HAS "saved the day" on
> occassions too numerous to count.

FACTS have proven that cellular telephones HAVE "saved the day" on occassions too numerous to count.

> > What exactly am I to try again?
>
> Acting like a man...It may be hard, but you'd not be the first
> puppet to experience it...
>
> Sgteve, K4YZ

Thanks Sgt. Steve. You are dismissed.

323. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:39:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403051539.1dcabdd5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88537

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
> news:20040304205200.02537.00003333@mb-m23.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns94A24E580C0Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>Personally, I don't have a cell phone, so if I lost wired phone service
> >>I would only have ham radio to fall back on. Oddly enough, cell phones
> >>have not yet spread to every man, woman and child, but I don't know
> >>anyone who doesn't have a phone number.
> >
> > Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are
> > 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's
> > about one for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say.
> > :-)
> >
> > If every licensed amateur in the USA had one useable radio, then the
> > number of amateur radios would be one per about 430 citizens. Not
> > as big a "spread."
> >
> > LHA / WMD
> >
>
> And your point is...?

Hey...! It's LENNIE, Alun! No point is necessary!

> The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the
> discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help out in an
> emergency.

And that they do, over and over and over, yet His Putziness still
insists that such is not the case, reams of evidence to the contrary.

73

Steve, K4YZ

324. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-05 23:46:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403051546.71a9bc78@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88538

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40474D7A.B024AA65@earthlink.net>...

> William (AKA Brain Burke, from what is surely but one of several screen names used in this forum) wrote:

> > You're still good for a
> > few laughs.
>
> The laughs, as usual, appear to be on you. I'd love to hear more of
> your amateur radio contesting exploits. I'd probably pick up a tip or
> too.
> Your insight into DXing was extremely valueable.

I am sure that he'd be the center of attention at a CB Jamboree, "enlightening" those impressionable souls with his "wisdom" on such antics...Until, of course, someone had the temerity to ask him to provide some evidence of his exploits.

And of course he could throw in some well timed colloquialisms like "flat side", "swing" and "dead key" and they'd be putty in his (cold and clammy) hands.

Or maybe not...

73

Steve, K4YZ

325. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 00:19:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TIKdnenQtPuBhNTdRVn-jQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88539

Brian Kelly wrote:
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com>...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910
>
>
>>>In the long run, those currently
>>>cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>>
>>Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>
>
> It's already happened.
>
> Among others big-name Jap manufacturers like Sony, Honda, Toshiba,
> etc. have been shoveling jobs into southeast Asia at a huge rate for
> years and now they're moving into China at an astonishing rate too.
> The Japanese unemployment rates are much worse than ours as a result.
> It's even more of a kick in the butt for them because it's happening
> in a society in which full employement has historically been a major
> component of their culture.
>
> Fifteen years ago moving manufacturing to Singapore was the hot
> ticket. So everybody did. The singaporean economy skyrocketed, their
> per capita wealth became the global model. Now the hot ticket is
> getting the hell outta Singapore because manufacturing there costs too
> much.
>
>
>>I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>>alone.
>
>
> That's because there is no such thing as a "service economy", the term
> and the concept are oxymorons. Economics 101: There are only three
> ways a nation can generate wealth: (1) Dig valuable minerals out of
> it's ground (2) Grow, catch or raise crops and critters (3) Enhance
> the value of the outputs from (1) and (2) via manufacturing. Anything
> else is just passing the same bucks around in circles until they peter
> out. As exemplified by our balance of trade deficit.

Correct! (shudder) We cannot make money by sitting in a closet and
selling our hats to each other. While the person who is a "Hamburger

Manufacturer" sells his/her wares to the buying public for minimum wage can do that, There has to be people that are doing something else that makes more. They have to buy from the Hamburger manufacturer. While we can expound on trickle down and all the other theories out there, if everyone is in a low paying service job, there won't be much discretionary cash floating around. therefore there won't be as much sold, and there won't be a healthy economy.

A healthy economy in the model that we in the US are used to requires a prosperous and large middle class. Somehow that has gone missing from some folks.

- Mike KB3EIA -

326. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 00:20:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TIKdnejQtPvShNTdRVn-jQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88540

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Jim,
>
> We are about to find out ...

And that my friend, scares the bejabbers out of me.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

327. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 00:34:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040305193447.21955.00000858@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88541

In article <104f7g7rtkdv7de@corp.supernews.com>, Glenn
<kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> writes:

>While I remember that the tests for Novice and General were of the
>multiple guess kind in the '60s (albeit at an FCC Field Office), I could
>swear that I remember that drawn circuit diagrams were required at least
>for the Extra written exam, if not the Advanced. This from the study
>guides that I had for the tests.

I have the ARRL License Manuals with copyright dates for 1947, 1951, 1953, 1962, and 1971. They detail the exact process of getting a license in those times, both by mail and at FCC exam points.

Some facts:

- The Novice was always multiple-choice only. All of the manuals describe the Novice written test as "about 20 questions"

- The 1953 and earlier manuals describe the higher-class written tests as requiring the drawing of a few diagrams. The 1962 manual says that all exams are multiple choice.

- The 1953 and earlier manuals say that some questions are neither multiple choice nor diagrams, but require the examinee to solve a problem and show the calculations used.

- The 1962 manual says that the written exams are all multiple choice.

QST for July 1960, page 54. "FCC Written Exam Procedure Changing" . This article describes the new FCC answer sheet that will go into use "in a few months". It shows the new answer sheet and describes how the "draw a diagram" questions will be replaced by questions about a diagram, such as "what should be done to neutralize this circuit"

Three noteworthy points:

1) the old multiple choice exams offered 5 choices, not the current 4, making a correct answer by guessing slightly less likely.

2) the article says that the number of diagram questions will be increased when the new exam method is implemented. And so it was, at least for General - compare the following tallies of required diagrams in the LMs:

1953 LM: General has 8 diagrams in its study guide, all schematics, Extra has 28 schematic and 3 block diagrams in its study guide.

1962 LM: General has 50 diagrams in its study guide, all schematics, Extra has 17 schematic and 3 block diagrams in its study guide.

One of the reasons for the higher number of diagrams in the '62 LM is the inclusion of multiple diagrams in one question, such as 8 filter diagrams being

the answer to a single question.

3) No exact date is given for the transition - the article says "in a few months", and it's clear that FCC would use up the old exams before starting the

new ones.

While the old General exams were probably quickly used up, there were very few getting Extras back then, and the supply of Extra exams at some FCC offices may have lasted quite a while.

Reason for the change: To speed up and simplify marking of the exams! By making them all multiple choice, the person marking the test did not have to understand the material at all, just the procedure.

In both 1953 and 1962, the Advanced test was not given, and hams had to upgrade from General to Extra in a single step. However, there were no additional operating privileges granted with an Extra, and only about 2% of US hams in 1962 were Extras. The Advanced was reopened to new issues in 1967.

73 de Jim, N2EY

328. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 00:47:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <CJOdnc3qYMMJgtTdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88542

N2EY wrote:
> In article <104f7g7rtkdv7de@corp.supernews.com>, Glenn
> <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> writes:
>
>
>>While I remember that the tests for Novice and General were of the
>>multiple guess kind in the '60s (albeit at an FCC Field Office), I could
>>swear that I remember that drawn circuit diagrams were required at least
>>for the Extra written exam, if not the Advanced. This from the study
>>guides that I had for the tests.
>
>
> I have the ARRL License Manuals with copyright dates for 1947, 1951, 1953,
> 1962, and 1971. They detail the exact process of getting a license in those
> times, both by mail and at FCC exam points.
>
> Some facts:
>
> - The Novice was always multiple-choice only. All of the manuals describe the
> Novice written test as "about 20 questions"
>
> - The 1953 and earlier manuals describe the higher-class written tests as
> requiring the drawing of a few diagrams. The 1962 manual says that all exams
> are multiple choice.
>
> - The 1953 and earlier manuals say that some questions are neither multiple
> choice nor diagrams, but require the examinee to solve a problem and show the
> calculations used.
>
> - The 1962 manual says that the written exams are all multiple choice.
>
> QST for July 1960, page 54. "FCC Written Exam Procedure Changing" . This
> article describes the new FCC answer sheet that will go into use "in a few
> months". It shows the new answer sheet and describes how the "draw a diagram"
> questions will be replaced by questions about a diagram, such as "what should
> be done to neutralize this circuit"
>
> Three noteworthy points:
>
> 1) the old multiple choice exams offered 5 choices, not the current 4, making
> a correct answer by guessing slightly less likely.
>
> 2) the article says that the number of diagram questions will be increased
> when the new exam method is implemented. And so it was, at least for General -

> compare the following tallies of required diagrams in the LMs:
>
> 1953 LM: General has 8 diagrams in its study guide, all schematics, Extra has
> 28 schematic and 3 block diagrams in its study guide.
>
> 1962 LM: General has 50 diagrams in its study guide, all schematics, Extra
> has 17 schematic and 3 block diagrams in its study guide.
>
> One of the reasons for the higher number of diagrams in the '62 LM is the
> inclusion of multiple diagrams in one question, such as 8 filter diagrams being
>
> the answer to a single question.
>
> 3) No exact date is given for the transition - the article says "in a few
> months", and it's clear that FCC would use up the old exams before starting the
>
> new ones.
>
> While the old General exams were probably quickly used up, there were very few
> getting Extras back then, and the supply of Extra exams at some FCC offices may
> have lasted quite a while.
>
> Reason for the change: To speed up and simplify marking of the exams! By making
> them all multiple choice, the person marking the test did not have to
> understand the material at all, just the procedure.

Well, if I had to make a choice, I would rather the person taking the
exam know the material! 8^)

>
> In both 1953 and 1962, the Advanced test was not given, and hams had to
> upgrade from General to Extra in a single step. However, there were no
> additional operating privileges granted with an Extra, and only about 2% of US
> hams in 1962 were Extras. The Advanced was reopened to new issues in 1967.
>

I have to say that I don't find as much difference between the older
tests and the newer tests as I thought there would be. I was kind of
under the impression (but skeptical) that the older tests were a
regular "hazing" compared to the easy tests we take today.

Thanks much for your research, Jim!

- Mike KB3EIA -

329. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 01:00:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403051700.3288e853@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88543

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303161722.13960.00001024@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <c253fc$646$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>, et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
> (Michael Black) writes:
>
> >JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc) writes:
> >> William wrote:

> >And that's where amateur radio comes in. Emergency preparedness is
> >always a gamble. Do we spend money on something that will see little
> >or no use, just in case of an emergency, or do we spend the money on
> >necessities, and risk not being able to handle emergencies?
>
> The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
> and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
> preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment
> to individual training.

What is "painfully obvious" is your glaring lack of real-world
experience in Amateur Radio matters...This compunded by your equally
woeful lack of experience in emergency communications in ANY radio
service.

> Mobile installations have only to start a vehicle to restore electric
> power to radios installed therein. However, if a fire or mudslide
> destroys that vehicle, then it is useless for the intended emergency.
> A "shack" in the residence is only as good as the building or
> external electric service allows...amateur radio equipment is largely
> "consumer grade" electronics that cannot withstand a wide range
> of environments possible in a natural disaster.

More ignorance.

My ICOM IC-O2AT was purchased in 1984, and until a few years ago
remained in continual service.

I carried to to 29Palms on instances too numeous to recall. It
was with me on several winter weather training exercises conducted by
the US Army's 10th Mountain at Fort Drum, NY in the middle of winter.
It was also my "close companion" while working EMS in Victorville and
Ridgecrest CA in the late 80's.

It was also on at least a dozen SAR missions with Civil Air
Patrol while stationed in PA, and once dropped by me in a creek. I
dried it out, changed the battery, and that was that.

I've also carried my Yaesu FT757GXII from coast-to-coast, used it
as a "base station", mobile and portable on numerous CAP activities.
I'd still be using it for CAP had CAP not required compliance with
NTIA standards.

> >If there is an "auxiliary" who have their own radios (saves money)
> >and has some ability in using those radios (saves staff) then that
> >money does not have to be spent "just in case".
>
> The California state Auxilliary Communications Service is organized
> to use ALL available communications facilities, landline or radio. It
> has proven itself well over the last decade through several natural
> disaster emergencies. The California ACS does not require members
> to hold amateur radio licenses.

However there are literally dozens of thier members who ARE
licensed Amateurs and make very good use of the flexibility of Amateur
Radio to augment thier duties.

> Disaster planning need not spend millions to install new equipment
> everywhere. (Snip to...)

> there is a moderate reservoir of "private"
> land mobile radio services that covers business radios to private boat
> owners which can be pressed into use during extreme emergencies;
> millions of no-license-required two-way radios such as CB or FRS
> types can also be utilized in extreme emergencies.

Uh huh. "extreme emergencies" like getting nuked.

With the exception of REACT, there are NO plans for "press(ing)
into use" of those unlicensed/untrained "facilities".

On the otherhand, ARES and REACT >>ARE<< included in and
routinely used by almost every state EM plan.

> Few amateur radio licensees are aware of anything but the last.

An absolute falsehood.

> The general thinking is that all communications was set in the
> 1950s style with the exception of cellular telephony which they claim
> "always fails in every emergency."

Another absolute falsehood.

> >If there is never
> >an emergency, hams will go on because their interest is not primarily
> >in providing emergency communication. It is a hobby, which means they
> >should get more practical use with the radios than if they took a training
> >weekend once a year. They want the radios for their hobby, so they gladly
> >pay for the equipment.
>
> Imagination, fantasy, and wishful thinking are all free and those items
> are in great operational use as hams rationalize their expenditures

> and boast of their "emergency preparedness" and "homeland security"
> "service" as if all they do IS emergency service ALL the time.

What's fantsy here is your assertions, Lennie. You've not
provided one bit of valid rhetoric, nor do your assertions reflect
facts otherwise documented in countless media sources.

In otherwords, you are, again, lying.

> >But just as an electric company can usually buy power from another company
> >on the grid when there is a surge in demand, amateur radio is there to
> >draw on when an emergency comes up that cannot be handled with regular
> >equipment and staff.
>
> So it is with the tremendous variety of existing communications facilities
> in use every day throughout the United States, public safety and utility
> radio services operating 24/7.

Given a true "disaster", those "facilities" will be (and have
been proven to be) hard pressed to serve the agencies they are
embedded with.

Amateur Radio, on the otherhand, does not exist to serve it's own
needs...it exists to support others.

This it does superbly. Unless you care to "argue" or "dispute"
the claims made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Red
Cross, the US Department of State, the Salvation Army, etc etc etc.

> The Greater Los Angeles Emergency Communications Center got its
> "baptism of fire" (so to speak) during the Northridge Earthquake in
> January, 1994. It is a central command post as well as a network
> coordinator tying together over 70 cities and communities in a portion
> of southern California. They use EXISTING radio services, those that
> can be coordinated and trained on a periodic basis. Those are working
> radio services, not the "let's pretend" of some hobby activities. The
> Center has had several emergency incidents since the quake of a
> decade ago and handled all of them.

Yes, it did. And Amateur Radio supported many of those incidents
within the scope of pre-planned and trained for contingencies. Again,
these are facts documented in numerous, verifyable third-party media.

> In a TRUE emergency, ANYTHING can be used for communications,
> anything from simple HTs to notes hand-carried by messengers on
> foot. Yes, amateur radio can be a part of that "anything" but such is
> practically worthless unless teamwork can be done through organization
> and periodic drills of simulated emergencies, training activities that
> prove out existing procedures or are good for showing needed changes.

Oh...you mean like ARES, RACES, REACT, etc etc etc?

The same organizations recognized by the governmental and public
agencies that I cited above?

"Practically worthless"...?!?! Not according to those who are
"in the know", Lennie...which of course excludes you.

> Amateur radio activity is generally very personal and few amateurs are
> willing to work in groups or even be directed by another amateur;
> certainly not by an outside agency that they claim "doesn't know the
> first things about ham radio!" Such individualism, parochialism
> doesn't work well in a real emergency situation that doesn't make room
> for boastful claims which are unproven.

"...boastful claims which are unproven"...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHA
! ! ! ! ! ! !!

WHAT A FREAKIN IDIOT!

Sheeesh!

> There should be nothing wrong with being just a hobby. Hobbies are
> excellent for recreation.

Yes, they are...And Amateur Radio is, for a great many people,
jsut that.

But it gives me no small amount of satisfaction to know that
since it's >>NOT<< "just a hobby" to a great many that you are getting
your one-size-too-small Fruit-of-the-Looms in a seriously
blood-constricting knot!

YOUR problem is that you have, once again, jumped in without
checking to see which way the tide was flowing and have found yourself
being dragged off-shore.

WHAT an IDIOT.

Steve, K4YZ

330. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 01:11:46 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A3CD4B89306elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88544

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403051528.6a526630@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
>> And your point is...?
>>
>> I'm not really sure what you're getting at, but my point was that it
>> is reasonable to assume that everyone has a TV and a phone, for
>> example, but we're not yet at that point with cellphones. Close, but
>> not there yet. Of course, I would say that, as I don't have one.
>>
>> The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the
>> discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help out
>> in an emergency.
>
> OK, Alun, lets look at it another way.
>
> We agree that cellular phones can be useful in an emergency.
>
> We agree that not everyone has a cellular phone, maybe only 1/3 of the
> US population.
>
> We know that there are very, very, very few amateur radio operators
> per capita in the US population.
>
> We can conclude that most people have better access to cellular phones
> in an emergency than they have access to amateur radio.
>

Possibly true, so long as the cell towers are still standing.

331. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 01:13:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403051713.4edca51e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88545

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<kh3d40lc3g737d098kmsfv7nd04o82mmj7@4ax.com>...
> On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 16:16:28 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> wrote:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >
> >>
> >> The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
> >> and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
> >> preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment
> >> to individual training.
> >
> >Lennyboy you are so far off base it isn't even funny.
>
> How so, JJ? I'd say that Len was quite correct on this one.

Nope. Not even close. Please read my post as validation as to
why.

Lennie makes yet again more assinine assertions that are
disproven by evidence from thir party sources.

> With few exceptions, all of the hams that I know are ragchewers,
> contesters or experimenters. There are only a couple who actively
> participate in the local ARES group, and they are the only ones with
> the rudimentary training to handle an emergency situation without
> hindering or interfering with it.
>
> In fact, this appears to be the norm in the hobby, from my perspective
> anyway - only a small percentage are actively involved in this area -
> the rest, like me, are just in it for the hobby. Why not?

Why not, indeed, and that's fine. Most emergency preparedness
plans DON'T need legions of persons to carry out the plan...Just a few
dedicated persons willing to apply themselves to the task at hand.
Most IC's DON'T want any more people there than what's necessary since
they become a burden on already limited resources.

Again, it has been PROVEN that ARES, REACT, RACES, etc, have
filled these niches well.

> Of course, in an emergency situation, any of us would be willing to
> pitch in and do whatever we could to help - but the vast majority of
> us lack the organization, equipment and training that the professional

> services have. For example, if an earthquake hit your area right now,
> what would you do? Who would you contact, and on what frequency? Who
> are the alternates, if he / she is not reachable? Who coordinates what
> with the various professional agencies? Do you have a preassigned role
> and duties that you have been trained and have rehearsed for? How
> about radio equipment - do you have sufficient spare batteries to keep
> operating during a prolonged power outage (and are they charged and
> fully tested?), or a generator to keep a base station on the air? Do
> you have back-up radio equipment in the event that yours fails? If
> not, how much could you be counted on to be there if needed throughout
> the entire emergency?

The "training" needed to effectively carry out most emergency
plans (for Amateur Radio's role, that is...) does not require military
precision nor 24/7 commitment. There's more than enough time to
ragchew, DX, "tinker", etc, in between events.

73

Steve, K4YZ

332. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 01:20:12 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88546

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0403051700.3288e853@posting.google.com:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040303161722.13960.00001024@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <c253fc$646$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>,
>> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) writes:
>>
>> >JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc) writes:
>> >> William wrote:
>
>> >And that's where amateur radio comes in. Emergency preparedness is
>> >always a gamble. Do we spend money on something that will see little
>> >or no use, just in case of an emergency, or do we spend the money on
>> >necessities, and risk not being able to handle emergencies?
>>
>> The answer is painfully obvious...except for mobile installations
>> and shacks in the deep woods, there is very little emergency
>> preparedness by radio amateurs...in everything from equipment to
>> individual training.
>
> What is "painfully obvious" is your glaring lack of real-world
> experience in Amateur Radio matters...This compunded by your equally
> woeful lack of experience in emergency communications in ANY radio
> service.
>
>> Mobile installations have only to start a vehicle to restore
>> electric power to radios installed therein. However, if a fire or
>> mudslide destroys that vehicle, then it is useless for the intended
>> emergency. A "shack" in the residence is only as good as the
>> building or external electric service allows...amateur radio
>> equipment is largely "consumer grade" electronics that cannot
>> withstand a wide range of environments possible in a natural
>> disaster.
>
> More ignorance.
>
> My ICOM IC-02AT was purchased in 1984, and until a few years ago
> remained in continual service.
>
> I carried to to 29Palms on instances too numeous to recall. It
> was with me on several winter weather training exercises conducted by
> the US Army's 10th Mountain at Fort Drum, NY in the middle of winter.
> It was also my "close companion" while working EMS in Victorville and

> Ridgecrest CA in the late 80's.
>
> It was also on at least a dozen SAR missions with Civil Air
> Patrol while stationed in PA, and once dropped by me in a creek. I
> dried it out, changed the battery, and that was that.
>
> I've also carried my Yaesu FT757GXII from coast-to-coast, used it
> as a "base station", mobile and portable on numerous CAP activities.
> I'd still be using it for CAP had CAP not required compliance with
> NTIA standards.
>
>> >If there is an "auxiliary" who have their own radios (saves money)
>> >and has some ability in using those radios (saves staff) then that
>> >money does not have to be spent "just in case".
>>
>> The California state Auxilliary Communications Service is organized
>> to use ALL available communications facilities, landline or radio.
>> It has proven itself well over the last decade through several
>> natural disaster emergencies. The California ACS does not require
>> members to hold amateur radio licenses.
>
> However there are literally dozens of thier members who ARE
> licensed Amateurs and make very good use of the flexibility of Amateur
> Radio to augment thier duties.
>
>> Disaster planning need not spend millions to install new equipment
>> everywhere. (Snip to...)
>
>> there is a moderate reservoir of "private"
>> land mobile radio services that covers business radios to private
>> boat owners which can be pressed into use during extreme
>> emergencies; millions of no-license-required two-way radios such as
>> CB or FRS types can also be utilized in extreme emergencies.
>
> Uh huh. "extreme emergencies" like getting nuked.
>
> With the exception of REACT, there are NO plans for "press(ing)
> into use" of those unlicensed/untrained "facilities".
>
> On the otherhand, ARES and REACT >>ARE<< included in and
> routinely used by almost every state EM plan.
>
>> Few amateur radio licensees are aware of anything but the last.
>
> An absolute falsehood.
>
>> The general thinking is that all communications was set in the
>> 1950s style with the exception of cellular telephony which they
>> claim "always fails in every emergency."
>

> Another absolute falsehood.
>
>> >If there is never
>> >an emergency, hams will go on because their interest is not primarily
>> >in providing emergency communication. It is a hobby, which means
>> >they should get more practical use with the radios than if they took
>> >a training weekend once a year. They want the radios for their
>> >hobby, so they gladly pay for the equipment.
>>
>> Imagination, fantasy, and wishful thinking are all free and those
>> items are in great operational use as hams rationalize their
>> expenditures and boast of their "emergency preparedness" and
>> "homeland security" "service" as if all they do IS emergency
>> service ALL the time.
>
> What's fantsy here is your assertions, Lennie. You've not
> provided one bit of valid rhetoric, nor do your assertions reflect
> facts otherwise documented in countless media sources.
>
> In otherwords, you are, again, lying.
>
>> >But just as an electric company can usually buy power from another
>> >company on the grid when there is a surge in demand, amateur radio is
>> >there to draw on when an emergency comes up that cannot be handled
>> >with regular equipment and staff.
>>
>> So it is with the tremendous variety of existing communications
>> facilities in use every day throughout the United States, public
>> safety and utility radio services operating 24/7.
>
> Given a true "disaster", those "facilities" will be (and have
> been proven to be) hard pressed to serve the agencies they are
> embedded with.
>
> Amateur Radio, on the otherhand, does not exist to serve it's own
> needs...it exists to support others.
>
> This it does superbly. Unless you care to "argue" or "dispute"
> the claims made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Red
> Cross, the US Department of State, the Salvation Army, etc etc etc.
>
>> The Greater Los Angeles Emergency Communications Center got its
>> "baptism of fire" (so to speak) during the Northridge Earthquake in
>> January, 1994. It is a central command post as well as a network
>> coordinator tying together over 70 cities and communities in a
>> portion of southern California. They use EXISTING radio services,
>> those that can be coordinated and trained on a periodic basis.
>> Those are working radio services, not the "let's pretend" of some
>> hobby activities. The Center has had several emergency incidents
>> since the quake of a decade ago and handled all of them.

>
> Yes, it did. And Amateur Radio supported many of those incidents
> within the scope of pre-planned and trained for contingencies. Again,
> these are facts documented in numerous, verifyable third-party media.
>
>> In a TRUE emergency, ANYTHING can be used for communications,
>> anything from simple HTs to notes hand-carried by messengers on
>> foot. Yes, amateur radio can be a part of that "anything" but such
>> is practically worthless unless teamwork can be done through
>> organization and periodic drills of simulated emergencies, training
>> activities that prove out existing procedures or are good for
>> showing needed changes.
>
> Oh...you mean like ARES, RACES, REACT, etc etc etc?
>
> The same organizations recognized by the governmental and public
> agencies that I cited above?
>
> "Practically worthless"...?!?! Not according to those who are
> "in the know", Lennie...which of course excludes you.
>
>> Amateur radio activity is generally very personal and few amateurs
>> are willing to work in groups or even be directed by another
>> amateur; certainly not by an outside agency that they claim
>> "doesn't know the first things about ham radio!" Such
>> individualism, parochialism doesn't work well in a real emergency
>> situation that doesn't make room for boastful claims which are
>> unproven.
>
> "...boastful claims which are unproven"...?!?!
>
> BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
> AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !!
>
> WHAT A FREAKIN IDIOT!
>
> Sheeesh!
>
>> There should be nothing wrong with being just a hobby. Hobbies are
>> excellent for recreation.
>
> Yes, they are...And Amateur Radio is, for a great many people,
> jsut that.
>
> But it gives me no small amount of satisfaction to know that
> since it's >>NOT<< "just a hobby" to a great many that you are getting
> your one-size-too-small Fruit-of-the-Looms in a seriously
> blood-constricting knot!
>
> YOUR problem is that you have, once again, jumped in without

> checking to see which way the tide was flowing and have found yourself
> being dragged off-shore.
>
> WHAT an IDIOT.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying
around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.

333. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:30:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > >
> > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company
will
> > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
> >
> The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> we're watching go down.
> >
> > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> >
> Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
>
> Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I know, -fool-.

If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really don't give
a ratsass about CBers.

Dan/W4NTI

334. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:32:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a 'unlicensed class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.

If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can come in and shut you down?

Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected by Federal Laws.

You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the spectrum.

Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on
> your
> > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
linears,
> > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per
> part
> > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't
helping
> > the
> > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I
> don't
> > do
> > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent
CBers.
> > > CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it
> you're
> > > in
> > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no longer
> > > > required
> > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a
license
> > > when
> > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to
Part
> > > 95 -
> > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the air
> and
> > > > talk.
> > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when people
> who
> > > have
> > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to
> > > research
> > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion or
> > > trying
> > > > to
> > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on
that
> > > issue.
> > > > I
> > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't
have
> > > money
> > > > to
> > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your
> > elected
> > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC
> website
> > if
> > > > you
> > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a page
> of
> > > it,
> > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while
you're
> > at
> > > > it.
> > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let
> them
> > > bull
> > > > > doze you over. CL

> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
attorney
> > and
> > > > > > after
> > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
for
> > > > because
> > > > > > I
> > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> from
> > > the
> > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
of
> > the
> > > > > cost
> > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
question
> > here
> > > > > last
> > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > experience.
> > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
the
> > > > utilities
> > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > > letters
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Tom
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

335. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:33:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <QLa2c.33958$hm4.25923@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88549

Shut up Lenny the loser. Tell your nurse to wipe your arse.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040304205156.02537.00003328@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> The FCC has "opinions" which "stand" longer and stronger than yours,
> Dan. See Hollingsworth, Riley letters.
>
> LHA / WMD

336. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:35:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uNa2c.33959$hm4.32667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nope...not the better ones....Just a hell of a lot better than a unlicensed CBer trashing up the specturm with over driven, over modulated Antique Modulation.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>> DUHHHHHH.....
But
> THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> utility
> > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
get
> > the
> > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > information!
> > > CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
attorney
> > and
> > > > > after
> > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
for
> > > > because I
> > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna

> from
> > > the
> > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
of
> > the
> > > > cost
> > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
question
> > here
> > > > last
> > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > experience.
> > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
the
> > > > utilities
> > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> > > letters
> > > > >
> > > > > > Tom
> > > > >
> > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > >
> > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
FCC
> > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > telecommunications
> > > > > law.
> > > > >
> > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
for
> > > > anything.
> > > > >
> > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> heard
> > > by
> > > > > a court.
> > > > >
> > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > > interested.
> > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > >
> > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > >
> > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
Nothing
> is

> > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

337. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:35:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bOa2c.33960$hm4.32114@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88551
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0403041446.4e9a244c@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> >
> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> >
> >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> >FCC says that the utility company will
> >have to take steps to stop any
> >interference to licensed stations.
> >
> >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an unlicensed
> freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which is why hes
> so touchy
>
>
>
> ==========
>
>
> From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 2002-01-05
>
> I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
>
> ~/Moparholic\~
>
> ==========

>
>
> From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> Date: 2002-02-03
>
> "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> >emissions?
>
> That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
>
>
> ============

Makes sense to me. Explains it all.

Dan/W4NTI

338. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:37:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MPa2c.33962$hm4.3786@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > >
> > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > >
> > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > >have to take steps to stop any
> > >interference to licensed stations.
> > >
> > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an unlicensed
> > freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which is why hes
> > so touchy
> >
> > ==========
> >
> > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > Date: 2002-01-05
> >
> > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> >
> > ~/Moparholic\~
> >
> > ==========
> >
> > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...

> > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > Date: 2002-02-03
> >
> > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > >emissions?
> >
> > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> >
> > ============
> >
> I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
>
> I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
>
> You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> are you stupid?

Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to pass
the give away ticket?

Dan/W4NTI

339. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:54:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <G3b2c.30743$W74.3436@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88553

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040305193447.21955.00000858@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <104f7g7rtkdv7de@corp.supernews.com>, Glenn
> <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> writes:
>
> >While I remember that the tests for Novice and General were of the
> >multiple guess kind in the '60s (albeit at an FCC Field Office), I could
> >swear that I remember that drawn circuit diagrams were required at least
> >for the Extra written exam, if not the Advanced. This from the study
> >guides that I had for the tests.
>
> I have the ARRL License Manuals with copyright dates for 1947, 1951, 1953,
> 1962, and 1971. They detail the exact process of getting a license in
those
> times, both by mail and at FCC exam points.
>
> Some facts:
>
> - The Novice was always multiple-choice only. All of the manuals describe
the
> Novice written test as "about 20 questions"
>
> - The 1953 and earlier manuals describe the higher-class written tests as
> requiring the drawing of a few diagrams. The 1962 manual says that all
exams
> are multiple choice.
>
> - The 1953 and earlier manuals say that some questions are neither
multiple
> choice nor diagrams, but require the examinee to solve a problem and show
the
> calculations used.
>
> - The 1962 manual says that the written exams are all multiple choice.

Data point: The General written I took for Technician in 1958 included 5
"draw a diagram of X" questions. The General study guide from ARRL at the
time included 14 diagrams that might an applicant might be asked to draw.
I memorized all 14 diagarms.

(SNIP)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

340. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 02:59:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040305215956.29660.00003299@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 88554

In article <CJOdnc3qYMMJgtTdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Reason for the change: To speed up and simplify marking of the exams! By
>making
>> them all multiple choice, the person marking the test did not have to
>> understand the material at all, just the procedure.
>
> Well, if I had to make a choice, I would rather the person taking the
>exam know the material! 8^)

That's always been the intent!
>
>> In both 1953 and 1962, the Advanced test was not given, and hams had to
>> upgrade from General to Extra in a single step. However, there were no
>> additional operating privileges granted with an Extra, and only about 2% of
>> US hams in 1962 were Extras. The Advanced was reopened to new issues in >>
1967.
>
> I have to say that I don't find as much difference between the older
>tests and the newer tests as I thought there would be. I was kind of
>under the impression (but skeptical) that the older tests were a
>regular "hazing" compared to the easy tests we take today.

There are three main differences:

1) The old tests covered a few subjects in depth while the new ones cover a lot
of subjects in much less detail.

2) A person taking the old tests did not know exactly what would be on the
tests, just general areas of knowledge. A person taking today's tests has
access to the exact questions and answers that will be on the test. For
example, we knew there would be questions on Ohm's Law in DC circuits, but we
didn't know how many or what they would look like.

3) The old tests were given at relatively few locations and at times that were
quite inconvenient for most people. The new tests are much more accessible.

End result is that we tended to "overlearn" .

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
> Thanks much for your research, Jim!
>

341. BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 04:29:21 UTC
From: JasanH <9ververver@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 88555
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Worried about BPL turning your radio into
a useless box with lights? Worry no more!

here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

342. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 05:10:48 UTC
From: Joe O'Connell <w7kqu@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <vsmdna94SeBswdTdRVn2hw@giganews.com>
Source record: 88556
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Was there ever any doubt that it would get the go ahead?
This administration will approve just about anything if someone makes a campaign contribution.
Just look at relaxing media ownership regulations.
Joe

343. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 05:30:53 UTC
From: Maximus <nomail@here.com>
Message-ID: <hmd2c.23760$aT1.9567@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88557
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

ROFLMAO. I think I'll tighten the mesh on my faraday cage <vbeg>.

Strength and Honor

"JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> Worried about BPL turning your radio into
> a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>
> here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

344. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 05:52:59 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab307146889c86a9896a8@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 88558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
9ververver@yahoo.com says...

> Worried about BPL turning your radio into
> a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>
> here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

Eeesh... The scammer/spammers are catching on quick, aren't they?

--
Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
with surreal ports?"

345. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 07:26:33 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88559
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as much right to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > >
> > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company
> will
> > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
> > >
> > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > we're watching go down.
> > >
> > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > >
> > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> >
> > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I know, -fool-.
>
> If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really don't
give
> a ratsass about CBers.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

346. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 07:31:18 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88561
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97. Cops don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of. Maybe in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off some day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again, THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a 'unlicensed
> class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>
> If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can come
> in and shut you down?
>
> Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected by
> Federal Laws.
>
> You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the spectrum.
>
> Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy on
> > your
> > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
> linears,
> > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating per

> > part
> > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't
> helping
> > > the
> > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion. I
> > don't
> > > do
> > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent
> CBers.
> > > > CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking it
> > you're
> > > > in
> > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no
longer
> > > > required
> > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a
> license
> > > when
> > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According to
> Part
> > > > 95 -
> > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the
air
> > and
> > > > talk.
> > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when
people
> > who
> > > > have
> > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need to
> > > > research
> > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an opinion
or
> > > > trying
> > > > > > to
> > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on
> that
> > > > issue.
> > > > > > I
> > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't
> have
> > > > money
> > > > > > to

> > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of your
> > > elected
> > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC
> > website
> > > if
> > > > > you
> > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a
page
> > of
> > > > it,
> > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while
> you're
> > > at
> > > > > it.
> > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and let
> > them
> > > > bull
> > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
utility
> > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> attorney
> > > and
> > > > > after
> > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
> for
> > > > because
> > > > > > I
> > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> > from
> > > > the
> > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
because
> of
> > > the
> > > > > cost
> > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> question
> > > here
> > > > > last
> > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > > experience.
> > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
> the
> > > > > utilities

> > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
desist
> > > > letters
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

347. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 07:32:11 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <28f2c.7465$5M.251060@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Man, you really have no clue - DO you?????? Come in out of the fog. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:uNa2c.33959$hm4.32667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Nope...not the better ones....Just a hell of a lot better than a
unlicensed
> CBer trashing up the specturm with over driven, over modulated Antique
> Modulation.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>> DUHHHHHH.........
> But
> > THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> > utility
> > > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out to
> get
> > > the
> > > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > > information!
> > > > CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> utility
> > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a

> attorney
> > > and
> > > > > after
> > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me
> for
> > > > > because I
> > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> > from
> > > > the
> > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
because
> of
> > > the
> > > > > cost
> > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> question
> > > here
> > > > > last
> > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > experience.
> > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against
> the
> > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
desist
> > > letters
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have an
> FCC
> > > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > > telecommunications
> > > > > > law.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can sue
> for
> > > > anything.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even be
> > heard
> > > > by
> > > > > > a court.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > > > interested.
> > > > > > Send the FCC a copy.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > --
> > > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> Nothing
> > is
> > > > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
> >

348. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 07:32:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403052332.10c017b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88560

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403051523.75bc15b0@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050701.679e737a@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031634.27eb72e@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...

> > THE POINT is that Brian Burke is not a person of reputable
> > character. Not that we'd expect anything less from a person who
> > publically expresses admiration for a known pathological liar and
> > antagonist.
> >
> > Thanks, Brain...You DO make this easy...You have now admitted to
> > publically lying...not that "we" didn't already know that.

> Steve, in your own eyes-rolled-back kind of way, I'm sure you really
> believe what you say.

Of course I do, Brain. Why would a rational person say something
he DIDN'T believe?

> But I don't.

Of course you don't, Brain. Probably due tot he fact that it's
your failure to understand why YOUR behaviour is the one in question
here...

YOU claim to have operated as "DX" from an area of the world in
which you obviously had no permission to operate from. I say
"obviously" since you cannot produce a single bit of evidence that you
DID have permission.

When asked to provide some documentary evidence of this
operation, you cannot provide a single QSL card, a single callsign of
somone who can verify they "worked" you, etc.

You then follow up THAT act by publically expressing admiration
and claiming as your "mentor" a person who ahs been clearly and
repeatedly documented as intentionally untruthful and openly spiteful
of the very radio service of which you are a licensee.

Several folks here have expressed disdain of my poking at you and
the Putzy one...Not because you don't deserve it, but because they
believe if you are "left alone", you'll go away.

I did that for a while and you didn't...Neither did your lying friend.

I for one believe when you try to placate bullies and liars, you only serve to embolden them.

Just as it is your right to lie and misrepresent, it's my right to challenge and expose your lies and misrepresentations. You and Lennie certainly give me plenty of opportunites to address them.

> I think you're nuts.

If thinking that makes you feel warm and fuzzy and let's you sleep at night, Brain, you go right on ahead and think it. Consider it yours.

Steve, K4YZ

349. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 07:44:01 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com>
Source record: 88563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
<does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:

>YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97. Cops
>don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.

They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry Mangan),
while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just because they
were parked in front of his house.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

350. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 08:01:44 UTC
From: Ronnie <NoSpam@NoEmail>
Message-ID: <c2c0h1$v50$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97. Cops don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of. Maybe in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off some day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again, THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL

Yeah, right. Next time you hear a CB type running high power out of band, tell me again that they are "protected."
They do NOT have as many "rights" as we...insofar as band spectrum is concerned.
Take your own advice...get a life.
10-4, Good Buddy?

351. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 08:07:40 UTC
From: Ronnie <NoSpam@NoEmail>
Message-ID: <c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97. Cops don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of. Maybe in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off some day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again, THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL

.....

And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't post a call.....

Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?

352. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 11:36:44 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <fJi2c.58122$PR3.1057825@attbi_s03>
Source record: 88566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to the $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.

The answer may be to establish local HF nets, need to be local to keep S/N ratios high, and get on the air during peak internet times and simply shut down the BPL service at the consumer level. Let the consumers complain about poor service. Then provide the defense of non-licensed Part 15 devices etc.

Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to communicate across town on 75 phone will certainly have an impact on local BPL users!!!

DD

Zoran Brlecic wrote:

> Hans K0HB wrote:
>
>> http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/03/02/HNbroadbandservice_1.html
>
>
> Yep, sadly it's becoming a reality.
>
> Personally, I'm looking forward to the day when I program my electronic
> keyer into a CQ loop, fire up the amp and leave on a vacation. Of
> course, the next logical step is the FCC protecting the BPL by placing
> amateur radio in part 15.
>
>
>
> WA7AA
>
>

353. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:02:30 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306070230.376$H0@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > >
> > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >> >
> > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > >
> > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > >
> > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which
> > > is why hes so touchy
> > >
> > > ==================
> > >
> > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > >
> > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > >
> > > ================
> > >
> > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
```

> > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > >
> > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > >emissions?
> > >
> > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > >
> > > ============
> > >
> > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> > antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >
> > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> >
> > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > are you stupid?
>
> Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> pass the give away ticket?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Not hardly. I have no interest in conversing with the likes of an
over-stuffed blowhard like you.

354. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:14:03 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <igj2c.7468$5M.251109@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Ok, so there is one case... question is, was it "radio" related as to why he did as he did? Sounds like more to it than just being "CBers! Even if it does happen, I'm sure they are exceptions rather than a "common place" type of thing. Which was the point I am really making. I have a real problem with believing that a part 95 compliant radio is "just" snatched up out of no where for "no" reason. CL

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
>
> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97. Cops
> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>
>
> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry Mangan),
> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just because they
> were parked in front of his house.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

355. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074818.23171.00004451@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88572

In article <d22b54c3.0403050834.3e955f0@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0403040937.245f70e1@posting.google.com>...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<cCl1c.31439$hm4.7910
>
>> > In the long run, those currently
>> > cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.

>> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>
>It's already happened.
>
>Among others big-name Jap manufacturers like Sony, Honda, Toshiba,
>etc. have been shoveling jobs into southeast Asia at a huge rate for
>years and now they're moving into China at an astonishing rate too.
>The Japanese unemployment rates are much worse than ours as a result.
>It's even more of a kick in the butt for them because it's happening
>in a society in which full employement has historically been a major
>component of their culture.

Yep. The salarymen aren't happy.

We even got a piece of that action. There's a plant in Westmoreland, PA that was built by Chrysler in the 1970s but never used. So VW bought it and assembled cars there (I had two of them). Then VW moved the assembly plant to Mexico for the cheaper labor and the plant was sold to Sony, who made CRTs in it. (CRT manufacture requires a lot of energy so it's cheaper to make them here than Japan. Now CRTs are being phased out....
>
>Fifteen years ago moving manufacturing to Singapore was the hot
>ticket. So everybody did. The singaporean economy skyrocketed, their
>per capita wealth became the global model. Now the hot ticket is
>getting the hell outta Singapore because manufacturing there costs too
>much.
>
Bingo. Or, more like "game over"

Remember NAFTA? Jobs moved to Mexico - now they're moving to China. That's why computer prices keep dropping.
>>
>> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>> alone.
>

>That's because there is no such thing as a "service economy", the term
>and the concept are oxymorons.

Jumbo shrimp, tight slacks, nondairy creamer,. My point exactly.

> Economics 101: There are only three
>ways a nation can generate wealth: (1) Dig valuable minerals out of
>it's ground (2) Grow, catch or raise crops and critters (3) Enhance
>the value of the outputs from (1) and (2) via manufacturing. Anything
>else is just passing the same bucks around in circles until they peter
>out. As exemplified by our balance of trade deficit.

Our deficit is even worse than that because it's the active transference of
capital away from this economy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

356. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074818.23171.00004452@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88573

In article <5c01b95b.0403031417.4499550b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Lastly, we need to get the ARRL to start lobbying Congress to
>mandate an informational insert in any BPL-accessing device informing
>the consumer of exactly what Part 15 means and what the consumer can
>expect.

I think that's premature, Steve. The NPRM is still open for comments, which means that FCC can still change things. The focus right now should be on NPRM comments. There are many points to be made about the various provisions of the NPRM. Note that BPL has *not* gotten an unconditional go-ahead from FCC - they have a number of requirements to meet. The focus now should be on getting specific, hard-and-fast definitions of those requirements, by paragraph and exact wording.

73 de Jim, N2EY

357. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074819.23171.00004453@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88570

In article <G3b2c.30743$W74.3436@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> - The 1962 manual says that the written exams are all multiple choice.
>
>Data point: The General written I took for Technician in 1958 included 5
>"draw a diagram of X" questions. The General study guide from ARRL at the
>time included 14 diagrams that might an applicant might be asked to draw.
>I memorized all 14 diagarms.
>
Read the original post down a little farther, Bill, and you'll see that FCC
changed the format around 1960. So your 1958 experience meshes perfectly with
the above history. Thanks for the info.

73 de Jim, N2EY

358. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074820.23171.00004454@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88571

In article <2qqdncftlPddLd_dRVn-jA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>>The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
>>>pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
>>>water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
>>>they were telling the truth or would do this or that.

>> IIRC every jurisdiction in this country is obliged (sometimes very
>> grudgingly) to allow a witness or affiant to "affirm" rather than
>> "swear" - no bible, no "so help me God". Gotta' ask for it, though.
>
> SOP for Quakers.
>
Yep. There are a couple of issues there - one is the use of His name, and the
other is rejection of the concept that there are various levels of
truth-telling. IOW if someone has to swear that they are telling the truth,
does that mean they are lying much of the rest of the time when they simply say
they are telling the truth?

>>>What is surreal about the whole issue is that it was usually one flavor of
>>>Christian telling another flavor of Christian what to do, and often doing
>>>it in the name of the One they supposedly follow.
>
> Kind of like the people that initiated the football prayer issue in
>Texas. THey were not Moslem, atheists, agnostics or Wicca for that
>matter. They were Catholic. The difference between the Catholic and
>Protestant version of the Lord's prayer, you know.

What *is* that difference, anyway? Is it "for thine is the kingdom..." part?

>And I'll wager that
>the Catholic players on the team had to use the Protestant version, or else.

Probably. Did you know the Ten Commandments used by Catholics are different?

> What I know about human nature tells me that if there were only two
>religions in the world that were identical with each other except for
>one word in their scriptures, there would be many that would be happy to
>destroy all the followers of the other religion for that one word.

Maybe. Depends what the word is.
>

>> Every religion has this problem. Consider the strife between the
>> Shiite Muslims and the Sunni Muslims, the internal differences between
>> the traditional, centrist, and liberal movements of Judaism, or the
>> Catholic versus Protestant strife in various parts of the world.
>
> I call it Coke vs Pepsi syndrome. The closer the product, the more
>intense the competition, and more intense the animosity.
>
"Keil and Loki" Same principle.

73 de Jim, N2EY

359. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074821.23171.00004455@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88569

In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403010818590.1126@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>And then we have the Buddists (and/or any other religious group like
>"Scientology") who was left out sue the Government for recognition of all
>religions except theirs, and as a result, we add more days to the week! :-)

As long as they are added to the weekend, that's OK with me!
>
>> They all mean the same thing (except for Monday) so why not?
>
>Varying the religion does not make it "religion neutral."
>
Of course not! Good point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

360. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:48:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306074822.23171.00004456@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 88574

In article <BXd1c.31162$hm4.19539@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >I see NO such claims that Jews
>> >or anyone else are forcing, pushing or otherwise causing any
>> >changes in availability of pork products.
>>
>> Did you mean "evidence", Bill? Dwight is making the claim, but provides us
>> with no evidence.
>
>Yep, should have said evidence. What was I thinking?
>
You must have been thinking about sausage and peppers......

>> >If I wanted to
>> >totaly avoid Kosher labeled products I'd have NO problem
>> >doing so. In fact, I can't even think of an area restaurant
>> >that claims to be Kosher.
>>
>> Nor can I.
>> >
>> >My local A&P and other supermarkets carry a wide array
>> >of pork and shellfish products (did you know most shelfish
>> >aren't Kosher?)
>>
>> Yup - and a lot of other things cannot be certified kosher. Yet they're
>> available.
>>
>> >I have NO problem in restaurants ordering
>> >a ham and cheese sandwish anywhere...or bacon and eggs,
>> >or sausage and pepers, or shrimp...etc.
>>
>> You're making me hungry, Bill!
>>
>> >The fact is, around
>> >here, restaurants would be nuts to try and limit there menu's
>> >to be Kosher only. Are there some truly Kosher restaurants?
>> >Absolutely...just as there are other specialty restaurants that
>> >cater to specific ethinics foods (Italian, Chineese, Japanesse,
>> >Thai, German, French, etc.)
>>
>> Don't forget Vietnamese, Korean, Portugese........
>>
>> I could really go for some kim-chi about now...
>

>My wife likes kim-chi but I can't get beyond the smell.

It smells as bad a gefilte fish looks. But if you can actually try some....
>
>> >You claim you can't order pork products anymore where
>> >you live...or in many places...
>>
>> But no solid evidence that things have really changed.
>
>Exactly.
>
Let's be concrete about this: I see no change in the avaialbility of pork
products since I was a child, more than 40 years ago. How about you, Bill?

>> >well one explanation for seeing
>> >a reduction of pork products might also be the fact that
>> >more people, Jews and Gentiles alike, just don't eat as
>> >much pork. Jews for obvious Kosher reasons and Gentiles
>> >because of the cholesterol concerns.
>>
>> *IF* per-capita pork consumption is down, that's one possible reason.
>> Another
>> is competition from other food products. When I was a kid, turkey was
>> something
>> you had at Thanksgiving and maybe Christmas. Now things like turkey
>> sausage,
>> turkeyburgers, and ground turkey are all over the place. Same with
>> chicken.
>>
>> I don't think Frank Perdue is Jewish, either.
>>
>> >As an aside, I have met
>> >more than a handful of Jews who have no problem eating
>> >non-kosher foods, including pork products.
>>
>> Of the many Jewish people I know, those who keep strictly kosher are a
>> small minority.
>>
>> >One last point, you (Dwight) raise the question of "if this
>> >was a Christian group" doing the same aleged influencing of
>> >food availability? Well, to my Christian upbringing and
>> >personal religion to this day, I can think of NO dietary
>> >constraints that are a part of Christianity.
>>
>> Roman Catholics and meatless Fridays. Did they "push" fish on the rest of
>>us?
>
>As a dietary law, meatless Fridays have pretty much gone by the
>wayside. meatless Fridays would also be analogous to only
>eating Kosher one day a week.

Not being catholic anymore I wouldn't know, but I recall that during Lent meatless Fridays are still observed. Plus fasting. There are also plenty of Catholics who do it as a matter of voluntary religious tradition rather than church law.

73 es buon appetit de Jim, N2EY

361. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 12:51:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <qPj2c.9351$t16.5687113@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88575
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
>
> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
Cops
> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>
>
> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
Mangan),
> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just because
they
> were parked in front of his house.

But was it because they were CB's or because they were a group of people
parked in front of his house? Perhaps CB had nothing to do with it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

362. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 13:18:14 UTC
From: PowerHouse CB & Scanner <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
Message-ID: <104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
Cops
> don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
Maybe
> in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off
some
> day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A
> HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again,
> THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
>
> ....
>
> And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't post a
> call.....
>
> Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
>

Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's what I
thought...

Don't talk about others as you are not any better...

363. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 13:59:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306085946.08626.00003453@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 88577

In article <ZDQ1c.30102$W74.23969@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>There's no sign that any sufficient number of folks in
>the USA are going to boycott non-USA made products
>or spend N dollars more to get a product "made in the USA'
>as opposed to buying a cheaper imported product.

That can change, though.
>
>> > In the long run, those currently
>> > cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>>
>> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>
>Like I said, global economy.

As long as we're not on a sinking ship..
>
>> > In the short
>> > run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>> > either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
>> > manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>>
>> OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
>> lower prices?
>>
>> > In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
>> > job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
>> > may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>> >
>> That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
>> person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
>> meantime?
>
>You retrain whenever it becomes necessary. There's nothing
>mystical about it. If your job skill goes wanting, you'd
>better find another skill set.

How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be learned overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose major threats.

And who pays for the retraining?
>
>> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy

>> alone.
>
>We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
>done with more and more automation resulting in less
>and less need for skilled labor.

We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production - automated and all - is moving to places like China.

And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....

73 de Jim, N2EY

364. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 13:59:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306085948.08626.00003454@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 88578

In article <86udncgTsbUTSNrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a global
>>>economy and that isn't going to change.
>>
>>
>> That's true to a point. But we don't have to simply accept everything
>> that comes down the pike as inevitable.
>
> It will probably stabilize when one of the programmers from India
>writes a good program to replace CEO's! ;^)

'zactly.

>>>The drastic reduction in costs
>>>of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as
>>>similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture
>>>and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't
>>>going to change in the short run.
>>
>> Only if it doesn't affect buyer behavior. If buyers protest with their
>> dollars, things will change.
>
>>>In the long run, those currently
>>>cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>>
>> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>
> Correct! I have alway though that the best argument for what is going
>on is the elevation of a population's living standard. A country has a
>low standard of living, and the workforce is available for next to
>nothing, wage wise. So like Pizza take-out's in a college town, everyone
>ant their brother migrate there for the cheap labor. AS the standard of
>living goes up, the cheap labor starts to demand more in salary and/or
>benefits. This works for a while, but eventually another poor country
>looks attractive to employers. So they move on to the next poor country.

The trick is to do that without creating more poor countries.

And the fundamental question is: Why are countries poor in the first place, and
how do countries get rich and stay rich without exploiting other countries?
>
> Examples are what has happened to Japan. Korea is the present hot >
spot,
>but is slowing. China is ascendant now, but the inevitible will happen

>there. Mexico is now experiencing import concerns too.
>
Remember NAFTA and the "giant sucking sound"? Where's Ross now?

> What happens when the cycle is complete, and the last third world
>nation is brought up to modern standards will be the interesting thing.

First you have to understand why it hasn't happened yet.
>
>>>In the short
>>>run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>>>either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
>>>manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>>
>> OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
>> lower prices?
>
> You see, the big trick is to have all this happen without ourselves
>turning into a third world country. See below.
>
And that trick is?

>>>In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
>>>job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
>>>may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>
>> That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
>> person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
>> meantime?
>>
>> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>> alone.
>
> Countries that are service based economies are the *servants* of other
>countries.
>
> We can "reality" each other all day long, but if economies chase the
>almighty profit without any moral guidance - that is if they are not in
>business for the sole purpose of making a buck, then disaster is the result.
>
Actually I think it's simpler than that. They have to consider both the
short-term buck and the long-term buck.

Henry Ford was criticized by other industrialists because he paid workers the
princely sum of $5 per day. His response was that it did not make sense to him
to have people building a product they could not afford to buy. He traded off
the short-term buck of higher wages for the long-term buck of a bigger market.
I don't think he did this out of any love for the workers or the country, but
rather because he saw a bigger picture.

73 de Jim, N2EY

365. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 14:51:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403060651.335a1a0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88579

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403052332.10c017b8@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403051523.75bc15b0@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050701.679e737a@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031634.27eb72e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030750.481dd22b@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > THE POINT is that Brian Burke is not a person of reputable
> > > character. Not that we'd expect anything less from a person who
> > > publically expresses admiration for a known pathological liar and
> > > antagonist.
> > >
> > > Thanks, Brain...You DO make this easy...You have now admitted to
> > > publically lying...not that "we" didn't already know that.
>
> > Steve, in your own eyes-rolled-back kind of way, I'm sure you really
> > believe what you say.
>
> Of course I do, Brain. Why would a rational person say something
> he DIDN'T believe?

He could be:

a. lying.

b. not rational and doesn't know what he's saying.

I think you're not rational (nuts).

366. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 14:56:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403060656.332e8398@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88580

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403051546.71a9bc78@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40474D7A.B024AA65@earthlink.net>...
>
> > William (AKA Brain Burke, from what is surely but one of several screen names used in
this forum) wrote:
>
> > > You're still good for a
> > > few laughs.
> >
> > The laughs, as usual, appear to be on you. I'd love to hear more of
> > your amateur radio contesting exploits. I'd probably pick up a tip or
> > too.
> > Your insight into DXing was extremely valueable.
>
> I am sure that he'd be the center of attention at a CB Jamboree,
> "enlightening" those impressionable souls with his "wisdom" on such
> antics...Until, of course, someone had the temerity to ask him to
> provide some evidence of his exploits.
>
> And of course he could throw in some well timed colloquialisms
> like "flat side", "swing" and "dead key" and they'd be putty in his
> (cold and clammy) hands.
>
> Or maybe not...

Steve, you seem to have the situation under control. You just go on
ahead of me with your seven (7) hostile action stories. They'll
especially enjoy the one about self-abuse.

Tell us how it turns out. Best of luck.

367. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 14:58:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88581

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A3CD4B89306elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0403051528.6a526630@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >
> >> And your point is...?
> >>
> >> I'm not really sure what you're getting at, but my point was that it
> >> is reasonable to assume that everyone has a TV and a phone, for
> >> example, but we're not yet at that point with cellphones. Close, but
> >> not there yet. Of course, I would say that, as I don't have one.
> >>
> >> The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the
> >> discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help out
> >> in an emergency.
> >
> > OK, Alun, lets look at it another way.
> >
> > We agree that cellular phones can be useful in an emergency.
> >
> > We agree that not everyone has a cellular phone, maybe only 1/3 of the
> > US population.
> >
> > We know that there are very, very, very few amateur radio operators
> > per capita in the US population.
> >
> > We can conclude that most people have better access to cellular phones
> > in an emergency than they have access to amateur radio.
> >
>
> Possibly true, so long as the cell towers are still standing.

Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
Amateur Radio Licensees?
```

368. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 15:00:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306100006.01019.00000826@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 88582

In article <xnfcneeyarg.htv6of1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 27 Feb 2004 12:30:29 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>No need to. Everybody who cares knows what it means. Do they advertise that
>>ketchup has tomatoes in it?
>
> IIRC both the name brands that we use and the generic ones (probably
> bottled on the same line as one of the name brands) use the words
> "Tomato Ketchup".

Interesting. Around here, many simply say "ketchup" or "catsup" with no mention
of tomatoes.
>
> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).

I gotta get me some. But it can't be hotter than Daves Total Insanity Sauce.
>
> Go to the Campbell's Soup shelves. Vegetarian Vegetable Soup -
> Kosher. Vegetable Soup with Beef - Not Kosher. Tomato Soup - Kosher.
> Chicken Noodle Soup - Not Kosher. Bean with Bacon Soup - Not Kosher.

Of course.
>
> Prime example of "pushing" the manufacturer? The vast majority of
> their soups are not kosher. Nobody is picketing the Campbell Soup
> Company over that - either way.

They get the certification when it suits their purpose. I assume the ones with
meat would be costlier to certify, and so are left out of the process. Bean
with Bacon? Hmmm...what if it were turkey bacon?
>
> All this talk about kosher food is making me hungry.... <ggg>
>
Me too!

I think the wide variety of cuisines available to me enriches my life, and is
not the result of any "pushing" or manipulating".

73 de Jim, N2EY

369. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 15:02:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403060702.7fd6e1fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88583

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403051539.1dcabdd5@posting.google.com>...
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> > And your point is...?
>
> Hey...! It's LENNIE, Alun! No point is necessary!

Heil had to assign a "point" to my statements. Then he said I had
stated such a point. He was wrong.

370. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 15:22:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306102220.549$RF@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > >
> > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >> >
> > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > >
> > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > >
> > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which
> > > is why hes so touchy
> > >
> > > ==================
> > >
> > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > >
> > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > >
> > > ================
> > >
> > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
```

> > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > >
> > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > >emissions?
> > >
> > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > >
> > > ============
> > >
> > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> > antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> >
> > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> >
> > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > are you stupid?
>
> Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> pass the give away ticket?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Hey hick, their testing bpl in Alabama too, you're next..lmao!!

http://www.energyusernews.com/CDA/ArticleInformation/features/BNP__Features__Item/0,2584,100843,00.html

371. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 15:25:09 UTC
From: kuzen001@duke.edu
Message-ID: <c2cqgl$i60$2@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu>
Source record: 88585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net> wrote:
> There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the
> courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to the
> $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.

They have. Mikey Powell was just in Raleigh (where I am)
talking to the public, and the paper quoted him on the BPL
issue among others. I don't have the exact quote but he
basically said, "We'll try not to harm hobbyists, but BPL
has too much potential (*) to let it be stopped."

(*) "Potential" = "people are going to get RICH on this."

Ken Kuzenski AC4RD kuzen001 at acpub .duke .edu

All disclaimers apply, see? www.duke.edu/~kuzen001

372. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 15:47:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vom2c.9387$t16.5711911@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88586

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040306085948.08626.00003454@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <86udncgTsbUTSNrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> Actually I think it's simpler than that. They have to consider both the
> short-term buck and the long-term buck.
>
> Henry Ford was criticized by other industrialists because he paid workers
the
> princely sum of $5 per day. His response was that it did not make sense to
him
> to have people building a product they could not afford to buy. He traded
off
> the short-term buck of higher wages for the long-term buck of a bigger
market.
> I don't think he did this out of any love for the workers or the country,
but
> rather because he saw a bigger picture.
>

Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

373. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 16:09:32 UTC
From: stewartx@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <d9c9457b.0403060809.79593ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88587

"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?
>
> No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of
> time before... (snip) This is the typical response
> whenever anyone questions, or objects to,
> anything done by.. [certain people] ..in this country.
> Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and
> much more. (snip)

And newsgroup access it seems. After months of working perfectly, my ISP is suddenly having "problems" with my newsgroup account that they just can't seem to fix. It all started gradually several days ago, right during this discussion, ending with no newsgroup access. Since this has happened before (with AOL years ago during a discussion about minority religions in a particular country overseas), this is an all too familiar pattern to me. Since they can't honestly say (and didn't say) I've violated their terms of service (or the concept of free speech in this country), they had to come up with a more creative way of hopefully shutting me up. It appears interfering with newsgroup access while acting innocent is the solution of choice (probably works for those who don't know about alternative newsgroup access).

On another note, somebody here also sent select copies of my messages to someone I'm associated with, carefully excluding any message that didn't fit his/her own little agenda (the person who complained to my ISP probably did the same thing). That was resolved after I sent a copy of the entire discussion, including the first two or three messages that started it and those which said I would object regardless of which religion. It was agreed that a discussion here has absolutely nothing to do with that association (none of their business - their words after basically saying they had no idea why this was even sent to them, something an employer might not have said).

I'll have to wait around a few more weeks to see what other mischief is in the works. But I thought these two examples would help illustrate what I said above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

374. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 16:58:24 UTC
From: Da Green Hornet <5daydepads@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <e234d$404a0333$d1cc5757$31841@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 88588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> Worried about BPL turning your radio into
> a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>
> here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

Amusing! Here is another way to deal
with BPL - specifically anyone who sells
it or advocates deployment of the same
in a residential area:

http://members.aon.at/pcnet/lachen/stfu.htm

(short movie link)

375. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 17:19:59 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88589

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A3CD4B89306elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
>> news:1e4e3692.0403051528.6a526630@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns94A369D3C263Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >
>> >> And your point is...?
>> >>
>> >> I'm not really sure what you're getting at, but my point was that
>> >> it is reasonable to assume that everyone has a TV and a phone, for
>> >> example, but we're not yet at that point with cellphones. Close,
>> >> but not there yet. Of course, I would say that, as I don't have
>> >> one.
>> >>
>> >> The level of use of ham radio is not particularly relevant to the
>> >> discussion, except in that there are clearly enough of us to help
>> >> out in an emergency.
>> >
>> > OK, Alun, lets look at it another way.
>> >
>> > We agree that cellular phones can be useful in an emergency.
>> >
>> > We agree that not everyone has a cellular phone, maybe only 1/3 of
>> > the US population.
>> >
>> > We know that there are very, very, very few amateur radio operators
>> > per capita in the US population.
>> >
>> > We can conclude that most people have better access to cellular
>> > phones in an emergency than they have access to amateur radio.
>> >
>>
>> Possibly true, so long as the cell towers are still standing.
>
> Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
> Amateur Radio Licensees?
>

Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back up...

376. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 17:53:14 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <0m4k405o7r16bpvd8cni8p3idrbh0lgggh@4ax.com>
Source record: 88590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 11:58:24 -0500, "Da Green Hornet"
<5daydepads@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>"JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>> Worried about BPL turning your radio into
>> a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>>
>> here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html
>
>Amusing! Here is another way to deal
>with BPL - specifically anyone who sells
>it or advocates deployment of the same
>in a residential area:
>
>http://members.aon.at/pcnet/lachen/stfu.htm
>
>(short movie link)
>

Ok, your in Philadelphia, PA, US. Are you sure that you want to
advertise this to eliminate BPL interference?

Or just a joke, right?

377. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:00:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306130012.25815.00006987@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 88591

In article <c2cqgl$i60$2@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu>, <kuzen001@duke.edu> writes:

>(*) "Potential" = "people are going to get RICH on this."

They can't make money if nobody signs up. Heck, the telcoms have enough trouble making money with millions signed up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

378. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:13:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Rwo2c.31073$W74.2484@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Now thats a good idea. Kinda like retro radio. From what I heard, during the days of King Spark, it took KW levels to be heard in the next town. Lets go for it.

We can send traffic to each part of the country via the National Traffic System...them set up short and long range relay stations. Dang...just like it was in the beginning. I like it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dave Shrader" <david.shrader@comcast.net> wrote in message news:fJi2c.58122$PR3.1057825@attbi_s03...
> There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the
> courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to the
> $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.
>
> The answer may be to establish local HF nets, need to be local to keep
> S/N ratios high, and get on the air during peak internet times and
> simply shut down the BPL service at the consumer level. Let the
> consumers complain about poor service. Then provide the defense of
> non-licensed Part 15 devices etc.
>
> Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to communicate across town
> on 75 phone will certainly have an impact on local BPL users!!!
>
> DD
>
> Zoran Brlecic wrote:
>
> > Hans K0HB wrote:
> >
> >> http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/03/02/HNbroadbandservice_1.html
> > >
> > >
> > > Yep, sadly it's becoming a reality.
> > >
> > > Personally, I'm looking forward to the day when I program my electronic
> > > keyer into a CQ loop, fire up the amp and leave on a vacation. Of
> > > course, the next logical step is the FCC protecting the BPL by placing
> > > amateur radio in part 15.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > WA7AA

> >
> >
>

379. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:18:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Your too dumb to be a ham.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
Cops
> don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
Maybe
> in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off
some
> day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A
> HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again,
> THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
'unlicensed
> > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >
> > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
come
> > in and shut you down?
> >
> > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected
> by
> > Federal Laws.
> >
> > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
spectrum.
> >
> > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.

> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to enjoy
> on
> > > your
> > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
> > linears,
> > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating
per
> > > part
> > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't
> > helping
> > > > the
> > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your opinion.
I
> > > don't
> > > > > do
> > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent
> > CBers.
> > > > > CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking
it
> > > you're
> > > > > > in
> > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no
> longer
> > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a
> > license
> > > > > when
> > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According
to
> > Part
> > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on the
> air
> > > and
> > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when
> people

> > > who
> > > > > have
> > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They need
to
> > > > > research
> > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
opinion
> or
> > > > > trying
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC on
> > that
> > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you don't
> > have
> > > > > money
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of
your
> > > > elected
> > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the FCC
> > > website
> > > > > if
> > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out a
> page
> > > of
> > > > > it,
> > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them while
> > you're
> > > > at
> > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and
let
> > > them
> > > > > bull
> > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> utility
> > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > attorney
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue
me

> > for
> > > > > > because
> > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
antenna
> > > from
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> because
> > of
> > > > the
> > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> > question
> > > > here
> > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
against
> > the
> > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
> desist
> > > > > letters
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

380. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:21:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
>
> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
Cops
> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>
>
> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
Mangan),
> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just because
they
> were parked in front of his house.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the local police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and the cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.

Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we hold a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?

Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.

Dan/W4NTI

381. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:24:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BHo2c.31088$W74.9819@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

How come I never heard of you until this group was linked to the 'cb' group?
Tells me a lot. I don't have a clue you say?

Get on the 'freeband', piss off your neighbor, and watch the cops shut you
down. Dumbass.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:28f2c.7465$5M.251060@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Man, you really have no clue - DO you?????? Come in out of the fog. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:uNa2c.33959$hm4.32667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Nope...not the better ones....Just a hell of a lot better than a
> unlicensed
> > CBer trashing up the specturm with over driven, over modulated Antique
> > Modulation.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>>
DUHHHHHH.....
> > But
> > > THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station. A
> > > utility
> > > > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out
to
> > get
> > > > the
> > > > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > > information!

> > > > > CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> utility
> > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > attorney
> > > > > and
> > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue
me
> > for
> > > > > > because I
> > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
antenna
> > > from
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> because
> > of
> > > > > the
> > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> > question
> > > > > here
> > > > > > last
> > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about my
> > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
against
> > the
> > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
> desist
> > > > > letters
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't have
an
> > FCC

> > > > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > > > > telecommunications
> > > > > > > > law.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can
sue
> > for
> > > > > > > anything.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will even
be
> > > heard
> > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > > a court.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would be
> > > > > interested.
> > > > > > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > --
> > > > > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> > Nothing
> > > is
> > > > > > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

382. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:26:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TJo2c.31090$W74.16086@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306070230.376$H0@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > >>
> > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > >
> > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > >
> > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which
> > > is why hes so touchy
> > >
> > > ==================
> > >
> > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > >
> > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > >
> > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > >
> > > ================
```

> > > >
> > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > >
> > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > > >emissions?
> > > > >
> > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > >
> > > > ============
> > > > >
> > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> > > antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > >
> > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > > >
> > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > are you stupid?
> > >
> > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> > pass the give away ticket?
> > >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> Not hardly. I have no interest in conversing with the likes of an
> over-stuffed blowhard like you.

Good...one less idiot to put up on ham radio.

Dan/W4NTI

383. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:29:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7Mo2c.31093$W74.2311@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306102220.549$RF@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > >>
> > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > >
> > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > >
> > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment which
> > > > is why hes so touchy
> > > >
> > > > ==========
> > > >
> > > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > > >
> > > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > > >
> > > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > > >
> > > > ==========

> > > >
> > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > >
> > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > > >emissions?
> > > > >
> > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > >
> > > > ============
> > > > >
> > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you what
> > > antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > >
> > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > > >
> > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > are you stupid?
> > >
> > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> > pass the give away ticket?
> > >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> Hey hick, their testing bpl in Alabama too, you're next..lmao!!
>
>
http://www.energyusernews.com/CDA/ArticleInformation/features/BNP__Features_
_Item/0,2584,100843,00.html

They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready for it.
Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the 'BPL repeater'
will be. Lets see them get through that.

And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.

Dan/W4NTI

384. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:30:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on un-authorized
frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The "holier
> than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as much right
to
> their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > >
> > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company
> > will
> > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
> > > >
> > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > we're watching go down.
> > > >
> > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > >
> > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> > >
> > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > I know, -fool-.
> >

> > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really don't
> give
> > a ratsass about CBers.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

385. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:45:56 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as
> > much right
> to
> > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > company
> > > > will
> > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
> > > > >
> > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > >
> > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > >
> > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> > > >

> > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > I know, -fool-.
> > >
> > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> > > don't
> > give
> > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

386. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:50:34 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306135034.790$8G@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306102220.549$RF@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > >> >
> > > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >> >
> > > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > > > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment
> > > > > > which is why hes so touchy
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ====================
> > > > > >
> > > > > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > > > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > > > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > > > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > ================
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > > >
> > > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > > > >emissions?
> > > > >
> > > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > >
> > > > > ============
> > > > >
> > > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
> > > > what antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > >
> > > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > > > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > > >
> > > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > > are you stupid?
> > >
> > > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> > > pass the give away ticket?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Hey hick, their testing bpl in Alabama too, you're next..lmao!!
> >
> >
> http://www.energyusernews.com/CDA/ArticleInformation/features/BNP__Featur
> es_ _Item/0,2584,100843,00.html
>
> They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready for
> it. Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the 'BPL
> repeater' will be. Lets see them get through that.
>
Don't exceed legal limit, you'll be braking the law. Speaking of laws,
did you hear about this Alabama law?

A new law recently passed in Alabama: When a couple gets divorced, they're
still brother and sister.
>

> And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.
>
Where did I say that, putz?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I know -fool-.

387. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:52:01 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306135201.876$YK@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306070230.376$H0@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > >> >
> > > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >> >
> > > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > > > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment
> > > > > > which is why hes so touchy
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ====================
> > > > > >
> > > > > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > > > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > > > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > > > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > ================
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > > >
> > > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no spurious
> > > > > >emissions?
> > > > > >
> > > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > > >
> > > > > ============
> > > > > >
> > > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband, but
> > > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
> > > > what antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > > >
> > > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one ever
> > > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > > > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > > > >
> > > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > > are you stupid?
> > > >
> > > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid to
> > > pass the give away ticket?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Not hardly. I have no interest in conversing with the likes of an
> > over-stuffed blowhard like you.
>
> Good...one less idiot to put up on ham radio.
>
That's an oxymoron coming from you.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I know -fool-.

388. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:52:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8_ednbamarhhgNfdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88352

N2EY wrote:
> In article <86udncgTsbUTSNrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>>The reality of things economic is that, like it or not, we are in a global
>>>>economy and that isn't going to change.
>>>
>>>
>>>That's true to a point. But we don't have to simply accept everything
>>>that comes down the pike as inevitable.
>>
>> It will probably stabilize when one of the programmers from India
>>writes a good program to replace CEO's! ;^)
>
>
> 'zactly.
>
>
>>>>The drastic reduction in costs
>>>>of shipping (both importing and exporting goods) as well as
>>>>similar reductions for communications makes it cheaper to manufacture
>>>>and even provide certain service functions off-shore. That isn't
>>>>going to change in the short run.
>>>
>>>Only if it doesn't affect buyer behavior. If buyers protest with their
>>>dollars, things will change.
>>
>>>>In the long run, those currently
>>>>cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>>>
>>>Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>>
>> Correct! I have alway though that the best argument for what is going
>>on is the elevation of a population's living standard. A country has a
>>low standard of living, and the workforce is available for next to
>>nothing, wage wise. So like Pizza take-out's in a college town, everyone
>>ant their brother migrate there for the cheap labor. AS the standard of
>>living goes up, the cheap labor starts to demand more in salary and/or
>>benefits. This works for a while, but eventually another poor country
>>looks attractive to employers. So they move on to the next poor country.
>
>
> The trick is to do that without creating more poor countries.

At the present time, I doubt that is a concern.

> And the fundamental question is: Why are countries poor in the first place, and
> how do countries get rich and stay rich without exploiting other countries?
>
>> Examples are what has happened to Japan. Korea is the present hot
>> spot,
>
>>but is slowing. China is ascendant now, but the inevitible will happen
>>there. Mexico is now experiencing import concerns too.
>>
>
> Remember NAFTA and the "giant sucking sound"? Where's Ross now?

Ahh, there was some comic relief!

>
>> What happens when the cycle is complete, and the last third world
>>nation is brought up to modern standards will be the interesting thing.
>
> First you have to understand why it hasn't happened yet.

There are plenty of countries yet to bring up.

>>>>In the short
>>>>run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>>>>either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
>>>>manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>>>
>>>OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
>>>lower prices?
>>
>> You see, the big trick is to have all this happen without ourselves
>>turning into a third world country. See below.
>>
> And that trick is?

As I see it, one of the first things to do is to stabilize the stock market. Right now it is so short term, that it will do damage to the companies involved, and to workers. The pressure to increase profits on the short time scales now involved makes longterm actions difficult if not impossible.

I don't subscribe to the Japanese lifetime employment thing, but at the base of it, there is a valid idea. Humans desire a little stability. Remove that stability, and a whole host of problems erupt. Employer loyalty goes away, and when that happens, things suffer. If I know my employer will just as soon get rid of me for .001 percent rise in their stock, I'm not going to be willing to stay in all night to make sure the project goes out the door on time.

Note the present legislative efforts to shift workers from overtime eligible to salaried. From the supershort term view, this makes perfect sense. Reduction of the employees salary by mandatory unpaid overtime.

This will make for a quick jump in profits. From a longer term
perspective, it makes for a "what do we do next quarter to increase
profits" issue, it makes the job less desireable, because now the
employees are taking a wage cut, and they have it reinforced that their
empoloyer would like nothing better than to get rid of them.

>>>>In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
>>>>job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
>>>>may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>>
>>>That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
>>>person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
>>>meantime?
>>>
>>>I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>>>alone.
>>
>> Countries that are service based economies are the *servants* of other
>>countries.
>>
>> We can "reality" each other all day long, but if economies chase the
>>almighty profit without any moral guidance - that is if they are not in
>>business for the sole purpose of making a buck, then disaster is the result.
>>
>
> Actually I think it's simpler than that. They have to consider both the
> short-term buck and the long-term buck.
>
> Henry Ford was criticized by other industrialists because he paid workers the
> princely sum of $5 per day. His response was that it did not make sense to him
> to have people building a product they could not afford to buy. He traded off
> the short-term buck of higher wages for the long-term buck of a bigger market.
> I don't think he did this out of any love for the workers or the country, but
> rather because he saw a bigger picture.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

- Mike KB3EIA -

389. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:55:10 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Your too dumb to be a ham.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.

390. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 18:55:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Z8p2c.31124$W74.9835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88354

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040306074822.23171.00004456@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <BXd1c.31162$hm4.19539@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> >I see NO such claims that Jews
> >> >or anyone else are forcing, pushing or otherwise causing any
> >> >changes in availability of pork products.
> >>
> >> Did you mean "evidence", Bill? Dwight is making the claim, but provides
us
> >> with no evidence.
> >
> >Yep, should have said evidence. What was I thinking?
> >
> You must have been thinking about sausage and peppers......
>
> >> >If I wanted to
> >> >totaly avoid Kosher labeled products I'd have NO problem
> >> >doing so. In fact, I can't even think of an area restaurant
> >> >that claims to be Kosher.
> >>
> >> Nor can I.
> >> >
> >> >My local A&P and other supermarkets carry a wide array
> >> >of pork and shellfish products (did you know most shelfish
> >> >aren't Kosher?)
> >>
> >> Yup - and a lot of other things cannot be certified kosher. Yet they're
> >> available.
> >>
> >> >I have NO problem in restaurants ordering
> >> >a ham and cheese sandwish anywhere...or bacon and eggs,
> >> >or sausage and pepers, or shrimp...etc.
> >>
> >> You're making me hungry, Bill!
> >>
> >> >The fact is, around
> >> >here, restaurants would be nuts to try and limit there menu's
> >> >to be Kosher only. Are there some truly Kosher restaurants?
> >> >Absolutely...just as there are other specialty restaurants that
> >> >cater to specific ethinics foods (Italian, Chineese, Japanesse,
> >> >Thai, German, French, etc.)
> >>

> >> Don't forget Vietnamese, Korean, Portugese........
> >>
> >> I could really go for some kim-chi about now...
> >
> >My wife likes kim-chi but I can't get beyond the smell.
>
> It smells as bad a gefilte fish looks. But if you can actually try
some....

I have actually tried it. Thanks, but no thanks.

> >> >You claim you can't order pork products anymore where
> >> >you live...or in many places...
> >>
> >> But no solid evidence that things have really changed.
> >
> >Exactly.
> >
> Let's be concrete about this: I see no change in the avaialbility of pork
> products since I was a child, more than 40 years ago. How about you, Bill?

No problem with supply around here that I can see.

> >> >well one explanation for seeing
> >> >a reduction of pork products might also be the fact that
> >> >more people, Jews and Gentiles alike, just don't eat as
> >> >much pork. Jews for obvious Kosher reasons and Gentiles
> >> >because of the cholesterol concerns.
> >>
> >> *IF* per-capita pork consumption is down, that's one possible reason.
> >> Another
> >> is competition from other food products. When I was a kid, turkey was
> >> something
> >> you had at Thanksgiving and maybe Christmas. Now things like turkey
> >> sausage,
> >> turkeyburgers, and ground turkey are all over the place. Same with
> >> chicken.
> >>
> >> I don't think Frank Perdue is Jewish, either.
> >>
> >> >As an aside, I have met
> >> >more than a handful of Jews who have no problem eating
> >> >non-kosher foods, including pork products.
> >>
> >> Of the many Jewish people I know, those who keep strictly kosher are a
> >> small minority.
> >>
> >> >One last point, you (Dwight) raise the question of "if this
> >> >was a Christian group" doing the same aleged influencing of
> >> >food availability? Well, to my Christian upbringing and
> >> >personal religion to this day, I can think of NO dietary

> >> >constraints that are a part of Christianity.
> >>
> >> Roman Catholics and meatless Fridays. Did they "push" fish on the rest
of
> >>us?
> >
> >As a dietary law, meatless Fridays have pretty much gone by the
> >wayside. meatless Fridays would also be analogous to only
> >eating Kosher one day a week.
>
> Not being catholic anymore I wouldn't know, but I recall that during Lent
> meatless Fridays are still observed. Plus fasting. There are also plenty
of
> Catholics who do it as a matter of voluntary religious tradition rather
than
> church law.

True, but "meatless" Friday's never impacted my ability to
order a cheeseburger on any Friday...even 30 years ago.

The whole discussion is "much ado about nothing".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

391. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:00:31 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab3ea3555e042179897e7@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In article <fJi2c.58122$PR3.1057825@attbi_s03>,
david.shrader@comcast.net says...
> There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the
> courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to the
> $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.
>
> The answer may be to establish local HF nets, need to be local to keep
> S/N ratios high, and get on the air during peak internet times and
> simply shut down the BPL service at the consumer level. Let the
> consumers complain about poor service. Then provide the defense of
> non-licensed Part 15 devices etc.
>
> Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to communicate across town
> on 75 phone will certainly have an impact on local BPL users!!!

LOL - that would do it. But even 100 or 200 watts would be enough to
muck up BPL if there were enough of you in the city.

392. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:00:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Bdp2c.31129$W74.22824@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88356

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:d9c9457b.0403060809.79593ed@posting.google.com...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?
> >
> > No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of
> > time before... (snip) This is the typical response
> > whenever anyone questions, or objects to,
> > anything done by.. [certain people] ..in this country.
> > Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and
> > much more. (snip)
>
> And newsgroup access it seems. After months of working perfectly, my
> ISP is suddenly having "problems" with my newsgroup account that they
> just can't seem to fix. It all started gradually several days ago,
> right during this discussion, ending with no newsgroup access. Since
> this has happened before (with AOL years ago during a discussion about
> minority religions in a particular country overseas), this is an all
> too familiar pattern to me. Since they can't honestly say (and didn't
> say) I've violated their terms of service (or the concept of free
> speech in this country), they had to come up with a more creative way
> of hopefully shutting me up. It appears interfering with newsgroup
> access while acting innocent is the solution of choice (probably works
> for those who don't know about alternative newsgroup access).

I hear those black helicopters coming too.

> On another note, somebody here also sent select copies of my
> messages to someone I'm associated with, carefully excluding any
> message that didn't fit his/her own little agenda (the person who
> complained to my ISP probably did the same thing). That was resolved
> after I sent a copy of the entire discussion, including the first two
> or three messages that started it and those which said I would object
> regardless of which religion. It was agreed that a discussion here has
> absolutely nothing to do with that association (none of their business
> - their words after basically saying they had no idea why this was
> even sent to them, something an employer might not have said).
>
> I'll have to wait around a few more weeks to see what other mischief
> is in the works. But I thought these two examples would help
> illustrate what I said above.

There is always a risk of something said by someone being taken out of context. In the case you describe, it appears you (Dwight) handled things without a problem.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

393. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:01:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88357

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040306085948.08626.00003454@mb-m27.aol.com...
>
>>In article <86udncgTsbUTSNrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>Actually I think it's simpler than that. They have to consider both the
>>short-term buck and the long-term buck.
>>
>>Henry Ford was criticized by other industrialists because he paid workers
>
> the
>
>>princely sum of $5 per day. His response was that it did not make sense to
>
> him
>
>>to have people building a product they could not afford to buy. He traded
>
> off
>
>>the short-term buck of higher wages for the long-term buck of a bigger
>
> market.
>
>>I don't think he did this out of any love for the workers or the country,
>
> but
>
>>rather because he saw a bigger picture.
>>
>
>
> Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
> would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.

And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our econmmic system works.

I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there

will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the monopoly problems.
- Mike KB3EIA

394. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:02:32 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab3eaab9e95f8309897e8@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88358
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In article <c2cqgl$i60$2@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu>, kuzen001@duke.edu
says...
> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net> wrote:
> > There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the
> > courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to the
> > $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.
>
> They have. Mikey Powell was just in Raleigh (where I am)
> talking to the public, and the paper quoted him on the BPL
> issue among others. I don't have the exact quote but he
> basically said, "We'll try not to harm hobbyists, but BPL
> has too much potential (*) to let it be stopped."
>
> (*) "Potential" = "people are going to get RICH on this."
>

Ah, but kill the potential and it becomes a non-viable service.

395. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:08:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88359

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040306085946.08626.00003453@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <ZDQ1c.30102$W74.23969@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >There's no sign that any sufficient number of folks in
> >the USA are going to boycott non-USA made products
> >or spend N dollars more to get a product "made in the USA'
> >as opposed to buying a cheaper imported product.
>
> That can change, though.
> >
> >> > In the long run, those currently
> >> > cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
> >>
> >> Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
> >
> >Like I said, global economy.
>
> As long as we're not on a sinking ship..
> >
> >> > In the short
> >> > run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's
something
> >> > either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
> >> > manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
> >>
> >> OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
> >> lower prices?
> >>
> >> > In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
> >> > job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
> >> > may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
> >> >
> >> That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
> >> person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
> >> meantime?
> >
> >You retrain whenever it becomes necessary. There's nothing
> >mystical about it. If your job skill goes wanting, you'd
> >better find another skill set.
>
> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be learned
> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose

major
> threats.

Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years. If I hadn't had the
opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
somewhere.

> And who pays for the retraining?

It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
training costs per employee are gone.

> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
> >> alone.
> >
> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
> >and less need for skilled labor.
>
> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
automated
> and all - is moving to places like China.
>
> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....

The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens. Look at the
ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs. Consider too that
a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
is applied by the consumer).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

396. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:21:15 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Lwp2c.38051$qo.27589@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.

You caught that, too? LOL!!!

397. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:32:53 UTC
From: Arnold <pigs@pink.floyd>
Message-ID: <FHp2c.51372$%d3.4299238@twister.southeast.rr.com>
Source record: 88362

On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 15:25:09 +0000 (UTC), in rec.radio.amateur.dx,
kuzen001@duke.edu wrote:

> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
> wrote:
>> There will be so much capital investment by companies in BPL that the
>> courts won't dare to overturn the decision!!!! The FCC will cave to
>> the $$$ interest, if they have not already done so.
>
> They have. Mikey Powell was just in Raleigh (where I am)
> talking to the public, and the paper quoted him on the BPL
> issue among others. I don't have the exact quote but he
> basically said, "We'll try not to harm hobbyists, but BPL
> has too much potential (*) to let it be stopped."
>
> (*) "Potential" = "people are going to get RICH on this."
>
> ____
> Ken Kuzenski AC4RD kuzen001 at acpub .duke .edu
> ____
> All disclaimers apply, see? www.duke.edu/~kuzen001

"We'll *try* not harm hobbyists.." Yeah, riiiight. To me what he
actually said was "Talk to the hand 'cause the face don't understand."
I think Powell would love nothing more than to see amateur radio die.

398. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 19:51:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NL6dneydOeMEttfdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88361

N2EY wrote:
> In article <2qqdncftlPddLd_dRVn-jA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>
>>>On 28 Feb 2004 02:41:33 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
>>>>The fact is that some Christians do, indeed, find the use of His name in
>>>>pledges and oaths to be offensive. Some have gotten into a lot of legal hot
>>>>water because they wouldn't put their hand on a Bible and swear to Him that
>>>>they were telling the truth or would do this or that.
>
>
>
>>> IIRC every jurisdiction in this country is obliged (sometimes very
>>> grudgingly) to allow a witness or affiant to "affirm" rather than
>>> "swear" - no bible, no "so help me God". Gotta' ask for it, though.
>>
>> SOP for Quakers.
>>
>
> Yep. There are a couple of issues there - one is the use of His name, and the
> other is rejection of the concept that there are various levels of
> truth-telling. IOW if someone has to swear that they are telling the truth,
> does that mean they are lying much of the rest of the time when they simply say
> they are telling the truth?
>
>
>>>>What is surreal about the whole issue is that it was usually one flavor of
>>>>Christian telling another flavor of Christian what to do, and often doing
>>>>it in the name of the One they supposedly follow.
>>
>> Kind of like the people that initiated the football prayer issue in
>>Texas. THey were not Moslem, atheists, agnostics or Wicca for that
>>matter. They were Catholic. The difference between the Catholic and
>>Protestant version of the Lord's prayer, you know.
>
>
> What *is* that difference, anyway? Is it "for thine is the kingdom..." part?

Yup, that's it. I remember it felt a little strange and awkward when I
was a kid, and I finished up while others kept on for another sentence.

>>And I'll wager that
>>the Catholic players on the team had to use the Protestant version, or else.
>
>
> Probably. Did you know the Ten Commandments used by Catholics are different?

I think most of them have some variation.
>
>> What I know about human nature tells me that if there were only two
>>religions in the world that were identical with each other except for
>>one word in their scriptures, there would be many that would be happy to
>>destroy all the followers of the other religion for that one word.
>
>
> Maybe. Depends what the word is.

define is.... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

399. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 20:03:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <o5WdnTb9GNfqs9fd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88363

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>Has anyone threatened you, Dwight?
>>
>> No, Jim. But I knew it was only a matter of
>>time before... (snip) This is the typical response
>>whenever anyone questions, or objects to,
>>anything done by.. [certain people] ..in this country.
>>Those who persist have lost jobs, careers, and
>>much more. (snip)
>
>
>
> And newsgroup access it seems. After months of working perfectly, my
> ISP is suddenly having "problems" with my newsgroup account that they
> just can't seem to fix. It all started gradually several days ago,
> right during this discussion, ending with no newsgroup access. Since
> this has happened before (with AOL years ago during a discussion about
> minority religions in a particular country overseas), this is an all
> too familiar pattern to me. Since they can't honestly say (and didn't
> say) I've violated their terms of service (or the concept of free
> speech in this country), they had to come up with a more creative way
> of hopefully shutting me up. It appears interfering with newsgroup
> access while acting innocent is the solution of choice (probably works
> for those who don't know about alternative newsgroup access).

Do you think these people that know enough about Newsgroups to "remove
your access" don't know about alternative access methods?

I also had some trouble with access for a few days. Turned out to be
server problems.

> On another note, somebody here also sent select copies of my
> messages to someone I'm associated with, carefully excluding any
> message that didn't fit his/her own little agenda (the person who
> complained to my ISP probably did the same thing).

Hold on a second. someone did complain to your ISP? About what? There
is a major disconnect here.

> That was resolved
> after I sent a copy of the entire discussion, including the first two

> or three messages that started it and those which said I would object
> regardless of which religion. It was agreed that a discussion here has
> absolutely nothing to do with that association (none of their business
> - their words after basically saying they had no idea why this was
> even sent to them, something an employer might not have said).

I have no idea either. In fact, I don't understand what you're saying.
You're saying that someone complained to your ISP about your posts here
complaining about Kosher food, and they killed your newsgroup access?

- Mike KB3EIA -

400. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 20:46:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EN6dnXQTC4Wxp9fdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88364

Arnold wrote:

>
> "We'll *try* not harm hobbyists.." Yeah, riiiight. To me what he
> actually said was "Talk to the hand 'cause the face don't understand."
> I think Powell would love nothing more than to see amateur radio die.
>

After BPL gets up and going, watch Powell and some of the other high up FCC lawyers take jobs at outlandish salaries with some of the BPL companies as their payoff to them for pushing BPL through.

401. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 20:47:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EN6dnXcTC4Xpp9fdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready for it.
> Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the 'BPL repeater'
> will be. Lets see them get through that.
>
> And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Do you receive any interference on HF from BPL?

402. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 21:08:47 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <mar2c.13348$Zp.12451@fed1read07>
Source record: 88366
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Dave Shrader wrote:

> Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to
> communicate across town on 75 phone will certainly
> have an impact on local BPL users!!!
>
> DD

Yes it will, and that's when Congress and G.W.Bush
will cough up the "Internet Counter-Terrorism Bill
of 2006" that will limit all HF amateur radio operators
to 5 watts PEP output to prevent this kind of
"cyberterrorism".

After all, they will argue, the QRP people showed that
amateur operators can work the world at that power level.
Anything higher than that should be viewed as really too
dangerous to be left in "civilian" hands. (They will nudge
the Democrats across the aisle and say "You know, just
like handguns", and it will be a slam-dunk).

Don't underestimate the political power of a 500-million-
dollar capital investment.

Jim Bromley, K7JEB
Glendale, AZ, USA

403. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 21:53:51 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <OLr2c.483442$I06.5319177@attbi_s01>
Source record: 88367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

If you read my original post that investment was my opening comment!!

K7JEB wrote:
> Dave Shrader wrote:
>
>
>>Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to
>>communicate across town on 75 phone will certainly
>>have an impact on local BPL users!!!
>>
>>DD
>
>
> Yes it will, and that's when Congress and G.W.Bush
> will cough up the "Internet Counter-Terrorism Bill
> of 2006" that will limit all HF amateur radio operators
> to 5 watts PEP output to prevent this kind of
> "cyberterrorism".
>
> After all, they will argue, the QRP people showed that
> amateur operators can work the world at that power level.
> Anything higher than that should be viewed as really too
> dangerous to be left in "civilian" hands. (They will nudge
> the Democrats across the aisle and say "You know, just
> like handguns", and it will be a slam-dunk).
>
> Don't underestimate the political power of a 500-million-
> dollar capital investment.
>
> Jim Bromley, K7JEB
> Glendale, AZ, USA
>
>

404. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater - My response to Steven Adell

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 21:59:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040306165955.01019.00000830@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 88368

In article <Z8p2c.31124$W74.9835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> >My wife likes kim-chi but I can't get beyond the smell.
>>
>> It smells as bad a gefilte fish looks. But if you can actually try
>some....
>
>I have actually tried it. Thanks, but no thanks.

Just leaves that much more for the rest of us!

>> Let's be concrete about this: I see no change in the avaialbility of pork
>> products since I was a child, more than 40 years ago. How about you, Bill?
>
>No problem with supply around here that I can see.

Three data points. Anybody else?

>True, but "meatless" Friday's never impacted my ability to
>order a cheeseburger on any Friday...even 30 years ago.

Excellent point!
>
>The whole discussion is "much ado about nothing".
>
Well, not the *whole* discussion...

73 de Jim, N2EY

405. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:01:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404A4A38.6090705@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88369
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Dave Shrader wrote:

>
> Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to communicate across town
> on 75 phone will certainly have an impact on local BPL users!!!
>
With the amount of interference and noise BPL will make, we will likely
not be in
violation of using excessive power "to carry on the desired
communications". And
we are federally licensed, so that would preempt any local rules and
also trump part 15.

406. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:04:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404A4AE5.7080809@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88370

>
>
>>
>>
>
>"We'll *try* not harm hobbyists.." Yeah, riiiight. To me what he
>actually said was "Talk to the hand 'cause the face don't understand."
>I think Powell would love nothing more than to see amateur radio die.
>
>
>
I doubt that he even know it still exists. He probably thinks that ham
radio operators
are still using homebrew 75 watt crystal controlled CW rigs and modified
AM radios,
or boatanchors. And are boy scouts, etc....

407. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:23:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404A4F4E.2080300@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88371

>
>
>
>
>QST for July 1960, page 54. "FCC Written Exam Procedure Changing" . This
>article describes the new FCC answer sheet that will go into use "in a few
>months". It shows the new answer sheet and describes how the "draw a diagram"
>questions will be replaced by questions about a diagram, such as "what should
>be done to neutralize this circuit"
>
>
>
Back in 1976 when I took the general written at the FCC field office, I
remember that
question was on it. The circuit looked a lot like an IF stage of an
early transistor radio,
which also used neutralization.

So of the other questions required knowledge of a few different points
of knowledge
to get right. "You have a linear which uses B+ of 800V. For use with
SSB, what is
the max current your ampmeter on the finals will show?" You had to know
1) The FCC
dictated input "plate" power for power limits for hams, 2) What the
power limit was
for SSB, 3) and how to factor in PEP averaging. And 4) how to calculate
plate power.
Knew everything except I was hazy on how to do #3. SSB voice is full of
short bursts
of higher power; however an analog amp meter's needle isn't responsive
enough to show
those spikes. So does this lack of response compensate for the FCC
permitting SSB
spikes up to 2KW, where CW is limited to 1KW (back then in the good 'ol
days)?
I made the choice to assume that this is true, and selected 1.25 amps
for the answer. No
way of knowing if I got it right or not, but I did pass (though by a
thin margin of one excess
correct answer). Embarrising as I was an EE student in college at the
time. :-) I did
ace the code test, which I had not expected to do so well on. Sometimes
wonder if

they gave me an all dit suffix (ISE) because I did so well on code.. :-)
I did ace my restructured
upgrade to "extra lite" a few years ago.

408. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:26:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404A502E.7030102@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88372

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Data point: The General written I took for Technician in 1958 included 5
>"draw a diagram of X" questions. The General study guide from ARRL at the
>time included 14 diagrams that might an applicant might be asked to draw.
>I memorized all 14 diagarms.
>
>
>
That means that the exam grader needed to know the material as well.
Someone of that
skill level costs more to hire than someone who just uses an answer key
to a multiple
choice test.

409. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:29:59 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab41b4ef413370c9897ee@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In article <mar2c.13348$Zp.12451@fed1read07>, k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net
says...
> Dave Shrader wrote:
>
> > Running 1 KW as the minimum power necessary to
> > communicate across town on 75 phone will certainly
> > have an impact on local BPL users!!!
> >
> > DD
>
> Yes it will, and that's when Congress and G.W.Bush
> will cough up the "Internet Counter-Terrorism Bill
> of 2006" that will limit all HF amateur radio operators
> to 5 watts PEP output to prevent this kind of
> "cyberterrorism".
>
> After all, they will argue, the QRP people showed that
> amateur operators can work the world at that power level.
> Anything higher than that should be viewed as really too
> dangerous to be left in "civilian" hands. (They will nudge
> the Democrats across the aisle and say "You know, just
> like handguns", and it will be a slam-dunk).
>
> Don't underestimate the political power of a 500-million-
> dollar capital investment.

Jim,

You make a good point. It's happened before where amateurs lost
spectrum. Remember the UPS fiasco where they snagged a chunk of the 220
band?

And of course there was the LEO debacle.

We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing. And it's
a bit like un-ringing the bell. There are a whole lot of transceivers
out there that put out anywhere from 50W to 200W right out of the box.
And a whole lot more amps that kick up to the 1.5KW range. Granted, the
FCC knows who and where every ham in the U.S. happens to be, but they
don't know exactly what gear you've got do they? I mean I'm an extra
without an HF rig right now.

And when you think about it, a properly placed 5W transmitter will do
stuttering wonders for BPL.

BPL needs to be killed and pronto.

410. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:40:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the 'outlaw'
band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed station.
And you agree? How about you keeping up.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as
> > > much right
> > to
> > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > > > company
> > > > > will
> > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
stations.

> > > > > >
> > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > >
> > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> > > > don't
> > > give
> > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >

411. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:42:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Nts2c.227$%q3.57@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306135034.790$8G@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306102220.549$RF@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > >> >
> > > > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >> >
> > > > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > > > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham equipment
> > > > > > which is why hes so touchy
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ====================
> > > > > >
> > > > > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > > > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > > > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night and
> > > > > > thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ================
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search engine...
> > > > > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no
spurious
> > > > > > > >emissions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ============
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
but
> > > > > > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told you
> > > > > > > what antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
ever
> > > > > > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I can
> > > > > > > watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins rocks.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > > > > > are you stupid?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too stupid
to
> > > > > > pass the give away ticket?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > Hey hick, their testing bpl in Alabama too, you're next..lmao!!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
http://www.energyusernews.com/CDA/ArticleInformation/features/BNP__Featur
> > es_ _Item/0,2584,100843,00.html
> > >
> > They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready for
> > it. Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the 'BPL
> > repeater' will be. Lets see them get through that.

> >
> Don't exceed legal limit, you'll be braking the law. Speaking of laws,
> did you hear about this Alabama law?
>
> A new law recently passed in Alabama: When a couple gets divorced, they're
> still brother and sister.
> >
> > And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.
> >
> Where did I say that, putz?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I know -fool-.

Must be losing the word fight eh goofball? Now comes the stupid southerner jokes right?

Whats next? You gonna tell me how superior the North is?

Oh BTW....I was born in Ohio.

Dan/W4NTI

412. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:44:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ovs2c.232$%q3.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.

Break in the conversation please...

Can someone please translate the above?

Dan/W4NTI

413. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:45:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Hws2c.234$%q3.156@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88377
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:EN6dnXcTC4Xpp9fdRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>
> >
> > They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready for
it.
> > Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the 'BPL
repeater'
> > will be. Lets see them get through that.
> >
> > And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Do you receive any interference on HF from BPL?
>

Not yet. I would have trouble hearing it with the S9 plus power line noise
Alabama Power puts out.

Dan/W4NTI

414. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:51:26 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306175126.501$VE@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88378
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

No he's not, here's the OP. Show me where it says anything of
the sort.

I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because
I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
of defending myself in a lawsuit.
I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
letters

Tom

Then -your reply was "just another CBer, who cares?"

From what I've read, you've already had at least one run in with
the power company. Bet they can't wait to bpl your ears now. hehe
>
>
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the 'outlaw'
> band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed station.
> And you agree? How about you keeping up.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have

> > > > as much right
> > > to
> > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > will
> > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> stations.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> > > > > > > > license?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> > > > > > > don't
> > > > > give
> > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >

415. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:54:38 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
>
> Break in the conversation please...
>
> Can someone please translate the above?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I'll type s-l-o-w for you.

You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
funny, get it now, dummy?
```

416. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 22:57:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040306175739.513$HH@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88380
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306135034.790$8G@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040306102220.549$RF@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040304185335.950$Vs@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > >news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > >> > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > >> >
> > > > > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >> >
> > > > > > >> You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Cry about what? The NPRM from the
> > > > > > >FCC says that the utility company will
> > > > > > >have to take steps to stop any
> > > > > > >interference to licensed stations.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan you have to understand that steveo aka moparholic is an
> > > > > > unlicensed freebander and illegal CB op who uses ham
> > > > > > equipment which is why hes so touchy
> > > > > >
> > > > > ==================
> > > > >
> > > > > From: Moparholic (moparho1ic@hotmail.com)
> > > > > Subject: Hey Landshark View: Complete Thread (2 articles)
> > > > > Original FormatNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > Date: 2002-01-05
> > > > >
> > > > > I was running my bootleg Collins gear on CB the other night
> > > > > and thought I heard ya. What channel you hang out on?
```

> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > ~/Moparholic\~
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > ================
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> > > > > > > > Subject: Re: Since twistie is too lazy to use a search
> > > > > > > > engine...
> > > > > > > > View this article onlyNewsgroups: rec.radio.cb
> > > > > > > > Date: 2002-02-03
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "WebDoc REACT Unit #602" <arcweb@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > > > > > > > >Oh and Mopar, how many of these freebanders, the guys
> > > > > > > > >running the amps run a scope or other test equipment to
> > > > > > > > >make sure their rigs are aligned, and that there are no
> spurious
> > > > > > > > >emissions?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That would include me and my Collins 30-L1,why would
> > > > > > > > I bother scoping it, I've never had rfi problems.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > ============
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I openly tell you that I run an S-Line Collins on the freeband,
> but
> > > > > > > never AM, cuz the S-line don't have it.<yea> I've also told
> > > > > > > you what antenna's I run, my full name, and the town I live in.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I've also told you I don't have neighbors around me, so no one
> ever
> > > > > > > complains about rfi. My gear runs clean, I've also told you I
> > > > > > > can watch tv with the rabbit ears in the shack at 1K. Collins
> > > > > > > rocks.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You keep re-posting what I admit too, is this a new strategy or
> > > > > > > are you stupid?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Well tell me Stevo....why are you not a licensed ham? Too
> > > > > > stupid
> to
> > > > > > pass the give away ticket?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > Hey hick, their testing bpl in Alabama too, you're next..lmao!!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> http://www.energyusernews.com/CDA/ArticleInformation/features/BNP__Featur
> > > es_ _Item/0,2584,100843,00.html

> > >
> > > They have been testing BPL in Birmingham for a LONG WHILE. Im ready
> > > for it. Got my KWs ready, Antennas pointed at the point where the
> > > 'BPL repeater' will be. Lets see them get through that.
> > >
> > Don't exceed legal limit, you'll be braking the law. Speaking of laws,
> > did you hear about this Alabama law?
> >
> > A new law recently passed in Alabama: When a couple gets divorced,
> > they're still brother and sister.
> > >
> > > And you think CB is immune to BPL? You really are stupid.
> > >
> > Where did I say that, putz?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I know -fool-.
>
> Must be losing the word fight eh goofball?
>
What fight would that be, Danny?
>
> Now comes the stupid
> southerner jokes right?
>
I'm sure they're not -all- about you, are they!?
>
> Whats next? You gonna tell me how superior the North is?
>
Nope.
>
> Oh BTW....I was born in Ohio.
>
Glad to be rid of you.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
-fool-

417. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 23:15:03 UTC
From: dougmc@frenzy.com
Message-ID: <XXs2c.54885$OH4.34578@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88381
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com>,
Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:

| Like it or not, CB and Ham radio are both in the same pot this time, and
| it's getting warmer.

The pot is bigger than that. For example, BPL could easily interfere
with the R/C bands (72 mhz, 75 mhz) as well. I believe the R/C bands
operate under rules similar to the CB bands ...

The AMA has investigated BPL, and officially expressed concern, but I
don't know if it's gone much further than that.

| This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference to
| low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.

Airports? Do they use 2-80 mhz much? Airplane radios typically use
108-137 mhz, which I wouldn't expect to be affected ...

--
Doug McLaren, dougmc@frenzy.com
"Give me ambiguity, or give me something else!"

418. Re: Cinergy brings BPL to Cincinnati for $29.95/mo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 23:18:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403061518.5ca5d25d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88382
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403031417.4499550b@posting.google.com>...
> "Jim Leder" <k8cxm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<4045e25c$0$52150$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>...
>
> > Unfortunately I agree. There is simply too much money backing BPL. The best
> > we can hope for is to slow it down or at least apply enough pressure that
> > the industry finds a way to clean it up. As it stands now, amateur radio as
> > we know it is in grave danger.
>
> Guys...the trick here is to get organized clubs to start placing
> informational ads in local papers and other media to INFORM the public
> of exactly what harm BPL will bring. Yeah...it's gonna cost some
> bucks, but what's it worth to you to keep this crap at bay...?!?!
>
> They ALSO need to be informed that since this is a Part 15
> program they are afforded NO PROTECTION from interferene from ANY
> licensed radiator.

I think that's already an FCC requirement Steve. Somewhere somebody
recently mentioned that warnings like that are required to be printed
in the instruction sheets which come with Part 15 wireless devices.
'Course the last thing anybody does when plugging widgets in and
firing 'em up is read the instructions.

> Lastly, we need to get the ARRL to start lobbying Congress to
> mandate an informational insert in any BPL-accessing device informing
> the consumer of exactly what Part 15 means and what the consumer can
> expect.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

419. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 23:25:43 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88383
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
> on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
> >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
> >group takes. They have as much right
> > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL

Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier than
thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband" ROTFLMAO

420. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-06 23:39:53 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403061539.4988fa92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:<Lwp2c.38051$qo.27589@fe1.texas.rr.com>...
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
>
> You caught that, too? LOL!!!

FYI dan,

Randy Chapman aka "I Am Not God and Steve Parks aka Steveo and some
others, they are the same outlaw cb bunch that harassed leland Scott
and Dwight Stewart when they discuss respect for FCC rules. Wait till
you hear there excuses for being illegal LOL.

421. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 00:45:01 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <hlhj409uhbaq147kvcpm185frvcul2v1qb@4ax.com>
Source record: 88385
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
On 06 Mar 2004 22:54:38 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
wrote:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
>>
>> Break in the conversation please...
>>
>> Can someone please translate the above?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
>
>You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
>funny, get it now, dummy?

Steve;
Why are bothering to argue with the dumbass? He will never get
it.
```

422. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:13:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%Gu2c.9516$t16.5785991@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88386
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Doug McLaren" <dougmc@frenzy.com> wrote in message
news:XXs2c.54885$OH4.34578@fe2.texas.rr.com...
> In article <P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com>,
> Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:
>
> | Like it or not, CB and Ham radio are both in the same pot this time, and
> | it's getting warmer.
>
> The pot is bigger than that. For example, BPL could easily interfere
> with the R/C bands (72 mhz, 75 mhz) as well. I believe the R/C bands
> operate under rules similar to the CB bands ...
>
> The AMA has investigated BPL, and officially expressed concern, but I
> don't know if it's gone much further than that.
>
> | This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference
to
> | low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.
>
> Airports? Do they use 2-80 mhz much? Airplane radios typically use
> 108-137 mhz, which I wouldn't expect to be affected ...
>

And what range is the 2nd harmonic of the BPL frequencies? 2x80 = 160mhz
which means the harmonics of the BPL signals can easily interfere with the
airplane radios.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

423. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:21:29 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88387
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

KISS MY ASS! CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Your too dumb to be a ham.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> Cops
> > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> Maybe
> > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off
> some
> > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A
> > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again,
> > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> 'unlicensed
> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >
> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
> come
> > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
protected
> > by
> > > Federal Laws.
> > >
> > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> spectrum.
> > >
> > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message

> > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to
enjoy
> > on
> > > > your
> > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
> > > linears,
> > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is operating
> per
> > > > part
> > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion isn't
> > > helping
> > > > > the
> > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
opinion.
> I
> > > > don't
> > > > > do
> > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and decent
> > > CBers.
> > > > > > CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am taking
> it
> > > > you're
> > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's no
> > longer
> > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without a
> > > license
> > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one? According
> to

> > > Part
> > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on
the
> > air
> > > > and
> > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when
> > people
> > > > who
> > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They
need
> to
> > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
> opinion
> > or
> > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the FCC
on
> > > that
> > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you
don't
> > > have
> > > > > money
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid of
> your
> > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the
FCC
> > > > website
> > > > > if
> > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print out
a
> > page
> > > > > of
> > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them
while
> > > you're
> > > > > at
> > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down and
> let

> > > > them
> > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> > utility
> > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > > attorney
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
sue
> me
> > > for
> > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> antenna
> > > > from
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> > because
> > > of
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> > > question
> > > > > here
> > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about
my
> > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> against
> > > the
> > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
> > desist
> > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > >

> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>

424. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:23:55 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <PQu2c.7508$5M.251772@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

IT IS CL - ASS WIPE! And maybe it holds true in "some" areas, but not all. I STILL think it is a case by case issue. CL - GOT IT? CL.....

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> > <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> >
> > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> Cops
> > >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> >
> >
> > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
> Mangan),
> > while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
because
> they
> > were parked in front of his house.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
> Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
local
> police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and
the
> cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
>
> Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
hold
> a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
>
>

> Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

425. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:25:02 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <SRu2c.7509$5M.251328@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88389
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit filled ass. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:BHo2c.31088$W74.9819@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> How come I never heard of you until this group was linked to the 'cb' group?
> Tells me a lot. I don't have a clue you say?
>
> Get on the 'freeband', piss off your neighbor, and watch the cops shut you
> down. Dumbass.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:28f2c.7465$5M.251060@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Man, you really have no clue - DO you?????? Come in out of the fog. CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:uNa2c.33959$hm4.32667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Nope...not the better ones....Just a hell of a lot better than a
> > unlicensed
> > > CBer trashing up the specturm with over driven, over modulated Antique
> > > Modulation.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>>
> DUHHHHHH.....
> > > But
> > > > THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio station.
A
> > > > utility
> > > > > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> > > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put out
> to
> > > get
> > > > > the
> > > > > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > > > > information!
> > > > > > CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> > utility
> > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > > attorney
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
sue
> me
> > > for
> > > > > > > because I
> > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> antenna
> > > > from
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> > because
> > > > of
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> > > question
> > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know about
my
> > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> against
> > > the
> > > > > > > utilities

> > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and
> > desist
> > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't
have
> an
> > > FCC
> > > > > > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > > > > > telecommunications
> > > > > > > > > law.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone can
> sue
> > > for
> > > > > > > > anything.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will
even
> be
> > > > heard
> > > > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > > > a court.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC would
be
> > > > > > > interested.
> > > > > > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > --
> > > > > > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> > > Nothing
> > > > > > is
> > > > > > > > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

426. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:26:41 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <pTu2c.7510$5M.251817@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88390
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

YO JACK OFF..... I HAVE STATED ALL ALONG - A PART 95 COMPLIANT system, I NEVER included Free banding or anything else. READ WHAT THE HELL IS WRITTEN..... CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on un-authorized
> frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The "holier
> > than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as much right
> to
> > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility company
> > > will
> > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed stations.
> > > > >
> > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > we're watching go down.
> > > >
> > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?

> > > > >
> > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> > > >
> > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > >
> > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
don't
> > give
> > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

427. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:28:17 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88391
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB were for Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means????? ASS HOLE.....

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the 'outlaw'
> band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed station.
> And you agree? How about you keeping up.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as
> > > > much right
> > > > to
> > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> stations.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
license?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> > > > > > don't
> > > > > give
> > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> >
>

428. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:30:50 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather stations and at least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:%Gu2c.9516$t16.5785991@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Doug McLaren" <dougmc@frenzy.com> wrote in message
> news:XXs2c.54885$OH4.34578@fe2.texas.rr.com...
> > In article <P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com>,
> > Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:
> >
> > | Like it or not, CB and Ham radio are both in the same pot this time,
and
> > | it's getting warmer.
> >
> > The pot is bigger than that. For example, BPL could easily interfere
> > with the R/C bands (72 mhz, 75 mhz) as well. I believe the R/C bands
> > operate under rules similar to the CB bands ...
> >
> > The AMA has investigated BPL, and officially expressed concern, but I
> > don't know if it's gone much further than that.
> >
> > | This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference
> to
> > | low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.
> >
> > Airports? Do they use 2-80 mhz much? Airplane radios typically use
> > 108-137 mhz, which I wouldn't expect to be affected ...
> >
>
> And what range is the 2nd harmonic of the BPL frequencies? 2x80 = 160mhz
> which means the harmonics of the BPL signals can easily interfere with the
> airplane radios.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

429. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 01:32:48 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want to know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about 20 years now. CL

"PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com> wrote in message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> Cops
> > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> Maybe
> > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you off
> some
> > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM A
> > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But again,
> > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> >
> > ....
> >
> > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't post a
> > call.....
> >
> > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> >
>
> Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's what I
> thought...
>
> Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
>
>

430. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 02:52:06 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather stations and at
> least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.

BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
bands.

431. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 03:13:26 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88395
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather stations and at
> > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
>
> BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> bands.
>

Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to 800 MHz in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why must they try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will have to be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for what? A BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I read a while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down it's system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with mixing and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same. This really ought to get interesting. CL.

432. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 04:12:44 UTC
From: Andy in NJ <"SHORECOGS at COMCAST DOT NET">
Message-ID: <jOadnQxpHM3ZPNfdRVn-jQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 88396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

I really can't believe someone actually went through the trouble of making
this website.

"JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> Worried about BPL turning your radio into
> a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>
> here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

433. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 04:21:04 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab46d98e11b138b9897f5@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather stations
> and at
> > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> >
> > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> > bands.
> >
>
> Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to 800 MHz
> in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why must they
> try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will have to
> be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for what? A
> BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I read a
> while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down it's
> system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with mixing
> and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same. This
> really ought to get interesting. CL.

Here in Providence there is no money to buy new radio system for police
and fire. Right now PFD is on 154.something, and PPD is on 441.600 and
up.

As to the cable system - yes indeed leakage has to be contained. They
can interfere with pretty much anything but aviation. For example, cable
channel 18 sits right in the middle of the 2m band. And I know Cox in RI
is leaking because I hear a dead carrier of about S3 on that frequency.

I'd love to see Cox shut down for that.

434. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 05:00:06 UTC
From: KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <k0bl401hskn0gka3hphirbe06r8k2g9me5@4ax.com>
Source record: 88398

On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 18:21:21 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>>
>> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
>Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the local
>police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and the
>cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
>
>Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we hold
>a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
>
>
>Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

The FCC ruling allows local law enforcement officials to take legal
action against ILLEGALLY operating CB operators. If the radio and
equipment is compliant with part 95, then local authorities are
powerless to act. against the operator.

Raymond Sirois KU2S
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

435. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 05:48:48 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9Jy2c.7521$5M.251927@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88399
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1ab46d98e11b138b9897f5@news.verizon.net...
> In article <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather
stations
> > and at
> > > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> > >
> > > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> > > bands.
> > >
> >
> > Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to 800
MHz
> > in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why must
they
> > try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will have
to
> > be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for what?
A
> > BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I read
a
> > while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down
it's
> > system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with
mixing
> > and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same. This
> > really ought to get interesting. CL.
>
> Here in Providence there is no money to buy new radio system for police
> and fire. Right now PFD is on 154.something, and PPD is on 441.600 and
> up.
>
> As to the cable system - yes indeed leakage has to be contained. They
> can interfere with pretty much anything but aviation. For example, cable
> channel 18 sits right in the middle of the 2m band. And I know Cox in RI
> is leaking because I hear a dead carrier of about S3 on that frequency.
>

> I'd love to see Cox shut down for that.
>

Well, I can say one thing for sure, IF they force this county to go 800 and the county doesn't get enough funds to help out the stations and police to switch over, there are going to be many police and fire departments hurting big time. I know one right now that will be done - period. They are struggling as it is to stay afloat - in man power and equipment. In many more ways than one, when you look at the big picture it seems some forces/departments are being squashed - purposefully. The bar just keeps getting raised. BPL could be just the tip of a big ugly iceberg. Yes siree, it sure is going to get interesting to say the least. IF BPL does as much "widespread" damage as is thought - boy, the infrastructure - communications wise - will be flushed right down the toilet. Not a pretty thought. CL

436. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 05:56:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88400

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403060651.335a1a0e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403052332.10c017b8@posting.google.com>...

> > Of course I do, Brain. Why would a rational person say something
> > he DIDN'T believe?
>
> He could be:
>
> a. lying.
>
> b. not rational and doesn't know what he's saying.
>
> I think you're not rational (nuts).

Of course you do.

You (and your "mentor") are the one's with credibility problems
here.

So.....How do YOU go about "fixing" it...?!?! You do your best
to try and put the onus of inpropriety off on anyone BUT yourself.
Since I work the hardest to keep your frequent foolishness in the
public eye, I catch the flak.

No problem. The worst YOU have to suggest is that I am "nuts" or
"irrational" for not allowing you and Lennie to get away with bullying
and lying.

So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

437. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 05:58:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062158.6e8560cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88401

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403041545.5c784ac0@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030723.106fdbe7@posting.google.com>...

> > I am not the one who sets the rules, Brain.
>
> You set your own rules.

Only when it comes to not accepting bullying and lying as
acceptable public behaviour.

Care to try again?

Steve, K4YZ

438. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:19:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062219.32320b07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88402

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403050837.3c5b01e6@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4047C663.4A7BD8A2@earthlink.net>...

> David, the reading of it takes no time at all since there is so little
> content. It's the contemplation, wonderment, and disappointment
> afterwards that you are supposed to be some kind of hotshot in the
> amateur radio world, yet none of it comes through in the way you
> express yourself here. Simply amazing.

I have found several references to "K8MN" in numerous issues of
several Amateur Radio periodicals over a period of years.

I find NO reference to N0IMD anywhere (except for Buckmaster, QRZ
and this forum...)

I have found several references to K8MN operating from various
foreign locales over the years.

I cannot find any reference to N0IMD operating from ANYwhere, let
alone outside the territorial boundries of the United States.

Now...I personally wouldn't choose the word "hotshot", but Dave
has certainly EARNED bragging rights that you seem to envy. You
certainly have tried to CLAIM similar bragging rights WITHOUT having
done the same deeds!

Sheeesh....

Steve, K4YZ

439. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:23:14 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 88403
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a 'unlicensed
> class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>
> If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can come
> in and shut you down?
>
> Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected
> by Federal Laws.
>
> You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the spectrum.
>
> Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

440. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:24:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062224.41c55674@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88404

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message news:<1e4e3692.0403060656.332e8398@posting.google.com>...

> Tell us how it turns out. Best of luck.

Ohhhh noooooo, Brain! I wouldn't have it any other way!

YOU are the big DXer, here! Please! You go right ahead!

Please, go right on ahead and tell us alllllllllll about your travels and exploits, and heap upon us your infinite knowledge, operating and licensing tips from rare DX locations...

"WE" are ALLLLLLLLL waiting...! ! ! !

(snickerin' at Brain... again!)

Steve, K4YZ

441. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:32:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062232.160eccdf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88405

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
> because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying
> around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.

The "point" Lennie it trying to make us believe, Alun, is that
Amateur Radio is >>ONLY<< a hobby, with no intrinsic value to anyone
for any reason OTHER than recreation...That's not true.

His ulterior motive is to discredit Amateur Radio's countless
contributions, not only to the "history" of radio, but to the
"service" of the Nation as a resource to be called upon in any number
of disasters or emergencies.

He's unable to do that, either, but he obviously believes that if
he keeps repeating it often enough perhaps he and he alone can
re-write 90 years of history.

73

Steve, K4YZ

442. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:35:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403062235.1a9284d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88406

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403051242.6dbf0875@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050621.629ce3c3@posting.google.com>...

> > Again, YOU are the one making some very sick suggestions,
> > Brain...
>
> No. I just figured that the seven year old wasn't messed up like you.

Whew...Coming from you, that hurt...(NOT!)

Especially since you can't seem to get your own stories straight...

Steve, K4YZ

443. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 06:37:02 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.03.07.06.37.01.576601@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 88407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

funny you should say this. you act like one(a cb'er that is!).

also, some former cb'ers (like me) got tired of dealing with the overcrowded conditions and the overall flakiness of the band. We (as former cb'ers) went up, took the test (btw, when I took mine, it was a lot harder than the ones they administer these days!), aced it and then awaited my ticket.

There are some people that I miss down on 11 and there are some I don't. However, since I don't have the equipment to go down there and say Hi, I don't go down there.

As an operator, I am not substantially any better (or worse) than most. In fact, I tend to lurk (listen) more than talk. Besides, a closed mouth gathers no foot.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:30:00 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really don't
> give a ratsass about CBers.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence has its limits.

444. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:28:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <XzE2c.26122$aT1.22094@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > In "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
> > >Part 97, Cops don't just rush in and shut them down.
> > >Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> >
> > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself
> > (Terry Mangan) while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the
> > the faces of some CBers just because they
> > were parked in front of his house.
>
> Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
local
> police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and
the
> cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.

Not true if the CDer is operating legally. The COPS have the authority
to enforce FCC rules...NOT to simply shut down any CBer because
that CBer is causing interference to TV. The expectation of the FCC
when it made the ruling it did, was that the TV interference problems
with CBers was from illegal stations (illegal high power)...not with
legal 4 watt CB stations.

> Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because
> why???? Because we hold
> a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.

The point Dan made, however, was not completely
accurate as I note above.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

445. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:33:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona
>
> On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
'unlicensed
> > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >
> > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
come
> > in and shut you down?

IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
shut the CB station down.

> > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected
> > by Federal Laws.

So is the legal CB operator.

> > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
spectrum.

IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
means they are not really CB at all.

> > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.

Just be careful with your facts.

Cheers,
Bill, K2UNK

446. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:34:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070434.7c49e89e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88410

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062235.1a9284d8@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403051242.6dbf0875@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403050621.629ce3c3@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Again, YOU are the one making some very sick suggestions,
> > > Brain...
> >
> > No. I just figured that the seven year old wasn't messed up like you.
>
> Whew...Coming from you, that hurt...(NOT!)
>
> Especially since you can't seem to get your own stories straight...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I have no trouble keeping my "stories" straight. That's the
beauty of telling the truth. Try it sometime - after you're back on
your meds.

447. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:39:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dKE2c.26126$aT1.22388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88411

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:404A502E.7030102@ix.netcom.com...
> >Data point: The General written I took for Technician in 1958 included 5
> >"draw a diagram of X" questions. The General study guide from ARRL at
the
> >time included 14 diagrams that might an applicant might be asked to draw.
> >I memorized all 14 diagarms.
> >
> That means that the exam grader needed to know the material.
> as well. Someone of that skill level costs more to hire than
> someone who just uses an answer key to a multiple
> choice test.

In 1958, the exam grader was always an FCC official...not a ham.
Even when you took the test administered by a ham,
it was not graded by the ham, the test was
sent pack to the FCC who graded it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

448. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:39:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88412

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062232.160eccdf@posting.google.com>...
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
> > In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
> > because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying
> > around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.
>
> The "point" Lennie it trying to make us believe, Alun, is that
> Amateur Radio is >>ONLY<< a hobby, with no intrinsic value to anyone
> for any reason OTHER than recreation...That's not true.

Really? I don't see that at all.

> His ulterior motive is to discredit Amateur Radio's countless
> contributions, not only to the "history" of radio, but to the
> "service" of the Nation as a resource to be called upon in any number
> of disasters or emergencies.

I'd suggest that you not rest on your laurels. Historically amateur
radio has provided an invaluable service to the nation. More
recently, more people have turned to cellular telephones to aid them
in an emergency. You do the math.

> He's unable to do that, either, but he obviously believes that if
> he keeps repeating it often enough perhaps he and he alone can
> re-write 90 years of history.

Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
amateur radio done for me lately?"

449. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:41:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070441.6f368a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88413

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062224.41c55674@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403060656.332e8398@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Tell us how it turns out. Best of luck.
>
> Ohhhh noooooo, Brain! I wouldn't have it any other way!

Nurses before gentlemen.

450. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:43:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88414

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:

> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
> >
>
> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back up...

Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
or years if they're ever replaced at all.

451. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:48:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070448.32a28de8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88415

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403062219.32320b07@posting.google.com>...

> Now...I personally wouldn't choose the word "hotshot", but Dave
> has certainly EARNED bragging rights that you seem to envy.

I'm just disappointed that such an amateur great turns out to be an uninspiring dullard and frequent imbecile on RRAP. His continued use of self-inflicted stupidity is really unbecoming someone of his reputation.

You
> certainly have tried to CLAIM similar bragging rights WITHOUT having
> done the same deeds!

Not at all, but you would like to think so.

452. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:49:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88416

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
> Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> amateur radio done for me lately?"

How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind. Then there was the great blackout of 2003. No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of which I haven't heard. There of course there are the emergencies to come such as future hurricanes. Although these have been rather quiet the last few years, that doesn't mean they are gone.

Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

453. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:52:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88417

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403060651.335a1a0e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403052332.10c017b8@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Of course I do, Brain. Why would a rational person say something
> > > he DIDN'T believe?
> >
> > He could be:
> >
> > a. lying.
> >
> > b. not rational and doesn't know what he's saying.
> >
> > I think you're not rational (nuts).
>
> Of course you do.
>
> You (and your "mentor") are the one's with credibility problems
> here.
>
> So.....How do YOU go about "fixing" it...?!?! You do your best
> to try and put the onus of inpropriety off on anyone BUT yourself.
> Since I work the hardest to keep your frequent foolishness in the
> public eye, I catch the flak.
>
> No problem. The worst YOU have to suggest is that I am "nuts" or
> "irrational" for not allowing you and Lennie to get away with bullying
> and lying.
>
> So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.

454. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:54:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403070454.222f174@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88418

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062158.6e8560cf@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403041545.5c784ac0@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030723.106fdbe7@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > I am not the one who sets the rules, Brain.
> >
> > You set your own rules.
>
> Only when it comes to not accepting bullying and lying as
> acceptable public behaviour.

Correct. You don't follow that rule, but you should.

You're favorite rule is "Do as I say, not as I do."

455. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:59:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307075945.25517.00004651@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88419

In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
>> would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.
>
> And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
>stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
>econmmic system works.

Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the long
view. That's considered old-fashioned today.
>
> I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
>thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
>is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
>there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
>will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
>monopoly problems.

Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental threat
is OK? What rights do employees really have?

Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?

Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here last
year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down slightly.
Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and it's
only March.

Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.

How do we get folks to take the long view again?

73 de Jim, N2EY

456. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:59:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307075945.25517.00004652@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88420

In article <MPG.1ab41b4ef413370c9897ee@news.verizon.net>, Tony P.
<kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> writes:

>> Don't underestimate the political power of a 500-million-
>> dollar capital investment.
>
>Jim,
>
>You make a good point. It's happened before where amateurs lost
>spectrum. Remember the UPS fiasco where they snagged a chunk of the 220
>band?
>
>And of course there was the LEO debacle.

One word: Iridium.
>
>We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing.

Then do the following:

1) Download and read the NPRM

2) Put together coherent comments that refute specific points. Example: In paragraph 35 FCC says that it would expect hams to point their antennas to minimize reception of emissions from power lines. That should be refuted by pointing out that

1) many if not most hams do not have directional antennas for the bands in question

2) installation of such antennas is not practical in many cases

3) such a solution does nothing when the BPL noise is coming from all directions, as it would tend to do in a residential area of typical density where all of the wiring - including the low voltage house wiring! - is radiating BPL noise.

That's just one point in the NPRM - there are lots more.

73 de Jim, N2EY

457. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 12:59:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307075946.25517.00004653@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 88421

In article <404A4F4E.2080300@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>QST for July 1960, page 54. "FCC Written Exam Procedure Changing" . This
>>article describes the new FCC answer sheet that will go into use "in a few
>>months". It shows the new answer sheet and describes how the "draw a
>>diagram" questions will be replaced by questions about a diagram, such
>>as "what should be done to neutralize this circuit"
>
>Back in 1976 when I took the general written at the FCC field office, I
>remember that question was on it. The circuit looked a lot like an IF stage
of an
>early transistor radio, which also used neutralization.

I recall a similar question in 1968.
>
>So of the other questions required knowledge of a few different points
>of knowledge to get right. "You have a linear which uses B+ of 800V.
>For use with SSB, what is the max current your ampmeter on the finals will
show?"

>You had to know
>1) The FCC dictated input "plate" power for power limits for hams,

And that the amateur rules of the time dictated that hams measure
plate/collector power input, not transmitter output.

>2) What the power limit was for SSB,

And the band in use

>3) and how to factor in PEP averaging.

>And

>4) how to calculate plate power.

Yup - all in *one* little multiple choice question!

>Knew everything except I was hazy on how to do #3. SSB voice is full of
>short bursts
>of higher power; however an analog amp meter's needle isn't responsive
>enough to show
>those spikes. So does this lack of response compensate for the FCC
>permitting SSB
>spikes up to 2KW, where CW is limited to 1KW (back then in the good 'ol
>days)?

The rule was 2 kW peak, which worked out to 1 kW average, according to the rules.

>I made the choice to assume that this is true, and selected 1.25 amps
>for the answer. No
>way of knowing if I got it right or not, but I did pass (though by a
>thin margin of one excess
>correct answer). Embarrising as I was an EE student in college at the
>time. :-)

Which is why FCC makes all applicants take the test, regardless of their "professional" status.

>I did
>ace the code test, which I had not expected to do so well on. Sometimes
>wonder if
>they gave me an all dit suffix (ISE) because I did so well on code.. :-)
> I did ace my restructured upgrade to "extra lite" a few years ago.

And what did you think of the written tests then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

458. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 13:37:18 UTC
From: kuzen001@duke.edu
Message-ID: <c2f8ie$a7e$2@gargoyle.oit.duke.edu>
Source record: 88422
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote:
> > basically said, "We'll try not to harm hobbyists, but BPL
> > has too much potential (*) to let it be stopped."
>
> Ah, but kill the potential and it becomes a non-viable service.

You mean, by running high power and interfering with
the BPL access? Never happen. When Suburban Dad can't
get his sports and Mom can't get AOL and Junior can't
download Korean porn, all because of one 80-year-old
down the street with a hobby that 98% of Americans don't
even understand, they'll pull the rug out from under ham
radio faster than you can say "broadband." If there were
50 million active hams and we were well organized, we
might have a chance.

Ken Kuzenski AC4RD kuzen001 at acpub .duke .edu

All disclaimers apply, see? www.duke.edu/~kuzen001

459. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 14:25:46 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88423
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona
>
> On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
'unlicensed
> > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >
> > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
come
> > in and shut you down?
> >
> > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected
> > by Federal Laws.
> >

I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told by some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told or you will go to jail.

460. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:11:38 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <52im40dvkppb39dt45ll5g0lkcoojf7p1k@4ax.com>
Source record: 88426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 00:45:01 GMT, Lancer <lancer@rock..com> wrote:

>>> Can someone please translate the above?
>>>
>>> Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
>>
>>You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
>>funny, get it now, dummy?
>
>Steve;
> Why are bothering to argue with the dumbass? He will never get
>it.

I wonder if VietNam Dan is still collecting disability off of our tax
dollars, or if he finally got off of his lazy ass and got a real job.

461. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:15:26 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <6fim409ehf0c74ril12aqeqgc2emika4c8@4ax.com>
Source record: 88424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 23:23:14 -0700, "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT"
<n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote:

>read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>
>DE N7ZZT
>Phoenix, Arizona

...and Oy Boy ought to know better than to post in certain binary
newsgroups.

462. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:18:23 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <jnim405f8k0lofaker9kfktfimc747eap1@4ax.com>
Source record: 88425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 20:25:02 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
wrote:

>YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit filled
>ass. CL

That already happened. It's why he's collecting disability.

463. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:40:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ZfI2c.26344$aT1.15456@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> > >
> > Break in the conversation please...
> >
> > Can someone please translate the above?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
>
> You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> funny, get it now, dummy?

So flippin what? Is this a writting class?

Dan/W4NTI

464. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:41:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NgI2c.26346$aT1.16731@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88428
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Lancer" <lancer@rock..com> wrote in message
news:hlhj409uhbaq147kvcpm185frvcul2v1qb@4ax.com...
> On 06 Mar 2004 22:54:38 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >> > >
> >> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > >
> >> > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> >>
> >> Break in the conversation please...
> >>
> >> Can someone please translate the above?
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> >
> >You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> >funny, get it now, dummy?
>
> Steve;
> Why are bothering to argue with the dumbass? He will never get
> it.

You are right....I am right....he is wrong....I get it just fine.

Dan/W4NTI

465. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:41:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307114154.741$RL@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> > >
> > > Break in the conversation please...
> > >
> > > Can someone please translate the above?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> >
> > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> > funny, get it now, dummy?
>
> So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
No -you're- too dumb for that.
```

466. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:47:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EmI2c.26357$aT1.11817@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Actually I have been fighting them for 5 years now about their line noise problems. Notice I said problems.

Over this period of time the company has assigned a engineer from Birmingham to work DIRECTLY with me. Which he has done.

They have purchased new equipment and even sent this engineer to ARRL classes in Newington on RFI. He is now quite good at locating it.

In the period I have been working with him, about 2 1/2 years now. He has done yoeman service and has found MANY sources of RFI. All of which have been corrected.

In fact right now the latest one was recently cured and I am now tracking, what I hope is, the last one. I expect him to be out here again this week or next, to try and locate it.

So, you are right. Alabama power definitly knows me. And they know the have to clear up their noise. It is against the law to have such a high level. It takes time, and I happen to be in a rough area.

But now when the wind blows my neighbors don't lose their power. And wires dont hang loose and endanger children walking around the poles. And it is so much more quiet on HF now.

As for BPL, this same engineer tells me he was involved with the testing and can NOT see any future for it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message news:20040306175126.501$VE@newsreader.com...
> No he's not, here's the OP. Show me where it says anything of
> the sort.
> ----------
> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and after
> looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for because
> I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna from the
> house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because of the cost
> of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here last
> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.

> Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> letters
>
> Tom
> ---
> Then -your reply was "just another CBer, who cares?"
>
> From what I've read, you've already had at least one run in with
> the power company. Bet they can't wait to bpl your ears now. hehe
> >
> >
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the 'outlaw'
> > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed station.
> > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They
have
> > > > > as much right
> > > > to
> > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> > stations.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> > > > > > > > license?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > >
> > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I
really
> > > > > don't
> > > > give
> > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >

467. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:50:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <spI2c.26361$aT1.1804@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather stations
> and at
> > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> >
> > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> > bands.
> >
>
> Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to 800
MHz
> in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why must
they
> try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will have
to
> be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for what? A
> BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I read a
> while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down
it's
> system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with mixing
> and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same. This
> really ought to get interesting. CL.
>
>

If you haven't already...go to www.arrl.org and download their CD of the
sounds of BPL. You will just love it.

Dan/W4NTI

468. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:54:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_sI2c.26378$aT1.13589@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1ab46d98e11b138b9897f5@news.verizon.net...
> In article <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather
stations
> > and at
> > > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> > >
> > > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> > > bands.
> > >
> >
> > Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to 800
MHz
> > in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why must
they
> > try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will have
to
> > be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for what?
A
> > BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I read
a
> > while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down
it's
> > system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with
mixing
> > and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same. This
> > really ought to get interesting. CL.
>
> Here in Providence there is no money to buy new radio system for police
> and fire. Right now PFD is on 154.something, and PPD is on 441.600 and
> up.
>
> As to the cable system - yes indeed leakage has to be contained. They
> can interfere with pretty much anything but aviation. For example, cable
> channel 18 sits right in the middle of the 2m band. And I know Cox in RI
> is leaking because I hear a dead carrier of about S3 on that frequency.
>

> I'd love to see Cox shut down for that.
>

I believe that is 145.25 . Just make it your new simplex frequency all around the COX area. Set your gear for tone squelch. And trash their entire system.

You know....Garbage out, Garbage in.

Dan/W4NTI

469. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:55:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hul2c.26388$aT1.11585@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88433
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:9Jy2c.7521$5M.251927@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1ab46d98e11b138b9897f5@news.verizon.net...
> > In article <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in
message
> > > news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > > > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather
> stations
> > > and at
> > > > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> > > >
> > > > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than aircraft
> > > > bands.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to
800
> MHz
> > > in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why
must
> they
> > > try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will
have
> to
> > > be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for
what?
> A
> > > BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I
read
> a
> > > while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut down
> it's
> > > system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with
> mixing
> > > and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same.
This
> > > really ought to get interesting. CL.
```

> >
> > Here in Providence there is no money to buy new radio system for police
> > and fire. Right now PFD is on 154.something, and PPD is on 441.600 and
> > up.
> >
> > As to the cable system - yes indeed leakage has to be contained. They
> > can interfere with pretty much anything but aviation. For example, cable
> > channel 18 sits right in the middle of the 2m band. And I know Cox in RI
> > is leaking because I hear a dead carrier of about S3 on that frequency.
> >
> > I'd love to see Cox shut down for that.
> >
>
> Well, I can say one thing for sure, IF they force this county to go 800
and
> the county doesn't get enough funds to help out the stations and police to
> switch over, there are going to be many police and fire departments
hurting
> big time. I know one right now that will be done - period. They are
> struggling as it is to stay afloat - in man power and equipment. In many
> more ways than one, when you look at the big picture it seems some
> forces/departments are being squashed - purposefully. The bar just keeps
> getting raised. BPL could be just the tip of a big ugly iceberg. Yes
siree,
> it sure is going to get interesting to say the least. IF BPL does as much
> "widespread" damage as is thought - boy, the infrastructure -
communications
> wise - will be flushed right down the toilet. Not a pretty thought. CL
>
>

EXACTLY.....now your thinking.

Dan/W4NTI

470. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:56:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uvI2c.26395$aT1.7953@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
> > on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
> > >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
> > >group takes. They have as much right
> > > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
>
> Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier than
> thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband" ROTFLMAO

Dang....I hadn't thought of it that way. But you know something? I think
you are right.

Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
silly stuff.

Dan/W4NTI

471. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:58:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LwI2c.26404$aT1.8830@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88435
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0403061539.4988fa92@posting.google.com...
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:<Lwp2c.38051$qo.27589@fe1.texas.rr.com>...
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> >
> > You caught that, too? LOL!!!
>
> FYI dan,
>
> Randy Chapman aka "I Am Not God and Steve Parks aka Steveo and some
> others, they are the same outlaw cb bunch that harassed leland Scott
> and Dwight Stewart when they discuss respect for FCC rules. Wait till
> you hear there excuses for being illegal LOL.

I am sitting back, waiting with baited breath as they say.

Dan/W4NTI

472. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:59:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oxI2c.26408$aT1.11340@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88436
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Only if you trim your mustache.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> KISS MY ASS! CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> > Cops
> > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> > Maybe
> > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
off
> > some
> > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM
A
> > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
again,
> > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > by
> > > > Federal Laws.

> > > >
> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > spectrum.
> > > >
> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to
> enjoy
> > > on
> > > > > > your
> > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
> > > linears,
> > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
operating
> > per
> > > > > part
> > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
isn't
> > > helping
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> opinion.
> > I
> > > > > don't
> > > > > > do
> > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and
decent
> > > CBers.
> > > > > > CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message

> > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
taking
> > it
> > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's
no
> > > longer
> > > > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without
a
> > > license
> > > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
According
> > to
> > > > > Part
> > > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on
> the
> > > air
> > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when
> > > people
> > > > > > who
> > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They
> need
> > to
> > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
> > opinion
> > > > or
> > > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the
FCC
> on
> > > > > that
> > > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you
> don't
> > > > > have
> > > > > > > money
> > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid
of

> > your
> > > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the
> FCC
> > > > > website
> > > > > > if
> > > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print
out
> a
> > > page
> > > > > of
> > > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them
> while
> > > > you're
> > > > > > at
> > > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down
and
> > let
> > > > > > them
> > > > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> > > utility
> > > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > > > attorney
> > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
> sue
> > me
> > > > > for
> > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> > antenna
> > > > > > from
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> > > because
> > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.

> > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
> > > > question
> > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
about
> my
> > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> > against
> > > > the
> > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease
and
> > > desist
> > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

473. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 16:59:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8yI2c.26411$aT1.9645@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:PQu2c.7508$5M.251772@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> IT IS CL - ASS WIPE! And maybe it holds true in "some" areas, but not all.
I
> STILL think it is a case by case issue. CL - GOT IT? CL.......
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> > news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > > In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> > > <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
97.
> > Cops
> > > > >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
of.
> > >
> > >
> > > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
> > Mangan),
> > > > while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
> because
> > they
> > > > were parked in front of his house.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> >
> > Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
> local
> > police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and

> the
> > cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> >
> > Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
> hold
> > a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> >
> >
> > Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

474. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:00:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3zI2c.26416$aT1.6195@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88438
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I rest my case. A CBer.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:SRu2c.7509$5M.251328@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit
filled
> ass. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:BHo2c.31088$W74.9819@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > How come I never heard of you until this group was linked to the 'cb'
> group?
> > Tells me a lot. I don't have a clue you say?
> >
> > Get on the 'freeband', piss off your neighbor, and watch the cops shut
> you
> > down. Dumbass.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:28f2c.7465$5M.251060@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Man, you really have no clue - DO you?????? Come in out of the fog. CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:uNa2c.33959$hm4.32667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > Nope...not the better ones....Just a hell of a lot better than a
> > > unlicensed
> > > > CBer trashing up the specturm with over driven, over modulated
Antique
> > > > Modulation.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:nmM1c.7398$5M.248975@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > I "KNOW" we're talking about a "Utility Company">>>>
> > DUHHHHHH.....
> > > > But
> > > > > THEY can experiment too! You think Hams are the only ones? CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in

message
> > > > > news:HCK1c.29838$W74.4191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > We are talking about a utility company. Not a ham radio
station.
> A
> > > > > utility
> > > > > > company can not just experiment when and where they want.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:1Ow1c.7369$5M.248244@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > Ever hear EXPERIMENTATION? Some do it BEFORE the word is put
out
> > to
> > > > > get
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > ball rolling. Maybe they got a jump start knowing some insider
> > > > > > information!
> > > > > > > CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > news:edt1c.31936$hm4.27680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > <jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:c2564chgk2@mail.specsol.com...
> > > > > > > > > In rec.radio.amateur.policy tom@wsd.spam wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
> > > utility
> > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
> > > > attorney
> > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
> sue
> > me
> > > > > for
> > > > > > > > because I
> > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> > antenna
> > > > > from
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
> > > because
> > > > > of
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my

> > > > question
> > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
about
> my
> > > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> > against
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease
and
> > > desist
> > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I still think this is a troll, but...
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > If an attorney said they could sue you because you don't
> have
> > an
> > > > > FCC
> > > > > > > > > > license, that attorney is an idiot and knows nothing about
> > > > > > > > > > telecommunications
> > > > > > > > > > law.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The reason you could be sued is because in the US anyone
can
> > sue
> > > > > for
> > > > > > > > > > anything.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > That does not mean they can win or that such a suit will
> even
> > be
> > > > > > heard
> > > > > > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > > > a court.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > If the utility were sending out such letters, the FCC
would
> be
> > > > > > interested.
> > > > > > > > > > Send the FCC a copy.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > --
> > > > > > > > > > Jim Pennino
> > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > Remove -spam-sux to reply.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > This whole thing is strange. The FCC just put out the NPRM.
> > > > Nothing
> > > > > is
> > > > > > > > > sealed (about BPL) yet. Can someone say troll ?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>

475. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:02:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fAI2c.26421$aT1.16022@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Now now Cj...er CL....Don't get all excited, you may stroke out.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:pTu2c.7510$5M.251817@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YO JACK OFF..... I HAVE STATED ALL ALONG - A PART 95 COMPLIANT system, I
> NEVER included Free banding or anything else. READ WHAT THE HELL IS
> WRITTEN..... CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
un-authorized
> > frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
"holier
> > > than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as much
> right
> > to
> > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> company

> > > > will
> > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
stations.
> > > > > >
> > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your license?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > >
> > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> don't
> > > give
> > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

476. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:03:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tBI2c.26428$aT1.6561@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed goofballs.
At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB were for
> Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means????? ASS
> HOLE.............
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the 'outlaw'
> > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed station.
> > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They
have
> as
> > > > > much right
> > > > > to
> > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >

> > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> > stations.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> license?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I
really
> > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > give
> > > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

477. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:04:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise. Difference
is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want to
> know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about 20
> years now. CL
>
> "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com> wrote
in
> message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> > Cops
> > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> > Maybe
> > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
off
> > some
> > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM
A
> > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
again,
> > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > >
> > > ....
> > >
> > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't post a
> > > call.....
> > >
> > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > >
> >
> > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's what I
> > thought...
> >

> > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> >
> >
>
>

478. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:06:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <xEI2c.26438$aT1.25058@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88442

"KU2S" <ku2s@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:k0bl401hskn0gka3hphirbe06r8k2g9me5@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 18:21:21 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >>
> >> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> >> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> >> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> >
> >Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
local
> >police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and
the
> >cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> >
> >Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
hold
> >a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> >
> >
> >Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> The FCC ruling allows local law enforcement officials to take legal
> action against ILLEGALLY operating CB operators. If the radio and
> equipment is compliant with part 95, then local authorities are
> powerless to act. against the operator.
>
>
> Raymond Sirois KU2S
> SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
> 607-733-5745
> telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

But they are ALL illegal is some way. You cant talk two feet with a legal
CB station. The 'big boys' won't let you. Thus they crank it up.

And how can the cops be expected to know the difference?

Bottom line...when the CBer is busted...he is gone.

Bring on the cops.

Dan/W4NTI

479. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:08:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >
> > DE N7ZZT
> > Phoenix, Arizona
> >
> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> 'unlicensed
> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >
> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
> come
> > > in and shut you down?
>
> IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
> shut the CB station down.
>
> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
protected
> > > by Federal Laws.
>
> So is the legal CB operator.
>
> > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> spectrum.
>
> IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> means they are not really CB at all.
>
> > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>
> Just be careful with your facts.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill, K2UNK
>

>
>

How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.

So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.

Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.

Dan/W4NTI

480. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:09:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rHI2c.26447$aT1.333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >
> > DE N7ZZT
> > Phoenix, Arizona
> >
> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> 'unlicensed
> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >
> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
> come
> > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
protected
> > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
>
> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
by
> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're
> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> or you will go to jail.
>
>

I won't shut down. I will show them my FCC license, give them the number
to Riley Hollingsworth and tell them to get off my property.

Dan/W4NTI

481. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:20:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A57D706F6F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88445

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
>> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:
>
>> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
>> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
>> >
>>
>> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back up...
>
> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> or years if they're ever replaced at all.
>

I wasn't talking about our towers, though, was I? I have one I've never put up. The point is that, for example, we can communicate in and out of a disaster area on HF SSB, for example, without needing a tower. Doesn't happen every day, but that's something to be thankful for.

482. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 17:25:58 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
> silly stuff.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
That why your dad told you to take a hike?

483. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:13:18 UTC
From: mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Message-ID: <c2fs8e$2ce$1@puck.litech.org>
Source record: 88447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

In <jOadnQxpHM3ZPNfdRVn-jQ@comcast.com> (rec.radio.amateur.misc), Andy in NJ wrote:
> I really can't believe someone actually went through the trouble of making
> this website.

> "JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > Worried about BPL turning your radio into
> > a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
> >
> > here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html

IIRC, that website has been around a _long_ time, and its URL is quite
often posted by folks in the news.admon.net-abuse.* newsgroups when
replying to netkooks.

--
"I *am* $PHB" -- Skud.
Mike Andrews
mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Tired old sysadmin

484. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:19:18 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net>
Message-ID: <WAK2c.26693$aT1.25017@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Top-postin' Andy in NJ wrote:

> I really can't believe someone actually went through the trouble of making
> this website.
>
> "JasanH" <9ververver@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:6b8d5$404953ed$d1cc5a66$26711@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
>>Worried about BPL turning your radio into
>>a useless box with lights? Worry no more!
>>
>>here: http://zapatopi.net/afdb.html
>
>
>

That's because the part of your brain that should be concerned about
this issue has been erased by tightly focused selective amnesia brain
beams, and the previous thoughts replaced by what They think you should
think. Happens to the best of us. It just happened to me, right now.
I've completely forgotten what I should warn you about.

I think it had something to with top-posting being righteous and just.

Oh, well, never mind.
--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

485. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:25:04 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <kGK2c.57227$lS1.6933@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:rHI2c.26447$aT1.333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > > >
> >
> > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
told
> by
> > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as
you're
> > told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're
told
> > or you will go to jail.
> >
> >
>
> I won't shut down. I will show them my FCC license, give them the number
> to Riley Hollingsworth and tell them to get off my property.
```

>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Is this before or after you have handcuffs on?

486. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143214.22081.00004446@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88451

In article <1e4e3692.0403070434.7c49e89e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Especially since you can't seem to get your own stories straight...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, I have no trouble keeping my "stories" straight. That's the
>beauty of telling the truth. Try it sometime - after you're back on
>your meds.

If, and only if he HAS meds. I'm not so sure he does.

Truth and reality interfere with the enjoyability of fanstasy. We
won't see much of truth and reality in here from the gunnery nurse.

LHA / WMD

487. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143215.22081.00004447@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88455

In article <6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
>> Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
>> amateur radio done for me lately?"
>
>How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.

Hams hijacked four airliners? :-)

>Then there was the great blackout of 2003.

Hams did that, too? Tsk, tsk, tsk... :-)

In all the thousands of press photographs, hundreds of minutes of press video recordings, any radios in evidence are all identifiable as belonging to governments or utilities.

IN the national press and in electronics industry trade publications were many mentions of communications supplies (HTs and telephones) rushed in to aid New York. The U.S. military adequately supported rescue at the Pentagon, also reported.

Note: The ARRL is NOT a "press," a journalism organization.

>No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of which I haven't
>heard.

Without any doubt of that...! :-)

Do you wish another recounting of the Great Blackout of the Greater Los Angeles area caused by the Northridge Earthquake a decade ago? No? Of course not, you refuse to view my posts... :-)

Continue to let the ARRL spoon-feed you all the information they think is "suitable" for you.

>Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons,
>bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely provide
>communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.

Even as I write this, the Los Angeles Marathon of 2004 is in progress. It is well-covered by a continuous telecast from one station and spot reporting on at least three other local TV stations. I am not listening to a sound-only AM station coverage. On-the-route video is provided by two-person teams on motorcycles equipped with two-way voice

and picture mobile equipment.

The video from locations along the 26.2 mile route show many different HTs being used by LAPD, LA government, and Marathon personnel identifiable by tags or outer vests. No one has mentioned any amateur radio activity yet. This isn't the first L.A. Marathon. Everything going well so far as it has for years.

The ARRL will no doubt post something later saying something like "the success of the L.A. Marathon was all due to the untiring efforts of many radio amateurs." That is, if they still recognize the west coast of the USA as belonging to the Union...

LHA / WMD

488. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143217.22081.00004448@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88454

In article <1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403062232.160eccdf@posting.google.com>...
>> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>> > In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
>> > because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying

>> > around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.
>>
>> The "point" Lennie it trying to make us believe, Alun, is that
>> Amateur Radio is >>ONLY<> for any reason OTHER than recreation...That's not
>true.
>
>Really? I don't see that at all.

Brian, the psychotic don't see things the same way that rational
humans such as you, Alun, and I do.

The gunnery nurse is stuck, wedged in his emotional rut of anger
and rage over long-ago perceived personal insults to his opinions
and statements. As the result all he can do is shout and holler and
egregiously denigrate his critics over the slightest hint of disapproval.

In his mental world amateur radio has substituted for "the corps"
and he must traverse all routes between the halls of Montezuma
and the shores of Tripoli, marching to the beat of olde-tyme
tradition and demanding strict and utter obeyance of the "gunny"
in a hobby activity. That is an absolute and cannot be otherwise.

That is also quite a bit sick. But, other amateurs allow his
presence, even with implications of "praise" for his exhortations
and pejorations. That implies some impurity of those others.
:-)

>> His ulterior motive is to discredit Amateur Radio's countless
>> contributions, not only to the "history" of radio, but to the
>> "service" of the Nation as a resource to be called upon in any number
>> of disasters or emergencies.
>
>I'd suggest that you not rest on your laurels. Historically amateur
>radio has provided an invaluable service to the nation. More
>recently, more people have turned to cellular telephones to aid them

>in an emergency. You do the math.

The gunnery nurse is still stuck in his obsessive rut and cannot tolerate a reality at odds with his mental fantasy.

That 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions exist in the USA as of U.S. Census Bureau data for 2003 is irrelevant to the gunnery nurse's fantasy world. He refuses to acknowledge that and focusses solely on himself and his relation to his activities as the only possible "truth." Anything contrary will bring forth a spate of the usual personal insults, spat with exaggerated anger and resentment.

The history of all radio has already been and has been documented in many other places besides Newington, CT. The contributions of amateur radio are quite countable, not so numerous as to be labeled "uncountable." The countable contributions - in the majority - all happened well before the gunnery nurse's life experience began.

>> He's unable to do that, either, but he obviously believes that if
>> he keeps repeating it often enough perhaps he and he alone can
>> re-write 90 years of history.

Recounting documented reality is not a "rewrite" of anything.

ALL radio is only 108 years old. The ARRL was organized in 1914 as a local New England radio club primarily interested in "relaying" telegraphic messages privately instead of using commercial telegram services. As a late-comer in U.S. national radio clubs (the Radio Club of America was organized 5 years before the ARRL and still exists today) it began to have dreams of greatness. But, the ARRL membership is still less than a quarter of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs. Their "greatness" seems to be a self-definition.

The use of "90" years is indicative of the mental tunnel vision and absolute Belief in the ARRL as the source, the oracle of All in radio. When the ARRL was first organized, "radio" was already 18 years old, having been demonstrated as a communications means in both Italy and Russia in 1896.

>Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
>amateur radio done for me lately?"

That is really for another thread, Brian, even though both of us do not look with favor upon Chairman Powell.

The gunnery nurse MUST wrap himself in the patriotic bunting and mythical glory of his corps-substitute. That is evidenciary in all the psychotic behavior shown in here over the past years. To him it seems not a hobby but a lifestyle, a "service" lacking only a common uniform. All must follow his personal patriotism or be villified forever and ever.

He wastes our time.

LHA / WMD

489. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143218.22081.00004450@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88450

In article <1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
>would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.

He has succeeded beyond his wildest dreams in that... :-)

LHA / WMD

490. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143218.22081.00004449@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88452

In article <1e4e3692.0403070454.222f174@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403062158.6e8560cf@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403041545.5c784ac0@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403030723.106fdbe7@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > > I am not the one who sets the rules, Brain.
>> >
>> > You set your own rules.
>>
>> Only when it comes to not accepting bullying and lying as
>> acceptable public behaviour.
>
>Correct. You don't follow that rule, but you should.
>
>You're favorite rule is "Do as I say, not as I do."

If he yells at you again "FALL DOWN AND GIVE ME TWENTY!!!"
tell him you have no cash but ask if he'll take PayPal instead... :-)

LHA / WMD

491. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:32:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040307143219.22081.00004451@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88453

In article <%Gu2c.9516$t16.5785991@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Doug McLaren" <dougmc@frenzy.com> wrote in message
>news:XXs2c.54885$OH4.34578@fe2.texas.rr.com...
>> In article <P9CdnUpthM91btjdRVn-jw@comcast.com>,
>> Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote:
>>
>> | Like it or not, CB and Ham radio are both in the same pot this time, and
>> | it's getting warmer.
>>
>> The pot is bigger than that. For example, BPL could easily interfere
>> with the R/C bands (72 mhz, 75 mhz) as well. I believe the R/C bands
>> operate under rules similar to the CB bands ...
>>
>> The AMA has investigated BPL, and officially expressed concern, but I
>> don't know if it's gone much further than that.
>>
>> | This battle is likely to be won however, by complaints of interference
>to
>> | low band VHF public service frequencies, and airports.
>>
>> Airports? Do they use 2-80 mhz much? Airplane radios typically use
>> 108-137 mhz, which I wouldn't expect to be affected ...
>
>And what range is the 2nd harmonic of the BPL frequencies? 2x80 = 160mhz
>which means the harmonics of the BPL signals can easily interfere with the
>airplane radios.

The international civil aviation band has been 108 to 137 MHz since
1955.

Examination of the very large table in Part 2, Title 47 C.F.R. will
reveal the radio service allocations in the USA for 160 MHz...and
every frequency from 9 KHz up to 300 GHz.

IFF an Access BPL system's bandwidth goes as high as 80 MHz
(not as low as 80 milliHertz as you wrote), then, in all probability,
any spectral content at 80 MHz *is* a harmonic of the wideband
digital signal.

Data signals do not appear as the narrowband, single-channel,
single-user relatively-simple modulation types found on HF ham
bands. Some self-education is in order to understand how much
of the rest of the radio world does their thing. The downside is
that such self-education takes you away from the Very Important

WORK necessary to be a proficient morseperson under 1930s standards and practices.

We 'must' keep the standards and practices of the 1930s alive into this new millennium?

LHA / WMD

492. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:48:25 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <p1vm40tv625i3g0suj61dt2988sbhc5us5@4ax.com>
Source record: 88457
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
>cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed goofballs.
>At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

You've got to listen to more than just channel six...

493. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 19:58:42 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <v6vm409lmv771rh8f94jhehq30qqsmdhbg@4ax.com>
Source record: 88459
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.

You also could say that you live with little purple leprechauns, and
he couldn't prove otherwise. IOW, if you make a claim, the burden of
proof is on you.

>Difference
>is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

...that's fine if you want to leave yourself open to identity theft.

494. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:00:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bbL2c.9715$t16.5916416@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:EmI2c.26357$aT1.11817@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Actually I have been fighting them for 5 years now about their line noise
> problems. Notice I said problems.
>
> Over this period of time the company has assigned a engineer from
Birmingham
> to work DIRECTLY with me. Which he has done.
>
> They have purchased new equipment and even sent this engineer to ARRL
> classes in Newington on RFI. He is now quite good at locating it.
>
> In the period I have been working with him, about 2 1/2 years now. He
has
> done yoeman service and has found MANY sources of RFI. All of which have
> been corrected.
>
> In fact right now the latest one was recently cured and I am now tracking,
> what I hope is, the last one. I expect him to be out here again this
week
> or next, to try and locate it.
>
> So, you are right. Alabama power definitly knows me. And they know the
> have to clear up their noise. It is against the law to have such a high
> level. It takes time, and I happen to be in a rough area.
>
> But now when the wind blows my neighbors don't lose their power. And
wires
> dont hang loose and endanger children walking around the poles. And it is
> so much more quiet on HF now.
>
> As for BPL, this same engineer tells me he was involved with the testing
> and can NOT see any future for it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I hope he is right. Did he give any indication as to what he thinks will
prevent it from being successful?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

495. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:05:03 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <8pvm40127duejb7gqq9pevulo0te7rra7d@4ax.com>
Source record: 88464
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 07 Mar 2004 16:41:54 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
wrote:

>> > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
>> > funny, get it now, dummy?
>>
>> So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>No -you're- too dumb for that.

...and Viet Nam Dan was talking about credibility. It's no wonder
WA8ULX, A.K.A. "Babbling Bruce" is his only friend.

496. Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:13:53 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <5oL2c.84040$C65.9507@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 88458

Forgive me if this has been mentioned before-
I haven't read this group for years.
Concerning fighting BPL, which the power industry
is ramming at us using Part 15, why can't
we use Part 15 to clobber *them?*

The FCC has a history of listening when you quote
their own laws to them. Here is a good one:

****
TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

CHAPTER I--FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

PART 15--RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES--Table of Contents

Subpart A--General

Sec. 15.5 General conditions of operation.

(a) Persons operating intentional or unintentional radiators
shall not be deemed to have any vested or recognizable right
to continued use of any given frequency by virtue
of prior registration or certification of equipment, or,
for power line carrier systems, on the basis of prior
notification of use pursuant to Sec. 90.63(g) of this chapter.
(b) Operation of an intentional, unintentional, or incidental
radiator is subject to the conditions that no harmful interference is
caused and that interference must be accepted that may be caused by the
operation of an authorized radio station, by another intentional or
unintentional radiator, by industrial, scientific and medical (ISM)
equipment, or by an incidental radiator.
(c) The operator of a radio frequency device shall be required to
cease operating the device upon notification by a Commission
representative that the device is causing harmful interference.
Operation shall not resume until the condition causing the harmful
interference has been corrected.

****

We are federally licensed stations. If their "Part 15"
"incidental radiators" interfere with our stations,
the law REQUIRES the power companies to cease
their operations until the interferance is fixed.

Why can't we take this angle to clobber these guys?

73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S
arc5@ix.netcom.com

497. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:21:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zvL2c.747$Cm3.599@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
> > shut the CB station down.
> > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > So is the legal CB operator.
> > >
> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > spectrum.
> > >
> > > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> > means they are not really CB at all.
> > >
> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >
> > Just be careful with your facts.
```

> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill, K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.

Perhaps so, but it doesn't change the law.

> So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.

Did you mean to say: So the CBer gets busted, goes off the air,
and then the court gets to sort it out? If yes...

The cops can't bust a CBer just for being on the ait. The cops
have to bust someone and charge that person with one or more
specific violations of FCC rules. Causing interference to BPL
or any other service using a legal CB rig and antenna is NOT
against any FCC rule.

> Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.

Huh??? Even if the cops confiscate a legal CB rig, that does
NOT prohibit the same CBer from buying or using another one.

Now for a reality check...just how many local cops have actually
taken any steps against any illegal or pirate CBers? I'm guessing
next to none...much less a legal CBer?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

498. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:21:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >
> > DE N7ZZT
> > Phoenix, Arizona
> >
> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> 'unlicensed
> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >
> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
> come
> > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
protected
> > > by Federal Laws.
>
> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
by
> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.

Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
a specific violation pretty damn quick.

> No, you'll do as you're
> told. You will
> win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> or you will go to jail.

Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor

will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

499. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:29:52 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9DL2c.7563$5M.252684@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Problem is - HE DOESN'T. CL

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona
>
> On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
'unlicensed
> > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >
> > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
come
> > in and shut you down?
> >
> > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are protected
> > by Federal Laws.
> >
> > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
spectrum.
> >
> > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> --
> the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
> has its limits.
>

500. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:31:32 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <KEL2c.7564$5M.252688@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
> > > shut the CB station down.
> > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > > So is the legal CB operator.
> > >
> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > > spectrum.
> > >
> > > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> > > means they are not really CB at all.
> > >
> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >
> > Just be careful with your facts.
```

> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill, K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
>
> So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.
>
> Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

The wise words of an ignorant self centered underinformed person who does
NOT speak for the entire ham community. CL

501. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:39:10 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <TLL2c.7565$5M.252673@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88465
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >
> > DE N7ZZT
> > Phoenix, Arizona
> >
> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> 'unlicensed
> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >
> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
> come
> > > in and shut you down?
> > >
> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
protected
> > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
>
> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
by
> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're
> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> or you will go to jail.
>
>

This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument. A cop may not be aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it. YOU have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case, is stupid. You exercise your rights to the judge. As long as HE is not on the take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent. Let's face it fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to know ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL

502. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:42:55 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <pPL2c.7566$5M.252659@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:jnim405f8k0lofaker9kfktfimc747eap1@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 20:25:02 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
> wrote:
>
> >YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit
filled
> >ass. CL
>
>
> That already happened. It's why he's collecting disability.

Ahhhh, I SEE! It all makes perfect sense now..... CL

503. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:43:41 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <6QL2c.7567$5M.252643@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88468
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZfI2c.26344$aT1.15456@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> > > >
> > > Break in the conversation please...
> > >
> > > Can someone please translate the above?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> >
> > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> > funny, get it now, dummy?
>
> So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

What, your spell checker doesn't work? OR you don't know how to use it? SHUT
UP and you won't be picked on. CL
```

504. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:46:56 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9TL2c.7569$5M.252696@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88469
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:huI2c.26388$aT1.11585@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:9Jy2c.7521$5M.251927@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >
> > "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.1ab46d98e11b138b9897f5@news.verizon.net...
> > > In article <urw2c.7518$5M.251856@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > > "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in
> message
> > > > news:MPG.1ab458b9d0c8462f9897f4@news.verizon.net...
> > > > > In article <iXu2c.7512$5M.251823@dfw-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > > > does_it_matter@noreply.com says...
> > > > > > Most aircraft I'm aware of operate from 118-136. The weather
> > stations
> > > > and at
> > > > > > least here locally - railroads are in the 160 MHz region. CL.
> > > > >
> > > > > BPL is more likely to affect VHF public service bands than
aircraft
> > > > > bands.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Which is "probably" why they've been busting their asses to move to
> 800
> > MHz
> > > > in many places. OR "forced".. If it failed in other countries, why
> must
> > they
> > > > try to follow suit? One can only guess that the electric bills will
> have
> > to
> > > > be compensated to pay for it. So, in the end, we'll be paying for
> what?
> > A
> > > > BIG MESS..... So what else is new? I'm not sure when it was, but I
> read
> > a
> > > > while back that a Texas based Cable TV company was forced to shut
down
> > it's
```

> > > > system when the leakage was interfering with Aviation ops. So, with
> > mixing
> > > > > and such, I supppose it may be possible for the BPL to do the same.
> This
> > > > > really ought to get interesting. CL.
> > >
> > > Here in Providence there is no money to buy new radio system for
police
> > > and fire. Right now PFD is on 154.something, and PPD is on 441.600 and
> > > up.
> > >
> > > As to the cable system - yes indeed leakage has to be contained. They
> > > can interfere with pretty much anything but aviation. For example,
cable
> > > channel 18 sits right in the middle of the 2m band. And I know Cox in
RI
> > > is leaking because I hear a dead carrier of about S3 on that
frequency.
> > >
> > > I'd love to see Cox shut down for that.
> > >
> >
> > Well, I can say one thing for sure, IF they force this county to go 800
> and
> > the county doesn't get enough funds to help out the stations and police
to
> > switch over, there are going to be many police and fire departments
> hurting
> > big time. I know one right now that will be done - period. They are
> > struggling as it is to stay afloat - in man power and equipment. In many
> > more ways than one, when you look at the big picture it seems some
> > forces/departments are being squashed - purposefully. The bar just keeps
> > getting raised. BPL could be just the tip of a big ugly iceberg. Yes
> siree,
> > it sure is going to get interesting to say the least. IF BPL does as
much
> > "widespread" damage as is thought - boy, the infrastructure -
> communications
> > wise - will be flushed right down the toilet. Not a pretty thought. CL
> >
> >
>
> EXACTLY.....now your thinking.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

I've "been" thinking..... You just caught on! CL

505. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:48:19 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <42c5c383e794cc0774e34637ab36f16d@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88466
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:40:25 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
>> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > >
>> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
>> >
>> > Break in the conversation please...
>> >
>> > Can someone please translate the above?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
>>
>> You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
>> funny, get it now, dummy?
>
>So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

not for you, its writing not writting,dummy
```

506. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:48:36 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <JUL2c.7570$5M.252534@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

The only "crummy lid" you know about is the one you ate from pulled from the dumpster. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:8yI2c.26411$aT1.9645@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:PQu2c.7508$5M.251772@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > IT IS CL - ASS WIPE! And maybe it holds true in "some" areas, but not all.
> I
> > STILL think it is a case by case issue. CL - GOT IT? CL.......
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> > > news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > > > In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> > > > <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
> 97.
> > > Cops
> > > > >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
> of.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
> > > Mangan),
> > > > while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
> > because
> > > they
> > > > were parked in front of his house.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > > -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> > >
> > > Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
> > local
> > > police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police
and
> > the
> > > cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> > >
> > > Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
> > hold
> > > a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> > >
> > >
> > > Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

507. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:49:06 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <dVL2c.7571$5M.252641@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

DAMNED, how'd you know I had a hairy ass? CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:oxI2c.26408$aT1.11340@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Only if you trim your mustache.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > KISS MY ASS! CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
97.
> > > Cops
> > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
of.
> > > Maybe
> > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
> off
> > > some
> > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I
AM
> A
> > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> again,
> > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS

> can
> > > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > protected
> > > > by
> > > > > Federal Laws.
> > > > >
> > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > > spectrum.
> > > > >
> > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to
> > > enjoy
> > > > > on
> > > > > > > your
> > > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such
as
> > > > > linears,
> > > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> operating
> > > per
> > > > > > part
> > > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
> isn't
> > > > > helping
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> > opinion.
> > > I
> > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > do
> > > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and

> decent
> > > > > CBers.
> > > > > > > > > CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > > message
> > > > > > > > >
news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
> taking
> > > it
> > > > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's
> no
> > > longer
> > > > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
without
> a
> > > > > license
> > > > > > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> According
> > > to
> > > > > > Part
> > > > > > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain
on
> the
> > > > > air
> > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off
when
> > > people
> > > > > > who
> > > > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They
> need
> > > to
> > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
> > > opinion
> > > > > or
> > > > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > > > > to

> > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the
> FCC
> > on
> > > > > that
> > > > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you
> > don't
> > > > > have
> > > > > > > > money
> > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid
> of
> > > your
> > > > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to
the
> > FCC
> > > > > website
> > > > > > > if
> > > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print
> out
> > a
> > > page
> > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them
> > while
> > > > > you're
> > > > > > > at
> > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down
> and
> > > let
> > > > > > them
> > > > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the
local
> > > > utility
> > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted
a
> > > > attorney
> > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > after

> > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility
could
> > sue
> > > me
> > > > > for
> > > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
> > > antenna
> > > > > > from
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility
is
> > > > because
> > > > > of
> > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with
my
> > > > > question
> > > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
> about
> > my
> > > > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
> > > against
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease
> and
> > > > desist
> > > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >

> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

508. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:49:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <_ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88477

William wrote:

> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> or years if they're ever replaced at all.

Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?

509. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:50:18 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <jWL2c.7572$5M.252700@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

The only person here stroking is you..... JACK OFF.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:fAI2c.26421$aT1.16022@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Now now Cj...er CL....Don't get all excited, you may stroke out.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:pTu2c.7510$5M.251817@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > YO JACK OFF..... I HAVE STATED ALL ALONG - A PART 95 COMPLIANT system, I
> > NEVER included Free banding or anything else. READ WHAT THE HELL IS
> > WRITTEN..... CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> un-authorized
> > > frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> "holier
> > > > than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They have as much
> > right
> > > > to
> > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the utility
> > company
> > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> stations.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
license?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I really
> > don't
> > > > > give
> > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>

510. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:51:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307155154.424$eV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 20:25:02 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
> wrote:
>
> >YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit
> >filled ass. CL
>
> That already happened. It's why he's collecting disability.
>
Figures, another freeloader!

511. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:52:05 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <%XL2c.7573$5M.252662@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Well at least we know you can "listen to sound".. Good job - rover. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:tBI2c.26428$aT1.6561@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
> cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
goofballs.
> At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB were
for
> > Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means????? ASS
> > HOLE.............
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the
'outlaw'
> > > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed
station.
> > > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either! The
> > > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They
> have

> > as
> > > > > > much right
> > > > > to
> > > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the
utility
> > > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> > > stations.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell out
> > > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> > license?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I
> really
> > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > give
> > > > > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
>

512. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:53:11 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88475
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or GOD.
CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise. Difference
> is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want to
> > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about
20
> > years now. CL
> >
> > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com> wrote
> in
> > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
97.
> > > Cops
> > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
of.
> > > Maybe
> > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
> off
> > > some
> > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I
AM
> A
> > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> again,
> > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > >
> > > > ....

> > > >
> > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't post
a
> > > > call.....
> > > >
> > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's what
I
> > > thought...
> > >
> > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

513. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 20:55:30 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <b%L2c.7575$5M.252683@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On second thought..... NTI... NOT TRAINED INTELLECTUALLY.... CL

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
GOD.
> CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
Difference
> > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want
to
> > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about
> 20
> > > years now. CL
> > >
> > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
wrote
> > in
> > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
> 97.
> > > > > Cops
> > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
> of.
> > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
you
> > off

> > > > some
> > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And,
I
> AM
> > A
> > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> > again,
> > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > >
> > > > > ....
> > > > >
> > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
post
> a
> > > > > call.....
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
what
> I
> > > > thought...
> > > >
> > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

514. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:03:02 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <f331bf5a10995785f1dffa6c2df68dff@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:56:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
>> > on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
>> > >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
>> > >group takes. They have as much right
>> > > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
>>
>> Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier than
>> thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband" ROTFLMAO
>
>Dang....I hadn't thought of it that way. But you know something? I think
>you are right.
>
>Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
>silly stuff.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

hey diaper dan, he said his station was legal. dang you should have
thought about you low comprehension level.

515. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:05:52 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <ea3f9fd89454250c6d15ce2fb1adf8e4@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88479
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:58:19 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
this mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:c034bd2.0403061539.4988fa92@posting.google.com...
>> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
>news:<Lwp2c.38051$qo.27589@fe1.texas.rr.com>...
>> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
>> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > >
>> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
>> >
>> > You caught that, too? LOL!!!
>>
>> FYI dan,
>>
>> Randy Chapman aka "I Am Not God and Steve Parks aka Steveo and some
>> others, they are the same outlaw cb bunch that harassed leland Scott
>> and Dwight Stewart when they discuss respect for FCC rules. Wait till
>> you hear there excuses for being illegal LOL.
>
>I am sitting back, waiting with baited breath as they say.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

waiting for what? maybe you can get someone to translate for you
diaper dan

516. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:07:51 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c216d3b20006d9a2e0ec25024b50304e@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:00 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
this mindspring.com> wrote:

>Only if you trim your mustache.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

dan, are you gay? or just have a thing for guys with trimmed
mustaches?
>
>"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> KISS MY ASS! CL
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
>> > Cops
>> > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>> > Maybe
>> > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
>off
>> > some
>> > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I AM
>A
>> > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
>again,
>> > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
>> > >
>> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> > 'unlicensed
>> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > > >
>> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
>can
>> > come

>> > > > in and shut you down?
>> > > >
>> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>> protected
>> > > by
>> > > > Federal Laws.
>> > > >
>> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
>> > spectrum.
>> > > >
>> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > >
>> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
>> > > > >
>> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>message
>> > > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like to
>> enjoy
>> > > > on
>> > > > > your
>> > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such as
>> > > > linears,
>> > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
>operating
>> > per
>> > > > > part
>> > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
>isn't
>> > > > helping
>> > > > > > the
>> > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
>> opinion.
>> > I
>> > > > > don't
>> > > > > > do
>> > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and
>decent
>> > > > CBers.
>> > > > > > > CL

>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > message
>> > > > > > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
>taking
>> > it
>> > > > > > you're
>> > > > > > > in
>> > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that CB's
>no
>> > > longer
>> > > > > > > required
>> > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating without
>a
>> > > > license
>> > > > > > when
>> > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
>According
>> > to
>> > > > Part
>> > > > > > 95 -
>> > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain on
>> the
>> > > air
>> > > > and
>> > > > > > talk.
>> > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off when
>> > > people
>> > > > who
>> > > > > > have
>> > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that. They
>> need
>> > to
>> > > > > research
>> > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
>> > opinion
>> > > > or
>> > > > > > trying
>> > > > > > > > to
>> > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the
>FCC
>> on
>> > > > that
>> > > > > > issue.
>> > > > > > > > > I
>> > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe you

>> don't
>> > > > have
>> > > > > > > money
>> > > > > > > > to
>> > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the aid
>of
>> > your
>> > > > > > elected
>> > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to the
>> FCC
>> > > > > website
>> > > > > > if
>> > > > > > > > you
>> > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print
>out
>> a
>> > > page
>> > > > > > of
>> > > > > > > > it,
>> > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them
>> while
>> > > > you're
>> > > > > > at
>> > > > > > > > > it.
>> > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie down
>and
>> > let
>> > > > > > them
>> > > > > > > > bull
>> > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
>> > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
>> > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local
>> > > utility
>> > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a
>> > > > attorney
>> > > > > > > > and
>> > > > > > > > > after
>> > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility could
>> sue
>> > me
>> > > > > for
>> > > > > > > > because
>> > > > > > > > > I
>> > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB
>> > antenna
>> > > > > > from
>> > > > > > > > the

>> > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is
>> > > because
>> > > > of
>> > > > > > the
>> > > > > > > > > cost
>> > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
>> > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with my
>> > > > question
>> > > > > > here
>> > > > > > > > > last
>> > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
>about
>> my
>> > > > > > experience.
>> > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up
>> > against
>> > > > the
>> > > > > > > > > utilities
>> > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease
>and
>> > > desist
>> > > > > > letters
>> > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > Tom
>> > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>>
>>
>

517. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:09:21 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <40697993f05c9d245f7258d1930a448f@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:48 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

thats true, you are sorry diaper dan
>

518. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:10:43 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <tdM2c.7576$5M.252691@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Sorry ole boy (danny) - truth is, I don't know where your lips have been. My ass is too clean for you. Who knows what diseases lurk in your mouth. The fact that you said trim my moustache first, tells me you are as queer as a $3 bill. NO THANKS..... I don't do queers. CL

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:c216d3b20006d9a2e0ec25024b50304e@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:00 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Only if you trim your mustache.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> dan, are you gay? or just have a thing for guys with trimmed
> mustaches?
> >
> >"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> KISS MY ASS! CL
> >>

519. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:13:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%fM2c.26817$aT1.14@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040307155154.424$eV@newsreader.com...
> Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> > On Sat, 6 Mar 2004 20:25:02 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >YO - F*&K YOU! You need your head ripped off and shoved up your shit
> > >filled ass. CL
> >
> > That already happened. It's why he's collecting disability.
> >
> Figures, another freeloader!

Yep, thats right, another freeloader. That will learn me to defend your
right to be stupid. Bet I won't do that again.

And do you really want to get pissed off? I can collect social security in
a few years on top of it.

Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so YOU
could be a freeloader?

Dan/W4NTI

520. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:15:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rhM2c.26819$aT1.12398@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88486
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:8pvm40127duejb7gqq9pevulo0te7rra7d@4ax.com...
> On 07 Mar 2004 16:41:54 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
> wrote:
>
>
> >> > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer
is
> >> > funny, get it now, dummy?
> >>
> >> So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >No -you're- too dumb for that.
>
> ...and Viet Nam Dan was talking about credibility. It's no wonder
> WA8ULX, A.K.A. "Babbling Bruce" is his only friend.

Geee whiz...I thought you were my friend.

Dan/W4NTI

521. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:16:21 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c13bd4b9d642e3f959992531179c9d53@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:00:47 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
this mindspring.com> wrote:

>I rest my case. A CBer.
>
>Diaper Dan/W4NTI

I rest my case,your an ignorant blowhard.

522. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:16:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MiM2c.26821$aT1.18295@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:6QL2c.7567$5M.252643@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZfI2c.26344$aT1.15456@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> > > > >
> > > > Break in the conversation please...
> > > >
> > > > Can someone please translate the above?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> > >
> > > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> > > funny, get it now, dummy?
> >
> > So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> What, your spell checker doesn't work? OR you don't know how to use it?
SHUT
> UP and you won't be picked on. CL
>
>
>
```

Thats right...I don't know how to use it. Or maybe it does not work.
Gee....please help me...oh great wizard.

Dan/W4NTI

523. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:17:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <DjM2c.26826$aT1.23472@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:42c5c383e794cc0774e34637ab36f16d@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:40:25 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> >> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > >
> >> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> >> >
> >> > Break in the conversation please...
> >> >
> >> > Can someone please translate the above?
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> >>
> >> You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer is
> >> funny, get it now, dummy?
> >
> >So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> not for you, its writing not writting,dummy

Golly gee whiz...does that mean you won't take the apple?

Dan/W4NTI

524. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:19:57 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4f8d42cb7058f878090d926076c53e70@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88485
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
this mindspring.com> wimpered:

>No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
>cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed goofballs.
>At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
meters.

525. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:20:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dmM2c.26831$aT1.3498@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88491
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:bbL2c.9715$t16.5916416@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:EmI2c.26357$aT1.11817@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > Actually I have been fighting them for 5 years now about their line
noise
> > problems. Notice I said problems.
> >
> > Over this period of time the company has assigned a engineer from
> Birmingham
> > to work DIRECTLY with me. Which he has done.
> >
> > They have purchased new equipment and even sent this engineer to ARRL
> > classes in Newington on RFI. He is now quite good at locating it.
> >
> > In the period I have been working with him, about 2 1/2 years now. He
> has
> > done yoeman service and has found MANY sources of RFI. All of which
have
> > been corrected.
> >
> > In fact right now the latest one was recently cured and I am now
tracking,
> > what I hope is, the last one. I expect him to be out here again this
> week
> > or next, to try and locate it.
> >
> > So, you are right. Alabama power definitly knows me. And they know the
> > have to clear up their noise. It is against the law to have such a high
> > level. It takes time, and I happen to be in a rough area.
> >
> > But now when the wind blows my neighbors don't lose their power. And
> wires
> > dont hang loose and endanger children walking around the poles. And it
is
> > so much more quiet on HF now.
> >
> > As for BPL, this same engineer tells me he was involved with the
testing
> > and can NOT see any future for it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

>
> I hope he is right. Did he give any indication as to what he thinks will
> prevent it from being successful?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Mainly the cost of the repeaters every 3/4 mile, and the problem with the lines not being capable of supporting BPL due to line noise, bad connections, etc. In other words, a maintenance nightmare.

Dan/W4NTI

526. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:21:21 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <8c105ed0a06a809c6e3715a1cd5b7210@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise. Difference
>is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

you could say your an ignorant idiot and all of would believe you.

527. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:21:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RnM2c.26835$aT1.16395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
> > silly stuff.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> That why your dad told you to take a hike?

Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually, I
took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.

Dan/W4NTI

528. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:22:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <FoM2c.26836$aT1.1718@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:f331bf5a10995785f1dffa6c2df68dff@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:56:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
> >> > on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
> >> > >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
> >> > >group takes. They have as much right
> >> > > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> >>
> >> Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier than
> >> thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband" ROTFLMAO
> >
> >Dang....I hadn't thought of it that way. But you know something? I
think
> >you are right.
> >
> >Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
> >silly stuff.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> hey diaper dan, he said his station was legal. dang you should have
> thought about you low comprehension level.

Not possible. CBers don't operate legal.

Dan/W4NTI

529. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:23:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rpM2c.26837$aT1.8653@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88495
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:ea3f9fd89454250c6d15ce2fb1adf8e4@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:58:19 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c034bd2.0403061539.4988fa92@posting.google.com...
> >> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> >news:<Lwp2c.38051$qo.27589@fe1.texas.rr.com>...
> >> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> >> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > >
> >> > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> >> >
> >> > You caught that, too? LOL!!!
> >>
> >> FYI dan,
> >>
> >> Randy Chapman aka "I Am Not God and Steve Parks aka Steveo and some
> >> others, they are the same outlaw cb bunch that harassed leland Scott
> >> and Dwight Stewart when they discuss respect for FCC rules. Wait till
> >> you hear there excuses for being illegal LOL.
> >
> >I am sitting back, waiting with baited breath as they say.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> waiting for what? maybe you can get someone to translate for you
> diaper dan

Oh please do good buddy.

Dan/W4NTI

530. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:23:43 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1b206234feaf2f5f187a03d7898d30a7@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:09:43 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
>news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>>
>> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
>> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
>> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>> >
>> > DE N7ZZT
>> > Phoenix, Arizona
>> >
>> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> 'unlicensed
>> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > >
>> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
>> come
>> > > in and shut you down?
>> > >
>> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>protected
>> > > by Federal Laws.
>> > >
>>
>> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
>by
>> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're
>> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
>> or you will go to jail.
>>
>>
>
>I won't shut down. I will show them my FCC license, give them the number
>to Riley Hollingsworth and tell them to get off my property.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

unless the cop has trimmed mustache, then you would try and kiss him

531. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:24:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VpM2c.26838$aT1.13007@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Your wife told me last night.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:dVL2c.7571$5M.252641@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> DAMNED, how'd you know I had a hairy ass? CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:oxI2c.26408$aT1.11340@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > Only if you trim your mustache.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > KISS MY ASS! CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
> 97.
> > > > Cops
> > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
> of.
> > > > Maybe
> > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
you
> > off
> > > > some
> > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And,
I
> AM
> > A
> > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> > again,
> > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > >

> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
COPS
> > can
> > > > > come
> > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > > protected
> > > > > by
> > > > > > Federal Laws.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > > > spectrum.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like
to
> > > enjoy
> > > > > > > > on
> > > > > > > > > your
> > > > > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities
such
> as
> > > > > > > > linears,
> > > > > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> > operating
> > > > > per

> > > > > > > part
> > > > > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
> > isn't
> > > > > > helping
> > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> > > opinion.
> > > > I
> > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > do
> > > > > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and
> > decent
> > > > > > CBers.
> > > > > > > > > > CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
in
> > > message
> > > > > > > > >
> news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
> > taking
> > > > > it
> > > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that
CB's
> > no
> > > > > longer
> > > > > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
> without
> > a
> > > > > license
> > > > > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> > According
> > > > > to
> > > > > > > Part
> > > > > > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain
> on
> > > the
> > > > > air
> > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off

> when
> > > > > people
> > > > > > > who
> > > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that.
They
> > > need
> > > > to
> > > > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing
an
> > > > opinion
> > > > > or
> > > > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting
the
> > FCC
> > > on
> > > > > > that
> > > > > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe
you
> > > don't
> > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > money
> > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the
aid
> > of
> > > > your
> > > > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to
> the
> > > FCC
> > > > > > website
> > > > > > > > if
> > > > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online.
Print
> > out
> > > a
> > > > > page
> > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail
them
> > > while
> > > > > > you're

> > > > > > > > at
> > > > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie
down
> > and
> > > > let
> > > > > > > them
> > > > > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the
> local
> > > > > utility
> > > > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
consulted
> a
> > > > > > attorney
> > > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility
> could
> > > sue
> > > > > me
> > > > > > > for
> > > > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my
CB
> > > > antenna
> > > > > > > from
> > > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility
> is
> > > > > because
> > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received
with
> my
> > > > > > question
> > > > > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
> > about
> > > > my

> > > > > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand
up
> > > > against
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out
cease
> > and
> > > > > > desist
> > > > > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
>

532. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:24:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yqM2c.26841$aT1.18146@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I was trying to be gentle. His wife is reading this over my shoulder.

Dan/W4NTI

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c216d3b20006d9a2e0ec25024b50304e@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:00 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Only if you trim your mustache.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> dan, are you gay? or just have a thing for guys with trimmed
> mustaches?
> >
> >"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> KISS MY ASS! CL
> >>
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
97.
> >> > Cops
> >> > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
of.
> >> > Maybe
> >> > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks you
> >off
> >> > some
> >> > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And, I
AM
> >A
> >> > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> >again,
> >> > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> >> > >

> >> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> >> > 'unlicensed
> >> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
> >can
> >> > come
> >> > > > in and shut you down?
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> >> protected
> >> > > by
> >> > > > Federal Laws.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> >> > spectrum.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > >
> >> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air. CL
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> >message
> >> > > > > news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like
to
> >> enjoy
> >> > > > on
> >> > > > > > your
> >> > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities such
as
> >> > > > linears,
> >> > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> >operating
> >> > > per
> >> > > > > > part
> >> > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
> >isn't

> >> > > > helping
> >> > > > > > > the
> >> > > > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> >> opinion.
> >> > I
> >> > > > > > don't
> >> > > > > > > do
> >> > > > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and
> >decent
> >> > > > CBers.
> >> > > > > > > > CL
> >> > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> > message
> >> > > > > > > >
news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> >> > > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >> > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
> >taking
> >> > it
> >> > > > > > you're
> >> > > > > > > > > in
> >> > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that
CB's
> >no
> >> > > longer
> >> > > > > > > > required
> >> > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
without
> >a
> >> > > > license
> >> > > > > > > > when
> >> > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> >According
> >> > to
> >> > > > > Part
> >> > > > > > > > 95 -
> >> > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to remain
on
> >> the
> >> > > air
> >> > > > > > and
> >> > > > > > > > > talk.
> >> > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off
when
> >> > people
> >> > > > > who
> >> > > > > > > > have

> >> > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that.
They
> >> need
> >> > to
> >> > > > > > > > research
> >> > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing an
> >> > opinion
> >> > > or
> >> > > > > > > trying
> >> > > > > > > > > to
> >> > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting the
> >FCC
> >> on
> >> > > > that
> >> > > > > > > > issue.
> >> > > > > > > > > I
> >> > > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe
you
> >> don't
> >> > > > have
> >> > > > > > > > money
> >> > > > > > > > > > to
> >> > > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the
aid
> >of
> >> > your
> >> > > > > > elected
> >> > > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to
the
> >> FCC
> >> > > > > website
> >> > > > > > > > if
> >> > > > > > > > > > you
> >> > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online. Print
> >out
> >> a
> >> > > page
> >> > > > > > of
> >> > > > > > > > > > it,
> >> > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail them
> >> while
> >> > > > you're
> >> > > > > > > > at
> >> > > > > > > > > > it.
> >> > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie
down
> >and
> >> > let
> >> > > > > > them
> >> > > > > > > > bull

> >> > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> >> > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> >> > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> >> > > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the
local
> >> > > utility
> >> > > > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
consulted a
> >> > > > attorney
> >> > > > > > and
> >> > > > > > > > > > > after
> >> > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility
could
> >> sue
> >> > me
> >> > > > > for
> >> > > > > > > > > > because
> >> > > > > > > > > > I
> >> > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my
CB
> >> > antenna
> >> > > > > > from
> >> > > > > > > > > > the
> >> > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility
is
> >> > > because
> >> > > > > > of
> >> > > > > > > > > > the
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > cost
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received with
my
> >> > > > question
> >> > > > > > > here
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > last
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
> >about
> >> my
> >> > > > > > > experience.
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand
up
> >> > against
> >> > > > > the
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > utilities
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease
> >and
> >> > > desist
> >> > > > > > > > > > letters

> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> >> > > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > >
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > >
> >> > >
> > >

533. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:25:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <irM2c.26842$aT1.2130@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Oh my, look folks, a little attempt at humor. Don't give up your day job
'CL'.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:JUL2c.7570$5M.252534@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> The only "crummy lid" you know about is the one you ate from pulled from
the
> dumpster. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:8yI2c.26411$aT1.9645@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:PQu2c.7508$5M.251772@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > IT IS CL - ASS WIPE! And maybe it holds true in "some" areas, but not
> all.
> > I
> > > STILL think it is a case by case issue. CL - GOT IT? CL.......
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > > > > In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> > > > > <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
Part
> > 97.
> > > > Cops
> > > > > >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
aware
> > of.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself
(Terry
> > > Mangan),

> > > > > while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
> > > because
> > > > they
> > > > > were parked in front of his house.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> > > > > -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> > > >
> > > > Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by
the
> > > local
> > > > police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police
> and
> > > the
> > > > cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> > > >
> > > > Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because
we
> > > hold
> > > > a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

534. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:25:57 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1ce71a2b8f086cfa5545b78cfa82f81f@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 14:48:25 -0500, Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
wrote:

>On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
>mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
>>cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed goofballs.
>>At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>You've got to listen to more than just channel six...

first he has figure out how to turn the power on.

535. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:26:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lsM2c.26843$aT1.14170@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88499
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:p1vm40tv625i3g0suj61dt2988sbhc5us5@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
> >cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
goofballs.
> >At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> You've got to listen to more than just channel six...

Why bother? Its all the same, right?

Dan/W4NTI

536. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:27:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ttM2c.26845$aT1.1440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

But don't make any sense. I guess I need a translation book to understand
the CBism gibberish. Why is it you CBers talk so funny anyway?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:%XL2c.7573$5M.252662@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Well at least we know you can "listen to sound".. Good job - rover. CL
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:tBI2c.26428$aT1.6561@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING.
You
> > cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> goofballs.
> > At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB were
> for
> > > Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means????? ASS
> > > HOLE.............
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the
> 'outlaw'
> > > > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed
> station.
> > > > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??

> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either!
The
> > > > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes. They
> > have
> > > as
> > > > > > > much right
> > > > > > to
> > > > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the
> utility
> > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to licensed
> > > > stations.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell
out
> > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> > > license?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I
> > really
> > > > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > > give
> > > > > > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

537. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:30:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WvM2c.26849$aT1.5192@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88602
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:v6vm409lmv771rh8f94jhehq30qqsmdhbg@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
>
> You also could say that you live with little purple leprechauns, and
> he couldn't prove otherwise. IOW, if you make a claim, the burden of
> proof is on you.
>
> >Difference
> >is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> ...that's fine if you want to leave yourself open to identity theft.

Yeah, good excuse. Come on now, tell the real truth? Your just too
gutless to stand by your statements. You want to hide under a rock.

Right?

Dan/W4NTI

538. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:31:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SwM2c.26850$aT1.21012@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Sure it does. Your pissed because Ive got the guts to say somthing under my real name and call. You on the other hand....well you know the rest of it.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or GOD.
> CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise. Difference
> > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want to
> > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about
> 20
> > > years now. CL
> > >
> > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com> wrote
> > in
> > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
> 97.
> > > > > Cops
> > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
> of.
> > > > > Maybe
> > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks

you
> > off
> > > > some
> > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And,
I
> AM
> > A
> > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> > again,
> > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
post
> a
> > > > > > call.....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
what
> I
> > > > > thought...
> > > > >
> > > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

539. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:32:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%xM2c.26853$aT1.21889@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with you turkeys anyway?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message news:b%L2c.7575$5M.252683@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> On second thought..... NTI... NOT TRAINED INTELLECTUALLY.... CL
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> GOD.
> > CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
> Difference
> > > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want
> to
> > > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for
about
> > 20
> > > > years now. CL
> > > >
> > > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
> wrote
> > > in
> > > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are

Part
> > 97.
> > > > > Cops
> > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
aware
> > of.
> > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
> you
> > > off
> > > > > some
> > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
And,
> I
> > AM
> > > A
> > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
But
> > > again,
> > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
> post
> > a
> > > > > > call.....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
> what
> > I
> > > > > > thought...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

540. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:34:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XzM2c.26857$aT1.14894@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:zvL2c.747$Cm3.599@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > >
> > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > >
> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
> can
> > > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
> > > shut the CB station down.
> > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > protected
> > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > So is the legal CB operator.
> >
> > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > > spectrum.
> > >
> > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> > means they are not really CB at all.
> >
```

> > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >
> > > Just be careful with your facts.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill, K2UNK
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
>
> Perhaps so, but it doesn't change the law.
>
> > So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.
>
> Did you mean to say: So the CBer gets busted, goes off the air,
> and then the court gets to sort it out? If yes...
>
> The cops can't bust a CBer just for being on the ait. The cops
> have to bust someone and charge that person with one or more
> specific violations of FCC rules. Causing interference to BPL
> or any other service using a legal CB rig and antenna is NOT
> against any FCC rule.
>
> > Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
>
> Huh??? Even if the cops confiscate a legal CB rig, that does
> NOT prohibit the same CBer from buying or using another one.
>
> Now for a reality check...just how many local cops have actually
> taken any steps against any illegal or pirate CBers? I'm guessing
> next to none...much less a legal CBer?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

I wouldn't know Bill. Your the lawyer, you tell me.

Have a nice day. Now go back to fencing with Lenny.

Dan/W4NTI

541. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:35:38 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c6b95f9bf3681e04e71b0de393041e01@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:21:53 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
>> > silly stuff.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> That why your dad told you to take a hike?
>
>Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually, I
>took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

we will take up a collection, buy you a one way ticket back there.
then evryone would be happy

542. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:36:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <QBM2c.26862$aT1.17900@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88606
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:KEL2c.7564$5M.252688@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > >
> > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > >
> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
> can
> > > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
> > > shut the CB station down.
> > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > protected
> > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > So is the legal CB operator.
> >
> > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
> > > spectrum.
> > >
> > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> > means they are not really CB at all.
> >
```

> > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >
> > > Just be careful with your facts.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill, K2UNK
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
> >
> > So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.
> >
> > Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> The wise words of an ignorant self centered underinformed person who does
> NOT speak for the entire ham community. CL
>
>

How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but offer
nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.

If it squaks like a CBer,
If it talks like a CBer,

Its a CBer.

Dan/W4NTI

543. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:39:18 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2g4q602o51@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
In article <rHI2c.26447$aT1.333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
says...
>
>
>"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
>news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>>
>> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
>> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
>> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>> >
>> > DE N7ZZT
>> > Phoenix, Arizona
>> >
>> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> 'unlicensed
>> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > >
>> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
>> come
>> > > in and shut you down?
>> > >
>> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>protected
>> > > by Federal Laws.
>> > >
>>
>> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
>by
>> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're
>> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
>> or you will go to jail.
>>
>>
>
>I won't shut down. I will show them my FCC license, give them the number
>to Riley Hollingsworth and tell them to get off my property.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
```

>
do the bama police trim there mustaches?
>
>

You ask w

544. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:40:08 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2g4ro02ocm@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88615
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <40697993f05c9d245f7258d1930a448f@news.bubbanews.com>, Mississippi Maul says...
>
>On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:48 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this >mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>thats true, you are sorry diaper dan
>>
>
he stole my name!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

You ask w

545. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:40:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ZEM2c.26869$aT1.8957@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
told
> by
> > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
>
> Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
> the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> a specific violation pretty damn quick.
>
> > No, you'll do as you're
> > told. You will
> > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told

> > or you will go to jail.
>
> Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Good work Bill....see everyone, I told you he was a lawyer.

Dan/W4NTI

546. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:41:50 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2g4uu02oo3@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88613
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
im diaper trained and have my ham licence

In article , CL says...
>
>On second thought..... NTI... NOT TRAINED INTELLECTUALLY.... CL
>
>"CL" wrote in message
>news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
>GOD.
>> CL
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote in message
>> news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
>Difference
>> > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> > "CL" wrote in message
>> > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want
>to
>> > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for about
>> 20
>> > > years now. CL
>> > >
>> > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner"
>wrote
>> > in
>> > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
>> > > >
>> > > > "Ronnie" wrote in message
>> > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > "CL" wrote in message
>> > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part
>> 97.
>> > > > Cops
>> > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware
>> of.
```

>> > > > Maybe
>> > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
>you
>> > off
>> > > > some
>> > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And,
>I
>> AM
>> > A
>> > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
>> > again,
>> > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
>> > > > >
>> > > > > ....
>> > > > >
>> > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
>post
>> a
>> > > > > call.....
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
>what
>> I
>> > > > thought...
>> > > >
>> > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

You ask w

547. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:44:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VIM2c.26876$aT1.21042@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88608

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:5oL2c.84040$C65.9507@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> Forgive me if this has been mentioned before-
> I haven't read this group for years.
> Concerning fighting BPL, which the power industry
> is ramming at us using Part 15, why can't
> we use Part 15 to clobber *them?*
>
> The FCC has a history of listening when you quote
> their own laws to them. Here is a good one:
>
> ************
> TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION
>
> CHAPTER I--FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
>
> PART 15--RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES--Table of Contents
>
> Subpart A--General
>
> Sec. 15.5 General conditions of operation.
>
> (a) Persons operating intentional or unintentional radiators
> shall not be deemed to have any vested or recognizable right
> to continued use of any given frequency by virtue
> of prior registration or certification of equipment, or,
> for power line carrier systems, on the basis of prior
> notification of use pursuant to Sec. 90.63(g) of this chapter.
> (b) Operation of an intentional, unintentional, or incidental
> radiator is subject to the conditions that no harmful interference is
> caused and that interference must be accepted that may be caused by the
> operation of an authorized radio station, by another intentional or
> unintentional radiator, by industrial, scientific and medical (ISM)
> equipment, or by an incidental radiator.
> (c) The operator of a radio frequency device shall be required to
> cease operating the device upon notification by a Commission
> representative that the device is causing harmful interference.
> Operation shall not resume until the condition causing the harmful
> interference has been corrected.
>
> *************
>
> We are federally licensed stations. If their "Part 15"
> "incidental radiators" interfere with our stations,

> the law REQUIRES the power companies to cease
> their operations until the interferance is fixed.
>
> Why can't we take this angle to clobber these guys?
>
> 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S
> arc5@ix.netcom.com
>

They are counting on the fact that most of us HF spectrum users are so fragmented, and at each others throat, that we could NEVER get up a real legal action. And they are probably right.

Dan/W4NTI

548. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:54:16 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <f4b4bf9926b1c3e33cce5ed71a4f96fc@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88609
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:24:46 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>I was trying to be gentle. His wife is reading this over my shoulder.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

nonsense, you are a faggot, you already admitted it

549. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 21:59:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307165947.15923.00004222@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88611

In article <5oL2c.84040$C65.9507@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>We are federally licensed stations. If their "Part 15"
>"incidental radiators" interfere with our stations,
>the law REQUIRES the power companies to cease
>their operations until the interferance is fixed.
>
>Why can't we take this angle to clobber these guys?
>
That's exactly what the NPRM says will happen. Take a look and read it
carefully - it's full of verbiage that says the BPL guys must "remediate".

Of course that's great in theory, but the practice is something else again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

550. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:00:51 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4feb6a28653918a20cf4b8d41a4cf81b@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:32:43 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No
>Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with you
>turkeys anyway?
>
>Diaper Dan/W4NTI
>

its taxable not taxible, dummy

551. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:06:30 UTC
From: Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <2aeb13a4c74ae0474dc78fbb51c64353@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 88612
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:36:48 GMT, "Dummy Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
this mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but offer
>nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
>
>If it squaks like a CBer,
>If it talks like a CBer,
>
>Its a CBer.
>
>Dummy Dan/W4NTI
>

Its squawks, not squaks, dummy. you are a joke. at least if nothing
else you are good for a laugh.

552. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:10:33 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <104n7ep8fm7s18c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88616
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Mississippi Maul <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:4f8d42cb7058f878090d926076c53e70@news.bubbanews.com:

> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wimpered:
>
>>No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING.
>>You cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
>>goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
> You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
> meters.
>
>

Nah, just a few bloviating bad apples. ..but not all of them.

553. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:12:36 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <o7N2c.57388$lS1.49889@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > by Federal Laws.
> > >
> > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
told
> by
> > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
>
> Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
> the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> a specific violation pretty damn quick.
>
> > No, you'll do as you're
> > told. You will
> > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
```

> > or you will go to jail.
>
> Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

They'll arrest for simply disturbing the peace.

554. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:21:21 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2g791030gq@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

im a cber and a hammmer. i hammer in the morning and cb at night

In article <2aeb13a4c74ae0474dc78fbb51c64353@news.bubbanews.com>, Mississippi
Maul says...
>
>On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:36:48 GMT, "Dummy Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
>this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but offer
>>nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
>>
>>If it squaks like a CBer,
>>If it talks like a CBer,
>>
>>Its a CBer.
>>
>>Dummy Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
>Its squawks, not squaks, dummy. you are a joke. at least if nothing
>else you are good for a laugh.
>

You ask w

555. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:24:27 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2g7er030v6@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

i here my name on 80 meters and its not me. what should i do?

In article <XzM2c.26857$aT1.14894@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
says...
>
>
>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:zvL2c.747$Cm3.599@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> >
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
>> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
>> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>> > > >
>> > > > DE N7ZZT
>> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
>> > > >
>> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> > > 'unlicensed
>> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
>> can
>> > > come
>> > > > > in and shut you down?
>> > > >
>> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
>> > > shut the CB station down.
>> > > >
>> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>> > protected
>> > > > > by Federal Laws.
>> > > >
>> > > So is the legal CB operator.
>> > >

>> > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
>> > > spectrum.
>> > >
>> > > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
>> > > means they are not really CB at all.
>> > >
>> > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>> > >
>> > > Just be careful with your facts.
>> > >
>> > > Cheers,
>> > > Bill, K2UNK
>> > >
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> > How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
>>
>> Perhaps so, but it doesn't change the law.
>>
>> > So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.
>>
>> Did you mean to say: So the CBer gets busted, goes off the air,
>> and then the court gets to sort it out? If yes...
>>
>> The cops can't bust a CBer just for being on the ait. The cops
>> have to bust someone and charge that person with one or more
>> specific violations of FCC rules. Causing interference to BPL
>> or any other service using a legal CB rig and antenna is NOT
>> against any FCC rule.
>>
>> > Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
>>
>> Huh??? Even if the cops confiscate a legal CB rig, that does
>> NOT prohibit the same CBer from buying or using another one.
>>
>> Now for a reality check...just how many local cops have actually
>> taken any steps against any illegal or pirate CBers? I'm guessing
>> next to none...much less a legal CBer?
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>>
>>
>>
>
>I wouldn't know Bill. Your the lawyer, you tell me.
>
>Have a nice day. Now go back to fencing with Lenny.
>

>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

You ask w

556. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies/Speaking of which...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 22:24:52 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403071424.64dc805c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

mrtimnebo@aol.com (MrTimNebo) wrote in message
news:<20040307001350.09437.00001106@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
> if i had something to admitt i would but for now i'm too busy
> calling cq and working the world on the various pirate bands
> thruout the hf spectrum.
>
> >Not that I really expected you to admit it. It's
> >the same as when you're bootlegging on those other
> >HF bands.
>
> no i'm ticked because stupid ass hams like you continue
> bothering us cb'ers instead of playing with all your super
> nerdy toys you like to brag so much about. whil;e you guys
> play radio where actually having fun using radios.
>
> >You're ticked because Hams have a system like
> >Echo-Link that you can't use and abuse like 11m
> >when you please.

another pirate puts his foot in his mouth

557. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:21:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403071521.aabb8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88621

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
> > Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> > amateur radio done for me lately?"
>
> How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.

I remember the video with music and scenes of the Twin Towers burning
and tumbling down. The caption read "NEVER FORGET."

Sorry Dee, but only four percent (4%) of those responding said that
9/11 terrorism was the most important issue in America today. The
mainstream press has gotten them in a frenzy over the economy and
jobs.

Then there was
> the great blackout of 2003.

Comms/Phones didn't go out. How was amateur radio useful when
everyone had comms?

> No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of
> which I haven't heard. There of course there are the emergencies to come
> such as future hurricanes. Although these have been rather quiet the last
> few years, that doesn't mean they are gone.

I know, I know. Does Powell know?

> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons,
> bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely provide
> communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.

Those are good practice.

558. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:26:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403071526.372ef00e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88622

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A57D706F6F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> >> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:
>
> >> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
> >> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
> >> >
> >>
> >> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back up...
> >
> > Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> > or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> >
>
> I wasn't talking about our towers, though, was I? I have one I've never put
> up. The point is that, for example, we can communicate in and out of a
> disaster area on HF SSB, for example, without needing a tower. Doesn't
> happen every day, but that's something to be thankful for.

True enough. People might be able to use cellular phones to do the same.

559. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:26:12 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2gb2k095c@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <VIM2c.26876$aT1.21042@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI says...
>
>They are counting on the fact that most of us HF spectrum users are so
>fragmented, and at each others throat, that we could NEVER get up a real
>legal action. And they are probably right.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
maybe we can get the cbers to help us.

You ask w

560. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies/Speaking of which...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:27:23 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2gb4r09al@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c034bd2.0403071424.64dc805c@posting.google.com>, I Am Not George says...
>
>mrtimnebo@aol.com (MrTimNebo) wrote in message
>news:<20040307001350.09437.00001106@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>>
>> if i had something to admitt i would but for now i'm too busy
>> calling cq and working the world on the various pirate bands
>> thruout the hf spectrum.
>>
>> >Not that I really expected you to admit it. It's
>> >the same as when you're bootlegging on those other
>> >HF bands.
>>
>> no i'm ticked because stupid ass hams like you continue
>> bothering us cb'ers instead of playing with all your super
>> nerdy toys you like to brag so much about. whil;e you guys
>> play radio where actually having fun using radios.
>>
>> >You're ticked because Hams have a system like
>> >Echo-Link that you can't use and abuse like 11m
>> >when you please.
>
>another pirate puts his foot in his mouth
>
do you have a foot fetish to?

You ask w

561. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:29:37 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2gb9109je@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88813
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

i have a roger beep mike on my cb it works real good.

In article <QBM2c.26862$aT1.17900@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
says...
>
>
>"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>news:KEL2c.7564$5M.252688@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> >
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
>> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
>> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>> > > >
>> > > > DE N7ZZT
>> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
>> > > >
>> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> > > 'unlicensed
>> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
>> can
>> > > come
>> > > > > in and shut you down?
>> > > >
>> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to
>> > > shut the CB station down.
>> > > >
>> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>> > protected
>> > > > > by Federal Laws.
>> > > >
>> > > So is the legal CB operator.
>> > > >

>> > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up the
>> > > spectrum.
>> > >
>> > > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
>> > > means they are not really CB at all.
>> > >
>> > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
>> > >
>> > > Just be careful with your facts.
>> > >
>> > > Cheers,
>> > > Bill, K2UNK
>> > >
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> > How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
>> >
>> > So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it out.
>> >
>> > Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>>
>> The wise words of an ignorant self centered underinformed person who does
>> NOT speak for the entire ham community. CL
>>
>>
>
>How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but offer
>nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
>
>If it squaks like a CBer,
>If it talks like a CBer,
>
>Its a CBer.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

You ask w

562. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:31:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403071531.4f578243@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88623

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040307143214.22081.00004446@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403070434.7c49e89e@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Especially since you can't seem to get your own stories straight...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, I have no trouble keeping my "stories" straight. That's the
> >beauty of telling the truth. Try it sometime - after you're back on
> >your meds.
>
> If, and only if he HAS meds. I'm not so sure he does.
>
> Truth and reality interfere with the enjoyability of fanstasy. We
> won't see much of truth and reality in here from the gunnery nurse.
>
> LHA / WMD

Len, this is how "homelessness" starts. You get a middle aged guy who
should be on meds, starts down the wrong path, can't seem to get it
together enough to get back up, and the next thing you know, he's
sleeping under a bridge, fighting with other homeless men, and
sniffing glue.

563. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:35:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <llO2c.9757$t16.5940127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88848

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:5oL2c.84040$C65.9507@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> Forgive me if this has been mentioned before-
> I haven't read this group for years.
> Concerning fighting BPL, which the power industry
> is ramming at us using Part 15, why can't
> we use Part 15 to clobber *them?*
>
> The FCC has a history of listening when you quote
> their own laws to them. Here is a good one:
>

It has been mentioned many times before. The fear is that commercial interests will be able to convince the FCC to change the rules so that hams have no defense against BPL.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

564. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:43:48 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <7gcn40l795rpd02p9kildua3bme4mr533b@4ax.com>
Source record: 88812
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:30:30 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> ...that's fine if you want to leave yourself open to identity theft.
>
>Yeah, good excuse. Come on now, tell the real truth? Your just too
>gutless to stand by your statements. You want to hide under a rock.
>
>Right?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Like you do when you threaten people on HF? Funny how you're never
heard on any of the local repeaters. Now, why is that?

565. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:48:37 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <81dn40p8vs19rq3canfm8eg32uirrd4bjc@4ax.com>
Source record: 88816
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:15:03 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>> ...and Viet Nam Dan was talking about credibility. It's no wonder
>> WA8ULX, A.K.A. "Babbling Bruce" is his only friend.
>
>Geee whiz...I thought you were my friend.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass and get a job.

566. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:50:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8zO2c.1309$Cm3.120@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZEM2c.26869$aT1.8957@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> > >
> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > >
> > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > >
> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
> can
> > > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > protected
> > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > >
> > > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
> told
> > by
> > > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > >
> > Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> > They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
> > the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> > Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> > a specific violation pretty damn quick.
> >
```

> > > No, you'll do as you're
> > > told. You will
> > > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> > > or you will go to jail.
> >
> > Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> > toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> > be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> > arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> > will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> > free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Good work Bill....see everyone, I told you he was a lawyer.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Not a lawyer at all. Just common sense application of
reality based on a general knowledge of the law and of
local government.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

567. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:54:05 UTC
From: Not leland <not@lee.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A5C0470C2941234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 88626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net:

> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> GOD. CL

There is no god anyhow, you made the claim now prove it.

568. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:54:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <JCO2c.1313$Cm3.213@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:o7N2c.57388$lS1.49889@fe2.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> > >
> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > >
> > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > >
> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
> can
> > > come
> > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > >
> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > protected
> > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > >
> > > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
> told
> > by
> > > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > >
> > Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> > They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
> > the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> > Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> > a specific violation pretty damn quick.
> >
```

> > > No, you'll do as you're
> > > told. You will
> > > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> > > or you will go to jail.
> >
> > Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> > toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> > be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> > arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> > will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> > free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> They'll arrest for simply disturbing the peace.

Based on what reasoning?

Even if a local cop was dumb enough to do that, any
1/2 brained attorney would have the charge dropped
in a heartbeat... if the prosecutor didn't do it first
because of the inapplicability of the charge to the
situation at hand.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

569. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:58:40 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <QGO2c.57419$lS1.26490@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not leland" <not@lee.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A5C0470C2941234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
> news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net:
>
> > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> > GOD. CL
>
> There is no god anyhow, you made the claim now prove it.

No, that would be Frank.

570. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-07 23:59:59 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <3IO2c.57420$IS1.20272@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:JCO2c.1313$Cm3.213@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:o7N2c.57388$lS1.49889@fe2.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > > news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > > >
> > > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > > >
> > > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
COPS
> > can
> > > > come
> > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > > protected
> > > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > > >
> > > > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
> > told
> > > > by
> > > > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > > >
> > > Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> > > They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
```

> > > the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> > > Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> > > a specific violation pretty damn quick.
> > >
> > > > No, you'll do as you're
> > > > told. You will
> > > > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> > > > or you will go to jail.
> > >
> > > Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> > > toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> > > be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> > > arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> > > will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> > > free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > They'll arrest for simply disturbing the peace.
>
> Based on what reasoning?
>
> Even if a local cop was dumb enough to do that, any
> 1/2 brained attorney would have the charge dropped
> in a heartbeat... if the prosecutor didn't do it first
> because of the inapplicability of the charge to the
> situation at hand.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Now you're starting to catch on. You will beat the rap, but you won't beat the ride.

571. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:01:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OJO2c.1322$Cm3.364@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:TLL2c.7565$5M.252673@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >
> > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > >
> > > DE N7ZZT
> > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > >
> > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > 'unlicensed
> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > >
> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> > come
> > > > in and shut you down?
> > > >
> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> protected
> > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > >
> >
> > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
told
> > by some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > No, you'll do as you're told. You will win in the long run
> > (court), but you will do as you're told
> > or you will go to jail.
>
> This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument. A cop may
> not be aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
> scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it. YOU
> have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case, is
> stupid.
```

In the case above, let's assume the CB activity isn't mobile,
but rather from a fixed station in your home. In that case,
the cop has no basis at all to do anything more than knock
on your door and talk to you. Without a warrant to search,
the cop has NO ability to enter your home at all. To get a warrant,
the police need the OK of a judge...which isn't done for
just any reason.

> You exercise your rights to the judge.

I'd suggest it won't even go that far.

> As long as HE is not on the
> take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent.

Any decent prosecutor wouldn't even let it go that far.
Proosecutor's don't like losing cases and probably
wouldn't press any charges at all.

> Let's face it
> fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to know
> ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL

And the cops don't give a hoot about CB. There's no
police glory in it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

572. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:06:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <7OO2c.1328$Cm3.268@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:3IO2c.57420$lS1.20272@fe2.texas.rr.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:JCO2c.1313$Cm3.213@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > news:o7N2c.57388$lS1.49889@fe2.texas.rr.com...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > > > >
> > > > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
> COPS
> > > can
> > > > > come
> > > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > > protected
> > > > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're
being
> > > told
> > > > > by
```

> > > > > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > > > >
> > > > Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> > > > They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
> > > > the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> > > > Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> > > > a specific violation pretty damn quick.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, you'll do as you're
> > > > > told. You will
> > > > > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> > > > > or you will go to jail.
> > > > >
> > > > Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> > > > toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation
to
> > > > be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> > > > arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> > > > will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> > > > free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
> > > > >
> > > > Cheers,
> > > > Bill K2UNK
> > >
> > They'll arrest for simply disturbing the peace.
> >
> Based on what reasoning?
> >
> Even if a local cop was dumb enough to do that, any
> 1/2 brained attorney would have the charge dropped
> in a heartbeat... if the prosecutor didn't do it first
> because of the inapplicability of the charge to the
> situation at hand.
> >
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
> Now you're starting to catch on. You will beat the rap, but you won't beat
> the ride.

BUT, do it once and the cop gets a warning from
the prosecutor to stop wasting his time. Additionally,
how does the cop gain entrance to a home to
arrest anyone based on what knowledge of a CBer being
on the air?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

573. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:17:23 UTC
From: Wh0m3? <me@the-hospital.com>
Message-ID: <3pen40lu10mlba7ljnq0mnaembrbb87kbp@4ax.com>
Source record: 88632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
On Sun, 7 Mar 2004 15:39:10 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
wrote:

>
>"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
>news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
>>
>> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
>> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
>> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
>> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
>> >
>> > DE N7ZZT
>> > Phoenix, Arizona
>> >
>> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
>> 'unlicensed
>> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
>> > >
>> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS can
>> come
>> > > in and shut you down?
>> > >
>> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
>protected
>> > > by Federal Laws.
>> > >
>>
>> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being told
>by
>> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as you're
>> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
>> or you will go to jail.
>>
>>
>
>This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument. A cop may
>not be aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
>scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it. YOU
>have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case, is
>stupid. You exercise your rights to the judge. As long as HE is not on the
```

>take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent. Let's face it
>fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to know
>ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL
>

same rules apply to all, and the powers that be say ignorance of the
law is no excuse if someone breaks the law, well that applies equally
to the law enforcement people. If I were in a situation where I was
fined or arrested when I did nothing wrong, they would be made to pay
for that error.

574. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:27:08 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <67fn40lfgip6ksdskbbdcaed9asrdm473r@4ax.com>
Source record: 88817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:54:05 -0600, Not leland <not@lee.com> wrote:

>"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
>news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net:
>
>> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
>> GOD. CL
>
>There is no god anyhow, you made the claim now prove it.

Actually, the concept of god can neither be proved nor disproved. Any evidence for the existence of god is purely subjective. Any evidence against the existence of god would be a futile attempt to prove a negative.

575. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:30:47 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <XaP2c.7587$5M.252673@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:FoM2c.26836$aT1.1718@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:f331bf5a10995785f1dffa6c2df68dff@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:56:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > >news:c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com...
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
> > >> > on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
> > >> > >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
> > >> > >group takes. They have as much right
> > >> > > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > >>
> > >> Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier than
> > >> thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband" ROTFLMAO
> > >
> > >Dang....I hadn't thought of it that way. But you know something? I
> think
> > >you are right.
> > >
> > >Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all that
> > >silly stuff.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > hey diaper dan, he said his station was legal. dang you should have
> > thought about you low comprehension level.
>
> Not possible. CBers don't operate legal.
>
```

> Dan/W4NTI
>

You know something, YOU ARE SO FULL OF SHIT. NOT ALL CBer's operate out of band or with more than the recommended wattage.. AND NOT ALL HAMS operate within the framework of Part 97 either. Check all those who've been fined, you'll see. YOU have a problem with using a broad paint brush. CL

576. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:32:49 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <%aP2c.7588$5M.252673@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE... Any more DIM ideas????? DICKHEAD. NTI = NOT TOO INTELLIGENT! They had you pegged when they gave you that call. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:yqM2c.26841$aT1.18146@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I was trying to be gentle. His wife is reading this over my shoulder.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c216d3b20006d9a2e0ec25024b50304e@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:00 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> > this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >Only if you trim your mustache.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > dan, are you gay? or just have a thing for guys with trimmed
> > mustaches?
> > >
> > >"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> KISS MY ASS! CL
> > >>
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
Part
> 97.
> > >> > Cops
> > >> > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
aware
> of.
> > >> > Maybe
> > >> > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
you

> > >off
> > >> > some
> > >> > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it. And,
I
> AM
> > >A
> > >> > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago. But
> > >again,
> > >> > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > >> > >
> > >> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > >> > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > >> > 'unlicensed
> > >> > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
COPS
> > >can
> > >> > come
> > >> > > > in and shut you down?
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > >> protected
> > >> > > by
> > >> > > > Federal Laws.
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up
the
> > >> > spectrum.
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >> > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air.
CL
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > >message
> > >> > > > >
news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > >> > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message

> > >> > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you like
> to
> > >> enjoy
> > >> > > on
> > >> > > > > your
> > >> > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities
such
> as
> > >> > > > linears,
> > >> > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> > >operating
> > >> > per
> > >> > > > > part
> > >> > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your opinion
> > >isn't
> > >> > > > helping
> > >> > > > > > the
> > >> > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> > >> opinion.
> > >> > I
> > >> > > > > don't
> > >> > > > > > do
> > >> > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good and
> > >decent
> > >> > > > CBers.
> > >> > > > > > > CL
> > >> > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
in
> > >> > message
> > >> > > > > > >
> news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >> > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I" am
> > >taking
> > >> > > > it
> > >> > > > > > you're
> > >> > > > > > > > in
> > >> > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that
> CB's
> > >no
> > >> > > > longer
> > >> > > > > > > > required
> > >> > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
> without
> > >a
> > >> > > > > license

> > >> > > > > > > when
> > >> > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> > >According
> > >> > to
> > >> > > > Part
> > >> > > > > > > > 95 -
> > >> > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to
remain
> on
> > >> the
> > >> > > air
> > >> > > > > and
> > >> > > > > > > > > talk.
> > >> > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me off
> when
> > >> > > people
> > >> > > > > > who
> > >> > > > > > > > > have
> > >> > > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that.
> They
> > >> need
> > >> > to
> > >> > > > > > > research
> > >> > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing
an
> > >> > opinion
> > >> > > or
> > >> > > > > > > trying
> > >> > > > > > > > > > to
> > >> > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting
the
> > >FCC
> > >> on
> > >> > > > that
> > >> > > > > > > > issue.
> > >> > > > > > > > > > I
> > >> > > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe
> you
> > >> don't
> > >> > > > have
> > >> > > > > > > money
> > >> > > > > > > > > > to
> > >> > > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the
> aid
> > >of
> > >> > your
> > >> > > > > > elected
> > >> > > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online to
> the
> > >> FCC

> > >> > > > > website
> > >> > > > > > if
> > >> > > > > > > > you
> > >> > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online.
Print
> > >out
> > >> a
> > >> > > page
> > >> > > > > of
> > >> > > > > > > it,
> > >> > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail
them
> > >> while
> > >> > > you're
> > >> > > > > at
> > >> > > > > > > it.
> > >> > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie
> down
> > >and
> > >> > let
> > >> > > > them
> > >> > > > > > bull
> > >> > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > >> > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > >> > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > >> > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the
> local
> > >> > utility
> > >> > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
> consulted a
> > >> > > > attorney
> > >> > > > > > and
> > >> > > > > > > > > after
> > >> > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility
> could
> > >> sue
> > >> > me
> > >> > > > > for
> > >> > > > > > > because
> > >> > > > > > > > > I
> > >> > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my
> CB
> > >> > antenna
> > >> > > > > > from
> > >> > > > > > > the
> > >> > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the
utility
> is

> > >> > > because
> > >> > > > of
> > >> > > > > > the
> > >> > > > > > > > > > cost
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received
with
> my
> > >> > > > question
> > >> > > > > > here
> > >> > > > > > > > > last
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to know
> > >about
> > >> my
> > >> > > > > > experience.
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand
> up
> > >> > against
> > >> > > > the
> > >> > > > > > > > utilities
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out
cease
> > >and
> > >> > > desist
> > >> > > > > > > > letters
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > >> > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > > >
> > >> > > > > >
> > >> > > > > >
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > >
> > >> > >
> > >> >
> > >> >

> >
>
>

577. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:33:37 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <HbP2c.7589$5M.252785@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:f4b4bf9926b1c3e33cce5ed71a4f96fc@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:24:46 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I was trying to be gentle. His wife is reading this over my shoulder.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> nonsense, you are a faggot, you already admitted it

I SECOND THAT!!!!!! HE IS A FAG..... YOU said it Danno..... NOT US. CL

578. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:34:48 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <OcP2c.7590$5M.252777@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"DANNY JESWALD" <DiaperDan@home.nut> wrote in message
news:c2g4ro02ocm@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <40697993f05c9d245f7258d1930a448f@news.bubbanews.com>,
Mississippi
> Maul says...
> >
> >On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:48 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> >mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> >>I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >thats true, you are sorry diaper dan
> >>
> >
> he stole my name!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> You ask w
>

Don't worry, we won't confuse you with him.. WE look at addresses and
messages... WE can tell who is who. He speaks with no sense. CL

579. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:36:08 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <2eP2c.7591$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:MiM2c.26821$aT1.18295@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:6QL2c.7567$5M.252643@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:ZfI2c.26344$aT1.15456@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040306175438.064$mS@newsreader.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040306135510.690$g7@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > HAHAHA! your should be you're, you idiot.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Break in the conversation please...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can someone please translate the above?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > I'll type s-l-o-w for you.
> > > > >
> > > > You're (not your) calling someone too dumb while using poor grammer
is
> > > > funny, get it now, dummy?
> > > >
> > > So flippin what? Is this a writting class?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> What, your spell checker doesn't work? OR you don't know how to use it?
> SHUT
> > UP and you won't be picked on. CL
> >
```

> >
> >
>
> Thats right...I don't know how to use it. Or maybe it does not work.
> Gee....please help me...oh great wizard.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Well at least you admit to your stupidity, that is a good start. CL

580. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:37:16 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <5fP2c.7592$5M.252825@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88638
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:4f8d42cb7058f878090d926076c53e70@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wimpered:
>
> >No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
> >cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
goofballs.
> >At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
> meters.
>

WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the CBers! CL.

581. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:38:57 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <HgP2c.7593$5M.252699@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:8c105ed0a06a809c6e3715a1cd5b7210@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
Difference
> >is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> you could say your an ignorant idiot and all of would believe you.

Just because you give your FOOL name and call sign does NOT make you
credible. It just signs off on your being a complete ASS. So the rest of us
know who you are. CL

582. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:39:28 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9hP2c.7594$5M.252812@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:RnM2c.26835$aT1.16395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
that
> > > silly stuff.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > That why your dad told you to take a hike?
>
> Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually, I
> took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Too bad you came back! CL

583. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:40:08 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <NhP2c.7595$5M.252782@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c6b95f9bf3681e04e71b0de393041e01@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:21:53 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
that
> >> > silly stuff.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> That why your dad told you to take a hike?
> >
> >Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually, I
> >took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> we will take up a collection, buy you a one way ticket back there.
> then evryone would be happy

Where do we send the contributions??????? CL

584. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:40:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307194049.07155.00001120@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88644

In article <8_ednbamarhhgNfdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> The trick is to do that without creating more poor countries.

> At the present time, I doubt that is a concern.

I meant that one of the poor countries would be the USA.
>
>> And the fundamental question is: Why are countries poor in the first place,
>> and how do countries get rich and stay rich without exploiting other
countries?

No substitute for the Econ 101 fundamentals that W3RV posted.
>>
>>> Examples are what has happened to Japan. Korea is the present hot
>>> spot, but is slowing. China is ascendant now, but the inevitible will
happen
>>>there. Mexico is now experiencing import concerns too.
>>
>> Remember NAFTA and the "giant sucking sound"? Where's Ross now?
>
> Ahh, there was some comic relief!

Except Ross Perot was exactly right.

Consider this, too: We got 8 years of Bill Clinton in large part because Perot
split his opposition. We got Shrub in 2000 because Ralkph Nader did the same
thing to *his* opposition. And now ol' Crazy Ralphie is poised to do it again.

>>> What happens when the cycle is complete, and the last third world
>>>nation is brought up to modern standards will be the interesting thing.
>>
>> First you have to understand why it hasn't happened yet.
>
> There are plenty of countries yet to bring up.

The reasons it hasn't happened are things like:

- Corrupt strongman governments
- Overpopulation for the country's resources
- Cultural factors that hinder development
- Different values of the people
>
>>>>>In the short
>>>>>run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>>>>>either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of

>>>>>manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>>>>
>>>>OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
>>>>lower prices?
>>>
>>> You see, the big trick is to have all this happen without ourselves
>>>turning into a third world country. See below.
>>>
>> And that trick is?
>
> As I see it, one of the first things to do is to stabilize the stock
>market. Right now it is so short term, that it will do damage to the
>companies involved, and to workers. The pressure to increase profits on
>the short time scales now involved makes longterm actions difficult if
>not impossible.

The market is slowly but surely recovering from the boom dot bust debacle of
2000.
>
> I don't subscribe to the Japanese lifetime employment thing, but at the

>base of it, there is a valid idea. Humans desire a little stability.
>Remove that stability, and a whole host of problems erupt. Employer
>loyalty goes away, and when that happens, things suffer. If I know my
>employer will just as soon get rid of me for .001 percent rise in their
>stock, I'm not going to be willing to stay in all night to make sure the
>project goes out the door on time.

That and a whole lot more. In an environment where employees jump ship a lot,
the continuity of how and why things are done is often lost and the same
mistakes are made over and over.
>
> Note the present legislative efforts to shift workers from overtime
>eligible to salaried. From the supershort term view, this makes perfect
>sense. Reduction of the employees salary by mandatory unpaid overtime.
>This will make for a quick jump in profits. From a longer term
>perspective, it makes for a "what do we do next quarter to increase
>profits" issue, it makes the job less desireable, because now the
>employees are taking a wage cut, and they have it reinforced that their
>empoloyer would like nothing better than to get rid of them.

Yup - and that's just one effect. Another is that tax revenue and consumer
spending drop. Efficiency drops because more mistakes are made. The really good
workers migrate to jobs that still pay decently and the employers find they are
left with those who can't go anywhere else.

And then the organized labor movement is revitalized as more and more workers
realize their only strength is in unity. This costs companies even more in the
form of strikes and restrictive contracts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

585. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:40:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307194050.07155.00001121@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88643

In article <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be learned
>> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose
>> major threats.
>
>Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
>Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years.

That depends on the technology. Houses today are not built much differently than they were 15/20 years ago. New materials and techniques are used alongside old ones. Most of those in the building trades, as well as DIY types, can keep up with the changes.

>If I hadn't had the
>opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
>Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
>compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
>somewhere.
>
>> And who pays for the retraining?
>
>It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
>training costs per employee are gone.

In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System) paid for your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your own. More important, your new training built on your existing skills and knowledge so you could stay in the same field.
>
>> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>> >> alone.
>> >
>> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
>> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
>> >and less need for skilled labor.
>>
>> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
>> automated and all - is moving to places like China.
>>
>> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
>
>The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.

Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready and of low quality. Companies do not support products after even a few years because they want you to buy the new products.

This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned" their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional. Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were the new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the best of care.

>Look at the
>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.

Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc. However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.

>Consider too that
>a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
>to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
>is applied by the consumer).
>
A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was balanced, Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend", unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I knew were talking about retiring at 55.

All changed now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

586. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:40:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040307194051.07155.00001122@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88642

In article <dKE2c.26126$aT1.22388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>In 1958, the exam grader was always an FCC official...not a ham.
>Even when you took the test administered by a ham,
>it was not graded by the ham, the test was
>sent pack to the FCC who graded it.

That was true right up to when the VEs took over in the early 1980s.

In the case of by-mail exams (all Novices and Conditionals, most Techs) you didn't know whether you had passed or failed until you got the envelope from the FCC six to eight weeks after your volunteer examiner sent the written test to them for grading. If you failed you had to do the whole thing all over again (code and theory), if you passed you got the license.

Those of us who took exams by mail were looking for the "thin envelope" (all that was inside was the license) and dreading the "thick envelope" (it had a letter telling you that you failed, plus retest instructions and a Form 610).

73 de Jim, N2EY

587. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:42:20 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <SjP2c.7596$5M.252777@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I told you "NOT TOO INTELLIGENT" - I'M NOT MARRIED! Good call sign! Fits you
well. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:VpM2c.26838$aT1.13007@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Your wife told me last night.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:dVL2c.7571$5M.252641@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > DAMNED, how'd you know I had a hairy ass? CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:oxI2c.26408$aT1.11340@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > Only if you trim your mustache.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > KISS MY ASS! CL
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
Part
> > 97.
> > > > > > Cops
> > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
aware
> > of.
> > > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
> you
> > > off
> > > > > some

> > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
And,
> I
> > AM
> > > A
> > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
But
> > > again,
> > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
> COPS
> > > can
> > > > > > come
> > > > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > > > protected
> > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > Federal Laws.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up
the
> > > > spectrum.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are
Facts.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the air.
CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > > message
> > > > > > >
news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you
like
> to
> > > > enjoy
> > > > > > on
> > > > > > > > your
> > > > > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities
> such
> > as
> > > > > > linears,
> > > > > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> > > operating
> > > > > per
> > > > > > > > part
> > > > > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your
opinion
> > > isn't
> > > > > > helping
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with your
> > > > opinion.
> > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > do
> > > > > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good
and
> > > decent
> > > > > > CBers.
> > > > > > > > > CL
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
> in
> > > > > message
> > > > > > > > > >
> > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I"
am
> > > taking
> > > > > > it
> > > > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is that
> CB's
> > > no
> > > > > > longer

> > > > > > > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
> > without
> > > a
> > > > > > > license
> > > > > > > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> > > According
> > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > Part
> > > > > > > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to
remain
> > on
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > air
> > > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me
off
> > when
> > > > > > people
> > > > > > > > who
> > > > > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as that.
> They
> > > > > need
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before issuing
> an
> > > > > > opinion
> > > > > > > > or
> > > > > > > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be contacting
> the
> > > > FCC
> > > > > > > on
> > > > > > > > > > > that
> > > > > > > > > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air. Maybe
> you
> > > > > don't
> > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > money
> > > > > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out the
> aid

> > > of
> > > > > your
> > > > > > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online
to
> > the
> > > > FCC
> > > > > > > > website
> > > > > > > > if
> > > > > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online.
> Print
> > > out
> > > > a
> > > > > > page
> > > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail
> them
> > > > while
> > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > at
> > > > > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just lie
> down
> > > and
> > > > > let
> > > > > > > > them
> > > > > > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the
> > local
> > > > > > utility
> > > > > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
> consulted
> > a
> > > > > > attorney
> > > > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the utility
> > could
> > > > > sue
> > > > > > > > me
> > > > > > > > > > for
> > > > > > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > > > I

> > > > > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down
my
> CB
> > > > > antenna
> > > > > > > > > from
> > > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the
utility
> > is
> > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received
> with
> > my
> > > > > > > question
> > > > > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to
know
> > > about
> > > > > my
> > > > > > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to
stand
> up
> > > > > > against
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out
> cease
> > > and
> > > > > > > desist
> > > > > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> >
>

588. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:42:56 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <pkP2c.7597$5M.252630@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Yes PLEASE, do not give up your day job... All your male clients would miss
you. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:irM2c.26842$aT1.2130@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Oh my, look folks, a little attempt at humor. Don't give up your day job
> 'CL'.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:JUL2c.7570$5M.252534@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > The only "crummy lid" you know about is the one you ate from pulled from
> the
> > dumpster. CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:8yI2c.26411$aT1.9645@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > I'm sorry CL....does that stand for Crummy Lid?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:PQu2c.7508$5M.251772@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > IT IS CL - ASS WIPE! And maybe it holds true in "some" areas, but
not
> > all.
> > > I
> > > > STILL think it is a case by case issue. CL - GOT IT? CL.......
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> > > > > > In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> > > > > > <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
> Part
> > > 97.
> > > > > > Cops
> > > > > > >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm

> aware
> > > of.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself
> (Terry
> > > > > Mangan),
> > > > > > while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers
just
> > > > because
> > > > > they
> > > > > > were parked in front of his house.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> > > > > > http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the
World!
> > > > > > -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> > > > >
> > > > > Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by
> the
> > > > local
> > > > > police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the
police
> > and
> > > > the
> > > > > cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> > > > >
> > > > > Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why????
Because
> we
> > > > hold
> > > > > a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

>
>

589. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:44:23 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <MIP2c.7598$5M.252819@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

From past posts, I'd day you need a translation on every thing everyone
tells you. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ttM2c.26845$aT1.1440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> But don't make any sense. I guess I need a translation book to understand
> the CBism gibberish. Why is it you CBers talk so funny anyway?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:%XL2c.7573$5M.252662@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > Well at least we know you can "listen to sound".. Good job - rover. CL
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:tBI2c.26428$aT1.6561@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING.
> You
> > > cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> > goofballs.
> > > At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB
were
> > for
> > > > Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means?????
ASS
> > > > HOLE.............
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the
> > 'outlaw'
> > > > > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed
> > station.
> > > > > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI

> > > > >
> > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US either!
> The
> > > > > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes.
They
> > > have
> > > > as
> > > > > > > > much right
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > > message
> > > > > > >
news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
> > wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you, loser.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the
> > utility
> > > > > > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > > > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to
licensed
> > > > > > stations.

> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the sell
> out
> > > > > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on your
> > > > license?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question? I
> > > really
> > > > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > > give
> > > > > > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
>
>

590. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:45:00 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <lmP2c.7599$5M.252757@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nah, but you were BORN under one... Still hiding there too! CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:WvM2c.26849$aT1.5192@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
> news:v6vm409lmv771rh8f94jhehq30qqsmdhbg@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
> >
> > You also could say that you live with little purple leprechauns, and
> > he couldn't prove otherwise. IOW, if you make a claim, the burden of
> > proof is on you.
> >
> > >Difference
> > >is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > ...that's fine if you want to leave yourself open to identity theft.
>
> Yeah, good excuse. Come on now, tell the real truth? Your just too
> gutless to stand by your statements. You want to hide under a rock.
>
> Right?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

591. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:45:52 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <9nP2c.7600$5M.252805@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Meet me somewhere some time, I'll show you guts. I'll smear your fat ass all over the street. CL

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:SwM2c.26850$aT1.21012@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Sure it does. Your pissed because Ive got the guts to say somthing under my
> real name and call. You on the other hand....well you know the rest of it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> GOD.
> > CL
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
> Difference
> > > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want
> to
> > > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for
> about
> > 20
> > > > years now. CL
> > > >
> > > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
> wrote
> > > in
> > > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > >

> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
Part
> > 97.
> > > > > > Cops
> > > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
aware
> > of.
> > > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
> you
> > > off
> > > > > > some
> > > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
And,
> I
> > AM
> > > A
> > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
But
> > > again,
> > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > ....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
> post
> > a
> > > > > > call.....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
> what
> > I
> > > > > > thought...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

592. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:48:14 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <npP2c.7601$5M.252691@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:QBM2c.26862$aT1.17900@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but
offer
> nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
>
> If it squaks like a CBer,
> If it talks like a CBer,
>
> Its a CBer.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

I do not owe you any proof.. You on the other hand though you offer proof of
a call sign, offer proof of being a complete ass hole. CL

593. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:49:30 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <AqP2c.7602$5M.252644@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

He hammers too, his meat with his hand and any of his male customers..... CL

"DANNY JESWALD" <DiaperDan@home.nut> wrote in message
news:c2g791030gq@drn.newsguy.com...
> im a cber and a hammmer. i hammer in the morning and cb at night
>
> In article <2aeb13a4c74ae0474dc78fbb51c64353@news.bubbanews.com>,
Mississippi
> Maul says...
> >
> >On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:36:48 GMT, "Dummy Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> >this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but
offer
> >>nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
> >>
> >>If it squaks like a CBer,
> >>If it talks like a CBer,
> >>
> >>Its a CBer.
> >>
> >>Dummy Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >
> >Its squawks, not squaks, dummy. you are a joke. at least if nothing
> >else you are good for a laugh.
> >
>
> You ask w
>

594. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:54:06 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <UuP2c.7603$5M.252787@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not leland" <not@lee.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A5C0470C2941234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
> news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net:
>
> > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> > GOD. CL
>
> There is no god anyhow, you made the claim now prove it.

Nor did I make a claim.... But more so questioning his acting as such. CL

595. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 00:55:22 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403071655.368925c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
>
>Meet me somewhere some time, I'll show you guts.
>I'll smear your fat ass all over the street. CL

Steveo? Is that you????

596. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:01:44 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <2CP2c.7604$5M.252757@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:OJO2c.1322$Cm3.364@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>

CL wrote:
> > This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument. A cop
may
> > not be aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
> > scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it. YOU
> > have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case, is
> > stupid.
>
> In the case above, let's assume the CB activity isn't mobile,
> but rather from a fixed station in your home. In that case,
> the cop has no basis at all to do anything more than knock
> on your door and talk to you. Without a warrant to search,
> the cop has NO ability to enter your home at all. To get a warrant,
> the police need the OK of a judge...which isn't done for
> just any reason.
>
> > You exercise your rights to the judge.
>
> I'd suggest it won't even go that far.
>
> > As long as HE is not on the
> > take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent.
>
> Any decent prosecutor wouldn't even let it go that far.
> Proosecutor's don't like losing cases and probably
> wouldn't press any charges at all.
>
> > Let's face it
> > fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to
know
> > ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL
>
> And the cops don't give a hoot about CB. There's no
> police glory in it.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

And I agree whole heartedly, they need a search warrant to gain access. Our cops here could give a shit less about CB in regards to busting some one. Matter of fact, some of them are CBers, Hams or both. But then again.... and this sort of answers another posts comments about "local law"... NOT ALL LOCAL LAWS are the same. They can vary greatly from place to place. CL

597. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:07:15 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <dHP2c.7605$5M.252733@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88805
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Wh0m3?" <me@the-hospital.com> wrote in message
news:3pen40lu10mlba7ljnq0mnaembrbb87kbp@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 7 Mar 2004 15:39:10 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> >news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> >>
> >> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> >> news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> >> > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> >> > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >> >
> >> > DE N7ZZT
> >> > Phoenix, Arizona
> >> >
> >> > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> >> 'unlicensed
> >> > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >> > >
> >> > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL COPS
can
> >> come
> >> > > in and shut you down?
> >> > >
> >> > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> >protected
> >> > > by Federal Laws.
> >> > >
> >>
> >> I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
told
> >by
> >> some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down. No, you'll do as
you're
> >> told. You will win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're
told
> >> or you will go to jail.
> >>
> >>
```

> >
> >This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument. A cop
may
> >not be aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
> >scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it. YOU
> >have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case, is
> >stupid. You exercise your rights to the judge. As long as HE is not on
the
> >take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent. Let's face it
> >fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to know
> >ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL
> >
>
>
> same rules apply to all, and the powers that be say ignorance of the
> law is no excuse if someone breaks the law, well that applies equally
> to the law enforcement people. If I were in a situation where I was
> fined or arrested when I did nothing wrong, they would be made to pay
> for that error.

As well they should. They are human, not a God... They have to (or SHOULD)
operate with in the laws they are supposed to be enforcing. Some may "think"
they're above that law, but any decent judge or DA will put them in their
place. It would otherwise give them all a black eye. In the case of say a
scanner or CB, if they're not familiar with the laws, it seems it would be
better to err on the side of caution and take NO action, especially if no
other crimes were being committed in the process. CL

598. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:15:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307201554.542$62@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> "CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
> >
> >Meet me somewhere some time, I'll show you guts.
> >I'll smear your fat ass all over the street. CL
>
> Steveo? Is that you????
>
No. Learn to read a header, dumbass.

599. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:24:42 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <QXP2c.7606$5M.252719@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88807
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nope, not Steveo! I am as I sign... CL

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0403071655.368925c8@posting.google.com...
> "CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
> >
> >Meet me somewhere some time, I'll show you guts.
> >I'll smear your fat ass all over the street. CL
>
> Steveo? Is that you????

600. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:28:33 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <5%P2c.56377$bA6.39741@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

CL wrote:
> Nope, not Steveo! I am as I sign... CL

Colonel Lingus?

--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

601. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:30:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307203049.390$SS@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88809
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote:
> CL wrote:
> > Nope, not Steveo! I am as I sign... CL
>
> Colonel Lingus?
>
DOH!

602. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:33:45 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <Z3Q2c.56381$1t6.4661@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88810
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:
>> Colonel Lingus?
>>
> DOH!

Season opener of Sopranos comes on in 20 minutes. Dood - come to the
Atlanta race. I got tix for the whole family.

--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

603. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:34:15 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2giin0tk9@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

i like chicken better than turkey its more fun choking it

In article <%xM2c.26853$aT1.21889@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
says...
>
>I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No
>Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with you
>turkeys anyway?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>news:b%L2c.7575$5M.252683@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> On second thought..... NTI... NOT TRAINED INTELLECTUALLY.... CL
>>
>> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
>> GOD.
>> > CL
>> >
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> > > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
>> Difference
>> > > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really want
>> to
>> > > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for
>about
>> > 20
>> > > > years now. CL
>> > > >
>> > > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
>> wrote
>> > > in
>> > > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
>> > > > >

>> > > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
>> > > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
>> > > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>> > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
>Part
>> > 97.
>> > > > > > Cops
>> > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
>aware
>> > of.
>> > > > > > Maybe
>> > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone knocks
>> you
>> > > off
>> > > > > > some
>> > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
>And,
>> I
>> > AM
>> > > > A
>> > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
>But
>> > > again,
>> > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > > ....
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
>> post
>> > a
>> > > > > > call.....
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
>> > > > > > > >
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah, that's
>> what
>> > I
>> > > > > > thought...
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > >
>> >
>>
>>

>> >
>>
>>
>
>

604. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:43:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040307204302.772$Ow@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88814
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> >> Colonel Lingus?
> >>
> > DOH!
>
> Season opener of Sopranos comes on in 20 minutes.
>
Yep, looking forward to it finally starting again! I watched a
short trailer that showed Steve Buccelli (sp) has joined the
cast as Tony's cousin from prison. Should be fun.
>
> Dood - come to the
> Atlanta race. I got tix for the whole family.
>
I'd sure like to but I brought 3 guys back to work this
week and I don't think I can afford the time away for
that and the Bristol race.

Congrats on the tickets, I really like that fast track. That
should be a blast with your family.

605. Re: F.A. Mint Ranger RCI-2950

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:52:03 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2gjk301073@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c034bd2.0403071702.18adae07@posting.google.com>, I Am Not George says...
>
>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote:
>>The Ranger is a 10 meter radio, which can be modified to operate on
>>the 12 meter ham band as well. Anything else is pure speculation on
>>your part, dimbulb.
>
>ROTFLMFAO how dense can you be Oh I forgot your the same dickhead
>cranium who said there were no CBers on the 10M band....
>
>
im a cber and im also a hammer on 10 meters. do i win a prize?

606. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 01:52:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404BD1CF.4060402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88815

>
>
>>So 1 of the other questions required knowledge of a few different points
>>of knowledge to get right. "You have a linear which uses B+ of 800V.
>>For use with SSB, what is the max current your ampmeter on the finals will
>>
>>
>show?"
>
>
>
>>You had to know
>>1) The FCC dictated input "plate" power for power limits for hams,
>>
>>
>
>And that the amateur rules of the time dictated that hams measure
>plate/collector power input, not transmitter output.
>
>
>
>>2) What the power limit was for SSB,
>>
>>
>
>And the band in use
>
>
>
>>3) and how to factor in PEP averaging.
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>And
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>4) how to calculate plate power.
>>
>>

>
>Yup - all in *one* little multiple choice question!
>
Maybe it could be rewritten and made part of the question pool. Updating
it as needed.

>And what did you think of the written tests then?
>
With the multi-point knowledge some of them required, actually quite good.
And this was pre-Bash.....

>
>
>

607. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 02:16:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zq6dnXn6NNIRR9bd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

ClueLess wrote:
> I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...

Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.

608. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 02:36:27 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <3jmn40do4920ahi7gnvev9vvi18dbqsmva@4ax.com>
Source record: 88821
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 7 Mar 2004 19:37:16 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
wrote:

>> >No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
>> >cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
>goofballs.
>> >At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>>
>> You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
>> goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
>> meters.
>>
>
>WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the CBers! CL.

Viet Nam Dan apparently believes that if you're into CB radio, even if
you operate within the rules of FCC part 95, you are a criminal.

609. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 02:42:22 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <45nn40taua8os39iqa50pk7o8vnoshama7@4ax.com>
Source record: 88825
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:13:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>Yep, thats right, another freeloader. That will learn me to defend your
>right to be stupid. Bet I won't do that again.
>
>And do you really want to get pissed off? I can collect social security in
>a few years on top of it.
>
>Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so YOU
>could be a freeloader?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
and the radio.

610. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 02:50:40 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <4cR2c.3190$041.1609@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 88822
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Just for chuckles and grins ..

About 5 years ago I was involved in a dispute with a neighbor. He was having his roof repaired. The roofers were dumping shingles on my side of the fence to be cleaned up later. I told them to get their ladder, the shingles and themselves off my property. He refused. I called the cops. The police talked to the roofers and then politely told me of the difficulties with the small property lines. I simply told the officer that I didn't have to let anyone on my property except him and only if he had a warrent. Did he have a warrent?

The cop made the folks leave my property.

End of story.

No handcuffs; that stuff has to go through the courts and local courts do not (I believe, but might be wrong) have jurisdiction over federally licensed stations be they commercial or amateur.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.614 / Virus Database: 393 - Release Date: 3/5/04

611. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 02:56:59 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <%hR2c.57454$lS1.44850@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88823
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:67fn40lfgip6ksdskbbdcaed9asrdm473r@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:54:05 -0600, Not leland <not@lee.com> wrote:
>
> >"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in
> >news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net:
> >
> >> YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> >> GOD. CL
> >
> >There is no god anyhow, you made the claim now prove it.
>
> Actually, the concept of god can neither be proved nor disproved. Any
> evidence for the existence of god is purely subjective. Any evidence
> against the existence of god would be a futile attempt to prove a
> negative.
>

Hi, Frank.

612. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:04:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040307220401.07155.00001130@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88824

In article <5ee63311.0403051101.6884e785@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>http://www.infoworld.com/article/04/03/02/HNbroadbandservice_1.html

Terrifying. It will be interesting to see how amateurs in the BPL-infected
areas are affected by this disease -- and how they respond!

We live in interesting times...

73 de Larry, K3LT

613. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:23:03 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <rGR2c.21902$Uc3.190@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I Am Not God wrote:
> Hi, Frank.

If you are not God, and you are not George, you must be Ru Paul.

--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

614. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:24:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <JHR2c.3193$eh1.2563@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 88827

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040307194051.07155.00001122@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <dKE2c.26126$aT1.22388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >In 1958, the exam grader was always an FCC official...not a ham.
> >Even when you took the test administered by a ham,
> >it was not graded by the ham, the test was
> >sent pack to the FCC who graded it.
>
> That was true right up to when the VEs took over in the early 1980s.
>
> In the case of by-mail exams (all Novices and Conditionals, most Techs)
you
> didn't know whether you had passed or failed until you got the envelope
from
> the FCC six to eight weeks after your volunteer examiner sent the written
test
> to them for grading. If you failed you had to do the whole thing all over
again
> (code and theory), if you passed you got the license.
>
> Those of us who took exams by mail were looking for the "thin envelope"
(all
> that was inside was the license) and dreading the "thick envelope" (it had
a
> letter telling you that you failed, plus retest instructions and a Form
610).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

Back when I obtained my licenses, I had an interesting experience. I had gone to Buffalo (FCC field office) for my 2nd phone during college in 1965-66. Then I obtained my extra and 2nd telegraph plus radar endorsement (same office, different day). I then went for my 1st phone in the summer of 1966 (after the other trips). A few days later, I received a letter from the Buffalo office! Man, was I worried. I opened it up and it began "Dear Jim, it seems you left your red sweater. Shall we send it or will you call for it?". The sweater had no identification. I had been in and out of that office so many times that they knew me LOL. I worked for WROC-TV that summer under the 2nd and then the 1st class license and returned to WWHG in Hornell, NY for a stint as chief engineer until I joined the Navy in early 1967. That little envelope gave me a fit until I opened it up LOL.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.614 / Virus Database: 393 - Release Date: 3/5/04

615. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:49:07 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <d4rn401vrl45rt7bkv4e7h7803rdnr694n@4ax.com>
Source record: 88829
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 19:16:40 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:

>ClueLess wrote:
>> I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...
>
>Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.

Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
was watching that night)

616. Re: Question about 10 m frequencies/Speaking of which...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:49:33 UTC
From: twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <c2gqgd$3r4$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 88828
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DANNY JESWALD DiaperDan@home.nut wrote:
>In article <c034bd2.0403071424.64dc805c@posting.google.com>,
> I Am Not George says...
>>
>>mrtimnebo@aol.com (MrTimNebo) wrote in message
>>news:<20040307001350.09437.00001106@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>>>
>>> if i had something to admitt i would but for now i'm too busy
>>> calling cq and working the world on the various pirate bands
>>> thruout the hf spectrum.
>>>
>>> >Not that I really expected you to admit it. It's
>>> >the same as when you're bootlegging on those other
>>> >HF bands.
>>>
>>> no i'm ticked because stupid ass hams like you continue
>>> bothering us cb'ers instead of playing with all your super
>>> nerdy toys you like to brag so much about. whil;e you guys
>>> play radio where actually having fun using radios.
>>>
>>> >You're ticked because Hams have a system like
>>> >Echo-Link that you can't use and abuse like 11m
>>> >when you please.
>>
>>another pirate puts his foot in his mouth
>>
>do you have a foot fetish to?
>
>You ask w

a lid like yourself relegated to the magnitude
comprehension deficit self hatred pie-hole
shame you have no problem illustrating
lack of self esteem

,,,laying down the law around Tampa Bay!

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Mar 8 04:49:33 2004 depuis l'IP : aca9dc1e.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

617. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 03:53:36 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2gqo001m69@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 88831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <zq6dnXn6NNIRR9bd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ says...
>
>ClueLess wrote:
>> I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...
>
>Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.
>
i want to go to the ceremony too. will their be beer?

618. The eleven meter free-band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 04:11:16 UTC
From: twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <c2grp4$s0t$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 88830

> Written by: RS 1175 (Florida, USA) e-mail: twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> Original story published in the April 2000 issue of Sporadic Waves
>
>
> DX Gone Crazy? International DX on the eleven meter free-band is there

> for the taking just about everyday on sideband. AM is also giving up
> rare contacts. But one of the better known frequencies for
> international DX contacts, 27.555 USB, once a jewel of pleasant
> listening and international contacts, has unfortunately deteriorated
> rapidly over the last few months, morphing itself into a vile
> cesspool, spewing forth all it's bile and waste, due to a small,
> intellectually-challenged, rapid group of angry, self-loathing and
> pathetic operators who have taken it upon themselves to take up a
> permanent-like residential status there, and in the process,
> completely abdicated any civil, polite conversation.
>
> 27.555 has long been an international world wide contact frequency.
> Standard protocol has always dictated one makes a contact and QSY's to

> another frequency for their conversation, thus leaving the call
> frequency open at all times for contacts. This small but nefarious
> group is attempting to jam, interfere, and prevent any DX contacts
> from being made on frequency. In case you haven't listened in on 555
> as of late, the frequency has literally become a key down fest with
> language that one would be embarrassed to hear in the company of
> children, while only those blowing ridiculous amounts of power are
> being heard. Some incredibly rare and difficult DX contacts have
> effectively been nullified because so many operators are choosing to
> fight fire with fire....in other words, many are pumping up their
> wattage rather than surrender the frequency. While I can somewhat
> empathize with the operators who are attempting to defend this bit of

> DX space, especially the ones who are located outside of the U.S. and

> are permitted to transmit there, I can't seem to shake the old adage
> that keeps playing in my mind, "If you are not part of the solution,
> you are part of the problem."
>
> Power wars are not going to solve anything. The frequency has so much

> trash on it that it is already beginning to sound like the frequencies

> many have attempted to elude. While 27.555 used to be an everyday stop

> during my channel surfing activities, it no longer is. Oh, I
> occasionally flip there in hopes that the channel may somehow have
> become civilized again, but as soon as I hear the hate and discontent,

> I no longer have the patience to listen for a far off exotic station
> just to have them get keyed on as they give the frequency they are
> QSYing to. It is easier to change the frequency.
>
> Other operators around the world are also gravitating to nearby and
> other frequencies. In the last 2 weeks, I have heard France, Italy,
> Germany, the U.K., and Holland comment on what a sad state 27.555 has

> become due to the selfish and inconsiderate actions of a few. 27.415
> to 27.595 is yielding great DX. It appears that operators are still
> making their contacts, they are just working a little harder to get
> them. Instead of relying strictly on 555, many long time ops who USED

> to utilize that frequency exclusively are found hovering close by.
> Since January, I have counted no less than 30 countries on frequencies

> close to 555. While 38 LSB(27.385) continues to be a productive DX
> channel, it mirrors 555 in language, harassment and abuse. Not
> surprisingly, the perpetrators on 38 claim the same geographical
> locale as the offenders on 555, which is more than likely true, as I
> noticed that when the skip conditions begin to fade from the
> blathering idiots on 555, the same occurs on 38.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Mar 8 05:11:15 2004 depuis l'IP : aca9dc1e.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

619. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 04:50:05 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <7YS2c.7608$5M.252965@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nope! Sorry to disappoint ya!

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
news:5%P2c.56377$bA6.39741@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
> CL wrote:
> > Nope, not Steveo! I am as I sign... CL
>
> Colonel Lingus?
>
> --
> _____________________________
> Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?
>
>

620. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 04:52:02 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <XZS2c.7609$5M.251828@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88833
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nope, wrong again. Not queer. Why, you looking for a mate? Sorry, can't help ya. Go see danno.

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:zq6dnXn6NNIRR9bd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> ClueLess wrote:
> > I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...
>
> Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.
>

621. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 04:54:15 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <10T2c.7610$5M.252897@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:45nn40taua8os39iqa50pk7o8vnoshama7@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:13:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Yep, thats right, another freeloader. That will learn me to defend your
> >right to be stupid. Bet I won't do that again.
> >
> >And do you really want to get pissed off? I can collect social security
in
> >a few years on top of it.
> >
> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so YOU
> >could be a freeloader?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
> and the radio.
>
>

His disability is rather evident... he displays it on here daily.

622. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 04:56:35 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <c2T2c.7611$5M.252996@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

You must be referring to Alabama - I believe that is where Danno lives!
Danno is waiting for someone.... He's already said he'd kiss me.. YUCK.
No queer here on this end.

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:zq6dnXn6NNIRR9bd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> ClueLess wrote:
> > I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...
>
> Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.
>

623. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:09:36 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <ueT2c.7612$5M.252969@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88836
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

You know, this is really sad... This problem is threatening to do damage to ALL OF US - be it CBers or Hams. Some among us have chosen to call the CBers names, saying they don't belong on the airwaves, etc. Then the insults went flinging back to the Hams... THIS SUCKS.

WE ALL are going to be affected by this bull shit. Rather than continue in a name calling event, we need to be aligning our efforts to stop the bull shit from happening. Whether you're a CBer who hates hams, or a Ham who hates CBers - NOW is not the time to be fighting amongst ourselves. United we stand, Divided we fall. In this case, none of us are better than the other, we'll all pay the price. It is time we all realize that. This bickering will be useless in the end and get us all - NO WHERE.

I'm just as guilty for getting my self involved in this mess... it simply isn't worth it. I've wasted more time than I care to think about. I'd rather spend my time wisely by learning all I can of the pending issue - it's history even in other attempts and seeing what can be done about it in a logical/legal manner even if in my own behalf should I have to defend my own actions after the fact. This crap here, isn't going to solve shit.

Have a nice day.... if you want to speak against me, that is fine - you're entitled to your opinion, be it correct or not. I'm blocking any of those who were a part of the problem - in particular - Dan - and the thread itself if need be.

CL

624. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:19:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cnT2c.1821$Cm3.312@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88837

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040307194050.07155.00001121@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be
learned
> >> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose
> >> major threats.
> >
> >Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
> >Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years.
>
> That depends on the technology. Houses today are not built much
differently
> than they were 15/20 years ago. New materials and techniques are used
alongside
> old ones. Most of those in the building trades, as well as DIY types, can
keep
> up with the changes.

Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
but even in building construction, there is technological advances and
automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
always come prefab.

> >If I hadn't had the
> >opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
> >Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
> >compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
> >somewhere.
> >
> >> And who pays for the retraining?
> >
> >It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
> >training costs per employee are gone.
>
> In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System) paid
for
> your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your own.
More
> important, your new training built on your existing skills and knowledge
so you
> could stay in the same field.

But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
expenses.

> >> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
economy
> >> >> alone.
> >> >
> >> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
> >> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
> >> >and less need for skilled labor.
> >>
> >> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
> >> automated and all - is moving to places like China.
> >>
> >> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
> >
> >The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
>
> Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready and
of
> low quality.

That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.

> Companies do not support products after even a few years because
> they want you to buy the new products.

Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
The irony of non-support for older products is that in
some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.

> This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
their
> cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
Their
> goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were the
> new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
> succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
years,
> and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the best of
> care.

Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.

> >Look at the
> >ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>
> Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
> However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.

Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?

> >Consider too that
> >a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
> >to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
> >is applied by the consumer).
> >
> A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
balanced,
> Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
> unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I knew
were
> talking about retiring at 55.

Your point?

> All changed now.

Your point?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

625. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:21:22 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403072121.7cba036@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88838
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
>You know, this is really sad... This problem is threatening to do
damage
>to
>ALL OF US - be it CBers or Hams. Some among us have chosen to call
the CBers
>names, saying they don't belong on the airwaves, etc. Then the
insults went
>flinging back to the Hams... THIS SUCKS.
>
>WE ALL are going to be affected by this bull shit. Rather than
continue
>in a
>name calling event, we need to be aligning our efforts to stop the
bull
>shit
>from happening. Whether you're a CBer who hates hams, or a Ham who
hates
>CBers - NOW is not the time to be fighting amongst ourselves. United
we
>stand, Divided we fall. In this case, none of us are better than the
other,
>we'll all pay the price. It is time we all realize that. This
bickering
>will
>be useless in the end and get us all - NO WHERE.
>
>I'm just as guilty for getting my self involved in this mess... it
simply
>isn't worth it. I've wasted more time than I care to think about. I'd
rather
>spend my time wisely by learning all I can of the pending issue -
it's
>history even in other attempts and seeing what can be done about it
in a
>logical/legal manner even if in my own behalf should I have to defend
my
>own
>actions after the fact. This crap here, isn't going to solve shit.
>
>Have a nice day.... if you want to speak against me, that is fine -
you're
>entitled to your opinion, be it correct or not. I'm blocking any of

those
>who were a part of the problem - in particular - Dan - and the thread
itself
>if need be.
>
>CL

after acting like a asshole your going to cry for a truce LOL

Dont worry if BPL comes will make CB signals sound distorted and
unreadable and the band sound terrible. IOW just like it is now

626. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:27:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <lvT2c.1839$Cm3.701@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88839
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:2CP2c.7604$5M.252757@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:OJO2c.1322$Cm3.364@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> CL wrote:
> > > This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument.
> > > A cop may not be
> > > aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
> > > scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it.
YOU
> > > have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY case,
is
> > > stupid.
> > >
> > In the case above, let's assume the CB activity isn't mobile,
> > but rather from a fixed station in your home. In that case,
> > the cop has no basis at all to do anything more than knock
> > on your door and talk to you. Without a warrant to search,
> > the cop has NO ability to enter your home at all. To get a warrant,
> > the police need the OK of a judge...which isn't done for
> > just any reason.
> >
> > > You exercise your rights to the judge.
> >
> > I'd suggest it won't even go that far.
> >
> > > As long as HE is not on the
> > > take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent.
> >
> > Any decent prosecutor wouldn't even let it go that far.
> > Proosecutor's don't like losing cases and probably
> > wouldn't press any charges at all.
> >
> > > Let's face it
> > > fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to
> > > know ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL
> >
> > And the cops don't give a hoot about CB. There's no
> > police glory in it.
> >
> > Cheers,

> > Bill K2UNK
>
> And I agree whole heartedly, they need a search warrant to gain access.
Our
> cops here could give a shit less about CB in regards to busting some one.
> Matter of fact, some of them are CBers, Hams or both.

We agree completely on that.

> But then again.... and
> this sort of answers another posts comments about "local
> law"... NOT ALL LOCAL LAWS are the same.
> They can vary greatly from place to place. CL

BUT, no town, city or state can make their own local
laws regarding CB use. The FCC ruling/regulation
some years back simply allows for local police to
enforce FCC rules. It did not grant local towns, etc
the authority to make up their own rules. As an extreme
example, a town can not ban the use of ham radio
or CB from private residences just because the local
residents might want that to happen.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

627. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:31:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5zT2c.1847$Cm3.1620@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88840

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040307194051.07155.00001122@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <dKE2c.26126$aT1.22388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >In 1958, the exam grader was always an FCC official...not a ham.
> >Even when you took the test administered by a ham,
> >it was not graded by the ham, the test was
> >sent pack to the FCC who graded it.
>
> That was true right up to when the VEs took over in the early 1980s.
>
> In the case of by-mail exams (all Novices and Conditionals, most Techs)
you
> didn't know whether you had passed or failed until you got the envelope
from
> the FCC six to eight weeks after your volunteer examiner sent the written
test
> to them for grading. If you failed you had to do the whole thing all over
again
> (code and theory), if you passed you got the license.

six to eigth weeks? I think my Novice took almost 3 months
to get to me after I took the test.

> Those of us who took exams by mail were looking for the "thin envelope"
(all
> that was inside was the license) and dreading the "thick envelope" (it had
a
> letter telling you that you failed, plus retest instructions and a Form
610).

Thankfully I never got a "think envelope".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

628. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:39:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KGT2c.1857$Cm3.95@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88841
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:ueT2c.7612$5M.252969@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> You know, this is really sad... This problem is threatening to do damage
to
> ALL OF US - be it CBers or Hams. Some among us have chosen to call the
CBers
> names, saying they don't belong on the airwaves, etc. Then the insults
went
> flinging back to the Hams... THIS SUCKS.

I agree. I think, however, the problem on the part of
some hams is related to illegal CB activity (i.e. high power,
freebanding, etc.). Most hams I know have no problem
with CB activity that stays within the allowed FCC
parameters. Some of us even use CB on occasion.
I do when I get together with friends of mine in our
antique car club road tours.

> WE ALL are going to be affected by this bull shit.
> Rather than continue in a
> name calling event, we need to be aligning our efforts to stop the bull
shit
> from happening. Whether you're a CBer who hates hams, or a Ham who hates
> CBers - NOW is not the time to be fighting amongst ourselves. United we
> stand, Divided we fall. In this case, none of us are better than the
other,
> we'll all pay the price. It is time we all realize that. This bickering
will
> be useless in the end and get us all - NO WHERE.

Agree 100%.

> I'm just as guilty for getting my self involved in this mess... it simply
> isn't worth it. I've wasted more time than I care to think about. I'd
rather
> spend my time wisely by learning all I can of the pending issue - it's
> history even in other attempts and seeing what can be done about it in a
> logical/legal manner even if in my own behalf should I have to defend my
own
> actions after the fact.

Agree again.

> This crap here, isn't going to solve shit.

Agree again.

> Have a nice day.... if you want to speak
> against me, that is fine - you're
> entitled to your opinion, be it correct or
> not. I'm blocking any of those
> who were a part of the problem - in particular -
> Dan - and the thread itself if need be.

I hope I have contributed some positive information
and dialog.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

629. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:45:34 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <2MT2c.32742$aS.26979@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88842
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

I Am Not George wrote:
> "CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
>> Have a nice day.... if you want to speak against me, that is fine -
>> you're entitled to your opinion, be it correct or not. I'm blocking
>> any of those who were a part of the problem - in particular - Dan -
>> and the thread itself if need be.
>>
> after acting like a asshole your going to cry for a truce LOL

You and the Colonel won't be getting a room? Bob Crane will be
disappointed.

--

Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

630. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:47:19 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <NNT2c.7613$5M.252960@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88843
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

No truce... and certainly not crying. Just saying what a shame it is. And maybe I did act somewhat an ass hole as I allowed myself to be suckered into this mess (it does take a man to admit his errors), but I'm surely NOT alone. Later!

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:c034bd2.0403072121.7cba036@posting.google.com...
> "CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
> >You know, this is really sad... This problem is threatening to do
> damage
> >to
> >ALL OF US - be it CBers or Hams. Some among us have chosen to call
> the CBers
> >names, saying they don't belong on the airwaves, etc. Then the
> insults went
> >flinging back to the Hams... THIS SUCKS.
> >
> >WE ALL are going to be affected by this bull shit. Rather than
> continue
> >in a
> >name calling event, we need to be aligning our efforts to stop the
> bull
> >shit
> >from happening. Whether you're a CBer who hates hams, or a Ham who
> hates
> >CBers - NOW is not the time to be fighting amongst ourselves. United
> we
> >stand, Divided we fall. In this case, none of us are better than the
> other,
> >we'll all pay the price. It is time we all realize that. This
> bickering
> >will
> >be useless in the end and get us all - NO WHERE.
> >
> >I'm just as guilty for getting my self involved in this mess... it
> simply
> >isn't worth it. I've wasted more time than I care to think about. I'd
> rather
> >spend my time wisely by learning all I can of the pending issue -
> it's
> >history even in other attempts and seeing what can be done about it
> in a
> >logical/legal manner even if in my own behalf should I have to defend

> my
> >own
> >actions after the fact. This crap here, isn't going to solve shit.
> >
> >Have a nice day.... if you want to speak against me, that is fine -
> you're
> >entitled to your opinion, be it correct or not. I'm blocking any of
> those
> >who were a part of the problem - in particular - Dan - and the thread
> itself
> >if need be.
> >
> >CL
>
>
> after acting like a asshole your going to cry for a truce LOL
>
> Dont worry if BPL comes will make CB signals sound distorted and
> unreadable and the band sound terrible. IOW just like it is now

631. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 05:58:19 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <5YT2c.7615$5M.252894@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88844
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lvT2c.1839$Cm3.701@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:2CP2c.7604$5M.252757@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:OJO2c.1322$Cm3.364@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > CL wrote:
> > > > This argument sort of parallels the scanner in the car argument.
> > > > A cop may not be
> > > > aware of the rules/laws regarding such item - i.e. a ham having a
> > > > scanner in the car when he is permitted by law. He busts you for it.
> YOU
> > > > have your day in court. To sit there and argue with them in ANY
case,
> is
> > > > stupid.
> > >
> > > In the case above, let's assume the CB activity isn't mobile,
> > > but rather from a fixed station in your home. In that case,
> > > the cop has no basis at all to do anything more than knock
> > > on your door and talk to you. Without a warrant to search,
> > > the cop has NO ability to enter your home at all. To get a warrant,
> > > the police need the OK of a judge...which isn't done for
> > > just any reason.
> > >
> > > > You exercise your rights to the judge.
> > >
> > > I'd suggest it won't even go that far.
> > >
> > > > As long as HE is not on the
> > > > take and reasonably competent, he should find you innocent.
> > >
> > > Any decent prosecutor wouldn't even let it go that far.
> > > Proosecutor's don't like losing cases and probably
> > > wouldn't press any charges at all.
> > >
> > > > Let's face it
> > > > fellas, there are HUNDREDS of laws out there. It is hard for them to
> > > > know ALL of them. Especially on the street in a moments' notice. CL
> > >
```

> > > And the cops don't give a hoot about CB. There's no
> > > police glory in it.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > And I agree whole heartedly, they need a search warrant to gain access.
> Our
> > cops here could give a shit less about CB in regards to busting some
one.
> > Matter of fact, some of them are CBers, Hams or both.
>
> We agree completely on that.
>
> > But then again.... and
> > this sort of answers another posts comments about "local
> > law"... NOT ALL LOCAL LAWS are the same.
> > They can vary greatly from place to place. CL
>
> BUT, no town, city or state can make their own local
> laws regarding CB use. The FCC ruling/regulation
> some years back simply allows for local police to
> enforce FCC rules. It did not grant local towns, etc
> the authority to make up their own rules. As an extreme
> example, a town can not ban the use of ham radio
> or CB from private residences just because the local
> residents might want that to happen.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Agreed... and in agreement, I say it doesn't stop those who have no clue of radio or it's laws - who govern - from "trying" to stop radio in it's path. Some of those who sit on councils and so on, are like bad cops.. They get a title and automatically their head swells. They think they can act in total disregard. So they set stupid rules. Some of which they may have no way to enforce. IF those rules aren't enacted as "ordinances", they have little chance of being enforced just speaking of the local level. Federal law "usually" supercedes most any local or state law. I say usually, because I've heard from some sources that there are exceptions.

632. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 06:03:41 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <71U2c.7616$5M.252989@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Yours is one of many I've enjoyed. While there are problems with illegal operations in both ham and cb - some of which spur a lot of the arguments herein, none of it will matter in the end, if this comes crashing down as it is expected.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:KGT2c.1857$Cm3.95@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> news:ueT2c.7612$5M.252969@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > You know, this is really sad... This problem is threatening to do damage
> to
> > ALL OF US - be it CBers or Hams. Some among us have chosen to call the
> CBers
> > names, saying they don't belong on the airwaves, etc. Then the insults
> went
> > flinging back to the Hams... THIS SUCKS.
>
> I agree. I think, however, the problem on the part of
> some hams is related to illegal CB activity (i.e. high power,
> freebanding, etc.). Most hams I know have no problem
> with CB activity that stays within the allowed FCC
> parameters. Some of us even use CB on occasion.
> I do when I get together with friends of mine in our
> antique car club road tours.
>
> > WE ALL are going to be affected by this bull shit.
> > Rather than continue in a
> > name calling event, we need to be aligning our efforts to stop the bull
> shit
> > from happening. Whether you're a CBer who hates hams, or a Ham who hates
> > CBers - NOW is not the time to be fighting amongst ourselves. United we
> > stand, Divided we fall. In this case, none of us are better than the
> other,
> > we'll all pay the price. It is time we all realize that. This bickering
> will
> > be useless in the end and get us all - NO WHERE.
>
> Agree 100%.
>
> > I'm just as guilty for getting my self involved in this mess... it
simply
> > isn't worth it. I've wasted more time than I care to think about. I'd

> rather
> > spend my time wisely by learning all I can of the pending issue - it's
> > history even in other attempts and seeing what can be done about it in a
> > logical/legal manner even if in my own behalf should I have to defend my
> own
> > actions after the fact.
>
> Agree again.
>
> > This crap here, isn't going to solve shit.
>
> Agree again.
>
> > Have a nice day.... if you want to speak
> > against me, that is fine - you're
> > entitled to your opinion, be it correct or
> > not. I'm blocking any of those
> > who were a part of the problem - in particular -
> > Dan - and the thread itself if need be.
>
> I hope I have contributed some positive information
> and dialog.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

633. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 06:18:36 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <6fU2c.7617$5M.253008@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88846
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Nope, not me..... have fun!

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
news:2MT2c.32742$aS.26979@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> I Am Not George wrote:
> > "CL" does_it_matter@noreply.com wrote:
> >> Have a nice day.... if you want to speak against me, that is fine -
> >> you're entitled to your opinion, be it correct or not. I'm blocking
> >> any of those who were a part of the problem - in particular - Dan -
> >> and the thread itself if need be.
> >>
> > after acting like a asshole your going to cry for a truce LOL
>
> You and the Colonel won't be getting a room? Bob Crane will be
> disappointed.
>
>
> --
> _____________________________
> Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?
>
>

634. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 06:24:22 UTC
From: CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
Message-ID: <wkU2c.7618$5M.252936@dfw-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 88847
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

It was said in here that Part 95 doesn't exist.

Part 95 as of 2002 .... at least it was still alive then. I can't see how it was erradicated. It now also includes FRS, GMRS, R/C.
http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_02/47cfr95_02.html

635. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 09:50:51 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A6314211B48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88849

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403071526.372ef00e@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A57D706F6F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
>> news:1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
>> >> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:
>>
>> >> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
>> >> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back
>> >> up...
>> >
>> > Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be
>> > months or years if they're ever replaced at all.
>> >
>>
>> I wasn't talking about our towers, though, was I? I have one I've
>> never put up. The point is that, for example, we can communicate in
>> and out of a disaster area on HF SSB, for example, without needing a
>> tower. Doesn't happen every day, but that's something to be thankful
>> for.
>
> True enough. People might be able to use cellular phones to do the
> same.
>

Exactly. Might or might not.

636. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 09:53:11 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88850

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
_ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:

> William wrote:
>
>
>> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
>> or years if they're ever replaced at all.
>
>
> Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
> on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
>
>

Of course he can't

637. It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 10:24:39 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88701

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403071521.aabb8f@posting.google.com:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
>> > Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
>> > amateur radio done for me lately?"
>>
>> How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.
>
> I remember the video with music and scenes of the Twin Towers burning
> and tumbling down. The caption read "NEVER FORGET."
>
> Sorry Dee, but only four percent (4%) of those responding said that
> 9/11 terrorism was the most important issue in America today. The
> mainstream press has gotten them in a frenzy over the economy and
> jobs.
>

As well it should. We are still down 2 million jobs since 911. Mine was one of the ones lost in the months after the attack. I am trying to run my own business now, but it is a hard struggle. I would go back to working for someone else, but there are no jobs in my field. The very few job ads I see ask for impossibly high qualifications (for me anyway!), as employers can pick and choose from the glut of people looking for work. For example, I have a BS and they are looking for PhDs.

If you still have a well paid job it is easy to overlook the situation, but it's dire. Employers are not hiring at anything like the rate expected at this stage of an economic recovery. 2.4 million jobs were lost, and only about 400,000 new ones have been added. It's impossible to look at those numbers and not conclude that the economy is in terrible shape. Other economic indicators may be good, but the employment problem is very real and very large.

The current administration might prefer that we all focus on security and foreign wars, but that's because if too many people look too hard at the employment numbers it will hurt their chances of reelection. FWIW, I doubt that any government can really influence the economy more than a tiny amount, but the political facts of life say that people will vote for someone who promises to fix the economy.

All the White House can do is distract, or 'run interference'. The employment stats are so bad that it's rather like trying to hide an

elephant under the rug. That's not to say that the other issues aren't important, although personally I'm not happy about what they are doing in either of these areas.

> Then there was
>> the great blackout of 2003.
>
> Comms/Phones didn't go out. How was amateur radio useful when
> everyone had comms?
>
>> No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of
>> which I haven't heard. There of course there are the emergencies to
>> come such as future hurricanes. Although these have been rather quiet
>> the last few years, that doesn't mean they are gone.
>
> I know, I know. Does Powell know?
>
>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>> these per year.
>
> Those are good practice.
>
BTW, I am not intending to call anyone stupid, but I just couldn't resist the title.

638. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 12:07:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 88702

In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>We are still down 2 million jobs since 911. Mine was one
>of the ones lost in the months after the attack. I am trying to run my own
>business now, but it is a hard struggle. I would go back to working for
>someone else, but there are no jobs in my field. The very few job ads I see
>ask for impossibly high qualifications (for me anyway!), as employers can
>pick and choose from the glut of people looking for work. For example, I
>have a BS and they are looking for PhDs.
>
>If you still have a well paid job it is easy to overlook the situation, but
>it's dire. Employers are not hiring at anything like the rate expected at
>this stage of an economic recovery.

That's because they learned to make do with the people they had, and are
reluctant to add more now.

>2.4 million jobs were lost, and only
>about 400,000 new ones have been added. It's impossible to look at those
>numbers and not conclude that the economy is in terrible shape. Other
>economic indicators may be good, but the employment problem is very real
>and very large.

Remember Ross Perot and the "giant sucking sound"?
>
>The current administration might prefer that we all focus on security and
>foreign wars, but that's because if too many people look too hard at the
>employment numbers it will hurt their chances of reelection. FWIW, I doubt
>that any government can really influence the economy more than a tiny
>amount, but the political facts of life say that people will vote for
>someone who promises to fix the economy.
>
Seems to me that the real problem is more fundamental. Short term fixes won't
change long-term problems.

For example, importing 57% of our oil, and letting that number rise every year,
isn't the right trend, but it's been allowed to go on because it's cheaper in
the short term than. (Please don't blame the environmental concerns of drilling
in the Arctic and similar places until you have solid numbers on what oil from
those places costs to extract, and how much can actually be extracted.)

Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without investing the
resources in education to produce that workforce. "Resources" doesn't just mean
"money", either, though money is a big part of it.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>All the White House can do is distract, or 'run interference'. The
>employment stats are so bad that it's rather like trying to hide an
>elephant under the rug. That's not to say that the other issues aren't
>important, although personally I'm not happy about what they are doing in
>either of these areas.
>

639. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 13:09:52 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88703

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>We are still down 2 million jobs since 911. Mine was one
>>of the ones lost in the months after the attack. I am trying to run my
>>own business now, but it is a hard struggle. I would go back to working
>>for someone else, but there are no jobs in my field. The very few job
>>ads I see ask for impossibly high qualifications (for me anyway!), as
>>employers can pick and choose from the glut of people looking for work.
>>For example, I have a BS and they are looking for PhDs.
>>
>>If you still have a well paid job it is easy to overlook the situation,
>>but it's dire. Employers are not hiring at anything like the rate
>>expected at this stage of an economic recovery.
>
> That's because they learned to make do with the people they had, and
> are reluctant to add more now.
>

That's a large part of it, although I think tere may be more going on.

>>2.4 million jobs were lost, and only
>>about 400,000 new ones have been added. It's impossible to look at
>>those numbers and not conclude that the economy is in terrible shape.
>>Other economic indicators may be good, but the employment problem is
>>very real and very large.
>
> Remember Ross Perot and the "giant sucking sound"?

I found his ears rather distracting

>>
>>The current administration might prefer that we all focus on security
>>and foreign wars, but that's because if too many people look too hard
>>at the employment numbers it will hurt their chances of reelection.
>>FWIW, I doubt that any government can really influence the economy more
>>than a tiny amount, but the political facts of life say that people
>>will vote for someone who promises to fix the economy.
>>
> Seems to me that the real problem is more fundamental. Short term fixes
> won't change long-term problems.
>
> For example, importing 57% of our oil, and letting that number rise

> every year, isn't the right trend, but it's been allowed to go on
> because it's cheaper in the short term than. (Please don't blame the
> environmental concerns of drilling in the Arctic and similar places
> until you have solid numbers on what oil from those places costs to
> extract, and how much can actually be extracted.)

I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was ever done before.

>
> Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
> investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
> "Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
> part of it.

Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control. Grants and scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>All the White House can do is distract, or 'run interference'. The
>>employment stats are so bad that it's rather like trying to hide an
>>elephant under the rug. That's not to say that the other issues aren't
>>important, although personally I'm not happy about what they are doing
>>in either of these areas.
>>
>
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

640. Re: F.A. Mint Ranger RCI-2950

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 13:30:16 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0403080530.2bf87b9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut> wrote in message news:<c2gjk301073@drn.newsguy.com>...
> In article <c034bd2.0403071702.18adae07@posting.google.com>, I Am Not George
> says...
> >
> >richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote:
> >>The Ranger is a 10 meter radio, which can be modified to operate on
> >>the 12 meter ham band as well. Anything else is pure speculation on
> >>your part, dimbulb.
> >
> >ROTFLMFAO how dense can you be Oh I forgot your the same dickhead
> >cranium who said there were no CBers on the 10M band....
> >
> >
> im a cber and im also a hammer on 10 meters. do i win a prize?

LOL! Don't pay any attention to DouGay Adair N8WWM. Nobody will talk
to him on 6 meters, so he trolls here 24/7 under fake names. You would
think that a licensed ham and machine shop owner in Toledo, Ohio,
would have something better to do than stir up trouble, but not
DouGay!

641. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 15:48:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404C95D4.8090406@psu.edu>
Source record: 88705

N2EY wrote:
> In article <ZDQ1c.30102$W74.23969@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>There's no sign that any sufficient number of folks in
>>the USA are going to boycott non-USA made products
>>or spend N dollars more to get a product "made in the USA'
>>as opposed to buying a cheaper imported product.
>
>
> That can change, though.
>
>>>>In the long run, those currently
>>>>cheap off shore labor markets will self adjust upwards.
>>>
>>>Maybe. And if so, might they not find themselves in the same boat?
>>
>>Like I said, global economy.
>
>
> As long as we're not on a sinking ship..
>
>>>>In the short
>>>>run, US labor has their head in the sand if they think there's something
>>>>either party (Dems or Reps) can really do to stem the shift of
>>>>manufacturing jobs overseas. The same thing is going on in Europe.
>>>
>>>OTOH, unemployed workers can't buy the goods anyway. So what good are
>>>lower prices?
>>>
>>>
>>>>In the long run, employees must be constantly reevaluating their
>>>>job skills and looking at the prospect of how vulnerable their job
>>>>may be as to their job being farmed out to off shore labor.
>>>>
>>>
>>>That's true up to a point. But how often is it reasonable to expect a
>>>person to retrain? And what happens to "the wealth of nations" in the
>>>meantime?
>>
>>You retrain whenever it becomes necessary. There's nothing
>>mystical about it. If your job skill goes wanting, you'd
>>better find another skill set.

>
>
> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be learned
> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose major
> threats.

Let's assume that the average worker is expected to job shift 4 times
over their career. You get your Bach in say Computer programming. Work
in tech support for 4 years. maybe you're working on your Masters. Your
job disappears so you either go back and finish you Masters (is this a
good move, considering the field is apparently moving to India) or start
over again in another field. Said other field might just go to some
other country also. So you have to do this 5 times over your working
life, and each degree costs an average of 50K. Keep in mind that the
first degree will cost more, and successive ones relatively less if
inflation doesn't increase the price. Of course the education price
depends on your school. Really good schools cost a good bit more. So
what you are going to do is spend maybe a quarter to a half million
dollars for education over your career, and at these education points,
you are going to have to find a way to support yourself and maybe a
family. What this all sounds like is a great way to go into personal
bankruptcy.

Sorry, it just won't work and I don't care what model yer usin'. If
you are doing a job that requires a couple months of training, you can
get away with job shifting from time to time. If your job training takes
years to do, then it simply isn't going to work.

> And who pays for the retraining?

Trickle down? 8^)

>>>I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service economy
>>>alone.
>>
>>We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
>>done with more and more automation resulting in less
>>and less need for skilled labor.
>
>
> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production - automated
> and all - is moving to places like China.

In our area, a whole glass production plant has been disassembled and
moved to China, where they are putting it back together. A lot of good
paying skilled jobs lost.

Another capacitor making plant has just shut down to move out also.
these jobs weren't as good paying, but they were still jobs. All this in
just one year.

Perhaps they should eat cake?

- mike KB3EIA -

642. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 16:04:55 UTC
From: Andy in NJ <"SHORECOGS at COMCAST DOT NET">
Message-ID: <Dt6dndsFbMkpBNHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 88706
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

I thought it had something to do with not cutting out extra stuff that
wasn't needed when replying.

Unable to cut out unneeded quotes "Unclaimed Mysteries"
<theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net> wrote in message
news:WAK2c.26693$aT1.25017@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Top-postin' Andy in NJ wrote:
>
> That's because the part of your brain that should be concerned about
> this issue has been erased by tightly focused selective amnesia brain
> beams, and the previous thoughts replaced by what They think you should
> think. Happens to the best of us. It just happened to me, right now.
> I've completely forgotten what I should warn you about.
>
> I think it had something to with top-posting being righteous and just.
>
> Oh, well, never mind.

643. Re: general class exams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 16:19:14 UTC
From: dougmc@frenzy.com
Message-ID: <6213c.60629$lS1.42014@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88707

In article <dd8fee65.0403042307.102fad74@posting.google.com>,
Willian Irving Zumwalt <wizumwalt@yahoo.com> wrote:

| Several popular exam books I've looked at expire in June of 2004 for
| the General class license. How long before we start seeing the new
| editions come out. Reason I ask is because I'd like to start studying
| but don't think I'll be ready by June and if there are changes, I'd
| just rather wait for the new edition.

The tests usually don't change much from revision to revision.
Studying the book that's one generation out of date isn't going to
hurt you much.

The general test isn't much harder than the technician test. If
you've got am ind for this stuff, just skim over whatever book you've
got for that level of test (even if it's one or two revisions out of
date) a few times, then go to http://www.qrz.com/testing.html and take
the test a few times. Once you can consistently score over 80%,
you're ready to go take the test and almost certainly pass.

I passed all three in a few months with little experience and little
effort, using three books (technician, general, extra) I bought at
Radio Shack for $1 each. I think the technician and extra books were
out of date, and the general book wasn't, but it didn't really hurt
me.

(Now I just need to pass the morse code test. My brain has a lot
harder time with that than the technical tests ... but I'm working on
it.)

--
Doug McLaren, dougmc@frenzy.com
He who fights monsters should see to it that in the process he does
not become a monster." - Neitschze

644. When is a re-stocking charge a good idea?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 17:49:48 UTC
From: wa8mea@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8a260fb2.0403080949.29a92f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88708

I've been a customer of AES for years. Spent THOUSANDS with them, usually buying at least a couple of different rigs a year.

Just got a call from one of the fellas there. I just returned a little 2/6/70cm HT in which I couldn't see the little keypad very well....among other technical problems with the HT. Only had it a couple of days. I requested the substitution of another HT and a 2 meter beam...resulting in them receiving $100 additional.

The gentleman was very polite, but said because there was some type of wear on the beltclip (and I certainly didn't see any. But there could have been since I did use the clip.), they couldn't resell the device as new...so they would have to charge me a 15% re-stocking fee. ($39)

As a ham businessman myself, I KNOW the cost of doing business. But I know I wouldn't go as far as to possibly alienate a customer in long standing. In fact, I have several customers in long standing and have had to "bite the bullet" on a couple of returns from them....just because I DID NOT want to alienate them from doing further business with me. I felt the greater need to keep these people as customers.

I'm not really mad. I understand both points. There probably isn't a big profit margin in this gear. But would you risk loosing further business from a long time customer? Or would you write it off??? (And we all know, that's exactly what you can do with damaged merchandise...write it off.)

What's your opinion???

73, Bill - WA8MEA
NEAT STUFF! DWM Communications - http://qth.com/dwm

645. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:00:04 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc4pdc9.a09.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 88709

In article <20040306100006.01019.00000826@mb-m25.aol.com>, N2EY wrote:
>> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
>> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
>> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
>> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).
>
> I gotta get me some. But it can't be hotter than Daves Total Insanity Sauce.

Not hotter, but certainly tastes better and contains all three major food
groups - chile, garlic and salt...

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

646. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:23:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uS23c.28086$aT1.14309@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

You are the only one talking about queers. Does that tell you anything?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:tdM2c.7576$5M.252691@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Sorry ole boy (danny) - truth is, I don't know where your lips have been.
My
> ass is too clean for you. Who knows what diseases lurk in your mouth. The
> fact that you said trim my moustache first, tells me you are as queer as a
> $3 bill. NO THANKS..... I don't do queers. CL
>
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c216d3b20006d9a2e0ec25024b50304e@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:59:00 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> > this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >Only if you trim your mustache.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > dan, are you gay? or just have a thing for guys with trimmed
> > mustaches?
> > >
> > >"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > >news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > >> KISS MY ASS! CL
> > >>
>
>
>

647. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:24:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <YT23c.28090$aT1.6645@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:45nn40taua8os39iqa50pk7o8vnoshama7@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:13:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Yep, thats right, another freeloader. That will learn me to defend your
> >right to be stupid. Bet I won't do that again.
> >
> >And do you really want to get pissed off? I can collect social security
in
> >a few years on top of it.
> >
> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so YOU
> >could be a freeloader?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
> and the radio.
>
>

Thats right, and your point is?

Dan/W4NTI

648. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:26:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iV23c.28095$aT1.25678@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:81dn40p8vs19rq3canfm8eg32uirrd4bjc@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:15:03 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> ...and Viet Nam Dan was talking about credibility. It's no wonder
> >> WA8ULX, A.K.A. "Babbling Bruce" is his only friend.
> >
> >Geee whiz...I thought you were my friend.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If
> you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on
> the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass
> and get a job.
>

Will you hire me then?

Dan/W4NTI

649. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:28:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IX23c.28099$aT1.8476@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:4f8d42cb7058f878090d926076c53e70@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:03:21 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wimpered:
>
> >No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING. You
> >cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
goofballs.
> >At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
> meters.
>
Can't argue with that one.

Dan/W4NTI

650. OT: Open Letter from a Green Beret to John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:28:44 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <404CBB09.6030600@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88714
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From Green Beret Officer Don Bendell

The old hurts are surfacing and the feelings of betrayal by fellow citizens, and their leader stirring them up, are breaking my heart again. I am being cut in the same scar. How did we who served in Vietnam suddenly become cold-blooded killers, torturers, and rapists, of the ilk of the Nazi SS or the Taliban? Most of us were American soldiers who grew up idolizing John Wayne, Roy Rogers, and all the other heroes. That was why I volunteered. But for political expediency, John Kerry has rewritten history, again. After spending only four months in the country of Vietnam, John Kerry testified before Congress in 1971 with these exact words about incidents he supposedly witnessed or heard about from other vets: "They personally raped, cut off ears, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks, and generally ravaged the countryside of South Vietnam."

I was a green beret officer who volunteered for duty in Vietnam and fought in the thick of it in 1968 and 1969 on a Special Forces A-team on the Ho Chi Minh Trail, just for starters. We were the elite. We saw the most action. Everybody in the world knows that. But we did not just kill people, we built a church, a school, treated illnesses, passed out soap, food, and clothing, and had fun and loving interaction with the indigenous people of Vietnam, just like our boys did in Normandy, Baghdad, Saigon, and everywhere American soldiers ever served. We all gave away our candy bars and rations to kids. Our hearts to oppressed people all over the globe.

My children and grandchildren could read your words, and think those horrendous things about me, Mr. Kerry. You are a bold-faced, unprincipled liar, and a disgrace, and you have dishonored me and all my fellow Vietnam veterans. Sure, there were a couple bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did, as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it, or at the very least report it. Why is there not a single record anywhere of you ever reporting any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested? The answer is simple. You are a liar. Your medals and mine are not a free pass for lifetime, Senator Kerry, to bypass character, integrity, and morality. I earn my green beret over and over daily in all aspects of my life.

Eight National Guard green berets, and other National Guard soldiers, have been killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, and you totally dishonored their widows and families by lumping National Guard service in with being a draft-dodger, conscientious objector, and deserter, just so you can try to sabotage the patriotism of our President who proudly served as an Air National Guard jet pilot. I have a son earning his green beret at Fort Bragg right now, and his wife serves honorably in the Air National Guard, just like President Bush did, and I am as proud of her as I am my son. I volunteered for Vietnam and have no problem whatsoever with President Bush being our Commander-In-Chief. In fact, I am proud of him as our leader.

John Kerry, you personally derailed the Vietnam Human Rights Bill, HR2883, in 2001, after it had passed the House by a 411 to 1 vote, and thousands of pro-American Montagnard tribespeople in Vietnam died since then who could have been saved, by you. Earlier, as Chair of the Senate Select Committee on MIA/POW Affairs, you personally quashed the efforts of any and all veterans to report sightings of living POW's, when you held those reins in Congress. You have fought tooth and nail to push for the US to normalize relations with Vietnam for years. Why, Mr. Kerry? Simple, your first cousin C. Stewart Forbes, CEO, of Colliers International, recently signed a contract with Hanoi, worth BILLIONS of dollars for Collier's International to become the exclusive real estate representative for the country of Vietnam.

"Hanoi John," now that it works for you, you beat your chest about your Vietnam service, but to me, you are a phony, opportunistic, hypocrite. You are one of those politicians that is like a fertilizer machine: all that comes out of you is horse manure, and you are spreading it everywhere.

Medals do not make a man. Morals do.

Don Bendell

Canon City, Colorado

Don Bendell served as an officer in four Special Forces Groups, is a best-selling author with over 1,500,000 books in print.

651. OT: Open Letter from a Green Beret to John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:28:57 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <JX23c.77019$6K.30183@nwrddc02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 88715
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From Green Beret Officer Don Bendell

The old hurts are surfacing and the feelings of betrayal by fellow citizens, and their leader stirring them up, are breaking my heart again. I am being cut in the same scar. How did we who served in Vietnam suddenly become cold-blooded killers, torturers, and rapists, of the ilk of the Nazi SS or the Taliban? Most of us were American soldiers who grew up idolizing John Wayne, Roy Rogers, and all the other heroes. That was why I volunteered. But for political expediency, John Kerry has rewritten history, again. After spending only four months in the country of Vietnam, John Kerry testified before Congress in 1971 with these exact words about incidents he supposedly witnessed or heard about from other vets: "They personally raped, cut off ears, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks, and generally ravaged the countryside of South Vietnam."

I was a green beret officer who volunteered for duty in Vietnam and fought in the thick of it in 1968 and 1969 on a Special Forces A-team on the Ho Chi Minh Trail, just for starters. We were the elite. We saw the most action. Everybody in the world knows that. But we did not just kill people, we built a church, a school, treated illnesses, passed out soap, food, and clothing, and had fun and loving interaction with the indigenous people of Vietnam, just like our boys did in Normandy, Baghdad, Saigon, and everywhere American soldiers ever served. We all gave away our candy bars and rations to kids. Our hearts to oppressed people all over the globe.

My children and grandchildren could read your words, and think those horrendous things about me, Mr. Kerry. You are a bold-faced, unprincipled liar, and a disgrace, and you have dishonored me and all my fellow Vietnam veterans. Sure, there were a couple bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did, as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it, or at the very least report it. Why is there not a single record anywhere of you ever reporting any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested? The answer is simple. You are a liar. Your medals and mine are not a free pass for lifetime, Senator Kerry, to bypass character, integrity, and morality. I earn my green beret over and over daily in all aspects of my life.

Eight National Guard green berets, and other National Guard soldiers, have been killed in Iraq and Afghanistan, and you totally dishonored their widows and families by lumping National Guard service in with being a draft-dodger, conscientious objector, and deserter, just so you can try to sabotage the patriotism of our President who proudly served as an Air National Guard jet pilot. I have a son earning his green beret at Fort Bragg right now, and his wife serves honorably in the Air National Guard, just like President Bush did, and I am as proud of her as I am my son. I volunteered for Vietnam and have no problem whatsoever with President Bush being our Commander-In-Chief. In fact, I am proud of him as our leader.

John Kerry, you personally derailed the Vietnam Human Rights Bill, HR2883, in 2001, after it had passed the House by a 411 to 1 vote, and thousands of pro-American Montagnard tribespeople in Vietnam died since then who could have been saved, by you. Earlier, as Chair of the Senate Select Committee on MIA/POW Affairs, you personally quashed the efforts of any and all veterans to report sightings of living POW's, when you held those reins in Congress. You have fought tooth and nail to push for the US to normalize relations with Vietnam for years. Why, Mr. Kerry? Simple, your first cousin C. Stewart Forbes, CEO, of Colliers International, recently signed a contract with Hanoi, worth BILLIONS of dollars for Collier's International to become the exclusive real estate representative for the country of Vietnam.

"Hanoi John," now that it works for you, you beat your chest about your Vietnam service, but to me, you are a phony, opportunistic, hypocrite. You are one of those politicians that is like a fertilizer machine: all that comes out of you is horse manure, and you are spreading it everywhere.

Medals do not make a man. Morals do.

Don Bendell

Canon City, Colorado

Don Bendell served as an officer in four Special Forces Groups, is a best-selling author with over 1,500,000 books in print.

652. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:31:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JZ23c.28103$aT1.22157@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:3jmn40do4920ahi7gnvev9vvi18dbqsmva@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 7 Mar 2004 19:37:16 -0500, "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com>
> wrote:
>
> >> >No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING.
You
> >> >cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> >goofballs.
> >> >At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >>
> >> You hams are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> >> goofballs. At least that is what I hear everytime I listen to 80
> >> meters.
> >>
> >
> >WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the CBers! CL.
>
> Viet Nam Dan apparently believes that if you're into CB radio, even if
> you operate within the rules of FCC part 95, you are a criminal.
>

I have NEVER heard a legal CB station in operation.

Dan/W4NTI

653. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:34:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <a133c.28115$aT1.20839@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88717
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:HgP2c.7593$5M.252699@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:8c105ed0a06a809c6e3715a1cd5b7210@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 17:04:31 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
> Difference
> > >is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > you could say your an ignorant idiot and all of would believe you.
>
> Just because you give your FOOL name and call sign does NOT make you
> credible. It just signs off on your being a complete ASS. So the rest of
us
> know who you are. CL
>
>
And your point is?

Dan/W4NTI

654. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:36:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <E233c.28121$aT1.21184@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88718
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c6b95f9bf3681e04e71b0de393041e01@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:21:53 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >> > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
that
> >> > silly stuff.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> That why your dad told you to take a hike?
> >
> >Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually, I
> >took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> we will take up a collection, buy you a one way ticket back there.
> then evryone would be happy

How is that? I'll still have access to this group.

You know the internet is world wide now, don't ya?

Dan/W4NTI

655. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:37:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <k333c.28123$aT1.15993@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88719
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:NhP2c.7595$5M.252782@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c6b95f9bf3681e04e71b0de393041e01@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:21:53 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >> > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
> that
> > >> > silly stuff.
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> That why your dad told you to take a hike?
> > >
> > >Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually,
I
> > >took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > we will take up a collection, buy you a one way ticket back there.
> > then evryone would be happy
>
> Where do we send the contributions??????? CL
>

Send them to me...Im ok in the callbook.

Dan/W4NTI

>
```

656. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:37:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5433c.28126$aT1.15820@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88720
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:9hP2c.7594$5M.252812@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:RnM2c.26835$aT1.16395@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040307122558.059$Ae@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
> that
> > > > silly stuff.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > That why your dad told you to take a hike?
> > >
> > Naw....he died a long time before that could have happened. Actually,
I
> > took a hike voluntarily and went to the other side of the world.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Too bad you came back! CL
>
>
I came back just so I could mess with folks like you.

Dan/W4NTI

657. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:41:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <v733c.28130$aT1.21752@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88721
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:XaP2c.7587$5M.252673@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:FoM2c.26836$aT1.1718@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:f331bf5a10995785f1dffa6c2df68dff@news.bubbanews.com...
> > > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 16:56:58 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > > mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:c034bd2.0403061525.65905fcd@posting.google.com...
> > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:<uNo2c.31096$W74.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > >> > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power,
> > > >> > on un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >> >
> > > >> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > >> > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > >> > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
> > > >> > >either! The "holier than thou" attitude that some of our
> > > >> > >group takes. They have as much right
> > > >> > > to their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > >>
> > > >> Dan these guys think anyone that obeys FCC law is acting holier
than
> > > >> thou LOL and they think they have a right to the "freeband"
ROTFLMAO
> > > >
> > > >Dang....I hadn't thought of it that way. But you know something? I
> > think
> > > >you are right.
> > > >
> > > >Guess my moma brought me up wrong. You know..obey the law and all
that
> > > >silly stuff.
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
```

> > >
> > > hey diaper dan, he said his station was legal. dang you should have
> > > thought about you low comprehension level.
> >
> > Not possible. CBers don't operate legal.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> You know something, YOU ARE SO FULL OF SHIT. NOT ALL CBer's operate out of
> band or with more than the recommended wattage.. AND NOT ALL HAMS operate
> within the framework of Part 97 either. Check all those who've been fined,
> you'll see. YOU have a problem with using a broad paint brush. CL
>
>

'recommended power level'.....see, you don't even understand what I'm talking about. It's not 'recommended power level'. It is maximum power authorized. See the difference? I rest my case.

And I am fully aware that there are hams doing the very same thing. I figure that they got their training on 11 meters. (Thats CB, in case you don't know).

Dan/W4NTI

658. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:44:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <X933c.28135$aT1.21016@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Whats wrong CL? You waiting till homos can marry in your state?

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:SjP2c.7596$5M.252777@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> I told you "NOT TOO INTELLIGENT" - I'M NOT MARRIED! Good call sign! Fits
you
> well. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:VpM2c.26838$aT1.13007@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > Your wife told me last night.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:dVL2c.7571$5M.252641@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > DAMNED, how'd you know I had a hairy ass? CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:oxI2c.26408$aT1.11340@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > > Only if you trim your mustache.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:xOu2c.7506$5M.251713@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > KISS MY ASS! CL
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:jCo2c.31081$W74.1880@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Your too dumb to be a ham.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
> Part
> > > > 97.
> > > > > > Cops
> > > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm

> aware
> > > of.
> > > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone
knocks
> > you
> > > > off
> > > > > > some
> > > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
> And,
> > I
> > > AM
> > > > A
> > > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
> But
> > > > again,
> > > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > news:5La2c.33957$hm4.8429@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under
a
> > > > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all
interference.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
> > COPS
> > > > > can
> > > > > > > come
> > > > > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And
are
> > > > > protected
> > > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > > Federal Laws.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up
> the
> > > > > spectrum.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are
> Facts.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:uoM1c.7399$5M.249099@dfw-read.news.verio.net...

> > > > > > > > > STUFF IT! CBers have as much right as you to be on the
air.
> CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
in
> > > message
> > > > > > > > >
> news:ENK1c.29870$W74.21992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > My opinion stands. If you don't like it....get over it.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > news:SMw1c.7368$5M.248281@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > What, they don't have the right to talk on CB as you
> like
> > to
> > > > > > enjoy
> > > > > > > > on
> > > > > > > > your
> > > > > > > > > ham? With out getting into a flame war over legalities
> > such
> > > > as
> > > > > > > linears,
> > > > > > > > > extra channels and so on, in my opinion, if the guy is
> > > > operating
> > > > > > per
> > > > > > > > part
> > > > > > > > > 95, then he has every right to be on the CB. Your
> opinion
> > > > > isn't
> > > > > > > helping
> > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > war between CB/Ham. Sorry, I strongly disagree with
your
> > > > > opinion.
> > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > do
> > > > > > > > > CB now, but I cut my teeth on it and I know many good
> and
> > > > > decent
> > > > > > > > CBers.
> > > > > > > > > > CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
wrote
> > in
> > > > > > message

> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > news:q3t1c.31927$hm4.5829@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > news:MUk1c.7340$5M.246363@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Unless I've missed something along the lines - "I"
> am
> > > > > taking
> > > > > > > > > it
> > > > > > > > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > in
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > the US, the last I heard from way back when is
that
> > CB's
> > > > > no
> > > > > > > > longer
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > required
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > a "license". So how can they sue you for operating
> > > without
> > > > > a
> > > > > > > > > license
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > when
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > the governing body of radios, doesn't require one?
> > > According
> > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > Part
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > 95 -
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > which still does exist, you're very eligible to
> remain
> > > on
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > air
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > talk.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Your attorney may be a smart man, but it ticks me
> off
> > > when
> > > > > > > people
> > > > > > > > > who
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > no knowledge of radio, issue opinions such as
that.
> > They
> > > > > > need
> > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > research
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > that which they have no knowledge of, before
issuing
> > an
> > > > > > opinion

> > > > > > > or
> > > > > > > > > > > > trying
> > > > > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > defend one. I don't know, I think I'd be
contacting
> > the
> > > > > FCC
> > > > > > on
> > > > > > > > > that
> > > > > > > > > > > issue.
> > > > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > > > can't see that they can force you off the air.
Maybe
> > you
> > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > have
> > > > > > > > > > > money
> > > > > > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > > > > > pursue a lawsuit, but you can certainly seek out
the
> > aid
> > > > > of
> > > > > > your
> > > > > > > > > elected
> > > > > > > > > > > officials. "I" think you DO have a case. Go online
> to
> > > the
> > > > > > FCC
> > > > > > > > > website
> > > > > > > > > > > if
> > > > > > > > > > > > you
> > > > > > > > > > > > > don't have a copy of Part 95, to view it online.
> > Print
> > > > > out
> > > > > > a
> > > > > > > > page
> > > > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > > > > it,
> > > > > > > > > > > > which shows you no longer need the license. E-Mail
> > them
> > > > > > while
> > > > > > > > > you're
> > > > > > > > > > > at
> > > > > > > > > > > > it.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Let them know what you've been told. Don't just
lie
> > down
> > > > > and
> > > > > > > > let
> > > > > > > > > > > them

> > > > > > > > > > > > bull
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > doze you over. CL
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > <tom@wsd.SPAM> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > > > > > > news:104barkjrua5m82@news.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that
the
> > > local
> > > > > > > > utility
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I
> > consulted
> > > a
> > > > > > > > attorney
> > > > > > > > > > > > > and
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > after
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > looking at the law he advised me that the
utility
> > > could
> > > > > > > sue
> > > > > > > > > > me
> > > > > > > > > > > > > for
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > I
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down
> my
> > CB
> > > > > > > antenna
> > > > > > > > > > > > from
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > house. The main reason I am not fighting the
> utility
> > > > is
> > > > > > > > > > because
> > > > > > > > > > > > > of
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > cost
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > I really can't believe the responses I received
> > with
> > > > > my
> > > > > > > > > > question
> > > > > > > > > > > > > here
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > last
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > week, but I know it is important for others to
> know
> > > > > about
> > > > > > > > > > my
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > experience.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Maybe some one with the money will be able to

> stand
> > up
> > > > > > against
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > utilities
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > that are now selling BPL access and sending out
> > cease
> > > > and
> > > > > > desist
> > > > > > > > > > > letters
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > Tom
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

659. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:45:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <0b33c.28136$aT1.3878@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:HbP2c.7589$5M.252785@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:f4b4bf9926b1c3e33cce5ed71a4f96fc@news.bubbanews.com...
> > On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:24:46 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >I was trying to be gentle. His wife is reading this over my shoulder.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > nonsense, you are a faggot, you already admitted it
>
> I SECOND THAT!!!!!! HE IS A FAG..... YOU said it Danno..... NOT US. CL
>
>

You guys really need to change your dope. It must have gone bad.

Dan/W4NTI

660. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:47:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ad33c.28138$aT1.9195@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:d4rn401vrl45rt7bkv4e7h7803rdnr694n@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 19:16:40 -0700, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> wrote:
>
> >ClueLess wrote:
> >> I'm NOT married - ASS WIPE...
> > >
> > >Must be waiting for his state to start allowing queer marriages.
>
> Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
> week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
> constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
> wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
> was watching that night)
>

Only liberals watch those shows.

Dan/W4NTI

661. Re: BPL - RFI Deflector now available

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:50:03 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net>
Message-ID: <vf33c.9697$%06.8042@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Who's in charge here, "Andy in NJ" <SHORECOGS at COMCAST DOT NET>?
Where's my Captain's Wafers?:

> I thought it had something to do with not cutting out extra stuff that
> wasn't needed when replying.
>
> Unable to cut out unneeded quotes "Unclaimed Mysteries"
> <theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net> wrote in message
> news:WAK2c.26693$aT1.25017@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>Top-postin' Andy in NJ wrote:
>>
>>That's because the part of your brain that should be concerned about
>>this issue has been erased by tightly focused selective amnesia brain
>>beams, and the previous thoughts replaced by what They think you should
>>think. Happens to the best of us. It just happened to me, right now.
>>I've completely forgotten what I should warn you about.
>>
>>I think it had something to with top-posting being righteous and just.
>>
>>Oh, well, never mind.
>

OH NO! THEY'VE GOTTEN TO YOU ALREADY!

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Religion isn't the opiate of the masses. When
properly used, religion is the methamphetamine
of the masses." - nu-monet v6.0 in alt.slack

662. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:51:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yg33c.28169$aT1.12153@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

See there you are admiting you are a CBer....you even understand what they
say on it.

Dan/W4NTI

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:MlP2c.7598$5M.252819@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> From past posts, I'd day you need a translation on every thing everyone
> tells you. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ttM2c.26845$aT1.1440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > But don't make any sense. I guess I need a translation book to
understand
> > the CBism gibberish. Why is it you CBers talk so funny anyway?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:%XL2c.7573$5M.252662@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > Well at least we know you can "listen to sound".. Good job - rover. CL
> > >
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:tBI2c.26428$aT1.6561@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > > No I don't know what that means CL. Because there is NO SUCH THING.
> > You
> > > > cbers are all a bunch of illegal, over modulating, trash mouthed
> > > goofballs.
> > > > At least that is what I hear everytime I listen there.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:UUu2c.7511$5M.251497@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > NO JACK OFF, YOU need to keep up. ALL ALONG - MY references to CB
> were
> > > for
> > > > > Part 95 COMPLIANT stations. Or don't you know what that means?????
> ASS
> > > > > HOLE.............
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message

> > > > > news:Zrs2c.226$%q3.68@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Hey Steveo.....he is saying that overpowered CB stations in the
> > > 'outlaw'
> > > > > > band. His name btw. Are as legal as a real federally licensed
> > > station.
> > > > > > And you agree? How about you keeping up.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:20040306134556.358$gV@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > The OP stated he is legal, try to keep up, dumbass.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > > > > > How do you figure a outlaw CBer, operating illegal power, on
> > > > > > > > un-authorized frequencies have any rights to ANY frequency??
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:M2f2c.7463$5M.250897@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > > > Speaking as a "HAM" - that is why THEY don't like US
either!
> > The
> > > > > > > > > "holier than thou" attitude that some of our group takes.
> They
> > > > have
> > > > > as
> > > > > > > > > much right
> > > > > > > > to
> > > > > > > > > their band as we do ours. Who died and made you God? CL
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
in
> > > > message
> > > > > > > > >
> news:IIa2c.33956$hm4.14390@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > > > > > > news:20040304182816.235$qy@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
> wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > > > > > > news:20040303175059.815$9P@newsreader.com...
> > > > > > > > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com>
> > > wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > One less CBer. Who cares?
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > You'll cry like a little bitch when it's you,
loser.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Cry about what? The NPRM from the FCC says that the
> > > utility
> > > > > > > > > > > > company
> > > > > > > > > > will
> > > > > > > > > > > > have to take steps to stop any interference to
> licensed
> > > > > > stations.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > The same stands for CBer's. That doesn't change the
sell
> > out
> > > > > > > > > > > we're watching go down.
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > I am a licensed station....any other questions?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Where does it say you should act like an asshole on
your
> > > > > license?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Any more stupid remarks, mr anti-cber?
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > I know, -fool-.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > If you don't like my responses, why ask me a question?
I
> > > > really
> > > > > > > > > > don't
> > > > > > > > > give
> > > > > > > > > > a ratsass about CBers.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >

> >
> >
>
>

663. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:53:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oi33c.28178$aT1.1839@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:7gcn40l795rpd02p9kildua3bme4mr533b@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:30:30 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> ...that's fine if you want to leave yourself open to identity theft.
> >
> >Yeah, good excuse. Come on now, tell the real truth? Your just too
> >gutless to stand by your statements. You want to hide under a rock.
> >
> >Right?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Like you do when you threaten people on HF? Funny how you're never
> heard on any of the local repeaters. Now, why is that?

Not on local repeaters? I am on any and all repeaters I desire to be.
Unfortunatly there is no one to talk to until a tornado comes by.

Threaten who ? Jammers. So what?

Dan/W4NTI

664. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:54:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Uj33c.28182$aT1.10351@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88728
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

What was that about threats? Now Now "CJ....er
"CL", you really need to control yourself.

Dan/W4NTI

<does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:9nP2c.7600$5M.252805@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> Meet me somewhere some time, I'll show you guts. I'll smear your fat ass
all
> over the street. CL
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:SwM2c.26850$aT1.21012@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > Sure it does. Your pissed because Ive got the guts to say somthing
under
> my
> > real name and call. You on the other hand....well you know the rest of
> it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > news:0ZL2c.7574$5M.252509@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > YOUR call sign don't mean dick to me. It doesn't make you an expert or
> > GOD.
> > > CL
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:zCI2c.26432$aT1.3983@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > > > I could say I am a astronaut and you couldn't prove otherwise.
> > Difference
> > > > is I have the guts to ID myself. Thus I am credible. And you?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:7Zu2c.7513$5M.251744@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > I do NOT post my call. Never did, never will. But if you really
want
> > to
> > > > > know, I'm a 20 WPM Extra and have been Commercially licensed for
> about
> > > 20
> > > > > years now. CL

> > > > >
> > > > > "PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com>
> > wrote
> > > > in
> > > > > message news:104jjsi1ofrg6bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Ronnie" <NoSpam@NoEmail> wrote in message
> > > > > news:c2c0s7$b2$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are
> Part
> > > 97.
> > > > > > Cops
> > > > > > > don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm
> aware
> > > of.
> > > > > > Maybe
> > > > > > > in your dreams. Climb off your high horse before someone
knocks
> > you
> > > > off
> > > > > > some
> > > > > > > day. Tomorrow wouldn't be soon enough from the sounds of it.
> And,
> > I
> > > AM
> > > > A
> > > > > > > HAM! I do NOT do CB anymore. Haven't since like 10 years ago.
> But
> > > > again,
> > > > > > > THEY have as much right as we do. YOU need to get a life. CL
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > And you are what? A No-Code Tech? Cannot tell since you didn't
> > post
> > > a
> > > > > > > call.....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Oh, well. Back to the outband, eh?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't tell what you are either. Where's YOUR call? Yeah,
that's
> > what
> > > I
> > > > > > thought...
> > > > > >

> > > > > > Don't talk about others as you are not any better...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

665. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:55:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yk33c.28183$aT1.9889@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88729
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:4feb6a28653918a20cf4b8d41a4cf81b@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:32:43 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No
> >Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with you
> >turkeys anyway?
> >
> >Diaper Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> its taxable not taxible, dummy

Don't matter one whit. I still don't have to pay any tax.

Dan/W4NTI

666. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:57:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bm33c.28185$aT1.23121@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Where at on 80 meters? I usually operate on 75 myself.

Dan/W4NTI

"DANNY JESWALD" <DiaperDan@home.nut> wrote in message
news:c2g7er030v6@drn.newsguy.com...
> i here my name on 80 meters and its not me. what should i do?
>
>
> In article <XzM2c.26857$aT1.14894@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:zvL2c.747$Cm3.599@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> news:mGI2c.26444$aT1.1970@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> >
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:qEE2c.26125$aT1.1496@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> > >
> >> > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> >> > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> >> > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> >> > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> >> > > >
> >> > > > DE N7ZZT
> >> > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> >> > > >
> >> > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> >> > > 'unlicensed
> >> > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
COPS
> >> can
> >> > > come
> >> > > > > in and shut you down?
> >> > > >
> >> > > IF the CB station is legal...the locals have no authority to

> >> > > shut the CB station down.
> >> > >
> >> > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> >> > protected
> >> > > > > > by Federal Laws.
> >> > > >
> >> > > So is the legal CB operator.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > > > You, on the other hand, are nothing but bandits trashing up
the
> >> > > spectrum.
> >> > > >
> >> > > IF and only IF they are operating ILLEGALLY...which, if so,
> >> > > means they are not really CB at all.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > > > Again////if you don't like it....get over it...Facts are Facts.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Just be careful with your facts.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Cheers,
> >> > > Bill, K2UNK
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > >
> >> > How many cops know the difference? I would guess ten country wide.
> >> >
> >> Perhaps so, but it doesn't change the law.
> >>
> >> > So, the get busted, the go off the air, the courts get to sort it
out.
> >>
> >> Did you mean to say: So the CBer gets busted, goes off the air,
> >> and then the court gets to sort it out? If yes...
> >>
> >> The cops can't bust a CBer just for being on the ait. The cops
> >> have to bust someone and charge that person with one or more
> >> specific violations of FCC rules. Causing interference to BPL
> >> or any other service using a legal CB rig and antenna is NOT
> >> against any FCC rule.
> >>
> >> > Still its end of problem. One less CBer trashing up the spectrum.
> >>
> >> Huh??? Even if the cops confiscate a legal CB rig, that does
> >> NOT prohibit the same CBer from buying or using another one.
> >>
> >> Now for a reality check...just how many local cops have actually
> >> taken any steps against any illegal or pirate CBers? I'm guessing
> >> next to none...much less a legal CBer?
> >>

> >> Cheers,
> >> Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >I wouldn't know Bill. Your the lawyer, you tell me.
> >
> >Have a nice day. Now go back to fencing with Lenny.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> You ask w
>

667. Re: YOU LARNT A LESSON NOW wVa MARTIAN HED? DON'T MESS WITH ME AN LLOYD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 18:58:34 UTC
From: Oris <oris@bcrighbigwts.net>
Message-ID: <c2ifm9$55f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Boris Pinson>; "Esq." <pinsionb23@no.where> wrote in message
news:87023238917833.2439128789@taranews.net...
> OLD MARTIAN HED THUNK HE COULD DO WHAT EVER WUZ IN HIS POINTED HAID AN
> THEIR WUD BE NO CONE SEQUENCES OVER AT NETWURK 54. BUT HE AN HIS
> MARTIAN HEDS MADE ME MAD AN I FINALLY HAD TO DO IT TO PROETCT SOCEITY.
>
> I PLONKERED THE WHOLE DAM NIM BASTARDS BOARD AN HAD IT SHUT DOWN. I
> NO DO SUHC A THANG LITELY, BUT I AM POWERFUL AN OL MARTIAN HED HE
> FORGET THAT AGAIN. HE AINT LEARNT NO MANNERS YET AN SO I SPANKED HIM
> HARD.
>
> I AM WAY BETTER THAN HIM. I AM HIS SUPREOR MENTALITY SO IT WERN'T NO
> PRBLEM TO DO IT AN I WIL DO IT AGAIN IF HE DON'T LEAF ME AN LLOYD
> ALONE FRUM NOW ON.
>
> A NOTE TO OL MARTIAN HED:
> I GOT MONEY NOW AND I CAN LAW YER ASS SIX WAYS FROM SUNDAY IFFEN I
> WANT TO. JUST REMEMBER THAT. I ALSO NO MARTIAL ARTS NOW, SO DON'T
> MESS AROUND AT ALL WITH ME. THE WEDBETTER TWINS TEACHED ME ALL ABOUT
> KONG FOO FIGHTIN LAST YEAR SO YOU HAVE BEN WARNED. YOU DON'T WANT ME
> KICKING YOUR DOOR DOWN UP THAR IN POVERTY STRICKEN wVa.
>
> LEAF ME ALOE!!!!!!! OR I WILL LAW YER ASS. RITE THEIR IN WAST
> VERGINA. YOU BETT I WILT. I GONE TO BRUNG THE WEDBETTERS UP THEIR.
> WE GONE TO LAW YER ASS. NITE & DAY. THE WEDBETTERS IS REEL. THEY
> CAN MAKE THE JUGE ORDER YOU TO BEE BAPTERIZED!!!!!!!!! HOW DO THAT
> GRAB YOU ATEIST!!!!!! THE JUGE GONE TO MAKE YOU BE BORN AGIN OF THE
> SPRITE. YOU GONE TO BE YER OWEN WURST ENMIE. WEE GONE TO LAW YOU.
> SURE ENUFF WEE IS!!!!!

hey bbinson,

ant hower ya gunt fine a bc610 i stills wanner bc610 an bc610 xmtr
my you furst no KAPTAL leddrs causin prolly me not fine mine
bc610 xmtr forto xmtr on channul 13 bit powvur. laz time to me
wanna bc610 big bc610 rayo.....

gud numers fm oris 73,

oris

668. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 19:01:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2q33c.28190$aT1.11953@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:2aeb13a4c74ae0474dc78fbb51c64353@news.bubbanews.com...
> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:36:48 GMT, "Dummy Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but
offer
> >nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
> >
> >If it squaks like a CBer,
> >If it talks like a CBer,
> >
> >Its a CBer.
> >
> >Dummy Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Its squawks, not squaks, dummy. you are a joke. at least if nothing
> else you are good for a laugh.
>

Its a CBer...it squaks.

Dan/W4NTI

669. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 19:04:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ys33c.28192$aT1.2107@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"CL" <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote in message
news:npP2c.7601$5M.252691@dfw-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:QBM2c.26862$aT1.17900@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > How would you know CL? Your just a CBer. You claim to be a ham, but
> offer
> > nothing to prove it. You don't even talk like a ham.
> >
> > If it squaks like a CBer,
> > If it talks like a CBer,
> >
> > Its a CBer.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> I do not owe you any proof.. You on the other hand though you offer proof
of
> a call sign, offer proof of being a complete ass hole. CL
>
>
No you dont. I will just continue to consider you having no credibility.

Dan/W4NTI

670. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 19:07:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fw33c.28196$aT1.895@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:8zO2c.1309$Cm3.120@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZEM2c.26869$aT1.8957@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:CvL2c.748$Cm3.483@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
> > > news:KhG2c.41174$qo.40849@fe1.texas.rr.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> > > > news:pan.2004.03.07.06.23.14.241877@127.0.0.1...
> > > > > read part 95 again and tell these folks that...
> > > > > c'mon dan, you of all people should know better!
> > > > >
> > > > > DE N7ZZT
> > > > > Phoenix, Arizona
> > > > >
> > > > > On Sat, 06 Mar 2004 02:32:33 +0000, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > No you don't. CBers have no rights at all. You come under a
> > > > 'unlicensed
> > > > > > class'. That means you must accept any and all interference.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If you are so much in the right, then tell me why the LOCAL
COPS
> > can
> > > > come
> > > > > > in and shut you down?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can't do that with the hams....we have real licenses. And are
> > > protected
> > > > > > by Federal Laws.
> > > > >
> > > > I can picture that...you screaming about your rights as you're being
> > told
> > > > by
> > > > some overly zealous, RF ignorant cop to shut down.
> > > >
> > > Cops can't stop you or anyone ele from doing something legal.
> > > They may get a person to stop today, but unless they confiscate
```

> > > the equipment, that person can be on the air again 10 minutes later.
> > > Now if the cops confiscate, they better charge the person with
> > > a specific violation pretty damn quick.
> > >
> > > > No, you'll do as you're
> > > > told. You will
> > > > win in the long run (court), but you will do as you're told
> > > > or you will go to jail.
> > >
> > > Go to jail for what? The cops have to charge arrest a person
> > > toi put the person in jail...and that requires a specific violation to
> > > be charged. Another aspect is that the cops aren't the sole
> > > arbiters of if someone gets arrested. The local prosecutor
> > > will likly be consulted before any "RF ignorant cop" is given
> > > free reign to arrest someone for an FCC CB violation.
> > >
> > > Cheers,
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Good work Bill....see everyone, I told you he was a lawyer.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Not a lawyer at all. Just common sense application of
> reality based on a general knowledge of the law and of
> local government.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Sorry to have insulted you.

Dan/W4NTI

671. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute <-- Can we please stop this thread?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 19:18:14 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <9mhp401bu560pfkc72gbc4pgm4oitbf19m@4ax.com>
Source record: 88735
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

[No readable article body recovered]

672. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:08:43 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <k4op409d2truevvti0oudc5t1rijt2snvk@4ax.com>
Source record: 88737
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:31:05 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> >WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the CBers! CL.
>>
>> Viet Nam Dan apparently believes that if you're into CB radio, even if
>> you operate within the rules of FCC part 95, you are a criminal.
>>
>
>I have NEVER heard a legal CB station in operation.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Well, I guess if all you listen to is channel six...

673. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:25:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403081325.52114d30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88736

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cnT2c.1821$Cm3.312@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040307194050.07155.00001121@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> > Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be
> > >> learned
> > >> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose
> > >> major threats.
> > >
> > >Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
> > >Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years.
> >
> > That depends on the technology. Houses today are not built much
> > differently
> > than they were 15/20 years ago. New materials and techniques are used
> > alongside
> > old ones. Most of those in the building trades, as well as DIY types, can
> > keep up with the changes.
>
> Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
> but even in building construction, there is technological advances and
> automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
> Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
> always come prefab.

Sure - but those changes occur slowly enough that builders can keep up
with them. And they're not faced with career obsolescence. The
introduction of nail guns and PVC pipe has not eliminated the need for
carpenters and plumbers.

While building a house isn't exactly cheap, here in the USA we manage
to do it with almost all domestic labor and materials. If it can be
done in that industry, why not others?

>
> > >If I hadn't had the
> > >opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
> > >Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
> > >compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
> > >somewhere.
> > >
> > >> And who pays for the retraining?
> > >

> > >It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
> > >training costs per employee are gone.
> >
> > In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System) paid
> > for
> > your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your own.
> > More
> > important, your new training built on your existing skills and knowledge
> > so you could stay in the same field.
>
> But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
> expenses.

That's exactly the problem.
>
> > >> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
> > >> >> economy alone.
> > >> >
> > >> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
> > >> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
> > >> >and less need for skilled labor.
> > >>
> > >> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
> > >> automated and all - is moving to places like China.
> > >>
> > >> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
> > >
> > >The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
> >
> > Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready and
> > of low quality.
>
> That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.

Same thing, essentially. Push a product that won't last out the door
so that the customers will have to replace it in a few years.
>
> > Companies do not support products after even a few years because
> > they want you to buy the new products.
>
> Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
> and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
> because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.

I disagree! See below.

> The irony of non-support for older products is that in
> some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
> to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>
> > This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"

> > their
> > cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
> > Their
> > goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were the
> > new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
> > succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
> > years,
> > and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the best of
> > care.
>
> Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.

Yep - and here's why:

Up until about the mid-60s or so, US automakers focused on the sizzle
rather than the steak. Their focus was on making lots of cars, and if
they polluted, didn't last or weren't as safe as they could be, that
wasn't much of a big deal. They fought all sorts of innovations
because they were afraid of tarnishing the image. Example: they didn't
like seat belts in part because of the cost but also because they're a
reminder that you could die in your car.

Then US automakers got a 1-2-3-4 punch in about a decade:

1) Safety issues
2) Pollution issues
3) Fuel economy issues
4) Foreign competition/quality issues

Detroit took a real thumping from all four, in large part because the
foreign automakers were more experienced building safer, cleaner, more
efficient cars that would last longer. The Big Three had to be dragged
kicking and screaming (by way of legislation requiring things like
seat belts and dual brake systems) into making better cars. In at
least one case (Chrysler) the Feds got involved with loan guarantees.

> > >Look at the
> > >ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
> > >
> > Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
> > However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>
> Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?

Based on repairs I've had to do to computers both at home and at work.
>
> > >Consider too that
> > >a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
> > >to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
> > >is applied by the consumer).
> > >
> > A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was

> > balanced,
> > Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
> > unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I knew
> > were talking about retiring at 55.
>
> Your point?
>

That a lot has changed in the past few years.

> > All changed now.
>
> Your point?

That something needs to be done.

One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal changes, particularly in the middle class.

40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to work and Mom to stay home with the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions, but as a rule if Dad had a good job, Mom did not have to work outside the home when the kids were small).

Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes well!

73 de Jim, N2EY

674. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:28:52 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <eaop40dg0iio6hvrlp1rgs4obed9rep2g6@4ax.com>
Source record: 88738
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:53:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> Like you do when you threaten people on HF? Funny how you're never
>> heard on any of the local repeaters. Now, why is that?
>
>Not on local repeaters? I am on any and all repeaters I desire to be.
>Unfortunatly there is no one to talk to until a tornado comes by.
>
>Threaten who ? Jammers. So what?

...as if you've never jammed the Liberty Net.

675. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:30:25 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <adpp40t6pl4k45pejia4ff1eqvnlev4vok@4ax.com>
Source record: 88739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:55:26 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:4feb6a28653918a20cf4b8d41a4cf81b@news.bubbanews.com...
>> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:32:43 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
>> this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>> >I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No
>> >Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with you
>> >turkeys anyway?
>> >
>> >Diaper Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>>
>> its taxable not taxible, dummy
>
>Don't matter one whit. I still don't have to pay any tax.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

That's only because the VA doesn't read Usenet. If it did, you'd be
busted for fraud and have to get a job like the rest of us.

676. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:32:31 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <7ipp40h07lq4a4dgv8499fv1sjojqvelvr@4ax.com>
Source record: 88740
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:26:22 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>> Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If
>> you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on
>> the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass
>> and get a job.
>>
>
>Will you hire me then?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I won't, but Walmart might.

677. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:33:25 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <fkpp409pdnlh2tqvb69r95tol098cr4tfh@4ax.com>
Source record: 88741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:47:34 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
>> week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
>> constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
>> wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
>> was watching that night)
>>
>
>Only liberals watch those shows.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Your point being?

678. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 21:35:35 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <empp40d8ikgnga862tbcv8h5shf6jvspvv@4ax.com>
Source record: 88742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:24:56 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so YOU
>> >could be a freeloader?
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
>> and the radio.
>>
>>
>
>Thats right, and your point is?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.

679. Re: When is a re-stocking charge a good idea?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:27:19 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab6bd5a5c40abf0989804@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 88743

In article <8a260fb2.0403080949.29a92f1@posting.google.com>,
wa8mea@hotmail.com says...
> I've been a customer of AES for years. Spent THOUSANDS with them,
> usually buying at least a couple of different rigs a year.
>
> Just got a call from one of the fellas there. I just returned a little
> 2/6/70cm HT in which I couldn't see the little keypad very
> well....among other technical problems with the HT. Only had it a
> couple of days. I requested the substitution of another HT and a 2
> meter beam...resulting in them receiving $100 additional.
>
> The gentleman was very polite, but said because there was some type of
> wear on the beltclip (and I certainly didn't see any. But there could
> have been since I did use the clip.), they couldn't resell the device
> as new...so they would have to charge me a 15% re-stocking fee. ($39)
>
> As a ham businessman myself, I KNOW the cost of doing business. But I
> know I wouldn't go as far as to possibly alienate a customer in long
> standing. In fact, I have several customers in long standing and have
> had to "bite the bullet" on a couple of returns from them....just
> because I DID NOT want to alienate them from doing further business
> with me. I felt the greater need to keep these people as customers.

Even without the large profit margins, the store can and does send the
unit back to the manufacturer in many cases. Plus, if they take a loss
on an item it gets recorded as an expense on their part. Lowers their
overall tax liability.

680. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:41:29 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308174129.885$fG@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:24:56 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so
> >> >YOU could be a freeloader?
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
> >> and the radio.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Thats right, and your point is?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.
>
Figures, Dan/W4NTI is another freeloader making up shit in order to collect
my hard earned tax money. Is it worse to be a freebander, or a
freeloader?

681. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:43:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308174305.346$Y5@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:47:34 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >> Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
> >> week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
> >> constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
> >> wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
> >> was watching that night)
> >>
> > >
> >Only liberals watch those shows.
> > >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
>
> Your point being?
>
The point of his empty dome?

682. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:44:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308174449.399$qv@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:26:22 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >> Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If
> >> you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on
> >> the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass
> >> and get a job.
> >>
> >
> >Will you hire me then?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> I won't, but Walmart might.
>
Only if they want to scare all their customers away.

683. [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:47:52 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <sK63c.210858$uV3.820801@attbi_s51>
Source record: 88747
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Original message:
> From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
> Subject: OT: Open Letter from a Green Beret to John Kerry
> (copy of editorial by Don Bendell snipped)

Mr. Stinson, are you employed by, a volunteer at, or otherwise associated with the Bush for President campaign?

It's interesting to note that when I did a Google search of "Don Bendell" the first site that comes up is titled "Welcome to Bendell Enterprises": it has a link to Mr. Bendell's agent prominently displayed on the page. The fact that Mr. Bendell is, as a Republican spokesman, so obviously (you'll excuse the pun) "bush league" is indicative of how desperately the Republican National Spin Meisters are trying to find anything or anyone who will denigrate Senator Kerry's war record.

No matter: Mr. Bendell was there, so I'll give him the benefit of the doubt. I doubt that his recollection is the only valid one of that place or time, and I also doubt that he has the one true account of Vietnam. Loyal service, even as part of an A team, does not grant an old soldier the right to rewrite history.

I was there, too: and everything John Kerry said is true.

That Mr. Bendell didn't see it doesn't mean it didn't happen: he is entitled to support and protect the memory of his comrades, as am I - but not at the expense of whitewashing what others have documented. Yes, some soldiers _did_ cut the ears off VC dead. Yes, some soldiers did other unspeakable things: just ask Rusty Calley if you don't believe me. Some of it, I saw with my own eyes, some I read in the courts-martial and/or arrest reports I saw as a Military Policeman.

Mr. Bendell is entitled to be proud of his relatives who are in the National Guard, especially in peacetime when there's little chance they'll be put in harm's way - and I am entitled to hold someone who is standing for election to a higher standard. The rich and powerful have a greater obligation to the ideal of service than do ordinary men and women, and Shrub wasn't there.

Whatever Mr. Bendell's perception of the Vietnam war is, he's not entitled to shoot the messenger who first brought the ugly, sad truth to America's attention in a way that could not be denied or swept under the rug. That John Kerry chose to leave the war zone early is no shame: nobody who's been shot at blames another for taking advantage of the "three strikes" rule, which spelled out early return for a sailor who was wounded three times. Only an former General Officer like President Eisenhower could tell the

military brass "I will not send one American boy into that elephant grass", and for the same reasons, only a decorated commander like John Kerry could have founded Vietnam Veterans Against the War.

At a time in our nation's history when the rich and well connected were scurrying to park their sons' yachts in safe backwaters, a well connected young man raised his hand, took an oath, and took everything that came with it. You can't fake that kind of courage, and you can't spin his opponent's kind of cowardice. John Kerry was there.

Bill Warren

P.S. Readers are invited to cross-post this to any newsgroup where Mr. Bendell's editorials are appearing.

P.P.S. FWIW, some soldiers did kill dogs: the unfortunate animals couldn't read signs, and those that were lucky enough to wander through a minefield unscathed would, sad to say, leaves tracks that Viet Minh sappers could follow. I did, too: in my case, as a courtesy to our Vietnamese workers, who wanted them for food but were unable to participate in butchery because of their religeous beliefs.

(William Warren is a pseudonym I use to protect my privacy. I will respond with my actual name to anyone who asks offline: modify the return address in an obvious way to email me directly. I don't work for the Kerry campaign, or the government, or the Democratic party, and have never even met the Senator.)

684. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 22:49:11 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308174911.248$UW@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88748
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:31:05 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >> >WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the CBers!
> >> >CL.
> >>
> >> Viet Nam Dan apparently believes that if you're into CB radio, even if
> >> you operate within the rules of FCC part 95, you are a criminal.
> >>
> >
> >I have NEVER heard a legal CB station in operation.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Well, I guess if all you listen to is channel six...
>
He listens to agent orange.

685. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:10:05 UTC
From: - - ex - - <exray@coqui.gov>
Message-ID: <104pv6o6pss9se4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88749
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

William Warren wrote:

>
> At a time in our nation's history when the rich and well connected
> were scurrying to park their sons' yachts in safe backwaters, a well
> connected young man raised his hand, took an oath, and took
> everything that came with it. You can't fake that kind of courage,
> and you can't spin his opponent's kind of cowardice. John Kerry was
> there.
>
> Bill Warren

THE FOLLOWING ITEM APPEARED IN A NON-PARTISAN (BUT EXTREMELY
CYNICAL) NEWSLETTER FOR INVESTORS. THE NEWSLETTER HAS BEEN RELENTLESSLY
CRITICAL OF BUSH ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC POLICIES.
And now this about `Lucky Jack Kerry` from a source we`re not sure we
can reveal, said to be a retired Rear Admiral:

`I was in the Delta shortly after he [Kerry] left. I know that area
well. I know the operations he was involved in well. I know the tactics
and the doctrine used. I know the equipment. Although I was attached to
CTF-116 (PBRs) I
spent a fair amount of time with CTF-115 (swift boats), Kerry`s command.

`Here are my problems and suspicions:

(1) Kerry was in-country less than four months and collected, a Bronze
Star, a Silver Star and three purple hearts. I never heard of anybody
with any outfit I worked with (including SEAL One, the Sea Wolves,
Riverines and the
River Patrol Force) collecting that much hardware so fast, and for such
pedestrian actions. The Swifts did a commendable job. But that duty
wasn`t the worst you could
draw. They operated only along the coast and in the major rivers (Bassac
and Mekong). The rough stuff in the hot areas was mainly handled by the
smaller, faster PBRs.

(2) Three Purple Hearts but no limp. All injuries so minor that he lost
no time from duty. Amazing luck. Or he was putting himself in for medals
every time he bumped his head
on the wheel house hatch? Combat on the boats was almost always at close
range. You didn`t have minor wounds. At least not often. Not three times
in a row. Then he used the
three purple hearts to request a trip home eight months before the end
of his tour. Fishy.

(3) The details of the event for which he was given the Silver Star make no sense at all. Supposedly, a B-40 was fired at the boat and missed. Charlie jumps up with the launcher in his hand, the bow gunner knocks him down with the twin .50, Kerry beaches the boat, jumps off, shoots Charlie, and retrieves the launcher. If true, he did everything wrong.

(a) Standard procedure when you took rocket fire was to put your stern to the action and go balls to the wall. A B-40 has the ballistic integrity of a Frisbee after about 25 yards, so you put 50 yards or so between you and the beach and begin raking it with your .50`s.
(b) Did you ever see anybody get knocked down with a .50 caliber round and get up? The guy was dead or dying. The rocket launcher was empty. There was no reason to go after
him (except if you knew he was no danger to you just flopping around in the dust during his last few seconds on earth, and you wanted some daring do in your after-action report). And we didn`t shoot wounded people. We had rules against that, too.
(c) Kerry got off the boat. This was a major breach of standing procedures. Nobody on a boat crew ever got off a boat in a hot area. EVER! The reason was simple. If you had
somebody on the beach your boat was defenseless. It couldn`t run and it couldn`t return fire. It was stupid and it put his crew in danger. He should have been relieved and
reprimanded. I never heard of any boat crewman ever leaving a boat during or after a firefight.

`Something is fishy.

`Here we have a JFK wannabe (the guy Halsey wanted to court martial for carelessly losing his boat and getting a couple people killed by running across the bow of a Jap destroyer)
who is hardly in Vietnam long enough to get a good tan, collects medals faster than Audie Murphy in a job where lots of medals weren`t common, gets sent home eight months early, requests separation from active duty a few months after that so he can run for Congress, finds out war heroes don`t sell well in Massachusetts in 1970 so reinvents himself as Jane Fonda, throws his ribbons in the dirt with
the cameras running to jump start his political career, gets Stillborn Pell to invite him to address Congress and Bobby Kennedy`s speechwriter to do the heavy lifting, winds
up in the Senate himself a few years later, votes against every major defense bill, says the CIA is irrelevant after the Wall came down, votes against the Gulf War, a big mistake since that turned out well, decides not to make the same mistake twice so votes for invading Iraq, but oops, that didn`t turn out so well so he now says he really didn`t mean for Bush to go to war when he voted to allow
him to go to war.

`I`m real glad you or I never had this guy covering our flanks in Vietnam. I sure don`t want him as Commander in Chief. I hope that somebody from CTF-115 shows up with some
facts challenging Kerry`s Vietnam record. I know in my gut it`s wildly

inflated. And fishy.`

686. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:15:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403081515.3f78460c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88750

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070441.6f368a1@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062224.41c55674@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403060656.332e8398@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Tell us how it turns out. Best of luck.
> >
> > Ohhhh noooooo, Brain! I wouldn't have it any other way!
>
> Nurses before gentlemen.

And in my case I have the distinct Honor of being both...Ergo I
defer to you, as BOTH a gentleman AND a Nurse would.

Steve, K4YZ

687. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:15:46 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308181546.680$HM@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> See there you are admiting you are a CBer....you even understand what
> they say on it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
You admit you're a freeloader....you even understand what
they say on it.

688. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:20:18 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308182018.322$4g@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> I have NEVER heard a legal CB station in operation.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
That's cuz you're an alligator station, all mouth and no ears. <g>

689. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:23:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403081523.5ed9c3ee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88653

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062232.160eccdf@posting.google.com>...
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> > > In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
> > > because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying
> > > around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.
> >
> > The "point" Lennie it trying to make us believe, Alun, is that
> > Amateur Radio is >>ONLY<< a hobby, with no intrinsic value to anyone
> > for any reason OTHER than recreation...That's not true.
>
> Really? I don't see that at all.

That's because you have YOUR head so far up the Putzy One's anus
that you can't SEE anything else.

> > His ulterior motive is to discredit Amateur Radio's countless
> > contributions, not only to the "history" of radio, but to the
> > "service" of the Nation as a resource to be called upon in any number
> > of disasters or emergencies.
>
> I'd suggest that you not rest on your laurels. Historically amateur
> radio has provided an invaluable service to the nation. More
> recently, more people have turned to cellular telephones to aid them
> in an emergency. You do the math.

There's no math to do, Brain.

There's ALWAYS been more telephones than licensed Amateurs, yet
there's ALWAYS been a need for persons able to conduct emergency
operations via two-way radio.

The invention of the cellular telephone has not changed that at
all. Cellular telephones are still dependent on wire-line based
infrastructure and thousands of very expensivecellsites that are fixed
assets.

Fixed assets in a tornado are ALSO called "collateral damage".

Man-made events are just as devastating as recent events have
demonstrated.

> > He's unable to do that, either, but he obviously believes that if
> > he keeps repeating it often enough perhaps he and he alone can
> > re-write 90 years of history.
>
> Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> amateur radio done for me lately?"

It's not "history", ya dimwit...It's RECENT current events. The
most recent firestorms in the west being testament to that.

Try again, Brain....

Steve, K4YZ

690. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:26:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ki73c.28490$aT1.18661@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:empp40d8ikgnga862tbcv8h5shf6jvspvv@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:24:56 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so
YOU
> >> >could be a freeloader?
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the computer
> >> and the radio.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Thats right, and your point is?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.

Why? Because I can type and talk on a radio? Please provide me with your
medical degree, and I will gladly submit to your exam.

Dan/W4NTI

691. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:27:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Oj73c.28493$aT1.19276@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040308174129.885$fG@newsreader.com...
> Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> > On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:24:56 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just so
> > >> >YOU could be a freeloader?
> > >> >
> > >> >Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the
computer
> > >> and the radio.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >Thats right, and your point is?
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.
> >
> Figures, Dan/W4NTI is another freeloader making up shit in order to
collect
> my hard earned tax money. Is it worse to be a freebander, or a
> freeloader?

I am neither. Again, provide me with your medical diploma and I will submit
to your exam.

Dan/W4NTI

692. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:29:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gl73c.28496$aT1.15592@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:7ipp40h07lq4a4dgv8499fv1sjojqvelvr@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:26:22 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If
> >> you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on
> >> the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass
> >> and get a job.
> >>
> > >
> > >Will you hire me then?
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
>
> I won't, but Walmart might.
>
Not according to the employement bureau.

Dan/W4NTI

693. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:32:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Do73c.28500$aT1.22381@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:fkpp409pdnlh2tqvb69r95tol098cr4tfh@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:47:34 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >> Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
> >> week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
> >> constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
> >> wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
> >> was watching that night)
> >>
> > >Only liberals watch those shows.
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
>
> Your point being?

I think its obvious.

Dan/W4NTI

694. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:34:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lp73c.28501$aT1.26112@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040308181546.680$HM@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > See there you are admiting you are a CBer....you even understand what
> > they say on it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> You admit you're a freeloader....you even understand what
> they say on it.

"The price of freedom is not free"

Dan/W4NTI

695. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:35:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Oq73c.28503$aT1.24018@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:eaop40dg0iio6hvrlp1rgs4obed9rep2g6@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:53:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> Like you do when you threaten people on HF? Funny how you're never
> >> heard on any of the local repeaters. Now, why is that?
> >
> >Not on local repeaters? I am on any and all repeaters I desire to be.
> >Unfortunatly there is no one to talk to until a tornado comes by.
> >
> >Threaten who ? Jammers. So what?
>
>
> ...as if you've never jammed the Liberty Net.

Why would I jam the liberty net? I actually enjoyed some of what they had
to say.

Oh, you mean the tapes that ole Walter Miller was running? He did a good
job, didn't he?

Dan/W4NTI

696. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:36:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Qr73c.28505$aT1.6424@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:adpp40t6pl4k45pejia4ff1eqvnlev4vok@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:55:26 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Mississippi Maul" <mississippi@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:4feb6a28653918a20cf4b8d41a4cf81b@news.bubbanews.com...
> >> On Sun, 07 Mar 2004 21:32:43 GMT, "Diaper Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of
> >> this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >I prefer either No Taxible Income around this time of the year. Or No
> >> >Turkeys Invited. Which reminds me...why am I wasting my time with
you
> >> >turkeys anyway?
> >> >
> >> >Diaper Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >>
> >> its taxable not taxible, dummy
> >
> >Don't matter one whit. I still don't have to pay any tax.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> That's only because the VA doesn't read Usenet. If it did, you'd be
> busted for fraud and have to get a job like the rest of us.

Give it your best shot goofball. Its been tried before.

Dan/W4NTI

697. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:40:06 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308184006.767$Cv@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040308174129.885$fG@newsreader.com...
> > Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> > > On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:24:56 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > > mindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >> >Damn don't you wish you could have had your life screwed up just
> > > >> >so YOU could be a freeloader?
> > > >> >
> > > >> >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >>
> > > >> ...but you're not so disabled that it keeps you away from the
> computer
> > > >> and the radio.
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >Thats right, and your point is?
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > >
> > > The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.
> > >
> > Figures, Dan/W4NTI is another freeloader making up shit in order to
> collect
> > my hard earned tax money. Is it worse to be a freebander, or a
> > freeloader?
>
> I am neither. Again, provide me with your medical diploma and I will
> submit to your exam.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Referral to the akc master n8wwm for your exam.

http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/n8-jpeg.JPG
```

698. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:45:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cA73c.10017$t16.6100353@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88662

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403071521.aabb8f@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
> > > Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> > > amateur radio done for me lately?"
> >
> > How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.
>
> I remember the video with music and scenes of the Twin Towers burning
> and tumbling down. The caption read "NEVER FORGET."
>
> Sorry Dee, but only four percent (4%) of those responding said that
> 9/11 terrorism was the most important issue in America today. The
> mainstream press has gotten them in a frenzy over the economy and
> jobs.
>

That other things now take precedence over 9/11 is normal and to be
expected. That does not negate the very necessary contribution that ham
radio made to a major emergency in a current situation.

> Then there was
> > the great blackout of 2003.
>
> Comms/Phones didn't go out. How was amateur radio useful when
> everyone had comms?
>

Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
a valuable asset.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

699. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:47:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OC73c.10018$t16.6100914@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88663

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403071526.372ef00e@posting.google.com...
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A57D706F6F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> > news:1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com:
> >
> > > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> > >> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:
> > >
> > >> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
> > >> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back
up...
> > >
> > > Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> > > or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> > >
> >
> > I wasn't talking about our towers, though, was I? I have one I've never
put
> > up. The point is that, for example, we can communicate in and out of a
> > disaster area on HF SSB, for example, without needing a tower. Doesn't
> > happen every day, but that's something to be thankful for.
>
> True enough. People might be able to use cellular phones to do the same.

Probably not though. The cell phone system is only set up to handle normal
levels of usage. It gets bogged down when traffic levels rise dramatically
as they do in emergencies. If any cell sites are lost in the emergency that
either cuts off that area from cell service entirely or further overloads
the system. In the case of 9/11, calls placed via landlines and/or cell
phones took 30 minutes or more to get through and some did not get through
at all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

700. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-08 23:54:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BI73c.10021$t16.6101878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88664

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0403081325.52114d30@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cnT2c.1821$Cm3.312@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message

[snip]

> > Your point?
>
> That something needs to be done.
>
> One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal
> changes, particularly in the middle class.
>
> 40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to work and Mom to stay home with
> the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious
> middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions, but as
> a rule if Dad had a good job, Mom did not have to work outside the
> home when the kids were small).
>
> Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and
> almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own
> educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's
> education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes
> well!
>

Much of it is due to changing expectations as to what is acceptable as a standard of living. The typical family 40 years ago in the major metropolitan areas either lived in an apartment or in an 800 sq. ft. house. A family with a single income today can still afford an 800 sq ft house. However that is now considered unacceptably small. They want a 1200 sq ft house as a minimum. That is just one example of changing expectations that have driven us to two-career families.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

701. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 00:04:19 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <gr1q40pquikiq4lnrj71bmoc6esujare3q@4ax.com>
Source record: 88665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
>> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
>> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
>>
>> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
>Cops
>> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>>
>>
>> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
>Mangan),
>> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just because
>they
>> were parked in front of his house.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> ------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
>Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the local
>police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and the
>cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.

This incident occured years befor HR2346 (or whatever number that was). And
nuisance laws vary depending on your locality, as well as their method of
enforcement.

>Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we hold
>a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?

Hams regs do not exempt a ham from local nuisance laws. You can be in 100%
compliance with federal law, but you can still be violating local laws if you
are creating or causing a nuisance with your station. Your FCC license is not a
'get-out-of-jail-free' card.

>Don't believe it CJ? Check it out.

I'm not CJ, but what should I 'check out'?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

702. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 00:56:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xdqdnbvLGJPci9DdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88666

N2EY wrote:
> In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
>>>would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.
>>
>> And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
>>stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
>>econmmic system works.
>
>
> Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the long
> view. That's considered old-fashioned today.

It's a debatable case for invoking Godwin, maybe?

>> I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
>>thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
>>is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
>>there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
>>will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
>>monopoly problems.
>
>
> Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental threat
> is OK? What rights do employees really have?

Sure. We have a local case in which a massive amount of known Iron
Pyrite rock was dumped in a small valley with a stream running along the
bottom of the valley. The valley is all filled in now. The predictable
happened, and we now have a massive acid drainage problem that will kill
many tourist frequented streams and will probably sterilize the creeks
it runs into and construction on the highway has been stopped, and we
have a real mess on our hands.

Not much of a gray area there I think. And we can keep busy enough with
the blatant cases that we don't have to go after Joe six-pack and his
Sunday BBQ or his lawnmower.

> Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?

> Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here last
> year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down slightly.
> Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full

> production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and it's
> only March.

Some people are making a good profit.

> Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
> Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.

Wellll, you are partially correct. You lump SUV's as if they are all of the Excursion/Suburban/Escalade type. And that is wrong. I just bought an SUV that gets in the 20's in town, and low 30's on the highway. It's downright tiny by comparison, and is a very responsible vehicle as far as resources go.

And I don't think that any of the Bio fuel options are viable or even desirable. To see what I mean, replacement of even a tiny fraction of what we use now in fossil fuel will take a lot of biofuel, and how much can we make?

The tragedy of the biofuels is this:

America decides that we should go ethanol in a big way. Lots of corn and other sources are grown for fermentation. After all, this will use up that silly surplus, right?

Only then it's no longer surplus. There would be a lot of pressure to grow more and more of the raw materials. Have you seen what has happened to much of the great plains lately? Salt desert, and besides that, the aquifer is not being recharged except at a very slow rate.

Now when push comes to shove, and population starts to strain our ability to produce food, you make the decision. Food or fuel? Who drives and who dies?

> How do we get folks to take the long view again?

It will probably take running out of/low on resources of one kind or the other. Like the above.

- Mike KB3EIA -

703. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:20:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4vednUSdV9lZhtDdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88667

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040307194050.07155.00001121@mb-m06.aol.com...
>
>>In article <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be
>
> learned
>
>>>>overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result pose
>>>>major threats.
>>>
>>>Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
>>>Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years.
>>
>>That depends on the technology. Houses today are not built much
>> differently
>>than they were 15/20 years ago. New materials and techniques are used
>> alongside
>>>old ones. Most of those in the building trades, as well as DIY types, can
>
> keep
>
>>up with the changes.
>
>
> Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
> but even in building construction, there is technological advances and
> automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
> Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
> always come prefab.

>>>If I hadn't had the
>>>opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
>>>Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
>>>compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
>>>somewhere.
>>>
>>>
>>>>And who pays for the retraining?
>>>

>>>It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
>>>training costs per employee are gone.
>>
>>In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System) paid
>> for your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your own.
>
> More
>
>>important, your new training built on your existing skills and knowledge
>
> so you
>
>>could stay in the same field.
>
>
> But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
> expenses.

That is because they intend to get rid of every possible employee
whenever possible. Why would you train people that aren't going to be
working for you in a few years?

Side note: These good folk could probably save money if they were to
get a bill passed requiring all Americans to learn Indian language in
school. That way they wouldn't have to train their new help to speak
English.

>>>>>>I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
>
> economy
>
>>>>>>alone.
>>>>>
>>>>>We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
>>>>>done with more and more automation resulting in less
>>>>>and less need for skilled labor.
>>>>
>>>>We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
>>>>automated and all - is moving to places like China.
>>>>
>>>>And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
>>>
>>>The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
>>
>>Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready and
>
> of
>
>>low quality.
>
> That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.

>
>
>>Companies do not support products after even a few years because
>>they want you to buy the new products.
>
>
> Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
> and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
> because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
> The irony of non-support for older products is that in
> some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
> to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>
>
>>This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
>>their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
>> Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were the
>>new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
>>succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
>> years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the best of
>>care.
>
>
> Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.

And the new car is so expensive that it darn well *better* make 200 K
miles. They have become waay too expensive. Did you know that they are
offering 7 year auto loans now? All the "innovative" techniques that the
companies had to do over the years to sell cars as the price went up is
reaching an end-game for them. Most people do not want to pay $500-$600
or more a month for a vehicle.
Leasing looked good for a while, but of course you have no trade-in, and
the lease company doesn't really want you to trade the thing in, they
want you to buy-out. But oh those car payments!

>>>Look at the
>>>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>>
>>Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
>>However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>
> Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?

Open up an old IBM PC, then open up a clone box built for cheap
performance. I can send you pix of some I have in my garage.

>
>>>Consider too that
>>>a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
>>>to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
>>>is applied by the consumer).

>>>
>>
>>A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
>
> balanced,
>
>>Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
>>unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I knew
>
> were
>
>>talking about retiring at 55.
>
>
> Your point?

You like it better this way?

>
>>All changed now.
>
>
> Your point?

Same question.

- mike KB3EIA -

704. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:33:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88668

In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>>> these per year.
>>
>> Those are good practice.
>>
>BTW, I am not intending to call anyone stupid, but I just couldn't resist
>the title.

Some things just "write themselves..." :-)

By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
record turn-out, everything run just fine. It can be done very well
without any amateur radio help but the ARRL copy scribblers
would have a cow about that. :-)

LHA / WMD

705. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:33:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040308203335.12631.00005426@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88669

In article <404C95D4.8090406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the production -
>automated
>> and all - is moving to places like China.
>
> In our area, a whole glass production plant has been disassembled and
>moved to China, where they are putting it back together. A lot of good
>paying skilled jobs lost.

Good grief, next thing to go would be flatware and napkins. First
china, then crystal, then more forking around. Your dinner done
up with all imported settings.

> Another capacitor making plant has just shut down to move out also.
>these jobs weren't as good paying, but they were still jobs. All this in
>just one year.

Support them. Increase your capacity.

> Perhaps they should eat cake?

Betty Croker is doing that to Little Debbie.

LHA / WMD

706. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:33:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040308203337.12631.00005427@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88671

In article <llO2c.9757$t16.5940127@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:5oL2c.84040$C65.9507@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
>> Forgive me if this has been mentioned before-
>> I haven't read this group for years.
>> Concerning fighting BPL, which the power industry
>> is ramming at us using Part 15, why can't
>> we use Part 15 to clobber *them?*
>>
>> The FCC has a history of listening when you quote
>> their own laws to them. Here is a good one:
>
>It has been mentioned many times before. The fear is that commercial
>interests will be able to convince the FCC to change the rules so that hams
>have no defense against BPL.

Do you have FCC NPRMs on your "killfile," too, Dee? :-)

If you look carefully at NPRM 04-29, you will find that they are NOT
going to change the levels of incidental radiation to above today's
standards. The Commission isn't giving in to any Access BPL
company's request to increase the incidental radiation.

The FCC is NOT sanctioning Access BPL nor is it "licensing" it.
They can't get involved directly with an Access BPL unless a
system's service area crosses a state boundary. All the FCC can
really do is regulate INCIDENTAL RF radiation from any system.

Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R. is involved with INCIDENTAL RF radiation.

Are you or is anyone displeased with the levels of incidental
RF radiation now in the Regulations (and has been the same for
years)? If so, what have you DONE other than scare up the
village that some bogeything appeared?

The NPRM 04-29 changes are mainly with a definition of the
service and some of the test methods to insure that incidental RF
radiation stays within regulations...regulations that aren't going to
be raised. READ the NPRM and all its footnotes before jumping
off into some rant.

Do you or anyone else have a bitch, gripe, or other complaint about
the existing incidental RF radiation limits? If so, DO something
about it. COMMUNICATE with the FCC...or with your elected
congresscritter who could, if you don't write in crayon, forward it to

the FCC which is obliged by law to make it part of the pulic record.

Or, you or anyone else can stay on newsgroups and foment more
and more hysteria about falling skies like so many headless
Chicken Littles.

Do you or anyone else want to make a case about "monitoring the
interference" from an Access BPL system now under test? If so,
get some amateurs who Know How To Measure, use some radio
receivers that have been calibrated with a traceable source, using
good (professional) standards and practices, describing all of it
along with the monitoring record. A tape or WAV file full of noise
all by itself isn't going to cut it as the "evidence." [I can generate
one of those using a SWLBC portable and standing next to a power
substation and it won't be worth technical squat] Know what you
are doing technically. FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology
can talk technical. Few hams can.

Or, you can sit back and play morseperson on your radios and let
the ARRL do all the work. But, think about it. The A in ARRL
stands for Amateur. ARRL has only one legal firm representing
them in DC. There are over a half dozen Access BPL companies
and more in the wings, PROs who want some potential profit, all
with their own legal firm representatives. Legal-wise, the ARRL is
outnumbered. Quit trying to act the spoiled child "deserving of
the attention" because you are hams and essentially hobbyists.

By the way, if you or anyone else wants to assert you are
untouchable becasue of that license, try reviewing Parts
97.101 (d), 97.121, and 97.303 (a). Or contact the Enforcement
Bureau at the FCC.

But, if you insist that the sky is falling even when it isn't, continue
the hysteria build-up and make yourselves and the "amateur
community" look like dummies.

LHA / WMD

707. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:33:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040308203338.12631.00005428@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88670

In article <Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
>_ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:
>
>> William wrote:
>>
>>> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
>>> or years if they're ever replaced at all.
>>
>> Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
>> on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
>
>Of course he can't

Cell phones need towers to operate?

My wife and I keep our cell phone in the car's glove compartment.
Hasn't fallen yet. :-)

However, if there's a NEED to operate on HF from a disaster area,
I'd rather depend on an Army National Guardsman walking into it
carrying an AN/PRC-104 HF transceiver. No tower needed. Whip
antenna is tuned by a built-in automatic antenna coupler anywhere
in the HF spectrum. Thousands of them operational since before
1986.

LHA / WMD

708. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:38:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Me93c.28681$aT1.7564@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:gr1q40pquikiq4lnrj71bmoc6esujare3q@4ax.com...
> In <BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
> >> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
> >> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
> >Cops
> >> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
> >>
> >>
> >> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
> >Mangan),
> >> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
because
> >they
> >> were parked in front of his house.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> >> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> >> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> >
> >Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
local
> >police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and
the
> >cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
>
> This incident occured years befor HR2346 (or whatever number that was).
And
> nuisance laws vary depending on your locality, as well as their method of
> enforcement.

The local police are ONLY enabled to inforce the FCC laws. That does
NOT include shuting down a legal CB station just because it might cause
interference.

Additionally, local nuisance laws are NOT applicable to authorized radio
transmissions per applicable FCC rules.

> >Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
hold
> >a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
>
> Hams regs do not exempt a ham from local nuisance laws. You can be in 100%
> compliance with federal law, but you can still be violating local laws if
you
> are creating or causing a nuisance with your station. Your FCC license is
not a
> 'get-out-of-jail-free' card.

It is against any effort to enforce a nuisance law against a legally
operated ham (or CB) station. If you think otherwise, please
provide applicable case law. From being a ham for
40+ years I have never heard of a single successful case of
local nuisance laws being used against a ham station.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

709. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:54:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <nt93c.28706$aT1.24813@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88673

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0403081325.52114d30@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<cnT2c.1821$Cm3.312@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040307194050.07155.00001121@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > In article <Pkp2c.31136$W74.25439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> > > Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >> How often is reasonable and practical? A lot of things cannot be
> > > >> learned
> > > >> overnight. Inexperience and the lack of judgement that can result
pose
> > > >> major threats.
> > > >
> > > >Consider the overall change in technology for almost anything.
> > > >Wholesale change almost every 15/20 years.
> > >
> > > That depends on the technology. Houses today are not built much
> > > differently
> > > than they were 15/20 years ago. New materials and techniques are used
> > > alongside
> > > old ones. Most of those in the building trades, as well as DIY types,
can
> > > keep up with the changes.
> >
> > Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
> > but even in building construction, there is technological advances and
> > automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
> > Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
> > always come prefab.
>
> Sure - but those changes occur slowly enough that builders can keep up
> with them. And they're not faced with career obsolescence. The
> introduction of nail guns and PVC pipe has not eliminated the need for
> carpenters and plumbers.
>
> While building a house isn't exactly cheap, here in the USA we manage
> to do it with almost all domestic labor and materials. If it can be
> done in that industry, why not others?

The reality of housing is that it isn't mass produced because
we don't want to all live in identical homes. That leads to considerable

customization and often to totally unique homes. Not so with
consumer products.

> > > >If I hadn't had the
> > > >opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
> > > >Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
> > > >compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
> > > >somewhere.
> > > >
> > > >> And who pays for the retraining?
> > > >
> > > >It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
> > > >training costs per employee are gone.
> > >
> > > In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System)
paid
> > > for
> > > your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your
own.
> > > More
> > > important, your new training built on your existing skills and
knowledge
> > > so you could stay in the same field.
> >
> > But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
> > expenses.
>
> That's exactly the problem.

Would you rather they fold-up completely?

> > > >> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
> > > >> >> economy alone.
> > > >> >
> > > >> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
> > > >> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
> > > >> >and less need for skilled labor.
> > > >>
> > > >> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the
production -
> > > >> automated and all - is moving to places like China.
> > > >>
> > > >> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
> > > >
> > > >The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
> > >
> > > Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready
and
> > > of low quality.
> >
> > That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.

>
> Same thing, essentially. Push a product that won't last out the door
> so that the customers will have to replace it in a few years.

The new technology makes the typical consumer product
obsolete...not poor quality by design.

> > > Companies do not support products after even a few years because
> > > they want you to buy the new products.
> >
> > Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
> > and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
> > because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
>
> I disagree! See below.

I suspect we'll still disagree.

> > The irony of non-support for older products is that in
> > some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
> > to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
> >
> > > This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers
"redesigned"
> > > their
> > > cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
> > > Their
> > > goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were
the
> > > new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They
almost
> > > succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
> > > years,
> > > and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the
best of
> > > care.
> >
> > Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
>
> Yep - and here's why:
>
> Up until about the mid-60s or so, US automakers focused on the sizzle
> rather than the steak. Their focus was on making lots of cars, and if
> they polluted, didn't last or weren't as safe as they could be, that
> wasn't much of a big deal. They fought all sorts of innovations
> because they were afraid of tarnishing the image. Example: they didn't
> like seat belts in part because of the cost but also because they're a
> reminder that you could die in your car.
>
> Then US automakers got a 1-2-3-4 punch in about a decade:
>

> 1) Safety issues
> 2) Pollution issues
> 3) Fuel economy issues
> 4) Foreign competition/quality issues
>
> Detroit took a real thumping from all four, in large part because the
> foreign automakers were more experienced building safer, cleaner, more
> efficient cars that would last longer. The Big Three had to be dragged
> kicking and screaming (by way of legislation requiring things like
> seat belts and dual brake systems) into making better cars. In at
> least one case (Chrysler) the Feds got involved with loan guarantees.

Your point? The automakers felt the impact of consumers.
That's what I have said all along.

> > > >Look at the
> > > >ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
> > >
> > > Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives,
etc.
> > > However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
> >
> > Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
>
> Based on repairs I've had to do to computers both at home and at work.

Anecdotal then.

> > > >Consider too that
> > > >a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
> > > >to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
> > > >is applied by the consumer).
> > > >
> > > A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
> > > balanced,
> > > Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
> > > unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I
knew
> > > were talking about retiring at 55.
> >
> > Your point?
> >
>
> That a lot has changed in the past few years.

And the rate of change keeps accelerating it seems.

> > > All changed now.
> >
> > Your point?
>
> That something needs to be done.

>
> One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal
> changes, particularly in the middle class.
>
> 40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to work and Mom to stay home with
> the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious
> middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions, but as
> a rule if Dad had a good job, Mom did not have to work outside the
> home when the kids were small).
>
> Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and
> almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own
> educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's
> education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes
> well!

OK, and that's not going to change.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

710. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:54:43 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <so8q40haloatkiefjvd7s393ea981e7uti@4ax.com>
Source record: 88679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:35:10 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> ...as if you've never jammed the Liberty Net.
>
>Why would I jam the liberty net? I actually enjoyed some of what they had
>to say.

I enjoy paranoid rantings as much as anyone, but to say that teaching
evolution in public schools causes children to become drug-using,
sexually perverted atheists, I say GUMAFB!

711. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 01:59:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403081759.7c543f74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88674

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
> _ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:
>
> > William wrote:
> >
> >
> >> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> >> or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> >
> >
> > Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
> > on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
> >
> >
>
> Of course he can't

You mean if the little antenna falls off a cellular telephone, I can't
replace it with a paper clip?

Did the laws of physics change?

712. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:00:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040308210019.07984.00001014@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 88675

In article <xdqdnbvLGJPci9DdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>>Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
>>>>would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.

>>> And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
>>>stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
>>>econmmic system works.

>> Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the long
>> view. That's considered old-fashioned today.
>
> It's a debatable case for invoking Godwin, maybe?

My point was simply that I'm not glorifying him.
>
>>> I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
>>>thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
>>>is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
>>>there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
>>>will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
>>>monopoly problems.
>>
>> Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental
>> threat is OK? What rights do employees really have?
>
>Sure. We have a local case in which a massive amount of known Iron
>Pyrite rock was dumped in a small valley with a stream running along the
>bottom of the valley. The valley is all filled in now. The predictable
>happened, and we now have a massive acid drainage problem that will kill
>many tourist frequented streams and will probably sterilize the creeks
>it runs into and construction on the highway has been stopped, and we
>have a real mess on our hands.

Who dumped the bad rock?
>
> Not much of a gray area there I think. And we can keep busy enough with

>the blatant cases that we don't have to go after Joe six-pack and his
>Sunday BBQ or his lawnmower.

Of course! That's the kind of details I'm talking about.

OTOH, one of the excuses given by industry is that environmental concerns cost too much.
>
>> Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?
>
>> Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here
>> last
>> year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down
>> slightly.
>> Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
>> production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and
>> it's only March.
>
> Some people are making a good profit.
>
Yup.

>> Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
>> Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.
>
> Wellll, you are partially correct. You lump SUV's as if they are all of

>the Excursion/Suburban/Escalade type.

Many of them are.

>And that is wrong. I just bought
>an SUV that gets in the 20's in town, and low 30's on the highway. It's
>downright tiny by comparison, and is a very responsible vehicle as far
>as resources go.

Sure - but how many of the big ones are sold for every responsible one? And how many are driven as commuting vehicles and status symbols rather than because their capabilities are really needed?
>
> And I don't think that any of the Bio fuel options are viable or even
>desirable. To see what I mean, replacement of even a tiny fraction of
>what we use now in fossil fuel will take a lot of biofuel, and how much
>can we make?

TDP isn't biofuel.

> The tragedy of the biofuels is this:
>
> America decides that we should go ethanol in a big way. Lots of corn
>and other sources are grown for fermentation. After all, this will use
>up that silly surplus, right?

Nope.
>
> Only then it's no longer surplus. There would be a lot of pressure to
>grow more and more of the raw materials. Have you seen what has happened
>to much of the great plains lately? Salt desert, and besides that, the
>aquifer is not being recharged except at a very slow rate.

Ethanol has other problems, too, such as poor performance at low temperatures.
TDP is something completely different.

> Now when push comes to shove, and population starts to strain our
>ability to produce food, you make the decision. Food or fuel? Who drives
>and who dies?

Exactly.

Point is, there's no single simple answer. Instead, we need a coordinated
approach on many fronts. Efficiency - conservation - recycling - new technology
- infrastructure. Most of all, changes in how we live.
>
>> How do we get folks to take the long view again?
>
> It will probably take running out of/low on resources of one kind or
>the other. Like the above.
>
Unfortunately, you may be right.

73 de Jim, N2EY

713. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:00:57 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <809q40hjf519tq8e382h4c55o4j8e8jk24@4ax.com>
Source record: 88680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:36:16 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> That's only because the VA doesn't read Usenet. If it did, you'd be
>> busted for fraud and have to get a job like the rest of us.
>
>Give it your best shot goofball. Its been tried before.

Give it a rest, Rambo Dan. We all know there's no one you won't mooch
off of. A little Google search will verify this fact.

714. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:01:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403081801.305d1a31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88676

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A6314211B48elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0403071526.372ef00e@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94A57D706F6F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> >> news:1e4e3692.0403070443.891c8cc@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns94A47D67840A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> >> >> news:1e4e3692.0403060658.4ab59cfc@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> >> > Question: Are there more cell towers in America than there are
> >> >> > Amateur Radio Licensees?
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> Don't know, but if we fall over in an eartquake we just get back
> >> >> up...
> >> >
> >> > Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be
> >> > months or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> >> >
> >>
> >> I wasn't talking about our towers, though, was I? I have one I've
> >> never put up. The point is that, for example, we can communicate in
> >> and out of a disaster area on HF SSB, for example, without needing a
> >> tower. Doesn't happen every day, but that's something to be thankful
> >> for.
> >
> > True enough. People might be able to use cellular phones to do the
> > same.
> >
>
> Exactly. Might or might not.

Just like an amateur may or may not be able to help.
```

715. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:01:39 UTC
From: I Am Not God <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <7A93c.76004$OH4.26823@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 88677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steve Parks Opens his trap again" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94A6B692A11841234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> news:20040308174911.248$UW@newsreader.com:
>
> > Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com> wrote:
> >> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:31:05 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> >> mindspring.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >> >WHOA..... TIME OUT.... I"m a ham..... "I" didn't pick on the
> >> >> >CBers! CL.
> >> >>
> >> >> Viet Nam Dan apparently believes that if you're into CB radio,
> >> >> even if you operate within the rules of FCC part 95, you are a
> >> >> criminal.
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >I have NEVER heard a legal CB station in operation.
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> Well, I guess if all you listen to is channel six...
> >>
> > He listens to agent orange.
>
> Mind you're own business
>

Geo, didn't you get spanked a while back? Please try to keep the same addy
for a day or two. Stop trying to bypass killfiles.

716. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:02:21 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <0c9q4094peq6qo261s4osq04fe6sithj3q@4ax.com>
Source record: 88681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:29:16 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
>news:7ipp40h07lq4a4dgv8499fv1sjojqvelvr@4ax.com...
>> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 18:26:22 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
>> mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> >> Anyone who fraudulently takes my tax dollars is no friend of mine. If
>> >> you're well enough to post messages on Usenet, and threaten people on
>> >> the airwaves every day, you're well enough to get off of your lazy ass
>> >> and get a job.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Will you hire me then?
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> I won't, but Walmart might.
>>
>Not according to the employement bureau.

Put one over on them, did you?

717. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:04:56 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <re9q40dqkb0p5e799tohhjrqusofnrs6f1@4ax.com>
Source record: 88682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:32:51 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>> >> Viet Nam Dan and Babbling Bruce got married in San Francisco last
>> >> week. GWB is trying to pass the "marriage amendment" to the
>> >> constitution because he's pissed about not getting invited to their
>> >> wedding. (OK, I stole that quip from Letterman, or Leno, or whoever I
>> >> was watching that night)
>> >>
>> >
>> >Only liberals watch those shows.
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>>
>> Your point being?
>
>I think its obvious.

Humor us.

718. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:06:18 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040308210618.290$7G@newsreader.com>
Source record: 88678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"I Am Not God" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote:
> "Steve Parks Opens his trap again"
>
Yep, I'm a people person.

719. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 02:10:19 UTC
From: Not CB Rambo <bark@the.moon.com>
Message-ID: <ak9q40p47266nvgfeb3nj6grcsk29pkdht@4ax.com>
Source record: 88683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:27:42 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>> > >Thats right, and your point is?
>> > >
>> > >Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> >
>> > The point is that you are fraudulently collecting disability.
>> >
>> Figures, Dan/W4NTI is another freeloader making up shit in order to
>collect
>> my hard earned tax money. Is it worse to be a freebander, or a
>> freeloader?
>
>I am neither. Again, provide me with your medical diploma and I will submit
>to your exam.

It doesn't take any medical diploma to know that your primary
disability is the inability to distinguish the difference between
"your" and "you're" when writing a sentence. That's hardly an excuse
for ripping off the taxpayers.

720. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 03:26:56 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <4Qa3c.151291$4o.186727@attbi_s52>
Source record: 88684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
news:104pv6o6pss9se4@corp.supernews.com...
> William Warren wrote:
>
> >
> > At a time in our nation's history when the rich and well connected
> > were scurrying to park their sons' yachts in safe backwaters, a well
> > connected young man raised his hand, took an oath, and took
> > everything that came with it. You can't fake that kind of courage,
> > and you can't spin his opponent's kind of cowardice. John Kerry was
> > there.
> >
> > Bill Warren
>
>
> THE FOLLOWING ITEM APPEARED IN A NON-PARTISAN (BUT EXTREMELY
> CYNICAL) NEWSLETTER FOR INVESTORS. THE NEWSLETTER HAS BEEN RELENTLESSLY
> CRITICAL OF BUSH ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC POLICIES.

(unatributed rant snipped)

They really ought to give you GOP PR types a quick course in Netiquette before they set you loose on the world: your ALL CAPS post shows you haven't been associating with the hoi poloi for a long time.

Let's see, where can I start:

"Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com. "

Nice one! No inconvenient IP address to trip you up. Win 98, too, at least according to your headers. You guys _do_ occasionally learn from your mistakes, don't you?

"Non partison (but extremely cynical) newsletter for investors..."

Wow, I'm impressed. In terms of FUD and intimidation, that's at least a 5 out of 10. I can't question your honesty because I'm not an "investor", and I'm ashamed to admit that I don't hang around with non-partisan and cynical newletter types. Way to go, GOP PR man!

"The newsletter has been relentlessly critical of Bush administration economic policies".

Oh, of course, and that's -so- easily verifiable, given your thorough coverage of the "newsletter" and it's background. I'm just brimming with patriotic left-wing fervor now that I know your "newletter" is "critical" -

nea, "relentlessly critical" - of shrub and his let-them-eat-dog-food economic policies. I'm all warm and fuzzy, you've won me over, I trust you without reservation. With the issue of your background, credentials, agenda, and employer settled, let's get to the good part.

"...from a source we`re not sure we can reveal, said to be a retired Rear Admiral..."

Ah, jeez, Mom, can't I meet the Real (sorry, "Rear") Admiral? Can I? Huh? Puhleeze?

I can't reveal *my* source, but (s)he said that it was really a retired corporate huckster collecting corporate welfare from the big island in Hawai, who dusts off his traveling salesman cap and majik elixar bottles every four years when the oil boys throw enough money at him. Trust me: my source is just as unimpeachable as yours!

"1) Kerry was in-country less than four months and collected, a Bronze Star, a Silver Star and three purple hearts. I never heard of anybody with any outfit I worked with (including SEAL One, the Sea Wolves, Riverines and the River Patrol Force) collecting that much hardware so fast, and for such pedestrian actions. "

Hmmm - "collecting" is a nice choice here: it infers that Kerry didn't deserve that "hardware", but leaves me a little flat on the impedimenta of how he "collected" that "hardware" without his commander and (IIRC) four other senior offices certifying that he deserved it. Oh, well, let's not get bogged down in details like exactly which Admiral's rear this came from.

BTW, that use of "pedestrian" is first rate FUD: it infers that nobody was really shooting at anybody, nobody got wounded, nobody killed, nothing much except the usual humdrum routine of having men in black pajamas shoot at you with - heaven forfend! - real 7.63 mm ammunition - instead of the deadly innuendo and poisonous slander that Kerry's own countrymen would shoot at him 30+ years later.

Of course, in the world of big oil, big banks, big "investors", and big lies, only the ungrateful and unapreciative working man - like me - would be so rude as to ask why this "Rear Admiral" didn't come forward way back when. Only someone who didn't understand the winks and nods that those-in-the-know trade during $5,000 per plate dinners could possibly be so impertinent as to ask how an arrogant, rich, drunk daddy's boy could have the gall to hire you to slander a reputation built on blood and deeds, when his was built on daddy's money and a PR firm's expertise.

It's a great country: only in America could someone type out bald-faced lies and not mention that Shrub was, depending on which version is currently being floated, either in Alabama, Arkansas, or Georgia - but not Texas, where he was supposedly assigned. Only in America could an unnamed, unavailable, unattributed "Real (sorry, 'Rear') Admiral" be created out of whole cloth so that the oilmen could grasp for another four years of let-them-eat-dog-food.

Shrub was drunk, although the details are, uh, foggy.

John Kerry was there.

And that, Mr. PR expert, is for attribution.

Bill Warren.

(Email address contains anti-spam measure)

721. Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 04:10:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082010.42a8bb0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88685

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040307143215.22081.00004447@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
> >> Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> >> amateur radio done for me lately?"
> >
> >How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.
>
> Hams hijacked four airliners?
>
> >Then there was the great blackout of 2003.
>
> Hams did that, too? Tsk, tsk, tsk...

Dee, as you can see, Lennie the Lame and his dusty sidekick
PuppetBoy can't stand facts. Espeically glaring, up front ones...

> In all the thousands of press photographs, hundreds of minutes
> of press video recordings, any radios in evidence are all
> identifiable as belonging to governments or utilities.

"Thousands of press photographs..."...?!?!

YOU personally proofed ALL those "THOUSANDS" of "press
photographs" and determined that NOT A ONE contained ANY picture of
ANY Amateur Radio realated or supported activity...?!?!

OR...(and more likely)...the few pictures you DID see in the LA
Times didn't have anything YOU deemed relevent, ergo you just
extrapolated the numbers to sound like something impressive...

> IN the national press and in electronics industry trade publications
> were many mentions of communications supplies (HTs and
> telephones) rushed in to aid New York. The U.S. military
> adequately supported rescue at the Pentagon, also reported.

And from the desks of the NY OES, the American Red Cross,
Salvation Army, NYC OES, NYPD, FDNY and numerous other "offical"
agencies ahve come letters of commendation and gratitude for Amateur
Radio support.

> Note: The ARRL is NOT a "press," a journalism organization.

Doesn't matter. Can you DISPRROVE anything they have
"reported"...?!?!

> >No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of which I haven't
> >heard.
>
> Without any doubt of that...!
>
> Do you wish another recounting of the Great Blackout of the Greater
> Los Angeles area caused by the Northridge Earthquake a decade
> ago? No? Of course not, you refuse to view my posts...

Your posts are still irrelevent.

Documentary evidence of participation by Amateur Radio
organizations exists within the California OES.

> Continue to let the ARRL spoon-feed you all the information they
> think is "suitable" for you.

What "spoon-feed(ing)", Your Scumminess...?!?!

What has been inaccurate? Where is the evidence of dishonesty or
misrepresentation of facts?

> >Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons,
> >bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely provide
> >communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.
>
> Even as I write this, the Los Angeles Marathon of 2004 is in progress.
> It is well-covered by a continuous telecast from one station and spot
> reporting on at least three other local TV stations. I am not listening
> to a sound-only AM station coverage. On-the-route video is provided
> by two-person teams on motorcycles equipped with two-way voice
> and picture mobile equipment.

Uh huh...and the news is...?!?!
>
> The video from locations along the 26.2 mile route show many
> different HTs being used by LAPD, LA government, and Marathon
> personnel identifiable by tags or outer vests. No one has mentioned
> any amateur radio activity yet. This isn't the first L.A. Marathon.
> Everything going well so far as it has for years.

I lived in the LA area for years and was a praticipant in two
marathons. Even though some hams got thier pictues in video bites, I
don't remember any of them having ever been interviewed nor Amateur
Radio being mentioned by name.

Does that exclusion mean we weren't there or didn't contribute?

I saw lot's of pictures of Goodhew and Schaeffer Ambulances in
those video shots, although none of them were mentioned by name
either...Does that mean those third party EMS units didn't
participate?

I also saw countless shots of runners with Evian water bottles
and drinking from cups with Gatorade logos on them...I never heard
them mentioned by name eithr. Soooooooo......What's your excuse for
THOSE exclusions, Scummy One...?!?!

> The ARRL will no doubt post something later saying something like
> "the success of the L.A. Marathon was all due to the untiring efforts
> of many radio amateurs." That is, if they still recognize the west
> coast of the USA as belonging to the Union...

No...they will do like they have (accurately) done before, and
will say Amateurs CONTRIBUTED to the overall event, and that TEAMWORK
between the supporting agencies resulted in a safe event.

Your excuse THEN will be...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

722. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 04:16:51 UTC
From: - - ex - - <exray@coqui.gov>
Message-ID: <104qh5saddnhdaf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88686
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

William Warren wrote:

> (unatributed rant snipped)
>
> They really ought to give you GOP PR types a quick course in Netiquette
> before they set you loose on the world: your ALL CAPS post shows you haven't
> been associating with the hoi poloi for a long time.

Not my post. It was copied and pasted from elsewhere. You're correct,
I should have attributed the writer but he was anonymous.
>
> Let's see, where can I start:
>
> "Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com. "
>
> Nice one! No inconvenient IP address to trip you up. Win 98, too, at least
> according to your headers. You guys _do_ occasionally learn from your
> mistakes, don't you?

email address is exray at coqui dot net if you need to know. and its
Win98 Second Edition, I'll have you know!
>
> "Non partison (but extremely cynical) newsletter for investors..."
>
> Wow, I'm impressed. In terms of FUD and intimidation, that's at least a 5
> out of 10. I can't question your honesty

I'll try to locate the source so that you can rant to the original
writer. You're not real fond of opposing opinions are you?

-Bill M

723. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 04:25:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <da-dnaJKGe7t0dDdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88688

William wrote:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
>>_ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:
>>
>>
>>>William wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
>>>>or years if they're ever replaced at all.
>>>
>>>
>>>Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
>>>on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Of course he can't
>
>
> You mean if the little antenna falls off a cellular telephone, I can't
> replace it with a paper clip?
>
> Did the laws of physics change?

No they did not, which means those cell towers can fall over as well.
Your paper clip isn't going to help much when the cell tower is out of
commission. Think you can communicate with you little cell phone if the
tower is down? As Alun stated, hams don't need a tower, a tall tree,
from the apex of the roof, just any support that will get the antenna up
in the air and we are back on. Not so with your cell phone, if the tower
is down (dosen't even have to be physically down, just off the air) and
your cell phone makes a good paper weight.

724. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 04:30:22 UTC
From: - - ex - - <exray@coqui.gov>
Message-ID: <104qhv6n0q56a5d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
- - ex - - wrote:
> William Warren wrote:
>
>> (unatributed rant snipped)
>>

This explains the source of the article, FWIW. Drop them a line and
maybe they can direct you how to locate the person who wrote it so that
you can personally assess his credibility.
http://frontpagemagazine.com/articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=12272

-BM
```

725. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 04:56:04 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <E7c3c.90453$C65.55987@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 88689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

William Warren wrote:
(a bunch of Kerry-loving crap)

All your blather and blah in support of Kerry
goes right out the window in this one passage, quote:

>...Sure, there were a couple
> bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did,
> as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it,
> or at the very least report it. Why is there not a
> single record anywhere of you (Kerry) ever reporting
> any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested?
> The answer is simple. You are a liar...

Democrats have shown who they really are by their
choice of this despicable man; a fine decendent of
the Clinton tradition. You are a sick, twisted
and evil party and the sooner you are stamped out,
the better for our poor nation.
D.S.

726. Re: When is a re-stocking charge a good idea?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 05:17:48 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0403082117.27a6072f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88690

wa8mea@hotmail.com (Bill) wrote
>
> What's your opinion???
>

$39.00 is a very modest restocking charge. I certainly wouldn't feel "alienated".

73, de Hans, K0HB

727. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 06:22:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309012205.12631.00005429@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88692

In article <5c01b95b.0403082010.42a8bb0d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(gunnery nurse off his meds shouts and waves his arms about, needing attention)
writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040307143215.22081.00004447@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
>> >> Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
>> >> amateur radio done for me lately?"
>> >
>> >How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.
>>
>> Hams hijacked four airliners?
>>
>> >Then there was the great blackout of 2003.
>>
>> Hams did that, too? Tsk, tsk, tsk...
>
> Dee, as you can see, Lennie the Lame and his dusty sidekick
>PuppetBoy can't stand facts. Espeically glaring, up front ones...
>
>> In all the thousands of press photographs, hundreds of minutes
>> of press video recordings, any radios in evidence are all
>> identifiable as belonging to governments or utilities.
>
> "Thousands of press photographs..."...?!?!
>
> YOU personally proofed ALL those "THOUSANDS" of "press
>photographs" and determined that NOT A ONE contained ANY picture of
>ANY Amateur Radio realated or supported activity...?!?!

Absolutely. I watched TV for many hours after the 11 Sep 01 attacks.
Got 30 complete video photographs every second. A thousand frames
of video are seen every half minute and a fraction. :-)

Do the math...if your meds have kicked in and you can still grasp
a pencil (or crayon) without breaking it...

> OR...(and more likely)...the few pictures you DID see in the LA
>Times didn't have anything YOU deemed relevent, ergo you just

>extrapolated the numbers to sound like something impressive...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...have you now assumed such god-like powers you
can mentally reach out and determine what anyone saw?

You ARE nuts.

>> IN the national press and in electronics industry trade publications
>> were many mentions of communications supplies (HTs and
>> telephones) rushed in to aid New York. The U.S. military
>> adequately supported rescue at the Pentagon, also reported.
>
> And from the desks of the NY OES, the American Red Cross,
>Salvation Army, NYC OES, NYPD, FDNY and numerous other "offical"
>agencies ahve come letters of commendation and gratitude for Amateur
>Radio support.

All nice little pieces of paper, suitable for framing.

>> Note: The ARRL is NOT a "press," a journalism organization.
>
> Doesn't matter. Can you DISPRROVE anything they have
>"reported"...?!?!

Not in here. :-)

No one can "disprove" something that doesn't exist and the ARRL
"news" does so much selective editing and selective adjectiving it
makes amateur activity sound absolutely totally completely
responsible for anything they report. :-)

>> >No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of which I haven't
>> >heard.
>>
>> Without any doubt of that...!
>>
>> Do you wish another recounting of the Great Blackout of the Greater
>> Los Angeles area caused by the Northridge Earthquake a decade
>> ago? No? Of course not, you refuse to view my posts...
>
> Your posts are still irrelevent.
>
> Documentary evidence of participation by Amateur Radio
>organizations exists within the California OES.

Make that "ACS" sweetums. Try to get your acronyms straight.

Or were you blood-pinned with some kind of distinguished civilian
service medal and suffered an infection?

>> Continue to let the ARRL spoon-feed you all the information they
>> think is "suitable" for you.
>
> What "spoon-feed(ing)", Your Scumminess...?!?!

See above on "selective editing." League copy scribblers are very
good at what they do. When they do a page make-up it's a cold
day in Newington when any other radio service is mentioned. :-)

> What has been inaccurate? Where is the evidence of dishonesty or
>misrepresentation of facts?

Take a trank, gunnery nurse. When it has kicked in, try reading or
viewing something BESIDES "official" information from Newington.

>> >Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons,
>> >bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely
>provide
>> >communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.
>>
>> Even as I write this, the Los Angeles Marathon of 2004 is in progress.
>> It is well-covered by a continuous telecast from one station and spot
>> reporting on at least three other local TV stations. I am not listening
>> to a sound-only AM station coverage. On-the-route video is provided
>> by two-person teams on motorcycles equipped with two-way voice
>> and picture mobile equipment.
>
> Uh huh...and the news is...?!?!

The "news" is that YOU are NOT Dee.

You could hold yourself down in public and let other folks have a chance
but your obsession won't let you, will it?

The L.A. Marathon was on Sunday. Nice pictures in the TIMES this
morning, more video from the marathon on TV.

Still haven't heard of all the noble, traditional, inspiring ham radio
aid to the L.A. Marathon. Lots more good news about the DARPA
Grand Challenge...first look at the team entries from display at
the Fontana raceway. But, you don't know anything about the
DARPA Grand Challenge, do you? :-)

One million bucks to the winner... :-)

>> The video from locations along the 26.2 mile route show many
>> different HTs being used by LAPD, LA government, and Marathon
>> personnel identifiable by tags or outer vests. No one has mentioned
>> any amateur radio activity yet. This isn't the first L.A. Marathon.
>> Everything going well so far as it has for years.
>
> I lived in the LA area for years and was a praticipant in two
>marathons. Even though some hams got thier pictues in video bites, I
>don't remember any of them having ever been interviewed nor Amateur
>Radio being mentioned by name.

Riiiiiight. :-) Uh-huh. You always tell the "truth" like that?

I'd rather hear details of your "seven hostile actions" such as when,
where, and what happened. :-)

> Does that exclusion mean we weren't there or didn't contribute?

They were there "in spirit." :-)

> I saw lot's of pictures of Goodhew and Schaeffer Ambulances in
>those video shots, although none of them were mentioned by name
>either...Does that mean those third party EMS units didn't
>participate?

? Irrelevant mention. Those ambulances have BIG names on the
sides, are seen on the streets regularly.

> I also saw countless shots of runners with Evian water bottles
>and drinking from cups with Gatorade logos on them...I never heard
>them mentioned by name eithr. Soooooooo......What's your excuse for
>THOSE exclusions, Scummy One...?!?!

You haven't made any specific mention of RADIO AMATEURS,
gunnery nurse. Try to stay on topic.

>> The ARRL will no doubt post something later saying something like
>> "the success of the L.A. Marathon was all due to the untiring efforts
>> of many radio amateurs." That is, if they still recognize the west
>> coast of the USA as belonging to the Union...
>
> No...they will do like they have (accurately) done before, and
>will say Amateurs CONTRIBUTED to the overall event, and that TEAMWORK
>between the supporting agencies resulted in a safe event.

The spirit is willing, but the actual flesh seems to be invisible. :-)

But, the ARRL is your source of amateur news and you are a
Believer in the Church of St. Hiram. You MUST discredit anyone
who spoils the old, old images of nobility, purity, and good from
the "services" of glorious amateur radio. You cannot help yourself,
poor baby.

Go snaffle a trank and try to calm down.

I'll still be around doing what I care to do. All your false and
misleading pejorations are empty words from a nutso.

All you are doing is wasting everyone's time, especially yours.

LHA / WMD

728. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 06:22:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309012206.12631.00005430@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88691

In article <1e4e3692.0403081759.7c543f74@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> > Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
>> > on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
>>
>> Of course he can't
>
>You mean if the little antenna falls off a cellular telephone, I can't
>replace it with a paper clip?
>
>Did the laws of physics change?

Well, somebody may have envisioned falling off a tower while USING
a cell phone. Guaranteed that such would not require any real
emergency people... :-)

The Law of Imagination keeps changing all the time, all the
Believers thinking they are radio minutemen defending ignorant
savage civilians against the elements of disaster. Every ham a
hero! :-)

LHA / WMD

729. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 06:46:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082246.32fdbf39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88693

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
> _ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:
>
> > William wrote:
> >
> >
> >> Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> >> or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> >
> >
> > Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
> > on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
> >
> >
>
> Of course he can't

And even if he could he wouldn't know who to get authorization from to operate!

Steve, K4YZ

730. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 06:55:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082255.6b6fd783@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88694

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040307143218.22081.00004450@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>
>
> >> So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
> >would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.
>
> He has succeeded beyond his wildest dreams in that.

I am curious as to what training eithr of you ahve had in psychiatry...?!?!

The same "training" that Lennie has had in Amateur Radio, no doubt.

And Brain, you have indeed, in public, failed...

Steve, K4YZ

731. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 07:09:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082309.debdd38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88695

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>...

> > So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!

> Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
> would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.

Luck is not needed here, Brain.

That which you call "nuts" is simply your attempt to writhe away
from being publically humiliated over and over, Brain.

Perhaps if YOU reconsidered YOUR own rhetoric and conduct, that
which you consider "nuts" would cease...?!?!

>>I<< consider anyone who publically expresses admiration for a
person who has been thoroughly documented as a liar and antagonist as
"nuts".

>>I<< consider anyone who makes public assertions that they
either cannot substantiate or validate via some third party source as
"nuts".

>>I<< consider anyone who's been caught doing those things who
then PERSISTS in doing them, contrary to evidence against them, as
nuts.

All of those things, Brain, would be you...

If calling me "nuts" makes you sleep better, or you feel you got
your sucker punch in, well then, I hope it makes that warm fuzzy
feeling for you. I think the evidence of odd behaviour rests on YOUR
shoulders, Brain...not anyone elses.

That I (or anyone else) apparently manage to effectively rub your
nose in your own errors and foolishness doesn't make me (us)
nuts...Just glad for the entertainment you provide. For that I (we)
thank you.

Steve, K4YZ

732. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 07:13:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082313.3224ee7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88696

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040303211144.23307.00007084@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
> >> and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
> >> headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
> >> trying to score some points...And failing...
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, my only goal is to keep you talking (and thereby convincing
> >any/every one who accidently stumbles on to one of your rants that
> >you're completely insane - most probably a future employer).
>
> He seems to move around a lot and change jobs often.

Odd, coming from somone who couldn't seem to stay in one place
more than a couple of years himself...Hmmmmmmm.

> He only worked a few months as a purchasing agent in a mid-sized
> electronics place that made set-top boxes. Must have learned all
> about electronic engineering there! He said something to that effect.

Nope....enjoyed a break from Nursing after the death of my
daughter...but hey, you knew that...

> He CAN quote from the Physicians' Desk Reference, though. That's
> as useful in amateur radio as Kosher dietary laws, religions (outside
> of the Church of St. Hiram), and s*x discussions.

Hmmm...wondering what "quote" from teh PDR to which yuo refer,
Lennie...I've not quoted it in this forum in any capacity.

(Not that I'd expect Lennie to be able to even understand it if
I did...Seems he makes up his own spellings and definitions as he goes
along)

Another LennieRant defused.

Steve, K4YZ

733. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 07:42:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403082342.3d1d4fcb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88697

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403030650.81551cf@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<403FB731.5EFB1488@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
>
> > > > So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.
> > >
> > > I submit that you don't know one end of a bat (baseball-type or the
> > > mammal) from the other.
> >
> > Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
> > and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
> > headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
> > trying to score some points...And failing...
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, my only goal is to keep you talking (and thereby convincing
> any/every one who accidently stumbles on to one of your rants that
> you're completely insane - most probably a future employer).

Well, Brain, as long as you keep posting obviously erroneous and
intentionally deceptive stuff, I guess I will have something to "talk"
about.

As for "proving" to any potential employer that I am "insane",
how about if I direct YOUR employer to this forum...specifically
selected passages wherein you make assertions you can't/won't back up
ALONG with YOUR expression of admiration for a person publically known
to be dishonest and deceitful...?!?!

We can further direct your employer to literally hundreds of
posts where you refer to third parties by demeaning or belittling
endearments where THEY did not lavish such endearments upon YOU.

Yeah...I got you two twerps by the tail and watching you writhe
around provides a bit of morbid entertainment. If you consider that

"insane", well, go right ahead. But you are, afterall, the source of my "material".

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

734. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 10:43:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040309054349.02537.00003426@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88698

In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>We are still down 2 million jobs since 911. Mine was one
>>>of the ones lost in the months after the attack. I am trying to run my
>>>own business now, but it is a hard struggle. I would go back to working
>>>for someone else, but there are no jobs in my field. The very few job
>>>ads I see ask for impossibly high qualifications (for me anyway!), as
>>>employers can pick and choose from the glut of people looking for work.
>>>For example, I have a BS and they are looking for PhDs.
>>>
>>>If you still have a well paid job it is easy to overlook the situation,
>>>but it's dire. Employers are not hiring at anything like the rate
>>>expected at this stage of an economic recovery.
>>
>> That's because they learned to make do with the people they had, and
>> are reluctant to add more now.
>
>That's a large part of it, although I think tere may be more going on.

Such as?

>
>>>2.4 million jobs were lost, and only
>>>about 400,000 new ones have been added. It's impossible to look at
>>>those numbers and not conclude that the economy is in terrible shape.
>>>Other economic indicators may be good, but the employment problem is
>>>very real and very large.
>>
>> Remember Ross Perot and the "giant sucking sound"?
>
>I found his ears rather distracting

Much of what he predicted has come to pass, though.

>>>The current administration might prefer that we all focus on security
>>>and foreign wars, but that's because if too many people look too hard
>>>at the employment numbers it will hurt their chances of reelection.
>>>FWIW, I doubt that any government can really influence the economy more
>>>than a tiny amount, but the political facts of life say that people

>>>will vote for someone who promises to fix the economy.
>>>
>> Seems to me that the real problem is more fundamental. Short term fixes
>> won't change long-term problems.
>>
>> For example, importing 57% of our oil, and letting that number rise
>> every year, isn't the right trend, but it's been allowed to go on
>> because it's cheaper in the short term than. (Please don't blame the
>> environmental concerns of drilling in the Arctic and similar places
>> until you have solid numbers on what oil from those places costs to
>> extract, and how much can actually be extracted.)
>
>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was
>ever done before.

And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this year.

>> Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>> investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>> "Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>> part of it.
>
>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.

It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary than ever.

Here's one data point:

In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania, tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY
Grants and
>scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.
>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>All the White House can do is distract, or 'run interference'. The
>>>employment stats are so bad that it's rather like trying to hide an
>>>elephant under the rug. That's not to say that the other issues aren't
>>>important, although personally I'm not happy about what they are doing
>>>in either of these areas.
>>>
>>

>>
>>
>
>73 de Alun, N3KIP

735. Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 12:00:12 UTC
From: sara_feinass@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a0f847f2.0403090400.798727a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88699

Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?

Sara

736. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 12:00:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403090400.979370@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88700

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...

> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> record turn-out, everything run just fine. It can be done very well
> without any amateur radio help but the ARRL copy scribblers
> would have a cow about that.

It very well may...but it seems to just eat at you that Amateur
Radio >>IS<< involved, much to the gratification of the folks who run
it...

Whew...

Steve, K4YZ

737. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 12:32:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88751

I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
and mistruths in appropriately titled threads. The problem is that
Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
of them.

In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
modicum of effort to keep him balanced.

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040309012205.12631.00005429@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403082010.42a8bb0d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com

> (gunnery nurse off his meds shouts and waves his arms about, needing attention)

(...that from the same person who says "I am only here to civilly
debate the Morse Code test issue"...)

> writes:

> >> In all the thousands of press photographs, hundreds of minutes
> >> of press video recordings, any radios in evidence are all
> >> identifiable as belonging to governments or utilities.
> >
> > "Thousands of press photographs..."...?!?!
> >
> > YOU personally proofed ALL those "THOUSANDS" of "press
> >photographs" and determined that NOT A ONE contained ANY picture of
> >ANY Amateur Radio realated or supported activity...?!?!
>
> Absolutely. I watched TV for many hours after the 11 Sep 01 attacks.
> Got 30 complete video photographs every second. A thousand frames
> of video are seen every half minute and a fraction.

All, Lennie..I asked you if you proofed them ALL...??? I am
soooo (not) impressed...

> Do the math...if your meds have kicked in and you can still grasp
> a pencil (or crayon) without breaking it...

Uh huh...

> > OR...(and more likely)...the few pictures you DID see in the LA
> >Times didn't have anything YOU deemed relevent, ergo you just
> >extrapolated the numbers to sound like something impressive...
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...have you now assumed such god-like powers you

> can mentally reach out and determine what anyone saw?
>
> You ARE nuts.

Perhaps. But I am not a liar...Like you...

> >> IN the national press and in electronics industry trade publications
> >> were many mentions of communications supplies (HTs and
> >> telephones) rushed in to aid New York. The U.S. military
> >> adequately supported rescue at the Pentagon, also reported.
> >
> > And from the desks of the NY OES, the American Red Cross,
> >Salvation Army, NYC OES, NYPD, FDNY and numerous other "offical"
> >agencies ahve come letters of commendation and gratitude for Amateur
> >Radio support.
>
> All nice little pieces of paper, suitable for framing.

And every one of them evidence that you are wrong...Again...

> >> Note: The ARRL is NOT a "press," a journalism organization.
> >
> > Doesn't matter. Can you DISPRROVE anything they have
> >"reported"...?!?!
>
> Not in here.

Not ANYWHERE, Lennie...You cannot provide ONE instance of
documented evidence that ANYTHING the ARRL has printed in QST or any
other periodical.

> No one can "disprove" something that doesn't exist and the ARRL
> "news" does so much selective editing and selective adjectiving it
> makes amateur activity sound absolutely totally completely
> responsible for anything they report.

So...we have a round-about way of you acknowledging that you LIED
about the ARRL's alleged "dishonesty"...

Per your OWN words..."No one can "disprove" something that
doesn't exist..."

Not that anyone else believed you, but at least we now have you
acknowledging that you were mistruthful.

> >> >No doubt there have been smaller emergencies of which I haven't
> >> >heard.
> >>
> >> Without any doubt of that...!
> >>
> >> Do you wish another recounting of the Great Blackout of the Greater
> >> Los Angeles area caused by the Northridge Earthquake a decade
> >> ago? No? Of course not, you refuse to view my posts...

> >
> > Your posts are still irrelevent.
> >
> > Documentary evidence of participation by Amateur Radio
> >organizations exists within the California OES.
>
> Make that "ACS" sweetums. Try to get your acronyms straight.

Well, "sweetums", ACS >IS< an agency of the California Office of
Emergency Services.

> Or were you blood-pinned with some kind of distinguished civilian
> service medal and suffered an infection?
>
> >> Continue to let the ARRL spoon-feed you all the information they
> >> think is "suitable" for you.
> >
> > What "spoon-feed(ing)", Your Scumminess...?!?!
>
> See above on "selective editing." League copy scribblers are very
> good at what they do. When they do a page make-up it's a cold
> day in Newington when any other radio service is mentioned.

Lennie, you ae the master of the artfully pasted URL, so don't
get all uppity about anyone else's alleged "selective editing"...Not
that I've seen anyone CHANGE anything you've ever said. (Why would
they? Your own words usually sink YOUR rants...!)

> > What has been inaccurate? Where is the evidence of dishonesty or
> >misrepresentation of facts?
>
> Take a trank, gunnery nurse. When it has kicked in, try reading or
> viewing something BESIDES "official" information from Newington.

A "trank", Lennie...?!?!

Is this another of YOUR "shortened medical terms"...?!?! It's
certainly NOT in any of MY references...

> >> >Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons, walk-a-thons,
> >> >bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which hams routinely
> provide
> >> >communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of these per year.
> >>
> >> Even as I write this, the Los Angeles Marathon of 2004 is in progress.
> >> It is well-covered by a continuous telecast from one station and spot
> >> reporting on at least three other local TV stations. I am not listening
> >> to a sound-only AM station coverage. On-the-route video is provided
> >> by two-person teams on motorcycles equipped with two-way voice
> >> and picture mobile equipment.
> >
> > Uh huh...and the news is...?!?!

>
> The "news" is that YOU are NOT Dee.

Hot Diggidy...ya think...?!?!?
>
> You could hold yourself down in public and let other folks have a chance
> but your obsession won't let you, will it?

What "chance"...?!?!

You mean letting YOU have a "fair shot" at lying, obfuscation,
misdirection and generally immature and child-like sandlot
behaviour...?!?!

Not as long as you keep misrepresenting the truth.

> The L.A. Marathon was on Sunday. Nice pictures in the TIMES this
> morning, more video from the marathon on TV.
>
> Still haven't heard of all the noble, traditional, inspiring ham radio
> aid to the L.A. Marathon. Lots more good news about the DARPA
> Grand Challenge...first look at the team entries from display at
> the Fontana raceway. But, you don't know anything about the
> DARPA Grand Challenge, do you?

Nope...And just like NOT seeing Amateur Radio featured on any
news-item relating to an event that it played a part in, >>MY<< not
knowing about your "DARPA grand Challenge" doesn't mean it didn't
happen either...

> One million bucks to the winner...

And YOUR entry is
>
> >> The video from locations along the 26.2 mile route show many
> >> different HTs being used by LAPD, LA government, and Marathon
> >> personnel identifiable by tags or outer vests. No one has mentioned
> >> any amateur radio activity yet. This isn't the first L.A. Marathon.
> >> Everything going well so far as it has for years.
> >
> > I lived in the LA area for years and was a praticipant in two
> >marathons. Even though some hams got thier pictues in video bites, I
> >don't remember any of them having ever been interviewed nor Amateur
> >Radio being mentioned by name.
>
> Riiiiiight. Uh-huh. You always tell the "truth" like that?
>
> I'd rather hear details of your "seven hostile actions" such as when,
> where, and what happened.

They are not pertinent to this forum, Putzy One. Just like you.

> > Does that exclusion mean we weren't there or didn't contribute?
>
> They were there "in spirit."

They were there in person.

> > I saw lot's of pictures of Goodhew and Schaeffer Ambulances in
> >those video shots, although none of them were mentioned by name
> >either...Does that mean those third party EMS units didn't
> >participate?
>
> ? Irrelevant mention. Those ambulances have BIG names on the
> sides, are seen on the streets regularly.

Hardly "irrelevant mention" An absolutely accurate analogy, one
you tried to avoid but didn't.

I saw a clip of a public event in which an 18-wheeler replete
with large logo of it's owner on the side...Am I to assume (under the
usual Andersonian logic) that this grocery delivery truck was
"supporting" the event...???

> > I also saw countless shots of runners with Evian water bottles
> >and drinking from cups with Gatorade logos on them...I never heard
> >them mentioned by name eithr. Sooooooo......What's your excuse for
> >THOSE exclusions, Scummy One...?!?!
>
> You haven't made any specific mention of RADIO AMATEURS,
> gunnery nurse. Try to stay on topic.

Of course I did and I am so-on-topic it hurts you. Stop lying.
(as if you COULD...)

I'll ask you again...Did the exclusion of SPECIFIC MENTION of the
products or firms I cited in teh previous post mean THEY DIDN'T
CONTRIBUTE...?!?!

> >> The ARRL will no doubt post something later saying something like
> >> "the success of the L.A. Marathon was all due to the untiring efforts
> >> of many radio amateurs." That is, if they still recognize the west
> >> coast of the USA as belonging to the Union...
> >
> > No...they will do like they have (accurately) done before, and
> >will say Amateurs CONTRIBUTED to the overall event, and that TEAMWORK
> >between the supporting agencies resulted in a safe event.
>
> The spirit is willing, but the actual flesh seems to be invisible.

I'll ask you again...Did the exclusion of SPECIFIC MENTION of the
products or firms I cited in teh previous post mean THEY DIDN'T
CONTRIBUTE...?!?!

> But, the ARRL is your source of amateur news and you are a
> Believer in the Church of St. Hiram. You MUST discredit anyone

> who spoils the old, old images of nobility, purity, and good from
> the "services" of glorious amateur radio. You cannot help yourself,
> poor baby.

There was nothing in any of your post that "spoil(ed)" any of the contributions of Amateur Radio in ANY event, Lennie.

You, on the otherhand, once again spoiled your family name by TRYING (unsuccessfully) to do teh spoiling.

> Go snaffle a trank and try to calm down.

More LennieMade "shortened" medical terms, Lennie...!?!?

> I'll still be around doing what I care to do. All your false and
> misleading pejorations are empty words from a nutso.

Sorry that I hurt your ego, Lennie, and spoiled yet another opportunity for you to lie, mislead and antagonize without interruption.

> All you are doing is wasting everyone's time, especially yours.

Nope...just yours...You just make it too darn easy to spoil YOUR rants...You AND Google give me everything I need...

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

738. Re: Get Railed Evinrude cover shaped head LLardass!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 12:51:33 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <EPA2QOUH38055.3274652778@anonymous>
Source record: 88752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c2ifm9$55f$0@pita.alt.net>
"WHOris" <oris@bcrighbigwts.net> whined through alt.net:
>
>
>
> <LARDASS Lloyd Davies Boris Pinson>; "Esq." <pinsionb23@no.where> wrote in message
> news:87023238917833.2439128789@taranews.net...
> > OLD MARTIAN HED

That's rich coming from you Llardass Lloyd, the bald 30 year old
VIRGIN with the head shaped like a cover for an Evinrude
outboard motor.

> >THE WHOLE DAM NIM BASTARDS BOARD AN HAD IT SHUT DOWN.

Really?
That why it's still there?
Go fuck yourself, LLardass Lloyd Davies the L-O-S-E-R!

>
> ant hower ya gunt fine a bc610 i stills wanner bc610 an bc610 xmtr
> my you furst no KAPTAL leddrs causin prolly me not fine mine
> bc610 xmtr forto xmtr on channul 13 bit powvur. laz time to me
> wanna bc610 big bc610 rayo.....
>
> gud numers fm oris 73,
>
> oris

Whorass and Lardass, the newsgroup's "Dumb and Dumber."

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

739. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 13:35:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404DC80A.7080008@psu.edu>
Source record: 88753

N2EY wrote:
> In article <xdqdnbvLGJPci9DdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
>>>>>would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.
>>>>
>>
>>>> And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
>>>>stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
>>>>econmmic system works.
>>>
>>
>>
>>>Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the long
>>>view. That's considered old-fashioned today.
>>
>> It's a debatable case for invoking Godwin, maybe?
>
>
> My point was simply that I'm not glorifying him.

Despite his reprehensible support for the N***s, he did know how to
sell cars and keep his people pretty well satisfied.

>>>> I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
>>>>thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
>>>>is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
>>>>there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
>>>>will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
>>>>monopoly problems.
>>>
>>>Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental
>>>threat is OK? What rights do employees really have?
>>
>>Sure. We have a local case in which a massive amount of known Iron
>>Pyrite rock was dumped in a small valley with a stream running along the

>>bottom of the valley. The valley is all filled in now. The predictable
>>happened, and we now have a massive acid drainage problem that will kill
>>many tourist frequented streams and will probably sterilize the creeks
>>it runs into and construction on the highway has been stopped, and we
>>have a real mess on our hands.
>
>
> Who dumped the bad rock?

The company making the road. My fault, I reread my post and didn't made
that clear at all. It was part of a large road building project. One
portion of it included basically lopping of the top of a mountain, and
filling in a small valley next to it to even out the terrain.

>> Not much of a gray area there I think. And we can keep busy enough with
>
>
>>the blatant cases that we don't have to go after Joe six-pack and his
>>Sunday BBQ or his lawnmower.
>
>
> Of course! That's the kind of details I'm talking about.
>
> OTOH, one of the excuses given by industry is that environmental concerns cost
> too much.

Oh, they do cost! But we have this warped mentality that some groups
are exempt from responsibility. If we wreck a large part of say the
tourist and vacation and vacation product industry in our area, we lose
all that money. And it's so much more money than would have been spent
by doing the job correctly in the first place. The little stream
connects into prime *native* fishing stream, a prime bass fishing stream
and a large lake heavily used for recreation.

My folks taught me that if it costs too much - don't do it.

>>>Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?
>>
>>>Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here
>>>last
>>>year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down
>>>slightly.
>>>Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
>>>production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and
>>>it's only March.
>>
>> Some people are making a good profit.
>>
>
> Yup.
>
>

>>>Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
>>>Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.
>>
>> Wellll, you are partially correct. You lump SUV's as if they are all of
>
>
>>the Excursion/Suburban/Escalade type.
>
>
> Many of them are.
>
>
>>And that is wrong. I just bought
>>an SUV that gets in the 20's in town, and low 30's on the highway. It's
>>downright tiny by comparison, and is a very responsible vehicle as far
>>as resources go.
>
>
> Sure - but how many of the big ones are sold for every responsible one? And how
> many are driven as commuting vehicles and status symbols rather than because
> their capabilities are really needed?

The Excursion has been canceled you know. The monsters really aren't
selling that well anymore

>> And I don't think that any of the Bio fuel options are viable or even
>>desirable. To see what I mean, replacement of even a tiny fraction of
>>what we use now in fossil fuel will take a lot of biofuel, and how much
>>can we make?
>
>
> TDP isn't biofuel.

Is that a definition thing Jim? The feed stock is certainly
biologically based. And it's a good process, that simply uses offal to
make it's goop.

On a small scale, it can be helpful, but I still believe that it is
insufficient on a large scale. Although maybe..... Soylent oil? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

740. Re: Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 13:38:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <404DC8F2.2020700@psu.edu>
Source record: 88754

Sara wrote:
> Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?

Hi Sara. Go to:

http://www.qrz.com/p/testing.pl

All three levels of the tests are there, Technician, General, and
Extra. Good luck!

- mike KB3EIA -

741. Re: When is a re-stocking charge a good idea?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 15:06:18 UTC
From: wa8mea@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <8a260fb2.0403090706.341d85df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88755

>
> Even without the large profit margins, the store can and does send the
> unit back to the manufacturer in many cases. Plus, if they take a loss
> on an item it gets recorded as an expense on their part. Lowers their
> overall tax liability.

I can vouch for that from personal experience. But perhaps AES doesn't want to take the time to send it back to Icom for a re-pack. Probably easier for them to sell as a demo.

Another scenario I almost brought to AES's attention was calling Icom and requesting a new belt clip. I doubt this piece of plastic was worth $39. But then again, parts have been known to cost 20 times more than they are worth.

I think they saw an opportunity to make a little extra cash on the transaction since I didn't use my charge card this time around. When you use a charge card, you protect yourself against re-stocking charges.

I think buying/selling is a give and take proposition. I purposely didn't return the $13 coax adapter I bought with the rig, figuring I could use it at some later point. I am aware of the cost of doing business, and didn't want to "pile on" when returning the items. But after their re-stocking fee, I figured I'll return it and get my $13 back. I will also use their toll free number from now on. I use to foot the bill for phone ordering, using the toll number. Don't think I will from now on.

73, Bill - WA8MEA

Neat Stuff! DWM Communications - http://qth.com/dwm

742. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 15:15:11 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88756

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040309054349.02537.00003426@mb-m23.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
><snip>
>>
>>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
>>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was
>>ever done before.
>
> And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a
> major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the
> opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this
> year.
>

Agreed up to a certain point. I think that Mr Nader will find that he gets
far fewer votes this time. The Democratic primaries have shown that people
are focussed on getting the oilmen out of the White House. That and the
fact that they saw what happened last time are likely to decimate his
support.

>>> Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>> investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>> "Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>>> part of it.
>>
>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
>
> It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary
> than ever.
>
> Here's one data point:
>
> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
> tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
> expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times

> that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more
> than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid
> 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> Grants and
>>scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.
>>
<snip>

I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to offshore production.

Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to do white collar and professional jobs for much less.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

743. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 15:45:21 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <lEl3c.91092$PR3.1405651@attbi_s03>
Source record: 88757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
news:104qhv6n0q56a5d@corp.supernews.com...
> - - ex - - wrote:
> > William Warren wrote:
> >
> >> (unatributed rant snipped)
> >>
>
> This explains the source of the article, FWIW. Drop them a line and
> maybe they can direct you how to locate the person who wrote it so that
> you can personally assess his credibility.
> http://frontpagemagazine.com/articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=12272
>
> -BM

I've never read "Front Page Magazine", and it's qualifications as an "Non partison (but extremely cynical) newsletter for investors..." remain open to question. The appeals for money on the splash page leave me to wonder which investors it's appealing to, but for the sake of argument, let's assume they really are an actual magazine with a meaningful readership.

The story you cite begins with the line

"The following was sent to a Marine chat net by a retired Marine Master Sergeant
who was in S-2, 3rd Bn, 1st Marines, Korea in 1954."

But, from there, it is a copy of the smear attributed to a "Rear Admiral" in your original post. I don't believe it was actually posted by a Marine, either: there's too much wrong with it.

1. The gratuitous reference to Korea, and the way in backfires on the PR man:

I don't know if being in the "3rd Bn., 1st Marines" has some cachet amoung Marines, but it smells like FUD put in to catch the eye of a key swing vote - older veterans. Anyone in Korea in 1954 would have to be at least 68 years old now, and I have never seen anyone of that age group participating in something as new as a "chat net".

2. "I know the tactics and the doctrine used, and I know the equipment. ".

This doesn't make sense: why would a Marine be trained in small boat tactics? What "doctrine" is he talking about? How would a Marine learn about Swift boats or PBR's, when the Marines pride themselves on being combat infantrymen and not "Rust pickers"? Don't forget, he'd have been an Sergeant

at the time of Vietnam, only ~30 years old: hardly an age or rank that would be expected to cross-train with Navy boat crews. More to the point, how many Marine Corps Master Sergeants would write like that?

3. Finally, the coup-de-grace that reveals this to be just more disinformation: "The details of the event for which he was given the Silver Star make no sense at all."

If whoever wrote that was actually a Marine, and had actually been in combat, he'd know that nothing ever goes according to the book. When the shooting starts, men revert to their most basic capabilities, and if Kerry chose to confront an attacher directly, instead of running away ("put your stern to the action and go balls to the wall") that speaks volumes about the fact that he put himself first in the line of fire. I don't doubt for a second that it wasn't the correct "Standard procedure", but procedures are designed by statisticians who want commanders to do what will give the greatest probability of success in an average encounter. Kerry threw away the book and did it himself instead of risking his men's lives: that's why he got the medal.

This all smells: second and third-hand slander, without a name attached, without confirmation (something a real "magazine" would be expected to do routinely). I don't believe it.

Of course, the Republicans hope it doesn't matter: having thrown the manure in front of the fan, they're hoping that it will stick to Senator Kerry and he'll be too busy cleaning it off for anyone to trace it back to the source before the election.

Concerning your earlier post:

> You're not real fond of opposing opinions are you?

I welcome opinions of all sorts, whether or not they support my viewpoint. So long as the sources are available, I'll accept quotes without prejudice, too.

Mostly, I'm "not fond of" Shrub's attitude that not being caught in a lie is the same thing as telling the truth. What I am especially "not fond of" is unattributed slander, quotes-out-of-context (as you did to me), nameless and unverifiable attacks, or the attitude some people take that it's OK to question Senator Kerry's courage while forgetting George Bush, Junior's cowardice.

Bill Warren

(My email address must be modified in an obvious way for direct replies)

744. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 15:49:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403090749.60d4b0db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88758

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040307075945.25517.00004651@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total profits
> >> would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick buck.
> > >
> > > And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
> > >stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
> > >econmmic system works.
> >
> > Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the long
> > view. That's considered old-fashioned today.
> > >
> > > I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
> > >thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
> > >is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
> > >there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
> > >will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
> > >monopoly problems.
> >
> > Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental threat
> > is OK? What rights do employees really have?
> >
> > Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?

And her stock is now dropping thru the floor which is impacting all
the little folk who put savings into pieces of her empires, layoffs
will ensue, etc. OYeah, the feds "won" this one big. But who is
getting *really* spanked? Martha? Ha! As if. Ashcroft & Co. strike
again.

> Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here last
> year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down slightly.
> Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
> production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and it's
> only March.
>
> Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
> Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.

TDP is another scam.

"This is classic pseudoscience - bordering on fraudulent!

FROM Discovery article May 03 :

"Thermal depolymerization, Appel [the guy who built the TDP pilot plant in Philly] says, has proved to be 85 percent energy efficient for complex feedstocks, such as turkey offal: "That means for every 100 Btus in the feedstock, we use only 15 Btus to run the process."

HOWEVER

"Their energy numbers are [highly] specious. They give efficiency as the energy content of the input waste over the energy use. That's flat-out misleading. They should tell us usable energy of the output fuel. That's all the matters. We do not rate coal plants by the energy of the coal they burn, after all, all we care about is the output. This little evasion suggests that they are not being completely honest in their entire analysis." (Bonehead at Metafilter.com)

An actual [honest] measure of TDP efficiency would contrast usable energy content of the OUTPUT (not of the inputs) to the energy required to drive the reaction/process.

"[This] is called marketing. Anybody selling anything has an interest in convincing you that it will give you eternal life and the Buddha's ten secrets of personal enlightenment. Their energy estimate is so dishonest that it hardly seems useful to give it any more time. A 100-BTU chicken couldn't possibly yield more than a few BTU's of useable fuel, a small percentage of which could actually be converted into useable energy. It's probably better to just heat your home by burning the chicken." {Atlantic Online post}

WRT Economics:

"If the New, Improved Poo Fuel and OPEC oil both come to market at $30/barrel or so, the only difference will be in the profit margin for Poo Energy Co. " {metafilter.com post}

This is NOT new. Chemistry is chemisty, period. It sure looks like a pyrolytic process to me, even though they've given it a snazzy new name. Their comparison chart also sets up pyrolysis as a straw man -- pyrolysis can also handle slurries,liquids, etc. and yields highly uniform products. So this appears to be 'fancy'[read: hyped, creatively marketed] pyrolysis to me. Also appears to be a 'classic' example of "research" finding the results they want to find. Virtually all experimental design (methodology, instrumentation, analytical tools) are carefully chosen (crafted) to identify the expected outcome. Choices are directed by prejudice - in this case, economic. Given sufficient data, statistics can be employed to 'prove' any theorum. Unless someone can tell me what I'm missing, of course...

"Most men think that they think, but what they are actually doing is rearranging their prejudice"(Bertrand Russell)

Get a grip folks! TANSTAAFL

Posted by: dr mac at April 26, 2003 02:09 PM"

> How do we get folks to take the long view again?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

745. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 16:08:27 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <%Zl3c.91189$PR3.1409553@attbi_s03>
Source record: 88759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:E7c3c.90453$C65.55987@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
>
> William Warren wrote:
> (a bunch of Kerry-loving crap)
>
> All your blather and blah in support of Kerry
> goes right out the window in this one passage, quote:
>
[From Don Bendell's editorial -bw]
> >...Sure, there were a couple
> > bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did,
> > as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it,
> > or at the very least report it. Why is there not a
> > single record anywhere of you (Kerry) ever reporting
> > any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested?
> > The answer is simple. You are a liar...

The answer IS simple, and it is that Kerry was a young, impressionable, idealistic junior officer with a boat and crew to care for, and with a dangerous and thankless job to do, and what were undoubtedly "Latrine Lawyer" fables at the time he heard them got lost in the noise until they were later verified by those who participated or those who apprehended the participants. I don't care when Kerry realized that the stories were true: I care that he had the guts to act on those truths.

As I said before, Mr. Bendell is not the guardian of the "one true version" of Vietnam history. His stipulating that he "saw none" just before bragging that he "saw it all" is understandable: old veterans, both he and I, each have our own version of the truth as we saw it, or (more accurately) as we remember it.

It happened. You don't need to take my word for it: look up the courts-martial records and interview the convicts who did it. Of course, the "30 old white men" who run America are counting on the likelihood that nobody will bother.

> Democrats have shown who they really are by their
> choice of this despicable man; a fine decendent of
> the Clinton tradition. You are a sick, twisted
> and evil party and the sooner you are stamped out,
> the better for our poor nation.
> D.S.

Oh, sorry, I thought we were having a discussion about politics: you appear to be reciting a speech by Juan Peron.

Call me back in ten or twenty years: if your "friends" stay in power, you'll be living in a tent, choosing between buying food or medicine, and you'll own nothing but the TV set your masters will use to tell you what to think.

I pity you.

Bill Warren.

746. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 16:18:35 UTC
From: jakdedert <jdedert@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <r2m3c.2992$p77.2401@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 88760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David Stinson wrote:
> William Warren wrote:
> (a bunch of Kerry-loving crap)
>
> All your blather and blah in support of Kerry
> goes right out the window in this one passage, quote:
>
> >...Sure, there were a couple
> > bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did,
> > as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it,
> > or at the very least report it. Why is there not a
> > single record anywhere of you (Kerry) ever reporting
> > any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested?
> > The answer is simple. You are a liar...
>
> Democrats have shown who they really are by their
> choice of this despicable man; a fine decendent of
> the Clinton tradition. You are a sick, twisted
> and evil party and the sooner you are stamped out,
> the better for our poor nation.
> D.S.

Good God, David. Are you so blind, or senile as to deny that atrocities occured in Vietnam? Do you also deny the Holocaust ever happened?

Our nation would not be so poor, if....

jak

747. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 16:28:11 UTC
From: - - ex - - <exray@coqui.gov>
Message-ID: <104rs11sh7f7b1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 88761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

William Warren wrote:

>
> Mostly, I'm "not fond of" Shrub's attitude that not being caught in a lie is
> the same thing as telling the truth. What I am especially "not fond of" is
> unattributed slander, quotes-out-of-context (as you did to me), nameless and
> unverifiable attacks, or the attitude some people take that it's OK to
> question Senator Kerry's courage while forgetting George Bush, Junior's
> cowardice.

Ok, then, take Kerry's own quotes and ask why he refuses to release his
military medical records to the pundits to 'prove' the PHs that got him
out of Nam in four months.

And while you're at it, see if you can find a copy of his book - you
know, the one with the upside-down American flag on the cover.

What we don't need in the White House is another liar or hypocrite and
his self-proclaimed "war hero" status raises some serious concerns about
his integrity.

You're having way too much fun with this topic and clearly you have the
ability to rant much better than I so I'm going to bow out now. Maybe
Stinson will continue to give you more rant opportunities. I think
you're a nut and I'm going back to messing with radios.

-Adios,
Bill M

748. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 18:12:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040309131206.05957.00000913@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 88762

In article <d22b54c3.0403090749.60d4b0db@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040307075945.25517.00004651@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>

>> Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?
>
>And her stock is now dropping thru the floor which is impacting all
>the little folk who put savings into pieces of her empires, layoffs
>will ensue, etc. OYeah, the feds "won" this one big. But who is
>getting *really* spanked? Martha? Ha! As if. Ashcroft & Co. strike
>again.

Exactly. So what's you're solution - let her go?
>
>> Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here
>> last
>> year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down
>> slightly.
>> Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
>> production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and
>> it's only March.
>>
>> Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP (Thermal
>> Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.
>
>TDP is another scam.
>
Maybe, maybe not. Certainly not something to bet the bank on.

>"This is classic pseudoscience - bordering on fraudulent!

Sez who? You a ChemE too?
>
>FROM Discovery article May 03 :
>
>"Thermal depolymerization, Appel [the guy who built the TDP pilot
>plant in Philly] says, has proved to be 85 percent energy efficient
>for complex feedstocks, such as turkey offal: "That means for every
>100 Btus in the feedstock, we use only 15 Btus to run the process."
>
>HOWEVER

>
>"Their energy numbers are [highly] specious. They give efficiency as
>the energy content of the input waste over the energy use. That's
>flat-out misleading. They should tell us usable energy of the output
>fuel. That's all the matters. We do not rate coal plants by the energy
>of the coal they burn, after all, all we care about is the output.
>This little evasion suggests that they are not being completely honest
>in their entire analysis." (Bonehead at Metafilter.com)

"Bonehead"?

>An actual [honest] measure of TDP efficiency would contrast usable
>energy content of the OUTPUT (not of the inputs) to the energy
>required to drive the reaction/process.

No, not really. See below.

>"[This] is called marketing. Anybody selling anything has an interest
>in convincing you that it will give you eternal life and the Buddha's
>ten secrets of personal enlightenment. Their energy estimate is so
>dishonest that it hardly seems useful to give it any more time. A
>100-BTU chicken couldn't possibly yield more than a few BTU's of
>useable fuel, a small percentage of which could actually be converted
>into useable energy. It's probably better to just heat your home by
>burning the chicken." {Atlantic Online post}

Has this person actually investigated the process?
>
>WRT Economics:
>
>"If the New, Improved Poo Fuel and OPEC oil both come to market at
>$30/barrel or so, the only difference will be in the profit margin for
>Poo Energy Co. " {metafilter.com post}

Well, sort of.

$ per barrel is the only measure that will really stand up in the real world.
It doesn't matter if the TDP process
is 9% or 90% efficient in terms of BTU, what matters is the final cost of the
finished product in dollars per barrel or BTU or ccf. And that will be proven
or disproven by the plants already in service (the turkey plant in the Midwest)
and others in development.
>
>This is NOT new. Chemistry is chemisty, period. It sure looks like a
>pyrolytic process to me, even though they've given it a snazzy new
>name. Their comparison chart also sets up pyrolysis as a straw man --
>pyrolysis can also handle slurries,liquids, etc. and yields highly
>uniform products. So this appears to be 'fancy'[read: hyped,
>creatively marketed] pyrolysis to me. Also appears to be a 'classic'
>example of "research" finding the results they want to find. Virtually
>all experimental design (methodology, instrumentation, analytical
>tools) are carefully chosen (crafted) to identify the expected

>outcome. Choices are directed by prejudice - in this case, economic.
>Given sufficient data, statistics can be employed to 'prove' any
>theorum. Unless someone can tell me what I'm missing, of course...

It's a combination of temperature and pressure, plus water, that allegedly do the breakdown. Again, the devil is in the details.
>
>"Most men think that they think, but what they are actually doing is
>rearranging their prejudice"(Bertrand Russell)
>
>Get a grip folks! TANSTAAFL
>
>Posted by: dr mac at April 26, 2003 02:09 PM"

"dr mac" huh?

Maybe TDP works, maybe it doesn't, the obvious measure is given above. Of course if a company has 200 tons of turkey offal per day to dispose of, they're going to pay the TDP folks just to get rid of it. And if something useful can be made from for a competitive price, so much the better. Same for sewage sludge and old plastic, etc.

But even if TDP works as advertised, it's not the entire answer because it will take decades to bring enough plants online *and* there may not be enough suitable feedstock meet the demand. (imagine - not enough waste?)

25 or so years ago a ChemE friend of mine did her master's thesis on shale oil recovery. Developed a process that would get good-quality feedstock from oil shales of the type that are all over the Rockies. Worked quite well, and was clean to boot. Only problem was that the resulting oil would cost about $45/barrel to extract - and that was in 1980 dollars. Figure $60-80/barrel today.
>
>> How do we get folks to take the long view again?
>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

749. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 18:16:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OvadnTGu1ct1INPdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88763

N2EY wrote:
> In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>We are still down 2 million jobs since 911. Mine was one
>>>>of the ones lost in the months after the attack. I am trying to run my
>>>>own business now, but it is a hard struggle. I would go back to working
>>>>for someone else, but there are no jobs in my field. The very few job
>>>>ads I see ask for impossibly high qualifications (for me anyway!), as
>>>>employers can pick and choose from the glut of people looking for work.
>>>>For example, I have a BS and they are looking for PhDs.
>>>>
>>>>If you still have a well paid job it is easy to overlook the situation,
>>>>but it's dire. Employers are not hiring at anything like the rate
>>>>expected at this stage of an economic recovery.
>>>
>>>That's because they learned to make do with the people they had, and
>>>are reluctant to add more now.
>>
>>That's a large part of it, although I think tere may be more going on.
>
>
> Such as?
>
>>>>2.4 million jobs were lost, and only
>>>>about 400,000 new ones have been added. It's impossible to look at
>>>>those numbers and not conclude that the economy is in terrible shape.
>>>>Other economic indicators may be good, but the employment problem is
>>>>very real and very large.
>>>
>>>Remember Ross Perot and the "giant sucking sound"?
>>
>>I found his ears rather distracting
>
>

> Much of what he predicted has come to pass, though.
>
>
>>>>The current administration might prefer that we all focus on security
>>>>and foreign wars, but that's because if too many people look too hard
>>>>at the employment numbers it will hurt their chances of reelection.
>>>>FWIW, I doubt that any government can really influence the economy more
>>>>than a tiny amount, but the political facts of life say that people
>>>>will vote for someone who promises to fix the economy.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Seems to me that the real problem is more fundamental. Short term fixes
>>>won't change long-term problems.
>>>
>>>For example, importing 57% of our oil, and letting that number rise
>>>every year, isn't the right trend, but it's been allowed to go on
>>>because it's cheaper in the short term than. (Please don't blame the
>>>environmental concerns of drilling in the Arctic and similar places
>>>until you have solid numbers on what oil from those places costs to
>>>extract, and how much can actually be extracted.)
>>
>>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
>>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was
>>ever done before.
>
>
> And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a major
> factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the opposition in
> 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this year.

I heard the Green party has something to say about all this. At any
rate, they aren't backing Ralph. His support this year is likely to be
down in the noise. Without a party backing him, he's just another Harold
Stassen.

>
>>>Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>>investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>>"Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>>>part of it.
>>
>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
>
> It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary than
> ever.

If the cost continues at double digit increases every year, and the
graduate stands a pretty good chance of his/her entire field being made
redundant, the necessity of the education is going to go away. Granted
the would-be student is flippin burgers, but their job won't be made
irrelevant.

Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"

> Here's one data point:
>
> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania, tuition
> alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very expensive at the
> time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times that. But will the
> starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more than 10 times what it was in
> 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time
> there? Nope.

- Mike KB3EIA -

750. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 18:19:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gIadnTcYru00l9PdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88764

Alun wrote:

> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040309054349.02537.00003426@mb-m23.aol.com:
>
>
>>In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>>>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>>
>>
>><snip>
>>
>>>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
>>>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was
>>>ever done before.
>>
>>And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a
>>major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the
>>opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this
>>year.
>>
>
>
> Agreed up to a certain point. I think that Mr Nader will find that he gets
> far fewer votes this time. The Democratic primaries have shown that people
> are focussed on getting the oilmen out of the White House. That and the
> fact that they saw what happened last time are likely to decimate his
> support.
>
>
>>>>Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>>>investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>>>"Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>>>>part of it.
>>>
>>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.

>>
>>It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary
>>than ever.
>>
>>Here's one data point:
>>
>>In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times
>>that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more
>>than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid
>>10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>> Grants and
>>
>>>scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.
>>>
>
> <snip>
>
> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get worse.
> At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to offshore
> production.

I dunno, Alun. It might soon be hard to convince a lot of people to go
drastically into debt just to have their field be decimated upon graduation.

> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class than
> America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to do white
> collar and professional jobs for much less.

Well, the tech help I've gotten surely doesn't speak English very well! 8^)

751. Re: Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 18:30:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403091030.6f7fa91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88765

sara_feinass@hotmail.com (Sara) wrote in message
news:<a0f847f2.0403090400.798727a@posting.google.com>...
> Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?
>

Go to http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

> Sara

w3rv

752. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 19:19:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TMo3c.4097$Cm3.2641@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88766
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Not CB Rambo" <bark@the.moon.com> wrote in message
news:so8q40haloatkiefjvd7s393ea981e7uti@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 08 Mar 2004 23:35:10 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> >> ...as if you've never jammed the Liberty Net.
> >
> >Why would I jam the liberty net? I actually enjoyed some of what they
had
> >to say.
>
> I enjoy paranoid rantings as much as anyone, but to say that teaching
> evolution in public schools causes children to become drug-using,
> sexually perverted atheists, I say GUMAFB!
>
>
I never heard that on the Liberty Net. Course I could hardly ever hear it
because WA9KJI was running his 'language lessons' nightly.

Dan/W4NTI

753. Re: Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 20:01:57 UTC
From: Incognito <BLB@sero.net>
Message-ID: <Wop3c.212$Nj.19@fed1read01>
Source record: 88767

Sara see all exam sites (or most all) at URL:

http://ac6v.com/help.htm#EXAMS

About 14 to choose from

Yes the Technician is the current entry level -- see URL:

http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

Good Luck
--
Incognito By Necessity (:-(

If you can't convince them, confuse them.
- - -Harry S Truman

"Sara" <sara_feinass@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:a0f847f2.0403090400.798727a@posting.google.com...
> Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?
>
> Sara

754. Re: Using Existing Law Against BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 20:25:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <uISdnclUv8WJt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88768

Len Over 21 wrote:

Lots of lennyboys incoherent babblings deleted:

> But, the ARRL is your source of amateur news and you are a
> Believer in the Church of St. Hiram. You MUST discredit anyone
> who spoils the old, old images of nobility, purity, and good from
> the "services" of glorious amateur radio. You cannot help yourself,
> poor baby.

Poor old senile lennyboy, to senile and stupid to get a ham license so the best he can do is spend his twilight days in the nursing home here on the newsgroup attempting to degrade that which he is so jealouse he cannot be a part of. The amateur radio service has a long distinguished record of public service recongonized by many local, state, and federal government agencies. Something that just really torques your hemmoriods dosen't it lennyboy?

755. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 20:28:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88769

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> The Law of Imagination keeps changing all the time, all the
> Believers thinking they are radio minutemen defending ignorant
> savage civilians against the elements of disaster. Every ham a
> hero! :-)

Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be ready for your afternoon nappy.

756. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 20:30:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <uISdnctUv8XottPdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88770
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David Stinson wrote:

>
>
> William Warren wrote:
> (a bunch of Kerry-loving crap)
>
> All your blather and blah in support of Kerry
> goes right out the window in this one passage, quote:
>
> >...Sure, there were a couple
> > bad-apples, but I saw none, and I saw it all, and if I did,
> > as an army officer, it was my obligation to stop it,
> > or at the very least report it. Why is there not a
> > single record anywhere of you (Kerry) ever reporting
> > any incidents like this or having the perpetrators arrested?
> > The answer is simple. You are a liar...
>
> Democrats have shown who they really are by their
> choice of this despicable man; a fine decendent of
> the Clinton tradition. You are a sick, twisted
> and evil party and the sooner you are stamped out,
> the better for our poor nation.
> D.S.
>

If Kerry should be elected president (God forbid!!!), and we have
another 9/11 type attack, Kerry will be leading the anti-war protest.

757. Re: Get Railed Evinrude cover shaped head LLardass!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 21:00:19 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20040309210019.19576.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 88771
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c2ifm9$55f$0@pita.alt.net>
"WHOris" <oris@bcrighbigwts.net> whined through alt.net:
>
>
>
> <LARDASS Lloyd Davies Boris Pinson>; "Esq." <pinsionb23@no.where> wrote in message
> news:87023238917833.2439128789@taranews.net...
> > OLD MARTIAN HED

That's rich coming from you Llardass Lloyd, the bald 30 year old
VIRGIN with the head shaped like a cover for an Evinrude
outboard motor.

> >THE WHOLE DAM NIM BASTARDS BOARD AN HAD IT SHUT DOWN.

Really?
That why it's still there?
Go fuck yourself, LLardass Lloyd Davies the L-O-S-E-R!

>
> ant hower ya gunt fine a bc610 i stills wanner bc610 an bc610 xmtr
> my you furst no KAPTAL leddrs causin prolly me not fine mine
> bc610 xmtr forto xmtr on channul 13 bit powvur. laz time to me
> wanna bc610 big bc610 rayo.....
>
> gud numers fm oris 73,
>
> oris

Whorass and Lardass, the newsgroup's "Dumb and Dumber."

758. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 21:07:28 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0403091307.3121f984@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88772

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<Rc6dnZUfEvFtOrLdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>...
>
> Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.

Yes... callsign could be "N6GAY"... I checked qrz.com, and amazingly
it isn't yet taken :)

> - Mike KB3EIA -

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

759. Re: WAR! What is it good for?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 21:12:18 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0403091312.3c31d502@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88773

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040224203912.12631.00005140@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20040224190656.13960.00000865@mb-m11.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >No, it's not a political protest thread.
>
> Of course it is...the POLITICS of trying to keep U.S. amateur radio
> stuck with a morse code test forever and ever because you came
> upon an OLD bit a data on the 'net and you refuse to give in on that
> test despite the WRC-03 decision.

Yep!

Unbelievable.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

760. Re: Hong Kong drops code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 21:17:11 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0403091317.1ccb789d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88774

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040222204233.05957.00000617@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <5tv930lls77pif39bnilkooh00r14cji13@4ax.com>, Philthy Phil
> <bogus@fake.com> writes:
>
> >> WHO CARES, HAM RADIO IS NOTHING MORE THAN A GLOIRIFIED CB SERVICE ANYMORE.
> > >
> > >Oh stop whining. Move forward into the 21st century or drop dead,
> > >whichever you prefer.
>
> Now, THERE is what I call a persuasive argument -- NOT!!! Of course, as
> no-coder arguments usually go, it is one of the more logical. Kind of
> reminds me of the "Democratic" Party, who have, as their principle
> motive for winning the 2004 Presidential Election, the visceral hatred of
> President Bush just because he is conducting himself as a true patriot
> in his efforts to secure our country from the threat of terrorism. Not a
> single one of the '04 Democratic Presidential candidates (with the
> possible exception of Sen. Joe Lieberman, who is now out of the race) has
> or had any vision for his administration more original than raising Federal
> taxes, expanding Federal government social programs, and subordinating
> our national sovreignty to the United Nations in matters of International
> security policy. All of which confirms my long-held opinion that no-coders
> are mainly liberal, socialist, Communist sympathizers who hate America
> and want to weaken us by reducing all standards in our society, thus
> making us just another Third World nation. How charming.

Actually, attempting to KEEP the non-Extra Morse Code requirements is
a OBVIOUS Commie plot to keep the USA under-productive.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

761. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:34:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309173400.21232.00004675@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88778

In article <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
>and mistruths in approprtiately titled threads. The problem is that
>Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
>of them.

No lies or mistruths. The gunnery nurse's OBSESSION with two individuals in here wastes everyone's time and Internet bandwidth.

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable behavior, obvious to lay people.

LHA / WMD

762. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:34:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309173401.21232.00004676@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88777

In article <5c01b95b.0403082342.3d1d4fcb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403030650.81551cf@posting.google.com>...
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<403FB731.5EFB1488@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > In article <403E1C31.1105D154@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > > writes:
>>
>> > > > So far you are batting 3 for 3. Well done. Not rare.
>> > >
>> > > I submit that you don't know one end of a bat (baseball-type or the
>> > > mammal) from the other.
>> >
>> > Dave, I think we should take up a collection and send Sir Scumbag
>> > and Puppet Boy some Excederin...they've GOT to have one heck of a
>> > headache from banging thier (diminutive) little heads on the walls
>> > trying to score some points...And failing...
>> >
>> > 73
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> Steve, my only goal is to keep you talking (and thereby convincing
>> any/every one who accidently stumbles on to one of your rants that
>> you're completely insane - most probably a future employer).
>
> Well, Brain, as long as you keep posting obviously erroneous and
>intentionally deceptive stuff, I guess I will have something to "talk"
>about.
>
> As for "proving" to any potential employer that I am "insane",
>how about if I direct YOUR employer to this forum...specifically
>selected passages wherein you make assertions you can't/won't back up
>ALONG with YOUR expression of admiration for a person publically known
>to be dishonest and deceitful...?!?!
>
> We can further direct your employer to literally hundreds of

>posts where you refer to third parties by demeaning or belittling
>endearments where THEY did not lavish such endearments upon YOU.
>
> Yeah...I got you two twerps by the tail and watching you writhe
>around provides a bit of morbid entertainment. If you consider that
>"insane", well, go right ahead. But you are, afterall, the source of
>my "material".

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your
own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally
coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable
behavior, obvious to lay people.

LHA / WMD

763. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:34:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309173402.21232.00004677@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88775

In article <5c01b95b.0403082313.3224ee7e@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040303211144.23307.00007084@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403031528.741d71ce@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>
> Another LennieRant defused.

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable behavior, obvious to lay people.

LHA / WMD

764. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:34:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309173402.21232.00004678@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88779

In article <5c01b95b.0403082309.debdd38@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>...
>

> That I (or anyone else) apparently manage to effectively rub your
>nose in your own errors and foolishness doesn't make me (us)
>nuts...Just glad for the entertainment you provide. For that I (we)
>thank you.

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable behavior, obvious to lay people.

LHA / WMD

765. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:34:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040309173403.21232.00004679@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88776

In article <5c01b95b.0403082255.6b6fd783@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >news:<20040307143218.22081.00004450@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>
> And Brain, you have indeed, in public, failed...

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable behavior, obvious to lay people.

LHA / WMD

766. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 22:59:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88780

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040309054349.02537.00003426@mb-m23.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> >>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
> >>
> >>> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>>
> <snip>
> >>
> >>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
> >>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much was
> >>ever done before.
> >
> > And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a
> > major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the
> > opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this
> > year.
> >
>
> Agreed up to a certain point. I think that Mr Nader will find that he gets
> far fewer votes this time.

I hope you are right. But it's not over till it's over.

> The Democratic primaries have shown that people
> are focussed on getting the oilmen out of the White House. That and the
> fact that they saw what happened last time are likely to decimate his
> support.

It was obvious four years ago and yet millions put their heads in the
sand.
>
> >>> Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
> >>> investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
> >>> "Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
> >>> part of it.
> >>
> >>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
```

> >
> > It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary
> > than ever.
> >
> > Here's one data point:
> >
> > In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
> > tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
> > expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times
> > that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more
> > than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid
> > 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > Grants and
> >>scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.
> >>
> <snip>
>
> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get worse.
> At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to offshore
> production.

Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
such.
>
> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class than
> America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to do white
> collar and professional jobs for much less.

Only because it costs so much less to live there.

Way back in 1783, when the US Constitution was written here in
Philadelphia, one of the limitations placed on Congress was that there
would be no tariffs on *exports*. *Imports* could be tarriffed/taxed
at will - and they were! This was done both as a source of income and
to protect local industry from destructive foreign competition. It is
my understanding that we still have some forms of this in place, in
the form of such things as limits on the number of cars that may be
imported without special taxes. These import quotas caused several
carmakers (mostly Japanese) to build assembly plants here in the USA.
Some cars are even built here and shipped *back to Japan*, because by
doing so they count against the import number.

Maybe it's time for that sort of thing to be expanded. Exporting jobs
may be good for some companies' bottom line in the short run, but in
the long run it spells big trouble.

73 de Jim, N2EY

767. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 23:44:21 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <pFs3c.510102$I06.5567389@attbi_s01>
Source record: 88781
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
news:104rs11sh7f7b1b@corp.supernews.com...
[snippage]
> You're having way too much fun with this topic and clearly you have the
> ability to rant much better than I so I'm going to bow out now. Maybe
> Stinson will continue to give you more rant opportunities. I think
> you're a nut and I'm going back to messing with radios.
>
> -Adios,
> Bill M

If expecting those who write here to back up their posts with facts, attribution to verifiable names, and/or citations from reputable sources is insane, then call me a nut. If I'm having fun exposing GOP FUD for what it is, then I'll keep laughing while the voters - you really _can't_ fool all the people all the time - send the junior Bush back to the farm.

Just remember that I didn't start it, have never pretended to be anything I wasn't, and have never started ad hominem attacks on those not in the limelight. Please feel free to come back and stand on the soapbox anytime you can support yourself with resonable and well-researched argument.

I'd say I support your right to do so, but I think that's already obvious.

Bill Warren

768. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-09 23:51:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403091551.4cdca7a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88782

Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
news:<slrnc4pdc9.a09.alex@homer.linux1.lan>...
> In article <20040306100006.01019.00000826@mb-m25.aol.com>, N2EY wrote:
> >> Go to the Southeast Asian food section of your local supermarket and
> >> you will find bottles that look like "ketchup" bottles but contain
> >> red stuff that is just this side of liquid C-4, especially the one with
> >> the rooster on the label (Saribachi ??).
> >
> > I gotta get me some. But it can't be hotter than Daves Total Insanity Sauce.
>
> Not hotter, but certainly tastes better

I dunno about that - will have to try it!

> and contains all three major food
> groups - chile, garlic and salt...

YES!

At the risk of reignition: Is it kosher?

73 de Jim, N2EY

769. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 00:14:13 UTC
From: David Ragsdale <dragsdal@calpoly.edu>
Message-ID: <404E5DD5.9AC8401F@calpoly.edu>
Source record: 88783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ wrote:
>

> If Kerry should be elected president (God forbid!!!), and we have
> another 9/11 type attack, Kerry will be leading the anti-war protest.

Absolutely. In fact, Kerry, in a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations last October, stated that he would cease the war on terrorists, would negotiate with terrorist states, would APOLOGIZE for the actions of the United States so far, and would return terrorism to a "law enforcement issue" rather than the declaration of war it rightfully is.

This is the exact policy followed by the Clinton Administration, which led to the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

The safety of my family is far too important to risk ever voting for a demonstrable ignorant buffoon like Kerry. President Bush has taken exactly the correct path in fighting the war on terror.

--
David Ragsdale, R.E.H.S.

770. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 00:53:14 UTC
From: Argus <phonyaddress@spamblock.net>
Message-ID: <_Ft3c.10465$t16.6287153@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88784
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I am a conservative. Yet, I have respect for John Kerry's war record. I am troubled because I don't believe he respects his war record.

Argus

771. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 01:46:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Eru3c.4680$Cm3.3802@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Argus" <phonyaddress@spamblock.net> wrote in message
news:_Ft3c.10465$t16.6287153@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> I am a conservative. Yet, I have respect for John Kerry's war record. I
am
> troubled because I don't believe he respects his war record.
>
> Argus
>
>

Kerry lost most right thinking peoples respect when he joined up with Hanoi
Jane.

Dan/W4NTI

772. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 01:51:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040309205149.25815.00007069@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 88786

In article <OvadnTGu1ct1lNPdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a major
>> factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the opposition
>in
>> 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this year.
>
> I heard the Green party has something to say about all this.

I betcha there were a LOT of resignations from that party when they saw what
happened in 2000.

>At any
>rate, they aren't backing Ralph. His support this year is likely to be
>down in the noise. Without a party backing him, he's just another Harold
>Stassen.

I hope so.
>
>>>>Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>>>investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>>>"Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>>>>part of it.
>>>
>>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
>>
>> It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary than
>> ever.
>
> If the cost continues at double digit increases every year, and the
>graduate stands a pretty good chance of his/her entire field being made
>redundant, the necessity of the education is going to go away. Granted
>the would-be student is flippin burgers, but their job won't be made
>irrelevant.

That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting defaults on
student and other loans.
>
> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>
>> Here's one data point:
>>
>> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania, tuition
>> alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very expensive at
>> the

>> time. Today the same school charges more than 10 times that. But will the
>> starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be more than 10 times what it was
>> in
>> 1976, when I graduated? Is fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time
>> there? Nope.

Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the weekends, summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year tuition. If a kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about 1/6 of the tuition.

That's just not right.

73 de Jim, N2EY

773. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 01:54:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091754.6b9fe57d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88787

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>...

> In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> modicum of effort to keep him balanced.

Keep posting, you unbalanced whacko.

774. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 01:56:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091756.3ef53d36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88788

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082342.3d1d4fcb@posting.google.com>...

>
> Yeah...I got you two twerps by the tail and watching you writhe
> around provides a bit of morbid entertainment. If you consider that
> "insane", well, go right ahead. But you are, afterall, the source of
> my "material".
>
> Thanks.

Yep. Pretty much whacked-out. Keep going - I'm sure you can go on and on and on.

775. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 01:59:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091759.732c471e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88789

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082313.3224ee7e@posting.google.com>...

>
> Hmmm...wondering what "quote" from teh PDR to which yuo refer,
> Lennie...I've not quoted it in this forum in any capacity.
>
> (Not that I'd expect Lennie to be able to even understand it if
> I did...Seems he makes up his own spellings and definitions as he goes
> along)
>
> Another LennieRant defused.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You need defused. Too many typos indicate seething rage (your definition).

776. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 02:01:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091801.8a75514@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88790

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082309.debdd38@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!
>
> > Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
> > would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.
>
> Luck is not needed here, Brain.

True. Professional help is indicated.

> That I (or anyone else) apparently manage to effectively rub your
> nose in your own errors and foolishness doesn't make me (us)
> nuts...Just glad for the entertainment you provide. For that I (we)
> thank you.

(We?) How many pesonalities you got in there?

777. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 02:04:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091804.149b9053@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88791

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082246.32fdbf39@posting.google.com>...
>
> And even if he could he wouldn't know who to get authorization from to operate!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Not a prob. Got it in my pocket. Renew it every 10 years.

778. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 02:07:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091807.1e1fc624@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88792

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<da-dnaJKGe7t0dDdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A631A78D60Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:
> >>_ZCdnYdOhcgUEdbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com:
> >>
> >>
> >>>William wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Hah, funny one. I've seen amateur towers fall over. It can be months
> >>>>or years if they're ever replaced at all.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Even if my tower should fall over, I can string up antennas and be back
> >>>on the air in hours of not minutes. Can you do that with your cell phone?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>Of course he can't
> >
> >
> > You mean if the little antenna falls off a cellular telephone, I can't
> > replace it with a paper clip?
> >
> > Did the laws of physics change?
>
> No they did not, which means those cell towers can fall over as well.
> Your paper clip isn't going to help much when the cell tower is out of
> commission. Think you can communicate with you little cell phone if the
> tower is down?

I'll make a tiny yagi. It will reach the next tower. That is, unless
the laws of physics has changed.

As Alun stated, hams don't need a tower, a tall tree,
> from the apex of the roof, just any support that will get the antenna up
> in the air and we are back on.

Riiight! Different law of physics again.

Not so with your cell phone, if the tower
> is down (dosen't even have to be physically down, just off the air) and
> your cell phone makes a good paper weight.

And when your ham radio goes off the air? Is it a good paper weight?

779. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 02:09:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091809.7a639a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88793

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403081515.3f78460c@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070441.6f368a1@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062224.41c55674@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403060656.332e8398@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Tell us how it turns out. Best of luck.
> > >
> > > Ohhhh noooooo, Brain! I wouldn't have it any other way!
> >
> > Nurses before gentlemen.
>
> And in my case I have the distinct Honor of being both...Ergo I
> defer to you, as BOTH a gentleman AND a Nurse would.

No, you only have the honor of being a Nurse. You are the very
definition of ungentlemanly.

780. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 02:14:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88794

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<cA73c.10017$t16.6100353@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403071521.aabb8f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<6TE2c.9606$t16.5860666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com...
> > > > Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> > > > amateur radio done for me lately?"
> > >
> > > How recent do you need? September 11, 2001 comes to mind.
> >
> > I remember the video with music and scenes of the Twin Towers burning
> > and tumbling down. The caption read "NEVER FORGET."
> >
> > Sorry Dee, but only four percent (4%) of those responding said that
> > 9/11 terrorism was the most important issue in America today. The
> > mainstream press has gotten them in a frenzy over the economy and
> > jobs.
> >
>
> That other things now take precedence over 9/11 is normal and to be
> expected.

Thomas Jefferson said the only legitimate purpose of a federal
government was the protection of it's citizens.

That purpose has now changed to job creation and the department of
education.

> That does not negate the very necessary contribution that ham
> radio made to a major emergency in a current situation.

That does not negate the very necessary contribution that cellular
telephones made to a major emergency in a current situation.

> > Then there was
> > > the great blackout of 2003.
> >
> > Comms/Phones didn't go out. How was amateur radio useful when
> > everyone had comms?
>
> Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> a valuable asset.

Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the comm outages?

781. Re: Open Letter from a Green Beret to John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 03:22:07 UTC
From: w4udx@bellsouth.net
Message-ID: <MMv3c.116066$Tn.53164@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 88795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Uhh..., did I miss something? What does any of this political rambling have
to do with
boatanchor radios?

Mark W4UDX

782. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 03:34:03 UTC
From: kashe@rahul.net
Message-ID: <753t40ddl1bbtb7h21j8l2vsogmlgpk5ti@4ax.com>
Source record: 88796
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 09 Mar 2004 12:28:11 -0400, - - ex - - <exray@coqui.gov>
wrote:

>William Warren wrote:
>
>>
>> Mostly, I'm "not fond of" Shrub's attitude that not being caught in a lie is
>> the same thing as telling the truth. What I am especially "not fond of" is
>> unattributed slander, quotes-out-of-context (as you did to me), nameless and
>> unverifiable attacks, or the attitude some people take that it's OK to
>> question Senator Kerry's courage while forgetting George Bush, Junior's
>> cowardice.
>
>Ok, then, take Kerry's own quotes and ask why he refuses to release his
>military medical records to the pundits to 'prove' the PHs that got him
>out of Nam in four months.

Taking a page from Shrub, maybe? Bush wants all kinds of
"transparency" and "accountability" for everyone except the swells who
surround him. Try getting transcripts of Cheney's meetings with the
energy industry when our national enregy policy was being written.
That's at least as relevant to his fitness to govern as whatever went
on thirty years ago.

783. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 03:54:42 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A7E902EEF1Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88797

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:gIadnTcYru00l9PdRVn-vA@adelphia.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20040309054349.02537.00003426@mb-m23.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>In article <Xns94A652FEC411Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>>>>news:20040308070720.01692.00000972@mb-m18.aol.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>>>
>>>
>>><snip>
>>>
>>>>I think reliance on oil is too strong. More needs to be done on other
>>>>sources of energy. Fat chance with oilmen in control, not that much
>>>>was ever done before.
>>>
>>>And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a
>>>major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the
>>>opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this
>>>year.
>>>
>>
>>
>> Agreed up to a certain point. I think that Mr Nader will find that he
>> gets far fewer votes this time. The Democratic primaries have shown
>> that people are focussed on getting the oilmen out of the White House.
>> That and the fact that they saw what happened last time are likely to
>> decimate his support.
>>
>>
>>>>>Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>>>>investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>>>>"Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big

>>>>>part of it.
>>>>
>>>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
>>>
>>>It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more necessary
>>>than ever.
>>>
>>>Here's one data point:
>>>
>>>In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>>more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>> Grants and
>>>
>>>>scholarships would make more sense than tax breaks for the rich.
>>>>
>>
>> <snip>
>>
>> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>> offshore production.
>
> I dunno, Alun. It might soon be hard to convince a lot of people
> to go
> drastically into debt just to have their field be decimated upon
> graduation.
>

Agreed. The only solution to that appears to be more money in grant form
rather than loan form. At least it can be targeted at particular subjects,
like EE and Comp Sci for example.

>
>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
>> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class
>> than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to
>> do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>
> Well, the tech help I've gotten surely doesn't speak English very
> well! 8^)
>
>

Indians in India use English mostly to communicate with eachother, as they
have a proliferation of different languages. Just because they are fluent

doesn't necessarily mean it's English as you know it, or even as I know it.

784. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 04:03:12 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88798

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
<snip>
>>
>> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>> offshore production.
>
> Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
> such.

Or foreign adventuring.

>>
>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
>> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class
>> than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to
>> do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>
> Only because it costs so much less to live there.

That's true, and ironically that's probably due to the huge number of poor
people there. Basic food and services are likely to be provided to the
Indian middle classes by people who are far poorer than we can really
imagine.

>
> Way back in 1783, when the US Constitution was written here in
> Philadelphia, one of the limitations placed on Congress was that there
> would be no tariffs on *exports*. *Imports* could be tarriffed/taxed
> at will - and they were! This was done both as a source of income and
> to protect local industry from destructive foreign competition. It is
> my understanding that we still have some forms of this in place, in
> the form of such things as limits on the number of cars that may be
> imported without special taxes. These import quotas caused several
> carmakers (mostly Japanese) to build assembly plants here in the USA.
> Some cars are even built here and shipped *back to Japan*, because by
> doing so they count against the import number.
>
> Maybe it's time for that sort of thing to be expanded. Exporting jobs
> may be good for some companies' bottom line in the short run, but in
> the long run it spells big trouble.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Forgive me for saying this as a foreigner, but there seems to be no limit to the level of greed exhibited by corporate America. As you say, it will lead to big trouble in the long run. Look at what happened to the stock market in the '20s.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

785. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 04:16:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88799

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040309205149.25815.00007069@mb-m07.aol.com:

> In article <OvadnTGu1ct1lNPdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>> And the truly ironic part is that Ralph "Unsafe At Any Speed" was a
>>> major factor in putting an oilman in the White House by dividing the
>>> opposition in 2000. And he's poised to repeat that trick later this
>>> year.
>>
>> I heard the Green party has something to say about all this.
>
> I betcha there were a LOT of resignations from that party when they saw
> what happened in 2000.
>
>>At any
>>rate, they aren't backing Ralph. His support this year is likely to be
>>down in the noise. Without a party backing him, he's just another
>>Harold Stassen.
>
> I hope so.
>>
>>>>>Another example is the expectation of a trained workforce without
>>>>>investing the resources in education to produce that workforce.
>>>>>"Resources" doesn't just mean "money", either, though money is a big
>>>>>part of it.
>>>>
>>>>Agreed. The cost of education is running out of control.
>>>
>>> It has far exceeded the general inflation level, yet is more
>>> necessary than ever.
>>
>> If the cost continues at double digit increases every year, and
>> the
>>graduate stands a pretty good chance of his/her entire field being made
>>redundant, the necessity of the education is going to go away. Granted
>>the would-be student is flippin burgers, but their job won't be made
>>irrelevant.
>
> That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
> defaults on student and other loans.

The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student loans
through bankruptcy. So, you may not get graduates going intentionally

bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid back.

>>
>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>
>>> Here's one data point:
>>>
>>> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>> tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>> expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>> times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>> more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>> fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>
> Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
> weekends,
> summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year
> tuition. If a
> kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per
> year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an
> hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about
> 1/6 of the tuition.
>
> That's just not right.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone grants.
They were means tested, and of course if your parents were middle income
you would be the poorest student in college. However, now they are phasing
out grants and bringing in loans. This is also a big mistake.

Our governments need to invest more in putting people through higher
education. It doesn't really matter whether they do it by giving money to
the colleges or to the students, provided the former results in lower fees,
but they need to do it. An educated workforce is the most important thing
they could be putting their money into.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

786. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 04:40:08 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20040310044008.12447.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 88800

In article <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
>
>
> I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
> and mistruths in approprtiately titled threads. The problem is that
> Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
> of them.
>
> In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> modicum of effort to keep him balanced.

Maybe he's just a masochist.

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)[FLUSH!]

787. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 05:00:06 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20040310050006.298.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 89001

In article <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
>
>
> I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
> and mistruths in approprtiately titled threads. The problem is that
> Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
> of them.
>
> In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> modicum of effort to keep him balanced.

Maybe he's just a masochist.

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)[FLUSH!]

788. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 05:26:20 UTC
From: Ed Zeranski <ezeran@concentric.net>
Message-ID: <c2m8ts$p03@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 89002
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I happened across this thread then read all the posts. Not much on radios
but I did use radio to kill communists during those years, 1967-1968.

> I was there, too: and everything John Kerry said is true.

I think the problem with Mr. Kerry is he testified he'd seen atrocities then
later admited he had not.

> That Mr. Bendell didn't see it doesn't mean it didn't happen: he is
entitled
> to support and protect the memory of his comrades, as am I - but not at
the
> expense of whitewashing what others have documented. Yes, some soldiers
> _did_ cut the ears off VC dead. Yes, some soldiers did other unspeakable
> things: just ask Rusty Calley if you don't believe me. Some of it, I saw
> with my own eyes, some I read in the courts-martial and/or arrest reports
I
> saw as a Military Policeman.

That Calley trial was a biggie but a biggie because his act was so rare.
Given the political climate after I got home, if there were other such
events they would have been jumped on by the press and Service. If you were
military police attending Courts Martial of people who did bad things that
is also a statement that soldiers were monitored and if they f'd up they
.were brought up on charges. The remains of people, men, women, children
horrendously murdered by the VC-NVA represent actions never addressed, and
they represent many MANY Mai Lais.

That was over for me on 5 May 1968, Hue, Dong Ha , Qua Viet, discharge
in San Francisco. Today, however, as a lifelong registered Democrat I will
not-can not vote for Kerry. I feel no trust. He represents a very left
highjacking of my party by '60s types who hate the Constitution, Bill of
Rights, fellow citizens, and America in general. Sorry, Kerry and his ilk
would not be good for our country or any other country'
EZ

789. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 05:46:09 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
Message-ID: <404EABBD.6010005@get.lost>
Source record: 89003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Tony P. wrote:

> We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing. And it's
> a bit like un-ringing the bell. There are a whole lot of transceivers
> out there that put out anywhere from 50W to 200W right out of the box.
> And a whole lot more amps that kick up to the 1.5KW range. Granted, the
> FCC knows who and where every ham in the U.S. happens to be, but they
> don't know exactly what gear you've got do they? I mean I'm an extra
> without an HF rig right now.
>
> And when you think about it, a properly placed 5W transmitter will do
> stuttering wonders for BPL.
>
> BPL needs to be killed and pronto.

The FCC tune has already changed. Read the article at:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/09/1/?nc=1

Notice the FCC statement "...Powell responded to the question by saying
the FCC would not let BPL interfere with critical services."

Now the protection appears to have migrated to "critical" services only,
and the burden of proof is thus shifted to amateur radio to show how our
service is "critical" and worthy of protection against the
best-thing-since-sliced-bread BPL.

And they are about to lock up a goddamn housewife while these vultures
roam unimpeded...

73 ... WA7AA

--

Anti-spam measure: look me up on qrz.com if you need to reply directly

790. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 10:47:15 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <NmC3c.2729$uh.336@fed1read02>
Source record: 89004
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"William Warren" <william_warren_noham@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:4Qa3c.151291$4o.186727@attbi_s52...
> "- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
> news:104pv6o6pss9se4@corp.supernews.com...
> > William Warren wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > At a time in our nation's history when the rich and well connected
> > > were scurrying to park their sons' yachts in safe backwaters, a well
> > > connected young man raised his hand, took an oath, and took
> > > everything that came with it. You can't fake that kind of courage,
> > > and you can't spin his opponent's kind of cowardice. John Kerry was
> > > there.
> > >
> > > Bill Warren
> >
> >
> > THE FOLLOWING ITEM APPEARED IN A NON-PARTISAN (BUT EXTREMELY
> > CYNICAL) NEWSLETTER FOR INVESTORS. THE NEWSLETTER HAS BEEN RELENTLESSLY
> > CRITICAL OF BUSH ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC POLICIES.
>
> (unatributed rant snipped)
>
> They really ought to give you GOP PR types

Thus far, the name-calling has been initiated by WW. He has chosen to use the term "Shrub", so I suppose we are now free to degenerate to his level and refer to Mr. Kerry as The Curr. Further, anyone who disagrees with WW will be given the label of a "GOP PR type." Yes, WW seems quite adept and at ease wielding a smear technique

It's unfortunate that the Democratic machine has chosen to conduct the initial 2004 campaign by attacking the President's moral credentials. Desperation and hatred color and distort their entire position.

Ed
wb6wsn

791. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 10:57:59 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <SwC3c.2730$uh.1971@fed1read02>
Source record: 89005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"William Warren" <william_warren_noham@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:pFs3c.510102$I06.5567389@attbi_s01...
> "- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
> news:104rs11sh7f7b1b@corp.supernews.com...
> [snippage]
> > You're having way too much fun with this topic and clearly you have the
> > ability to rant much better than I so I'm going to bow out now. Maybe
> > Stinson will continue to give you more rant opportunities. I think
> > you're a nut and I'm going back to messing with radios.
> >
> > -Adios,
> > Bill M
>
> If expecting those who write here to back up their posts with facts,
> attribution to verifiable names, and/or citations from reputable sources
is
> insane, then call me a nut. If I'm having fun exposing GOP FUD for what it
> is, then I'll keep laughing while the voters - you really _can't_ fool all
> the people all the time - send the junior Bush back to the farm.
>
> Just remember that I didn't start it, have never pretended to be anything
I
> wasn't, and have never started ad hominem attacks on those not in the
> limelight. Please feel free to come back and stand on the soapbox anytime
> you can support yourself with resonable and well-researched argument.
>
> I'd say I support your right to do so, but I think that's already obvious.
>
> Bill Warren
>

So why do you think an ad hominem attack against a public figure is
acceptable?

Ed
wb6wsn

792. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 14:01:35 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3dF3c.223867$jk2.916635@attbi_s53>
Source record: 89006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Price" <edprice@cox.net> wrote in message
news:NmC3c.2729$uh.336@fed1read02...
>
> "William Warren" <william_warren_noham@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:4Qa3c.151291$4o.186727@attbi_s52...
> > "- - ex - -" <exray@coqui.gov> wrote in message
> > news:104pv6o6pss9se4@corp.supernews.com...
> > > William Warren wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > At a time in our nation's history when the rich and well connected
> > > > were scurrying to park their sons' yachts in safe backwaters, a well
> > > > connected young man raised his hand, took an oath, and took
> > > > everything that came with it. You can't fake that kind of courage,
> > > > and you can't spin his opponent's kind of cowardice. John Kerry was
> > > > there.
> > > >
> > > > Bill Warren
> > >
[snip]
> > They really ought to give you GOP PR types
>
>
> Thus far, the name-calling has been initiated by WW. He has chosen to use
> the term "Shrub", so I suppose we are now free to degenerate to his level
> and refer to Mr. Kerry as The Curr. Further, anyone who disagrees with WW
> will be given the label of a "GOP PR type." Yes, WW seems quite adept and
at
> ease wielding a smear technique

You are free to call John Kerry whatever you like: it's a free country,
after all. :-) I am free to call George Bush whatever I like, so long as
it's clear that I'm voicing my personal opinion. Both men are standing for
election to public office, and it's not a game for the faint-hearted.

I don't label "anyone who disagrees" with me: I used the "GOP PR" metaphor
as a sarcastic reply to an unattributed, and untracable, piece of
disinformation. If it wasn't clear to you that I was being sarcastic, then I
suggest you need to get out more: please recall that within 24 hours it had
gone from being the alleged report of a "Retired Rear Admiral" to being a
putative contribution by "Marine Master Sergeant" in a chat room, and I
think I was able to shoot _that_ nonsense down as well.

I don't, and haven't, smeared anyone: I've never lied and I never invented tall tales about George Bush, but if I call him by a nickname you don't like, well, as I said, it's not a game for the faint-hearted. I think he _is_ a Shrub compared to his father, and I think his father was a dwarf pine to begin with.

As I said, I don't attack those "not in the limelight". You, for example, are simply a ham operator with an opinion to share.

Me too.

> It's unfortunate that the Democratic machine has chosen to conduct the
> initial 2004 campaign by attacking the President's moral credentials.
> Desperation and hatred color and distort their entire position.
>
> Ed
> wb6wsn

How? In what way? _WHAT_ moral credentials?

Have at it. Bring it on. Stand up and be counted.

You have the right. ;-)

Bill

(Modify my return address in an obvious way for direct replies)

793. Re: Open Letter from a Green Beret to John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 14:10:42 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <CIF3c.163249$4o.285435@attbi_s52>
Source record: 89007
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<w4udx@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:MMv3c.116066$Tn.53164@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
>
> Uhh..., did I miss something? What does any of this political rambling
have
> to do with boatanchor radios?
>
> Mark W4UDX

Some old Republicans and some old ham operators both want the world to glow
in the dark.

Bill

794. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 16:11:13 UTC
From: DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c2nen1018on@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

i tried that but the 240 burned up my ht..

In article <hgau405qj0ckce6gj2fjdgfp5mdhe4u7b8@4ax.com>, Barry OGrady says...
>
>Has anyone considered loading their HF transmitter into the power lines to
>see what sort of range they get? Might have interesting effects on BPL users.
>
>
>-Barry
>========
>Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

795. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 16:21:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100821.689b161f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89008

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040309173400.21232.00004675@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
> >and mistruths in approprtiately titled threads. The problem is that
> >Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
> >of them.
>
> No lies or mistruths.

That is in-and-of-itself a lie, Lennie. Nice shot.

> The gunnery nurse's OBSESSION with two
> individuals in here wastes everyone's time and Internet bandwidth.

I told you...I don't tolerate liars and bullies. You are both.

The "wasted" bandwidth is yuors, Lennie...

> Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your
> own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally
> coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable
> behavior, obvious to lay people.

You're "imaginary", Lennie...?!?!

And since you've brought up what YOU consider to be
"contributions", would you be so kind as to tell us what YOUR
"contributions" to Amateur Radio are?

And what's "obvious to lay people", Lennie, is that you have no
vested interest in Amateur Radio, yet you seem to have your OWN
"obsessive" drive to harrass Amateurs, compounded with your inane
ramblings and bullying insistence on how we should be conducting our
business.

Now...please tell me why YOUR conduct is NOT "obsessive", "nuts"
or othrwise inappropriate...?!?!

And please remind us of how you're "...only here to civilly
debate the Morse Code test issue" by throwing around racial slurs,
demeaning endearments and profanity...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

796. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 16:24:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100824.130ce908@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89009

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091754.6b9fe57d@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>...
>
> > In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> > is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> > modicum of effort to keep him balanced.
>
> Keep posting, you unbalanced whacko.

As long as you deem it important to lie, mislead and otherwise
misrepresent Amateur Radio, Brain, I shall.

As for the "unbalanced whacko", I take that as evidence of your
inability to otherwisde justify YOUR history of intentional mistruths
and otherwise bizzare behaviour...ie: making assertions your
can't/won't validate with facts.

Steve, K4YZ

797. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 16:27:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100827.726bbe7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89010

lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu> wrote in message
news:<20040310044008.12447.qmail@nym.alias.net>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
> >
> >
> > I am trying to keep all my disruptions of Leonard H. Anderson's lies
> > and mistruths in approprtiately titled threads. The problem is that
> > Lennie lies so often and in so MANY threads, it's hard to keep ahead
> > of them.
> >
> > In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> > is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> > modicum of effort to keep him balanced.
>
> Maybe he's just a masochist.

Must be...or he just might not really understand how ludicrous
his ramblings are. He doens't seem to understand that he's been
caught lying not once, not twice, but countless times and everyone
else EXCEPT him knows it!

Steve, K4YZ

798. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 16:39:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89012

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...

> Thomas Jefferson said the only legitimate purpose of a federal
> government was the protection of it's citizens.
>
> That purpose has now changed to job creation and the department of
> education.

Thomas Jefferson, as enlightened and as forward looking as he may
have been, could have hardly envisioned the United States as it exists
today.

> > That does not negate the very necessary contribution that ham
> > radio made to a major emergency in a current situation.
>
> That does not negate the very necessary contribution that cellular
> telephones made to a major emergency in a current situation.

You keep trying to avoid the very real truth that Amateur Radio
STILL fills a need, even in these early days of the 21st century.

These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
programs.

> > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > a valuable asset.
>
> Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> comm outages?

How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
involvement?

Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.

Amateur Radio's contributions in emergencies does NOT exist
solely "when the comms are down".

Steve, K4YZ

799. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:12:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100912.2588bab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89013

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040307143217.22081.00004448@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403070439.1151b59c@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403062232.160eccdf@posting.google.com>...
> >> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A3CEB943718elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >>
> >> > In one way he does have a point. What I am alluding to is that prcisely
> >> > because it is a hobby we all have thousands of bucks worth of radios lying
>
> >> > around, and we can use them without wires and cell phone towers.
> >>
> >> The "point" Lennie it trying to make us believe, Alun, is that
> >> Amateur Radio is >>ONLY<> for any reason OTHER than recreation...That's not
> >true.
> >
> >Really? I don't see that at all.
>
> Brian, the psychotic don't see things the same way that rational
> humans such as you, Alun, and I do.

You shouldn't be so quick to bring Alun down to your level,
Lennie.

Opposing opinions aside, he's polite, respectful, and thoughtful
in his words...All things that you are anything but...

> The gunnery nurse is stuck, wedged in his emotional rut of anger
> and rage over long-ago perceived personal insults to his opinions
> and statements. As the result all he can do is shout and holler and
> egregiously denigrate his critics over the slightest hint of disapproval.

Nope.

I don't tolerate liars and bullies. You are both.

> In his mental world amateur radio has substituted for "the corps"
> and he must traverse all routes between the halls of Montezuma
> and the shores of Tripoli, marching to the beat of olde-tyme
> tradition and demanding strict and utter obeyance of the "gunny"
> in a hobby activity. That is an absolute and cannot be otherwise.

Hardly an "absolute", Lennie...But it seems to make you feel
better about yourself to think that it's so...So have a it!

> That is also quite a bit sick. But, other amateurs allow his
> presence, even with implications of "praise" for his exhortations
> and pejorations. That implies some impurity of those others.

"Praise"...?!?! Hardly. I know they'd rather I just not respond
to your lying, decietful rhetoric on the outside chance that you'd
tire and go away.

I prefer to keep rubbing your nose in your obvious errors and
mistruths, thereby blunting the negativism you try to engender about
Amateur Radio.

> >> His ulterior motive is to discredit Amateur Radio's countless
> >> contributions, not only to the "history" of radio, but to the
> >> "service" of the Nation as a resource to be called upon in any number
> >> of disasters or emergencies.
> >
> >I'd suggest that you not rest on your laurels. Historically amateur
> >radio has provided an invaluable service to the nation. More
> >recently, more people have turned to cellular telephones to aid them
> >in an emergency. You do the math.
>
> The gunnery nurse is still stuck in his obsessive rut and cannot
> tolerate a reality at odds with his mental fantasy.

No less than YOU are stuck in YOUR rut to discredit any
contribution Amateur Radio makes.

> That 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions exist in the
> USA as of U.S. Census Bureau data for 2003 is irrelevant to the
> gunnery nurse's fantasy world. He refuses to acknowledge that
> and focusses solely on himself and his relation to his activities
> as the only possible "truth." Anything contrary will bring forth a
> spate of the usual personal insults, spat with exaggerated anger
> and resentment.

The census of the United States as it pertains to cellphone
subscribers has nothing to do with the FACT that Amateur Radio
continues to be a vibrant, progressive and contributing resource to
this nation's ability to respond to emergencies of MANY kinds.

That is a fact.

> The history of all radio has already been and has been
> documented in many other places besides Newington, CT.
> The contributions of amateur radio are quite countable, not so
> numerous as to be labeled "uncountable." The countable
> contributions - in the majority - all happened well before the
> gunnery nurse's life experience began.

OK, Lennie...

Since YOU seem to think the contributions of Amateur Radio are a
finite, "countable" figure, let's see YOU do it...!

> >> He's unable to do that, either, but he obviously believes that if
> >> he keeps repeating it often enough perhaps he and he alone can
> >> re-write 90 years of history.
>
> Recounting documented reality is not a "rewrite" of anything.

YOUR "recounting" is contrary to numerous archived tellings,
Lennie.

That is directly due to your desire to see any reference to
Amateur Radio considered as insignificant or irrelevent for your own
satisfaction.

> ALL radio is only 108 years old. The ARRL was organized in 1914
> as a local New England radio club primarily interested in "relaying"
> telegraphic messages privately instead of using commercial
> telegram services. As a late-comer in U.S. national radio clubs
> (the Radio Club of America was organized 5 years before the ARRL
> and still exists today) it began to have dreams of greatness. But,
> the ARRL membership is still less than a quarter of all licensed U.S.
> radio amateurs. Their "greatness" seems to be a self-definition.
>
> The use of "90" years is indicative of the mental tunnel vision and
> absolute Belief in the ARRL as the source, the oracle of All in
> radio. When the ARRL was first organized, "radio" was already 18
> years old, having been demonstrated as a communications means
> in both Italy and Russia in 1896.

I said nothing of the ARRL in my reference to the "ballpark"
figure of 90 years of Amateur Radio.

More than one historical reference on the matter makes that
number about the same.

I am sure YOU have so "exact" date when Amateur Radio as an
entity came to be...?!?!

And thank you for demonstrating your OWN rut of ARRL-bashing.

> >Get over the glory of our history. Mike Powell asks, "What has
> >amateur radio done for me lately?"
>
> That is really for another thread, Brian, even though both of us do
> not look with favor upon Chairman Powell.
>
> The gunnery nurse MUST wrap himself in the patriotic bunting and
> mythical glory of his corps-substitute. That is evidenciary in all the
> psychotic behavior shown in here over the past years. To him it
> seems not a hobby but a lifestyle, a "service" lacking only a common
> uniform. All must follow his personal patriotism or be villified forever
> and ever.

>
> He wastes our time.

Hardly.

I simply use MY time to provide a balance to the lies, misrepresentations and Amateur Radio bashing that you seem leather-bent on lavishing upon this forum

YOUR time is wasted by not researching your facts, posting material and opinions that are easily refuted with even the most circumspect of effort, and your insistance on the liberal use of obviously inciteful, hurtful and demeaning epithets and profanities.

So...if your time is being wasted, it's you doing the wasting...not me.

Steve, K4YZ

800. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:16:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100916.51617d1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89014

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040309173402.21232.00004678@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your
> own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally
> coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable
> behavior, obvious to lay people.

Lennie..that is so...so...so...YOU!

Perhaps in some other life you'll be able to read your own posts
in this forum in an objective manner. Then, and only then, will you
gain an understanding as to why very few persons rally to your
"cause", and then those who do are the likes of Brain and Vippy.

Until then I won't hold my breath, as much as I am sure that
would please you.

Steve, K4YZ

801. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:20:43 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <shju401eos1r70256ol7togc6ibsjol3p6@4ax.com>
Source record: 89015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 10 Mar 2004 08:11:13 -0800, DANNY JESWALD <DiaperDan@home.nut>
wrote:

>i tried that but the 240 burned up my ht..
>

Try it again, only this time use a 100 ufd cap to isolate it.

>
>In article <hgau405qj0ckce6gj2fjdgfp5mdhe4u7b8@4ax.com>, Barry OGrady says...
>>
>>Has anyone considered loading their HF transmitter into the power lines to
>>see what sort of range they get? Might have interesting effects on BPL users.
>>
>>
>>-Barry
>>========
>>Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>>Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

802. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:21:20 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <jjju401gp27rau0avivl14hqaetodqpa9m@4ax.com>
Source record: 89016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 11 Mar 2004 01:46:55 +1100, Barry OGrady
<god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote:

>Has anyone considered loading their HF transmitter into the power lines to
>see what sort of range they get? Might have interesting effects on BPL users.
>
>
>-Barry
>========
>Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

You wouldn't get past the transformer Barry.

803. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:23:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89017

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091801.8a75514@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082309.debdd38@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403062156.15760923@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > So far, you've failed. Try again...?!?!
>
> > > Whether I've failed or not is immaterial to your being nuts. You
> > > would be nuts with or without my presence on rrap. Best of luck.
> >
> > Luck is not needed here, Brain.
>
> True. Professional help is indicated.

Please remind us, Brain, of your credentials to make such an
assertion...??
>
> > That I (or anyone else) apparently manage to effectively rub your
> > nose in your own errors and foolishness doesn't make me (us)
> > nuts...Just glad for the entertainment you provide. For that I (we)
> > thank you.
>
> (We?) How many pesonalities you got in there?

"WE" being the "royal we" your "mentor" refers to. "We" being
everyone except your inner voice and Lennie)

As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),
coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names, I'd rethink
making such a silly insinuation...

Steve, K4YZ

804. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 17:55:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zoadnXw1L-CvxdLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

William Warren wrote:

>
> I don't label "anyone who disagrees" with me: I used the "GOP PR" metaphor
> as a sarcastic reply to an unattributed, and untracable, piece of
> disinformation. If it wasn't clear to you that I was being sarcastic, then I
> suggest you need to get out more: please recall that within 24 hours it had
> gone from being the alleged report of a "Retired Rear Admiral" to being a
> putative contribution by "Marine Master Sergeant" in a chat room, and I
> think I was able to shoot _that_ nonsense down as well.

Go read this, it even gives the Marine Master Sargent's name, you can
call him and verify it yourself.

http://www.keepingapace.com/blogarchives/politics/veterans_and_the_kerry_controversy.php

805. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 18:00:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zoadnX81L-AMxNLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ wrote:

> William Warren wrote:
>
>
>>
>> I don't label "anyone who disagrees" with me: I used the "GOP PR"
>> metaphor
>> as a sarcastic reply to an unattributed, and untracable, piece of
>> disinformation. If it wasn't clear to you that I was being sarcastic,
>> then I
>> suggest you need to get out more: please recall that within 24 hours
>> it had
>> gone from being the alleged report of a "Retired Rear Admiral" to being a
>> putative contribution by "Marine Master Sergeant" in a chat room, and I
>> think I was able to shoot _that_ nonsense down as well.
>
>
> Go read this, it even gives the Marine Master Sargent's name, you can
> call him and verify it yourself.
>
> http://www.keepingapace.com/blogarchives/politics/veterans_and_the_kerry_controversy.php
>
>

Correction, Marine Major.

806. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 18:42:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <39idnWF9Lo8B_tLdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David Ragsdale wrote:

>
> JJ wrote:
>
>
>>If Kerry should be elected president (God forbid!!!), and we have
>>another 9/11 type attack, Kerry will be leading the anti-war protest.
>
>
> Absolutely. In fact, Kerry, in a speech to the Council on Foreign
> Relations last October, stated that he would cease the war on
> terrorists, would negotiate with terrorist states, would APOLOGIZE for
> the actions of the United States so far, and would return terrorism to a
> "law enforcement issue" rather than the declaration of war it rightfully
> is.
>
> This is the exact policy followed by the Clinton Administration, which
> led to the events of Sept. 11, 2001.
>
> The safety of my family is far too important to risk ever voting for a
> demonstrable ignorant buffoon like Kerry. President Bush has taken
> exactly the correct path in fighting the war on terror.
>
>
>
Maybe Kerry is going to get Jane Fonda to run on the ticket with him,
and appoint Barbra Streisand, Whoopei Goldberg, Martin Sheen, and Rosie
O'Donald to the White House advisory staff. You know, those folks that
said they would leave the country if Bush were elected.

807. Re: [OT] Re: Smear campaign against John Kerry

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 21:15:43 UTC
From: William Warren <william_warren_noham@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3AL3c.225464$jk2.927796@attbi_s53>
Source record: 89021
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy,talk.politics

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:zoadnX81L-AMxNLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> JJ wrote:
>
> > William Warren wrote:
> >
> >
> >>
> >> I don't label "anyone who disagrees" with me: I used the "GOP PR"
> >> metaphor as a sarcastic reply to an unattributed, and untracable, piece
of
> >> disinformation. If it wasn't clear to you that I was being sarcastic,
> >> then I suggest you need to get out more: please recall that within 24
hours
> >> it had gone from being the alleged report of a "Retired Rear Admiral"
to being a
> >> putative contribution by "Marine Master Sergeant" in a chat room, and I
> >> think I was able to shoot _that_ nonsense down as well.
> >
> > Go read this, it even gives the Marine Master Sargent's name, you can
> > call him and verify it yourself.
> >
> >
http://www.keepingapace.com/blogarchives/politics/veterans_and_the_kerry_controversy.php
> >
>
> Correction, Marine Major.

You post implies that you have confirmed the authenticity of what was
originally posted here, and that's not the case: the material at that URL is
an opinion piece by a commentator, who quotes nine sentences from the former
Major Stolz, none of which appeared in the original post or the followup
that I responded to. I stand by my opinion concerning my previous messages:
that there never was any such thing published in a chat room, by a "Retired
Rear Admiral", a "Master Sergeant", or anyone else who was ever in a
possition to know didly about the 'nam. It's GOP FUD, plain and simple.

As to _this_ publication: it's author, Thomas D. Seigal, says at the start
of the second paragraph that

"I would argue that anyone who experienced shots fired in
anger has the right to ask questions about any other person
who makes similar claims. "

... but he does not provide any information as to whether he or the two officers he quoted were ever in Vietnam or even in combat : in its absence, I assume they were not.

Let's leave that aside, though: there is a larger issue, and it is getting swamped (no doubt as the spindoctors at the RNC planned), in minutiae about whether John Kerry acted wisely in conducting operations during close-order combat. I submit that it is unimportant whether Kerry "should" have gotten off his boat or whether he "should" have acted differently under fire.

Senator Kerry was a commander of a combat crew that was regularly involved in life or death struggles with hardened, experienced Viet Minh cadres, at the same time that the current President was evading even the minimal obligations to the Texas Air National Guard which his father had arranged for him.

There's a phrase that's used a lot in substance-abuse counseling: "Don't should on yourself". I don't care what Kerry "should" have done: he was there, and Shrub wasn't.

Bill Warren

P.S. This really has gotten too far off the subject of ham radio. I've set the followups to talk.politics.

(My email address has an anti-spam meassure you must remove for direct replies)

808. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-10 21:39:49 UTC
From: doberman <doberman_2000_us@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <104v2p6q70ps546@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

George Z. Bush wrote:

>
>
>> The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook
>>
>> 1. You have to believe that the AIDS virus is spread by a lack of
>> federal funding.
>>
>> 2. You have to believe that the same teacher who can't teach 4th
>> graders how to read is somehow qualified to teach those same kids
>> about sex.
>>
>> 3. You have to believe that guns in the hands of law-abiding Americans
>> are more of a threat than U.S. nuclear weapons technology in the hands
>> of Chinese and North Korean communists.
>>
>> 4. You have to believe that there was no art before Federal funding.
>>
>> 5. You have to believe that global temperatures are less affected by
>> cyclical, documented changes in the earth's climate, and more affected
>> by soccer moms driving SUVs.
>>
>> 6. You have to believe that gender roles are artificial, but being
>> homosexual is natural.
>>
>> 7. You have to be against capital punishment for criminals, even
>> murderers, but support abortion on demand.
>>
>> 8. You have to believe that businesses create oppression, and
>> governments create prosperity.
>>
>> 9. You have to believe that hunters don't care about nature, but loony
>> activists who have never been outside of San Francisco do.
>>
>> 10. You have to believe that self-esteem is more important than
>> actually doing something to earn it.
>>
>> 11. You have to believe that the military, not politicians, start
>> wars.
>>
>> 12. You have to believe the NRA is bad, because it supports certain
>> parts of the Constitution, while the ACLU is good because it supports

>> certain parts of the Constitution.
>>
>> 13. You have to believe that taxes are too low, but ATM fees are too
>> high.
>>
>> 14. You have to believe that Margaret Sanger and Gloria Steinem are
>> more important to American history than Thomas Jefferson, Gen. Robert
>> E.Lee and Thomas Edison.
>>
>> 15. You have to believe that standardized tests are racist, but racial
>> quotas and set-asides are not.
>>
>> 16. You have to believe that Hillary Clinton is normal, and really a
>> very nice person.
>>
>> 17. You have to believe that the only reason socialism hasn't worked
>> anywhere it's been tried, is because the right people haven't been in
>> charge.
>>
>> 18. You have to believe conservatives telling the truth belong in
>> jail, but a draft-dodging liar and sex offender belonged in the White
>> House.
>>
>> 19. You have to believe that homosexual parades displaying drag,
>> transvestites and bestiality should be constitutionally protected, and
>> manger scenes at Christmas should be illegal.
>>
>> 20. You have to believe that illegal Democratic Party funding by the
>> Chinese government is somehow in the best interests of the United
>> States.
>>
>> 21. You have to refuse to discuss the issues in a rational manner and
>> whenever someone attempts to do so, throw a 3 ring tantrum, rant and
>> rave, go into a lunatic rage and outshout them (preferably with
>> profanity and name-calling) and stick to personal slurs, smear
>> tactics, slander and building strawmen so you can knock down the
>> strawmen (oops, sorry, strawpersons) and hopefully sidetrack the
>> conversation away from your lack of ability to support your position.
>>
>> 22. You must always ignore the message and attack the messenger. When
>> stuck, remember the tactic that won't reveal your inability to think
>> or say anything original: smugly change a couple of your adversaries
>> words' and repeat their comments back to them verbatim and even if it
>> isn't true, by all means always
>> be sure to accuse your opponents of using the very tactics the
>> Leftwing Liberals try to hide, remembering all the while that Lenin
>> would be proud.
>>
>> 23. No matter how credible a source may be - always do your Leftwing
>> Liberal duty and rabidly claim it's been debunked and discredited and

>> call anyone who believes it "mean spirited", crazy, a Nazi or any
>> other of the monikers from the Leftwing Liberal grab bag of infantile
>> epithets and sarcastic sobriquets.
>>
>> 24. Whenever demonstrated facts don't agree with your agenda, twist
>> them and mangle them until you can make them fit into your prejudices,
>> the media will assist you greatly.
>>
>> 25. Once you've told a lie or slandered someone, be sure to repeat it
>> as often as possible until it becomes true. "Members and front
>> organizations must continually embarrass, discredit and degrade our
>> critics. When obstructionists become too irritating, label them as
>> fascist, or Nazi or anti-Semitic .... The association will, after
>> enough repetition, become "fact" in the public mind." [~ Communist
>> Party, Moscow Central Committee, 1943]
>>
>> 26. You have to believe that all spirituality and all religions except
>> Islam are bad.
>>
>> 27. You have to use the following buzzwords as often as possible:
>> "Nazi", "Hitler", "Gestapo", "police state", "totalitarian state",
>> "imperialism", "imperialist", "greedy corporations", "shrub",
>> "fascist", "paranoid", "goose-stepping", "ruling-class",
>> "class-strife", "class warfare", "stolen election", "racist",
>> "entitlements", "hate", "bourgeois" or better yet, "petty bourgeois",
>> "counter-revolutionary", "progressive", "red-baiter",
>> "anti-Communist", "deviationist", "revisionist", "reactionary",
>> "multiculturalism", "oppressed", "victims of Yankee oppression",
>> "plight of the [fill in the blank] people", "mean-spirited",
>> "McCarthyism", "jingoism", "flag-wavers", "neocons" and, of course,
>> overuse of the indispensable "F"
>> word.
>>
>> 28. You have to believe that there were never any weapons of mass
>> destruction in Iraq, even though they were used against Iran, the
>> Kurds and the the Iraqi people and even though the many Democrats
>> warned us about WMD before the Iraqi invasion: William Jefferson
>> Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Sandy Berger, Madeline Albright, Senators
>> Carl Levin, Tom Daschle, Robert Byrd, Jay Rockefeller, John Kerry, Bob
>> Graham, Ted Kennedy, Representatives Nancy Pelosi and Henry Waxman and
>> vice-president Al Gore to name only the most vociferous.
>>
>> 29. You have to be a purveyor of perennial pessimism and a dispatcher
>> of doomsday gloom and hyperbolic hysteria whenever you can work some
>> scare tactics into the foreboding warnings of eventual catastrophe at
>> the hands of your adversaries, i.e. people who disagree with you.
>>
>> 30. Whenever possible, if you hear or read something that seems quite
>> logical and might influence someone against the Leftwing Liberal
>> viewpoint, be sure to pounce on the exception or some tiny,

>> inconsequential irrelevancy, such as the misspelling, poor punctuation
>> or mispronunciation of a word, unusual facial expression, article of
>> clothing or some morsel of arcane trivia or irrelevant minutia in an
>> attempt to derail the conversation into petty bickering replete with
>> name-calling and personal slurs. [Use of the "F" word
>> is particularly effective, especially when combined with prepubescent
>> profanity and puerile posturing.]
>>
>> 31. Always have unkind and accusatory slurs cocked and ready to use
>> regarding any armed forces personnel, especially military people in
>> harm's way other than your own candidates, sell-outs, turncoats,
>> traitors and those who are guilty of or advocate treason.
>>
>> 32. When your adversary presents a particularly damning discovery,
>> pervert it, twist it around, fabricate something out of thin air and
>> accuse him of something he didn't say, falsely attribute your
>> invention to him and then proceed to argue against your own creation
>> with the hope nobody will notice. This is best done by beginning your
>> remarks with "in other words" or "so what you are suggesting" or "are
>> you saying that..." followed by the most implausible, irrelevant non
>> sequitur you can fantasize.
>>
>> 33. You have to remember that nobody but your adversaries, real or
>> imagined are ever to blame for anything and no one should ever be
>> accountable or held responsible for their words or actions - they're
>> just misunderstood.
>>
>> 34. You have to be a victim of as many forms of melodrama as possible
>> and be ever vigilant to promote victimization of almost anything and
>> anyone although that's very difficult to reconcile with the assertion
>> that nobody's to blame for anything, except the people who don't agree
>> with you.
>>
>> 35. You must always have Double Standards, a higher standard that you
>> demand of corporations as well as people you don't like and people who
>> don't agree with you and another set for yourself and your Leftwing
>> Liberal confederates which is preferably no standards at all.
>>
>> 36. You must with all your heart and soul hate America and Americans
>> and bash them at every opportunity, while claiming you love America
>> though you contend that American patriots are really traitors.
>>
>> 37. You must always remember that you are a member of the grown up 4-H
>> and it is incumbent on you to always display their watchwords:
>> hallucinations, hyperbole, hysteria and hate.
>>
>> 38. You have to believe that just because your candidate lost an
>> election (by all means shriek "election fraud" or "stolen election")
>> or an unacceptable law was passed there's always the possibility of
>> going to court to get your way in spite of the electorate and their

>> congressional delegates.
>>
>> 39. You are always to belittle and deride concepts such as optimism,
>> patriotism, honor, honesty, faithfulness, fidelity, loyalty, courage,
>> bravery, principles, trust, trustworthiness, reliability,
>> responsibility,
>> respect, common-courtesy, common decency, kindness, Good Samaritanism,
>> sacrifice, patience, fortitude, values, integrity and character as
>> being naive and passe. Call anyone who uses those words, "judgmental"
>> and "intolerant".
>>
>> 40. You are encouraged to lionize, venerate, yea, worship sloth, lust,
>> self-centeredness, selfishness, instant gratification, slander,
>> criminal behavior, drug addiction, degenerate behavior, promiscuous
>> sex, lewd remarks and behavior, rudeness, crudeness, crassness, smutty
>> language, vulgarity of all kinds, disrespect for authority, laws, law
>> enforcement and military while showing respect for prostitution, drug
>> dealing, gang-bangers, organized crime, pornography and generally
>> everything that would aid in tearing down the social fabric of the
>> United States of America and all she stands for.
>>
>> 41. Be sure to exhibit incessant anger at America and Americans in
>> general and rage at conservatives, centrists and anyone who doesn't
>> agree with your ideas.
>>
>> 42. You must be "politically correct" when it suits your purpose and
>> point out that political correctness is a form of freedom rather than
>> more mind-control, but, it's more important to demand that others be
>> politically correct" than actually follow those demands yourself.
>>
>> 43. You must always offer praise and/or excuses for all of America's
>> enemies, especially terrorists who aren't really murdering cowards,
>> but, rather multiculturally misunderstood.
>>
>> 44. Remember to claim that the flag is only a piece of cloth and
>> stands for nothing while you explain how you love America and that's
>> why hurl hateful epithets regarding America and Americans, especially
>> those who disagree with you.
>>
>> 45. Whenever someone says something that rubs your prejudgments the
>> wrong way, ignore the contents of the remarks and vilify, defame,
>> malign and slander that person while claiming everything that person
>> has ever said or will ever utter is wrong. You are encouraged to take
>> cheap shots and engage in name-calling and ad hominem attacks, but,
>> above all, if you're a true standard-bearer for the Leftwing Liberals,
>> avoid discussing issues you can't debate - which are, of course, all
>> of them.
>>
>> 46. Honor multiculturalism and know it's "truths": "Multiculturalism,
>> n. The doctrine that persons of European ancestry are morally

>> inferior to all other human beings." ~ John Derbyshire, inspired by
>> Ambrose Bierce and his _Devil's Dictionary_
>>
>> 47. When confronted with something that is critical of Leftwing
>> Liberals, read or listen to one or two lines and jump to conclusions
>> (it's the best exercise many Leftwing Liberals get) that the beginning
>> was awful (meaning it might ask a Leftwing Liberal to actually think
>> or to look at Leftwing Liberals in an uncomplimentary light) - and
>> claim you didn't bother to read the rest or listen to the remainder
>> all the while claiming to be open-minded.
>>
>> 48. You must take it as your sworn duty to do your utmost to prevent
>> people from printing, voicing, writing or otherwise disseminating any
>> communication which is either unfavorable to or not in agreement with
>> Leftwing Liberal dogma and you must also strictly enforce Political
>> Correctness, while at the same time doing your best to muzzle and
>> silence those who don't agree with you. Tell adversaries to "Do as I
>> say, and I'll do as I please!" This is not censorship, hypocrisy or
>> Double Standards, but rather, "Freedom of Speech" an important
>> Constitutional Amendment written to give Leftwing Liberals their
>> God-given rights, even if they renounce and don't believe in God.
>>
>> 49. If you don't agree with the points of others, under no
>> circumstances should you present a rational counter argument or
>> discuss the issue itself when it is much more effective to call people
>> liars and cast aspersions on their veracity. This is also effective if
>> a person makes a mistake, don't overlook or excuse the error or admit
>> there was a possibility of a mistake - call them liars ferociously,
>> unless it's a petty sideline mistake that will help you construct
>> smoke and mirrors, in that case see Article #30 above.
>>
>> 50. Conservatives suggest that people should "hate the sin, love the
>> sinner". Remember, as a Leftwing Liberal you must always hate the
>> sinner [person or corporation who doesn't agree with you] and love the
>> sin as all sins are "relative" and finding anything wrong with them is
>> "judgmental". This may be difficult to grasp at first glance since
>> Leftwing Liberals don't believe in "sin" [unless it's being applied
>> via Double Standard, see Article #35, toward corporations or people
>> who don't agree with us] except for hypocrisy which is the only sin,
>> when applied to our opponents and one of the most effective slurs in
>> our arsenal. See Article #54
>>
>> 51. You must never be willing to take the consequences of your own
>> actions or words or expect your confederates to do the same as long as
>> you can unjustly lay the blame on someone else. But, of course, it is
>> critical that you demand that people who don't agree with your ideas
>> be held to strict adherence of taking the consequences of their
>> actions: See Article #35 above regarding nurturing our trademark:
>> Double Standards.
>>

>> 52. When asked to give citations, sources or support for your
>> propaganda, you can do one of 4 things: Use secondary sources
>> [McClatchy] which give "expert" Leftwing Liberal opinion on the
>> primary sources when they're not ignoring them, taking phrases out of
>> context, twisting their words or perverting their meaning; make an
>> official-looking, bogus website with the fake "facts" you've
>> presented; refer them to a propaganda site that may or may not support
>> your claims or the third and preferred solution is to give them the
>> URL of an official or universally accepted website and claim
>> vehemently that the so-called information you've invented, created or
>> faked is from that website though anyone who looks won't find it
>> there.
>>
>> 53. Remember, "A liberal is someone who feels a great debt to his
>> fellow man, which debt he proposes to pay off with your money." ~ G.
>> Gordon Liddy
>>
>> 54. You have to support and promote socialized medicine as "Socialized
>> medicine is based on the belief that, while individual bankruptcy by
>> medical bills is tragic and wicked, bankrupting the entire country is
>> beneficial and noble." ~ Nicolas Martin ["If you think health care is
>> expensive now, wait 'til you see how much it costs when it's free."] ~
>> P. J. O'Rourke
>>
>> 55. When your adversaries make statements that ring true, seem logical
>> or appear to have merit, ask them completely irrelevant non sequitur
>> questions in an attempt to evade the issue and derail the
>> conversation. If that doesn't work, announce with all due grandiosity
>> that your opponents refuse to answer your questions or give cites,
>> therefore, they cannot support their assertions. This ploy of course
>> won't work with people who can think, but, it will bring Leftwing
>> Liberals and the lunatic fringe out of the woodwork to jump on your
>> bellicose, bungling bandwagon.
>>
>> 56. You must always point out vociferously and incessantly that the
>> reason any conservative's failing is always major news is that it
>> allows liberals to engage in their very favorite taunt: "Hypocrisy!"
>> Hypocrisy is the only sin that really inflames us Leftwing Liberals
>> and, of course, only applies to others because Liberals can always
>> invoke the time-honored Double Standard. Inasmuch as Leftwing Liberals
>> have no moral principles, we can sit back, march, or otherwise create
>> a ruckus as we criticize other people for failing to meet the
>> standards that liberals simply renounce. It's an intriguing strategy.
>> By openly admitting to being philanderers, draft dodgers, liars,
>> weasels and cowards, liberals avoid ever being hypocrites. Remember,
>> admission that morals and ethics are passe always gets you off the
>> hook - but, do not hesitate to point out the immorality or unethical
>> behavior of people who don't agree with Leftwing Liberals.
>>
>> 57. Remember, as a cheerleader for decadence, when any despot,

>> criminal or maniac is treated in any way differently from the way he
>> treated others, it's your sworn duty to shriek to the heavens that he
>> isn't being treated with dignity and is being embarrassed in spite of
>> the fact he may have raped, tortured, maimed and slaughtered others;
>> as a Leftwing Liberal you must remain silent about the victims of
>> despots, criminals and maniacs. The victims got what they deserved and
>> despots, criminals and maniacs are to be honored, lionized, venerated
>> and if they're bad enough, worshipped.
>>
>> 58. As a Leftwing Liberal, you must believe that all America foreign
>> policy must have the unanimous approval of France, Russia, Syria,
>> Cuba, Communist China and the United Nations. KM
>>
>> 59. You must learn to be agile at pulling the old Leftwing Liberal
>> Switcheroo. Naturally in normal discourse, you must incessantly and
>> nauseatingly bash your country, slur and slander the founding fathers,
>> calling them terrorists and murderers, disparage all religions except
>> Islam, denounce all military institutions and personnel, chide all
>> people who have moral convictions and on and on [See articles 1-58];
>> but, remember, when trying to win a petty bickering match, employ the
>> Leftwing Liberal Switcheroo - which means dropping your old mantras
>> and immediately feigning to embrace your opponents' views momentarily
>> and don the mask of reverence for those you hate, but know you
>> adversary admires. If you are successful
>> enough in public discourse and exhibit it with enough frequency, you
>> may be eligible to win a toaster from The Leftwing Liberal Liberty
>> Lobby.
>>
>> 60. You, as a Leftwing Liberal, have to believe that all of the above
>> is part of a vast right wing conspiracy.

PC'ness is stupidity

809. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:12:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101612.5c893311@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89023

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>...
>
> As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
> whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),

I make typo's, but its just poor hand placement on the keyboard or
mispelled word.

It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.

> coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names,

Keeps? First change in about four (4) years. I got a whopping four
(4) spam emails today on my real email account since posting under
this throwaway screen name.

I'd rethink
> making such a silly insinuation...

Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.

1. Over-the-top, and

2. Major-Whacked-Out.

810. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:15:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101615.6b91753d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89024

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040309173403.21232.00004679@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403082255.6b6fd783@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040307143218.22081.00004450@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0403070452.1037a8d1@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >
> > And Brain, you have indeed, in public, failed...
>
> Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your
> own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally
> coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable
> behavior, obvious to lay people.
>
> LHA / WMD

Perhaps a third personality, Don Quixoterobeson?

811. Re: Ham-radio is all about....wasting one's time

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:23:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101623.570f2d25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89025

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100912.2588bab@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040307143217.22081.00004448@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >
> > He wastes our time.
>
> Hardly.
>
> I simply use MY time to provide a balance to the lies,
> misrepresentations and Amateur Radio bashing that you seem
> leather-bent on lavishing upon this forum
>
> YOUR time is wasted by not researching your facts, posting
> material and opinions that are easily refuted with even the most
> circumspect of effort, and your insistance on the liberal use of
> obviously inciteful, hurtful and demeaning epithets and profanities.
>
> So...if your time is being wasted, it's you doing the
> wasting...not me.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hardly.

You're a huge waste of time, Don Quixoteroberson. It's that
self-inflicted stupidity similar to what ails Dave.

Accept it.

The truth will change your life.

812. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:35:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89026

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Thomas Jefferson said the only legitimate purpose of a federal
> > government was the protection of it's citizens.
> >
> > That purpose has now changed to job creation and the department of
> > education.
>
> Thomas Jefferson, as enlightened and as forward looking as he may
> have been, could have hardly envisioned the United States as it exists
> today.

True. He would vomit blood at the welfare state that we have become.

> > > That does not negate the very necessary contribution that ham
> > > radio made to a major emergency in a current situation.
> >
> > That does not negate the very necessary contribution that cellular
> > telephones made to a major emergency in a current situation.
>
> You keep trying to avoid the very real truth that Amateur Radio
> STILL fills a need, even in these early days of the 21st century.

I accept that. However, what I find amusing is that you and Dee
cannot accept that other forms of communications are fast eclipsing
amateur radio as a means of portable emergency communications.

> These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
> from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
> benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
> the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
> programs.

And cell phones.

> > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > > a valuable asset.
> >
> > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > comm outages?
>
> How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio

> involvement?

You'll have to ask Dee.

> Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
> employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
> LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.

And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?

Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
communications during the east coast power outage?

Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?

C'mon, third grader, explain cell phones from of the picture. Tell us
that cell phones played NO role?

> Amateur Radio's contributions in emergencies does NOT exist
> solely "when the comms are down".

C'mon, third grader, show us where I stated that.

You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
a major role in emergency comms.

Were you two colleagues in third grade???

813. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:39:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89027

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100824.130ce908@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091754.6b9fe57d@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403090432.3a891c14@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > In any case, I am sure the case has been well-made that this fool
> > > is, as always, so self deluded and off-the-wall, that it only takes a
> > > modicum of effort to keep him balanced.
> >
> > Keep posting, you unbalanced whacko.
>
> As long as you deem it important to lie, mislead and otherwise
> misrepresent Amateur Radio, Brain, I shall.
>
> As for the "unbalanced whacko", I take that as evidence of your
> inability to otherwisde justify YOUR history of intentional mistruths
> and otherwise bizzare behaviour...ie: making assertions your
> can't/won't validate with facts.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Sorry, Steve Quixote'robeson, but it has become an eternal truth of
RRAP that you're not worthy of serious discussion.

814. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:42:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101642.135fd9ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89028

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403100821.689b161f@posting.google.com>...

> I told you...I don't tolerate liars and bullies. You are both.

Self-hatred is just a part of your problem, Don Quixote'robeson.

815. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:46:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403101646.69e13b54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89029

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> <snip>
> >>
> >> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
> >> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
> >> offshore production.
> >
> > Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
> > such.
>
> Or foreign adventuring.

True. We could just sit on our fat asses and let the world implode.
Then we'd have lots of dxpeditions cleverly disguised as UN peace
missions with 400,000 qso's per foray.

816. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 00:55:13 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.03.11.00.55.13.387077@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 89030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 03 Mar 2004 01:54:47 -0800, to wrote:

> I wrote here last week about the lawsuit that the local utility
> here in Cincinnati has threatened me with. I consulted a attorney and
> after looking at the law he advised me that the utility could sue me for
> because I do not have a FCC license. I will be taking down my CB antenna
> from the house. The main reason I am not fighting the utility is because
> of the cost of defending myself in a lawsuit.
> I really can't believe the responses I received with my question here
> last
> week, but I know it is important for others to know about my experience.
> Maybe some one with the money will be able to stand up against the
> utilities that are now selling BPL access and sending out cease and desist
> letters
>
> Tom

WHOA!
it doesn't matter that you don't have a license. you are still compliant with part 95 (and thus, deserving of any protections therein). the Utility company there must adhere to part 15 (as their devices fall under those regulations) and they have NO RIGHTS to deny you your services because of that.

instead of spending money to defend yourself, get hold of someone in the local ham radio clubs (sure, you may not be a ham, but someone there should be able to help in any case). in fact, go out, take your tech no-code test, get a license for part 97 spectrum and then tell the utilitiy company to go pound sand (if they choose to sue you at that point, they will lose and all it will cost you is a little time, $10-$15 for the license fee and perhaps the book "now your talking"). Believe me, you go this way and they'll have no choice but to lay off.

We haven't had anything like this in Arizona yet. We (as hams) work fairly closely with the local utilities and, frankly, they look at BPL as a dead end technology out here.

On a last note, don't take your station down. You use it to talk to friends and in times of disaster, it can be pressed into service to pass helth and welfare traffic (emergency services duty). there are a fair number of groups nationwide that do this on CB (REACT). We even have on here in Phoenix. A lot of times, hams will appreciate ANY assistance they can get to pass the traffic along (even if its on an unlicensed spectrum such as 11 meter). I am one such, having come up to ham from CB in 1992. I got out of CB though for other reasons (trash mouths, stalking and the

other bullshit nonsense that went on). If I had the equipment here, I'd probably do a lot more listening than transmitting.

BTW, I voluteer time with the red cross, the Maricopa County Emergency Services group and a few others. I am fairly busy during large chunks of the year doing public service duty. I live in a place that has an HA (and they have told me to take down my antennas on more than one occasion only to be told to pound sand as their bylaws don't prohibit such antennas and nearly everyone here has an antenna of some kind on their roofs in full view of the public areas). That HA has since gone out of business here (4 years ago) and I have gotten no complaints from the neighbors at all (in fact, a few of them became hams and at least one is still on CB, but with some help, has cleaned up his station to the point where I can't even hear him on 10 meters anymore).

Point is, you don't have to lose your station because some utility company says you do. until they actually subpeona you into court, all their threat are: HOT AIR!

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence has its limits.

817. Re: When is a re-stocking charge a good idea?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 01:12:21 UTC
From: Harry <hdennend444e@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <5313c$404fbcf6$d8536ff9$4082@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89031

"Bill" <wa8mea@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:8a260fb2.0403080949.29a92f1@posting.google.com...
> I've been a customer of AES for years. Spent THOUSANDS with them,
> usually buying at least a couple of different rigs a year.
>
> The gentleman was very polite, but said because there was some type of
> wear on the beltclip (and I certainly didn't see any. But there could
> have been since I did use the clip.), they couldn't resell the device
> as new...so they would have to charge me a 15% re-stocking fee. ($39)

So....AES is now doing the old "restocking fee" scam eh?
What a load of BULL SHI+. They really *love* their customers. : (

Re-stocking involves nothing more than inspecting the
item, issuing a diffrential credit if applicable and punching
a few keys on the computer inventory database and
putting it back on the shelf for sale - albeit "slightly used".

But 15%? I could understand a 5% fee!
Guess I'll make that next purchase at HRO instead.

I also seem to recall, during a visit to AES 15 years ago,
them pulling another clever 'scam' during Icom or Yaesu day.
Midway thru the day they got on the PA and announced
that the "..prices were going up tomorrow" because of
the **currency exchange differential** between the Dollar
and the Yen (!!!)

Needless to say I ain't been back to any AES since
and wouldn't give them 1 red cent of my business after that
crass display of high-pressure marketing BS, that even the
used car dealers (the skunks that car dealers are) even wouldn't
have the balls to try and pull off....

>
> As a ham businessman myself, I KNOW the cost of doing business. But I
> know I wouldn't go as far as to possibly alienate a customer in long
> standing. In fact, I have several customers in long standing and have
> had to "bite the bullet" on a couple of returns from them....just
> because I DID NOT want to alienate them from doing further business
> with me. I felt the greater need to keep these people as customers.
>
> I'm not really mad. I understand both points. There probably isn't a
> big profit margin in this gear. But would you risk loosing further
> business from a long time customer? Or would you write it off??? (And
> we all know, that's exactly what you can do with damaged

> merchandise...write it off.)
>
> What's your opinion???
>
> 73, Bill - WA8MEA
> NEAT STUFF! DWM Communications - http://qth.com/dwm

818. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 01:17:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403101717.7bc2f7fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89032

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091759.732c471e@posting.google.com>...

> You need defused. Too many typos indicate seething rage (your definition).

Geeze...you really ARE an idiot, Brain...

As has been pointed out before, the "typo syndrome" is your
mentor's claim...Not mine.

Thank-you for providing me yet another example of how you don't
get your attributions right. As if we needed any more proof...

What a fool.

Steve, K4YZ

819. KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 01:20:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403101720.43646a6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89033

I have an old FM2015R that I want to restore. Does anyone have a schematic and/or owner's manual they'd be willing to sell, trade or otherwise share?

73

Steve, K4YZ

820. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 02:02:41 UTC
From: Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
Message-ID: <404FC8DC.5070204@get.lost>
Source record: 89034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Barry OGrady wrote:

> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few amateurs
> then it is justified.

Funny, I haven't heard this type of rationalization since Berlin wall
fell down. Should we all start wearing red star berets now or later?

> Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.

Ah, sort of like your post?

WA7AA

--

Anti-spam measure: look me up on qrz.com if you need to reply directly

821. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 02:18:09 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ab9966fb4bdd9198981e@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 89035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com>,
god_freee_jones@hotmail.com says...
> On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost> wrote:
>
> >Tony P. wrote:
> >
> >> We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing. And it's
> >> a bit like un-ringing the bell. There are a whole lot of transceivers
> >> out there that put out anywhere from 50W to 200W right out of the box.
> >> And a whole lot more amps that kick up to the 1.5KW range. Granted, the
> >> FCC knows who and where every ham in the U.S. happens to be, but they
> >> don't know exactly what gear you've got do they? I mean I'm an extra
> >> without an HF rig right now.
> >>
> >> And when you think about it, a properly placed 5W transmitter will do
> >> stuttering wonders for BPL.
> >>
> >> BPL needs to be killed and pronto.
> >
> >
> >The FCC tune has already changed. Read the article at:
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/09/1/?nc=1
> >
> >Notice the FCC statement "...Powell responded to the question by saying
> >the FCC would not let BPL interfere with critical services."
> >
> >Now the protection appears to have migrated to "critical" services only,
> >and the burden of proof is thus shifted to amateur radio to show how our
> >service is "critical" and worthy of protection against the
> >best-thing-since-sliced-bread BPL.
> >
> >And they are about to lock up a goddamn housewife while these vultures
> >roam unimpeded...
> >
> >
> > 73 ... WA7AA
>
> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few amateurs
> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.

You are just the kind of sheep that big business loves. BPL as it stands is a BAD idea. The interference potential isn't just to amateur radio but a host of other services.

822. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 02:24:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040310212438.21457.00004553@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89036

In article <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
>> defaults on student and other loans.
>
>The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student loans
>through bankruptcy.

I'm not sure if you can or cannot. Anybody know for sure?

>So, you may not get graduates going intentionally
>bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
>bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid back.

Either way spells trouble.

>>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>>
>>>> Here's one data point:
>>>>
>>>> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>> tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>> expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>> times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>>> more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>> fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>
>> Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
>> weekends,
>> summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year
>> tuition. If a
>> kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per
>> year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an
>> hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about
>> 1/6 of the tuition.
>>
>> That's just not right.
>>
>No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone grants.
>They were means tested, and of course if your parents were middle income
>you would be the poorest student in college.

Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart enough to get
in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones paid their way and the
rest got various forms of help but did not have to start out their professional

lives way in debt.

>However, now they are phasing
>out grants and bringing in loans. This is also a big mistake.

Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.

The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college cost so much?"

Here in Radnor Township, we spend a bit over $10,000 per year per student in the public schools. And that's one of the highest outlays in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, if not the whole country. Why should a year of college tuition cost more than that? The college school day and school year are shorter, the classes bigger, and the college students pretty much provide their own supplies and/or pay lab fees. College students also usually provide their own transportation, don't need special ed services, etc.

So why does college cost so much?

>Our governments need to invest more in putting people through higher
>education. It doesn't really matter whether they do it by giving money to
>the colleges or to the students, provided the former results in lower fees,
>but they need to do it. An educated workforce is the most important thing
>they could be putting their money into.

I agree 100%. It's an investment in the future.

Public education (meaning universally-available, publicly funded education) was recognized as a necessary function of government from the very beginning of this country. Nowadays that means either college or some form of post-high-school specialized training.

Money well spent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

823. Re: Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 02:29:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <waQ3c.10863$t16.6453503@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89037

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:404DC8F2.2020700@psu.edu...
> Sara wrote:
> > Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?
>
>
> Hi Sara. Go to:
>
>
> http://www.qrz.com/p/testing.pl
>
>
> All three levels of the tests are there, Technician, General, and
> Extra. Good luck!
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

Also these exams select from the question pool at random so you need to study the entire pool (or the material from which the pool is developed). So you are unlikely to get the particular group of questions that you see on any particular practice exam.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

824. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 02:56:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89038

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> a major role in emergency comms.
>

I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a significant role. You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms. My position is and has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as possible. No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out in the next emergency.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

825. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 03:02:48 UTC
From: Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net>
Message-ID: <404FD6D8.3000300@myob.net>
Source record: 89039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Amateur radio is a hobby, yes -- but it is a hobby that also provides
training for services to the public. E.g., search and rescue operations
(e.g., much of the shuttle debris was in areas with no cell-phone or
regular two-way radio service), emergency communications when major
power outages occur, etc., etc.

Alan AB2OS

On 03/10/04 08:35 pm Barry OGrady put fingers to keyboard and launched
the following message into cyberspace:

> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few amateurs
> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.

826. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 03:22:31 UTC
From: Hank Oredson <horedson@att.net>
Message-ID: <XXQ3c.97334$aH3.2953648@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 89040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
wrote:
>
> >Tony P. wrote:
> >
> >> We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing. And it's
> >> a bit like un-ringing the bell. There are a whole lot of transceivers
> >> out there that put out anywhere from 50W to 200W right out of the box.
> >> And a whole lot more amps that kick up to the 1.5KW range. Granted, the
> >> FCC knows who and where every ham in the U.S. happens to be, but they
> >> don't know exactly what gear you've got do they? I mean I'm an extra
> >> without an HF rig right now.
> >>
> >> And when you think about it, a properly placed 5W transmitter will do
> >> stuttering wonders for BPL.
> >>
> >> BPL needs to be killed and pronto.
> >
> >
> >The FCC tune has already changed. Read the article at:
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/09/1/?nc=1
> >
> >Notice the FCC statement "...Powell responded to the question by saying
> >the FCC would not let BPL interfere with critical services."
> >
> >Now the protection appears to have migrated to "critical" services only,
> >and the burden of proof is thus shifted to amateur radio to show how our
> >service is "critical" and worthy of protection against the
> >best-thing-since-sliced-bread BPL.
> >
> >And they are about to lock up a goddamn housewife while these vultures
> >roam unimpeded...
> >
> >
> >
> > 73 ... WA7AA
>
> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few
amateurs
> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that

unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.

Well, guess you are not a US Radio Amateur, or you would
know that Amateur Radio is not a hobby, but is a service.

If you ARE a ham and live in the US, please go read Part 97 again.

--

... Hank

http://horedson.home.att.net
http://w0rli.home.att.net

827. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 03:52:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040310225210.05957.00000917@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 89041

In article <1e4e3692.0403101615.6b91753d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Perhaps a third personality, Don Quixoterobeson?

I think it's more like Done Peyoterobeson...

828. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 03:52:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040310225211.05957.00000918@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 89042

In article <5c01b95b.0403101720.43646a6f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>I have an old FM2015R that I want to restore. Does anyone have a
>schematic and/or owner's manual they'd be willing to sell, trade or
>otherwise share?

Go to - http://www.w7fg.com and check his listing.

Prompt, courteous service for manual copies of many kinds.

No! Don't do it!

Everything I write here you call a LIE and distortion! It can't be true! Don't go there!

No! Don't take that advice. DO go there!

But, if you think everything I write is a LIE you can't believe it!

No! Don't go, it is a LIE! Don't go there!

But, but, but...that is a LIE and can't be correct so you must go!

Repeat rant until EVERYONE, including your multiple personaliteis, are fully satisfied!

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAAHAHHAHAHAHA

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHHHH

AAAAAAAAAHHHHHHHEEEEEEEHAWHAWHAWHAW!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

829. Re: Amateur Radio Exams Online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 07:58:20 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403110758170.402@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 89043

On Thu, 11 Mar 2004, Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:404DC8F2.2020700@psu.edu...
> > Sara wrote:
> > > Are the exams online? What's the beginner exam, Technician?
> > Hi Sara. Go to:
> > http://www.qrz.com/p/testing.pl
> > All three levels of the tests are there, Technician, General, and
> > Extra. Good luck!
>
> Also these exams select from the question pool at random so you need to
> study the entire pool (or the material from which the pool is developed).
> So you are unlikely to get the particular group of questions that you see on
> any particular practice exam.

I'm glad to see that someone mentioned that the online ones are PRACTICE exams.
You still have to take the exam that counts in person at a test session to
actually get a license.

830. Re: Sex Discussions on 2 Meter Repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 08:05:36 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403110806060.402@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 89044

On Tue, 9 Mar 2004, stewart wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<Rc6dnZUfEvFtOrLdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>...
> >
> > Let 'em take it to simplex, or get their own private repeater.
>
> Yes... callsign could be "N6GAY"... I checked qrz.com, and amazingly
> it isn't yet taken :)
>
> - Stewart

Stewart: No one is stopping YOU. Remember that YOU looked it up....

831. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 09:53:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89045

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040310225211.05957.00000918@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403101720.43646a6f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >I have an old FM2015R that I want to restore. Does anyone have a
> >schematic and/or owner's manual they'd be willing to sell, trade or
> >otherwise share?
>
> Go to - http://www.w7fg.com and check his listing.
>
> Prompt, courteous service for manual copies of many kinds.
>
>
>
> No! Don't do it!
>
> Everything I write here you call a LIE and distortion! It can't be
> true! Don't go there!

A couple of points, Lennie...

First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
distortion.

I HAVE publically stated in this forum that I acknowledge that
you know far more about the inner workings of the box than I do. When
YOU respond in a fraternal, respectful manner I ahve done the same
(ie: a couple years ago when I asked about plastic model
sources...Your INITIAL response was polite, precise and appreciated)

What I ALSO have said is that you lie and mislead people about
the character of the AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, that you find it necessary
to use demeaning and belittling endearments in order to place yourself
above everyone else, and that your purpose in doing so is for mere
spite, nothing else. (ie: your SECOND response to the above referenced
item wherein you made a 180 deg turnabout and resumed your typical
snide manner)

That you started off on a purely fraternal offer of information
for another radio hobbyist was appreciated.

That you finsihed off in your usual spiteful slashing was
typical. At elast this time you did it all in one post...

Thanks for once again proving me correct.

Steve, K4YZ

PS...Thanks for the tip, Len.

832. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 09:59:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403110159.1356679d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89046

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101612.5c893311@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
> > whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),
>
> I make typo's, but its just poor hand placement on the keyboard or
> mispelled word.
>
> It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.

Again...YOU ARE IN ERROR...

What >>I<< have stated is that said mistakes are "rage" as
defined by "your mentor", that being Lennie.

It is NOT my assertion that it is such. Ask around, Brain...YOUR
attribution is WRONG.

> > coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names,
>
> Keeps? First change in about four (4) years. I got a whopping four
> (4) spam emails today on my real email account since posting under
> this throwaway screen name.

I have zero. So what's YOUR problem...?!?!

> I'd rethink
> > making such a silly insinuation...
>
> Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.
>
> 1. Over-the-top, and
>
> 2. Major-Whacked-Out.

OK, Brain...if you insist. As long as it makes you feel warm and
fuzzy to hold on to it.

In the mean time, please work on getting YOUR problem with
attributes fixed, OK...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

833. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 10:23:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403110223.1b1cf1a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89047

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > a major role in emergency comms.
> >
>
> I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not
> let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a
> significant role. You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur
> radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms. My position is and
> has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as
> possible. No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out
> in the next emergency.

Actually, Dee, his "unlicensed services" frame is awfully narrow.
Only Class D CB, MURS and FRS are "unlicensed".

Cellphones are NOT a "radio service" as defined by any FCC
part...they are a FEE-FOR-SERVICE provided by common carriers who are,
indeed, licensed services providing that fee-for-service. Every one
of those carriers has a plethora of callsigns issued for thier
services. You,a cellphone "subscriber" are using your telephone under
the auspices of thier license.

There are some REACT groups remaining who continue to monitor
Class D CB to some degree, but most REACT groups participating in
organized "public service" events use GMRS which still requires an
FCC-issued station license.

FRS is used mostly as a "wireless intercom" within disaster
shelters or extremely close areas, NOT as a "major role" in providing
disaster relief communications.

And I am sure that MURS radios may be used in some areas just as
FRS is, but for no more than FRS is.

Brain's assertion that "unlicensed" services play a "major role"
in "emergency comms" is absolutely assinine. He'll wallow around in
this one for a long time to come trying to justify his claims and will
come out of it looking just as foolish as he has for his other
"claims".

I am sure his "definition" of "major role" is far from what REAL
IC's consider a "major role". The "unlicensed services" play no more
than a "bit part"...a "cameo" at best.

So Brain...what "major role" do "unlicensed services" play...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

834. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 10:28:52 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A937BFA27E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89048

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0403101646.69e13b54@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> <snip>
>> >>
>> >> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>> >> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>> >> offshore production.
>> >
>> > Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
>> > such.
>>
>> Or foreign adventuring.
>
> True. We could just sit on our fat asses and let the world implode.
> Then we'd have lots of dxpeditions cleverly disguised as UN peace
> missions with 400,000 qso's per foray.
>

As opposed to dxpeditions disguised as invasions?

835. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 10:41:21 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A939DD068B1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89049

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040310212438.21457.00004553@mb-m10.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>> That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
>>> defaults on student and other loans.
>>
>>The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student
>>loans through bankruptcy.
>
> I'm not sure if you can or cannot. Anybody know for sure?
>
>>So, you may not get graduates going intentionally
>>bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
>>bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid
>>back.
>
> Either way spells trouble.
>
>>>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>>>
>>>>> Here's one data point:
>>>>>
>>>>> In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>>> tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>>> expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>>> times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006
>>>>> be more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>>> fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>>
>>> Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
>>> weekends, summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that
>>> $3000/year
>>> tuition. If a
>>> kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours
>>> per year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5
>>> an hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only
>>> about 1/6 of the tuition.
>>>
>>> That's just not right.
>>>
>>No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone

>>grants. They were means tested, and of course if your parents were
>>middle income you would be the poorest student in college.
>
> Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart
> enough to get in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones
> paid their way and the rest got various forms of help but did not have
> to start out their professional lives way in debt.
>

Correct

>>However, now they are phasing out grants and bringing in loans. This
>>is also a big mistake.
>
> Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job
> situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.
>

True.

I'm not sure whether those couple of IFs hold true in the UK as I'm not there. An engineer's starting salary over there would not have been enough to pay back a loan when I graduated (it was barely enough to live on), but I think things have improved since then.

As for the US, the problem is more the size of the fees rather than the size of the paychecks. That and finding a job.

> The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college
> cost so much?"
>
> Here in Radnor Township, we spend a bit over $10,000 per year per
> student in the public schools. And that's one of the highest outlays in
> the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, if not the whole country. Why should
> a year of college tuition cost more than that? The college school day
> and school year are shorter, the classes bigger, and the college
> students pretty much provide their own supplies and/or pay lab fees.
> College students also usually provide their own transportation, don't
> need special ed services, etc.
>
> So why does college cost so much?

I don't know. It's a puzzle. I don't think it's big salaries.

>
>>Our governments need to invest more in putting people through higher
>>education. It doesn't really matter whether they do it by giving money
>>to the colleges or to the students, provided the former results in
>>lower fees, but they need to do it. An educated workforce is the most
>>important thing they could be putting their money into.
>
> I agree 100%. It's an investment in the future.
>

> Public education (meaning universally-available, publicly funded
> education) was recognized as a necessary function of government from
> the very beginning of this country. Nowadays that means either college
> or some form of post-high-school specialized training.
>
> Money well spent.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

836. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 10:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89050

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...

> > Thomas Jefferson, as enlightened and as forward looking as he may
> > have been, could have hardly envisioned the United States as it exists
> > today.
>
> True. He would vomit blood at the welfare state that we have become.

WHOA, BillyB! You at once espouse making Amateur Radio a
"once-size-fits-all" radio service, then make reference to a "welfare
state"...?!?!

Nice turn-about there! Get whiplash making that turn...?!?!

> > You keep trying to avoid the very real truth that Amateur Radio
> > STILL fills a need, even in these early days of the 21st century.
>
> I accept that. However, what I find amusing is that you and Dee
> cannot accept that other forms of communications are fast eclipsing
> amateur radio as a means of portable emergency communications.

I have NEVER, in this forum or any other, refused to acknowledged
that other radio, wireline, or other common carrier services provide
any other means of "portable emergency communications".

I challenge you to prove otherwise.

What I HAVE stated in this and other forums is that Amateur Radio
CONTINUES to provide a necessary and almost irreplaceable asset. NO
OTHER RADIO SERVICE provides the flexibility and utility that Amateur
Radio does.

I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.

> > These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
> > from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
> > benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
> > the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
> > programs.
>
> And cell phones.

How well does a cellphone operate without a functioning cellsite,
Brain?

Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
role.

I have NEVER said anything even CLOSE to the idea that we're the
only game in town. Quite the contrary.

I >>HAVE<< said we provide a service to those who make the plans
and need the help.

> > > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > > > a valuable asset.
> > >
> > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > comm outages?
> >
> > How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
> > involvement?
>
> You'll have to ask Dee.

I am asking you.

> > Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
> > employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
> > LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.
>
> And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?
>
> Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
> communications during the east coast power outage?

Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
an assertion, Brain...?!?!

> Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?

Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
an assertion, Brain...?!?!

> C'mon, third grader, explain cell phones from of the picture. Tell us
> that cell phones played NO role?

WHERE do you GET such assinine insinuations, Brain...?!?!

I have NEVER made ANY SUCH ASSERTION!

> > Amateur Radio's contributions in emergencies does NOT exist
> > solely "when the comms are down".
>
> C'mon, third grader, show us where I stated that.

From above:

> > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > comm outages?

The INSINUATION you make here is VERY clear...in YOUR estimation,
the "comms" had to be "down" in order for Amateur Radio to have played
a role in "emergency comms".

"Emergency comms" are NOT >>only<< when the wires are down or the
cell site destroyed, Brain.

Perhaps if you were actively involved in the programs of some
disaster mitigation agency you might have a better insight as to what
Amateur Radio's OTHER roles are...?!?!

> You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> a major role in emergency comms.

What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
compliant devices?

Cellphones are a "fee-for-service" provided by the common
carriers under the auspices of THIER licenses.

> Were you two colleagues in third grade???

Perhaps.. I knew a "Dee" in gradeschool, however I doubt we were
classmates.

On the otherhand we both seem to acknowledge that Amateur Radio
plays a PART in emergency communications, and that PART is
acknowledged and incorporated by almost every major disaster
mitigation organization in the United States, including FEMA, The Red
Cross, The Salvation Army, the Department of Defense, the Department
of State, most state's OES's, etc etc etc.

Unless, of course, you have evidence to the contrary...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

837. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 11:16:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88851

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...

> Sorry, Steve Quixote'robeson, but it has become an eternal truth of
> RRAP that you're not worthy of serious discussion.

Then you've only proven yet again that you don't understand
what's going on.

This is only about "me" in that I keep "calling you" on you and
Lennie's misrepresentations on the character of the Amateur Radio
service.

YOU are the one who keeps trying to somehow make this about "me".
It's not. It's only about "me" in that I tick you off by rubbing
YOUR nose in YOUR inaccuracies and innuendos.

Sorry to upset you, but YOU keep providing me with the material
to work with. (BTW...thanks...)

Steve, K4YZ

838. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 11:51:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88852

In article <Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
>
>> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
><snip>
>>>
>>> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>>> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>>> offshore production.
>>
>> Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
>> such.
>
>Or foreign adventuring.

We had good teachers in that....

>>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
>>> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class
>>> than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to
>>> do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>>
>> Only because it costs so much less to live there.
>
>That's true, and ironically that's probably due to the huge number of poor
>people there. Basic food and services are likely to be provided to the
>Indian middle classes by people who are far poorer than we can really
>imagine.

That's true but there are other factors to consider: the budget deficit, the
trade deficit and the strong dollar.

The figures for the January trade deficit came out recently. The highest in US
history, something like 46 billion in one month. Much of that is with East
Asian countires like China, Japan, and maybe India. But particularly China.

Imports are inexpensive in part because these countries keep their currencies
low relative to the dollar. Because of the trade deficit, lots of dollars wind
up there, but they don't use those dollars to buy US products. Instead, they
buy US investments - both government securities and private-sector companies.

IOW we export money and jobs, and they use the money to finance our debt and buy up the USA a little at a time.

>> Way back in 1783, when the US Constitution was written here in
>> Philadelphia, one of the limitations placed on Congress was that there
>> would be no tariffs on *exports*. *Imports* could be tarriffed/taxed
>> at will - and they were! This was done both as a source of income and
>> to protect local industry from destructive foreign competition. It is
>> my understanding that we still have some forms of this in place, in
>> the form of such things as limits on the number of cars that may be
>> imported without special taxes. These import quotas caused several
>> carmakers (mostly Japanese) to build assembly plants here in the USA.
>> Some cars are even built here and shipped *back to Japan*, because by
>> doing so they count against the import number.
>>
>> Maybe it's time for that sort of thing to be expanded. Exporting jobs
>> may be good for some companies' bottom line in the short run, but in
>> the long run it spells big trouble.
>>

>Forgive me for saying this as a foreigner, but there seems to be no limit
>to the level of greed exhibited by corporate America.

How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much profit is OK and how much is greed?

>As you say, it will
>lead to big trouble in the long run. Look at what happened to the stock
>market in the '20s.
>
And in 2000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

839. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 12:02:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403110402.433f1692@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88853

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040310225210.05957.00000917@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403101615.6b91753d@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Perhaps a third personality, Don Quixoterobeson?
>
> I think it's more like Done Peyoterobeson...

That could explain a lot!

840. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 12:06:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403110406.71f51c2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88854

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > a major role in emergency comms.
> >
>
> I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not
> let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a
> significant role. You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur
> radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms. My position is and
> has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as
> possible. No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out
> in the next emergency.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I too think that multiple forms of communications are the best bet
when the chips are down.

But cell phones sure are playing a much larger role than amateur radio
in emergency communications.

841. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 12:11:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403110411.6b3e54fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88855

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403101717.7bc2f7fd@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091759.732c471e@posting.google.com>...
>
> > You need defused. Too many typos indicate seething rage (your definition).
>
> Geeze...you really ARE an idiot, Brain...
>
> As has been pointed out before, the "typo syndrome" is your
> mentor's claim...Not mine.
>
> Thank-you for providing me yet another example of how you don't
> get your attributions right. As if we needed any more proof...
>
> What a fool.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The first time I saw it, it was your strong assertion with no
attribution to Len as the originator. I would say that it is you who
cannot get the attribution correct. You just steal what suits you,
Don Quixoterobeson.

842. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 12:47:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040311074703.22081.00004490@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88856

In article <Xns94A7E902EEF1Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> I dunno, Alun. It might soon be hard to convince a lot of people
>> to go
>> drastically into debt just to have their field be decimated upon
>> graduation.
>>
>
>Agreed. The only solution to that appears to be more money in grant form
>rather than loan form. At least it can be targeted at particular subjects,
>like EE and Comp Sci for example.

I agree with grants, but they should be targeted at occupations where there's a
shortage, not a glut, of trained workers.
>>
>>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
>>> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class
>>> than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to
>>> do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>>
>> Well, the tech help I've gotten surely doesn't speak English very
>> well! 8^)

>Indians in India use English mostly to communicate with eachother, as they
>have a proliferation of different languages. Just because they are fluent
>doesn't necessarily mean it's English as you know it, or even as I know it.
>
From a purely numerical standpoint, it could be claimed that *their* usage is
standard and *we* all have accents...

73 de Jim, N2EY

843. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 12:47:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040311074704.22081.00004491@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88857

In article <Xns94A939DD068B1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart
>> enough to get in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones
>> paid their way and the rest got various forms of help but did not have
>> to start out their professional lives way in debt.
>
>Correct

That's a good thing!
>
>>>However, now they are phasing out grants and bringing in loans. This
>>>is also a big mistake.
>>
>> Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job
>> situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.

>True.
>
>I'm not sure whether those couple of IFs hold true in the UK as I'm not
>there. An engineer's starting salary over there would not have been enough
>to pay back a loan when I graduated (it was barely enough to live on), but
>I think things have improved since then.

If that's the case, then I share your opinion that loans aren't a good idea at
all.
>
>As for the US, the problem is more the size of the fees rather than the
>size of the paychecks. That and finding a job.

Exactly.

>> The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college
>> cost so much?"
>>
>> Here in Radnor Township, we spend a bit over $10,000 per year per
>> student in the public schools. And that's one of the highest outlays in
>> the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, if not the whole country. Why should
>> a year of college tuition cost more than that? The college school day
>> and school year are shorter, the classes bigger, and the college
>> students pretty much provide their own supplies and/or pay lab fees.
>> College students also usually provide their own transportation, don't
>> need special ed services, etc.
>>
>> So why does college cost so much?

>
>I don't know. It's a puzzle. I don't think it's big salaries.

Some years back the local paper did a series of stories on my alma mater and the tuition explosion. Two things were obvious cost-increasers: big jump in the number and ratio of nonteaching administrators, and a building boom.

Still, the local school district built a new elementary school a few years ago without breaking the bank. We're not top-heavy with administration by any means, either.

I would think that primary and secondary education are actually more complex and costly than college, for a number of factors ranging from classroom hours to diversity of student needs.

>>>Our governments need to invest more in putting people through higher
>>>education. It doesn't really matter whether they do it by giving money
>>>to the colleges or to the students, provided the former results in
>>>lower fees, but they need to do it. An educated workforce is the most
>>>important thing they could be putting their money into.
>>
>> I agree 100%. It's an investment in the future.
>>
>> Public education (meaning universally-available, publicly funded
>> education) was recognized as a necessary function of government from
>> the very beginning of this country. Nowadays that means either college
>> or some form of post-high-school specialized training.
>>
>> Money well spent.

Responsibility to the next generation. What a concept.

73 de Jim, N2EY

844. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 16:20:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405091D6.6000107@psu.edu>
Source record: 88858

N2EY wrote:
> In article <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
>>>That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
>>>defaults on student and other loans.
>>
>>The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student loans
>>through bankruptcy.
>
>
> I'm not sure if you can or cannot. Anybody know for sure?

Yes and no:

from

http://www.mdbankruptcylaw.com/lawguide/studentloans/when_you_cant_pay.asp

Another possible solution is to discharge your student loan in
bankruptcy. However, due to a 1998 change in the bankruptcy law, this is
harder than ever to do. In general, you can discharge a student loan in
bankruptcy only if you can prove that repaying the loan would be a
severe hardship for you. There are several factors that courts consider
in making this determination, but suffice it to say, it's a very
difficult standard to meet.

At one time, many students simply completed their education, and as a
matter of course, declared bankruptcy and wiped out their debts (HA!
America's best and brightest, eh?) After it caught on that they were
doing this, the law was changed.

So a person that declares bankruptcy has to continue repayment unless
they can prove they simply can't pay. And that isn't all that likely to
happen.

>
>>So, you may not get graduates going intentionally
>>bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
>>bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid back.
>
>
> Either way spells trouble.
>
>

>>>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Here's one data point:
>>>>>
>>>>>In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>>>tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>>>expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>>>times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>>>>more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>>>fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>>>
>>>Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
>>>weekends,
>>> summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year
>>> tuition. If a
>>>kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per
>>>year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an
>>>hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about
>>>1/6 of the tuition.
>>>
>>>That's just not right.
>>>
>>
>>No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone grants.
>>They were means tested, and of course if your parents were middle income
>>you would be the poorest student in college.
>
>
> Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart enough to get
> in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones paid their way and the
> rest got various forms of help but did not have to start out their professional
> lives way in debt.
>
>
>>However, now they are phasing
>>out grants and bringing in loans. This is also a big mistake.
>
>
> Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job
> situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.

The loans and their repayment are pretty reasonable.

> The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college cost so
> much?"

You actually do know, don't you?

- Mike KB3EIA -

845. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 19:16:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88859

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >>> these per year.
> >>
> >> Those are good practice.
> >>
>
> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> record turn-out, everything run just fine.

What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?

> It can be done very well
> without any amateur radio help

How do you know? Ever work at a race? I have, in a variety of roles.
LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
for race communications for years.

See:

http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php

http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488

(sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)

http://www.cert-la.com/

(scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")

> but the ARRL copy scribblers would have a cow about that. :-)

"ARRL copy scribblers"? Who are they? You mean folks who write the
facts about what actually happened?

http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/02/28/1/?nc=1

Nice write up about the 2002 LA Marathon

Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
and play no role. That's simply Not True.

846. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 20:57:55 UTC
From: "Z.Z." <nobody@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A98E1031962nobodynowhere@68.6.19.6>
Source record: 88860
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Pappy wrote:

> Your most important words where: "Critical Services", does the FCC
> consider amateur radio such a service?
> ...

Hmmm...how much campaign money does the ARRL give???...

847. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 21:15:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>
Source record: 88861

N2EY wrote:
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>>Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>>>>>>walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>>>>>>hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>>>>>>these per year.
>>>>
>>>>Those are good practice.
>>>>
>>>
>> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>
>
> What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>
>
>> It can be done very well
>> without any amateur radio help
>
>
> How do you know? Ever work at a race? I have, in a variety of roles.
> LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
> for race communications for years.

A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
"redundant in the future. They found out:

Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
the whole group, everyone had to be called.

Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.

Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.

Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized
this on the first call that had to go to everyone.

Cell phones work for some things, but the idea that they can replace
radio operators is best advanced by those that don't really know how
that particular job is done.

> http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php

Some hams and ham equipment spotted in the pix.

>
> http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488

>
> (sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)

Really? I thunk all you needed was a cell phone and the ability to say
"can you hear me now?....how about now? 8^)

> http://www.cert-la.com/
>
> (scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")

Do you think maybe they put that in as an affirmative action sort of
thing? Maybe they just wanted to get the Hams to shut their yap's? ;^)

>> but the ARRL copy scribblers would have a cow about that. :-)
>
>
> "ARRL copy scribblers"? Who are they? You mean folks who write the
> facts about what actually happened?
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/02/28/1/?nc=1
>
> Nice write up about the 2002 LA Marathon
>
> Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
> and play no role. That's simply Not True.

Capitalization noted, Jim. Do some people think that the hams are
suppose to be in the lead vehicle or leading the parade? Heck they are
supposed to be behind the scenes. Go figure.

-

- Mike KB3EIA -

848. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 23:44:25 UTC
From: JackGibson@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <72e86d08.0403111544.734dd260@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

doberman <doberman_2000_us@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<104v2p6q70ps546@corp.supernews.com>...

> (several hundred lines deleted)
>
> PC'ness is stupidity

As opposed to quoting the whole fucking message to add
a one line comment?

- Jack

849. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 23:56:48 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94A9C0B7B1EE5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 88863

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
>>
>>> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>><snip>
>>>>
>>>> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>>>> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>>>> offshore production.
>>>
>>> Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
>>> such.
>>
>>Or foreign adventuring.
>
> We had good teachers in that....

Guilty as charged

>
>>>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite
>>>> their overall poverty they have more English speaking educated
>>>> middle class than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they
>>>> are willing to do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>>>
>>> Only because it costs so much less to live there.
>>
>>That's true, and ironically that's probably due to the huge number of
>>poor people there. Basic food and services are likely to be provided to
>>the Indian middle classes by people who are far poorer than we can
>>really imagine.
>
> That's true but there are other factors to consider: the budget
> deficit, the trade deficit and the strong dollar.
>
> The figures for the January trade deficit came out recently. The
> highest in US history, something like 46 billion in one month. Much of
> that is with East Asian countires like China, Japan, and maybe India.

> But particularly China.
>
> Imports are inexpensive in part because these countries keep their
> currencies low relative to the dollar. Because of the trade deficit,
> lots of dollars wind up there, but they don't use those dollars to buy
> US products. Instead, they buy US investments - both government
> securities and private-sector companies.
>
> IOW we export money and jobs, and they use the money to finance our
> debt and buy up the USA a little at a time.
>
>>> Way back in 1783, when the US Constitution was written here in
>>> Philadelphia, one of the limitations placed on Congress was that
>>> there would be no tariffs on *exports*. *Imports* could be
>>> tarriffed/taxed at will - and they were! This was done both as a
>>> source of income and to protect local industry from destructive
>>> foreign competition. It is my understanding that we still have some
>>> forms of this in place, in the form of such things as limits on the
>>> number of cars that may be imported without special taxes. These
>>> import quotas caused several carmakers (mostly Japanese) to build
>>> assembly plants here in the USA. Some cars are even built here and
>>> shipped *back to Japan*, because by doing so they count against the
>>> import number.
>>>
>>> Maybe it's time for that sort of thing to be expanded. Exporting jobs
>>> may be good for some companies' bottom line in the short run, but in
>>> the long run it spells big trouble.
>>>
>
>>Forgive me for saying this as a foreigner, but there seems to be no
>>limit to the level of greed exhibited by corporate America.
>
> How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much
> profit is OK and how much is greed?

It's more of an attitude

>
>>As you say, it will
>>lead to big trouble in the long run. Look at what happened to the stock
>>market in the '20s.
>>
> And in 2000.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

850. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88868

In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>> >>> these per year.
>> >>
>> >> Those are good practice.
>> >>
>>
>> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>
>What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>
>> It can be done very well
>> without any amateur radio help
>
>How do you know?

1. By reading about it in a respected newspaper.

2. By viewing it on broadcast television.

3. By knowing some details about it from one of its officials.

> Ever work at a race?

Not in a foot race.

Why is that important to the "Economy, Stupid?"

>LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
>for race communications for years.

If you insist...and you WILL insist. You are a Believer.

Have you ever been IN Los Angeles?

Have you ever worked IN any volunteer function here?

YOU have NO relationship with the city of Los Angeles. I live here. You don't.

Reality check: ANY marathon foot race can be done with available non-amateur radio communications readily available in any large urban area. The first Olympic marathon event was done without any amateur radio "help." Several Games after that had NO amateur radio "help" and also succeeded.

>Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
>and play no role. That's simply Not True.

I don't care one way or another about "ham radio help in marathons."

I know a marathon can be run WITHOUT amateur radio help. That's been done many times.

You keep insisting amateur radio MUST be there...and that's simply Not True.

Now go do some DX or gab expertly about The Economy, Kosher Food, or choo-choo trains. Don't they need "ham radio help?"

LHA / WMD

851. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212339.23307.00007251@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88864

In article <20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much profit is >OK and how much is greed?

Profit is defined as pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

U.S. amateur radio is defined as specifically NOT for pecuniary interest.

Try to stay focussed.

LHA / WMD

852. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212341.23307.00007252@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88870

In article <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040310225211.05957.00000918@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0403101720.43646a6f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >I have an old FM2015R that I want to restore. Does anyone have a
>> >schematic and/or owner's manual they'd be willing to sell, trade or
>> >otherwise share?
>>
>> Go to - http://www.w7fg.com and check his listing.
>>
>> Prompt, courteous service for manual copies of many kinds.
>>
>>
>>
>> No! Don't do it!
>>
>> Everything I write here you call a LIE and distortion! It can't be
>> true! Don't go there!
>
> A couple of points, Lennie...
>
> First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
>distortion.

YES you have. Plus a LOT more in the form of excessive personal
insults of many kinds.

> I HAVE publically stated in this forum that I acknowledge that
>you know far more about the inner workings of the box than I do.

You have NEVER said anything in public about "my having far more
(knowledge) about the inner workings of the (FM2015R) box."

NEVER.

If the "FM2015R" is an amateur radio, then, by YOUR own rules in
here, I cannot possibly know anything about it because I have "zero"
experience in amateur radio.

Your "definition" is multiply faulty. I have learned many many things
about radio and have applied them in all disciplines of such radio.
All radios work by the SAME physics regardless of any human

legislation or advertising/marketing or membership organizations say.

>When
>YOU respond in a fraternal, respectful manner I ahve done the same
>(ie: a couple years ago when I asked about plastic model
>sources...Your INITIAL response was polite, precise and appreciated)

I am NOT a "member of any fraternity."

Mentions in public of other sources in this newsgroup is done for the BENEFIT of all, not for any 'fraternalism.' All public access newsgroups are readable by all and are NOT one-on-one private correspondance.

But, YOU cannot ever remain "in phase" with what you say and MUST vent your rage against another you personally dislike. That is exemplified by the following -

> What I ALSO have said is that you lie and mislead people about
>the character of the AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, that you find it necessary
>to use demeaning and belittling endearments in order to place yourself
>above everyone else, and that your purpose in doing so is for mere
>spite, nothing else. (ie: your SECOND response to the above referenced
>item wherein you made a 180 deg turnabout and resumed your typical
>snide manner)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You have been taken to task for demonstrating an unusual personal mythos about amateur radio that is not real. That has already been explained to you. You refuse to accept it...and must continue to dwell on your peculiar personal outrage and disagreements...which you did as shown.

You inadvertently LIE in stating I say "bad things" about the Amateur Radio Service. I do NOT. I state up front that I say bad things about INDIVIDUALS who have amateur radio licenses, because they do so.

YOU do NOT represent ALL of U.S. amateur radio. Ergo, you cannot transpose your personality to that of ALL U.S. radio amateurs. (they would feel or should feel insulted by such a gross misrepresentation)

YOU cannot seem to accept the slightest correction or rebuke or even difference of opinion to your own personal opinions with any sort of civility. YOU can't handle the truth and typify the "Colonel Jessups" of your imaginary "service" world.*

> That you started off on a purely fraternal offer of information
>for another radio hobbyist was appreciated.

YOU have repeatedly claimed that I am not allied in any way with U.S. amateur radio. Now you claim "fraternal offers." A LIE of a LIE by yourself. [how hypocritical can 'done peyote...' be?]

The "W7FG Manuals" service is an old one and links to the business are made on many websites of interest to hams as well as hobbyists.

There are many businesses involved in supplying service manuals
for electronic equipment, easily found by a simple Search function
available at all major ISPs. I suggest a review of the functions
available to AOL users as a benefit to your own education for
Internet operations.

> That you finsihed off in your usual spiteful slashing was
>typical. At elast this time you did it all in one post...

There is NO "elast" in or about time. TRY to control rage and anger
when typing. Clean copy is a positive attribute in communications.

>PS...Thanks for the tip, Len.

WHAT "tip?" W7FG has been supplying manuals for a long time.

I never looked to see if your particular part number was available
there. I just pulled down a copy of an H-P 606A signal generator
manual that I obtained from there two years ago. The business
name (using an amateur radio callsign, a grey area in "non-
pecuniary" definition of amateur radio in a business name) is
printed predominently on its cover.

Did you go to the www.w7fg.com site to check for yourself? Or
didn't you just shoot off your keyboard in personal rage and anger
about imaginary slights against your attitudes and opinions in
long-ago discussions now defunct?

Why are you always so angry and rage-filled, wanting to fight all
the time? Have you seen an analyst or therapist to cure that
aggressive, uncivil behavior?

Try getting on the list for the first copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies"
that is rumored to arrive in April. Get one. You may learn
something about the insides of radio and electronics boxes and
become productive in your amateur community.

Keep up that good work on the morse code and making sure that
all U.S. prospective radio amateurs MUST take that code test
forever and ever. Morse code can be "a significant factor" in
emergencies and "play a major role" there as the League blabs.

LHA / WMD

* "Colonel Jessup" is the character in the film "A Few Good Men"
and protrayed convincingly by actor Jack Nicholson. The
character of Colonel Jessup was removed from the military court
in arrest at the end of the film after the character lost his cool
arrogance. "You can't handle the truth!" is Colonel Jessups'
now-famous line that reveals his arrogance and imaginary beliefs
about those not in the USMC.

853. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212342.23307.00007253@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88865

In article <1e4e3692.0403110402.433f1692@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040310225210.05957.00000917@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403101615.6b91753d@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Perhaps a third personality, Don Quixoterobeson?
>>
>> I think it's more like Done Peyoterobeson...
>
>That could explain a lot!

It's one possibility...and no one need worry Cervantes fans with that.

Given the royal "we" he insists on used, there may be another
personality. Rather than borrow from Cervantes and use "Sancho
Panza" I think that this other personality is more like Pancho Villa.

That fits the widely exhibited rage and anger demonstrated in posts
by him. Unfortunately, Pancho Villa didn't succeed in real life. :-)

LHA / WMD

854. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212343.23307.00007254@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88867

In article <5c01b95b.0403110159.1356679d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403101612.5c893311@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> > As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
>> > whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),
>>
>> I make typo's, but its just poor hand placement on the keyboard or
>> mispelled word.
>>
>> It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.
>
> Again...YOU ARE IN ERROR...

Your postings are, and have been evidenciary of consistent rage and anger against anyone who disagrees with you.

> What >>I<< have stated is that said mistakes are "rage" as
>defined by "your mentor", that being Lennie.

Everyone can see the actual rage in hundreds of postings.

Such rage is only intensified by someone pointing out what already exists.

> It is NOT my assertion that it is such. Ask around, Brain...YOUR
>attribution is WRONG.

Not at all. It is correct and to the point.

Refusal to acknowledge what everyone else can see is only denial on your part.

>> > coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names,
>>
>> Keeps? First change in about four (4) years. I got a whopping four
>> (4) spam emails today on my real email account since posting under
>> this throwaway screen name.
>
> I have zero. So what's YOUR problem...?!?!

Did "K4CAP" exist four years ago? :-)

Did the long, libelous fictious screen name you tried to use on AOL
to put an even more gross libelous distortion of one individual in an
AOL home page? It only existed for three days but some saw it.
AOL member services wiped that home page clean and took away
your new, extra screen name.

Others, particularly AOL members, can find out that there are
several screen names under your single account.

So, you've tried to bluff through another very wrong statement. You
will not acknowledge that those screen names exist and your only
comeback will be misdirections into more personal insults.

>> I'd rethink
>> > making such a silly insinuation...
>>
>> Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.
>>
>> 1. Over-the-top, and
>>
>> 2. Major-Whacked-Out.
>
> OK, Brain...if you insist. As long as it makes you feel warm and
>fuzzy to hold on to it.

Reality isn't making warm and fuzzy. Reality can be harsh, cruel.

Stay in your little imaginary world where you are safe, even if nuts.

You need to relax. Go away from the Internet and play with your
radios. The Internet is full of those who have and can put you down.

LHA / WMD

855. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212345.23307.00007256@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88866

In article <%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
>> a major role in emergency comms.
>
>I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not
>let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a
>significant role.

Define "significant role."

That's an emotionally-loaded indefinite adjective designed to state an opinion rather than any quanitifed value. It is very useful to membership organizations in trying to get new members by appeals to their personal need for recognition.

>You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur
>radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms.

Such as...?

Define "major role" by general terms of reference, NOT from the League's point of view.

Go to any newspaper or broadcasting archive and research the above assertation before stating it again (incorrectly).

Amateur radio COULD play a major role and it MIGHT do so at some future time. It just hasn't done so in the mass media.

>My position is and
>has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as
>possible.

That is very true.

That has also been used as a rationale to continue morse code testing for U.S. radio amateurs. According to the tRoll yodelings in here, morse code has been the base rock, the cornerstone of his imaginary world of "emergencies."

>No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out
>in the next emergency.

That INCLUDES amateur radio.

Try to remember that last sentence in FULL reality.

LHA / WMD

856. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212345.23307.00007255@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88869

In article <1e4e3692.0403110406.71f51c2b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
>> > a major role in emergency comms.
>>
>> I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not
>> let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a
>> significant role. You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur
>> radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms. My position is
>and
>> has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as
>> possible. No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out
>> in the next emergency.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>I too think that multiple forms of communications are the best bet
>when the chips are down.
>
>But cell phones sure are playing a much larger role than amateur radio
>in emergency communications.

Brian, reminding folks that 100 MILLION cell phone subscriptions
have been taken out in the USA is not a valid fact to Believers.

Believers - those whose only access amateur radio sites and
especially that of the League - cannot rid themselves of the
urban myth that "cell phones always fail in an emergency."

Believers don't believe that any other "radios" except cell phones
and amateur radio exist. They don't believe that Public Safety
(police, fire, ambulance, etc.) services ever use their radios in
emergencies...the "emergency" in their minds seems to be of
such a large scale, so devastating that Public Safety agencies
are also "down." They don't believe that there are hundreds of
thousands of other radios in utility companies, taxicabs, private
corporations, private boats, private and commercial aviation can
even be used in any emergencies. Believers don't believe that
any government agency such as FEMA can use "radio" or
acknowledge that such is ever used in any emergency. Believers
don't even bother to consider the U.S. military or the various states'

National Guards, all of whom have portable or mobile radios, radios designed for survivability and operability in the very harsh environment of warfare.

Believers only believe in three kinds of radios - amateur, cell phones, and some vague amorphous 'other kind' not specified because they don't know anything about all those 'other kinds.' Believers only believe that "cell phones always go down in emergencies" but amateur radio is always so robust and damage proof that all of them survive and continue to work.

Believers believe what they are told by the League who seems to always say that "amateur radio was 'significant' in some emergency (or event of occasion)."* The League doesn't define 'significant' since that would take away the emotional loading that makes all League members and other amateurs very proud, warm, and fuzzy...which is what they want to do to increase interest in joining the League to keep getting proud, warm, fuzzy feelings through membership.

* the homonymic phrase "played a major role" is sometimes used for similar effect. Also, NASA astronauts who accept getting a ham license as one of the many tasks of having to do required NASA public relations are always labeled as "ham-astronauts" to get folks proud, warm, and fuzzy thinking that they got to be astronauts through their amateur radio license first.

All throughout Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, the word "service" is used as a regulatory term meaning a type and kind of radio activity being regulated. Believers insist that "service" means the same as "a service to the country." They don't acknowledge that amateur radio is basically an avocational pursuit, a hobby, done without pecuniary compensation to enjoy a particular radio activity. No, Believers insist that "they perform a service to the nation" through having a ham hobby, much in the same way the we both served our country in the military.

Believers cannot be convinced of reality. Believers are a cult stuck in an imaginary world reinforced by the many words of membership organizations into mythical proportions. Anything said to disturb their pride and warm, fuzzy feelings about their hobby are considered heretical and damnations of their national service.

LHA / WMD

857. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 02:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040311212347.23307.00007257@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 88871

In article <XXQ3c.97334$aH3.2953648@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Hank Oredson" <horedson@att.net> writes:

>"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...
>> On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
>wrote:
>>
>> >Tony P. wrote:
>> >
>> >> We really need to fight this and make them do the right thing. And it's
>> >> a bit like un-ringing the bell. There are a whole lot of transceivers
>> >> out there that put out anywhere from 50W to 200W right out of the box.
>> >> And a whole lot more amps that kick up to the 1.5KW range. Granted, the
>> >> FCC knows who and where every ham in the U.S. happens to be, but they
>> >> don't know exactly what gear you've got do they? I mean I'm an extra
>> >> without an HF rig right now.
>> >>
>> >> And when you think about it, a properly placed 5W transmitter will do
>> >> stuttering wonders for BPL.
>> >>
>> >> BPL needs to be killed and pronto.
>> >
>> >
>> >The FCC tune has already changed. Read the article at:
>> >
>> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/03/09/1/?nc=1
>> >
>> >Notice the FCC statement "...Powell responded to the question by saying
>> >the FCC would not let BPL interfere with critical services."
>> >
>> >Now the protection appears to have migrated to "critical" services only,
>> >and the burden of proof is thus shifted to amateur radio to show how our
>> >service is "critical" and worthy of protection against the
>> >best-thing-since-sliced-bread BPL.
>> >
>> >And they are about to lock up a goddamn housewife while these vultures
>> >roam unimpeded...
>> >
>> >
>> > 73 ... WA7AA
>>
>> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
>> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few

>amateurs
>> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that
>unjustifiably occupies
>> valuable radio spectrum.
>
>
>Well, guess you are not a US Radio Amateur, or you would
>know that Amateur Radio is not a hobby, but is a service.

I hazard a guess that YOU are misinformed.

All throughout Title 47, C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory term
denoting a type and kind of radio activity being regulated.

It is NOT a "service" the same a military service, a jury service, or a
service for eight used in dining.

>If you ARE a ham and live in the US, please go read Part 97 again.

It is not necessary to be licensed as a radio amateur to read
Part 97 of Title 47 C.F.R. All the Parts of Title 47 are adminstered
by a Commission and staff, none of whom need to be licensed in
ANY radio service.

LHA / WMD

858. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 03:00:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040311220041.06226.00003361@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88872

In article <Xns94A9C0B7B1EE5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>>>news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>>> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>><snip>
>>>>>
>>>>> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
>>>>> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
>>>>> offshore production.
>>>>
>>>> Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
>>>> such.
>>>
>>>Or foreign adventuring.
>>
>> We had good teachers in that....
>
>Guilty as charged

Exactly. You'd think we'd learn by others' mistakes.
>>
>>>>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite
>>>>> their overall poverty they have more English speaking educated
>>>>> middle class than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they
>>>>> are willing to do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
>>>>
>>>> Only because it costs so much less to live there.
>>>
>>>That's true, and ironically that's probably due to the huge number of
>>>poor people there. Basic food and services are likely to be provided to
>>>the Indian middle classes by people who are far poorer than we can
>>>really imagine.
>>
>> That's true but there are other factors to consider: the budget
>> deficit, the trade deficit and the strong dollar.

>>
>> The figures for the January trade deficit came out recently. The
>> highest in US history, something like 46 billion in one month. Much of
>> that is with East Asian countires like China, Japan, and maybe India.
>> But particularly China.
>>
>> Imports are inexpensive in part because these countries keep their
>> currencies low relative to the dollar. Because of the trade deficit,
>> lots of dollars wind up there, but they don't use those dollars to buy
>> US products. Instead, they buy US investments - both government
>> securities and private-sector companies.
>>
>> IOW we export money and jobs, and they use the money to finance our
>> debt and buy up the USA a little at a time.
>>
>>>> Way back in 1783, when the US Constitution was written here in
>>>> Philadelphia, one of the limitations placed on Congress was that
>>>> there would be no tariffs on *exports*. *Imports* could be
>>>> tarriffed/taxed at will - and they were! This was done both as a
>>>> source of income and to protect local industry from destructive
>>>> foreign competition. It is my understanding that we still have some
>>>> forms of this in place, in the form of such things as limits on the
>>>> number of cars that may be imported without special taxes. These
>>>> import quotas caused several carmakers (mostly Japanese) to build
>>>> assembly plants here in the USA. Some cars are even built here and
>>>> shipped *back to Japan*, because by doing so they count against the
>>>> import number.
>>>>
>>>> Maybe it's time for that sort of thing to be expanded. Exporting jobs
>>>> may be good for some companies' bottom line in the short run, but in
>>>> the long run it spells big trouble.
>>>>
>>
>>>Forgive me for saying this as a foreigner, but there seems to be no
>>>limit to the level of greed exhibited by corporate America.
>>
>> How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much
>> profit is OK and how much is greed?
>
>It's more of an attitude

Check this out:

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&cid=1802&ncid=716&e=17&u=/washpost/20040311/ts_washpost/a48216_2004mar10

"Six months after promising to create an office to help the nation's struggling manufacturers, President Bush settled on someone to head it, but the nomination was being reconsidered last night after Democrats revealed that his candidate had opened a factory in China."

73 de Jim, N2EY

859. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 03:16:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88873

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Were you two colleagues in third grade???
>
> Perhaps.. I knew a "Dee" in gradeschool, however I doubt we were
> classmates.
>

Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

860. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 03:48:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88874

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Thomas Jefferson, as enlightened and as forward looking as he may
> > > have been, could have hardly envisioned the United States as it exists
> > > today.
> >
> > True. He would vomit blood at the welfare state that we have become.
>
> WHOA, BillyB! You at once espouse making Amateur Radio a
> "once-size-fits-all" radio service, then make reference to a "welfare
> state"...?!?!
>
> Nice turn-about there! Get whiplash making that turn...?!?!

You see, TJ liked the government that governed the least. He was part
of the war against arbitrary and unnecessary government tyranny.

> > > You keep trying to avoid the very real truth that Amateur Radio
> > > STILL fills a need, even in these early days of the 21st century.
> >
> > I accept that. However, what I find amusing is that you and Dee
> > cannot accept that other forms of communications are fast eclipsing
> > amateur radio as a means of portable emergency communications.
>
> I have NEVER, in this forum or any other, refused to acknowledged
> that other radio, wireline, or other common carrier services provide
> any other means of "portable emergency communications".

> I challenge you to prove otherwise.

You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
role in emergency response communications.

> What I HAVE stated in this and other forums is that Amateur Radio
> CONTINUES to provide a necessary and almost irreplaceable asset.

To the exclusion of all other communications means. At least until
you posted the above.

NO
> OTHER RADIO SERVICE provides the flexibility and utility that Amateur
> Radio does.

You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.

> I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.

Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.

> > > These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
> > > from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
> > > benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
> > > the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
> > > programs.
> >
> > And cell phones.
>
> How well does a cellphone operate without a functioning cellsite,
> Brain?

Don, if you can say my cell site is dead, I can say your ham radio is
dead.

> Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
> role.

Just did.

> I have NEVER said anything even CLOSE to the idea that we're the
> only game in town. Quite the contrary.

You omit any discussion that any other radio service or common carrier
can provide emergency comms. That is a form of lying.

> I >>HAVE<< said we provide a service to those who make the plans
> and need the help.

Until the emergency happens, you don't know who your customer might be
or if you can provide a service to him or her.

Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
not emergencies.

> > > > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > > > > a valuable asset.
> > > >
> > > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > > comm outages?
> > >
> > > How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
> > > involvement?

> >
> > You'll have to ask Dee.
>
> I am asking you.

You'll have to ask Dee.

> > > Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
> > > employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
> > > LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.
> >
> > And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?
> >
> > Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
> > communications during the east coast power outage?
>
> Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> an assertion, Brain...?!?!

Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
outages?

> > Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?
>
> Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> an assertion, Brain...?!?!

Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular sites are
capable of operating in an emergency?

> > C'mon, third grader, explain cell phones from of the picture. Tell us
> > that cell phones played NO role?
>
> WHERE do you GET such assinine insinuations, Brain...?!?!
>
> I have NEVER made ANY SUCH ASSERTION!

Just making a clarification. Just trying to get your non-verbals on
paper.

> > > Amateur Radio's contributions in emergencies does NOT exist
> > > solely "when the comms are down".
> >
> > C'mon, third grader, show us where I stated that.
>
> From above:
>
> > > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > > comm outages?
>
> The INSINUATION you make here is VERY clear...in YOUR estimation,

> the "comms" had to be "down" in order for Amateur Radio to have played
> a role in "emergency comms".
>
> "Emergency comms" are NOT >>only<< when the wires are down or the
> cell site destroyed, Brain.

JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
always up. That is the picture he paints.

> Perhaps if you were actively involved in the programs of some
> disaster mitigation agency you might have a better insight as to what
> Amateur Radio's OTHER roles are...?!?!

I was a MARS volunteer and BST member. I have no problem with that
concept. But there sure are a lot of DP planners running around with
cellular telephones nowadays.

> > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > a major role in emergency comms.
>
> What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> compliant devices?

Sure. Why not?

> Cellphones are a "fee-for-service" provided by the common
> carriers under the auspices of THIER licenses.

THIER?

> > Were you two colleagues in third grade???
>
> Perhaps.. I knew a "Dee" in gradeschool, however I doubt we were
> classmates.
>
> On the otherhand we both seem to acknowledge that Amateur Radio
> plays a PART in emergency communications, and that PART is
> acknowledged and incorporated by almost every major disaster
> mitigation organization in the United States, including FEMA, The Red
> Cross, The Salvation Army, the Department of Defense, the Department
> of State, most state's OES's, etc etc etc.
>
> Unless, of course, you have evidence to the contrary...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

861. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 03:56:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403111956.53078b39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88875

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110159.1356679d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101612.5c893311@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
> > > whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),
> > >
> > I make typo's, but its just poor hand placement on the keyboard or
> > mispelled word.
> > >
> > It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.
> >
> Again...YOU ARE IN ERROR...

And the first time I saw that theory it was -you- who had presented
it, without attributing the author/originator.

Now you are saying that you simply stole it and presented it as your
own material?

> What >>I<< have stated is that said mistakes are "rage" as
> defined by "your mentor", that being Lennie.

Nice backtracking. When you "used" Len's material, you gave no
attribution. You presented it as if it were your own idea.

> It is NOT my assertion that it is such. Ask around, Brain...YOUR
> attribution is WRONG.

Your lack of attribution is wrong.

> > > coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names,
> > >
> > Keeps? First change in about four (4) years. I got a whopping four
> > (4) spam emails today on my real email account since posting under
> > this throwaway screen name.
> >
> I have zero. So what's YOUR problem...?!?!

I have no problem.

> > I'd rethink
> > > making such a silly insinuation...
> > >

> > Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.
> >
> > 1. Over-the-top, and
> >
> > 2. Major-Whacked-Out.
>
> OK, Brain...if you insist. As long as it makes you feel warm and
> fuzzy to hold on to it.
>
> In the mean time, please work on getting YOUR problem with
> attributes fixed, OK...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You can help by getting your attribs correct. If you steal someone elses work, at least give them credit for the intellectual property that was stolen. Best of luck to you.

862. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 03:58:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8eGdnd7z6MIep8zdRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88877

Witless William wrote:

>
>
> JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
> always up. That is the picture he paints.

Please show us where I made those statements.

863. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 04:01:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ro2dnRo49dfJpszd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88879

And witless William also wrote:

>
> I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
will be there if needed.

864. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 04:02:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88876

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Sorry, Steve Quixote'robeson, but it has become an eternal truth of
> > RRAP that you're not worthy of serious discussion.
>
> Then you've only proven yet again that you don't understand
> what's going on.
>
> This is only about "me" in that I keep "calling you" on you and
> Lennie's misrepresentations on the character of the Amateur Radio
> service.
>
> YOU are the one who keeps trying to somehow make this about "me".
> It's not. It's only about "me" in that I tick you off by rubbing
> YOUR nose in YOUR inaccuracies and innuendos.
>
> Sorry to upset you, but YOU keep providing me with the material
> to work with. (BTW...thanks...)
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
yourself.

You're obsessed.

865. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 04:22:55 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <theletter_k_andthenumeral_4_doh@unclaimedmysteries.net>
Message-ID: <zWa4c.900$GQ3.423@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

Jack Gibson wrote:
> doberman <doberman_2000_us@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<104v2p6q70ps546@corp.supernews.com>...
>
>
>>(several hundred lines deleted)
>>
>>PC'ness is stupidity
>
>
> As opposed to quoting the whole fucking message to add
> a one line comment?
>
> - Jack

Me too.

--
It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Religion isn't the opiate of the masses. When
properly used, religion is the methamphetamine
of the masses." - nu-monet v6.0 in alt.slack

866. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 04:41:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6OudnXj4kNgXoszdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88880

N2EY wrote:

> Check this out:
>
> http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&cid=1802&ncid=716&e=17&u=/wash
> post/20040311/ts_washpost/a48216_2004mar10
>
> "Six months after promising to create an office to help the nation's
> struggling manufacturers, President Bush settled on someone to head it, but
> the nomination was being reconsidered last night after Democrats revealed
> that his candidate had opened a factory in China."

He ended up "declining" to take the position. Probably a smart move.

- Mike KB3EIA -

867. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 11:52:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403120352.1bc1b2d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88881

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I went to Mickey's Razzle Dazzle in Council Bluffs, IA.

868. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 11:53:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4051A4D9.DD8DDC79@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88882

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >> >>> these per year.
> >> >>
> >> >> Those are good practice.
> >> >>
> >>
> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
> >
> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
> >
> >> It can be done very well
> >> without any amateur radio help
> >
> >How do you know?
>
> 1. By reading about it in a respected newspaper.

Grit? USA Today, the newspaper for those who haven't the time for CNN's
in-depth coverage?

> 2. By viewing it on broadcast television.

You strike me as the kind of guy who has time for lots of things, like
watching an entire marathon in order to see if amateur radio is involved
or like making numerous lengthy posts to an internet newsgroup which
deals with an activity in which you are not a participant.

> 3. By knowing some details about it from one of its officials.

One official. Some details. Yep, that makes you an expert on the L.A.
Marathon.

> > Ever work at a race?
>
> Not in a foot race.

Political race?

> Why is that important to the "Economy, Stupid?"

Allow me to jog your memory. Jim responded to your comments. How did
they relate to the "Economy", Stupid?

> >LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
> >for race communications for years.
>
> If you insist...and you WILL insist. You are a Believer.

He didn't insist. He provided you with a way to check out details.

> Have you ever been IN Los Angeles?

Have you ever been in Bissau?

> Have you ever worked IN any volunteer function here?

Did you ever worked in any capacity in Bissau?

> YOU have NO relationship with the city of Los Angeles. I live here.
> You don't.

YOU must BE an EXPERT. YOU live THERE so YOU must KNOW everything which
goes on THERE.

> Reality check: ANY marathon foot race can be done with available
> non-amateur radio communications readily available in any large
> urban area. The first Olympic marathon event was done without any
> amateur radio "help." Several Games after that had NO amateur
> radio "help" and also succeeded.

That's nice. You were provided links to information which seems to
disprove your earlier statements. Your "first Olympic marathon" tap
dance isn't going to get you on "American Idol".

> >Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
> >and play no role. That's simply Not True.
>
> I don't care one way or another about "ham radio help in marathons."

That's odd. You certainly seemed to care when you decided to take
another shot at amateur radio by bringing up the topic.

> I know a marathon can be run WITHOUT amateur radio help. That's
> been done many times.

A marathon. You brought up the Los Angeles Marathon. Run without
amateur radio help? Those links provided by Jim seem to disprove your
claims, kindly old gent.

> You keep insisting amateur radio MUST be there...and that's simply
> Not True.

What's not true is that amateur radio wasn't there. Look at the links.

> Now go do some DX or gab expertly about The Economy, Kosher
> Food, or choo-choo trains. Don't they need "ham radio help?"

Why, Len? Are you a ham?

Dave K8MN

869. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 11:55:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403120355.a024ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88883

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<8eGdnd7z6MIep8zdRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
> > always up. That is the picture he paints.
>
> Please show us where I made those statements.

See your second post , this subject.

870. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 11:57:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4051A5A2.21999BF6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88884

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much profit is
> >OK and how much is greed?
>
> Profit is defined as pecuniary compensation for services rendered.

That'd be incorrect. You'd have to deduct expenditures first.

> U.S. amateur radio is defined as specifically NOT for pecuniary interest.

No kidding? Are you a radio amateur?

> Try to stay focussed.

Are we to do as you do or do as you say, Leonard?

Dave K8MN

871. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 12:10:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403120410.5fcfb293@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88885

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212342.23307.00007253@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> It's one possibility...and no one need worry Cervantes fans with that.
>
> Given the royal "we" he insists on used, there may be another
> personality. Rather than borrow from Cervantes and use "Sancho
> Panza" I think that this other personality is more like Pancho Villa.
>
> That fits the widely exhibited rage and anger demonstrated in posts
> by him. Unfortunately, Pancho Villa didn't succeed in real life. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

I think we sent Pershing and McArthur after Pancho. On rrap,
Panchorobeson gets a pass.

872. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 15:26:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403120726.64fcefe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88886

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212341.23307.00007252@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > A couple of points, Lennie...
> >
> > First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
> >distortion.
>
> YES you have. Plus a LOT more in the form of excessive personal
> insults of many kinds.

No, I have not.

You'd better re-think that, since Google is at EVERYONE'S
disposal.

Do you REALLY want me to go pull up an example and PROVE YOU
WRONG AGAIN?

> > I HAVE publically stated in this forum that I acknowledge that
> >you know far more about the inner workings of the box than I do.
>
> You have NEVER said anything in public about "my having far more
> (knowledge) about the inner workings of the (FM2015R) box."

YES, I have, although not SPECIFICALLY about the FM2015R...

I have SPECIFICALLY stated that I acknowledge that your superior
knowledge of the inner workings of "the box" (refering to electronic
devices generically) on SEVERAL occassions.

Again, if you put me to the task of wading through all thos
Google archives to once again prove you WRONG, I will, but then I will
have bragging rights on you for the next decade.

> NEVER.

Never say never, Pumpkin...cuz if you DO, it WILL come back to
HAUNT YOU!

> If the "FM2015R" is an amateur radio, then, by YOUR own rules in
> here, I cannot possibly know anything about it because I have "zero"
> experience in amateur radio.

The FM2015R is an elctronic device designed to be used primarily
by licensed Radio Amateurs.

I don't fault your knowledge of electronics...I fault your
knowledge of AMATEUR PRACTICE. I am sure you were an adequate bench
technician at some point in your life, and could probably do OK with
current technology.

> Your "definition" is multiply faulty. I have learned many many things
> about radio and have applied them in all disciplines of such radio.
> All radios work by the SAME physics regardless of any human
> legislation or advertising/marketing or membership organizations say.

And as I have sated over and over and over, Lennie...

It's NOT about the physics of radio...It's about application...

> >When
> >YOU respond in a fraternal, respectful manner I ahve done the same
> >(ie: a couple years ago when I asked about plastic model
> >sources...Your INITIAL response was polite, precise and appreciated)
>
> I am NOT a "member of any fraternity."

I did not say you were a member of a fraternity.

Please QUOTE the EXACT statement wheerein you alledge that I said
you did.

> Mentions in public of other sources in this newsgroup is done for
> the BENEFIT of all, not for any 'fraternalism.' All public access
> newsgroups are readable by all and are NOT one-on-one private
> correspondance.
>
> But, YOU cannot ever remain "in phase" with what you say and
> MUST vent your rage against another you personally dislike. That
> is exemplified by the following -
>
> > What I ALSO have said is that you lie and mislead people about
> >the character of the AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, that you find it necessary
> >to use demeaning and belittling endearments in order to place yourself
> >above everyone else, and that your purpose in doing so is for mere
> >spite, nothing else. (ie: your SECOND response to the above referenced
> >item wherein you made a 180 deg turnabout and resumed your typical
> >snide manner)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. You have been taken to task for demonstrating an
> unusual personal mythos about amateur radio that is not real. That
> has already been explained to you. You refuse to accept it...and
> must continue to dwell on your peculiar personal outrage and
> disagreements...which you did as shown.

Lennie, there is nothing about Amateur Radio in any aspect of
which I participate that is "not real".

You have TRIED to "explain" your OPINION on Amateur Radio, but in
as much as you have NO practical experience from which to substantiate

your comments, you usually falter in facts!

> You inadvertently LIE in stating I say "bad things" about the Amateur
> Radio Service. I do NOT. I state up front that I say bad things about
> INDIVIDUALS who have amateur radio licenses, because they do so.

I have not lied, inadvertently or otherwise.

Furthermore YOUR above statement is in-and-of-itself untrue.

You BLATANTLY stated the American Radio Relay League is
dishonest. When tasked with providing something OTHER than your
opinion, you have failed to do so.

No evidence = Obvious lie.

> YOU do NOT represent ALL of U.S. amateur radio. Ergo, you cannot
> transpose your personality to that of ALL U.S. radio amateurs. (they
> would feel or should feel insulted by such a gross misrepresentation)

No, I don't. But I "represent" enough who share some of the same
opinions when it comes to YOUR honesty, integrity and character.

> YOU cannot seem to accept the slightest correction or rebuke or
> even difference of opinion to your own personal opinions with any
> sort of civility. YOU can't handle the truth and typify the "Colonel
> Jessups" of your imaginary "service" world.*

I accept lots of "corrections"...Especially when it's brought to
my attention in the same fashion that the bearer would like to
beaddressed if the shoe were on the other foot.

And it's not YOUR place to "rebuke" anyone in this forum. You
don't have the experience in Amateur practice from which to make an
informed correction.

> > That you started off on a purely fraternal offer of information
> >for another radio hobbyist was appreciated.
>
> YOU have repeatedly claimed that I am not allied in any way with
> U.S. amateur radio. Now you claim "fraternal offers." A LIE of
> a LIE by yourself. [how hypocritical can 'done peyote...' be?]

You are NOT "allied in any way with U. S. amateur radio"...

GOOGLE is not "allied" with Amateur Radio, yet I can find
information from it, too...Shall we get the FCC to send Google a
license?

> The "W7FG Manuals" service is an old one and links to the business
> are made on many websites of interest to hams as well as hobbyists.

Congratulations on having this bit of knowledge at hand.

> There are many businesses involved in supplying service manuals
> for electronic equipment, easily found by a simple Search function
> available at all major ISPs. I suggest a review of the functions
> available to AOL users as a benefit to your own education for
> Internet operations.

I was willing to take the info you suppled, say "tahnks" and be
on my way.

You found it necessary to add the lampooning. No problem. I can
play too.

> > That you finsihed off in your usual spiteful slashing was
> >typical. At elast this time you did it all in one post...
>
> There is NO "elast" in or about time. TRY to control rage and anger
> when typing. Clean copy is a positive attribute in communications.

A typo is not about rage or anger. It's about the wrong finger
on teh wrong key at the wrong time...Nothing else.

> >PS...Thanks for the tip, Len.
>
> WHAT "tip?" W7FG has been supplying manuals for a long time.

So...?!?!

You can't take a bit of gratitude for your efforts?

If someone doesn't know about something and you inform them of
it, you just gave them a "tip". I didn't know about W7FG. Now I do.
If I am asked a similar question by anotehr person, I'll pass it on.

> I never looked to see if your particular part number was available
> there. I just pulled down a copy of an H-P 606A signal generator
> manual that I obtained from there two years ago. The business
> name (using an amateur radio callsign, a grey area in "non-
> pecuniary" definition of amateur radio in a business name) is
> printed predominently on its cover.
>
> Did you go to the www.w7fg.com site to check for yourself? Or
> didn't you just shoot off your keyboard in personal rage and anger
> about imaginary slights against your attitudes and opinions in
> long-ago discussions now defunct?

No, I've not gone to the W7FG site yet. That's for the weekend.

Nothing I stated in either post addressed the functionality of
the W7FG site or whether or not I found what I am looking for.

My comments were directly relevent to YOUR shooting your mouth
off again.

> Why are you always so angry and rage-filled, wanting to fight all
> the time? Have you seen an analyst or therapist to cure that

> aggressive, uncivil behavior?

Why did YOU feel compelled to express YOUR anger? Why are YOU so
"rage-filled" about Amateur Radio that you feel compelled to spend an
obscene amount of time lambasting persons who DO love it?

I am in this forum becasue I am a LICENSED Radio Amateur.

If anyone needs a therapist, it's you, Putzy One.

> Try getting on the list for the first copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies"
> that is rumored to arrive in April. Get one. You may learn
> something about the insides of radio and electronics boxes and
> become productive in your amateur community.

Too late, Lennie...I am already a productive member of the
Amateur Radio community.

> Keep up that good work on the morse code and making sure that
> all U.S. prospective radio amateurs MUST take that code test
> forever and ever. Morse code can be "a significant factor" in
> emergencies and "play a major role" there as the League blabs.

Too bad you are so self absorbed in YOUR rage, Lennie, to haev
paid attention to other exchanges in the last, oh, two or three years,
to know where I really stand on this.

> * "Colonel Jessup" is the character in the film "A Few Good Men"
> and protrayed convincingly by actor Jack Nicholson. The
> character of Colonel Jessup was removed from the military court
> in arrest at the end of the film after the character lost his cool
> arrogance. "You can't handle the truth!" is Colonel Jessups'
> now-famous line that reveals his arrogance and imaginary beliefs
> about those not in the USMC.

Hot flash, Lennie...I WAS in the USMC, and "Colonel Jessup", as
portrayed by Mr Nicholson was a fictional character without precedent
or model.

You try to pidgeon-hole me with some lame rhetoric about "mythos"
of Amateur Radio, but then you try and make real-world analogies with
fictional movie characters...

Yes, Lennie...One of us needs "therapy", but one of them is NOT
me...

Take another hit of the Geritol, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

873. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 16:02:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403120802.1751dfd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88887

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212347.23307.00007257@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> In article <XXQ3c.97334$aH3.2953648@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, "Hank
> Oredson" <horedson@att.net> writes:>

>>Well, guess you are not a US Radio Amateur, or you would
>>know that Amateur Radio is not a hobby, but is a service.
>
> I hazard a guess that YOU are misinformed.
>
> All throughout Title 47, C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory term
> denoting a type and kind of radio activity being regulated.
>
> It is NOT a "service" the same a military service, a jury service, or a
> service for eight used in dining.

Hank...you'll have to forgive Lennie.

You're correct in your assumption that Lennie is NOT an Amateur
Radio licensee...He almost takes "pride" in it.

He spends hundreds of hours ranting in a forum over a radio
service that he specifically expresses disdain and disgust for, all in
the name of exercising his right to be a putz. (THAT he does WELL!)
Then when members of that forum have the audacity to defend what they
know to be true (from practical experience), he "dismisses" them with
allegations of being Nazis, "jack-booted-thugs", "elitists", etc etc
etc...

> >If you ARE a ham and live in the US, please go read Part 97 again.
>
> It is not necessary to be licensed as a radio amateur to read
> Part 97 of Title 47 C.F.R. All the Parts of Title 47 are adminstered
> by a Commission and staff, none of whom need to be licensed in
> ANY radio service.

It's irrelevent that the Commissioners are not licensees. Such is
the nature of our government. The ladies down at the Clerk of Courts
office issue driver's licenses for 18-wheelers and dump trucks, but I
never see any of them driving one.

We are discussing the Amateur Radio SERVICE. Lennie tries to
skew the conversation by claiming that others refer to it as they
would the ARMED Forces as a "service".

The rules and regulations that pertain to the Amateur Radio Service (in the United States, anyway...) very specifically spell out certain expectations that those same Commissioners that Lennie refers to have for the ARS.

None of them say "fun".

But is this a fun way to spend one's time...!??! OF COURSE!

Is it CODIFIED that this is ONLY a HOBBY...?!?! Of course NOT!

Lennie has made other absurd claims of other radio services existing for "solely recreational purposes", yet I cannot for the life of me find ANY such service in ANY part of 47CFR...No where...When asked to produce a reference to such service, he's failed to produce.

Of course you'll not find the word "hobby" in any part of Part 97, but Lennie assures us that that's what the Commissioners "meant"...(of course he's also NOT an FCC commissioner, nor does he have a degree in jurisprudence)

Soooooo.....Lennie can ramble on for hours about his rights, his perceptions of the Amateur Radio service, his exploits with HF radio while in the Army in 1953, etc etc etc...He also spends much time whining about how HE is treated, yet he usually engages those who dismiss/ignore/refute him with profanities, indignities and inuendo...And THEN cries "FOUL!" when it's revisited upon him in like fashion!

Engage him at your caution! He's a real piece of work!

73

Steve, K4YZ

874. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 17:40:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88888

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >> >>> these per year.
> >> >>
> >> >> Those are good practice.
> >>
> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
> >
> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?

Well, Len? You said "everything run just fine".

My marathon PR (personal record) is 3 hours 57 minutes 37 seconds. Of
course that was a long time ago, and I'd need some really serious
training to do another marathon. This morning I ran for 47 minutes,
bringing my weekly total
up to 259 minutes. Nice morning, cool, sun coming up over the town of
Wayne.

What's your marathon PR, Len?

> >> It can be done very well
> >> without any amateur radio help
> >
> >How do you know?
>
> 1. By reading about it in a respected newspaper.

Did they say "the LA Marathon can be run very well without any amateur
radio help"?
>
> 2. By viewing it on broadcast television.

Did they say "the LA Marathon can be run very well without any amateur radio help"?
>
> 3. By knowing some details about it from one of its officials.

Did the official say "the LA Marathon can be run very well without any amateur radio help"?

Or is that statement merely your opinion as an inexperienced observer of both the LA Marathon and amateur radio?
>
> > Ever work at a race?
>
> Not in a foot race.

They're called "road races" by those who do them, Len. "Road" to distinguish them from track and cross country events. Your use of the term "foot race" shows your lack of knowledge about them.
>
> Why is that important to the "Economy, Stupid?"

You brought up the LA Marathon, Len, not me.

> >LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
> >for race communications for years.
>
> If you insist...and you WILL insist.

Is it true or not? Los Angeles, New York City, Boston, to name just a few.

> You are a Believer.

I'm simply telling the truth, Len. You brought up the LA Marathon, Len, not me.

> Have you ever been IN Los Angeles?

Sure - several times.

Have you ever run a marathon? Half-marathon? Ten-miler? 10K? Five-miler? 5K? I've run all of those distances and others.
>
> Have you ever worked IN any volunteer function here?

Not in LA - have you?

Have you ever worked as a volunteer at a road race? Water stop, mile marker, starting line, finish line, time keeping, set up, take down, applications, race packets, results, etc.? I've done all of those.
>
> YOU have NO relationship with the city of Los Angeles. I live here.
> You don't.

So what? Do you have a relationship the LA marathon, or with running, other than the commercial media?

You have no relationship with amateur radio other than as an observer and very verbose critic.

So if it's OK for you to comment on amateur radio, it's OK for me to comment on the LA Marathon.

btw, I probably have far more experience in marathons, running and road races than you have in amateur radio.

> Reality check: ANY marathon foot race can be done with available
> non-amateur radio communications readily available in any large
> urban area.

Really? OK, Len, tell us how it could be done. For example, the New York City Marathon. Tell us how the communications for the NYC marathon could be done without amateur radio and still have "everything run just fine".

> The first Olympic marathon event was done without any
> amateur radio "help."

I know. Some of my distant ancestors originated those Games. They didn't need any radio at all. They didn't have 20,000 marathoners like LA did, though.

> Several Games after that had NO amateur
> radio "help" and also succeeded.

Nobody denies that, Len. What's your point?

The Olympic marathons are relatively small affairs, with relatively few participants. Maybe 100 runners, all of the elite athletes, over a course carefully prepared for them. Biggest problems in the Olympic marathon are spectator control and security.

Nobody is "insisting" that the LA Marathon must have amateur radio help in order to happen. The fact is, however, that hams *do* help out there, and at many other major road races.

> >Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
> >and play no role. That's simply Not True.
>
> I don't care one way or another about "ham radio help in marathons."

Your words here disprove that claim. If you really didn't care, you would not have brought up the subject.

It's clear that you *do* care, in a negative way. You want to deny that amateur radio plays *any* significant public service role, even to the point of denying the facts. You obviously hate amateur radio and want it to die out. Why is that?

> I know a marathon can be run WITHOUT amateur radio help. That's
> been done many times.

Nobody denies that, Len. But you wrote:

"By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
record turn-out, everything run just fine. It can be done very well
without any amateur radio help."

That statement of yours clearly implies that no amateur radio help was
used in the LA Marathon. And that's simply Not True.

You used the cunning stunt of juxtaposition there. But it backfired on
you.
>
> You keep insisting amateur radio MUST be there

No, I don't. I simply point out that it *was* there, performing a
needed function. You weren't there at all.

The LA Marathon organizers specifically asked for amateur radio help.
Not GMRS, not FRS, not cb or cell phones. Not even a bunch of folks
with marine radios on their friends' sailboats. Licensed amateur radio
operators only were requested. For some reason that simple fact really
bothers you, Len.

Did you visit the urls I listed?

>...and that's simply Not True.

Was amateur radio a part of the LA Marathon or not, Len?

875. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 17:54:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403120954.46ce970f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88889

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >
> >>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>>>Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >>>>>walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >>>>>hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >>>>>these per year.
> >>>>
> >>>>Those are good practice.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
> >
> >
> > What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
> >
> >
> >> It can be done very well
> >> without any amateur radio help
> >
> >
> > How do you know? Ever work at a race? I have, in a variety of roles.
> > LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
> > for race communications for years.
>
> A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
> year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
> "redundant in the future. They found out:
>
> Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
> the whole group, everyone had to be called.
>
> Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.
>
> Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.
>
> Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized

> this on the first call that had to go to everyone.

They couldn't figure all that out ahead of time?

Sounds to me like the hams were smart enough to simply let them try it
and see the problems first-hand.

Those same problems surfaced in groups searching for wreckage from the
space shuttle disaster last year.

Of course cell phones *do* have uses in those situations. Where one
specific person needs to talk to another specific person, and both are
in the coverage area, they're perfect.
>
> Cell phones work for some things, but the idea that they can replace
> radio operators is best advanced by those that don't really know how
> that particular job is done.
>
You mean like folks who comment on marathons without ever having been
involved in one other than as a spectator? Or like folks who comment
on amateur radio without ever having been involved other than as a
spectator?

> > http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php
>
> Some hams and ham equipment spotted in the pix.

Of course.

> > http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488
> >
> > (sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)
>
> Really? I thunk all you needed was a cell phone and the ability to say
> "can you hear me now?....how about now? 8^)

That's what some "professionals" would have us believe...
>
> > http://www.cert-la.com/
> >
> > (scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")
>
> Do you think maybe they put that in as an affirmative action sort of
> thing? Maybe they just wanted to get the Hams to shut their yap's? ;^)

Naw, it's simpler than that.

Besides their considerable skills and experience, ham volunteers at
events like the LA Marathon provide their own equipment and usually
their own transportation and other support. Try hiring 200
"communications professionals" for a day just to supply radio
communications and see what happens to the race entry fee. (LA says
200 hams, NYC marathon says 400, but of course NYC is a lot bigger

race).

> >> but the ARRL copy scribblers would have a cow about that. :-)

> > "ARRL copy scribblers"? Who are they? You mean folks who write the
> > facts about what actually happened?
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/features/2002/02/28/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Nice write up about the 2002 LA Marathon
> >
> > Maybe you didn't see the hams, so you just assume they are not there
> > and play no role. That's simply Not True.
>
> Capitalization noted, Jim. Do some people think that the hams are
> suppose to be in the lead vehicle or leading the parade?

Looks like it. But there are some folks who would deny the
participation and contributions of hams no matter what they did.

> Heck they are
> supposed to be behind the scenes. Go figure.

Of course. It's about the race!

73 de Jim, N2EY

Philadelphia Independence Marathon, 1982 and 1983.

876. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 18:07:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <0vGdnbxobZjOYMzdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 88890

Witless Willie wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<8eGdnd7z6MIep8zdRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
>>>always up. That is the picture he paints.
>>
>>Please show us where I made those statements.
>
>
> See your second post , this subject.

Your still hallucinating, I have never stated that your's or anyone
else's cell is always down, but I can say that I have never been without
ham radio capability.

877. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 20:26:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312152623.21955.00000970@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88892

In article <4051A5A2.21999BF6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Are we to do as you do or do as you say, Leonard?

Not required...but, most readers get the impression that all MUST
do, say, act, and everything else as YOU direct.

Go back to sulking about long-ago perceived personal affronts. That's
your forte'.

LHA / WMD

878. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 20:26:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312152623.21955.00000969@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88894

In article <4051A4D9.DD8DDC79@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>> >> >>> these per year.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Those are good practice.
>> >>
>> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>> >
>> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?

Go back to your usual participatory rantings. No one has to be IN
a race in order to WATCH it. None of the officials who run it have to
be IN the race in order to administer it.

Have you understood that yet or must you RANT and WHINE some
more about not being IN something?

Did you get a legal surname change? Try not to respond to certain
posts made to others as if they were directed to you. Few care
about your imagined personal affronts.

Go back to sitting in fromt of your orion and get more oriongasms.

LHA / WMD

879. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 20:26:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312152624.21955.00000971@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88893

In article <1e4e3692.0403120410.5fcfb293@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040311212342.23307.00007253@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>
>> It's one possibility...and no one need worry Cervantes fans with that.
>>
>> Given the royal "we" he insists on used, there may be another
>> personality. Rather than borrow from Cervantes and use "Sancho
>> Panza" I think that this other personality is more like Pancho Villa.
>>
>> That fits the widely exhibited rage and anger demonstrated in posts
>> by him. Unfortunately, Pancho Villa didn't succeed in real life. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I think we sent Pershing and McArthur after Pancho. On rrap,
>Panchorobeson gets a pass.

He is a "gorilla fighter" and wants to join the "gorilla forces" on
Isla Flacka. :-)

[...those who've never watched the Carson show with guest Reni
Santoni won't understand that... :-)]

LHA / WMD

880. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 20:26:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312152624.21955.00000972@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88895

In article <5c01b95b.0403120802.1751dfd4@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>news:<20040311212347.23307.00007257@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>> In article <XXQ3c.97334$aH3.2953648@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
>"Hank
>> Oredson" <horedson@att.net> writes:>
>
>>>Well, guess you are not a US Radio Amateur, or you would
>>>know that Amateur Radio is not a hobby, but is a service.
>>
>> I hazard a guess that YOU are misinformed.
>>
>> All throughout Title 47, C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory term
>> denoting a type and kind of radio activity being regulated.
>>
>> It is NOT a "service" the same a military service, a jury service, or a
>> service for eight used in dining.
>
> Hank...you'll have to forgive Lennie.
>
> You're correct in your assumption that Lennie is NOT an Amateur
>Radio licensee...He almost takes "pride" in it.

Still at the psychotic ranting? Take your tranquilizers like a good little patient.

All throughout Title 47 C.F.R. the word "service" is a regulatory word denoting the type and kind of radio activity being regulated.

It is NOT a "service" the same a military service, a jury service, or a service for eight used in dining.

Dismissed.

LHA / WMD

881. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 20:26:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312152625.21955.00000973@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88891

In article <5c01b95b.0403120726.64fcefe@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040311212341.23307.00007252@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > A couple of points, Lennie...
>> >
>> > First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
>> >distortion.
>>
>> YES you have. Plus a LOT more in the form of excessive personal
>> insults of many kinds.
>
> No, I have not.

Google has them all archived. Before that, DejaView had them.

> You'd better re-think that, since Google is at EVERYONE'S
>disposal.

Then you are truly mentally deranged and unable to tell your own
postings from anyone else's.

Take your meds like a good little patient.

Dismissed. Fall out.

LHA / WMD

882. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 21:18:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312161802.05539.00004738@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88896

In article <1e4e3692.0403120352.1bc1b2d5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>>
>> Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>I went to Mickey's Razzle Dazzle in Council Bluffs, IA.

Wasn't Mr. Foreign Service Dave assigned to the Amana
Colonies? :-)

LHA / WMD

883. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 21:18:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312161802.05539.00004737@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88897

In article <1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
>post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
>yourself.
>
>You're obsessed.

I'm thinking he's advanced from obsession to posession.

He should be out getting more exorcise. :-)

LHA / WMD

884. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 21:18:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040312161803.05539.00004739@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88898

In article <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(TAFKARJ on a verbal marathon without end) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>> >> >>> these per year.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Those are good practice.
>> >>
>> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>> >
>> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>
>Well, Len? You said "everything run just fine".

Yes. Everything RAN just fine...using the word "ran" (or "run") as in
an adminstrative action or organizing, starting, keeping it going, and
finally take-down.

You are mighty peevish again, perceiving personal insults at the
slightest provocation. Tsk, tsk, tsk...too many endorphins? :-)

>My marathon PR (personal record) is 3 hours 57 minutes 37 seconds.

Have you written the Guiness editors yet?

Did you carry along your code key while setting that terrific time?

Work any DX while running your foot race?

>What's your marathon PR, Len?

I don't do Public Relations any more, TAFKARJ.

League isn't too swift in that department and can't get good penetration
of the mass media.

Not my problem.

Go file a complaint with the two League presidents.

Consider that Sports CARS are in Road Races...on roads.
Did that once in a sporty '53 Austin Healey two-seater; the
aluminum body was a great ground plane for a short CB
whip 1959 - 1961. Great make-out vehicle. :-)

The L.A. 2004 Marathon was on the STREETS of Los Angeles,
on on any "roads." :-)

Go back to solving the nation's Economic and Social and
Political Problems in this amateur radio policy newsgroup,
TAFKARJ. Your ham license and marathon times and
morsemanship and ivy-fringed degrees are the
"qualifications" for that, are they not? :-)

LHA / WMD

885. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 22:09:57 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Uyq4c.2526$vP3.975@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 88899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Regardless of your ignorance, it is the amateurs that are pointing out the potential problems of BPL. If nothing else, this speaks volumes about the need for reasonable tests for potential amateurs (not something that you can walk into a test and walk away with an 'extra' class license). The code/no code arguement, in my opinion, is moot; what is more to the point is what these amateurs can and *do* contribute, regardless of the rants of many folks who may be envious of the frequencies available to amateurs.

I worked in EMC compliance. We had a problem with interference from powerlines. Yes, it is possible to reduce the problem. Whilst it won't qualify as a test to pass a particular piece of hardware, it is *great* for determining sources of RFI. Someone has a problem with RF interference to home equipment (not necessarily amateur). How do you solve it? I've helped in both cases. Some folks have minds so closed that they can't see the forest for the trees (or vice-versa).

I remember finishing my active duty with the U.S. Navy. I suspect it was verteran's day as there had been a parade and I was in a bar later on. A few guys in Navy uniforms had a problem. I overheard the conversation. Their transmitter had low output and couldn't tune. I went over to them and asked to see the transmitter. Sure enough, a bad cap in the tank circuit. We repaired it on the spot (dang if I didn't get hornswaggled into joining the reserves LOL).

When folks like you ask "did you repair that pothole in interstate 90 between ....", you are missing the point. It is the knowlege and theory that can enable hams to assist in many situations. Although I had engaged in emergency communications on Guam Island (and it was many years ago) and an SOS on 500 KHz at sea (also many years ago), you assume that I am obsolete. I would suggest that bad capacitors still happen and the folks with some technical background still can help. Although that situation with the U.S. Naval Reserve was many years ago, I've also repaired much more modern transceivers in the past decade. I am also quite capable of reducing interference between devices today. You dwell on the past; the technically astute needn't.

BTW, BPL is *not* going to serve the "underserved". I won't explain it. You take the time and effort (*if* you have the perseverence - which I doubt - and research it).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...

> On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
wrote:
>
>
> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few
amateurs
> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that
unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.
>
> >--
>
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.615 / Virus Database: 394 - Release Date: 3/8/04

886. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:02:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <05t4c.11586$t16.6732547@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88900

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com...
>
> Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
> played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
> outages?
>

It is a documented fact that the cell phones were all but useless to handle the emergency communication needs during 9/11. Too many of the towers had been on top of the World Trade Center buildings. Those calls that did get through took over 30 minutes to do so, which is a real problem in handling emergency communications.

In the power outage of August 2003, I personally experienced the erratic availability of cell phones.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

887. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:11:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403121711.7df110fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88901

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<0vGdnbxobZjOYMzdRVn-jw@gbronline.com>...
> Witless Willie wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<8eGdnd7z6MIep8zdRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
> >>>always up. That is the picture he paints.
> >>
> >>Please show us where I made those statements.
> >
> >
> > See your second post , this subject.
>
> Your still hallucinating, I have never stated that your's or anyone
> else's cell is always down, but I can say that I have never been without
> ham radio capability.

You lie. You were w/o ham capability prior to becoming licensed.

See below for your other malstatements.

From: JJ (radiobuff0@mailcity.moc)
Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

View this article only
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-11 20:23:50 PST

And witless William also wrote:

>
> I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
will be there if needed.
Post a follow-up to this message

888. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:22:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403121722.28cb19f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88902

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212345.23307.00007255@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403110406.71f51c2b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >news:<%zQ3c.10881$t16.6456289@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> >> > a major role in emergency comms.
> >>
> >> I have never refused to accept the role of unlicensed services but I do not
> >> let that blind me to the fact that amateur radio continues to play a
> >> significant role. You are the one who cannot accept the fact that amateur
> >> radio continues to play a major rule in emergency comms. My position is
> and
> >> has always been that we need as many different forms of communication as
> >> possible. No one can predict what services will or will not be knocked out
> >> in the next emergency.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >I too think that multiple forms of communications are the best bet
> >when the chips are down.
> >
> >But cell phones sure are playing a much larger role than amateur radio
> >in emergency communications.
>
> Brian, reminding folks that 100 MILLION cell phone subscriptions
> have been taken out in the USA is not a valid fact to Believers.

100,000,000 cellular telephones cannot possibly compare with the
600,000 introverted (minus nursie) licensed amateurs. All are active,
have charged batteries, and backup generators, towers that cannot
fall, and electronics that cannot fail. Propofagion always occurs
when needed.

> Believers - those whose only access amateur radio sites and
> especially that of the League - cannot rid themselves of the
> urban myth that "cell phones always fail in an emergency."
>
> Believers don't believe that any other "radios" except cell phones
> and amateur radio exist. They don't believe that Public Safety
> (police, fire, ambulance, etc.) services ever use their radios in
> emergencies...the "emergency" in their minds seems to be of

> such a large scale, so devastating that Public Safety agencies
> are also "down." They don't believe that there are hundreds of
> thousands of other radios in utility companies, taxicabs, private
> corporations, private boats, private and commercial aviation can
> even be used in any emergencies. Believers don't believe that
> any government agency such as FEMA can use "radio" or
> acknowledge that such is ever used in any emergency. Believers
> don't even bother to consider the U.S. military or the various states'
> National Guards, all of whom have portable or mobile radios,
> radios designed for survivability and operability in the very harsh
> environment of warfare.

All true. You never worked radio while in the service. Heil never
worked radio while in the department of state. I never set up hf
intercept, nor did branywine ever tell me to reduce power.

It is an evil genius that just made us think we did.

> Believers only believe in three kinds of radios - amateur, cell
> phones, and some vague amorphous 'other kind' not specified
> because they don't know anything about all those 'other kinds.'
> Believers only believe that "cell phones always go down in
> emergencies" but amateur radio is always so robust and damage
> proof that all of them survive and continue to work.

Robust - beyond belief. Actually incredible.

> Believers believe what they are told by the League who seems to
> always say that "amateur radio was 'significant' in some emergency
> (or event of occasion)."* The League doesn't define 'significant' since
> that would take away the emotional loading that makes all League
> members and other amateurs very proud, warm, and fuzzy...which
> is what they want to do to increase interest in joining the League to
> keep getting proud, warm, fuzzy feelings through membership.
>
> * the homonymic phrase "played a major role" is sometimes used
> for similar effect. Also, NASA astronauts who accept getting a ham
> license as one of the many tasks of having to do required NASA
> public relations are always labeled as "ham-astronauts" to get folks
> proud, warm, and fuzzy thinking that they got to be astronauts
> through their amateur radio license first.
>
> All throughout Title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, the word
> "service" is used as a regulatory term meaning a type and kind of
> radio activity being regulated. Believers insist that "service" means
> the same as "a service to the country." They don't acknowledge
> that amateur radio is basically an avocational pursuit, a hobby, done
> without pecuniary compensation to enjoy a particular radio activity.
> No, Believers insist that "they perform a service to the nation" through
> having a ham hobby, much in the same way the we both served our
> country in the military.
>

> Believers cannot be convinced of reality. Believers are a cult stuck
> in an imaginary world reinforced by the many words of membership
> organizations into mythical proportions. Anything said to disturb
> their pride and warm, fuzzy feelings about their hobby are considered
> heretical and damnations of their national service.
>
> LHA / WMD

Yup.

889. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:24:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403121724.11be7f6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88903

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
> >
> > The Law of Imagination keeps changing all the time, all the
> > Believers thinking they are radio minutemen defending ignorant
> > savage civilians against the elements of disaster. Every ham a
> > hero! :-)
>
> Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought
> not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be
> ready for your afternoon nappy.

You're quite disrespectful of a radio veteran.

890. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:29:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403121729.268d9ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88904

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4051A5A2.21999BF6@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > Profit is defined as pecuniary compensation for services rendered.
>
> That'd be incorrect. You'd have to deduct expenditures first.
>
> > U.S. amateur radio is defined as specifically NOT for pecuniary interest.
>
> No kidding? Are you a radio amateur?

Really? No kidding?

Is that why I said that repeater owners cannot charge for repeater use?

Yep, probably.

891. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:34:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403121734.35f840b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88905

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403120802.1751dfd4@posting.google.com>...
>
> Hank...you'll have to forgive Lennie.

Quixoterobeson, why are you always commanding other people to do sumptin?

> It's irrelevent that the Commissioners are not licensees. Such is
> the nature of our government. The ladies down at the Clerk of Courts
> office issue driver's licenses for 18-wheelers and dump trucks, but I
> never see any of them driving one.

You should look closer. They have that license in their purses.

892. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 01:50:03 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <42a464a6e1a95c3e10a8af780d3f3450@dizum.com>
Source record: 88906

In article <4051A5A2.21999BF6@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20040311065121.12631.00005480@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >How do you define "greed", Alun? Wanting to make a profit? How much profit is
> > >OK and how much is greed?
> >
> > Profit is defined as pecuniary compensation for services rendered.
>
> That'd be incorrect. You'd have to deduct expenditures first.
>
> > U.S. amateur radio is defined as specifically NOT for pecuniary interest.
>
> No kidding? Are you a radio amateur?
>
> > Try to stay focussed.
>
> Are we to do as you do or do as you say, Leonard?

A situation *you* sure do desire to impose upon others. I don't
know you really have anything to say of relevance or not, but
you didn't even allow the death of your father last week
(croaked March 1, became worm food March 8)to change your myopic
views or torrent of narrow-mindedness and mentally ill desire to
impose your will and "mindset" upon the newsgroup, you bush-
league Hitler.

893. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 02:42:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040312214216.05957.00000992@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 88907

In article <20040312161803.05539.00004739@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>> (N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>>> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>>> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>>> >> >>> these per year.
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> Those are good practice.
>>> >>
>>> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>>> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>>> >
>>> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>>
>>Well, Len? You said "everything run just fine".
>
> Yes.

What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?

Or were you DNS?

> Everything RAN just fine...using the word "ran" (or "run") as in
> an adminstrative action or organizing, starting, keeping it going, and
> finally take-down.

How do you know?
>
> You are mighty peevish again, perceiving personal insults at the
> slightest provocation.

Not me. You're the one shouting and calling names.

>>My marathon PR (personal record) is 3 hours 57 minutes 37 seconds.
>
> Have you written the Guiness editors yet?

You sound jealous, Len.
>
>>What's your marathon PR, Len?
>
> I don't do Public Relations any more,

Good. Your style here indicates you'd be very bad at it.

> Consider that Sports CARS are in Road Races...on roads.

They're not allowed in the LA Marathon.

> The L.A. 2004 Marathon was on the STREETS of Los Angeles,
> on on any "roads." :-)

They're called road races, Len.

As suspected, you were not involved in the LA Marathon in any way except as a distant spectator. Same as your involvement as in amateur radio.

Well, Len, once more you've lived up to your profile and shown us your purpose here. As if there was any doubt. Plonk time again.

894. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 03:20:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1sidnfnU3fqL48_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88908

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
>>>>>>>>>walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
>>>>>>>>>hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
>>>>>>>>>these per year.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Those are good practice.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
>>>> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
>>>
>>>
>>>What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> It can be done very well
>>>> without any amateur radio help
>>>
>>>
>>>How do you know? Ever work at a race? I have, in a variety of roles.
>>>LA and other major marathons have been using amateur radio operators
>>>for race communications for years.
>>
>>A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
>>year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
>>"redundant in the future. They found out:
>>
>> Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
>>the whole group, everyone had to be called.

>>
>> Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.
>>
>> Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.
>>
>>Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized
>>this on the first call that had to go to everyone.
>
>
> They couldn't figure all that out ahead of time?

Amazingly enough, no! Cell phones are seductive little things. After
all you can call around the world, send pictures of whatever, and even
look up your email on the web with them. So how on earth can such a
wonderful instrument *not* be good at running a race? Imagine, each and
every participant with their own little radio, ready for direct contact.

Any conclusion may be reached with insufficient thought!

> Sounds to me like the hams were smart enough to simply let them try it
> and see the problems first-hand.

Yup. All of us that had done events before just chuckled and waited.
First call for our help came through a couple minutes after the start.

> Those same problems surfaced in groups searching for wreckage from the
> space shuttle disaster last year.
>
> Of course cell phones *do* have uses in those situations. Where one
> specific person needs to talk to another specific person, and both are
> in the coverage area, they're perfect.

Sure enough. But when many people need to hear instructions at the same
time, or if the area is large and rural, You need a multi-mode system,
and not just line of site low power stuff.

>> Cell phones work for some things, but the idea that they can replace
>>radio operators is best advanced by those that don't really know how
>>that particular job is done.
>>
>
> You mean like folks who comment on marathons without ever having been
> involved in one other than as a spectator? Or like folks who comment
> on amateur radio without ever having been involved other than as a
> spectator?

Well, when you put it *that* way, yup!

>
>>>http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php
>>
>> Some hams and ham equipment spotted in the pix.
>

>
> Of course.
>
>
>>>http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488
>>>
>>>(sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)
>>
>> Really? I thunk all you needed was a cell phone and the ability to say
>>"can you hear me now?....how about now? 8^)
>
>
> That's what some "professionals" would have us believe...

Any conclusion is possible given insufficient..... oh wait, I
already said that, didn't I?

>>>http://www.cert-la.com/
>>>
>>>(scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")
>>
>> Do you think maybe they put that in as an affirmative action sort of
>>thing? Maybe they just wanted to get the Hams to shut their yap's? ;^)
>
>
> Naw, it's simpler than that.
>
> Besides their considerable skills and experience, ham volunteers at
> events like the LA Marathon provide their own equipment and usually
> their own transportation and other support. Try hiring 200
> "communications professionals" for a day just to supply radio
> communications and see what happens to the race entry fee. (LA says
> 200 hams, NYC marathon says 400, but of course NYC is a lot bigger
> race).

The price for professional radio operators would be from 80 to 160
thousand dollars for an 8 hour day, according to my BOE scribbling.

- Mike KB3EIA -

895. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 03:50:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403121950.23909988@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

>
> BTW, BPL is *not* going to serve the "underserved". I won't explain it.
> You take the time and effort (*if* you have the perseverence - which I
> doubt - and research it).

Whack! right on James. As if any of today's grid gloms are some kinda
dreamy nitwits who are gonna take Internet access into the boonies
like the TVA did with volts and amps.

Bwaaaahaha! Never in this world . . !

>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...
> > On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
> wrote:
> >
> >
> > What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> > If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few
> amateurs
> > then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that
> unjustifiably occupies
> > valuable radio spectrum.
> >
> > >--
> >
> >
> > -Barry
> > ========
> > Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> > Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.615 / Virus Database: 394 - Release Date: 3/8/04

896. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 05:11:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40529827.24D26912@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88910

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4051A5A2.21999BF6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Are we to do as you do or do as you say, Leonard?
>
> Not required...but, most readers get the impression that all MUST
> do, say, act, and everything else as YOU direct.

I don't believe you. I don't think you've had any input from "most readers". It is interesting that you responded to a question with two distinct choices with "Not required". Do you think most readers have the idea that radio amateurs are supposed to go along with your view of how amateur radio should be regulated? After all, you have nothing to do with amateur radio.

> Go back to sulking about long-ago perceived personal affronts. That's
> your forte'.

I am forte-laden, Leonard. One of mine is that I'm a radio amateur. You aren't.

Dave K8MN

897. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 05:15:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88911

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4051A4D9.DD8DDC79@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >> >> >>> these per year.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Those are good practice.
> >> >>
> >> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> >> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
> >> >
> >> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
>
> Go back to your usual participatory rantings. No one has to be IN
> a race in order to WATCH it. None of the officials who run it have to
> be IN the race in order to administer it.
>
> Have you understood that yet or must you RANT and WHINE some
> more about not being IN something?
>
> Did you get a legal surname change? Try not to respond to certain
> posts made to others as if they were directed to you. Few care
> about your imagined personal affronts.

Uhhhhhh, Len? You seem to be tangled up in your responses. You're
addressing Jim's statement.

> Go back to sitting in fromt of your orion and get more oriongasms.

Do you think that "most readers" get the idea that you're busy telling
people what to do?

You can buy an Orion too, Leonard. You can think of it as a very expensive SWL receiver.

Dave K8MN

898. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 05:18:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40529994.F8DC6A52@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88912

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0403120410.5fcfb293@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040311212342.23307.00007253@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> It's one possibility...and no one need worry Cervantes fans with that.
> >>
> >> Given the royal "we" he insists on used, there may be another
> >> personality. Rather than borrow from Cervantes and use "Sancho
> >> Panza" I think that this other personality is more like Pancho Villa.
> >>
> >> That fits the widely exhibited rage and anger demonstrated in posts
> >> by him. Unfortunately, Pancho Villa didn't succeed in real life. :-)
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >I think we sent Pershing and McArthur after Pancho. On rrap,
> >Panchorobeson gets a pass.
>
> He is a "gorilla fighter" and wants to join the "gorilla forces" on
> Isla Flacka. :-)
>
> [...those who've never watched the Carson show with guest Reni
> Santoni won't understand that... :-)]

The Carson Show? Johnny Carson? Aren't you the guy always singing the
song about others living in the past?

Dave K8MN

899. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 05:22:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40529AA1.DDA2D0B2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88913

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0403120352.1bc1b2d5@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >news:<xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >>
> >> Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >I went to Mickey's Razzle Dazzle in Council Bluffs, IA.
>
> Wasn't Mr. Foreign Service Dave assigned to the Amana
> Colonies? :-)

More civil discussion of morse code testing, Leonardo?

I had six Foreign Service overseas assignments. You were no more
involved with them than you are involved with amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

900. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 05:26:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40529B7B.A548F933@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88914

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (TAFKARJ on a verbal marathon without end) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >>> Then outside the disaster arena, there's all the marathons,
> >> >> >>> walk-a-thons, bike-a-thons and myriad other public events for which
> >> >> >>> hams routinely provide communications. Our club supports 4 or 5 of
> >> >> >>> these per year.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Those are good practice.
> >> >>
> >> >> By the way, the Los Angeles Marathon was a success on Sunday,
> >> >> record turn-out, everything run just fine.
> >> >
> >> >What was your finishing time, Len? How were course conditions?
> >
> >Well, Len? You said "everything run just fine".
>
> Yes. Everything RAN just fine...using the word "ran" (or "run") as in
> an adminstrative action or organizing, starting, keeping it going, and
> finally take-down.
>
> You are mighty peevish again, perceiving personal insults at the
> slightest provocation. Tsk, tsk, tsk...too many endorphins? :-)
>
> >My marathon PR (personal record) is 3 hours 57 minutes 37 seconds.
>
> Have you written the Guiness editors yet?
>
> Did you carry along your code key while setting that terrific time?
>
> Work any DX while running your foot race?
>

> >What's your marathon PR, Len?
>
> I don't do Public Relations any more, TAFKARJ.
>
> League isn't too swift in that department and can't get good penetration
> of the mass media.
>
> Not my problem.
>
> Go file a complaint with the two League presidents.
>
> Consider that Sports CARS are in Road Races...on roads.
> Did that once in a sporty '53 Austin Healey two-seater; the
> aluminum body was a great ground plane for a short CB
> whip 1959 - 1961. Great make-out vehicle. :-)
>
> The L.A. 2004 Marathon was on the STREETS of Los Angeles,
> on on any "roads." :-)
>
> Go back to solving the nation's Economic and Social and
> Political Problems in this amateur radio policy newsgroup,
> TAFKARJ. Your ham license and marathon times and
> morsemanship and ivy-fringed degrees are the
> "qualifications" for that, are they not? :-)

Smileys aside, Len, did you look at those links provided by Jim yet?
You blew a lot of smoke about radio amateurs not being involved in the
L.A. Marathon but you don't seem to have anything to counter cold fact.
What about your newspaper reading, TV viewing and your "friend". Were
they all just plain wrong?

Dave K8MN

901. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313012417.07155.00001228@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88917

In article <20040312214216.05957.00000992@mb-m26.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040312161803.05539.00004739@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>>> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>,
>N2EY@AOL.COM
>>>> (N2EY) writes:
>>>>
>>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>>> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Everything RAN just fine...using the word "ran" (or "run") as in
>> an adminstrative action or organizing, starting, keeping it going, and
>> finally take-down.
>
>How do you know?

The L.A. TIMES reported that, several TV news programs reported
that, and at least one official with the Marathon said so to me.

Is everyone required to wait for the "official" word from the ARRL
on the verdict?!?!?

>> You are mighty peevish again, perceiving personal insults at the
>> slightest provocation.
>
>Not me. You're the one shouting and calling names.

I didn't name anyone in the Marathon. :-)

The very first marathons didn't need any ham radio to help them.

Why do you keep implying that marathons MUST have ham
radio help to be successful?

>>>My marathon PR (personal record) is 3 hours 57 minutes 37 seconds.
>>
>> Have you written the Guiness editors yet?

>
>You sound jealous, Len.

Of what? :-)

You haven't proved anything about ham radio being NECESSARY
to stage and operate any marathon.

>>>What's your marathon PR, Len?
>>
>> I don't do Public Relations any more,
>
>Good. Your style here indicates you'd be very bad at it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."you sound jealous." :-)

>> Consider that Sports CARS are in Road Races...on roads.
>
>They're not allowed in the LA Marathon.

Never said they were.

Road Races are run by sports cars on roads.

Marathoners run on foot.

TAFKARJ sounds like he is developing Road Rage... :-)

>They're called road races, Len.

I KNOW some sports car racing events are called ROAD RACES.

Try not to be too much like the Schoolmaster who was once
assigned to the far Amana Colonies...

>As suspected, you were not involved in the LA Marathon in any way except as a
>distant spectator.

Do you now need the EXACT distance from my TV set to the
northernmost point on the marathon route?!?!?!

You're getting to be as nuts as the gunnery nurse.

I has WRITTEN IN PUBLIC that I WATCHED the marathon. Are
your eyes shot from all that running exertion that you can't read?

But, you never answered about "carrying a code key" while
running. Do you?

You've never said anything about "working DX" while running
either.

Is RUNNING (on foot) something REQUIRED in amateur radio?

Or are you personally disturbed because no one ackhnowledges
your fleetness of foot and renowned running time?

Go rent a DVD of "The Running Man." Consider that the star managed to get elected to Governor of a state. Aim high, TAFKARJ. Governorship is far better than ham radio...you could win and tell MILLIONS what to do and how to behave!

Now, what in the world has all this fuss and bother you are stirring to do with AMATEUR RADIO?

Sorry to divert you from all those splended AMATEUR RADIO subjects like national economy, politics, morality, kosher food.

You keep up the good work and keep on essaying in the newsgroup every day. Folks are hanging on every word...or is that wanting to hang you for all those words? :-)

Walk the plonk...

LHA / WMD

902. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313012418.07155.00001230@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88915

In article <05t4c.11586$t16.6732547@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
>> played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
>> outages?
>
>It is a documented fact that the cell phones were all but useless to handle
>the emergency communication needs during 9/11. Too many of the towers had
>been on top of the World Trade Center buildings.

Most of those were broadcast towers, Dee.

The Emergency Communications Center was right next door and
became damaged by falling debris which also cut several landline
trunks.

>Those calls that did get
>through took over 30 minutes to do so, which is a real problem in handling
>emergency communications.

Of course...and all the NYFD and NYPD radios were all cell phones,
right? Gosh, somehow they managed to get there anyway!

>In the power outage of August 2003, I personally experienced the erratic
>availability of cell phones.

Then you should have fired up your rig and stayed OFF the cell phones.
Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Think AHEAD...

LHA / WMD

903. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313012418.07155.00001229@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 88916

In article <1e4e3692.0403121724.11be7f6a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > The Law of Imagination keeps changing all the time, all the
>> > Believers thinking they are radio minutemen defending ignorant
>> > savage civilians against the elements of disaster. Every ham a
>> > hero! :-)
>>
>> Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought
>> not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be
>> ready for your afternoon nappy.
>
>You're quite disrespectful of a radio veteran.

That's how teenagers have always been...

LHA / WMD

904. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:48:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313014816.22081.00004528@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88920

In article <40529994.F8DC6A52@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>The Carson Show? Johnny Carson? Aren't you the guy always singing the
>song about others living in the past?

Johnny Carson is still living and around here.

Go discuss the higher plains of National Economics and Kosher
Food with TAFKARJ and all the Ham Gurus. Lots of exciting
stuff there NOT about amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

905. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:48:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313014816.22081.00004527@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88922

In article <40529AA1.DDA2D0B2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I had six Foreign Service overseas assignments.

Okay, so you were NOT assigned to the Amana Colonies.

Well, you wouldn't have been "DX" to the states... :-)

There's no microwave action in the Amana Colonies...thsoe are all
done in Mexico. The rest is a gas! :-)

LHA / WMD

906. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:48:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313014817.22081.00004529@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88918

In article <40529B7B.A548F933@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>. Were they all just plain wrong?

No, but you are.

LHA / WMD

907. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:48:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88921

In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.

I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.

>You can think of it as a very expensive SWL receiver.

No, I think of it as an updated version of the defunct Kachina.

Poor baby, still miffed because I KNOW how SDRs work
and you don't have a clue?

Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
it! :-)

LHA / WMD

908. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 06:48:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313014818.22081.00004531@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 88919

In article <40529827.24D26912@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I am forte-laden, Leonard. One of mine is that I'm a radio amateur.
>You aren't.

Right...I'm a professional radio person and have been since 1952.

[didn't you get an oriongasm on the last sit-down in fron of your
orion? Tsk, tsk, tsk...]

LHA / WMD

909. Fw: 40m allocation expanded in LA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 09:57:47 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@QSL.net>
Message-ID: <c2uluq$6u0$01$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 88923
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[trans]Effective April 1st 2004 (no April-joke) Norwegian hams may use
7100KHz - 7200KHz on a secondary basis using not more than 100 watts.
This was announced yesterday by the norwegian Communications Authority.

Source: LA5HE
[trans end]

----- Original Message -----
From: "Peter Vï¿½lpel" <qro1750nospam@compuserve.de>
Newsgroups: de.comm.ham
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2004 4:35 PM
Subject: 40m Erweiterung in LA

> Mit Wirkung ab 1.April (kein Aprilscherz!) dï¿½rfen die Norweger mit
> Leistungen bis 100W den Bereich 7100-7200KHz auf sekundï¿½rer Basis
> benutzen.
> Dies wurde heute von der norwegischen P&T bekanntgegeben
>
> Quelle: LA5HE
>
> 73
> Peter, DF3KV

910. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 12:20:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313072004.12501.00006737@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 88924

In article <1sidnfnU3fqL48_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>...

>>>A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
>>>year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
>>>"redundant in the future. They found out:
>>>
>>> Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
>>>the whole group, everyone had to be called.
>>>
>>> Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.
>>>
>>> Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.
>>>
>>>Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized
>>>this on the first call that had to go to everyone.
>>
>>
>> They couldn't figure all that out ahead of time?
>
> Amazingly enough, no! Cell phones are seductive little things. After
>all you can call around the world, send pictures of whatever, and even
>look up your email on the web with them. So how on earth can such a
>wonderful instrument *not* be good at running a race? Imagine, each and
>every participant with their own little radio, ready for direct contact.

Well, there you have it: They did not understand their communications needs.
>
> Any conclusion may be reached with insufficient thought!

Can I steal that phrase? It's the perfect companion to this one:

"If it happens, it must be possible."
>
>> Sounds to me like the hams were smart enough to simply let them try it
>> and see the problems first-hand.
>
> Yup. All of us that had done events before just chuckled and waited.
>First call for our help came through a couple minutes after the start.

Fortunate that you folks were there.

>> Those same problems surfaced in groups searching for wreckage from the
>> space shuttle disaster last year.
>>
>> Of course cell phones *do* have uses in those situations. Where one
>> specific person needs to talk to another specific person, and both are
>> in the coverage area, they're perfect.
>
> Sure enough. But when many people need to hear instructions at the same

>time, or if the area is large and rural, You need a multi-mode system,
>and not just line of site low power stuff.

Seems to me that *both* have a role.
>
>>> Cell phones work for some things, but the idea that they can replace
>>>radio operators is best advanced by those that don't really know how
>>>that particular job is done.
>>
>> You mean like folks who comment on marathons without ever having been
>> involved in one other than as a spectator? Or like folks who comment
>> on amateur radio without ever having been involved other than as a
>> spectator?
>
> Well, when you put it *that* way, yup!

We call 'em "sidewalk superintendents" or "armchair athletes".
>
>>>>http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php
>>>
>>> Some hams and ham equipment spotted in the pix.

>> Of course.

>>>>http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488

>>>>(sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)
>>>
>>> Really? I thunk all you needed was a cell phone and the ability to say
>>>"can you hear me now?....how about now? 8^)

>> That's what some "professionals" would have us believe...

> Any conclusion is possible given insufficient..... oh wait, I
>already said that, didn't I?

Bears repeating.
>
>>>>http://www.cert-la.com/
>>>>
>>>>(scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")
>>>
>>> Do you think maybe they put that in as an affirmative action sort of
>>>thing? Maybe they just wanted to get the Hams to shut their yap's? ;^)
>>

>> Naw, it's simpler than that.
>>
>> Besides their considerable skills and experience, ham volunteers at
>> events like the LA Marathon provide their own equipment and usually
>> their own transportation and other support. Try hiring 200
>> "communications professionals" for a day just to supply radio
>> communications and see what happens to the race entry fee. (LA says
>> 200 hams, NYC marathon says 400, but of course NYC is a lot bigger
>> race).

> The price for professional radio operators would be from 80 to 160
>thousand dollars for an 8 hour day, according to my BOE scribbling.
>
Marathon day is a lot longer than 8 hours. Figure that the staff is on the course at least two hours before the starting gun, and that the slowest particiapnts will finish in more than 5-6 hours, plus awards ceremony, cleanup, etc., and it's not an 8 hour day for anybody. With 20,000 participants, that's 4 to 8 dollars tacked on to the entry fee.

Which reminds me...time to put the running shoes on..

73 de Jim, N2EY

911. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 12:57:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ByD4c.11745$t16.6811938@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 88925

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040313072004.12501.00006737@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <1sidnfnU3fqL48_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> > The price for professional radio operators would be from 80 to 160
> >thousand dollars for an 8 hour day, according to my BOE scribbling.
> >
> Marathon day is a lot longer than 8 hours. Figure that the staff is on the
> course at least two hours before the starting gun, and that the slowest
> particiapnts will finish in more than 5-6 hours, plus awards ceremony,
cleanup,
> etc., and it's not an 8 hour day for anybody. With 20,000 participants,
that's
> 4 to 8 dollars tacked on to the entry fee.
>
> Which reminds me...time to put the running shoes on..
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You left out another block of time. For a large event, there needs to be a planning/coordination meeting in advance of the marathon that the communications staff would need to attend. Paid operators won't attend that for free either.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

912. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 13:46:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88927

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313014816.22081.00004528@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <40529994.F8DC6A52@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >The Carson Show? Johnny Carson? Aren't you the guy always singing the
> >song about others living in the past?
>
> Johnny Carson is still living and around here.
>
> Go discuss the higher plains of National Economics and Kosher
> Food with TAFKARJ and all the Ham Gurus. Lots of exciting
> stuff there NOT about amateur radio.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...Leonard H Anderson.

Yeah...right...

Steve, K4YZ

913. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 13:47:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130547.39b1ec5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88928

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403120410.5fcfb293@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212342.23307.00007253@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >
> > It's one possibility...and no one need worry Cervantes fans with that.
> >
> > Given the royal "we" he insists on used, there may be another
> > personality. Rather than borrow from Cervantes and use "Sancho
> > Panza" I think that this other personality is more like Pancho Villa.
> >
> > That fits the widely exhibited rage and anger demonstrated in posts
> > by him. Unfortunately, Pancho Villa didn't succeed in real life. :-)
> >
> > LHA / WMD
>
> I think we sent Pershing and McArthur after Pancho. On rrap,
> Panchorobeson gets a pass.

Nope...I get to TAKE a pass at liars and fools...Those being
Lennie and BillyBeeper.

Steve, K4YZ

914. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 13:47:35 UTC
From: 14313 <democreeps@herblivesnow.net>
Message-ID: <c2v3ao$pp8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88926
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

You losers from r.r.a.p. need to quit x-posting and go back to
worshipping Phil Kane.

Herbie Lives!

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:Uyq4c.2526$vP3.975@news02.roc.ny...
> Regardless of your ignorance, it is the amateurs that are pointing out the
> potential problems of BPL. If nothing else, this speaks volumes about the
> need for reasonable tests for potential amateurs (not something that you
can
> walk into a test and walk away with an 'extra' class license). The
code/no
> code arguement, in my opinion, is moot; what is more to the point is what
> these amateurs can and *do* contribute, regardless of the rants of many
> folks who may be envious of the frequencies available to amateurs.
>
> I worked in EMC compliance. We had a problem with interference from
> powerlines. Yes, it is possible to reduce the problem. Whilst it won't
> qualify as a test to pass a particular piece of hardware, it is *great*
for
> determining sources of RFI. Someone has a problem with RF interference to
> home equipment (not necessarily amateur). How do you solve it? I've
helped
> in both cases. Some folks have minds so closed that they can't see the
> forest for the trees (or vice-versa).
>
> I remember finishing my active duty with the U.S. Navy. I suspect it was
> verteran's day as there had been a parade and I was in a bar later on. A
> few guys in Navy uniforms had a problem. I overheard the conversation.
> Their transmitter had low output and couldn't tune. I went over to them
and
> asked to see the transmitter. Sure enough, a bad cap in the tank circuit.
> We repaired it on the spot (dang if I didn't get hornswaggled into joining
> the reserves LOL).
>
> When folks like you ask "did you repair that pothole in interstate 90
> between ....", you are missing the point. It is the knowlege and theory
> that can enable hams to assist in many situations. Although I had engaged
> in emergency communications on Guam Island (and it was many years ago) and
> an SOS on 500 KHz at sea (also many years ago), you assume that I am
> obsolete. I would suggest that bad capacitors still happen and the folks
> with some technical background still can help. Although that situation
with

> the U.S. Naval Reserve was many years ago, I've also repaired much more
> modern transceivers in the past decade. I am also quite capable of
reducing
> interference between devices today. You dwell on the past; the
technically
> astute needn't.
>
> BTW, BPL is *not* going to serve the "underserved". I won't explain it.
> You take the time and effort (*if* you have the perseverence - which I
> doubt - and research it).
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...
> > On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
> wrote:
> >
> >
> > What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> > If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few
> amateurs
> > then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that
> unjustifiably occupies
> > valuable radio spectrum.
> >
> > >--
> >
> >
> > -Barry
> > ========
> > Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> > Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.615 / Virus Database: 394 - Release Date: 3/8/04
>
>

915. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:10:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XYudnRFa6cXfi87dRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88929

Are you keeping count of your new knicknames Steve? They 're coming hard and fast!

- Mike KB3EIA -

916. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:21:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403130621.3c61fa9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88930

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...

> Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
> at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
> it! :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Someone musta flipped over his rock.

917. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:24:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130624.115256fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88931

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212343.23307.00007254@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403110159.1356679d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >news:<1e4e3692.0403101612.5c893311@posting.google.com>...
> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0403100923.38988d6a@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> > As for how many "pesonalities" (at this point your "mentor" would
> >> > whoop-and-holler about how mad you were since you uttered a typo...),
> >>
> >> I make typo's, but its just poor hand placement on the keyboard or
> >> mispelled word.
> >>
> >> It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.
> >
> > Again...YOU ARE IN ERROR...
>
> Your postings are, and have been evidenciary of consistent rage and
> anger against anyone who disagrees with you.

"Anyone"...?!?!

Now who's in error, Oh Putzy One...?!?!

> > What >>I<< have stated is that said mistakes are "rage" as
> >defined by "your mentor", that being Lennie.
>
> Everyone can see the actual rage in hundreds of postings.
>
> Such rage is only intensified by someone pointing out what
> already exists.

Like your LYING, Lennie? Your open hatred and antagonism of
licensed Amateur Radio operators in a public forum...?!?!

Don't go there, Scummy One, since you'll only find yourself in
that pool.

> > It is NOT my assertion that it is such. Ask around, Brain...YOUR
> >attribution is WRONG.
>
> Not at all. It is correct and to the point.

No, it's not.

YOU are the one who always insists that typos are indicative of
"rage". I ahve NEVER stated that except to sarcastically throw it
back at YOU when you do it yourself.

> Refusal to acknowledge what everyone else can see is only denial on
> your part.

So I guess that leaves you and PuppetBoy in there too then,
huh...?!?!

> > I have zero. So what's YOUR problem...?!?!
>
> Did "K4CAP" exist four years ago?

Nope...but it did a year ago. I still have the FCC Form 660 to
prove it.

> Did the long, libelous fictious screen name you tried to use on AOL
> to put an even more gross libelous distortion of one individual in an
> AOL home page? It only existed for three days but some saw it.
> AOL member services wiped that home page clean and took away
> your new, extra screen name.

Anything that can be proven as factual is neither libellous nor
is it "ficticious".

It was not a distortion to suggest that NO ONE should EVER trust
Lennie!

And they did not "take away the screen name", Lennie. I could
have re-wrote the entire page if I had chosen to.

The FACTS are that YOU can't stand up to the scrutiny of others
whne YOUR misdeeds are laid bare.

YOU, the ALLEGED "professional" radio engineer who can't seem to
send an e mail without misrepresenting your true intent.

Yes, Lennie...You showed YOUR true colors then.

> Others, particularly AOL members, can find out that there are
> several screen names under your single account.

Yes, there are. My wife has one, as do two of my kids. I also
have anotehr screen name I use for CAP purposes. Your point is...?!?!

The fact HERE is that all posts I make HERE are under
"k4yz@aol.com", whether I post from AOL or I post from Google...

> So, you've tried to bluff through another very wrong statement. You
> will not acknowledge that those screen names exist and your only
> comeback will be misdirections into more personal insults.

Nope...Acknowledged them right here. And you're roght...anyone
can go find them if they care to. None of them are in this forum with

my name, either.

> >> I'd rethink
> >> > making such a silly insinuation...
> >>
> >> Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.
> >>
> >> 1. Over-the-top, and
> >>
> >> 2. Major-Whacked-Out.
> >
> > OK, Brain...if you insist. As long as it makes you feel warm and
> >fuzzy to hold on to it.
>
> Reality isn't making warm and fuzzy. Reality can be harsh, cruel.

Yes...it can...so harsh and cruel that it has KEPT you from being
able to go about your self-assigned mission to misrepresent the true
character of the Amateur Radio Service in a public forum without
having your misrepresentations and blatant lies from being allowed to
go unchallenged.

Too bad for you.

> Stay in your little imaginary world where you are safe, even if nuts.

What "imaginary world" would that be, Lennie?

The one where I am a licensed Amateur Radio operator, authorized
by law to engage in a plethora of activities involving the emmistting
of RF energy for any number of purposes...?!?!

OOOOOPS! >>NOT<< imaginary! So says the FCC!

Or maybe you meant the "imaginary world" wherein I am a licensed
Aviator, duly authorized by the FAA to act as pilot-in-command of
single engine land aircraft...?!?!

OOOOOOPS! >>NOT<< imaginary either! So says the FAA!

Or perhaps you meant the "imaginary world" wherein I am a
licensed Nurse, licensed to perform the duties of a professional
Nurse, professionally credentialed in 15 different SE Tennessee
healthcare facilities...?!?! With endorsements in Advanced Cardiac
Life Support, Pediatric Advance Life Support, EMS-Children, BCLS
Instructor, etc etc etc...?!?! Is THAT the "imaginary" world you are
refering to, Loser?

OOOOOOPS! AGAIN >>NOT<< imaginary! Got the license from the
State of Tennessee and invoices for services rendered to prove THAT
too!

Soooooo....WHICH "imaginary" world is it that you refer to,
Lennie...!??!

> You need to relax. Go away from the Internet and play with your
> radios. The Internet is full of those who have and can put you down.

You TRY to put me down, Lennie, and every time you do you come up looking more foolish than when you started...So you go right on ahead and knock yourself out. I'm enjoying the show!

Steve, K4YZ

918. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:31:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403130631.5498134a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88932

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94A937BFA27E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0403101646.69e13b54@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns94A7EA738D4DCelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:c2356669.0403091459.5df3e877@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns94A7683D9D88elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> <snip>
> >> >>
> >> >> I think access to education is already a problem and likely to get
> >> >> worse. At the same time it's probably about the only antidote to
> >> >> offshore production.
> >> >
> >> > Then it should be a major priority, rather than trips to Mars ans
> >> > such.
> >>
> >> Or foreign adventuring.
> >
> > True. We could just sit on our fat asses and let the world implode.
> > Then we'd have lots of dxpeditions cleverly disguised as UN peace
> > missions with 400,000 qso's per foray.
> >
>
> As opposed to dxpeditions disguised as invasions?

You tell me. The sun never sets on the _____________ Empire.
```

919. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:34:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130634.24b85768@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88933

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403111956.53078b39@posting.google.com>...

> > > It is your assertion that typo = seething rage.
> >
> > Again...YOU ARE IN ERROR...
>
> And the first time I saw that theory it was -you- who had presented
> it, without attributing the author/originator.

Sorry, Brain...I most certainly did.

Once again, you're caught with your pants down, and it's NOT a
pretty picture!

> Now you are saying that you simply stole it and presented it as your
> own material?

It will be a looooooooong time before I am that lame and that
desperate for "material", PuppetBoy.

I've "attributed" it to your master frequently...usually after YOU
try to run it back to me.

This is NOT the FIRST time I've told you about it, nor is it the
first time I'e addressed it to your "mentor", so don't try to slide
this one under the door...You're TOO LATE!

> > What >>I<< have stated is that said mistakes are "rage" as
> > defined by "your mentor", that being Lennie.
>
> Nice backtracking. When you "used" Len's material, you gave no
> attribution. You presented it as if it were your own idea.

You need to go waaaaaaay back, Scumster...It's been "attributed"
countless times...

> > It is NOT my assertion that it is such. Ask around, Brain...YOUR
> > attribution is WRONG.
>
> Your lack of attribution is wrong.

Nice try...you go tap dancing often...?!?!

> > > > coming from a guy who keeps changing his screen names,
> > >
> > > Keeps? First change in about four (4) years. I got a whopping four
> > > (4) spam emails today on my real email account since posting under

> > > this throwaway screen name.
> >
> > I have zero. So what's YOUR problem...?!?!
>
> I have no problem.

Ahhhhh...but you DO! That you won't do anything about it
compounds the problem!

> > > I'd rethink
> > > > making such a silly insinuation...
> > >
> > > Not silly. I know of at least two of your personalities.
> > >
> > > 1. Over-the-top, and
> > >
> > > 2. Major-Whacked-Out.
> >
> > OK, Brain...if you insist. As long as it makes you feel warm and
> > fuzzy to hold on to it.
> >
> > In the mean time, please work on getting YOUR problem with
> > attributes fixed, OK...?!?!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> You can help by getting your attribs correct. If you steal someone
> elses work, at least give them credit for the intellectual property
> that was stolen. Best of luck to you.

"Intellectual property"...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
! ! ! !

You DO have a sense of humor!

What a PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

920. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:38:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130638.16372c80@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88934

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
>
> I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.

A TYPO!!! A TYPO!!!

LENNIE'S MAD! HE'S SEETHING IN RAGE!

Well...at least he >>IS<< "mad", albeit not of the "anger"
sort...

> >You can think of it as a very expensive SWL receiver.
>
> No, I think of it as an updated version of the defunct Kachina.
>
> Poor baby, still miffed because I KNOW how SDRs work
> and you don't have a clue?
>
> Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
> at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
> it.

Please, Lennie...remind us how fast YOU can "go"...?!?! With or
without a Model 15 teletype...?!?! "56K" through your dial-up modem?
Maybe you're on "braodband?"...But it's >>RF<< that WE want to know
about...

Please...tell us at what warp-speeds YOUR >>radio station<<
operates, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

921. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 14:46:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130646.5306a630@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88935

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.

Nope....Streetsboro, Ohio...Hard to believe it's been as long as
it has...Seems like only yesterday. The school was so new that for
the first two weeks we were there we ahd to walk arond guys laying
linoleum tiles still...

Whew...

73

Steve, K4YZ

922. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 15:00:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313100057.01632.00001292@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 88937

In article <JHR2c.3193$eh1.2563@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040307194051.07155.00001122@mb-m06.aol.com...

>> Those of us who took exams by mail were looking for the "thin envelope"
>> (all that was inside was the license) and dreading the "thick envelope"
>> (it had a letter telling you that you failed, plus retest instructions and a
>> Form 610).

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Jim,
>
>Back when I obtained my licenses, I had an interesting experience. I had
>gone to Buffalo (FCC field office) for my 2nd phone during college in
>1965-66. Then I obtained my extra and 2nd telegraph plus radar endorsement
>(same office, different day). I then went for my 1st phone in the summer of
>1966 (after the other trips).

DANG!

>A few days later, I received a letter from
>the Buffalo office! Man, was I worried. I opened it up and it began "Dear
>Jim, it seems you left your red sweater. Shall we send it or will you call
>for it?". The sweater had no identification. I had been in and out of that
>office so many times that they knew me LOL.

HAW!! They knew you by first name!

>I worked for WROC-TV that
>summer under the 2nd and then the 1st class license and returned to WWHG in
>Hornell, NY for a stint as chief engineer until I joined the Navy in early
>1967. That little envelope gave me a fit until I opened it up LOL.
>
I can understand why! Back then *anything* from FCC got the pulse racing and
the BP up. Remember how the envelope had a warning about being for "official
use only"?

Still gives me a bit of goosebumps when my renewed license comes in the mail.

HEY - get THIS!

Just before writing this post, I opened up an innocent-looking letter - from
FCC! Took a second to realize it was from "First Choice Corporation", offering
me yet another mortgage refi deal......

73 es tnx for a great story de Jim, N2EY

923. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 15:00:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313100058.01632.00001293@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 88936

In article <405091D6.6000107@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
>>>>defaults on student and other loans.
>>>
>>>The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student loans
>
>>>through bankruptcy.
>>
>>
>> I'm not sure if you can or cannot. Anybody know for sure?
>
>
>Yes and no:
>
>from
>
>http://www.mdbankruptcylaw.com/lawguide/studentloans/when_you_cant_pay.asp
>
>
>Another possible solution is to discharge your student loan in
>bankruptcy. However, due to a 1998 change in the bankruptcy law, this is
>harder than ever to do. In general, you can discharge a student loan in
>bankruptcy only if you can prove that repaying the loan would be a
>severe hardship for you. There are several factors that courts consider
>in making this determination, but suffice it to say, it's a very
>difficult standard to meet.
>
>
> At one time, many students simply completed their education, and as a
>matter of course, declared bankruptcy and wiped out their debts (HA!
>America's best and brightest, eh?) After it caught on that they were
>doing this, the law was changed.

Guess I wasn't one of the best and brightest - I paid all mine back in full!
>
> So a person that declares bankruptcy has to continue repayment unless
>they can prove they simply can't pay. And that isn't all that likely to
>happen.

Yup, they'll just renegotiate the loan but it's still there.
>
>>
>>>So, you may not get graduates going intentionally
>>>bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
>>>bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid back.
>>
>>
>> Either way spells trouble.
>>
>>
>>>>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Here's one data point:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>>>>tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>>>>expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>>>>times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>>>>>more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>>>>fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>>>>
>>>>Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
>>>>weekends,
>>>> summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year
>>>> tuition. If a
>>>>kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per
>>>>year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an
>>>>hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about
>>>>1/6 of the tuition.
>>>>
>>>>That's just not right.
>>>>
>>>
>>>No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone grants.
>>>They were means tested, and of course if your parents were middle income
>>>you would be the poorest student in college.
>>
>>
>> Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart enough to
>get
>> in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones paid their way and
>the
>> rest got various forms of help but did not have to start out their
>professional
>> lives way in debt.
>>
>>
>>>However, now they are phasing
>>>out grants and bringing in loans. This is also a big mistake.

>>
>>
>> Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job
>> situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.
>
> The loans and their repayment are pretty reasonable.
>
>> The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college cost
>so
>> much?"
>
> You actually do know, don't you?
>
I'm not sure.

Seems to me that at the bottom of it all is the fact that people will pay the inflated tuitions because colege is seen as an absolute necessity these days.

73 de Jim, N2EY

924. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 15:38:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130738.3243111@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88938

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Sorry, Steve Quixote'robeson, but it has become an eternal truth of
> > > RRAP that you're not worthy of serious discussion.
> >
> > Then you've only proven yet again that you don't understand
> > what's going on.
> >
> > This is only about "me" in that I keep "calling you" on you and
> > Lennie's misrepresentations on the character of the Amateur Radio
> > service.
> >
> > YOU are the one who keeps trying to somehow make this about "me".
> > It's not. It's only about "me" in that I tick you off by rubbing
> > YOUR nose in YOUR inaccuracies and innuendos.
> >
> > Sorry to upset you, but YOU keep providing me with the material
> > to work with. (BTW...thanks...)
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
> post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
> yourself.

Jim has his own ideas and objectives when they come to you. We
usually agree 90% of the time...this is not one of them.

> You're obsessed.

Coming from a guy who continues to post to a newsgroup about a
radio service that he's stated he has no use for, we should take you
seriously...WHY...?!?!

You're a liar...that means I have no tolerence for you.

You misrepresent the truth about the Amateur Radio service. You
do this because you are an evil, petty little person. But you
wouldn't be the FIRST petty little person who got his way by repeating
the same lies over and over...I just intend to not LET you have your
way.

So far, it's working.

Steve, K4YZ

925. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 15:51:57 UTC
From: 14313 <democreeps@herblivesnow.net>
Message-ID: <c2vajs$7gu$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 88939
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Walt Davidson" <g3nyy@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:be665018dbehr6cclfdtglkk9cq8nmppss@4ax.com...
>
> And you need to quit top-posting and leaving 85 lines of irrelevant
> quotes trailing beneath your comments like a long, gray beard.
>
> Have a nice life.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
> 'Death to No-Coders'
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @despammed.com

PLONK!

FLUSHED!

gone

14313

926. Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 15:58:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130758.9ee40e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88940

Is Lennie must be getting lazier...It used to be he'd try to waffle
through at least two or three posts before trying to cut-and-paste his
way out of having cornered himself...but this time he didn't even wait
THAT long.

Ya cudda made "points" with everyone in this forum, Lennie, by
just offering the info on the manual and then accepting some gratitude
for it's rendering.

Instead you had to make it one more opportunity to bad-mouth
Amateurs in general, me in particular, and then make the fool that you
are even more laughable with even more obvious lame attempts to dig
your way out while trying to prove your "superior intellect".

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040312152625.21955.00000973@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403120726.64fcefe@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040311212341.23307.00007252@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >> > A couple of points, Lennie...
> >> >
> >> > First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
> >> >distortion.
> >>
> >> YES you have. Plus a LOT more in the form of excessive personal
> >> insults of many kinds.
> >>
> > No, I have not.
>
> Google has them all archived. Before that, DejaView had them.
>
> > You'd better re-think that, since Google is at EVERYONE'S
> >disposal.
>
> Then you are truly mentally deranged and unable to tell your own
> postings from anyone else's.
>
> Take your meds like a good little patient.
>
> Dismissed. Fall out.

Lennie...WHO'S the "dill sergeant" now...?!?!
>
> LHA / WMD

From: Steve Robeson, K4CAP (k4yz@aol.com)
Subject: Re: KDK FM2015R Manual Needed
View: Complete Thread (6 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-12 07:26:08 PST

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040311212341.23307.00007252@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403110153.390cc797@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > A couple of points, Lennie...
> >
> > First of all, I have never said EVERYTHING you write is a lie or
> >distortion.
>
> YES you have. Plus a LOT more in the form of excessive personal
> insults of many kinds.

No, I have not.

You'd better re-think that, since Google is at EVERYONE'S
disposal.

Do you REALLY want me to go pull up an example and PROVE YOU
WRONG AGAIN?

> > I HAVE publically stated in this forum that I acknowledge that
> >you know far more about the inner workings of the box than I do.
>
> You have NEVER said anything in public about "my having far more
> (knowledge) about the inner workings of the (FM2015R) box."

YES, I have, although not SPECIFICALLY about the FM2015R...

I have SPECIFICALLY stated that I acknowledge that your superior
knowledge of the inner workings of "the box" (refering to electronic
devices generically) on SEVERAL occassions.

Again, if you put me to the task of wading through all thos
Google archives to once again prove you WRONG, I will, but then I will
have bragging rights on you for the next decade.

> NEVER.

Never say never, Pumpkin...cuz if you DO, it WILL come back to
HAUNT YOU!

> If the "FM2015R" is an amateur radio, then, by YOUR own rules in
> here, I cannot possibly know anything about it because I have "zero"
> experience in amateur radio.

The FM2015R is an elctronic device designed to be used primarily
by licensed Radio Amateurs.

I don't fault your knowledge of electronics...I fault your
knowledge of AMATEUR PRACTICE. I am sure you were an adequate bench
technician at some point in your life, and could probably do OK with
current technology.

> Your "definition" is multiply faulty. I have learned many many things
> about radio and have applied them in all disciplines of such radio.
> All radios work by the SAME physics regardless of any human
> legislation or advertising/marketing or membership organizations say.

And as I have sated over and over and over, Lennie...

It's NOT about the physics of radio...It's about application...

> >When
> >YOU respond in a fraternal, respectful manner I ahve done the same
> >(ie: a couple years ago when I asked about plastic model
> >sources...Your INITIAL response was polite, precise and appreciated)
>
> I am NOT a "member of any fraternity."

I did not say you were a member of a fraternity.

Please QUOTE the EXACT statement wheerein you alledge that I said
you did.

> Mentions in public of other sources in this newsgroup is done for
> the BENEFIT of all, not for any 'fraternalism.' All public access
> newsgroups are readable by all and are NOT one-on-one private
> correspondance.
>
> But, YOU cannot ever remain "in phase" with what you say and
> MUST vent your rage against another you personally dislike. That
> is exemplified by the following -
>
> > What I ALSO have said is that you lie and mislead people about
> >the character of the AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE, that you find it necessary
> >to use demeaning and belittling endearments in order to place yourself
> >above everyone else, and that your purpose in doing so is for mere
> >spite, nothing else. (ie: your SECOND response to the above referenced
> >item wherein you made a 180 deg turnabout and resumed your typical
> >snide manner)
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. You have been taken to task for demonstrating an
> unusual personal mythos about amateur radio that is not real. That
> has already been explained to you. You refuse to accept it...and
> must continue to dwell on your peculiar personal outrage and
> disagreements...which you did as shown.

Lennie, there is nothing about Amateur Radio in any aspect of
which I participate that is "not real".

You have TRIED to "explain" your OPINION on Amateur Radio, but in
as much as you have NO practical experience from which to substantiate
your comments, you usually falter in facts!

> You inadvertently LIE in stating I say "bad things" about the Amateur
> Radio Service. I do NOT. I state up front that I say bad things about
> INDIVIDUALS who have amateur radio licenses, because they do so.

I have not lied, inadvertently or otherwise.

Furthermore YOUR above statement is in-and-of-itself untrue.

You BLATANTLY stated the American Radio Relay League is
dishonest. When tasked with providing something OTHER than your
opinion, you have failed to do so.

No evidence = Obvious lie.

> YOU do NOT represent ALL of U.S. amateur radio. Ergo, you cannot
> transpose your personality to that of ALL U.S. radio amateurs. (they
> would feel or should feel insulted by such a gross misrepresentation)

No, I don't. But I "represent" enough who share some of the same
opinions when it comes to YOUR honesty, integrity and character.

> YOU cannot seem to accept the slightest correction or rebuke or
> even difference of opinion to your own personal opinions with any
> sort of civility. YOU can't handle the truth and typify the "Colonel
> Jessups" of your imaginary "service" world.*

I accept lots of "corrections"...Especially when it's brought to
my attention in the same fashion that the bearer would like to
beaddressed if the shoe were on the other foot.

And it's not YOUR place to "rebuke" anyone in this forum. You
don't have the experience in Amateur practice from which to make an
informed correction.

> > That you started off on a purely fraternal offer of information
> >for another radio hobbyist was appreciated.
>
> YOU have repeatedly claimed that I am not allied in any way with
> U.S. amateur radio. Now you claim "fraternal offers." A LIE of
> a LIE by yourself. [how hypocritical can 'done peyote...' be?]

You are NOT "allied in any way with U. S. amateur radio"...

GOOGLE is not "allied" with Amateur Radio, yet I can find
information from it, too...Shall we get the FCC to send Google a
license?

> The "W7FG Manuals" service is an old one and links to the business
> are made on many websites of interest to hams as well as hobbyists.

Congratulations on having this bit of knowledge at hand.

> There are many businesses involved in supplying service manuals
> for electronic equipment, easily found by a simple Search function
> available at all major ISPs. I suggest a review of the functions
> available to AOL users as a benefit to your own education for
> Internet operations.

I was willing to take the info you suppled, say "tahnks" and be
on my way.

You found it necessary to add the lampooning. No problem. I can
play too.

> > That you finsihed off in your usual spiteful slashing was
> >typical. At elast this time you did it all in one post...
>
> There is NO "elast" in or about time. TRY to control rage and anger
> when typing. Clean copy is a positive attribute in communications.

A typo is not about rage or anger. It's about the wrong finger
on teh wrong key at the wrong time...Nothing else.

> >PS...Thanks for the tip, Len.
>
> WHAT "tip?" W7FG has been supplying manuals for a long time.

So...?!?!

You can't take a bit of gratitude for your efforts?

If someone doesn't know about something and you inform them of
it, you just gave them a "tip". I didn't know about W7FG. Now I do.
If I am asked a similar question by anotehr person, I'll pass it on.

> I never looked to see if your particular part number was available
> there. I just pulled down a copy of an H-P 606A signal generator
> manual that I obtained from there two years ago. The business
> name (using an amateur radio callsign, a grey area in "non-
> pecuniary" definition of amateur radio in a business name) is
> printed predominently on its cover.
>
> Did you go to the www.w7fg.com site to check for yourself? Or
> didn't you just shoot off your keyboard in personal rage and anger
> about imaginary slights against your attitudes and opinions in
> long-ago discussions now defunct?

No, I've not gone to the W7FG site yet. That's for the weekend.

Nothing I stated in either post addressed the functionality of
the W7FG site or whether or not I found what I am looking for.

My comments were directly relevent to YOUR shooting your mouth
off again.

> Why are you always so angry and rage-filled, wanting to fight all
> the time? Have you seen an analyst or therapist to cure that

> aggressive, uncivil behavior?

Why did YOU feel compelled to express YOUR anger? Why are YOU so
"rage-filled" about Amateur Radio that you feel compelled to spend an
obscene amount of time lambasting persons who DO love it?

I am in this forum becasue I am a LICENSED Radio Amateur.

If anyone needs a therapist, it's you, Putzy One.

> Try getting on the list for the first copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies"
> that is rumored to arrive in April. Get one. You may learn
> something about the insides of radio and electronics boxes and
> become productive in your amateur community.

Too late, Lennie...I am already a productive member of the
Amateur Radio community.

> Keep up that good work on the morse code and making sure that
> all U.S. prospective radio amateurs MUST take that code test
> forever and ever. Morse code can be "a significant factor" in
> emergencies and "play a major role" there as the League blabs.

Too bad you are so self absorbed in YOUR rage, Lennie, to haev
paid attention to other exchanges in the last, oh, two or three years,
to know where I really stand on this.

> * "Colonel Jessup" is the character in the film "A Few Good Men"
> and protrayed convincingly by actor Jack Nicholson. The
> character of Colonel Jessup was removed from the military court
> in arrest at the end of the film after the character lost his cool
> arrogance. "You can't handle the truth!" is Colonel Jessups'
> now-famous line that reveals his arrogance and imaginary beliefs
> about those not in the USMC.

Hot flash, Lennie...I WAS in the USMC, and "Colonel Jessup", as
portrayed by Mr Nicholson was a fictional character without precedent
or model.

You try to pidgeon-hole me with some lame rhetoric about "mythos"
of Amateur Radio, but then you try and make real-world analogies with
fictional movie characters...

Yes, Lennie...One of us needs "therapy", but one of them is NOT
me...

Take another hit of the Geritol, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ
Post a follow-up to this message

Google Home - Advertise with Us - Business Solutions - Services &
Tools - Jobs, Press, & Help

ï¿½2004 Google

927. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 16:00:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403130800.b65c83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88941

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403110411.6b3e54fd@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403101717.7bc2f7fd@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091759.732c471e@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > You need defused. Too many typos indicate seething rage (your definition).
> >
> > Geeze...you really ARE an idiot, Brain...
> >
> > As has been pointed out before, the "typo syndrome" is your
> > mentor's claim...Not mine.
> >
> > Thank-you for providing me yet another example of how you don't
> > get your attributions right. As if we needed any more proof...
> >
> > What a fool.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> The first time I saw it, it was your strong assertion with no
> attribution to Len as the originator. I would say that it is you who
> cannot get the attribution correct. You just steal what suits you,
> Don Quixoterobeson.

Then you are now as prolific a lair as Lennie, PuppetBoy.

Congratulations. Two of a kind...

Steve, K4YZ

928. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 16:33:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qLSdnSTCTrZQqs7dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88942

N2EY wrote:

> In article <1sidnfnU3fqL48_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>...
>
>
>>>>A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
>>>>year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
>>>>"redundant in the future. They found out:
>>>>
>>>> Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
>>>>the whole group, everyone had to be called.
>>>>
>>>> Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.
>>>>
>>>> Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.
>>>>
>>>>Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized
>>>>this on the first call that had to go to everyone.
>>>
>>>
>>>They couldn't figure all that out ahead of time?
>>
>> Amazingly enough, no! Cell phones are seductive little things. After
>>all you can call around the world, send pictures of whatever, and even
>>look up your email on the web with them. So how on earth can such a
>>wonderful instrument *not* be good at running a race? Imagine, each and
>>every participant with their own little radio, ready for direct contact.
>
>
> Well, there you have it: They did not understand their communications needs.
>
>> Any conclusion may be reached with insufficient thought!
>
>
> Can I steal that phrase? It's the perfect companion to this one:

Certainly! I kid of thought you would like that one.

> "If it happens, it must be possible."
>
>>>Sounds to me like the hams were smart enough to simply let them try it
>>>and see the problems first-hand.
>>
>> Yup. All of us that had done events before just chuckled and waited.
>>First call for our help came through a couple minutes after the start.
>
>
> Fortunate that you folks were there.

A young lady that fell and got a pavement rash certainly thought so. We
got there first aid, a repair truck, and back in the race. Year before
that, a fellow had a collision with a rear view mirror on a car and
messed his hand up.

>>>Those same problems surfaced in groups searching for wreckage from the
>>>space shuttle disaster last year.
>>>
>>>Of course cell phones *do* have uses in those situations. Where one
>>>specific person needs to talk to another specific person, and both are
>>>in the coverage area, they're perfect.
>>
>> Sure enough. But when many people need to hear instructions at the same
>
>
>>time, or if the area is large and rural, You need a multi-mode system,
>>and not just line of site low power stuff.
>
>
> Seems to me that *both* have a role.
>
>>>> Cell phones work for some things, but the idea that they can replace
>>>>radio operators is best advanced by those that don't really know how
>>>>that particular job is done.
>>>
>>>You mean like folks who comment on marathons without ever having been
>>>involved in one other than as a spectator? Or like folks who comment
>>>on amateur radio without ever having been involved other than as a
>>>spectator?
>>
>> Well, when you put it *that* way, yup!
>
>
> We call 'em "sidewalk superintendents" or "armchair athletes".
>
>>>>>http://www.lamarathon.com/2004/volunteers.php
>>>>
>>>> Some hams and ham equipment spotted in the pix.
>
>
>

>>>Of course.
>
>
>
>>>>>http://www.doitsports.com/volunteer/info.tcl?job_id=488
>
>
>>>>>(sign up for radio operators - only licensed hams need apply)
>>>>
>>>> Really? I thunk all you needed was a cell phone and the ability to say
>>>>"can you hear me now?....how about now? 8^)
>
>
>
>>>That's what some "professionals" would have us believe...
>
>
>> Any conclusion is possible given insufficient..... oh wait, I
>>already said that, didn't I?
>
>
> Bears repeating.
>
>>>>>http://www.cert-la.com/
>>>>>
>>>>>(scroll down a bit to where it says "ham radio operators wanted")
>>>>
>>>> Do you think maybe they put that in as an affirmative action sort of
>>>>thing? Maybe they just wanted to get the Hams to shut their yap's? ;^)
>>>
>>>Naw, it's simpler than that.
>>>
>>>Besides their considerable skills and experience, ham volunteers at
>>>events like the LA Marathon provide their own equipment and usually
>>>their own transportation and other support. Try hiring 200
>>>"communications professionals" for a day just to supply radio
>>>communications and see what happens to the race entry fee. (LA says
>>>200 hams, NYC marathon says 400, but of course NYC is a lot bigger
>>>race).
>
>
>> The price for professional radio operators would be from 80 to 160
>>thousand dollars for an 8 hour day, according to my BOE scribbling.
>>
>
> Marathon day is a lot longer than 8 hours. Figure that the staff is on the
> course at least two hours before the starting gun, and that the slowest
> particiapnts will finish in more than 5-6 hours, plus awards ceremony, cleanup,
> etc., and it's not an 8 hour day for anybody. With 20,000 participants, that's
> 4 to 8 dollars tacked on to the entry fee.

Of course. I just used the 8 hours as a real back of the envelope
thing. You can tie up a lot of time between assignment, training and
other meetings. And if you are using professionals they will need paid.

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

> Which reminds me...time to put the running shoes on..
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

929. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 16:44:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <K8SdnSiNj_nvp87d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 88943

N2EY wrote:

> In article <405091D6.6000107@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <Xns94A7ECAFD77D7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>That's one possibility. Another is bankruptcy and the resulting
>>>>defaults on student and other loans.
>>>>
>>>The problem with that is that I don't think you can write off student loans
>>
>>>through bankruptcy.
>>>
>>>
>>>I'm not sure if you can or cannot. Anybody know for sure?
>>
>>
>>Yes and no:
>>
>>from
>>
>>http://www.mdbankruptcylaw.com/lawguide/studentloans/when_you_cant_pay.asp
>>
>>
>>Another possible solution is to discharge your student loan in
>>bankruptcy. However, due to a 1998 change in the bankruptcy law, this is
>>harder than ever to do. In general, you can discharge a student loan in
>>bankruptcy only if you can prove that repaying the loan would be a
>>severe hardship for you. There are several factors that courts consider
>>in making this determination, but suffice it to say, it's a very
>>difficult standard to meet.
>>
>>
>> At one time, many students simply completed their education, and as a
>>matter of course, declared bankruptcy and wiped out their debts (HA!
>>America's best and brightest, eh?) After it caught on that they were
>>doing this, the law was changed.
>

>
> Guess I wasn't one of the best and brightest - I paid all mine back in full!

They are definitely the ones that are stupid. That bankruptcy follows
them forever. Seven years is the legal time limit, but face it, it's
forever. Then when they do get some semblance of credit back, they
aren't getting the most favorable rates.

>> So a person that declares bankruptcy has to continue repayment unless
>>they can prove they simply can't pay. And that isn't all that likely to
>>happen.
>
>
> Yup, they'll just renegotiate the loan but it's still there.
>
>>>>So, you may not get graduates going intentionally
>>>>bankrupt, but the inability to pay it off may lead more people into
>>>>bankruptcy. They may then still owe the loan, but it won't get paid back.
>>>
>>>
>>>Either way spells trouble.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>> Makes me think of the "They Might be Giants" Sone "Minimum Wage"
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Here's one data point:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>In the fall of 1972, when I entered the University of Pennsylvania,
>>>>>>>tuition alone (no books, fees, etc.) was $3000/year. Which was very
>>>>>>>expensive at the time. Today the same school charges more than 10
>>>>>>>times that. But will the starting salary offered to a BSEE in 2006 be
>>>>>>>more than 10 times what it was in 1976, when I graduated? Is
>>>>>>>fininacial aid 10 times what it was in my time there? Nope.
>>>>>>
>>>>>Add to this the fact that a kid who worked at minimum wage during the
>>>>>weekends,
>>>>>summer and holidays could make a sizable dent in that $3000/year
>>>>>tuition. If a
>>>>>kid could take home $1.50 an hour, and manage to put in 1000 hours per
>>>>>year, there's half the tuition. Today, if a kid can take home $5 an
>>>>>hour and put in the same 1000 hours, the resulting $5000 is only about
>>>>>1/6 of the tuition.
>>>>>
>>>>>That's just not right.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>No argument there. Back home in the UK they used to give everyone grants.
>>>>They were means tested, and of course if your parents were middle income

>>>>you would be the poorest student in college.
>>>
>>>
>>>Still, the effective result was that almost any kid who was smart enough to
>>get in could go to college and get a degree. The rich ones paid their way and
>>the rest got various forms of help but did not have to start out their
>>professional
>>lives way in debt.
>>>
>>>>However, now they are phasing
>>>>out grants and bringing in loans. This is also a big mistake.
>>>
>>>Actually, I think loans make sense *IF* they are reasonable and the job
>>>situation is such that they can be paid back in a short period of time.
>>
>> The loans and their repayment are pretty reasonable.
>>
>>
>>>The big question nobody wants to answer is "why does a year of college cost
>>so much?"
>>
>> You actually do know, don't you?
>
> I'm not sure.

Colleges build a lot of new buildings these days. They are involved in
a lot of the research that used to be done by Research and Development
divisions of business. Many of them don't get as much support from their
State governments as in years past. All of this adds up to increased
costs that are driving the education cost inflation.

> Seems to me that at the bottom of it all is the fact that people will pay the
> inflated tuitions because colege is seen as an absolute necessity these days.

For now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

930. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 17:00:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313120059.21232.00004738@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88944

In article <ByD4c.11745$t16.6811938@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> Marathon day is a lot longer than 8 hours. Figure that the staff is on the
>> course at least two hours before the starting gun, and that the slowest
>> particiapnts will finish in more than 5-6 hours, plus awards ceremony,
>cleanup,
>> etc., and it's not an 8 hour day for anybody. With 20,000 participants,
>that's
>> 4 to 8 dollars tacked on to the entry fee.
>>
>> Which reminds me...time to put the running shoes on..

42 minutes this morning - spring is coming..
>
>You left out another block of time. For a large event, there needs to be a
>planning/coordination meeting in advance of the marathon that the
>communications staff would need to attend. Paid operators won't attend that
>for free either.

That's absolutely correct! And it's probably a series of meetings and coordination settings, too.

Thanks, Dee.

73 de Jim, N2EY

931. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 17:00:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 88945

In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
>issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
>
> Yeah...right...
>

Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do you bother with him?

73 de Jim, N2EY

932. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:08:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313130812.15923.00004308@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88948

In article <404DC80A.7080008@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <xdqdnbvLGJPci9DdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>In article <28SdndH_T7yRvdfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>>>>Exactly, he saw that by looking at the longterm, his overall total
>profits
>>>>>>would be enhanced. He wanted a longterm, stable income than a quick
>buck.

>>>>> And the most amazing thing is that with just that outlook, we not only
>>>>>stabilize the situation, but we preserve the best part of how our
>>>>>econmmic system works.

>>>>Henry Ford wasn't a paragon of virtue by any means but he did take the
>long
>>>>view. That's considered old-fashioned today.
>>>
>>> It's a debatable case for invoking Godwin, maybe?
>
>> My point was simply that I'm not glorifying him.
>
> Despite his reprehensible support for the N***s, he did know how to
>sell cars and keep his people pretty well satisfied.
>
And all those Willow Run B-24s....
>
>>>>> I always thought that the best way was to let the businesses do their
>>>>>thing as much as possible, with a light touch. The time for intervention
>>>>>is when the business threatens the environment, employee rights (such as
>>>>>there are any) or of course engaging in illegal activities, which there
>>>>>will always be some companies willing to do that. And of course the
>>>>>monopoly problems.
>>>>
>>>>Of course - the devil is in the details, though. How much environmental
>>>>threat is OK? What rights do employees really have?
>>>
>>>Sure. We have a local case in which a massive amount of known Iron
>>>Pyrite rock was dumped in a small valley with a stream running along the
>>>bottom of the valley. The valley is all filled in now. The predictable
>>>happened, and we now have a massive acid drainage problem that will kill

>>>many tourist frequented streams and will probably sterilize the creeks
>>>it runs into and construction on the highway has been stopped, and we
>>>have a real mess on our hands.
>>
>> Who dumped the bad rock?
>
> The company making the road. My fault, I reread my post and didn't made

>that clear at all. It was part of a large road building project. One
>portion of it included basically lopping of the top of a mountain, and
>filling in a small valley next to it to even out the terrain.

Sounds like lawsuit time and serious trouble for whoever did the signing-off.
Particularly the PEs involved.

>>> Not much of a gray area there I think. And we can keep busy enough with
>>>the blatant cases that we don't have to go after Joe six-pack and his
>>>Sunday BBQ or his lawnmower.
>>
>> Of course! That's the kind of details I'm talking about.
>>
>> OTOH, one of the excuses given by industry is that environmental concerns
>cost
>> too much.
>
> Oh, they do cost! But we have this warped mentality that some groups
>are exempt from responsibility. If we wreck a large part of say the
>tourist and vacation and vacation product industry in our area, we lose
>all that money. And it's so much more money than would have been spent
>by doing the job correctly in the first place. The little stream
>connects into prime *native* fishing stream, a prime bass fishing stream
>and a large lake heavily used for recreation.
>
>My folks taught me that if it costs too much - don't do it.

Again, the problem consists of getting the big picture and taking the long
view. One can imagine that the reason for the road in the first place was so
the tourist/vacation set could have easier access to the fishing and lake....

>>>>Martha and her bookie...I mean broker...got convicted, didn't they?
>>>
>>>>Here's a datapoint for ya: The USA imported 57% of the petroleum used here
>>>>last
>>>>year, up from 56% in the previous year. Domestic production is down
>>>>slightly.
>>>>Even if the Alaskan refuge is drilled, it will be 10 years before full
>>>>production is reached there. Gasoline prices are already about $1.75 and
>>>>it's only March.
>>>
>>> Some people are making a good profit.

>> Yup.
>
>>>>Meanwhile, SUV sales are at record levels and a process called TDP
>(Thermal
>>>>Depolymerization) is almost unheard of.
>>>
>>> Wellll, you are partially correct. You lump SUV's as if they are all of
>>>the Excursion/Suburban/Escalade type.
>
>> Many of them are.
>>
>>>And that is wrong. I just bought
>>>an SUV that gets in the 20's in town, and low 30's on the highway. It's
>>>downright tiny by comparison, and is a very responsible vehicle as far
>>>as resources go.
>
>> Sure - but how many of the big ones are sold for every responsible one? And
>how
>> many are driven as commuting vehicles and status symbols rather than
>because
>> their capabilities are really needed?
>
>The Excursion has been canceled you know. The monsters really aren't
>selling that well anymore

That's good.
>
>>> And I don't think that any of the Bio fuel options are viable or even
>>>desirable. To see what I mean, replacement of even a tiny fraction of
>>>what we use now in fossil fuel will take a lot of biofuel, and how much
>>>can we make?

>> TDP isn't biofuel.
>
> Is that a definition thing Jim? The feed stock is certainly
>biologically based. And it's a good process, that simply uses offal to
>make it's goop.

It's a big thing if what is now a disposal problem can be turned into a usable
product.
>
> On a small scale, it can be helpful, but I still believe that it is
>insufficient on a large scale. Although maybe..... Soylent oil? 8^)
>
bwaahaahaa!

But I agree that even if TDP works (both technically *and* economically), it's
only a piece of the puzzle and not a complete solution.

73 de Jim, N2EY

933. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:08:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313130813.15923.00004309@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88947

In article <Uyq4c.2526$vP3.975@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Regardless of your ignorance, it is the amateurs that are pointing out the
>potential problems of BPL. If nothing else, this speaks volumes about the
>need for reasonable tests for potential amateurs (not something that you can
>walk into a test and walk away with an 'extra' class license). The code/no
>code arguement, in my opinion, is moot; what is more to the point is what
>these amateurs can and *do* contribute, regardless of the rants of many
>folks who may be envious of the frequencies available to amateurs.

Well said, Jim!
>
>I worked in EMC compliance. We had a problem with interference from
>powerlines. Yes, it is possible to reduce the problem. Whilst it won't
>qualify as a test to pass a particular piece of hardware, it is *great* for
>determining sources of RFI. Someone has a problem with RF interference to
>home equipment (not necessarily amateur). How do you solve it? I've helped
>in both cases. Some folks have minds so closed that they can't see the
>forest for the trees (or vice-versa).
>
>I remember finishing my active duty with the U.S. Navy. I suspect it was
>verteran's day as there had been a parade and I was in a bar later on. A
>few guys in Navy uniforms had a problem. I overheard the conversation.
>Their transmitter had low output and couldn't tune. I went over to them and
>asked to see the transmitter. Sure enough, a bad cap in the tank circuit.
>We repaired it on the spot (dang if I didn't get hornswaggled into joining
>the reserves LOL).
>
bwaahaahaa

>When folks like you ask "did you repair that pothole in interstate 90
>between ....", you are missing the point. It is the knowlege and theory
>that can enable hams to assist in many situations. Although I had engaged
>in emergency communications on Guam Island (and it was many years ago) and
>an SOS on 500 KHz at sea (also many years ago), you assume that I am
>obsolete. I would suggest that bad capacitors still happen and the folks
>with some technical background still can help. Although that situation with
>the U.S. Naval Reserve was many years ago, I've also repaired much more
>modern transceivers in the past decade. I am also quite capable of reducing
>interference between devices today. You dwell on the past; the technically
>astute needn't.

Seems to me that you're also pretty good at seeing the difference between a
well-designed system and a poorly-designed system....

>
>BTW, BPL is *not* going to serve the "underserved". I won't explain it.
>You take the time and effort (*if* you have the perseverence - which I
>doubt - and research it).
>
>"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:2cgv40plruna52lu189bfk0vgaij0lt0t0@4ax.com...
>> On Wed, 10 Mar 2004 05:46:09 GMT, Zoran Brlecic <...WA7AA...@get.lost>
>wrote:
>
>> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
>> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few
>> amateurs then it is justified.

Classic collectivist thinking. The benefit of the many supposedly justifies trampling on the rights of the few. Usually "the many" is wildly overestimated and "the few" wildy underestimated.

>> Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that
>> unjustifiably occupies valuable radio spectrum.

Says who? The ITU and its predecessors have justified it since at least 1927.

More to the point:

Why should BPL be allowed to pollute the radio spectrum with noise when other, better technologies (DSL, cable, 802.11xx) exist to do the same job without the noise pollution? For example, cable TV companies spend serious $$ to keep their systems buttoned up tight - why should their competitors be allowed to radiate?

Who are the folks who will be served by Access BPL? All of the test and deployment sites I've seen mentioned are in suburban/urban areas that are already served, or could be served, by DSL and/or cable broadband. Farmer Jones isn't on their list yet. Nor is he likely to be, for exactly the same reasons cable and DSL aren't.

Is BPL cheaper? One deployment I say said $29.95 a month - for the first three months! Then it goes up to $49.95. Meanwhile the telcos are offering bundled packages of POTS, cell and DSL for less than $100/month.

73 de Jim, N2EY

934. Re: Just when you thought it couldn't get any worse...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:08:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313130814.15923.00004310@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88946

In article <404BD1CF.4060402@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>So 1 of the other questions required knowledge of a few different points
>>>of knowledge to get right. "You have a linear which uses B+ of 800V.
>>>For use with SSB, what is the max current your ampmeter on the finals will
>>>show?"

>>>You had to know
>>>1) The FCC dictated input "plate" power for power limits for hams,

>>And that the amateur rules of the time dictated that hams measure
>>plate/collector power input, not transmitter output.

>>>2) What the power limit was for SSB,

>>And the band in use

>>>3) and how to factor in PEP averaging.

>>>And

>>>4) how to calculate plate power.

>>Yup - all in *one* little multiple choice question!

>Maybe it could be rewritten and made part of the question pool. Updating
>it as needed.

Anyone can submit questions to the QPC. Might be worth a go.

>>And what did you think of the written tests then?
>>
>With the multi-point knowledge some of them required, actually quite good.
>And this was pre-Bash.....

I agree. But we're not going back to secret tests, so we need the next-best
thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

935. For Sale - Texscan Sweep Generator model SG-677U $99.00

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:37:27 UTC
From: mikelgiles@bfesystems.com
Message-ID: <51d5c4f4.0403131037.4cf774d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88949

For Sale - Texscan Sweep Generator model SG-677U $99.00 + shipping & handling.

Unit is mounted in a very sturdy military carrying case but can be removed for rack mounting. I have no way of testing other than making sure it turns on and the dials and gages looks like they are working, so I am offering on a money back guarantee (less return shipping cost). Pictures can be found at www.dentonmarket.com or contact me at mikelgiles@bfesystems.com

936. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:59:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313135912.06226.00003388@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88951

In article <XYudnRFa6cXfi87dRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Are you keeping count of your new knicknames Steve? They 're coming hard
>and fast!

Not near as fast as the gunnery nurse is inventing new pejoratives.

He is too busy basking in the attention he gets in this Chat Room
to pay attention. Today's download of messages seems to be all
about hisself and trying to put down his perceived "enemies."

Those all result in verbal enemas.

Now go back to your terribly amateur-radio-meaningful discussions
of the whichness of the what of National Economy, College and
University Education, Kosher Food, and whatever thread mutations
occur to avoid any ham radio tawk.

Morse code testing is starting to disappear among the world's
administrations regulations for their amateur radio licensing (see
the start of this thread, way back when in the veldt).

Are you into denial about the subject or did you think the ham
license made you all gurus on NON-amateur-radio subjects?

If you can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen. Get home
delivery of kosher food so you won't be hungry...

LHA / WMD

937. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:59:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313135913.06226.00003389@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88950

In article <20040313100058.01632.00001293@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>Seems to me that at the bottom of it all is the fact that people will pay the >inflated tuitions because colege is seen as an absolute necessity these days. >

"Colege?" An MSEE who failed English? :-)

Is a college or university degree necessary for being an radio amateur?

Is an amateur radio license test equal to a college or university examination?

Walk the plonk, TAFKARJ...

LHA / WMD

938. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:59:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313135913.06226.00003390@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88953

In article <1e4e3692.0403130621.3c61fa9c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>
>> Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
>> at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
>> it! :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Someone musta flipped over his rock.

I don't think so. Mr. Foreign Service Dave just wants attention to
himself so he can order folks around during his misdirectional
postings. He can't come up with any convincing arguments against
morse code test elimination so he loves to bait and misdirect the
NCTA. He wants a Chat Room atmosphere where he can vie
with TAFKARJ for King of the Chat Room.

The PCTA regulars all want to misdirect into Chat Room fights for
ascendency. That way they think they can hurt others by trying
to show they are all expert at NON-amateur radio subjects...and
then hit on others anywhichwaytheycan for speaking against them.

It looks like they want to be the Biggest Rock in a field of pebbles.

LHA / WMD

939. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 18:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040313135914.06226.00003391@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 88952

In article <ByD4c.11745$t16.6811938@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You left out another block of time. For a large event, there needs to be a >planning/coordination meeting in advance of the marathon that the >communications staff would need to attend. Paid operators won't attend that >for free either.

Were the very first marathons, especially in the Olympic Games, run by professionals?

The Los Angeles 2004 Marathon used LAPD and LAFD personnel who are paid all the time. Do they count in your analysis?

Are marathon rules and regulations in Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R.?

Do marathoners and marathon staff need to learn morse code in order to make the event a success?

LHA / WMD

940. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 21:21:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313162139.15923.00004312@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88955

In article <4vednUSdV9lZhtDdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

(Bill Sohl wrote):

>> But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
>> expenses.
>
> That is because they intend to get rid of every possible employee
>whenever possible. Why would you train people that aren't going to be
>working for you in a few years?

The military does it all the time!
>
> Side note: These good folk could probably save money if they were to
>get a bill passed requiring all Americans to learn Indian language in
>school. That way they wouldn't have to train their new help to speak
>English.

Which language of India?

>> Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
>> and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
>> because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
>> The irony of non-support for older products is that in
>> some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
>> to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>>
>>>This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
>>>their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
>>> Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who
>were the
>>>new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
>>>succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
>>> years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the
>best of
>>>care.
>>
>> Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
>
> And the new car is so expensive that it darn well *better* make 200 K
>miles. They have become waay too expensive. Did you know that they are
>offering 7 year auto loans now? All the "innovative" techniques that the
>companies had to do over the years to sell cars as the price went up is
>reaching an end-game for them. Most people do not want to pay $500-$600
>or more a month for a vehicle.

Are cars *really* more expensive, adjusted for inflation?

Back in 2001, my Honda Odyssey minivan cost about $26,000 new. How much did, say, the classic Ford Country Squire station wagon with the woodlike sides cost in 1964? How much has typical income increased in that time period?

I just paid it off, and it's got a lot more usable life in it. So the total lifetime cost may be less in inflation-adjusted dollars.

>Leasing looked good for a while, but of course you have no trade-in, and
>the lease company doesn't really want you to trade the thing in, they
>want you to buy-out. But oh those car payments!

All depends on a whole bunch of unknowns like residual value, interest rate, repair cost, etc.
>
>>>>Look at the
>>>>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>>>
>>>Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
>>>However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>>
>> Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
>
>Open up an old IBM PC, then open up a clone box built for cheap
>performance. I can send you pix of some I have in my garage.

Agreed. But that's in large part because they are not meant to last that long. And because enough people buy on price alone.

Meanwhile, folks like me cherrypick the trailing edge for pennies. This Amidon 350MHz box cost me a lot less than $100, and most of that was for the CD-ROM burner and the modem.
>
>>>>Consider too that
>>>>a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
>>>>to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
>>>>is applied by the consumer).

>>>A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
>>>balanced, Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
>>>unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I knew
>> were
>>>talking about retiring at 55.

And Ahnold was a movie actor.
>>
>> Your point?
>
> You like it better this way?

I don't.
>

>>>All changed now.

>> Your point?
>
> Same question.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

941. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 21:21:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313162140.15923.00004313@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 88954

In article <qLSdnSTCTrZQqs7dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Fortunate that you folks were there.
>
> A young lady that fell and got a pavement rash certainly thought so. We

>got there first aid, a repair truck, and back in the race. Year before
>that, a fellow had a collision with a rear view mirror on a car and
>messed his hand up.

And while maybe it *could* have been done by "professionals", the fact is that
it *was* done by amateurs.

Some folks get all bent out of shape by such plain, simple facts.

>> Marathon day is a lot longer than 8 hours. Figure that the staff is on the
>> course at least two hours before the starting gun, and that the slowest
>> particiapnts will finish in more than 5-6 hours, plus awards ceremony,
>> cleanup,
>> etc., and it's not an 8 hour day for anybody. With 20,000 participants,
>> that's 4 to 8 dollars tacked on to the entry fee.
>
> Of course. I just used the 8 hours as a real back of the envelope
>thing. You can tie up a lot of time between assignment, training and
>other meetings.

As Dee pointed out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

942. Re: Section 21 of - Yet another petition submitted

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 22:39:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131439.2c13b0bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88956

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130800.b65c83@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403110411.6b3e54fd@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403101717.7bc2f7fd@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091759.732c471e@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > You need defused. Too many typos indicate seething rage (your definition).
> > >
> > > Geeze...you really ARE an idiot, Brain...
> > >
> > > As has been pointed out before, the "typo syndrome" is your
> > > mentor's claim...Not mine.
> > >
> > > Thank-you for providing me yet another example of how you don't
> > > get your attributions right. As if we needed any more proof...
> > >
> > > What a fool.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > The first time I saw it, it was your strong assertion with no
> > attribution to Len as the originator. I would say that it is you who
> > cannot get the attribution correct. You just steal what suits you,
> > Don Quixoterobeson.
>
> Then you are now as prolific a lair as Lennie, PuppetBoy.
>
> Congratulations. Two of a kind...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

That's not the way I see it. I see you as the terrific, prolific liar.

943. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:01:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131501.6cfefad9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88957

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130738.3243111@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Sorry, Steve Quixote'robeson, but it has become an eternal truth of
> > > > RRAP that you're not worthy of serious discussion.
> > >
> > > Then you've only proven yet again that you don't understand
> > > what's going on.
> > >
> > > This is only about "me" in that I keep "calling you" on you and
> > > Lennie's misrepresentations on the character of the Amateur Radio
> > > service.
> > >
> > > YOU are the one who keeps trying to somehow make this about "me".
> > > It's not. It's only about "me" in that I tick you off by rubbing
> > > YOUR nose in YOUR inaccuracies and innuendos.
> > >
> > > Sorry to upset you, but YOU keep providing me with the material
> > > to work with. (BTW...thanks...)
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
> > post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
> > yourself.
>
> Jim has his own ideas and objectives when they come to you. We
> usually agree 90% of the time...this is not one of them.

So it continues to be about you. You cannot control yourself.

> > You're obsessed.
>
> Coming from a guy who continues to post to a newsgroup about a
> radio service that he's stated he has no use for, we should take you
> seriously...WHY...?!?!

I've stated no such thing. You continue to lie.

> You're a liar...that means I have no tolerence for you.

Quixoterobeson, it comes as no suprise that you have no tolerance for people who don't lie, either.

> You misrepresent the truth about the Amateur Radio service.

Absolutely not. What lies have I told?

You
> do this because you are an evil, petty little person. But you
> wouldn't be the FIRST petty little person who got his way by repeating
> the same lies over and over...I just intend to not LET you have your
> way.

Holy guacamole! A person points out that you are nuts, and so they are evil, petty little people? Are your ex's evil petty little people? Is your shrink an evil petty little person?

> So far, it's working.

So far all we hear is your flatulent mouth spewing lies. When are you going to get to the truth? It will set you free.

944. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:03:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131503.13cec261@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88958

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040312161802.05539.00004737@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
> >post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
> >yourself.
> >
> >You're obsessed.
>
> I'm thinking he's advanced from obsession to posession.
>
> He should be out getting more exorcise. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

He is certainly demon filled. I don't know if a mere shrink could
help him at this point. Maybe a tag-team of Jesuits?

945. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:07:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131507.4b703ed6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88959

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130638.16372c80@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
> >
> > I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.
>
> A TYPO!!! A TYPO!!!
>
> LENNIE'S MAD! HE'S SEETHING IN RAGE!

Quixoterobeson, you did it again.

946. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:09:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131509.734a7eae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88960

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130646.5306a630@posting.google.com>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<xY94c.11398$t16.6607427@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > Not unless you went to 3rd grade in Andrew, Iowa or Elwood, Iowa.
>
> Nope....Streetsboro, Ohio...Hard to believe it's been as long as
> it has...Seems like only yesterday.

And acts like only yesterday.

> Whew...

...

947. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:17:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131517.66d772fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88961

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313012418.07155.00001229@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403121724.11be7f6a@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>...

> >> Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought
> >> not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be
> >> ready for your afternoon nappy.
> >
> >You're quite disrespectful of a radio veteran.
>
> That's how teenagers have always been...
>
> LHA / WMD

And some of those that just got out of third grade yesterday.

948. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:19:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131519.1e2428b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88962

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0403130634.24b85768@posting.google.com>...

> What a PUTZ!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What a schwanz.

949. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:22:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131522.603e2aed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88963

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130624.115256fe@posting.google.com>...
>
> YOU are the one who always insists that typos are indicative of
> "rage". I ahve NEVER stated that except to sarcastically throw it
> back at YOU when you do it yourself.

But Quixoterobeson, you're always in a rage. So when you commit
typo's, you're in a... rage.

So how did Len get it wrong?

950. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:26:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88964

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
> >issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
> >
> > Yeah...right...
> >
> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do you
> bother with him?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with Len.

951. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:29:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131529.566a2e1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88965

Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<42a464a6e1a95c3e10a8af780d3f3450@dizum.com>...

If true, you're a #1 jerk.

952. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-13 23:33:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403131533.6bd4a6d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88966

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040311074703.22081.00004490@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns94A7E902EEF1Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >> I dunno, Alun. It might soon be hard to convince a lot of people
> >> to go
> >> drastically into debt just to have their field be decimated upon
> >> graduation.
> >>
> >
> >Agreed. The only solution to that appears to be more money in grant form
> >rather than loan form. At least it can be targeted at particular subjects,
> >like EE and Comp Sci for example.
>
> I agree with grants, but they should be targeted at occupations where there's a
> shortage, not a glut, of trained workers.

According to the Dem's, there's a glut of workers, i.e., unemployment
is at Great Depression levels.

Thus, according to your targeted grant scheme, there will be no
grants.

Meanwhile jobs continue to flow overseas.

> >>> Even then, you have countries like India to worry about. Despite their
> >>> overall poverty they have more English speaking educated middle class
> >>> than America (their sheer numbers help here), and they are willing to
> >>> do white collar and professional jobs for much less.
> >>
> >> Well, the tech help I've gotten surely doesn't speak English very
> >> well! 8^)
> >
> >Indians in India use English mostly to communicate with eachother, as they
> >have a proliferation of different languages. Just because they are fluent
> >doesn't necessarily mean it's English as you know it, or even as I know it.
> >
> From a purely numerical standpoint, it could be claimed that *their* usage is
> standard and *we* all have accents...

Depends if they went to the school of English, or the school of
American.

953. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 00:00:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040313190034.05539.00004752@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88967

In article <nt93c.28706$aT1.24813@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> > Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
>> > but even in building construction, there is technological advances and
>> > automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
>> > Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
>> > always come prefab.
>>
>> Sure - but those changes occur slowly enough that builders can keep up
>> with them. And they're not faced with career obsolescence. The
>> introduction of nail guns and PVC pipe has not eliminated the need for
>> carpenters and plumbers.
>>
>> While building a house isn't exactly cheap, here in the USA we manage
>> to do it with almost all domestic labor and materials. If it can be
>> done in that industry, why not others?
>
>The reality of housing is that it isn't mass produced because
>we don't want to all live in identical homes.

Where you been, Bill? Most new houses over the past 50+ years have been mass-produced. The Levitt brothers made it a science.

>That leads to considerable
>customization and often to totally unique homes. Not so with
>consumer products.

Most homes are built by standard techniques that permit customization at little or no extra cost. Ask Kim when she gets back.

>> > > >If I hadn't had the
>> > > >opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
>> > > >Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and application
>> > > >compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
>> > > >somewhere.
>> > > >
>> > > >> And who pays for the retraining?
>> > > >
>> > > >It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
>> > > >training costs per employee are gone.
>> > >
>> > > In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System)
>paid
>> > > for
>> > > your continuing education. You weren't expected to do it all on your

>own.
>> > > More
>> > > important, your new training built on your existing skills and
>knowledge
>> > > so you could stay in the same field.
>> >
>> > But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
>> > expenses.
>>
>> That's exactly the problem.
>
>Would you rather they fold-up completely?

I'd rather they took the long view. And I'd rather the govt. supported that.
>
>> > > >> >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
>> > > >> >> economy alone.
>> > > >> >
>> > > >> >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
>> > > >> >done with more and more automation resulting in less
>> > > >> >and less need for skilled labor.
>> > > >>
>> > > >> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the
>production -
>> > > >> automated and all - is moving to places like China.
>> > > >>
>> > > >> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
>> > > >
>> > > >The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
>> > >
>> > > Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market, often unready
>and
>> > > of low quality.
>> >
>> > That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.
>>
>> Same thing, essentially. Push a product that won't last out the door
>> so that the customers will have to replace it in a few years.
>
>The new technology makes the typical consumer product
>obsolete...not poor quality by design.

Same difference.
>
>> > > Companies do not support products after even a few years because
>> > > they want you to buy the new products.
>> >
>> > Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
>> > and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
>> > because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
>>

>> I disagree! See below.
>
>I suspect we'll still disagree.
>
>> > The irony of non-support for older products is that in
>> > some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
>> > to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>> >
>> > > This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers
>"redesigned"
>> > > their
>> > > cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
>> > > Their
>> > > goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who were
>the
>> > > new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They
>almost
>> > > succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
>> > > years,
>> > > and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the
>best of
>> > > care.
>> >
>> > Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
>>
>> Yep - and here's why:
>>
>> Up until about the mid-60s or so, US automakers focused on the sizzle
>> rather than the steak. Their focus was on making lots of cars, and if
>> they polluted, didn't last or weren't as safe as they could be, that
>> wasn't much of a big deal. They fought all sorts of innovations
>> because they were afraid of tarnishing the image. Example: they didn't
>> like seat belts in part because of the cost but also because they're a
>> reminder that you could die in your car.
>>
>> Then US automakers got a 1-2-3-4 punch in about a decade:
>>
>> 1) Safety issues
>> 2) Pollution issues
>> 3) Fuel economy issues
>> 4) Foreign competition/quality issues
>>
>> Detroit took a real thumping from all four, in large part because the
>> foreign automakers were more experienced building safer, cleaner, more
>> efficient cars that would last longer. The Big Three had to be dragged
>> kicking and screaming (by way of legislation requiring things like
>> seat belts and dual brake systems) into making better cars. In at
>> least one case (Chrysler) the Feds got involved with loan guarantees.
>
>Your point?

That when they stopped taking the long view, they took a real beating. And they had to go hat-in-hand to the govt. to keep from being wiped out completely. And it's happening all over again in a different area.

>The automakers felt the impact of consumers.
>That's what I have said all along.

They *fought* all of those things rather than responding to them. It took legislation and near-bankruptcy to get safer, cleaner, more efficient US cars.
>
>> > > >Look at the
>> > > >ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>> > >
>> > > Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives,
>etc.
>> > > However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>> >
>> > Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
>>
>> Based on repairs I've had to do to computers both at home and at work.
>
>Anecdotal then.

My experience caring for quite a few machines over the past 20 years.
>
>> > > >Consider too that
>> > > >a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
>> > > >to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
>> > > >is applied by the consumer).
>> > > >
>> > > A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
>> > > balanced,
>> > > Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace dividend",
>> > > unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks I
>knew
>> > > were talking about retiring at 55.
>> >
>> > Your point?
>> >
>>
>> That a lot has changed in the past few years.
>
>And the rate of change keeps accelerating it seems.

It doesn't have to.

>> > > All changed now.
>> >
>> > Your point?
>>
>> That something needs to be done.
>>
>> One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal

>> changes, particularly in the middle class.
>>
>> 40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to work and Mom to stay home with
>> the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious
>> middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions, but as
>> a rule if Dad had a good job, Mom did not have to work outside the
>> home when the kids were small).
>>
>> Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and
>> almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own
>> educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's
>> education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes
>> well!
>
>OK, and that's not going to change.

I think it can, and for the better - if we want it to.

73 de Jim, N2EY

954. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 01:25:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4053B489.2D04D0F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 88968

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040313100058.01632.00001293@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Seems to me that at the bottom of it all is the fact that people will pay the
> >inflated tuitions because colege is seen as an absolute necessity these days.
> >
>
> "Colege?" An MSEE who failed English? :-)
>
> Is a college or university degree necessary for being an radio
> amateur?
>
> Is an amateur radio license test equal to a college or university
> examination?
>
> Walk the plonk, TAFKARJ...

I seem to remember you using terms like "Atila" and "beligerant" and you used them more than once, indicating not a typographical error but in inability to spell the words.

You're quite a fellow, Len.

Dave K8MN

955. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 05:58:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314005841.12631.00005517@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88970

In article <1e4e3692.0403131517.66d772fb@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040313012418.07155.00001229@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403121724.11be7f6a@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> >news:<uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>...
>
>> >> Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought
>> >> not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be
>> >> ready for your afternoon nappy.
>> >
>> >You're quite disrespectful of a radio veteran.
>>
>> That's how teenagers have always been...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>And some of those that just got out of third grade yesterday.

...and are probably teen agers, too... :-)

LHA / WMD

956. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 05:58:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314005841.12631.00005516@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88972

In article <1e4e3692.0403131503.13cec261@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040312161802.05539.00004737@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Quixoterobeson, this is about you. You make it about you with every
>> >post. TAFKARJ has asked you not to respond, but you can't help
>> >yourself.
>> >
>> >You're obsessed.
>>
>> I'm thinking he's advanced from obsession to posession.
>>
>> He should be out getting more exorcise. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>He is certainly demon filled. I don't know if a mere shrink could
>help him at this point. Maybe a tag-team of Jesuits?

I think only those Jesuits who were once marines could do it.
Perhaps getting into exorcism action with a HALO jump (High
Altitude jump, Low altitude Opening).

Temper fry.

LHA / WMD

957. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 05:58:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314005843.12631.00005519@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88969

In article <1e4e3692.0403131522.603e2aed@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403130624.115256fe@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> YOU are the one who always insists that typos are indicative of
>> "rage". I ahve NEVER stated that except to sarcastically throw it
>> back at YOU when you do it yourself.
>
>But Quixoterobeson, you're always in a rage. So when you commit
>typo's, you're in a... rage.
>
>So how did Len get it wrong?

Doesn't matter, Brian, to the gunnery nurse I'm either lying, a putz,
or scum, or any combination thereof. :-)

LHA / WMD

958. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 05:58:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314005843.12631.00005518@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88973

In article <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
>> >issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
>> >
>> > Yeah...right...
>> >
>> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do
>you
>> bother with him?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with Len.

There's more to that than is apparent on the surface.

The PCTAs all use misdirection via questions or "challenges" on other subjects in order to divert the thread away from the morse code test issue. By being sufficiently inflamatory, those misdirections now attract others who just want to fight and holler at others. The threads diverge and take on new subjects and the PCTAs are saved...their arguments for retention of the code test were not viable so they feel secure in not having "lost."

TAFKARJ uses the newsgroup as a Chat Room to talk about almost anything BUT the morse code test and ventures far, far afield from amateur radio policy subjects, so far that they don't include any amateur radio at all. He wants to be an essayist.

Mr. Foreign Service (who doesn't know that the Amana Colonies are in Iowa!) simply wants to fight. He isn't quite so obsessed as the gunnery nurse but he has the arrogance of an SA fairy. He likes to use the misdirection of "He's an amateur and I ain't" (in varying words) therefore trying to imply that I am "nothing." :-)

The gunnery nurse is just nuts and can't get his act together. He can't take the slightest negative comment without going berserk.

A common trait among them is one of Control. They want (perhaps need) to moderate the newsgroup to their view, their opinions, their personal likes/dislikes. Control and Ego together to build the concept of righteous service to the nation by being hams.

Amateur radio is supposed to be an enjoyable hobby. But, with the tree regulars mentioned above (up a tree without a piddle), it's all one of being inordinately proud of their imaginary world and a desire to be respected because of that Belief.

The morse code test is being removed from the regulations of many nations' amateur radio. PCTAs cannot abide by that. They remain in denial since loss of the morse test is a loss to their self-esteem. They can't use that mighty morse test as a bragging point if it is eliminated. "If they had to take a morse test, EVERYBODY has to take a morse test to be as 'good' as they."

LHA / WMD

959. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 05:58:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314005844.12631.00005520@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 88971

In article <1e4e3692.0403131507.4b703ed6@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403130638.16372c80@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> > In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
>> >
>> > I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.
>>
>> A TYPO!!! A TYPO!!!
>>
>> LENNIE'S MAD! HE'S SEETHING IN RAGE!
>
>Quixoterobeson, you did it again.

Obsessives can't help it... :-)

LHA / WMD

960. Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 15:16:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403140716.539a7008@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88974

I guess someone should have told the Governor that all that stuff he just lauded Amateurs for never happens, that cell-sites never fail, that every Public Service employee using the "company radio" is more valuable than trained Amateurs, and that his Proclamation was just a self-serving waste of time that only perpetuates the "mythos" of Amateur Radio's public service role...?!?!

Naaaaaahhhhh...Let's all enjoy the moment and wish our congrats to all WI Hams...

Lennie..."I am laughing at the superior intellect...! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, during times of national and state emergencies, amateur radio operators continue to provide communication resources which are provided at no cost to the Wisconsin taxpayers; and

WHEREAS, there continues to be a need for amateur radio operators to provide emergency communication capabilities as a backup resource during state and national emergencies; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio operators participate in the Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) program as volunteers providing their communications expertise; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio clubs throughout the State of Wisconsin, provide radio courses of instruction, encourage and assist with grade school and high school programs about amateur radio, and in the process, enhance student interest in science, geography and physics, thus provide the opportunity to become a licensed amateur radio operator; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio operators, participating in SKYWARN provide trained and radio equipped severe weather spotters to assist the National Weather Service and the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio organizations such as the Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Services (RACES) and the Amateur Radio Emergency Services (ARES) are organized and trained to provide emergency communication support; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio organizations such as Amateur Radio Emergency Services (ARES) provide communication support for community and public

service events to help ensure the safety of all attendees, participants and observers; and

WHEREAS, amateur radio operators test their capability to operate “in the field” using alternate power sources during the June annual Field Day;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jim Doyle, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim June 26, 2004

AMATEUR RADIO OPERATOR RECOGNITION DAY

I commend this observance to all citizens.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison this fifth day of March in the year two thousand four.

Jim Doyle
Governor

Douglas La Follette
Secretary Of State

961. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 15:21:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403140721.7f65da8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88975

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040314005843.12631.00005518@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
> >> >issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
> >> >
> >> > Yeah...right...
> >> >
> >> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do
> you
> >> bother with him?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with Len.
>
> There's more to that than is apparent on the surface.
>
> The PCTAs all use misdirection via questions or "challenges" on other
> subjects in order to divert the thread away from the morse code test
> issue.

Talk about obsessed.

The Morse Code test issue is being respolved in Washington and
Gettysburg via the NPRM process. All indicators are that it will be
deleted, or at least reserved for the highest class (and greatest
breadth of priviledges...Mostly in parts of the spectrum where only
Morse Code can be sued anyway...).

There's no "misdirection", Yuor Scumminess.

And if you'd ANSWER some of the questions, they MIGHT go away, IF
you have a valid answer for them..."I don't HAVE to answer and you
can't make me" is pretty sophmoric...nothing less that we expect from
you and PuppetBoy, however.

Steve, K4YZ

962. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 15:50:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <1b%4c.3219$CJ5.2012@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88976

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040313190034.05539.00004752@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <nt93c.28706$aT1.24813@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > Your example underscores my point. There really is no one example...
> >> > but even in building construction, there is technological advances
and
> >> > automation. Framing a house is much quicker with nail guns, etc.
> >> > Houses can and are prefabed (i.e. modular). Roof trusses almost
> >> > always come prefab.
> >>
> >> Sure - but those changes occur slowly enough that builders can keep up
> >> with them. And they're not faced with career obsolescence. The
> >> introduction of nail guns and PVC pipe has not eliminated the need for
> >> carpenters and plumbers.
> >>
> >> While building a house isn't exactly cheap, here in the USA we manage
> >> to do it with almost all domestic labor and materials. If it can be
> >> done in that industry, why not others?
> >
> >The reality of housing is that it isn't mass produced because
> >we don't want to all live in identical homes.
>
> Where you been, Bill? Most new houses over the past 50+ years have been
> mass-produced. The Levitt brothers made it a science.

True only to a point. Around here, unless it is a townhouse
or condo development, the new houses are still stick built
with a great deal of "customizaton" involved. You'll find
similar styles in the same development, but no two will
look alike.

When Levitt did his thing in Long Island and PA he
had only a small set of plans and lmited customization.
Over time, however, through additions, remodeling, etc the
"sameness" has become less and less in those communities.

> >That leads to considerable
> >customization and often to totally unique homes. Not so with
> >consumer products.
>
> Most homes are built by standard techniques that permit customization at
little
> or no extra cost. Ask Kim when she gets back.

Where do you live? Usually ANY change to the basic
model choosen ends up as an extra cost. Maybe it doesn't cost
the builder that much, but it will definetly cost the buyer.

> >> > > >If I hadn't had the
> >> > > >opportunity to learn semiconductors via additional training in the
> >> > > >Navy (1967) and then a full array of digital theory and
application
> >> > > >compliments of "ma bell", I'd probably be pushing a broom
> >> > > >somewhere.
> >> > > >
> >> > > >> And who pays for the retraining?
> >> > > >
> >> > > >It depends. Even in telecommunications, the old days of heavy
> >> > > >training costs per employee are gone.
> >> > >
> >> > > In your own example, however, your employer (Navy and Bell System)
> >> > > paid for your continuing
> >> > > education. You weren't expected to do it all on your own.
> >> > > More important, your new training built on your existing
> >> > > skills and knowledge so you could stay in the same field.
> >> >
> >> > But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
> >> > expenses.
> >>
> >> That's exactly the problem.
> >
> >Would you rather they fold-up completely?
>
> I'd rather they took the long view. And I'd rather the govt. supported
that.

How do you suggest the gov't support that?

> >> > > >> I don't know of any country that grew prosperous on a service
> >> > > >> economy alone.
> >> > > >
> >> > > >We still manufacture and produce in the USA, it is just
> >> > > >done with more and more automation resulting in less
> >> > > >and less need for skilled labor.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> We manufacture and produce some things, but much of the
> >> > > >> production - automated and all - is moving to places like China.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> And the concept of planned obsolescence has been reinvented....
> >> > > >
> >> > > >The obsolescence isn't planned...it just happens.
> >> > >
> >> > > Much of it *is* planned. Products are rushed to market,
> >> > > oftern unready and of low quality.
> >> >
> >> > That's not planned obsolescence, it is just poor quality.

> >>
> >> Same thing, essentially. Push a product that won't last out the door
> >> so that the customers will have to replace it in a few years.
> >
> >The new technology makes the typical consumer product
> >obsolete...not poor quality by design.
>
> Same difference.

You're joking aren't you? Are you suggesting that a
company should NOT produce improved products using
new technology? Would you rather NOT have an 80 gig
harddrive today at less than the cost of a 20 gig two
years ago? Would you rather NOT have the technology
advances of electronic fuel injection in your car? ...etc

> >> > > Companies do not support products after even a few
> >> > > years because they want you to buy the new products.
> >> >
> >> > Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
> >> > and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
> >> > because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
> >>
> >> I disagree! See below.
> >
> >I suspect we'll still disagree.
> >
> >> > The irony of non-support for older products is that in
> >> > some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
> >> > to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
> >> >
> >> > > This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US
> >> > > automakers redesigned their cars every year.
> >> > > Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
> >> > > Their goal wasn't to make cars that would
> >> > > last - they wanted those who were the new-car buyers
> >> > > to come back into the dealerships every year. They
> >> > > almost succeeded - at one point,
> >> > > the average new-car buyer was back every two
> >> > > years,
> >> > > and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles
> >> > > even with the best of care.
> >> >
> >> > Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
> >>
> >> Yep - and here's why:
> >>
> >> Up until about the mid-60s or so, US automakers focused on the sizzle
> >> rather than the steak. Their focus was on making lots of cars, and if
> >> they polluted, didn't last or weren't as safe as they could be, that
> >> wasn't much of a big deal. They fought all sorts of innovations

> >> because they were afraid of tarnishing the image. Example: they didn't
> >> like seat belts in part because of the cost but also because they're a
> >> reminder that you could die in your car.
> >>
> >> Then US automakers got a 1-2-3-4 punch in about a decade:
> >>
> >> 1) Safety issues
> >> 2) Pollution issues
> >> 3) Fuel economy issues
> >> 4) Foreign competition/quality issues
> >>
> >> Detroit took a real thumping from all four, in large part because the
> >> foreign automakers were more experienced building safer, cleaner, more
> >> efficient cars that would last longer. The Big Three had to be dragged
> >> kicking and screaming (by way of legislation requiring things like
> >> seat belts and dual brake systems) into making better cars. In at
> >> least one case (Chrysler) the Feds got involved with loan guarantees.
> >
> >Your point?
>
> That when they stopped taking the long view,
> they took a real beating.

They took a beating because the competition stepped
up to the task of delivering what a significant part of the
public wanted. If the Toyotas of the world hadn't
been there to deliver cheaper, better mileage and functional
cars, then the public would have stayed with the US
makes. Add in also the gas crunch of 1973 and that drove
a majorshift towards fuel efficiency demands of consumers.
Before that, who cared about gas mileage when gas was
selling at $0.30/gal or less.

> And they had to go hat-in-hand to the govt. to
> keep from being wiped out completely. And
> it's happening all over again in a different area.

What's the different area?

> >The automakers felt the impact of consumers.
> >That's what I have said all along.
>
> They *fought* all of those things rather than
> responding to them.

I agree...and that was their own undoing.

> It took legislation and near-bankruptcy to
> get safer, cleaner, more efficient US cars.

The vast majority of people don't
give a hoot about cleaner or safer. They do care about

efficiency because they can measure that in
their monthly bufged.

> >> > > >Look at the
> >> > > >ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
> >> > >
> >> > > Not just memory but every part of the
> >> > > machine - processor, drives, etc.
> >> > > However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
> >> >
> >> > Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
> >>
> >> Based on repairs I've had to do to computers both at home and at work.
> >
> >Anecdotal then.
>
> My experience caring for quite a few machines over the past 20 years.

On a comparison to earlier equipment,
my experience doesn't come out the same

> >> > > >Consider too that
> >> > > >a few years back, marketing considered anything under $300
> >> > > >to be an "impulse buy" (i.e. no real thought as to price vs value
> >> > > >is applied by the consumer).
> >> > > >
> >> > > A few years back, the Dow was near 12,000, the Federal budget was
> >> > > balanced,
> >> > > Congress was trying to figure out how to spend the "peace
dividend",
> >> > > unemployment *and* inflation were at record lows and a lot of folks
I
> >> > > a lot of folks I knew were talking about retiring at 55.
> >> >
> >> > Your point?
> >>
> >> That a lot has changed in the past few years.
> >
> >And the rate of change keeps accelerating it seems.
>
> It doesn't have to.

You're expecting the consumer market to be static? Sorry,
there's always someone else around the corner who
has a better mouse trap or has developed a way to
make the current "best mouse trap" cheaper.

> >> > > All changed now.
> >> >
> >> > Your point?
> >>
> >> That something needs to be done.

> >> One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal
> >> changes, particularly in the middle class.
> >>
> >> 40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to
> >> work and Mom to stay home with
> >> the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious
> >> middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions,
> >> but as a rule if Dad had a good job,
> >> Mom did not have to work outside the
> >> home when the kids were small).
> >>
> >> Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and
> >> almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own
> >> educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's
> >> education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes
> >> well!
> >
> >OK, and that's not going to change.
>
> I think it can, and for the better - if we want it to.

HOW is that going to change? Two income families
WANT all their toys NOW. They don't want to wait
until the career of the single wage owner gets to the
point where they can afford stuff. Just look at the size
of homes that relatively newly married couples are
buying.

If you think the "double income" lifestyle is driven by
nexessity alone, then you're imagining it. Like I said,
they want their toys today, they want vacations in Aruba
today, they want the best SUVs, Plasma TV, etc. and
they want it NOW.

Here's a perfect example.
On the Suze Osmon financial show the other
day a woman was describing how she was going into debt
because everything was Sooo expensive and she had no
way to reduce her monthly expenses...GUESS WHAT?....
this "poor woman" still was doing her $3 a day double Latte,
an annualtravel vacation, buying DVDs and music CDs
every month, driving an expensive car....etc.

This was all purly discretionary purchases that could have
and should have been stopped if the woman truly wanted
to live within her means.

Another examples included a couple
who still took an expensive vacation even though the
husband had lost his job and was out of work for
several months already.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

963. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 17:16:56 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <O0FTRUFS38060.5117592593@anonymous>
Source record: 88977

In article <1e4e3692.0403131529.566a2e1a@posting.google.com>
billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:
>
>
> Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<42a464a6e1a95c3e10a8af780d3f3450@dizum.com>...
>
> If true, you're a #1 jerk.

all true....he's currently becoming worm food 6 feet under Ft.
Thomas, Kentucky.

how's things in colorado, billy, me boy?

HTTP-Posting-Host: 204.32.71.59
Search results for: 204.32.71.59

OrgName: ICG NetAhead, Inc.
OrgID: ICGN
Address: 161 Inverness Drive West
City: Englewood
StateProv: CO
PostalCode: 80112
Country: US

NetRange: 204.32.0.0 - 204.32.127.255
CIDR: 204.32.0.0/17
NetName: ICG-BLK-BLK8C
NetHandle: NET-204-32-0-0-1
Parent: NET-204-0-0-0-0
NetType: Direct Allocation
NameServer: AS1.ICG.NET
NameServer: AS2.ICG.NET
Comment: Addresses within this block are non-portable
RegDate:
Updated: 2001-08-01

TechHandle: ST452-ARIN
TechName: IP Administrator
TechPhone: +1-303-414-5000
TechEmail: IP_Admin@icgcomm.com

OrgAbuseHandle: ABUSE170-ARIN
OrgAbuseName: Abuse
OrgAbusePhone: +1-303-414-5000
OrgAbuseEmail: abuse@icgcom.com

OrgTechHandle: IPADM127-ARIN
OrgTechName: IP Admin
OrgTechPhone: +1-303-414-5000
OrgTechEmail: ip_admin@icgcomm.com

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2004-03-13 19:15
Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS
database.

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

964. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 17:25:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040314122558.01019.00000939@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 88978

In article <BI73c.10021$t16.6101878@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0403081325.52114d30@posting.google.com...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<cnT2c.1821$Cm3.312@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>
>[snip]
>
>> > Your point?
>>
>> That something needs to be done.
>>
>> One factor that hasn't been mentioned is the effect of societal
>> changes, particularly in the middle class.
>>
>> 40 years ago, it was typical for Dad to work and Mom to stay home with
>> the kids and they all lived a comfortable if not luxurious
>> middle-class existence. (Yes, there were plenty of exceptions, but as
>> a rule if Dad had a good job, Mom did not have to work outside the
>> home when the kids were small).
>>
>> Today, two-career families are the rule rather than the exception, and
>> almost always by necessity. First it's to pay off their own
>> educations, then to afford a house, then kids, then the kid's
>> education, then retirement. And that's if they're lucky and all goes
>> well!
>
>Much of it is due to changing expectations as to what is acceptable as a
>standard of living. The typical family 40 years ago in the major
>metropolitan areas either lived in an apartment or in an 800 sq. ft. house.
>A family with a single income today can still afford an 800 sq ft house.
>However that is now considered unacceptably small. They want a 1200 sq ft
>house as a minimum. That is just one example of changing expectations that
>have driven us to two-career families.
>
Dee,

800 square feet (or even 1200) is a very small house! Where do you get those figures?

But you do have a point in that the typical middle-class houses of 40-50 years ago were built to a different paradigm than today. Those houses typically were

built with very few closets and bathrooms, simple, tiny kitchens, no air conditioning and maybe a 1 car garage. OTOH, basements, porches and attics were much more common back then.

Another factor is the cost of running the house - maintenance, utilities, insurance and taxes.

The big question is whether a comparable house in a comparable neighborhood today is as affordable in total cost as 40-50 years ago.

73 de Jim, N2EY

965. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 18:36:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314133641.21457.00004599@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 88979

In article <5c01b95b.0403140721.7f65da8c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >news:<20040314005843.12631.00005518@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, >k4yz@aol.com
>> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
>> >> >issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
>> >> >
>> >> > Yeah...right...
>> >> >
>> >> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do
>> you
>> >> bother with him?
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with >Len.
>>
>> There's more to that than is apparent on the surface.
>>
>> The PCTAs all use misdirection via questions or "challenges" on other
>> subjects in order to divert the thread away from the morse code test
>> issue.
>
> Talk about obsessed.

No, the subject is the morse code test. It is not about Control by PCTA or the incessant name-calling done by yourself.

> The Morse Code test issue is being respolved in Washington and >Gettysburg via the NPRM process.

Absolutely incorrect.

As of this date there is NO new Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) concerning Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R.

So far there have only been 14 PETITIONS given a docket and
shown to the public with comments invited.

There is a PROPOSED petition by the ARRL which, so far, is only
seen by the public on the ARRL website. The FCC has not given
it a docket number nor shown it on its website.

"Gettysburg?" Someone gave you the wrong Gettysburg Address.

>All indicators are that it will be
>deleted, or at least reserved for the highest class (and greatest
>breadth of priviledges...Mostly in parts of the spectrum where only
>Morse Code can be sued anyway...).

Are you going to "sue" the government to make morse code testing
there forever and ever?

There are NO "all indicators." You are imagining the FCC and ARRL
are one and the same insofar as regulations are concerned.

The ARRL supposed "petition" remains on their website. It is NOT
a petition with invitation for public commentary from the FCC.

ARRL does NOT make amateur radio regulations. It only implies
it does.

ARRL still has membership LESS than a quarter of all licensed U.S.
radio amateurs. ARRL is therefore a MINORITY special-interest
group.

> There's no "misdirection", Yuor Scumminess.

YES there is. Your posting is an example. Total IGNORANT
rambling trying to "draw fire" (so to speak) coupled with both
name-calling and rage-induced typing mistakes ("Yuor").

If you had any sincerity about discussing any subject matter (you
obviously don't, only want to fight), then you would have identified
the difference in FCC docket subjects and what they mean.

You obviously don't know them.

The FCC has made definitions of NPRMs, NOIs, (petitions for) RMs
available to the public long before the Internet was formed, before
the Internet went public access.

You should, but obviously don't even after a long licensed period,
at least acquaint yourself (if you can't learn) with the rule-making
process AND who is in charge of amateur radio regulations.

Hint: ARRL is NOT in charge, never was.

> And if you'd ANSWER some of the questions, they MIGHT go away, IF
>you have a valid answer for them..."I don't HAVE to answer and you
>can't make me" is pretty sophmoric...nothing less that we expect from
>you and PuppetBoy, however.

You are NOT the moderator in here.

You are NOT some kind of "official" in this newsgroup who can demand answers.

You are NOT any sort of "NCO" Dill Instructor and this is NOT the corps.

You are NOT anything but a poor deluded and ignorant petty person trying to control others by insults, innuendo, and ignorant ramblings of suppositions from an obviously NOT-insider.

Stop trying to impose your own personal fantasy on others. You can NOT transform reality to suit yourself...try to suit yourself to the reality. Accomplish that and you've made yourself acceptible to others.

Right now you are NOT acceptible.

LHA / WMD

966. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 19:45:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141145.2c2b7267@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88980

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403140721.7f65da8c@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040314005843.12631.00005518@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > >>
> > >> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
> > >>issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
> > >>
> > >> > Yeah...right...
> > >>
> > >> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do
> you
> > >> bother with him?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with Len.
> >
> > There's more to that than is apparent on the surface.
> >
> > The PCTAs all use misdirection via questions or "challenges" on other
> > subjects in order to divert the thread away from the morse code test
> > issue.
>
> Talk about obsessed.
>
> The Morse Code test issue is being respolved in Washington and
> Gettysburg via the NPRM process. All indicators are that it will be
> deleted, or at least reserved for the highest class (and greatest
> breadth of priviledges...Mostly in parts of the spectrum where only
> Morse Code can be sued anyway...).

Morse can be sued? Now there's a tactic that hasn't been tried yet.

> There's no "misdirection", Yuor Scumminess.

Yuoza!

> And if you'd ANSWER some of the questions, they MIGHT go away,

Only to be replaced by more questions.

IF
> you have a valid answer for them..."I don't HAVE to answer and you
> can't make me" is pretty sophmoric...nothing less that we expect from
> you and PuppetBoy, however.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

"POP" goes the weazel.

967. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 20:01:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 88981

In article <c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
writes:

>To give you a lough for the day, and maybe you fell better about your fuel
>prices:
>
>Gernerally, fuel prices over here in EU are around 1,00 Euro PER LITER
>(quarter gallon), so don't complain about high prices.

European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes.
The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit
(Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is
not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.

>Though almost 50%
>driving diesel (abt 0,80 euros /liter) powered vehicles (exluding commercial
>trucks), we also have this price differences within short range.

>Szenario: Driving from Venice/IT to Prague/Tschechnia (400 miles) fill up in
>venice for 1.09, next stop near Vienna/Austria you pay only 0.65 and in
>prague you can get hte liter of diesel for slightly over 50 cents.

That's only $2.00 per gallon! I've seen diesel prices in excess of $2 gallon
here at times.

>They (Oil Companies) use the same excuse for the different prices as they do
>over there at your side. BTW, ESSO and MOBILE also are the most expensive
>brands over here.
>
>Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
>manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
>vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
>
>Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70.

Only in small cars.

>And their
>performance is not less the gas engines.

Agreed. But the first-cost is greater. And at US fuel prices, the difference
may not be worth it.

Suppose the diesel car gets 60 MPG and the equivalent gasoline car gets 40 MPG.
And suppose the car is driven 12,000 miles per year. That's 300 gallons of
gasoline vs. 200 gallons of diesel. If both fuels cost about the same (as they
usually do in the USA), the saving is only $150-200 per year. Compared to the

price of the car, insurance, repairs, maintenance, etc, that's not much saving.
>
>So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
>your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
>You know, you are filling up CHEAP.

Back in 1980 I bought a VW Rabbit Diesel. Over its 17 year lifetime, I got 43 mpg combined (I kept very accurate records). An equivalent gasoline Rabbit would have probably done about 30 mpg.

But the diesel engine cost $900 more back then. Considering all factors, I didn't save very much driving an oil burner.

73 de Jim, N2EY

968. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 22:10:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403141410.6b8928c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88982

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403141145.2c2b7267@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403140721.7f65da8c@posting.google.com>...

> > The Morse Code test issue is being respolved in Washington and
> > Gettysburg via the NPRM process. All indicators are that it will be
> > deleted, or at least reserved for the highest class (and greatest
> > breadth of priviledges...Mostly in parts of the spectrum where only
> > Morse Code can be sued anyway...).
>
> Morse can be sued? Now there's a tactic that hasn't been tried yet.
>
> > There's no "misdirection", Yuor Scumminess.
>
> Yuoza!
>
> > And if you'd ANSWER some of the questions, they MIGHT go away,
>
> Only to be replaced by more questions.
>
> IF
> > you have a valid answer for them..."I don't HAVE to answer and you
> > can't make me" is pretty sophmoric...nothing less that we expect from
> > you and PuppetBoy, however.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> "POP" goes the weazel.

I consider it pretty good evidence of "mission accomplished" when
all you can "reply" to are some typos, PuppetBoy...

Not that I expected anything else.

Steve, K4YZ

969. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 23:14:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141514.7d478c0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88983

Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
news:<O0FTRUFS38060.5117592593@anonymous>...
>
> how's things in colorado, billy, me boy?

Dunno. Haven't been there since about 85.

How are things in la-la land?

970. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 23:17:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141517.67e7d1bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88984

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4053B489.2D04D0F3@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20040313100058.01632.00001293@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >Seems to me that at the bottom of it all is the fact that people will pay the
> > >inflated tuitions because colege is seen as an absolute necessity these days.
> > >
> >
> > "Colege?" An MSEE who failed English? :-)
> >
> > Is a college or university degree necessary for being an radio
> > amateur?
> >
> > Is an amateur radio license test equal to a college or university
> > examination?
> >
> > Walk the plonk, TAFKARJ...
>
> I seem to remember you using terms like "Atila" and "beligerant" and you
> used them more than once, indicating not a typographical error but in
> inability to spell the words.
>
> You're quite a fellow, Len.
>
> Dave K8MN

in inability

971. BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-14 23:56:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 88985

It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban radio environment. It's also apparent that way too many commenters are trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place.

FCC 04-29, the NPRM or Notice of Proposed Rule Making, was released on 23 February 2004 with a 45 day period for Comments and a total 75 day period for Replies to Comments.

Once an NPRM is released, any previous documentation (comments, threats, entreaties, etc.) on the same subject are essentially ignored by the FCC for the purposes of making new rules indicated in the NPRM. While the website location may remain open for comment on a subject long after the subject is closed, those remain just bits on a very large hard drive and do not have to be looked at by the FCC for any sort of rulemaking.

ET Docket 03-104 was an NOI or Notice Of Inquiry request by the FCC to get suggested standards and testing for Broadband over Power Lines (now called "Access BPL"). By the FCC's format, the first two digits indicate the year of release (in that case 2003). The comment and reply-to-comment period on 03-104 is long over, yet radio amateurs keep posting on 03-104, even after an NPRM has been released nearly a month before.

03-104 now has 5,713 documents in its ECFS section as of Sunday, 14 March 2004. At least 600 of those were submitted AFTER the initial notice of the NPRM (12 February 2004). Any further input at 03-104 is not going to do any good. According to the 12 Feb 04 Notice, the Docket number is 04-37. The NPRM is 04-29. As of Sunday, 14 Mar 04, the ECFS listings indicate the following number of documents on the two dockets -

04-29: 5 04-37: 21

If anyone REALLY wants to make their voice heard on the BPL subject, the above are the two places to file (I don't know yet why the initial notice said "docket 04-37" but my Comment went to both and were indicated as accepted).

The R&O (Report and Order) that established the latest Restructuring in U.S. amateur radio was FCC 99-412 and was effective 30 Dec 99. By the ECFS listings on the NPRM 98-143, 218 sent in Comments AFTER that date. All commentary on 98-143 was cut off on 15 Jan 99 but many continued on regardless. The last person to "file" comments on 98-143 was Peter Alterman, PhD, W2CDO, document accepted 24 Sep 03 (!),

over two and a half years AFTER the R&O. Does anyone think
that 200+ comments filed on an NPRM after an R&O has been
issued will somehow make an R&O go away?

No one HAS to file anything on any subject with the FCC. Hams
can just let the ARRL do all the work for them and go back to
playing with their radios. However, anyone who really and truly
cares to comment as a thinking, independent citizen has an
excellent opportunity to speak DIRECTLY to our government.

There's no real delay with electronic filing. But...there's only about
two weeks left for initial Comments and a month more for Reply to
Comments and back-and-forth on same. Time doesn't stand still
and a minority membership organization can't do all the effective
speaking for you.

The alternative is to do NOTHING. Very safe, no effort required.
But, you don't qualify all the subsequent whines and crying about
the awful interference on HF when you did NOTHING. You did
NOTHING even if you sit around high-fiving all the other do-nothing
hams about your self-perceived wonderfulness and glorious
"service" to something or other.

CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
even though they may not have been born when CB was.

DO SOMETHING. Tell the government what you think.

LHA / WMD

972. Re: Be the first on your block!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 00:31:57 UTC
From: Stormhound <storm.nospam.hound@nocomcastspam.net>
Message-ID: <6aWdnSCHkqjtZMndRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 88986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Barry OGrady wrote:

> What needs to be weighed up is the cost/benefit ratio.
> If BPL can benefit a huge number of people while inconveniencing a few amateurs
> then it is justified. Remember that amateur radio is a hobby that unjustifiably occupies
> valuable radio spectrum.

Yeah, that's exactly the problem we face (well, that and a lack of appreciation for irony, judging by some of the responses I'm seeing to your post)...non-hams, including a lot of businesspeople involved in lines that are looking for more frequencies to use, look at it from just that perspective: hamming is a fringe hobby that eats up valuable spectrum and provides nothing to the average person that they can't already get from the Internet. That's the superficial sound-byte opinion, and people won't invest much time in trying to get beyond that. One can only educate those who want to be educated...

73, David KC0EKV

973. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1387 March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 01:14:02 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040314201402.26484.00001482@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 88987

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1387 ï¿½ March 12, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1387 with a release date of Friday, March 12th, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The FCC says that automatic stations have to avoid willful interference to other hams. Also, a magazine editor speaks out on restructuring. Hear the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1387 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LAW: AUTOMATIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL HAMS

The FCC says no Amateur Radio stations are exempt from the requirement to avoid unnecessarily interference with ongoing communications. This includes automated operations. Amateur Radio Newsline's Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, is in Antioch Illinois with rest of the story:

--

According to the ARRL Letter, FCC rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth says that it is important for all stations, including automated ones, to realize that they are responsible for any interference caused when they come on top of existing communications Hollingswoth told the ARRL Letter that an amateur had written to him alleging that what appeared to be automated PACTOR stations that were routinely starting to transmit atop PSK31 QSO's on 40 and 30 meters.

In response, Hollingsworth noted that there are no exemptions for automated stations. Rather that the Amateur Service rules address interference with other communications. The rules say that no amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause interference to any other radio communication or signal.

The amateur who filed the complaint reportedly also contacted one of the PACTOR stations in an effort to develop a dialogue to solve the problem. Hollingsworth expressed the hope that all involved in the PACTOR versus P-S-K 31 problem can work things out. He also points out that stations responding to automated interrogations are equally responsible for not causing interference to existing communications.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, near Chicago.

--

Hollingsworth also issued advisory letters to three hams who operate automated stations to remind them of the rules. (FCC, ARRL Letter)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM WHO ALLEGEDLY HARASSED POLICE ASKED TO EXPLAIN OR TURN IN HIS LICENSE

The FCC Enforcement Bureau is once again naming names and it has asked one ham to explain why he allegedly transmitted on a public service frequency to harass law enforcement. Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, has the rest of the story:

--

In a February 18th letter to Russel A. Brown, N1KHV, of Palmer, Massachusetts the FCC says that it is considering action based on a February 3rd Incident Report from the Monson Police Department and a February 15th Investigatory Report and a Statement. The latter reportedly was signed by Brown and documents his deliberate operation on Police frequencies without a license. This, the FCC alleges was an attempt by Brown to interfere with police communications and harass police personnel.

The FCC inquiry makes it clear that the information he submits will be used by the Commission in determining Brown's qualifications to remain a Commission licensee. The FCC also has given Brown the option of voluntarily submitting his license for cancellation in order to avoid a hearing on the issue. Brown was told to indicate his preference in his response which was due within 20 days of the FCC letter of inquiry being issued.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, in New Jersey.

--

The FCC also warned Brown that providing a willfully false or misleading reply would be the subject of a separate enforcement action and could subject him to additional sanctions. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: CHANGING CALL SIGNS BRINGS FCC INQUIRY

The FCC wants to know why a Tennessee radio amateur keeps changing his call sign. And, in a February 18th letter it is asking Donald H. Binkley the regulatory agency is asking the Nashville ham to explain why he has been jumping between two calls for the past six years.

According to its letter of inquiry, Binkley currently holds the call K4WX. The FCC says that license grant was originally made on September 23, 1998. On June 19, 2000 the FCC says that Binkley filed an application to change his call sign from K4WX to N4ZZ. That

application was granted on July 7, 2000. Then, on May 15, 2002 Binkley applied to change your his sign from N4ZZ back to K4WX. That application was granted on June 4, 2002. Now, Binkley has applied for the N4ZZ call once again and this time his request appears to have raised a proverbial red flag with the FCC. As a result, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau has forwarded the latest application to the enforcement folks for follow-up and review.

In his letter to Binkley, FCC rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth says that these ongoing applications raise questions about apparent abuse of the licensing system. He notes that the Communications Act gives the Commission the authority to request information from licensees and applicants regarding their applications and operation of their radio stations. And that's just what he is doing with Binkley,

He has told K4WX to respond stating his intentions regarding the filing of these applications. He also told Binkley to let his office know which of the two call signs he wants to keep. Binkley was given the usual 20 days from the date of the FCC's letter to respond. (FCC)

**

RESTRUCTURING: AN EDITOR SPEAKS OUT

The editor of a popular ham radio magazine says that his readers have strong opinions on restructuring, and he wants them shared. In an interview with Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, CQ's Rich Moseson, W2VU, talked on a general level about the various restructuring proposals and about his upcoming C-Q reader survey:

--

CQ's Rich Moseson says there's been an active dialogue going among readers of the magazine since the latest round of amateur radio licensing restructuring proposals landed at the FCC's door:

--

"We have a whole raft of petitions that have been filed with the FCC over the past several months all proposing various things from radical changes to little tweaks from eliminating the code requirements completely to adding new ones," Moseson says. "It's a great opportunity for discussion and for a forum on what the ham community thinks our hobby should look like going into the future."

--

Moseson says despite the diversity of those proposals, he says there seemed to be some consensus emerging among those who submitted comments to the FCC and other forums:

--

"It looked like the majority of those people would agree on a restructuring where the code requirement was kept in place at 5 wpm for Extra," he says.

--

And now that the American Radio Relay League has weighed in with its own proposal - a no-code entry license called the Novice - complete with HF privileges, Moseson says CQ wants to know what readers think.

--

"W5YI's 'Washington Readout' colum is all about the League's proposal in detail and our reader survey for April is also about the League's proposal," Moseson explains. "It's going to be asking our readers what they think of each of the major points of the proposal, whether they agree or disagree or have no opinion. And we'll, of course, be reporting the results of that survey in probably the June issue."

--

Even if you're not a CQ subscriber, you can find a copy at a newstand or bookstore.

Moseson says amateur radio must and has kept in step with the times:

--

"I'm not sure what we're going to come out of this with or what direction it's going to go to, " Moseson says. "But one of the points that I've always made is that if we are going to keep ham radio as a healthy, vital hobby and service then it has to adapt to changing times and the licensing structure has been doing that over the course of many, many years."

--

As to how soon, we might expect action from Washington. Moseson says it's difficult to predict:

--

"My guess would be the earliest that you'd see any kind of a decision from the FCC would be the end of this year, probably more likely about a year from now in the spring of 2005," Moseson says.
--

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

Moseson also offered his opinion that even if Morse testing was not included as a requirement for any of the license classes that it wouldn't go away. He says CW contest entries have grown in recent years. Thats good news for those advocating long term preservation

of the historic mode. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W3BN repeater of the Reading Amateur Radio Club serving Reading Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

CONVENTIONS: THE NAB HAM RADIO RECEPTION IN LAS VEGAS NV.

Its only a few weeks until the National Association of Broadcasters holds its 2004 gathering. One of the major social events that occurs at the NAB convention each year is the `Amateur Radio Reception'. This year will be no exception but for the first time ever this years `Ham Radio Reception' will be hosted by Heil Sound, Limited and its well known owners Bob, K9EID, and Sarah Heil. They would like to invite any and all amateur radio operators who will be in attendance at the NAB show to join them for this annual fun event.

Audio Only: Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Bob and Sarah are promising a fun time. They are also planning appearances by some of their special friends as well as dozens of attendance prizes that will be given during the two hour reception. This includes several of the new Heil Poline performance microphones autographed by legendary Eagles guitarist Joe Walsh, WB6ACU.

This years NAB Ham Radio Reception takes place Wednesday April 21st, from 6 to 9 P.M. local time. The venue is the Las Vegas Hilton Hotel, Ballrom B. Of coarse, thats in Las Vegas, Nevada. Bob says all that is required to join in the festivities is to bring a smile and your NAB attendance badge for complimentary food and drink.

For more information please feel to contact Bob or Sarah at 618-257-3000 or by e-mail to bob@heilsound.com. The Heil's say that they hope to see you there. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFEST TRAVEL TIPS: TRY FLYING OR TAKE THE BUS

Talking of ham radio social events, its no secret that gasoline prices here in the United States at historically high levels, and the Department of Energy saying to expect prices to go a lot higher. As a result, many hams are asking the rhetorical question: Can I afford to go to a major hamfest or convention this year? Especially one of

the big ones like Dayton or NAB. The answer for the most part is yes, but a lot depends on where you live and how far you have to travel to that show. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, explores some alternatives to driving your own car:

--

If your QTH is several hundred miles away from your favorite hamfest and you drive a gas guzzling vehicle like an S-U-V then you may think twice about going this year. That is, unless you can find an alternative to $3 or more for each gallon of gasoline. Well, there are currently two very good transportation buys available if you are willing to give up the luxury of a personal vehicle.

Lets take a centrally located city like Dallas, Texas. There's a big convention every year in the suburb of Arlington that draws exhibitors and attendees from all across the country. If you live in Houston and plan to attend, its about a 275 mile drive each way. In an S-U-V that gets 10 to 12 miles to a gallon at the projected $3 a gallon the drive one way will cost about $81 each way or $162 round trip. Compare that to the $89 round trip currently being offered between the two cities on Delta and Continental airlines. Want cheaper? Go greyhound, buy your ticket 7 days in advance and it will only cost you $58 round trip.

And what about Hamvention in Dayton Ohio? That's coming up in May. Well, its the same thing here. Using Chicago as your home, the trip is also about 275 miles each way. To drive will cost about the same but make your reservations now and fly out of Chicago's Midway airport and ATA will take you full circle for about $120. Go Greyhound and you can go full circle for only $82

Live further way. Say Los Angeles or San Francisco? Well, you can really get a bargain. Fly United Airlines out of Santa Ana California early in the morning with a connection in Chicago and you can go round trip for $255. By way of comparison, that same ticket a year ago went for about $100 more. And for you Northern California folks, you can do the trip for $283 out of San Jose on American Trans Air.

And the usual disclaimer here,. The prices we quoted we those showing on Sunday March 8th on several travel websites including greyhound.com and orbitz.com. Since the airlines are notorious for changing prices at a moments notice, these could be gone by the time this newscast goes to air.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Two final tips that most frequent flyers already know. First, book early. The best prices for flights are usually sold on-line months in advance. Also, keep an eye on all of the Internet based travel

discounters and check their prices daily. You never know when a flight or a bus ride to your favorite hamfest may be a lot less expensive than what it costs to drive your vehicle. And you won't have to hunt for a place to park, either. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

INTERNET SCAMS: ARRL AND RAC E-MAIL BEING SPOOFED

The ARRL and Radio Amateurs of Canada are warning their members and others about bogus or spoofed messages carrying ARRL.net or rac.ca suffixes. Both organizations say that they have been notifoed by people who have received e-mail messages alleging to be from the ARRL E-Mail Forwarding Service or directly from Radio Amateurs of Canada.

The senders of the e-mail encourage you to open the file or an attachment to the e-mail. Don't do it. These messages are false and are the result of one of the variants on a number of viruses now permeating the Internet. The attached file contains variations of worm viruses, MyDoom, Bagle and Netsky. Opening the file could result in your computer being infected. The bottom line: Delete the message and forget you ever got it. Your computer will be a lot safer that way. (ARRL, RAC)

**

HAM RADIO ADVENTURE: COMMUNICATORS NEEDED FOR CAVEING EXPEDITION

Gulf Coast United States, along with Caribbean, or South America base station operators are needed for communication on the ham bands with a scientific expedition. This, in July through August time frame.

The 60 day expedition will explore deep caves in the high Andes mountains and jungle in the western Amazon area of South America. Expedition access to the remote areas is via trekking on foot and pack animal. The expedition will use a solar and battery powered 20 Watt backpack transceiver. Antennas will be a wire dipole or vertical. A miniature notebook computer will be along for digital operations.

Communications will consist of position reports, some short messages with families of expedition members, and any possible emergency or medical messages. All operation will be non-commercial.

Operators with good base stations, efficient antennas and low noise locations are needed on the 40 through 15 meter amateur bands. The operations will use SSB, CW and a variety of digital modes. If you are interested, e-mail Bonnie Crystal, KQ6XA, at radioadventure@aol.com. (KC5FM, KQ6XA)

**

PUBLIC SERVICE: BAKER TO VEGAS FOOTRACE NEEDS YOUR HELP

Also in need of ham radio communicators is the famed Baker to Vegas Challenge Cup Relay race. Baker is Baker California and of coarse Vegas refers to Las Vegas, Nevada.

This year's foot race for teams from Law Enforcement Agencies takes place on April 24 th and 25, starting near Baker, traveling along State Route 127. The race then continues through radio show host Art Bell, W6OBB's hometown of Pahrump, Nevada and finishes up in Las Vegas.

For years, Amateur Radio has played an important role in the annual event. If you or your group is interested in helping with communications, please visit www.bakertovegas.com on the world-wide-web, to sign up. (Via e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: CONGRESS ON ITS WAY TO INCVREASING INDECENCY PENALTIES AGAINST BROADCASTERS

Federal legislators are inching closer to increasing the penalties against broadcasters who permit indecent or obscene material to hit the public airwaves. This, as the House and Senate Commerce committees pass bills that would sharply boost fines of television and radio broadcasters who violate indecency regulations.

The U.S. House of Representatives measure increases fines to as much as $500,000 per violation from the current $27,500 per violation level. That version also contains a so-called three strikes provision that would require the FCC to hold a hearing to determine whether a broadcast license should be revoked after three violations take place. It also permits the FCC to weigh heftier penalties against the person who actually utters indecent material on the air as well as the ability to go after the network that broadcast the material in addition to the individual stations. Right now, the FCC can only fine the licensed station that aired the material and has limited ability to penalize the person who said it.

Current FCC rules limit indecent material presented in a patently offensive manner to late night hours, when children are less likely to be a part of the listening or viewing audience. In some past instances the broadcast standard has been applied to obsenity and indecency issues in private radio including the Amateur service.

Newsline attempted to find out if new and higher penalties directed by Congress might be applied to ham radio. We were told that at this point, the FCC's and Congressional actions are directed at the "broadcasters" and not at Amateur Radio. (Published news reports)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: QRZ.COM HAS T1 TROUBLE

If you tried to access the QRZ.com website late on Thursday March 4th you probably found it down. The sites owner, Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ, reports that around 1800 UTC both of the dual T1 lines that supply the sites 3 Megabit feed to the Internet went down.

According to Lloyd, the sites network is supplier is Cable & Wireless and his location is served by two leased high-speed lines by the local phone company, Qwest. The Qwest lines connect the Arizona based QRZ.com servers to the Cable & Wireless location in downtown Phoenix.

About 2 hours after the outage was reported on Thursday, one of the lines was repaired and brought back up. For reasons unknown to Lloyd, the second T1 line has not been brought back up. Now, however, instead of a Qwest problem, it appears that the second line was intentionally disconnected by Cable & Wireless. Lloyd says that Cable & Wireless is currently pulling out of some of the less profitable market areas. Apparently, QRZ was mistakenly disconnected from the grid even though Lloyd had previously been assured that Cable & Wireless is not pulling out of his market. This put Q-R-Zeds back at 1.5 Megabits. That's the same speed that they were for years before the upgrade last December. (QRZ.com)

**

WORLDBEAT: MOTOROLA DONATES RADIOS TO VK EMERGENCY CORPS

Communication is set to improve for one of Australia's most remote indigenous Army Cadet Units following the donation of 24 state-of-the-art two way radio's by Motorola Australia. The company presented the radios destined for the Bamaga Cadet Unit in Far North Queensland to the Australian Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Defence , Fran Bailey , at a recent ceremony in Melbourne. Bailey said that she was delighted with the generous support shown by Motorola and acknowledged the contribution the company has made to the nations Indigenous Participation Project. The Bamaga Cadet Unit comprises Two Adult Officers and about 15 cadets. Bamaga is located the tip of Northern Queensland and is one of the most remote parts of Australia. (Q-News)

**

WORLDBEAT: TOWARD RESOLVING THE MEXICO - US 560, 780 & 920 KHZ BORDER SITUATIONS

An update on the radio border war developing between Mexico and the United States as we reported a few weeks ago. According to Joseph Berring in a letter to the CGC Communicator, the alleged problems caused by the Mexican broadcasters on 560, 780 and 920 kHz has become a top priority for both the U.S. FCC and the State Dept. as well as for the Mexican Administration.

According to Berring, top U.S. officials recently met with their Mexican counterparts in Mexico City. Berring observes that despite the controversy and problems that have arisen, Mexico's position has been very clear and unwavering. That being existing bilateral agreements are valid and they have not been violated. Additionally, Mexico seems to have some complaints of its own regarding U.S. stations.

The United States position is obviously a bit different. Not only does the US administration feel that there are clear violations, but that there are specific sidebar agreements dating as far back as 1996 that address the issues at hand.

Berring, who is a consultant on United States and Mexico border issues says to stay tuned. It should prove interesting. (CGC)

**

WORLDBEAT: AN ECUADOR DIPLOMA FOR YOU

A new Republic of Ecuador "Equatorial Line Diploma" for contacting stations at a latitude of zero degrees is being issued by the DX-TA-SEA DX CLUB, This multicolored certificate is awarded to Amateur Radio Operators and Short Wave Listeners for confirming contacts with the 20 different Ecuadorean HC and HD prefix areas. This award was developed to recognize past Amateur Radio activities from Ecuador. More information is available from Dr. Rick Dorsch, NE8Z, P.O. BOX 616, Hamburg Michigan. The zipcode is 48139. (NE8Z)

**

WORLDBEAT: SOTA EXPANDS TO GERMANY

According to the RSGB, the 'Summits on the Air' - or 'SOTA' - awards program has announced that the Alpine region of Germany is the latest geographic area embrace this awards project.

The Alpine SOTA program began operation on March 1st and is already being heralded as a success. The parent 'Summits on the Air' program began in 2002 . Since then there have been over 2000 hilltop activations and 15,000 contacts made. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that GM4YXI, is active portable 9M2 from Kuala Lumpur through the 29th of March. He also plans to operate from one or two

Islands On The Air island groups. Look for him on 20, 17 and 15 metres and maybe 12 and 10 metres CW and SSB. (GB2RS)

And PA3GIO will be active slash HI9 from the Dominican Republic through March 18th. Look for his signal on 80 through 10 meter SSB. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: TRANSMITTING DATA FROM MARS - AND CONSERVING ENERGY

And finally this week, were you aware that the pair of Mars Rovers now exploring the red planet actually have two ways to send data back to Earth? They can send it direct or indirect. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

As you might expect, direct entails using the rovers own high-powered microwave systems and using up a lot of very precious power reserves. Kind of like making a long distance contact on 2 meter FM simplex. You can do it but you need high power and a very directional antenna.

The indirect method uses low-powered UHF links to relay the data to orbiting satellites. These satellites then use their high-powered transmitters to beam the data back to scientists. Thats not much diferent than working a long distance on 2 meters, but doing it with an H-T through your favorite repeater.

To save energy on the solar powered rovers, the UHF relay method is preferred. As of February 18th, the two rovers had sent 10 billion bits of data from Mars to Earth. Of this, only 18% of that data was transmitted directly. The rest was relayed through the Mars Odyssey and Mars Global Surveyor satellites.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles.

--

The rest of the story can be found on the web at www.wired.com/news/print/0,1294,62409,00.html (CGC)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937,

Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

974. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 02:05:58 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <5j2a50lumtcq1ll472lkafoenjl1se58nd@4ax.com>
Source record: 88988
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <Me93c.28681$aT1.7564@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:gr1q40pquikiq4lnrj71bmoc6esujare3q@4ax.com...
>> In <BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>> >news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
>> >> In <d7f2c.7464$5M.251030@dfw-read.news.verio.net>, "CL"
>> >> <does_it_matter@noreply.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >YOU ARE SO WRONG! CBers are protected under Part 95 as we are Part 97.
>> >Cops
>> >> >don't just rush in and shut them down. Not anywhere that I'm aware of.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> They do in Spokane. A few years ago the police chief himself (Terry
>> >Mangan),
>> >> while off-duty, shoved a shotgun the the faces of some CBers just
>because
>> >they
>> >> were parked in front of his house.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> >> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> >> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>> >
>> >Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of CBers can be accomplished by the
>local
>> >police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police and
>the
>> >cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
>>
>> This incident occured years befor HR2346 (or whatever number that was).

>And
>> nuisance laws vary depending on your locality, as well as their method of
>> enforcement.
>
>The local police are ONLY enabled to inforce the FCC laws. That does
>NOT include shuting down a legal CB station just because it might cause
>interference.

My point exactly.

>Additionally, local nuisance laws are NOT applicable to authorized radio
>transmissions per applicable FCC rules.

There is no federal law that exempts a licensed radio operator from other violations he makes in the operation of his station. Such violations may include, but not limited to, causing a nuisance, trespassing, local noise ordinances, construction/building code violations, etc, etc.

>> >Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because why???? Because we
>hold
>> >a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
>>
>> Hams regs do not exempt a ham from local nuisance laws. You can be in 100%
>> compliance with federal law, but you can still be violating local laws if
>you
>> are creating or causing a nuisance with your station. Your FCC license is
>not a
>> 'get-out-of-jail-free' card.
>
>It is against any effort to enforce a nuisance law against a legally
>operated ham (or CB) station. If you think otherwise, please
>provide applicable case law. From being a ham for
>40+ years I have never heard of a single successful case of
>local nuisance laws being used against a ham station.

Nor have I, but I do know of at least two cases where radio operators were sucessfully sued in civil court for causing a nuisance. The articles didn't state whether those operators were licensed or not. But since they weren't prosecuted for violating federal laws, the issue of licensure is moot, and therefore a ham can indeed be held responsible under local laws for causing a nuisance. I'll even bet you that it has happened already, because there sure are a lot of high-and-mighty hams who think that the feds are going to come running to protect their sorry asses if they so much as get a speeding ticket while jawing on their mobile. Fortunately, it just doesn't work that way, Bill.

And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide one case where a ham was excused from violating a local law because he was licensed.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

975. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 02:50:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141850.4ebf4fdc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88989

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403141410.6b8928c2@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403141145.2c2b7267@posting.google.com>...

> > "POP" goes the weazel.
>
> I consider it pretty good evidence of "mission accomplished" when
> all you can "reply" to are some typos, PuppetBoy...

Seething rage is your mission? I'd say you are quite accomplished.

> Not that I expected anything else.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

So sorry not to live up to your expectations.

976. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 02:57:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141857.2a7a2321@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88990

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <c1hm8k$1nc$07$1@news.t-online.com>, "Helmut" <Helmut@Stroeml.com>
> writes:
>
> >To give you a lough for the day, and maybe you fell better about your fuel
> >prices:
> >
> >Gernerally, fuel prices over here in EU are around 1,00 Euro PER LITER
> >(quarter gallon), so don't complain about high prices.
>
> European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes.

Helmut has been informed.

> The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit
> (Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is
> not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.

Where in America does public transportation meet its own expenses?

977. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 03:01:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403141901.4299f600@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88991

WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back anyway.

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403140716.539a7008@posting.google.com>...
> I guess someone should have told the Governor that all that stuff he
> just lauded Amateurs for never happens, that cell-sites never fail,
> that every Public Service employee using the "company radio" is more
> valuable than trained Amateurs, and that his Proclamation was just a
> self-serving waste of time that only perpetuates the "mythos" of
> Amateur Radio's public service role...?!?!
>
> Naaaaaahhhhh...Let's all enjoy the moment and wish our congrats
> to all WI Hams...
>
> Lennie..."I am laughing at the superior intellect...! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
> A PROCLAMATION
>
> WHEREAS, during times of national and state emergencies, amateur radio
> operators continue to provide communication resources which are
> provided at no cost to the Wisconsin taxpayers; and
>
> WHEREAS, there continues to be a need for amateur radio operators to
> provide emergency communication capabilities as a backup resource
> during state and national emergencies; and
>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio operators participate in the Community
> Emergency Response Teams (CERT) program as volunteers providing their
> communications expertise; and
>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio clubs throughout the State of Wisconsin,
> provide radio courses of instruction, encourage and assist with grade
> school and high school programs about amateur radio, and in the
> process, enhance student interest in science, geography and physics,
> thus provide the opportunity to become a licensed amateur radio
> operator; and
>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio operators, participating in SKYWARN provide
> trained and radio equipped severe weather spotters to assist the
> National Weather Service and the State of Wisconsin; and

>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio organizations such as the Radio Amateur Civil
> Emergency Services (RACES) and the Amateur Radio Emergency Services
> (ARES) are organized and trained to provide emergency communication
> support; and
>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio organizations such as Amateur Radio Emergency
> Services (ARES) provide communication support for community and public
> service events to help ensure the safety of all attendees,
> participants and observers; and
>
> WHEREAS, amateur radio operators test their capability to operate
> “in the field” using alternate power sources during the
> June annual Field Day;
>
> NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jim Doyle, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do
> hereby proclaim June 26, 2004
>
> AMATEUR RADIO OPERATOR RECOGNITION DAY
>
> I commend this observance to all citizens.
>
>
>
> IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great
> Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in
> the City of Madison this fifth day of March in the year two thousand
> four.
>
> Jim Doyle
> Governor
>
> Douglas La Follette
> Secretary Of State

978. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 04:04:18 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c339vb$21u501$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 88992

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

Your only contribution in here seems to be one of FIGHTING your own little personal battles with imaginary foes and generally coming unglued at the slightest provocation. That's unstable behavior, obvious to lay people.

Yes it is, Leonard -- and a simple look in the mirror will verify that for you. You could not have described your behavior in this group over the last few years any better. Bravo, your self-analysis is flawless.

Arnie -

979. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 04:10:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40552CD1.10204@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 88993

William wrote:

>WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back anyway.
>
>
>
For the system to work, you need hams outside the disaster area to talk
to the
hams in the disaster area....

980. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 04:54:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5Ga5c.4456$CJ5.3329@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 88994
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:5j2a50lumtcq1ll472lkafoenjl1se58nd@4ax.com...
> In <Me93c.28681$aT1.7564@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:gr1q40pquikiq4lnrj71bmoc6esujare3q@4ax.com...
> >> In <BEo2c.31084$W74.22585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> >> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:4uvi40tjds89fhhhuq7ojsmb4cu3cfktnm@4ax.com...
(SNIP)
> >> >> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> >> >> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> >> >> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> >> >
> >> >Under new FCC rules the 'policing' of
> >> >CBers can be accomplished by the local
> >> >police. I.E. If they are trashing up my TV. I can call the police
> >> >and the cops can take them off the air as a nuisance.
> >>
> >> This incident occured years befor HR2346 (or whatever number that was).
> >> and nuisance laws vary depending on your locality, as well
> >> as their method of enforcement.
> >
> >The local police are ONLY enabled to inforce the FCC laws.
> >That does NOT include shuting down a legal
> >CB station just because it might cause interference.
>
> My point exactly.
>
> >Additionally, local nuisance laws are NOT applicable to authorized radio
> >transmissions per applicable FCC rules.
>
> There is no federal law that exempts a licensed radio operator from other
> violations he makes in the operation of his station. Such violations may
> include, but not limited to, causing a nuisance,

Please provide an example which you think would hold up
in court.

> trespassing,

Examples please. How is operating a legal CB station in your
own home or even in a vehicle in any way an act of trespass.

> local noise ordinances,

Again, examples please. Unless the CB (or ham) has a speaker
blaring into the neighborhood, just how would legal operation
of a CB or ham station fall under any local noise ordinance?

> construction/building code violations, etc, etc.

Again, examples please. Yes, one can be in violation
of building or construction codes for certain antenna
installations if done without a permit, but evn so, that
would just cause a CBer or ham to eliminate the code
violation. Having done so (i.e. elimated the code violation)
then the CBer or ham could certainly install an antenna
in accordance to local codes or file for the appropriate
permits and, if applicable, apply for a variance (e.g.
to put up a tower above locally permitted height).

> >> >Actual Amateur Radio licensees are exemp because
> >> >why???? Because we hold
> >> >a valid Federal License. Point counter point...cj?
> >>
> >> Hams regs do not exempt a ham from local nuisance
> >> laws. You can be in 100%
> >> compliance with federal law, but you can still be
> >> violating local laws if you atr creating or
> >> a nuisance with your station. Your FCC license is
> >> not a 'get-out-of-jail-free' card.
> >
> >It is against any effort to enforce a nuisance law against a legally
> >operated ham (or CB) station. If you think otherwise, please
> >provide applicable case law. From being a ham for
> >40+ years I have never heard of a single successful case of
> >local nuisance laws being used against a ham station.
>
> Nor have I, but I do know of at least
> two cases where radio operators were
> sucessfully sued in civil court for causing a nuisance.

How about some facts as to those cases.

> The articles didn't
> state whether those operators were licensed or not.

Anyone can be sued. What was the basis of the civil nuisance
complaint? More to the point,
if it is a "civil" suit, then it is NOT a violation of local ordinances
under municipal law.

> But since they weren't
> prosecuted for violating federal laws,

> the issue of licensure is moot, and
> therefore a ham can indeed be held
> responsible under local laws for causing a
> nuisance.

You keep saying that but offer not one concrete example..
or even a hypothetical case to discuss.

> I'll even bet you that it has happened
> already, because there sure are
> a lot of high-and-mighty hams who
> think that the feds are going to come running
> to protect their sorry asses if they so
> much as get a speeding ticket while
> jawing on their mobile.

I truly doubt your speeding ticket analogy. BUT...
let's use that for the moment. Speeding is NOT
a radio operation related charge and has ZERO
relationship to this discussion.

> Fortunately, it just doesn't work that way, Bill.

Fortunately? In actuality, you have yet
to show even one factual example.

> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide
> one case where a ham was excused from
> violating a local law because he was licensed.

Sorry, that's not my position to prove. The question
is raised from the point of IF and WHEN any ham
was even charged under any of the local
ordinances you argue on a general basis...i.e nuisance
laws, noise ordinances, trespass, etc.

Again, even for construction code or building code
violations, such violations are NOT for operation,
but rather for construction (usually, if not always,
for some sort of antenna or tower installation).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

981. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 12:33:23 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <dk8b50tc0k4m4sbdag45ep1ugitfj1j56t@4ax.com>
Source record: 88995
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

To begin with, I quoted a newspaper article about a case here in Spokane:

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=3ade1b9d.77554%40news.cet.com

And Twisty was nice enough to find a reference to another case on the other side of the state. I read the article after it was posted, but that was a couple years ago and you will have to search the referenced newpaper's archives to find it again:

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=QE9h6.153%24L35.40420%40news.uswest.net

That's two cases from one state. I'm sure there are more.

>if it is a "civil" suit, then it is NOT a violation of local ordinances
>under municipal law.

Now where did you get that idea? You can't file a complaint, civil OR criminal, unless there is an alleged violation of law, and it must be a law under which a remedy can be granted. Otherwise it gets tossed out of court.

>> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide
>> one case where a ham was excused from
>> violating a local law because he was licensed.
>
>Sorry, that's not my position to prove.

Too bad, because that was an easy one. As it turns out there -is- a federal law that preempts local laws from dealing with RFI-related issues, and it has been exercised many times. Instead of being defensively lazy you could have done a quick search on google and found the answer. Regardless.....

The FCC may have declared that any state or local RFI regulations are preempted by federal regs, but when the FCC won't get off it's lazy ass to enforce their own laws, that leaves victims with no remedy against asshole hams. Now any judge has the right to make any decision he/she deems legal and appropriate. Usually the courts side with the FCC, but evidently there are a few cases (such as the ones above) where they don't. And we all know (or should know) the legal process by now: If the decision should be against the FCC, the decision is not void just because a law exists which contradicts the decision. The case must go through the process of adjudication; i.e, the appeals courts. Most such cases can be appealed, one exception being Small Claims Courts in WA which doesn't allow appeals, only trials de novo. But on appeal there arises another thorn in the bush -- the FCC suddenly gets allergic to higher courts whenever there is a case that makes a challenge to their authority, especially to the constitutionality

of their laws. So if a case ever looks like it might end with a ruling that the FCC's preemptions are in conflict with the civil rights of the general public (as would be the case with a public nuisance) you can bet that the case will be quickly and quietly dropped. It has happened before and it will happen again.

To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference under the umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find their defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell swoop, but it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there is an increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to RFI complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about their cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on google I found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of the FCC's preemption, so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal hams they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as they did with HR2346.

So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't going to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic communications devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be there to defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They won't. And they won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few holier-than-thou hams.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

982. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 13:22:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403150522.4bdad156@posting.google.com>
Source record: 88996

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<40552CD1.10204@ix.netcom.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back anyway.
> >
> >
> >
> For the system to work, you need hams outside the disaster area to talk
> to the
> hams in the disaster area....

Did you and/or Steve handle any message traffic?

983. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 14:21:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4055BBFC.2020301@psu.edu>
Source record: 88997

N2EY wrote:
> In article <1sidnfnU3fqL48_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<4050D70A.6060102@psu.edu>...
>
>
>>>>A local bike race decided to try using cell phones as an experiment last
>>>>year. The hams were along, with the knowledge that we might be
>>>>"redundant in the future. They found out:
>>>>
>>>> Every person had to be called separately. When a message had to go to
>>>>the whole group, everyone had to be called.
>>>>
>>>> Those who were out of coverage range did not get the messages.
>>>>
>>>> Coverage over the entire course was pretty bad.
>>>>
>>>>Using cell phones was an immediate and complete failure. they realized
>>>>this on the first call that had to go to everyone.
>>>
>>>
>>>They couldn't figure all that out ahead of time?
>>
>> Amazingly enough, no! Cell phones are seductive little things. After
>>all you can call around the world, send pictures of whatever, and even
>>look up your email on the web with them. So how on earth can such a
>>wonderful instrument *not* be good at running a race? Imagine, each and
>>every participant with their own little radio, ready for direct contact.
>
>
> Well, there you have it: They did not understand their communications needs.

And they really don't have to. Problem is that so many people think
that they are "high-tech" when they use a cell phone or surf the web,
when in truth, they don't know one thing about what they are doing. Ask
the average person about how a cell phone works, or how that computer
works, and odds are they will draw a blank.

That's okay, as knowledge isn't mandated, but if they try to put together a comm support network with the level of knowledge that they *do* have, they are more likely than not to suffer failure. In other words, they are reaching a conclusion with insufficient thought. My thoughts are to learn to do it correctly, or allow someone that *does* know to do their job.

- Mike KB3EIA -

984. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 14:28:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4055BD95.8010205@psu.edu>
Source record: 88998

N2EY wrote:
> In article <qLSdnSTCTrZQqs7dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Fortunate that you folks were there.
>>
>> A young lady that fell and got a pavement rash certainly thought so. We
>
>
>>got there first aid, a repair truck, and back in the race. Year before
>>that, a fellow had a collision with a rear view mirror on a car and
>>messed his hand up.
>
>
> And while maybe it *could* have been done by "professionals", the fact is that
> it *was* done by amateurs.
>
> Some folks get all bent out of shape by such plain, simple facts.

Whatever else can be said about hams, in general, they provide
inexpensive and reliable support for public events in which they give
free time to support charities or other nonprofit groups. Not possible
to dispute.

That some people have a problem with that is a bigger statement about
those people than it is about Hams.

- Mike KB3EIA -

985. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 14:46:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4055C1C5.9050409@psu.edu>
Source record: 88999

N2EY wrote:
> In article <4vednUSdV9lZhtDdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> (Bill Sohl wrote):
>
>>>But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
>>>expenses.
>>
>> That is because they intend to get rid of every possible employee
>>whenever possible. Why would you train people that aren't going to be
>>working for you in a few years?
>
>
> The military does it all the time!

Ad they aren't so worried about bottom line profit.

>> Side note: These good folk could probably save money if they were to
>>get a bill passed requiring all Americans to learn Indian language in
>>school. That way they wouldn't have to train their new help to speak
>>English.
>
>
> Which language of India?

>
>>>Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
>>>and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
>>>because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
>>>The irony of non-support for older products is that in
>>>some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
>>>to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>>>
>>>
>>>>This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
>>>>their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
>>>>Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who
>>>
>>were the
>>
>>>>new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
>>>>succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
>>>>years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the
>>>

>>best of
>>
>>>>care.
>>>
>>>Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
>>
>> And the new car is so expensive that it darn well *better* make 200 K
>>miles. They have become waay too expensive. Did you know that they are
>>offering 7 year auto loans now? All the "innovative" techniques that the
>>companies had to do over the years to sell cars as the price went up is
>>reaching an end-game for them. Most people do not want to pay $500-$600
>>or more a month for a vehicle.
>
>
> Are cars *really* more expensive, adjusted for inflation?
>
> Back in 2001, my Honda Odyssey minivan cost about $26,000 new. How much did,
> say, the classic Ford Country Squire station wagon with the woodlike sides cost
> in 1964? How much has typical income increased in that time period?

I don't have statistics in front of me, but I do know that when I
started buying cars, a typical loan was 2 years. now they are doing 6
and seven year loans.

> I just paid it off, and it's got a lot more usable life in it. So the total
> lifetime cost may be less in inflation-adjusted dollars.

That's good to pay off a car in two years. Hopefully you got a good
trade in, or your payments were pretty steep. A 0 percent loan with no
down payment would be almost $1100 per month.

>
>>Leasing looked good for a while, but of course you have no trade-in, and
>>the lease company doesn't really want you to trade the thing in, they
>>want you to buy-out. But oh those car payments!
>
>
> All depends on a whole bunch of unknowns like residual value, interest rate,
> repair cost, etc.

I've leased two cars now, and did okay by both of them. For this go
round, I wanted to buy, and to do that, I spent 10K less for the new
vehicle than I did 5 years ago for my last one to keep the payments
reasonable.

>>>>>Look at the
>>>>>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>>>>
>>>>Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
>>>>However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>>>
>>> Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?

>>
>>Open up an old IBM PC, then open up a clone box built for cheap
>>performance. I can send you pix of some I have in my garage.
>
>
> Agreed. But that's in large part because they are not meant to last that long.
> And because enough people buy on price alone.

The old IBM's were meant to last. One of these days maybe we'll
concentrate on writing good functional software and operatin systems
that actually work, and then we won't have to get new computers every
two years.

> Meanwhile, folks like me cherrypick the trailing edge for pennies. This Amidon
> 350MHz box cost me a lot less than $100, and most of that was for the CD-ROM
> burner and the modem.

I do both. I have the latest and greatest for some of my uses, and I'm
using an old P166 Thinkpad running Win95 for my rig computer. The old PC
laptops had very nice sound output, and were built well.

- Mike KB3EIA -

986. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 15:37:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89000

Len Over 21 wrote:
> CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
> and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
> even though they may not have been born when CB was.

They are? Would it be too much trouble for you to name one or two of
'em?

You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.

Dave K8MN

987. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 15:41:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055CEBA.19C5FC94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89051

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <5c01b95b.0403140721.7f65da8c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> You are NOT anything but a poor deluded and ignorant petty person
> trying to control others by insults, innuendo, and ignorant ramblings
> of suppositions from an obviously NOT-insider.

Wow, Len! That paragraph pretty much sums up your actions here.

> Stop trying to impose your own personal fantasy on others. You
> can NOT transform reality to suit yourself...try to suit yourself to
> the reality. Accomplish that and you've made yourself acceptible
> to others.

This one sounds a lot like you too! Your personal fantasy of somehow
being a part of amateur radio and outlining the regulations under which
amateur radio should be governed is the stuff of legend. You must
realize that you can't transform reality to suit yourself. Maybe you
should work on trying to make yourself acceptible to others.

Dave K8MN

988. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:00:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055D305.A55E660B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89052

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0403131526.20912b0@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040313120059.21232.00004739@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0403130546.4f37f59@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
> >> >issue"...Leonard H Anderson.
> >> >
> >> > Yeah...right...
> >> >
> >> Since his claim has been proven to be false so many times, Steve, why do
> >you
> >> bother with him?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >TAFKARJ, my theory is that he can't help himmself. He is obsessed with Len.
>
> There's more to that than is apparent on the surface.
>
> The PCTAs all use misdirection via questions or "challenges" on other
> subjects in order to divert the thread away from the morse code test
> issue. By being sufficiently inflamatory, those misdirections now
> attract others who just want to fight and holler at others. The threads
> diverge and take on new subjects and the PCTAs are saved...their
> arguments for retention of the code test were not viable so they feel
> secure in not having "lost."

You mean that it is like your recent shuffle and twirl on amateur
radio's involvement in the L.A. Marathon--the one you watched, read
about in the paper and spoke about with an unnamed race official? You
certainly did some misdirection after being provided with those url
links.

> TAFKARJ uses the newsgroup as a Chat Room to talk about almost
> anything BUT the morse code test and ventures far, far afield from
> amateur radio policy subjects, so far that they don't include any
> amateur radio at all. He wants to be an essayist.

Don't be modest, Len. Jim's output pales to yours. You write as if you
were being paid by the word.

> Mr. Foreign Service (who doesn't know that the Amana Colonies are
> in Iowa!) simply wants to fight. He isn't quite so obsessed as the
> gunnery nurse but he has the arrogance of an SA fairy. He likes to
> use the misdirection of "He's an amateur and I ain't" (in varying words)
> therefore trying to imply that I am "nothing." :-)

Believe me, Len. You're "something" but you aren't involved in any
capacity with amateur radio.

When you have some spare time (and you seem to have plenty of that), why
not put forth one of your lengthy pieces on these newly found Amana
Colonies. I'm sure you'll hold us spellbound.

> The gunnery nurse is just nuts and can't get his act together. He
> can't take the slightest negative comment without going berserk.
>
> A common trait among them is one of Control. They want (perhaps
> need) to moderate the newsgroup to their view, their opinions, their
> personal likes/dislikes. Control and Ego together to build the concept
> of righteous service to the nation by being hams.

Talk about control! How about a fellow who is not a participant in nor
a regulator of amateur radio who would tell us how amateur radio should
be regulated? How about one who would set a minimum age for entry into
amateur radio or one who would dictate whether morse testing should be
part of amateur radio license testing? Try reining in your gusto for
control and that ego of yours.

> Amateur radio is supposed to be an enjoyable hobby. But, with the
> tree regulars mentioned above (up a tree without a piddle), it's all
> one of being inordinately proud of their imaginary world and a desire
> to be respected because of that Belief.

Ham radio is an enjoyable hobby. You'll have to take my word for it.
It isn't an imaginary world at all. It is a world with over 600,000
individuals licensed just in the U.S. That you don't respect any who
hold those licenses reads like more of your "Fox and the Grapes"
routine.

> The morse code test is being removed from the regulations of many
> nations' amateur radio. PCTAs cannot abide by that. They remain
> in denial since loss of the morse test is a loss to their self-esteem.

Not abiding isn't the same as not approving or working against. It has
nothing to do with self-esteem since many of us have passed a number of
morse exams. Worry about your own self-esteem. After all, you're the
guy who is on the sidelines.

> They can't use that mighty morse test as a bragging point if it is
> eliminated.

Sure they can. Elimination of a morse test or reduction in morse testing speed doesn't mean they never took or passed such a test. You're brag-yet-to-come of an "Extra right out of the box" is another matter.
You can't brag if you didn't take the action. You haven't done so.

> "If they had to take a morse test, EVERYBODY has to
> take a morse test to be as 'good' as they."

Really? I'll let you know about it the first time I run into someone on the bands who has never taken a morse test and who can copy 35 or 40 wpm.

Dave K8MN

989. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:06:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055D48C.78E37212@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89053

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0403130621.3c61fa9c@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040313014817.22081.00004530@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
> >> at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
> >> it! :-)
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Someone musta flipped over his rock.
>
> I don't think so. Mr. Foreign Service Dave just wants attention to
> himself so he can order folks around during his misdirectional
> postings. He can't come up with any convincing arguments against
> morse code test elimination so he loves to bait and misdirect the
> NCTA. He wants a Chat Room atmosphere where he can vie
> with TAFKARJ for King of the Chat Room.

Mr. Former Service desires attention for himself and his past
involvement in military and civilian radio so he can attempt to impress
mere radio amateurs. As to misdirection, witness the subject of the
L.A. Marathon, introduced by you and your quick change of direction when
confronted by fact.

> The PCTA regulars all want to misdirect into Chat Room fights for
> ascendency. That way they think they can hurt others by trying
> to show they are all expert at NON-amateur radio subjects...and
> then hit on others anywhichwaytheycan for speaking against them.

Funny. Are you trying to hurt others by trying to show that you're an
expert IN amateur radio subjects. You seem to hit on others for
speaking against you.

> It looks like they want to be the Biggest Rock in a field of pebbles.

When it comes to amateur radio, you have yet to become a pebble.

Dave K8MN

990. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:07:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403150807.3c99ecd5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89054

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403141901.4299f600@posting.google.com>...

> WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back anyway.

Only as far as laughing my buns off at the mere idea that yet
another LennieRant has been shredded by an ENDORSEMENT of Amateur
Radio by someone whose opinion on the matter is far more respected
than Lennie's is ! ! !

The sad part is that Lennie's angst against Amateur Radio is
probably the result of some pride-shattering moment that left him
scarred for life...But YOU, well...I haven't figured out WHY anyone
could WILLINGLY express anything close to admiration for an idiot that
is proven wrong over and over and over and...well...you get the
picture.

Well...now that I think about it, I guess you DON'T!

Steve, K4YZ

991. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:08:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055D516.EF8D6079@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89055

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <ByD4c.11745$t16.6811938@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >You left out another block of time. For a large event, there needs to be a
> >planning/coordination meeting in advance of the marathon that the
> >communications staff would need to attend. Paid operators won't attend that
> >for free either.
>
> Were the very first marathons, especially in the Olympic Games,
> run by professionals?
>
> The Los Angeles 2004 Marathon used LAPD and LAFD personnel
> who are paid all the time. Do they count in your analysis?
>
> Are marathon rules and regulations in Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R.?
>
> Do marathoners and marathon staff need to learn morse code in
> order to make the event a success?

Skip the shuck and jive routine, Len. You seem to forget that you told
us that amateur radio wasn't involved in the L.A. Marathon. Fact has
never dissueded you from promoting your view as gospel.

Dave K8MN

992. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:13:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403150813.f0eb526@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89056

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<40552CD1.10204@ix.netcom.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back anyway.
> >
> >
> >
> For the system to work, you need hams outside the disaster area to talk
> to the
> hams in the disaster area....

It doesn't matter, Robert...Lennie and PuppetBoy have been left
with their fly's open once again, and they'll be digging hard to try
and "spin" their collective way out of this, yet another glaring
example of Lennie's "mythos" rants against Amateur Radio.

The programs specifically cited about in the Proclamation are the
same programs in every State of the Union.

I'm "laughing at the superior intellect" once again.

73

Steve, K4YZ

993. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:25:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055D908.38B55CCE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89057

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040312214216.05957.00000992@mb-m26.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >In article <20040312161803.05539.00004739@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <c2356669.0403120940.34040456@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> writes:
> >>
> >>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>>news:<20040311212338.23307.00007250@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >>>> In article <c2356669.0403111116.6a174053@posting.google.com>,
> >>N2EY@AOL.COM
> >>>> (N2EY) writes:
> >>>>
> >>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>>> >news:<20040308203335.12631.00005425@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >>>> >> In article <Xns94A636FD25B02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >>>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

> The very first marathons didn't need any ham radio to help them.

No and the Greeks and Persians didn't use any short range bombers during
their wars.

> Why do you keep implying that marathons MUST have ham
> radio help to be successful?

I didn't see that implied. Don't waffle, Len. You introduced the topic
of the Los Angeles Marathon and you claimed that amateur radio wasn't
involved. It is a good thing you're typing your responses 'cuz you
surely couldn't talk with that foot in your mouth.

> You haven't proved anything about ham radio being NECESSARY
> to stage and operate any marathon.

That isn't the issue at all. You said that amateur radio WASN'T
involved in a particular marathon. You were dead wrong.

> Road Races are run by sports cars on roads.

On tires.

> Marathoners run on foot.

On roads.

> Try not to be too much like the Schoolmaster who was once
> assigned to the far Amana Colonies...

I'm not a schoolmaster and I've never heard of the Amana Colonies. You might want to make those the subject of one of your frequent lectures.

Dave K8MN

994. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:27:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055D974.71EEE259@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89058

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40529994.F8DC6A52@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >The Carson Show? Johnny Carson? Aren't you the guy always singing the
> >song about others living in the past?
>
> Johnny Carson is still living and around here.

Is he doing a late night, public access cable show?

Dave K8MN

995. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:33:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055DADB.E520B0D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89059

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
>
> I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.

I wouldn't either. What's an H2.

> >You can think of it as a very expensive SWL receiver.
>
> No, I think of it as an updated version of the defunct Kachina.

Then you'd think incorrectly.

> Poor baby, still miffed because I KNOW how SDRs work
> and you don't have a clue?

It hasn't been established that you know anything about them. You
couldn't even get the definition of "firmware" straight.

> Ah, but you can do 20 wpm and operate! Wow! Blazing along
> at 1/3 the speed of an old, obsolete Model 15 Teletype. Go for
> it! :-)

I could slow down and do 20 wpm if I chose to do so. Most modern
computer/HF multi-mode controller TTY users still stick with the 45 baud
speed of the old, obsolete Model 15. If I choose to work RTTY, I'll do
so. If I choose to operate using morse, I'll do so. You do what you
can.

Dave K8MN

996. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:34:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4055DB09.41B44AA0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89060

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40529827.24D26912@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I am forte-laden, Leonard. One of mine is that I'm a radio amateur.
> >You aren't.
>
> Right...I'm a professional radio person and have been since 1952.

Super. It hasn't helped you enter amateur radio, has it?

Dave K8MN

997. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:35:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403150835.6af93839@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89061

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403131501.6cfefad9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130738.3243111@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>...
> > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...

> > Jim has his own ideas and objectives when they come to you. We
> > usually agree 90% of the time...this is not one of them.
>
> So it continues to be about you. You cannot control yourself.

Sure I can. When you and Lennie make idiotic postsings, I present
information or evidence that you are wrong. No problem.

> > > You're obsessed.
> >
> > Coming from a guy who continues to post to a newsgroup about a
> > radio service that he's stated he has no use for, we should take you
> > seriously...WHY...?!?!
>
> I've stated no such thing. You continue to lie.

Nice "cut-and-paste", Sir Scummy II...That was in reference to
Lennie, when in context is no "lie".

> > You're a liar...that means I have no tolerence for you.
>
> Quixoterobeson, it comes as no suprise that you have no tolerance for
> people who don't lie, either.

Such as...YOU...?!?!

Please provide me some "ferinstance", Brain...

> > You misrepresent the truth about the Amateur Radio service.
>
> Absolutely not. What lies have I told?

Let's start off with your "Somalia" operation, Brain.

> You
> > do this because you are an evil, petty little person. But you

> > wouldn't be the FIRST petty little person who got his way by repeating
> > the same lies over and over...I just intend to not LET you have your
> > way.
>
> Holy guacamole! A person points out that you are nuts, and so they
> are evil, petty little people? Are your ex's evil petty little
> people? Is your shrink an evil petty little person?

First of all, you have yet to provide this forum with your credentials as to what qualifies YOU as determining who is "nuts"...You HAVE been asked SEVERAL time to do so. (Just being peeved about getting your nose effectively rubbed in your silliness does not "qualify" you)

As for what I consider "petty" or "evil" (no, neither of my "ex's" are and I have NO "shrink"), that would include people who find it necessary to intentionally misrepresent dedicated and motivated volunteers.

> > So far, it's working.
>
> So far all we hear is your flatulent mouth spewing lies. When are you
> going to get to the truth? It will set you free.

"...flatulent mouth spewing lies..."

Interesting, coming from the guy who can't/won't validate a single aspect of his big "DX" operation from a UN-controlled Somalia....

Interesting coming from a guy who claims that a military officer gave him "permission" to operate from said area, but can't/won't name the officer or that officer's billet which allowed him to render the permission.

Interesting, coming from a guy who claims a known pathological liar and antagonist as his "mentor".

You can try to toss the "lie" ball back and forth all you want, PuppetBoy, but so far all you've done is that...

Now..back to your comment about the truth setting you free...Take some of your own advice, Brain, and pony up some facts and evidence and you can say "I told you so"...Otherwise I hold to MY claim that all YOU told were lies. So far YOU are proving ME right...Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

998. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:39:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403150839.1ea43ae0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89062

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403141850.4ebf4fdc@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403141410.6b8928c2@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403141145.2c2b7267@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > "POP" goes the weazel.
> >
> > I consider it pretty good evidence of "mission accomplished" when
> > all you can "reply" to are some typos, PuppetBoy...
>
> Seething rage is your mission? I'd say you are quite accomplished.
>
> > Not that I expected anything else.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> So sorry not to live up to your expectations.

Oh, no! Brain! Don't be sorry! You've HAVE "lived up to (my)
expectations", and MORE, for which >>I<< am sorry to say!

Now...if you'd just pony up some evidence to back up all of the
silly claims you've made here, or be a man and just admit you've been
polishing your own brass and move on...either way you'd gain much more
respect than claiming Lennie as your "mentor"...THAT was nuts!

Steve, K4YZ

999. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 16:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403150855.55e47de3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89063

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040314005843.12631.00005519@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403131522.603e2aed@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403130624.115256fe@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> YOU are the one who always insists that typos are indicative of
> >> "rage". I ahve NEVER stated that except to sarcastically throw it
> >> back at YOU when you do it yourself.
> >
> >But Quixoterobeson, you're always in a rage. So when you commit
> >typo's, you're in a... rage.
> >
> >So how did Len get it wrong?
>
> Doesn't matter, Brian, to the gunnery nurse I'm either lying, a putz,
> or scum, or any combination thereof.

Lennie, you've had several lucid moments in this forum, and in
those moments I called you "Len", sincerely thanked you for your
participation/input, and moved on along.

I've acknowledged YOUR knowledge of radio theory, and even asked
you to conduct/participate in a forum that would have put you in the
drivers seat, license or not.

YOUR response was a weeks-long on-going rant about how you'd NOT
be "forced" to do such a thing, yet you couldn't understand why such a
fountain of knowledge such as yourself (a "professional") was scorned
by "amateurs".

Then you go right back to uttering the same transparent, easily
refuted mistruths about Amateur Radio in general and some Amateurs in
particular.

You're a person of unique and contradictory presentation, and
unfortunately for you none of the contradictions substantiate any of
what you have to say about the "some" of us or Amateur Radio in
general.

Sucks to be you, Lennie. I am sure "you" was a nice guy once
upon a time, but what's wound up here is anyhting but.

If you honestly and sincerely stuck to your assertion of "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue", and actually had some argument other than "commercial ships and the Army don't use it", we might find soemthing to talk about.

YOU sank any hopes of that when you set in with the "Nazi", "jack-boot", etc etc rants.

Again...sucks to be you.

Back up and punt, Lennie...It's all you have left.

Steve, K4YZ

1000. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 17:15:47 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c34oc30g7r@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

what about bisexual hams like me and leland?

In article <t_k5c.8772$Oo5.5416@twister.nyroc.rr.com>, WA8ULX says...
>
>http://groups.yahoo.com/group/NOCBPLUSSERS/
>
>CBers are NOT allowed!
>
>

1001. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 18:41:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4055F8C5.8050202@psu.edu>
Source record: 89065

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
>>
>> I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.
>
>
> I wouldn't either. What's an H2.

The second Generation of the HumVee. I guess that means he has money. I don't blame him for not wanting to but the H2.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1002. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 18:50:54 UTC
From: Ham the Sham and the Pharaohs <smokedham@porkbutt.com>
Message-ID: <afbaac8c5072e20c05764e0e8fc45ee2@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 89067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"WA3MOJ" <Busch@home.nut> wrote in message
news:c34oc30g7r@drn.newsguy.com...
> what about bisexual hams like me and leland?
>
>
nope,no knuckle draggers allowed.

> In article <t_k5c.8772$Oo5.5416@twister.nyroc.rr.com>, WA8ULX says...
> >
> >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/NOCBPLUSSERS/
> >
> >CBers are NOT allowed!
> >
> >
>

1003. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 18:55:57 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1%m5c.14$iC1.12@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 89066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

The reality of the situation is that if *your* telephone is clean and *your* stereo is clean in *your* house, a neighbor would have a far more difficult time of convincing anyone that the problem is *your* transmitter and not *their* poorly filtered consumer equipment. Often, changing the direction of an antenna may reduce the problem many dBs. It is much easier to work with a neighbor than to let things get that far out of hand.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.622 / Virus Database: 400 - Release Date: 3/13/04

1004. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 19:31:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315143100.06658.00001507@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 89068

>what about bisexual hams like me and leland?
>

NONE WILL BE PERMITTED

1005. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 20:16:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315151612.15923.00004346@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89069

In article <40552CD1.10204@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>William wrote:
>
>>WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back
>>anyway.
>>

>For the system to work, you need hams outside the disaster area to talk
>to the hams in the disaster area....

Some hams ARE disaster areas... :-)

LHA / WMD

1006. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 20:16:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315151612.15923.00004345@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89070

In article <c339vb$21u501$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>Yes it is, Leonard -- and a simple look in the mirror will verify that for
>you. You could not have described your behavior in this group over the last
>few years any better. Bravo, your self-analysis is flawless.

After a long absence, Mr. Army Lawnorder comes in here with
nothing but a personal attack on another.

Are you now going to "check papers" at the door of the newsgroup
and prevent "unauthorized personnel" from entering?

Go back to your NTS and work traffic to aid Homeland Security
or something that sounds VERY important.

LHA / WMD

1007. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 20:16:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315151613.15923.00004347@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89072

In article <4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
>even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.

Poor baby. ANGER affecting your thinking, is it?

Access BPL is going to affect ANYONE desiring to tune anything
in the HF and low-VHF spectrum.

You have some choices. Stay in here, do nothing about BPL, and
snarl at non-hams (like you always do); or, make your comments to
the FCC...free, quite quick, and you go on public record as one of
many who oppose Access BPL; or just let the ARRL do it, one
special-interest group against MANY others who want it.

You have this wonderful opportunity as a citizen to make your
feelings known to our government, freely, and without censorship.
But, you don't (at least not yet) and all you do in here is bitch and
snarl and try to arrogantly control others.

Play all you want with your mighty HF radios now. They might be
worthless in the future when BPL comes into your area and the
FCC has relaxed incidental RF radiation limits because not enough
citizens showed interest in the problem. Continue to snarl and
make nasty to selected individuals...that way you can say you are
"too busy" to comment on Access BPL because you were trying
to maintain ethnic cleansing of the newsgroup.

So long, Slobodan,

LHA / WMD

1008. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 20:16:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315151614.15923.00004348@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89071

In article <4055F8C5.8050202@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> I wouldn't either. What's an H2.
>
> The second Generation of the HumVee. I guess that means he has money. I

>don't blame him for not wanting to but the H2.

H2 = "Nomenclature" of the civilian equivalent of the military "HumVee,"
the ultimate SUV. :-) Good for off-road travel as-is, can make a
wonderful military-style mobile rig for ham "service" afficionados. Just
paint it flat olive or desert cammy color and install a huge manual code
key, plus a big "Official Ham Emergency Vehicle" sign on the side
right next to a copy of the mysterious sideways chevron used on all
military vehicles for visual ID.

Bye on the H2, thank you. :-)

Poor lad doesn't know where the Amana Colonies are. Those are in Iowa,
actually a collection of small towns settled by largely German immigrants
in the 1800s. Mostly a tourist enclave, they do have some delicious
midwest eating at many restaurants there...most restaurants having true
"all you can eat" menus with second+ helpings on entrees if you want.
See any AAA Guidebook. If you don't like midwest cooking, just go to
one of several smokehouses there and sample the many sausages.
Good desert wines, too.

Amana ranges are made in the central city (Amana, Iowa). Amana
microwave ovens are assembled in Mexico according to the lables on
our kitchen appliances installed in 2000. Amana bought the "radarange"
trademark and microwave range technology from Raytheon many years
ago.

Okay, now back to poor Mr. Foreign Service snarling and spewing
against those who won't bow and kiss his ring. :-)

LHA / WMD

1009. When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 20:32:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403151232.29ae8159@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89073

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
> > and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
> > even though they may not have been born when CB was.
>
> They are? Would it be too much trouble for you to name one or two of
> 'em?

Actually, Dave, the citizens' radio service was created by FCC in 1946
and the first licenses issued in 1947. See:

http://hamgallery.com/Tribute/W8PAL/

The first allocations were in the 460 MHz range, and were known as
Class A and Class B cb. (One class was voice and the other
radio-control). The more-popular ~27 MHz cb (Class C and Class D) were
authorized by FCC in 1958. FRS and GMRS are really the lineal
descendants of 1946-era cb.
>
> You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
> even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.
>
There's a profile floating around that you might find handy, Dave...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1010. Straight Talk on Access BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 21:12:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315161219.05957.00001020@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 89074

Access BPL poses a threat for all radio amateurs working HF through incidental RF radiation on HF and low VHF. That is national and will affect the majority of radio amateurs and other citizens making up about 96 percent of the USA population, those who live in urban and suburban residential areas.

Radio amateurs have several choices, all free, no obligations to do anything -

1. Do nothing, let someone else do the talking...such as the ARRL.

2. Make your comments known directly to the FCC on NPRM 04-29 via the ECFS. Do it doubly, on that and on ET Docket 04-37; 04-37 has the first document as the NPRM itself.

3. Sit in here and bitch and whine and snarl at others and make noises about "big money intrests" and "we are all doomed" and other excuses for not doing anything.

The FCC does NOT run any BPL system. It can't unless there is Congressional legislation made that allows them to that. Right now, all the FCC can do is to establish INCIDENTAL RF RADIATION limits on Access BPL systems. The FCC can regulate that and does so now on many electronic devices.

NPRM 04-29 as proposed does NOT allow any incidental RF radiation beyond that already established in Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R. If you don't know what that means, you can get a free download of Part 15 from the GPO link on the FCC website. If you don't know what that means, ask someone who does for an education in the subject. Whether realizing it or not, everyone is living with those Part 15 incidental RF radiation limits right now.

The FCC cannot do anything against any Access BPL system except regulate that incidental RF. The FCC can't stop a system from being installed, can't halt planning, or anything else. What you CAN do is make sure the Part 15 limits REMAIN AS THEY ARE. LOWER the limits for less HF noise if you can...but know what you are talking about when you request that.

Nobody is going to stop BPL. It is there. It can be there. What CAN be done is to demand stringent measurement and enforcement rules on incidental RF radiation. Make it tough enough to force the Access BPL proponents to spend money and effort on PROOF of PERFORMANCE of the eventual huge antenna array of an installed Access BPL system. You can force the enactment of regulations that might make BPL proponents think twice about

installing one.

No Access BPL system is running KiloWatts of power into those
power lines. It iis relatively low level. But, the enormous length
and breadth of the electric power distribution network already there
can be a gigantic antenna larger than any that has existed in radio
at any time. While those power lines work fine at 60 cycles, every
discontinuity in those lines, every amplifier along the way, every
coupling device, is a potential point-source for incidental RF radiation
from about 4 to 80 MHz. All those potential radiation points will add
to the HF and low VHF RF radiation. In an area of 50,000 population
there may be 10,000 possibilities for incidental RF radiation, not just
in the Access BPL equipment but every single power line splice and
change in wire spacing. All of those things ADD RF noise power to
the interference field stretching to many square miles.

It is the task of the FCC to HOLD DOWN the incidental RF radiation
levels and KEEP them down. You have to tell them that.

The ARRL can't do it alone. They are only one special interest group
competing with MANY special interest groups, most of whom are
Access BPL proponents. The FCC does listen to CITIZENS. It must
since that is the law. The FCC WILL "listen" to you via the ECFS
as a CITIZEN of the USA.

You aren't going to win many points babbling pseudo-patriotic stuff
about "amateur radio vital to Homeland Security and for emergencies."
The FCC knows damn well that hams are basically hobbyists having
fun with radios. They've known that for a long time. Don't kid yourself
differently or to others. We are all CITIZENS. All citizens are vital to
this nation. ALL deserve to be heard. Make yourself heard and
you WILL be listened to.

Your choice on what to do. I've made my Comment to the FCC on
NPRM 04-29. Will any of you do the same?

LHA

1011. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 21:59:41 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c3590d02822@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89075

In article <20040315143100.06658.00001507@mb-m05.aol.com>, WA8ULX says...
>
>>what about bisexual hams like me and leland?
>>
>
>NONE WILL BE PERMITTED
>
what about your homo butty dan?

1012. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 22:38:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4056307F.1EE7F66F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89076

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >>In article <40529908.337A1A6E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>You can buy an Orion too, Leonard.
> >>
> >> I can also by an H2 and pay cash. Don't care to.
> >
> >
> > I wouldn't either. What's an H2.
>
> The second Generation of the HumVee. I guess that means he has money. I
> don't blame him for not wanting to but the H2.

He'd certainly get more use from the Hummer than he would an amateur
radio transceiver.

Dave K8MN

1013. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 22:42:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4056316C.18E3BD67@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89077

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c339vb$21u501$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
> >Yes it is, Leonard -- and a simple look in the mirror will verify that for
> >you. You could not have described your behavior in this group over the last
> >few years any better. Bravo, your self-analysis is flawless.
>
> After a long absence, Mr. Army Lawnorder comes in here with
> nothing but a personal attack on another.

...in response to a personal attack by you on another, Loon.

> Are you now going to "check papers" at the door of the newsgroup
> and prevent "unauthorized personnel" from entering?

Do you think that'd work?

> Go back to your NTS and work traffic to aid Homeland Security
> or something that sounds VERY important.

Or maybe he could follow in your footsteps and become an expert on
amateur radio's involvement in the Los Angeles Marathon.

Dave K8MN

1014. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 22:46:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40563232.8028438E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89078

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
> >even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.
>
> Poor baby. ANGER affecting your thinking, is it?

No, Loon. Was it effecting your thinking when you wrote something
similar about what you believe hams are thinking about the loss of 11m?

> Access BPL is going to affect ANYONE desiring to tune anything
> in the HF and low-VHF spectrum.

Really?

> You have some choices. Stay in here, do nothing about BPL, and
> snarl at non-hams (like you always do); or, make your comments to
> the FCC...free, quite quick, and you go on public record as one of
> many who oppose Access BPL; or just let the ARRL do it, one
> special-interest group against MANY others who want it.

You know, I've never needed your assistance in posting my comments to
the FCC before. What made you think I'd need it now?

Dave K8MN

1015. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 22:55:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89079

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
> > > and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
> > > even though they may not have been born when CB was.
> >
> > They are? Would it be too much trouble for you to name one or two of
> > 'em?
>
> Actually, Dave, the citizens' radio service was created by FCC in 1946
> and the first licenses issued in 1947. See:
>
> http://hamgallery.com/Tribute/W8PAL/
>
> The first allocations were in the 460 MHz range, and were known as
> Class A and Class B cb. (One class was voice and the other
> radio-control). The more-popular ~27 MHz cb (Class C and Class D) were
> authorized by FCC in 1958. FRS and GMRS are really the lineal
> descendants of 1946-era cb.

I would have thought our resident expert on all things radio would have
known that.

> > You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
> > even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.
> >
> There's a profile floating around that you might find handy, Dave...

Oh, don't worry. Your summary of Len's likely actions will pop up from
time to time as long as he acts as he does. The humorous part of
dealing with Leonard is that he just can't see is that he is guilty of
those things of which he accuses others. If someone like him moved next
door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
of pink plastic flamingos.

Dave K8MN

1016. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 23:19:47 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <gibc5050d367d9mpuultju3ljarns8kgfu@4ax.com>
Source record: 89080
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <1%m5c.14$iC1.12@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

>The reality of the situation is that if *your* telephone is clean and *your*
>stereo is clean in *your* house, a neighbor would have a far more difficult
>time of convincing anyone that the problem is *your* transmitter and not
>*their* poorly filtered consumer equipment. Often, changing the direction
>of an antenna may reduce the problem many dBs. It is much easier to work
>with a neighbor than to let things get that far out of hand.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA

I got home from work about an hour ago. While I was there I checked through the records for interference issues the station has had in the past. There were a few to be sure. Some of them were found to be simple imaging in cheap, single conversion receivers. There was one incident where the station had a bad trap which resulted in several complaints all at once, but the problem was quickly fixed. However, not one complaint was about RFI in a cordless phone, and no complaints were found where the cause was unintentional rectification. Mind you that this station transmits many kilowatts and that residents live less than a 1/4 mile from the tower, many of whom have televisions, cordless phones, and all the other electronic devices which hams claim are responsible for receiving interference due to 'poor filtering'.

On the other hand, the station has had incidents where it was the -receiver- of RFI despite a level of filtering above and beyond what should be required to prevent interference (much of which I have installed myself). Filtering does nothing to stop RFI when the transmitter is dirty. I have to prove this fact to at least a couple hams each year by parking the van outside their house and showing them their spurs on the spectrum analyzer. And these are hams who swear up and down that their signal is clean and that the problem is with the neighbors equipment. Most of them clean up their act in a hurry. The rest get a complaint filed with the FCC by the station because they are interfering with the station's transmission.

My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.

BTW, I should point out that we at the station take care of our listeners and respond to complaints of interference to our signal wherever they occur (within our contour). Many times that interference is caused by radio operators, legal or not. We determine the nature of the interference then attempt to resolve it. If it is caused by a radio operator that is unwilling to clean up his act then the station files a complaint with the FCC. We get a better response from the

FCC than do a few angry neighbors because the station pays a lot of money to stay on the air, and the FCC responds to money, not people.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1017. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 23:35:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040315183507.821$W2@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut> wrote:
> what about bisexual hams like me and leland?
>
> In article <t_k5c.8772$Oo5.5416@twister.nyroc.rr.com>, WA8ULX says...
> >
> >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/NOCBPLUSSERS/
> >
> >CBers are NOT allowed!
> >
>
Who cares about your loser club?

--
Nowadays it just don't pay to be a good ol' boy.

1018. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 23:46:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040315184605.01855.00001421@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89082

>what about your homo butty dan?

Dans not A HOMO

1019. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-15 23:57:40 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <Upr5c.58563$hn1.29300@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Duke Of Windsor wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
>> Who cares about your loser club?
>
> Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in the
> 70's.

Who cares about the Duke of Windsor? He died on 5/2/1972.

--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

1020. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 00:07:01 UTC
From: "I Am Not George, Either" <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Fyr5c.1544$Mm2.1441@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 89084
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
news:Upr5c.58563$hn1.29300@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
> Duke Of Windsor wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> >> Who cares about your loser club?
> >
> > Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in the
> > 70's.
>
> Who cares about the Duke of Windsor? He died on 5/2/1972.
>

That would explain the smell.

1021. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 00:34:05 UTC
From: Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net>
Message-ID: <105cirttf76fo7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89085
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I bought my HT and some other items there, and AFAIR everything shipped promptly.

My one complaint is that their online "shopping basket" times out very quickly: a couple of times I needed to check something and by the time I came back to continue shopping my basket was empty again.

My biggest purchases have been from HRO, but their prices are sometimes higher.

Alan AB2OS

On 02/18/04 01:13 pm Rusty in Louisville put fingers to keyboard and launched the following message into cyberspace:

> I would like to get some opinions about
> Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
>
> My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> or more to back order.

1022. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 01:00:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dls5c.5148$CJ5.280@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:dk8b50tc0k4m4sbdag45ep1ugitfj1j56t@4ax.com...
> To begin with, I quoted a newspaper article about a case here in Spokane:
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=3ade1b9d.77
554%40news.cet.com
>
> And Twisty was nice enough to find a reference to another case on the
other side
> of the state. I read the article after it was posted, but that was a
couple
> years ago and you will have to search the referenced newpaper's archives
to find
> it again:
>
>
http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=QE9h6.153%2
4L35.40420%40news.uswest.net
>
> That's two cases from one state. I'm sure there are more.
>
> >if it is a "civil" suit, then it is NOT a violation of local ordinances
> >under municipal law.
>
> Now where did you get that idea? You can't file a complaint, civil OR
criminal,
> unless there is an alleged violation of law, and it must be a law under
which a
> remedy can be granted. Otherwise it gets tossed out of court.

Apologies...should have said "criminal" law.

> >> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide
> >> one case where a ham was excused from
> >> violating a local law because he was licensed.
> >
> >Sorry, that's not my position to prove.
>
> Too bad, because that was an easy one. As it turns out there -is- a
federal law
> that preempts local laws from dealing with RFI-related issues, and it has
been
> exercised many times.

Then why'd you ask me to prove anything?

> Instead of being defensively lazy you could have done a
> quick search on google and found the answer.

My life doesn't live or die based on newsgroup discussions.

> Regardless.....
>
> The FCC may have declared that any state or local RFI regulations are
preempted
> by federal regs, but when the FCC won't get off it's lazy ass to enforce
their
> own laws, that leaves victims with no remedy against asshole hams.

Excuse me. just what does that mean?

> Now any judge has the right
> to make any decision he/she deems legal and appropriate.

And on what basis do you make that leap of logic?

> Usually
> the courts side with the FCC, but evidently there are a few cases (such as
the
> ones above) where they don't. And we all know (or should know) the legal
process
> by now: If the decision should be against the FCC, the decision is not
void just
> because a law exists which contradicts the decision.

The initial court decision can and may well be reversed on appeal.
I have not read of any case being upheld on local jurisdiction vs
federal preemption when it gets to the feds.

> The case must go through
> the process of adjudication; i.e, the appeals courts. Most such cases can
be
> appealed, one exception being Small Claims Courts in WA which doesn't
allow
> appeals, only trials de novo.

And why would a ham or a CD interference case end up
in small claims court anyway?

> But on appeal there arises another thorn in the
> bush -- the FCC suddenly gets allergic to higher courts whenever there is
a case
> that makes a challenge to their authority, especially to the
constitutionality
> of their laws. So if a case ever looks like it might end with a ruling
that the
> FCC's preemptions are in conflict with the civil rights of the general
public
> (as would be the case with a public nuisance) you can bet that the case

will be
> quickly and quietly dropped. It has happened before and it will happen
again.

Dropped by who? If I am being sued and my defense is federal preemption,
then why would I drop the case? The FCC doesn't even have to be
a direct party to the case for the issue of federal preemption to be
argued.

> To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference

Guess that shows your true colors...

> under the
> umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find
their
> defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell
swoop, but
> it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there
is an
> increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to
RFI
> complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about
their
> cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on
google I
> found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of
the
> FCC's preemption,

So...the situation that a law exists can just be that the law hasn't
been challenged.

> so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
> anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal
hams
> they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as
they
> did with HR2346.

Yet I find no such "doom and gloom" predictions or examples being
recorded in ham publications. The fact that some ill advised local
government
enacts a piece of law that "outlaws" interference doesn't
makethe law immune to being overturned on the preemption
basis. The argument for pre-emption, if made, doesn't even
require the FCC to do so. the defendent's attorney can and likely
would raise the argument.

> So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't
going
> to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic
communications

> devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be
there to
> defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They won't. And
they
> won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not
a few
> holier-than-thou hams.

Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
who the real smart ass is.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1023. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 02:18:20 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <Mtt5c.25181$7w3.1033@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89087
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
I Am Not George, Either wrote:
> "Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
>> Duke Of Windsor wrote:
>>> Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in
>>> the 70's.
>>
>> Who cares about the Duke of Windsor? He died on 5/2/1972.
>
> That would explain the smell.

And the ineffectiveness of Viagra.
```

1024. Re: Stirrings in the veldt

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 02:22:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403151822.2245de25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89088

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403150839.1ea43ae0@posting.google.com>...

> Oh, no! Brain! Don't be sorry! You've HAVE "lived up to (my)
> expectations", and MORE, for which >>I<< am sorry to say!
>
> Now...if you'd just pony up some evidence to back up all of the
> silly claims you've made here, or be a man and just admit you've been
> polishing your own brass and move on...either way you'd gain much more
> respect than claiming Lennie as your "mentor"...THAT was nuts!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Quixoterobeson, you've got the typo problem cleared up. What kind of
meds are you on?

1025. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 02:25:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403151825.2442c166@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89089

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403150835.6af93839@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403131501.6cfefad9@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403130738.3243111@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403112002.4d0e41e9@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110316.337cda12@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101639.767172d4@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Jim has his own ideas and objectives when they come to you. We
> > > usually agree 90% of the time...this is not one of them.
> >
> > So it continues to be about you. You cannot control yourself.
>
> Sure I can. When you and Lennie make idiotic postsings, I present
> information or evidence that you are wrong. No problem.

Yeh, sure you can - when you're on your meds. Rest of the time you go berzerk.

1026. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 02:26:24 UTC
From: "I Am Not George, Either" <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <kBt5c.42072$u_5.14573@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 89090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
news:Mtt5c.25181$7w3.1033@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> I Am Not George, Either wrote:
> > "Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
> >> Duke Of Windsor wrote:
> >>> Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in
> >>> the 70's.
> >>
> >> Who cares about the Duke of Windsor? He died on 5/2/1972.
> >
> > That would explain the smell.
>
> And the ineffectiveness of Viagra.
>
>

Too funny!

1027. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 02:59:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040315215905.01019.00000947@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89091

In article <4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
>> > > and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
>> > > even though they may not have been born when CB was.
>> >
>> > They are? Would it be too much trouble for you to name one or two of
>> > 'em?
>>
>> Actually, Dave, the citizens' radio service was created by FCC in 1946
>> and the first licenses issued in 1947. See:
>>
>> http://hamgallery.com/Tribute/W8PAL/
>>
>> The first allocations were in the 460 MHz range, and were known as
>> Class A and Class B cb. (One class was voice and the other
>> radio-control). The more-popular ~27 MHz cb (Class C and Class D) were
>> authorized by FCC in 1958. FRS and GMRS are really the lineal
>> descendants of 1946-era cb.
>
>I would have thought our resident expert on all things radio would have
>known that.

Such a person should also know that FCC will accept comments up to 45 days from
the date an NPRM is published in the federal register.

Such a person should also know that FCC has been doing the comment thing for
decades. Back in the 60s FCC got over 6000 comments to the various "incentive
licensing" proposals. This was back in the days when such comments were usually
manually typed and mailed - no PCs, no internet, no emails. This was
back when the number of US hams was about 40% of what it is today.

And you'd think such a person would have filed comments on 98-143 during the
comment period, not the reply comment period, and done it electronically. But
hey, even professionals have computer trouble.
>
>> > You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues
>> > even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.
>> >

>> There's a profile floating around that you might find handy, Dave...
>
>Oh, don't worry. Your summary of Len's likely actions will pop up from
>time to time as long as he acts as he does.

So predictable.

>The humorous part of
>dealing with Leonard is that he just can't see is that he is guilty of
>those things of which he accuses others.

Maybe he can. Maybe that's his point.

>If someone like him moved next
>door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
>lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
>of pink plastic flamingos.
>
Did you ever see the John Waters film by that name?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1028. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 03:01:09 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c35qln$245bva$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89092

"Dave Heil" wrote ...

...in response to a personal attack by you on another, Loon.

Leonard is long on insults but short on memory --something that will never change. Even so, I think he got the self analysis just right.

BTW, how have you been Dave?

73,

Arnie -

1029. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 03:26:19 UTC
From: "I Am Not George, Either" <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <vtu5c.1834$Mm2.1001@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 89093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94ADE1973FCE61234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "I Am Not George, Either" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in
> news:Fyr5c.1544$Mm2.1441@fe1.texas.rr.com:
>
> >
> > "Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote in message
> > news:Upr5c.58563$hn1.29300@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
> >> Duke Of Windsor wrote:
> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
> >> >> Who cares about your loser club?
> >> >
> >> > Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in
the
> >> > 70's.
> >>
> >> Who cares about the Duke of Windsor? He died on 5/2/1972.
> >>
> > >
> > That would explain the smell.
>
>
>
> That is you're breath backing up on you crackman.
>

You illiterate moron, go take a remedial English class.
```

1030. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 03:28:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40567474.17D6A6A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89094

Arnie Macy wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote ...
>
> ...in response to a personal attack by you on another, Loon.
> ____
>
> Leonard is long on insults but short on memory --something that will never
> change. Even so, I think he got the self analysis just right.
>
> BTW, how have you been Dave?
>

I've had better months and expect some when warm weather comes to stay
for a while.

Onward and upward!

73,

Dave

1031. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 04:09:56 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <G-OdnfHFPsqHHcvdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89095

William wrote:

>
>
> You lie. You were w/o ham capability prior to becoming licensed.

It would be obvious to anyone with more than three working brain cells
that the statement applies to the period in which I hold a valid ham
radio operator's license.

1032. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 04:16:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <dt2dnZmiMJYhHMvdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89096

William wrote:

> >
>
>>I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
>>play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>
>
> Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
> will be there if needed.
> Post a follow-up to this message

And how in your infinite witless wisdom did you get out of this that I said that cells phones are always down and my ham radio is always up? I w i l l t y p e t h i s v e r y s l o o o o l y s o t r y t o k e e p u p. I s a i d, *W H E N* t h e c e l l n e t w o r k i s d o w n. The statement, *WHEN* it is down, implys that it is sometimes up.

1033. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 04:17:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <dt2dnZiiMJalH8vdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89097

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<uISdnchUv8VDt9PdRVn-hw@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>> The Law of Imagination keeps changing all the time, all the
>>> Believers thinking they are radio minutemen defending ignorant
>>> savage civilians against the elements of disaster. Every ham a
>>> hero! :-)
>>
>>Not every ham lennyboy, but some have been. You ever been? I thought
>>not. No go tell the nurse you need your diaper changed and you will be
>>ready for your afternoon nappy.
>
>
> You're quite disrespectful of a radio veteran.

When lennyboy does or says something to warrent respect, he will get it.

1034. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1387 March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 04:36:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ZrydnYGynpTcGsvdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89098

Radionews wrote:

> HAM RADIO ADVENTURE: COMMUNICATORS NEEDED FOR CAVEING EXPEDITION
>
> Gulf Coast United States, along with Caribbean, or South America base
> station operators are needed for communication on the ham bands with
> a scientific expedition. This, in July through August time frame.
>
> The 60 day expedition will explore deep caves in the high Andes
> mountains and jungle in the western Amazon area of South America.
> Expedition access to the remote areas is via trekking on foot and
> pack animal. The expedition will use a solar and battery powered 20
> Watt backpack transceiver. Antennas will be a wire dipole or
> vertical. A miniature notebook computer will be along for digital
> operations.
>
> Communications will consist of position reports, some short messages
> with families of expedition members, and any possible emergency or
> medical messages. All operation will be non-commercial.
>
> Operators with good base stations, efficient antennas and low noise
> locations are needed on the 40 through 15 meter amateur bands. The
> operations will use SSB, CW and a variety of digital modes. If you
> are interested, e-mail Bonnie Crystal, KQ6XA, at
> radioadventure@aol.com. (KC5FM, KQ6XA)

Oh wow! I would think that something like a scientific expedition would want some reliable communication that you can use anywhere and count on at all times, like cell phones. Right witless willie?

1035. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 05:33:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89099

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>...

> > The first allocations were in the 460 MHz range, and were known as
> > Class A and Class B cb. (One class was voice and the other
> > radio-control). The more-popular ~27 MHz cb (Class C and Class D) were
> > authorized by FCC in 1958. FRS and GMRS are really the lineal
> > descendants of 1946-era cb.
>
> I would have thought our resident expert on all things radio would have
> known that.

You don't think Lennie was going to let somehting like "details"
or "facts" get in the way of his chance to let loose yet another
anti-Amateur barrage, do ya...?!?!

(...and pretty much puts a hole in his "hams don't know anything
about radio outside of ham bands" rants...)

> > There's a profile floating around that you might find handy, Dave...
>
> Oh, don't worry. Your summary of Len's likely actions will pop up from
> time to time as long as he acts as he does. The humorous part of
> dealing with Leonard is that he just can't see is that he is guilty of
> those things of which he accuses others. If someone like him moved next
> door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
> lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
> of pink plastic flamingos.

Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
"carriage boy with lantern" figurine..

73

Steve, K4YZ

1036. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 05:45:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403152145.185ccd8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89100

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040315151614.15923.00004348@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <4055F8C5.8050202@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >> I wouldn't either. What's an H2.
> > >
> > > The second Generation of the HumVee. I guess that means he has money. I
>
> >don't blame him for not wanting to but the H2.
>
> H2 = "Nomenclature" of the civilian equivalent of the military "HumVee,"
> the ultimate SUV. :-) Good for off-road travel as-is, can make a
> wonderful military-style mobile rig for ham "service" afficionados. Just
> paint it flat olive or desert cammy color and install a huge manual code
> key, plus a big "Official Ham Emergency Vehicle" sign on the side
> right next to a copy of the mysterious sideways chevron used on all
> military vehicles for visual ID.

How about institutional white, festooned with antennas...mostly
Amateur?

Or do you not count the American Red Cross as a valid example of
Amateur Radio's public service role, Putzy One...?!?!

> Bye on the H2, thank you.

Wise decision. People your age generally tend to be involved in
more accidents operating vehicles larger than sedan size. Waning
motor skills and vision...

> Okay, now back to poor Mr. Foreign Service snarling and spewing
> against those who won't bow and kiss his ring. :-)

Who needs to "snarl() and spew()..." when YOU do such a good job
of sinking your own rants, Lennie...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1037. Re: Uh Oh, Lennie...More Bad News...!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 05:52:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403152152.1e150a9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89151

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040315151612.15923.00004346@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <40552CD1.10204@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> writes:
>
> >William wrote:
> >
> >>WHERAS Steve Quixoterobeson is not from WI, but pats hisself on the back
> >>anyway.
> >>
>
> >For the system to work, you need hams outside the disaster area to talk
> >to the hams in the disaster area....
>
> Some hams ARE disaster areas...

Oh?

Still waiting for you to answer up to the offer to go around the
block a couple times, Lennie...I even offered to run it with my field
pack on, but I guess your assertions of my "pudginess" and lack of
fitness were yet more NG fodder meant to deceive the lay reader.

So how about 5 times around your house? The car? How about one
of those inflatable kiddie swimming pools? I'll throw a couple extra
bricks into my rucksack to help level the playing field. (Don't
worry...I WON'T throw them at you...all temptations to the
contrary...)

Steve, K4YZ

1038. Access BPL NPRM versus NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 06:00:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316010056.05539.00004773@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89153

It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban radio environment. It's also apparent that way too many commenters are trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place.

FCC 04-29, the NPRM or Notice of Proposed Rule Making, was released on 23 February 2004 with a 45 day period for Comments and a total 75 day period for Replies to Comments.

Once an NPRM is released, any previous documentation (comments, threats, entreaties, etc.) on the same subject are essentially ignored by the FCC for the purposes of making new rules indicated in the NPRM. While the website location may remain open for comment on a subject long after the subject is closed, those remain just bits on a very large hard drive and do not have to be looked at by the FCC for any sort of rulemaking.

ET Docket 03-104 was an NOI or Notice Of Inquiry request by the FCC to get suggested standards and testing for Broadband over Power Lines (now called "Access BPL"). By the FCC's format, the first two digits indicate the year of release (in that case 2003). The comment and reply-to-comment period on 03-104 is long over, yet radio amateurs keep posting on 03-104, even after an NPRM has been released nearly a month before.

03-104 now has 5,713 documents in its ECFS section as of Sunday, 14 March 2004. At least 600 of those were submitted AFTER the initial notice of the NPRM (12 February 2004). Any further input at 03-104 is not going to do any good. According to the 12 Feb 04 Notice, the Docket number is 04-37. The NPRM is 04-29. As of Sunday, 14 Mar 04, the ECFS listings indicate the following number of documents on the two dockets -

04-29: 5 04-37: 21

If anyone REALLY wants to make their voice heard on the BPL subject, the above are the two places to file (I don't know yet why the initial notice said "docket 04-37" but my Comment went to both and were indicated as accepted).

The R&O (Report and Order) that established the latest Restructuring in U.S. amateur radio was FCC 99-412 and was effective 30 Dec 99. By the ECFS listings on the NPRM 98-143, 218 sent in Comments AFTER that date. All commentary on 98-143 was cut off on 15 Jan 99 but many continued on regardless. The last person to "file" comments on 98-143 was Peter Alterman, PhD, W2CDO, document accepted 24 Sep 03 (!),

over two and a half years AFTER the R&O. Does anyone think
that 200+ comments filed on an NPRM after an R&O has been
issued will somehow make an R&O go away?

No one HAS to file anything on any subject with the FCC. Hams
can just let the ARRL do all the work for them and go back to
playing with their radios. However, anyone who really and truly
cares to comment as a thinking, independent citizen has an
excellent opportunity to speak DIRECTLY to our government.

There's no real delay with electronic filing. But...there's only about
two weeks left for initial Comments and a month more for Reply to
Comments and back-and-forth on same. Time doesn't stand still
and a minority membership organization can't do all the effective
speaking for you.

The alternative is to do NOTHING. Very safe, no effort required.
But, you don't qualify all the subsequent whines and crying about
the awful interference on HF when you did NOTHING. You did
NOTHING even if you sit around high-fiving all the other do-nothing
hams about your self-perceived wonderfulness and glorious
"service" to something or other.

CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
even though they may not have been born when CB was.

DO SOMETHING. Tell the government what you think.

LHA / WMD

1039. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 06:01:03 UTC
From: Juafi <n7rcm@pobox.com>
Message-ID: <zKw5c.23647$%06.8011@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
>
> Nor have I, but I do know of at least two cases where radio operators were
> sucessfully sued in civil court for causing a nuisance. The articles
didn't
> state whether those operators were licensed or not. But since they weren't
> prosecuted for violating federal laws, the issue of licensure is moot, and
> therefore a ham can indeed be held responsible under local laws for
causing a
> nuisance. I'll even bet you that it has happened already, because there
sure are
> a lot of high-and-mighty hams who think that the feds are going to come
running
> to protect their sorry asses if they so much as get a speeding ticket
while
> jawing on their mobile. Fortunately, it just doesn't work that way, Bill.
>
> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide one case where a ham was excused
from
> violating a local law because he was licensed.
>
>
I have a friend that got a speeding ticket in a little town of about 30,000
people
and it turned out that the Justice of the Peace was also a ham and when he
found
out my friend was also one, he dismissed the case and returned the fine
money.
He was doing about 10 miles over the limit not being crazy or anything like
that.

You asked and here is a case.

1040. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 08:07:30 UTC
From: Athome@casual.com
Message-ID: <405baa18.3898686@news.prodigy.net>
Source record: 89154
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

JackGibson@hotmail.com (Jack Gibson) wrote:

>doberman <doberman_2000_us@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<104v2p6q70ps546@corp.supernews.com>...
>
>> (several hundred lines deleted)
>>
>> PC'ness is stupidity
>
>As opposed to quoting the whole "--------------- " message to add
>a one line comment?
>
>- Jack

You do, of course, recognize that "fucking" is against the law now, as an expression of intense emotion, such as a plate breaking and severing several really important arteries while doing the dishes.

Laws specifically require that the word "fucking" not be used. It is written down and law, that btw, you as a citizen of the U.S. (I assume you are a citizen and are required to be informed of these laws) are required to have read and understood. According to law, you must have read and understand this law. It is extremely important that you understand the law about words you can't say. In the case you have not read this law as according to the law every citizen of the United States is assumed by the courts to have read, you face very severe fines and penalties for using the word "fucking".

Somebody has to make clear the laws that every citizen of the U.S. is expected to know. Assumed to have read.

Usage of the word "fucking" is against the law. A law that is important to people in their daily conversations and expressions of extreme emotion, distress, or agony.

Since it may be a law, I felt you should be informed of this law as required of any law-abiding citizen of the United States. It is my responsibility that I should inform people of what they are required to know that the word "fucking" is no longer lawful.

I'm not actually super positive that this is in reality a law at this time, but, in order to prevent anyone from being arrested for using the word "fucking" I will treat it as a word that is unlawful and hence every american should understand is against the law. Which is, btw, required by law, in the United States of America.

Having performed my civic and lawful duty in informing you of this fact,
I will now rest easier, knowing that you have been informed of the
"fucking" law.

TheNIGHTCRAWLER
(I copyright nothing at this time. Have fun, Anonymous.)

1041. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 10:31:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403160231.da65a6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89155

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403151825.2442c166@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403150835.6af93839@posting.google.com>...

> > Sure I can. When you and Lennie make idiotic postsings, I present
> > information or evidence that you are wrong. No problem.
>
> Yeh, sure you can - when you're on your meds. Rest of the time you go berzerk.

"...you go bezerk." OK...define "bezerk"...

You mean when I nag you about presenting SOME evidence of
factuality of YOUR assertions (none of which has been
forthcoming)...???

Or do you mean when I present yet another bit of third-party
corroboration that I am indeed correct and your or Scummy is wrong?

Perhaps you mean when I stand up to liars and bullies whio
intentionally misrepresent the character of Amateur Radio in a public
forum...?!?!

So far you only make claims that I am "nuts", yet cannot present
any documentation of qualification in any discipline of pyschiatry
that would substantiate your claim.

You've childishly tried to suggest that I was trying to
physically harm you yet refused to provide any proof of that.

You have yet to substantiate any of your claims of experience as
a "DXer" from Somalia. All we asked for was the callsign of just ONE
person who could verify having worked you....ONE QSL card. Heck,
Brain...I still have some QSL's from 1981 when I was KA6CM/JR6. You
were in Somalia...WHEN...???

So...If there's anyone here who is "nuts", I think it's the
self-proclaimed DX-operator with no evidence of that operation....And
if anyone is "bezerk", it's the person who makes unsubstantiated
claims of impropriety against another with no corroboration, which is
what YOUR 'assertions" are...

Try again, PuppetBoy....And tell Lennie to be a bit more subtle
pulling your strings...Maybe next time it won't be so obvious.
(yeeeeah...rrrrrrright)

Better yet, be a man and try moving your lips WITHOUT his input.

Steve, K4YZ

1042. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:36:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160336.29d82792@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89156

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>...

The humorous part of
> dealing with Leonard is that he just can't see is that he is guilty of
> those things of which he accuses others.

The humorous part of it is that those things of which he accuses
others is generally correct.

If someone like him moved next
> door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
> lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
> of pink plastic flamingos.
>
> Dave K8MN

Hmmmm? A Lavendar painted tar-paper shack? WV Chic?

1043. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:36:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403160336.599486ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89157

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0403151232.29ae8159@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4055CD9B.F4C87CF9@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
> > > and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
> > > even though they may not have been born when CB was.
> >
> > They are? Would it be too much trouble for you to name one or two of
> > 'em?
>
> Actually, Dave, the citizens' radio service was created by FCC in 1946
> and the first licenses issued in 1947. See:
>
> http://hamgallery.com/Tribute/W8PAL/
>
> The first allocations were in the 460 MHz range,

462 Mhz to be more precise I do believe.

> and were known as
> Class A and Class B cb. (One class was voice and the other
> radio-control).

Yessir. Maybe 1950 or so and I was prowling Arch around Tenth and one
of those radio row junk shops had it's usual pile lined up on the
sidewalk. In addition to the half ton of WW2 surplus goodies there
were several clean new-looking boxes which, in retrospect, were along
the lines of the Gonset Communicators and/or Benton Harbor Lunchboxes.
Nice looking pieces, mics included, had short whips atop the boxes.
Looked like complete two-way radios to me and were marked $5 each,
same $$ as all the ARC-5 boxes. I asked the guy what they were. His
exact words are long lost of course but the gist of it was that they
were for a new kind of two-way radio band everybody could use without
having to take any FCC tests at all. "WHAT??". Unthinkable! "What
frequencies do they run on?" "UHF crap, 400 Mhz or something. Don't
work worth a damn for more than a few blocks away, don't bother kid."
I didn't.

> The more-popular ~27 MHz cb (Class C and Class D) were
> authorized by FCC in 1958. FRS and GMRS are really the lineal
> descendants of 1946-era cb.
> >
> > You seem to be whining and crying about amateur radio licensing issues

> > even though you weren't born when amateur radio was.
> >
> There's a profile floating around that you might find handy, Dave...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

b.

1044. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:42:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89158

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
>
> Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
> HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
> with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
> "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
>
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.

But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves what he gets.

Pffft!

1045. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1387 March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:45:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403160345.5948983e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89159

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ZrydnYGynpTcGsvdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
> Radionews wrote:
>
>
> >
> > HAM RADIO ADVENTURE: COMMUNICATORS NEEDED FOR CAVEING EXPEDITION
> >
> >
> > Gulf Coast United States, along with Caribbean, or South America base
> > station operators are needed for communication on the ham bands with
> > a scientific expedition. This, in July through August time frame.
> >
> >
> > The 60 day expedition will explore deep caves in the high Andes
> > mountains and jungle in the western Amazon area of South America.
> > Expedition access to the remote areas is via trekking on foot and
> > pack animal. The expedition will use a solar and battery powered 20
> > Watt backpack transceiver. Antennas will be a wire dipole or
> > vertical. A miniature notebook computer will be along for digital
> > operations.
> >
> >
> > Communications will consist of position reports, some short messages
> > with families of expedition members, and any possible emergency or
> > medical messages. All operation will be non-commercial.
> >
> >
> > Operators with good base stations, efficient antennas and low noise
> > locations are needed on the 40 through 15 meter amateur bands. The
> > operations will use SSB, CW and a variety of digital modes. If you
> > are interested, e-mail Bonnie Crystal, KQ6XA, at
> > radioadventure@aol.com. (KC5FM, KQ6XA)
>
> Oh wow! I would think that something like a scientific expedition would
> want some reliable communication that you can use anywhere and count on
> at all times, like cell phones. Right witless willie?

Uhhh . . don't particularly mean to bust yer stones here JJ but how
many dialup cells do you suppose Verizon and/or AT&T or any other
telco has up and running in the headwaters region of the Amazon?

w3rv

1046. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:56:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160356.398a5c4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89160

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<G-OdnfHFPsqHHcvdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > You lie. You were w/o ham capability prior to becoming licensed.
>
> It would be obvious to anyone with more than three working brain cells
> that the statement applies to the period in which I hold a valid ham
> radio operator's license.

Then why make such broad claims?

You said, "I can say that I have never been without ham radio
capability."

Now you're telling me that you really meant to say, "For as long as I
have been a licensed amateur radio operator, I have never been without
ham radio capability."

I think Dick/W0EX used to beat the "I've never been w/o, I'm always
ready for an emergency" drum. But when Hans invited him to operate
his favorite mode (cw), Dick was nowhere to be heard.

So, I'll let you slide on the unlicensed period of your life not being
with ham radio capability. This time. Just don't go broad brushing
your magnificent capabilities again.

Just be sure that should Hans invite you to a CW QSO, you'll be there,
because "For as long as I have been a licensed amateur radio operator,
I have never been without ham radio capability."

;^)

1047. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 11:58:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160358.2367f5dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89161

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<dt2dnZmiMJYhHMvdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
>
> > >
>
> >>I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> >>play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
> >
> >
> > Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
> > will be there if needed.
> > Post a follow-up to this message
>
> And how in your infinite witless wisdom did you get out of this that I
> said that cells phones are always down and my ham radio is always up?
> I w i l l t y p e t h i s v e r y s l o o o o l y s o t r y t o
> k e e p u p. I s a i d, *W H E N* t h e c e l l n e t w o r k i
> s d o w n. The statement, *WHEN* it is down, implys that it is
> sometimes up.

"Ham radio WILL be there..."

What about the part where ham radios never break down down?

1048. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 12:04:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160404.32bfb2c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89162

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40567474.17D6A6A1@earthlink.net>...
> Arnie Macy wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" wrote ...
> >
> > ...in response to a personal attack by you on another, Loon.
> > ____
> >
> > Leonard is long on insults but short on memory --something that will never
> > change. Even so, I think he got the self analysis just right.
> >
> > BTW, how have you been Dave?
> >
>
> I've had better months and expect some when warm weather comes to stay
> for a while.
>
> Onward and upward!
>
> 73,
>
> Dave

Hang in there while the last cold snap blows thru. Here, schools are
closed and we have to go downtown to refinance today - with the kids.
Joy.

1049. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 12:13:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403160413.10de17bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89163

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40563232.8028438E@earthlink.net>...
>
> You know, I've never needed your assistance in posting my comments to
> the FCC before. What made you think I'd need it now?
>
> Dave K8MN

Len stated, "It's also apparent that way too many commenters are
trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."

Len did not state that "David Heil/K8MN is trying to voice his
grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."

What made you think he did?

1050. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 12:15:08 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <1mqd50h8j0065ru5gb2lvn9npej38c04mi@4ax.com>
Source record: 89164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference under the
>umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find their
>defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell swoop, but
>it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there is an
>increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to RFI
>complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about their
>cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on google I
>found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of the
>FCC's preemption, so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
>anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal hams
>they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as they
>did with HR2346.

Woah! I think it's time to look at things from a different
perspective. One of the main reasons why the FCC, as you put it,
became "inattentive", has to do with the fact that the great majority
of RFI complaints are the fault of the electronic widget being
interfered with. Since the emphasis has been on producing things
cheaply, and with the minimum amount of engineering, it should not be
surprising that these devices are made so poorly with respect to R.F.
immunity. Hams are not so much getting "cocky" as they are becoming
increasingly defensive as more and more RFI problems are being leveled
at their feet which didn't exist 10 or 15 years ago. The FCC should
mandate tougher shielding specs for consumer widgets, and the majority
of RFI problems would disappear.

You can argue the relative difference between a person's "right" to
enjoy their radio hobby versus another's "right" to enjoy internet
porn. But if the ham is clean (and they usually are), it's not his
problem directly.

>So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't going
>to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic communications
>devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be there to
>defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal.

This is not the case in most instances. You have to remember these are
hams, not class "C" amp running CB'ers. Most hams understand RFI to
some degree, and most ham equipment is manufactured to comply with
spurious emissions requirements. Hams will do what they can to clean
up their own act. But once they've done all that they can do on their
end, if the problem's still there, then what?

> They won't. And they
>won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few

>holier-than-thou hams.

You might want to re-examine your conjecture there. While I would agree that logically the rule of the majority would make the most sense. But especially in the last several years, there have been increasingly small, but highly vocal, special interest lobbyists which have managed to thwart the wishes of the majority, and have been responsible for laws which protect the "rights" of certain minorities above and beyond what the majority enjoys. Take a look at political correctness if you have any doubts.

The problem is with the cheap Chinese produced electronic devices. Something needs to be done to minimize their susceptibility to RFI. Trying to sweep the problem of RFI under the rug (and thereby saving XYZ company the cost of making RFI resistant devices) by persecuting legally operating hams is not , IMHO, the right solution. Remember, that what they do to hams, will also trickle down to CBers, since the RFI potential is worse on the CB band, with the preponderance of illegally operating stations who are there.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1051. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 12:48:11 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <r3sd501blg3b5k6te7ojvh7elpd20pnnne@4ax.com>
Source record: 89165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 15 Mar 2004 15:19:47 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <1%m5c.14$iC1.12@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>>The reality of the situation is that if *your* telephone is clean and *your*
>>stereo is clean in *your* house, a neighbor would have a far more difficult
>>time of convincing anyone that the problem is *your* transmitter and not
>>*their* poorly filtered consumer equipment. Often, changing the direction
>>of an antenna may reduce the problem many dBs. It is much easier to work
>>with a neighbor than to let things get that far out of hand.
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>
>
>I got home from work about an hour ago. While I was there I checked through the
>records for interference issues the station has had in the past. There were a
>few to be sure. Some of them were found to be simple imaging in cheap, single
>conversion receivers. There was one incident where the station had a bad trap
>which resulted in several complaints all at once, but the problem was quickly
>fixed. However, not one complaint was about RFI in a cordless phone, and no
>complaints were found where the cause was unintentional rectification. Mind you
>that this station transmits many kilowatts and that residents live less than a
>1/4 mile from the tower, many of whom have televisions, cordless phones, and all
>the other electronic devices which hams claim are responsible for receiving
>interference due to 'poor filtering'.

But Jim's point is valid. If your transmitter is truly "dirty", then
you will interfere with your own equipment as well as any neighbors.
Harmonics do not discriminate. If you can demonstrate to your
neighbors that you can watch TV, listen to the stereo, and surf the
internet with RFI immunity, it lets the air out of their balloon.

On the other hand, I used to live about a mile and a half away from
both an FM radio station's transmitter, a directionally phased AM
broadcast transmitter and a "low power" AM broadcast transmitter.
Those things used to come though all sorts of poorly shielded stuff.
It wasn't the stations' fault, we were just getting hammered with a
large RF field. Every now and then the phone company would have to
come out and tighten their connections, as they would act like an
antenna, and a poor joint would become a diode and we'd have a radio
station in the background when talking on the phone. It wasn't a dirty
transmitter. It was near field rectification, and RF overload. The

plus side of all this, was that the local area was so used to dealing
with the "bleed" from the commercial stations, that RFI shielding was
a priority for utilities, and that worked in my favor as a CBer and
ham.

>
>On the other hand, the station has had incidents where it was the -receiver- of
>RFI despite a level of filtering above and beyond what should be required to
>prevent interference (much of which I have installed myself). Filtering does
>nothing to stop RFI when the transmitter is dirty.

And filtering a transmitter does nothing when fundamental signal
rectification is the cause of the RFI.

> I have to prove this fact to
>at least a couple hams each year by parking the van outside their house and
>showing them their spurs on the spectrum analyzer.

I have my own analyzer and my station IS clean. Now what?

> And these are hams who swear
>up and down that their signal is clean and that the problem is with the
>neighbors equipment.

It usually is, trust me.

> Most of them clean up their act in a hurry.

Most will once they realize that they truly have a problem.

>The rest get a
>complaint filed with the FCC by the station because they are interfering with
>the station's transmission.
>
>My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic
>emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
>device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.

I've been doing radio for over 30 years now and I've seen exactly the
opposite. Most of the cases (and the FCC database backs this up) of
RFI are the fault of the receiving equipment. When you run a squeaky
clean 4 watt CB, and 100 watt H.F. ham gear and you still have
interference complaints, with all filtering, grounding, and proper
antenna decoupling in place, it's usually not the ham's fault. If
you're going to fight the fight, it's helpful to have all of your
facts straight before you do.

>BTW, I should point out that we at the station take care of our listeners and
>respond to complaints of interference to our signal wherever they occur (within
>our contour).

I would propose that your motives are less altruistic and more to do
with market impact.

> Many times that interference is caused by radio operators, legal
>or not. We determine the nature of the interference then attempt to resolve it.
>If it is caused by a radio operator that is unwilling to clean up his act then
>the station files a complaint with the FCC.

Unwilling or unable? It's tough to solve a problem that's not yours to
solve. Other than giving up your radio hobby.

> We get a better response from the
>FCC than do a few angry neighbors because the station pays a lot of money to
>stay on the air, and the FCC responds to money, not people.

Exactly!

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1052. Re: The new group address

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 13:16:00 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c36umg0135s@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89166
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <20040315225452.194$Qp@newsreader.com>, Steveo says...
>
>Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com> wrote:
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20040315185602.151
>> $RM@newsreader.com:
>>
>> > Duke Of Windsor <duke@hen.com> wrote:
>> >> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
>> >> news:20040315183507.821$W2 @newsreader.com:
>> >>
>> >> > WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut> wrote:
>> >> >> what about bisexual hams like me and leland?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In article <t_k5c.8772$Oo5.5416@twister.nyroc.rr.com>, WA8ULX
>> says...
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >http://groups.yahoo.com/group/NOCBPLUSSERS/
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >CBers are NOT allowed!
>> >> >> >
>> >> >>
>> >> > Who cares about your loser club?
>> >> >>
>> >> Who cares about your retarded Cb's? besides you. Cb's went out in the
>> >> 70's.
>> >>
>> > If that's the case, you should of snipped the rec.radio.cb part
>> > from your post, dumbass.
>> >
>> > Why is rec.radio.cb -your- favorite group, geo?
>>
>> Why is rec.radio.policy you favorite group? you are not a ham but a
>> freebander and illegal cber?? btw, i am not geo.
>>
>Cb went out in the 70's.
>
>--
>Nowadays it just don't pay to be a good ol' boy.
>
i love my cb radio and all the truckers good buddy. 10-4 over and out.

2 weeks to go.

im not george

1053. Re: Access BPL NPRM versus NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 13:38:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403160538.68c173f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89167

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040316010056.05539.00004773@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> The alternative is to do NOTHING. Very safe, no effort required.
> But, you don't qualify all the subsequent whines and crying about
> the awful interference on HF when you did NOTHING. You did
> NOTHING even if you sit around high-fiving all the other do-nothing
> hams about your self-perceived wonderfulness and glorious
> "service" to something or other.

I knew, I just KNEW after getting through an otherwise informative
and well written post, Lennie COULDN'T resist taking a swipe...

> CB was created 46 years ago and hams of today are still crying
> and whining and P&Ming about the FCC "stealing away 'their' band"
> even though they may not have been born when CB was.

Like we said in another post...Nothing like a whiney rant to get
in the way of facts.

> DO SOMETHING. Tell the government what you think.

Good advice.

Steve, K4YZ

1054. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 13:39:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403160539.27d4ec7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89168

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091804.149b9053@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082246.32fdbf39@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > And even if he could he wouldn't know who to get authorization from to operate!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Not a prob. Got it in my pocket. Renew it every 10 years.

Weeeeellllllll...waddaya know...?!?!

Now...where's the one from Somalia...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1055. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 14:50:32 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <jd4e50pg16ph9d3hcvvbkmseskjmme6aba@4ax.com>
Source record: 89169
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <1mqd50h8j0065ru5gb2lvn9npej38c04mi@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>
>>To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference under the
>>umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find their
>>defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell swoop, but
>>it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there is an
>>increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to RFI
>>complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about their
>>cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on google I
>>found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of the
>>FCC's preemption, so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
>>anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal hams
>>they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as they
>>did with HR2346.
>
>Woah! I think it's time to look at things from a different
>perspective. One of the main reasons why the FCC, as you put it,
>became "inattentive", has to do with the fact that the great majority
>of RFI complaints are the fault of the electronic widget being
>interfered with. Since the emphasis has been on producing things
>cheaply, and with the minimum amount of engineering, it should not be
>surprising that these devices are made so poorly with respect to R.F.
>immunity.

That's not what I have experienced. If these cheap devices are so suseptible to
fundamental RF transmissions, how can so many of them be used without trouble
next to radio and television stations? The majority of interference is caused to
televisions, and cordless phones ring in at second place on the list (excuse the
pun). They work on frequencies that extend from low VHF up to about 1 GHz, yet
there are almost no reports of interference above VHF. In fact, most of the
interference happens in the low TV channels and low-VHF cordless phones. Not
suprisingly, this is the area where harmonics from high HF are strongest. And I
know for a fact that a ham can run 1kW on HF and not cause interference to
televisions, cordless phones, radios, or just about anything else accused of
having poor RFI rejection because I have seen more than one station that does.
And again, in the course of my job I have met more than a couple hams who
sincerly thought their signal was 'clean' only to find out it wasn't.

> Hams are not so much getting "cocky" as they are becoming
>increasingly defensive as more and more RFI problems are being leveled
>at their feet which didn't exist 10 or 15 years ago. The FCC should
>mandate tougher shielding specs for consumer widgets, and the majority

>of RFI problems would disappear.

There are indeed more and more RFI complaints than there were 10, 20, or even 30 years ago during the CB craze. This is not a matter of the quality of the devices people have in their homes, but the sheer number of them that are available these days compared to years ago. There was a time when a color television was a luxury, yet nowdays people have TV's in almost every room. Cordless phones were almost non-existent in the 70's, yet they are almost standard issue in todays appliance market. But interference still occured to these devices in the past just it does today. They are no more suseptible to RFI than they were 30 years ago -- on the contrary, since the frequencies used are much higher, cable TV is much more popular, signal processing is more advanced and the bandwidth response of tuners is better than ever, these devices actually receive -less- interference than ever before. But they are -not- immune to harmonics that land on their operating frequencies, which, in my experience, is the cause of almost all of the interference that is caused by intentional radio transmissions.

(I should point out that -most- radio and TV interference is not caused by radio stations of any sort, but by light-dimmers, motor speed controls, computer power supplies, wall-warts, coffee-makers, and a myriad of other switching devices that connect directly to the power lines. But of the cases where the source was clearly a radio station, the cause was almost always harmonics.)

>You can argue the relative difference between a person's "right" to
>enjoy their radio hobby versus another's "right" to enjoy internet
>porn. But if the ham is clean (and they usually are), it's not his
>problem directly.

I can argue that a person has the right to peaceful use and enjoyment of their property and premises. And I'm not saying that all, or even most, hams run a dirty station. In fact I believe quite the opposite. It's just a few hams that are either too lazy to check their signal or too ignorant to realize the possibility of harmonics.

>>So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't going
>>to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic communications
>>devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be there to
>>defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal.
>
>This is not the case in most instances. You have to remember these are
>hams, not class "C" amp running CB'ers. Most hams understand RFI to
>some degree, and most ham equipment is manufactured to comply with
>spurious emissions requirements. Hams will do what they can to clean
>up their own act. But once they've done all that they can do on their
>end, if the problem's still there, then what?

If the ham has done everything reasonably possible on his end, it's very likely the problem will be no more. But if it -still- exists then the neighbor must decide whether he is willing to sacrifice his everyday appliances so the ham can play with his radio. Federal law says the neighbor is screwed. Many local and state laws state that the neighbor does not have to put up with such intrusions.

This is a conflict that must eventually be solved in the courts.

>> They won't. And they
>>won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few
>>holier-than-thou hams.
>
>You might want to re-examine your conjecture there. While I would
>agree that logically the rule of the majority would make the most
>sense. But especially in the last several years, there have been
>increasingly small, but highly vocal, special interest lobbyists which
>have managed to thwart the wishes of the majority, and have been
>responsible for laws which protect the "rights" of certain minorities
>above and beyond what the majority enjoys. Take a look at political
>correctness if you have any doubts.

I agree with you 100%, and one of those "special interest" groups is the ARRL. They have done more to defend those that cause interference than they have to help resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both the hams -and- the general public.

>The problem is with the cheap Chinese produced electronic devices.
>Something needs to be done to minimize their susceptibility to RFI.

Honestly, I don't believe that at all. I have yet to find one of these devices that are ultra-suseptible to fundamentals on HF. If someone has an example, please post it so I can get one and test it for myself.

>Trying to sweep the problem of RFI under the rug (and thereby saving
>XYZ company the cost of making RFI resistant devices) by persecuting
>legally operating hams is not , IMHO, the right solution. Remember,
>that what they do to hams, will also trickle down to CBers, since the
>RFI potential is worse on the CB band, with the preponderance of
>illegally operating stations who are there.

I think it's the other way around -- it is the illegal CBers that started the "I don't care" attitude towards interference, and that attitude is being adopted by some in the ham community. And yes, I believe the illegal CB problem far outweighs the problems caused by a few asshole hams that learn their operating practices from the keyclowns. But when good hams start defending the bad hams by wielding the sword of preemption, you can bet that the keyclowns will do the same and the problem in both arenas will just get worse.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1056. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 15:08:23 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <025e50dk04aii7rdaj0u74sd041h93agpo@4ax.com>
Source record: 89170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <dls5c.5148$CJ5.280@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:dk8b50tc0k4m4sbdag45ep1ugitfj1j56t@4ax.com...
>> To begin with, I quoted a newspaper article about a case here in Spokane:
>>
>>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=3ade1b9d.77
>554%40news.cet.com
>>
>> And Twisty was nice enough to find a reference to another case on the
>other side
>> of the state. I read the article after it was posted, but that was a
>couple
>> years ago and you will have to search the referenced newpaper's archives
>to find
>> it again:
>>
>>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=QE9h6.153%2
>4L35.40420%40news.uswest.net
>>
>> That's two cases from one state. I'm sure there are more.
>>
>> >if it is a "civil" suit, then it is NOT a violation of local ordinances
>> >under municipal law.
>>
>> Now where did you get that idea? You can't file a complaint, civil OR
>criminal,
>> unless there is an alleged violation of law, and it must be a law under
>which a
>> remedy can be granted. Otherwise it gets tossed out of court.
>
>Apologies...should have said "criminal" law.

Civil -and- criminal law. If you file a civil suit, it is filed and tried in a
court of LAW. Codified laws usually include both civil and criminal remedies for
various violations, and many times even for the same violation.

>> >> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide
>> >> one case where a ham was excused from
>> >> violating a local law because he was licensed.

>> >
>> >Sorry, that's not my position to prove.
>>
>> Too bad, because that was an easy one. As it turns out there -is- a
>federal law
>> that preempts local laws from dealing with RFI-related issues, and it has
>been
>> exercised many times.
>
>Then why'd you ask me to prove anything?

Because an affirmative answer would have supported your position. A better question is why you didn't bother to look, the answer to which might be that you had concerns that I could have been right and there was no such law. Or there might be some other reason.....

>> Instead of being defensively lazy you could have done a
>> quick search on google and found the answer.
>
>My life doesn't live or die based on newsgroup discussions.

With nearly 8000 posts it sure looks like you spend more time clicking the keyboard than than I do.

>> Regardless.....
>>
>> The FCC may have declared that any state or local RFI regulations are
>preempted
>> by federal regs, but when the FCC won't get off it's lazy ass to enforce
>their
>> own laws, that leaves victims with no remedy against asshole hams.
>
>Excuse me. just what does that mean?

It means that if the neighbors are being bothered by interference from a dirty ham (or even an illegal operator), and the FCC chooses to ignore the complaints as they do most of the time, federal law says the neighbors are screwed.

>> Now any judge has the right
>> to make any decision he/she deems legal and appropriate.
>
>And on what basis do you make that leap of logic?

Because that's their job. Duh....

>> Usually
>> the courts side with the FCC, but evidently there are a few cases (such as
>the
>> ones above) where they don't. And we all know (or should know) the legal
>process
>> by now: If the decision should be against the FCC, the decision is not
>void just
>> because a law exists which contradicts the decision.

>
>The initial court decision can and may well be reversed on appeal.
>I have not read of any case being upheld on local jurisdiction vs
>federal preemption when it gets to the feds.
>
>> The case must go through
>> the process of adjudication; i.e, the appeals courts. Most such cases can
>be
>> appealed, one exception being Small Claims Courts in WA which doesn't
>allow
>> appeals, only trials de novo.
>
>And why would a ham or a CD interference case end up
>in small claims court anyway?

In WA you can sue in Small Claims court on the grounds of causing, maintaining, or failing to abate a public or private nuisance, provided the requested damages do not exceed the limits of the court. That's where the case I quoted was tried.

>> But on appeal there arises another thorn in the
>> bush -- the FCC suddenly gets allergic to higher courts whenever there is
>a case
>> that makes a challenge to their authority, especially to the
>constitutionality
>> of their laws. So if a case ever looks like it might end with a ruling
>that the
>> FCC's preemptions are in conflict with the civil rights of the general
>public
>> (as would be the case with a public nuisance) you can bet that the case
>will be
>> quickly and quietly dropped. It has happened before and it will happen
>again.
>
>Dropped by who? If I am being sued and my defense is federal preemption,
>then why would I drop the case? The FCC doesn't even have to be
>a direct party to the case for the issue of federal preemption to be
>argued.

Try it the other way around -- suppose a community prosecutes a ham for causing a nuisance, but the case is dismissed on the grounds of federal preemption. The case doesn't need to stop there, as the preemption law can be challenged by the community. If they have a good case, the FCC may not take the chance of losing and will most likely drop the case or settle out-of-court. That's their MO, and that's why you have rarely seen any case challenging the constitutionality of their laws get anywhere near the US Supreme Court.

>> To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference
>
>Guess that shows your true colors...

You can guess next week's winning lottery numbers, too. If you do, let me know if you win, eh?

>> under the
>> umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find
>their
>> defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell
>swoop, but
>> it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there
>is an
>> increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to
>RFI
>> complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about
>their
>> cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on
>google I
>> found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of
>the
>> FCC's preemption,
>
>So...the situation that a law exists can just be that the law hasn't
>been challenged.

Ever hear of the Patriot Act?

>> so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
>> anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal
>hams
>> they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as
>they
>> did with HR2346.
>
>Yet I find no such "doom and gloom" predictions or examples being
>recorded in ham publications. The fact that some ill advised local
>government
>enacts a piece of law that "outlaws" interference doesn't
>makethe law immune to being overturned on the preemption
>basis.

What you perceive as "ill advised" might just be a precursor to a challenge
against the FCC's authority over the matter.

> The argument for pre-emption, if made, doesn't even
>require the FCC to do so. the defendent's attorney can and likely
>would raise the argument.

Assuming the attorney knows anything about FCC regs. Regardless, the judge can
rule any law as unconstitutional. It has been done many times before. Whether
that judgement holds up on appeal is another ball of twine.

>> So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't
>going
>> to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic
>communications
>> devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be
>there to

>> defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They won't. And
>they
>> won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not
>a few
>> holier-than-thou hams.
>
>Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
>who the real smart ass is.

Yep... anyone who smirks at a group of angry neighbors while hiding behind a
federal statute.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1057. Re: Opinions of Universal Radio ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 15:13:25 UTC
From: Roger Baldwin <rogerandsarah@cox.net>
Message-ID: <rogerandsarah-129C16.07132516032004@news.west.cox.net>
Source record: 89171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <105cirttf76fo7b@corp.supernews.com>,
Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net> wrote:

My experience with HRO is that they will at least match *any* listed
price.

Roger
kg6ras

> My biggest purchases have been from HRO, but their prices are sometimes
> higher.
>
> Alan AB2OS
>
>
> On 02/18/04 01:13 pm Rusty in Louisville put fingers to keyboard and
> launched the following message into cyberspace:
>
> > I would like to get some opinions about
> > Universal Radio, Inc., located in Reynoldsburg, Ohio.
> >
> > My reason for asking is they seem to never ship on time
> > and always have to back order, sometimes taking 30 days
> > or more to back order.

1058. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 16:20:40 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <786e50t8l9p5r0rad8hk34sscs48hql55b@4ax.com>
Source record: 89172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <r3sd501blg3b5k6te7ojvh7elpd20pnnne@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Mon, 15 Mar 2004 15:19:47 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>
>>In <1%m5c.14$iC1.12@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>>
>>>The reality of the situation is that if *your* telephone is clean and *your*
>>>stereo is clean in *your* house, a neighbor would have a far more difficult
>>>time of convincing anyone that the problem is *your* transmitter and not
>>>*their* poorly filtered consumer equipment. Often, changing the direction
>>>of an antenna may reduce the problem many dBs. It is much easier to work
>>>with a neighbor than to let things get that far out of hand.
>>>
>>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>>
>>I got home from work about an hour ago. While I was there I checked through the
>>records for interference issues the station has had in the past. There were a
>>few to be sure. Some of them were found to be simple imaging in cheap, single
>>conversion receivers. There was one incident where the station had a bad trap
>>which resulted in several complaints all at once, but the problem was quickly
>>fixed. However, not one complaint was about RFI in a cordless phone, and no
>>complaints were found where the cause was unintentional rectification. Mind you
>>that this station transmits many kilowatts and that residents live less than a
>>1/4 mile from the tower, many of whom have televisions, cordless phones, and all
>>the other electronic devices which hams claim are responsible for receiving
>>interference due to 'poor filtering'.
>
>
>But Jim's point is valid. If your transmitter is truly "dirty", then
>you will interfere with your own equipment as well as any neighbors.
>Harmonics do not discriminate. If you can demonstrate to your
>neighbors that you can watch TV, listen to the stereo, and surf the
>internet with RFI immunity, it lets the air out of their balloon.

Jim also pointed out that changing the direction of the antenna can help.
Harmonics don't come off a beam as if it were isotropic.

>On the other hand, I used to live about a mile and a half away from
>both an FM radio station's transmitter, a directionally phased AM
>broadcast transmitter and a "low power" AM broadcast transmitter.

>Those things used to come though all sorts of poorly shielded stuff.
>It wasn't the stations' fault, we were just getting hammered with a
>large RF field. Every now and then the phone company would have to
>come out and tighten their connections, as they would act like an
>antenna, and a poor joint would become a diode and we'd have a radio
>station in the background when talking on the phone. It wasn't a dirty
>transmitter. It was near field rectification, and RF overload. The
>plus side of all this, was that the local area was so used to dealing
>with the "bleed" from the commercial stations, that RFI shielding was
>a priority for utilities, and that worked in my favor as a CBer and
>ham.

I run into the same issues. In fact, my house sits smack-dab center of an interference lobe from a two-tower Class A station, and I can even pick it up on my scope. But it doesn't cause any interference with anything else, not even any of the sensitive audio equipment I service from time to time. If an electrical connection is corroded, that may indeed cause interference from a local source via unintentional rectification, but I haven't found that to happen nearly as often as some people claim. This discrepancy may be due to the larger wavelength of the broadcasted signal from the station, but I haven't seen any evidence to support that conclusion, either.

>>On the other hand, the station has had incidents where it was the -receiver- of
>>RFI despite a level of filtering above and beyond what should be required to
>>prevent interference (much of which I have installed myself). Filtering does
>>nothing to stop RFI when the transmitter is dirty.
>
>And filtering a transmitter does nothing when fundamental signal
>rectification is the cause of the RFI.

No it doesn't.

>> I have to prove this fact to
>>at least a couple hams each year by parking the van outside their house and
>>showing them their spurs on the spectrum analyzer.
>
>I have my own analyzer and my station IS clean. Now what?

Are your neighbors picking up your signal?

Finding the source of RFI is just like troubleshooting any other piece of electronic equipment. Take your spectrum analyzer to where the interference is occuring -- it doesn't do any good to measure signal strength where it doesn't matter. Also, what are the devices that are receiving the interference? If you bring those same devices into your home (assuming you don't have interference with your own stuff, as per Bill's example), does it still pick up RFI? If you add a device to filter the fundamental does it still receive interference? Is the interference entering the device from the antenna, the power line, or some other unknown route? Is there RF on your power feed? Does either house have aluminum siding? If the RFI is coming through the TV, is it interfering with the audio or video, or both?

Some of these might sound like silly questions, but putting a bunch of silly answers together can draw a very different picture. And it's very possible that the device or devices in question simply need repair. But since I don't have the whole picture I can't say one way or the other.

>> And these are hams who swear
>>up and down that their signal is clean and that the problem is with the
>>neighbors equipment.
>
>It usually is, trust me.

You are right, it usually is. But a few aren't. Those are the one's I was talking about.

I thought I said this before, but I'll say it again: I don't think that all hams, or even most hams, run dirty stations. I believe most of them -do- run clean. The problem, as I stated before, is a few hams that don't have a clue and are going to ruin it for the good ones. But then again, I'm not a ham and I'm not about to defend any of them, good or bad. I see things from a bit different perspective because of my job, and until you have done the same job for a few years I don't expect you to see it the same way. But I -would- expect you to consider what I have to say because it is what I have seen first-hand. And what I have seen is that unintentional rectification is a far less common source of interference than poorly filtered transmitters. You may have seen different, and that's fine. Our tower cranks out several thousand watts 24/7, and one would think that with that kind of power unintentional rectification would be a major problem. It isn't, at least not here. Maybe it's a geographical thing....

>> Most of them clean up their act in a hurry.
>
>Most will once they realize that they truly have a problem.

Yes they do.

>>The rest get a
>>complaint filed with the FCC by the station because they are interfering with
>>the station's transmission.
>>
>>My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic
>>emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
>>device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
>
>I've been doing radio for over 30 years now and I've seen exactly the
>opposite. Most of the cases (and the FCC database backs this up) of
>RFI are the fault of the receiving equipment. When you run a squeaky
>clean 4 watt CB, and 100 watt H.F. ham gear and you still have
>interference complaints, with all filtering, grounding, and proper
>antenna decoupling in place, it's usually not the ham's fault. If
>you're going to fight the fight, it's helpful to have all of your
>facts straight before you do.

The FCC 'investigators' rarely visit the scene to determine the cause of interference. If you read those cases in the FCC database they simply reflect

what is claimed by one party or the other, but usually by the ham. Check the records for interference claims regarding commercial stations and you will see a very different picture.

>>BTW, I should point out that we at the station take care of our listeners and
>>respond to complaints of interference to our signal wherever they occur (within
>>our contour).
>
>I would propose that your motives are less altruistic and more to do
>with market impact.

Damn straight! It's good PR, great WOM advertising, and it's well within the station's rights to try to resolve any source of interference to its signal. Actually, the campaign started because of a couple broadcast pirates that were messing up the band. Go figure....

>> Many times that interference is caused by radio operators, legal
>>or not. We determine the nature of the interference then attempt to resolve it.
>>If it is caused by a radio operator that is unwilling to clean up his act then
>>the station files a complaint with the FCC.
>
>Unwilling or unable? It's tough to solve a problem that's not yours to
>solve. Other than giving up your radio hobby.

Unwilling. I haven't seen a case yet where a ham (or even a keyclown) wasn't able to keep his signal off the TV, radio or cordless phones if he made the effort. Mind you that there are still some old single-conversion radios that seemingly scan for the most obnoxious RFI on the band, and there is nothing you can do about that except replace them. Fortunately, they are usually old and cheap.

And the problem -is- your's to solve if you are the source. That's not law, it's just decent social behavior. If we choose to live communities, we should really learn how to respect the others in the community instead of shoving a federal regulation in their face and saying "tough titties" (that may not be the way it is intended, but that's the way it sounds to the other guy).

>> We get a better response from the
>>FCC than do a few angry neighbors because the station pays a lot of money to
>>stay on the air, and the FCC responds to money, not people.
>
>
>Exactly!

And ain't it a shame!

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1059. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 17:05:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403160905.15bb0ab6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89173

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 15, 2004:

Novice - 32,445 (decrease of 16,884)
Technician - 261,786 (increase of 56,392)
Technician Plus - 61,356 (decrease of 67,504)
General - 141,043 (increase of 28,366)
Advanced - 81,285 (decrease of 18,497)
Extra - 105,132 (increase of 26,382)
Total - 683,047 (increase of 8,255)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1060. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 17:27:15 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <0eae50t0bsprp6umke76s3pq414gkc7oq2@4ax.com>
Source record: 89174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 06:50:32 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <1mqd50h8j0065ru5gb2lvn9npej38c04mi@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>
>>>To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference under the
>>>umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find their
>>>defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell swoop, but
>>>it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because there is an
>>>increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention to RFI
>>>complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about their
>>>cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on google I
>>>found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite of the
>>>FCC's preemption, so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
>>>anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise legal hams
>>>they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities as they
>>>did with HR2346.
>>
>>Woah! I think it's time to look at things from a different
>>perspective. One of the main reasons why the FCC, as you put it,
>>became "inattentive", has to do with the fact that the great majority
>>of RFI complaints are the fault of the electronic widget being
>>interfered with. Since the emphasis has been on producing things
>>cheaply, and with the minimum amount of engineering, it should not be
>>surprising that these devices are made so poorly with respect to R.F.
>>immunity.
>
>
>That's not what I have experienced. If these cheap devices are so suseptible to
>fundamental RF transmissions, how can so many of them be used without trouble
>next to radio and television stations?

That depends. I've had cheap $5 phones which picked up radio stations
faintly in the background, while in use. Switching to a more
"bulletproof" phone eliminated the problem.

Interference from a TV station would be harder to ascertain. The
greatest power output in on the video carrier, which, when received by
a simple diode detection (As in RFI rectification), sound like a
buzzing noise, not too much different than electrical interference.
Frequency modulated audio does not rectify well, in this scheme and
will also not usually be discernable as intelligent audio broadcasts,

unless it is especially strong, or there is some frequency determining component which promotes slope detection in the face of the FM modulation.

> The majority of interference is caused to
>televisions, and cordless phones ring in at second place on the list (excuse the
>pun). They work on frequencies that extend from low VHF up to about 1 GHz, yet
>there are almost no reports of interference above VHF. In fact, most of the
>interference happens in the low TV channels and low-VHF cordless phones.

I don't know about the latest generation of 2.4 GHz digital cordless phones, but back a few years, I had a neighbor who was 5 doors down the street who claimed he could hear me on his 49 Mhz cordless phone. I was running a bone stock 4 watt CB, which was spectrally clean. You might be able to make a case that the near field was especially strong due to antenna design issues. But even so, it should not have brought that phone to its knees, if it was properly shielded.

>Not
>suprisingly, this is the area where harmonics from high HF are strongest.

And ground wave propagation is also the most effective.

>And I
>know for a fact that a ham can run 1kW on HF and not cause interference to
>televisions, cordless phones, radios, or just about anything else accused of
>having poor RFI rejection because I have seen more than one station that does.

I can run 100 watts and not interfere with neighbor "A", but I destroy neighbor "B"'s TV. Neighbor B has a Sony TV, which are notorious for RFI issues.

>And again, in the course of my job I have met more than a couple hams who
>sincerly thought their signal was 'clean' only to find out it wasn't.

I don't doubt that. Not all hams are RF savvy, even though they should be.

>> Hams are not so much getting "cocky" as they are becoming
>>increasingly defensive as more and more RFI problems are being leveled
>>at their feet which didn't exist 10 or 15 years ago. The FCC should
>>mandate tougher shielding specs for consumer widgets, and the majority
>>of RFI problems would disappear.
>
>
>There are indeed more and more RFI complaints than there were 10, 20, or even 30
>years ago during the CB craze. This is not a matter of the quality of the
>devices people have in their homes, but the sheer number of them that are
>available these days compared to years ago.

They are both true. There are more devices AND they are made with less regard for RFI protection.

Case in point, I have a Fisher tube-type stereo receiver/amp, which
was made in the late 60's. I could run all the power I ever wanted on
any band, and there was nary a whisper out of that tube stereo. I
recently replaced it for a "newfangled" JVC with a remote control,
digital tuning, and all sorts of bells and whistles. My 4 watt CB
destroys it. My 25 Watt 6 meter station blanks out the music
(Fortunately it's FM so I don't get that awful feedback). Even my 2
meter SSB station gets into it. Fortunately I don't operate the stereo
and the radios at the same time, or I'd have to think seriously about
going back to my old stereo.

>There was a time when a color television was a luxury,

And hams running on 80 meters, close to the colorburst frequency of a
TV would make the color vanish. A common problem back then.

>yet nowdays people have TV's in almost every room.
>Cordless phones were almost non-existent in the 70's, yet they are almost
>standard issue in todays appliance market. But interference still occured to
>these devices in the past just it does today.

Some were more prone to RFI than others. Just changing brands could
often cure an RFI problem.

>They are no more suseptible to RFI
>than they were 30 years ago -- on the contrary, since the frequencies used are
>much higher, cable TV is much more popular, signal processing is more advanced
>and the bandwidth response of tuners is better than ever, these devices actually
>receive -less- interference than ever before.

Yes and no. By having a TV receive through a shielded cable rather
than from an external TV antenna, reduces the potential for RF front
end overload, it does little to prevent RFI which creeps in through
the A.C. line cord. Not all RFI comes in through the tuner.

>But they are -not- immune to
>harmonics that land on their operating frequencies, which, in my experience, is
>the cause of almost all of the interference that is caused by intentional radio
>transmissions.

You're right, you can't expect a TV to reject an on-channel harmonic.
But a properly operating radio should be operating with a -40 to -60
(depending on year of manufacture) dbc harmonic suppression. At 100
watts, a -50 dbc harmonic is 1 mW of radiated power. Not much in the
grand scheme of things, and certainly no match for the grade A
coverage footprint of a 50 KW TV station.

>(I should point out that -most- radio and TV interference is not caused by radio
>stations of any sort, but by light-dimmers, motor speed controls, computer power
>supplies, wall-warts, coffee-makers, and a myriad of other switching devices
>that connect directly to the power lines.

On that point, I also agree. I once ran across a poorly designed Radio
Shack TV signal preamp which had a nasty tendency to self oscillate in

the 220 Mhz region. Every now and then it would drift into the input
of our 220 repeater. Talk about a bugger to pin down.

>But of the cases where the source was
>clearly a radio station, the cause was almost always harmonics.)

Then I guess we have to agree to disagree, as I have had to mediate on
several radio op's behalf to prove that their stations were not
generating the interference (I was the only one with test equipment).
The FCC's website has documentation on RFI issues and what consumers
should do to reduce near field rectification and front end overload.
In many cases, a high pass filter needed to be added to the TV to
eliminate the problem. A.C. line interference was cured by wrapping a
A.C. line cord around a toroidal ferrite core.

I had a neighbor who, back in 1983, complained to the FCC about my
station. It seems that he was happy as a pig in mud, until one day his
TV died and he bought a new one. All of a sudden he started hearing me
loud and clear though the speaker in the TV. He swore that I was
suddenly running "big power". He just didn't want to make the
connection that the problem didn't start until he got a new TV. The
FCC sent me a letter informing me that they had received a complaint.
I wisely sent them my ham call, even though I knew that it was the CB
that my neighbor was hearing. The FCC, once they realized that I was a
ham, literally let the matter drop. They referred me to a "TVI
committee" (A group of hams who investigate RFI claims), but once we
made initial contact, they dropped the ball, and I never heard another
word.

>
>
>>You can argue the relative difference between a person's "right" to
>>enjoy their radio hobby versus another's "right" to enjoy internet
>>porn. But if the ham is clean (and they usually are), it's not his
>>problem directly.
>
>
>I can argue that a person has the right to peaceful use and enjoyment of their
>property and premises.

Which includes a ham or CB station.

> And I'm not saying that all, or even most, hams run a
>dirty station. In fact I believe quite the opposite. It's just a few hams that
>are either too lazy to check their signal or too ignorant to realize the
>possibility of harmonics.

Well, keyclowns have to go somewhere when they upgrade.... ;-)

>>>So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't going
>>>to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic communications
>>>devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be there to
>>>defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal.

>>
>>This is not the case in most instances. You have to remember these are
>>hams, not class "C" amp running CB'ers. Most hams understand RFI to
>>some degree, and most ham equipment is manufactured to comply with
>>spurious emissions requirements. Hams will do what they can to clean
>>up their own act. But once they've done all that they can do on their
>>end, if the problem's still there, then what?
>
>
>If the ham has done everything reasonably possible on his end, it's very likely
>the problem will be no more. But if it -still- exists then the neighbor must
>decide whether he is willing to sacrifice his everyday appliances so the ham can
>play with his radio. Federal law says the neighbor is screwed. Many local and
>state laws state that the neighbor does not have to put up with such intrusions.
>This is a conflict that must eventually be solved in the courts.

And that is the crux of the matter. If a case can be made that the
fault of the interference is caused by a dirty transmitter, then it
becomes an easy case to mediate. If, on the other hand, the ham (or
CBer) has done everything he can to make his station clean, but the
neighbor is the victim of a poorly designed (Even if it's a $5000 HD
TV) consumer product, then the only thing the ham can do, is not
transmit. That may be an acceptable solution to the neighbor, but most
hams love their radio as much as other people love TV, so it's back to
who's rights carry more weight. That's not a case I'd want the courts
to set precedent on, as they might just decide that mindless drivel
such as "American Idol" or the umpteenth episode of "Friends" deserves
more consideration than someone looking to further his electronics
knowledge through the art of radio.

>>> They won't. And they
>>>won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few
>>>holier-than-thou hams.
>>
>>You might want to re-examine your conjecture there. While I would
>>agree that logically the rule of the majority would make the most
>>sense. But especially in the last several years, there have been
>>increasingly small, but highly vocal, special interest lobbyists which
>>have managed to thwart the wishes of the majority, and have been
>>responsible for laws which protect the "rights" of certain minorities
>>above and beyond what the majority enjoys. Take a look at political
>>correctness if you have any doubts.
>
>
>I agree with you 100%, and one of those "special interest" groups is the ARRL.
>They have done more to defend those that cause interference than they have to
>help resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both the hams -and- the general
>public.

They defend hams against "witch hunts", where the radio operator is
automatically painted as a "bad guy" simply because he enjoys a

different venue for his pass time. You cannot expect the non-technical consumer to understand the nuances of RFI. All they know is that when the ham next door transmits, he kills their "XYZ device", therefore it must be his fault.

>>The problem is with the cheap Chinese produced electronic devices.
>>Something needs to be done to minimize their susceptibility to RFI.
>
>
>Honestly, I don't believe that at all. I have yet to find one of these devices
>that are ultra-suseptible to fundamentals on HF. If someone has an example,
>please post it so I can get one and test it for myself.

Go find one of those cheap phones that Radio Shack used to sell. They were one of the worst. Grab a few touch lamps too, while you're there.

>
>>Trying to sweep the problem of RFI under the rug (and thereby saving
>>XYZ company the cost of making RFI resistant devices) by persecuting
>>legally operating hams is not , IMHO, the right solution. Remember,
>>that what they do to hams, will also trickle down to CBers, since the
>>RFI potential is worse on the CB band, with the preponderance of
>>illegally operating stations who are there.
>
>
>I think it's the other way around -- it is the illegal CBers that started the "I
>don't care" attitude towards interference, and that attitude is being adopted by
>some in the ham community.

That has happened largely because most "normal" consumers don't know the difference between a ham and a CB'er. CB'ers have gotten a bad rap due to their blatant disregard of the rules and their penchant for operating high power and dirty amplifiers. In the consumer's mind Cb'er = Ham. I've had people tell me that I can't run 100 watts on the ham bands, and that they were going to call the FCC about it. Hams are starting to get tired of being lumped in with CB'ers, especially when there may be both an illegally running CB'er AND a ham in the same neighborhood. Guess which one is the likely cause of interference?

>And yes, I believe the illegal CB problem far
>outweighs the problems caused by a few asshole hams that learn their operating
>practices from the keyclowns.

Because in all likelihood, they used to be keyclowns themselves.

> But when good hams start defending the bad hams by
>wielding the sword of preemption, you can bet that the keyclowns will do the
>same and the problem in both arenas will just get worse.

PRB-1 does not apply to CB'ers, nor does many of the preemptions that were cited previously. CB'ers should be allowed the protection that their service by rule provides. But since the federal government does not grant CB licenses to specific individuals, local governments have

seized upon this to justify legislation which restricts CB operation in many municipalities. IMHO, there should be no difference between a legally operating and clean ham station and an equivalently operating CB station WRT interference protection. But the local municipalities are much less likely to bring action against a federally licensed ham, than an unlicensed CBer. Many legal CB'ers may have to fold their operations rather than having to pay a large amount of money to defend against such a case.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1061. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) R epo rt 1387 • March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 17:46:49 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94AE81F9D8DEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89175

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0403160345.5948983e@posting.google.com:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:<ZrydnYGynpTcGsvdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
>> Radionews wrote:
>>
>>
>> >
>> > HAM RADIO ADVENTURE: COMMUNICATORS NEEDED FOR CAVEING EXPEDITION
>> >
>> >
>> > Gulf Coast United States, along with Caribbean, or South America
>> > base station operators are needed for communication on the ham bands
>> > with a scientific expedition. This, in July through August time
>> > frame.
>> >
>> >
>> > The 60 day expedition will explore deep caves in the high Andes
>> > mountains and jungle in the western Amazon area of South America.
>> > Expedition access to the remote areas is via trekking on foot and
>> > pack animal. The expedition will use a solar and battery powered 20
>> > Watt backpack transceiver. Antennas will be a wire dipole or
>> > vertical. A miniature notebook computer will be along for digital
>> > operations.
>> >
>> >
>> > Communications will consist of position reports, some short messages
>> > with families of expedition members, and any possible emergency or
>> > medical messages. All operation will be non-commercial.
>> >
>> >
>> > Operators with good base stations, efficient antennas and low noise
>> > locations are needed on the 40 through 15 meter amateur bands. The
>> > operations will use SSB, CW and a variety of digital modes. If you
>> > are interested, e-mail Bonnie Crystal, KQ6XA, at
>> > radioadventure@aol.com. (KC5FM, KQ6XA)
>>
>> Oh wow! I would think that something like a scientific expedition
>> would want some reliable communication that you can use anywhere and
>> count on at all times, like cell phones. Right witless willie?
>
> Uhhh . . don't particularly mean to bust yer stones here JJ but how
> many dialup cells do you suppose Verizon and/or AT&T or any other

> telco has up and running in the headwaters region of the Amazon?
>
> w3rv
>

I went with a group of scouts to a ski resort (didn't ski, but my son did). They had this marvellous plan to communicate with cell phones instead of moving around the resort together as a group. Guess what? No coverage. Nobody knew where anyone else was for 80-90% of the time.

I was the only ham there, so I'm not suggesting that ham radio would have been a solution. However, if there had been some sort of HTs (FRS or the like) that would have worked where cell phones failed altogether. One family did bring a pair of FRS radios and were able to stay in touch. And yes, there are other solutions to coordinating groups of people that don't rely on radio atall, but once you actually rely on radios they better work.

My point? Even in the absence of a disaster cell phones are not the answer. In an actual disaster situation relying on cellular is foolish. Yes, it may work. Or not ...

1062. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 17:50:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403160950.3a77a59d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89176

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4055C1C5.9050409@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <4vednUSdV9lZhtDdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > (Bill Sohl wrote):
> >
> >>>But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
> >>>expenses.
> >>
> >> That is because they intend to get rid of every possible employee
> >>whenever possible. Why would you train people that aren't going to be
> >>working for you in a few years?
> >
> >
> > The military does it all the time!
>
> Ad they aren't so worried about bottom line profit.

Or the stock price, or bond ratings...

> >> Side note: These good folk could probably save money if they were to
> >>get a bill passed requiring all Americans to learn Indian language in
> >>school. That way they wouldn't have to train their new help to speak
> >>English.

> > Which language of India?

English is probably the most-spoken language there.
>
> >>>Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
> >>>and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
> >>>because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
> >>>The irony of non-support for older products is that in
> >>>some cases, cottage or niche companies are created
> >>>to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.

> >>>>This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
> >>>>their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
> >>>>Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who
> >>>
> >>were the
> >>
> >>>>new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
> >>>>succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
> >>>>years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the

> >>>
> >>best of
> >>
> >>>>care.
> >>>
> >>>Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
> >>
> >> And the new car is so expensive that it darn well *better* make 200 K
> >>miles. They have become waay too expensive. Did you know that they are
> >>offering 7 year auto loans now? All the "innovative" techniques that the
> >>companies had to do over the years to sell cars as the price went up is
> >>reaching an end-game for them. Most people do not want to pay $500-$600
> >>or more a month for a vehicle.
> >>
> >>
> > Are cars *really* more expensive, adjusted for inflation?
> >
> > Back in 2001, my Honda Odyssey minivan cost about $26,000 new. How much did,
> > say, the classic Ford Country Squire station wagon with the woodlike sides cost
> > in 1964? How much has typical income increased in that time period?
>
> I don't have statistics in front of me, but I do know that when I
> started buying cars, a typical loan was 2 years. now they are doing 6
> and seven year loans.

Apples and oranges. The imporatan factoid is whether the prices have
lagged or led inflation and real income. If the Squire was $2,600 in
1961 and a good middle-class income was $5K/yr, then today the Odyssey
and a $50K income are sorta comparable. I say "sorta" because the
percentage of income you actually get to take home today is less.

OTOH, if you can keep a car 10 years today, compared to, say, 4 years
back then, that has to be factored in. How long before that Squire was
worth, say, 25% of its sticker price, compared to an Odyssey today?

(btw, it's a 2001 Odyssey. One guess what it's called....)

> > I just paid it off, and it's got a lot more usable life in it. So the total
> > lifetime cost may be less in inflation-adjusted dollars.
>
> That's good to pay off a car in two years. Hopefully you got a good
> trade in, or your payments were pretty steep. A 0 percent loan with no
> down payment would be almost $1100 per month.

??

I had a good down and 3 year loan, and the payments were a little over
$300/mo.
> >
> >>Leasing looked good for a while, but of course you have no trade-in, and
> >>the lease company doesn't really want you to trade the thing in, they
> >>want you to buy-out. But oh those car payments!

> >
> > All depends on a whole bunch of unknowns like residual value, interest rate,
> > repair cost, etc.
>
> I've leased two cars now, and did okay by both of them. For this go
> round, I wanted to buy, and to do that, I spent 10K less for the new
> vehicle than I did 5 years ago for my last one to keep the payments
> reasonable.

What did you buy that was $10K *less*?

> >>>>>Look at the
> >>>>>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
> >>>>
> >>>>Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
> >>>>However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
> >>>
> >>> Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
> >>
> >>Open up an old IBM PC, then open up a clone box built for cheap
> >>performance. I can send you pix of some I have in my garage.
>
> > Agreed. But that's in large part because they are not meant to last that long.
> > And because enough people buy on price alone.
>
> The old IBM's were meant to last. One of these days maybe we'll
> concentrate on writing good functional software and operatin systems
> that actually work, and then we won't have to get new computers every
> two years.

Yep. That's exactly the point.

> > Meanwhile, folks like me cherrypick the trailing edge for pennies. This Amidon
> > 350MHz box cost me a lot less than $100, and most of that was for the CD-ROM
> > burner and the modem.
>
> I do both. I have the latest and greatest for some of my uses, and I'm
> using an old P166 Thinkpad running Win95 for my rig computer.

All depends on the job to be done.

"Use it up
Wear it out
Make it do
Or do without".

> The old PC
> laptops had very nice sound output, and were built well.
>
Agreed.

btw, on the issue of exporting jobs and inflation, check out:

http://management.itmanagersjournal.com/management/04/03/12/0715217.shtml?tid=102&tid=85&tid=86

73 de Jim, N2EY

1063. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 18:32:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316133202.23171.00004648@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 89178

In article <1e4e3692.0403160413.10de17bd@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40563232.8028438E@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> You know, I've never needed your assistance in posting my comments to
>> the FCC before. What made you think I'd need it now?
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Len stated, "It's also apparent that way too many commenters are
>trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
>
>Len did not state that "David Heil/K8MN is trying to voice his
>grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
>
>What made you think he did?

Mr. Foreign Serviceman thinks that every PUBLIC posting I make is
aimed straight at him and his ego wounds are grievous.

The gunnery nurse thinks every PUBLIC posting I make is aimed
straight at him and he is mad as heck and can't take it any more.

But, over 600 comments have been filed on NOI 03-104 since the
04-29 NPRM was released...over 600 comments that will have no
effect on FCC decision-making on NPRM 04-29.

As of the close of FCC business on 15 March 2004, the number
of comments on 04-29 and 04-37 are the SAME number as on
the close of business on 11 March 2004. No one seems to be
filing anything. Not even FISTS...but then "CW gets through when
nothing else will" according to them and they aren't worried about
Access BPL.

Everyone else seems happy and content with personal in-fighting
in newsgroups instead of going out and DOING anything about
BPL. That shows everyone how "dedicated" they are to preserving
their hobby lifestyles. Dedication = nothing. Imagination and
fantasy = everything.

LHA / WMD

1064. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 18:32:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316133203.23171.00004649@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 89177

In article <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
>> HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
>> with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
>> "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
>
>But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
>mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
>what he gets.
>
>Pffft!

Brian, the murine corpse are preparing even as you write. Hundreds
of Heroic Mighty Men in cammies and greasepaint are putting on
their chutes and 80-pound GP bags, hooking up in the C5 jump door
waiting for the HALO drop signal from Fearless Leider, the
gunnery nurse. The Amateur Expeditionary FORCE at the ready!

Death to professionals! Death to CB! Death to No-Coders! Phrases
are mouthed silently as the murine corpse AEF read their phrase
cards, fingers moving slowly under the printing as they chant
mentally, anxious to drop and KILL all that disagree with Their
Beliefs!

All is not well in the C5. Dozens of pink flamingos are pooping on
cans of lavendar paint, that stuff clogging the control lines of the C5.
The C5 drifts off course, heading for the Amana Colonies. No
matter, the PA system on the C5 blares out the recorded Hymn,
"From the halls of down-town Tennessee to the shores of Mary
Land, we will fight our imaginary battle foes..."

Tune in tomorrow for another chapter in the gunnery nurse's
fevered imagination as he seethes righteously in front of his
screen, murderous thoughts causing his eyes to glow like red
LEDs on overvoltage.

Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...

LHA / WMD

1065. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 18:40:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40574A1D.EBC1F083@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89179

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
> >> HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
> >> with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
> >> "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >>
> >Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
> >
> >But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
> >mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
> >what he gets.
> >
> >Pffft!
>
> Brian, the murine corpse are preparing even as you write. Hundreds
> of Heroic Mighty Men in cammies and greasepaint are putting on
> their chutes and 80-pound GP bags, hooking up in the C5 jump door
> waiting for the HALO drop signal from Fearless Leider, the
> gunnery nurse. The Amateur Expeditionary FORCE at the ready!
>
> Death to professionals! Death to CB! Death to No-Coders! Phrases
> are mouthed silently as the murine corpse AEF read their phrase
> cards, fingers moving slowly under the printing as they chant
> mentally, anxious to drop and KILL all that disagree with Their
> Beliefs!
>
> All is not well in the C5. Dozens of pink flamingos are pooping on
> cans of lavendar paint, that stuff clogging the control lines of the C5.
> The C5 drifts off course, heading for the Amana Colonies. No
> matter, the PA system on the C5 blares out the recorded Hymn,
> "From the halls of down-town Tennessee to the shores of Mary
> Land, we will fight our imaginary battle foes..."
>

> Tune in tomorrow for another chapter in the gunnery nurse's
> fevered imagination as he seethes righteously in front of his
> screen, murderous thoughts causing his eyes to glow like red
> LEDs on overvoltage.

You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.

> Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...

...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
(ho hum), why do you hang around?

Dave K8MN

1066. Re: It's baaaack!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 19:48:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40575A20.3020902@psu.edu>
Source record: 89180

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4055C1C5.9050409@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <4vednUSdV9lZhtDdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>(Bill Sohl wrote):
>>>
>>>
>>>>But in today's world, even telecom has cut back on training
>>>>expenses.
>>>>
>>>> That is because they intend to get rid of every possible employee
>>>>whenever possible. Why would you train people that aren't going to be
>>>>working for you in a few years?
>>>
>>>
>>>The military does it all the time!
>>
>>Ad they aren't so worried about bottom line profit.
>
>
> Or the stock price, or bond ratings...
>
>
>>>> Side note: These good folk could probably save money if they were to
>>>>get a bill passed requiring all Americans to learn Indian language in
>>>>school. That way they wouldn't have to train their new help to speak
>>>>English.
>>>
>
>
>>>Which language of India?
>>
>
> English is probably the most-spoken language there.
>
>>>>Companies can not afford to support products for long terms
>>>>and they MUST keep coming out with the latest products
>>>>because if they don't, the consumer will pass them by.
>>>>The irony of non-support for older products is that in
>>>>some cases, cottage or niche companies are created

>>>>>to fill the void if there is sufficient consumer interest.
>>>>
>
>>>>>>This isn;t a new game. Back in the late 1950s, US automakers "redesigned"
>>>>>>their cars every year. Most of the "redesign" was cosmetic, not functional.
>>>>>>Their goal wasn't to make cars that would last - they wanted those who
>>>>>
>>>>were the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>new-car buyers to come back into the dealerships every year. They almost
>>>>>>succeeded - at one point, the average new-car buyer was back every two
>>>>>>years, and it was very rare for a car to last 100,000 miles even with the
>>>>>
>>>>best of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>care.
>>>>>
>>>>>Yet today the average car hit 200K miles or more.
>>>>
>>>> And the new car is so expensive that it darn well *better* make 200 K
>>>>miles. They have become waay too expensive. Did you know that they are
>>>>offering 7 year auto loans now? All the "innovative" techniques that the
>>>>companies had to do over the years to sell cars as the price went up is
>>>>reaching an end-game for them. Most people do not want to pay $500-$600
>>>>or more a month for a vehicle.
>>>
>>>
>>>Are cars *really* more expensive, adjusted for inflation?
>>>
>>>Back in 2001, my Honda Odyssey minivan cost about $26,000 new. How much did,
>>>say, the classic Ford Country Squire station wagon with the woodlike sides cost
>>>in 1964? How much has typical income increased in that time period?
>>
>> I don't have statistics in front of me, but I do know that when I
>>started buying cars, a typical loan was 2 years. now they are doing 6
>>and seven year loans.
>
>
> Apples and oranges. The imporatant factoid is whether the prices have
> lagged or led inflation and real income. If the Squire was $2,600 in
> 1961 and a good middle-class income was $5K/yr, then today the Odyssey
> and a $50K income are sorta comparable. I say "sorta" because the
> percentage of income you actually get to take home today is less.

There are many methods of comparison. I don't know if my methods are
apples and oranges. A person has a reasonable expectation of getting
ahead by comparison to how they were doing X number of years ago. but
how on earth would that be factored in.

We have to have some sort of comparison, and I really doubt you can
factor in all the differences between the years. Does this mean no
comparisons are possible?

> OTOH, if you can keep a car 10 years today, compared to, say, 4 years
> back then, that has to be factored in. How long before that Squire was
> worth, say, 25% of its sticker price, compared to an Odyssey today?

Yeah, and leases confuse the issue even more.....

> (btw, it's a 2001 Odyssey. One guess what it's called....)
>
>
>>>I just paid it off, and it's got a lot more usable life in it. So the total
>>>lifetime cost may be less in inflation-adjusted dollars.
>>
>> That's good to pay off a car in two years. Hopefully you got a good
>>trade in, or your payments were pretty steep. A 0 percent loan with no
>>down payment would be almost $1100 per month.
>
>
> ??
>
> I had a good down and 3 year loan, and the payments were a little over
> $300/mo.

Yes, you down payment was probably around half the price of the car,
whether through trade/cash or combination of both.

>>>>Leasing looked good for a while, but of course you have no trade-in, and
>>>>the lease company doesn't really want you to trade the thing in, they
>>>>want you to buy-out. But oh those car payments!
>>>
>>>All depends on a whole bunch of unknowns like residual value, interest rate,
>>>repair cost, etc.
>>
>> I've leased two cars now, and did okay by both of them. For this go
>>round, I wanted to buy, and to do that, I spent 10K less for the new
>>vehicle than I did 5 years ago for my last one to keep the payments
>>reasonable.
>
>
> What did you buy that was $10K *less*?

A Vitara. Been a wonderful little twerp so far. Gets good gas mileage,
especially compared to what I had before. $16k, and has all the
amenities the last vehicle did plus a CD player. The other choices in
this type vehicle were from $23-30K. I got the chance to try it out in
the snow today, and it's a real mudder, just like I hoped.

>>>>>>>Look at the
>>>>>>>ever newer, faster and more memory for PCs.
>>>>>>

>>>>>>Not just memory but every part of the machine - processor, drives, etc.
>>>>>>However, these improvements are often done at the price of quality.
>>>>>
>>>>>Huh? Based on what information do you make that statement?
>>>>
>>>>Open up an old IBM PC, then open up a clone box built for cheap
>>>>performance. I can send you pix of some I have in my garage.
>>>
> >
>
>>>Agreed. But that's in large part because they are not meant to last that long.
>>>And because enough people buy on price alone.
>>
>> The old IBM's were meant to last. One of these days maybe we'll
>>concentrate on writing good functional software and operatin systems
>>that actually work, and then we won't have to get new computers every
>>two years.
>
>
> Yep. That's exactly the point.
>
>
>>>Meanwhile, folks like me cherrypick the trailing edge for pennies. This Amidon
>>>350MHz box cost me a lot less than $100, and most of that was for the CD-ROM
>>>burner and the modem.
>>
>> I do both. I have the latest and greatest for some of my uses, and I'm
>>using an old P166 Thinkpad running Win95 for my rig computer.
>
>
> All depends on the job to be done.
>
> "Use it up
> Wear it out
> Make it do
> Or do without".
>
>
>>The old PC
>>laptops had very nice sound output, and were built well.
>>
>
> Agreed.
>
>
> btw, on the issue of exporting jobs and inflation, check out:
>
>
> http://management.itmanagersjournal.com/management/04/03/12/0715217.shtml?tid=102&tid=85
&tid=86

As I read it, the apparent answer is to turn ourselves into a third-world country. That sucks! I can hardly wait to hear who the coming inflation is blamed on!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1067. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 19:53:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40575B47.70301@psu.edu>
Source record: 89181

Dave Heil wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>In article <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>,
>>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>>
>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>>>news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
>>>
>>>> Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
>>>>HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
>>>>with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
>>>>"carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
>>>>
>>>>73
>>>>
>>>>Steve, K4YZ
>>>
>>>Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
>>>
>>>But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
>>>mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
>>>what he gets.
>>>
>>>Pffft!
>>
>> Brian, the murine corpse are preparing even as you write. Hundreds
>> of Heroic Mighty Men in cammies and greasepaint are putting on
>> their chutes and 80-pound GP bags, hooking up in the C5 jump door
>> waiting for the HALO drop signal from Fearless Leider, the
>> gunnery nurse. The Amateur Expeditionary FORCE at the ready!
>>
>> Death to professionals! Death to CB! Death to No-Coders! Phrases
>> are mouthed silently as the murine corpse AEF read their phrase
>> cards, fingers moving slowly under the printing as they chant
>> mentally, anxious to drop and KILL all that disagree with Their
>> Beliefs!
>>
>> All is not well in the C5. Dozens of pink flamingos are pooping on
>> cans of lavendar paint, that stuff clogging the control lines of the C5.
>> The C5 drifts off course, heading for the Amana Colonies. No
>> matter, the PA system on the C5 blares out the recorded Hymn,
>> "From the halls of down-town Tennessee to the shores of Mary

>> Land, we will fight our imaginary battle foes..."
>>
>> Tune in tomorrow for another chapter in the gunnery nurse's
>> fevered imagination as he seethes righteously in front of his
>> screen, murderous thoughts causing his eyes to glow like red
>> LEDs on overvoltage.
>
>
> You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.
>
>
>> Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...
>
>
> ...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
> (ho hum), why do you hang around?

If I may be so direct, it's because he can rely on a good row with
Steve and you. I understand your rationale, but he'll be happy to fight
with y'all as long as y'all are happy to fight with him. just newsgroup
BPL. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1068. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 22:22:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316172231.11022.00004692@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 89182

In article <40575B47.70301@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dave Heil wrote:
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>,
>>>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>>>news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
>>>>
>>>>> Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
>>>>>HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
>>>>>with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
>>>>>"carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
>>>>>
>>>>>73
>>>>>
>>>>>Steve, K4YZ
>>>>
>>>>Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
>>>>
>>>>But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
>>>>mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
>>>>what he gets.
>>>>
>>>>Pffft!
>>>
>>> Brian, the murine corpse are preparing even as you write. Hundreds
>>> of Heroic Mighty Men in cammies and greasepaint are putting on
>>> their chutes and 80-pound GP bags, hooking up in the C5 jump door
>>> waiting for the HALO drop signal from Fearless Leider, the
>>> gunnery nurse. The Amateur Expeditionary FORCE at the ready!
>>>
>>> Death to professionals! Death to CB! Death to No-Coders! Phrases
>>> are mouthed silently as the murine corpse AEF read their phrase
>>> cards, fingers moving slowly under the printing as they chant
>>> mentally, anxious to drop and KILL all that disagree with Their
>>> Beliefs!
>>>
>>> All is not well in the C5. Dozens of pink flamingos are pooping on
>>> cans of lavendar paint, that stuff clogging the control lines of the C5.
>>> The C5 drifts off course, heading for the Amana Colonies. No

>>> matter, the PA system on the C5 blares out the recorded Hymn,
>>> "From the halls of down-town Tennessee to the shores of Mary
>>> Land, we will fight our imaginary battle foes..."
>>>
>>> Tune in tomorrow for another chapter in the gunnery nurse's
>>> fevered imagination as he seethes righteously in front of his
>>> screen, murderous thoughts causing his eyes to glow like red
>>> LEDs on overvoltage.
>>
>> You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.
>>
>>> Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...
>>
>> ...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
>> (ho hum), why do you hang around?
>
> If I may be so direct, it's because he can rely on a good row with
>Steve and you. I understand your rationale, but he'll be happy to fight
>with y'all as long as y'all are happy to fight with him. just newsgroup
>BPL. 8^)

You're right in one way, Mike. Mr. FS wants to Put Me Down.
It's his way of asserting control over this automotive chat room.
He's tried all sorts of ways to put me down and hasn't yet
succeeded. It must be terribly frustrating that he doesn't Get
His Way.

So, how's your CW rate coming along? Are you ready for the
next emergency where you have to communicate by morse
outside of a disaster area?

Or are you going to use BPL...Beeping Pejorative Language?

LHA / WMD

1069. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 23:08:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040316180856.23307.00007339@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 89183

In article <20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes.
>The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit
>(Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is
>not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.

Jim:

Don't look now, but ALL public transit in the United States exists mainly due to state and federal subsidies which provide virtually all of the funding needed
for the procurement of vehicles, facilities, communications systems, and most of the operating costs. If public transit had to "pay it's own way," I, for one
public transit employee, would not have a job. I drive Paratransit in Kent County, Delaware, and the cash I turn in from my fare box at the end of the day would not pay for an hour's worth of my wages. At best, a few of our more heavily utilized fixed-routes in Wilmington might just possibly pay for the fuel consumed and other routine expenses, but wouldn't even come close to covering all of the essential overhead.

>>Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
>>manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
>>vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
>>
>>Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70.
>
>Only in small cars.

True, and that's part of the reason why diesel engines are not more common in U.S. passenger vehicles. Partly by necessity but mainly by preference, us Americans prefer to drive massive, heavy, inherently inefficient vehicles such as all those 4-wheel drive SUV's being driven exclusively on perfectly clear dry roads and highways. If only we were a lot smarter in our choices of vehicles, we could probably benefit from the many advantages of diesel engines, which can now be made as "clean" as gasoline engines.

>>And their
>>performance is not less the gas engines.
>
>Agreed. But the first-cost is greater. And at US fuel prices, the difference
>may not be worth it.

It would be if we started viewing our vehicles as the mere transportation appliances they should be, and not as outward extensions of our personalities or demonstrations of our wealth.

>Suppose the diesel car gets 60 MPG and the equivalent gasoline car gets 40
>MPG.
>And suppose the car is driven 12,000 miles per year. That's 300 gallons of
>gasoline vs. 200 gallons of diesel. If both fuels cost about the same (as
>they
>usually do in the USA), the saving is only $150-200 per year. Compared to the
>price of the car, insurance, repairs, maintenance, etc, that's not much
>saving.

Now consider a driver who must drive anywhere from 25 to 30,000 miles a year, for business purposes or just a particularly long commute from a rural area to the city where he/she works. Now the fuel cost savings of a diesel start to look very attractive indeed!

>>So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
>>your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
>>You know, you are filling up CHEAP.
>
>Back in 1980 I bought a VW Rabbit Diesel. Over its 17 year lifetime, I got 43
>mpg combined (I kept very accurate records). An equivalent gasoline Rabbit
>would have probably done about 30 mpg.
>
>But the diesel engine cost $900 more back then. Considering all factors, I
>didn't save very much driving an oil burner.

If a high mileage diesel-engine version of the Ford Focus, Honda Civic, Toyota Corolla (my automobile!) and every other econo-box in the same class as the VW Rabbit were available, then the additional cost wouldn't be so great as to skim the potential savings off from the top. Modern diesel engines are clean, efficient, and have more than adequate power for vehicles that would adequately serve over 80% of the American travelling public. They are no more difficult to maintain than a gasoline engine of equivalent power, and generally last longer because they are, out of necessity, built stronger. There's gotta be some reason why we aren't using more diesel power here in the U.S., but I am at a loss to explain it.

73 de Larry, K3LT
2003 Toyota Corolla LE (Automatic)
Averaging 30 MPG City, 41 MPG Highway

1070. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 23:12:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403161512.150c02c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89184

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40574A1D.EBC1F083@earthlink.net>...
>
> You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.

Then it all balances out. Some here are wrapped too tightly.

> > Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...
>
> ...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
> (ho hum), why do you hang around?

Because you cannot resist commenting.

1071. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 23:29:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403161529.2aad826c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89185

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403160539.27d4ec7@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091804.149b9053@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403082246.32fdbf39@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > And even if he could he wouldn't know who to get authorization from to operate!
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Not a prob. Got it in my pocket. Renew it every 10 years.
>
> Weeeeellllllll...waddaya know...?!?!
>
> Now...where's the one from Somalia...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The one from Somalia was non-renewable. One to a customer, valid only
as long as you were in-country.

1072. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 23:30:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <L6M5c.6477$GQ3.5342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89186

I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040316133202.23171.00004648@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403160413.10de17bd@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40563232.8028438E@earthlink.net>...
> >>
> >> You know, I've never needed your assistance in posting my comments to
> >> the FCC before. What made you think I'd need it now?
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >>
> >Len stated, "It's also apparent that way too many commenters are
> >trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
> >
> >Len did not state that "David Heil/K8MN is trying to voice his
> >grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
> >
> >What made you think he did?
>
> Mr. Foreign Serviceman thinks that every PUBLIC posting I make is
> aimed straight at him and his ego wounds are grievous.
>
> The gunnery nurse thinks every PUBLIC posting I make is aimed
> straight at him and he is mad as heck and can't take it any more.
>
> But, over 600 comments have been filed on NOI 03-104 since the
> 04-29 NPRM was released...over 600 comments that will have no
> effect on FCC decision-making on NPRM 04-29.
>
> As of the close of FCC business on 15 March 2004, the number
> of comments on 04-29 and 04-37 are the SAME number as on
> the close of business on 11 March 2004. No one seems to be
> filing anything. Not even FISTS...but then "CW gets through when
> nothing else will" according to them and they aren't worried about
> Access BPL.
>
> Everyone else seems happy and content with personal in-fighting
> in newsgroups instead of going out and DOING anything about
> BPL. That shows everyone how "dedicated" they are to preserving

> their hobby lifestyles. Dedication = nothing. Imagination and
> fantasy = everything.
>
> LHA / WMD

1073. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-16 23:33:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <19M5c.6058$CJ5.4340@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89187
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:025e50dk04aii7rdaj0u74sd041h93agpo@4ax.com...
> In <dls5c.5148$CJ5.280@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:dk8b50tc0k4m4sbdag45ep1ugitfj1j56t@4ax.com...
> >> To begin with, I quoted a newspaper article about a case here in
Spokane:
> >>
> >>
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=3ade1b9d.7
7
> >554%40news.cet.com
> >>
> >> And Twisty was nice enough to find a reference to another case on the
> >other side
> >> of the state. I read the article after it was posted, but that was a
> >couple
> >> years ago and you will have to search the referenced newpaper's
archives
> >to find
> >> it again:
> >>
> >>
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=QE9h6.153%
2
> >4L35.40420%40news.uswest.net
> >>
> >> That's two cases from one state. I'm sure there are more.
> >>
> >> >if it is a "civil" suit, then it is NOT a violation of local
ordinances
> >> >under municipal law.
> >>
> >> Now where did you get that idea? You can't file a complaint, civil OR
> >criminal,
> >> unless there is an alleged violation of law, and it must be a law under
> >which a
> >> remedy can be granted. Otherwise it gets tossed out of court.

> >
> >Apologies...should have said "criminal" law.
>
>
> Civil -and- criminal law. If you file a civil suit, it is filed and tried
in a
> court of LAW. Codified laws usually include both civil and criminal
remedies for
> various violations, and many times even for the same violation.
>
>
> >> >> And now I'll ask -you- if you can provide
> >> >> one case where a ham was excused from
> >> >> violating a local law because he was licensed.
> >> >
> >> >Sorry, that's not my position to prove.
> >>
> >> Too bad, because that was an easy one. As it turns out there -is- a
> >federal law
> >> that preempts local laws from dealing with RFI-related issues, and it
has
> >been
> >> exercised many times.
> >
> >Then why'd you ask me to prove anything?
>
>
> Because an affirmative answer would have supported your position. A better
> question is why you didn't bother to look, the answer to which might be
that you
> had concerns that I could have been right and there was no such law. Or
there
> might be some other reason.....
>
>
> >> Instead of being defensively lazy you could have done a
> >> quick search on google and found the answer.
> >
> >My life doesn't live or die based on newsgroup discussions.
>
>
> With nearly 8000 posts it sure looks like you spend more time clicking the
> keyboard than than I do.
>
>
> >> Regardless.....
> >>
> >> The FCC may have declared that any state or local RFI regulations are
> >preempted
> >> by federal regs, but when the FCC won't get off it's lazy ass to

enforce
> >their
> >> own laws, that leaves victims with no remedy against asshole hams.
> >
> >Excuse me. just what does that mean?
>
>
> It means that if the neighbors are being bothered by interference from a
dirty
> ham (or even an illegal operator), and the FCC chooses to ignore the
complaints
> as they do most of the time, federal law says the neighbors are screwed.
>
>
> >> Now any judge has the right
> >> to make any decision he/she deems legal and appropriate.
> >
> >And on what basis do you make that leap of logic?
>
>
> Because that's their job. Duh....
>
>
> >> Usually
> >> the courts side with the FCC, but evidently there are a few cases (such
as
> >the
> >> ones above) where they don't. And we all know (or should know) the
legal
> >process
> >> by now: If the decision should be against the FCC, the decision is not
> >void just
> >> because a law exists which contradicts the decision.
> >
> >The initial court decision can and may well be reversed on appeal.
> >I have not read of any case being upheld on local jurisdiction vs
> >federal preemption when it gets to the feds.
> >
> >> The case must go through
> >> the process of adjudication; i.e, the appeals courts. Most such cases
can
> >be
> >> appealed, one exception being Small Claims Courts in WA which doesn't
> >allow
> >> appeals, only trials de novo.
> >
> >And why would a ham or a CD interference case end up
> >in small claims court anyway?
>
>

> In WA you can sue in Small Claims court on the grounds of causing,
maintaining,
> or failing to abate a public or private nuisance, provided the requested
damages
> do not exceed the limits of the court. That's where the case I quoted was
tried.
>
>
> >> But on appeal there arises another thorn in the
> >> bush -- the FCC suddenly gets allergic to higher courts whenever there
is
> >a case
> >> that makes a challenge to their authority, especially to the
> >constitutionality
> >> of their laws. So if a case ever looks like it might end with a ruling
> >that the
> >> FCC's preemptions are in conflict with the civil rights of the general
> >public
> >> (as would be the case with a public nuisance) you can bet that the case
> >will be
> >> quickly and quietly dropped. It has happened before and it will happen
> >again.
> >
> >Dropped by who? If I am being sued and my defense is federal preemption,
> >then why would I drop the case? The FCC doesn't even have to be
> >a direct party to the case for the issue of federal preemption to be
> >argued.
>
>
> Try it the other way around -- suppose a community prosecutes a ham for
causing
> a nuisance, but the case is dismissed on the grounds of federal
preemption. The
> case doesn't need to stop there, as the preemption law can be challenged
by the
> community. If they have a good case, the FCC may not take the chance of
losing
> and will most likely drop the case or settle out-of-court.

In your example, the FCC isn't the one making the preemptive argument...
the defendent is. The FCC doesn't get the chane to drop anything.

> That's their MO, and
> that's why you have rarely seen any case challenging the constitutionality
of
> their laws get anywhere near the US Supreme Court.
>
> >> To be blunt: as long as fat, lazy hams keep causing interference
> >
> >Guess that shows your true colors...
>

>
> You can guess next week's winning lottery numbers, too. If you do, let me
know
> if you win, eh?
>
>
> >> under the
> >> umbrella of preemption, the probability increases that they will find
> >their
> >> defense is no longer valid. It may happen case by case or in one fell
> >swoop, but
> >> it -will- happen. I believe this for three reasons: First, because
there
> >is an
> >> increasing number of people that are fed up with the FCC's inattention
to
> >RFI
> >> complaints; Second, because hams are becoming increasingly cocky about
> >their
> >> cloak of federal protection; and Third, after doing a quick search on
> >google I
> >> found several current statutes where RFI is declared illegal in spite
of
> >the
> >> FCC's preemption,
> >
> >So...the situation that a law exists can just be that the law hasn't
> >been challenged.
>
> Ever hear of the Patriot Act?

Your point?

> >> so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
> >> anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise
legal
> >hams
> >> they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities
as
> >they
> >> did with HR2346.
> >
> >Yet I find no such "doom and gloom" predictions or examples being
> >recorded in ham publications. The fact that some ill advised local
> >government
> >enacts a piece of law that "outlaws" interference doesn't
> >makethe law immune to being overturned on the preemption
> >basis.
>
> What you perceive as "ill advised" might just be a precursor to a
challenge

> against the FCC's authority over the matter.

And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?

> > The argument for pre-emption, if made, doesn't even
> >require the FCC to do so. the defendent's attorney can and likely
> >would raise the argument.
>
> Assuming the attorney knows anything about FCC regs. Regardless, the judge
can
> rule any law as unconstitutional. It has been done many times before.
Whether
> that judgement holds up on appeal is another ball of twine.

And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.

> >> So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people
aren't
> >going
> >> to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic
> >communications
> >> devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be
> >there to
> >> defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They won't.
And
> >they
> >> won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people,
not
> >a few
> >> holier-than-thou hams.
> >
> >Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
> >who the real smart ass is.
>
> Yep... anyone who smirks at a group of angry neighbors while hiding
> behind a federal statute.

Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
name calling.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1074. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:13:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40579834.8099206B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89188

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40574A1D.EBC1F083@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.
>
> Then it all balances out. Some here are wrapped too tightly.
>
> > > Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...
> >
> > ...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
> > (ho hum), why do you hang around?
>
> Because you cannot resist commenting.

I beg your pardon. What exactly did you do? I suppose you just could
not resist commenting.

Dave K8MN

1075. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:22:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40579A59.D165ED99@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89189

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40575B47.70301@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >>>In article <1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>,
> >>>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> > If I may be so direct, it's because he can rely on a good row with
> > >Steve and you. I understand your rationale, but he'll be happy to fight
> > >with y'all as long as y'all are happy to fight with him. just newsgroup
> > >BPL. 8^)
> >
> > You're right in one way, Mike. Mr. FS wants to Put Me Down.

What's with the "Put Me Down"? I don't think that highly of you. Just
plain old "put me down" would suffice. Oh, and I'm not Mr. Field
Strength, Loon.

> It's his way of asserting control over this automotive chat room.

This is a newsgroup, not a chat room. If I had control over it, you
certainly wouldn't be posting here.

> He's tried all sorts of ways to put me down and hasn't yet
> succeeded. It must be terribly frustrating that he doesn't Get
> His Way.

You must not be paying attention. You've been easily had easily and
recently. I just love a good Los Angeles Marathon tale.

Dave K8MN

1076. NCVEC files license resstructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:24:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <UUM5c.6127$CJ5.1992@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89190

The NCVEC has filed a petition on restructuring US
licensing. You can obtain a PDF or RTF copy
via one of the following:

http://www.arnewsline.org/newspages/Morse%20Petition.pdf

or

http://www.arnewsline.org/newspages/Morse%20Petition.rtf

1077. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:24:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40579ADA.FA9E01FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89191

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >If someone like him moved next
> >door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
> >lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
> >of pink plastic flamingos.
> >
> Did you ever see the John Waters film by that name?

No. Then again, I was away for a long time.

Dave K8MN

1078. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:46:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qdN5c.6528$GQ3.2287@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89192

Official NCVEC Press Release:

VECs PROPOSE NEW ENTRY LEVEL COMMUNICATOR HAM LICENSE

The National Conference of VECs filed a Petition for Rulemaking on
March 1, 2004 proposing their version of a new entry-level Amateur Service
license and redistribution of some HF frequencies to General and Amateur
Extra Class licensees.

The petition, which is somewhat similar to the one filed by the
American Radio League, requires no required demonstrated Morse code
proficiency for any license class ...including Extra.

The NCVEC proposed the same HF/VHF/UHF bands for the entry level
class as the ARRL and both petitions grant more privileges to all classes.
The VEC's proposal, however, allows wider voice subbands and less exclusive
CW/digital frequencies. The NCVEC petition also places more emphasis on the
use of 15 and 10 meters for entry-level voice operation than does the ARRL.

The VECs proposed an additional 50 kHz of 80-meter voice spectrum
over the ARRL proposal and 25 kHz more 40 meter voice spectrum for both the
General and Extra Class. At 15 Meters, the General Class would get an
additional 75 kHz of voice spectrum over ARRL proposal; Extra Class, an
additional 50 kHz.

The frequency privileges proposed for the new entry level class
which the VECs want called the "Communicator" Class are:

80 Meters:
3950-4000 kHz (voice/image), 3550-3675 kHz (digital/CW).

40 Meters:
7250-7300 kHz (voice/image), 7050-7150 kHz (Digital/CW).

15 Meters:
21350-21450 kHz voice/image), 21050-21150 kHz (Digital/CW).

10 meters:
28.300-28.500 and 29000-29700 kHz (voice/image), 28050-28150 kHz
(CW/Digital).

All bands 6 Meters through 70 cm:
Full Amateur privileges.

The NCVEC envisions that all Novice Class operators would
automatically become Communicator Class licensees as of the effective date.
At the same time, Technician and Tech Plus amateurs would be upgraded to the
General Class ...Advanced Class licensees would become Extra Class. The

VECs believed that there was no other effective way to redistribute Novice/Tech Plus spectrum to the General and Extra Class without this automatic upgrade feature.

This means that some 350,000 Tech/Tech Plus and 85,000 Advanced Class would not be testing for an upgrade to the next class. This amounts to about 60 percent or all current licensees and those in the two year grace period. On the other hand, the VECs anticipate a greatly expanded demand for entry-level ("Communicator") testing and license preparation material. Some 40,000 Novices would be automatically upgraded to the new entry level which would not only contain their existing frequency bands, but additional HF/VHF/UHF bands as well.

The NCVEC proposes that existing Novice, Technician, Tech Plus and Advanced Class operators be issued a new Communicator, General or Extra Class license document upon their next renewal. The new privileges will "kick in," of course, as of the effective date. The Novice, Technician, Tech Plus and Advanced Class licenses will be permanently retired.

The VECs suggested that Communicator Class call signs might come from the authorized but unallocated NA1AAA through NZ0ZZZ call sign block.

Proposed entry level transmitter power is proposed to be 100 watts when the operation takes place below 24 MHz; 50 watts above. This is the same as the ARRL proposal. In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage and that only commercially manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees. Communicator Class licensees may not install repeater or remote base stations, be a volunteer examiner or establish a club station.

Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination questions.

This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of the VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin. While some areas of disagreement were to be expected, the fact that such an overwhelming majority of the VEC's approved the NCVEC petition speaks well for it's being representative of the true feelings and opinions of those most in tune with the examination process and the needs of the Amateur Radio community.

This is further supported by the fact that the NCVEC and ARRL petitions are similar in basic concept, and in fact agree on most issues. Taken together, these two filings appear to be speaking in a unified voice as to the needs of the future of Amateur Radio in the United States"

The FCC acknowledged receipt of the Petition for Rulemaking on March 4, 2004. It is not known when it will be distributed for initial Public Comment. The ARRL Petition has not been assigned an RM (rulemaking) file number yet either.

---End of press release---

> The NCVEC has filed a petition on restructuring US
> licensing. You can obtain a PDF or RTF copy
> via one of the following:
>
> http://www.arnewsline.org/newspages/Morse%20Petition.pdf
>
> or
>
> http://www.arnewsline.org/newspages/Morse%20Petition.rtf
>
>
>
>

1079. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 00:58:13 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com>
Source record: 89193
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <19M5c.6058$CJ5.4340@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
<snip>
>> Try it the other way around -- suppose a community prosecutes a ham for
>causing
>> a nuisance, but the case is dismissed on the grounds of federal
>preemption. The
>> case doesn't need to stop there, as the preemption law can be challenged
>by the
>> community. If they have a good case, the FCC may not take the chance of
>losing
>> and will most likely drop the case or settle out-of-court.
>
>In your example, the FCC isn't the one making the preemptive argument...
>the defendent is. The FCC doesn't get the chane to drop anything.

If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.

<snip>
>> >So...the situation that a law exists can just be that the law hasn't
>> >been challenged.
>>
>> Ever hear of the Patriot Act?
>
>Your point?

The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional but has yet to be
challenged. As such it remains law.

>> >> so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
>> >> anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise
>legal
>> >hams
>> >> they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower authorities
>as
>> >they
>> >> did with HR2346.
>> >
>> >Yet I find no such "doom and gloom" predictions or examples being
>> >recorded in ham publications. The fact that some ill advised local
>> >government
>> >enacts a piece of law that "outlaws" interference doesn't

>> >makethe law immune to being overturned on the preemption
>> >basis.
>>
>> What you perceive as "ill advised" might just be a precursor to a
>challenge
>> against the FCC's authority over the matter.
>
>And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?

Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's avoidance of the same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.

>> > The argument for pre-emption, if made, doesn't even
>> >require the FCC to do so. the defendent's attorney can and likely
>> >would raise the argument.
>>
>> Assuming the attorney knows anything about FCC regs. Regardless, the judge
>can
>> rule any law as unconstitutional. It has been done many times before.
>Whether
>> that judgement holds up on appeal is another ball of twine.
>
>And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
>resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.

The keyword here is "yet".

>> >> So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people
>aren't
>> >going
>> >> to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic
>> >communications
>> >> devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be
>> >there to
>> >> defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They won't.
>And
>> >they
>> >> won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people,
>not
>> >a few
>> >> holier-than-thou hams.
>> >
>> >Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
>> >who the real smart ass is.
>>
>> Yep... anyone who smirks at a group of angry neighbors while hiding
>> behind a federal statute.
>
>Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
>name calling.

Nor does it change the fact that both you and the FCC are ignoring the basic democratic concept of 'majority rules'.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1080. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 01:00:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040316200049.23171.00004656@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 89194

In article <20040316180856.23307.00007339@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes. >>The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit >>(Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is >>not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.
>
>Jim:
>
>Don't look now, but ALL public transit in the United States exists mainly due >to state and federal subsidies which provide virtually all of the funding >needed
>for the procurement of vehicles, facilities, communications systems, and most >of the operating costs.

Not in the case of SEPTA and Amtrak! While there is some support, it is nowhere near the level of support in Europe.

More importantly, the support is not long-term.

> If public transit had to "pay it's own way," I, for >one
>public transit employee, would not have a job. I drive Paratransit in Kent >County, Delaware, and the cash I turn in from my fare box at the end of the >day would not pay for an hour's worth of my wages.

That's because of the location and route. Try a major metro area like Philly at rush hour.

>At best, a few of our
>more heavily utilized fixed-routes in Wilmington might just possibly pay for >the fuel consumed and other routine expenses, but wouldn't even come close >to covering all of the essential overhead.

The same is true of other forms of transportation. Airlines don't build airports, nor air traffic control systems, nor the weather and comm systems needed to run them.
>
>>>Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car >>>manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption >>>vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.
>>>

>>>Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70.
>>
>>Only in small cars.
>
>True, and that's part of the reason why diesel engines are not more common
>in U.S. passenger vehicles. Partly by necessity but mainly by preference,
>us Americans prefer to drive massive, heavy, inherently inefficient vehicles
>such as all those 4-wheel drive SUV's being driven exclusively on perfectly
>clear dry roads and highways.

I agree 100%.

>If only we were a lot smarter in our choices
>of vehicles, we could probably benefit from the many advantages of diesel
>engines, which can now be made as "clean" as gasoline engines.

Been that way for years. My 19080 Rabbit had to meet the same emission specs as
gasoline engines.
>
>>>And their
>>>performance is not less the gas engines.
>>
>>Agreed. But the first-cost is greater. And at US fuel prices, the difference
>>may not be worth it.
>
>It would be if we started viewing our vehicles as the mere transportation
>appliances they should be, and not as outward extensions of our personalities
>or demonstrations of our wealth.

Something I've said for years.

>>Suppose the diesel car gets 60 MPG and the equivalent gasoline car gets 40
>>MPG.
>>And suppose the car is driven 12,000 miles per year. That's 300 gallons of
>>gasoline vs. 200 gallons of diesel. If both fuels cost about the same (as
>>they
>>usually do in the USA), the saving is only $150-200 per year. Compared to
>>the
>>price of the car, insurance, repairs, maintenance, etc, that's not much
>>saving.
>
>Now consider a driver who must drive anywhere from 25 to 30,000 miles a
>year, for business purposes or just a particularly long commute from a rural
>area to the city where he/she works. Now the fuel cost savings of a diesel
>start to look very attractive indeed!
>
Maybe. Let's see - at 30K miles per year, the diesel burns 500 gallons per year
and the gasoline car 750 gallons. That's a sayings of 250 gallons per year. At
$2 per gallon, it's still not much of savings compared to other costs.

More important, the person who drives that much (such as a certain absent
rrapper who commutes ~120 miles per day) often wants a bigger car for the

perceived comfort and safety. (Note the word "perceived").

>>>So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
>>>your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
>>>You know, you are filling up CHEAP.
>>
>>Back in 1980 I bought a VW Rabbit Diesel. Over its 17 year lifetime, I got
>>43
>>mpg combined (I kept very accurate records). An equivalent gasoline Rabbit
>>would have probably done about 30 mpg.
>>
>>But the diesel engine cost $900 more back then. Considering all factors, I
>>didn't save very much driving an oil burner.
>
>If a high mileage diesel-engine version of the Ford Focus, Honda Civic,
>Toyota Corolla (my automobile!)

Toyota is the world leader in hybrid car technology. The Prius is an example.

>and every other econo-box in the same
>class as the VW Rabbit were available, then the additional cost wouldn't
>be so great as to skim the potential savings off from the top.

Not exactly. The manufacturers all use different engines. The cost differential
reflectes the added manufacturing cost of the diesel.

>Modern
>diesel engines are clean, efficient, and have more than adequate power for
>vehicles that would adequately serve over 80% of the American travelling
>public.

But you don't drive one!

>They are no more difficult to maintain than a gasoline engine of
>equivalent power, and generally last longer because they are, out of
>necessity, built stronger.

They are also less tolerant of poor maintenance, bad fuel, and sloppy driving.
They also have a bad reputation in some circles due to poorly designed engines
such as were used in some GM cars 20+ years ago.

> There's gotta be some reason why we aren't
>using more diesel power here in the U.S., but I am at a loss to explain it.

A combination of factors, but they fall into two categories: "Image" (diesels
are not perceived to be "cool" in the USA) and cost (gas is so cheap and
plentiful that most people don't worry about it much.)
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>2003 Toyota Corolla LE (Automatic)
>Averaging 30 MPG City, 41 MPG Highway
>
My old car got ~41 city, ~52 highway. With late-1970s technology in a car

weighing over 2200 pounds. The modern TDI VWs do even better.

Then there's the other end of the spectrum:

http://www.bath.ac.uk/~ccsshb/12cyl/

73 de Jim, N2EY

1081. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 01:55:39 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c38b6r$25ve3q$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89195

"Dave Heil" wrote ...

I've had better months and expect some when warm weather comes to stay for a while. Onward and upward!

We've had some very strange weather this winter here in Georgia. 30 in the morning, low 70's by noon. It seems that the warmer weather is going to stay -- good news. Hope the warmer weather where you are comes sooner rather than later.

Arnie -

1082. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 01:56:36 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c38b8l$24a809$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89196

"William" wrote ...

Hang in there while the last cold snap blows thru. Here, schools are
closed and we have to go downtown to refinance today - with the kids. Joy.

_____

Ditto, Hang in there.

Arnie -

1083. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) R

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:09:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <b_mdnfz3d7j6KMrdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89198

Brian Kelly wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ZrydnYGynpTcGsvdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Radionews wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>HAM RADIO ADVENTURE: COMMUNICATORS NEEDED FOR CAVEING EXPEDITION
>>>
>>>
>>>Gulf Coast United States, along with Caribbean, or South America base
>>>station operators are needed for communication on the ham bands with
>>>a scientific expedition. This, in July through August time frame.
>>>
>>>
>>>The 60 day expedition will explore deep caves in the high Andes
>>>mountains and jungle in the western Amazon area of South America.
>>>Expedition access to the remote areas is via trekking on foot and
>>>pack animal. The expedition will use a solar and battery powered 20
>>>Watt backpack transceiver. Antennas will be a wire dipole or
>>>vertical. A miniature notebook computer will be along for digital
>>>operations.
>>>
>>>
>>>Communications will consist of position reports, some short messages
>>>with families of expedition members, and any possible emergency or
>>>medical messages. All operation will be non-commercial.
>>>
>>>
>>>Operators with good base stations, efficient antennas and low noise
>>>locations are needed on the 40 through 15 meter amateur bands. The
>>>operations will use SSB, CW and a variety of digital modes. If you
>>>are interested, e-mail Bonnie Crystal, KQ6XA, at
>>>radioadventure@aol.com. (KC5FM, KQ6XA)
>>
>>Oh wow! I would think that something like a scientific expedition would
>>want some reliable communication that you can use anywhere and count on
>>at all times, like cell phones. Right witless willie?
>
>
> Uhhh . . don't particularly mean to bust yer stones here JJ but how
> many dialup cells do you suppose Verizon and/or AT&T or any other
> telco has up and running in the headwaters region of the Amazon?

>
> w3rv

Uhhh...precisely my point, but if you listen to witless willie cell
phones can always out do ham radio anywhere anytime.

1084. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:13:07 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <b_mdnf_3d7jWK8rdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89199

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<dt2dnZmiMJYhHMvdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>> >
>>
>>
>>
>>>>I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
>>>>play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>>>
>>>
>>>Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
>>>will be there if needed.
>>>Post a follow-up to this message
>>
>>And how in your infinite witless wisdom did you get out of this that I
>>said that cells phones are always down and my ham radio is always up?
>>I w i l l t y p e t h i s v e r y s l o o o o l y s o t r y t o
>> k e e p u p. I s a i d, *W H E N* t h e c e l l n e t w o r k i
>>s d o w n. The statement, *WHEN* it is down, implys that it is
>>sometimes up.
>
>
>
> "Ham radio WILL be there..."
>
> What about the part where ham radios never break down down?

Again you hallucinate, enlighten us, where did I ever state that ham
radios never break down?

1085. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:15:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89197

(quoting the NCVEC proposal)

> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
> voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage

What about the 110 AC line?

> and that only commercially
> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.

Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.

> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
> certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.

This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it *really"
means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on the 20 question
test!

It is precisely this sort of thing that messed up cb.

> The VECs Question Pool
> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
> be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination questions.

The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I did from
Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could safely build
transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these additional limits today?
>
> This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of the
> VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin.

Which means a third of them disapproved. Were the individual VEs polled?

This NCVEC thing is very similar to the "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
paper by KL7CC. I wrote a detailed commentary on it some time back.

NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying much...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1086. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:22:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2e6dnTxVnOp_Jcrd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89200
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> the station's transmission.
> > My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic
> emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
> device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
>
>

Shows you have very little experience unless maybe you are speaking of
cb operation. In my experience of over 40 years of ham radio operation I
have been involved in and had knowledge of *many* interference cases,
and the inteference problem is almost always caused not by the ham
station radiating excessive harmonic emission, poor filtering at the
transmitter, but with the falult of the device being interfered with
because of poor engineering, construction, and lack of shielding.

1087. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:44:22 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040316214422.935$D8@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89201
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
> > the station's transmission.
> > > My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive
> > > harmonic
> > emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver
> > (or device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
> >
> >
>
> Shows you have very little experience unless maybe you are speaking of
> cb operation. In my experience of over 40 years of ham radio operation I
> have been involved in and had knowledge of *many* interference cases,
> and the inteference problem is almost always caused not by the ham
> station radiating excessive harmonic emission, poor filtering at the
> transmitter, but with the falult of the device being interfered with
> because of poor engineering, construction, and lack of shielding.
>
The trouble is, how do you convince an irate neighbor that
their household electronics suck? They keep mass producing
the same crap so it's not going to get any better in that
respect.

I just bought a 52" tv for the family room, and it's a little
bit sensitive to my shack, not real bad tho. I'm more concerned
about messing up the screen.

My 27" or less tv's aren't really sensitive with my rf. (?)

If I had a neighbor tearing up my new 52" tv, he'd have a hard
time convincing me that it was my fault. License or not.

1088. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 02:50:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89202

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.

1089. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:13:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Dc2dnfNwtNDDX8rdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89203

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
>
>>European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes.
>>The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit
>>(Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is
>>not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.
>
>
> Jim:
>
> Don't look now, but ALL public transit in the United States exists mainly due
> to state and federal subsidies which provide virtually all of the funding
> needed
> for the procurement of vehicles, facilities, communications systems, and most
> of the operating costs. If public transit had to "pay it's own way," I, for
> one
> public transit employee, would not have a job. I drive Paratransit in Kent
> County, Delaware, and the cash I turn in from my fare box at the end of the
> day would not pay for an hour's worth of my wages. At best, a few of our
> more heavily utilized fixed-routes in Wilmington might just possibly pay for
> the fuel consumed and other routine expenses, but wouldn't even come close
> to covering all of the essential overhead.

Here is my take on Public Transit, Larry:

Is public transit a good thing, or a waste of taxpayers money? Is the
subsidy of public transit a liberal plot to undermine America's core
values, or what? (hehe, kind of melodramatic there!)

The use of public transit, even when subsidized by government, is a LOT
less than the amount of money that would be taken up by the construction
and maintenance of new highways that would be needed if everyone had to
use their own automobiles to get to work. These new roads would
eliminate valuable real estate from productivity, as well as the space
needed for parking the said automobiles. And guess where the money for
these new roads comes from? Taxes. Sometimes, ya just have to pay
something, I think.

>
>>>Thats why Volkswagen, BMW, Mercedes and all the other non-US Car
>>>manufacturers sell their "premium edition" multi cylinder high consumption
>>>vehicles to the States. They never could sell lots of them over here.

>>>
>>>Modern Diesel engines have a mileage per gallon of 60 or 70.
>>
>>Only in small cars.
>
>
> True, and that's part of the reason why diesel engines are not more common
> in U.S. passenger vehicles. Partly by necessity but mainly by preference,
> us Americans prefer to drive massive, heavy, inherently inefficient vehicles
> such as all those 4-wheel drive SUV's being driven exclusively on perfectly
> clear dry roads and highways. If only we were a lot smarter in our choices
> of vehicles, we could probably benefit from the many advantages of diesel
> engines, which can now be made as "clean" as gasoline engines.
>
>
>>>And their
>>>performance is not less the gas engines.
>>
>>Agreed. But the first-cost is greater. And at US fuel prices, the difference
>>may not be worth it.
>
>
> It would be if we started viewing our vehicles as the mere transportation
> appliances they should be, and not as outward extensions of our personalities
> or demonstrations of our wealth.
>
>
>>Suppose the diesel car gets 60 MPG and the equivalent gasoline car gets 40
>>MPG.
>>And suppose the car is driven 12,000 miles per year. That's 300 gallons of
>>gasoline vs. 200 gallons of diesel. If both fuels cost about the same (as
>>they
>>usually do in the USA), the saving is only $150-200 per year. Compared to the
>>price of the car, insurance, repairs, maintenance, etc, that's not much
>>saving.
>
>
> Now consider a driver who must drive anywhere from 25 to 30,000 miles a
> year, for business purposes or just a particularly long commute from a rural
> area to the city where he/she works. Now the fuel cost savings of a diesel
> start to look very attractive indeed!
>
>
>>>So, now you can rest back at your next refueling stop, let the gas go into
>>>your tank, and when at the cashier, just SMILE.
>>>You know, you are filling up CHEAP.
>>
>>Back in 1980 I bought a VW Rabbit Diesel. Over its 17 year lifetime, I got 43
>>mpg combined (I kept very accurate records). An equivalent gasoline Rabbit
>>would have probably done about 30 mpg.

>>
>>But the diesel engine cost $900 more back then. Considering all factors, I
>>didn't save very much driving an oil burner.
>
>
> If a high mileage diesel-engine version of the Ford Focus, Honda Civic,
> Toyota Corolla (my automobile!) and every other econo-box in the same
> class as the VW Rabbit were available, then the additional cost wouldn't
> be so great as to skim the potential savings off from the top. Modern
> diesel engines are clean, efficient, and have more than adequate power for
> vehicles that would adequately serve over 80% of the American travelling
> public. They are no more difficult to maintain than a gasoline engine of
> equivalent power, and generally last longer because they are, out of
> necessity, built stronger. There's gotta be some reason why we aren't
> using more diesel power here in the U.S., but I am at a loss to explain it.

There is a particulate emission problem for diesel engines, but I
suspect that can be solved. Probably the biggest problem in the past was
the lack of available fuel where we needed it. I don't think that is a
problem anymore, and I suspect that if fuel prices continue edging
upward, diesel may make a comeback.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1090. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:36:00 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <7n8f50571nmeh0hi32rp94fqhl4h1essi6@4ax.com>
Source record: 89204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <0eae50t0bsprp6umke76s3pq414gkc7oq2@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 06:50:32 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
<snip>
>>That's not what I have experienced. If these cheap devices are so suseptible to
>>fundamental RF transmissions, how can so many of them be used without trouble
>>next to radio and television stations?
>
>That depends. I've had cheap $5 phones which picked up radio stations
>faintly in the background, while in use. Switching to a more
>"bulletproof" phone eliminated the problem.
>
>Interference from a TV station would be harder to ascertain. The
>greatest power output in on the video carrier, which, when received by
>a simple diode detection (As in RFI rectification), sound like a
>buzzing noise, not too much different than electrical interference.

To me it sounds like a high-pitched whine.

>Frequency modulated audio does not rectify well, in this scheme and
>will also not usually be discernable as intelligent audio broadcasts,
>unless it is especially strong, or there is some frequency determining
>component which promotes slope detection in the face of the FM
>modulation.

Audio modulated FM doesn't rectify into audio at all unless there is an AM
component. Broadcast-quality limiters are quite good at eliminating AM from an
FM BC signal.

>> The majority of interference is caused to
>>televisions, and cordless phones ring in at second place on the list (excuse the
>>pun). They work on frequencies that extend from low VHF up to about 1 GHz, yet
>>there are almost no reports of interference above VHF. In fact, most of the
>>interference happens in the low TV channels and low-VHF cordless phones.
>
>
>I don't know about the latest generation of 2.4 GHz digital cordless
>phones, but back a few years, I had a neighbor who was 5 doors down
>the street who claimed he could hear me on his 49 Mhz cordless phone.
>I was running a bone stock 4 watt CB, which was spectrally clean. You
>might be able to make a case that the near field was especially strong
>due to antenna design issues. But even so, it should not have brought
>that phone to its knees, if it was properly shielded.

People are funny. When I was a kid I put up my first CB antenna on the roof. Like many people I spent the first few weeks just listening to the chatter. But not more than a week after the antenna went up I had a neighbor knock on the door whining about interference. A couple years ago I put up my first lowfer antenna. It is quite tall (60 ft.), and can be easily seen by the neighbors. But this antenna was used only for receiving, not transmitting. Well whaddya know, a couple weeks after the antenna went up another neighbor comes a'knockin' at my door whining about interference. Funny thing was that I hadn't even finished building the receiver!

>>Not
>>suprisingly, this is the area where harmonics from high HF are strongest.
>
>And ground wave propagation is also the most effective.

That's news to me. I always thought that ground-waves were best propogated around .5 to 5 MHz.....

>>And I
>>know for a fact that a ham can run 1kW on HF and not cause interference to
>>televisions, cordless phones, radios, or just about anything else accused of
>>having poor RFI rejection because I have seen more than one station that does.
>
>I can run 100 watts and not interfere with neighbor "A", but I destroy
>neighbor "B"'s TV. Neighbor B has a Sony TV, which are notorious for
>RFI issues.

Sony sucks all around. I would rather not get started on -that- issue, but the chances are that the Sony is bad. They work fine when they are new. But one spike on the antenna or coax and they will pick up RFI from anything and everything. If your radio is coming through a Sony I'll bet that you are not the only source of interference. However, if they have cable, it's a good idea to check it -- you could be inadvertently coupling RF onto their line.

>>And again, in the course of my job I have met more than a couple hams who
>>sincerly thought their signal was 'clean' only to find out it wasn't.
>
>I don't doubt that. Not all hams are RF savvy, even though they should
>be.

Well, learning is part of the hobby, right? What suprises me are the number of hams who think that they are running clean because they plugged in a LP filter, or because their radio was expensive. If it were only that simple.....

>>> Hams are not so much getting "cocky" as they are becoming
>>>increasingly defensive as more and more RFI problems are being leveled
>>>at their feet which didn't exist 10 or 15 years ago. The FCC should
>>>mandate tougher shielding specs for consumer widgets, and the majority
>>>of RFI problems would disappear.
>>
>>
>>There are indeed more and more RFI complaints than there were 10, 20, or even 30
>>years ago during the CB craze. This is not a matter of the quality of the

>>devices people have in their homes, but the sheer number of them that are
>>available these days compared to years ago.
>
>They are both true. There are more devices AND they are made with less
>regard for RFI protection.

It's true that they don't build 'em like they used to. Sony is a perfect example of that. But even there, if the device is working properly there usually isn't a problem. The problems occur when the device is made faulty by some other cause, such as line surges or CATV bullets. Now -that's- where product cheapness really shows it's ugly head.

>Case in point, I have a Fisher tube-type stereo receiver/amp, which
>was made in the late 60's. I could run all the power I ever wanted on
>any band, and there was nary a whisper out of that tube stereo. I
>recently replaced it for a "newfangled" JVC with a remote control,
>digital tuning, and all sorts of bells and whistles. My 4 watt CB
>destroys it. My 25 Watt 6 meter station blanks out the music
>(Fortunately it's FM so I don't get that awful feedback). Even my 2
>meter SSB station gets into it. Fortunately I don't operate the stereo
>and the radios at the same time, or I'd have to think seriously about
>going back to my old stereo.

That's surpising because JVC (RCA of Japan) is usually pretty solid stuff. Email me the model number and I'll see if there's a fix.

>>There was a time when a color television was a luxury,
>
>And hams running on 80 meters, close to the colorburst frequency of a
>TV would make the color vanish. A common problem back then.

And many hams would transmit using colorburst crystals because they were cheap and readily available. Some still do, but most realize the problem it creates.

>>yet nowdays people have TV's in almost every room.
>>Cordless phones were almost non-existent in the 70's, yet they are almost
>>standard issue in todays appliance market. But interference still occured to
>>these devices in the past just it does today.
>
>Some were more prone to RFI than others. Just changing brands could
>often cure an RFI problem.

That's because some were FM and some were AM. The AM phones will pick up harmonics just like a shortwave radio. The FM phones are mostly immune to RFI, even to harmonics that land on it's operating freqs. But even with FM, if the harmonic is strong enough it will dominate the discriminator.

>>They are no more suseptible to RFI
>>than they were 30 years ago -- on the contrary, since the frequencies used are
>>much higher, cable TV is much more popular, signal processing is more advanced
>>and the bandwidth response of tuners is better than ever, these devices actually
>>receive -less- interference than ever before.
>

>Yes and no. By having a TV receive through a shielded cable rather
>than from an external TV antenna, reduces the potential for RF front
>end overload, it does little to prevent RFI which creeps in through
>the A.C. line cord. Not all RFI comes in through the tuner.

No it doesn't. Modern TV's use switching supplies, a design which filters RF quite nicely. Older TV's used linear supplies where the transformer stopped RF dead in it's tracks. The way RF gets into a TV hooked to CATV (or a long run of coax to the antenna) is through an RF ground loop. You can eliminate the RFI either by ground-isolating the power lines and running a seperate ground wire adjacent to the coax (hard), or by powering the TV through an extention cord running adjacent to the coax for as long as possible (less hard).

>>But they are -not- immune to
>>harmonics that land on their operating frequencies, which, in my experience, is
>>the cause of almost all of the interference that is caused by intentional radio
>>transmissions.
>
>You're right, you can't expect a TV to reject an on-channel harmonic.
>But a properly operating radio should be operating with a -40 to -60
>(depending on year of manufacture) dbc harmonic suppression. At 100
>watts, a -50 dbc harmonic is 1 mW of radiated power. Not much in the
>grand scheme of things, and certainly no match for the grade A
>coverage footprint of a 50 KW TV station.

The emission limitations for broadcast stations are not based on decibels below the fundamental, but on absolute limits that are very, very low. And if you check the current FCC regs you will see that similar (and also very low) limits have been imposed for any new manufactured ham transmitters and amps. This was done in response to the FCC recognizing that receivers are more sensitive than ever before, and even harmonics of very low power can cause interference to the intended function of these receivers.

>>(I should point out that -most- radio and TV interference is not caused by radio
>>stations of any sort, but by light-dimmers, motor speed controls, computer power
>>supplies, wall-warts, coffee-makers, and a myriad of other switching devices
>>that connect directly to the power lines.
>
>On that point, I also agree. I once ran across a poorly designed Radio
>Shack TV signal preamp which had a nasty tendency to self oscillate in
>the 220 Mhz region. Every now and then it would drift into the input
>of our 220 repeater. Talk about a bugger to pin down.

Is that the one with the three BF960's? Stupid design if you ask me, putting three MOSFET's on a single board with no shielding between stages and set for an overall gain of 40 dB!

>>But of the cases where the source was
>>clearly a radio station, the cause was almost always harmonics.)
>
>Then I guess we have to agree to disagree, as I have had to mediate on
>several radio op's behalf to prove that their stations were not

>generating the interference (I was the only one with test equipment).
>The FCC's website has documentation on RFI issues and what consumers
>should do to reduce near field rectification and front end overload.
>In many cases, a high pass filter needed to be added to the TV to
>eliminate the problem. A.C. line interference was cured by wrapping a
>A.C. line cord around a toroidal ferrite core.

The toroidal choke works better if you split the wires and wind them in opposite directions on the core.

>I had a neighbor who, back in 1983, complained to the FCC about my
>station. It seems that he was happy as a pig in mud, until one day his
>TV died and he bought a new one. All of a sudden he started hearing me
>loud and clear though the speaker in the TV. He swore that I was
>suddenly running "big power". He just didn't want to make the
>connection that the problem didn't start until he got a new TV. The
>FCC sent me a letter informing me that they had received a complaint.
>I wisely sent them my ham call, even though I knew that it was the CB
>that my neighbor was hearing. The FCC, once they realized that I was a
>ham, literally let the matter drop. They referred me to a "TVI
>committee" (A group of hams who investigate RFI claims), but once we
>made initial contact, they dropped the ball, and I never heard another
>word.

Now this is what I'm talking about. It's like the FCC says RFI is a bad thing unless it comes from a ham, in which case the rest of the world must suffer.

>>>You can argue the relative difference between a person's "right" to
>>>enjoy their radio hobby versus another's "right" to enjoy internet
>>>porn. But if the ham is clean (and they usually are), it's not his
>>>problem directly.
>>
>>
>>I can argue that a person has the right to peaceful use and enjoyment of their
>>property and premises.
>
>Which includes a ham or CB station.

.....sic utere tuo ut alienum no laedas.....

>> And I'm not saying that all, or even most, hams run a
>>dirty station. In fact I believe quite the opposite. It's just a few hams that
>>are either too lazy to check their signal or too ignorant to realize the
>>possibility of harmonics.
>
>Well, keyclowns have to go somewhere when they upgrade.... ;-)
>
>
>>>>So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people aren't going
>>>>to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic communications
>>>>devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always be there to
>>>>defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal.

>>>
>>>This is not the case in most instances. You have to remember these are
>>>hams, not class "C" amp running CB'ers. Most hams understand RFI to
>>>some degree, and most ham equipment is manufactured to comply with
>>>spurious emissions requirements. Hams will do what they can to clean
>>>up their own act. But once they've done all that they can do on their
>>>end, if the problem's still there, then what?
>>
>>
>>If the ham has done everything reasonably possible on his end, it's very likely
>>the problem will be no more. But if it -still- exists then the neighbor must
>>decide whether he is willing to sacrifice his everyday appliances so the ham can
>>play with his radio. Federal law says the neighbor is screwed. Many local and
>>state laws state that the neighbor does not have to put up with such intrusions.
>>This is a conflict that must eventually be solved in the courts.
>
>And that is the crux of the matter. If a case can be made that the
>fault of the interference is caused by a dirty transmitter, then it
>becomes an easy case to mediate.

Not really, but anyway....

> If, on the other hand, the ham (or
>CBer) has done everything he can to make his station clean, but the
>neighbor is the victim of a poorly designed (Even if it's a $5000 HD
>TV) consumer product, then the only thing the ham can do, is not
>transmit. That may be an acceptable solution to the neighbor, but most
>hams love their radio as much as other people love TV, so it's back to
>who's rights carry more weight. That's not a case I'd want the courts
>to set precedent on, as they might just decide that mindless drivel
>such as "American Idol" or the umpteenth episode of "Friends" deserves
>more consideration than someone looking to further his electronics
>knowledge through the art of radio.

There is a difference here. The ham is transmitting a signal into someone else's
private space. The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham. It
should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
for anyone else. Point the antenna in a different direction. Use a different
antenna. Make an agreement with the other person to only transmit at certain
times (more commonly called 'sharing'). There is no reason a ham can't stop his
interference, or at least limit it to an acceptable level.

From a different perspective, and assuming you can prove that your signal is
clean, have you ever thought of suggesting to the person that they return the
merchandise as defective?

>>>> They won't. And they
>>>>won't because this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few
>>>>holier-than-thou hams.
>>>
>>>You might want to re-examine your conjecture there. While I would
>>>agree that logically the rule of the majority would make the most

>>>sense. But especially in the last several years, there have been
>>>increasingly small, but highly vocal, special interest lobbyists which
>>>have managed to thwart the wishes of the majority, and have been
>>>responsible for laws which protect the "rights" of certain minorities
>>>above and beyond what the majority enjoys. Take a look at political
>>>correctness if you have any doubts.
>>
>>
>>I agree with you 100%, and one of those "special interest" groups is the ARRL.
>>They have done more to defend those that cause interference than they have to
>>help resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both the hams -and- the general
>>public.
>
>They defend hams against "witch hunts", where the radio operator is
>automatically painted as a "bad guy" simply because he enjoys a
>different venue for his pass time. You cannot expect the non-technical
>consumer to understand the nuances of RFI. All they know is that when
>the ham next door transmits, he kills their "XYZ device", therefore it
>must be his fault.

Because it is. You are intruding into their homes. You take from them some of
the comforts of everyday life that any reasonable person would expect to enjoy
in the privacy of their own home. It's a nuisance like any other nuisance,
except that it's a nuisance which is protected by a federal law.

>>>The problem is with the cheap Chinese produced electronic devices.
>>>Something needs to be done to minimize their susceptibility to RFI.
>>
>>
>>Honestly, I don't believe that at all. I have yet to find one of these devices
>>that are ultra-suseptible to fundamentals on HF. If someone has an example,
>>please post it so I can get one and test it for myself.
>
>Go find one of those cheap phones that Radio Shack used to sell. They
>were one of the worst.

I had one and it caused me no problems.

> Grab a few touch lamps too, while you're there.

Touch lamps will respond to ghost farts.

>>>Trying to sweep the problem of RFI under the rug (and thereby saving
>>>XYZ company the cost of making RFI resistant devices) by persecuting
>>>legally operating hams is not , IMHO, the right solution. Remember,
>>>that what they do to hams, will also trickle down to CBers, since the
>>>RFI potential is worse on the CB band, with the preponderance of
>>>illegally operating stations who are there.
>>
>>
>>I think it's the other way around -- it is the illegal CBers that started the "I
>>don't care" attitude towards interference, and that attitude is being adopted by

>>some in the ham community.
>
>That has happened largely because most "normal" consumers don't know
>the difference between a ham and a CB'er. CB'ers have gotten a bad rap
>due to their blatant disregard of the rules and their penchant for
>operating high power and dirty amplifiers. In the consumer's mind
>Cb'er = Ham. I've had people tell me that I can't run 100 watts on the
>ham bands, and that they were going to call the FCC about it. Hams are
>starting to get tired of being lumped in with CB'ers, especially when
>there may be both an illegally running CB'er AND a ham in the same
>neighborhood. Guess which one is the likely cause of interference?

All the more reason for hams to pay attention to problems on the CB instead of
just trying to fence them out of the ham bands.

>>And yes, I believe the illegal CB problem far
>>outweighs the problems caused by a few asshole hams that learn their operating
>>practices from the keyclowns.
>
>Because in all likelihood, they used to be keyclowns themselves.

Very possible.

>> But when good hams start defending the bad hams by
>>wielding the sword of preemption, you can bet that the keyclowns will do the
>>same and the problem in both arenas will just get worse.
>
>PRB-1 does not apply to CB'ers, nor does many of the preemptions that
>were cited previously.

The FCC has sole jurisdiction over -all- issues regarding RFI. They have made
that perfectly clear.

> CB'ers should be allowed the protection that
>their service by rule provides. But since the federal government does
>not grant CB licenses to specific individuals, local governments have
>seized upon this to justify legislation which restricts CB operation
>in many municipalities. IMHO, there should be no difference between a
>legally operating and clean ham station and an equivalently operating
>CB station WRT interference protection. But the local municipalities
>are much less likely to bring action against a federally licensed ham,
>than an unlicensed CBer. Many legal CB'ers may have to fold their
>operations rather than having to pay a large amount of money to defend
>against such a case.

In re 960 Radio, Inc.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1091. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:47:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316224737.12501.00006781@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89208

In article <20040316200049.23171.00004656@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>My old car got ~41 city, ~52 highway. With late-1970s technology in a car
>weighing over 2200 pounds. The modern TDI VWs do even better.
>
>Then there's the other end of the spectrum:
>
>http://www.bath.ac.uk/~ccsshb/12cyl/

How does that apply to amateur RADIO policy?

Try the automotive newsgroups on the first floor. They are chock
full of mileage gas brags.

LHA / WMD

1092. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:47:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316224737.12501.00006780@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89209

In article <qdN5c.6528$GQ3.2287@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

> This is further supported by the fact that the NCVEC and ARRL
>petitions are similar in basic concept, and in fact agree on most issues.
>Taken together, these two filings appear to be speaking in a unified voice
>as to the needs of the future of Amateur Radio in the United States"
>
> The FCC acknowledged receipt of the Petition for Rulemaking on March
>4, 2004. It is not known when it will be distributed for initial Public
>Comment. The ARRL Petition has not been assigned an RM (rulemaking) file
>number yet either.
>
>---End of press release---

Good on the NECVEC! I got my copy and will look it over caarefully.

LHA / WMD

1093. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:47:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316224738.12501.00006782@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89206

In article <20040316180856.23307.00007339@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>If a high mileage diesel-engine version of the Ford Focus, Honda Civic,
>Toyota Corolla (my automobile!) and every other econo-box in the same
>class as the VW Rabbit were available, then the additional cost wouldn't
>be so great as to skim the potential savings off from the top. Modern
>diesel engines are clean, efficient, and have more than adequate power for
>vehicles that would adequately serve over 80% of the American travelling
>public. They are no more difficult to maintain than a gasoline engine of
>equivalent power, and generally last longer because they are, out of
>necessity, built stronger. There's gotta be some reason why we aren't
>using more diesel power here in the U.S., but I am at a loss to explain it.

Hello? This isn't the automotive newsgroup is it? Why are you
babbling all that in an amateur RADIO policy newsgroup?

LHA / WMD

1094. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:47:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89207

In article <1e4e3692.0403161512.150c02c5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40574A1D.EBC1F083@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> You know, Loon, you're not wrapped very tightly.
>
>Then it all balances out. Some here are wrapped too tightly.

Some have NO wrapping at all...as in the old tale of "The
Emperor's New Clothes." :-)

The fella who didn't know what or who an Iowa tourist location
was is too full of anger and resentment to be able to "wrap
himself" or exhibit any sense of humor. Everything has to be
"wrapped" Just So, nice precise uniform creases to opinions,
all marching in ranks like good little "service" men.

>> > Ho hum...all that about a hobby involving radios...
>>
>> ...and one in which you are not the least bit involved. If it bores you
>> (ho hum), why do you hang around?
>
>Because you cannot resist commenting.

...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is just
so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
NOT leave. :-)

LHA / WMD

1095. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:47:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040316224741.12501.00006784@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89210

In article <L6M5c.6477$GQ3.5342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040316133202.23171.00004648@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403160413.10de17bd@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<40563232.8028438E@earthlink.net>...
>> >>
>> >> You know, I've never needed your assistance in posting my comments to
>> >> the FCC before. What made you think I'd need it now?
>> >>
>> >> Dave K8MN
>> >
>> >Len stated, "It's also apparent that way too many commenters are
>> >trying to voice their grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
>> >
>> >Len did not state that "David Heil/K8MN is trying to voice his
>> >grievances to the FCC in the wrong place."
>> >
>> >What made you think he did?
>>
>> Mr. Foreign Serviceman thinks that every PUBLIC posting I make is
>> aimed straight at him and his ego wounds are grievous.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse thinks every PUBLIC posting I make is aimed
>> straight at him and he is mad as heck and can't take it any more.
>>
>> But, over 600 comments have been filed on NOI 03-104 since the
>> 04-29 NPRM was released...over 600 comments that will have no
>> effect on FCC decision-making on NPRM 04-29.
>>
>> As of the close of FCC business on 15 March 2004, the number
>> of comments on 04-29 and 04-37 are the SAME number as on
>> the close of business on 11 March 2004. No one seems to be
>> filing anything. Not even FISTS...but then "CW gets through when
>> nothing else will" according to them and they aren't worried about
>> Access BPL.

>>
>> Everyone else seems happy and content with personal in-fighting
>> in newsgroups instead of going out and DOING anything about
>> BPL. That shows everyone how "dedicated" they are to preserving
>> their hobby lifestyles. Dedication = nothing. Imagination and
>> fantasy = everything.
>>
>> LHA / WMD

Thank you, Dan.

Checking the FCC website ECFS for 16 March 2004 after the close of business there (about 8:10 PM EST), there were NO additional comments filed on 04-29 since 10 March 2004. There were only 2 comments on 04-37 by Lionel Booth, PE, N3LB, MARS AR6IP, and good old rambling Earl Gosnell III, also a licensed radio amateur.

Booth's comment is good since he is approaching the problem in broad terms, that of the electric power lines becoming actual RF radiators. Those affect ALL wanting to use HF to low VHF. It is a literate document and worth reading the 11 pages on file.

If folks don't want to trouble themselves with engineering details or EM theory, then at least they ought to scan the Booth document and say they SUPPORT it...in public...on the ECFS. The FCC sees all those and considers them for a final R&O.

It isn't difficult to file a comment at the FCC. Anyone can do it on-line for a short comment, no fancy formatting or word processing needed. Hundreds have already done so on other subjects. The FCC has made it EASY for ordinary citizens to comment.

There's no real excuse to sit like lumps in a bog, doing nothing but on-line newsgroup combat. That won't make Access BPL go away, won't stop the BPL interference from that power line in front of the house.

Red-dog the FCC ECFS, hit both 04-29 and 04-37. If anyone goes to 04-29 and wants to comment based on Booth's comment, then mention his filing under Et Docket 04-37 for 16 March 2004.

I can understand some who hate my guts for other reasons and won't want to mention my comments on both 04-29 and 04-37. But, LIonel Booth filed under 04-37 and he IS a licensed radio amateur as well as a registered Professional Engineer. At least reference Booth's comment and SUPPORT it.

LHA / WMD

1096. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 03:48:45 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <deif50pnqmpev6ius9k4c7gvcv2dfp4lhh@4ax.com>
Source record: 89205
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <2e6dnTxVnOp_Jcrd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> the station's transmission.
>> > My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic
>> emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
>> device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
>>
>>
>
>Shows you have very little experience unless maybe you are speaking of
>cb operation. In my experience of over 40 years of ham radio operation I
>have been involved in and had knowledge of *many* interference cases,
>and the inteference problem is almost always caused not by the ham
>station radiating excessive harmonic emission, poor filtering at the
>transmitter, but with the falult of the device being interfered with
>because of poor engineering, construction, and lack of shielding.

I have plenty of experience as an EE. My point was not that there are devices which are suseptible to RFI, but that the RFI can be eliminated by the ham if he really wants to do so. Most do, but some fall back on federal preemption as an excuse not to even try.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1097. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 04:13:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89211

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Official NCVEC Press Release:
>
> VECs PROPOSE NEW ENTRY LEVEL COMMUNICATOR HAM LICENSE
>
> The National Conference of VECs filed a Petition for Rulemaking on
> March 1, 2004 proposing their version of a new entry-level Amateur Service
> license and redistribution of some HF frequencies to General and Amateur
> Extra Class licensees.
>
> The petition, which is somewhat similar to the one filed by the
> American Radio League, requires no required demonstrated Morse code
> proficiency for any license class ...including Extra.
>
> The NCVEC proposed the same HF/VHF/UHF bands for the entry level
> class as the ARRL and both petitions grant more privileges to all classes.
> The VEC's proposal, however, allows wider voice subbands and less exclusive
> CW/digital frequencies. The NCVEC petition also places more emphasis on the
> use of 15 and 10 meters for entry-level voice operation than does the ARRL.
>
> The VECs proposed an additional 50 kHz of 80-meter voice spectrum
> over the ARRL proposal and 25 kHz more 40 meter voice spectrum for both the
> General and Extra Class. At 15 Meters, the General Class would get an
> additional 75 kHz of voice spectrum over ARRL proposal; Extra Class, an
> additional 50 kHz.
>
> The frequency privileges proposed for the new entry level class
> which the VECs want called the "Communicator" Class are:
>
> 80 Meters:
> 3950-4000 kHz (voice/image), 3550-3675 kHz (digital/CW).
>
> 40 Meters:
> 7250-7300 kHz (voice/image), 7050-7150 kHz (Digital/CW).
>
> 15 Meters:
> 21350-21450 kHz voice/image), 21050-21150 kHz (Digital/CW).
>
> 10 meters:
> 28.300-28.500 and 29000-29700 kHz (voice/image), 28050-28150 kHz
> (CW/Digital).
>
> All bands 6 Meters through 70 cm:

> Full Amateur privileges.
>
> The NCVEC envisions that all Novice Class operators would
> automatically become Communicator Class licensees as of the effective date.
> At the same time, Technician and Tech Plus amateurs would be upgraded to the
> General Class ...Advanced Class licensees would become Extra Class. The
> VECs believed that there was no other effective way to redistribute
> Novice/Tech Plus spectrum to the General and Extra Class without this
> automatic upgrade feature.
>
> This means that some 350,000 Tech/Tech Plus and 85,000 Advanced
> Class would not be testing for an upgrade to the next class. This amounts
> to about 60 percent or all current licensees and those in the two year grace
> period. On the other hand, the VECs anticipate a greatly expanded demand
> for entry-level ("Communicator") testing and license preparation material.
> Some 40,000 Novices would be automatically upgraded to the new entry level
> which would not only contain their existing frequency bands, but additional
> HF/VHF/UHF bands as well.

We already know what I think about that, so I'll pass on arguing this point

> The NCVEC proposes that existing Novice, Technician, Tech Plus and
> Advanced Class operators be issued a new Communicator, General or Extra
> Class license document upon their next renewal. The new privileges will
> "kick in," of course, as of the effective date. The Novice, Technician,
> Tech Plus and Advanced Class licenses will be permanently retired.
>
> The VECs suggested that Communicator Class call signs might come
> from the authorized but unallocated NA1AAA through NZ0ZZZ call sign block.
>
> Proposed entry level transmitter power is proposed to be 100 watts
> when the operation takes place below 24 MHz; 50 watts above. This is the
> same as the ARRL proposal.

I still want to see the people (tech's specifically) that have been
harmed by RF.

> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
> voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage

How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
Magloops?

These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!

I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.

> and that only commercially
> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.

This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a commercially built product be? mThe main reason I am in Amateur radio at all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.

I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL defense fund.

The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or something

> Communicator Class licensees may not install repeater or remote base
> stations, be a volunteer examiner or establish a club station.

That is pretty much like it is now, I think it makes sense

> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
> certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
> be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination questions.

Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than 25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.

What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had" to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.

If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97, there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book about the whole process and sign for that.

> This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of the
> VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin. While some
> areas of disagreement were to be expected, the fact that such an
> overwhelming majority of the VEC's approved the NCVEC petition speaks well
> for it's being representative of the true feelings and opinions of those
> most in tune with the examination process and the needs of the Amateur Radio
> community.
>

50 million flies can't be wrong.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1098. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 04:50:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qOQ5c.6585$CJ5.5509@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com...
> In <19M5c.6058$CJ5.4340@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> <snip>
> >> Try it the other way around -- suppose a community prosecutes a ham for
> >causing
> >> a nuisance, but the case is dismissed on the grounds of federal
> >preemption. The
> >> case doesn't need to stop there, as the preemption law can be
challenged
> >by the
> >> community. If they have a good case, the FCC may not take the chance of
> >losing
> >> and will most likely drop the case or settle out-of-court.
> >
> >In your example, the FCC isn't the one making the preemptive argument...
> >the defendent is. The FCC doesn't get the chane to drop anything.
>
>
> If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.

So if my town passes some nutty no interference law and the locals
then apply that law to a local ham and he then challenges the law
because he says federal law pre-empts it, then the FCC automatically
gets into the case? If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn
to sell you.

> <snip>
> >> >So...the situation that a law exists can just be that the law hasn't
> >> >been challenged.
> >>
> >> Ever hear of the Patriot Act?
> >
> >Your point?
>
>
> The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional but has yet
to be
> challenged. As such it remains law.

That is only your opinion and clearly not shared by congress,
the executive branch, nor any judiciary at this time.

> >> >> so it looks like the FCC's fear tactics aren't working
> >> >> anymore. If the FCC doesn't start enforcing violations by otherwise
> >legal
> >> >hams
> >> >> they run the risk of forfeiting some jurisdiction to lower
authorities
> >as
> >> >they
> >> >> did with HR2346.
> >> >
> >> >Yet I find no such "doom and gloom" predictions or examples being
> >> >recorded in ham publications. The fact that some ill advised local
> >> >government
> >> >enacts a piece of law that "outlaws" interference doesn't
> >> >makethe law immune to being overturned on the preemption
> >> >basis.
> >>
> >> What you perceive as "ill advised" might just be a precursor to a
> >challenge
> >> against the FCC's authority over the matter.
> >
> >And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?
>
>
> Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's avoidance of
the
> same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.

The authority hasn't diminished because of HR2346. All that
did was extend ability to take action against illegal
CB activity to local police (if and only if local
jurisdictions empowered their police to do so).

> >> > The argument for pre-emption, if made, doesn't even
> >> >require the FCC to do so. the defendent's attorney can and likely
> >> >would raise the argument.
> >>
> >> Assuming the attorney knows anything about FCC regs. Regardless, the
judge
> >can
> >> rule any law as unconstitutional. It has been done many times before.
> >Whether
> >> that judgement holds up on appeal is another ball of twine.
> >
> >And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
> >resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.
>
> The keyword here is "yet".

True...but "YET" has decades of case law behind it already.

> >> >> So believe what you want about the law -- the facts are that people
> >aren't
> >> >going
> >> >> to give up their entertainment, electronic conveniences and basic
> >> >communications
> >> >> devices just because some smart-ass ham thinks the feds will always
be
> >> >there to
> >> >> defend him even when he's too lazy to clean up his signal. They
won't.
> >> >> And they won't because this country is
> >> >> governed by the majority of the people,
> >> >> not a few holier-than-thou hams.
> >> >
> >> >Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
> >> >who the real smart ass is.
> >>
> >> Yep... anyone who smirks at a group of angry neighbors while hiding
> >> behind a federal statute.
> >
> >Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
> >name calling.
>
> Nor does it change the fact that both you
> and the FCC are ignoring the basic
> democratic concept of 'majority rules'.

How you come to that conclusion is beyond
comprehension.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1099. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 04:59:04 UTC
From: Hate ARRL <No.code@no.ham>
Message-ID: <4057daa4$0$97302$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 89213

Citizen Band was created when they started issueing licenses without a CW requirement.

1100. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 05:22:50 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnificent <tobaccoman42@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <cdbd7$4057e27d$d1cc5af5$32544@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89215

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com...
> (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
>
> > In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
> > voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>
> What about the 110 AC line?

Good glub OM, where did you get your technical facts?
110 VAC was the standard line voltage in 1927!
Today the standard is 125 VAC. Update your notes.

> > and that only commercially
> > manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>
> Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.

Sour grapes. Poo-Poohs. Cry me a river.
Same shi+ different day. Blah Blah Blah.
You old ham farts think everyone should know
code just because YOU had to learn it 40+
Years ago in a smoke filled room. OyVey
Bitch-Piss-and-Moan.....(playing my violin)

> > Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
> > multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
> > certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
>
> This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
*really"
> means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on the 20
question
> test!

How do you know that? You don't even know
what the present day standard Line Voltage is!

> The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I
did from
> Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could safely build
> transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these additional limits
today?

That was THEN - this is NOW.

I got my licence in 1969 btw and my first xmitter was
a DX-60B (which I built from a kit) and a Drake 2B.
Would I burden today's hams to do the same? No way.
It's a different era.

As someone said at a Bond Traders Luncheon I was
at 2 Months ago: "Glue-ing feathers to your ass
DOES NOT make you a rooster in the hen house".

> NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying much...

I'll give you that one. The ARRL is trying to backpeddle
big time as the hobby is dying on the vine with ever month
of the full-page listings of SK's. They should have been doing
this kind of restructuring 20 Years ago!! It's probably too
late now. EXAMPLE: Plunk a teenager in front of a new Yaesu HF station
and a 2 gHz Pentium w/DSL, DVD, CD burner and a Kazaa
account and *try to guess* which one he'll want to play with.....(grin)

1101. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 05:26:07 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac1ab7b30d4440598985b@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 89214

In article <4057daa4$0$97302$45beb828@newscene.com>, No.code@no.ham
says...
>
>
> Citizen Band was created when they started issueing licenses without a CW
> requirement.

From someone who entered via no-code and advanced to extra within a year
I take issue with that.

Perhaps the no-code license was the best thing that happened to amateur
radio. It removed an obstacle I wasn't ready to face at the time but
after a couple months I got my 5WPM code. And then a couple months later
my 13WPM and then the 20WMP.

What ticks me off is the watered down code requirement that we have now.
But in essence, we're all appliance operators now anyhow. It doesn't
really matter. And I think the days of amateur radio are numbered what
with BPL and such.

1102. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 09:21:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040317042131.29815.00003733@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 89216

In article <20040316224738.12501.00006782@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>If a high mileage diesel-engine version of the Ford Focus, Honda Civic,
>>Toyota Corolla (my automobile!) and every other econo-box in the same
>>class as the VW Rabbit were available, then the additional cost wouldn't
>>be so great as to skim the potential savings off from the top. Modern
>>diesel engines are clean, efficient, and have more than adequate power for
>>vehicles that would adequately serve over 80% of the American travelling
>>public. They are no more difficult to maintain than a gasoline engine of
>>equivalent power, and generally last longer because they are, out of
>>necessity, built stronger. There's gotta be some reason why we aren't
>>using more diesel power here in the U.S., but I am at a loss to explain it.
>
> Hello? This isn't the automotive newsgroup is it? Why are you
> babbling all that in an amateur RADIO policy newsgroup?
>
> LHA / WMD

Oh, and I forgot to mention -- diesel engines don't have any ignition system, therefore, no ignition system noise. This makes it much easier to operate mobile HF from an automobile with a diesel engine!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1103. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 10:59:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040317055917.15923.00004373@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89218

In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
>> voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>
>How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
>Magloops?

Or dipoles? Or antenna tuners? Or line-powered power supplies?
>
>These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
>are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
>safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!
>
There's a logical inconsistency in this requirement. The purpose of safety
questions in the written test is not so much to protect an amateur from the
consequences of his/her own ignorance as to protect *others*.

> I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
>limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.

Consider this: In most areas that I know of, a homeowner can work on his/her
electrical wiring without a license or test of any kind. Same for plumbing.
Just can't do it to somebody else's house as a "professional" - meaning for
money.

So a Communicator could legally wire or re-wire his/her entire house, but could
not legally *operate* a TS-520. Or even a solid-state rig with 48 volt
finals....because he/she might hurt themselves!
>
>> and that only commercially
>> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>
> This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a
>commercially built product be?

1) To sell more commercially built products (read the "21st Century" paper - it
talks about how we need more hams or the ham equipment manufacturers will close
up shop).

2) To get new hams in the habit of buying, not building

3) To eliminate even more theory from the written test

>The main reason I am in Amateur radio at
>all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.

>
More to the point: How many hams do we lose each year to electrocution from
their transmitters? How many hams cause serious interference problems with
their home-brew or restored rigs?

> I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must

>drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL
>defense fund.

The Dr. Pepper contingent will have a fit!

> The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or

>electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built
>transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from
>foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or
>something

But they would legally be allowed to build power supplies for their
commercially built rigs....

>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
>> certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
>> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
>> be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination questions.
>
> Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than
>25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.

Me too. You should see the tests they give second-graders here.

The old Novice test was originally 20 questions, then 25, then 30. Most of the
added questions were concerned with safety and the expanded privileges. Novices
are allowed to homebrew anything they can legally use on the air.
>
> What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought
>in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was
>still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had"
>to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange
>method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.

Where do you think NCVEC got the idea about the rules?
>
> If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97,
>there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book
>about the whole process and sign for that.
>
BINGO!

Check this out:

From the 1976 ARRL License Manual:

NOVICE (1976)

Study Question #31:
Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
(a) battery with internal resistance, (b) resistive load, (c) voltmeter,
(d) ammeter.

Study Question #32:
From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
by the load be determined?

Study Question #33:
In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?

Study Question #34:
Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having the
following components: (a) triode vacuum tube, (b) pi-network output tank, (c)
high voltage source, (d) plate-current meter, (e) plate-voltage meter, (f)
rf chokes, (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.

Study Question #35:
What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?

The actual exam was multiple choice, and would show a schematic of the
amplifier circuit - close, but not exactly like the one shown inthe license
manual - and had 5 of the components labelled "a" thru "e". The question would
be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?"
"what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"

That was for a Novice!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1104. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 10:59:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89217

In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
>Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
>
He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a year
now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1105. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 11:41:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403170341.1f1f4abe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89219

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
>
> > In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
> > voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>
> What about the 110 AC line?
>
> > and that only commercially
> > manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>
> Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.

Tafkarj, there's no point to reading the rest of your comments.

You're only here for intelligent discourse concerning amateur radio.

Right!

1106. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 11:44:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403170344.10dc6c66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89220

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:

> > Proposed entry level transmitter power is proposed to be 100 watts
> > when the operation takes place below 24 MHz; 50 watts above. This is the
> > same as the ARRL proposal.
>
> I still want to see the people (tech's specifically) that have been
> harmed by RF.

It makes sense in light of the present rf hazard calcs that we have to perform.

But I've not seen anyone claimed to have been harmed by rf.

1107. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 12:01:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403170401.59ed3527@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89221

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
> in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is just
> so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
> eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
> NOT leave. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Sort of like a repeater. He hears sumptin he don't like, and not
being a Control Op, he can't turn off the machine.

1108. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 12:10:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403170410.502ef05d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89222

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<b_mdnf_3d7jWK8rdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<dt2dnZmiMJYhHMvdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> >>> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> >>>>I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> >> >>>>play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>>Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
> >> >>>will be there if needed.
> >> >>>Post a follow-up to this message
> >>
> >> >>And how in your infinite witless wisdom did you get out of this that I
> >> >>said that cells phones are always down and my ham radio is always up?
> >> >>I w i l l t y p e t h i s v e r y s l o o o o l y s o t r y t o
> >> >> k e e p u p. I s a i d, *W H E N* t h e c e l l n e t w o r k i
> >> >>s d o w n. The statement, *WHEN* it is down, implys that it is
> >> >>sometimes up.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> > > "Ham radio WILL be there..."
> > >
> > > What about the part where ham radios never break down down?
> >
> > Again you hallucinate, enlighten us, where did I ever state that ham
> > radios never break down?

I think I've got your statements figured out.

Cell phones or cell phone systems may break down and leave you w/o communications.

Amateur radio may break down and leave you without communications.

1109. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 12:18:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040317071810.12631.00005561@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89223

In article <20040317042131.29815.00003733@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Oh, and I forgot to mention -- diesel engines don't have any ignition system, >therefore, no ignition system noise. This makes it much easier to operate >mobile HF from an automobile with a diesel engine!
>
That's generally true, Larry.

But many modern diesel engines use electronically-controlled fuel injectors. The control circuits to these injectors can be a source of electrical noise. But said noise can be fixed.

Another advantage we didn't mention was that diesel cars generally have higher-capacity electrical systems, mostly because of the starting requirements. My Rabbit's diesel engine was rated at 48 hp - and had a 2 hp starter, 63 AH Series 24 battery and 55 amp alternator. I could jump-start almost anything with a 12 volt electrical system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1110. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 12:46:07 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <greg50hsnfuj1onhg8lm124i3qg5i9iggn@4ax.com>
Source record: 89224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <qOQ5c.6585$CJ5.5509@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com...
<snip>
>> If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.
>
>So if my town passes some nutty no interference law and the locals
>then apply that law to a local ham and he then challenges the law
>because he says federal law pre-empts it, then the FCC automatically
>gets into the case? If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn
>to sell you.

No. If the town loses based on federal preemption, they may have standing to appeal on the grounds that the federal preemption law is unconstitutional (or on some other grounds), at which time the agency responsible for the law being challenged (the FCC) would be enjoined.

>> The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional but has yet
>to be
>> challenged. As such it remains law.
>
>That is only your opinion and clearly not shared by congress,
>the executive branch, nor any judiciary at this time.

It seems to be the popular opinion of congress despite the fact that they initially held a different opinion. Didn't you listen to the to the last State-of-the-Union speech? And how can anyone with standing challenge the constitutionality of the Act when it is under those laws that anyone, even a natural-born US citizen, can be locked up for months or even years on only the -suspicion- of terrorism, without a trial, without being charged with a crime, without access to legal representation, without visitors, without due process of law..... without any of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution? That's what the Patriot Act allows the government to do. Do -you- think those laws are constitutional? If you do, then think about this: Under the Patriot Act, the same thing can happen to you. All that needs to happen is for someone to claim that you threatened someone with a weapon, and if the powers that be don't like your choice of breakfast cereal, you too can become a political prisoner in the great United States of America. That's all it takes under the Patriot Act. And if you didn't know that about the Patriot Act then you really need to spend a little more time catching up on current events.

>> >And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?
>>
>>
>> Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's avoidance of
>the
>> same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.
>
>The authority hasn't diminished because of HR2346. All that
>did was extend ability to take action against illegal
>CB activity to local police (if and only if local
>jurisdictions empowered their police to do so).

Before HR2346 the FCC was either unwilling or unable to effectively enforce the Citizen's Band. Cause or effect, take your pick because in either case their authority suffered until they conceded a portion of their jurisdiction to local authority. Since nothing has improved at the FCC since that time, it's very likely that they will concede more of their jurisdiction in the future.

>> >And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
>> >resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.
>>
>> The keyword here is "yet".
>
>True...but "YET" has decades of case law behind it already.

So did abortion before Roe vs. Wade.

>> >Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
>> >name calling.
>>
>> Nor does it change the fact that both you
>> and the FCC are ignoring the basic
>> democratic concept of 'majority rules'.
>
>How you come to that conclusion is beyond
>comprehension.

In case you missed it (or just ignoring it), I said that "this country is governed by the majority of the people, not a few holier-than-thou hams," which is true. But instead of addressing the issue you decided to whine about name calling. To wit: "Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up who the real smart ass is." I have refrained from "name calling", yet you are still avoiding the issue that the majority rules under a democracy, and that hams are not the majority -- not even close. Do you have an opinion about that, or would you rather go back to whining about name calling?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1111. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 13:12:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <99Y5c.6705$CJ5.4074@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:greg50hsnfuj1onhg8lm124i3qg5i9iggn@4ax.com...
> In <qOQ5c.6585$CJ5.5509@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com...
> <snip>
> >> If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.
> >
> >So if my town passes some nutty no interference law and the locals
> >then apply that law to a local ham and he then challenges the law
> >because he says federal law pre-empts it, then the FCC automatically
> >gets into the case? If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn
> >to sell you.
>
>
> No. If the town loses based on federal preemption, they may have standing
to
> appeal on the grounds that the federal preemption law is unconstitutional
(or on
> some other grounds), at which time the agency responsible for the law
being
> challenged (the FCC) would be enjoined.

WHO would enjoin the FCC. If the town loses, just who would then
enjoin the FCC on appeal to. Typically, the town wins on the
local level (i.e. the local court/magistrate or whatever. The appeal is
then on a state appeals court basis by the defendent. IF, the
state appeals court then reverses...or perhaps it even goes to the
state supreme court where it is appealed, I still see no one directly
engaging the FCC in the court process.

> >> The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional
> >> but has yet to be challenged. As such it remains law.
> >
> >That is only your opinion and clearly not shared by congress,
> >the executive branch, nor any judiciary at this time.

> It seems to be the popular opinion of congress despite the fact that they
> initially held a different opinion. Didn't you listen to the to the last
> State-of-the-Union speech? And how can anyone with standing challenge the
> constitutionality of the Act when it is under those laws that anyone, even

a
> natural-born US citizen, can be locked up for months or even years on only
the
> -suspicion- of terrorism, without a trial, without being charged with a
crime,
> without access to legal representation, without visitors, without due
process of
> law..... without any of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution?

Personally I'm not at all worried about it.

> That's what
> the Patriot Act allows the government to do. Do -you- think those laws are
> constitutional? If you do, then think about this: Under the Patriot Act,
the
> same thing can happen to you. All that needs to happen is for someone to
claim
> that you threatened someone with a weapon, and if the powers that be don't
like
> your choice of breakfast cereal, you too can become a political prisoner
in the
> great United States of America.

People threaten others all the time and no one is being locked up
as you suggest. Now if someone threatens ala the terrorits in Spain,
then I have no sympathy for them. For all the hew and cry of
the liberals against the Patriot act they can't cite one example
of abuse to any US citizen.

> That's all it takes under the Patriot Act. And
> if you didn't know that about the Patriot
> Act then you really need to spend a
> little more time catching up on current events.

I repeat again, I have no worries about myself.

> >> >And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?
> >>
> >> Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's
> >> avoidance of the same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.
> >
> >The authority hasn't diminished because of HR2346. All that
> >did was extend ability to take action against illegal
> >CB activity to local police (if and only if local
> >jurisdictions empowered their police to do so).
>
> Before HR2346 the FCC was either unwilling or unable to effectively
enforce the
> Citizen's Band. Cause or effect, take your pick because in either case
their
> authority suffered until they conceded a portion of their jurisdiction to
local

> authority. Since nothing has improved at the FCC since that time, it's
very
> likely that they will concede more of their jurisdiction in the future.

Your opinion only. The HR2346, does not give cart blanche
power to local government to simply shut down legally operated
CB stations. HR2346 allows local governments to empower their
local police to enforce existing FCC rules and regs regarding
CB. It does NOT allow local government to create more
intrusive or more restrictive CB rules. For example, a town can
not simply outlaw all CB activity, a town can not ban CB
antennas, etc.

> >> >And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
> >> >resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.
> >>
> >> The keyword here is "yet".
> >
> >True...but "YET" has decades of case law behind it already.
>
> So did abortion before Roe vs. Wade.

But in the area of law we are discussing, YET has still
prevailed. The truth is, most local law enforcement don't
care or want to be bothered with things like radio
interference, etc. There's no glory in it and winning
in court requires significant technological proof.

> >> >Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
> >> >name calling.
> >>
> >> Nor does it change the fact that both you
> >> and the FCC are ignoring the basic
> >> democratic concept of 'majority rules'.
> >
> >How you come to that conclusion is beyond
> >comprehension.
>
> In case you missed it (or just ignoring it), I said that "this country is
> governed by the majority of the people, not a few holier-than-thou hams,"
which
> is true. But instead of addressing the issue you decided to whine about
name
> calling. To wit: "Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
> who the real smart ass is." I have refrained from "name calling", yet you
are
> still avoiding the issue that the majority rules under a democracy, and
that
> hams are not the majority -- not even close. Do you have an opinion about
that,
> or would you rather go back to whining about name calling?

Actually, majority doesn't always rule. For example, a town
can not outlaw antennas for CB, Ham, or anything else just
because a majority of people might want that. A town can't
impose a set of "approved" colors for which I would
only be allowed to paint my house (small exception in that arena
for special historic districks). A town can not prohibit me
from parking my legally registered car/truck in my driveway.
A town can't outlaw operation of CB, Ham or any other
federally permitted radio service.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1112. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 13:28:52 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <vkfg5052tbavduo9ptb5sf7n0jtfml8m9g@4ax.com>
Source record: 89226
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 08:20:40 -0800, Frank Gilliland

>>But Jim's point is valid. If your transmitter is truly "dirty", then
>>you will interfere with your own equipment as well as any neighbors.
>>Harmonics do not discriminate. If you can demonstrate to your
>>neighbors that you can watch TV, listen to the stereo, and surf the
>>internet with RFI immunity, it lets the air out of their balloon.
>
>
>Jim also pointed out that changing the direction of the antenna can help.
>Harmonics don't come off a beam as if it were isotropic.

Likely, if changing a beam heading helps, it's probably reducing the
near field strength of the interfering signal, below the point of
susceptibility. The same can hold true for any harmonic content as
well.

>>On the other hand, I used to live about a mile and a half away from
>>both an FM radio station's transmitter, a directionally phased AM
>>broadcast transmitter and a "low power" AM broadcast transmitter.
>>Those things used to come though all sorts of poorly shielded stuff.
>>It wasn't the stations' fault, we were just getting hammered with a
>>large RF field. Every now and then the phone company would have to
>>come out and tighten their connections, as they would act like an
>>antenna, and a poor joint would become a diode and we'd have a radio
>>station in the background when talking on the phone. It wasn't a dirty
>>transmitter. It was near field rectification, and RF overload. The
>>plus side of all this, was that the local area was so used to dealing
>>with the "bleed" from the commercial stations, that RFI shielding was
>>a priority for utilities, and that worked in my favor as a CBer and
>>ham.
>
>
>I run into the same issues. In fact, my house sits smack-dab center of an
>interference lobe from a two-tower Class A station, and I can even pick it up on
>my scope. But it doesn't cause any interference with anything else, not even any
>of the sensitive audio equipment I service from time to time. If an electrical
>connection is corroded, that may indeed cause interference from a local source
>via unintentional rectification, but I haven't found that to happen nearly as
>often as some people claim. This discrepancy may be due to the larger wavelength
>of the broadcasted signal from the station, but I haven't seen any evidence to
>support that conclusion, either.

I guess conditions vary. I've talked to people who have claimed that
they could hear our nearby broadcast station through appliances that
shouldn't be able to receive radio signals. Granted, this is only
anecdotal evidence, as I didn't witness it personally. But I would
wonder why these people would need to lie about something like that.

>>>On the other hand, the station has had incidents where it was the -receiver- of
>>>RFI despite a level of filtering above and beyond what should be required to
>>>prevent interference (much of which I have installed myself). Filtering does
>>>nothing to stop RFI when the transmitter is dirty.
>>
>>And filtering a transmitter does nothing when fundamental signal
>>rectification is the cause of the RFI.
>
>
>No it doesn't.
>
>
>>> I have to prove this fact to
>>>at least a couple hams each year by parking the van outside their house and
>>>showing them their spurs on the spectrum analyzer.
>>
>>I have my own analyzer and my station IS clean. Now what?
>
>
>Are your neighbors picking up your signal?

Now, no (at least I don't think so, as I don't have much time to "do
radio" these days. However, back in my "radioactive" days in the old
neighborhood, I heard many second and third party accounts of hearing
my station through phones, cheap clock radios, and equally cheap
stereos. TV's I didn't bother, as a rule, except for a few notable
exceptions, where I didn't herringbone the picture (as the classic
case of harmonic interference would manifest itself), but instead my
audio would blast through the speaker (Which should never occur as the
TV's audio receiver is FM, and I was using AM), which smacked of
rectification in the audio stage of the TV.

>
>Finding the source of RFI is just like troubleshooting any other piece of
>electronic equipment. Take your spectrum analyzer to where the interference is
>occuring -- it doesn't do any good to measure signal strength where it doesn't
>matter.

Ah, but it does matter! I was verifying that the signal I was putting
into the air with my equipment was clean, and I did that.

You touched on some interesting external causes of RFI. There have
been cases where strong near field signals have been rectified by
corroded connections (like metal gutters or siding), and the signal
reradiated as a form of intermodulation, which can have the same
effect as harmonic generation. In this case, the transmitter is clean,
but the effects of the surrounding area can mimic a dirty transmitter.

I've even seen a case where a poor joint in a ham's antenna, caused a spur to be generated. This is especially troublesome in repeater operation, where these IMD products can desense the repeater's receiver.

But unless these culprits are on your own property, you have no control over them. If I find that "harmonics" were being generated as a result of rectification in my next door neighbor's siding (a different neighbor from the one complaining from RFI), what can I do? I'm not about to pay to re-side his house, and he's under no obligation to do it himself.

> Also, what are the devices that are receiving the interference? If you
>bring those same devices into your home (assuming you don't have interference
>with your own stuff, as per Bill's example), does it still pick up RFI? If you
>add a device to filter the fundamental does it still receive interference? Is
>the interference entering the device from the antenna, the power line, or some
>other unknown route? Is there RF on your power feed? Does either house have
>aluminum siding? If the RFI is coming through the TV, is it interfering with the
>audio or video, or both?

Those are all intelligent questions to ask, when trying to get to the bottom of the issue. The problem is that in many cases, you won't have access to the problem devices, as the neighbor may not be receptive to "that radio asshole" tampering with his stuff. Also, I am not comfortable with adding any devices to people's equipment, as in their eyes, any future problems that they may have with their equipment, will automatically be the fault of the work that you did. It doesn't matter that you and I know that this is a ridiculous conclusion. But remember, we're dealing with non-technical people here, and that is the least of the wild theories that they come up with. I had a radio associate about 20 years ago, who had a neighbor who bought a new TV (it was a Sony), who then started getting TVI. Then this neighbor also started having reception problems, and blamed it on the radio op's large beam antenna (even when the radio op was not transmitting). Never mind the fact that this neighbor's other TVs worked alright. But the neighbor insisted that beam antenna was blocking signals only to his new Sony TV. It didn't help that a local TV repairman could not find anything obviously wrong, and concurred that it was "likely" that the radio op had something to do with the problem. We joked about it, and nicknamed the radio op's beam the "Sony Signal Sucker" (Or S.O.S. for short). But this situation illustrates the lunacy of dealing with the non-technical mind.

>
>Some of these might sound like silly questions, but putting a bunch of silly
>answers together can draw a very different picture.

Those are hardly silly questions! They get right to the core of the issue. But sometimes solving them is the real challenge.

>And it's very possible that
>the device or devices in question simply need repair. But since I don't have the
>whole picture I can't say one way or the other.

If would call the installation of devices to limit exposure to near
field RF, a "repair". One that should 've been made at the factory.
But those $.50 worth of parts add up when factored against millions
of consumer devices, and has an impact on profit. Considering that RFI
situation are not likely for most consumers, the manufacturers took
the risk of cutting corners in the name of increased profit.

>>> And these are hams who swear
>>>up and down that their signal is clean and that the problem is with the
>>>neighbors equipment.
>>
>>It usually is, trust me.
>
>
>You are right, it usually is. But a few aren't. Those are the one's I was
>talking about.

There are a few bad apples in every bunch. That's why we have so many
entitlement programs. Some people just don't get the concept of
personal responsibility.

>I thought I said this before, but I'll say it again: I don't think that all
>hams, or even most hams, run dirty stations. I believe most of them -do- run
>clean. The problem, as I stated before, is a few hams that don't have a clue and
>are going to ruin it for the good ones.

That's true in many facets of life. That's why I am attempting to
throw some cold water on the assumption that the problem is bigger
than it really is, and that the fault lies with the radio op in the
majority of the cases.

> But then again, I'm not a ham and I'm
>not about to defend any of them, good or bad. I see things from a bit different
>perspective because of my job, and until you have done the same job for a few
>years I don't expect you to see it the same way.

Granted.

> But I -would- expect you to
>consider what I have to say because it is what I have seen first-hand. And what
>I have seen is that unintentional rectification is a far less common source of
>interference than poorly filtered transmitters. You may have seen different, and
>that's fine. Our tower cranks out several thousand watts 24/7, and one would
>think that with that kind of power unintentional rectification would be a major
>problem. It isn't, at least not here. Maybe it's a geographical thing....

I can't explain it either. But I've been a party either directly or as
a "consultant" to other people, who have had RFI issues. From
proximity lights, to burglar alarms, to smoke detectors, computer
speakers, and all sorts of other electronic devices, many of which do

not contain a receiver in them at all. How can a device with no
receiver, discriminate between a dirty transmitter and a clean one? Is
it more likely that a device like an amplified computer speaker, is
responding to a -20dbc (I would consider that "dirty") harmonic, or
the full strength fundamental?

>>>The rest get a
>>>complaint filed with the FCC by the station because they are interfering with
>>>the station's transmission.
>>>
>>>My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic
>>>emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
>>>device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
>>
>>I've been doing radio for over 30 years now and I've seen exactly the
>>opposite. Most of the cases (and the FCC database backs this up) of
>>RFI are the fault of the receiving equipment. When you run a squeaky
>>clean 4 watt CB, and 100 watt H.F. ham gear and you still have
>>interference complaints, with all filtering, grounding, and proper
>>antenna decoupling in place, it's usually not the ham's fault. If
>>you're going to fight the fight, it's helpful to have all of your
>>facts straight before you do.
>
>
>The FCC 'investigators' rarely visit the scene to determine the cause of
>interference. If you read those cases in the FCC database they simply reflect
>what is claimed by one party or the other, but usually by the ham.

The FCC had investigated a number of cases. They also rely on
competent independent engineers to do so as well. It didn't take them
long to realize that the majority of cases were the fault of
inadequately shielded C.E. devices. They also have a fact sheet which
addresses what to do if you receive interference on a telephone, since
a telephone has no receiver, and therefore has no reason to have any
RF on it. Other devices fall under the same parameters.

Some may try to make the case that the FCC dropped the ball, and
should have done a more thorough job. But my own experiences back up
what the FCC has concluded.

> Check the
>records for interference claims regarding commercial stations and you will see a
>very different picture.

I would offer that commercial stations have a financial and public
relations agenda, which would be more than sufficient motive for
limiting their exposure as an RF "bad guy". If they can "explain" away
RFI problems as IMD products from another transmitter (A "sloppy" ham
for instance), they can deflect their responsibility in the matter.

I have an Icom 706 HF transceiver. I can hear a strong local AM
broadcast station on its fundamental frequency, the second harmonic,

and the third harmonic, which falls right below the 80 meter band. If
I turn off the radio's preamp, the harmonic goes away. I also have a
Yaesu FT-757, on which I do not hear the same interference. Now, based
on my own investigation, I would conclude that the Icom's receiver
preamp is being overloaded by the fundamental signal from the radio
station, and is creating IMD products or some other spurs. Is this the
fault of the radio station? What makes my situation any different from
a consumer device problem other than I am technically able to diagnose
the real problem on my own? Should I have complained to the radio
station? Would you not agree that my "interference" was the fault of
my own equipment?

>>>BTW, I should point out that we at the station take care of our listeners and
>>>respond to complaints of interference to our signal wherever they occur (within
>>>our contour).
>>
>>I would propose that your motives are less altruistic and more to do
>>with market impact.
>
>
>Damn straight! It's good PR, great WOM advertising, and it's well within the
>station's rights to try to resolve any source of interference to its signal.

Even if it means deflecting their part of it onto a nearby ham by
suggesting that his transmitter is "dirty"?

>Actually, the campaign started because of a couple broadcast pirates that were
>messing up the band. Go figure....

I love radio pirates. Not because they defy the law. But I enjoy the
raw, un packaged productions. Nowadays most commercial stations are
clones of hundreds of others. They've taken the creativity and local
personality out of individual markets in the name of a "proven"
corporate strategy. The result is a network of bland cookie cutter
programming, which lacks the style and depth that I remember from the
60's and the early 70's.

>>> Many times that interference is caused by radio operators, legal
>>>or not. We determine the nature of the interference then attempt to resolve it.
>>>If it is caused by a radio operator that is unwilling to clean up his act then
>>>the station files a complaint with the FCC.
>>
>>Unwilling or unable? It's tough to solve a problem that's not yours to
>>solve. Other than giving up your radio hobby.
>
>
>Unwilling. I haven't seen a case yet where a ham (or even a keyclown) wasn't
>able to keep his signal off the TV, radio or cordless phones if he made the
>effort.

I have. Other than offering to buy the neighbor a new TV or other
"device" that's more RF immune, once you're within your technical

spec's, there's often not much else you can do other than reducing
your power, or reducing the amount of time to spend "talking".

> Mind you that there are still some old single-conversion radios that
>seemingly scan for the most obnoxious RFI on the band, and there is nothing you
>can do about that except replace them. Fortunately, they are usually old and
>cheap.

No they're not, that's my point. There are still MANY of these "signal
seeking" widgets on the market. My JVC stereo, amplified computer
speakers, Sony TV's, the list goes on. I have ham friends who, either
for themselves or as a "favor" (to themselves actually) to their
friends and neighbors, will take their 2 meter HT with them when they
go to a place like Best Buy to look at new TV's. Waving the HT in
close proximity to each TV while it is on will reveal which ones are
somewhat immune to RFI and which ones are problems in the making.
Lines in a picture or buzzing sounds out of the speaker, are signs
that this is not the TV for you.

>And the problem -is- your's to solve if you are the source. That's not law, it's
>just decent social behavior. If we choose to live communities, we should really
>learn how to respect the others in the community instead of shoving a federal
>regulation in their face and saying "tough titties" (that may not be the way it
>is intended, but that's the way it sounds to the other guy).

I agree with this 100%. The problem is that many neighbors wait until
they've had it "up to here" with the problem before calling your
attention to it. By then they've become somewhat belligerent, and not
too receptive to you tampering with their stuff (not that I'd want to
for the earlier reasons). They will also insist that YOU, the ham, pay
for it all because, after all, the ham is "causing" the problem, even
if the symptoms are the fault of the poor C.E. device. I had another
ham friend who hung a tray full of high pass filters on his front door
with a note that basically said, "For TV interference, take one filter
and call me in the morning".

>>> We get a better response from the
>>>FCC than do a few angry neighbors because the station pays a lot of money to
>>>stay on the air, and the FCC responds to money, not people.
>>
>>
>>Exactly!
>
>
>And ain't it a shame!

It's reality.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1113. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 13:59:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <105gmdrml94sn32@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89227

Not here.... mine worked great!

Ryan KC8PMX

> In the power outage of August 2003, I personally experienced the erratic
> availability of cell phones.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1114. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:14:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>
Source record: 89228

N2EY wrote:
> In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
>>>voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>>
>>How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
>>Magloops?
>
>
> Or dipoles? Or antenna tuners? Or line-powered power supplies?
>
>>These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
>>are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
>>safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!
>>
>
> There's a logical inconsistency in this requirement. The purpose of safety
> questions in the written test is not so much to protect an amateur from the
> consequences of his/her own ignorance as to protect *others*.

Sure. And there is no logical argument that can convince me that safety
shouldn't be practiced from the start. It doesn't have to be safety
officer level, but it has to be there, and it has to be there from the
start.

>> I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
>>limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.
>
>
> Consider this: In most areas that I know of, a homeowner can work on his/her
> electrical wiring without a license or test of any kind. Same for plumbing.
> Just can't do it to somebody else's house as a "professional" - meaning for
> money.
>
> So a Communicator could legally wire or re-wire his/her entire house, but could
> not legally *operate* a TS-520. Or even a solid-state rig with 48 volt
> finals....because he/she might hurt themselves!

That's why they shouldn't be allowed to have electrical tools! ;^)

>>>and that only commercially
>>>manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.

>>
>> This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a
>>commercially built product be?
>
>
> 1) To sell more commercially built products (read the "21st Century" paper - it
> talks about how we need more hams or the ham equipment manufacturers will close
> up shop).
>
> 2) To get new hams in the habit of buying, not building
>
> 3) To eliminate even more theory from the written test

zzzzzzzzzz..... now *that* sounds like a much fun as a stick in the eye.

>>The main reason I am in Amateur radio at
>>all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.
>>
>
> More to the point: How many hams do we lose each year to electrocution from
> their transmitters? How many hams cause serious interference problems with
> their home-brew or restored rigs?

>
>> I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must
>
>
>>drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL
>>defense fund.
>
>
> The Dr. Pepper contingent will have a fit!

If they provide enough money, then maybe they will be the one!

>>The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or
>>electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built
>>transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from
>>foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or
>>something
>
>
> But they would legally be allowed to build power supplies for their
> commercially built rigs....

Right! we'll have to work on that! The goal is no booboo's. We have to
protect the new hams from themselves. So I would amend the proposal to
not allow Communicator's to use ANY voltages over 48 volts.

Maybe they should wear aluminum foil hats too?

>>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>>>multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and

>>>certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
>>>Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
>>>be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination questions.
>>
>> Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than
>>25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.
>
>
> Me too. You should see the tests they give second-graders here.

> The old Novice test was originally 20 questions, then 25, then 30. Most of the
> added questions were concerned with safety and the expanded privileges. Novices
> are allowed to homebrew anything they can legally use on the air.

I have always though that having more questions on a test made the test
easier! If you have a twenty question test, you don't have to miss many
to get a failing grade.

>> What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought
>>in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was
>>still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had"
>>to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange
>>method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.
>
>
> Where do you think NCVEC got the idea about the rules?

But didn't learn much else. Maybe they should check the aftermath of
that example.

>> If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97,
>>there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book
>>about the whole process and sign for that.
>>
>
> BINGO!

Testing would certainly be easier!

> Check this out:
>
> From the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>
> NOVICE (1976)
>
> Study Question #31:
> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
> (a) battery with internal resistance, (b) resistive load, (c) voltmeter,
> (d) ammeter.
>
> Study Question #32:
> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can

> the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
> by the load be determined?
>
> Study Question #33:
> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
> order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
>
> Study Question #34:
> Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having the
> following components: (a) triode vacuum tube, (b) pi-network output tank, (c)
> high voltage source, (d) plate-current meter, (e) plate-voltage meter, (f)
> rf chokes, (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>
> Study Question #35:
> What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>
> The actual exam was multiple choice, and would show a schematic of the
> amplifier circuit - close, but not exactly like the one shown inthe license
> manual - and had 5 of the components labelled "a" thru "e". The question would
> be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?"
> "what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>
> That was for a Novice!

Good questions! And actually not all that hard. Sounds like an
enjoyable test to take.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1115. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:21:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170621.71218151@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89229

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
> > HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
> > with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
> > "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
> >
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.

Uh huh...
>
> But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
> mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
> what he gets.

I guess you meant "Len", Brain...but another typo, per the
LennieRant of "typo = rage" must mean we're getting under you skin!
Too bad!

Yeah...he does...Offers himself up as a "professional", scolds
EVERYONE for allegedly not knowing about anything not directly Part 97
related, then makes stupid, easily caught errors.

Kinda like you, Brain, without the assertion of "professional".

Steve, K4YZ

1116. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:22:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170622.5ffd0576@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89230

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message news:<1e4e3692.0403161512.150c02c5@posting.google.com>...

> Because you cannot resist commenting.

And YOUR excuse, SillyWilly, is...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1117. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:25:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89231

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
> in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is just
> so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
> eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
> NOT leave.

And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.

Fair enough...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1118. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:36:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4058626E.9080407@psu.edu>
Source record: 89232

William wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
>>> Proposed entry level transmitter power is proposed to be 100 watts
>>>when the operation takes place below 24 MHz; 50 watts above. This is the
>>>same as the ARRL proposal.
>>
>> I still want to see the people (tech's specifically) that have been
>>harmed by RF.
>
>
> It makes sense in light of the present rf hazard calcs that we have to perform.
>
> But I've not seen anyone claimed to have been harmed by rf.

I was nailed by maybe 50 watts of RF one time on the tip of my finger.
I was tuning up a MFJ tuner, and there was a problem somewhere. The
metal band on the tuner apparently capacitively coupled me to the tuning
cap and shazam! Darned if RF burns don't hurt a LOT.

I think that NCVEC and ARRL and others are missing the boat here. With
the likely disappearance of Morse as a requirement, they are simply
proposing *another* caste system, in which there is an elite, and an
underclass ghetto of people with what to me seem to be radically reduced
privileges. I don't have anything against different levels, but this
seems like too much discrimination.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1119. Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:44:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>
Source record: 89233

Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC, ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some sense.

The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"

We DON'T learn do we?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1120. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 14:58:05 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94AF6560E1C97elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89234

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com:

> (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
>
>> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low voltage to the final
>> transmitter amplifier stage
>
> What about the 110 AC line?
>
>> and that only commercially
>> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>
> Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.
>
>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
>> certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
>
> This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
> *really" means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on
> the 20 question test!
>

Agreed

> It is precisely this sort of thing that messed up cb.
>
>> The VECs Question Pool
>> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what
>> would be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination
>> questions.
>
> The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I
> did from Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could
> safely build transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these
> additional limits today?
>>
>> This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of the
>> VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin.
>
> Which means a third of them disapproved. Were the individual VEs
> polled?
>

No, I wasn't

> This NCVEC thing is very similar to the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
> Century" paper by KL7CC. I wrote a detailed commentary on it some time
> back.
>
> NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying
> much...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

It has some improvements over the League's plan, but that all depends on your perspective.

I'm not in favour of making the theory requirements easier. Both of these plans upgrade all the Techs to General just to add a lower class licence without increasing the number of classes. This is because they know the FCC won't accept anything that makes the end result more complicated.

I don't think we need an easier theory test to attract people. If someone is genuinely interested they will learn the theory. What we need is simply publicity. Most people are scarcely aware that ham radio even exists.

The code test does need to be dumped to get over the hurdle of potential recruits who immediately lose interest when it is mentioned. No-code licencing for VHF+ did not eliminate that problem, no matter what anyone says to the contrary. Any intelligent person knew that code testing was only postponed if they wanted HF. However, most people don't even get that far. Our visibility is zero. Besides, I am sure that the FCC will eliminate Element 1 anyway.

By all means restructure, but these petitions are misguided.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1121. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:00:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94AF65C4B99AEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89235

"Hambone the Magnificent" <tobaccoman42@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:cdbd7$4057e27d$d1cc5af5$32544@snip.allthenewsgroups.com:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
>>
>> > In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low voltage to the final
>> > transmitter amplifier stage
>>
>> What about the 110 AC line?
>
> Good glub OM, where did you get your technical facts?
> 110 VAC was the standard line voltage in 1927!
> Today the standard is 125 VAC. Update your notes.
>
>> > and that only commercially
>> > manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>>
>> Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.
>
> Sour grapes. Poo-Poohs. Cry me a river.
> Same shi+ different day. Blah Blah Blah.
> You old ham farts think everyone should know
> code just because YOU had to learn it 40+
> Years ago in a smoke filled room. OyVey
> Bitch-Piss-and-Moan.....(playing my violin)
>
>> > Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>> > multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read
>> > and certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
>>
>> This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
>> *really" means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on
>> the 20 question test!
>
> How do you know that? You don't even know
> what the present day standard Line Voltage is!
>
>> The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I
>> did from Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could
>> safely build transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these
>> additional limits today?

>
> That was THEN - this is NOW.
>
> I got my licence in 1969 btw and my first xmitter was
> a DX-60B (which I built from a kit) and a Drake 2B.
> Would I burden today's hams to do the same? No way.
> It's a different era.
>
> As someone said at a Bond Traders Luncheon I was
> at 2 Months ago: "Glue-ing feathers to your ass
> DOES NOT make you a rooster in the hen house".
>
>> NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying
>> much...
>
> I'll give you that one. The ARRL is trying to backpeddle
> big time as the hobby is dying on the vine with ever month
> of the full-page listings of SK's. They should have been doing
> this kind of restructuring 20 Years ago!! It's probably too
> late now. EXAMPLE: Plunk a teenager in front of a new Yaesu HF station
> and a 2 gHz Pentium w/DSL, DVD, CD burner and a Kazaa
> account and *try to guess* which one he'll want to play with.....(grin)
>
>

It's 120v actually, not 125, and the International IEC standards are
115v/60Hz and 230v/50Hz

1122. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:13:15 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <8oqg50db20ds69b79di8irdc4b36a7dkef@4ax.com>
Source record: 89236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <99Y5c.6705$CJ5.4074@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:greg50hsnfuj1onhg8lm124i3qg5i9iggn@4ax.com...
>> In <qOQ5c.6585$CJ5.5509@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>> >news:nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com...
>> <snip>
>> >> If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.
>> >
>> >So if my town passes some nutty no interference law and the locals
>> >then apply that law to a local ham and he then challenges the law
>> >because he says federal law pre-empts it, then the FCC automatically
>> >gets into the case? If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn
>> >to sell you.
>>
>>
>> No. If the town loses based on federal preemption, they may have standing
>to
>> appeal on the grounds that the federal preemption law is unconstitutional
>(or on
>> some other grounds), at which time the agency responsible for the law
>being
>> challenged (the FCC) would be enjoined.
>
>WHO would enjoin the FCC. If the town loses, just who would then
>enjoin the FCC on appeal to. Typically, the town wins on the
>local level (i.e. the local court/magistrate or whatever. The appeal is
>then on a state appeals court basis by the defendent. IF, the
>state appeals court then reverses...or perhaps it even goes to the
>state supreme court where it is appealed, I still see no one directly
>engaging the FCC in the court process.

Are you really that confused, or are you intentionally trying to complicate the
issue?

>> >> The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional
>> >> but has yet to be challenged. As such it remains law.
>> >

>> >That is only your opinion and clearly not shared by congress,
>> >the executive branch, nor any judiciary at this time.
>
>> It seems to be the popular opinion of congress despite the fact that they
>> initially held a different opinion. Didn't you listen to the to the last
>> State-of-the-Union speech? And how can anyone with standing challenge the
>> constitutionality of the Act when it is under those laws that anyone, even
>a
>> natural-born US citizen, can be locked up for months or even years on only
>the
>> -suspicion- of terrorism, without a trial, without being charged with a
>crime,
>> without access to legal representation, without visitors, without due
>process of
>> law..... without any of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution?
>
>Personally I'm not at all worried about it.

You should be. Everyone should be worried, because if they can pass laws like that, the next act of congress might include a provision that might take away basic civil rights that affect you directly.

>> That's what
>> the Patriot Act allows the government to do. Do -you- think those laws are
>> constitutional? If you do, then think about this: Under the Patriot Act,
>the
>> same thing can happen to you. All that needs to happen is for someone to
>claim
>> that you threatened someone with a weapon, and if the powers that be don't
>like
>> your choice of breakfast cereal, you too can become a political prisoner
>in the
>> great United States of America.
>
>People threaten others all the time and no one is being locked up
>as you suggest.

Some people are indeed being locked up. But what I am suggesting is that this law is wide open for abuse by the government, and there is little chance for any victims to challenge it because those same victims are locked up tight and stripped of their right to mount any sort of legal defense.

> Now if someone threatens ala the terrorits in Spain,
>then I have no sympathy for them. For all the hew and cry of
>the liberals against the Patriot act they can't cite one example
>of abuse to any US citizen.

There have been such cases. If you can't find the energy to look them up yourself I'll do it for you when I get home from work later today.

>> That's all it takes under the Patriot Act. And
>> if you didn't know that about the Patriot

>> Act then you really need to spend a
>> little more time catching up on current events.
>
>I repeat again, I have no worries about myself.

Maybe it's better you don't.

>> >> >And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?
>> >>
>> >> Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's
>> >> avoidance of the same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.
>> >
>> >The authority hasn't diminished because of HR2346. All that
>> >did was extend ability to take action against illegal
>> >CB activity to local police (if and only if local
>> >jurisdictions empowered their police to do so).
>>
>> Before HR2346 the FCC was either unwilling or unable to effectively
>enforce the
>> Citizen's Band. Cause or effect, take your pick because in either case
>their
>> authority suffered until they conceded a portion of their jurisdiction to
>local
>> authority. Since nothing has improved at the FCC since that time, it's
>very
>> likely that they will concede more of their jurisdiction in the future.
>
>Your opinion only.

Right or wrong, my opinion is shared by many, and I'm not the first person to
have it.

> The HR2346, does not give cart blanche
>power to local government to simply shut down legally operated
>CB stations.

Oh come on now, what's up with this word-twisting game? I never said anything
about the FCC passing "cart blanche" to local yokels.

> HR2346 allows local governments to empower their
>local police to enforce existing FCC rules and regs regarding
>CB. It does NOT allow local government to create more
>intrusive or more restrictive CB rules. For example, a town can
>not simply outlaw all CB activity, a town can not ban CB
>antennas, etc.

I agree 100%. So why do you think I said anything different?

>> >> >And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
>> >> >resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.
>> >>
>> >> The keyword here is "yet".
>> >

>> >True...but "YET" has decades of case law behind it already.
>>
>> So did abortion before Roe vs. Wade.
>
>But in the area of law we are discussing, YET has still
>prevailed. The truth is, most local law enforcement don't
>care or want to be bothered with things like radio
>interference, etc. There's no glory in it and winning
>in court requires significant technological proof.

Local LE's do indeed have a stake in the elimination of RFI at the local level because the FCC doesn't do the job at the federal level. If you do a thorough search on google you will find dozens upon dozens of local ordinances that outlaw RFI despite federal preemption. Many of them exclude hams, many don't. And local LEA's are especially concerned when the FCC interferes with the prosecution of anyone that causes RFI which disrupts their local emergency and vital services (Helm v. Louisville Two-Way Radio Corp.,(Ky. 1984); Southwestern Bell Wireless, Inc. v. Johnson County Board of Commissioners,(10th Cir. 1999)). The desire was there, and so was the proof. The deciding issue was federal preemption. But hey, nothing lasts forever.

>> >> >Your generalization doesn't change your derogatory
>> >> >name calling.
>> >>
>> >> Nor does it change the fact that both you
>> >> and the FCC are ignoring the basic
>> >> democratic concept of 'majority rules'.
>> >
>> >How you come to that conclusion is beyond
>> >comprehension.
>>
>> In case you missed it (or just ignoring it), I said that "this country is
>> governed by the majority of the people, not a few holier-than-thou hams,"
>which
>> is true. But instead of addressing the issue you decided to whine about
>name
>> calling. To wit: "Again, your derogatory name calling pretty much sums up
>> who the real smart ass is." I have refrained from "name calling", yet you
>are
>> still avoiding the issue that the majority rules under a democracy, and
>that
>> hams are not the majority -- not even close. Do you have an opinion about
>that,
>> or would you rather go back to whining about name calling?
>
>Actually, majority doesn't always rule. For example, a town
>can not outlaw antennas for CB, Ham, or anything else just
>because a majority of people might want that.

Interesting thought.....

> A town can't
>impose a set of "approved" colors for which I would
>only be allowed to paint my house (small exception in that arena
>for special historic districks). A town can not prohibit me
>from parking my legally registered car/truck in my driveway.

Have you ever heard of a 'planned community'? I think they have a new phrase to describe them these days, but the concept is the same: If you buy property in a neighborhood, as part of the sale you must agree to follow the bylaws of the neighborhood. I don't know if it's legal, but it's done.

>A town can't outlaw operation of CB, Ham or any other
>federally permitted radio service.

Who said they can? More word-twisting? I just said "majority rules in a democracy", and it does. If the majority is fed up with FCC's lack of action regarding RFI complaints, you can bet that eventually the majority will speak and be heard at the federal level. That's the way this country works (most of the time, at least).

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1123. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:23:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89237

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...

> You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
> clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
> role in emergency response communications.

Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
MiniLennie...

I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.

Can you/do you refute this?

> > What I HAVE stated in this and other forums is that Amateur Radio
> > CONTINUES to provide a necessary and almost irreplaceable asset.
>
> To the exclusion of all other communications means. At least until
> you posted the above.

An absolute Brian Burke mistruth.

Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?

Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?

> NO
> > OTHER RADIO SERVICE provides the flexibility and utility that Amateur
> > Radio does.
>
> You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
> flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.

Oh...?!?! How?

(this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
him to his face...)

When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
communicate with your cellphone?

> > I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.
>
> Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
> Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.

So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)

> > > > These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
> > > > from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
> > > > benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
> > > > the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
> > > > programs.
> > >
> > > And cell phones.
> >
> > How well does a cellphone operate without a functioning cellsite,
> > Brain?
>
> Don, if you can say my cell site is dead, I can say your ham radio is
> dead.

When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
switch to a data mode or SSB.

So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
ignorance...but you've done THAT well...

> > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
> > role.
>
> Just did.

No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
supported by a shred of evidence.

> > I have NEVER said anything even CLOSE to the idea that we're the
> > only game in town. Quite the contrary.
>
> You omit any discussion that any other radio service or common carrier
> can provide emergency comms. That is a form of lying.

First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
Amateur Radio.

> > I >>HAVE<< said we provide a service to those who make the plans
> > and need the help.
>

> Until the emergency happens, you don't know who your customer might be
> or if you can provide a service to him or her.

Ahhhh...but I do...

You see, Mr Clueless, there are things called "MOU's", or
"Memorandum of Understanding", that exist between agencies for just
these instances.

Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".

Is it possible to train or prepare for ALL eventualities...?!?!
Of course not, but short of The Rapture or complete nuclear
annihilation, I'd say most responding agencies have SOME plan in
place.

ARES has MOU's with nearly every state EMA in the Union. That
pretty well puts them in a positon to be able to train with just about
everyone they will need to be in touch with during any given
emergency.

> Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
> not emergencies.

Sure they are.

Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course
not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,
power grids will fail, etc etc etc.

Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?

> > > > > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > > > > > a valuable asset.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > > > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > > > > comm outages?
> > > > >
> > > > > How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
> > > > > involvement?
> > > >
> > > > You'll have to ask Dee.
> > >
> > > I am asking you.
> >
> > You'll have to ask Dee.

Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.

> > > > Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
> > > > employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
> > > > LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.
> > >
> > > And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?
> > >
> > > Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
> > > communications during the east coast power outage?
> >
> > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
>
> Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
> played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
> outages?

You interject adjectives again, Your Cowardness. You also tried
to skate around answering MY request to cite the post wherein you
alledge I say such a thing...

Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
documented fact.

> > > Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?
> >
> > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
>
> Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular sites are
> capable of operating in an emergency?

Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
been studying...???

> Just making a clarification. Just trying to get your non-verbals on
> paper.

No clarification needed, Brain, unless you have a rectal-cranial
inversion that you need resolved (which is reasonably apparant from
your posts)

As for "non-verbals", we're still waiting for YOUR "non-verbals",
ie: from whom you got permission to operate Amateur Radio in Somalia,
and by what United Nations authorizaton that person had to GIVE you
that authority...

I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war
zone with...?!?!

> > "Emergency comms" are NOT >>only<< when the wires are down or the
> > cell site destroyed, Brain.

>
> JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
> always up. That is the picture he paints.

Is it?

> > Perhaps if you were actively involved in the programs of some
> > disaster mitigation agency you might have a better insight as to what
> > Amateur Radio's OTHER roles are...?!?!
>
> I was a MARS volunteer and BST member. I have no problem with that
> concept. But there sure are a lot of DP planners running around with
> cellular telephones nowadays.

Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.

When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
mitigation exercise in ANY role?

> > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > > a major role in emergency comms.
> >
> > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > compliant devices?
>
> Sure. Why not?

OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
played a major role in emergency comms".

Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
services" playing a "major role".

To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
a meaningful, positive outcome.

So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
pertinent examples.

And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.

> I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.

Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
substantiate.

You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???

Steve, K4YZ

1124. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:30:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170730.70f24d8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89238

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<G-OdnfHFPsqHHcvdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > You lie. You were w/o ham capability prior to becoming licensed.
>
> It would be obvious to anyone with more than three working brain cells
> that the statement applies to the period in which I hold a valid ham
> radio operator's license.

JJ...common sense and a bit of adult maturity would have
precluded any reasonable person in this forum from using such a lame
and childish "answer"...

More evidence that this coward has nothing valid to offer except
childish sandlot accusations. Did we expect anything less?

Steve, K4YZ

1125. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:41:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403170741.176d07d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89239

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040313012418.07155.00001230@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <05t4c.11586$t16.6732547@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com...

> Most of those were broadcast towers, Dee.
>
> The Emergency Communications Center was right next door and
> became damaged by falling debris which also cut several landline
> trunks.

And up until they DID fall (which was NOT immediately after being
hit), those systems DID operate. They did NOT operate AFTER the
Towers collapsed.

> >Those calls that did get
> >through took over 30 minutes to do so, which is a real problem in handling
> >emergency communications.
>
> Of course...and all the NYFD and NYPD radios were all cell phones,
> right? Gosh, somehow they managed to get there anyway!

They got there based on dispatches via repeaters that were on the
Towers, neither of which immediately collapsed after being struck.

There are reams of documentation of how those repeaters failed,
Lennie, and the subsequent lack of "talk-around" (simplex to you and
me...) capabiltiy in the EMS and Fire Service HT's...or at least any
contingency planning for redirecting thier communications to simplex
and how to do it...

BTW, Lennie...Unless you're refering to "New York Floral
Delivery" you have once again erred...

The Fire Service in the City of New York is "FDNY"...Fire
Department of New York"

> Think AHEAD...

Good advice...when are YOU going to take it...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1126. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 15:59:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405875FF.4000003@psu.edu>
Source record: 89240

Not if you needed to call Dee, it didn't! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Not here.... mine worked great!
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
>
>>In the power outage of August 2003, I personally experienced the erratic
>>availability of cell phones.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>
>

1127. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 16:08:14 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <kglg50ppln06c7i7ort7tfs9lb8115popk@4ax.com>
Source record: 89241
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 19:36:00 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <0eae50t0bsprp6umke76s3pq414gkc7oq2@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 06:50:32 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
><snip>
>>>That's not what I have experienced. If these cheap devices are so suseptible to
>>>fundamental RF transmissions, how can so many of them be used without trouble
>>>next to radio and television stations?
>>
>>That depends. I've had cheap $5 phones which picked up radio stations
>>faintly in the background, while in use. Switching to a more
>>"bulletproof" phone eliminated the problem.
>>
>>Interference from a TV station would be harder to ascertain. The
>>greatest power output in on the video carrier, which, when received by
>>a simple diode detection (As in RFI rectification), sound like a
>>buzzing noise, not too much different than electrical interference.
>
>
>To me it sounds like a high-pitched whine.

I guess it depends on what you're hearing it through. The 15.734 Khz
horizontal sweep rate is more like a whine. The 60 Hz vertical sweep
component is more like a buzz.

>
>
>>Frequency modulated audio does not rectify well, in this scheme and
>>will also not usually be discernable as intelligent audio broadcasts,
>>unless it is especially strong, or there is some frequency determining
>>component which promotes slope detection in the face of the FM
>>modulation.
>
>
>Audio modulated FM doesn't rectify into audio at all unless there is an AM
>component. Broadcast-quality limiters are quite good at eliminating AM from an
>FM BC signal.

Exactly! So any intelligible sound that passes through a TV's audio
section is being rectified in a place that it has no business being,

usually well past the limiter stages. This phenomenon is reflective of
poor design. In many of these cases, the RFI entered through the A.C.
line cord and got coupled into the audio amp stages.

>>I don't know about the latest generation of 2.4 GHz digital cordless
>>phones, but back a few years, I had a neighbor who was 5 doors down
>>the street who claimed he could hear me on his 49 Mhz cordless phone.
>>I was running a bone stock 4 watt CB, which was spectrally clean. You
>>might be able to make a case that the near field was especially strong
>>due to antenna design issues. But even so, it should not have brought
>>that phone to its knees, if it was properly shielded.
>
>
>People are funny. When I was a kid I put up my first CB antenna on the roof.
>Like many people I spent the first few weeks just listening to the chatter. But
>not more than a week after the antenna went up I had a neighbor knock on the
>door whining about interference. A couple years ago I put up my first lowfer
>antenna. It is quite tall (60 ft.), and can be easily seen by the neighbors. But
>this antenna was used only for receiving, not transmitting. Well whaddya know, a
>couple weeks after the antenna went up another neighbor comes a'knockin' at my
>door whining about interference. Funny thing was that I hadn't even finished
>building the receiver!

Oh boy! have you hit the nail on the head there. People have other
interference problems (squirrels chewing their antenna lead), but if
they see an antenna, they conclude that their problems are the fault
of a "transmitter".

>>>Not
>>>suprisingly, this is the area where harmonics from high HF are strongest.
>>
>>And ground wave propagation is also the most effective.
>
>
>That's news to me. I always thought that ground-waves were best propogated
>around .5 to 5 MHz.....

Key word: "best". Ground wave has some effect throughout the HF bands.
It can also propagate signals into neighboring homes.

>
>>>And I
>>>know for a fact that a ham can run 1kW on HF and not cause interference to
>>>televisions, cordless phones, radios, or just about anything else accused of
>>>having poor RFI rejection because I have seen more than one station that does.
>>
>>I can run 100 watts and not interfere with neighbor "A", but I destroy
>>neighbor "B"'s TV. Neighbor B has a Sony TV, which are notorious for
>>RFI issues.
>
>
>Sony sucks all around. I would rather not get started on -that- issue, but the

>chances are that the Sony is bad. They work fine when they are new. But one
>spike on the antenna or coax and they will pick up RFI from anything and
>everything. If your radio is coming through a Sony I'll bet that you are not the
>only source of interference. However, if they have cable, it's a good idea to
>check it -- you could be inadvertently coupling RF onto their line.

I find that a number of cable installation are not grounded properly
at the entry point to the home. That's supposed to be code, but some
of the contractors who do the majority of cable installs around here
are only interested in getting the most money they can in one day.
Time is money for them.

>>>And again, in the course of my job I have met more than a couple hams who
>>>sincerly thought their signal was 'clean' only to find out it wasn't.
>>
>>I don't doubt that. Not all hams are RF savvy, even though they should
>>be.
>
>
>Well, learning is part of the hobby, right? What suprises me are the number of
>hams who think that they are running clean because they plugged in a LP filter,
>or because their radio was expensive. If it were only that simple.....

It's never THAT simple. But it's a start. Good (and properly grounded)
low pass filters will further reduce any harmonics that weren't
properly filtered in the radio.

>>They are both true. There are more devices AND they are made with less
>>regard for RFI protection.
>
>
>It's true that they don't build 'em like they used to. Sony is a perfect example
>of that. But even there, if the device is working properly there usually isn't a
>problem. The problems occur when the device is made faulty by some other cause,
>such as line surges or CATV bullets. Now -that's- where product cheapness really
>shows it's ugly head.

There is no excuse for short cutting engineering. Saving money is
their only motivation. Old man Muntz is alive and well in the consumer
electronics market.

>>Case in point, I have a Fisher tube-type stereo receiver/amp, which
>>was made in the late 60's. I could run all the power I ever wanted on
>>any band, and there was nary a whisper out of that tube stereo. I
>>recently replaced it for a "newfangled" JVC with a remote control,
>>digital tuning, and all sorts of bells and whistles. My 4 watt CB
>>destroys it. My 25 Watt 6 meter station blanks out the music
>>(Fortunately it's FM so I don't get that awful feedback). Even my 2
>>meter SSB station gets into it. Fortunately I don't operate the stereo
>>and the radios at the same time, or I'd have to think seriously about
>>going back to my old stereo.
>

>
>That's surpising because JVC (RCA of Japan) is usually pretty solid stuff. Email
>me the model number and I'll see if there's a fix.

I love JVC products as well. I have another JVC system downstairs
(Different model) and it's fine. If I remember tonight, I'll look at
the receiver for the model number. I assume that the problem is either
A.C. line or speaker cable related. I just haven't had the motivation
to apply all of my known remedies yet.

>>>There was a time when a color television was a luxury,
>>
>>And hams running on 80 meters, close to the colorburst frequency of a
>>TV would make the color vanish. A common problem back then.
>
>
>And many hams would transmit using colorburst crystals because they were cheap
>and readily available. Some still do, but most realize the problem it creates.

I've had both a frequency counter and a DTMF generator which used
colorburst crystals for that reason.

>>>yet nowdays people have TV's in almost every room.
>>>Cordless phones were almost non-existent in the 70's, yet they are almost
>>>standard issue in todays appliance market. But interference still occured to
>>>these devices in the past just it does today.
>>
>>Some were more prone to RFI than others. Just changing brands could
>>often cure an RFI problem.
>
>
>That's because some were FM and some were AM. The AM phones will pick up
>harmonics just like a shortwave radio. The FM phones are mostly immune to RFI,
>even to harmonics that land on it's operating freqs. But even with FM, if the
>harmonic is strong enough it will dominate the discriminator.

Most of the 46/49 Mhz phones that I've seen are all FM. The last
cordless phones that I saw which might have used AM where the old
49/1.7 Mhz phones. Even some of them were full FM.

>>>They are no more suseptible to RFI
>>>than they were 30 years ago -- on the contrary, since the frequencies used are
>>>much higher, cable TV is much more popular, signal processing is more advanced
>>>and the bandwidth response of tuners is better than ever, these devices actually
>>>receive -less- interference than ever before.
>>
>>Yes and no. By having a TV receive through a shielded cable rather
>>than from an external TV antenna, reduces the potential for RF front
>>end overload, it does little to prevent RFI which creeps in through
>>the A.C. line cord. Not all RFI comes in through the tuner.
>
>

>No it doesn't. Modern TV's use switching supplies, a design which filters RF
>quite nicely. Older TV's used linear supplies where the transformer stopped RF
>dead in it's tracks.

Then there were the "transformerless" linear supply designs. THEY
were, by far, the worst for AC line RFI ingress. There was nothing to
stop the RF from riding along the supply rails and into an audio
stage.

> The way RF gets into a TV hooked to CATV (or a long run of
>coax to the antenna) is through an RF ground loop. You can eliminate the RFI
>either by ground-isolating the power lines and running a seperate ground wire
>adjacent to the coax (hard), or by powering the TV through an extention cord
>running adjacent to the coax for as long as possible (less hard).

Most consumers have a problem with "extra wires" attached to their
sets.

>>You're right, you can't expect a TV to reject an on-channel harmonic.
>>But a properly operating radio should be operating with a -40 to -60
>>(depending on year of manufacture) dbc harmonic suppression. At 100
>>watts, a -50 dbc harmonic is 1 mW of radiated power. Not much in the
>>grand scheme of things, and certainly no match for the grade A
>>coverage footprint of a 50 KW TV station.
>
>
>The emission limitations for broadcast stations are not based on decibels below
>the fundamental, but on absolute limits that are very, very low.

At 50 KW or more, you would need tighter specs. -50dbc down from 50 KW
is still .5 watts, which could be significant, and outside Part 15
specs.

>And if you
>check the current FCC regs you will see that similar (and also very low) limits
>have been imposed for any new manufactured ham transmitters and amps. This was
>done in response to the FCC recognizing that receivers are more sensitive than
>ever before, and even harmonics of very low power can cause interference to the
>intended function of these receivers.

Unless they very recently changed the rules, -60dbc is the current
harmonic spec for most transmitters used in the amateur and land
mobile services.

>>>(I should point out that -most- radio and TV interference is not caused by radio
>>>stations of any sort, but by light-dimmers, motor speed controls, computer power
>>>supplies, wall-warts, coffee-makers, and a myriad of other switching devices
>>>that connect directly to the power lines.
>>
>>On that point, I also agree. I once ran across a poorly designed Radio
>>Shack TV signal preamp which had a nasty tendency to self oscillate in
>>the 220 Mhz region. Every now and then it would drift into the input
>>of our 220 repeater. Talk about a bugger to pin down.

>
>
>Is that the one with the three BF960's? Stupid design if you ask me, putting
>three MOSFET's on a single board with no shielding between stages and set for an
>overall gain of 40 dB!

I don't know as I never physically had the device in my hands. That
might be the one, as the better design used CATV gain blocks, which
were internally stabilized.

>>>But of the cases where the source was
>>>clearly a radio station, the cause was almost always harmonics.)

>
>The toroidal choke works better if you split the wires and wind them in opposite
>directions on the core.

Yes it does, but that involves more work. If it works without going
that extra mile, then we don't have to "damage" the neighbor's
equipment.

>
>
>>I had a neighbor who, back in 1983, complained to the FCC about my
>>station. It seems that he was happy as a pig in mud, until one day his
>>TV died and he bought a new one. All of a sudden he started hearing me
>>loud and clear though the speaker in the TV. He swore that I was
>>suddenly running "big power". He just didn't want to make the
>>connection that the problem didn't start until he got a new TV. The
>>FCC sent me a letter informing me that they had received a complaint.
>>I wisely sent them my ham call, even though I knew that it was the CB
>>that my neighbor was hearing. The FCC, once they realized that I was a
>>ham, literally let the matter drop. They referred me to a "TVI
>>committee" (A group of hams who investigate RFI claims), but once we
>>made initial contact, they dropped the ball, and I never heard another
>>word.
>
>
>Now this is what I'm talking about. It's like the FCC says RFI is a bad thing
>unless it comes from a ham, in which case the rest of the world must suffer.

It's just a case of experience. Hams are noted for being more
technically aware of their stations operation. That may not be as true
today as it once was, but it's still a valid observation when compared
to other services which are designed to be used by non-technical
people (Like CB).

Hams also have volunteer groups within their own ranks to take care of
these things. I just got lucky that the matter dropped. Had my
neighbor made a bigger fuss, they may have pushed the issue. I figure
that my neighbor (Who himself used to be a CBer) turned me into the
FCC just to "scare" me.

>>>>You can argue the relative difference between a person's "right" to
>>>>enjoy their radio hobby versus another's "right" to enjoy internet
>>>>porn. But if the ham is clean (and they usually are), it's not his
>>>>problem directly.
>>>
>>>
>>>I can argue that a person has the right to peaceful use and enjoyment of their
>>>property and premises.
>>
>>Which includes a ham or CB station.
>
>
>.....sic utere tuo ut alienum no laedas.....

Latin? Sorry I'm one of those "Ugly Americans", who only knows English
(and a few "bad" words in a few other languages).

>>Well, keyclowns have to go somewhere when they upgrade.... ;-)

>>And that is the crux of the matter. If a case can be made that the
>>fault of the interference is caused by a dirty transmitter, then it
>>becomes an easy case to mediate.
>
>
>Not really, but anyway....
>
>
>> If, on the other hand, the ham (or
>>CBer) has done everything he can to make his station clean, but the
>>neighbor is the victim of a poorly designed (Even if it's a $5000 HD
>>TV) consumer product, then the only thing the ham can do, is not
>>transmit. That may be an acceptable solution to the neighbor, but most
>>hams love their radio as much as other people love TV, so it's back to
>>who's rights carry more weight. That's not a case I'd want the courts
>>to set precedent on, as they might just decide that mindless drivel
>>such as "American Idol" or the umpteenth episode of "Friends" deserves
>>more consideration than someone looking to further his electronics
>>knowledge through the art of radio.
>
>
>There is a difference here. The ham is transmitting a signal into someone else's
>private space.

Last time I looked RF doesn't observe borders either real or imagined.
It is impossible to prevent (Unless you want to enclose your house in
a faraday cage) RF from "polluting" your airwaves.

>The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham. It
>should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
>for anyone else.

In other words stop transmitting. Hardly fair. Especially when the
person with the interference can fix the problem by buying better

consumer devices.

> Point the antenna in a different direction. Use a different
>antenna. Make an agreement with the other person to only transmit at certain
>times (more commonly called 'sharing'). There is no reason a ham can't stop his
>interference, or at least limit it to an acceptable level.

What's considered "acceptable" is subjective. And that difference in perception is the source of most of the contention. Most people work during the day time, and enjoy their "entertainment" at night. That leaves a fairly small window for compromise where either party isn't giving up something that is important to them.

Some people are happy if you stay quiet during certain sporting events. Other people will settle for nothing short of the total elimination of any and all interference. I've had to deal with some people so paranoid that they feel that the ham might give them cancer as a result of the RF exposure. How do you fight that level of paranoia?

>From a different perspective, and assuming you can prove that your signal is
>clean, have you ever thought of suggesting to the person that they return the
>merchandise as defective?

Human nature is such that people become very defensive at the mere suggestion that their equipment is to blame. And since this is normally a design issue, any replacement that they get of the same model will likely be just as bad. Suggesting a different brand/model now begins to infringe on that person's right of individual choice. It's never a pretty sight.

>
>>>I agree with you 100%, and one of those "special interest" groups is the ARRL.
>>>They have done more to defend those that cause interference than they have to
>>>help resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both the hams -and- the general
>>>public.
>>
>>They defend hams against "witch hunts", where the radio operator is
>>automatically painted as a "bad guy" simply because he enjoys a
>>different venue for his pass time. You cannot expect the non-technical
>>consumer to understand the nuances of RFI. All they know is that when
>>the ham next door transmits, he kills their "XYZ device", therefore it
>>must be his fault.
>
>
>Because it is. You are intruding into their homes. You take from them some of
>the comforts of everyday life that any reasonable person would expect to enjoy
>in the privacy of their own home.

Ok, look at it this way, would you blame the weather for making your house cold, if your front door was wide open? Maybe we should just stop all cold weather? Afterall, that cold weather is "intruding" into

someone's home. Why should a homeowner take steps to block these
intrusions? They should be eliminated at the source.

That's basically the position you are taking.

>It's a nuisance like any other nuisance,
>except that it's a nuisance which is protected by a federal law.

Being told to give up an important hobby and passtime, is a "nuisance"
as well. It all depends on your perspective.

I believe that all radio operators should be responsible for making
sure that thei stations are all in compliance with FCC rules and are
built and operated within the guidance of good engineering practice.
Once this criteria is met, then any further RFI becomes the problem of
the recipient, since it can be demonstrated easily that poorly
designed consumer devices are responsible for the inability of the
device to reject interference. You wouldn't live in a house without
walls, so why should you settle for devices which lack proper
shielding?

>>>>The problem is with the cheap Chinese produced electronic devices.
>>>>Something needs to be done to minimize their susceptibility to RFI.
>>>
>>>
>>>Honestly, I don't believe that at all. I have yet to find one of these devices
>>>that are ultra-suseptible to fundamentals on HF. If someone has an example,
>>>please post it so I can get one and test it for myself.
>>
>>Go find one of those cheap phones that Radio Shack used to sell. They
>>were one of the worst.
>
>
>I had one and it caused me no problems.

Wish I could say the same.......

>> Grab a few touch lamps too, while you're there.
>
>
>Touch lamps will respond to ghost farts.

You should see what they do when the ham next door decides to run CW
on 20 meters. One lady thought that her house had become haunted....

>
>>>>Trying to sweep the problem of RFI under the rug (and thereby saving
>>>>XYZ company the cost of making RFI resistant devices) by persecuting
>>>>legally operating hams is not , IMHO, the right solution. Remember,
>>>>that what they do to hams, will also trickle down to CBers, since the
>>>>RFI potential is worse on the CB band, with the preponderance of
>>>>illegally operating stations who are there.
>>>

>>>
>>>I think it's the other way around -- it is the illegal CBers that started the "I
>>>don't care" attitude towards interference, and that attitude is being adopted by
>>>some in the ham community.
>>
>>That has happened largely because most "normal" consumers don't know
>>the difference between a ham and a CB'er. CB'ers have gotten a bad rap
>>due to their blatant disregard of the rules and their penchant for
>>operating high power and dirty amplifiers. In the consumer's mind
>>Cb'er = Ham. I've had people tell me that I can't run 100 watts on the
>>ham bands, and that they were going to call the FCC about it. Hams are
>>starting to get tired of being lumped in with CB'ers, especially when
>>there may be both an illegally running CB'er AND a ham in the same
>>neighborhood. Guess which one is the likely cause of interference?
>
>
>All the more reason for hams to pay attention to problems on the CB instead of
>just trying to fence them out of the ham bands.

Paying attention is one thing. Getting CB'ers on board with proper RFI
responsibility is totally another.

>>> But when good hams start defending the bad hams by
>>>wielding the sword of preemption, you can bet that the keyclowns will do the
>>>same and the problem in both arenas will just get worse.
>>
>>PRB-1 does not apply to CB'ers, nor does many of the preemptions that
>>were cited previously.
>
>
>The FCC has sole jurisdiction over -all- issues regarding RFI. They have made
>that perfectly clear.
>
>
>> CB'ers should be allowed the protection that
>>their service by rule provides. But since the federal government does
>>not grant CB licenses to specific individuals, local governments have
>>seized upon this to justify legislation which restricts CB operation
>>in many municipalities. IMHO, there should be no difference between a
>>legally operating and clean ham station and an equivalently operating
>>CB station WRT interference protection. But the local municipalities
>>are much less likely to bring action against a federally licensed ham,
>>than an unlicensed CBer. Many legal CB'ers may have to fold their
>>operations rather than having to pay a large amount of money to defend
>>against such a case.
>
>
>In re 960 Radio, Inc.

Huh?

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1128. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 16:51:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89242

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
> >
> He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a year
> now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.

He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1129. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 17:00:39 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <5rrg50htsbg1p2v2n8qbk85sk72htivgu9@4ax.com>
Source record: 89243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <vkfg5052tbavduo9ptb5sf7n0jtfml8m9g@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 08:20:40 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<snip>
>>Are your neighbors picking up your signal?
>
>Now, no (at least I don't think so, as I don't have much time to "do
>radio" these days. However, back in my "radioactive" days in the old
>neighborhood, I heard many second and third party accounts of hearing
>my station through phones, cheap clock radios, and equally cheap
>stereos. TV's I didn't bother, as a rule, except for a few notable
>exceptions, where I didn't herringbone the picture (as the classic
>case of harmonic interference would manifest itself), but instead my
>audio would blast through the speaker (Which should never occur as the
>TV's audio receiver is FM, and I was using AM), which smacked of
>rectification in the audio stage of the TV.

Sounds like a bad limiter.

>>Finding the source of RFI is just like troubleshooting any other piece of
>>electronic equipment. Take your spectrum analyzer to where the interference is
>>occuring -- it doesn't do any good to measure signal strength where it doesn't
>>matter.
>
>Ah, but it does matter! I was verifying that the signal I was putting
>into the air with my equipment was clean, and I did that.
>
>You touched on some interesting external causes of RFI. There have
>been cases where strong near field signals have been rectified by
>corroded connections (like metal gutters or siding), and the signal
>reradiated as a form of intermodulation, which can have the same
>effect as harmonic generation. In this case, the transmitter is clean,
>but the effects of the surrounding area can mimic a dirty transmitter.
>I've even seen a case where a poor joint in a ham's antenna, caused a
>spur to be generated. This is especially troublesome in repeater
>operation, where these IMD products can desense the repeater's
>receiver.

Exactly! Sympathetic vibrations. It's like your signal is tapping someone else's
tuning fork.

>But unless these culprits are on your own property, you have no
>control over them. If I find that "harmonics" were being generated as
>a result of rectification in my next door neighbor's siding (a

>different neighbor from the one complaining from RFI), what can I do?
>I'm not about to pay to re-side his house, and he's under no
>obligation to do it himself.

No, but what you -can- do is isolate the 'tuning fork' and dampen it so it doesn't oscillate. The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video cables.

>> Also, what are the devices that are receiving the interference? If you
>>bring those same devices into your home (assuming you don't have interference
>>with your own stuff, as per Bill's example), does it still pick up RFI? If you
>>add a device to filter the fundamental does it still receive interference? Is
>>the interference entering the device from the antenna, the power line, or some
>>other unknown route? Is there RF on your power feed? Does either house have
>>aluminum siding? If the RFI is coming through the TV, is it interfering with the
>>audio or video, or both?
>
>Those are all intelligent questions to ask, when trying to get to the
>bottom of the issue. The problem is that in many cases, you won't have
>access to the problem devices, as the neighbor may not be receptive to
>"that radio asshole" tampering with his stuff.

If the neighbor is not receptive to your efforts to track down the source of the interference then it's his problem. It's just like if someone complains about termites but won't let the exterminator do his job.

> Also, I am not
>comfortable with adding any devices to people's equipment, as in their
>eyes, any future problems that they may have with their equipment,
>will automatically be the fault of the work that you did. It doesn't
>matter that you and I know that this is a ridiculous conclusion.

Not ridiculous at all. People must find someone to blame for their problems other than themselves.

> But
>remember, we're dealing with non-technical people here, and that is
>the least of the wild theories that they come up with. I had a radio
>associate about 20 years ago, who had a neighbor who bought a new TV
>(it was a Sony), who then started getting TVI. Then this neighbor also
>started having reception problems, and blamed it on the radio op's
>large beam antenna (even when the radio op was not transmitting).
>Never mind the fact that this neighbor's other TVs worked alright. But
>the neighbor insisted that beam antenna was blocking signals only to
>his new Sony TV. It didn't help that a local TV repairman could not
>find anything obviously wrong, and concurred that it was "likely" that
>the radio op had something to do with the problem. We joked about it,
>and nicknamed the radio op's beam the "Sony Signal Sucker" (Or S.O.S.
>for short). But this situation illustrates the lunacy of dealing with
>the non-technical mind.

That's not such a looney concept. Every antenna has a capture radius. Maybe that one had an exceptionally large "suck zone". Also, have you ever checked out Bill Beaty's site? http://www.amasci.com/

>>Some of these might sound like silly questions, but putting a bunch of silly
>>answers together can draw a very different picture.
>
>Those are hardly silly questions! They get right to the core of the
>issue. But sometimes solving them is the real challenge.
>
>>And it's very possible that
>>the device or devices in question simply need repair. But since I don't have the
>>whole picture I can't say one way or the other.
>
>If would call the installation of devices to limit exposure to near
>field RF, a "repair". One that should 've been made at the factory.
>But those $.50 worth of parts add up when factored against millions
>of consumer devices, and has an impact on profit. Considering that RFI
>situation are not likely for most consumers, the manufacturers took
>the risk of cutting corners in the name of increased profit.

Or, in the case of Sony, built their stuff in modules that cost a fortune to replace even when the fault is a 3 cent resistor.

>>>> And these are hams who swear
>>>>up and down that their signal is clean and that the problem is with the
>>>>neighbors equipment.
>>>
>>>It usually is, trust me.
>>
>>
>>You are right, it usually is. But a few aren't. Those are the one's I was
>>talking about.
>
>There are a few bad apples in every bunch. That's why we have so many
>entitlement programs. Some people just don't get the concept of
>personal responsibility.

I wouldn't go that far, because some people are definately screwed up and need help. But welfare does attract more than it's share of bad apples.

>>I thought I said this before, but I'll say it again: I don't think that all
>>hams, or even most hams, run dirty stations. I believe most of them -do- run
>>clean. The problem, as I stated before, is a few hams that don't have a clue and
>>are going to ruin it for the good ones.
>
>That's true in many facets of life. That's why I am attempting to
>throw some cold water on the assumption that the problem is bigger
>than it really is, and that the fault lies with the radio op in the
>majority of the cases.

I probably mistated myself in all this quagmire: The dirty hams are few, and are only a small contribution to the problem as a whole. A larger part comes from

keyclowns, who I believe will be responsible once again for tighter restrictions on ham radio. But if there's one thing I don't like it's a cocky amateur trying to educate me, a professional, about radio and electronics. They are different fields to be sure, but many aspects are the same. So while I can't tell an RCI from a Ranger without looking at the ID tag, I -can- give a qualified opinion on other issues. I digress.....

>> But then again, I'm not a ham and I'm
>>not about to defend any of them, good or bad. I see things from a bit different
>>perspective because of my job, and until you have done the same job for a few
>>years I don't expect you to see it the same way.
>
>Granted.
>
>
>> But I -would- expect you to
>>consider what I have to say because it is what I have seen first-hand. And what
>>I have seen is that unintentional rectification is a far less common source of
>>interference than poorly filtered transmitters. You may have seen different, and
>>that's fine. Our tower cranks out several thousand watts 24/7, and one would
>>think that with that kind of power unintentional rectification would be a major
>>problem. It isn't, at least not here. Maybe it's a geographical thing....
>
>I can't explain it either. But I've been a party either directly or as
>a "consultant" to other people, who have had RFI issues. From
>proximity lights, to burglar alarms, to smoke detectors, computer
>speakers, and all sorts of other electronic devices, many of which do
>not contain a receiver in them at all. How can a device with no
>receiver, discriminate between a dirty transmitter and a clean one? Is
>it more likely that a device like an amplified computer speaker, is
>responding to a -20dbc (I would consider that "dirty") harmonic, or
>the full strength fundamental?

It's the basic amplifier circuit. Any amplifier will oscillate if given enough feedback in appropriate phase. An RF signal can be enough to cause a high-gain amplifier to oscillate. It might oscillate on the frequency of the stimulating signal, or it might just sit there and 'ping' on it's own resonant freq. But one thing is common to most of these devices, and that is they are most suseptible to frequencies in the high-HF and VHF portions of the spectrum. I don't know exactly why that is, but I suspect two possibilities: the physical size of the circuit and it's wires have lengths that make efficient secondary couplings to stray RF. The other idea is that while some equipment is intentionally protected from strong AM broadcast signals, the efficiency of the filter drops off with increasing frequency. Of course those ideas are nothing more than speculation, but they are things I intend to pay attention to in the future.

>>>>The rest get a
>>>>complaint filed with the FCC by the station because they are interfering with
>>>>the station's transmission.
>>>>
>>>>My point is that interference is almost always caused by excessive harmonic

>>>>emissions; i.e, poor filtering at the transmitter, not at the receiver (or
>>>>device receiving the interference) as most hams claim is the case.
>>>
>>>I've been doing radio for over 30 years now and I've seen exactly the
>>>opposite. Most of the cases (and the FCC database backs this up) of
>>>RFI are the fault of the receiving equipment. When you run a squeaky
>>>clean 4 watt CB, and 100 watt H.F. ham gear and you still have
>>>interference complaints, with all filtering, grounding, and proper
>>>antenna decoupling in place, it's usually not the ham's fault. If
>>>you're going to fight the fight, it's helpful to have all of your
>>>facts straight before you do.
>>
>>
>>The FCC 'investigators' rarely visit the scene to determine the cause of
>>interference. If you read those cases in the FCC database they simply reflect
>>what is claimed by one party or the other, but usually by the ham.
>
>The FCC had investigated a number of cases.

Was it affiliated with Operation Blue Book?

> They also rely on
>competent independent engineers to do so as well. It didn't take them
>long to realize that the majority of cases were the fault of
>inadequately shielded C.E. devices. They also have a fact sheet which
>addresses what to do if you receive interference on a telephone, since
>a telephone has no receiver, and therefore has no reason to have any
>RF on it. Other devices fall under the same parameters.

.....weather balloons? ;-)

>Some may try to make the case that the FCC dropped the ball, and
>should have done a more thorough job. But my own experiences back up
>what the FCC has concluded.

I don't know when these investigations occured, but I know that sometimes they
will refer a ham to an "RFI committee" which is comprised of more hams. Either
way, the state of electronics is changing so fast that it's hard even for a
professional to keep up with the latest advances. That may be why I like vintage
CB's so much.... simplicity!

>> Check the
>>records for interference claims regarding commercial stations and you will see a
>>very different picture.
>
>I would offer that commercial stations have a financial and public
>relations agenda, which would be more than sufficient motive for
>limiting their exposure as an RF "bad guy". If they can "explain" away
>RFI problems as IMD products from another transmitter (A "sloppy" ham
>for instance), they can deflect their responsibility in the matter.

On the contrary, most stations are perfectly willing to admit any case when
their emissions exceed specs. In fact, such instances are required to be logged
in the station's records. What broadcast stations -don't- like is being blamed
for interference that is caused by other sources, such as keyclowns and a few
dirty hams. I'm sure that good hams can appreciate this point of view since they
are always getting a bad rep because of the keyclowns.

>I have an Icom 706 HF transceiver. I can hear a strong local AM
>broadcast station on its fundamental frequency, the second harmonic,
>and the third harmonic, which falls right below the 80 meter band. If
>I turn off the radio's preamp, the harmonic goes away. I also have a
>Yaesu FT-757, on which I do not hear the same interference. Now, based
>on my own investigation, I would conclude that the Icom's receiver
>preamp is being overloaded by the fundamental signal from the radio
>station, and is creating IMD products or some other spurs. Is this the
>fault of the radio station? What makes my situation any different from
>a consumer device problem other than I am technically able to diagnose
>the real problem on my own? Should I have complained to the radio
>station? Would you not agree that my "interference" was the fault of
>my own equipment?

The difference is that a person can walk into any house in the US and expect to
see a TV, a radio, CD player, computer, and wouldn't be at all suprised to see a
cordless phone, garage door opener, etc, etc. They -don't- expect to see an
ultra-sensitive ham radio. Your equipment is exceptional -- an 'exception' from
the norm. Another difference is that as a ham you -expect- and -accept- such
issues as receiver overload and RFI. Most people don't.

>>>>BTW, I should point out that we at the station take care of our listeners and
>>>>respond to complaints of interference to our signal wherever they occur (within
>>>>our contour).
>>>
>>>I would propose that your motives are less altruistic and more to do
>>>with market impact.
>>
>>
>>Damn straight! It's good PR, great WOM advertising, and it's well within the
>>station's rights to try to resolve any source of interference to its signal.
>
>Even if it means deflecting their part of it onto a nearby ham by
>suggesting that his transmitter is "dirty"?

That's way off base, Dave. We don't deflect anything. If a listener calls us and
tells us that something or someone is interfering with their reception of our
transmissions we will check it out. Like I said before, most of the time it's a
power line problem. If it's a radio problem we can easily pin down the source
and address the issue with the ham (or keyclown, as the case may be). We help
resolve the problem on both sides of the fence. In fact, that's how we found two
of our best employees (long story).

>>Actually, the campaign started because of a couple broadcast pirates that were
>>messing up the band. Go figure....
>

>I love radio pirates. Not because they defy the law. But I enjoy the
>raw, un packaged productions. Nowadays most commercial stations are
>clones of hundreds of others. They've taken the creativity and local
>personality out of individual markets in the name of a "proven"
>corporate strategy. The result is a network of bland cookie cutter
>programming, which lacks the style and depth that I remember from the
>60's and the early 70's.

I'm with you 110% there. The station I work for is one of the few remaining
independant stations in the area, and every month I wonder how long it will be
until we get swallowed up. If you think about it, radio is just going through a
transition into networking, something that television did decades ago. But you
still won't catch me working for Pinnacle or Clear Channel.

>>>> Many times that interference is caused by radio operators, legal
>>>>or not. We determine the nature of the interference then attempt to resolve it.
>>>>If it is caused by a radio operator that is unwilling to clean up his act then
>>>>the station files a complaint with the FCC.
>>>
>>>Unwilling or unable? It's tough to solve a problem that's not yours to
>>>solve. Other than giving up your radio hobby.
>>
>>
>>Unwilling. I haven't seen a case yet where a ham (or even a keyclown) wasn't
>>able to keep his signal off the TV, radio or cordless phones if he made the
>>effort.
>
>I have. Other than offering to buy the neighbor a new TV or other
>"device" that's more RF immune, once you're within your technical
>spec's, there's often not much else you can do other than reducing
>your power, or reducing the amount of time to spend "talking".

If that's what it takes. I found that most neighbors are more than willing to
give a little if the ham is willing to do the same. That's how we all get along
in a society -- compromise. If they are not willing to compromise, perhaps a
third party can mediate an agreement.

>> Mind you that there are still some old single-conversion radios that
>>seemingly scan for the most obnoxious RFI on the band, and there is nothing you
>>can do about that except replace them. Fortunately, they are usually old and
>>cheap.
>
>No they're not, that's my point. There are still MANY of these "signal
>seeking" widgets on the market. My JVC stereo, amplified computer
>speakers, Sony TV's, the list goes on. I have ham friends who, either
>for themselves or as a "favor" (to themselves actually) to their
>friends and neighbors, will take their 2 meter HT with them when they
>go to a place like Best Buy to look at new TV's. Waving the HT in
>close proximity to each TV while it is on will reveal which ones are
>somewhat immune to RFI and which ones are problems in the making.
>Lines in a picture or buzzing sounds out of the speaker, are signs

>that this is not the TV for you.

Anything will overload if you feed it enough RF. But like I said before, unless I can see it for myself I really can't say one way or another. And I still think there might be a fault with your JVC because that's not very characteristic of their quality. I have a lot of JVC gear and none of it has ever caused me a problem with RFI even in a noisy environment.

>>And the problem -is- your's to solve if you are the source. That's not law, it's
>>just decent social behavior. If we choose to live communities, we should really
>>learn how to respect the others in the community instead of shoving a federal
>>regulation in their face and saying "tough titties" (that may not be the way it
>>is intended, but that's the way it sounds to the other guy).
>
>I agree with this 100%. The problem is that many neighbors wait until
>they've had it "up to here" with the problem before calling your
>attention to it. By then they've become somewhat belligerent, and not
>too receptive to you tampering with their stuff (not that I'd want to
>for the earlier reasons).

True, and true.

> They will also insist that YOU, the ham, pay
>for it all because, after all, the ham is "causing" the problem, even
>if the symptoms are the fault of the poor C.E. device.

I kinda have to agree with them there. If ya wanna play, ya gotta pay.

> I had another
>ham friend who hung a tray full of high pass filters on his front door
>with a note that basically said, "For TV interference, take one filter
>and call me in the morning".

That's pretty good! How did the neighbors react?

>>>> We get a better response from the
>>>>FCC than do a few angry neighbors because the station pays a lot of money to
>>>>stay on the air, and the FCC responds to money, not people.
>>>
>>>
>>>Exactly!
>>
>>
>>And ain't it a shame!
>
>It's reality.
>
>
>Dave
>"Sandbagger"
>http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1130. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 17:05:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403170905.7a320a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89244

Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1ac1ab7b30d4440598985b@news.verizon.net>...
> In article <4057daa4$0$97302$45beb828@newscene.com>, No.code@no.ham
> says...
> >
> > Citizen Band was created when they started issueing licenses without a CW
> > requirement.
>
> From someone who entered via no-code and advanced to extra within a year
> I take issue with that.

He's just a troll, Tony.
>
> Perhaps the no-code license was the best thing that happened to amateur
> radio. It removed an obstacle I wasn't ready to face at the time but
> after a couple months I got my 5WPM code. And then a couple months later
> my 13WPM and then the 20WMP.

Was it really that hard to learn?
>
> What ticks me off is the watered down code requirement that we have now.

It's the logical result. Gradually reduce the requirements.

> But in essence, we're all appliance operators now anyhow.

Not me!

> It doesn't really matter.

I think it does.

> And I think the days of amateur radio are numbered what
> with BPL and such.

I hope not. But even if deployed, BPL may not survive for other
reasons. Ever hear of the Iridium system?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1131. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 18:30:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <DP06c.7418$GQ3.5241@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:8oqg50db20ds69b79di8irdc4b36a7dkef@4ax.com...
> In <99Y5c.6705$CJ5.4074@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:greg50hsnfuj1onhg8lm124i3qg5i9iggn@4ax.com...
> >> In <qOQ5c.6585$CJ5.5509@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:nu7f50pqsu3nv4er138meah1c54nk82i9r@4ax.com...
> >> <snip>
> >> >> If the law is challenged, the FCC would be automatically enjoined.
> >> >
> >> >So if my town passes some nutty no interference law and the locals
> >> >then apply that law to a local ham and he then challenges the law
> >> >because he says federal law pre-empts it, then the FCC automatically
> >> >gets into the case? If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn
> >> >to sell you.
> >>
> >> No. If the town loses based on federal preemption, they may have
standing
> >to
> >> appeal on the grounds that the federal preemption law is
unconstitutional
> >(or on
> >> some other grounds), at which time the agency responsible for the law
> >being
> >> challenged (the FCC) would be enjoined.
> >
> >WHO would enjoin the FCC. If the town loses, just who would then
> >enjoin the FCC on appeal to. Typically, the town wins on the
> >local level (i.e. the local court/magistrate or whatever. The appeal is
> >then on a state appeals court basis by the defendent. IF, the
> >state appeals court then reverses...or perhaps it even goes to the
> >state supreme court where it is appealed, I still see no one directly
> >engaging the FCC in the court process.
>
> Are you really that confused, or are you intentionally trying to
complicate the
> issue?

Not confused at all. Let's try it agin slowly:

1. Local gov't charges me with some infraction
which I claim they have no right to because of
federal pre-emption. (Here's a good example:
a local law that prohibits the public from having
a radio in a vehicle that can receive police
broadcasts.) I have a ham transceiver which,
like most such rigs, has a very extended receive
range that can also pick up local police channels.

2. Several years ago, the FCC
issued a blanket pre-emption against
such local laws IF the violation is because the ham
has a commercial ham tranceiver that happens
to also cover local police channel(s).

3. In court (local court) I raise the federal
preemption as my defense. The local court sides
with the town and doesn't accept my defense.
I lose at the local level. (If, on the other hand,
I win, then end of case.)

4. I appeal the case to the next level, again asserting
feeral preemption as over riding and that the lower court
was in error in not accepting the defense argument.
The town files its own counter argument. At this
point, the FCC is STILL NOT involved...nor would
I expect it to be. The arguing of the federal
pre-emption is all under my legal position.

5. Do you expect the court to "enjoin" the FCC directly
at that point? If so, by who? If not at the appeal level,
then why or how would the state supreme court
level be any different?

> >> >> The Patriot Act is an example of law that is unconstitutional
> >> >> but has yet to be challenged. As such it remains law.
> >> >
(SNIP)
> >
> >Personally I'm not at all worried about it.
>
> You should be. Everyone should be worried, because if they can pass laws
like
> that, the next act of congress might include a provision that might take
away
> basic civil rights that affect you directly.

They'd have to do so by changing the Bill of Rights first.
Not an easy task.

> >> That's what the Patriot Act allows
> >> the government to do. Do -you- think those laws are

> >> constitutional? If you do, then think about this: Under the Patriot
> >> Act, the same thing can happen to you.
> >> All that needs to happen is for someone to claim that you
> >> threatened someone with a weapon, and if the powers that be don't
> >> be don't like your choice of breakfast cereal,
> >> you too can become a political prisoner
> >> in the great United States of America.
> >
> >People threaten others all the time and no one is being locked up
> >as you suggest.
>
> Some people are indeed being locked up. But what I am suggesting is that
this
> law is wide open for abuse by the government, and there is little chance
for any
> victims to challenge it because those same victims are locked up tight and
> stripped of their right to mount any sort of legal defense.

> > Now if someone threatens ala the terrorits in Spain,
> >then I have no sympathy for them. For all the hew and cry of
> >the liberals against the Patriot act they can't cite one example
> >of abuse to any US citizen.

> There have been such cases. If you can't find the energy to look them up
> yourself I'll do it for you when I get home from work later today.

Save yourself the time. I'm not interested or
worried about it.

> >> That's all it takes under the Patriot Act. And
> >> if you didn't know that about the Patriot
> >> Act then you really need to spend a
> >> little more time catching up on current events.
> >
> >I repeat again, I have no worries about myself.

> Maybe it's better you don't.
>
> >> >> >And that authority has never diminsihed...has it?
> >> >>
> >> >> Of course it has. Not by judicial decision, but by the FCC's
> >> >> avoidance of the same. That's how and why HR2346 was drafted.
> >> >
> >> >The authority hasn't diminished because of HR2346. All that
> >> >did was extend ability to take action against illegal
> >> >CB activity to local police (if and only if local
> >> >jurisdictions empowered their police to do so).
> >>
> >> Before HR2346 the FCC was either unwilling or unable to effectively
> >enforce the
> >> Citizen's Band. Cause or effect, take your pick because in either case
> >their

> >> authority suffered until they conceded a portion of their jurisdiction
to
> >local
> >> authority. Since nothing has improved at the FCC since that time, it's
> >very
> >> likely that they will concede more of their jurisdiction in the future.
> >
> >Your opinion only.
>
> Right or wrong, my opinion is shared by many,
> and I'm not the first person to
> have it.

You are free to have whatever opinion you want.

> > The HR2346, does not give cart blanche
> >power to local government to simply shut down
> >legally operated CB stations.
>
> Oh come on now, what's up with this
> word-twisting game? I never said anything
> about the FCC passing "cart blanche" to local yokels.

Good, then we agree that if a neighbor complains about another
neighbor's CB operation, and upon investigation it turns out
the CBer is operating in full compliance with FCC rules, then
no further action can be taken under local law.

> > HR2346 allows local governments to empower their
> >local police to enforce existing FCC rules and regs regarding
> >CB. It does NOT allow local government to create more
> >intrusive or more restrictive CB rules. For example, a town can
> >not simply outlaw all CB activity, a town can not ban CB
> >antennas, etc.
>
> I agree 100%. So why do you think I said anything different?

Maybe I read more into your comments than I should have.
Glad we agree 100% on the above.

> >> >> >And I have yet to read about any actual case that has
> >> >> >resulted in FCC pre-emption being overturned.
> >> >>
> >> >> The keyword here is "yet".
> >> >
> >> >True...but "YET" has decades of case law behind it already.
> >>
> >> So did abortion before Roe vs. Wade.
> >
> >But in the area of law we are discussing, YET has still
> >prevailed. The truth is, most local law enforcement don't
> >care or want to be bothered with things like radio

> >interference, etc. There's no glory in it and winning
> >in court requires significant technological proof.
>
>
> Local LE's do indeed have a stake in the elimination of RFI at the local
level
> because the FCC doesn't do the job at the federal level. If you do a
thorough
> search on google you will find dozens upon dozens of local ordinances that
> outlaw RFI despite federal preemption.

The point is still one of enforcement...and even you
note that many of said ordinances exempt hams.

> Many of them exclude hams, many don't.
> And local LEA's are especially concerned when the FCC interferes with the
> prosecution of anyone that causes RFI which disrupts their local emergency
and
> vital services (Helm v. Louisville Two-Way Radio Corp.,(Ky. 1984);
Southwestern
> Bell Wireless, Inc. v. Johnson County Board of Commissioners,(10th Cir.
1999)).
> The desire was there, and so was the proof. The deciding issue was federal
> preemption. But hey, nothing lasts forever.

Many of those types of RFI laws are not for incidental RFI,
but rather they were created to take action against anyone
deliberately interfering with police transmissions...usually
using an acctual radio setup to transmit on the police frequency.

(SNIP)

> >Actually, majority doesn't always rule. For example, a town
> >can not outlaw antennas for CB, Ham, or anything else just
> >because a majority of people might want that.
>
> Interesting thought.....

Interetsing in what way?

> > A town can't
> >impose a set of "approved" colors for which I would
> >only be allowed to paint my house (small exception in that arena
> >for special historic districks). A town can not prohibit me
> >from parking my legally registered car/truck in my driveway.
>
> Have you ever heard of a 'planned community'?

Yes, but, the bylaws of such a planned
community are not laws at all, but rather they are
contract clauses.

> I think they have a new phrase to
> describe them these days, but the concept is the same:
> If you buy property in a
> neighborhood, as part of the sale you
> must agree to follow the bylaws of the
> neighborhood. I don't know if it's legal, but it's done.

Yes it is legal...but it isn't done under local township ordinance.
The "planned community" is done by contract law. As a buyer,
you agree to the terms of the community's bylaws when you
purchase the property.

If you
violate the bylaws, the community or homeowners association
takes a civil action against you under contract law...it does
not involve the township at all other than the case probably
being handled in the local court system.

> >A town can't outlaw operation of CB, Ham or any other
> >federally permitted radio service.
>
> Who said they can? More word-twisting? I just said "majority rules in a
> democracy", and it does. If the majority is fed up with FCC's lack of
action
> regarding RFI complaints, you can bet that eventually the majority will
speak
> and be heard at the federal level. That's the way this country works (most
of
> the time, at least).

What happened to "the majority rules" on the local level? You
placed no criteria as to federal vs local in your original
expression.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1132. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 18:53:51 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <cj1h50584dht1ol50tulgv281u9na0qg0e@4ax.com>
Source record: 89246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <kglg50ppln06c7i7ort7tfs9lb8115popk@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 19:36:00 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
<snip>
>>Audio modulated FM doesn't rectify into audio at all unless there is an AM
>>component. Broadcast-quality limiters are quite good at eliminating AM from an
>>FM BC signal.
>
>Exactly! So any intelligible sound that passes through a TV's audio
>section is being rectified in a place that it has no business being,
>usually well past the limiter stages. This phenomenon is reflective of
>poor design. In many of these cases, the RFI entered through the A.C.
>line cord and got coupled into the audio amp stages.

I was thinking more along the lines of weak limiters/poor AM rejection, but poor
supply regulation could just as easily be responsible for what you describe. In
that case a power line filter won't do the job -- you would need either an
isolation transformer, or run the power cord with the coax (if there is coax).

>>People are funny. When I was a kid I put up my first CB antenna on the roof.
>>Like many people I spent the first few weeks just listening to the chatter. But
>>not more than a week after the antenna went up I had a neighbor knock on the
>>door whining about interference. A couple years ago I put up my first lowfer
>>antenna. It is quite tall (60 ft.), and can be easily seen by the neighbors. But
>>this antenna was used only for receiving, not transmitting. Well whaddya know, a
>>couple weeks after the antenna went up another neighbor comes a'knockin' at my
>>door whining about interference. Funny thing was that I hadn't even finished
>>building the receiver!
>
>Oh boy! have you hit the nail on the head there. People have other
>interference problems (squirrels chewing their antenna lead)....

Have a mouse problem here. Cute little things, but they sure do shit a lot.

>>>And ground wave propagation is also the most effective.
>>
>>
>>That's news to me. I always thought that ground-waves were best propogated
>>around .5 to 5 MHz.....
>
>Key word: "best". Ground wave has some effect throughout the HF bands.
>It can also propagate signals into neighboring homes.

....um, wouldn't that be better classified as near-field radiation and not
ground-wave propagation? How far away are your neighbors' houses?

>>Sony sucks all around. I would rather not get started on -that- issue, but the
>>chances are that the Sony is bad. They work fine when they are new. But one
>>spike on the antenna or coax and they will pick up RFI from anything and
>>everything. If your radio is coming through a Sony I'll bet that you are not the
>>only source of interference. However, if they have cable, it's a good idea to
>>check it -- you could be inadvertently coupling RF onto their line.
>
>I find that a number of cable installation are not grounded properly
>at the entry point to the home. That's supposed to be code, but some
>of the contractors who do the majority of cable installs around here
>are only interested in getting the most money they can in one day.
>Time is money for them.

Time <> quality.

>>It's true that they don't build 'em like they used to. Sony is a perfect example
>>of that. But even there, if the device is working properly there usually isn't a
>>problem. The problems occur when the device is made faulty by some other cause,
>>such as line surges or CATV bullets. Now -that's- where product cheapness really
>>shows it's ugly head.
>
>There is no excuse for short cutting engineering. Saving money is
>their only motivation. Old man Muntz is alive and well in the consumer
>electronics market.

Which reminds me.... what's Griffey doing these days?

>>And many hams would transmit using colorburst crystals because they were cheap
>>and readily available. Some still do, but most realize the problem it creates.
>
>I've had both a frequency counter and a DTMF generator which used
>colorburst crystals for that reason.

Hmmmm..... do they receive any RFI from the TV?

>Most of the 46/49 Mhz phones that I've seen are all FM. The last
>cordless phones that I saw which might have used AM where the old
>49/1.7 Mhz phones. Even some of them were full FM.

Rat Shack sold quite a few AM phones when the market was young.

>>> Not all RFI comes in through the tuner.
>>
>>
>>No it doesn't. Modern TV's use switching supplies, a design which filters RF
>>quite nicely. Older TV's used linear supplies where the transformer stopped RF
>>dead in it's tracks.
>
>Then there were the "transformerless" linear supply designs. THEY
>were, by far, the worst for AC line RFI ingress. There was nothing to
>stop the RF from riding along the supply rails and into an audio

>stage.

No kidding! And remember those plug-in doo-hickeys that allegedly used the power lines for a TV antenna? They did nothing but establish a power/antenna loop that turned the TV into a very good white noise generator.

>> The way RF gets into a TV hooked to CATV (or a long run of
>>coax to the antenna) is through an RF ground loop. You can eliminate the RFI
>>either by ground-isolating the power lines and running a seperate ground wire
>>adjacent to the coax (hard), or by powering the TV through an extention cord
>>running adjacent to the coax for as long as possible (less hard).
>
>Most consumers have a problem with "extra wires" attached to their
>sets.

For some of them I think it's a 'counting' issue -- they are worried about running out of fingers and toes.

>>And if you
>>check the current FCC regs you will see that similar (and also very low) limits
>>have been imposed for any new manufactured ham transmitters and amps. This was
>>done in response to the FCC recognizing that receivers are more sensitive than
>>ever before, and even harmonics of very low power can cause interference to the
>>intended function of these receivers.
>
>Unless they very recently changed the rules, -60dbc is the current
>harmonic spec for most transmitters used in the amateur and land
>mobile services.

They were changed to the new specs in 2002. I'll dig up the code later. If I remember correctly, it only applies to devices of new manufacture.

>>Is that the one with the three BF960's? Stupid design if you ask me, putting
>>three MOSFET's on a single board with no shielding between stages and set for an
>>overall gain of 40 dB!
>
>I don't know as I never physically had the device in my hands. That
>might be the one, as the better design used CATV gain blocks, which
>were internally stabilized.

The one I'm thinking of had a 20/40 dB switch. Does that help?

>>The toroidal choke works better if you split the wires and wind them in opposite
>>directions on the core.
>
>Yes it does, but that involves more work. If it works without going
>that extra mile, then we don't have to "damage" the neighbor's
>equipment.

I set aside a day or two each month to make 'trinkets', for lack of a better term. Things like pigtails, toroidal chokes, jumper leads, mic cables, etc.

>>>I had a neighbor who, back in 1983, complained to the FCC about my
>>>station. It seems that he was happy as a pig in mud, until one day his
>>>TV died and he bought a new one. All of a sudden he started hearing me
>>>loud and clear though the speaker in the TV. He swore that I was
>>>suddenly running "big power". He just didn't want to make the
>>>connection that the problem didn't start until he got a new TV. The
>>>FCC sent me a letter informing me that they had received a complaint.
>>>I wisely sent them my ham call, even though I knew that it was the CB
>>>that my neighbor was hearing. The FCC, once they realized that I was a
>>>ham, literally let the matter drop. They referred me to a "TVI
>>>committee" (A group of hams who investigate RFI claims), but once we
>>>made initial contact, they dropped the ball, and I never heard another
>>>word.
>>
>>
>>Now this is what I'm talking about. It's like the FCC says RFI is a bad thing
>>unless it comes from a ham, in which case the rest of the world must suffer.
>
>It's just a case of experience. Hams are noted for being more
>technically aware of their stations operation. That may not be as true
>today as it once was, but it's still a valid observation when compared
>to other services which are designed to be used by non-technical
>people (Like CB).
>
>Hams also have volunteer groups within their own ranks to take care of
>these things. I just got lucky that the matter dropped. Had my
>neighbor made a bigger fuss, they may have pushed the issue. I figure
>that my neighbor (Who himself used to be a CBer) turned me into the
>FCC just to "scare" me.

Well, if hams are expected to be the FCC's technical liasons to the general
public, maybe they should put that in the rules.

>>.....sic utere tuo ut alienum no laedas.....
>
>Latin? Sorry I'm one of those "Ugly Americans", who only knows English
>(and a few "bad" words in a few other languages).

.....to so use your own land as not to injure another.....

>>There is a difference here. The ham is transmitting a signal into someone else's
>>private space.
>
>Last time I looked RF doesn't observe borders either real or imagined.
>It is impossible to prevent (Unless you want to enclose your house in
>a faraday cage) RF from "polluting" your airwaves.

That much is obvious. My point is that radio operation requires a level of
responsibility as high as the level of the privelege.

>>The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham. It
>>should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
>>for anyone else.

>
>In other words stop transmitting. Hardly fair. Especially when the
>person with the interference can fix the problem by buying better
>consumer devices.
>
>> Point the antenna in a different direction. Use a different
>>antenna. Make an agreement with the other person to only transmit at certain
>>times (more commonly called 'sharing'). There is no reason a ham can't stop his
>>interference, or at least limit it to an acceptable level.
>
>What's considered "acceptable" is subjective. And that difference in
>perception is the source of most of the contention. Most people work
>during the day time, and enjoy their "entertainment" at night. That
>leaves a fairly small window for compromise where either party isn't
>giving up something that is important to them.

So the interfering ham should just brush off the neighbor and transmit anytime
he wants just because he can? That's not very fair, is it?

>Some people are happy if you stay quiet during certain sporting
>events. Other people will settle for nothing short of the total
>elimination of any and all interference. I've had to deal with some
>people so paranoid that they feel that the ham might give them cancer
>as a result of the RF exposure. How do you fight that level of
>paranoia?

I dunno. Ask Twisty. But looking at it from the other person's point of view
helps a lot. For example, people have a reasonable expectation that things they
own and use should work they way they were intended. Manufacturers can't make
things bullet-proof, and there will always be some vulnerabilities. So they have
to limit those vulnerabilities to what can be expected in normal, everyday use
by the vast majority of people. Close exposure to ham radio transmitters, I
don't think, could be classified as normal, everyday use by the vast majority of
people.

You have to draw some lines somewhere. There are what.... about 100,000 hams in
the US? Out of more than 300,000,000 people? So is it unreasonable for people to
expect that their modern appliances don't talk to them in the voice of the ham
next door? Sure it is. Whose responsibility is it to make sure that doesn't
happen? The manufacturers? No, because they make these products for the millions
of people who pay for them, not the thousands of hams who interfere with them.
It's up to the ham to make sure he doesn't piss off his neighbors. That's the
bottom line.

>>From a different perspective, and assuming you can prove that your signal is
>>clean, have you ever thought of suggesting to the person that they return the
>>merchandise as defective?
>
>Human nature is such that people become very defensive at the mere
>suggestion that their equipment is to blame. And since this is
>normally a design issue, any replacement that they get of the same
>model will likely be just as bad. Suggesting a different brand/model

>now begins to infringe on that person's right of individual choice.
>It's never a pretty sight.

Well, human nature is such that hams become very definsive at the mere suggestion that the manufacturer of that equipment isn't the person transmitting RF into your neighbor's home. And that person's right of individual choice was limited by the actions of the ham and nobody else.

>>>>I agree with you 100%, and one of those "special interest" groups is the ARRL.
>>>>They have done more to defend those that cause interference than they have to
>>>>help resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both the hams -and- the general
>>>>public.
>>>
>>>They defend hams against "witch hunts", where the radio operator is
>>>automatically painted as a "bad guy" simply because he enjoys a
>>>different venue for his pass time. You cannot expect the non-technical
>>>consumer to understand the nuances of RFI. All they know is that when
>>>the ham next door transmits, he kills their "XYZ device", therefore it
>>>must be his fault.
>>
>>
>>Because it is. You are intruding into their homes. You take from them some of
>>the comforts of everyday life that any reasonable person would expect to enjoy
>>in the privacy of their own home.
>
>Ok, look at it this way, would you blame the weather for making your
>house cold, if your front door was wide open? Maybe we should just
>stop all cold weather? Afterall, that cold weather is "intruding" into
>someone's home. Why should a homeowner take steps to block these
>intrusions? They should be eliminated at the source.

Cold weather is a normal fact of life that everyone expects to happen and therefore prepares for. Home intrusions by weather or anything else has a high probablity of occuring if there is no door. OTOH, most people will live their entire lives without ever witnessing a case of RFI. So why should everyone have to "buy a door"? It is just plain unreasonable to expect 300 million people to spend their time and money to protect themselves from the occasional ham radio operator.

The world does not revolve around ham radio.

>That's basically the position you are taking.
>
>>It's a nuisance like any other nuisance,
>>except that it's a nuisance which is protected by a federal law.
>
>Being told to give up an important hobby and passtime, is a "nuisance"
>as well. It all depends on your perspective.

How about the FCC telling people that they must either give up the use of their TV, cordless phone, and whatever electronic gadgets they use, or pay gobs of money to get the house under an RF condom, just because some ham moved in next

door and wants to play with his radio? That's not a nuisance?

Is there something I'm missing here? Are hams some sort of superior race that the rest of the world must crawl in their presence? What right do hams think they have to take away the rights of others for the sake of a hobby? Am I the only person that can see the arrogance of that kind of attitude? Or is that what the human race is evolving into and I just got left behind? If that's the case then stop this thread because I want to get off!

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1133. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 19:13:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <q7SdnUXVs60VOcXdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89247

William wrote:

>
> I think I've got your statements figured out.
>
> Cell phones or cell phone systems may break down and leave you w/o communications.
>
> Amateur radio may break down and leave you without communications.

It is possible, but what are the odds that both will be down at the same
times, especially since I have backup for ham radio. It is much more
likely that the cell phone or cell phone system will leave me without
cell phone communications than my ham radio will leave me without the
ability to communicate via ham radio.

1134. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 19:35:16 UTC
From: JackGibson@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <72e86d08.0403171135.1fe73a57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

Athome@casual.com (TheNIGHTCRAWLER) wrote in message
news:<405baa18.3898686@news.prodigy.net>...

> Somebody has to make clear the laws that every citizen of the U.S. is
> expected to know. Assumed to have read.
>
> Usage of the word "fucking" is against the law. A law that is important
> to people in their daily conversations and expressions of extreme
> emotion, distress, or agony.
>
> Since it may be a law, I felt you should be informed of this law as
> required of any law-abiding citizen of the United States. It is my
> responsibility that I should inform people of what they are required to
> know that the word "fucking" is no longer lawful.

I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
U.S. fucking citizen.

So fucking there.

- Fucking Jack

1135. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 20:28:35 UTC
From: kstahl <ktsahl@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <6Jidna6Eg5lpKcXdRVn-iQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 89249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

Jack Gibson wrote:
> Athome@casual.com (TheNIGHTCRAWLER) wrote in message
news:<405baa18.3898686@news.prodigy.net>...
>
>
>>Somebody has to make clear the laws that every citizen of the U.S. is
>>expected to know. Assumed to have read.
>>
>>Usage of the word "fucking" is against the law. A law that is important
>>to people in their daily conversations and expressions of extreme
>>emotion, distress, or agony.
>>
>>Since it may be a law, I felt you should be informed of this law as
>>required of any law-abiding citizen of the United States. It is my
>>responsibility that I should inform people of what they are required to
>>know that the word "fucking" is no longer lawful.
>
>
> I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
> U.S. fucking citizen.
>
> So fucking there.
>
> - Fucking Jack

You are a monk with a vow of celibacy?

1136. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) R epo rt 1387 March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 20:49:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403171249.49947953@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89250

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94AE81F9D8DEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0403160345.5948983e@posting.google.com:
>

> >> Oh wow! I would think that something like a scientific expedition
> >> would want some reliable communication that you can use anywhere and
> >> count on at all times, like cell phones. Right witless willie?
> >
> > Uhhh . . don't particularly mean to bust yer stones here JJ but how
> > many dialup cells do you suppose Verizon and/or AT&T or any other
> > telco has up and running in the headwaters region of the Amazon?
> >
> > w3rv
> >
>
> I went with a group of scouts to a ski resort (didn't ski, but my son did).
> They had this marvellous plan to communicate with cell phones instead of
> moving around the resort together as a group. Guess what? No coverage.
> Nobody knew where anyone else was for 80-90% of the time.

Good lesson for 'em on the frailties of the technologies they think
they'd die without. How did we ever survive the throes of puberty
without a cell phone glued to an ear?

> I was the only ham there, so I'm not suggesting that ham radio would have
> been a solution. However, if there had been some sort of HTs (FRS or the
> like) that would have worked where cell phones failed altogether. One
> family did bring a pair of FRS radios and were able to stay in touch.

Sure. I live upstairs, another Extra lives downstairs. We use a pair
of FRS HTs all the time to communicate with each other. "Mailman just
dropped off some for you Bub". They're perefect for comms during
"antenna parties", etc.

Bugles worked when I was a Scout. Especially chow call. Heh.

> And
> yes, there are other solutions to coordinating groups of people that don't
> rely on radio atall, but once you actually rely on radios they better work.

Amen.

> My point? Even in the absence of a disaster cell phones are not the answer.
> In an actual disaster situation relying on cellular is foolish. Yes, it may
> work. Or not ...

The last emergency comms gear I'd depend on out in the bush is any kind cell phone or ham gear, simple common sense indicates that both have to completely unreliable when it comes to summoning first responders. And it gets worse than idiotic in the case of this Bonnie nitwit who thinks that some qrp op on a mountain in South America is going to be able to reliably call a ham in North America to launch an S&R operation in SA.

Real scientific expeditions, which Bonnie's cave-crawling trips are not, use real emergency comms gear. ELT type equipment on 406.025 Mhz to satellites which are monitored by goverments globally, air band HTs on 121.500 Mhz, etc.

w3rv

1137. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 22:24:34 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac29a2964bd37019898d1@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 89101

NexTel, &diety's gift to first responders with their PTT feature, lacks more than a few hours
of battery backup at their tower sites and that is only if the batteries have been maintained.
After that it's "The Number You Dialed Is not Working"

Steve
N2UBP

1138. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 22:47:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403171447.13020680@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89102

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40586436.2040505@psu.edu>...
> Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
> ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
> is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
> sense.
>
> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures
> of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and
> the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is
> just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>
> We DON'T learn do we?
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I can hear Larry now, "I'm a Superior Ham because I have higher voltage finals..."

Or Bruce, "Know Ham = Know Voltage."

1139. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 22:57:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403171457.41ead2a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89103

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403170621.71218151@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
> > > HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
> > > with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
> > > "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
>
> Uh huh...
> >
> > But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
> > mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
> > what he gets.
>
> I guess you meant "Len", Brain...but another typo, per the
> LennieRant of "typo = rage" must mean we're getting under you skin!
> Too bad!

Nope, no anger or rage. Len has been working out and now I call him
"Lean."

But I do detect yet another typo in your reply.

> Yeah...he does...Offers himself up as a "professional", scolds
> EVERYONE for allegedly not knowing about anything not directly Part 97
> related, then makes stupid, easily caught errors.

He would praise you for knowing sumptin about about Part 97. Best of
Luck.

> Kinda like you, Brain, without the assertion of "professional".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I can read and understand Part 97, re: Morse vs Farnsworth, re:
repeater owners charging $$$ for use of a repeater.

And another typo on your part.

1140. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:02:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403171502.15f37eff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89104

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<Dc2dnfNwtNDDX8rdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <20040314150147.02537.00003503@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>European fuel prices are that high in large part because of very high taxes.
> >>The tax revenues are used for the roads and also to subsidize bus, transit
> >>(Metro) and rail service. Unlike the USA, public transportation in Europe is
> >>not expected to make money or even to meet its own expenses.
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > Don't look now, but ALL public transit in the United States exists mainly due
> > to state and federal subsidies which provide virtually all of the funding
> > needed
> > for the procurement of vehicles, facilities, communications systems, and most
> > of the operating costs. If public transit had to "pay it's own way," I, for
> > one
> > public transit employee, would not have a job. I drive Paratransit in Kent
> > County, Delaware, and the cash I turn in from my fare box at the end of the
> > day would not pay for an hour's worth of my wages. At best, a few of our
> > more heavily utilized fixed-routes in Wilmington might just possibly pay for
> > the fuel consumed and other routine expenses, but wouldn't even come close
> > to covering all of the essential overhead.
>
> Here is my take on Public Transit, Larry:
>
> Is public transit a good thing, or a waste of taxpayers money? Is the
> subsidy of public transit a liberal plot to undermine America's core
> values, or what? (hehe, kind of melodramatic there!)

But Mike, w/o public transit, Larry would have a hard time telling us
his "Favorite Black on the Bus..." stories.

1141. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:08:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403171508.5849640e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89105

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
> >
> He's just repeating what ARRL...

Damn you, Lean. You sold out!!!

You've become just another mouthpiece for the ARRL!

I'm gonna have to call you "The Non-Amateur Formerly Known Not As
Mouth-Piece for the ARRL," or TNAFKNAMPARRL for short.

Thanks for the tip, TAFKARJ.

Billy

1142. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:32:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <r4qdnW_aU76PfMXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

Jack Gibson wrote:

>
> I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
> U.S. fucking citizen.
>
> So fucking there.

Obviously that is a big plus for the U.S.

1143. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:46:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040317184603.12501.00006806@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89109

In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
>here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.

Looks like Kellie has already set the stage for his excuses in not filing a damn thing and will then tawk tuff about nasty gubmint afterwards.

Kellie tawks tuff all over the place in here. He can't do it to the FCC? :-)

LHA / WMD

1144. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:46:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040317184604.12501.00006808@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89107

In article <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> That was for a Novice!
>
> Good questions! And actually not all that hard. Sounds like an
>enjoyable test to take.

Easy to say when you've taken all your tests and never have to
take another test (if you renew within time bounds).

Put yourself in the newcomer's place and look at it from their
vantage point -and- that of the FCC.

But, I don't think you will. You will, like way too many others,
look at it from your own personal viewpoint and experience and
desires and by default try to make all newcomers think as you do.

You can't freeze testing as it was in 1976...or 1986, 1966, 1956,
1946, or 1936. The overall environment is constantly changing
even if your personal activities isn't changing.

LHA / WMD

1145. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:46:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040317184604.12501.00006807@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89108

In article <4058626E.9080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> I think that NCVEC and ARRL and others are missing the boat here. With
>the likely disappearance of Morse as a requirement, they are simply
>proposing *another* caste system, in which there is an elite, and an
>underclass ghetto of people with what to me seem to be radically reduced
>privileges. I don't have anything against different levels, but this
>seems like too much discrimination.

It doesn't sit well with you that you are cast with the pro-code caste?

Some hams NEED a caste system just to prove they are "better"
than others, thus fulfilling a self-deficiency.

For a very long time morse code ability was the caste marker,
having no reasonable value except for some to brag that they
were "better" than no-coders.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all the pro-coders beginning to cry and whine...?

LHA / WMD

1146. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-17 23:48:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <cYGdnTQd5qzgeMXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89110

Steve Stone wrote:

> NexTel, &diety's gift to first responders with their PTT feature, lacks more than a few hours
> of battery backup at their tower sites and that is only if the batteries have been maintained.
> After that it's "The Number You Dialed Is not Working"
>
>
> Steve
> N2UBP
>

I just came from a seminar with USN Rear Admiral Daniel Stone, Director of Logistics and Engineering for NORAD/USNORTHCOM, he reports directly to General Eberhart, commander of NORAD. One of the issues discussed was emergency communications in times of disasters like 9/11. I ask him about the use of cell phones during such times, he just laughed and said that the cell phone network was useless for any emergency comms in such a scenario. Witless willie's cell phone network is not even a consideration in their emergency planning. He also works with The Office of Homeland Defense on emergengy communications issues and he confirmed that the OHD is attempting to intergrate Amateur Radio in their plans for emergency comms.

1147. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 00:25:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4066c.13151$t16.7654797@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89111

"Hambone the Magnificent" <tobaccoman42@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:cdbd7$4057e27d$d1cc5af5$32544@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
> >
> > > In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
> > > voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
> >
> > What about the 110 AC line?
>
> Good glub OM, where did you get your technical facts?
> 110 VAC was the standard line voltage in 1927!
> Today the standard is 125 VAC. Update your notes.
>
> > > and that only commercially
> > > manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
> >
> > Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.
>
> Sour grapes. Poo-Poohs. Cry me a river.
> Same shi+ different day. Blah Blah Blah.
> You old ham farts think everyone should know
> code just because YOU had to learn it 40+
> Years ago in a smoke filled room. OyVey
> Bitch-Piss-and-Moan.....(playing my violin)
>
> > > Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
> > > multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
> > > certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
> >
> > This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
> *really"
> > means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on the 20
> question
> > test!
>
> How do you know that? You don't even know
> what the present day standard Line Voltage is!
>
> > The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I
> did from
> > Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could safely build

> > transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these additional limits
> today?
>
> That was THEN - this is NOW.
>
> I got my licence in 1969 btw and my first xmitter was
> a DX-60B (which I built from a kit) and a Drake 2B.
> Would I burden today's hams to do the same? No way.
> It's a different era.
>

But why forbid them from experiencing such an activity?? That makes no sense in light of the basis and purpose of amateur radio as stated in the current Part 97. They should not be required to homebrew nor should they be prevented from home brewing.

> As someone said at a Bond Traders Luncheon I was
> at 2 Months ago: "Glue-ing feathers to your ass
> DOES NOT make you a rooster in the hen house".
>
> > NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying much...
>
> I'll give you that one. The ARRL is trying to backpeddle
> big time as the hobby is dying on the vine with ever month
> of the full-page listings of SK's. They should have been doing
> this kind of restructuring 20 Years ago!! It's probably too
> late now. EXAMPLE: Plunk a teenager in front of a new Yaesu HF station
> and a 2 gHz Pentium w/DSL, DVD, CD burner and a Kazaa
> account and *try to guess* which one he'll want to play with.....(grin)
>

The problem is NOT in the licensing structure. There is no structure that will dramatically increase the number of amateur radio operators, not even a no test license. The non-licensed services have proven that. Today CB activity is way down. It is so low that there are now people who not only have not heard of ham radio, they haven't even heard of CB!

The actual problem is stems from several elements. 1) Most people outside of amateur radio have never heard of it. So even if they might be inclined to pursue this hobby, they will never be involved. 2) Amateur radio, as with any specialized activity, is only going to appeal to a limited number of people in the first place. 3) There is a greater multitude of hobbies and activities available today than ever before. People have to make choices on how to spend their time and money.

I've seen no evidence of ham radio "dying on the vine". The listing of SK's has shown no quantum leap. The number of new licensees exceeds the number of licenses expiring.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1148. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 00:39:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Vc66c.13158$t16.7657503@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89112

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:405875FF.4000003@psu.edu...
>
> Not if you needed to call Dee, it didn't! 8^)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Good one Mike and absolutely correct.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Not here.... mine worked great!
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> >
> >>In the power outage of August 2003, I personally experienced the erratic
> >>availability of cell phones.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1149. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 01:07:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040317200723.07155.00001309@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89113

In article <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
>>>>voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage

>>>How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
>>>Magloops?

>> Or dipoles? Or antenna tuners? Or line-powered power supplies?
>>
>>>These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
>>>are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
>>>safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!

>> There's a logical inconsistency in this requirement. The purpose of safety
>> questions in the written test is not so much to protect an amateur from the
>> consequences of his/her own ignorance as to protect *others*.

> Sure. And there is no logical argument that can convince me that safety

>shouldn't be practiced from the start. It doesn't have to be safety
>officer level, but it has to be there, and it has to be there from the
>start.

I agree 100%. Even back in my Novice days there were safety questions on the
test.

>>> I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
>>>limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.
>>
>> Consider this: In most areas that I know of, a homeowner can work on
>> his/her
>> electrical wiring without a license or test of any kind. Same for plumbing.
>> Just can't do it to somebody else's house as a "professional" - meaning for
>> money.
>>
>> So a Communicator could legally wire or re-wire his/her entire house, but
>> could
>> not legally *operate* a TS-520. Or even a solid-state rig with 48 volt
>> finals....because he/she might hurt themselves!
>
> That's why they shouldn't be allowed to have electrical tools! ;^)

HAW!

But it just points out how ridiculous that part of the NCVEC proposal really is.

Here's two more:

1) Audiophiles and radio restorers build and work on all sorts of high-voltage electronics without any test. Why is a ham transmitter so dangerous if it has more than 30 volts, but not a ham receiver or a stereo amplifier?

2) Low voltage is no guarantee of safety. A 100 watt transceiver powered by 13.8 volts will typically require 20 A or more to transmit full power. 35 A and 50 A supplies are common. Don't get your rig across those terminals...

>
>>>>and that only commercially
>>>>manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>>>
>>> This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a
>>>commercially built product be?
>>
>> 1) To sell more commercially built products (read the "21st Century" paper
>>- it
>> talks about how we need more hams or the ham equipment manufacturers will
>>close
>> up shop).
>>
>> 2) To get new hams in the habit of buying, not building
>>
>> 3) To eliminate even more theory from the written test
>
> zzzzzzzzzz..... now *that* sounds like a much fun as a stick in the eye.
>
It's what NCVEC is trying to sell. Some folks here seem to be buying it. I don't.

Some of the main Basis and Purposes of the ARS are technical education, experimentation, and related stuff. Limiting *any* class of ham license to manufactured gear and so many final volts directly contradicts those B&P.

>
>>>The main reason I am in Amateur radio at
>>>all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.
>>
>> More to the point: How many hams do we lose each year to electrocution from
>> their transmitters? How many hams cause serious interference problems with
>> their home-brew or restored rigs?

>>> I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must
>>>drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL
>>>defense fund.
>
>> The Dr. Pepper contingent will have a fit!

>
>If they provide enough money, then maybe they will be the one!

I prefer Sprite or 7Up, myself. Better yet, a Yuengling Black & Tan or a
Guiness Stout.
>
>>>The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or
>>>electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built
>>>transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from
>>>foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or
>>>something
>>
>> But they would legally be allowed to build power supplies for their
>> commercially built rigs....
>
> Right! we'll have to work on that! The goal is no booboo's. We have to
>protect the new hams from themselves. So I would amend the proposal to
>not allow Communicator's to use ANY voltages over 48 volts.

No power tools, no vacuum cleaners..oh wait, what about the CRT in the computer
monitor? Or the ATX power supply in the computer! Oh the humanity!
>
> Maybe they should wear aluminum foil hats too?

Seriously, I think such rules insult those we are trying to attract.
>
>>>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>>>>multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
>>>>certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
>>>>Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
>>>>be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination
>questions.
>>>
>>> Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than
>>>25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.
>>
>> Me too. You should see the tests they give second-graders here.
>
>> The old Novice test was originally 20 questions, then 25, then 30. Most of
>> the
>> added questions were concerned with safety and the expanded privileges.
>> Novices
>> are allowed to homebrew anything they can legally use on the air.
>
> I have always though that having more questions on a test made the test

>easier! If you have a twenty question test, you don't have to miss many
>to get a failing grade.
>
That's one way to look at it.

>>> What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought
>>>in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was
>>>still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had"
>>>to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange
>>>method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.

>> Where do you think NCVEC got the idea about the rules?
>
> But didn't learn much else. Maybe they should check the aftermath of
>that example.

Maybe it's what they want!
>
>>> If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97,
>>>there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book
>>>about the whole process and sign for that.
>>>
>>
>> BINGO!
>
> Testing would certainly be easier!

One wonders what would be left to test!

And here's the bottom line:

If there is *anything* that *must* be part of testing for a ham license of
any class, it's safety and the rules and regulations. No exceptions, no
signed statements.

What you are seeing is exactly what I predicted about the anticodetest
arguments being used against the written test.
>
>> Check this out:
>>
>> From the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>>
>> NOVICE (1976)
>>
>> Study Question #31:
>> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
>> (a) battery with internal resistance, (b) resistive load, (c) voltmeter,
>> (d) ammeter.
>>
>> Study Question #32:
>> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
>> the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
>> by the load be determined?
>>
>> Study Question #33:
>> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
>> order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
>>

>> Study Question #34:
>> Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having
>the
>> following components: (a) triode vacuum tube, (b) pi-network output tank,
>(c)
>> high voltage source, (d) plate-current meter, (e) plate-voltage meter, (f)
>> rf chokes, (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>>
>> Study Question #35:
>> What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>>
>> The actual exam was multiple choice, and would show a schematic of the
>> amplifier circuit - close, but not exactly like the one shown inthe license
>> manual - and had 5 of the components labelled "a" thru "e". The question
>would
>> be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf
>chokes?"
>> "what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>>
>> That was for a Novice!
>
> Good questions! And actually not all that hard.

Not for you and not for me. Even when I was a 13 year old Novice-to-be those questions were not "hard". Some folks here are obviously stumped by them, though..

>Sounds like an enjoyable test to take.

Challenge is the word I'd use.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1150. If ham radio were created today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 01:52:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%h76c.13182$t16.7668821@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89114

Well here's a possible scenario if ham radio came into being today. It is based on the following hypothetical history.

1. Radio was developed by commercial interests and government.
2. Hams were allocated bands as the commercial interests and government interests increased or decreased usage of bands.
3. Hams would be allowed technical experimentation. This is quite a stretch as it would be hard to justify when there is no history of contribution by hams.

Based on this here is what I would conjecture.

1. Amateurs would have no VHF or higher frequencies as these would be completely allocated to commercial and government interests.
2. Limited HF access would be granted as the commercial & government users migrated to satellite for worldwide communications.
3. Initial operations would be HF AM as sideband probably would not have been developed by commercial interests and only experimented with in government/military apps.
4. No FM would be allowed as hams would have no bands with sufficient bandwidth available for FM use.
5. Eventually hams would turn the experimental government use into practical application since they would need to find ways of narrowing the signals to permit more users to occupy what would probably be much more limited HF spectrum than we now enjoy.
6. Hams would try developing digital modes. Probably the first to be tried would be packet as it uses a modulation scheme like that which connects computers to the Internet. Since HF packet would prove to be too subject to disruption by natural static, it's use would become minimal after the initial flush of excited experimentation just as it has done in the real history.
7. Hams would then search through other possible digital modes and eventually light on RTTY, long abandoned by military users, but sufficiently robust to stand up to the vagaries of HF propagation reasonably well. This would a fairly steady level of popularity.
9. However hams would continue to experiment with modes. They would seek simple, basic non-computer driven mode to use when voice was getting not through and when computer was unable to decipher the digital signals. They might light on the idea of using Morse code transmitted via a simple on/off keying of the radio. As a simple, reliable, portable mode of operation, it would be as popular as voice and far more popular than digital. There would be frequent contests and everyone would be pestering the experts for tips on how to get better at code.

The greatest difference between ham radio coming into being today versus the actual history of ham radio is that amateurs would have no access to VHF and higher frequencies. This I think would be quite a sad development.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1151. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 02:28:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hK-dnXttjJ_FIMTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89115

N2EY wrote:

> In article <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>>In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
>>>>>voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>
>
>>>>How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
>>>>Magloops?
>
>
>>>Or dipoles? Or antenna tuners? Or line-powered power supplies?
>>>
>>>
>>>>These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
>>>>are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
>>>>safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!
>
>
>
>>>There's a logical inconsistency in this requirement. The purpose of safety
>>>questions in the written test is not so much to protect an amateur from the
>>>consequences of his/her own ignorance as to protect *others*.
>
>
>> Sure. And there is no logical argument that can convince me that safety
>
>
>>shouldn't be practiced from the start. It doesn't have to be safety
>>officer level, but it has to be there, and it has to be there from the
>>start.
>
>
> I agree 100%. Even back in my Novice days there were safety questions on the
> test.

>
>
>>>> I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
>>>>limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.
>>>
>>>Consider this: In most areas that I know of, a homeowner can work on
>>>his/her
>>>electrical wiring without a license or test of any kind. Same for plumbing.
>>>Just can't do it to somebody else's house as a "professional" - meaning for
>>>money.
>>>
>>>So a Communicator could legally wire or re-wire his/her entire house, but
>>>could
>>>not legally *operate* a TS-520. Or even a solid-state rig with 48 volt
>>>finals....because he/she might hurt themselves!
>>
>> That's why they shouldn't be allowed to have electrical tools! ;^)
>
>
> HAW!
>
> But it just points out how ridiculous that part of the NCVEC proposal really
> is.
>
> Here's two more:
>
> 1) Audiophiles and radio restorers build and work on all sorts of high-voltage
> electronics without any test. Why is a ham transmitter so dangerous if it has
> more than 30 volts, but not a ham receiver or a stereo amplifier?
>
> 2) Low voltage is no guarantee of safety. A 100 watt transceiver powered by
> 13.8 volts will typically require 20 A or more to transmit full power. 35 A and
> 50 A supplies are common. Don't get your rig across those terminals...

I know what you mean. One of my jobs in the deep past involved working
around 5 Volt power supplies. Problem was they were many hundreds of
amps! I couldn't wear my wedding ring or any jewelry, and they bought me
a pair of non-conductive glasses. No metal belt buckles, etc.

>>>>>and that only commercially
>>>>>manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>>>>
>>>> This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a
>>>>commercially built product be?
>>>
>>>1) To sell more commercially built products (read the "21st Century" paper
>>>- it
>>>talks about how we need more hams or the ham equipment manufacturers will
>>>close
>>>up shop).
>>>

>>>2) To get new hams in the habit of buying, not building
>>>
>>>3) To eliminate even more theory from the written test
>>
>> zzzzzzzzzz..... now *that* sounds like a much fun as a stick in the
>
> eye.
>
> It's what NCVEC is trying to sell. Some folks here seem to be buying it. I
> don't.
>
> Some of the main Basis and Purposes of the ARS are technical education,
> experimentation, and related stuff. Limiting *any* class of ham license to
> manufactured gear and so many final volts directly contradicts those B&P.

Agreed!

>>>>The main reason I am in Amateur radio at
>>>>all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.
>>>
>>>More to the point: How many hams do we lose each year to electrocution from
>>>their transmitters? How many hams cause serious interference problems with
>>>their home-brew or restored rigs?
>
>
>
>>>> I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must
>>>>drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL
>>>>defense fund.
>>
>>>The Dr. Pepper contingent will have a fit!
>>
>>If they provide enough money, then maybe they will be the one!
>
>
> I prefer Sprite or 7Up, myself. Better yet, a Yuengling Black & Tan or a
> Guiness Stout.

I believe that is *2* Guiness Stout's! For some reason you're supposed
to have 2. I won't argue! Happy St Paddy's day BTW

>>>>The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or
>>>>electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built
>>>>transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from
>>>>foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or
>>>>something
>>>
>>>But they would legally be allowed to build power supplies for their
>>>commercially built rigs....
>>
>> Right! we'll have to work on that! The goal is no booboo's. We have to

>>protect the new hams from themselves. So I would amend the proposal to
>>not allow Communicator's to use ANY voltages over 48 volts.
>
>
> No power tools, no vacuum cleaners..oh wait, what about the CRT in the computer
> monitor? Or the ATX power supply in the computer! Oh the humanity!
>
>> Maybe they should wear aluminum foil hats too?
>
>
> Seriously, I think such rules insult those we are trying to attract.

Not that we're arguing, but I'll give you Game, Set, and Match on that
comment.

>>>>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>>>>>multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
>>>>>certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
>>>>>Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what would
>>>>>be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination
>>
>>questions.
>>
>>>> Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than
>>>>25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.
>>>
>>>Me too. You should see the tests they give second-graders here.
>>
>>>The old Novice test was originally 20 questions, then 25, then 30. Most of
>>>the
>>>added questions were concerned with safety and the expanded privileges.
>>>Novices
>>>are allowed to homebrew anything they can legally use on the air.
>>
>> I have always though that having more questions on a test made the test
>
>
>>easier! If you have a twenty question test, you don't have to miss many
>>to get a failing grade.
>>
>
> That's one way to look at it.
>
>
>>>> What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought
>>>>in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was
>>>>still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had"
>>>>to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange
>>>>method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.
>
>

>
>>>Where do you think NCVEC got the idea about the rules?
>>
>> But didn't learn much else. Maybe they should check the aftermath of
>>that example.
>
>
> Maybe it's what they want!

rrrgh, (twitching a bit here)

>>>> If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97,
>>>>there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book
>>>>about the whole process and sign for that.
>>>>
>>>
>>>BINGO!
>>
>> Testing would certainly be easier!
>
>
> One wonders what would be left to test!
>
> And here's the bottom line:
>
> If there is *anything* that *must* be part of testing for a ham license of
> *any* class, it's safety and the rules and regulations. No exceptions, no
> signed statements.
>
> What you are seeing is exactly what I predicted about the anticodetest
> arguments being used against the written test.

Yup! Remember, the tests cannot be simple enough for some people.

>>>Check this out:
>>>
>>>From the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>>>
>>>NOVICE (1976)
>>>
>>>Study Question #31:
>>> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
>>>(a) battery with internal resistance, (b) resistive load, (c) voltmeter,
>>>(d) ammeter.
>>>
>>>Study Question #32:
>>> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
>>>the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
>>>by the load be determined?
>>>
>>>Study Question #33:

>>> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
>>>order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
>>>
>>>Study Question #34:
>>> Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having
>>
>>the
>>
>>>following components: (a) triode vacuum tube, (b) pi-network output tank,
>>
>>(c)
>>
>>>high voltage source, (d) plate-current meter, (e) plate-voltage meter, (f)
>>>rf chokes, (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>>>
>>>Study Question #35:
>>> What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>>>
>>>The actual exam was multiple choice, and would show a schematic of the
>>>amplifier circuit - close, but not exactly like the one shown inthe license
>>>manual - and had 5 of the components labelled "a" thru "e". The question
>>
>>would
>>
>>>be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf
>>
>>chokes?"
>>
>>> "what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>>>
>>>That was for a Novice!
>>
>> Good questions! And actually not all that hard.
>
>
> Not for you and not for me. Even when I was a 13 year old Novice-to-be those
> questions were not "hard". Some folks here are obviously stumped by them,
> though..
>
>
>>Sounds like an enjoyable test to take.
>

> Challenge is the word I'd use.

I like a challenge! Some people do not. I think that one of the most
damning things about the age that we live in is that somehow, some way,
those who want no challenges are in their ascendancy.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1152. AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 02:33:23 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac2d46d1b655d359898d2@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 89116

****
AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL
INTERFERENCE ISSUES

Amateur radio enthusiasts are submitting copious comments that are flooding the docket for the FCC's notice of proposed rulemaking on broadband-over-powerline technologies. The comments are coming well in advance of a May 3 due date.

"From what I've seen, BPL will wipe out the [high frequency] and some [very high frequency] bands," said one typical filing. "It's been rejected in other places and should not be allowed in the United States.
In an emergency, government and communities are loosely held together by using these bands with emergency communications. Don't let Big Money outweigh the good of our country."

Sources say the FCC has been respectful of amateur radio concerns but also has recognized that they may not reflect real problems. "The FCC has determined that the end-of-the-world interference scenarios put forward by some in the amateur community are unrealistic," said Mitchell Lazarus, a lawyer who represents BPL service provider Current Technologies. "The NPRM is a good beginning of the process of finding a fair balance between the needs of broadband users and users of the radio spectrum."

Last month when the FCC approved the NPRM, Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein said, "While we must be mindful of harmful interference, we cannot let unsupported claims stand in the way of such an innovation as BPL systems."

The FCC approved the NPRM on Feb. 12 and released it 11 days later, but it was not published in the Federal Register until today, starting a 45-day clock for comments. Reply comments are due 30 days later. - Howard Buskirk, hbuskirk@tr.com

http://www.tr.com/online/trd/2004/td031704/index.htm

1153. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:09:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318000905.21642.00005021@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89117

In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,

>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>sense.
>
> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures
>of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and
>the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is
>just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>
> We DON'T learn do we?

Apparently there's NO reading, either. The only power limitation of
the NECVEC petition-proposal is in a 400 KHz low sub-band on 10m
for the three lower classes.

Re-read the NECVEC petition-proposal and report back.

LHA / WMD

1154. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:09:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318000907.21642.00005023@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89118

In article <1e4e3692.0403171508.5849640e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>> >>
>> >> Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
>> >
>> He's just repeating what ARRL...
>
>Damn you, Lean. You sold out!!!
>
>You've become just another mouthpiece for the ARRL!

Ah, but I put the ARRL definitely in one cheek...

>I'm gonna have to call you "The Non-Amateur Formerly Known Not As
>Mouth-Piece for the ARRL," or TNAFKNAMPARRL for short.

Why not? All the pro-coders call me something... :-)

>Thanks for the tip, TAFKARJ.

Jimmie has tips on everything. He knows what is, what isn't, who is
right, who is wrong, even what the FCC thinks. Information
technology or IT. He's full of IT. :-)

Yours sincerely,
TNAFKNAMPARRL

1155. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:09:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318000907.21642.00005022@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89119

In article <1e4e3692.0403170344.10dc6c66@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> > Proposed entry level transmitter power is proposed to be 100
>watts
>> > when the operation takes place below 24 MHz; 50 watts above. This is the
>> > same as the ARRL proposal.
>>
>> I still want to see the people (tech's specifically) that have been
>> harmed by RF.
>
>It makes sense in light of the present rf hazard calcs that we have to
>perform.
>
>But I've not seen anyone claimed to have been harmed by rf.

It might have been Mike or Bill in writing the limits of emission
power in the NECVEC petition.

I just read it through and the ONLY limitation is the NECVEC
modification of 97.313 (c) which states "no station may transmit
with a transmitter power exceeding 200 W PEP on -(2)- the
28.1 - 28.5 MHz segment when the control operator is a Novice
Class operator, a Technician Class operator or a Technician Plus
Class."

If those folks are going to argue about things, they ought to get
their sources in order. The way I see it, Mike Coslo hasn't seen
the NECVEC petition. It's only 9 pages.. They must be arguing
the ARRL petition in the wrong thread. ?

LHA / WMD

1156. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:09:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318000908.21642.00005024@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89120

In article <1e4e3692.0403171457.41ead2a8@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170621.71218151@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403160342.7eb1ea47@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403152133.69accef6@posting.google.com>...
>> > >
>> > > Better idea: Paint HIS house lavender and put the flamingoes in
>> > > HIS yard...especially when he takes one of his vaunted "road trips"
>> > > with Mrs Lennie...Don't forget the metallized fountain ball and the
>> > > "carriage boy with lantern" figurine..
>> > >
>> > > 73
>> > >
>> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> > Vandalism? An effigy of racism? You're acting out of control again.
>>
>> Uh huh...
>> >
>> > But you guys go ahead with your stomp-fest. It is well deserved. I
>> > mean Lean was waaay off with his date for CB creation. He deserves
>> > what he gets.
>>
>> I guess you meant "Len", Brain...but another typo, per the
>> LennieRant of "typo = rage" must mean we're getting under you skin!
>> Too bad!
>
>Nope, no anger or rage. Len has been working out and now I call him
>"Lean."

Actually, I've been out working, not working out. :-)

>But I do detect yet another typo in your reply.
>
>> Yeah...he does...Offers himself up as a "professional", scolds
>> EVERYONE for allegedly not knowing about anything not directly Part 97
>> related, then makes stupid, easily caught errors.
>
>He would praise you for knowing sumptin about about Part 97. Best of
>Luck.

He knows it exists. That's a plus. Beyond that, his score isn't
the highest grade on the report card.

>> Kinda like you, Brain, without the assertion of "professional".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I can read and understand Part 97, re: Morse vs Farnsworth, re:
>repeater owners charging $$$ for use of a repeater.
>
>And another typo on your part.

Nothing new. Gunnery nurse is mad has heck and hasn't been
taking anything. He should take something.

Sincerely,
TNAFKNAMPARRL

1157. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:11:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40592F65.AF9D47F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89121

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <4058626E.9080407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> > I think that NCVEC and ARRL and others are missing the boat here. With
> >the likely disappearance of Morse as a requirement, they are simply
> >proposing *another* caste system, in which there is an elite, and an
> >underclass ghetto of people with what to me seem to be radically reduced
> >privileges. I don't have anything against different levels, but this
> >seems like too much discrimination.
>
> It doesn't sit well with you that you are cast with the pro-code caste?
>
> Some hams NEED a caste system just to prove they are "better"
> than others, thus fulfilling a self-deficiency.
>
> For a very long time morse code ability was the caste marker,
> having no reasonable value except for some to brag that they
> were "better" than no-coders.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...all the pro-coders beginning to cry and whine...?

I have a caste system for you, Len: Everyone who has an amateur radio
license is "in". You're "out".

Dave K8MN

1158. Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:12:05 UTC
From: Sedina II <overman41042@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <83dea$40592fb3$d1cc4e52$17449@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89122
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
special guest on Coast to Coast AM
Thursday/Friday evening.

On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!

Show info for the above:
http://www.coasttocoastam.com/shows/2004/03/18.html

Main: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/

See also: http://www.whatdoesitmean.com/

1159. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 05:18:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40593134.8926EFA7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89123

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> >> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> That was for a Novice!
> > >
> > > Good questions! And actually not all that hard. Sounds like an
> > >enjoyable test to take.
>
> Easy to say when you've taken all your tests and never have to
> take another test (if you renew within time bounds).
>
> Put yourself in the newcomer's place and look at it from their
> vantage point -and- that of the FCC.
>
> But, I don't think you will. You will, like way too many others,
> look at it from your own personal viewpoint and experience and
> desires and by default try to make all newcomers think as you do.

You, Len, like way too many others, look at things from your own personal viewpoint and experience and desires and attempt to dictate regulation of amateur radio from that perspective. You'd have all the newcomers think of a five word per minute code test as an insurmountable obstacle.

> You can't freeze testing as it was in 1976...or 1986, 1966, 1956,
> 1946, or 1936. The overall environment is constantly changing
> even if your personal activities isn't changing.

"Activities isn't"?

Testing was changed again just a few years back. You know, around the time you were going to get an "Extra right out of the box". You really mustn't rush into these things. Take a few decades. Try to decide about GETTING INTO AMATEUR RADIO. Then all you have to do is wait and hope that the requirements will be lowered enough so that you can get in.

Dave K8MN

1160. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 06:09:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318010932.13960.00001247@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89124

In article <MPG.1ac2d46d1b655d359898d2@news.frontiernet.net>, Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>Subject: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN >OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL
>From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
>Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2004 02:33:23 GMT
>
>**********
>AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO >NPRM ON BPL INTERFERENCE ISSUES
>
>Amateur radio enthusiasts are submitting copious comments that are
>flooding the docket for the FCC's notice of proposed rulemaking on
>broadband-over-powerline technologies. The comments are coming
>well in advance of a May 3 due date.

"Submitting copious comments?!?!?"

As of the close of offices on 17 March 2004, there were exactly 25, that's TWENTY-FIVE comments on Et Docket 04-37. There are exactly 5 on ET Docket 04-29.

THIRTY comments (a few are doubles in each docket) is "copious?"

If you want "copiousness" then go to ET Docket 03-104 where there were 5,731 comments filed as of close of 17 Mar 04.

The only problem is that NOI 03-104 has ended.

If you look carefully down a few hundred on the ECFS page for 03-104 you will see that ALL the documents filed between 6 Feb 04 and 20 Feb 04 are "Sunshine"...the staff can't look at them to use for decision-making. Noticeable RED letters on those Sunshine notes.

>The FCC approved the NPRM on Feb. 12 and released it 11 days later,
>but it was not published in the Federal Register until today, starting
>a 45-day clock for comments. Reply comments are due 30 days later. -
>Howard Buskirk, hbuskirk@tr.com

Okay when is the "today" in the second line?

If you MUST quote someone playing reporter, please try to get the proper dates in there. You posted this on 18 Mar 04 as indicated on the header. [it's still 17 Mar 04 here on the west coast as I write this and has been circulating in the Internet posted on 17 Mar 04 in the

USA - USA is on 7 time zones, none of which are UTC] The FCC stated RELEASE date of 04-29 was 23 Feb 04. What is the date you are claiming for publishing in the Federal Register?

I count 46 days left until 3 May 04 from today, 17 March 04 (Saint Patrick's Day). "45 days" would mean you have posted in ADVANCE of a news break. Not a good thing in journalism circles and won't look good on your reporter's resume...not even if you get supernatural advance copies of a newspaper.

But, "45 days" isn't the end of comments. There's 60 [SIXTY] days from publishing in the Federal Register for Replies to Comments.

Not everyone reads the Federal Register at breakfast. Some don't even read petitions carefully.

Okay, there's still ALL of April to file comments on NPRM 04-29. Your name hasn't come up on the FCC's ECFS yet you are here trying to "scoop" someone?

If you want a "news scoop," investigate some dates. Look at the first document in the ECFS under docket 04-37...that's NPRM 04-29 and indicated as posted 23 Feb 04. However...the next document is a preliminary statement by the National Antenna Consortium and Amhearst Alliance and it is dated 19 Feb 04 (the document itself bears that date)! Which is what there?

The next two comments have posting dates of 24 Feb 04.

Find out why NPRM 04-29 is under docket 04-37 instead of the other docket in the ECFS, 04-29. If there is a docket 04-29, why is the NPRM posted under docket 04-37?

Why isn't the "Sunshine" notice continued on about 500 comments under docket 03-104 from 21 Feb 04 to today? That NOI should be toast...but the FCC hasn't removed 03-104 from the "hot button" listing on the FCC Consumer Complaints page.

If you can't consider a compound error situation at the FCC, then wonder why the mixup in dockets and that 03-104 is still there receiving comments when they won't be seen by staff? Can you smell something strange going on in DC (besides the usual) like diverting citizens' attention to post in what amounts to a digital trash bucket?

LHA / WMD

1161. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 06:31:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40594245.1010206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89125

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>
>The actual problem is stems from several elements. 1) Most people outside
>of amateur radio have never heard of it. So even if they might be inclined
>to pursue this hobby, they will never be involved. 2) Amateur radio, as
>with any specialized activity, is only going to appeal to a limited number
>of people in the first place. 3) There is a greater multitude of hobbies
>and activities available today than ever before. People have to make
>choices on how to spend their time and money.
>
>
>
Some people probably will choose a hobby that doesn't require taking a test
to get a license to do it. So we have to get a prospective ham person past
that chore. Not a big chore, but still a chore.

1162. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 10:42:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403180242.5b5450f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89126

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040317184603.12501.00006806@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
> >here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
>
> Looks like Kellie has already set the stage for his excuses in
> not filing a damn thing and will then tawk tuff about nasty
> gubmint afterwards.
>
> Kellie tawks tuff all over the place in here. He can't do it to
> the FCC? :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

I called that one right on the money didn't I ya PUTZ.

1163. Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 11:12:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 89127

Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the actual petition):

(begin quote)

II. PROPOSAL

D. Creation of a new entry level license.

....

19. Basic framework of the new entry level license:

....

d. Power limits: Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all frequencies below 24 MHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 MHz. This allows enough power for adequate communication under most circumstances, and matches the nominal power output of the largest number of commercially available transmitters and transceivers available as of this writing. The use of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for RF safety evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated threshold values for the frequencies concerned.

e. Additional electrical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may incorporate a final amplifier stage that requires more than 30 volts DC for normal operation. The goal of this restriction is to prevent, as much as is possible, injury to inexperienced operators. All known current production Amateur Radio transmitters and transceivers, including kits, available as of this writing, operate using 28 volts or less for the final stage. While this restriction of necessity prevents use of some "legacy" or "vintage" equipment, it is not likely to be a serious impediment to assembling a station.

f. Additional technical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may be used unless it is of commercial manufacture, or built from a kit of commercial origin. The reason for this provision is to prevent, as much as possible, spurious emissions from units lacking proper engineering design. Again, we realize that this leaves out one of the traditions of Amateur Radio, namely that of building your own station from "scratch". However, we note that technically inclined persons are likely to upgrade fairly quickly to a General Class license, where this restriction, and that of the previous paragraph, is no longer an issue.

(end quote)

1164. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 12:35:27 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac36192acb8b6b9898d3@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 89128

If you look at my original post it includs the source website of the information.

Please go to that website and look up the exact dates (if posted)

Thanks,

Steve
N2UBP

1165. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 12:38:42 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac362607c60f8c49898d4@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 89129

For those who lost my original post:

http://www.tr.com/online/trd/2004/td031704/td031704-04.htm#TopOfPage

The original post was copied from a Yahoo group.

This is the source data.

Table of Contents
AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL INTERFERENCE ISSUES

Amateur radio enthusiasts are submitting copious comments that are flooding the docket for the
FCC's notice of proposed rulemaking on broadband-over-powerline technologies. The comments are
coming well in advance of a May 3 due date.

"From what I've seen, BPL will wipe out the [high frequency] and some [very high frequency] bands," said one typical filing. "It's been rejected in other places and should not be allowed
in the United States. In an emergency, government and communities are loosely held together by
using these bands with emergency communications. Don't let Big Money outweigh the good of our
country."

Sources say the FCC has been respectful of amateur radio concerns but also has recognized that
they may not reflect real problems. "The FCC has determined that the end-of-the-world interference scenarios put forward by some in the amateur community are unrealistic," said Mitchell Lazarus, a lawyer who represents BPL service provider Current Technologies. "The NPRM
is a good beginning of the process of finding a fair balance between the needs of broadband users and users of the radio spectrum."

Last month when the FCC approved the NPRM, Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein said, "While we
must be mindful of harmful interference, we cannot let unsupported claims stand in the way of
such an innovation as BPL systems."

The FCC approved the NPRM on Feb. 12 and released it 11 days later, but it was not published
in the Federal Register until today, starting a 45-day clock for comments. Reply comments

are
due 30 days later. - Howard Buskirk, hbuskirk@tr.com

TR Daily, March 17, 2004

Copyright © 2004, Telecommunications Reports International, Inc.

1166. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 12:54:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040318075412.29660.00003459@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 89130

In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>> >>
>> >> Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
>> >
>> He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a
>> year
>> now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.
>
>He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
>here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
>
That too! As proved elsewhere, you hit that one dead-on.

The deadline for comments is May 3. Today is March 18. Some of us are already working on comments. Such serious stuff should not be rushed, though, and need to be thoroughly proofread and spellchecked. And the comments need to go two places since two sets of regs are changing.

ARRL has been beating this drum from the first. Full details at

http://www.arrl.org

73 de Jim, N2EY

1167. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 13:47:49 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <r46j50d32e0habm03t3nm39mr1cvk7k62l@4ax.com>
Source record: 89131
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <vkfg5052tbavduo9ptb5sf7n0jtfml8m9g@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 08:20:40 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><snip>
>>>Are your neighbors picking up your signal?
>>
>>Now, no (at least I don't think so, as I don't have much time to "do
>>radio" these days. However, back in my "radioactive" days in the old
>>neighborhood, I heard many second and third party accounts of hearing
>>my station through phones, cheap clock radios, and equally cheap
>>stereos. TV's I didn't bother, as a rule, except for a few notable
>>exceptions, where I didn't herringbone the picture (as the classic
>>case of harmonic interference would manifest itself), but instead my
>>audio would blast through the speaker (Which should never occur as the
>>TV's audio receiver is FM, and I was using AM), which smacked of
>>rectification in the audio stage of the TV.
>
>
>Sounds like a bad limiter.

Or rectification in an audio stage. For a simple AM detector, you only
need a half wave rectifier. Practically any semiconductor device has
this capability. When the volume control has no effect on the
intensity of the RFI, it's a sure bet that the interference is being
coupled into a stage downstream from the volume control.

>>>Finding the source of RFI is just like troubleshooting any other piece of
>>>electronic equipment. Take your spectrum analyzer to where the interference is
>>>occuring -- it doesn't do any good to measure signal strength where it doesn't
>>>matter.
>>
>>Ah, but it does matter! I was verifying that the signal I was putting
>>into the air with my equipment was clean, and I did that.
>>
>>You touched on some interesting external causes of RFI. There have
>>been cases where strong near field signals have been rectified by
>>corroded connections (like metal gutters or siding), and the signal
>>reradiated as a form of intermodulation, which can have the same
>>effect as harmonic generation. In this case, the transmitter is clean,
>>but the effects of the surrounding area can mimic a dirty transmitter.

>>I've even seen a case where a poor joint in a ham's antenna, caused a
>>spur to be generated. This is especially troublesome in repeater
>>operation, where these IMD products can desense the repeater's
>>receiver.
>
>
>Exactly! Sympathetic vibrations. It's like your signal is tapping someone else's
>tuning fork.

That's one way to look at it. But be that as it may, finding the
causes is only half of the trouble. Trying to convince unrelated third
parties to participate in your crusade, can be even tougher,
especially when there is nothing in it for them.

People tend to look at any "tampering" with their property as a
potential for future problems. You then unwillingly assume the
liability for any problems (related or not) that my occur for many
years afterward.

>>But unless these culprits are on your own property, you have no
>>control over them. If I find that "harmonics" were being generated as
>>a result of rectification in my next door neighbor's siding (a
>>different neighbor from the one complaining from RFI), what can I do?
>>I'm not about to pay to re-side his house, and he's under no
>>obligation to do it himself.
>
>
>No, but what you -can- do is isolate the 'tuning fork' and dampen it so it
>doesn't oscillate. The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video
>cables.

How do you apply that solution to aluminum siding or gutters, without
having access to physically modify them?

>>> Also, what are the devices that are receiving the interference? If you
>>>bring those same devices into your home (assuming you don't have interference
>>>with your own stuff, as per Bill's example), does it still pick up RFI? If you
>>>add a device to filter the fundamental does it still receive interference? Is
>>>the interference entering the device from the antenna, the power line, or some
>>>other unknown route? Is there RF on your power feed? Does either house have
>>>aluminum siding? If the RFI is coming through the TV, is it interfering with the
>>>audio or video, or both?
>>
>>Those are all intelligent questions to ask, when trying to get to the
>>bottom of the issue. The problem is that in many cases, you won't have
>>access to the problem devices, as the neighbor may not be receptive to
>>"that radio asshole" tampering with his stuff.
>
>
>If the neighbor is not receptive to your efforts to track down the source of the
>interference then it's his problem. It's just like if someone complains about
>termites but won't let the exterminator do his job.

Some people are unwilling to accept that the source of the problem is
in their equipment, and expect that the radio op "fix" the problem on
his end. Since this may not be possible, you can quickly reach an
impasse.

>> Also, I am not
>>comfortable with adding any devices to people's equipment, as in their
>>eyes, any future problems that they may have with their equipment,
>>will automatically be the fault of the work that you did. It doesn't
>>matter that you and I know that this is a ridiculous conclusion.
>
>
>Not ridiculous at all. People must find someone to blame for their problems
>other than themselves.

And that is the crux of the issue.

>> But
>>remember, we're dealing with non-technical people here, and that is
>>the least of the wild theories that they come up with. I had a radio
>>associate about 20 years ago, who had a neighbor who bought a new TV
>>(it was a Sony), who then started getting TVI. Then this neighbor also
>>started having reception problems, and blamed it on the radio op's
>>large beam antenna (even when the radio op was not transmitting).
>>Never mind the fact that this neighbor's other TVs worked alright. But
>>the neighbor insisted that beam antenna was blocking signals only to
>>his new Sony TV. It didn't help that a local TV repairman could not
>>find anything obviously wrong, and concurred that it was "likely" that
>>the radio op had something to do with the problem. We joked about it,
>>and nicknamed the radio op's beam the "Sony Signal Sucker" (Or S.O.S.
>>for short). But this situation illustrates the lunacy of dealing with
>>the non-technical mind.
>
>
>That's not such a looney concept. Every antenna has a capture radius. Maybe that
>one had an exceptionally large "suck zone". Also, have you ever checked out Bill
>Beaty's site? http://www.amasci.com/

But only for Sony TV's?

>
>I probably mistated myself in all this quagmire: The dirty hams are few, and are
>only a small contribution to the problem as a whole. A larger part comes from
>keyclowns, who I believe will be responsible once again for tighter restrictions
>on ham radio. But if there's one thing I don't like it's a cocky amateur trying
>to educate me, a professional, about radio and electronics. They are different
>fields to be sure, but many aspects are the same. So while I can't tell an RCI
>from a Ranger without looking at the ID tag, I -can- give a qualified opinion on
>other issues. I digress.....

That sheds some light on your position. Someone who has spent
considerable time learning a trade, tends to get defensive and
contradictory when an "amateur" tries to tell them what to do. But the

truth is that sometimes professionals become too "scripted", or set in
their ways, and may refuse to consider other options, especially when
they come from people who they consider to be their technical
subordinates.

>>I can't explain it either. But I've been a party either directly or as
>>a "consultant" to other people, who have had RFI issues. From
>>proximity lights, to burglar alarms, to smoke detectors, computer
>>speakers, and all sorts of other electronic devices, many of which do
>>not contain a receiver in them at all. How can a device with no
>>receiver, discriminate between a dirty transmitter and a clean one? Is
>>it more likely that a device like an amplified computer speaker, is
>>responding to a -20dbc (I would consider that "dirty") harmonic, or
>>the full strength fundamental?
>
>
>It's the basic amplifier circuit. Any amplifier will oscillate if given enough
>feedback in appropriate phase.

It's even simpler than that, any amplifier which contains
semiconductors, can rectify an R.F. signal, if those circuits are not
bypassed properly.

> An RF signal can be enough to cause a high-gain
>amplifier to oscillate. It might oscillate on the frequency of the stimulating
>signal, or it might just sit there and 'ping' on it's own resonant freq. But one
>thing is common to most of these devices, and that is they are most suseptible
>to frequencies in the high-HF and VHF portions of the spectrum. I don't know
>exactly why that is, but I suspect two possibilities: the physical size of the
>circuit and it's wires have lengths that make efficient secondary couplings to
>stray RF.

I tend to agree with this notion.

>The other idea is that while some equipment is intentionally protected
>from strong AM broadcast signals, the efficiency of the filter drops off with
>increasing frequency. Of course those ideas are nothing more than speculation,
>but they are things I intend to pay attention to in the future.

Some line filters, which are designed to block 60 Hz components may
also work fairly well at 500 Khz, but are totally ineffective at 28
Mhz.

>>>The FCC 'investigators' rarely visit the scene to determine the cause of
>>>interference. If you read those cases in the FCC database they simply reflect
>>>what is claimed by one party or the other, but usually by the ham.
>>
>>The FCC had investigated a number of cases.
>
>
>Was it affiliated with Operation Blue Book?

Not unless a UFO was destroying someone's TV reception. I think they
refer those cases to Agent Mulder at the FBI.........

>> They also rely on
>>competent independent engineers to do so as well. It didn't take them
>>long to realize that the majority of cases were the fault of
>>inadequately shielded C.E. devices. They also have a fact sheet which
>>addresses what to do if you receive interference on a telephone, since
>>a telephone has no receiver, and therefore has no reason to have any
>>RF on it. Other devices fall under the same parameters.
>
>
>.....weather balloons? ;-)

Spy Balloons?

>>Some may try to make the case that the FCC dropped the ball, and
>>should have done a more thorough job. But my own experiences back up
>>what the FCC has concluded.
>
>
>I don't know when these investigations occured, but I know that sometimes they
>will refer a ham to an "RFI committee" which is comprised of more hams.

That's what they did in my case.

> Either
>way, the state of electronics is changing so fast that it's hard even for a
>professional to keep up with the latest advances. That may be why I like vintage
>CB's so much.... simplicity!

You and me both. I have a fairly good collection. Hopefully I'll get
to add to it in the future.

>>> Check the
>>>records for interference claims regarding commercial stations and you will see a
>>>very different picture.
>>
>>I would offer that commercial stations have a financial and public
>>relations agenda, which would be more than sufficient motive for
>>limiting their exposure as an RF "bad guy". If they can "explain" away
>>RFI problems as IMD products from another transmitter (A "sloppy" ham
>>for instance), they can deflect their responsibility in the matter.
>
>
>On the contrary, most stations are perfectly willing to admit any case when
>their emissions exceed specs.

If their feet are put to the fire. Like any other "for-profit"
operation, they will not volunteer to call attention to a problem that
would most likely result in an expenditure of money to cure, unless
someone else "outs" them first.

> In fact, such instances are required to be logged
>in the station's records.

Sure, along with the meter readings on the transmitter and the hours
left on the tubes, and any maintenance that was performed.

>What broadcast stations -don't- like is being blamed
>for interference that is caused by other sources, such as keyclowns and a few
>dirty hams. I'm sure that good hams can appreciate this point of view since they
>are always getting a bad rep because of the keyclowns.

In that case, I'd agree. But you and I are talking about 2 different
things. On the one hand you have the case of a "dirty" ham or CB'er
blocking the reception of a legitimate broadcast station. On the other
hand, there are RFI complaints leveled at a broadcast station for
interference to nearby consumer devices, in the same vein as that
which is leveled against hams and CB'ers.

>>I have an Icom 706 HF transceiver. I can hear a strong local AM
>>broadcast station on its fundamental frequency, the second harmonic,
>>and the third harmonic, which falls right below the 80 meter band. If
>>I turn off the radio's preamp, the harmonic goes away. I also have a
>>Yaesu FT-757, on which I do not hear the same interference. Now, based
>>on my own investigation, I would conclude that the Icom's receiver
>>preamp is being overloaded by the fundamental signal from the radio
>>station, and is creating IMD products or some other spurs. Is this the
>>fault of the radio station? What makes my situation any different from
>>a consumer device problem other than I am technically able to diagnose
>>the real problem on my own? Should I have complained to the radio
>>station? Would you not agree that my "interference" was the fault of
>>my own equipment?
>
>
>The difference is that a person can walk into any house in the US and expect to
>see a TV, a radio, CD player, computer, and wouldn't be at all suprised to see a
>cordless phone, garage door opener, etc, etc. They -don't- expect to see an
>ultra-sensitive ham radio. Your equipment is exceptional -- an 'exception' from
>the norm.
So, what are you saying here? That because I am a ham and not "normal"
I don't deserve the same consideration and protection when it comes to
RFI? Are only technical illiterates allowed to "make noise" about RFI?

>Another difference is that as a ham you -expect- and -accept- such
>issues as receiver overload and RFI. Most people don't.

Maybe they should. Some people need to understand the fine print in
Part 15 which states that these devices will not generate
interference AND has to accept all interference.

>>>Damn straight! It's good PR, great WOM advertising, and it's well within the
>>>station's rights to try to resolve any source of interference to its signal.
>>
>>Even if it means deflecting their part of it onto a nearby ham by

>>suggesting that his transmitter is "dirty"?
>
>
>That's way off base, Dave. We don't deflect anything. If a listener calls us and
>tells us that something or someone is interfering with their reception of our
>transmissions we will check it out.

Why? That's the FCC's job, not the radio station's. The radio station
is only responsible for making sure that their transmitter is not
"dirty", or trying to provide solutions to reduce interference from
THEIR transmitter. It has no place intervening in a situation which
involves a third party transmitter.

Since your time is money, the only reason I can see where the
management of a radio station would condone this sort of "charity"
work, would be for P.R. reasons. Who else but the mass media could be
responsible for spinning issues into larger monsters than they are, in
order to advance an agenda. No one need look any farther than the
democratic party and the propaganda that it spreads through the
liberally slanted media to see that.

> Like I said before, most of the time it's a
>power line problem. If it's a radio problem we can easily pin down the source
>and address the issue with the ham (or keyclown, as the case may be). We help
>resolve the problem on both sides of the fence. In fact, that's how we found two
>of our best employees (long story).
>
>
>>>Actually, the campaign started because of a couple broadcast pirates that were
>>>messing up the band. Go figure....
>>
>>I love radio pirates. Not because they defy the law. But I enjoy the
>>raw, un packaged productions. Nowadays most commercial stations are
>>clones of hundreds of others. They've taken the creativity and local
>>personality out of individual markets in the name of a "proven"
>>corporate strategy. The result is a network of bland cookie cutter
>>programming, which lacks the style and depth that I remember from the
>>60's and the early 70's.
>
>
>I'm with you 110% there. The station I work for is one of the few remaining
>independant stations in the area, and every month I wonder how long it will be
>until we get swallowed up.

It's only a matter of time. There isn't much profit in the radio
business. The independents can't compete in the diverse market that
has emerged today.

> If you think about it, radio is just going through a
>transition into networking, something that television did decades ago. But you
>still won't catch me working for Pinnacle or Clear Channel.

Unless you plan on changing careers, you may not have much choice in
that matter.

>>I have. Other than offering to buy the neighbor a new TV or other
>>"device" that's more RF immune, once you're within your technical
>>spec's, there's often not much else you can do other than reducing
>>your power, or reducing the amount of time to spend "talking".
>
>
>If that's what it takes. I found that most neighbors are more than willing to
>give a little if the ham is willing to do the same. That's how we all get along
>in a society -- compromise. If they are not willing to compromise, perhaps a
>third party can mediate an agreement.

If you are lucky enough to have a neighbor who is open minded, and
patient, you might have a chance.

>
>
>Anything will overload if you feed it enough RF.

And determining at what point this happens is the point. Some will
endure more RF than others.

>But like I said before, unless
>I can see it for myself I really can't say one way or another. And I still think
>there might be a fault with your JVC because that's not very characteristic of
>their quality. I have a lot of JVC gear and none of it has ever caused me a
>problem with RFI even in a noisy environment.

When I get some time (I know I sound like a broken record), I'll look
into it a bit more. I suspect that it's either speaker wires or the AC
line cord that is the ingress point. I'll eliminate all connected
accessories (Which were also on my old Fisher stereo, lest you want to
say "Ah-HA, it's the accessories that's causing the problem), down to
the basics and go from there.

>>I agree with this 100%. The problem is that many neighbors wait until
>>they've had it "up to here" with the problem before calling your
>>attention to it. By then they've become somewhat belligerent, and not
>>too receptive to you tampering with their stuff (not that I'd want to
>>for the earlier reasons).
>
>
>True, and true.
>
>
>> They will also insist that YOU, the ham, pay
>>for it all because, after all, the ham is "causing" the problem, even
>>if the symptoms are the fault of the poor C.E. device.
>
>
>I kinda have to agree with them there. If ya wanna play, ya gotta pay.

I'm sorry, but I'm not paying to replace a $5000 HD component TV system. I'll spring for a high pass filter or a toroid AC line filter. But I'm not going to enhance his viewing experience on my nickel. I don't even own that type of equipment myself (maybe that's why I am immune to my own RF). A simple TV, with a VCR and a DVD player attached.

>> I had another
>>ham friend who hung a tray full of high pass filters on his front door
>>with a note that basically said, "For TV interference, take one filter
>>and call me in the morning".
>
>
>That's pretty good! How did the neighbors react?

A few of the filters had been taken. He moved out to a better house a few years later, so I don't know if his solution was totally effective and to what degree. I imagine that it must have helped since he was only affecting the neighbors who were not on cable. Those who still had outdoor antennas, would 've benefitted by the reduction of his signals by the high pass filter.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1168. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 14:15:46 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <ecbj50p29mbo3ucndpeooelcjckg83lk9a@4ax.com>
Source record: 89132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <r46j50d32e0habm03t3nm39mr1cvk7k62l@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
<snip>
>>Sounds like a bad limiter.
>
>Or rectification in an audio stage. For a simple AM detector, you only
>need a half wave rectifier. Practically any semiconductor device has
>this capability. When the volume control has no effect on the
>intensity of the RFI, it's a sure bet that the interference is being
>coupled into a stage downstream from the volume control.

Or, more likely, into the power supply.

>> The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video
>>cables.
>
>How do you apply that solution to aluminum siding or gutters, without
>having access to physically modify them?

You have audio coming from the gutters? Hmmm..... I've heard audio coming from a
chain-link fence, but it was the perimeter fence for a 50kW tower.

>>>> Also, what are the devices that are receiving the interference? If you
>>>>bring those same devices into your home (assuming you don't have interference
>>>>with your own stuff, as per Bill's example), does it still pick up RFI? If you
>>>>add a device to filter the fundamental does it still receive interference? Is
>>>>the interference entering the device from the antenna, the power line, or some
>>>>other unknown route? Is there RF on your power feed? Does either house have
>>>>aluminum siding? If the RFI is coming through the TV, is it interfering with the
>>>>audio or video, or both?
>>>
>>>Those are all intelligent questions to ask, when trying to get to the
>>>bottom of the issue. The problem is that in many cases, you won't have
>>>access to the problem devices, as the neighbor may not be receptive to
>>>"that radio asshole" tampering with his stuff.
>>
>>
>>If the neighbor is not receptive to your efforts to track down the source of the
>>interference then it's his problem. It's just like if someone complains about
>>termites but won't let the exterminator do his job.
>
>Some people are unwilling to accept that the source of the problem is

>in their equipment, and expect that the radio op "fix" the problem on
>his end. Since this may not be possible, you can quickly reach an
>impasse.
>
>
>>> Also, I am not
>>>comfortable with adding any devices to people's equipment, as in their
>>>eyes, any future problems that they may have with their equipment,
>>>will automatically be the fault of the work that you did. It doesn't
>>>matter that you and I know that this is a ridiculous conclusion.
>>
>>
>>Not ridiculous at all. People must find someone to blame for their problems
>>other than themselves.
>
>And that is the crux of the issue.
>
>
>>> But
>>>remember, we're dealing with non-technical people here, and that is
>>>the least of the wild theories that they come up with. I had a radio
>>>associate about 20 years ago, who had a neighbor who bought a new TV
>>>(it was a Sony), who then started getting TVI. Then this neighbor also
>>>started having reception problems, and blamed it on the radio op's
>>>large beam antenna (even when the radio op was not transmitting).
>>>Never mind the fact that this neighbor's other TVs worked alright. But
>>>the neighbor insisted that beam antenna was blocking signals only to
>>>his new Sony TV. It didn't help that a local TV repairman could not
>>>find anything obviously wrong, and concurred that it was "likely" that
>>>the radio op had something to do with the problem. We joked about it,
>>>and nicknamed the radio op's beam the "Sony Signal Sucker" (Or S.O.S.
>>>for short). But this situation illustrates the lunacy of dealing with
>>>the non-technical mind.
>>
>>
>>That's not such a looney concept. Every antenna has a capture radius. Maybe that
>>one had an exceptionally large "suck zone". Also, have you ever checked out Bill
>>Beaty's site? http://www.amasci.com/
>
>But only for Sony TV's?
>
>>
>>I probably mistated myself in all this quagmire: The dirty hams are few, and are
>>only a small contribution to the problem as a whole. A larger part comes from
>>keyclowns, who I believe will be responsible once again for tighter restrictions
>>on ham radio. But if there's one thing I don't like it's a cocky amateur trying
>>to educate me, a professional, about radio and electronics. They are different
>>fields to be sure, but many aspects are the same. So while I can't tell an RCI
>>from a Ranger without looking at the ID tag, I -can- give a qualified opinion on
>>other issues. I digress.....

>
>That sheds some light on your position. Someone who has spent
>considerable time learning a trade, tends to get defensive and
>contradictory when an "amateur" tries to tell them what to do. But the
>truth is that sometimes professionals become too "scripted", or set in
>their ways, and may refuse to consider other options, especially when
>they come from people who they consider to be their technical
>subordinates.
>
>
>>>I can't explain it either. But I've been a party either directly or as
>>>a "consultant" to other people, who have had RFI issues. From
>>>proximity lights, to burglar alarms, to smoke detectors, computer
>>>speakers, and all sorts of other electronic devices, many of which do
>>>not contain a receiver in them at all. How can a device with no
>>>receiver, discriminate between a dirty transmitter and a clean one? Is
>>>it more likely that a device like an amplified computer speaker, is
>>>responding to a -20dbc (I would consider that "dirty") harmonic, or
>>>the full strength fundamental?
>>
>>
>>It's the basic amplifier circuit. Any amplifier will oscillate if given enough
>>feedback in appropriate phase.
>
>It's even simpler than that, any amplifier which contains
>semiconductors, can rectify an R.F. signal, if those circuits are not
>bypassed properly.
>
>
>> An RF signal can be enough to cause a high-gain
>>amplifier to oscillate. It might oscillate on the frequency of the stimulating
>>signal, or it might just sit there and 'ping' on it's own resonant freq. But one
>>thing is common to most of these devices, and that is they are most suseptible
>>to frequencies in the high-HF and VHF portions of the spectrum. I don't know
>>exactly why that is, but I suspect two possibilities: the physical size of the
>>circuit and it's wires have lengths that make efficient secondary couplings to
>>stray RF.
>
>I tend to agree with this notion.
>
>
>>The other idea is that while some equipment is intentionally protected
>>from strong AM broadcast signals, the efficiency of the filter drops off with
>>increasing frequency. Of course those ideas are nothing more than speculation,
>>but they are things I intend to pay attention to in the future.
>
>Some line filters, which are designed to block 60 Hz components may
>also work fairly well at 500 Khz, but are totally ineffective at 28
>Mhz.
>

>
>>>>The FCC 'investigators' rarely visit the scene to determine the cause of
>>>>interference. If you read those cases in the FCC database they simply reflect
>>>>what is claimed by one party or the other, but usually by the ham.
>>>
>>>The FCC had investigated a number of cases.
>>
>>
>>Was it affiliated with Operation Blue Book?
>
>Not unless a UFO was destroying someone's TV reception. I think they
>refer those cases to Agent Mulder at the FBI.........
>
>>> They also rely on
>>>competent independent engineers to do so as well. It didn't take them
>>>long to realize that the majority of cases were the fault of
>>>inadequately shielded C.E. devices. They also have a fact sheet which
>>>addresses what to do if you receive interference on a telephone, since
>>>a telephone has no receiver, and therefore has no reason to have any
>>>RF on it. Other devices fall under the same parameters.
>>
>>
>>.....weather balloons? ;-)
>
>Spy Balloons?
>
>
>>>Some may try to make the case that the FCC dropped the ball, and
>>>should have done a more thorough job. But my own experiences back up
>>>what the FCC has concluded.
>>
>>
>>I don't know when these investigations occured, but I know that sometimes they
>>will refer a ham to an "RFI committee" which is comprised of more hams.
>
>That's what they did in my case.
>
>> Either
>>way, the state of electronics is changing so fast that it's hard even for a
>>professional to keep up with the latest advances. That may be why I like vintage
>>CB's so much.... simplicity!
>
>You and me both. I have a fairly good collection. Hopefully I'll get
>to add to it in the future.
>
>
>>>> Check the
>>>>records for interference claims regarding commercial stations and you will see a
>>>>very different picture.
>>>

>>>I would offer that commercial stations have a financial and public
>>>relations agenda, which would be more than sufficient motive for
>>>limiting their exposure as an RF "bad guy". If they can "explain" away
>>>RFI problems as IMD products from another transmitter (A "sloppy" ham
>>>for instance), they can deflect their responsibility in the matter.
>>
>>
>>On the contrary, most stations are perfectly willing to admit any case when
>>their emissions exceed specs.
>
>If their feet are put to the fire. Like any other "for-profit"
>operation, they will not volunteer to call attention to a problem that
>would most likely result in an expenditure of money to cure, unless
>someone else "outs" them first.
>
>> In fact, such instances are required to be logged
>>in the station's records.
>
>Sure, along with the meter readings on the transmitter and the hours
>left on the tubes, and any maintenance that was performed.
>
>
>>What broadcast stations -don't- like is being blamed
>>for interference that is caused by other sources, such as keyclowns and a few
>>dirty hams. I'm sure that good hams can appreciate this point of view since they
>>are always getting a bad rep because of the keyclowns.
>
>In that case, I'd agree. But you and I are talking about 2 different
>things. On the one hand you have the case of a "dirty" ham or CB'er
>blocking the reception of a legitimate broadcast station. On the other
>hand, there are RFI complaints leveled at a broadcast station for
>interference to nearby consumer devices, in the same vein as that
>which is leveled against hams and CB'ers.
>
>>>I have an Icom 706 HF transceiver. I can hear a strong local AM
>>>broadcast station on its fundamental frequency, the second harmonic,
>>>and the third harmonic, which falls right below the 80 meter band. If
>>>I turn off the radio's preamp, the harmonic goes away. I also have a
>>>Yaesu FT-757, on which I do not hear the same interference. Now, based
>>>on my own investigation, I would conclude that the Icom's receiver
>>>preamp is being overloaded by the fundamental signal from the radio
>>>station, and is creating IMD products or some other spurs. Is this the
>>>fault of the radio station? What makes my situation any different from
>>>a consumer device problem other than I am technically able to diagnose
>>>the real problem on my own? Should I have complained to the radio
>>>station? Would you not agree that my "interference" was the fault of
>>>my own equipment?
>>
>>
>>The difference is that a person can walk into any house in the US and expect to

>>see a TV, a radio, CD player, computer, and wouldn't be at all suprised to see a
>>cordless phone, garage door opener, etc, etc. They -don't- expect to see an
>>ultra-sensitive ham radio. Your equipment is exceptional -- an 'exception' from
>>the norm.
>So, what are you saying here? That because I am a ham and not "normal"
>I don't deserve the same consideration and protection when it comes to
>RFI? Are only technical illiterates allowed to "make noise" about RFI?
>
>>Another difference is that as a ham you -expect- and -accept- such
>>issues as receiver overload and RFI. Most people don't.
>
>Maybe they should. Some people need to understand the fine print in
>Part 15 which states that these devices will not generate
>interference AND has to accept all interference.
>
>
>>>>Damn straight! It's good PR, great WOM advertising, and it's well within the
>>>>station's rights to try to resolve any source of interference to its signal.
>>>
>>>Even if it means deflecting their part of it onto a nearby ham by
>>>suggesting that his transmitter is "dirty"?
>>
>>
>>That's way off base, Dave. We don't deflect anything. If a listener calls us and
>>tells us that something or someone is interfering with their reception of our
>>transmissions we will check it out.
>
>Why? That's the FCC's job, not the radio station's. The radio station
>is only responsible for making sure that their transmitter is not
>"dirty", or trying to provide solutions to reduce interference from
>THEIR transmitter. It has no place intervening in a situation which
>involves a third party transmitter.
>
>Since your time is money, the only reason I can see where the
>management of a radio station would condone this sort of "charity"
>work, would be for P.R. reasons. Who else but the mass media could be
>responsible for spinning issues into larger monsters than they are, in
>order to advance an agenda. No one need look any farther than the
>democratic party and the propaganda that it spreads through the
>liberally slanted media to see that.
>
>
>> Like I said before, most of the time it's a
>>power line problem. If it's a radio problem we can easily pin down the source
>>and address the issue with the ham (or keyclown, as the case may be). We help
>>resolve the problem on both sides of the fence. In fact, that's how we found two
>>of our best employees (long story).
>>
>>
>>>>Actually, the campaign started because of a couple broadcast pirates that were

>>>>messing up the band. Go figure....
>>>
>>>I love radio pirates. Not because they defy the law. But I enjoy the
>>>raw, un packaged productions. Nowadays most commercial stations are
>>>clones of hundreds of others. They've taken the creativity and local
>>>personality out of individual markets in the name of a "proven"
>>>corporate strategy. The result is a network of bland cookie cutter
>>>programming, which lacks the style and depth that I remember from the
>>>60's and the early 70's.
>>
>>
>>I'm with you 110% there. The station I work for is one of the few remaining
>>independant stations in the area, and every month I wonder how long it will be
>>until we get swallowed up.
>
>It's only a matter of time. There isn't much profit in the radio
>business. The independents can't compete in the diverse market that
>has emerged today.
>
>
>> If you think about it, radio is just going through a
>>transition into networking, something that television did decades ago. But you
>>still won't catch me working for Pinnacle or Clear Channel.
>
>Unless you plan on changing careers, you may not have much choice in
>that matter.
>
>>>I have. Other than offering to buy the neighbor a new TV or other
>>>"device" that's more RF immune, once you're within your technical
>>>spec's, there's often not much else you can do other than reducing
>>>your power, or reducing the amount of time to spend "talking".
>>
>>
>>If that's what it takes. I found that most neighbors are more than willing to
>>give a little if the ham is willing to do the same. That's how we all get along
>>in a society -- compromise. If they are not willing to compromise, perhaps a
>>third party can mediate an agreement.
>
>If you are lucky enough to have a neighbor who is open minded, and
>patient, you might have a chance.
>
>>
>>
>>Anything will overload if you feed it enough RF.
>
>And determining at what point this happens is the point. Some will
>endure more RF than others.
>
>
>

>>But like I said before, unless
>>I can see it for myself I really can't say one way or another. And I still think
>>there might be a fault with your JVC because that's not very characteristic of
>>their quality. I have a lot of JVC gear and none of it has ever caused me a
>>problem with RFI even in a noisy environment.
>
>When I get some time (I know I sound like a broken record), I'll look
>into it a bit more. I suspect that it's either speaker wires or the AC
>line cord that is the ingress point. I'll eliminate all connected
>accessories (Which were also on my old Fisher stereo, lest you want to
>say "Ah-HA, it's the accessories that's causing the problem), down to
>the basics and go from there.
>
>
>>>I agree with this 100%. The problem is that many neighbors wait until
>>>they've had it "up to here" with the problem before calling your
>>>attention to it. By then they've become somewhat belligerent, and not
>>>too receptive to you tampering with their stuff (not that I'd want to
>>>for the earlier reasons).
>>
>>
>>True, and true.
>>
>>
>>> They will also insist that YOU, the ham, pay
>>>for it all because, after all, the ham is "causing" the problem, even
>>>if the symptoms are the fault of the poor C.E. device.
>>
>>
>>I kinda have to agree with them there. If ya wanna play, ya gotta pay.
>
>I'm sorry, but I'm not paying to replace a $5000 HD component TV
>system. I'll spring for a high pass filter or a toroid AC line
>filter. But I'm not going to enhance his viewing experience on my
>nickel. I don't even own that type of equipment myself (maybe that's
>why I am immune to my own RF). A simple TV, with a VCR and a DVD
>player attached.
>
>
>>> I had another
>>>ham friend who hung a tray full of high pass filters on his front door
>>>with a note that basically said, "For TV interference, take one filter
>>>and call me in the morning".
>>
>>
>>That's pretty good! How did the neighbors react?
>
>A few of the filters had been taken. He moved out to a better house a
>few years later, so I don't know if his solution was totally effective
>and to what degree. I imagine that it must have helped since he was

>only affecting the neighbors who were not on cable. Those who still
>had outdoor antennas, would 've benefitted by the reduction of his
>signals by the high pass filter.
>
>
>Dave
>"Sandbagger"
>http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1169. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 14:32:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4059B2F0.201@psu.edu>
Source record: 89133

William wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40586436.2040505@psu.edu>...
>
>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>sense.
>>
>> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures
>>of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and
>>the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is
>>just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>>
>> We DON'T learn do we?
>>
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> I can hear Larry now, "I'm a Superior Ham because I have higher voltage finals..."
>
> Or Bruce, "Know Ham = Know Voltage."

You've been on a roll lately, Brian. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1170. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 15:26:01 UTC
From: Holger Dansk <holger1Spam@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cpfj50hi0ftg8lde8gnu88cjbjd1qs1ias@4ax.com>
Source record: 89134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,atl.general,alt.atlanta

On 17 Mar 2004 11:35:16 -0800, JackGibson@hotmail.com (Jack Gibson)
wrote:

>I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
>U.S. fucking citizen.
>
>So fucking there.

Well, I'll be a muhfugger. :-)

Holger

http://www.mindspring.com/~holger1/holger1.htm

1171. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 15:29:11 UTC
From: Ida Takencash <news@eleven.com>
Message-ID: <cofj50lrhfhi8rr70aretm9gk9sqr4dvia@4ax.com>
Source record: 89136
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 00:12:05 -0500, "Sedina II"
<overman41042@yahoo.com> wrote:

>Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
>and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
>special guest on Coast to Coast AM
>Thursday/Friday evening.
>
>On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!

All of these kooks should have disclaimers on their web sites that say
"For entertainment purposes only."

1172. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 15:48:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403180748.437acaf2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89135

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<cYGdnTQd5qzgeMXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...

> I just came from a seminar with USN Rear Admiral Daniel Stone, Director
> of Logistics and Engineering for NORAD/USNORTHCOM, he reports directly
> to General Eberhart, commander of NORAD. One of the issues discussed
> was emergency communications in times of disasters like 9/11.

Absolutely should be discussed.

I ask him
> about the use of cell phones during such times, he just laughed and said
> that the cell phone network was useless for any emergency comms in such
> a scenario.

For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
official to respond differently.

Witless willie's cell phone network is not even a
> consideration in their emergency planning.

Shouldn't be. It's not secure.

He also works with The Office
> of Homeland Defense on emergengy communications issues and he confirmed
> that the OHD is attempting to intergrate Amateur Radio in their plans
> for emergency comms.

As they should; the military has backups to backups. Redundancy
equals Survivability.

Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
their emergency comms.

Do you doubt it?

1173. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 16:18:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403180818.50cc701e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89137

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040318000908.21642.00005024@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403171457.41ead2a8@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >Nope, no anger or rage. Len has been working out and now I call him
> >"Lean."
>
> Actually, I've been out working, not working out.

Doubtful, but we'll give you the benefit of the doubt on this one
since "work" is a relative term.

> >He would praise you for knowing sumptin about about Part 97. Best of
> >Luck.
>
> He knows it exists. That's a plus. Beyond that, his score isn't
> the highest grade on the report card.

>>MY<< score on Part 97 isn't the "highest grade"...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HA
! ! ! ! !

What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!

Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
detriment.

Sheeeesh!

Steve, K4YZ

1174. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 16:21:00 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <8rij501nh1vja4m5lqf8eaa3psndfpp0j6@4ax.com>
Source record: 89138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>That's not such a looney concept. Every antenna has a capture radius. Maybe that
>one had an exceptionally large "suck zone". Also, have you ever checked out Bill
>Beaty's site? http://www.amasci.com/

>
>-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

Frank;

Suck Zone? I looked at the link, didn't see what part of it you
were referring too. Do you think there is a "zone" outside the
physical demensions of the antenna that "sucks " the RF toward it?

1175. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 16:32:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89139

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ro2dnRo49dfJpszd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> And witless William also wrote:
>
> >
> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>
> Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
> will be there if needed.

This weekend will see "Heartland Response 2004" conducted in
Western Tennessee and parts of Mississippi, Arkansas, Kentucky and
Missouri.

It will simulate (among other things) and earthquake along the
New Madrid fault.

One of the scenarios to be practiced for will be the loss of
commercial telephone service, both conventional hardline and wireless
service.

Of the several senarios that WON'T be playing will be one wherein
cellphones are deployed to provide "emergency comms" because of a loss
of RADIO communication, regardless of whose radio service it is.

Among other features to be deployed will be HIGHBIRD missions
flown by Civil Air Patrol to provide orbiting radio relay capabilites
in addition to datalink service.

Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.

ARES and RACES will be represented, however.

Go figure, huh...?!?!?

Steve, K4YZ

PS: If any of you are "Utility DXers" and log "TENNESSEECAP TEMA" or
"TENNESSEECAP 250" on Saturday the 20th or Sunday the 21st, QSL via
K4YZ and I'll be glad to return a card for you.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1176. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 17:12:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403180912.5fb7b27b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89140

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94AF6560E1C97elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com:
>
> > (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
> >
> >> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low voltage to the final
> >> transmitter amplifier stage
> >
> > What about the 110 AC line?
> >
> >> and that only commercially
> >> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
> >
> > Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.
> >
> >> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
> >> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
> >> certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
> >
> > This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
> > *really" means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions on
> > the 20 question test!
>
> Agreed
>
> > It is precisely this sort of thing that messed up cb.
>
> >> The VECs Question Pool
> >> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what
> >> would be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination
> >> questions.
> >
> > The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which I
> > did from Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could
> > safely build transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these
> > additional limits today?
> >>
> >> This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of the
> >> VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin.
> >
> > Which means a third of them disapproved. Were the individual VEs
> > polled?

> No, I wasn't

Do you get to vote on who represents your VEC at NCVEC? Do individual
VEs have any say at all?

It seems to me that NCVEC wants to get into the regulatory side of
things without having to get input of *any* kind from the VEs
themselves.
>
> > This NCVEC thing is very similar to the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
> > Century" paper by KL7CC. I wrote a detailed commentary on it some time
> > back.
> >
> > NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying
> > much...
> >

> It has some improvements over the League's plan, but that all depends on
> your perspective.

I don't see *any* improvements over the ARRL proposal. What do you
see, besides no code test for Extra (ARRL proposal drops all code
testing except 5 wpm for Extra)?
>
> I'm not in favour of making the theory requirements easier.

But that's exactly what the NCVEC proposal does - to an extent even
greater than the ARRL proposal.

> Both of these
> plans upgrade all the Techs to General just to add a lower class licence
> without increasing the number of classes. This is because they know the FCC
> won't accept anything that makes the end result more complicated.

They also upgrade Advanceds to Extra.

> I don't think we need an easier theory test to attract people. If someone
> is genuinely interested they will learn the theory.

I agree 100%. NCVEC doesn't - where is the "improvement"?

> What we need is simply
> publicity. Most people are scarcely aware that ham radio even exists.

Too true.

But we also have to accept that only a small percentage of those who
become aware will be interested, and that of those who are interested
only some will actually become active licensed amateurs regardless of
what is done to the requirements.
>
> The code test does need to be dumped to get over the hurdle of potential
> recruits who immediately lose interest when it is mentioned.

I disagree. People who are *really* interested will learn 5 wpm. That
has been demonstrated over and over again.

> No-code
> licencing for VHF+ did not eliminate that problem, no matter what anyone
> says to the contrary. Any intelligent person knew that code testing was
> only postponed if they wanted HF.

Sure - but not all want HF, or can get on HF effectively.

> However, most people don't even get that
> far. Our visibility is zero.

Not zero, but not as high as it needs to be.

> Besides, I am sure that the FCC will eliminate
> Element 1 anyway.

Let's say for a moment that you're right, and Element 1 is simply
dropped for all license classes. Which proposal do you think is better
- ARRL's or NCVEC's, and why?
>
> By all means restructure, but these petitions are misguided.
>
I agree that NCVEC's is very misguided.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1177. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 17:27:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <kp6dnUYMlPhgQMTdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89142

William wrote:

>
>
> For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
> official to respond differently.

No, not just for military use, they are coordinating between military, police, fire, Civil Defense, and other civil agencies, and cell phones play no part.

>
> Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
> cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
> communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
> system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
> their emergency comms.
>
> Do you doubt it?

It dosen't even work well for the AC when the networks become so overloaded you can't get a call through. The AC is not participating in official emergency communicatins, they are making calls to say, "Im OK", or "turn on your TV", and other such non official emergency calls. When something like 9/11 happens everyone with a cell phone wants to call twenty other people making the system usless for any official emergency communicatioins.
The cell phone network is not a consideration amoung government and civil agencies for emergency communications, ham radio is.

1178. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 17:35:46 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B0801B2A8CAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89141

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0403180912.5fb7b27b@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94AF6560E1C97elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20040316211549.07984.00001128@mb-m22.aol.com:
>>
>> > (quoting the NCVEC proposal)
>> >
>> >> In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low voltage to the final
>> >> transmitter amplifier stage
>> >
>> > What about the 110 AC line?
>> >
>> >> and that only commercially
>> >> manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>> >
>> > Might as well call it "Appliance Class" and be done with it.
>> >
>> >> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>> >> multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read
>> >> and certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules.
>> >
>> > This is the worst part. We must fight this like the plague. What it
>> > *really" means is that there will be *no* rules and regs questions
>> > on the 20 question test!
>>
>> Agreed
>>
>> > It is precisely this sort of thing that messed up cb.
> >
>> >> The VECs Question Pool
>> >> Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in
>> >> what would be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25
>> >> examination questions.
>> >
>> > The old Novice I took was 20 questions, and we could homebrew. Which
>> > I did from Day One. If a 13 year old kid with books for Elmers could
>> > safely build transmitters in the hollowstate era, why all these
>> > additional limits today?
>> >>
>> >> This petition was reviewed prior to submission by all 14 of
>> >> the

>> >> VEC's around the country, and was approved by a 2 to 1 margin.
>> >
>> > Which means a third of them disapproved. Were the individual VEs
>> > polled?
>
>> No, I wasn't
>
> Do you get to vote on who represents your VEC at NCVEC?

No

> Do individual
> VEs have any say at all?

Apparently not

>
> It seems to me that NCVEC wants to get into the regulatory side of
> things without having to get input of *any* kind from the VEs
> themselves.

Probably our contact person might have some input into the ARRL VEC. Maybe
I should ask him.

>>
>> > This NCVEC thing is very similar to the "Amateur Radio in the 21st
>> > Century" paper by KL7CC. I wrote a detailed commentary on it some
>> > time back.
>> >
>> > NCVEC's proposal makes the ARRL one look good. Which isn't saying
>> > much...
>> >
>
>> It has some improvements over the League's plan, but that all depends
>> on your perspective.
>
> I don't see *any* improvements over the ARRL proposal. What do you
> see, besides no code test for Extra (ARRL proposal drops all code
> testing except 5 wpm for Extra)?

More phone spectrum - but that's what I meant when I said that it depends
on your perspective

>>
>> I'm not in favour of making the theory requirements easier.
>
> But that's exactly what the NCVEC proposal does - to an extent even
> greater than the ARRL proposal.
>

Not that the ARRL petition is much better on that point

>> Both of these
>> plans upgrade all the Techs to General just to add a lower class
>> licence without increasing the number of classes. This is because they
>> know the FCC won't accept anything that makes the end result more
>> complicated.
>
> They also upgrade Advanceds to Extra.
>

I have nothing against that

>> I don't think we need an easier theory test to attract people. If
>> someone is genuinely interested they will learn the theory.
>
> I agree 100%. NCVEC doesn't - where is the "improvement"?
>
>> What we need is simply
>> publicity. Most people are scarcely aware that ham radio even exists.
>
> Too true.
>
> But we also have to accept that only a small percentage of those who
> become aware will be interested, and that of those who are interested
> only some will actually become active licensed amateurs regardless of
> what is done to the requirements.

True

>>
>> The code test does need to be dumped to get over the hurdle of
>> potential recruits who immediately lose interest when it is mentioned.
>
> I disagree. People who are *really* interested will learn 5 wpm. That
> has been demonstrated over and over again.
>

At that point our opinions diverge

>> No-code
>> licencing for VHF+ did not eliminate that problem, no matter what
>> anyone says to the contrary. Any intelligent person knew that code
>> testing was only postponed if they wanted HF.
>
> Sure - but not all want HF, or can get on HF effectively.

True

>
>> However, most people don't even get that far. Our visibility is zero.
>
> Not zero, but not as high as it needs to be.
>
>> Besides, I am sure that the FCC will eliminate
>> Element 1 anyway.

>
> Let's say for a moment that you're right, and Element 1 is simply
> dropped for all license classes. Which proposal do you think is better
> - ARRL's or NCVEC's, and why?

I don't like either very much, but the latter would give me more spectrum
for phone

>>
>> By all means restructure, but these petitions are misguided.
>>
> I agree that NCVEC's is very misguided.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
73 de Alun, N3KIP

1179. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 19:16:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4059F586.5060601@psu.edu>
Source record: 89143

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ro2dnRo49dfJpszd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>And witless William also wrote:
>>
>> >
>>
>>>I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
>>>play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>>
>>Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
>>will be there if needed.
>
>
> This weekend will see "Heartland Response 2004" conducted in
> Western Tennessee and parts of Mississippi, Arkansas, Kentucky and
> Missouri.
>
> It will simulate (among other things) and earthquake along the
> New Madrid fault.
>
> One of the scenarios to be practiced for will be the loss of
> commercial telephone service, both conventional hardline and wireless
> service.

Oh oh! how on earth will their be any emergency services, not to
mention calling out for Pizza? ;^)

> Of the several senarios that WON'T be playing will be one wherein
> cellphones are deployed to provide "emergency comms" because of a loss
> of RADIO communication, regardless of whose radio service it is.
>
> Among other features to be deployed will be HIGHBIRD missions
> flown by Civil Air Patrol to provide orbiting radio relay capabilites
> in addition to datalink service.
>
> Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
> do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
> those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
> Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.

I heard they were planning on checking in with their cellphones as part
of the CYHMNEPT (Can You Hear Me Now Emergency Preparedness Team) 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1180. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 19:45:29 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <f0vj50hn06tgv8d5u1295urqthrhg1ibbp@4ax.com>
Source record: 89144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <8rij501nh1vja4m5lqf8eaa3psndfpp0j6@4ax.com>, Lancer <lancer@rock..com>
wrote:

>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>
>
>>That's not such a looney concept. Every antenna has a capture radius. Maybe that
>>one had an exceptionally large "suck zone". Also, have you ever checked out Bill
>>Beaty's site? http://www.amasci.com/
>
>>
>>-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>>http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>>-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
>Frank;
>
> Suck Zone? I looked at the link, didn't see what part of it you
>were referring too. Do you think there is a "zone" outside the
>physical demensions of the antenna that "sucks " the RF toward it?

It's a big site. Try here:

http://amasci.com/tesla/tesceive.html

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1181. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:11:16 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <5g0k50ped3h1e3d1iv48hsn1g8bb7t3a7v@4ax.com>
Source record: 89145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 06:15:46 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <r46j50d32e0habm03t3nm39mr1cvk7k62l@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
><snip>
>>>Sounds like a bad limiter.
>>
>>Or rectification in an audio stage. For a simple AM detector, you only
>>need a half wave rectifier. Practically any semiconductor device has
>>this capability. When the volume control has no effect on the
>>intensity of the RFI, it's a sure bet that the interference is being
>>coupled into a stage downstream from the volume control.
>
>
>Or, more likely, into the power supply.
>
>>> The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video
>>>cables.
>>
>>How do you apply that solution to aluminum siding or gutters, without
>>having access to physically modify them?
>
>
>You have audio coming from the gutters? Hmmm..... I've heard audio coming from a
>chain-link fence, but it was the perimeter fence for a 50kW tower.

Not audio, non-linear rectification and re-radiation of IMD products.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1182. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:11:33 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <cbkj50lkue9tuar141tqvtf9ut42nhsb4g@4ax.com>
Source record: 89146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 10:53:51 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <kglg50ppln06c7i7ort7tfs9lb8115popk@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Tue, 16 Mar 2004 19:36:00 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
><snip>
>>>Audio modulated FM doesn't rectify into audio at all unless there is an AM
>>>component. Broadcast-quality limiters are quite good at eliminating AM from an
>>>FM BC signal.
>>
>>Exactly! So any intelligible sound that passes through a TV's audio
>>section is being rectified in a place that it has no business being,
>>usually well past the limiter stages. This phenomenon is reflective of
>>poor design. In many of these cases, the RFI entered through the A.C.
>>line cord and got coupled into the audio amp stages.
>
>
>I was thinking more along the lines of weak limiters/poor AM rejection, but poor
>supply regulation could just as easily be responsible for what you describe. In
>that case a power line filter won't do the job -- you would need either an
>isolation transformer, or run the power cord with the coax (if there is coax).

Toroidal coils on the AC line had helped in this case. In the case of
TV's with detached component speakers or cheap stereos, the speaker
wires are also a source of ingress. Many times people space speakers
apart in opposite directions, and they may be separated at a distance
of the width of their family room, which is often 20 feet or so. Can
you say "dipole" antenna at HF frequencies? The RF gets picked up by
the speaker leads and gets coupled into and demodulated by the power
amp of the stereo or TV. In this case, bypassing the speaker leads
with small caps, or running coaxial speaker wire can help.
>
>
>>>People are funny. When I was a kid I put up my first CB antenna on the roof.
>>>Like many people I spent the first few weeks just listening to the chatter. But
>>>not more than a week after the antenna went up I had a neighbor knock on the
>>>door whining about interference. A couple years ago I put up my first lowfer
>>>antenna. It is quite tall (60 ft.), and can be easily seen by the neighbors. But
>>>this antenna was used only for receiving, not transmitting. Well whaddya know, a
>>>couple weeks after the antenna went up another neighbor comes a'knockin' at my
>>>door whining about interference. Funny thing was that I hadn't even finished

>>>building the receiver!
>>
>>Oh boy! have you hit the nail on the head there. People have other
>>interference problems (squirrels chewing their antenna lead)....
>
>
>Have a mouse problem here. Cute little things, but they sure do shit a lot.

That's why I used to have cats.

>>
>>Key word: "best". Ground wave has some effect throughout the HF bands.
>>It can also propagate signals into neighboring homes.
>
>
>....um, wouldn't that be better classified as near-field radiation and not
>ground-wave propagation? How far away are your neighbors' houses?

The line between where near field radiation ends and ground wave picks
up is not always obvious. If the guy receiving the interference is 4
doors down the street, I tend to think that he's outside the "cone" of
the near field. But I could be wrong.

>>There is no excuse for short cutting engineering. Saving money is
>>their only motivation. Old man Muntz is alive and well in the consumer
>>electronics market.
>
>
>Which reminds me.... what's Griffey doing these days?

Trying to get 1000 watts out of a beer can and a bunch of used
capacitors.

>>>And many hams would transmit using colorburst crystals because they were cheap
>>>and readily available. Some still do, but most realize the problem it creates.
>>
>>I've had both a frequency counter and a DTMF generator which used
>>colorburst crystals for that reason.
>
>
>Hmmmm..... do they receive any RFI from the TV?

The counter would jump around if placed in close proximity. Since a
DTMF generator is not a receiving device, it's hard to tell if its
operation is affected.

>
>>>> Not all RFI comes in through the tuner.
>>>
>>>
>>>No it doesn't. Modern TV's use switching supplies, a design which filters RF
>>>quite nicely. Older TV's used linear supplies where the transformer stopped RF
>>>dead in it's tracks.

>>
>>Then there were the "transformerless" linear supply designs. THEY
>>were, by far, the worst for AC line RFI ingress. There was nothing to
>>stop the RF from riding along the supply rails and into an audio
>>stage.
>
>
>No kidding! And remember those plug-in doo-hickeys that allegedly used the power
>lines for a TV antenna? They did nothing but establish a power/antenna loop that
>turned the TV into a very good white noise generator.

My father had one of them connected to our old console B&W TV in the
early 60's. He found that it worked better if he unplugged it from the
wall, and just draped it over a nearby chair.

>
>>>And if you
>>>check the current FCC regs you will see that similar (and also very low) limits
>>>have been imposed for any new manufactured ham transmitters and amps. This was
>>>done in response to the FCC recognizing that receivers are more sensitive than
>>>ever before, and even harmonics of very low power can cause interference to the
>>>intended function of these receivers.
>>
>>Unless they very recently changed the rules, -60dbc is the current
>>harmonic spec for most transmitters used in the amateur and land
>>mobile services.
>
>
>They were changed to the new specs in 2002. I'll dig up the code later. If I
>remember correctly, it only applies to devices of new manufacture.

I'll have to look this up. This is the first that I've heard of any
changes. Naturally, I'll want to do what I can to stay in spec, even
if existing equipment is "grandfathered". It makes for a better
defense if you already meet the tougher specs, and you receive an RFI
complaint.

>>I don't know as I never physically had the device in my hands. That
>>might be the one, as the better design used CATV gain blocks, which
>>were internally stabilized.
>
>
>The one I'm thinking of had a 20/40 dB switch. Does that help?

Don't know, I never actually saw the device. The potential source of
the problem was brought to my attention by a repeater user's group who
had documented similar problems. We had been trying to locate the
device which would come and go depending on temperature and humidity.
As luck would have it, as we were getting close, a summer thunderstorm
may lave produced a fatal lightning strike, as the interference
suddenly ceased.

>
>
>>>The toroidal choke works better if you split the wires and wind them in opposite
>>>directions on the core.
>>
>>Yes it does, but that involves more work. If it works without going
>>that extra mile, then we don't have to "damage" the neighbor's
>>equipment.
>
>
>I set aside a day or two each month to make 'trinkets', for lack of a better
>term. Things like pigtails, toroidal chokes, jumper leads, mic cables, etc.

For someone who had been advancing the notion that consumer devices
are not all that bad, WRT RFI susceptibility, you spend a lot of time
making up RFI blocking devices for them..... ;-)

>>>Now this is what I'm talking about. It's like the FCC says RFI is a bad thing
>>>unless it comes from a ham, in which case the rest of the world must suffer.
>>
>>It's just a case of experience. Hams are noted for being more
>>technically aware of their stations operation. That may not be as true
>>today as it once was, but it's still a valid observation when compared
>>to other services which are designed to be used by non-technical
>>people (Like CB).
>>
>>Hams also have volunteer groups within their own ranks to take care of
>>these things. I just got lucky that the matter dropped. Had my
>>neighbor made a bigger fuss, they may have pushed the issue. I figure
>>that my neighbor (Who himself used to be a CBer) turned me into the
>>FCC just to "scare" me.
>
>
>Well, if hams are expected to be the FCC's technical liasons to the general
>public, maybe they should put that in the rules.

Not technical liaisons, just self policing.

>>
>>Last time I looked RF doesn't observe borders either real or imagined.
>>It is impossible to prevent (Unless you want to enclose your house in
>>a faraday cage) RF from "polluting" your airwaves.
>
>
>That much is obvious. My point is that radio operation requires a level of
>responsibility as high as the level of the privelege.

And that responsibility extends to the operation and maintenance of
his equipment. That responsibility becomes unreasonable when extended
to include the prevention of RF ingress into neighboring consumer
devices (Which should have been done by the manufacturer). IMHO it is
unfair for the manufacturers, by choosing to cut corners, to place
this burden on radio ops. At the very least, the manufacturers should

be held accountable as enablers or orchestrators of these incidents by facilitating the easy reception of RFI.

I remember the earlier days of ham radio. If a ham interfered with a TV, he made a trap out of a length of twinlead, and placed it across the TV's antenna terminals, and that usually was all it took. The issue today has become way more complicated. Which is ironic, since most hams use commercial equipment these days, and those ham radios have become cleaner then they ever were, so the percentage of "dirty" transmitters has dropped in the last 40 years, yet the incidents of RFI has increased dramatically..

>>>The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham.

I would consider incessant complaints to be a form of "interference".

>>>It should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
>>>for anyone else.

That's like saying that everyone should drive their cars as to not emit pollution.

>>In other words stop transmitting. Hardly fair. Especially when the
>>person with the interference can fix the problem by buying better
>>consumer devices.
>>
>>> Point the antenna in a different direction. Use a different
>>>antenna. Make an agreement with the other person to only transmit at certain
>>>times (more commonly called 'sharing'). There is no reason a ham can't stop his
>>>interference, or at least limit it to an acceptable level.
>>
>>What's considered "acceptable" is subjective. And that difference in
>>perception is the source of most of the contention. Most people work
>>during the day time, and enjoy their "entertainment" at night. That
>>leaves a fairly small window for compromise where either party isn't
>>giving up something that is important to them.
>
>
>So the interfering ham should just brush off the neighbor and transmit anytime
>he wants just because he can? That's not very fair, is it?

The converse to that is that the ham should transmit at all?

>>Some people are happy if you stay quiet during certain sporting
>>events. Other people will settle for nothing short of the total
>>elimination of any and all interference. I've had to deal with some
>>people so paranoid that they feel that the ham might give them cancer
>>as a result of the RF exposure. How do you fight that level of
>>paranoia?
>
>
>I dunno. Ask Twisty.

I'd rather not. As Hank Hill would say; "That boy ain't right".

>But looking at it from the other person's point of view
>helps a lot. For example, people have a reasonable expectation that things they
>own and use should work they way they were intended.

Including ham radio.

> Manufacturers can't make things bullet-proof

Yes, yes they can! Maybe not 100% "bullet proof", but certainly
"bullet resistant". They choose not to because of the increased cost,
on the risk that the interference potential only exists in small
isolated cases. But by adopting this attitude, they have effectively
transferred the responsibility and the "bad press" for RFI incidents
to the innocent radio operator.

> and there will always be some vulnerabilities. So they have
>to limit those vulnerabilities to what can be expected in normal, everyday use
>by the vast majority of people. Close exposure to ham radio transmitters, I
>don't think, could be classified as normal, everyday use by the vast majority of
>people.

So hams are to be held hostage by cost centric manufacturers, and
gadget junkie neighbors?

>You have to draw some lines somewhere. There are what.... about 100,000 hams in
>the US? Out of more than 300,000,000 people? So is it unreasonable for people to
>expect that their modern appliances don't talk to them in the voice of the ham
>next door?
> Sure it is. Whose responsibility is it to make sure that doesn't
>happen? The manufacturers? No, because they make these products for the millions
>of people who pay for them, not the thousands of hams who interfere with them.

Sure, but the major accountability for this issue rests squarely on
the shoulders of the manufacturers. They have gambled that a
relatively small group of hams does not represent a significant risk
to their bottom line. By allowing or participating in bad press which
paints hams with the same broad brush as the keyclowns, in the RFI
arena, they are only furthering their own agenda. If they are
successful at fueling anti-radio sentiment among the general
population, which then results in restrictive legislation against
radio op's, these same manufacturers can avoid having to address their
role in the whole deal.

That's why the ARRL remains a strong voice in the ear of the FCC.
Someone has to keep the players honest. Otherwise radio hobbies (Ham
and CB alike) will be squished out of existence by a bunch of reality
show watching, game boy playing, phone-a-holics.

>It's up to the ham to make sure he doesn't piss off his neighbors. That's the
>bottom line.

Not if the cards are stacked against him.

>>>From a different perspective, and assuming you can prove that your signal is
>>>clean, have you ever thought of suggesting to the person that they return the
>>>merchandise as defective?
>>
>>Human nature is such that people become very defensive at the mere
>>suggestion that their equipment is to blame. And since this is
>>normally a design issue, any replacement that they get of the same
>>model will likely be just as bad. Suggesting a different brand/model
>>now begins to infringe on that person's right of individual choice.
>>It's never a pretty sight.
>
>
>Well, human nature is such that hams become very definsive at the mere
>suggestion that the manufacturer of that equipment isn't the person transmitting
>RF into your neighbor's home.

Nonetheless, those same manufacturers are responsible for the
subjectability of those devices.

>And that person's right of individual choice was
>limited by the actions of the ham and nobody else.

Hams have rights too! Who respects those?

>>>Because it is. You are intruding into their homes. You take from them some of
>>>the comforts of everyday life that any reasonable person would expect to enjoy
>>>in the privacy of their own home.
>>
>>Ok, look at it this way, would you blame the weather for making your
>>house cold, if your front door was wide open? Maybe we should just
>>stop all cold weather? Afterall, that cold weather is "intruding" into
>>someone's home. Why should a homeowner take steps to block these
>>intrusions? They should be eliminated at the source.
>
>
>Cold weather is a normal fact of life that everyone expects to happen and
>therefore prepares for. Home intrusions by weather or anything else has a high
>probablity of occuring if there is no door. OTOH, most people will live their
>entire lives without ever witnessing a case of RFI.

Not if they live in a major metro area loaded with keyclowns, trying
to be "world-wide"......

> So why should everyone have
>to "buy a door"? It is just plain unreasonable to expect 300 million people to
>spend their time and money to protect themselves from the occasional ham radio
>operator.

But it would be the responsible thing to do, because it could happen.

It might be ham radio today, it could be BPL tomorrow. When your front
door is open to all weather, you never know what might come in.

That's the basis of personal responsibility. When you live in a multi-faceted society, you can be assured that freedom gives people the right to pursue a variety of pass time activities. It is also a certainty that there will be certain people who will take offense at the activities of other people. Now there are those who believe that people should be forced to not do their "offensive" activities (based, of course, on their own opinionated criteria, of what should be considered "proper"), while there are others who believe that those who are offended should take the steps to remove the offense from their senses. Obviously neither case should be 100% the rule. Some activities are generally more offensive to the general population, and are regulated (Like porn). Other things (Rap music for example) is a matter of taste, and if you don't like it, too bad, move somewhere else.

Where it becomes interesting is when both sides attempt to make judgement calls about the relative worthiness of the others' respective activities. When you are faced with purely subjective judgement criteria, who is qualified to make that call?

I guess it all boils down to where your mind is. If you believe that it's society's responsibility to protect us from each other, then you might be more inclined to buy into the "ham has the ultimate responsibility for RFI" mindset. If, on the other hand, you believe that we all have a responsibility to protect our own interests, then you would be more inclined to allow everyone to enjoy their activities (In as much as they don't directly threaten health safety or welfare), and take whatever measures need to be taken on a case by case basis.

>The world does not revolve around ham radio.

Nor does it revolve around the last 4 episodes of "Friends".

>>That's basically the position you are taking.
>>
>>>It's a nuisance like any other nuisance,
>>>except that it's a nuisance which is protected by a federal law.
>>
>>Being told to give up an important hobby and passtime, is a "nuisance"
>>as well. It all depends on your perspective.
>
>
>How about the FCC telling people that they must either give up the use of their
>TV, cordless phone, and whatever electronic gadgets they use, or pay gobs of
>money to get the house under an RF condom, just because some ham moved in next
>door and wants to play with his radio? That's not a nuisance?

Thems the breaks of living in "widget world". Remember Part 15.....

And what if the ham was there first?

And what if the "nuisance" interference is coming from a commercial radio or TV station (The ultimate irony). Should that commercial station be forced to curtail operation because they are causing a

"nuisance"?

>Is there something I'm missing here? Are hams some sort of superior race that
>the rest of the world must crawl in their presence? What right do hams think
>they have to take away the rights of others for the sake of a hobby?

What right do certain others have to take away a ham's right of
advancing or enjoying the radio art, over that of inane sit-coms? See,
you are making a value judgement. Hopefully, by me turning it around,
you can see that.

> Am I theonly person that can see the arrogance of that kind of attitude?

Arrogance, or simply a matter of standing up for our rights?

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1183. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:29:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318152909.21457.00004689@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89147

In article <5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
>do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
>those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
>Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.

Isn't it a pity? [for you, that is] :-)

Will you be having a press conference afterwards and signing autographs for your adoring fans? Giving out 8x10 glossies?

Maybe the Blue Angels will perform a fly-over and aerobatic demonstration at the conclusion? If so, find out who is one of the Solo pilots. That name may come as a surprise. :-)

Be sure and snarl, spit, and otherwise pejorate anyone with a cell phone. Hit them with your "shack-on-the-belt" HT if they give you any trouble. Show them who is Boss. :-)

Happy simulating emergencies.

In southern California we don't need any "simulations" of earthquakes. We have the REAL THING. :-)

LHA / WMD

1184. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:29:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318152910.21457.00004690@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89148

In article <MPG.1ac362607c60f8c49898d4@news.frontiernet.net>, Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>For those who lost my original post:
>
>http://www.tr.com/online/trd/2004/td031704/td031704-04.htm#TopOfPage
>
>The original post was copied from a Yahoo group.

That is from Aspen Publishers who have nice, expensive, and (in this case) questionable accuracy. They have very expensive tele-communications law reports and text books. The above link is from their Telecommunications Reports section.

The last paragraph of the Reports item mentioned is incorrect. There is a 30-day from FR publishing for COMMENTS; there is a 45-day from FR publishing for REPLIES TO COMMENTS.

ALL of the Comments and Replies to Comments on a docket are indicated on the FCC ECFS. That's free. No one has to pay thousands of dollars to subscribe to some publisher's "reports" to get information.

As of Noon EST on 18 Mar 04, there were still only 24 Comments on Docket 04-37, the first Comment filed on 19 Feb 04. There are still only 5 Comments on Docket 04-29. Hardly any "flood" of input from "enthusiasts coming out swinging" on anything. The Public Notice about the Access BPL NPRM has been in public view since 12 Feb 04, a bit over a month ago.

Can you find a Yahoo or any other place that explains the use of TWO docket numbers for the SAME NPRM?

LHA / WMD

1185. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:29:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318152911.21457.00004691@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89149

In article <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
>actual petition):
>
>(begin quote)
>
>II. PROPOSAL
>
>D. Creation of a new entry level license.
>
>.......
>
>19. Basic framework of the new entry level license:
>
>.......
>d. Power limits: Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all
>frequencies below 24 MHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 MHz. This
>allows enough power for adequate communication under most circumstances, and
>matches the nominal power output of the largest number of commercially
>available transmitters and transceivers available as of this writing. The
use
>of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for RF safety
>evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated threshold values for the
>frequencies concerned.
>
>e. Additional electrical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may
>incorporate a final amplifier stage that requires more than 30 volts DC for
>normal operation. The goal of this restriction is to prevent, as much as is
>possible, injury to inexperienced operators. All known current production
>Amateur Radio transmitters and transceivers, including kits, available as of
>this writing, operate using 28 volts or less for the final stage. While
this
>restriction of necessity prevents use of some "legacy" or "vintage" equipment,
>it is not likely to be a serious impediment to assembling a station.
>
>f. Additional technical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may be used
>unless it is of commercial manufacture, or built from a kit of commercial
>origin. The reason for this provision is to prevent, as much as possible,
>spurious emissions from units lacking proper engineering design. Again, we
>realize that this leaves out one of the traditions of Amateur Radio, namely
>that of building your own station from "scratch". However, we note that
>technically inclined persons are likely to upgrade fairly quickly to a General

>Class license, where this restriction, and that of the previous paragraph, is
>no longer an issue.
>
>(end quote)

"Quote" from WHAT?

The link published by Bill Sohl in here is to Amateur Radio Newsline's
"new" items. Going there will get anyone a very nice copy of the
original NECVEC petition RM-10787 submitted on 29 Jul 03!

RM-10787 is toast just like all the other 13 RMs. The last comment
filed on RM-10787 was 4 November 2003.

WHERE is this "new" petition proposal from NECVEC?

It isn't on the NCI website. It doesn't show up on a Search of Amateur
Radio Newsline's website. It doesn't show up on the W5YI Organization
website.

Is it on the ARRL website? If so, provide the LINK for it.

Are you talking about the ARRL "new proposal?" That "new proposal"
doesn't show up on any FCC Public Notices page for the morning of
18 Mar 04 ["Consumers & Governmental Affairs Bureau Reference
Information Center Petitions For Rulemaking Filed"].

Is there an RM number for the "new" ARRL proposal? If there is, tell
us, don't let us accuse you of quoting from vaporware.

ALL of these "new" petitions are nothing but vaporware until it shows
up at the FCC for public viewing with an assigned RM number.

LHA / WMD

1186. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:29:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318152913.21457.00004693@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89150

In article <d22b54c3.0403180242.5b5450f1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040317184603.12501.00006806@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
>> >here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
>>
>> Looks like Kellie has already set the stage for his excuses in
>> not filing a damn thing and will then tawk tuff about nasty
>> gubmint afterwards.
>>
>> Kellie tawks tuff all over the place in here. He can't do it to
>> the FCC? :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I called that one right on the money didn't I ya PUTZ.

No, all you are doing is TAWKING TUFF...which I "predicted." :-)

Did Kellie file anything on NPRM 04-29? Is he planning to?

Did Kellie file anything on NOI 03-104?

Kellie has all of April to prepare something on 04-29. He won't,
reserving his valuable time to bad-mouthing certain others.

Kellie WANTS BPL to happen?

LHA / WMD

1187. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:29:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318152913.21457.00004692@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89251

In article <20040318075412.29660.00003459@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com >(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message >>news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>>> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ >><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>> >
>>> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>>> >>
>>> >> Dan/W4NTI
>>> >
>>> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good >point.
>>> >
>>> He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a >>> year
>>> now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.
>>
>>He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around >>here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
>>
>That too! As proved elsewhere, you hit that one dead-on.
>
>The deadline for comments is May 3. Today is March 18.

You HAVE the Federal Register to "prove" that, do you?

Yesterday, 17 March, there were already 29 comments on the ECFS.

>Some of us are already working on comments.

Mostly for the newsgroup? :-)

>Such serious stuff should not be rushed, though, and need >to be thoroughly proofread and spellchecked.

Oh my, Miccolis was one the early birds on 03-104. Did he "thoroughly proofread and spellcheck" his comment on the

NOI?

>And the comments need to go two
>places since two sets of regs are changing.

WHICH "two sets of regs?"

The NPRM 04-29 specifically states Part 15 of Title 47 C.F.R.

It concerns incidental radiation, the only thing the FCC can
regulate (with the possible exception of a power line crossing
state boundaries with Access BPL serving more than one state).

WHICH docket is the "correct" one, mighty seer?

>ARRL has been beating this drum from the first.

From the "first" what?

Nobody so far has "beat" the National Antenna Consortium and
The Amhearst Alliance on NPRM 04-29 with a 19 Feb 04 filing!
:-)

As of 17 Mar 04, there were 5,731 documents in the ECFS on
NOI 03-104. Did the ARRL file all of those? A "large part" of
those? Are they the "only one" with any sort of "technical
dissertation" about Access BPL and incidental radiation?

>Full details at
>
>http://www.arrl.org

NOT EVEN CLOSE TO "FULL DETAILS!"

ARRL is still mentioning NOI 03-104 as if it were a current docket.
Why? It is toast. That NOI is just a digital wastebasket for citizens
getting their complain jollies over with...so they will learn to accept
Access BPL as a given in the future and not complain then.

ARRL can't even (yet) explain why there are TWO dockets on ONE
NPRM. [04-37 and 04-29 for NPRM 04-29]

ARRL hasn't (yet) posted any deadline date on filing for Access
BPL. Why not? Isn't that "important" or something?

LHA / WMD

1188. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 20:50:19 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <nr1k50to0f62ueep5tcj6occul6ua0po3i@4ax.com>
Source record: 89252
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <5g0k50ped3h1e3d1iv48hsn1g8bb7t3a7v@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 06:15:46 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>
>>In <r46j50d32e0habm03t3nm39mr1cvk7k62l@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>>
>>>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>><snip>
>>>>Sounds like a bad limiter.
>>>
>>>Or rectification in an audio stage. For a simple AM detector, you only
>>>need a half wave rectifier. Practically any semiconductor device has
>>>this capability. When the volume control has no effect on the
>>>intensity of the RFI, it's a sure bet that the interference is being
>>>coupled into a stage downstream from the volume control.
>>
>>
>>Or, more likely, into the power supply.
>>
>>>> The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video
>>>>cables.
>>>
>>>How do you apply that solution to aluminum siding or gutters, without
>>>having access to physically modify them?
>>
>>
>>You have audio coming from the gutters? Hmmm..... I've heard audio coming from a
>>chain-link fence, but it was the perimeter fence for a 50kW tower.
>
>
>Not audio, non-linear rectification and re-radiation of IMD products.

Step one: get access. Step two: Either replace them with PVC gutters, or run a
bare copper wire in the bottom of the aluminum gutters.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1189. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 21:25:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <405A13E4.5040406@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89253

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
>
> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive
> measures of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on
> homebrewing and the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class
> of operation is just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>
A few questions on electrical safety on the test should solve the
problem that the
final voltage restriction is trying to address. How would you enforce
it anyway?
The frequency of your carrier is easily enforced (by someone tuning a
receiver
at a remote FCC field office), power level less so, and the B+ on the finals
can't be except by a visit from the FCC. They don't have the budget for
that.

1190. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 21:33:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405A15A4.30804@psu.edu>
Source record: 89254

Robert Casey wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:

>> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive
>> measures of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on
>> homebrewing and the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class
>> of operation is just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>>
> A few questions on electrical safety on the test should solve the
> problem that the
> final voltage restriction is trying to address. How would you enforce
> it anyway?
> The frequency of your carrier is easily enforced (by someone tuning a
> receiver
> at a remote FCC field office), power level less so, and the B+ on the finals
> can't be except by a visit from the FCC. They don't have the budget for
> that.
>

Agreed. I have never been in favor of unenforceable rules.

Can anyone come up with a good rationale for not teaching RF safety in
some depth at the lowest level of license class? Are these newbies worth
less to us?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1191. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 22:03:55 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403181403.67bc49d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed) wrote:
>Dave Hall n3cvj can't provide for any answers when asked. Ask him a
>question concerning one of his bullsh*t claims and he attacks the
person
>who asked the question on a personal level in order to avoid getting
>caught in another of him many, many, long winded lies he has been
caught
>in. dave is a notorious liar and lies only to lie. Davey boy pretends
to
>be a legal-advocate, but owns a Davemade amplifier and was partner in
a
>cb hack shop with a person he claims was a sex fiend. Davey boy once
>claimed he had a Phelps Stationmaster and when asked about it a year
>later, he replied "What Phelps?" Now,,I ask any of you, can you all
not
>remember the antennas you have owned over the years? But of course
you
>can,,,in fact, most people can remember not only each and every
antenna
>they ever owned, but brands of radios and mics as well, but then
again,
>most people are not habitual liars like Davey-boy Hall who claimed he
>knew
>a cber in Philly who went to court and was found guilty for some cb
>related offense.
>Presented with the evidence that no such case existed in which Davey
boy
>referrred, Davey boy began a character assassination in a pathetic
>attempt at distancing himself from his claim. With nowhere to run, he
>recanted his claim and said he never claimed it was in Philly, even
when
>presented with his post showing indeed it was what he claimed. The
>attacks resumed from Davey Boy and he ran as fast as he could to get
>away from yet another lie in the pathological, desolate world in
which
>he resides. Davey-boy has since lost yet another isp and is now
>relegated to behaving himself and minding his ps and qs lest he be
>writing another check for a new provider.
>--
>You ask w
>
>
>

>
>
>

lies,davemade,sex fiend,phelps,philly,isp's....yawn the usual Twisted
formula attack nothing new here

1192. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 22:54:34 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <75ak5096q926sgrbcnm6vgaqlsqklhi7qr@4ax.com>
Source record: 89256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <cbkj50lkue9tuar141tqvtf9ut42nhsb4g@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 10:53:51 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
<snip>
>>Have a mouse problem here. Cute little things, but they sure do shit a lot.
>
>That's why I used to have cats.

Got one. It's afraid of mice.

>
>>>
>>>Key word: "best". Ground wave has some effect throughout the HF bands.
>>>It can also propagate signals into neighboring homes.
>>
>>
>>....um, wouldn't that be better classified as near-field radiation and not
>>ground-wave propagation? How far away are your neighbors' houses?
>
>The line between where near field radiation ends and ground wave picks
>up is not always obvious. If the guy receiving the interference is 4
>doors down the street, I tend to think that he's outside the "cone" of
>the near field. But I could be wrong.

I might have to look this up, but IIRC, the 97% point is something like 9
wavelengths for the E-field and 5 wavelengths for the M-field.... or is it the
other way around.....

>>They were changed to the new specs in 2002. I'll dig up the code later. If I
>>remember correctly, it only applies to devices of new manufacture.
>
>
>I'll have to look this up. This is the first that I've heard of any
>changes. Naturally, I'll want to do what I can to stay in spec, even
>if existing equipment is "grandfathered". It makes for a better
>defense if you already meet the tougher specs, and you receive an RFI
>complaint.

97.307(d) "The mean power of any spurious emission from a station
transmitter or external RF power amplifier transmitting on a frequency
below 30 MHz must not exceed 50 mW and must be at least 40 dB below the
mean power of the fundamental emission......"

There are also changes in Part 2 for the manufacturing standards of ham equipment.

>>I set aside a day or two each month to make 'trinkets', for lack of a better
>>term. Things like pigtails, toroidal chokes, jumper leads, mic cables, etc.
>
>For someone who had been advancing the notion that consumer devices
>are not all that bad, WRT RFI susceptibility, you spend a lot of time
>making up RFI blocking devices for them..... ;-)

I work at a radio station where we have lots of audio and radio equipment, computers and networking hardware, telephones and routing system, our own backup generator, and keyclowns driving up and down the street. It is not a typical "consumer" environment.

>>..... My point is that radio operation requires a level of
>>responsibility as high as the level of the privelege.
>
>And that responsibility extends to the operation and maintenance of
>his equipment. That responsibility becomes unreasonable when extended
>to include the prevention of RF ingress into neighboring consumer
>devices (Which should have been done by the manufacturer). IMHO it is
>unfair for the manufacturers, by choosing to cut corners, to place
>this burden on radio ops. At the very least, the manufacturers should
>be held accountable as enablers or orchestrators of these incidents by
>facilitating the easy reception of RFI.

Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1. When it comes to RFI and manufacturing quality, there are much higher priorities. Such as interference to and/or from cell phones, public utility and emergency communications, land-line telephone, television services including cable, satellite and broadcast, broadcast radio services, etc... all of which are far more common and far more important than hams. But they also have to deal with government safety agencies, insurance companies, manufacturing costs (labor is a biggie and that's why so many jobs are exported overseas), consumer demand, market competition, etc..... You are talking about changing the practices of multi-BILLION dollar markets just so a relatively few hams can play with their radios? I don't think so, Dave. That's an unjustified burden. When there are a couple million hams paying hundreds of thousands of dollars each for their equipment, then -maybe- hams might make those manufacturers take notice. But until that happens, the rest of the world sure as hell isn't going to shoulder the 'burdens' of a few hams.

>I remember the earlier days of ham radio. If a ham interfered with a
>TV, he made a trap out of a length of twinlead, and placed it across
>the TV's antenna terminals, and that usually was all it took. The
>issue today has become way more complicated. Which is ironic, since
>most hams use commercial equipment these days, and those ham radios
>have become cleaner then they ever were, so the percentage of "dirty"
>transmitters has dropped in the last 40 years, yet the incidents of
>RFI has increased dramatically..

When I find a well-documented study on the issue I may agree. Until then my opinion is based on logic.

>>>>The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham.
>
>I would consider incessant complaints to be a form of "interference".

Cause and effect. Your interference is the cause, the complaints are the effect. Think of it as "constructive feedback".

>>>>It should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
>>>>for anyone else.
>
>That's like saying that everyone should drive their cars as to not
>emit pollution.

You are missing the big picture here. Cars are common. Televisions are common. Cordless phones are common. People expect these things to work in the manner in which they were intended, and accept the problems they are expected to cause. Ham radio stations are -not- common. Ham radio interference is -not- what people expect to deal with when they come home from a hard days work, pop open a brew, kick back in their comfy-chair and turn on the tube to watch the news. I don't see how any ham should expect the average person to accept such interference even if it -is- the law.

And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal, or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....

97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal."

Notice that it doesn't exempt Part 15 devices or Sony televisions, it doesn't release the ham of responsibility just because he tried and failed to prevent the interference, and it doesn't specify where or how that interference occurs. The fact is that if you know your transmission is interfering with the audio, distorting the picture (distortion = interference, Blackburn v. Doubleday Broadcasting Co., Minn. 1984), or crashing someone's wireless palm-pilot, only YOU are at fault. Sony is not responsible for your transmissions and subsequent interference, nor is Zenith, Motorola, or even the poor schmuck who paid too much for an El Cheapo TV that even picks up his coffee maker.... if you know that you are causing interference, you are legally responsible. Period. But you knew that already, right?

>>So the interfering ham should just brush off the neighbor and transmit anytime
>>he wants just because he can? That's not very fair, is it?
>
>The converse to that is that the ham should transmit at all?

Well, how about using a frequency, band or modulation mode that doesn't cause any interference? Or maybe move the antenna so as to point the null at the problem device? Or if you have a vertical, how about setting up a null zone with another pole? I don't see any reason why it can't be done. The same laws of physics apply to both amateur and broadcast, and since broadcast stations can do it, so can hams.

>>But looking at it from the other person's point of view
>>helps a lot. For example, people have a reasonable expectation that things they
>>own and use should work they way they were intended.
>
>Including ham radio.

When you cause interference, is your ham radio not working the way it was
intended?

>> Manufacturers can't make things bullet-proof
>
>Yes, yes they can! Maybe not 100% "bullet proof", but certainly
>"bullet resistant". They choose not to because of the increased cost,
>on the risk that the interference potential only exists in small
>isolated cases. But by adopting this attitude, they have effectively
>transferred the responsibility and the "bad press" for RFI incidents
>to the innocent radio operator.

Innocent?

>> and there will always be some vulnerabilities. So they have
>>to limit those vulnerabilities to what can be expected in normal, everyday use
>>by the vast majority of people. Close exposure to ham radio transmitters, I
>>don't think, could be classified as normal, everyday use by the vast majority of
>>people.
>
>So hams are to be held hostage by cost centric manufacturers, and
>gadget junkie neighbors?

Held hostage? Don't you think that's a bit strong? I mean... geez, nobody is
preventing you from using your radio, and you can certainly use it in a way that
doesn't interfere with the lives of people that otherwise wouldn't even be aware
of your existence. How is that being "held hostage"?

>>You have to draw some lines somewhere. There are what.... about 100,000 hams in
>>the US? Out of more than 300,000,000 people? So is it unreasonable for people to
>>expect that their modern appliances don't talk to them in the voice of the ham
>>next door?
>> Sure it is. Whose responsibility is it to make sure that doesn't
>>happen? The manufacturers? No, because they make these products for the millions
>>of people who pay for them, not the thousands of hams who interfere with them.
>
>Sure, but the major accountability for this issue rests squarely on
>the shoulders of the manufacturers.

Oh that's bullshit! You are skateboarding in a rock quarry and blaming the
excavators for the bumps! Get a clue, Dave!

> They have gambled that a
>relatively small group of hams does not represent a significant risk
>to their bottom line. By allowing or participating in bad press which
>paints hams with the same broad brush as the keyclowns, in the RFI
>arena, they are only furthering their own agenda.

Now you are starting to sound as paranoid as Twisty, and that's where I quit.
Sorry Dave, but I really thought you were smarter than that.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1193. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 22:55:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RNp6c.13433$t16.7807700@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89257

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40594245.1010206@ix.netcom.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >
> >The actual problem is stems from several elements. 1) Most people
outside
> >of amateur radio have never heard of it. So even if they might be
inclined
> >to pursue this hobby, they will never be involved. 2) Amateur radio, as
> >with any specialized activity, is only going to appeal to a limited
number
> >of people in the first place. 3) There is a greater multitude of
hobbies
> >and activities available today than ever before. People have to make
> >choices on how to spend their time and money.
> >
> >
> >
> Some people probably will choose a hobby that doesn't require taking a
test
> to get a license to do it. So we have to get a prospective ham person
past
> that chore. Not a big chore, but still a chore.
>

It only takes a very tiny bit of encouragement to get them to take the test if their interest is more than just a "that's kind of interesting" level.

The biggest problem remains the fact that so few people have heard of amateur radio. Today we are at the point where there are even people who haven't even heard of CB.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1194. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 23:18:18 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <nbbk50d2ou3ut3ium16tbb2ni2rc01h07f@4ax.com>
Source record: 89258

On 18 Mar 2004 20:29:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
>>do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
>>those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
>>Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.
>
> Isn't it a pity? [for you, that is] :-)
>
> Will you be having a press conference afterwards and signing
> autographs for your adoring fans? Giving out 8x10 glossies?
>
> Maybe the Blue Angels will perform a fly-over and aerobatic
> demonstration at the conclusion? If so, find out who is one
> of the Solo pilots. That name may come as a surprise. :-)

That would be Maj. Len Anderson, USMC.

A relative, perhaps?

>
> Be sure and snarl, spit, and otherwise pejorate anyone with a
> cell phone. Hit them with your "shack-on-the-belt" HT if they
> give you any trouble. Show them who is Boss. :-)
>
> Happy simulating emergencies.
>
> In southern California we don't need any "simulations" of
> earthquakes. We have the REAL THING. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

1195. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-18 23:59:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040318185954.12631.00005602@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89259

In article <20040318152911.21457.00004691@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
>>actual petition):
>>
>>(begin quote)
>>
>>II. PROPOSAL
>>
>>D. Creation of a new entry level license.
>>
>>.......
>>
>>19. Basic framework of the new entry level license:
>>
>>.......
>>d. Power limits: Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all
>>frequencies below 24 MHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 MHz.
>This
>>allows enough power for adequate communication under most circumstances, and
>>matches the nominal power output of the largest number of commercially
>>available transmitters and transceivers available as of this writing. The
>use
>>of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for RF safety
>>evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated threshold values for
>the
>>frequencies concerned.
>>
>>e. Additional electrical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may
>>incorporate a final amplifier stage that requires more than 30 volts DC for
>>normal operation. The goal of this restriction is to prevent, as much as is
>>possible, injury to inexperienced operators. All known current production
>>Amateur Radio transmitters and transceivers, including kits, available as
>of
>>this writing, operate using 28 volts or less for the final stage. While
>this
>>restriction of necessity prevents use of some "legacy" or "vintage"
>equipment,
>>it is not likely to be a serious impediment to assembling a station.
>>

>>f. Additional technical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may be used
>>unless it is of commercial manufacture, or built from a kit of commercial
>>origin. The reason for this provision is to prevent, as much as possible,
>>spurious emissions from units lacking proper engineering design. Again, we
>>realize that this leaves out one of the traditions of Amateur Radio, namely
>>that of building your own station from "scratch". However, we note that
>>technically inclined persons are likely to upgrade fairly quickly to a
>General
>>Class license, where this restriction, and that of the previous paragraph,
>is
>>no longer an issue.
>>
>>(end quote)
>
> "Quote" from WHAT?

From the actual NCVEC restructuring petition, Len. I downloaded it yesterday
and read it. Didn't you?
>
> The link published by Bill Sohl in here is to Amateur Radio Newsline's
> "new" items. Going there will get anyone a very nice copy of the
> original NECVEC petition RM-10787 submitted on 29 Jul 03!

Both published links were in error. That was obvious from the first page of the
petition. Didn't you notice that it wasn't a new petition, and that it did not
match the news release?
>
> RM-10787 is toast just like all the other 13 RMs. The last comment
> filed on RM-10787 was 4 November 2003.

They're not "toast", Len. Obviously, FCC is still gathering input for an NPRM.
>
> WHERE is this "new" petition proposal from NECVEC?

Len, it's "NCVEC". Only one "E".

The new NCVEC petition is online and can be downloaded easily, once you know
where to look.

> It isn't on the NCI website.

It's not an NCI petition.

> It doesn't show up on a Search of Amateur
> Radio Newsline's website.

It's not a Newsline petition either.

> It doesn't show up on the W5YI Organization
> website.

It's not a W5YI Organization petition, although you can bet your bippy that
every single word of the NCVEC petition had to be personally approved by ol'
Fast Freddie.

>
> Is it on the ARRL website?

I don't know. That's not where I got it.

> If so, provide the LINK for it.

Is that an order, Len? Sounds like one. Who are you to give me or anyone else here orders?

Why should I help you find the new NCVEC petition, Len, given the way you behave here? Will you act in a civil manner towards me if I help you? Or will I simply be the target of more of your name calling, ridicule, bad jokes, and other abuse?

> Are you talking about the ARRL "new proposal?"

No.

I am referring to, and quoting, the new NCVEC proposal. The one mentioned in the news release. Don't you have a copy yet, Len? If not, why are you commenting on something you haven't read?

> That "new proposal"
> doesn't show up on any FCC Public Notices page for the morning of
> 18 Mar 04 ["Consumers & Governmental Affairs Bureau Reference
> Information Center Petitions For Rulemaking Filed"].

That's not where I found it.
>
> Is there an RM number for the "new" ARRL proposal?

I'm not talking about the ARRL proposal. I'm talking about the new NCVEC proposal.

> If there is, tell
> us, don't let us accuse you of quoting from vaporware.

Is that an order? Who are you to give me or anyone else here orders?

I'm quoting from the new NCVEC petition. It's online, available for download. Took me about 2 minutes to find it, once I realized that the links posted were to the old NCVEC petition, not the new one.
>
> ALL of these "new" petitions are nothing but vaporware until it shows
> up at the FCC for public viewing with an assigned RM number.
>
Then what's your problem, Len? If it's not a real petition, why are you all worked up about it?

Here's a hint: It's a real petition, not vaporware. It can be downloaded from an easily accessed site. I even printed it out this morning.

1196. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 00:06:56 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <A7OdnRup-pIqpMfdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89260
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Sedina II wrote:
> Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
> and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
> special guest on Coast to Coast AM
> Thursday/Friday evening.
>
> On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!
>
> Show info for the above:
> http://www.coasttocoastam.com/shows/2004/03/18.html
>
> Main: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/
>
> See also: http://www.whatdoesitmean.com/
>

Wayne Green. Loser extrordinaire. Failed more ham radio businesses and magazines than anyone in human history.

I don't want to pay to listen to him, unless I'm writing a book about "good examples of a bad example".

1197. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 00:41:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181641.7fc7a449@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89261

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ro2dnRo49dfJpszd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > And William wrote:
> >
> > > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
> >
> > Sure they have and can, but when the cell network is down, ham radio
> > will be there if needed.
>
> This weekend will see "Heartland Response 2004" conducted in
> Western Tennessee and parts of Mississippi, Arkansas, Kentucky and
> Missouri.
>
> It will simulate (among other things) and earthquake along the
> New Madrid fault.

Say Hi to Dick/W0EX.

I think the New Madrid Fault was the only thing that kept him going.

1198. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 00:43:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0Omdne4gW_6838fdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89262

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>> Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>
>
>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>sense.
>>
>> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures
>>of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and
>>the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is
>>just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>>
>> We DON'T learn do we?
>
>
> Apparently there's NO reading, either. The only power limitation of
> the NECVEC petition-proposal is in a 400 KHz low sub-band on 10m
> for the three lower classes.
>
> Re-read the NECVEC petition-proposal and report back.

I have, and are you talking about something else? I took NECVEC to be a typo, since NCVEC is a group that put forth a proposal some time ago. Perhaps you are referring to a different group?

At any rate, No need to modify my argument if you are referring to the NCVEC and not the NECVEC.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1199. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 00:54:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <c4ydnbNkmtJb2cfdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89263

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20040318152911.21457.00004691@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>In article <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
>>>actual petition):
>>>
>>>(begin quote)
>>>
>>>II. PROPOSAL
>>>
>>>D. Creation of a new entry level license.
>>>
>>>.......
>>>
>>>19. Basic framework of the new entry level license:
>>>
>>>.......
>>>d. Power limits: Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all
>>>frequencies below 24 MHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 MHz.
>>
>>This
>>
>>>allows enough power for adequate communication under most circumstances, and
>>>matches the nominal power output of the largest number of commercially
>>>available transmitters and transceivers available as of this writing. The
>>
>>use
>>
>>>of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for RF safety
>>>evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated threshold values for
>>
>>the
>>
>>>frequencies concerned.
>>>
>>>e. Additional electrical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may
>>>incorporate a final amplifier stage that requires more than 30 volts DC for

>>>normal operation. The goal of this restriction is to prevent, as much as is
>>>possible, injury to inexperienced operators. All known current production
>>>Amateur Radio transmitters and transceivers, including kits, available as
>>
>>of
>>
>>>this writing, operate using 28 volts or less for the final stage. While
>>
>>this
>>
>>>restriction of necessity prevents use of some "legacy" or "vintage"
>>
>>equipment,
>>
>>>it is not likely to be a serious impediment to assembling a station.
>>>
>>>f. Additional technical limits: No transmitter or transceiver may be used
>>>unless it is of commercial manufacture, or built from a kit of commercial
>>>origin. The reason for this provision is to prevent, as much as possible,
>>>spurious emissions from units lacking proper engineering design. Again, we
>>>realize that this leaves out one of the traditions of Amateur Radio, namely
>>>that of building your own station from "scratch". However, we note that
>>>technically inclined persons are likely to upgrade fairly quickly to a
>>
>>General
>>
>>>Class license, where this restriction, and that of the previous paragraph,
>>
>>is
>>
>>>no longer an issue.
>>>
>>>(end quote)
>>
>> "Quote" from WHAT?
>
>
> From the actual NCVEC restructuring petition, Len. I downloaded it yesterday
> and read it. Didn't you?
I think he's talking about th eNECVEC propoasal, not the NCVEC
proposal, Jim!

>> The link published by Bill Sohl in here is to Amateur Radio Newsline's
>> "new" items. Going there will get anyone a very nice copy of the
>> original NECVEC petition RM-10787 submitted on 29 Jul 03!
>
>
> Both published links were in error. That was obvious from the first page of the
> petition. Didn't you notice that it wasn't a new petition, and that it did not
> match the news release?

>
>> RM-10787 is toast just like all the other 13 RMs. The last comment
>> filed on RM-10787 was 4 November 2003.
>
>
> They're not "toast", Len. Obviously, FCC is still gathering input for an NPRM.
>
>> WHERE is this "new" petition proposal from NECVEC?
>
>
> Len, it's "NCVEC". Only one "E".

You must be mistaken Jim.

> The new NCVEC petition is online and can be downloaded easily, once you know
> where to look.

Got that one on all my computers. The NCVEC does indeed seem to have
power limits on the newbies. The NECVEC proposal must be different.

>
>> It isn't on the NCI website.
>
>
> It's not an NCI petition.

Go figure, eh?

>
>> It doesn't show up on a Search of Amateur
>> Radio Newsline's website.
>
>
> It's not a Newsline petition either.

LIB!

>
>>It doesn't show up on the W5YI Organization
>> website.
>
>
> It's not a W5YI Organization petition, although you can bet your bippy that
> every single word of the NCVEC petition had to be personally approved by ol'
> Fast Freddie.

You bet.

>> Is it on the ARRL website?
>
>
> I don't know. That's not where I got it.
>

>
>>If so, provide the LINK for it.
>
>
> Is that an order, Len? Sounds like one. Who are you to give me or anyone else
> here orders?

It's not on the arrl website Jim. So I doubt you could provide a link! 8^)

> Why should I help you find the new NCVEC petition, Len, given the way you
> behave here? Will you act in a civil manner towards me if I help you? Or will I
> simply be the target of more of your name calling, ridicule, bad jokes, and
> other abuse?
>

Remember good manners are a sign of weakness, Jim!

>
>> Are you talking about the ARRL "new proposal?"
>
>
> No.
>
> I am referring to, and quoting, the new NCVEC proposal. The one mentioned in
> the news release. Don't you have a copy yet, Len? If not, why are you
> commenting on something you haven't read?
>
>
>> That "new proposal"
>> doesn't show up on any FCC Public Notices page for the morning of
>> 18 Mar 04 ["Consumers & Governmental Affairs Bureau Reference
>> Information Center Petitions For Rulemaking Filed"].
>
>
> That's not where I found it.
>
>> Is there an RM number for the "new" ARRL proposal?
>
>
> I'm not talking about the ARRL proposal. I'm talking about the new NCVEC
> proposal.
>
>
>> If there is, tell
>> us, don't let us accuse you of quoting from vaporware.
>
>
> Is that an order? Who are you to give me or anyone else here orders?
>
> I'm quoting from the new NCVEC petition. It's online, available for download.
> Took me about 2 minutes to find it, once I realized that the links posted were

> to the old NCVEC petition, not the new one.
>
>> ALL of these "new" petitions are nothing but vaporware until it shows
>> up at the FCC for public viewing with an assigned RM number.
>>
>
> Then what's your problem, Len? If it's not a real petition, why are you all
> worked up about it?
>
> Here's a hint: It's a real petition, not vaporware. It can be downloaded from
> an easily accessed site. I even printed it out this morning.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1200. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 01:58:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89264

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>
> > You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
> > clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
> > role in emergency response communications.
>
> Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
> MiniLennie...
>
> I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
> thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
> the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
> Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.
>
> Can you/do you refute this?

Yes, I can.

Quoting Lean:

"Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are 100
million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about one
for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say. :-)

"If every licensed amateur in the USA had one useable radio, then the
number of amateur radios would be one per about 430 citizens. Not as
big a "spread.

LHA / WMD"

I'll add that there are about 265 million people in the US, and less
than 700,000 licensed amateurs, who TAFKARJ will tell you some are
dead, some have quit, some are expired, and many are inactive.
Regardless of how many are alive and active, half don't use CW/Morse,
so according to you overplayed and unrealistic disaster scenarios,

they are useless. Right?

Now, not every American Citizen has access to an amateur radio
operator. I'd say most don't know even one amateur, and many don't
know what ham radio is (Isn't that like CB?)

I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
people. You do the math.

> > > What I HAVE stated in this and other forums is that Amateur Radio
> > > CONTINUES to provide a necessary and almost irreplaceable asset.
> >
> > To the exclusion of all other communications means. At least until
> > you posted the above.
>
> An absolute Brian Burke mistruth.
>
> Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
> might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?
>
> Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?

Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???

> > NO
> > > OTHER RADIO SERVICE provides the flexibility and utility that Amateur
> > > Radio does.
> >
> > You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
> > flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.
>
> Oh...?!?! How?

Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
would be overloaded and useless.

CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???

> (this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
> him to his face...)

I'd rather not meet you in person. You scare me.

So stay away from me.

> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
> communicate with your cellphone?

When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?

> > > I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.
> >
> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
>
> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)

Is that a threat?

> > > > > These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions come
> > > > > from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who have
> > > > > benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have expressed
> > > > > the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
> > > > > programs.
> > > >
> > > > And cell phones.
> > >
> > > How well does a cellphone operate without a functioning cellsite,
> > > Brain?
> >
> > Don, if you can say my cell site is dead, I can say your ham radio is
> > dead.
>
> When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
> propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
> switch to a data mode or SSB.
>
> So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
> ignorance...but you've done THAT well...

I said your radio is broke. Switch away for all the good it does you.

> > > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
> > > role.
> >
> > Just did.
>
> No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
> supported by a shred of evidence.

Yes, I did. You only have one scenario in your head. That scenario
is that cell phones won't work in an emergency.

> > > I have NEVER said anything even CLOSE to the idea that we're the
> > > only game in town. Quite the contrary.
> >
> > You omit any discussion that any other radio service or common carrier
> > can provide emergency comms. That is a form of lying.
>
> First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
> other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
> Amateur Radio.

Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
that cell phones won't be working.

Am I wrong?

> > > I >>HAVE<< said we provide a service to those who make the plans
> > > and need the help.
> >
> > Until the emergency happens, you don't know who your customer might be
> > or if you can provide a service to him or her.
>
> Ahhhh...but I do...
>
> You see, Mr Clueless, there are things called "MOU's", or
> "Memorandum of Understanding", that exist between agencies for just
> these instances.

You have no MOU with me. You have no MOU with Larry. You have no MOU
with Lean.

Will you deny emergency comms to us if we needed them?

> Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
> prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".

You trained for the Twin Towers attack?

Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?

Or did it actually work as actual 9/11 survivors said it worked?

> Is it possible to train or prepare for ALL eventualities...?!?!
> Of course not, but short of The Rapture or complete nuclear
> annihilation, I'd say most responding agencies have SOME plan in
> place.

> ARES has MOU's with nearly every state EMA in the Union. That
> pretty well puts them in a positon to be able to train with just about
> everyone they will need to be in touch with during any given
> emergency.

Most American Citizens are not responding agencies, don't have MOUs,
aren't amateur radio operators.

What do they use?

Cell Phones.

> > Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
> > not emergencies.
>
> Sure they are.
>
> Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course
> not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
> come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,

> power grids will fail, etc etc etc.
>
> Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
> some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?

You got me there. In all of the situations above, how will the
average Joe communicate?

> > > > > > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio turned out to be
> > > > > > > a valuable asset.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no reports
> > > > > > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing the
> > > > > > > comm outages?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
> > > > > > > involvement?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You'll have to ask Dee.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I am asking you.
> > > > >
> > > > > You'll have to ask Dee.
> >
> > Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
> > wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
> > my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.

Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't
you?

> > > > > > Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
> > > > > > employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved. That's a
> > > > > > LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
> > > > > > communications during the east coast power outage?
> > > > >
> > > > > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> > > > > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
> > > >
> > > > Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
> > > > played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
> > > > outages?
> >
> > You interject adjectives again, Your Cowardness. You also tried
> > to skate around answering MY request to cite the post wherein you
> > alledge I say such a thing...
> >

> Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
> attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
> documented fact.

Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
answereing machine.

He didn't use amateur radio or CW.

> > > > Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?
> > >
> > > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
> > > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
> >
> > Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular sites are
> > capable of operating in an emergency?
>
> Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
> been studying...???

You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
any use whatsoever in an emergency.

> > Just making a clarification. Just trying to get your non-verbals on
> > paper.
>
> No clarification needed, Brain, unless you have a rectal-cranial
> inversion that you need resolved (which is reasonably apparant from
> your posts)

Nope. I'm five by.

> As for "non-verbals", we're still waiting for YOUR "non-verbals",
> ie: from whom you got permission to operate Amateur Radio in Somalia,
> and by what United Nations authorizaton that person had to GIVE you
> that authority...

I thought we were talking about emergency communications, not amateur
past times in a forward location.

> I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
> served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
> camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war
> zone with...?!?!

Forward location. Not a war zone though the VFW thinks so.

> > > "Emergency comms" are NOT >>only<< when the wires are down or the
> > > cell site destroyed, Brain.
> >
> > JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
> > always up. That is the picture he paints.
>

> Is it?

Is that the picture you paint?

> > > Perhaps if you were actively involved in the programs of some
> > > disaster mitigation agency you might have a better insight as to what
> > > Amateur Radio's OTHER roles are...?!?!
> >
> > I was a MARS volunteer and BST member. I have no problem with that
> > concept. But there sure are a lot of DP planners running around with
> > cellular telephones nowadays.
>
> Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
> organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.

Thus, military installations can work with their IMD to set up a BST
under MARS. Much better outcome than relying on people who CHOP
themselves to the ARC, Salvation Army, County EOC, CAP, Homeless
Shelter, Friends of the Library, and Bicycle Rodeos.

> When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
> Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
> mitigation exercise in ANY role?

I do enough on the job re mitigation.

> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > >
> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > > compliant devices?
> >
> > Sure. Why not?
>
> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> played a major role in emergency comms".
>
> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> services" playing a "major role".
>
> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> a meaningful, positive outcome.
>
> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> pertinent examples.
>
> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
>
> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>

> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
>
> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> substantiate.
>
> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
>
> Steve, K4YZ

1201. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 01:59:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040318205933.12501.00006832@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89265

In article <c4ydnbNkmtJb2cfdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <20040318152911.21457.00004691@mb-m10.aol.com>,
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>>In article <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>,
>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>>>>Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
>>>>actual petition):

>>>>(begin quote)
>>>>
>>>>II. PROPOSAL
>>>>
>>>>D. Creation of a new entry level license.
>>>>
>>>>.......
>>>>
>>>>19. Basic framework of the new entry level license:
>>>>
>>>>.......
>>>>d. Power limits:
......

>>>>no longer an issue.
>>>>
>>>>(end quote)
>>>
>>> "Quote" from WHAT?

>> From the actual NCVEC restructuring petition, Len. I downloaded it
>> yesterday and read it. Didn't you?

> I think he's talking about th eNECVEC propoasal, not the NCVEC
>proposal, Jim!

Something like that.

>>> The link published by Bill Sohl in here is to Amateur Radio Newsline's
>>> "new" items. Going there will get anyone a very nice copy of the
>>> original NECVEC petition RM-10787 submitted on 29 Jul 03!

>> Both published links were in error. That was obvious from the first page of
>> the
>> petition. Didn't you notice that it wasn't a new petition, and that it did
>> not match the news release?
>>
>>> RM-10787 is toast just like all the other 13 RMs. The last comment
>>> filed on RM-10787 was 4 November 2003.

>> They're not "toast", Len. Obviously, FCC is still gathering input for an
>> NPRM.
>>
>>> WHERE is this "new" petition proposal from NECVEC?

>> Len, it's "NCVEC". Only one "E".

>You must be mistaken Jim.

Not me.
>
>> The new NCVEC petition is online and can be downloaded easily, once you
>> know where to look.
>
>Got that one on all my computers.

Easy to find, wasn't it?

>The NCVEC does indeed seem to have
>power limits on the newbies.

100 W below 24 MHz, 50 W above.

>The NECVEC proposal must be different.
>
Don't hold yer breath waiting to see the "NECVEC" proposal.

>>> It isn't on the NCI website.

>> It's not an NCI petition.

>Go figure, eh?

Exactly.

>>> It doesn't show up on a Search of Amateur
>>> Radio Newsline's website.
>>
>> It's not a Newsline petition either.
>
>LIB!

?? I don't know that one, Mike.
>
>>>It doesn't show up on the W5YI Organization
>>> website.

>> It's not a W5YI Organization petition, although you can bet your bippy that
>> every single word of the NCVEC petition had to be personally approved by
>> ol' Fast Freddie.
>
> You bet.
>
There's a guy used to getting his way.

>>> Is it on the ARRL website?

It's not an ARRL petition.
>>
>> I don't know. That's not where I got it.

>>>If so, provide the LINK for it.

>> Is that an order, Len? Sounds like one. Who are you to give me or anyone
>> else here orders?

>It's not on the arrl website Jim. So I doubt you could provide a link! 8^)

I could provide a link in a few seconds. But why should I? Len's a
self-proclaimed "professional in radio" - he doesn't need my help, does he?
>
>> Why should I help you find the new NCVEC petition, Len, given the way you
>> behave here? Will you act in a civil manner towards me if I help you? Or
>> will I
>> simply be the target of more of your name calling, ridicule, bad jokes, and
>> other abuse?

> Remember good manners are a sign of weakness, Jim!
>
Never heard that one.

>>> Are you talking about the ARRL "new proposal?"

>> No.

>> I am referring to, and quoting, the new NCVEC proposal. The one mentioned
>> in
>> the news release. Don't you have a copy yet, Len? If not, why are you
>> commenting on something you haven't read?

The world wonders.

>>> That "new proposal"
>>> doesn't show up on any FCC Public Notices page for the morning of
>>> 18 Mar 04 ["Consumers & Governmental Affairs Bureau Reference
>>> Information Center Petitions For Rulemaking Filed"].

>> That's not where I found it.
>>
>>> Is there an RM number for the "new" ARRL proposal?

>> I'm not talking about the ARRL proposal. I'm talking about the new NCVEC
>> proposal.

>>> If there is, tell
>>> us, don't let us accuse you of quoting from vaporware.

>> Is that an order? Who are you to give me or anyone else here orders?
>>
>> I'm quoting from the new NCVEC petition. It's online, available for
>> download.
>> Took me about 2 minutes to find it, once I realized that the links posted
>> were
>> to the old NCVEC petition, not the new one.

>>> ALL of these "new" petitions are nothing but vaporware until it shows
>>> up at the FCC for public viewing with an assigned RM number.
>
>> Then what's your problem, Len? If it's not a real petition, why are you all
>> worked up about it?
>>
>> Here's a hint: It's a real petition, not vaporware. It can be downloaded
>> from
>> an easily accessed site. I even printed it out this morning.

So what do you think of the NCVEC petition in its entirety, Mike? Not the press release, the actual petition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

And note this: All of these petitions are simply delaying any new restructuring NPRM. We won't even see an NPRM until both the ARRL and NCVEC petitions get RM numbers and have comment periods.

And Hans hasn't done his proposal yet.

The ARRL estimate of two years looks like it was too soon!

1202. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:05:50 UTC
From: Leonard Martin <lmarti49NOSPAM@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <lmarti49NOSPAM-0DB173.20055018032004@bignews.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89266
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <cofj50lrhfhi8rr70aretm9gk9sqr4dvia@4ax.com>,
Ida Takencash <news@eleven.com> wrote:

>On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 00:12:05 -0500, "Sedina II"
><overman41042@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>>Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
>>and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
>>special guest on Coast to Coast AM
>>Thursday/Friday evening.
>>
>>On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!
>
>All of these kooks should have disclaimers on their web sites that say
>"For entertainment purposes only."

Once that poor lady named Barbara who used to do Coast to Coast on weekends was stuck with Wayne for four hours. I listened for thirty minutes, my gorge slowly rising, as he spewed smelly chunk after chunk of typical Coast to Coast-type utterly baseless drivel, all delivered without supporting evidence or citation, and in tones of absolute authority, somewhat as if he Moses on the mount. Wayne Green, at least when he appears on Coast to Coast, is as full of off-the-wall theories and opinions as your local surly homeless man. No, I take that back. He's worse! The fact that he's made a lot of money in his life apparently means he's never been humbled enough to learn to apply even the slightest pinch of doubt to his own opinions. He's as sublimely sure of himself in his nonsense as a petty dictator to whom no-one has ever said "No."

Leonard

--
"Everything that rises must converge"
--Flannery O'Connor

1203. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:08:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89270

William wrote:

>
> I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
> someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
> so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
> people. You do the math.

And the network becomes useless in an emergency, that is why military and civil officials do not consider the cell network to be a viable means of communications in a major disaster, it isn't even in their emergency planning. Ham radio is. So next time there is a major disaster, have fun punching numbers into you little cell phone attempting to call twenty of your friends to warn them or tell them to, "turn on your tee-vee", and when you can't get through because of all the other cell users flooding the system doing the same, you can amuse yourself by playing a game on your phone which has now become nothing more than a game-boy.

1204. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:11:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89267

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<kp6dnUYMlPhgQMTdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
> > official to respond differently.
>
> No, not just for military use, they are coordinating between military,
> police, fire, Civil Defense, and other civil agencies, and cell phones
> play no part.

Then encryption is a handicap. Use megaphones.

> > Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
> > cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
> > communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
> > system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
> > their emergency comms.
> >
> > Do you doubt it?
>
> It dosen't even work well for the AC when the networks become so
> overloaded you can't get a call through.

Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
message thru?

The AC is not participating in
> official emergency communicatins, they are making calls to say, "Im OK",
> or "turn on your TV", and other such non official emergency calls. When

Sounds like the health and welfare traffic that hams get to pass.

> something like 9/11 happens everyone with a cell phone wants to call
> twenty other people making the system usless for any official emergency
> communicatioins.

Weren't there some buried firemen that used a cell phone to call for
help and were rescued?

> The cell phone network is not a consideration amoung government and
> civil agencies for emergency communications, ham radio is.

The average citizen doesn't know a ham. Who/What do they turn to?

Is this where you go into denial mode?

1205. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:13:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181813.62fc763e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89268

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403170730.70f24d8d@posting.google.com>...

> More evidence that this coward has nothing valid to offer except
> childish sandlot accusations. Did we expect anything less?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

From the #1 namecaller and bully on RRAP?

Try taking the high-raod sometime.

1206. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:14:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181814.7f7fd30e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89269

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40592F65.AF9D47F3@earthlink.net>...

> I have a caste system for you, Len: Everyone who has an amateur radio
> license is "in". You're "out".
>
> Dave K8MN

We'll see.

1207. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:17:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <H_6dnXnumbCDx8fd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89272

William wrote:

>
> You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
> any use whatsoever in an emergency.

For handling official emergency traffic they are not of any use, that is why the military and civil officials dismiss them completely from their emergency planning. They do include ham radio.

1208. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:23:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181823.131eeb46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89271

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
> >
> He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a year
> now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Looks like TAFKARJ no longer has the corner on the regulatory
information market. Otta stick to speroni database.

1209. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:25:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181825.43afcb31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89273

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040318152913.21457.00004693@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0403180242.5b5450f1@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040317184603.12501.00006806@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
> >> >here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
> >>
> >> Looks like Kellie has already set the stage for his excuses in
> >> not filing a damn thing and will then tawk tuff about nasty
> >> gubmint afterwards.
> >>
> >> Kellie tawks tuff all over the place in here. He can't do it to
> >> the FCC? :-)
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >I called that one right on the money didn't I ya PUTZ.
>
> No, all you are doing is TAWKING TUFF...which I "predicted." :-)
>
> Did Kellie file anything on NPRM 04-29? Is he planning to?
>
> Did Kellie file anything on NOI 03-104?
>
> Kellie has all of April to prepare something on 04-29. He won't,
> reserving his valuable time to bad-mouthing certain others.
>
> Kellie WANTS BPL to happen?
>
> LHA / WMD

Careful, Lean. Kellie might knock your code-key in the dirt.

1210. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:32:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181832.5937830a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89274

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040318152913.21457.00004692@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <20040318075412.29660.00003459@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Full details at
> >
> >http://www.arrl.org
>
> NOT EVEN CLOSE TO "FULL DETAILS!"
>
> ARRL is still mentioning NOI 03-104 as if it were a current docket.
> Why? It is toast. That NOI is just a digital wastebasket for citizens
> getting their complain jollies over with...so they will learn to accept
> Access BPL as a given in the future and not complain then.
>
> ARRL can't even (yet) explain why there are TWO dockets on ONE
> NPRM. [04-37 and 04-29 for NPRM 04-29]
>
> ARRL hasn't (yet) posted any deadline date on filing for Access
> BPL. Why not? Isn't that "important" or something?
>
> LHA / WMD

Careful, Lean. Once TAFKARJ is toppled, rrap anarchy will follow.

Mitigate the inevitable and have him sign an MOU; he can play King of
the Hill but has to say what you tell him to say.

1211. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:37:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181837.5f78905e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89275

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040318000907.21642.00005023@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> Jimmie has tips on everything. He knows what is, what isn't, who is
> right, who is wrong, even what the FCC thinks. Information
> technology or IT. He's full of IT. :-)
>
> Yours sincerely,
> TNAFKNAMPARRL

TNAFKNAMPARRL, TAFKARJ is about to be toppled.

Time to back-channel a mitigating response.

MSIT A8J.

Authenticate.

1212. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:41:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <W5t6c.13475$t16.7836040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89276

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com...
> Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
> message thru?
>

You are obviously unaware that in an emergency, the government can and does declare designated frequencies off limits to general usage for the duration of that emergency.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1213. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:54:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181854.c38140e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89277

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
> actual petition):
>
> (begin quote)

TAFKARJ, that's Mighty Bold of you to title the subject, "Wrong Again,
Len!" without quoting what you think TNAFKNAMPARRL got wrong. You
really gotta do a better job than that laying a foundation to entrap
TNAFKNAMPARRL.

I think he's got you rattled.

Advice: Get a Grip before you lose title of El Supremo Amateur de
RRAP.

While you compose yourself, give us a hint what TNAFKNAMPARRL said
that was so wrong (again).

1214. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 02:59:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181859.45fcde62@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89278

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040317071810.12631.00005561@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20040317042131.29815.00003733@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Oh, and I forgot to mention -- diesel engines don't have any ignition system,
> >therefore, no ignition system noise. This makes it much easier to operate
> >mobile HF from an automobile with a diesel engine!
> >
> That's generally true, Larry.
>
> But many modern diesel engines use electronically-controlled fuel injectors.
> The control circuits to these injectors can be a source of electrical noise.
> But said noise can be fixed.

So can the tires. Not so sure they can be fixed.

> Another advantage we didn't mention was that diesel cars generally have
> higher-capacity electrical systems, mostly because of the starting
> requirements. My Rabbit's diesel engine was rated at 48 hp - and had a 2 hp
> starter, 63 AH Series 24 battery and 55 amp alternator. I could jump-start
> almost anything with a 12 volt electrical system.

You should have helped jump start the W0EX mobile emergency station
(if any) so that he could accept Hans' invitation to a CW QSO in two
consecutive years.

1215. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) R epo rt 1387 March 12, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 03:02:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403181902.33c73cd4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89279

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0403171249.49947953@posting.google.com>...

> Real scientific expeditions, which Bonnie's cave-crawling trips are
> not, use real emergency comms gear. ELT type equipment on 406.025 Mhz
> to satellites which are monitored by goverments globally,

Sure. That's where the USGS/USACE stream gaging stations are (+/-).

1216. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 03:47:26 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c3dqgegiq1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 89280
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dave Bushong (dbushong@adelphia.net) writes:
> Sedina II wrote:
>> Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
>> and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
>> special guest on Coast to Coast AM
>> Thursday/Friday evening.
>>
>> On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!
>>
>> Show info for the above:
>> http://www.coasttocoastam.com/shows/2004/03/18.html
>>
>> Main: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/
>>
>> See also: http://www.whatdoesitmean.com/
>>
>
> Wayne Green. Loser extrordinaire. Failed more ham radio businesses and
> magazines than anyone in human history.
>
I think he's a kook when he's on the show, because I sure
have not heard him talk of radio, but actually kooky things.

But I don't think it's fair to categorize him as a "loser".

He may have turned CQ around when he was editor in the fifties,
and most definitely one cannot say it was a bad magazine when
he was editor. While he was there, the first practical parametric
amplifer wsa described, along with a practical selectible sideband
synchronous detector. He drew various well known people to the magazine,
Sam Harris and John W. Campbell to name two (I can't remember if Don Stoner
was already there when Wayne took over as editor), as article writers or
columnists.

He left, and started 73. How do you rate a failed magazine? It lasted
over forty years, which is a pretty good life for an independent magazine.
Yes, it decayed badly in it's last ten years, but for 25 years or so
it was a pretty good construction magazine.

He started Byte, and while he lost it within three issues, I don't think
anyone can argue its success. But of course, it only lasted about 20 years.

He started Kilobaud, and it only lasted about 7 or 8 years. But then,
a whole slew of computer magazines, a field that he pretty muchs tarted,
died off at the same time.

He started various magazines dedicated to specific computers, which also had a relatively limited run, but then, so did the computers they dealt with. They, and Kilobaud for that matter, I don't think generally failed under his watch, because he sold them off to IDG for a bundle.

He started a CD magazine, that maybe lasted ten years, but it was pretty successful for a while. I'm pretty sure he sold it off, again for a bundle, before it faded away.

Note that with a lot of his magazines that "failed", he was picking topics that were on a rising curve, where there was a need for specialized magazines because the topic was so new. They were a source of infortion, a place to find ads for related items, and a place for advertisers to reach the specialized field. As such things moved to the mainstream, they lost steam becuse one could find information elsewhere, and for that matter one needed the information maybe less because the topic was all over the place. Take the CD magazine; it arrived when CDs were relatively new and they could run a list of all CDs in each issue. You likely had to go out of your way to find CDs, and you needed help to decide which player to buy, since they were uncommon and quite expensive. Now, you can buy the players everywhere, and for under a hundred dollars, and you can find those CDs everywhere too.

Of course Wayne had some magazines that bombed really fast. But over the same span, plenty of magazines have come and gone. Wayne had the money, or gumption, to try magazines on new topics, and since he kept trying, he was bound to fail sometimes. Others would stop after one failure.

How many ham businesses did he ever start? Radio Kits in the sixties? A useful service for people who wanted to build what were in the magazines but apparently it was always a money loser. There was a time when he could publish books, because he had the press for 73. He stopped at some point, does that make it a failure? He sold code tapes for some years, and then that too faded away. Does that make it a failure?

Were there some I don't know about? I had suspicions about some advertising in 73 in the sixties, that happened to be in New Hampshire near 73. Was it Redline, that made converters? They didn't last too long, but plenty of such small businesses came and went, even without Wayne's help.

He had his hands in multiple fields, because the core magazine, 73, was successful enough that he could try other things. The computer magazines were successful, likely some of them had greater readership than 73 at any time in its history, and that meant he could try new things. When he sold them off, the cash meant he could still try new things.

Sure, there was a period when 73 was part of IDG, but that was fallout from selling the computer magazines. But basically, for over forty years he was an independent publisher. He never had to go to a regular job, never had to fallback on that when his projects failed. That has to make him successful.

Hardly any magazines over the same period were published by independents. Most were under big publishers. Independents had a tendency to fail.

Or, they'd be sold to the big publishers, and then had tendency to disappear. Gernsback himself started an awful lot of magazines, and most of them "failed" too, maybe faster than Wayne's. Gernsback, the publisher, failed last year, killing it's last remaining magazine, that basically hadn't had much of a life.

No, I think Wayne was pretty successful.

Michael VE2BVW

1217. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:11:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318231151.15923.00004420@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89283

In article <nbbk50d2ou3ut3ium16tbb2ni2rc01h07f@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 18 Mar 2004 20:29:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>> Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
>>>do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
>>>those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
>>>Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.
>>
>> Isn't it a pity? [for you, that is] :-)
>>
>> Will you be having a press conference afterwards and signing
>> autographs for your adoring fans? Giving out 8x10 glossies?
>>
>> Maybe the Blue Angels will perform a fly-over and aerobatic
>> demonstration at the conclusion? If so, find out who is one
>> of the Solo pilots. That name may come as a surprise. :-)
>
>That would be Maj. Len Anderson, USMC.
>
>A relative, perhaps?

Not a relative...but isn't so terribly IRONIC, though!!!!

Imagine, a real live commissioned U.S. Marine Corps Officer
and an F-18 Hornet PILOT with that name!!!!!!!

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Oops, let myself cut and paste from the mighty CAP ace's postings.

My apologies.

Oops again, I spelled with a C and E instead of two S!

BWAHAHAHAHA.... (this is too easy)

"It just writes itself..."

LHA / WMD

1218. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:11:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318231152.15923.00004421@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89282

In article <0Omdne4gW_6838fdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> I have, and are you talking about something else? I took NECVEC to be a

>typo, since NCVEC is a group that put forth a proposal some time ago.
>Perhaps you are referring to a different group?
>
> At any rate, No need to modify my argument if you are referring to the
>NCVEC and not the NECVEC.

My apologies, most noble of high rank amateurdom.

A mere typo...and you vulture-wannabes are attracted as to carrion.

NEC = Numerical Electromagnetic Code (method of moments
computer calculation for EM fields)

NEC = National Electrical Code (for electric power distribution)

NC = No Comment...the left hand middle finger trembled on the E
key as I laughed in trying to suppress The Finger sign?

:-)

LHA / WMD

1219. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:11:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318231153.15923.00004422@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89281

In article <405A15A4.30804@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Can anyone come up with a good rationale for not teaching RF safety in
>some depth at the lowest level of license class? Are these newbies worth
>less to us?

Newbies aren't worth anything to you royal, noble AMATEUR
licensees.

That's a given. QED by everything in Google. :-)

Is the FCC supposed to enforce OHSA, too?

Surgeon General's office?

How about the Center for Disease Control? :-)

LHA / WMD

1220. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:11:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040318231154.15923.00004423@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89284

In article <20040318185954.12631.00005602@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040318152911.21457.00004691@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>, >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO >>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the >>>actual petition):
>>>
>>>(begin quote)
>>>
>>>II. PROPOSAL
>>>
>>>D. Creation of a new entry level license.

>> "Quote" from WHAT?
>
>From the actual NCVEC restructuring petition, Len. I downloaded it yesterday >and read it. Didn't you?

There's only ONE "actual NCVEC petition," RM-10787.

Downloaded that one a long time ago...first of September 2003.

There's one OTHER proposal which has been tossed about under "Ham radio for the 21st Century" title. That's been out for a while too and I've had that in the download folder. It is NOT in any FCC Notice as any "RM" (petition for Rule Making).

>> The link published by Bill Sohl in here is to Amateur Radio Newsline's >> "new" items. Going there will get anyone a very nice copy of the >> original NECVEC petition RM-10787 submitted on 29 Jul 03!
>
>Both published links were in error. That was obvious from the first page of the >petition. Didn't you notice that it wasn't a new petition, and that it did not >match the news release?

I noticed the exact similarity of the posted link download after viewing it, that's why I commented.

I don't eagerly view each and every download as it comes in. I just use "save as" to download PDFs and DOCs in the background while

I surf elsewhere.

Was I supposed to check in with you first or what?

>> RM-10787 is toast just like all the other 13 RMs. The last comment
>> filed on RM-10787 was 4 November 2003.
>
>They're not "toast", Len. Obviously, FCC is still gathering input for an
>NPRM.

Obviously NOT. The LAST comment on RM-10787 was made over
four months ago.

The ECFS files on NPRM 98-143 are still available to the public. Are
you saying the FCC is also "still gathering input" on that?!?

News flash: R&O 99-412 happened at the end of 1999. NPRM 98-143
was no longer under consideration for anything except checking on
the complaints of a few.

>> WHERE is this "new" petition proposal from NECVEC?
>
>Len, it's "NCVEC". Only one "E".

Oh my! Fuss and furor going to be raised on a simple typo... :-)

I can hear your strident messaging even now..."error!"..."mistake!"
"not worthy of consideration!" :-) :-)

>The new NCVEC petition is online and can be downloaded easily, once you know
>where to look.

The FCC doesn't seem to have it available for the public.

Where is it?

>> It isn't on the NCI website.
>
>It's not an NCI petition.

Bill Sohl is with NCI and he is the one posting links in here.

>> It doesn't show up on a Search of Amateur
>> Radio Newsline's website.
>
>It's not a Newsline petition either.

Never said it was. Newsline has made other petitions, have they?

>> It doesn't show up on the W5YI Organization
>> website.
>
>It's not a W5YI Organization petition, although you can bet your bippy that
>every single word of the NCVEC petition had to be personally approved by ol'
>Fast Freddie.

Is Fred Maia still on the NCVEC? Answer Yes or No.

>> Is it on the ARRL website?
>
>I don't know. That's not where I got it.

I think you "got it" all in your head...

>> If so, provide the LINK for it.
>
>Is that an order, Len? Sounds like one. Who are you to give me or anyone else
>here orders?

Poor baby. Getting all upset are you?

"Nobody can give YOU orders!" Not of any kind, shape, or form! :-)

No problem. When the REAL petition shows up as an RM,
then it is worth looking at.

>Or will I simply be the target of more of your name calling, ridicule, bad
>jokes, and other abuse?

OH! You've been ABUSED have you?!? Poor baby...!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, all you of the self-perceived nobility are the same.
It must be all that blue blood, royal cynaosis not letting enough
oxygen into your emotion centers!

>Here's a hint: It's a real petition, not vaporware. It can be downloaded from
>an easily accessed site. I even printed it out this morning.

"Real petitions," yer lardship, are on the FCC site.

Sorry to not bow and scrape to your most esteemed worthiness,
but if you ever got down from your high horse, you might be
tolerable to other civilized humans.

Don't get off...yer horse piddled on da ground, 'e did...ya'll step
in it an' get yer booties all wet...

LHA / WMD

1221. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:36:54 UTC
From: Charles Gillen <gillen@nospam.his.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B0F045D10A0chas@216.194.192.13>
Source record: 89285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote:

> No, I think Wayne was pretty successful.

I'd have to agree. Back in the late '70s (long before the IBM PC) Green published "80-Micro" devoted to the Radio Shack TRS-80 (of which I owned three or four, various models). It was a thick, hefty magazine with tempting ads for expensive things like a 5-MB hard drive. Every issue carried many program listings in Basic, or hex code which could be laboriously keyboarded to produce an .exe file. I typed in most of them, learning how to program in the process (and I'm sure MANY current old programmers started out the same way), and eventually sold a few of my own new programs to Wayne for publication.

Wayne was a pioneer, and the TRS-80 was the first "serious" (even with only 16K ram) computer most of us saw... it had a 64-column screen fine for word processing, compared to only 40 or so on the Apple. The early TRS-80 had a very bouncy keyboard, and I had a real epiphany about the power of software when Wayne's magazine published a little software patch... I keyed it in and the bounce went away for good.

I've never heard him on the radio and thus can't comment on whether his current ideas are wacky or not, but his many contributions to ham radio and home computing are indisputable.

Back on topic: once I even programmed a controller for my NRD-525 in compiled basic with full dual VFOs and could control everything on the receiver but the volume. Without Wayne, I might never have taught myself how to do that :^)

--
Anti-Spam address: my last name at his dot com
Charles Gillen -- Reston, Virginia, USA

1222. Re: It's the Economy, Stupid! (Was Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 04:43:19 UTC
From: nobody@See.Comments.Header
Message-ID: <B7D4U4D638065.2384143519@anonymous.poster>
Source record: 89286

In article <1e4e3692.0403141514.7d478c0c@posting.google.com>
billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:
>
>
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
news:<O0FTRUFS38060.5117592593@anonymous>...
> >
> > how's things in colorado, billy, me boy?
>
> Dunno. Haven't been there since about 85.

Left just as soon as your parole was completed, did you?

Your previous post used a server in Colorado, learn to read.

> How are things in la-la land?

NNTP-Posting-Host: 199.35.5.26
Search results for: 199.35.5.26

OrgName: ICG NetAhead, Inc.
OrgID: ICGN
Address: 161 Inverness Drive West
City: Englewood
StateProv: CO
PostalCode: 80112
Country: US

NetRange: 199.35.0.0 - 199.35.47.255
CIDR: 199.35.0.0/19, 199.35.32.0/20
NetName: ICG-BLK-BLK3
NetHandle: NET-199-35-0-0-1
Parent: NET-199-0-0-0-0
NetType: Direct Allocation
NameServer: AS1.ICG.NET
NameServer: AS2.ICG.NET
Comment: Addresses within this block are non-portable
RegDate: 2000-07-19
Updated: 2001-07-13

TechHandle: ST452-ARIN
TechName: IP Administrator
TechPhone: +1-303-414-5000
TechEmail: IP_Admin@icgcomm.com

OrgAbuseHandle: ABUSE170-ARIN
OrgAbuseName: Abuse

OrgAbusePhone: +1-303-414-5000
OrgAbuseEmail: abuse@icgcom.com

OrgTechHandle: IPADM127-ARIN
OrgTechName: IP Admin
OrgTechPhone: +1-303-414-5000
OrgTechEmail: ip_admin@icgcomm.com

ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2004-03-17 19:15
Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS
database.

Looks like you're still using a Colorado NTTP-Posting Host.
Maybe your parole there hasn't been revoked, after all.

1223. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 05:28:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403182128.5f2f0c2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89287

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040318185954.12631.00005602@mb-m28.aol.com>...

> >
> > ALL of these "new" petitions are nothing but vaporware until it shows
> > up at the FCC for public viewing with an assigned RM number.
> >
> Then what's your problem, Len? If it's not a real petition, why are you all
> worked up about it?
>
> Here's a hint: It's a real petition, not vaporware. It can be downloaded from
> an easily accessed site. I even printed it out this morning.

WHAT??! This is ridiculous. I haven't been following this topic area
at all recently, I don't much care about it one way or another. But
having stopped to take a quick look at this thread you got my
curiosity up and running so I went out and dredged up the NCVEC
petition via the usual trick. Cold start to the whole thing in it's
original .doc format up onscreen ready to print out in maybe 60
seconds. If that.

He's off his meds again or he hasn't wiped his eyglasses for a couple
months.

Goofy Putz: Who cares?

w3rv

1224. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010311.01692.00001172@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89289

In article <1e4e3692.0403181837.5f78905e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040318000907.21642.00005023@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>> Jimmie has tips on everything. He knows what is, what isn't, who is
>> right, who is wrong, even what the FCC thinks. Information
>> technology or IT. He's full of IT. :-)
>>
>> Yours sincerely,
>> TNAFKNAMPARRL
>
>TNAFKNAMPARRL, TAFKARJ is about to be toppled.
>
>Time to back-channel a mitigating response.
>
>MSIT A8J.
>
>Authenticate.

Roger that, Red Dog Leader, you are 5 by 9 all the way.

Would you repeat the last groups? :-)

Red Dog 7 clear.

<squeep>

LHA / WMD

1225. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010312.01692.00001173@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89290

In article <1e4e3692.0403181832.5937830a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> >Full details at
>> >
>> >http://www.arrl.org
>>
>> NOT EVEN CLOSE TO "FULL DETAILS!"
>>
>> ARRL is still mentioning NOI 03-104 as if it were a current docket.
>> Why? It is toast. That NOI is just a digital wastebasket for citizens
>> getting their complain jollies over with...so they will learn to accept
>> Access BPL as a given in the future and not complain then.
>>
>> ARRL can't even (yet) explain why there are TWO dockets on ONE
>> NPRM. [04-37 and 04-29 for NPRM 04-29]
>>
>> ARRL hasn't (yet) posted any deadline date on filing for Access
>> BPL. Why not? Isn't that "important" or something?
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Careful, Lean. Once TAFKARJ is toppled, rrap anarchy will follow.
>
>Mitigate the inevitable and have him sign an MOU; he can play King of
>the Hill but has to say what you tell him to say.

Nevah hoppen, G.I.!

Mr. Southgate will NEVER concede to be told anydamnthing. QED.
He and his court jouster (Mr. Foreign Service) tell others what to say
and when to say it. :-)

Sign a MOU? Him? Might look good in a MOU-MOU though... :-)

"CW gets through when nothing else will" is their credo. Only PCTAs
are "right." All NCTAs are "wrong."

PCTAs are the most civilized of people and they NEVER swear.
NCTAs are all uncouth, ignorant, make mistakes all the time...and
tell bad jokes. :-)

ARRL is perfect all the time, never makes mistakes. [the ARRL
is PCTA]

LHA / WMD

1226. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010313.01692.00001174@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89291

In article <1e4e3692.0403181825.43afcb31@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040318152913.21457.00004693@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0403180242.5b5450f1@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040317184603.12501.00006806@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0403170851.5f0efb4f@posting.google.com>,
>> kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >He's setting the stage for making rant fodder out of anybody around
>> >> >here who doesn't submit a set of commnents to the FCC.
>> >>
>> >> Looks like Kellie has already set the stage for his excuses in
>> >> not filing a damn thing and will then tawk tuff about nasty
>> >> gubmint afterwards.
>> >>
>> >> Kellie tawks tuff all over the place in here. He can't do it to
>> >> the FCC? :-)
>> >>
>> >> LHA / WMD
>> >
>> >I called that one right on the money didn't I ya PUTZ.
>>
>> No, all you are doing is TAWKING TUFF...which I "predicted." :-)
>>
>> Did Kellie file anything on NPRM 04-29? Is he planning to?
>>
>> Did Kellie file anything on NOI 03-104?
>>
>> Kellie has all of April to prepare something on 04-29. He won't,
>> reserving his valuable time to bad-mouthing certain others.
>>
>> Kellie WANTS BPL to happen?
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Careful, Lean. Kellie might knock your code-key in the dirt.

Not to worry...I've got just the bear for him to take pictures of...:-)

1227. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010314.01692.00001175@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89288

In article <1e4e3692.0403181823.131eeb46@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040317055918.15923.00004374@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <P5CdnXWDc5VBIsrdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>> >
>> >> I hate to agree with Len. But he is right on this one.
>> >>
>> >> Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >Gotta admit too Dan, and give Len credit here, he makes a very good point.
>> >
>> He's just repeating what ARRL and many of us have been saying for about a
>year
>> now - get the facts and comment to FCC in the appropriate places.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Looks like TAFKARJ no longer has the corner on the regulatory
>information market. Otta stick to speroni database.

ARRL is TAFKARJ's Big Brother.

And he is probably back there in 1984...and earlier.

LHA / WMD

1228. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010314.01692.00001176@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89292

In article <1e4e3692.0403181854.c38140e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040318061211.29660.00003458@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> Quoting from the NCVEC restructuring petition (not the press release, the
>> actual petition):
>>
>> (begin quote)
>
>TAFKARJ, that's Mighty Bold of you to title the subject, "Wrong Again,
>Len!" without quoting what you think TNAFKNAMPARRL got wrong. You
>really gotta do a better job than that laying a foundation to entrap
>TNAFKNAMPARRL.
>
>I think he's got you rattled.
>
>Advice: Get a Grip before you lose title of El Supremo Amateur de
>RRAP.
>
>While you compose yourself, give us a hint what TNAFKNAMPARRL said
>that was so wrong (again).

"Anything." :-)

LHA / WMD

1229. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010315.01692.00001177@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89294

In article <W5t6c.13475$t16.7836040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com...
>> Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
>> message thru?
>
>You are obviously unaware that in an emergency, the government can and does
>declare designated frequencies off limits to general usage for the duration
>of that emergency.

Right, Mama Dee, that's "exactly" what happened after the second hijacked airliner crashed into the WTC towers, didn't it?

Right...just like the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes when the government ordered every radio thing be all ham emergency...

Right...just like all the southwest and northwest firestorms had every radio commandeered for emergency use.

Right...just like every hurricane striking the east coast has all radios off limits by Order.

Right...except the broadcast people, the news people, the Public Safety Radio Services people, the utility radio (PLMRS) people, the activated National Guards people, FEMA, etc., etc., etc. were all using their radios as they usually would WITHOUT any nasty gubmint orders.

I am saddened that your local telephone infrastructure has such poor service wherever you live. However, here in the sunny Greater Los Angeles area the telephone infrastructure was quite normal after the first two hours of the Northridge quake. That was ten years ago, of course, and the cell phones weren't as many but neither were there as many cell sites. It all evened out.

But, in your scenario of the mind, "all cell sites fall down during emergencies" and only ham radio can save everyone. In real life they sure didn't. Don't let that trouble you. We are all children to you.

LHA / WMD

1230. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010316.01692.00001178@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89293

In article <1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<kp6dnUYMlPhgQMTdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
>> William wrote:
>> >
>> > For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
>> > official to respond differently.
>>
>> No, not just for military use, they are coordinating between military,
>> police, fire, Civil Defense, and other civil agencies, and cell phones
>> play no part.
>
>Then encryption is a handicap. Use megaphones.

Signal flags by day, torches by night were good enough for the U.S.
Army during the American Civil War...on both sides. Anybody with
sight could read all of them...and did! :-)

>> > Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
>> > cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
>> > communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
>> > system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
>> > their emergency comms.
>> >
>> > Do you doubt it?
>>
>> It dosen't even work well for the AC when the networks become so
>> overloaded you can't get a call through.
>
>Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
>message thru?

"CW always get through..." :-)

> The AC is not participating in
>> official emergency communicatins, they are making calls to say, "Im OK",
>> or "turn on your TV", and other such non official emergency calls. When
>
>Sounds like the health and welfare traffic that hams get to pass.
>
>> something like 9/11 happens everyone with a cell phone wants to call
>> twenty other people making the system usless for any official emergency
>> communicatioins.
>

>Weren't there some buried firemen that used a cell phone to call for
>help and were rescued?
>
>> The cell phone network is not a consideration amoung government and
>> civil agencies for emergency communications, ham radio is.
>
>The average citizen doesn't know a ham. Who/What do they turn to?

Irrelevant to the fantasies of emergencies. ACs go to Piggly Wiggly
for ham. Those are in the cold meat department pretending they
are beef.

>Is this where you go into denial mode?

Riverine warfare..."denial is a river in egypt."

LHA / WMD

1231. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 06:03:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319010321.01692.00001179@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89295

In article <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
>> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
>> > clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
>> > role in emergency response communications.
>>
>> Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
>> MiniLennie...
>>
>> I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
>> thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
>> the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
>> Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.
>>
>> Can you/do you refute this?
>
>Yes, I can.
>
>Quoting Lean:
>
>"Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are 100
>million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about one
>for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say. :-)
>
>"If every licensed amateur in the USA had one useable radio, then the
>number of amateur radios would be one per about 430 citizens. Not as
>big a "spread.
>
>LHA / WMD"
>

>I'll add that there are about 265 million people in the US, and less
>than 700,000 licensed amateurs, who TAFKARJ will tell you some are
>dead, some have quit, some are expired, and many are inactive.
>Regardless of how many are alive and active, half don't use CW/Morse,
>so according to you overplayed and unrealistic disaster scenarios,
>they are useless. Right?
>
>Now, not every American Citizen has access to an amateur radio
>operator. I'd say most don't know even one amateur, and many don't
>know what ham radio is (Isn't that like CB?)

Mama Dee claims there are some Americans who don't even
know what a "CB" is!

TAFKARJ claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
"11 meters" is not at 465 MHz. :-)

ARRL ought to get Broose out there telling Americans about
"CB." :-)

>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
>people. You do the math.

The gunnery nurse has a maximum count base of 20. :-)

>> > > What I HAVE stated in this and other forums is that Amateur Radio
>> > > CONTINUES to provide a necessary and almost irreplaceable asset.
>> >
>> > To the exclusion of all other communications means. At least until
>> > you posted the above.
>>
>> An absolute Brian Burke mistruth.
>>
>> Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
>> might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?
>>
>> Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?
>
>Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???

Brian, the gunnery nurse doesn't KNOW of any other form of
communications...

He is a Believer. If he reads some political screed about
"emergency service" he thinks that ALL hams do that and
ALL got into amateur radio to be "emergency communicators."

>> > NO
>> > > OTHER RADIO SERVICE provides the flexibility and utility that Amateur
>> > > Radio does.
>> >

>> > You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
>> > flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.
>>
>> Oh...?!?! How?
>
>Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
>there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
>would be overloaded and useless.
>
>CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???

His battery needs recharging?

>> (this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
>> him to his face...)
>
>I'd rather not meet you in person. You scare me.
>
>So stay away from me.

I think he is a fascinating example...of aberration and political
icon worship at the Church of St. Hiram.

>> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
>> communicate with your cellphone?
>
>When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?

He THROWS it? :-)

His radios NEVER break. They always work. He can march
50 miles with a Yaecomwood on his back if he has on a
uniform.

>> > > I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.
>> >
>> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
>> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
>>
>> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)
>
>Is that a threat?

The gunnery nurse would like you to THINK that.

He may also think Kim and Dee have "cojones." :-)

>> > > > > These facts are not from some ARRL source...these assertions
>come
>> > > > > from a plethora of govenmental, public and private agencies who
>have
>> > > > > benefitted from the contributions of Amateur Radio and have
>expressed

>> > > > > the intent to continue to include Amateur Radio in thier plans and
>> > > > > programs.
>> > > > >
>> > > > And cell phones.
>> > >
>> > > How well does a cellphone operate without a functioning cellsite,
>> > > Brain?
>> >
>> > Don, if you can say my cell site is dead, I can say your ham radio is
>> > dead.
>>
>> When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
>> propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
>> switch to a data mode or SSB.
>>
>> So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
>> ignorance...but you've done THAT well...
>
>I said your radio is broke. Switch away for all the good it does you.

His radios never break. Doesn't matter. He uses CW and "CW
gets through when nothing else will," including inoperative
transmitters and electric power failure. :-)

>> > > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
>> > > role.
>> >
>> > Just did.
>>
>> No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
>> supported by a shred of evidence.
>
>Yes, I did. You only have one scenario in your head. That scenario
>is that cell phones won't work in an emergency.
>
>> > > I have NEVER said anything even CLOSE to the idea that we're the
>> > > only game in town. Quite the contrary.
>> >
>> > You omit any discussion that any other radio service or common carrier
>> > can provide emergency comms. That is a form of lying.
>>
>> First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
>> other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
>> Amateur Radio.
>
>Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
>that cell phones won't be working.
>
>Am I wrong?

Only the gunnery nurse and any other PCTA is "right" in this
newsgroup. Everyone else is "wrong."

>> > > I >>HAVE<< said we provide a service to those who make the plans
>> > > and need the help.
>> >
>> > Until the emergency happens, you don't know who your customer might be
>> > or if you can provide a service to him or her.
>>
>> Ahhhh...but I do...
>>
>> You see, Mr Clueless, there are things called "MOU's", or
>> "Memorandum of Understanding", that exist between agencies for just
>> these instances.
>
>You have no MOU with me. You have no MOU with Larry. You have no MOU
>with Lean.

Nooo, man, dat guy he got a mean MOUt!

He has a constant "MOM" (Memorandum of Misunderstanding).

>Will you deny emergency comms to us if we needed them?

He will allow them if, and only if, you have the proper credentials,
permits, etc., all witnessed by hisself.

>> Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
>> prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".
>
>You trained for the Twin Towers attack?

He might have stood at a CAP airport runway centerline, posing
as a tall skyscraper...?

>Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?

"Cell sites ALWAYS fail in an emergency..." [PCTA motto]

>Or did it actually work as actual 9/11 survivors said it worked?

He won't believe it unless the whole thing is written up by the
ARRL. That's the "official" version.

>> Is it possible to train or prepare for ALL eventualities...?!?!
>> Of course not, but short of The Rapture or complete nuclear
>> annihilation, I'd say most responding agencies have SOME plan in
>> place.
>
>> ARES has MOU's with nearly every state EMA in the Union. That
>> pretty well puts them in a positon to be able to train with just about
>> everyone they will need to be in touch with during any given
>> emergency.
>
>Most American Citizens are not responding agencies, don't have MOUs,

>aren't amateur radio operators.
>
>What do they use?
>
>Cell Phones.

The gunnery nurse isn't the average American Citizen. :-)

He has "seven hostile actions" all in his "jacket."

>> > Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
>> > not emergencies.
>>
>> Sure they are.
>>
>> Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course
>> not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
>> come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,
>> power grids will fail, etc etc etc.
>>
>> Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
>> some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?
>
>You got me there. In all of the situations above, how will the
>average Joe communicate?

To him the "average Joe" will have to beg for mercy, on their knees.

>> > > > > > > Phones and comms did go out in some areas here. Ham radio
>turned out to be
>> > > > > > > a valuable asset.
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Power went out north of here. Other than power, there were no
>reports
>> > > > > > of comms going out. Do you have a newspaper clipping detailing
>the
>> > > > > > comm outages?
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > How about SITREP's from OES/EMA's detailing Amateur Radio
>> > > > > involvement?
>> > > > >
>> > > > You'll have to ask Dee.
>> > > >
>> > > I am asking you.
>> > >
>> > You'll have to ask Dee.
>>
>> Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
>> wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
>> my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.
>
>Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't

>you?

He has more testosterone than smarts...which is not a great deal...

Or, maybe he wants to open a USMC recruiting station in his
fantasy of "Clan of the Cave Bear?"

I think he just wants to beat you up in the schoolyard when
classes are over...

>> > > > > Just becasue the papers don't name each and every resource
>> > > > > employed in an emergency doesn't mean they weren't involved.
>That's a
>> > > > > LennieRant tactic that any 3rd grader can see through.
>> > > >
>> > > > And you're entirely up to the task. Congrats?
>> > > >
>> > > > Did you say that cell phones played no role in providing
>> > > > communications during the east coast power outage?
>> > >
>> > > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
>> > > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
>> >
>> > Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular telephones
>> > played a major role in the 9/11 attacks and in the summer power
>> > outages?
>>
>> You interject adjectives again, Your Cowardness. You also tried
>> to skate around answering MY request to cite the post wherein you
>> alledge I say such a thing...
>>
>> Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
>> attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
>> documented fact.
>
>Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
>to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
>answereing machine.
>
>He didn't use amateur radio or CW.

That can't be true...the ARRL never put THAT in their web page as
"official."

>> > > > Did you say that cell sites don't have emergency backup generators?
>> > >
>> > > Absolutely not. You'll please quote the post wherein I made such
>> > > an assertion, Brain...?!?!
>> >
>> > Just making a clarification. So you do say that cellular sites are
>> > capable of operating in an emergency?
>>

>> Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
>> been studying...???
>
>You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
>any use whatsoever in an emergency.

He is captured in the world of his inner fantasy. That is one of
absolutes and only He can determine what is "correct" in there.

>> > Just making a clarification. Just trying to get your non-verbals on
>> > paper.
>>
>> No clarification needed, Brain, unless you have a rectal-cranial
>> inversion that you need resolved (which is reasonably apparant from
>> your posts)
>
>Nope. I'm five by.
>
>> As for "non-verbals", we're still waiting for YOUR "non-verbals",
>> ie: from whom you got permission to operate Amateur Radio in Somalia,
>> and by what United Nations authorizaton that person had to GIVE you
>> that authority...
>
>I thought we were talking about emergency communications, not amateur
>past times in a forward location.

I don't think the gunnery nurse fully recognized "chain of command"
or that commissioned officers could order Him around... :-)

It might have escaped notice, but the gunnery nurse's "commission"
in the TN State Guard must have expired or whatever those things
do. Pity that. Another uniform of his down the tubes...

>> I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
>> served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
>> camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war
>> zone with...?!?!
>
>Forward location. Not a war zone though the VFW thinks so.

He was in "seven hostile actions." Strange, he can't even name ONE
of those in any detail whatsoever! :-)

>> > > "Emergency comms" are NOT >>only<< when the wires are down or the
>> > > cell site destroyed, Brain.
>> >
>> > JJ thinks they are. My cell site is always down, his ham radio is
>> > always up. That is the picture he paints.
>>
>> Is it?
>
>Is that the picture you paint?

With a paint-by-number kit...

>> > > Perhaps if you were actively involved in the programs of some
>> > > disaster mitigation agency you might have a better insight as to what
>> > > Amateur Radio's OTHER roles are...?!?!
>> >
>> > I was a MARS volunteer and BST member. I have no problem with that
>> > concept. But there sure are a lot of DP planners running around with
>> > cellular telephones nowadays.
>>
>> Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
>> organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.
>
>Thus, military installations can work with their IMD to set up a BST
>under MARS. Much better outcome than relying on people who CHOP
>themselves to the ARC, Salvation Army, County EOC, CAP, Homeless
>Shelter, Friends of the Library, and Bicycle Rodeos.

Yup, all SOP with MOUs, ASAP.

>> When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
>> Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
>> mitigation exercise in ANY role?
>
>I do enough on the job re mitigation.

Hey, Brian, yon gunnery nurse are gonna play Let's Pretend with
a "simulated" earthquake. They will shake in their boots to make
like the earth moved for them. Maybe they will have a "hostile
action" too and award pretty decorations for all of that. High fives
all around (simulated, of course).

I can't wait for the documentary movie of the event to be shown on
the History Channel.

LHA / WMD

1232. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 07:31:07 UTC
From: Beerbarrel Boomer <martydonger400@farkkers.com>
Message-ID: <da7ca$405aa1be$d1cc4525$6856@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Michael Black" <et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA> wrote in message
news:c3dqgegiq1@freenet9.carleton.ca...

> Hardly any magazines over the same period were published by independents.
> Most were under big publishers. Independents had a tendency to fail.
> Or, they'd be sold to the big publishers, and then had tendency to
> disappear. Gernsback himself started an awful lot of magazines, and
> most of them "failed" too, maybe faster than Wayne's. Gernsback,
> the publisher, failed last year, killing it's last remaining magazine,
> that basically hadn't had much of a life.
>
> No, I think Wayne was pretty successful.
>
> Michael VE2BVW

Gernsback and Green have/had two things in common.
Both sold cleverly veiled bullshit which was *dressed up*
as valid future science to geeks, nerds and fools. Modern day
PT Barnum's who wrap their circus act in 5-point colored
paper. Noorey and Bell do the same thing by giving them
and their ilk an occasional microphone today. If they
were not in print media or broadcasting, they all most certanly
would be selling pre-owned automobiles someplace, or perhaps
partners with shady local politicians.

1233. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 07:38:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319023842.06889.00000006@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89297

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/18/2004 9:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403180748.437acaf2@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<cYGdnTQd5qzgeMXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...

> I ask him
>> about the use of cell phones during such times, he just laughed and said
>> that the cell phone network was useless for any emergency comms in such
>> a scenario.
>
>For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
>official to respond differently.

Hey Billy Clueless...

Guess who's in charge if inland disaster response in the United States?

(1) The local and state agencies of the affected state, then:

(2) FEMA, then:

(3) The United States Army.

So...ya think that General's ONLY cnvern is calling in a fire mission with
those radios, Brain?!?!

You laid claim to having been a MARS BST member...were the ONLY
"comms" that you supported tactical or strategic military traffic...?!?!

(Refore you answer, REMEMBER that I was also a member of USAFMARS and am
VERY familiar with MARS programs and policies...then AND now...)

>He also works with The Office
>> of Homeland Defense on emergengy communications issues and he confirmed
>> that the OHD is attempting to intergrate Amateur Radio in their plans
>> for emergency comms.
>
>As they should; the military has backups to backups. Redundancy
>equals Survivability.

From the Prince of the Putz who keeps arguning AGAINST the concept of
Amateur Radio AS a redundent communications program, this is funny!

This is the VERY thing most of "us" have ben arguing, but you keep trying
to denounce as false!

>Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
>cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
>communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
>system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
>their emergency comms.
>
>Do you doubt it?

For sending the police to an accident, fire, or medical emergency, yes,
this is "AC's" "emergency comms".

But you are arguing apples and oranges. The "emergency comms" being
argued here is NOT the average citizen's call for "routine" 9-1-1 service. Not
by a magnitude.

Nice try to skew the numbers, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

1234. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 07:41:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319024112.06889.00000007@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89298

]>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/18/2004 8:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181813.62fc763e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170730.70f24d8d@posting.google.com>...
>
>> More evidence that this coward has nothing valid to offer except
>> childish sandlot accusations. Did we expect anything less?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>From the #1 namecaller and bully on RRAP?
>
>Try taking the high-raod sometime.

Oh NO, Brain, I am quite clearly #2...probably #3...Your Mentor gets crack at #1 without peer!

And I see you're in the LennieRage mode, again! More typos = Rage!

See ya!

Steve, K4YZ

1235. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 07:55:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319025502.06889.00000009@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89299

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/2004 12:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040319010315.01692.00001177@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <W5t6c.13475$t16.7836040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com...
>>> Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
>>> message thru?
>>
>>You are obviously unaware that in an emergency, the government can and does
>>declare designated frequencies off limits to general usage for the duration
>>of that emergency.
>
> Right, Mama Dee, that's "exactly" what happened after the second
> hijacked airliner crashed into the WTC towers, didn't it?

Was it necessary?

> Right...just like the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes when
> the government ordered every radio thing be all ham emergency...

Nope...but they did declare a communicaitons emergency and certain
discreet HF frequencies WERE made hands-off to "routine" Amateur use...Just
likes dozens of other times they've done so for other like incidents.

> Right...just like all the southwest and northwest firestorms had
> every radio commandeered for emergency use.

Nice try at scare tactics...Except the only thing "scary" here is that
people like you are allowed to procreate without control.

> Right...just like every hurricane striking the east coast has all radios
> off limits by Order.

"Every"...?!?!

Certainly not.

Does the FCC order "communications emergencies" based upon these events?
They certainly do.

> Right...except the broadcast people, the news people, the Public
> Safety Radio Services people, the utility radio (PLMRS) people,
> the activated National Guards people, FEMA, etc., etc., etc. were
> all using their radios as they usually would WITHOUT any nasty
> gubmint orders.

And used them well.

But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by Amateur Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other services of having to worry about that.

> I am saddened that your local telephone infrastructure has such
> poor service wherever you live. However, here in the sunny
> Greater Los Angeles area the telephone infrastructure was quite
> normal after the first two hours of the Northridge quake. That was
> ten years ago, of course, and the cell phones weren't as many
> but neither were there as many cell sites. It all evened out.

Good for them. The incident was in a localized area, and I'd be very dissappointed if the local utilities COULDN'T make this "fix" in a hurry.

But even MORE unfortuntate for YOU, Your Scumminess, is that YOU and YOU ALONE keep trying to use the Northridge Earthquake as some "evidence" that Amateur Radio is of no value in an emergency. That was ONE event in over 90 years of archived Amateur histroy.

I say unfortunate for you because YOU keep making these assinine assertions only to have one report after another of Amateur Radio's services being deployed in the very manner YOU say they aren't...

> But, in your scenario of the mind, "all cell sites fall down during
> emergencies" and only ham radio can save everyone. In real
> life they sure didn't. Don't let that trouble you. We are all
> children to you.

In real life, Lennie, NO ONE has made such an assinine assertion...

Only you in "support" of your rants.

Steve, K4YZ

1236. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:04:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319030407.06889.00000010@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89300

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/18/2004 2:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040318152909.21457.00004689@mb-m10.aol.com>

> In southern California we don't need any "simulations" of
> earthquakes. We have the REAL THING. :-)

So...you are telling us that the disaster response agencies in Southern California DON'T stage practice events?

Shall I start posting some references that prove you wrong, or shall we condier your nose justly tweaked once again, and you admit an error...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1237. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:08:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319030838.06889.00000011@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89301

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: Leo nomail@noway.com
>Date: 3/18/2004 5:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <nbbk50d2ou3ut3ium16tbb2ni2rc01h07f@4ax.com>
>
>On 18 Mar 2004 20:29:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>> Maybe the Blue Angels will perform a fly-over and aerobatic
>> demonstration at the conclusion? If so, find out who is one
>> of the Solo pilots. That name may come as a surprise. :-)
>
>That would be Maj. Len Anderson, USMC.
>
>A relative, perhaps?

I know two "Len Anderson"'s here in SE Tennessee...

Thankfully, both of them are responsible, thoughtful men of reputable
character.

Unlike the "Len Anderson" who posts to RRAP.

Steve, K4YZ

1238. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:12:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319031245.06889.00000012@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89302

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/18/2004 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040318231151.15923.00004420@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>In article <nbbk50d2ou3ut3ium16tbb2ni2rc01h07f@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:

>>That would be Maj. Len Anderson, USMC.
>>
>>A relative, perhaps?
>
> Not a relative...but isn't so terribly IRONIC, though!!!!

Ironic? Perhaps.

But I wonder how he'd react to reading posts written by a like-named
person who tries to embellish his military "career" by associating himself with
men who were KIA 3 years before you were in the Armed Forces...?!?!

> Imagine, a real live commissioned U.S. Marine Corps Officer
> and an F-18 Hornet PILOT with that name!!!!!!!
>
> BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
> HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Oops, let myself cut and paste from the mighty CAP ace's postings.
>
> My apologies.
>
> Oops again, I spelled with a C and E instead of two S!
>
> BWAHAHAHAHA.... (this is too easy)

Being foolish IS "too easy" for you, Lennie. Waaaaaaaaaay too easy.

Steve, K4YZ

1239. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:15:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319031522.06889.00000013@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89303

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 3/18/2004 1:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4059F586.5060601@psu.edu>
>
>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<ro2dnRo49dfJpszd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>>
>>>And witless William also wrote:

> Oh oh! how on earth will their be any emergency services, not to
>mention calling out for Pizza? ;^)

For EMS, there's RADIO.

For PIZZA, there's the HUMVEE and a Duty Runner ! ! ! !

>> Yours truly will be at the EOC in Nashville. As of this hour I
>> do not find the names of "Brian Burke" or "Leonard Anderson" among
>> those consultants being brought in by FEMA, The Army Corps of
>> Engineers, TEMA, or other supporting agencies.
>
> I heard they were planning on checking in with their cellphones as part

>of the CYHMNEPT (Can You Hear Me Now Emergency Preparedness Team) 8^)

I am sure there will be lot's of THAT going on! =)

Steve, K4YZ

1240. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:17:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319031711.06889.00000014@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89304

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/18/2004 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181641.7fc7a449@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>...

>> It will simulate (among other things) and earthquake along the
>> New Madrid fault.
>
>Say Hi to Dick/W0EX.
>
>I think the New Madrid Fault was the only thing that kept him going.

I am sure there are some othr sick, demeaning things you could say or do
about the dead, but I am not too sure what they are....

Thanks for validating my Estimated Creep Score for you...

Steve, K4YZ

1241. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:22:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319032216.06889.00000015@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89305

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/17/2004 11:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040318000907.21642.00005023@mb-m01.aol.com>
>

> Jimmie has tips on everything. He knows what is, what isn't, who is
> right, who is wrong, even what the FCC thinks. Information
> technology or IT. He's full of IT. :-)

Whew!

Lennie's got a bad case of the "Mee Too's" tonight!

Steve, K4YZ

1242. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 08:42:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040319034240.21955.00001069@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89306

In article <20040317071810.12631.00005561@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>>Oh, and I forgot to mention -- diesel engines don't have any ignition
>system,
>>therefore, no ignition system noise. This makes it much easier to operate
>>mobile HF from an automobile with a diesel engine!
>>
>That's generally true, Larry.
>
>But many modern diesel engines use electronically-controlled fuel injectors.
>The control circuits to these injectors can be a source of electrical noise.
>But said noise can be fixed.

Ooops, almost forgot to mention -- if you're a lazy, whining,
Welfare-sycophant,
No-coder crybaby with your hand out waiting for code-free HF privileges, you
won't be
able to take advantage of a diesel engine powered HF mobile station!

Whew! Had to slip that in so that Lennie wouldn't be disappointed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1243. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 09:06:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89307

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/18/2004 7:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
>> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
>> > clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
>> > role in emergency response communications.
>>
>> Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
>> MiniLennie...
>>
>> I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
>> thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
>> the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
>> Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.
>>
>> Can you/do you refute this?
>
>Yes, I can.
>
>Quoting Lean:
>
>"Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are 100
>million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about one
>for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say.

This is no proof, Brain.

SHOW ME where those UNLICENSED SERVICES are USED in playing a MAJOR ROLE
(your choice of adjectives) in "emergency comms".

>> Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
>> might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?
>>
>> Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?
>
>Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???

I haven't.

We have been discussing AMATEUR RADIO'S role in emergency communications,
since this IS a forum for Amateur Radio.

Nonetheless those other servies get thier mention as the conversation
leans that way.

YOU have NOT answered TWO questions:

What "major role" have unlicensed services played in "emergency comms",

And..."Do you ENJOY being proven a liar".

>> > You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
>> > flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.
>>
>> Oh...?!?! How?
>
>Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
>there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
>would be overloaded and useless.
>
>CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???

There is no way that 100 million cellphones could occupy the
infrastructure at the same time.

As for those 100 million people being on the air at the same time, WHO
NEEDS THEM?

It has already been proven that a small number of well trained people can
do a job far more efficeintly and effectively than 10 times thier number of
UNtrained people.

>> (this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
>> him to his face...)
>
>I'd rather not meet you in person. You scare me.

I should. I expose the true nature of your character, and that's just
from unravelling your poorly prepared rants in this forum. I can imagine what
a fool I could make of you in a TRUE public forum.

>So stay away from me.

I imagine that will be no problem...If your in-person stench approximates
your on-line nature, I will have plenty of time to change my direction of
travel.

Of course you could find something else to do this May. Judging from the character of your posts here, Witless Willy, I imagine you have little tolerence for licensed Amateur Radio operators anyway.

>> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
>> communicate with your cellphone?
>
>When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?

I don't. But I CAN open the box, fix the problem, and continue with what I was doing.

And if that's impractical, I switch radios.

>> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
>> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
>>
>> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)
>
>Is that a threat?

Only "threat(ening)" to your ego, Brain.

I said you don't have the cajones to honestly answer quetions put to you.

Your "response" is to NOT answer the question, and then insinuate my assertion of your lack of 'nads" is somehow a threat.

>>> When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
>> propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
>> switch to a data mode or SSB.
>>
>> So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
>> ignorance...but you've done THAT well...
>
>I said your radio is broke. Switch away for all the good it does you.

And >>I<< said if it breaks, I'll fix it. Amateurs (well...at least SOME of us...) know how to do that.

>> > > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
>> > > role.
>> >
>> > Just did.
>>
>> No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
>> supported by a shred of evidence.
>
>Yes, I did. You only have one scenario in your head. That scenario
>is that cell phones won't work in an emergency.

That's the scenario YOU have. I've cired many others. You simply keep trying to come back to only one that you think you can legitimately argue.

>> First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
>> other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
>> Amateur Radio.
>
>Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
>that cell phones won't be working.

Among others...That is only one part of a very large plan.

And can YOU tell ME that if a major earthquake occured that those services
would, without question, remain in service?

>Am I wrong?

Usually, yes.

>Will you deny emergency comms to us if we needed them?

Of course.

>> Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
>> prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".
>
>You trained for the Twin Towers attack?

We've trained for a loss of commercial telephone service, regardless of
how it occurs, Brain.

>Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?

Yep.

>Or did it actually work as actual 9/11 survivors said it worked?

"...actual 9/11 survivors" used their phones prior to the towers falling.

>Most American Citizens are not responding agencies, don't have MOUs,
>aren't amateur radio operators.
>
>What do they use?
>
>Cell Phones.

Please tell me, Brain, what SERVICE to all those cellphone carrying
citizens perform?

They are only calling for thier own needs.

Again, you try to argue the needs of the one as opposed to the meads of the
many.

>> > Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
>> > not emergencies.
>>
>> Sure they are.
>>
>> Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course

>> not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
>> come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,
>> power grids will fail, etc etc etc.
>>
>> Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
>> some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?
>
>You got me there. In all of the situations above, how will the
>average Joe communicate?

Communicate what? "HELP...THERE'S A TORNADOI!"

You try to meld "emergency communications" with "distress calls".

You need to learn the difference, Brain.

>> Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
>> wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
>> my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.
>
>Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't
>you?

You're already "in it", Brain.

You deceive, you make allegations you can't/won't substantiate. You
humiliate yourself by claiming another person, known to be a pathological liar,
as your "mentor".

There's no "challenge" there. You said these things. I didn't have to
make this up.

>> Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
>> attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
>> documented fact.
>
>Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
>to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
>answereing machine.
>
>He didn't use amateur radio or CW.

No, he didn't. I read those stories too. They were made before the
Towers fell and the system was still, essentially, in tact.

>> Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
>> been studying...???
>
>You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
>any use whatsoever in an emergency.

YOU are the person making that allegation, Lennie...I mean Brain...

I have already stated otherwise.

>> I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
>> served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
>> camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war
>> zone with...?!?!
>
>Forward location. Not a war zone though the VFW thinks so.

Ahhhhhh....an excuse. I see. OK.

>> Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
>> organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.
>
>Thus, military installations can work with their IMD to set up a BST
>under MARS. Much better outcome than relying on people who CHOP
>themselves to the ARC, Salvation Army, County EOC, CAP, Homeless
>Shelter, Friends of the Library, and Bicycle Rodeos.

And the members of MARS who flesh out those BST's are.....

(1) CB users

(2) FRS/MURS owners

(3) Licensed Amateur Radio operators

? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?

>> When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
>> Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
>> mitigation exercise in ANY role?
>
>I do enough on the job re mitigation.

You mean yo stay out of everyone else's way...?!?!

GOOD FOR YOU!

>> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
>played
>> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
>> > >
>> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
>> > > compliant devices?
>> >
>> > Sure. Why not?
>>
>> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
>> played a major role in emergency comms".
>>
>> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
>> services" playing a "major role".
>>
>> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
>> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
>> a meaningful, positive outcome.

>>
>> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
>> pertinent examples.
>>
>> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
>>
>> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
>> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>>
>> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
>>
>> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
>> substantiate.
>>
>> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
>> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???

You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single bit of it...even facetiously...

Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid argument and lack of cajones to do so...

Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in disaster and/or emergency communications.

So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average calling 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".

I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in disaster mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

1244. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 09:13:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040319041334.21955.00001070@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89309

Jack Gibson wrote:

> I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
> U.S. fucking citizen.
>
> So fucking there.

How charming! Tell you what, Jack -- for the sake of continued good diplomatic relations between the U.S. and which ever country you do come from, please don't reveal your nationality on this newsgroup. I'm sure that not all the people
of your country are as rude as you are, nor would they care for you acting as their spokesman and representative.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1245. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 09:13:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040319041335.21955.00001071@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89308

In article <1e4e3692.0403171447.13020680@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> The only logical argument that I can accept for the punitive measures
>> of power limitations and the ridiculous restrictions on homebrewing and
>> the "final voltage restrictions for the lowest class of operation is
>> just the creation of another group of "great unwashed"
>>
>> We DON'T learn do we?
>>
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>I can hear Larry now, "I'm a Superior Ham because I have higher voltage
>finals..."
>
>Or Bruce, "Know Ham = Know Voltage."

Billy:

I am a superior ham (to you) because I took the time and made the effort
to gain the technical knowledge and operating skill required for me to earn
the privilige of using higher-voltage finals. Unfortunately, all of you lazy,
whining no-coders can only complain about a "caste system!" Well,
don't look now, but you, the unwashed "lower caste," will always be that
way -- since you will obviously not have the same technical competence
and operating skill as your "upper caste" superiors! You have made the
choice to be the underclass, and there you shall remain -- no matter
what happens to the licensing structure!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1246. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 09:23:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319042336.06889.00000018@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89310

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/2004 12:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040319010321.01692.00001179@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>>Now, not every American Citizen has access to an amateur radio
>>operator. I'd say most don't know even one amateur, and many don't
>>know what ham radio is (Isn't that like CB?)
>
> Mama Dee claims there are some Americans who don't even
> know what a "CB" is!

You say that EVERY American citizens DOES know what "CB" is, SCummy One?

> TAFKARJ claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
> "11 meters" is not at 465 MHz.

"CB" does not solely refer to operations at 11 meters, Lennie.

>>Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???
>
> Brian, the gunnery nurse doesn't KNOW of any other form of
> communications...
>
> He is a Believer. If he reads some political screed about
> "emergency service" he thinks that ALL hams do that and
> ALL got into amateur radio to be "emergency communicators."

Yet another lie, but Leonard H Anderson is capable of nothing more.

>>When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?
>
> He THROWS it? :-)
>
> His radios NEVER break. They always work. He can march
> 50 miles with a Yaecomwood on his back if he has on a
> uniform.

I just fix them, Lennie.

You're not the only person here who can use a spectrum analyzer, VTVM, or
a signal gererator.

>>> > > I challenge you to prove THAT otherwise, also.
>>> >
>>> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
>>> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
>>>
>>> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)
>>
>>Is that a threat?
>
> The gunnery nurse would like you to THINK that.
>
> He may also think Kim and Dee have "cojones."

They have more than you or PuppetBoy, Lennie...

>>Am I wrong?
>
> Only the gunnery nurse and any other PCTA is "right" in this
> newsgroup. Everyone else is "wrong."

People are only "wrong" when the information they supply is in error.

So far, PuppetBoy has not provided any "evidence" to support his
allegations.

YOU have already been caught blatantly lying and making accusations you
cannot/will not validate.

>>Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?
>
> "Cell sites ALWAYS fail in an emergency..."

"Train For The Worst, Hope For The Best"..or my personal reference,
"Paratus et Vigilans".

>>Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't
>>you?
>
> He has more testosterone than smarts...which is not a great deal...

So far I have more facts than you or Brain.

>>Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
>>to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
>>answereing machine.
>>
>>He didn't use amateur radio or CW.
>
> That can't be true...the ARRL never put THAT in their web page as
> "official."

The New York Times did, however...the message was left before the Towers
toppled.

Also, the messages left from the third hijacked plane were left before the passengers tried to re-take the plane.

To the best of my knowlewdge, none of the cellphone on that flight worked after the plane crashed.

>>Is that the picture you paint?
>
> With a paint-by-number kit...

That's the ONLY picture you can paint accurately, Lennie...But I am willing to bet even then you substitute the colors at will there, too...

> Hey, Brian, yon gunnery nurse are gonna play Let's Pretend with
> a "simulated" earthquake. They will shake in their boots to make
> like the earth moved for them. Maybe they will have a "hostile
> action" too and award pretty decorations for all of that. High fives
> all around (simulated, of course).

I still challenge you, Sir Scummy of Anderson, to refute that any emergency response agencies in SoCal (or anywhere in the Schwartzennegger Empire) do NOT "train" (ie: SIMULATE) disaster scenarios.

> I can't wait for the documentary movie of the event to be shown on
> the History Channel.

I can't wait for you to show me how OES prepares for emergencies without training thier personnel.

Steve, K4YZ

1247. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 09:31:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319043124.06889.00000019@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89311

>Subject: Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18
>From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black)
>Date: 3/18/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c3dqgegiq1@freenet9.carleton.ca>

>No, I think Wayne was pretty successful.

Wayne has had his "successes", for sure...

He succeeded in ruining "73" magazine.

He succeeded in making a mockery of himself.

He succeeded in spending a lifetime "dissing" the ARRL, yet everytime a rallying cry was sounded by those disenfranchised with the ARRL (most of whom WERE that way BECAUSE of him!) he had some lame excuse as to why he couldn't/wouldn't do it.

Needless to say, Michael, I disagee. Wayne had the opportunity to be a significant leader in Amateur Radio's future, but he will be, afterall, nothing but a footnote in it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1248. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 10:59:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040319055925.25517.00004817@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 89312

In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>sense.

Mike,

There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level license:

1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need to be tested on it)

2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why bother to upgrade?)

The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal accomplishment. "Class" would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.

The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1249. Re: [highly OT) Boycott Exxon & Mobil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 12:35:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040319073553.00545.00004914@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89313

In article <Dc2dnfNwtNDDX8rdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Here is my take on Public Transit, Larry:
>
> Is public transit a good thing, or a waste of taxpayers money? Is the
>subsidy of public transit a liberal plot to undermine America's core
>values, or what? (hehe, kind of melodramatic there!)
>
> The use of public transit, even when subsidized by government, is a >
LOT
>less than the amount of money that would be taken up by the construction
>and maintenance of new highways that would be needed if everyone had to
>use their own automobiles to get to work. These new roads would
>eliminate valuable real estate from productivity, as well as the space
>needed for parking the said automobiles. And guess where the money for
>these new roads comes from? Taxes. Sometimes, ya just have to pay
>*something*, I think.
>
All valid points, Mike.

Here are some more:

- increased pollution
- decreased transportation opportunities for those unable to drive for any
reason (the disabled, poor, underage, etc.)
- increased losses (life, injury, property damage) due to increased
road/highway traffic (the most dangerous form of transportation generally
used).

> There is a particulate emission problem for diesel engines, but I
>suspect that can be solved.

Fixable with improved technology. The overall pollution impact of a diesel is
less than that of a gasoline engine of equivalent horsepower-hours.

>Probably the biggest problem in the past was
>the lack of available fuel where we needed it. I don't think that is a
>problem anymore, and I suspect that if fuel prices continue edging
>upward, diesel may make a comeback.

I drove a diesel Rabbit from February 1980 to February 1997 and never, ever had
a problem finding fuel. The car had only a 10 gallon tank, and I rarely let it
get down below 1/4 full. That meant about 400 highway/300 city miles between
fillups, which cost $10 or so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1250. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 12:44:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <n_WdnVjVNMTfdsfdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89314

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <0Omdne4gW_6838fdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>> I have, and are you talking about something else? I took NECVEC to be a
>
>
>>typo, since NCVEC is a group that put forth a proposal some time ago.
>>Perhaps you are referring to a different group?
>>
>> At any rate, No need to modify my argument if you are referring to the
>>NCVEC and not the NECVEC.
>
>
> My apologies, most noble of high rank amateurdom.

No need to apologize, Len. Thanks for the clarification.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1251. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 12:58:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89315

N2EY wrote:

> In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>sense.
>
>
> Mike,
>
> There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
> license:
>
> 1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't run
> more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need to be
> tested on it)

Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
giving the tests are being overburdened?

> 2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
> class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why bother
> to upgrade?)

But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
isn't anything to hold ya back.

From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.

> The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a person
> is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal accomplishment. "Class"
> would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.

The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
mind! ;^)

> The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
> unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important part

> of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.

Agreed 100 percent!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1252. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:19:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190519.12274e25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89316

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> > I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
> > someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
> > so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
> > people. You do the math.
>
> And the network becomes useless in an emergency,

Stop right there.

In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?

1253. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:20:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190520.2951b374@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89317

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<H_6dnXnumbCDx8fd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> > You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
> > any use whatsoever in an emergency.
>
> For handling official emergency traffic they are not of any use, that is
> why the military and civil officials dismiss them completely from their
> emergency planning. They do include ham radio.

Lemme see.

Emergency planners have cell phones tagged to their belts, right?

Emergency planners don't have ham radio tagged to their belts, right?

1254. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:31:04 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac4c023d687e6ff9898d7@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 89318

Here is another clip for you from a newspaper:

Tuesday, March 2, 2004

Cinergy plugs in as Web provider
Power lines set to carry Internet to outlet near you

By Mike Boyer
The Cincinnati Enquirer

A unit of Cinergy Corp. today will become the nation's first electric utility to offer high-
speed Internet service to customers via its power lines, turning every electrical outlet in homes or offices into a Web connection.

The technology, which will be offered first in Hyde Park and Mount Lookout, holds the promise
of adding competition and cutting prices for broadband services while making such service available (particularly in remote and rural areas) without costly investments in cables.

The Federal Communications Commission has been pushing the technology to bolster competition -
and thus spur more Americans, who are less likely than Japanese or South Korean consumers, to
have broadband access. FCC Chairman Michael Powell has said the technology like the kind Cinergy will use "could simply blow the doors off the provision of broadband."

Cinergy Broadband teamed with Current Communications Group, a Germantown, Md., technology company to test the service - known as broadband over power lines or BPL - in about 100 homes
in Hyde Park in the last year.

"Our pilot has been very successful, with more than 75 percent saying they would be willing to
subscribe to the service" said William Grealis, Cinergy executive vice president and president
of Cinergy Broadband.

Cinergy and Current have formed a 50-50 joint venture to roll out the service here under the
Current Communications name.

Current joins Cincinnati Bell's Zoomtown digital subscriber service and Time Warner Cable's
Road Runner service in marketing high-speed Internet in Cincinnati.

Cinergy thinks that BPL has a couple of advantages over competitors. It doesn't require a cable or phone line, and can be operated from anyplace where there's an electric wall outlet.
Upload and download speeds are the same, unlike DSL and cable modem service - whose upload speeds are slower than download speeds.

"We believe we have better speeds at competitive prices," Grealis said.

Cinergy and Current plan to offer several levels of service starting at 1 megabit a second at
$29.95 a month. Road Runner locally costs $44.95 a month for download speeds of up to 3 megabits; Cincinnati Bell's Zoomtown costs $41.95 a month for the same speed. They both offer
signup discounts.

Cinergy's service will be marketed initially to about 16,000 homes in the Hyde Park-Mount Lookout area.

In what he described as a "measured rollout," Grealis said the partners plan to make the service available to about 55,000 homes in a dozen communities in Hamilton County this year,
including Wyoming, Delhi Township, Terrace Park and Norwood. Early next year, it will expand
into Northern Kentucky.

The joint venture also plans to begin offering voice over the Internet telephone service to customers next fall. Prices for that service haven't been set.

Cinergy and privately held Current are forming another joint venture to market the technology
to municipally owned power companies nationally. Grealis said that's a potential market of 24
million homes.

Cinergy is also investing $10 million in Current Communications, as part of a new round of venture funding of more than $70 million, along with Current's other investors Liberty Associated Partners and EnerTech Capital LP. Cinergy Broadband is part of the utility's nonregulated business and isn't funded by electric or gas rates.

"I think there will be a stampede toward (broadband over power lines) in 2005," said Alan Shark, president of the Power Line Communications Association, an industry trade group in Arlington, Va.

Growing popularity of high-speed Internet service for game playing and downloading music, coupled with refinements in the technology itself, are building momentum for commercial deployment, he said.

One of the problems with broadband over power lines in the past has been a lack of industry standards and competing technologies, he said.

About a dozen utilities and technology companies have been experimenting with broadband for several years.

Shark said the only commercial deployment of BPL now is in Manassas, Va., where the municipality has teamed with a New York investment firm to market the capability to about

15,000 homes.

Although broadband over power lines has been discussed for years, technical limitations have
slowed its development, but that might be about to change.

The FCC recently announced it plans to begin developing rules for the technology and has signaled that its views BPL as a third "pipeline" to deliver high-speed Internet service, along with cable modems and digital telephone lines.

After evaluating various BPL technologies for several years, Grealis said Current's system "is
one that works, and we think it's the only one that works,"

Tim Barhorst, an information technology consultant in Hyde Park who has been using the technology for a year, said he's been impressed.

"I find it's very convenient," he said, noting that he can set up his computer anywhere there's an electric outlet.

He said the speeds are better than his Zoomtown service and comparable to Road Runner.

Alex Pardo of Cinergy said the Internet traffic travels on a separate band wave from the electric current, so there's no interference.

He said the utility has found no problem with radio wave interference, a concern raised by many amateur radio operators.

E-mail mboyer@enquirer.com

Copyright 1995-2004. The Cincinnati Enquirer, a Gannett Co. Inc. newspaper.
Use of this site signifies agreement to terms of service updated 12/19/2002.

1255. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:34:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190534.5ca5cfa0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89319

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319023842.06889.00000006@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/18/2004 9:48 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403180748.437acaf2@posting.google.com>
> >
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<cYGdnTQd5qzgeMXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
> > I ask him
> >> about the use of cell phones during such times, he just laughed and said
> >> that the cell phone network was useless for any emergency comms in such
> >> a scenario.
> >
> >For military use, absolutely. I wouldn't expect a senior military
> >official to respond differently.
>
> Hey Billy Clueless...
>
> Guess who's in charge if inland disaster response in the United States?
>
> (1) The local and state agencies of the affected state, then:
>
> (2) FEMA, then:
>
> (3) The United States Army.
>
> So...ya think that General's ONLY cnvern is calling in a fire mission with
> those radios, Brain?!?!

Ahem, Bush didn't declare Martial Law after 9/11.

> You laid claim to having been a MARS BST member...were the ONLY
> "comms" that you supported tactical or strategic military traffic...?!?!

Local and strategic.

> (Refore you answer, REMEMBER that I was also a member of USAFMARS and am
> VERY familiar with MARS programs and policies...then AND now...)

Ooops. You got me there! Hihi.

Which BST were you on?

> >He also works with The Office
> >> of Homeland Defense on emergengy communications issues and he confirmed
> >> that the OHD is attempting to intergrate Amateur Radio in their plans
> >> for emergency comms.
> >
> >As they should; the military has backups to backups. Redundancy
> >equals Survivability.
>
> From the Prince of the Putz who keeps arguning AGAINST the concept of
> Amateur Radio AS a redundent communications program, this is funny!

Your correct to misspell ration is going up again. Name Calling is
through the roof. Time to do your breathing exercises.

> This is the VERY thing most of "us" have ben arguing, but you keep trying
> to denounce as false!

That's because I think the military can take care of their own comms
w/o a bunch of heroes with "shacks on their hips" running around
acting impotent.

I realize that I am no longer an instrument of national policy. You,
however, keep flopping from one pseudo-martial program to another.
You cannot let go of the fact that you are no longer in the service.
Get over it.

And I have consistently confined my argument to what the average
citizen needs.

You consistently ignore that, and go on and on with the continuity of
operations (government) agenda.

Average citizen doesn't need comms in an emergency?

> >Now lets talk about Average Citizen (AC). AC has actually used
> >cellular telephones IN the 9/11 emergency. Many ACs had successful
> >communications. AC has greater access to the cellular telephone
> >system than they have to amateur radio. For many ACs, cellular is
> >their emergency comms.
> >
> >Do you doubt it?
>
> For sending the police to an accident, fire, or medical emergency, yes,
> this is "AC's" "emergency comms".
>
> But you are arguing apples and oranges. The "emergency comms" being
> argued here is NOT the average citizen's call for "routine" 9-1-1 service. Not
> by a magnitude.

Then you have failed to read my posts and blindly respond with
garbage.

1256. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:36:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190536.489b36ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89320

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319024112.06889.00000007@mb-m16.aol.com>...

>
> Oh NO, Brain, I am quite clearly #2

I never doubted it.

1257. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:43:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190543.30c0177b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89321

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040319010311.01692.00001172@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403181837.5f78905e@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040318000907.21642.00005023@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Jimmie has tips on everything. He knows what is, what isn't, who is
> >> right, who is wrong, even what the FCC thinks. Information
> >> technology or IT. He's full of IT. :-)
> >>
> >> Yours sincerely,
> >> TNAFKNAMPARRL
> >
> >TNAFKNAMPARRL, TAFKARJ is about to be toppled.
> >
> >Time to back-channel a mitigating response.
> >
> >MSIT A8J.
> >
> >Authenticate.
>
> Roger that, Red Dog Leader, you are 5 by 9 all the way.
>
> Would you repeat the last groups? :-)
>
> Red Dog 7 clear.
>
> <squeep>
>
> LHA / WMD

Red Dog 7, you are 5 by 9. Say again all after "Roger that." ;^)

1258. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 13:49:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403190549.29912bc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89322

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403180818.50cc701e@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040318000908.21642.00005024@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0403171457.41ead2a8@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> > >Nope, no anger or rage. Len has been working out and now I call him
> > >"Lean."
> >
> > Actually, I've been out working, not working out.
>
> Doubtful, but we'll give you the benefit of the doubt on this one
> since "work" is a relative term.
>
> > >He would praise you for knowing sumptin about about Part 97. Best of
> > >Luck.
> >
> > He knows it exists. That's a plus. Beyond that, his score isn't
> > the highest grade on the report card.
>
> >>MY<< score on Part 97 isn't the "highest grade"...?!?!
>
> BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHA
> ! ! ! ! !
>
> What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!

Impossible. I own a copy of Part 97 and it fills the space of one
small book.

> Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
> regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
> more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
> detriment.

Because Amateur Radio exists in a parallel universe where conventional
laws of physics do not apply.

1259. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 14:30:02 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <lt0m50det3u5gjn5jcoeefmro8dhi3bgpb@4ax.com>
Source record: 89323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 12:50:19 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <5g0k50ped3h1e3d1iv48hsn1g8bb7t3a7v@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 06:15:46 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>>
>>>In <r46j50d32e0habm03t3nm39mr1cvk7k62l@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>>><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>>On Wed, 17 Mar 2004 09:00:39 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>>>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>>><snip>
>>>>Sounds like a bad limiter.
>>>>
>>>Or rectification in an audio stage. For a simple AM detector, you only
>>>need a half wave rectifier. Practically any semiconductor device has
>>>this capability. When the volume control has no effect on the
>>>intensity of the RFI, it's a sure bet that the interference is being
>>>coupled into a stage downstream from the volume control.
>>>
>>>
>>>Or, more likely, into the power supply.
>>>
>>>> The culprits are usually resonant lengths of audio and video
>>>>cables.
>>>>
>>>How do you apply that solution to aluminum siding or gutters, without
>>>having access to physically modify them?
>>>
>>>
>>>You have audio coming from the gutters? Hmmm..... I've heard audio coming from a
>>>chain-link fence, but it was the perimeter fence for a 50kW tower.
>>
>>
>>Not audio, non-linear rectification and re-radiation of IMD products.
>
>
>Step one: get access. Step two: Either replace them with PVC gutters, or run a
>bare copper wire in the bottom of the aluminum gutters.

Step one is the problem in most cases.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1260. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 14:46:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319094632.17665.00000020@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89324

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>sense.
>> Mike,
>>
>> There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>> license:
>>
>> 1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>run
>> more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need to
>be
>> tested on it)
>
> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should

>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>giving the tests are being overburdened?

What I am wondering is why everyone wants to set these power levels low to
avoid testing on questions about SAFETY!

We're talking about requiring some knowledge that might prevent the person
from hurting himself or others. Why are we so anxious to avoid them..?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1261. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 15:18:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319101832.17665.00000023@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89325

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403190549.29912bc2@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403180818.50cc701e@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040318000908.21642.00005024@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> > In article <1e4e3692.0403171457.41ead2a8@posting.google.com>,
>> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> > >Nope, no anger or rage. Len has been working out and now I call him
>> > >"Lean."
>> >
>> > Actually, I've been out working, not working out.
>>
>> Doubtful, but we'll give you the benefit of the doubt on this one
>> since "work" is a relative term.
>>
>> > >He would praise you for knowing sumptin about about Part 97. Best of
>> > >Luck.
>> >
>> > He knows it exists. That's a plus. Beyond that, his score isn't
>> > the highest grade on the report card.
>>
>> >>MY<< score on Part 97 isn't the "highest grade"...?!?!
>>
>>
>BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
>> ! ! ! ! !
>>
>> What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!
>
>Impossible. I own a copy of Part 97 and it fills the space of one
>small book.
>
>> Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
>> regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
>> more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
>> detriment.
>
>Because Amateur Radio exists in a parallel universe where conventional

>laws of physics do not apply.

No...becasue that blithering idiot likes to make up his OWN rules as he goes in order to vindicate his rants.

He's a fool, Brain, and you're his bagboy. What does that say about you...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1262. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 15:21:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319102154.17665.00000024@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89326

>Subject: Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO
>NPRM ON BPL
>From: Steve Stone spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:31 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <MPG.1ac4c023d687e6ff9898d7@news.frontiernet.net>
>
>Here is another clip for you from a newspaper:
>
>
>
>Tuesday, March 2, 2004
>
>Cinergy plugs in as Web provider
>Power lines set to carry Internet to outlet near you
>
>By Mike Boyer
>The Cincinnati Enquirer
>
>A unit of Cinergy Corp. today will become the nation's first electric utility
>to offer high-
>speed Internet service to customers via its power lines, turning every
>electrical outlet in
>homes or offices into a Web connection.

Uh oh......

I wonder how long it will take some idiot to read that and then try to
plug thier line feed to the AC directly...?!?! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1263. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 16:40:10 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>
Source record: 89327
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Thu, 18 Mar 2004 14:54:34 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>>>>Key word: "best". Ground wave has some effect throughout the HF bands.
>>>>It can also propagate signals into neighboring homes.
>>>
>>>
>>>....um, wouldn't that be better classified as near-field radiation and not
>>>ground-wave propagation? How far away are your neighbors' houses?
>>
>>The line between where near field radiation ends and ground wave picks
>>up is not always obvious. If the guy receiving the interference is 4
>>doors down the street, I tend to think that he's outside the "cone" of
>>the near field. But I could be wrong.
>
>
>I might have to look this up, but IIRC, the 97% point is something like 9
>wavelengths for the E-field and 5 wavelengths for the M-field.... or is it the
>other way around.....

Whatever you want to call it though is basically irrelevant. That fact
that the RFI exists and needs to be corrected is the only point that
matters.

>
>
>>>They were changed to the new specs in 2002. I'll dig up the code later. If I
>>>remember correctly, it only applies to devices of new manufacture.
>>
>>
>>I'll have to look this up. This is the first that I've heard of any
>>changes. Naturally, I'll want to do what I can to stay in spec, even
>>if existing equipment is "grandfathered". It makes for a better
>>defense if you already meet the tougher specs, and you receive an RFI
>>complaint.
>
>
>97.307(d) "The mean power of any spurious emission from a station
>transmitter or external RF power amplifier transmitting on a frequency
>below 30 MHz must not exceed 50 mW and must be at least 40 dB below the
>mean power of the fundamental emission......"

That's not new. HF equipment has been -40dbc for while now. VHF
equipment is at -60 dbc. a 1000 watt station with a harmonic at -40dbc

is radiating at a power of 100mW. So the max limit of 50 mW only kicks
in at those higher power levels, where -40dbc exceeds 50 mW.

>>>I set aside a day or two each month to make 'trinkets', for lack of a better
>>>term. Things like pigtails, toroidal chokes, jumper leads, mic cables, etc.
>>
>>For someone who had been advancing the notion that consumer devices
>>are not all that bad, WRT RFI susceptibility, you spend a lot of time
>>making up RFI blocking devices for them..... ;-)
>
>
>I work at a radio station where we have lots of audio and radio equipment,
>computers and networking hardware, telephones and routing system, our own backup
>generator, and keyclowns driving up and down the street. It is not a typical
>"consumer" environment.

But the RFI is pretty "typical".

>
>>>..... My point is that radio operation requires a level of
>>>responsibility as high as the level of the privelege.
>>
>>And that responsibility extends to the operation and maintenance of
>>his equipment. That responsibility becomes unreasonable when extended
>>to include the prevention of RF ingress into neighboring consumer
>>devices (Which should have been done by the manufacturer). IMHO it is
>>unfair for the manufacturers, by choosing to cut corners, to place
>>this burden on radio ops. At the very least, the manufacturers should
>>be held accountable as enablers or orchestrators of these incidents by
>>facilitating the easy reception of RFI.
>
>
>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.

So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
rights people would love your attitude.

>When
>it comes to RFI and manufacturing quality, there are much higher priorities.
>Such as interference to and/or from cell phones, public utility and emergency
>communications, land-line telephone, television services including cable,
>satellite and broadcast, broadcast radio services, etc... all of which are far
>more common and far more important than hams.

Yes, but collectively they are all potential RFI generators. You've
just made my case even more solid by acknowledging that there are
other potential sources of RFI. There is nothing unique or special
about ham radio which would make the design of more "RF proof",
equipment any more costly than the equivalent design considerations
for other forms of radio transmissions.

Would you be so arrogant if it were a cell phone operator causing RFI? The fact is that cell phone users are experiencing an explosive growth spurt, and the potential for RFI could increase as well. If the cell phone system starts interfering with some person's TV, would you be so insistent that the cell company cease their operations?

And how about the commercial radio or TV station? Should THEY be forced to cut their power or stop transmitting, if it's found that their equipment is clean, but the lack of proper shielding in the consumer's device is allowing in an excessive amount of RF?

How about municipal systems? Pagers? Police/fire/EMS?

It would seem that the whole basis of your argument hinges on the fact that since hams (and CB'ers) are such a small segment of the population, that they deserve no consideration in the matter.

> But they also have to deal with
>government safety agencies, insurance companies, manufacturing costs (labor is a
>biggie and that's why so many jobs are exported overseas), consumer demand,
>market competition, etc..... You are talking about changing the practices of
>multi-BILLION dollar markets just so a relatively few hams can play with their
>radios?

How would adopting a more immune design affect any of the factors that you've just listed? The design improvements would be invisible to the consumer. It does not affect where the device is manufactured. The only affect will be that the changes, necessary to make a more RFI immune product, will add to the BOM cost, which the company will either pass on to the consumer, or take it out of their profit margin.

So it's all about money. Nothing more.

> I don't think so, Dave. That's an unjustified burden. When there are a
>couple million hams paying hundreds of thousands of dollars each for their
>equipment, then -maybe- hams might make those manufacturers take notice. But
>until that happens, the rest of the world sure as hell isn't going to shoulder
>the 'burdens' of a few hams.

And you wonder why hams develop an "attitude" about RFI..........

>>I remember the earlier days of ham radio. If a ham interfered with a
>>TV, he made a trap out of a length of twinlead, and placed it across
>>the TV's antenna terminals, and that usually was all it took. The
>>issue today has become way more complicated. Which is ironic, since
>>most hams use commercial equipment these days, and those ham radios
>>have become cleaner then they ever were, so the percentage of "dirty"
>>transmitters has dropped in the last 40 years, yet the incidents of
>>RFI has increased dramatically..
>
>
>When I find a well-documented study on the issue I may agree. Until then my
>opinion is based on logic.

And mine is based on experience.

>>>>>The other person is doing nothing to interfere with the ham.
>>
>>I would consider incessant complaints to be a form of "interference".
>
>
>Cause and effect. Your interference is the cause, the complaints are the effect.
>Think of it as "constructive feedback".

www.sony.com or talk to the hand.....

>>>>>It should be up to the ham to use his radio in a way that doesn't cause problems
>>>>>for anyone else.
>>
>>That's like saying that everyone should drive their cars as to not
>>emit pollution.
>
>
>You are missing the big picture here. Cars are common. Televisions are common.
>Cordless phones are common.

Irrelevant. The logic is the same regardless of the percentages of the
population versus various devices. If someone has to deal with RFI
from a commercial station, then they also have to deal with it from a
ham radio station.

>People expect these things to work in the manner in
>which they were intended, and accept the problems they are expected to cause.
>Ham radio stations are -not- common. Ham radio interference is -not- what people
>expect to deal with when they come home from a hard days work, pop open a brew,
>kick back in their comfy-chair and turn on the tube to watch the news.

Read Part 15 again. Then write the manufacturer to express your
displeasure with their devices not working under these conditions.

> I don't
>see how any ham should expect the average person to accept such interference
>even if it -is- the law.

Because no one forced someone to buy a particular device, and it's not
necessary to maintain a particular standard of living. In the grand
scheme of things, the right to watch TV, or play X-box, has no higher
priority that the right to freely operate a ham radio station (within
the legal standards).

You're back to making value judgements again.

>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....

Not if his station is clean.

>97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
>cause interference to any radio communication or signal."

That does not apply to RFI, it applies to on-channel stations. IOW no ham may deliberately interfere with another licensed service, which occupies the same frequency including, but not limited to, 40 meter broadcast stations, stations with secondary authorization, or other hams etc.

>Notice that it doesn't exempt Part 15 devices or Sony televisions, it doesn't
>release the ham of responsibility just because he tried and failed to prevent
>the interference, and it doesn't specify where or how that interference occurs.

Because it doesn't apply to RFI.

And Part 15 itself puts the burden on the device's user when it states that "this device must not create harmful interference, and must accept any interference, including that which may cause improper operation".

>The fact is that if you know your transmission is interfering with the audio,
>distorting the picture (distortion = interference, Blackburn v. Doubleday
>Broadcasting Co., Minn. 1984), or crashing someone's wireless palm-pilot, only
>YOU are at fault. Sony is not responsible for your transmissions and subsequent
>interference, nor is Zenith, Motorola, or even the poor schmuck who paid too
>much for an El Cheapo TV that even picks up his coffee maker.... if you know
>that you are causing interference, you are legally responsible. Period. But you
>knew that already, right?

I do not agree with your draconian interpretation. If that were the case, practically every ham (or commercial operator) would be forced off the air, as a result of RFI complaints. Since this is not the case, your interpretation is obviously flawed. The FCC upholds the right of hams to operate a reasonable station. They may force quiet hours or reduced power in cases where the ham refused to compromise (some hams can be arzholes). But if the ham can demonstrate that he's made a reasonable effort to minimize the problem, including moving antennas, adding grounds and filters where appropriate, the FCC usually will take a more lenient view. We ALL know that the consumer electronic industry has become lax in proper RFI immunity design. The FCC has proposed tighter standards. The consumer electronics lobby is powerful however, and they don't want to deal with the increased cost. But THEY are the ones who have made this problem what it is.

When I can place a 1960's vintage stereo side by side with a 1990's version and see the night and day difference, what other conclusion is one supposed to make?

>>>So the interfering ham should just brush off the neighbor and transmit anytime
>>>he wants just because he can? That's not very fair, is it?
>>
>>The converse to that is that the ham should transmit at all?
>
>
>Well, how about using a frequency, band or modulation mode that doesn't cause
>any interference?

So, all hams should give up HD and simply run on 2 meters and above?
Sort of puts a damper on working DB.....

>Or maybe move the antenna so as to point the null at the
>problem device?

That's part of the many things which should 've been automatically
performed at the onset of the complaint. Assume for the purposes of
this discussion that nothing the ham does on his end fixes the
problem.

> Or if you have a vertical, how about setting up a null zone with
>another pole? I don't see any reason why it can't be done. The same laws of
>physics apply to both amateur and broadcast, and since broadcast stations can do
>it, so can hams.

Remember that when you can't cure a case of RFI from bothering
someone's Sony TV, or amplified computer speakers and you try to tell
your boss that the station should shut down.

>>>But looking at it from the other person's point of view
>>>helps a lot. For example, people have a reasonable expectation that things they
>>>own and use should work they way they were intended.
>>
>>Including ham radio.
>
>
>When you cause interference, is your ham radio not working the way it was
>intended?

If it is spectrally clean, then yes. It's not the ham's fault that
consumer devices are so poorly made.

>>> Manufacturers can't make things bullet-proof
>>
>>Yes, yes they can! Maybe not 100% "bullet proof", but certainly
>>"bullet resistant". They choose not to because of the increased cost,
>>on the risk that the interference potential only exists in small
>>isolated cases. But by adopting this attitude, they have effectively
>>transferred the responsibility and the "bad press" for RFI incidents
>>to the innocent radio operator.
>
>
>Innocent?

Yes, innocent. He's not doing anything wrong, yet is being made to
look like the bad guy, simply because manufacturers refuse to take the
extra effort to make this a non-issue.

>>> and there will always be some vulnerabilities. So they have
>>>to limit those vulnerabilities to what can be expected in normal, everyday use
>>>by the vast majority of people. Close exposure to ham radio transmitters, I
>>>don't think, could be classified as normal, everyday use by the vast majority of
>>>people.

>>
>>So hams are to be held hostage by cost centric manufacturers, and
>>gadget junkie neighbors?
>
>
>Held hostage? Don't you think that's a bit strong? I mean... geez, nobody is
>preventing you from using your radio, and you can certainly use it in a way that
>doesn't interfere with the lives of people that otherwise wouldn't even be aware
>of your existence. How is that being "held hostage"?

Read your own statement. "nobody is preventing you from using your
radio", That's not what you've been promoting here. If we adopt your
logic here, the minute the ham is involved in an RFI dispute, it
becomes HIS ultimate responsibility to "fix" the problem, even if that
means that he has to alter or stop his operation. THAT is being held
hostage.

>>>You have to draw some lines somewhere. There are what.... about 100,000 hams in
>>>the US? Out of more than 300,000,000 people? So is it unreasonable for people to
>>>expect that their modern appliances don't talk to them in the voice of the ham
>>>next door?
>>> Sure it is. Whose responsibility is it to make sure that doesn't
>>>happen? The manufacturers? No, because they make these products for the millions
>>>of people who pay for them, not the thousands of hams who interfere with them.
>>
>>Sure, but the major accountability for this issue rests squarely on
>>the shoulders of the manufacturers.
>
>
>Oh that's bullshit! You are skateboarding in a rock quarry and blaming the
>excavators for the bumps! Get a clue, Dave!

I have a clue. It's a simple business ploy for consumer device
manufactures to deflect their design responsibility, and get more
people to think like you are here, and eventually swing the
legislative tide against radio operators. That way the problem gets
solved, and THEY don't have to spend dime one.

It's the same thing with the ECPA. Rather than accept responsibility
for ensuring the security of cell phone transmissions through
encryption schemes (which would have cost money), the cell phone
makers instead lobbies congress to outlaw receivers capable of picking
up cell phones. It's joke really, as anyone who's truly interested in
listening, can find ways to do so. It was feel-good legislation and a
band aid at best. Now, the technology has caught up with the issues,
and encryption is becoming the norm, making the ECPA somewhat
superfluous. But we're stuck with it on the books anyway.

>> They have gambled that a
>>relatively small group of hams does not represent a significant risk
>>to their bottom line. By allowing or participating in bad press which
>>paints hams with the same broad brush as the keyclowns, in the RFI

>>arena, they are only furthering their own agenda.
>
>
>Now you are starting to sound as paranoid as Twisty, and that's where I quit.
>Sorry Dave, but I really thought you were smarter than that.

So you are of the impression that big business does not operate with the bottom line as their highest priority? How receptive do you think they'd be to more stringent FCC RFI standards? Do you think that it's not in their best interests to malign (or allow to be maligned) radio operators as "RF terrorists" rather than responsible operators in order to sway the FCC into not giving serious thought to passing those tighter standards? It's funny that they're not coming to the rescue of hams and other radio operators who are being plagued by this RFI problem.

Am I really paranoid, or are you simply hiding your head in the sand?

Dave

1264. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 17:24:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <oPydnY45tet1sMbdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89328

Len Over 21 wrote:

>>D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>You are obviously unaware that in an emergency, the government can and does
>>declare designated frequencies off limits to general usage for the duration
>>of that emergency.
>
>
> Right, Mama Dee, that's "exactly" what happened after the second
> hijacked airliner crashed into the WTC towers, didn't it?
>
> Right...just like the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes when
> the government ordered every radio thing be all ham emergency...
>
> Right...just like all the southwest and northwest firestorms had
> every radio commandeered for emergency use.
>
> Right...just like every hurricane striking the east coast has all radios
> off limits by Order.

It is common for the FCC to declared certain frequencies on the ham
bands off limits to all but emergency traffic in times of emergencies,
during hurricanes is an example.

>
> But, in your scenario of the mind, "all cell sites fall down during
> emergencies" and only ham radio can save everyone. In real
> life they sure didn't. Don't let that trouble you. We are all
> children to you.

The cell phone network is not even a consideration for emergency
communications by the military and civil authorities, ham radio is.

1265. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 17:33:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <APmdnYHQg7CQrcbdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89329

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> TAFKARJ claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
> "11 meters" is not at 465 MHz. :-)

There was a band at that frequency that citizens could apply for and
use, thus a "citizens band" or "cb".

>>
>>Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
>>there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
>>would be overloaded and useless.
>>
>>CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???

And that is exactly why the cell network is useless for official
emergency comms, every cell user wants to dial up twenty of their
closest friends and tell them to turn on the tee-vee, overloading the
network. The military and civil autorities do not consider the cell
network a viable means of emergency comms, they do for ham radio.

>
>>> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
>>>communicate with your cellphone?
>>
>>When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?
>
>
> He THROWS it? :-)

Which one, I have several, what are the odds they are all down at the
same time? How many cell phones do you have?

>>Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
>>that cell phones won't be working.
>>
>>Am I wrong?

As far as using the cell network for official emergency comms, you can
consider it not working. In times of a major emergency it becomes
useless for anything but attempting to make a call.

1266. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 17:42:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89330

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by Amateur
> Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other services
> of having to worry about that.

Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
radio.
Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.

1267. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 17:46:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89331

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
>>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
>>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
>>>people. You do the math.
>>
>>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
>
>
> Stop right there.
>
> In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?

As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
emergency comms... a big *yes*.

1268. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 17:50:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89332

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<H_6dnXnumbCDx8fd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
>>>any use whatsoever in an emergency.
>>
>>For handling official emergency traffic they are not of any use, that is
>>why the military and civil officials dismiss them completely from their
>>emergency planning. They do include ham radio.
>
>
> Lemme see.
>
> Emergency planners have cell phones tagged to their belts, right?

Sure they do, but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.

>
> Emergency planners don't have ham radio tagged to their belts, right?

If they are licensed hams they might have. Why would they if they were
not licensed? Face it billyboy, for the real comms needed in an
emergency situation, the cell network is not considered by emergency
officials to be of use, they do consider ham radio.

1269. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 18:00:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89333

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/18/2004 7:58 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>
> >> > You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
> >> > clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
> >> > role in emergency response communications.
> >>
> >> Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
> >> MiniLennie...
> >>
> >> I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
> >> thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
> >> the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
> >> Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.
> >>
> >> Can you/do you refute this?
> >
> >Yes, I can.
> >
> >Quoting Lean:
> >
> >"Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are 100
> >million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about one
> >for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say.
>
> This is no proof, Brain.
>

> SHOW ME where those UNLICENSED SERVICES are USED in playing a MAJOR ROLE
> (your choice of adjectives) in "emergency comms".
>
>
> >> Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
> >> might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?
> >>
> >> Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?
> >
> >Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???
>
> I haven't.
>
> We have been discussing AMATEUR RADIO'S role in emergency communications,
> since this IS a forum for Amateur Radio.
>
> Nonetheless those other servies get thier mention as the conversation
> leans that way.
>
> YOU have NOT answered TWO questions:
>
> What "major role" have unlicensed services played in "emergency comms",
>
> And..."Do you ENJOY being proven a liar".
>
> >> > You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
> >> > flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.
> >>
> >> Oh...?!?! How?
> >
> >Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
> >there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
> >would be overloaded and useless.
> >
> >CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???
>
> There is no way that 100 million cellphones could occupy the
> infrastructure at the same time.
>
> As for those 100 million people being on the air at the same time, WHO
> NEEDS THEM?
>
> It has already been proven that a small number of well trained people can
> do a job far more efficeintly and effectively than 10 times thier number of
> UNtrained people.
>
> >> (this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
> >> him to his face...)
> >
> >I'd rather not meet you in person. You scare me.

>
> I should. I expose the true nature of your character, and that's just
> from unravelling your poorly prepared rants in this forum. I can imagine what
> a fool I could make of you in a TRUE public forum.
>
> >So stay away from me.
>
> I imagine that will be no problem...If your in-person stench approximates
> your on-line nature, I will have plenty of time to change my direction of
> travel.
>
> Of course you could find something else to do this May. Judging from the
> character of your posts here, Witless Willy, I imagine you have little
> tolerence for licensed Amateur Radio operators anyway.
>
> >> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
> >> communicate with your cellphone?
> >
> >When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?
>
> I don't. But I CAN open the box, fix the problem, and continue with what
> I was doing.
>
> And if that's impractical, I switch radios.
>
> >> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
> >> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
> >>
> >> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)
> >
> >Is that a threat?
>
> Only "threat(ening)" to your ego, Brain.
>
> I said you don't have the cajones to honestly answer quetions put to you.
>
> Your "response" is to NOT answer the question, and then insinuate my
> assertion of your lack of 'nads" is somehow a threat.
>
> >>> When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
> >> propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
> >> switch to a data mode or SSB.
> >>
> >> So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
> >> ignorance...but you've done THAT well...
> >
> >I said your radio is broke. Switch away for all the good it does you.
>
> And >>I<< said if it breaks, I'll fix it. Amateurs (well...at least SOME
> of us...) know how to do that.

>
> >> > > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
> >> > > role.
> >> >
> >> > Just did.
> >>
> >> No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
> >> supported by a shred of evidence.
> >
> >Yes, I did. You only have one scenario in your head. That scenario
> >is that cell phones won't work in an emergency.
>
> That's the scenario YOU have. I've cired many others. You simply keep
> trying to come back to only one that you think you can legitimately argue.
>
> >> First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
> >> other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
> >> Amateur Radio.
> >
> >Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
> >that cell phones won't be working.
>
> Among others...That is only one part of a very large plan.
>
> And can YOU tell ME that if a major earthquake occured that those services
> would, without question, remain in service?
>
> >Am I wrong?
>
> Usually, yes.
>
> >Will you deny emergency comms to us if we needed them?
>
> Of course.
>
> >> Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
> >> prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".
> >
> >You trained for the Twin Towers attack?
>
> We've trained for a loss of commercial telephone service, regardless of
> how it occurs, Brain.
>
> >Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?
>
> Yep.
>
> >Or did it actually work as actual 9/11 survivors said it worked?
>
> "...actual 9/11 survivors" used their phones prior to the towers falling.

>
> >Most American Citizens are not responding agencies, don't have MOUs,
> >aren't amateur radio operators.
> >
> >What do they use?
> >
> >Cell Phones.
>
> Please tell me, Brain, what SERVICE to all those cellphone carrying
> citizens perform?
>
> They are only calling for thier own needs.
>
> Again, you try to argue the needs of the one as opposed to the meads of the
> many.
>
> >> > Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
> >> > not emergencies.
> >>
> >> Sure they are.
> >>
> >> Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course
> >> not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
> >> come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,
> >> power grids will fail, etc etc etc.
> >>
> >> Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
> >> some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?
> >
> >You got me there. In all of the situations above, how will the
> >average Joe communicate?
>
> Communicate what? "HELP...THERE'S A TORNADOI!"
>
> You try to meld "emergency communications" with "distress calls".
>
> You need to learn the difference, Brain.
>
> >> Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
> >> wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
> >> my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.
> >
> >Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't
> >you?
>
> You're already "in it", Brain.
>
> You deceive, you make allegations you can't/won't substantiate. You
> humiliate yourself by claiming another person, known to be a pathological liar,
> as your "mentor".

>
> There's no "challenge" there. You said these things. I didn't have to
> make this up.
>
> >> Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
> >> attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
> >> documented fact.
> >
> >Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
> >to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
> >answereing machine.
> >
> >He didn't use amateur radio or CW.
>
> No, he didn't. I read those stories too. They were made before the
> Towers fell and the system was still, essentially, in tact.
>
> >> Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
> >> been studying...???
> >
> >You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
> >any use whatsoever in an emergency.
>
> YOU are the person making that allegation, Lennie...I mean Brain...
>
> I have already stated otherwise.
>
> >> I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
> >> served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
> >> camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war
> >> zone with...?!?!
> >
> >Forward location. Not a war zone though the VFW thinks so.
>
> Ahhhhhh....an excuse. I see. OK.
>
> >> Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
> >> organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.
> >
> >Thus, military installations can work with their IMD to set up a BST
> >under MARS. Much better outcome than relying on people who CHOP
> >themselves to the ARC, Salvation Army, County EOC, CAP, Homeless
> >Shelter, Friends of the Library, and Bicycle Rodeos.
>
> And the members of MARS who flesh out those BST's are.....
>
> (1) CB users
>
> (2) FRS/MURS owners
>

> (3) Licensed Amateur Radio operators
>
> ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
>
> >> When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
> >> Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
> >> mitigation exercise in ANY role?
> >
> >I do enough on the job re mitigation.
>
> You mean yo stay out of everyone else's way...?!?!
>
> GOOD FOR YOU!
>
> >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
> played
> >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> >> > >
> >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> >> > > compliant devices?
> >> >
> >> > Sure. Why not?
> >>
> >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> >> played a major role in emergency comms".
> >>
> >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> >> services" playing a "major role".
> >>
> >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
> >>
> >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> >> pertinent examples.
> >>
> >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
> >>
> >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
> >>
> >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
> >>
> >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> >> substantiate.
> >>
> >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
>
> You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single bit

> of it...even facetiously...
>
> Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
> argument and lack of cajones to do so...
>
> Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in disaster
> and/or emergency communications.
>
> So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average calling
> 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
>
> I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in disaster
> mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
>
> Thanks.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
to you.

Billy

1270. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 19:02:46 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <a5fm50d4gd4sahbgkesj55568m2em4huti@4ax.com>
Source record: 89334
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

<snip>
>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>
>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>rights people would love your attitude.

The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".

>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>
>Not if his station is clean.

Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?

>>97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
>>cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>
>That does not apply to RFI, it applies to on-channel stations.

Again, where does it say that?

> IOW no
>ham may deliberately interfere with another licensed service, which
>occupies the same frequency including, but not limited to, 40 meter
>broadcast stations, stations with secondary authorization, or other
>hams etc.

Where did you find that in the rules? I can't find that anywhere. Got a link or
citation?

>>Notice that it doesn't exempt Part 15 devices or Sony televisions, it doesn't
>>release the ham of responsibility just because he tried and failed to prevent
>>the interference, and it doesn't specify where or how that interference occurs.
>
>Because it doesn't apply to RFI.

The law says "interference", doesn't it? Isn't RFI one cause of interferece? Did
you all-of-a-sudden forget that RFI stands for....

..... Radio Frequency Interference?

>And Part 15 itself puts the burden on the device's user when it states
>that "this device must not create harmful interference, and must
>accept any interference, including that which may cause improper
>operation".

Not all Part 15 devices are communication devices, and not all RFI comes from communication devices. Regardless, a television transmitter is -not- a Part 15 device.

>>The fact is that if you know your transmission is interfering with the audio,
>>distorting the picture (distortion = interference, Blackburn v. Doubleday
>>Broadcasting Co., Minn. 1984), or crashing someone's wireless palm-pilot, only
>>YOU are at fault. Sony is not responsible for your transmissions and subsequent
>>interference, nor is Zenith, Motorola, or even the poor schmuck who paid too
>>much for an El Cheapo TV that even picks up his coffee maker.... if you know
>>that you are causing interference, you are legally responsible. Period. But you
>>knew that already, right?
>
>I do not agree with your draconian interpretation. If that were the
>case, practically every ham (or commercial operator) would be forced
>off the air, as a result of RFI complaints.

Hardly! There are PLENTY of hams, probably the vast majority of them, that don't cause interference.

This is pointless. You can make all the excuses you want. Our station will continue to put the kybosh on uncooperative radio operators that cause interference to our signal, regardless of whether they are licensed or not, and we are well within our legal rights to do so. Maybe someday a broadcast station in your locality will take the same course of action as us. And maybe they won't be so nice about it. Like it or not, that's the way it is.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1271. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 19:34:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iNOdnZF1jcap1sbdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89335

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 3/19/2004 6:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>>sense.
>>>
>>>Mike,
>>>
>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>>>license:
>>>
>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>>
>>run
>>
>>>more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need to
>>
>>be
>>
>>>tested on it)
>>
>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>
>
>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>giving the tests are being overburdened?
>
>
> What I am wondering is why everyone wants to set these power levels low to
> avoid testing on questions about SAFETY!

Here is an answer that seems to fit the equation, Steve:

I have noted that many people that are in favor of removing Element 1
from the tests are also in favor of this removal of safety questions, or
whatever gets those tests down to an elementary school level. This is
despite protestations from some that they would NEVER support reductions

like that. My disappointment is immense that I trusted them and that they were inaccurate in their dealings with me. Whatever, I'm sure that means nothing to them.

Drawing from that experience, I can safely conclude that they are willing to chip away at any part of the test that they can, and that no level of simplicity is too simple for them.

And they have no intention of stopping there.

D'Zat work?

> We're talking about requiring some knowledge that might prevent the person
> from hurting himself or others. Why are we so anxious to avoid them..?!?!

Knowledge is BAD!

- Mike KB3EIA

1272. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 19:56:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
> <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>>
>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>>rights people would love your attitude.
>
>
>
> The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
> Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
>
>
>
>
>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>
>>Not if his station is clean.
>
>
>
> Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?

And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?

1273. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 20:35:26 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <vtkm50l2hk6k7u59slp56sm4gmr7su0fi5@4ax.com>
Source record: 89337
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>> <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>>
>> <snip>
>>
>>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>>>
>>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>>>rights people would love your attitude.
>>
>>
>>
>> The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
>> Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".

Just a correction: That should be "essential liberty", as it is in the quote by
B. Franklin.

>>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>>
>>>Not if his station is clean.
>>
>>
>>
>> Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?
>
>And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?

97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
cause interference to any radio communication or signal."

I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But however
unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the interference
that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the category of
'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to play
semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to who is
legally responsible.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1274. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 20:47:27 UTC
From: Beerbarrel Boomer <martydonger400@farkkers.com>
Message-ID: <24f1c$405b5c6e$d1cc5908$16694@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dave Holford" <mylastname@.deletethis.sympatico.ca> wrote in message
news:405B3D38.D9AB6E9E@.deletethis.sympatico.ca...
>
>
> Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
> >
> >
> > Gernsback and Green have/had two things in common.
> > Both sold cleverly veiled bullshit which was *dressed up*
> > as valid future science to geeks, nerds and fools. Modern day
> > PT Barnum's who wrap their circus act in 5-point colored
> > paper. Noorey and Bell do the same thing by giving them
> > and their ilk an occasional microphone today. If they
> > were not in print media or broadcasting, they all most certanly
> > would be selling pre-owned automobiles someplace, or perhaps
> > partners with shady local politicians.
>
>
> Aha, you've been reading his editorials, not his magazines.
> That is the difference between entertainment and information.
>
> Dave

I taped the show last night.
Guess what folks..!

BOTH Wayne and that GOLD PLATED KOOK David
were booted off of the show last night by Noorey!
Seems that Booth did not want to talk about *anything*
and all that Green seemed to want to do was shill for
Booth and his crap for sale. After wasting ONE HOUR of
airtime (..on 500+ AM stations and XM Sat Radio live)
and logging THOUSANDS of listener complain e-mails
that they were cheated, Noorey booted both these
jerks off the program!

BAAAAAAAAAAAAA
HAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!
Just what these two carnival circuis
sideshow barkers needed! Booth made a
total schmuck of himself and Green sat there
grinning like a cheshire cat with a microphone
inserted up it's anus.....all on live AM Radio.

Here's the official release from C to C AM:

Meeting with Lucia?

Returning to the show, precognitive David Booth
was joined by author Wayne Green to ostensibly
discuss his recent meeting with Lucia, witness to
the Miracles of Fatima in 1917. Booth had been
invited to meet with Sister Lucia, presumably
because of the apocalyptic visions he had in
2003.

Booth said he met Sister Lucia, now 97, at a
Carmelite convent in Portugal and held a
private conversation with her for five minutes.
He would only reveal that he was told that
a "new star" that had been prophesized
about would begin to shine. Because Booth
had been booked on the show to discuss
his meeting with Lucia, and refused to elaborate
further upon it, the interview was cut short, and
the last 90 minutes of the program was
reserved for Open Lines.

1275. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 20:59:36 UTC
From: Beerbarrel Boomer <martydonger400@farkkers.com>
Message-ID: <c6ba2$405b5f3b$d1cc5908$16845@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89339
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Here's a repost from alt.fan.art-bell
Says it all VERY WELL!

===== cut here ======

"fc045" <fc045@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:R2A6c.28747$%06.712@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...

Noory finally stands up to the fraud$

Remember when Art Bell tried to scare us shitless by bringing on guests
who
predicted the end of the world then actively
selecting which guests he would label on his fraud "list" he would never
have on his show again? He continually
ditched guests and "friends" in a lame attempt to bring integrity to the
show yet only interested in saving his own butt. Things
came to a head when he spooked the Heaven's Gate cult members to kill
themselves. Art was never the wildly alarmist
hit-and-runner like his guests, at least apparently. Whitley Shitter and
Ed
Damn-you-all-to-h*ll we all know are on his team.
They write "collaborative" books like bargian trash bin "superstorm" and
call themselves prophets vs. the "mainstream" media.
Then Art tells them to shut up on end of the world ultimatims and even
Dames
relented that his death prophecies could with .00000001%
chance be "averted" with enough "positive" thinking by Coast listeners.

First there was Nigel Cawler or someone who couldn't come up with the UFO
landing specifics, and Art got "impatient" and knocked him
off after the break in 1996. Follow up to the heady days with the Hale
Bopp
"companion" kept people awake with deathwatch pulses. Then
Art dumped the Reverse Speech guy. Courtney Brown was next. Later on it
was
the guy who lit "flares" in the nevada desert where an old lady in
a wheelchair had traveled there spending hundreds of dollars to see a UFO.

Finally, Noory couldn't stand it anymore. Night after night, he had to
have
the frauds sell their books and videos and make excuses for them.
And now he finally broke with "Wayne Greene" and the "vision-1979" man
tonight-morning. What a schmuck the vision man is saying 97% of
the world's population is going to die in Sept. (read 5.9+ billion people

wasted just like that). If vision-man cared so much for humanity
why doesn't he just offer his information free on his website? At least
put
up a pay-pal donation option like Hoaxland does now.

At least Hoaxland is entertaining. And he's quick on his feet especially
with the scientific stuff. Hoaxie should be a NASA administrator instead
of the lazybum desk pushers in charge of NASA now.

But all the other "end of the world" pushers of their video and books, I'd
say Noory continue and throw them all out if Art won't do it.

(10 million listeners. If only .01% scared shitless listeners bought into
the bunk, that's 1000 people who buy $20-$100 books or video tapes
making a hefty $20,000-$100,000 from 1 night of advertising! This must go
through every bullshitters mind who's lucky or glib enough to
get a guest spot on C2C. No wonder Noory has to reign it in finally. C2C
has
become whose the best bullshitter who can come up with the
best spiel and promote books/tapes so listeners can "learn more". C2C has
become the "Who wants to be a millionare" of the airwaves, or
any of thos "reality" shows which always feature a lame $100,000+ prize at
the end of the season.

------- cut here ------

"Dave Holford" <mylastname@.deletethis.sympatico.ca> wrote in message
news:405B3D38.D9AB6E9E@.deletethis.sympatico.ca...
>
>
> Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
> >
> >
> > Gernsback and Green have/had two things in common.
> > Both sold cleverly veiled bullshit which was *dressed up*
> > as valid future science to geeks, nerds and fools. Modern day
> > PT Barnum's who wrap their circus act in 5-point colored
> > paper. Noorey and Bell do the same thing by giving them
> > and their ilk an occasional microphone today. If they
> > were not in print media or broadcasting, they all most certanly
> > would be selling pre-owned automobiles someplace, or perhaps
> > partners with shady local politicians.
>
>
> Aha, you've been reading his editorials, not his magazines.
> That is the difference between entertainment and information.
>
> Dave

1276. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 22:08:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89340
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:vtkm50l2hk6k7u59slp56sm4gmr7su0fi5@4ax.com...
> In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:
>
> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >
> >> In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
> >> <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
> >>
> >> <snip>
> >>
> >>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to
1.
> >>>
> >>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
> >>>rights people would love your attitude.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound
like
> >> Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
>
>
> Just a correction: That should be "essential liberty", as it is in the
quote by
> B. Franklin.
>
>
> >>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or
television signal,
> >>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
> >>>
> >>>Not if his station is clean.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like
that?
> >
> >And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
>

>
> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere
with or
> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>
> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But
however
> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the
interference
> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the
category of
> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to
play
> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to
who is
> legally responsible.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

I have been following the arguement with interest. Are you saying that no matter what the reason for the alleged interference, that if the ham knows he is interfering, then it is the hams fault?

Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.

Dan/W4NTI

1277. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 22:25:22 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com>
Source record: 89341
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:vtkm50l2hk6k7u59slp56sm4gmr7su0fi5@4ax.com...
>> In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>wrote:
>>
>> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> >
>> >> In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>> >> <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> <snip>
>> >>
>> >>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to
>1.
>> >>>
>> >>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>> >>>rights people would love your attitude.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound
>like
>> >> Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
>>
>>
>> Just a correction: That should be "essential liberty", as it is in the
>quote by
>> B. Franklin.
>>
>>
>> >>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or
>television signal,
>> >>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>> >>>
>> >>>Not if his station is clean.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like
```

>that?
>> >
>> >And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
>>
>>
>> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere
>with or
>> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>>
>> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But
>however
>> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the
>interference
>> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the
>category of
>> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to
>play
>> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to
>who is
>> legally responsible.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
>I have been following the arguement with interest. Are you saying that no
>matter what the reason for the alleged interference, that if the ham knows
>he is interfering, then it is the hams fault?

That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the rules. And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the amateur radio service.

>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.

Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule say, "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver is suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have explained the reasons why to the point of excess.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1278. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 23:09:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040319180934.11022.00004796@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 89342

In article <APmdnYHQg7CQrcbdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>>claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
>> "11 meters" is not at 465 MHz. :-)
>
>There was a band at that frequency that citizens could apply for and
>use, thus a "citizens band" or "cb".

It was called the "citizens radio service" even back then, and the 465 MHz
allocations were referred to as Class A and Class B citizens' band - or cb.
(One class was voice and the other was radio control). When the 27 MHz
allocations were authorized, they were known as Class C and Class D cb.

CB was already more than a decade old in 1958.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1279. Amateur radio operator only and not Superman

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 23:30:36 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <6f930330732f06709f549b78ff64ee14@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 89343

You will not save Earth with your
transceiver and your ridiculous CW.

In the last days, the Sun became a
red giant star will burn all on Earth
that will finally explode and will
became dust as it was before. Amen

Memento homo, quia pulvis est, et in
pulverum reverteris ...

1280. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:05:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191605.495ae5e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89344

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<H_6dnXnumbCDx8fd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
> >>>any use whatsoever in an emergency.
> >>
> >>For handling official emergency traffic they are not of any use, that is
> >>why the military and civil officials dismiss them completely from their
> >>emergency planning. They do include ham radio.
> >>
> >>
> > Lemme see.
> >
> > Emergency planners have cell phones tagged to their belts, right?
>
> Sure they do,

Hmmm? wonder why?

> but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
> pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
> the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.

They do, huh? So rather than flipping open their cell phone and
stating "dial EOC," they race back to the EOC and invoke a 100% recall
of emergency responders without even trying their cell.

> > Emergency planners don't have ham radio tagged to their belts, right?
>
> If they are licensed hams they might have.

And the chances of that are?

They probably have a greater chance of gettin thru on their cell
phones than they do being licensed.

Why would they if they were
> not licensed?

They would have an amateur hooked to their belt keying the PTT button.

Face it billyboy, for the real comms needed in an
> emergency situation, the cell network is not considered by emergency
> officials to be of use, they do consider ham radio.

Yet they wouldn't be w/o that cell on their hip. Wonder why?

1281. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:09:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191609.2d43e810@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89345

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
> >>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
> >>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
> >>>people. You do the math.
> >>
> >>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
> >
> >
> > Stop right there.
> >
> > In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?
>
> As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
> emergency comms... a big *yes*.

Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?

You paint with a broad brush and without authority.

That makes it grafitti.

1282. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:14:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191614.540c796b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89346

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319031245.06889.00000012@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> But I wonder how he'd react to reading posts written by a like-named
> person who tries to embellish his military "career" by associating himself with
> men who were KIA 3 years before you were in the Armed Forces...?!?!

It isn't called the "Armed Forces" for nothing. It is the nature of
what we do that associates us with KIA.

1283. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:16:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191616.2a113a7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89347

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319030838.06889.00000011@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: Leo nomail@noway.com
> >Date: 3/18/2004 5:18 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <nbbk50d2ou3ut3ium16tbb2ni2rc01h07f@4ax.com>
> >
> >On 18 Mar 2004 20:29:09 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> >> Maybe the Blue Angels will perform a fly-over and aerobatic
> >> demonstration at the conclusion? If so, find out who is one
> >> of the Solo pilots. That name may come as a surprise. :-)
> >
> >That would be Maj. Len Anderson, USMC.
> >
> >A relative, perhaps?
>
> I know two "Len Anderson"'s here in SE Tennessee...
>
> Thankfully, both of them are responsible, thoughtful men of reputable
> character.
>
> Unlike the "Len Anderson" who posts to RRAP.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I know only one Steve Roberson and he's nuts.

1284. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:17:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191617.6371ff74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89348

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<W5t6c.13475$t16.7836040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403181811.1afa8302@posting.google.com...
> > Put 100 million amateurs on our bands and you think you can get a
> > message thru?
> >
>
> You are obviously unaware that in an emergency, the government can and does
> declare designated frequencies off limits to general usage for the duration
> of that emergency.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

That is correct. They would likely put amateurs off the air.

1285. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:21:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191621.78d5d75a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89349

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
>
> > But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by Amateur
> > Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other services
> > of having to worry about that.
>
> Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
> relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
> relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
> radio.
> Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
> military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
> communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.

JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
trained.

I am available should the need arise.

I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.

Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
made on emergency communications.

1286. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:24:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191624.3f093566@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89350

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319102154.17665.00000024@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO
> >NPRM ON BPL
> >From: Steve Stone spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net
> >Date: 3/19/2004 7:31 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <MPG.1ac4c023d687e6ff9898d7@news.frontiernet.net>
> >
> >Here is another clip for you from a newspaper:
> >
> >
> >
> >Tuesday, March 2, 2004
> >
> >Cinergy plugs in as Web provider
> >Power lines set to carry Internet to outlet near you
> >
> >By Mike Boyer
> >The Cincinnati Enquirer
> >
> >A unit of Cinergy Corp. today will become the nation's first electric utility
> >to offer high-
> >speed Internet service to customers via its power lines, turning every
> >electrical outlet in
> >homes or offices into a Web connection.
>
> Uh oh......
>
> I wonder how long it will take some idiot to read that and then try to
> plug thier line feed to the AC directly...?!?! =)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What idiot would even think such a thing?

1287. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 00:27:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403191627.3c994d9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89401

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319101832.17665.00000023@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> No...becasue that blithering idiot likes to make up his OWN rules as he
> goes in order to vindicate his rants.
>
> He's a fool, Brain, and you're his bagboy. What does that say about
> you...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What do posts like this say about you?

Three words come to mind: Rude, Obnoxious, Nuts.

1288. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:08:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <sO2dnYjiP7UCB8bd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89402

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>
> But even MORE unfortuntate for YOU, Your Scumminess, is that YOU and YOU
> ALONE keep trying to use the Northridge Earthquake as some "evidence" that
> Amateur Radio is of no value in an emergency. That was ONE event in over 90
> years of archived Amateur histroy.

In which it has been documented many times over that ninety years of the
valuable service Amateur Radio has provided.

1289. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:12:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Ge-dnVMLiNsBBsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89403
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>
>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>>><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>>>
>>><snip>
>>>
>>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>>>>
>>>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>>>>rights people would love your attitude.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
>>>Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
>
>
>
> Just a correction: That should be "essential liberty", as it is in the quote by
> B. Franklin.
>
>
>
>>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>>>
>>>>Not if his station is clean.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?
>>
>>And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
>
>
>

> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>
> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But however
> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the interference
> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the category of
> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to play
> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to who is
> legally responsible.

If the ham's station is clean and the interference is caused by the
device being interfered with due to poor design or a device that is not
supposed to pick up radio waves, the ham has no legal responsibility. It
is the responsibity of the owner of the device to fix the problem.

1290. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:16:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%XM6c.13836$t16.7985069@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:vtkm50l2hk6k7u59slp56sm4gmr7su0fi5@4ax.com...
> In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
wrote:
>
> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But
however
> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the
interference
> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the
category of
> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to
play
> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to
who is
> legally responsible.
>

The ham radio frequencies are not the same frequencies as commercial radio and television. If the ham's signal is clean, then any device that is disrupted by that signal is incorrectly acting as a receiver of what should be out of band for that receiver. It's not interference when the commercial TV or radio receiver picks up signals that it should not be able to receive.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1291. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:20:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <D%M6c.503$V66.259@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89405
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get
> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> >news:vtkm50l2hk6k7u59slp56sm4gmr7su0fi5@4ax.com...
> >> In <G46dnRx0V7M8zMbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> >wrote:
> >>
> >> >Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
> >> >> <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> <snip>
> >> >>
> >> >>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000
to
> >1.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
> >> >>>rights people would love your attitude.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you
sound
> >like
> >> >> Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
> >>
> >>
> >> Just a correction: That should be "essential liberty", as it is in the
> >quote by
> >> B. Franklin.
> >>
> >>
> >> >>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or
> >television signal,
> >> >>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
> >> >>>

> >> >>>Not if his station is clean.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything
like
> >that?
> >> >
> >> >And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
> >>
> >>
> >> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously
interfere
> >with or
> >> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
> >>
> >> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But
> >however
> >> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the
> >interference
> >> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the
> >category of
> >> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to
> >play
> >> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to
> >who is
> >> legally responsible.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> >> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> >> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
> >
> >I have been following the arguement with interest. Are you saying that
no
> >matter what the reason for the alleged interference, that if the ham
knows
> >he is interfering, then it is the hams fault?
>
>
> That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
rules.
> And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
> amateur radio service.
>

>
> >Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>
>
> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
say,
> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
is
> suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
explained
> the reasons why to the point of excess.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

I don't have the FCC comments in front of me. Since you are the blowhard here I'll let you find them. But sometime back, and I don't remember how far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically told the manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most' cases the receiving equipment was at fault.

So, I am sure you will rant and rave, but I am not going to do your research. I highly recommend you do so. And quite showing your ignorance.

If you were in my neighborhood I assure you I would fight your silly little broadcast is superior crap.

Dan/W4NTI

1292. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:21:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319202143.02537.00003564@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89409

In article <APmdnYHQg7CQrcbdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> TAFKARJ claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
>> "11 meters" is not at 465 MHz. :-)
>
>There was a band at that frequency that citizens could apply for and
>use, thus a "citizens band" or "cb".

Only two of the original four Citizens Band Radio Service classes
survive.

"Class C" CB evolved into Radio Control as shown in Part 95,
Title 47 C.F.R. That Radio Control Radio Service also achieved
its own band in the 72 MHz region, now favored by modelers
instead of the 27 MHz fixed frequencies.

"Class D," originally only 23 fixed frequencies on the old amateur
11 meter band, was expanded to 40 fixed frequencies several
years ago. "CB radios" now are all considered to be THE CB.

"Class A" and "Class B" CB, both on UHF, were deallocated
and eliminated from U.S. regulations back before "CB" was
expanded from 23 to 40 channels.

"Class C" and "Class D" CB was created in 1958 by the FCC.
That was over 45 years ago. I read about that first in 1958 in
Popular Electronics magazine during lunchbreak at Ramo-
Wooldridge Corporation in El Segundo, CA.

>>>Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
>>>there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
>>>would be overloaded and useless.
>>>
>>>CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???
>
>And that is exactly why the cell network is useless for official
>emergency comms, every cell user wants to dial up twenty of their
>closest friends and tell them to turn on the tee-vee, overloading the
>network. The military and civil autorities do not consider the cell
>network a viable means of emergency comms, they do for ham radio.

The military have their own radios. Those work very well and
in environments far harsher than most "emergencies."

Civil authorities have their own radios. Public Safety Radio
Services include police, fire department, and medical services.
Those are backed-up with emergency electrical power at
base stations and are already networked.

Real emergency organizations consider ALL forms of
communications to be viable and will use anything that survives
a real emergency. They plan for that, train for that, and work
with the infrastructure of existing radios and landlines.

The best source of what happened aboard the "fourth plane"
on 11 Sep 01 came from passengers' and crews' cell phones.
Hijackers had taken over regular aircraft communications
devices in the cockpit. No ham radio was on board to do
anything in that Very Real emergency.

In the Pentagon Attack area during 11 Sep 01, military and
civilian communications was handled by existing military
and civilian communications means...a part of that was by
cell phone although most of it was by VHF and UHF HTs.
No ham radio was used in fire control or rescue work then.

In the WTC Attack during 11 Sep 01, the NYC Emergency
Communications Center (in an adjacent building) was largely
destroyed by falling debris, also severing many trunk lines
of the telephone system. NYC police and fire units did work-
arounds using their own radios in a relay system to several
centrals, calling in other agencies as well as special units to
help. Some cell phone service did work, regardless of myth to
the contrary and some wired phone service still worked, used
by almost anyone on the WTC Attack scene. Amateur radio
did not play any significant part (if any at all) during the few
hours after the Attack on the WTC.

>>>> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
>>>>communicate with your cellphone?
>>>
>>>When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?
>>
>> He THROWS it? :-)
>
>Which one, I have several, what are the odds they are all down at the
>same time? How many cell phones do you have?

Since neither you nor your equipment is identified and we don't
know the working status of your "several" radios, the above is
just a brag claim of no intrinsic value.

>>>Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
>>>that cell phones won't be working.
>>>
>>>Am I wrong?
>

>As far as using the cell network for official emergency comms, you can
>consider it not working. In times of a major emergency it becomes
>useless for anything but attempting to make a call.

That is a popular myth but it remains only a myth.

The cellular telephone network is part of the telephone infrastructure
and is intimately connected with the local exchange's switching unit.
That switching unit is designed to handle only a fraction of installed
numbers, both wireline and cell phone. But the switch itself is also
backed up by battery supplies "riding on" the primary power; also
true for cell sites themselves.

During any sudden event there WILL be a flurry of telephone calls
made and that MAY overtax the limited number-handling capability
of the switch. The probability of overload is in inverse relationship
to the suddenness of the event. The overload, if any, does NOT
last indefinitely. Such an overload is also dependent on the
telephone exchange and subscriber services arrangement. Note:
Not all subscribers are routed through the switch but may be direct
to some PBX-equivalent.

The onset of an earthquake is sudden, as yet not predictable. That
will guarantee an overload of telephone switches as worried,
distraught subscribers seek information and reassurance.

The onset of the 11 Sep 01 Attack by four hijacked airliners was not
only sudden but unprecedented, without any possible warning. The
subsequent crash of two airliners into the WTC towers did destroy a
portion of the lower Manhattan telephone system wiring but did NOT
destroy or disable the entire Manhattan telephone infrastructure.

The onset of a fire storm, typically in dry open country, is not sudden
and may take literal days from ignition start to reaching fire storm
conditions. There is plenty of warning time using conventional
communications means to begin fighting that.

Hurricanes are known and predicted from NOAA tracking, allow days
for all in the path to prepare. Again, communications may be done
by conventional means. Tornados are more sudden but allow hours
of preparation from first sighting. Storm and flood conditions allow
hours to days of preparation, again using conventional
communications to effect that.

Whenever conventional communications means survive any
emergency, those will be used. If from nothing else, their availability
such as with cellular telephones (at least 100 Million in the USA).

Regardless of the popular myth, the telephone system in the USA
has remained viable and grown in two decades that include several
earthquakes, several hurricanes, several tornados, several fire
storms, several floodings and storms...and the 11 Sep 01 Attack
On America from three hijacked airliners deliberately crashed into

buildings. It remains working.

There is no reported evidence of amateur radio ever stopping an earthquake, hurricane, tornado, flood, storm, or aircraft hijacking.

LHA / WMD

1293. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:21:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319202144.02537.00003565@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89406

In article <n_WdnVjVNMTfdsfdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> My apologies, most noble of high rank amateurdom.
>
> No need to apologize, Len. Thanks for the clarification.

Tis' grateful we are yer lardship and bid ya a foine day ridin'
off on yer foine horse. 'Ave a good day.

LHA / WMD

1294. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:21:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319202145.02537.00003566@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89407

In article <1e4e3692.0403190549.29912bc2@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!
>
>Impossible. I own a copy of Part 97 and it fills the space of one
>small book.

I have all five volumes of Title 47 C.F.R., soft-cover, printed by
the U.S. Government Printing Office. Part 97 is one of the
smaller sections in the 5th volume.

There are several USGPO branch outlets in major urban centers
and will take orders for publications over the phone, accepting
major credit card payment. USPS regular surface delivery is
free on order shipment.

>> Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
>> regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
>> more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
>> detriment.
>
>Because Amateur Radio exists in a parallel universe where conventional
>laws of physics do not apply.

The sad part is that some, like Robeson, perceive U.S. amateur radio
only in terms of their own involvement. Further, he demands some
kind of "rule by tenure and involvement" (similar to a kind of ancient
tribal leadership by brawn and bravado) solely by the participants.

Robeson reacts in the typical "military syndrome" of absolute pride
in "his outfit" and assumes some kind of officer or NCO rank above
others, demanding uncompromising obeyance to his "orders." If
there is objection to what he says, he goes into the abusive nature
of typical NCOs whipping the troops into line.

The problem is that U.S. amateur radio is NOT a military service
nor even a paramilitary service. It is basically a hobby, a
recreational activity involving radio. It is, by default, a hobby
because federal regulations forbid monetary compensation for
any radio communications rendered.

There is the common thread among the "tribal rule" individuals that
no one unlicensed in amateur radio can possibly know anything
about amateur radio, therefore they should be silent. Preposterous
since U.S. amateur radio activity is widely publicized (among those
who care to find out) and federal regulations forbid any secrecy in

amateur communications.

No one on the staff of the FCC or the Commissioners themselves are required to have any amateur radio licenses, yet the FCC has the lawful duty to regulate amateur radio and mitigate interference matters, up to and including imposing fines and calling on U.S. Marshals to arrest extreme miscreants. That rather destroys their concept that "only other amateurs can tell them what to do."

Amateur radios operate by exactly the same physics as radios in all other radio services. Propagation of radio waves occurs in exactly the same way as for all other radio services. There are no exceptions despite some odd ideas and strange misconceptions among certain radio amateurs.

It is impossible to rationally discuss anything with certain people (such as Robeson) since they are too emotionally-driven and too prideful in their concept of their personal hobby involvement. They must - absolutely - have their way or all are treated to personally abusive remarks from them.

The above is representative of their non-reasoning in demanding a morse code test for all new amateurs...pure emotional basis on what they had to endure long ago (and probably resent).

LHA / WMD

1295. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:21:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319202147.02537.00003567@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89408

In article <ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>William wrote:
>
>> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<H_6dnXnumbCDx8fd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>>
>>>William wrote:
>>>
>>>>You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
>>>>any use whatsoever in an emergency.
>>>
>>>For handling official emergency traffic they are not of any use, that is
>>>why the military and civil officials dismiss them completely from their
>>>emergency planning. They do include ham radio.
>>
>> Lemme see.
>>
>> Emergency planners have cell phones tagged to their belts, right?
>
>Sure they do, but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
>pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
>the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.

Not always true.

You want to select the 11 September 2001 Attack on America as
a typical emergency but that was a very UNtypical emergency
that no one could foresee or plan for. In the "9/11" incident ALL
methods of communications were strained.

There are NO verifiable stories about amateur radio doing anything
to aid anyone in the first few hours of the Attack in New York City
on 11 Sep 01. Conversely, even though the NYC Emergency
Center was almost destroyed in that Attack, police and fire
department personnel were in constant communications before and
immediately after the Attack in and around the World Trade Center.
Add to that the medical people, NYC officials, and various utilities
and other businesses who got into immediate action. All of that is
quite well documented in many and various media outside of
hobby groups.

>> Emergency planners don't have ham radio tagged to their belts, right?
>
>If they are licensed hams they might have. Why would they if they were

>not licensed? Face it billyboy, for the real comms needed in an
>emergency situation, the cell network is not considered by emergency
>officials to be of use, they do consider ham radio.

"Officials" who have already been through emergencies of many kinds consider and plan for ANY kind of communications in ANY kind of emergency or disaster situation.

A case in point is the "other" "9/11" Attack on the Pentagon in DC. A year prior to the "9/11" Attack, the internal HVAC and utilities communications and control system of that very large (horizontally) structure were modified to allow selected sections to be isolated, cut off from the main systems in order to minimize fire damage. That system got a very real test on 11 Sep 01 and proved to be good. Pentagon damage was confined to the immediate quintant (?, one-fifth) with no spread beyond the aircraft crash point. After-crash fire control and search and rescue was coordinated by on-site military and civilian communications, not by amateur radio.

In the largely forgotten "fourth aircraft" incident on 11 Sep 04, we have become familiar with the phrase "Let's [rock and] Roll!" that was transmitted over a cellular telephone from the hijacked airliner passenger cabin by a passenger. A stewardess' cell phone call from that fourth hijacked plane has been recorded by the media and played several times in broadcasts. Since the hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane, the only available means of communications for the passengers was by cell phone. Those calls got through. There are no viable reports of amateur radio being used while that most definite emergency situation was happening.

The "9/11" Attack is popular to espouse because of the enormous emotional impact to all Americans. But, it was an ATTACK done by other humans against all of us and definitely NOT some kind of natural event emergency or disaster. The "kamikazi" nature of this suicide attack was NOT anticipated by anyone and all were in surprise and all had to work through the immediate aftermath with whatever reseources were available.

"Radio" (as in two-way transceivers) doesn't exist in just cell phones and ham rigs. There are - literally - hundreds of thousands of radios existing now and in all the government and commercial infra-structures. All of those hundreds of thousands of infrastructure radios are available NOW and already networked. Those are and will continue to be primary radio communications means in the real emergencies that have been and are expected to happen in the future. The secondary means are a mixture of infrastructure fall-back planning and private-use radios, principally utility, business, and other commercial radio services. Amateur radio is in the tertiary level lumped in with CB, FRS, GMRS, and other private radios...seldom organized to work with primary and secondary levels and not depended upon as reliable for anything but health

and welfare (psychological reassurance) messaging for victims
after an emergency has occurred.

It does no good to express outrage and perceived insult the radios
in an essentially-recreational activity isn't venerated or rewarded
for exaggerated tales of heroism and good deeds. That only shows
an emotional instability that refuses to consider the vast infra-
structure of communications that exists and is robust enough to
have survived many disasters and emergencies of the past.

If cell phones work in some future emergency, they WILL be used.
There are just too many of them, the cell infrastructure too large to
overlook them. Public Service radios are already organized and
backed up, networked, planned, trained to work in emergency
conditions. Those will bear the brunt of future emergency
communications as they have successfully in the past. In the USA
there exist many and varied wired and fiber communications means,
locally to nationally...plus a variety of frequencies, modes, and
methods already in-place with the military and national guards
units, able to use equipment designed and proven to work through
the harshest of all enviornments: Warfare. Everything that can
work is useable and has been used, emergency planners and
coordinators already well aware of what is available and reliable.

This isn't the 1920s when "radio" was not widespread nor
technologically advanced, suitable only for some broadcasting
and on-off keying mode communications. This is 80 years later,
over three generations of time, and "radios" are numerous in the
governmental and commercial infrastructure. It would be best to
stop the self-perceived outrage at your hobby being slighted to
educate yourself on the entire world of "radio," what is there and
how it is being used and planned-for in real emergencies.

LHA / WMD

1296. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:21:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040319202151.02537.00003568@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89410

In article <1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/18/2004 7:58 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181758.30548e16@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0403170723.3c9af805@posting.google.com>...
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0403111948.f46909f@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0403110255.9c867ab@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0403101635.3b820e5d@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0403100839.23ab4702@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0403091814.7a55a1ae@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> >> > You sure seemed to be doing a good job of it above. Thanks for coming
>> >> > clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones have played a huge
>> >> > role in emergency response communications.
>> >>
>> >> Here you go with putting words in other peoples post,
>> >> MiniLennie...
>> >>
>> >> I DID NOT say they play a "huge role". They are important, but
>> >> thier loss of service is a contingency planned for. So is the loss of
>> >> the commercial and public service systems. Those plans include using
>> >> Amateur Radio as a stop-gap.
>> >>
>> >> Can you/do you refute this?
>> >
>> >Yes, I can.
>> >
>> >Quoting Lean:
>> >
>> >"Alun, according to the Census Bureau's data as of 2003, there are 100
>> >million cellular telephone subscriptions in the USA. That's about one
>> >for every three citizens. Rather large "spread," I'd say.

>>
>> This is no proof, Brain.
>>
>> SHOW ME where those UNLICENSED SERVICES are USED in playing a MAJOR
>ROLE
>> (your choice of adjectives) in "emergency comms".
>>
>>
>> >> Brain, WHY do you insist on making assertions that ANYONE who
>> >> might care to research can find out are so blatantly false?
>> >>
>> >> Do you ENJOY being proven a liar?
>> >
>> >Why do you leave out other forms of cummunications???
>>
>> I haven't.
>>
>> We have been discussing AMATEUR RADIO'S role in emergency
>communications,
>> since this IS a forum for Amateur Radio.
>>
>> Nonetheless those other servies get thier mention as the conversation
>> leans that way.
>>
>> YOU have NOT answered TWO questions:
>>
>> What "major role" have unlicensed services played in "emergency
>comms",
>>
>> And..."Do you ENJOY being proven a liar".
>>
>> >> > You're simply wrong on that one. Amateur radio does not offer the
>> >> > flexibility and utility that cellular telephones provide.
>> >>
>> >> Oh...?!?! How?
>> >
>> >Because if there were 100 million amateur licensees in America like
>> >there are 100 million cellular telephone subscriptions, our bands
>> >would be overloaded and useless.
>> >
>> >CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW???
>>
>> There is no way that 100 million cellphones could occupy the
>> infrastructure at the same time.
>>
>> As for those 100 million people being on the air at the same time, WHO
>> NEEDS THEM?
>>
>> It has already been proven that a small number of well trained people
>can

>> do a job far more efficeintly and effectively than 10 times thier number of
>> UNtrained people.
>>
>> >> (this guy IS an idiot...Hope I get to see him at Dayton and tell
>> >> him to his face...)
>> >
>> >I'd rather not meet you in person. You scare me.
>>
>> I should. I expose the true nature of your character, and that's just
>> from unravelling your poorly prepared rants in this forum. I can imagine
>what
>> a fool I could make of you in a TRUE public forum.
>>
>> >So stay away from me.
>>
>> I imagine that will be no problem...If your in-person stench
>approximates
>> your on-line nature, I will have plenty of time to change my direction of
>> travel.
>>
>> Of course you could find something else to do this May. Judging from
>the
>> character of your posts here, Witless Willy, I imagine you have little
>> tolerence for licensed Amateur Radio operators anyway.
>>
>> >> When the cellsite is down, unaccessable, or overloaded, HOW do you
>> >> communicate with your cellphone?
>> >
>> >When your ham radio is broke, how do you communicate with it?
>>
>> I don't. But I CAN open the box, fix the problem, and continue with
>what
>> I was doing.
>>
>> And if that's impractical, I switch radios.
>>
>> >> > Challenges, challenges, challenges! That's a part of your problem,
>> >> > Don Quixoterobeson. Always making challenges.
>> >>
>> >> So far, Putz, you've not been up to ANY challenge. (no cajones)
>> >
>> >Is that a threat?
>>
>> Only "threat(ening)" to your ego, Brain.
>>
>> I said you don't have the cajones to honestly answer quetions put to
>you.
>>
>> Your "response" is to NOT answer the question, and then insinuate my
>> assertion of your lack of 'nads" is somehow a threat.

>>
>> >>> When the repeater is down, I can switch to simplex...When the
>> >> propagation is bad, I can switch bands...If FM is inappropriate, I can
>> >> switch to a data mode or SSB.
>> >>
>> >> So far, Brain, you've not proved anything except your
>> >> ignorance...but you've done THAT well...
>> >
>> >I said your radio is broke. Switch away for all the good it does you.
>>
>> And >>I<< said if it breaks, I'll fix it. Amateurs (well...at least
>SOME
>> of us...) know how to do that.
>>
>> >> > > Please DISPROVE >>ANYTHING<< I have said about Amateur Radio's
>> >> > > role.
>> >> >
>> >> > Just did.
>> >>
>> >> No, you've not. You have made a foolish assertion that is NOT
>> >> supported by a shred of evidence.
>> >
>> >Yes, I did. You only have one scenario in your head. That scenario
>> >is that cell phones won't work in an emergency.
>>
>> That's the scenario YOU have. I've cired many others. You simply
>keep
>> trying to come back to only one that you think you can legitimately argue.
>>
>> >> First of all I have not "ommited" anything. I have discussed
>> >> other services on many occassions...It happens THIS is a forum on
>> >> Amateur Radio.
>> >
>> >Your emergency plan scenario that you are acting out this weekend is
>> >that cell phones won't be working.
>>
>> Among others...That is only one part of a very large plan.
>>
>> And can YOU tell ME that if a major earthquake occured that those
>services
>> would, without question, remain in service?
>>
>> >Am I wrong?
>>
>> Usually, yes.
>>
>> >Will you deny emergency comms to us if we needed them?
>>
>> Of course.
>>

>> >> Those of us who are actually involved in these types of activities
>> >> prepare in advance for these issues. It's called "TRAINING".
>> >
>> >You trained for the Twin Towers attack?
>>
>> We've trained for a loss of commercial telephone service, regardless
>of
>> how it occurs, Brain.
>>
>> >Did your exercise scenario shut down the cell system?
>>
>> Yep.
>>
>> >Or did it actually work as actual 9/11 survivors said it worked?
>>
>> "...actual 9/11 survivors" used their phones prior to the towers
>falling.
>>
>> >Most American Citizens are not responding agencies, don't have MOUs,
>> >aren't amateur radio operators.
>> >
>> >What do they use?
>> >
>> >Cell Phones.
>>
>> Please tell me, Brain, what SERVICE to all those cellphone carrying
>> citizens perform?
>>
>> They are only calling for thier own needs.
>>
>> Again, you try to argue the needs of the one as opposed to the meads of
>the
>> many.
>>
>> >> > Unless your emergencies are always predictable, in which case they are
>> >> > not emergencies.
>> >>
>> >> Sure they are.
>> >>
>> >> Can anyone say exactly WHEN an emergency will occur? Of course
>> >> not! But I know, with unfaltering certainty, that tornadoes will
>> >> come, rivers will flood, buildings will burn, aircraft will crash,
>> >> power grids will fail, etc etc etc.
>> >>
>> >> Are YOU saying that these events, which we KNOW will occur at
>> >> some time, are NOT emergencies simply becasue we know they occur?
>> >
>> >You got me there. In all of the situations above, how will the
>> >average Joe communicate?
>>

>> Communicate what? "HELP...THERE'S A TORNADOI!"
>>
>> You try to meld "emergency communications" with "distress calls".
>>
>> You need to learn the difference, Brain.
>>
>> >> Put in the spot of being asked to validate his assertions, he
>> >> wants to play silly sandlot games. OK... That pretty well validates
>> >> my assessment of him....Brian Burke is a coward.
>> >
>> >Sounds like more challenges. You really want to get into it, don't
>> >you?
>>
>> You're already "in it", Brain.
>>
>> You deceive, you make allegations you can't/won't substantiate. You
>> humiliate yourself by claiming another person, known to be a pathological
>liar,
>> as your "mentor".
>>
>> There's no "challenge" there. You said these things. I didn't have
>to
>> make this up.
>>
>> >> Cellphones were nearly USELESS in the initial stages of the
>> >> attacks in NYC due to overload and loss of cell sites. This is
>> >> documented fact.
>> >
>> >Nope. Lots of people used their cell phones. One even used his phone
>> >to call home and leave a goodbye message to his wife on their
>> >answereing machine.
>> >
>> >He didn't use amateur radio or CW.
>>
>> No, he didn't. I read those stories too. They were made before the
>> Towers fell and the system was still, essentially, in tact.
>>
>> >> Why are you being an idiot? Was this a birth defect, or have you
>> >> been studying...???
>> >
>> >You just cannot bring yourself to say that cellular telephones have
>> >any use whatsoever in an emergency.
>>
>> YOU are the person making that allegation, Lennie...I mean Brain...
>>
>> I have already stated otherwise.
>>
>> >> I can remember the names of every commanding officer or OIC I
>> >> served under in the USMC going back to my Series Commander in boot
>> >> camp in 1974. You can't pony-up a name of a guy you served in a war

>> >> zone with...?!?!
>> >
>> >Forward location. Not a war zone though the VFW thinks so.
>>
>> Ahhhhhh....an excuse. I see. OK.
>>
>> >> Yes, there are. And they still depend on Amateur Radio
>> >> organizations to fill essential billets in EOC's.
>> >
>> >Thus, military installations can work with their IMD to set up a BST
>> >under MARS. Much better outcome than relying on people who CHOP
>> >themselves to the ARC, Salvation Army, County EOC, CAP, Homeless
>> >Shelter, Friends of the Library, and Bicycle Rodeos.
>>
>> And the members of MARS who flesh out those BST's are.....
>>
>> (1) CB users
>>
>> (2) FRS/MURS owners
>>
>> (3) Licensed Amateur Radio operators
>>
>> ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
>>
>> >> When was the last time YOU were in an EOC as a functionary,
>> >> Brain? When was the last time you participated in ANY disaster
>> >> mitigation exercise in ANY role?
>> >
>> >I do enough on the job re mitigation.
>>
>> You mean yo stay out of everyone else's way...?!?!
>>
>> GOOD FOR YOU!
>>
>> >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
>> played
>> >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
>> >> > > compliant devices?
>> >> >
>> >> > Sure. Why not?
>> >>
>> >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
>> >> played a major role in emergency comms".
>> >>
>> >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
>> >> services" playing a "major role".
>> >>
>> >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial

>> >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
>> >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
>> >>
>> >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
>> >> pertinent examples.
>> >>
>> >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
>> >>
>> >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
>> >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>> >>
>> >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
>> >>
>> >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
>> >> substantiate.
>> >>
>> >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
>> >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
>>
>> You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single
>bit
>> of it...even facetiously...
>>
>> Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
>> argument and lack of cajones to do so...
>>
>> Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in
>disaster
>> and/or emergency communications.
>>
>> So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average
>calling
>> 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
>>
>> I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in
>disaster
>> mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
>>
>> Thanks.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
>obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
>to you.

He can't tone it down. No control there. Obsessive personal
necessity to go off on an emotional bender every time someone
hints at disagreeing with him and his "pride" about his personal

activities which he deems far superior to what others do.

The unfortunate part is that his lack of emotional control in post after post makes the hobby look bad to others. He can't see that and refuses to recognize it, so we all get to see the name-calling and damning epithets directed against others.

LHA / WMD

1297. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:22:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Zr-dnWQ6uZOSA8bdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89411
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

>
>
>
> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule say,
> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver is
> suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have explained
> the reasons why to the point of excess.

In the case were the inteference is the fault of the device the FCC has
many times told the complaing party the problem is theirs and not the
Amateur's, and it is the complaintant's responsibilty to fix the problem.
I will site a case that happened to me. When I was first licensed I
liked to operate on the 15 meter band (21 mHz). A neighbor had a
television that used 21 mHz for the Intermediate Frequency. Guess what?
Every time I operated the tv IF picked up my signal just like a 15 meter
receiver. She complained to the FCC. I was asked to responed to the FCC
about the problem. When I explained the problem, the FCC told the
neighbor it was her problem because her television was picking up
signals it was not supposed to and I was under no responsibility to fix
it or to stop operating on 15 meters.
Now go on back to the cb folks where you can spout your nonsense and no
one knows the difference.

1298. Re: Amateur radio operator only and not Superman

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:24:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Zr-dnWc6uZPCA8bdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89413

Anonymous Sender wrote:

> You will not save Earth with your
> transceiver and your ridiculous CW.
>
> In the last days, the Sun became a
> red giant star will burn all on Earth
> that will finally explode and will
> became dust as it was before. Amen

And 100 million people, including witless willie and lennieboy will be attempting to make cell phone calls.

1299. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:25:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <04N6c.13839$t16.7985784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get
> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
> That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
rules.
> And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
> amateur radio service.
>
>
> >Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>
>
> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
say,
> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
is
> suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
explained
> the reasons why to the point of excess.
>

Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they do, it is the fault of the receiver.

If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean signal, then he is not interfering with any service. Interference is transmitting on the same frequency as another service. We don't do that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1300. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:27:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89414

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>William wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
>>>>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
>>>>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
>>>>>people. You do the math.
>>>>
>>>>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
>>>
>>>
>>>Stop right there.
>>>
>>>In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?
>>
>>As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
>>emergency comms... a big *yes*.
>
>
> Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
>
> You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
>
> That makes it grafitti.

I suggest you call NORAD/NORTHCOM, FEMA, The Red Cross, Civil
Defense,and other emergency agencies and ask them how much weight they
place on the cell phone system for emergency comms in times of a major
disaster.

1301. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 01:31:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <guCdnR-NV86vPcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89415

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>> But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by Amateur
>>>Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other services
>>>of having to worry about that.
>>
>>Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
>>relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
>>relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
>>radio.
>>Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
>>military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
>>communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.
>
>
> JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
> trained.
>
> I am available should the need arise.
>
> I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.
>
> Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
> made on emergency communications.

Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
network will be, far all practical purposes, useless. The emergency
officials will not rely on the cell network for major comms during an
emergency. In addition to the communication ability of military and
civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed, and
Amateur Radio will be there if needed. If a service is needed to
suplement other comms, they will not call on or count on the cell phone
network, they will call on Amateur Radio.

1302. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:01:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040319210139.05957.00001055@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 89416

In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>sense.

>> Mike,
>>
>> There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>> license:
>>
>> 1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>> run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need
to
>> be tested on it)
>
> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should

>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>giving the tests are being overburdened?

It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?

However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed -
just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must then
migrate to the next-higher class of license.

So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the next-level
test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff removed.
Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>
>> 2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
>> class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>> bother to upgrade?)

> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>isn't anything to hold ya back.

Here's the problem:

What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges are very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from HF/MF. This means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.

And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and almost certainly with manufactured equipment.

The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in very little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not. After all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained an entry-level amateur license?

Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a balanced mix
of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges, coupled with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can sample more of what ham radio has to offer.

For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore old gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which do you think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?

Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?

That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're really trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was to have a very limited license to get people started, so they could learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham radio.
>
> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.

I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other factors.

But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise in the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once and for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be very upset.....

Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another NPRM cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just about 4 years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...

>
>> The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>> person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>> accomplishment. "Class"
>> would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>

> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>mind! ;^)

Very bad karma!

Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot change.
That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>
>> The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>> unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important
>> part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>
> Agreed 100 percent!

This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it must be
opposed. No good can come of such requirements.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1303. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:04:26 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <KEN6c.44993$1p.646788@attbi_s54>
Source record: 89417

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20040319041334.21955.00001070@mb-m20.aol.com...
> Jack Gibson wrote:
>
>
> > I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
> > U.S. fucking citizen.
> >
> > So fucking there.

I thought that we in the good old USA were the sole proprietorship of the bum society. It appears not. The liberal use of the universal "sentence enhancer" in the above post reflects nicely upon the intelligence of the poster. As an old black minister said in a sermon ....people who use that language should have their mouths washed out by their mamas with Bowlene.

Please send me your name and address and I will gladly forward a thesaurus of the English language so you can find and use the appropriate adjectives.

God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

1304. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:20:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040319212039.208$qB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89418
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Now go on back to the cb folks where you can spout your nonsense and no
> one knows the difference.
>
You read every post in rec.radio.cb. JJ.

1305. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:28:57 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040319212857.098$zR@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> I don't have the FCC comments in front of me.
>
They ain't worth the paper they're printed on anyway, so who cares?
>
> Since you are the blowhard
> here I'll let you find them.
>
Hey diaper dan, everyone knows you're an asshole.
>
> But sometime back, and I don't remember
> how far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically
> told the manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most'
> cases the receiving equipment was at fault.
>
Big surprise there..inferior receiver's and such.
>

> So, I am sure you will rant and rave, but I am not going to do your
> research. I highly recommend you do so. And quite showing your
> ignorance.
>
> If you were in my neighborhood I assure you I would fight your silly
> little broadcast is superior crap.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
If you fuck up my stereo or TV I'm gonna be in your face about it. Your
FCC license doesn't mean squat to me.

I'll plug your ears so bad you'll never talk to anyone.

I'll do the same to bpl when it's time.

1306. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:37:10 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040319213710.688$io@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Have you considered an irate neighbor?

1307. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:39:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040319213938.701$UD@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89421
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
> > In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
> > <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
> >
> > <snip>
> >
> >>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to
> >>>1.
> >>
> >>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
> >>rights people would love your attitude.
> >
> >
> >
> > The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound
> > like Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or
> >>>television signal, or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at
> >>>fault....
> >>
> >>Not if his station is clean.
> >
> >
> >
> > Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like
> > that?
>
> And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
>
Street rules?

1308. Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 02:50:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89422

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
> played
> > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > >> > > compliant devices?
> > >> >
> > >> > Sure. Why not?
> > >>
> > >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> > >> played a major role in emergency comms".
> > >>
> > >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> > >> services" playing a "major role".
> > >>
> > >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> > >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> > >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
> > >>
> > >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> > >> pertinent examples.
> > >>
> > >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
> > >>
> > >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
> > >>
> > >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
> > >>
> > >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> > >> substantiate.
> > >>
> > >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> > >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
> > >
> > > You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single bit
> > > of it...even facetiously...
> > >
> > > Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid

> > argument and lack of cajones to do so...
> >
> > Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in disaster
> > and/or emergency communications.
> >
> > So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average calling
> > 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
> >
> > I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in disaster
> > mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
> >
> > Thanks.
>
> Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> to you.

"Tone it down a bit"...?!?!

YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major"
role in emergency comms".

I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your
claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you
several times.

You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.

You call ME "bizarre", yet you make outlandish assertions in a
public forum, then dodge all requests to "prove", at any level, your
claims.

I believe you to be a chronic liar. You have been "called" on
several occassions to back up your assertions, but then use this ruse
to try and avoid taking responsibility for your own actions.

Call me rude and obnoxious if you think it deflects attention from
you, but I can assure you that it does nothing of the sort. If
anything, childish dodges like this only highlight YOUR bizarre
behaviour.

The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS,
MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in
ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.

I certainly do in as much as I am INVOLVED with "emergency comms"
on SEVERAL levels, not all of which involve the Amateur Radio or CAP.
Most everyone else in this forum knows these things to be true too.

You and Lennie seem to be the only ones in this forum who think
that if you keep repeating the same lame, untrue "stuff" that it will
somehow manifest a thread of truth. Sorry...that doesn't work.

Now...PLEASE try and exceed my expectations with the next post and pony-up some cajones to either admit you are either blatantly lying, making wild guesses, or just trolling for the sake of making arguments that you obviously can't support.

Or REALLY try something new and discuss something you have some EXPERIENCE in...THAT would be refreshing.

Steve, K4YZ

1309. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 03:59:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040319225932.21457.00004705@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89423

In article <iNOdnZF1jcap1sbdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>I have noted that many people that are in favor of removing Element 1
>from the tests are also in favor of this removal of safety questions, or
>whatever gets those tests down to an elementary school level.

They're already at that level, aren't they? I got my ham license while in
elementary school...

>This is
>despite protestations from some that they would NEVER support reductions
>like that.

The real kicker isn't the easier entry-level exam. That can be justified. It's
the free upgrades.

>My disappointment is immense that I trusted them and that
>they were inaccurate in their dealings with me. Whatever, I'm sure that
>means nothing to them.

Yet when it was pointed out that the same arguments used against the code test
could be used against the written test.....
>
>Drawing from that experience, I can safely conclude that they are
>willing to chip away at any part of the test that they can, and that no
>level of simplicity is too simple for them.
>
> And they have no intention of stopping there.

> D'Zat work?

That sums it up quite nicely, Mike.

And consider this: If FCC accepts the signed statement of a newcomer about Part
97, why test for it at all at any class of license?
>
>> We're talking about requiring some knowledge that might prevent the
>> person
>> from hurting himself or others. Why are we so anxious to avoid them..?!?!
>
> Knowledge is BAD!

Here's another possibility:

Portraying something as difficult can have a dramatic effect on how difficult
it is perceived to be. For example, a major part of marathon training is
learning to believe that you can, indeed, do the distance. That sort of thing

does not replace training runs, but it is a part of the training. You have to believe you can do it.

In the same fashion, portraying the exam tests (written or code!) as "difficult" can have a similar effect.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1310. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 04:15:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89424

N2EY wrote:

> In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>>sense.
>
>
>>>Mike,
>>>
>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>>>license:
>>>
>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>>>run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need
>
> to
>
>>>be tested on it)
>>
>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>
>
>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>giving the tests are being overburdened?
>
> It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
> privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?

Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
licensed contractors.

I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
privileges right out from under our feet.

I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.

Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?

> However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed -
> just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must then
> migrate to the next-higher class of license.

If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all? For
anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
those self destructive hams from themselves. Just like cigarette
smokers. And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?

> So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the next-level
> test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff removed.
> Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?

Nope.

>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>bother to upgrade?)
>
>
>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>
>
> Here's the problem:
>
> What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges are
> very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from HF/MF. This
> means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.

> And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and almost
> certainly with manufactured equipment.
>
> The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in very
> little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those

> questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not. After
> all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained an
> entry-level amateur license?
>
> Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a balanced
> mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges, coupled
> with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can sample
> more of what ham radio has to offer.

Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade. In
addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.

I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
privileges. It also makes for less of a class system. If the Tech has
the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
there, then it's a great thing.

> For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore old
> gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
> realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which do you
> think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?

Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's. I'd
certainly like that myself.

> Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
> beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?

> That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're really
> trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was to
> have a very limited license to get people started, so they could
> learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham radio.
>
>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>
>
> I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other factors.
>
> But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let
> everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise in
> the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once and
> for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be very
> upset.....

comments:

We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!

> Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another NPRM
> cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just about 4
> years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...
>
>
>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>accomplishment. "Class"
>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>
>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>mind! ;^)
>
>
> Very bad karma!
>
> Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot change.
> That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>
>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important
>>>part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>
>> Agreed 100 percent!
>
>
> This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it must be
> opposed. No good can come of such requirements.

And How!

BTW Jim, in one of my previous posts I used the letter combination LIB.
Especially in this age of internet acronyms, that would be tricky. It's
a sound thing. Along the lines of MR Ducks. Simply say the letters and
you'll have the comment. L I B (well I'll Be) All you have to do is
remember the context in which I wrote it.

- Mike KB3EIA

1311. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 05:46:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <p5udnWPAIbBjRsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89425

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Since the
> hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane,
> the only available means of communications for the passengers
> was by cell phone. Those calls got through.

Of course those calls got through dimwit, the plane was in the air away from any city that was experiencing a disaster, and any number of cell sites that were not overloaded with thousands attempting dial 911, their friends, ect., were available.
Do you think if that call had been attempted in NYC it would have gotten through? Maybe, but more than likely not.

1312. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 12:46:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200446.1ab880b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89426

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<p5udnWPAIbBjRsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >
> > Since the
> > hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane,
> > the only available means of communications for the passengers
> > was by cell phone. Those calls got through.
>
> Of course those calls got through

And that is the point. An emergency call got through. They get
through every day using cellular phones.

> dimwit,

Interesting how you smart guys always end up calling people names.
That usually happens about the time they run out of valid arguments.

the plane was in the air away
> from any city that was experiencing a disaster, and any number of cell
> sites that were not overloaded with thousands attempting dial 911, their
> friends, ect., were available.
> Do you think if that call had been attempted in NYC it would have gotten
> through? Maybe, but more than likely not.

Hmmm. So passengers on airlines should not use cell phones in
emergencies. Every passenger flight should contain one Air Marshall
and one Amateur Radio Operator to handle whatever emergency comes up.

1313. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 12:49:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200449.5ba4f542@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89427

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040319202151.02537.00003568@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> >Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> >obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> >to you.
>
> He can't tone it down. No control there. Obsessive personal
> necessity to go off on an emotional bender every time someone
> hints at disagreeing with him and his "pride" about his personal
> activities which he deems far superior to what others do.
>
> The unfortunate part is that his lack of emotional control in post
> after post makes the hobby look bad to others. He can't see
> that and refuses to recognize it, so we all get to see the name-
> calling and damning epithets directed against others.
>
> LHA / WMD

Being a Nurse, he probably has an excellent health plan that he could
use to get well. But admitting a problem is the first step.

1314. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 12:53:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200453.3cbdba1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89428

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>William wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
> >>>>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
> >>>>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
> >>>>>people. You do the math.
> >>>>
> >>>>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Stop right there.
> >>>
> >>>In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?
> >>
> >>As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
> >>emergency comms... a big *yes*.
> >
> >
> > Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
> >
> > You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
> >
> > That makes it grafitti.
>
> I suggest you call NORAD/NORTHCOM, FEMA, The Red Cross, Civil
> Defense,and other emergency agencies and ask them how much weight they
> place on the cell phone system for emergency comms in times of a major
> disaster.

I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.

Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens emergency communications.

1315. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 12:57:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200457.7eca6143@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89429

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319031711.06889.00000014@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/18/2004 6:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403181641.7fc7a449@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403180832.3fbe59bb@posting.google.com>...
>
> >> It will simulate (among other things) and earthquake along the
> >> New Madrid fault.
> >
> >Say Hi to Dick/W0EX.
> >
> >I think the New Madrid Fault was the only thing that kept him going.
>
> I am sure there are some othr sick, demeaning things you could say or do
> about the dead, but I am not too sure what they are....
>
> Thanks for validating my Estimated Creep Score for you...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I hadn't heard of Dick's passing. Sorry. I'll thumb thru my past
issues of QST and look for his call on the Silent Key pages.

There was another Dick who passed several years ago. His son sent an
email to those in his e-mail address book to notify. That was very
thoughtful of his son.

Thank you for the information. bb

1316. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 12:59:37 UTC
From: tj <wd4nmq@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <UuidndrA8N1eUcHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 89450
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

73 failed because of the "dumbing down" of ham radio. I started
subscribing to 73 and Ham Radio, remember that one, because of their
TECHNICAL content and projects. I look through my late 70s and 80s
issues and they are just full of projects.
Yes, Wayne was full of himself. Tho sometimes he said things againest
the arrl that needed saying, causing food for thought.
What killed 73 was solid state "sealed" rigs that could not be modified
and the manufacturing of full featured radios cheap by yesterdays
standards making homebrewing economically unreasonable. Why do you think
Heath, Echo and other kit manufactures closed. Back in those days all
rigs had huge wiring harnesses that HAD to be hand soldered. Real labor
intensive. Labor costs now with solid state and "computer" type boards
is actually the least of the manufacturing cost. A complete turn around
from the '70s & '80s time frame.
Hams, for the most part, quit building and experimenting. So 73's and
Ham Radio's meat and potatoes disappeared.

Dave Bushong wrote:
> Sedina II wrote:
>
>> Wayne Green W2NSD the editor of the former 73 Magazine
>> and David Booth (2004 Earth Changes) will be George Noorey's
>> special guest on Coast to Coast AM
>> Thursday/Friday evening.
>>
>> On a 1 to 10 scale this show should be a 12 !!
>>
>> Show info for the above:
>> http://www.coasttocoastam.com/shows/2004/03/18.html
>>
>> Main: http://www.coasttocoastam.com/
>>
>> See also: http://www.whatdoesitmean.com/
>>
>
> Wayne Green. Loser extrordinaire. Failed more ham radio businesses and
> magazines than anyone in human history.
>
> I don't want to pay to listen to him, unless I'm writing a book about
> "good examples of a bad example".
>

1317. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:06:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89430

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<guCdnR-NV86vPcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>> But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by Amateur
> >>>Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other services
> >>>of having to worry about that.
> >>
> >>Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
> >>relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
> >>relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
> >>radio.
> >>Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
> >>military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
> >>communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.
> >
> >
> > JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
> > trained.
> >
> > I am available should the need arise.
> >
> > I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.
> >
> > Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
> > made on emergency communications.
>
> Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
> network will be, far all practical purposes, useless.

You have only one size of emergency: Huge!

That's laughable.

The emergency
> officials will not rely on the cell network for major comms during an
> emergency.

Hint: They will if it is useful for them to do so. Should the
network fail, they will resort to other means.

In addition to the communication ability of military and
> civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed,

So Amateur Radio isn't their first choice? How sad.

and
> Amateur Radio will be there if needed.

Perhaps it will and perhaps it won't. That is the nature of
volunteers. And if you're radio volunteers are also committed to
numerous other emergency and quasi-emergency relief agencies, and your
emergency is Huge, and if the cellular network is down, and if the
agency wireless communications fail, Then and only then will you learn
if Amatuer Radio was there when needed.

If a service is needed to
> suplement other comms, they will not call on or count on the cell phone
> network, they will call on Amateur Radio.

Because all emergencies are Huge!

1318. Re: Amateur radio operator only and not Superman

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:11:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200511.47f07d8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89432

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Zr-dnWc6uZPCA8bdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
> Anonymous Sender wrote:
>
> > You will not save Earth with your
> > transceiver and your ridiculous CW.
> >
> > In the last days, the Sun became a
> > red giant star will burn all on Earth
> > that will finally explode and will
> > became dust as it was before. Amen
>
> And 100 million people, including witless willie and lennieboy will be
> attempting to make cell phone calls.

I have amateur radio also, and in the above scenario, it will not save us.

What do you plan to do?

1319. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:12:20 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <0ngo50dlhola3p0d0s2tjn983o3upi61bm@4ax.com>
Source record: 89431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <D%M6c.503$V66.259@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

<snip>
>I don't have the FCC comments in front of me. Since you are the blowhard
>here I'll let you find them.

Why should I? My case is solid.

> But sometime back, and I don't remember how
>far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically told the
>manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most' cases the
>receiving equipment was at fault.

Once again, where in the rules is that opinion incorporated so as to vindicate a
ham from violating 97.101(d)?

>So, I am sure you will rant and rave, but I am not going to do your
>research. I highly recommend you do so. And quite showing your ignorance.

Find your own facts. Back up your own statements. Otherwise you are
demonstrating the same lazy-ham attitude I was talking about before....
expecting someone else to do your work for you, dumping your own
responsibilities on anyone but yourself.

>If you were in my neighborhood I assure you I would fight your silly little
>broadcast is superior crap.

A few have tried. You, like the others, would lose.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1320. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:14:53 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <npgo50lgtq556t942devrd8lrae50k23ap@4ax.com>
Source record: 89433
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <04N6c.13839$t16.7985784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
>> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@get
>> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
>rules.
>> And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
>> amateur radio service.
>>
>>
>> >Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>>
>>
>> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
>say,
>> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
>is
>> suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
>explained
>> the reasons why to the point of excess.
>>
>
>Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
>aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they
>do, it is the fault of the receiver.

I have read Part 15 and it says no such thing. What it -does- say is this
(emphasis added):

Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
(a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are ADVISED to CONSIDER the
proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio stations, such as
broadcast, amateur, land mobile, [etc], when choosing operating frequencies
during the design of their equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for
receiving HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.

15.3(m) defines "harmful interference" (again, emphasis added):

ANY emission, radiation or induction that [...] seriously degrades, obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunications service operating in accordance with this chapter.

Now look at 97.101(d) again (and again, emphasis added):

No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause interference to ANY radio communication or signal.

Notice that the limiting word 'harmful' is NOT included, which means this rule applies to ANY form of interference. It also says "ANY radio communication or signal", which does -not exclude- intermediate frequency (IF) radio signals.

>If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>signal, then he is not interfering with any service.

Most of the time that's the case.

> Interference is
>transmitting on the same frequency as another service.

The FCC defines interference in 2.1(c) as:

"The effect of unwanted energy due to one or a combination of emissions, radiations, or inductions upon reception in a radio[chyph]communication system, manifested by any performance degradation, misinterpretation, or loss of information which could be extracted in the absence of such unwanted energy."

So much for your semantic spin-job.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1321. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:15:08 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <hugo50t95b0729g33foi8dkq8tab91p1cd@4ax.com>
Source record: 89434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <Ge-dnVMLiNsBBsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>If the ham's station is clean and the interference is caused by the
>device being interfered with due to poor design or a device that is not
>supposed to pick up radio waves, the ham has no legal responsibility. It
>is the responsibity of the owner of the device to fix the problem.

Here's the link to Title 47:

http://www.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/cfrassemble.cgi?title=200247

Now find any part of it that says a ham is not responsible for RFI if the device
is of "poor design".

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1322. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:27:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89435

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040319202145.02537.00003566@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403190549.29912bc2@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!
> > >
> > >Impossible. I own a copy of Part 97 and it fills the space of one
> > >small book.
> >
> > I have all five volumes of Title 47 C.F.R., soft-cover, printed by
> > the U.S. Government Printing Office. Part 97 is one of the
> > smaller sections in the 5th volume.
> >
> > There are several USGPO branch outlets in major urban centers
> > and will take orders for publications over the phone, accepting
> > major credit card payment. USPS regular surface delivery is
> > free on order shipment.

Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
post a retraction of his statement above?

> >> Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
> >> regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
> >> more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
> >> detriment.
> > >
> > >Because Amateur Radio exists in a parallel universe where conventional
> > >laws of physics do not apply.
> >
> > The sad part is that some, like Robeson, perceive U.S. amateur radio
> > only in terms of their own involvement. Further, he demands some
> > kind of "rule by tenure and involvement" (similar to a kind of ancient
> > tribal leadership by brawn and bravado) solely by the participants.
> >
> > Robeson reacts in the typical "military syndrome" of absolute pride
> > in "his outfit" and assumes some kind of officer or NCO rank above
> > others, demanding uncompromising obeyance to his "orders." If
> > there is objection to what he says, he goes into the abusive nature
> > of typical NCOs whipping the troops into line.

I find it interesting that Steve, having supposedly served in seven
hostile actions, never served in a unit with a single KIA, present or
past.

Even though I was in the USAF, I served the Second Infantry Division. It has a proud history and I was proud to serve it. Though hostilities were low due to the cease fire of 1954, I would like to think that having competant armed forces facing the enemy along the DMZ helped maintain that cease fire.

> The problem is that U.S. amateur radio is NOT a military service
> nor even a paramilitary service. It is basically a hobby, a
> recreational activity involving radio. It is, by default, a hobby
> because federal regulations forbid monetary compensation for
> any radio communications rendered.

Though monetary compensation is forbidden, it often occurs. Some call them "repeater dues."

Be that as it may, the Amateur Service has been useful and probably will continue to be useful in emergency communications when other comms fail.

> There is the common thread among the "tribal rule" individuals that
> no one unlicensed in amateur radio can possibly know anything
> about amateur radio, therefore they should be silent. Preposterous
> since U.S. amateur radio activity is widely publicized (among those
> who care to find out) and federal regulations forbid any secrecy in
> amateur communications.

I've seen it bragged on here that the ARRL Amateur Handbook is found in professional radio engineers library shelves. Must be a one way street.

> No one on the staff of the FCC or the Commissioners themselves
> are required to have any amateur radio licenses, yet the FCC has
> the lawful duty to regulate amateur radio and mitigate interference
> matters, up to and including imposing fines and calling on U.S.
> Marshals to arrest extreme miscreants. That rather destroys their
> concept that "only other amateurs can tell them what to do."

I hope someone in authority is watching the nutty one. He really spooks me.

> Amateur radios operate by exactly the same physics as radios in
> all other radio services. Propagation of radio waves occurs in
> exactly the same way as for all other radio services. There are
> no exceptions despite some odd ideas and strange misconceptions
> among certain radio amateurs.

Might be because they do not understand other radio services and think amateur radio is special.

> It is impossible to rationally discuss anything with certain people
> (such as Robeson) since they are too emotionally-driven and too
> prideful in their concept of their personal hobby involvement. They
> must - absolutely - have their way or all are treated to personally
> abusive remarks from them.

I tire of him. He's irrational.

> The above is representative of their non-reasoning in demanding a
> morse code test for all new amateurs...pure emotional basis on
> what they had to endure long ago (and probably resent).
>
> LHA / WMD

uphill both ways. bb

1323. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 13:30:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5IX6c.13955$t16.8053117@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89436

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403200453.3cbdba1d@posting.google.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
>
> I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
> amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>
> Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular
> telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens
> emergency communications.

You make the mistake by considering all emergencies to be equal. They are not. Cell phone is great for communicating when you go off the road in an ice storm. It is useless when all the local cell towers have been taken out by a hurricane. Emergency communications need to be appropriate to the situation. Nothing more and nothing less.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1324. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 15:37:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <U_GdnbQvVpW0-MHdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <Ge-dnVMLiNsBBsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>
>
>>If the ham's station is clean and the interference is caused by the
>>device being interfered with due to poor design or a device that is not
>>supposed to pick up radio waves, the ham has no legal responsibility. It
>>is the responsibity of the owner of the device to fix the problem.
>
>
>
> Here's the link to Title 47:
>
> http://www.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/cfrassemble.cgi?title=200247
>
> Now find any part of it that says a ham is not responsible for RFI if the device
> is of "poor design".

Let us put you theory to the test.

Someone builds a crystal rig just for the fun of it. As typical, it has
almost no selectivity. I can hear nearby hams as well as the station I
am tuning.

According to your argument, I can shut down everything I hear that
isn't the station I'm trying to listen to.

Why don't you try it and report back your results to us?

Your argument is reminiscent of the fellow that got on rrap and claimed
that after the international treaty requirement for Morse code was
dropped, that every Technician now had HF access.

RFI supression equipment is sold, this place is typical:

http://www.sncmfg.com/telecom/noise_protection/ht-stories.html

This story is very good:

http://www.sncmfg.com/telecom/noise_protection/rid-ht.html

Some interesting stuff from part 15:

PART 15--RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES

Subpart A--General

Sec. 15.5 General conditions of operation.

(a) Persons operating intentional or unintentional radiators shall not be deemed to have any vested or recognizable right to continued use of any given frequency by virtue of prior registration or certification of equipment, or, for power line carrier systems, on the basis of prior notification of use pursuant to Sec. 90.63(g) of this chapter.
(b) Operation of an intentional, unintentional, or incidental radiator is subject to the conditions that no harmful interference is caused and that interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an authorized radio station, by another intentional or unintentional radiator, by industrial, scientific and medical (ISM) equipment, or by an incidental radiator.
(c) The operator of a radio frequency device shall be required to cease operating the device upon notification by a Commission representative that the device is causing harmful interference. Operation shall not resume until the condition causing the harmful interference has been corrected.
(d) Intentional radiators that produce Class B emissions (damped wave) are prohibited.

another interesting part:

Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.

(a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to consider the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-geostationary mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S. Government radio stations, which could include high-powered radar systems, when choosing operating frequencies during the design of their equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful interference. Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be obtained by consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in Sec. 2.106 of this chapter.
(b) Information on U.S. Government operations can be obtained by contacting: Director, Spectrum Plans and Policy, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce, Room 4096, Washington, DC 20230.

[54 FR 17714, Apr. 25, 1989, as amended at 62 FR 4655, Jan. 31, 1997; 63 FR 40835, July 31, 1998]

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html

is another good link.

http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/consumerfacts/interference.html

More homework is left up to you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1325. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 19:06:47 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89438

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

"Sorry to not bow and scrape to your most esteemed worthiness, but if you ever got down from your high horse, you might be tolerable to other civilized humans."

Sounds like good self-advice, Leonard. Why don't you try it? And if you can't, just do your best impression of a human being. It would certainly be an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.

BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the Mobile Incident Command Center the other day. First contact was via CW with a station in Iowa. Conditions for SSB were just not up to par. We just love having all those tools in our communications kit.

We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We are now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever needed. 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.

Arnie -

1326. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 21:08:47 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Bn27c.120239$rB4.104671@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89439

Plus he didn't have any idea on what to do once a lot of his "issues" were addressed (such as holding W2NSD when living in 1 land)...

Wayne now seems to be a sucker for every half-baked idea that comes along. (heard the program, sad.)

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040319043124.06889.00000019@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18
> >From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black)
> >Date: 3/18/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c3dqgegiq1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
>
> >No, I think Wayne was pretty successful.
>
> Wayne has had his "successes", for sure...
>
> He succeeded in ruining "73" magazine.
>
> He succeeded in making a mockery of himself.
>
> He succeeded in spending a lifetime "dissing" the ARRL, yet everytime a
> rallying cry was sounded by those disenfranchised with the ARRL (most of whom
> WERE that way BECAUSE of him!) he had some lame excuse as to why he
> couldn't/wouldn't do it.
>
> Needless to say, Michael, I disagee. Wayne had the opportunity to be a
> significant leader in Amateur Radio's future, but he will be, afterall, nothing
> but a footnote in it.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>

1327. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 21:44:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NbudnRYLH_6jJsHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <04N6c.13839$t16.7985784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
>
>>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>>news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
>>
>>>In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>>
>><w4nti@get
>>
>>>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
>>
>>rules.
>>
>>>And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
>>>amateur radio service.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>>>
>>>
>>>Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
>>
>>say,
>>
>>>"....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
>>
>>is
>>
>>>suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
>>
>>explained
>>
>>>the reasons why to the point of excess.
>>>
>>
>>Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices

>>aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they
>>do, it is the fault of the receiver.
>
>
>
> I have read Part 15 and it says no such thing. What it -does- say is this
> (emphasis added):
>
> --------
> Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
> (a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are ADVISED to CONSIDER the
> proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio stations, such as
> broadcast, amateur, land mobile, [etc], when choosing operating frequencies
> during the design of their equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for
> receiving HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.
> --------
>
> 15.3(m) defines "harmful interference" (again, emphasis added):
>
> --------
> ANY emission, radiation or induction that [...] seriously degrades, obstructs or
> repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunications service operating in accordance with
> this chapter.
> --------
>
> Now look at 97.101(d) again (and again, emphasis added):
>
> --------
> No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause
> interference to ANY radio communication or signal.
> --------
>
> Notice that the limiting word 'harmful' is NOT included, which means this rule
> applies to ANY form of interference. It also says "ANY radio communication or
> signal", which does -not exclude- intermediate frequency (IF) radio signals.
>
>
>
>>If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>>signal, then he is not interfering with any service.
>
>
>
> Most of the time that's the case.
>
>
>
>> Interference is
>>transmitting on the same frequency as another service.
>

>
>
> The FCC defines interference in 2.1(c) as:
>
> "The effect of unwanted energy due to one or a combination of emissions,
> radiations, or inductions upon reception in a radio[chyph]communication system,
> manifested by any performance degradation, misinterpretation, or loss of
> information which could be extracted in the absence of such unwanted energy."
>
> So much for your semantic spin-job.

When trying to do a semantic spin job, the trick is to always accuse
the person your discussing the issue with of it.

And you have spun a good one. In the time I have been a Ham, you are
the only one that has put forth your argument. You're taking several
different sections of the rules, combining them together, then adding a
liberal dose of conjecture and conclusion jumping. Doesn't work like
that. Maybe consulting a good communications lawyer might help?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1328. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 21:52:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 89441

Hello, Steve

I think I have figured out the real problem behind most of the flames both in this group and rec.radio.cb. I might be wrong, but it appears everyone is trying to defend that their particular turf is "important" and someone else's is not.

If you go back into the 50s and 60s, amateur radio served quite well for long-haul phone patches and in emergencies. Very localized emergencies, such as an auto accident would largely be reported by normal telephone. In the 70s, the cb craze took hold and certainly I would expect that cb was sometimes used to report the accidents. The small number of amateurs would preclude them being involved very often in such a situation. Voilla, cb is more important than ham radio.

Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who needs cb?"

A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a hobby.

Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones, telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected. That nasty ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?) affected areas for hundreds of miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat, power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!

One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator backup with a *lot* of fuel available.

I don't think it is as important "how" something is done as opposed to the fact that it gets done. If someone is assisting at a shelter cooking meals, that individual is *doing* something. That, to me, is more important than all of the useless crying that goes on around these parts from time to time ;)

BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries, flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over 100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on VHF/UHF or cb.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.637 / Virus Database: 408 - Release Date: 3/20/04

1329. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:03:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <7fKdnU6agNFNXcHdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89442

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>William wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>William wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
>>>>>>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
>>>>>>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
>>>>>>>people. You do the math.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Stop right there.
>>>>>
>>>>>In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?
>>>>
>>>>As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
>>>>emergency comms... a big *yes*.
>>>
>>>
>>>Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
>>>
>>>You paint with a broad brush and without authority.

>>>
>>>That makes it grafitti.
>>
>>I suggest you call NORAD/NORTHCOM, FEMA, The Red Cross, Civil
>>Defense,and other emergency agencies and ask them how much weight they
>>place on the cell phone system for emergency comms in times of a major
>>disaster.
>
>
> I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
> amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.

Where did I speak of the average citizen?
>
> Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular
> telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens
> emergency communications.

So they may, but in times of emergency, the military and other civil
authorites will not rely on cell phones to handle major emergency
communications. They will rely on Amateur Radio if the need arises and
AR can supplement military or other civil emergency comms, but they will
not rely on the cell network.

1330. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:06:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <7fKdnUmagNEPXMHdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89443

Witless Willie splutterd again and said:

> So Amateur Radio isn't their first choice? How sad.

So who said it was?
>
> and
>
>>Amateur Radio will be there if needed.
>
>
> Perhaps it will and perhaps it won't. That is the nature of
> volunteers. And if you're radio volunteers are also committed to
> numerous other emergency and quasi-emergency relief agencies, and your
> emergency is Huge, and if the cellular network is down, and if the
> agency wireless communications fail, Then and only then will you learn
> if Amatuer Radio was there when needed.

I have never seen the Amateur Radio community fail to responed when needed.
>
> If a service is needed to
>
>>suplement other comms, they will not call on or count on the cell phone
>>network, they will call on Amateur Radio.
>
>
> Because all emergencies are Huge!

You said that, I didn't.

1331. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:13:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <64SdnTyseIv1XsHdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89445

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
> telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected. That nasty
> ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?) affected areas for hundreds of
> miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after
> power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for
> hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat,
> power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!
>
Surley you jest, according to witless willie cell phones will be there
for emergencies.

> One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know
> if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to
> the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator
> backup with a *lot* of fuel available.

You mean that Amateur Radio withstood the ravages of the storm and the
cell network did not! Looks like Amateur Radio was there when needed
again, but the cell network just couldn't hack it.

>
> BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries,
> flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur
> operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over
> 100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on
> VHF/UHF or cb.

I guess the batteries for the cell network hadn't been charged up in
prep for an emergency.

1332. Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:16:29 UTC
From: Mark <merees@suny.nospam.edu>
Message-ID: <adc68$405cc2c1$d1cc7b2e$32684@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89444
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

---

FOUND THIS IN ALT.FAN.ART.BELL - NOT CONFIRMED
IF THIS PROGRAM CHANGE IS VALID, BUT IF SO IT SHOULD
BE A GOOD PROGRAM FOR ALL RADIO AMATEURS...

"Occasional AB Listener" <iamnot@aol.com> wrote in message
news:405C9BD6.7DFD@aol.com...

Tonight (March 20, 2004), at 10:05 Pacific Time on "Coast to Coast A.M,"
late-night radio talk-show host Art Bell is going to take a breather
from the customary paranormal and conspiracy-related format and discuss
a topic that will interest most -- if not all -- radio amateurs,
shortwave radio enthusiasts and broadband users: Broadband Power Lines
(BPLs).

Now under development, BPL is a technology that will allow computer
users to access high-speed, broadband Internet connections just by
plugging the computer into the wall outlet. No need to pay hundreds of
dollars in installation, activation/deactivation and service fees for
Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL) or cable modems, just literally plug and
play.

Fans and supporters of BPL include the Federal Communications
Commission, Power Line Communications Association and local utility
companies. Since power lines are available in urban and rural areas,
while DSL and cable services are limited or inaccessible in some
sparsely populated areas, BPL is anticipated to be a major challenge to
the existing methods of high-speed access. But BPL is not without its
drawbacks.

The American Radio Relay League (ARRL) is concerned about the amount of
RF interference generated by BPL. According to their website
(http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc), "Studies done by amateurs and
regulators worldwide demonstrate conclusively that BPL that uses HF or
VHF spectrum will cause serious degradation of the communications
capability to nearby receivers on frequencies that BPL uses. HF is a
unique international resource that is in use by commercial radio
services, broadcasting, amateurs, government and military operators."

Early Saturday morning, about 2 a.m. PST on 3840kHz, Art himself (radio
amateur W6OBB) and his roundtable of fellow ham radio operators were
discussing the amount of interference -- especially from 2MHz to 80MHz
-- BPL can cause if service is implemented nationally. The hams

conversing with Art on the 80-meter band said that constant buzzing heard on those frequencies will anger shortwave listeners and hams alike if RF interference is constantly heard on those frequencies.

Another problem is the potential health risks associated. Could a substantial increase in RF exposure -- especially around the household -- contribute to the rise in cancer-related diseases? A very close friend of mine, who happens to be a ham radio operator living near Switzerland, explained to me that most of Europe has scrapped plans for BPL because of possible RF-related diseases, as well as RF interference in commercial and amateur/SWL communications.

Nevertheless, tonight's "C2C" is going to be extremely interesting and worthwhile to those who are interested in all forms of radio communications. My friends and I will definitely be listening.

---------- end message ---------

1333. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:50:10 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <vhip501vr41h0gapnnj3n736035dme8m83@4ax.com>
Source record: 89446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

This didn't seem to get through the first time so I'm sending it again.....

In <gobble-de-guke@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> In <Ge-dnVMLiNsBBsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>If the ham's station is clean and the interference is caused by the
>>>device being interfered with due to poor design or a device that is not
>>>supposed to pick up radio waves, the ham has no legal responsibility. It
>>>is the responsibity of the owner of the device to fix the problem.
>>
>>
>>
>> Here's the link to Title 47:
>>
>> http://www.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/cfrassemble.cgi?title=200247
>>
>> Now find any part of it that says a ham is not responsible for RFI if the device
>> is of "poor design".
>
>Let us put you theory to the test.
>
> Someone builds a crystal rig just for the fun of it. As typical, it has
>almost no selectivity. I can hear nearby hams as well as the station I
>am tuning.
>
> According to your argument, I can shut down everything I hear that
>isn't the station I'm trying to listen to.
>
> Why don't you try it and report back your results to us?

If your crystal radio does not have the selectivity to seperate one transmission from another, you can't expect it to work at the minimum level of performance that would be expected if the receiver is to designed according to the basic requirements established for the broadcast bands (or, for that matter, any other service). IOW, you can't expect it to function as a communication receiver, the key word here being 'communication'. That's just common sense.

And the majority of the problems with RFI are not of the selectivity of the receiver, which makes your example moot.

> Your argument is reminiscent of the fellow that got on rrap and claimed
>that after the international treaty requirement for Morse code was
>dropped, that every Technician now had HF access.

To each his own.

>RFI supression equipment is sold, this place is typical:
>
>http://www.sncmfg.com/telecom/noise_protection/ht-stories.html
>
>This story is very good:
>
>http://www.sncmfg.com/telecom/noise_protection/rid-ht.html

It's an advertisement. What would you expect them to use for a story?

>Some interesting stuff from part 15:
>
>PART 15--RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES
>
> Subpart A--General
>
>Sec. 15.5 General conditions of operation.
>
> (a) Persons operating intentional or unintentional radiators shall
>not be deemed to have any vested or recognizable right to continued use
>of any given frequency by virtue of prior registration or certification
>of equipment, or, for power line carrier systems, on the basis of prior
>notification of use pursuant to Sec. 90.63(g) of this chapter.

.....so?

> (b) Operation of an intentional, unintentional, or incidental
>radiator is subject to the conditions that no harmful interference is
>caused and that interference must be accepted that may be caused by the
>operation of an authorized radio station, by another intentional or
>unintentional radiator, by industrial, scientific and medical (ISM)
>equipment, or by an incidental radiator.

And your point is?

> (c) The operator of a radio frequency device shall be required to
>cease operating the device upon notification by a Commission
>representative that the device is causing harmful interference.
>Operation shall not resume until the condition causing the harmful
>interference has been corrected.

Is this discussion about receiving interference -from- a Part 15 device?

> (d) Intentional radiators that produce Class B emissions (damped
>wave) are prohibited.

Ok. Maybe you missed the very first line of Part 15:

Sec. 15.1 Scope of this part.
(a) This part sets out the regulations under which an intentional, unintentional, or incidental radiator may be operated without an individual license.....

So the sections you cited relate to the discussion....how?

>another interesting part:
>
>Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
>
> (a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to
>consider the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed
>radio stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-
>geostationary mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S.
>Government radio stations, which could include high-powered radar
>systems, when choosing operating frequencies during the design of their
>equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful
>interference. Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be
>obtained by consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in Sec. 2.106
>of this chapter.
> (b) Information on U.S. Government operations can be obtained by
>contacting: Director, Spectrum Plans and Policy, National
>Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of
>Commerce, Room 4096, Washington, DC 20230.
>
>[54 FR 17714, Apr. 25, 1989, as amended at 62 FR 4655, Jan. 31, 1997; 63
>FR 40835, July 31, 1998]
>
>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html

I already quoted that law in another post. How does this support your argument? And again, where does that, or any other law, excuse a ham for a violation of their own rule against interference; i.e, 97.101(d)?

>is another good link.
>
>http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/consumerfacts/interference.html

A carefully-constructed PR statement, probably drafted by Riley himself, in an attempt to pass the buck to the manufacterers, take the heat off the hams, and reduce the number of RFI complaints the FCC has to deal with. Notice there is no mention of the possibility of dirty transmitters, illegal CBers, or of any legal responsibility by anyone -including- the manufacturers. Typical FCC squirm-out.

> More homework is left up to you.

I did my homework long before this thread was started. The rule is clear. Any attempt to pin a different interpretation on it is no better than illegal CBers claiming that CB rules are not laws, or any of the other cock-and-bull excuses they make.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!

------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1334. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:51:14 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <7lip50tg4e2p70no9gv9es164om7nphk8k@4ax.com>
Source record: 89447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <NbudnRYLH_6jJsHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>
>
>Frank Gilliland wrote:
<snip>
>> So much for your semantic spin-job.
>
> When trying to do a semantic spin job, the trick is to always accuse
>the person your discussing the issue with of it.
>
> And you have spun a good one. In the time I have been a Ham, you are
>the only one that has put forth your argument. You're taking several
>different sections of the rules, combining them together, then adding a
>liberal dose of conjecture and conclusion jumping.

I think you were looking in the mirror when you came up with that opinion
because I have been staying true to 97.101(d) the entire time. It is you and
everyone else that is grasping for irrelevant issues, such as interference
-from- Part 15 devices, and making up your own definitions for 'interference'.

And -still- nobody has come forward to cite any law that exempts hams from
97.101(d) when the receiver being interfered with is of 'poor design'.

> Doesn't work like
>that.

No it doesn't. I'm glad you agree.

> Maybe consulting a good communications lawyer might help?

Got a good one at the station. Talked to him on several occasions about this and
other issues.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1335. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:52:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1X37c.197$OP3.162@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 89448

Sure, the cell phone towers have batteries. They're likely fine for a number of hours of outage - but Gouverneur had no power for over two weeks. Those batteries aren't designed to last for weeks of drain without recharge. In this country, an engineer could well be fired for overdesigning something (that costs money). Likewise, those batteries are there to keep things working for a *short* power outage. It would cost too much to design those cell towers to run on batteries for weeks on end with no recharging in that period. It probably wouldn't have mattered much anyways as the conventional phone lines were out too - and cell phones are wireless only between the user and the tower. BTW, unless you had your own generator and were on two-way satellite internet, you wouldn't have the internet either. No telephone, no dial-up, no DSL. I have no idea how well any cable systems made out, but with the telephone system down I don't know if they had any way to get information out of the area.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:64SdnTyseIv1XsHdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
> You mean that Amateur Radio withstood the ravages of the storm and the
> cell network did not! Looks like Amateur Radio was there when needed
> again, but the cell network just couldn't hack it.
>
>
> I guess the batteries for the cell network hadn't been charged up in
> prep for an emergency.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.637 / Virus Database: 408 - Release Date: 3/20/04

1336. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175903.21955.00001080@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89351

In article <04N6c.13839$t16.7985784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
>> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@get
>> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
>aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they
>do, it is the fault of the receiver.

Mama Dee, YOU go read Part 97 as well as Part 15 and take a look at the big frequency allocation table in Part 2.

Go look at the sub-parts Frank showed you and read them for yourself.

>If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>signal, then he is not interfering with any service.

Ahem, next time you are out driving with a mobile rig (hopefully NOT during an "ice storm"), stop next to any highway patrol car and key-down your mobile rig (that is "legal and clean"). See if your rig will NOT interfere with patrol communications. :-)

>Interference is
>transmitting on the same frequency as another service. We don't do that.

Ahem, HF amateur radio is allocated mostly primary for amateurs. Not quite so for military communications, including VHF. The military generally stays away from ham bands to avoid the irritating "this is OUR band!" shouting and hollering of hams when QRMed by signals they can't identify nor demodulate.

A quarter million SINCGARS sets operate on 30-88 MHz but ARs for Signal centers say to avoid the ham 6m band...they can work through any ham signals quite well, but not the opposite.

Dee, "interference" can be anything, even a "clean and legal" ham rig disrupting another radio service.

Spank, spank

LHA / WMD

1337. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175905.21955.00001081@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89355

In article <5IX6c.13955$t16.8053117@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403200453.3cbdba1d@posting.google.com...
>> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
>>
>> I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
>> amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>>
>> Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular
>> telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens
>> emergency communications.
>
>You make the mistake by considering all emergencies to be equal. They are
>not. Cell phone is great for communicating when you go off the road in an
>ice storm. It is useless when all the local cell towers have been taken out
>by a hurricane. Emergency communications need to be appropriate to the
>situation. Nothing more and nothing less.

Dee, in trying to spank us children, you are trying to use a paddle
too large for you to handle.

ALL emergencies ARE "equal" to a victim.

Whether the victim is having a heart attack or trapped in a burning
WTC tower, that is a definite emergency situation for them.

The concept and implementation of the "911" emergency system
IS intended for handling real emergencies in real time as
expeditiously as possible. It is not perfect, but it is better than
all previous methods of seeking aid at the onset of a very real
emergency situation to a victim.

"Traffic handling" by any communications means, amateur radio
included, is ALWAYS strained during the ONSET of a sudden
emergency. The bigger the emergency situation, the larger the
strain on everyone directly involved, amateur radio included.

Amateurs like to bring out the 11 September 2001 Attack on
America, featuring all the emotional heart-tugging scenes we've
all seen about the burning and collapse of the World Trade
Center in New York City. The typical comment is simply "all
the cell phones failed" and that somehow justifies amateur radio
being elevated to a place of honor and glory and wonderfulness?

In actual truth, there's NO valid evidence that any amateur radio communications was used as any essential communications in the first few hours after the ONSET of the WTC towers crash site. In those same hours the police and fire departments of NYC were able to work around destruction of their own emergency communications central, report in, ask for assistance, ask for other services, try to organize a very sudden disruption that brought chaos to a small part of Manhattan Island. All of the infrastructure of NYC did a fantastic job in my opinion, saving whomever they could find, giving immediate aid when they could, losing some of their own in the process. They used whatever communications means they could, landline or radio or on-foot note relaying. Was cellular telephone an aid? Partly. Loss of the World Trade Center did not shut down Manhattan or other boroughs.

Did the abominable, monstrous Attack on the WTC require any notification that it happened? Hardly. It was visible to millions. Communications was necessary to report the extent of the Attack, what assistance was immediately needed, and generally begin organizing to handle the totally unexpected chaos that was not envisioned or expected by anyone. Did that communications "fail?" It did not fully fail even though the local communications infrastructure was partly destroyed.

Did amateur radio "emergency teams" help any during the worst part of the WTC Attack's aftermath? None have been reported. Amateur radio is reported to have helped a day after the Attack, passing "health and welfare" messages. There are no reports of hams bravely sending CW on HF messages from the WTC site vicinity to aid victims or call for fire crews and construction crews. It wasn't Kuwait of 1990, a lone Kuwaiti sending "reports" of the invasion and occupancy by Iraqi forces by ham radio.

Sudden onset of emergencies: The 17 January 1994 Northridge Earthquake is memorable to me since I was awakened by the jolting and the sudden cessation of electrical power a bit after 0430 hours. Most of the Greater Los Angeles complex lost all primary electric power service due to a fallen MHV tower of the Pacific Intertie. About ten million without power. Did ham radio "emergency teams" spring into action and begin emergency communications? I really don't know since all that can be verified is the glowing self-important phrasings of a few ham radio groups well after the onset. I was then associated with utility service communications and had nothing portable to listen to ham bands. The infrastructure of LA didn't need ham radio at the onset of that emergency since the public safety agencies had already prepared themselves with back-up emergency power and had trained for that eventuality. The fire departments here have long had dedicated alert landlines that do not route through telephone switches. All the engines rolled out of the fire houses as a matter of standard procedure during earthquakes. No "alert" was

needed that an earthquake had started, few people slept through it unaware of it.

There were no reports of heroic ham radio operators sending emergency messages out of LA at the onset of that earthquake of ten years ago. Yes, a day after that earthquake a small ham radio group was handling "health and welfare" messages. So was FEMA using their ready-to-transit-by-air sat terminals and having a video "billboard" display for messages. The FEMA billboard got broadcasting attention.

I was born and raised in the northern midwest, learned to drive and licensed in Illinois. Well before cell phones were even imagined. Anyone who goes out driving DURING an "ice storm" is either a trained, experienced utility vehicle operator or a crazy civilian who badly needs their common sense repaired. Try another metaphor. May the metaphors be with you.

Spank, spank

LHA / WMD

1338. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175906.21955.00001082@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89353

In article <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<guCdnR-NV86vPcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>> William wrote:
>>
>> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>> >
>> >>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>> >>
>> >>> But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by
>Amateur
>> >>>Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other
>services
>> >>>of having to worry about that.
>> >>
>> >>Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
>> >>relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
>> >>relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
>> >>radio.
>> >>Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
>> >>military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
>> >>communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.
>> >
>> >
>> > JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
>> > trained.
>> >
>> > I am available should the need arise.
>> >
>> > I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.
>> >
>> > Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
>> > made on emergency communications.
>>
>> Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
>> network will be, far all practical purposes, useless.
>
>You have only one size of emergency: Huge!
>
>That's laughable.

It may be all he has that is huge...

> The emergency
>> officials will not rely on the cell network for major comms during an
>> emergency.
>
>Hint: They will if it is useful for them to do so. Should the
>network fail, they will resort to other means.
>
> In addition to the communication ability of military and
>> civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed,
>
>So Amateur Radio isn't their first choice? How sad.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...another Legend of the Airwaves down in flames.

>> and
>> Amateur Radio will be there if needed.
>
>Perhaps it will and perhaps it won't. That is the nature of
>volunteers. And if you're radio volunteers are also committed to
>numerous other emergency and quasi-emergency relief agencies, and your
>emergency is Huge, and if the cellular network is down, and if the
>agency wireless communications fail, Then and only then will you learn
>if Amatuer Radio was there when needed.

Our AA has already been through all that...in his mind.

> If a service is needed to
>> suplement other comms, they will not call on or count on the cell phone
>> network, they will call on Amateur Radio.
>
>Because all emergencies are Huge!

And the ARRL said so, nyah, nyah! :-) :-) :-)

LHA / WMD

1339. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175908.21955.00001083@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89352

In article <1e4e3692.0403200446.1ab880b0@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<p5udnWPAIbBjRsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > Since the
>> > hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane,
>> > the only available means of communications for the passengers
>> > was by cell phone. Those calls got through.
>>
>> Of course those calls got through
>
>And that is the point. An emergency call got through. They get
>through every day using cellular phones.
>
>> dimwit,
>
>Interesting how you smart guys always end up calling people names.
>That usually happens about the time they run out of valid arguments.

Emotional ham-lifestylers do that sort of thing regularly in here.

This anonymous anamalous poster seems unaware of the civil
airways communications capabilities of air carriers ("radios on
airliners"). He (or she, unknown) could have mentioned that and
a single button-press for the Transponder "squawk" signal. That
would have been a knowledgeable retort. But, those don't work
for spit if hijackers have taken over the cockpit.

> the plane was in the air away
>> from any city that was experiencing a disaster, and any number of cell
>> sites that were not overloaded with thousands attempting dial 911, their
>> friends, ect., were available.

Our friend AA seems to think that "911" is a national network...an
overload in NYC is going to disable Jersey City or Anchorage? :-)

>> Do you think if that call had been attempted in NYC it would have gotten
>> through? Maybe, but more than likely not.
>
>Hmmm. So passengers on airlines should not use cell phones in
>emergencies. Every passenger flight should contain one Air Marshall
>and one Amateur Radio Operator to handle whatever emergency comes up.

Sounds like a Plan! Send that to Dave Sumner (ARRL executive president for life). He can make a dandy Editorial on that.

On-board Emergency Hams can wear a little shield in a wallet just like real cops. In-flight attendants can ask other passengers, "Coffee, tea, or health-and-welfare-messages?" :-)

LHA / WMD

1340. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <4147c.198$Jp4.132@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 89449

Hello, Mark

Interesting. I didn't pay for installation or activation. Certainly, I pay for service. I *love* that statement about no need to pay service fees. Yepper, it's gonna be free! Just plug and play.

Why don't I believe that? Why do I get the feeling that there will be charges? I also *highly* doubt it will service places outside of cities and suburbs.

As far as plug and play, when I fire up on HF, it's gonna be plug and pray LOL.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
"Mark" <merees@suny.nospam.edu> wrote in message
news:adc68$405cc2c1$d1cc7b2e$32684@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> ---
> FOUND THIS IN ALT.FAN.ART.BELL - NOT CONFIRMED
>
> No need to pay hundreds of
> dollars in installation, activation/deactivation and service fees for
> Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL) or cable modems, just literally plug and
> play.
>
> Fans and supporters of BPL include the Federal Communications
> Commission, Power Line Communications Association and local utility
> companies. Since power lines are available in urban and rural areas,
> while DSL and cable services are limited or inaccessible in some
> sparsely populated areas, BPL is anticipated to be a major challenge to
> the existing methods of high-speed access.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.637 / Virus Database: 408 - Release Date: 3/20/04

1341. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175914.21955.00001084@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89356

In article <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040319202145.02537.00003566@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403190549.29912bc2@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> What Lennie DOESN'T know about Part 97 could fill libraries!
>> >
>> >Impossible. I own a copy of Part 97 and it fills the space of one
>> >small book.
>>
>> I have all five volumes of Title 47 C.F.R., soft-cover, printed by
>> the U.S. Government Printing Office. Part 97 is one of the
>> smaller sections in the 5th volume.
>>
>> There are several USGPO branch outlets in major urban centers
>> and will take orders for publications over the phone, accepting
>> major credit card payment. USPS regular surface delivery is
>> free on order shipment.
>
>Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
>himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
>post a retraction of his statement above?

Hell will freeze over first... :-)

>> >> Lennie's understanding and comprehension of Amateur Radio
>> >> regulations, both in theory and practice have been ripped apart by
>> >> more than ONE poster in this forum, and always to his ultimate
>> >> detriment.
>> >
>> >Because Amateur Radio exists in a parallel universe where conventional
>> >laws of physics do not apply.
>>
>> The sad part is that some, like Robeson, perceive U.S. amateur radio
>> only in terms of their own involvement. Further, he demands some
>> kind of "rule by tenure and involvement" (similar to a kind of ancient
>> tribal leadership by brawn and bravado) solely by the participants.
>>
>> Robeson reacts in the typical "military syndrome" of absolute pride
>> in "his outfit" and assumes some kind of officer or NCO rank above
>> others, demanding uncompromising obeyance to his "orders." If
>> there is objection to what he says, he goes into the abusive nature

>> of typical NCOs whipping the troops into line.
>
>I find it interesting that Steve, having supposedly served in seven
>hostile actions, never served in a unit with a single KIA, present or
>past.
>
>Even though I was in the USAF, I served the Second Infantry Division.
>It has a proud history and I was proud to serve it. Though
>hostilities were low due to the cease fire of 1954, I would like to
>think that having competant armed forces facing the enemy along the
>DMZ helped maintain that cease fire.

The Korean War Cease Fire took place in 1953 but sporadic fighting happened for at least another three decades. The Korean War remains in a curious "cease fire" after nearly 51 years, not over yet. Korea is still divided and the "talks" continue at Panmunjom on a regular basis. Ridiculous.

Robeson tries to vainly manufacture indiscretions by others but all that does is to discredit himself. He says that I "associate myself with KIAs" and that is not true. What I've stated is that I was assigned to a Signal Battalion, then called the 71st, in February of 1953. That Signal Battalion was organized in 1946 to directly serve Far East Command Headquarters then in Tokyo. After the June, 1950, start of the Korean War, FEC Hq ordered some personnel and communications equipment from the 71st Sig Svc Bn to be air-lifted into Korea to reinforce communications there. The C-54 crashed on landing, killing all on board, on 1 Jul 50. The main billet (and US Army Central Command offices) was named "Hardy Barracks" after one of those killed; "Camp Tomlinson" was made the name of the station ADA transmitter site and barracks at Kashiwa in mid-1956, also honoring one of those killed. There were three other casualties from my Signal Battalion between 1952 and 1956.

I use the term "my Signal Battalion" because I was assigned to it and remained in it for three years. During that time the name was changed and between 1956 and 1958 it was consolidated with the 72nd Signal Battalion at Camp Zama as part of the post-Korea downsizing of military in Japan. The battalion's name changed twice more after that, eventually stabilizing as the 78th Signal Battalion, still at Camp Zama, under the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, that Brigade attached to Headquarters, U.S. Army Pacific. Callsign ADA remains as that of USARPAC Hq after 6 decades of providing primary communications.

Even though my service was uneventful and rather ordinary, "my battalion" earned two Presidential Unit Citations while I was assigned to it. I've stood Retreat more than once to honor those few signalmen from the battalion who perished while on duty. We all "got the message through" in the everyday motto of the

Signal Corps. I'm proud to have been a part of it.

I've been in communications with five former signalmen who were in my battalion plus a civilian who was a DAC at ADA. One of the signalmen, Eugene Rosenbaum, served at the same time I did and we knew each other then. Gene is a long-time radio amateur, retired from the FAA, and his interest now is in radio controlled model airplanes. We fought no glorious battles, did not earn any pretty medals (beyond a Good Conduct medal), just did our duty. No "hostile actions," just the ordinary hazards of military service. In the words of one of the signalmen, "we (of the 71st) didn't yield an inch of Tokyo ground to the communists!" :-)

Actually, we yielded to the USAF. As part of the downsizing after the Korean War and before the start of Vietnam War, the USAF was assigned responsibility for all the HF radio, torn-tape teleprinter relay, and microwave relay activity formerly done by the Army. That continued by the USAF until 1978 when the whole thing was shut down and returned to the Japanese. Only a portion of the huge ADA receiver site (Camp Owada) remains, leased by the U.S. DIA as a monitoring station.

Camp Tomilinson was built on a former Japanese airfield and about 1 mile by 2 miles in area, festooned with wire antennas for (then) 43 HF transmitters. Barracks and offices and mess for personnel were in one corner of the airfield. We literally lived IN an antenna field there (USAF folks did after they took over). The USA and USAF added some more transmitters, replaced some of the old ones. 24/7 operation by both service branches.

All of that is gone now. HF radio is no longer a primary medium for military communications, has been relegated to a secondary role. Primary medium is the DSN, the "government's own Internet" through wirelines, fiber-optics, and satellite radio relay with terrestrial radio relay on microwave troposcatter and LOS terminals plus towed telephone central office equivalents available that can connect any unit if any existing communications infrastructure is totally destroyed.

>> The problem is that U.S. amateur radio is NOT a military service
>> nor even a paramilitary service. It is basically a hobby, a
>> recreational activity involving radio. It is, by default, a hobby
>> because federal regulations forbid monetary compensation for
>> any radio communications rendered.
>
>Though monetary compensation is forbidden, it often occurs. Some call
>them "repeater dues."
>
>Be that as it may, the Amateur Service has been useful and probably
>will continue to be useful in emergency communications when other
>comms fail.

Absolutely. ANY useable communications means is always useful
in an extreme emergency.

However, too many hams wallow in that possibility as if it were an
everyday fact, wanting undue praise and respect for being part of
it (yet not ever having been IN any emergency themselves).

They don't understand that most emergencies are rather small-
scale things, unlikely to make the cover of Time or Newsweek.

>> There is the common thread among the "tribal rule" individuals that
>> no one unlicensed in amateur radio can possibly know anything
>> about amateur radio, therefore they should be silent. Preposterous
>> since U.S. amateur radio activity is widely publicized (among those
>> who care to find out) and federal regulations forbid any secrecy in
>> amateur communications.
>
>I've seen it bragged on here that the ARRL Amateur Handbook is found
>in professional radio engineers library shelves. Must be a one way
>street.

That may be true in some places and I have seen personal copies
of the handbook on individual office bookshelves. Usually we are
all awash in great heaping globs of other printed material and
specifications. Reference textbooks are many and varied in any
engineering environment. An ARRL Handbook there would be a
rare find. Referencing an ARRL Handbook in a Report is likely
to put one in the negative side of personnel review... :-)

If the Handbook is the only big reference they have on radio, and
never having seen what is available on ALL radio, they will
naturally assume professionals use it too. They seldom do.

A column by Robert W. Lucky in this months' issue of Spectrum,
the IEEE membership magazine, addresses "archiving" of
information with an example of his employer's (Lucent) library
closure.

>> No one on the staff of the FCC or the Commissioners themselves
>> are required to have any amateur radio licenses, yet the FCC has
>> the lawful duty to regulate amateur radio and mitigate interference
>> matters, up to and including imposing fines and calling on U.S.
>> Marshals to arrest extreme miscreants. That rather destroys their
>> concept that "only other amateurs can tell them what to do."
>
>I hope someone in authority is watching the nutty one. He really
>spooks me.

I have to ask, "WHICH nutty one?" :-)

>> Amateur radios operate by exactly the same physics as radios in
>> all other radio services. Propagation of radio waves occurs in
>> exactly the same way as for all other radio services. There are
>> no exceptions despite some odd ideas and strange misconceptions

>> among certain radio amateurs.
>
>Might be because they do not understand other radio services and think
>amateur radio is special.

True! Plus they've been fed information from a single source which
uses selective editing to allow only part of the information to reach
them. That results in a cult-like Belief that is very strong.

Unreasonable, but strong.

>> It is impossible to rationally discuss anything with certain people
>> (such as Robeson) since they are too emotionally-driven and too
>> prideful in their concept of their personal hobby involvement. They
>> must - absolutely - have their way or all are treated to personally
>> abusive remarks from them.
>
>I tire of him. He's irrational.

Agreed.

>> The above is representative of their non-reasoning in demanding a
>> morse code test for all new amateurs...pure emotional basis on
>> what they had to endure long ago (and probably resent).
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>uphill both ways. bb

:-)

LHA / WMD

1342. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 22:59:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320175917.21955.00001085@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 89354

In article <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>>>sense.
>>
>>>>Mike,
>>>>
>>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>>>>license:
>>>>
>>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>>>>run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't need
>>>>to be tested on it)
>>>
>>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>>
>>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>>giving the tests are being overburdened?
>>
>> It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
>> privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?
>
> Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
>eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
>appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
>connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
>licensed contractors.
>
> I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
>it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
>privileges right out from under our feet.

Paranoic rationalization is fun?

> I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
>is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
>only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
>seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.

New concepts are "strange," unfamiliar. Familiar things are warm,
comfortable, fuzzy things you can understand...

> Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
>Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?

Winning top points in "radio sport?" "Pioneering" HF?

>> However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed -
>> just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must
then
>> migrate to the next-higher class of license.
>
> If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all? For
>anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
>not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
>Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
>those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
>those self destructive hams from themselves. Just like cigarette
>smokers. And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
>of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?

"Radiation" is a talisman word for paranoic control-freaks...and some
politicians wanting attention.

A half century ago I was part of a group of radio transmitter operators
running KiloWatt output HF transmitters. We got rather simple verbal
instruction (no classrooms, no written tests) of "don't touch this (or
that), it will KILL you." No problem. In three years of transmitting, no
one at ADA was killed by HV or RF.

Arguing with radiation paranoics about things they don't understand
is quite another thing. That's why we've all got those EMI regulations
now.

>> So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the next-level
>> test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff removed.
>> Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>
> Nope.

RM-10787 doesn't. :-)

>>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
>>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>>bother to upgrade?)
>>
>>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that

>>>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>>
>> Here's the problem:
>>
>> What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges
are
>> very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from HF/MF.
>> This means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.
>
>> And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and
almost
>> certainly with manufactured equipment.
>>
>> The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in
very
>> little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those
>> questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not.
>> After all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even
obtained
>> an entry-level amateur license?
>>
>> Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a
balanced
>> mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges,
coupled
>> with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can
sample
>> more of what ham radio has to offer.
>
> Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
>worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade. In
>addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
>from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
>have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
>them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.
>
> I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
>HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
>privileges. It also makes for less of a class system.

Of course. Call it something else and "it is not a class distinction."

:-)

"Let them eat cake?" [attributed to one Marie Antoinette long ago...]

>If the Tech has
>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>there, then it's a great thing.

All are happy in the back of the bus, playing banjos and munching
watermelon? :-)

>> For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore
old
>> gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
>> realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which do
you
>> think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?
>
> Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's. I'd
>certainly like that myself.

You didn't answer his question.

>> Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
>> beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?
>
>> That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're really
>> trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was
to
>> have a very limited license to get people started, so they could
>> learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham radio.
>>
>>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>>
>> I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other
factors.
>>
>> But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let
>> everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise in
>> the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once
and
>> for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be
very
>> upset.....
>
> comments:
>
> We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!

Riiiiiiight....

>> Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another
NPRM
>> cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just about
4
>> years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...
>>
>>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>>accomplishment. "Class"

>>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>>
>>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>>mind! ;^)
>>
>> Very bad karma!
>>
>> Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot
change.
>> That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>>
>>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important
>>>>part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>>
>>> Agreed 100 percent!
>>
>> This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it must
be
>> opposed. No good can come of such requirements.
>
> And How!

To the barricades! Defend to the death your version of bigotry!

Raise the drawbridge! Drag out the thrownet!

> BTW Jim, in one of my previous posts I used the letter combination LIB.

>Especially in this age of internet acronyms, that would be tricky. It's
>a sound thing. Along the lines of MR Ducks. Simply say the letters and
>you'll have the comment. L I B (well I'll Be) All you have to do is
>remember the context in which I wrote it.

Shame! You're bring in cell phone shorthand in here!

This is a ham radio policy newsgroup where the PCTA meet to fight.

None of the cell phone pheng shooey here!

LHA / WMD

1343. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:26:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <juCdnUnHndDOScHdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89357

Len Over 21 wrote:

>>>emergency.
>>
>>Hint: They will if it is useful for them to do so. Should the
>>network fail, they will resort to other means.

The military and civil authorities don't even consider the cell network
in there emergency communications plans, they know it is too unreliable,
they do consider Amateur Radio.

1344. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:46:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kPqdnUTCzbJQSsHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89358
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <gobble-de-guke@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

Hehe, cute one Frank!

> I did my homework long before this thread was started. The rule is clear. Any
> attempt to pin a different interpretation on it is no better than illegal CBers
> claiming that CB rules are not laws, or any of the other cock-and-bull excuses
> they make.

But you didn't do enough nmework to see that you are wrong....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1345. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:48:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320184822.12501.00006884@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89361

In article <c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>"Sorry to not bow and scrape to your most esteemed worthiness, but if you
>ever got down from your high horse, you might be tolerable to other
>civilized humans."
>_____
>
>Sounds like good self-advice, Leonard. Why don't you try it? And if you
>can't, just do your best impression of a human being. It would certainly be
>an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.

Poor baby. No one giving you the love, attention, and respect you
richly deserve?

Darn shame that is.

Okay everybody...one...two...three...all respect Arnie!

Wonderful human being and champion 1930s radio operator!

Yay!

<sound of one hand clapping...>

LHA / WMD

1346. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:48:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320184823.12501.00006885@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89360

In article <1X37c.197$OP3.162@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Sure, the cell phone towers have batteries. They're likely fine for a
>number of hours of outage - but Gouverneur had no power for over two weeks.
>Those batteries aren't designed to last for weeks of drain without recharge.
>In this country, an engineer could well be fired for overdesigning something
>(that costs money).

Right, those darn engineers are the cause of all the problems!

>Likewise, those batteries are there to keep things
>working for a *short* power outage. It would cost too much to design those
>cell towers to run on batteries for weeks on end with no recharging in that
>period. It probably wouldn't have mattered much anyways as the conventional
>phone lines were out too - and cell phones are wireless only between the
>user and the tower. BTW, unless you had your own generator and were on
>two-way satellite internet, you wouldn't have the internet either.

You don't have a motor-generator set for emergency power?!?

Gosh and golly, aren't all radio amateurs "emergency minutemen,"
ready to leap in and save the day with ham radio?

I've been told that...

LHA / WMD

1347. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:48:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320184824.12501.00006886@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89362

In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Hello, Steve
>
>I think I have figured out the real problem behind most of the flames both
>in this group and rec.radio.cb. I might be wrong, but it appears everyone
>is trying to defend that their particular turf is "important" and someone
>else's is not.

...more likely just defending their own pesonna, but why spoil your
nice rant? :-)

>If you go back into the 50s and 60s, amateur radio served quite well for
>long-haul phone patches and in emergencies. Very localized emergencies,
>such as an auto accident would largely be reported by normal telephone. In
>the 70s, the cb craze took hold and certainly I would expect that cb was
>sometimes used to report the accidents. The small number of amateurs would
>preclude them being involved very often in such a situation. Voilla, cb is
>more important than ham radio.
>
>Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
>reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
>needs cb?"
>
>A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a hobby.

Amateurs are all there to SERVE as "emergency minutemen!"

Right.

>Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
>telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected.

Riiight...on 11 Sep 01 the entire borough of Manhattan went down
after the Attack on the WTC towers...?

Ham radio was Johnny-on-the-spot immediately notifying all?

>That nasty
>ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?) affected areas for hundreds of
>miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after
>power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for
>hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat,
>power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!

Upstate New York is YOUR "turf," right?

Was anyone knocking the state of New York? (or New Yourk?)

I don't think so.

>One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know
>if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to
>the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator
>backup with a *lot* of fuel available.

Did the nasty police engineer get fired because he didn't specify
emergency power for the "police repeater?"

>I don't think it is as important "how" something is done as opposed to the
>fact that it gets done. If someone is assisting at a shelter cooking meals,
>that individual is *doing* something. That, to me, is more important than
>all of the useless crying that goes on around these parts from time to time

Right...I'm going to need a ham license in order to volunteer serving
at homeless shelters? They do serve ham. Quite good, tastes like
chicken...wonder who it was?

>BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries,
>flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur
>operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over
>100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on
>VHF/UHF or cb.

Did New York state close down all its National Guard units? Air
Guard? Political disagreement between NY Governor and the
White House? Was FEMA on vacation? No aid available for NY
state? Terrible situation!

Well, next time that happens, send me an aid request via NTS.
I'll put together a CARE package for you with an extra can of
Sterno so you won't be too cold. Ought to arrive in two months;
takes 7 weeks to get the NTS message through...allow for
sufficient time.

Anything to help.

LHA / WMD

1348. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:48:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040320184826.12501.00006887@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89363

In article <NbudnRYLH_6jJsHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> In <04N6c.13839$t16.7985784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
>>>news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
>>>
>>>>In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>>>
>>><w4nti@get
>>>
>>>>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
>>>
>>>rules.
>>>
>>>>And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
>>>>amateur radio service.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
>>>
>>>say,
>>>
>>>>"....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
>>>
>>>is
>>>
>>>>suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
>>>
>>>explained
>>>
>>>>the reasons why to the point of excess.
>>>>

>>>
>>>Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
>>>aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If
>they
>>>do, it is the fault of the receiver.
>>
>>
>>
>> I have read Part 15 and it says no such thing. What it -does- say is this
>> (emphasis added):
>>
>> --------
>> Sec. 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
>> (a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are ADVISED to
>CONSIDER the
>> proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio stations,
>such as
>> broadcast, amateur, land mobile, [etc], when choosing operating frequencies
>> during the design of their equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for
>> receiving HARMFUL INTERFERENCE.
>> --------
>>
>> 15.3(m) defines "harmful interference" (again, emphasis added):
>>
>> --------
>> ANY emission, radiation or induction that [...] seriously degrades,
>obstructs or
>> repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunications service operating in accordance
>with
>> this chapter.
>> --------
>>
>> Now look at 97.101(d) again (and again, emphasis added):
>>
>> --------
>> No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause
>> interference to ANY radio communication or signal.
>> --------
>>
>> Notice that the limiting word 'harmful' is NOT included, which means this
>rule
>> applies to ANY form of interference. It also says "ANY radio communication
>or
>> signal", which does -not exclude- intermediate frequency (IF) radio
>signals.
>>
>>
>>
>>>If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>>>signal, then he is not interfering with any service.

>>
>>
>>
>> Most of the time that's the case.
>>
>>
>>
>>> Interference is
>>>transmitting on the same frequency as another service.
>>
>>
>>
>> The FCC defines interference in 2.1(c) as:
>>
>> "The effect of unwanted energy due to one or a combination of emissions,
>> radiations, or inductions upon reception in a radio[chyph]communication
>system,
>> manifested by any performance degradation, misinterpretation, or loss of
>> information which could be extracted in the absence of such unwanted
>energy."
>>
>> So much for your semantic spin-job.
>
> When trying to do a semantic spin job, the trick is to always accuse
>the person your discussing the issue with of it.

...or just follow the format of Mike's postings. :-)

> And you have spun a good one. In the time I have been a Ham, you are
>the only one that has put forth your argument. You're taking several
>different sections of the rules, combining them together, then adding a
>liberal dose of conjecture and conclusion jumping. Doesn't work like
>that. Maybe consulting a good communications lawyer might help?

Maybe YOU ought to re-read Parts 15 and 97 more closely?

USGPO has all the Parts of Title 47 C.F.R. on free download.
You can link to it from the FCC website.

Have you made any Comments on Access BPL to the FCC?

NPRM 04-29 is also free for the download at the FCC website.

Look under Docket 04-37 for the first document or go to the
Office of Engineering and Technology for a direct link.

Or are you just content to make like a hockey player in here,
thinking you make "goals" by sticking everyone and tawkin tuff?

LHA / WMD

1349. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:48:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kPqdnUfCzbLCRcHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <NbudnRYLH_6jJsHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>>
>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
>>>So much for your semantic spin-job.
>>
>> When trying to do a semantic spin job, the trick is to always accuse
>>the person your discussing the issue with of it.
>>
>> And you have spun a good one. In the time I have been a Ham, you are
>>the only one that has put forth your argument. You're taking several
>>different sections of the rules, combining them together, then adding a
>>liberal dose of conjecture and conclusion jumping.
>
>
>
> I think you were looking in the mirror when you came up with that opinion
> because I have been staying true to 97.101(d) the entire time. It is you and
> everyone else that is grasping for irrelevant issues, such as interference
> -from- Part 15 devices, and making up your own definitions for 'interference'.

You are right. Everyone else, me included. And apparently you and your
lawyer friend
.
>
>
>
>>Maybe consulting a good communications lawyer might help?
>
>
>
> Got a good one at the station. Talked to him on several occasions about this and
> other issues.

Cool! perhaps s/he would care to tell us how things got turned around.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1350. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-20 23:55:38 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <oamp50lf7v8ssqbln2qv1gg43ihdsa10bu@4ax.com>
Source record: 89364
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <kPqdnUfCzbLCRcHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <NbudnRYLH_6jJsHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>> <snip>
>>
>>>>So much for your semantic spin-job.
>>>
>>> When trying to do a semantic spin job, the trick is to always accuse
>>>the person your discussing the issue with of it.
>>>
>>> And you have spun a good one. In the time I have been a Ham, you are
>>>the only one that has put forth your argument. You're taking several
>>>different sections of the rules, combining them together, then adding a
>>>liberal dose of conjecture and conclusion jumping.
>>
>>
>>
>> I think you were looking in the mirror when you came up with that opinion
>> because I have been staying true to 97.101(d) the entire time. It is you and
>> everyone else that is grasping for irrelevant issues, such as interference
>> -from- Part 15 devices, and making up your own definitions for 'interference'.
>
> You are right. Everyone else, me included. And apparently you and your
>lawyer friend
>.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Maybe consulting a good communications lawyer might help?
>>
>>
>>
>> Got a good one at the station. Talked to him on several occasions about this and
>> other issues.

>
> Cool! perhaps s/he would care to tell us how things got turned around.

Nothing is "turned around". Everything is as clear and concise as 97.101(d). Why don't you find yourself a lawyer and have him/her try to find the answer you can't find yourself -- which law exempts hams from 97.101(d) when the device receiving the interference is a "poor design"?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1351. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:02:02 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <4gmp505gf6ueool1s0cckrnbtmm1ebncs3@4ax.com>
Source record: 89365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <kPqdnUTCzbJQSsHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <gobble-de-guke@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
> Hehe, cute one Frank!

Well, I thought the original mess of letters might have been what prevented my
first reply from getting through to the server. It's happened before.

>> I did my homework long before this thread was started. The rule is clear. Any
>> attempt to pin a different interpretation on it is no better than illegal CBers
>> claiming that CB rules are not laws, or any of the other cock-and-bull excuses
>> they make.
>
>
> But you didn't do enough nmework to see that you are wrong....

What law releases a ham from the legal responsibility of a violation of their
own rule against interference just because the device that is interfered with is
of "poor design"? Why can't you answer the question, Mike? Why do you continue
with this prolonged song and dance routine?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1352. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:05:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <h%47c.1275$V66.878@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89366
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040319213938.701$UD@newsreader.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > Frank Gilliland wrote:
> >
> > > In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
> > > <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > <snip>
> > >
> > >>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000
to
> > >>>1.
> > >>
> > >>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
> > >>rights people would love your attitude.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound
> > > like Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or
> > >>>television signal, or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at
> > >>>fault....
> > >>
> > >>Not if his station is clean.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like
> > > that?
> >
> > And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
> >
> Street rules?

Steveo is making a threat, that if someone messes up his piece of junk
stereo, he will come over and kick your ass.

Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.

Dan/W4NTI

1353. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:27:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403201627.63438487@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89367

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> "Sorry to not bow and scrape to your most esteemed worthiness, but if you
> ever got down from your high horse, you might be tolerable to other
> civilized humans."
> --
>
> Sounds like good self-advice, Leonard. Why don't you try it? And if you
> can't, just do your best impression of a human being. It would certainly be
> an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.

Personally, I think it's arrogance to the Nth degree that Lennie
even remotely PRESUMES himself to be "civilized"...especially when
it's his profane, untruthful rantings herein that so lovingly endeear
him to us all.

> BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the Mobile
> Incident Command Center the other day. First contact was via CW with a
> station in Iowa. Conditions for SSB were just not up to par. We just love
> having all those tools in our communications kit.
>
> We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP
> network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We are
> now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever
> needed. 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old
> and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.

I spent the day at TEMA (Tennessee Emergency Management Agency)
EOC and GUESS what I found...?!?!

A rack of R F Harris gear DEDICATED to Amateur HF nets. Also, the
EOC has two operating positions for V/UHF, as well as a packet station
and a seperate UHF rig dedicated to the SKYWARN net.

Seems that TEMA and FEMA don't have the same cavalier attitude
about Amateur Radio that Lennie insists such governmental agencies do.

In the course of the discussion the California ACS came up.
Seems Lennie doesn't have all his facts together there, either...And
THAT came from the mouth of a FEMA officer...Not that I doubted Lennie
was wrong.

"I'm laughing at the superior intellect..." Again.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1354. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:33:36 UTC
From: chahta <chahta@chahtatushka.org>
Message-ID: <Ap57c.31121$%06.11166@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89368
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Who in hell is "art Bell?????????????

"Mark" <merees@suny.nospam.edu> wrote in message
news:adc68$405cc2c1$d1cc7b2e$32684@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> ---
> FOUND THIS IN ALT.FAN.ART.BELL - NOT CONFIRMED
> IF THIS PROGRAM CHANGE IS VALID, BUT IF SO IT SHOULD
> BE A GOOD PROGRAM FOR ALL RADIO AMATEURS...
> ---
>
>
> "Occasional AB Listener" <iamnot@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:405C9BD6.7DFD@aol.com...
>
> Tonight (March 20, 2004), at 10:05 Pacific Time on "Coast to Coast A.M,"
> late-night radio talk-show host Art Bell is going to take a breather
> from the customary paranormal and conspiracy-related format and discuss
> a topic that will interest most -- if not all -- radio amateurs,
> shortwave radio enthusiasts and broadband users: Broadband Power Lines
> (BPLs).
>
> Now under development, BPL is a technology that will allow computer
> users to access high-speed, broadband Internet connections just by
> plugging the computer into the wall outlet. No need to pay hundreds of
> dollars in installation, activation/deactivation and service fees for
> Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL) or cable modems, just literally plug and
> play.
>
> Fans and supporters of BPL include the Federal Communications
> Commission, Power Line Communications Association and local utility
> companies. Since power lines are available in urban and rural areas,
> while DSL and cable services are limited or inaccessible in some
> sparsely populated areas, BPL is anticipated to be a major challenge to
> the existing methods of high-speed access. But BPL is not without its
> drawbacks.
>
> The American Radio Relay League (ARRL) is concerned about the amount of
> RF interference generated by BPL. According to their website
> (http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc), "Studies done by amateurs and
> regulators worldwide demonstrate conclusively that BPL that uses HF or
> VHF spectrum will cause serious degradation of the communications
> capability to nearby receivers on frequencies that BPL uses. HF is a
> unique international resource that is in use by commercial radio

> services, broadcasting, amateurs, government and military operators."
>
> Early Saturday morning, about 2 a.m. PST on 3840kHz, Art himself (radio
> amateur W6OBB) and his roundtable of fellow ham radio operators were
> discussing the amount of interference -- especially from 2MHz to 80MHz
> -- BPL can cause if service is implemented nationally. The hams
> conversing with Art on the 80-meter band said that constant buzzing
> heard on those frequencies will anger shortwave listeners and hams alike
> if RF interference is constantly heard on those frequencies.
>
> Another problem is the potential health risks associated. Could a
> substantial increase in RF exposure -- especially around the household
> -- contribute to the rise in cancer-related diseases? A very close
> friend of mine, who happens to be a ham radio operator living near
> Switzerland, explained to me that most of Europe has scrapped plans for
> BPL because of possible RF-related diseases, as well as RF interference
> in commercial and amateur/SWL communications.
>
> Nevertheless, tonight's "C2C" is going to be extremely interesting and
> worthwhile to those who are interested in all forms of radio
> communications. My friends and I will definitely be listening.
>
> ----------- end message ---------
>

1355. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:36:51 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <405CE3A3.AE37623A@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 89369
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

chahta wrote:

> Who in hell is "art Bell?????????????

It's just a Google search away...

>
>
> "Mark" <merees@suny.nospam.edu> wrote in message
> news:adc68$405cc2c1$d1cc7b2e$32684@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > ---
> > FOUND THIS IN ALT.FAN.ART.BELL - NOT CONFIRMED
> > IF THIS PROGRAM CHANGE IS VALID, BUT IF SO IT SHOULD
> > BE A GOOD PROGRAM FOR ALL RADIO AMATEURS...
> > ---
> >
> >
> > "Occasional AB Listener" <iamnot@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:405C9BD6.7DFD@aol.com...
> >
> > Tonight (March 20, 2004), at 10:05 Pacific Time on "Coast to Coast A.M,"
> > late-night radio talk-show host Art Bell is going to take a breather
> > from the customary paranormal and conspiracy-related format and discuss
> > a topic that will interest most -- if not all -- radio amateurs,
> > shortwave radio enthusiasts and broadband users: Broadband Power Lines
> > (BPLs).
> >
> > Now under development, BPL is a technology that will allow computer
> > users to access high-speed, broadband Internet connections just by
> > plugging the computer into the wall outlet. No need to pay hundreds of
> > dollars in installation, activation/deactivation and service fees for
> > Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL) or cable modems, just literally plug and
> > play.
> >
> > Fans and supporters of BPL include the Federal Communications
> > Commission, Power Line Communications Association and local utility
> > companies. Since power lines are available in urban and rural areas,
> > while DSL and cable services are limited or inaccessible in some
> > sparsely populated areas, BPL is anticipated to be a major challenge to
> > the existing methods of high-speed access. But BPL is not without its
> > drawbacks.
> >
> > The American Radio Relay League (ARRL) is concerned about the amount of

> > RF interference generated by BPL. According to their website
> > (http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc), "Studies done by amateurs and
> > regulators worldwide demonstrate conclusively that BPL that uses HF or
> > VHF spectrum will cause serious degradation of the communications
> > capability to nearby receivers on frequencies that BPL uses. HF is a
> > unique international resource that is in use by commercial radio
> > services, broadcasting, amateurs, government and military operators."
> >
> > Early Saturday morning, about 2 a.m. PST on 3840kHz, Art himself (radio
> > amateur W6OBB) and his roundtable of fellow ham radio operators were
> > discussing the amount of interference -- especially from 2MHz to 80MHz
> > -- BPL can cause if service is implemented nationally. The hams
> > conversing with Art on the 80-meter band said that constant buzzing
> > heard on those frequencies will anger shortwave listeners and hams alike
> > if RF interference is constantly heard on those frequencies.
> >
> > Another problem is the potential health risks associated. Could a
> > substantial increase in RF exposure -- especially around the household
> > -- contribute to the rise in cancer-related diseases? A very close
> > friend of mine, who happens to be a ham radio operator living near
> > Switzerland, explained to me that most of Europe has scrapped plans for
> > BPL because of possible RF-related diseases, as well as RF interference
> > in commercial and amateur/SWL communications.
> >
> > Nevertheless, tonight's "C2C" is going to be extremely interesting and
> > worthwhile to those who are interested in all forms of radio
> > communications. My friends and I will definitely be listening.
> >
> > ---------- end message ---------
> >

1356. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 00:38:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403201638.32d3ffaa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89370

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>
> > > > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
> played
> > > > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > > > >> > >
> > > > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > > > >> > > compliant devices?
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> > Sure. Why not?

> The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS,
> MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in
> ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.

As I stated in another thread, I had the chance to spend the day
in the TEMA/FEMA facility in Nashville.

The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.

I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
ROLE"...?!?!

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1357. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 01:31:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.huwb518.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89371

On Sat, 20 Mar 2004 22:52:45 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>Sure, the cell phone towers have batteries. They're likely fine for a
>number of hours of outage - but Gouverneur had no power for over two weeks.
>Those batteries aren't designed to last for weeks of drain without recharge.
>In this country, an engineer could well be fired for overdesigning something
>(that costs money). Likewise, those batteries are there to keep things
>working for a *short* power outage. It would cost too much to design those
>cell towers to run on batteries for weeks on end with no recharging in that
>period.

UPS float-charged batteries are designed to keep the equipment on
line until the backup generator gets up to speed/voltage. This
assumes that the latter is tested regularly. Pac*Bell learned that
the hard way when one of their gas turbine backup generators
literally tore itself to pieces when it attempted to start after
the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake - it had not been serviced or
tested for four years. Any garage mechanic can service a diesel
genset - it takes an aviation A&P qualified mechanic to service the
gas turbine....and their services cost money.

>It probably wouldn't have mattered much anyways as the conventional
>phone lines were out too - and cell phones are wireless only between the
>user and the tower.

Survivable microwave and fiber are the downlinks of choice nowadays.

The engineering firm that I consult for is in the business of
designing such facilities for the public safety amd land
transportation sector. Seismic Class 4 - storm and earthquake
survivable - is now required for all new or upgraded critical (i.e.
public safety) radio installations in California and we recommend it
for everyone.

What the make-it-cheaply phone companies do would make ol' Ma Bell
spin in her grave.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1358. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 01:31:52 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040320203152.583$Ri@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Why, is your disability contagious, freeloader?

1359. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 01:37:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3irk9$27e7m7$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89373

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

Poor baby. No one giving you the love, attention, and respect you richly deserve? Darn shame that is. Okay everybody...one...two...three...all respect Arnie! Wonderful human being and champion 1930s radio operator! Yay! <sound of one hand clapping...

No -- actually I get a lot of respect in my job, so I don't need any from you whatever as my ego is just fine.

As to the 1930s radio comment. You seem to be caught in a 1950's time warp, Leonard (Hell, no surprise there). The great gear that we have in our MICP is more akin to the 2030s -- We are well ahead of the curve. I'll bet you don't even know what a "Scotty" does? Again, no surprise if you don't. A quick Yahoo search to save face if you do.

Arnie -

1360. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 02:33:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403201833.1ecd007c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89374

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> "Sorry to not bow and scrape to your most esteemed worthiness, but if you
> ever got down from your high horse, you might be tolerable to other
> civilized humans."
> ----------
>
> Sounds like good self-advice, Leonard. Why don't you try it?

Arnie, sounds like good advice for lots of folks on here, doesn't it?

And if you
> can't, just do your best impression of a human being.

Wow. Warms the heart to see such humanity on the group.

It would certainly be
> an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.

Arn, ever see what Steve posts?

> BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the Mobile
> Incident Command Center the other day.

But 9/11 was more than 2.5 years ago.

First contact was via CW with a
> station in Iowa.

Was it Iowa that you needed to contact? I'm trying to think what an
East Coast military installation might need with Iowa? Looking for
obsolete Collins parts?

Conditions for SSB were just not up to par.

For a contact with Iowa? Did you try a band higher? Did you try a
band lower? Again, what was the reason Iowa was needed for a contact?

We just love
> having all those tools in our communications kit.

Wow. Me too.

> We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP
> network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We are
> now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever
> needed.

So you really didn't need to contact Iowa with amateur radio. I was wondering about that.

> 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old
> and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.

Strong redundancy equals GAO audits. They don't like redundancy even if it means survivability. They'd rather have the money spent on food stamps and WIC.

Arnie, its always great to read one of you posts. Thanks for stopping in.

1361. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 02:38:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403201838.66dfc775@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89375

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<5IX6c.13955$t16.8053117@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403200453.3cbdba1d@posting.google.com...
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
> >
> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
> >
> > Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular
> > telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens
> > emergency communications.
>
> You make the mistake by considering all emergencies to be equal.

No I don't.

They are
> not.

You won the door prize.

> Cell phone is great for communicating when you go off the road in an
> ice storm.

Actually, cell phones just might suck when you go off the road in an ice storm.

> It is useless when all the local cell towers have been taken out
> by a hurricane.

Has that ever happened? Name the storm.

> Emergency communications need to be appropriate to the
> situation.

Ding ding ding. Give that monkey a banana!

> Nothing more and nothing less.

Has ham radio ever NOT gotten through? Did the ham survive that emergency?

Even in a total comm blackout, people do survive.

1362. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 02:43:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89376

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
> > ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
> > in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is just
> > so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
> > eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
> > NOT leave.
>
> And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
> abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
> your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.
>
> Fair enough...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.

1363. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 03:34:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lJednUJ98tYBk8Dd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89377

Len Over 21 knocked the little old lady resthome resident from in front of the computer, grabbed the keybord and blathered:

> Well, next time that happens, send me an aid request via NTS.
> I'll put together a CARE package for you with an extra can of
> Sterno so you won't be too cold. Ought to arrive in two months;
> takes 7 weeks to get the NTS message through...allow for
> sufficient time.
>
> Anything to help.

No, ham radio does not "save the day" in every emergency, although it has at times, nor does every ham claim to be a hero, although some have gone above and beyond just like a lot of other good folks. Not often does ham radio become *the* major means of communications in a disaster situation, but it has in the past and likely will again in the future. Not in every disaster is ham radio called upon to help and supplement other official comms, but it has in the past and likely will in the future.

Poor old senile lennieboy, he just can't bring himself to admit that ham radio has and will play a vital part in emergency communications, and he can't be a part of it because he can't pass the test.

The military, Homeland Defense, and other civil officials recgonize the value that ham radio can be in times of emergencies, they intergrate it in their disaster planning, but they wouldn't give you the time of day lennieboy. Grinds your hemorrhoids dosen't it?
Now go back to pestering the little old ladies in the sitting room.

1364. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 03:38:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lJednX198tY0ksDd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89379

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> As I stated in another thread, I had the chance to spend the day
> in the TEMA/FEMA facility in Nashville.
>
> The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
> phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.
>
> I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
> ROLE"...?!?!

Steve, are you trying to tell us that the facility did *not* have a
specially dedicated cell phone just for disaster emergency comms?

1365. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 03:40:44 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3j2rg$28he3j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89378

"William" wrote ...

> Wow. Warms the heart to see such humanity on the group.
>

Apparently you've never been on the end of a personal attack from Leonard.
I have. He deserves a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his way.

> It would certainly be
> > an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.
>
> Arn, ever see what Steve posts?

Sure. They are usually in response to a first strike from Leonard. What's
your point?
>
> > BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the
Mobile
> > Incident Command Center the other day.
>
> But 9/11 was more than 2.5 years ago.
>

We've had plenty of comms ability since then, but put the gear in the MICP
as a means of improvement. Improvement of comms systems is a good thing,
right William?

> First contact was via CW with a
> > station in Iowa.
>
> Was it Iowa that you needed to contact? I'm trying to think what an
> East Coast military installation might need with Iowa? Looking for
> obsolete Collins parts?
>
> Conditions for SSB were just not up to par.
>
> For a contact with Iowa? Did you try a band higher? Did you try a
> band lower? Again, what was the reason Iowa was needed for a contact?
>

We tested the gear on ALL bands (and both modes). And Iowa was the place we
happened to contact first. If I need to contact FEMA via HF in another
state (including IOWA) I think I have proven that it can be done by this
test. And that, after all, was the purpose to begin with.

> We just love
> > having all those tools in our communications kit.

>
> Wow. Me too.
>
> > We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP
> > network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We
are
> > now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever
> > needed.
>
> So you really didn't need to contact Iowa with amateur radio. I was
> wondering about that.
>
Sure we did. The Ham gear is for redundancy. That's why we have it. A
test of it's HF capability was important. Test complete, test successful.

> > 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old
> > and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.
>
> Strong redundancy equals GAO audits. They don't like redundancy even
> if it means survivability. They'd rather have the money spent on food
> stamps and WIC.
>

Strong redundancy equals uninterrupted communications in an emergency. The
GAO cares not as long as we spend the money appropriately. Since the
purchases were pre-approved, I guess we already did that.

> Arnie, its always great to read one of you posts. Thanks for stopping
> in.

And you too William.

Arnie -

1366. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 03:49:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040320224918.05539.00004832@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89380

In article <Bn27c.120239$rB4.104671@bignews6.bellsouth.net>, "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Plus he didn't have any idea on what to do once a lot of his "issues" were
>addressed (such as holding W2NSD when living in 1 land)...

Bill:

What's wrong with holding an out-of-area call sign? I spent seven years as N3CRA while stationed in Germany and New York, and subsequently spent six years as WR2F while stationed in Colorado and Delaware. Holding an out-of-area call sign has been "legal" for at least as long as I've been a ham, and that's over 23 years now.

>Wayne now seems to be a sucker for every half-baked idea that comes along.
>(heard the program, sad.)

I heard the broadcast myself, in it's entirety. It made me cringe. If I had not been
reading his "Never Say Die" Editorials (purely for fun) in 73 Magazine for years, I
would have thought that this guy was a total fruitcake, and so must be everyone else who claims to be a "ham radio" operator. I'm concerned that a lot of non-ham listeners may have reached that very conclusion, but then again, those who listen to "Coast to Coast" are probably already predisposed in that direction. The only reason I listened was that I was taking a long night-drive from Delaware to New York, and that W2NSD just happened to be the "Guest Nutcase" that evening.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1367. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 03:58:17 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tp87c.233$gc4.27@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 89381

Len,

It wasn't the lack of a back-up generator that brought the police tower down - it was *ICE*. Ice destroyed the antenna.

Immediately after the attack on the WTC, everyone in Rochester that was on AT&T worldnet lost our internet. Funny how that happened. We had telephone, but no dial-up internet. I suspect there were major switching operations where the attack occurred.

As far as the ice storm, I was lucky. It did not get this far west. It was the Eastern half of NYS.

BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors in this newsgroup ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.637 / Virus Database: 408 - Release Date: 3/20/04

1368. Re: Amateur radio operator only and not Superman

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 04:00:18 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <mr87c.234$l84.171@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 89382

It isn't going to happen in the next 100 years and 100 years from now, I'm not going to care. I doubt any of us will 100 years from now ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.637 / Virus Database: 408 - Release Date: 3/20/04

1369. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 04:07:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <UfCdnX6xwJtnicDdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89383

Jim Hampton wrote:

> BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors
> in this newsgroup ...

Were you ever at a party and trying to talk to the adults while some 5
year old was running around pestering people just to get attention?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1370. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 04:21:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iqSdnXooy7jfhcDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank, there is a thread on rra.misc you should be in on. It's where some dude has done an interpretation on f.c.c rules, and now argues that jamming cell phones is legal. Sounds like a discussion that you would have a lot to contribute to. You might want to get on over there and participate! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1371. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 05:02:53 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B7CdnduQvfu4ucDdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89385
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

>
> Nothing is "turned around". Everything is as clear and concise as 97.101(d). Why
> don't you find yourself a lawyer and have him/her try to find the answer you
> can't find yourself -- which law exempts hams from 97.101(d) when the device
> receiving the interference is a "poor design"?
>

According to your warped logic, if a commercial broadcast station is
comming in on a nearby neighbor's crappy stereo, and the neighbor has
been made aware that they are interfering with his stereo, and the
broadcast station continues to broadcast, now knowing they are
interfering, then the broadcast station is legally at fault.
If a police or fire department base station is interfering with someones
television due to front end overload because the poor design of the set
prevents it from rejecting out of band signals, and the person notifies
the police or fire department of the interference, and if the police or
fire department continue to use their radios, even though they are clean
of harmonics, spurious signals, and the problem is the fault of the
television set, then the police and fire department are legally at fault.
NOT!!!!!!
Same for any ham radio station.

1372. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 05:35:55 UTC
From: Kevin O'Neill <onekev@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <A8KdnSwitZcmtMDdRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 89386
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Thanks for announcing this.

"Mark" <merees@suny.nospam.edu> wrote in message
news:adc68$405cc2c1$d1cc7b2e$32684@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> ---
> FOUND THIS IN ALT.FAN.ART.BELL - NOT CONFIRMED
> IF THIS PROGRAM CHANGE IS VALID, BUT IF SO IT SHOULD
> BE A GOOD PROGRAM FOR ALL RADIO AMATEURS...
> ---
>
>
> "Occasional AB Listener" <iamnot@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:405C9BD6.7DFD@aol.com...
>
> Tonight (March 20, 2004), at 10:05 Pacific Time on "Coast to Coast A.M,"
> late-night radio talk-show host Art Bell is going to take a breather
> from the customary paranormal and conspiracy-related format and discuss
> a topic that will interest most -- if not all -- radio amateurs,
> shortwave radio enthusiasts and broadband users: Broadband Power Lines
> (BPLs).
>
> Now under development, BPL is a technology that will allow computer
> users to access high-speed, broadband Internet connections just by
> plugging the computer into the wall outlet. No need to pay hundreds of
> dollars in installation, activation/deactivation and service fees for
> Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL) or cable modems, just literally plug and
> play.
>
> Fans and supporters of BPL include the Federal Communications
> Commission, Power Line Communications Association and local utility
> companies. Since power lines are available in urban and rural areas,
> while DSL and cable services are limited or inaccessible in some
> sparsely populated areas, BPL is anticipated to be a major challenge to
> the existing methods of high-speed access. But BPL is not without its
> drawbacks.
>
> The American Radio Relay League (ARRL) is concerned about the amount of
> RF interference generated by BPL. According to their website
> (http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc), "Studies done by amateurs and
> regulators worldwide demonstrate conclusively that BPL that uses HF or
> VHF spectrum will cause serious degradation of the communications
> capability to nearby receivers on frequencies that BPL uses. HF is a
> unique international resource that is in use by commercial radio

> services, broadcasting, amateurs, government and military operators."
>
> Early Saturday morning, about 2 a.m. PST on 3840kHz, Art himself (radio
> amateur W6OBB) and his roundtable of fellow ham radio operators were
> discussing the amount of interference -- especially from 2MHz to 80MHz
> -- BPL can cause if service is implemented nationally. The hams
> conversing with Art on the 80-meter band said that constant buzzing
> heard on those frequencies will anger shortwave listeners and hams alike
> if RF interference is constantly heard on those frequencies.
>
> Another problem is the potential health risks associated. Could a
> substantial increase in RF exposure -- especially around the household
> -- contribute to the rise in cancer-related diseases? A very close
> friend of mine, who happens to be a ham radio operator living near
> Switzerland, explained to me that most of Europe has scrapped plans for
> BPL because of possible RF-related diseases, as well as RF interference
> in commercial and amateur/SWL communications.
>
> Nevertheless, tonight's "C2C" is going to be extremely interesting and
> worthwhile to those who are interested in all forms of radio
> communications. My friends and I will definitely be listening.
>
> ----------- end message ---------
>

1373. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 05:49:44 UTC
From: melvincreep@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <811235ad.0403202149.2254ff09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89387
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<A7OdnRup-pIqpMfdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>...
> Wayne Green. Loser extrordinaire. Failed more ham radio businesses and
> magazines than anyone in human history.
>
> I don't want to pay to listen to him, unless I'm writing a book about
> "good examples of a bad example".
++
Wayne Green loser? You can like or dislike the guy but making such
idiotic statements like that make you look like, well, an idiot. Below
are some of Mr. Green's accomplishments, loser eh? How about postings
yours Bushog? 7-11 cashier, wal-mart stocker, truck driver, am I
close? Sounds like you are a loser in life who's more than a bit
jealous than anyone who actually has a successful and fulfilling life.
Do society a favor and die asshole.
Melvin

From http://www.waynegreen.com
Who is Wayne Green? I'm a been there done that guy. I have......

piloted a nuclear attack submarine 800 feet under the Pacific ocean.
piloted an Air Force C5B (it's bigger than a 747).
climbed the Great Wall of China
visited the Chinese terra cotta army in Xian.
operated a ham station from the famed American Embassy in Tehran.
operated from the Korean Demilitarized Zone.
operated for two weeks from King's Hussein's palace in Amman, Jordan.
visited the lost city of Petra in Jordan.
scuba dived in the Red Sea.
visited 133 countries (so far).
helped new technologies such as cellular telephones. personal
computers, and compact discs to grow into major industries.
represented the US at an international communications conference.
represented New Hampshire for Governor Sununu at a governor's
conference in Halifax.
served on the New Hampshire Economic Development Commission.
been a president of the Peterborough NH Chamber of Commerce.
been on the board of directors of billion dollar IDG corporation.
been a professional psychologist.
had over 1,000 (long) editorials published - so far.
started first digital communications magazine in 1951, (Amateur Radio
Frontiers).
started the first microcomputer magazine (Byte).)
started the first computer magazine devoted to a single computer (80

Micro - for the TRS-80)
started the first Apple magazine (InCider).
started the first Commodore magazine (Run).
started the first laptop computer magazine (Pico).
started one of the first personal computer software companies (Instant Software).
opened computer software stores - eventually sold a national chain of 58 stores.
while in college started a broadcasting station (WRPI) which is now the largest student activity.
served on the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Board of Overseers and RPI Council.
served as the First Executive in Residence at RPI.
served as a consultant for the RPI Business Incubator - which won the 1996 prize as the best in the country.
been a licensed amateur radio operator as W2NSD since 1940.
pioneered amateur radio repeaters since 1969, starting with WRLAAB on Mt. Monadnock NH.
established amater radio in Jordan in 1970 and wrote their rules and regulations.
supplied and installed the first repeater in Jordan, J-Y73, in 1973.
helped radio amateurs pioneer FM, radio Teletype, single sideband, and slow scan TV.
bounced amateur radio signals off the Moon from the big dish at the Arecibo Observatory, PR.
been editing and publishing amateur radio magazines for 47 years.
a state-of-the-art digital recording studio.
four record labels and produced over 150 CDs.
helped re-popularize ragtime music and personally knows all of the top ragtime performers.
started 25 successful publications in the radio, computer and music fields.
published over 100 books.
wrote one of the first books on digital communications.
been on an African hunting safari.
visited the ruins of Ba'albek in Lebanon, the Queen of Sheba's water catchments in Aden.
visited the Pyramids, the Sphynx. the ruins in Athens, the Taj Mahal and Katmandu.
visited the head-hunter longhouses in Sarawak.
helped organize and lead trade groups of around 250 people to yearly electronic shows in Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong.
given keynote addresses to radio, educational, computer, and music conferences.
helped invent a new kind of loud speaker - borrowed $1,000 on my car to start a manufacturing company and within two and a half years it became the largest speaker manufacturer in the country with seven factories.
performed in The Mikado and Pirates of Penzance in high school
served as president of radio clubs in high school and college.

served in Navy 1942-1946 in WWII - electronic technician on USS Drum SS-228 (which is on display at Mobile, Alabama) for five war patrols.
been a radio engineer and announcer in North Carolina, Florida and Virginia.
been chief cameraman at WPIX-TV (11) in NYC.
produced and directed network TV shows in Dallas and Cleveland.
a reputation as a gourmet cook.
served as president of Porsche Club of America.
raced my Porsche on the Nurburgring and Solitude race tracks in Germany.
both driven and navigated in many national SCCA car rallies.
served as a founder and first secretary of American Mensa.
a Ph.D. in Entrepreneurial Science.
lectured on entrepreneurialism at Yale, Boston University, Case Western, Babson College, RPL and many other colleges.
been on the first commercial airline flight between Philadelphia and New York in 1927.
flown with father since 1922.
served on the FCC's National Industry Advisory Committee (NIAC).
served on the FCC's Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC).
testified before a Congressional hearing on the music industry.
had the usual toys: airplane, Porsche, yacht, Jaguar, Mercedes 600 Pullman limosine.
worked on a Guggenheim grant on a color organ for the Guggenheim Museum on 5th Avenue.
graduated Bliss Electrical SchooL Tacoma Padc MD.
attended Radio Materiel School on Treasure Island, San Francisco and graduated as ETM2/c.
served for five war patrols on SS-228 USS Dnun, made ETMI/c.
taught electronics at Submarine School, New London CT.
organized and run successful mail order Elm Stamp Company at age 12.
sung in St. Pauls Church choir as boy soprano.
sung in Philharmonic Choir of Brooklyn.
sung in Erasmus High School Choral Club.
pioneered the 6-meter ham band as the first New York City station on that band.
run a 6-meter beacon station for several years in cooperation with the Radio Amateur Scientific Observations (RASO) program.
for years had a VHF/UHF station on Mt. Monadnock NH; regularly heard for over 600 miles.
been Excutive Secretary of the Music Research Foundation, Madison Avenue, N.Y.
worked for GE as a test engineer on Army radio equipment.
been an engineer at Airborne Instrument Laboratories in Mineola NY developing radar equip.
tried marijuana in 1948 to see what it was like.
tried LSD in 1960 to see what that was like.
drunk with shipmates on liberty while in the Navy. Have seldom drunk since.
tried smoking as a teenager, thought it was stupid. Ignored peer

pressure.
know the real dope on Amelia Earhart's last trip.
been convinced that NASA had to have faked all of the moon landings.
driven from Brooklyn NY to Peterborough NH (250 miles), averaging 100 mph one night - including a gas stop.
interesting friends such as Barry Goldwater, King Hussein, Steve Jobs, Bill Gates, and Rod McKuen.
been convinced that with proper nutrition and avoiding poisons we ran dependably live to over 100.
ridden Starlit Night, the Ringling Brothers top show horse.
a professorship of horsemanship and taught riding instructors.
a Hubbard Dianetic Auditor certificate and has processed over 100 patients, with some remarkable successes.
swum the three mile length of Coney Island many times.
investigated crop circles and a UFO hovering over a house in nearby Francistown NH.
Other than all that I've been taking it easy and having a great time.

1374. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013309.01632.00001403@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89395

In article <c3j2rg$28he3j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"William" wrote ...
>
>> Wow. Warms the heart to see such humanity on the group.
>
>Apparently you've never been on the end of a personal attack from Leonard.
>I have. He deserves a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his way.

I'm sure you think so. You have a terrible ego problem in that
you need to have agreement from everyone that your viewpoint
is the only possible "correct" one. It isn't, and you don't like
certain folks who won't kiss your [expletive deleted].

You managed a personal attack on me some time back via a
web page with my allege "photo" on there. Beat the gunnery
nurse by months.

I've been up-front in public in all these arguments. I didn't try
to sneak behind any backs to defame another like you or the
gunnery nurse did.

>> It would certainly be
>> > an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.
>>
>> Arn, ever see what Steve posts?
>
>Sure. They are usually in response to a first strike from Leonard.

Wayyyyy incorrect, inspector clueless.

Want proof? Go to Google. Start looking. It will take days.

But, if past is prologue, you will see only what you WANT to see.

>What's
>your point?
>>
>> > BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the
>Mobile
>> > Incident Command Center the other day.
>>
>> But 9/11 was more than 2.5 years ago.
>
>We've had plenty of comms ability since then, but put the gear in the MICP
>as a means of improvement. Improvement of comms systems is a good thing,

>right William?

Work on your SSB equipment some more. You couldn't reach Iowa.

>> First contact was via CW with a
>> > station in Iowa.
>>
>> Was it Iowa that you needed to contact? I'm trying to think what an
>> East Coast military installation might need with Iowa? Looking for
>> obsolete Collins parts?
>>
>> Conditions for SSB were just not up to par.
>>
>> For a contact with Iowa? Did you try a band higher? Did you try a
>> band lower? Again, what was the reason Iowa was needed for a contact?
>
>We tested the gear on ALL bands (and both modes). And Iowa was the place we
>happened to contact first. If I need to contact FEMA via HF in another
>state (including IOWA) I think I have proven that it can be done by this
>test. And that, after all, was the purpose to begin with.

But, you couldn't make there and had to resort to CW.

>> We just love
>> > having all those tools in our communications kit.
>>
>> Wow. Me too.
>>
>> > We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP
>> > network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We
>are
>> > now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever
>> > needed.
>>
>> So you really didn't need to contact Iowa with amateur radio. I was
>> wondering about that.
>>
>Sure we did. The Ham gear is for redundancy. That's why we have it. A
>test of it's HF capability was important. Test complete, test successful.

But, you said you only got Iowa by CW. Only one mode.

>> > 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old
>> > and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.
>>
>> Strong redundancy equals GAO audits. They don't like redundancy even
>> if it means survivability. They'd rather have the money spent on food
>> stamps and WIC.
>
>Strong redundancy equals uninterrupted communications in an emergency. The
>GAO cares not as long as we spend the money appropriately. Since the
>purchases were pre-approved, I guess we already did that.

Riiight...you got it through the bureaocracy. :-)

Is the General Accounting Office (GAO) staffed with radio experts?

LHA / WMD

1375. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013310.01632.00001404@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89391

In article <c3irk9$27e7m7$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>No -- actually I get a lot of respect in my job, so I don't need any from
>you whatever as my ego is just fine.

Not believable. You've been absent from public view in this newsgroup
for months. The first post you make is a direct attack against me.
Not about amateur radio policy, but about me.

You still have a bruised and sore ego from long-ago go-arounds
in here. You need better treatment for those self-perceived wounds.

>As to the 1930s radio comment. You seem to be caught in a 1950's time warp,
>Leonard (Hell, no surprise there). The great gear that we have in our MICP
>is more akin to the 2030s -- We are well ahead of the curve.

You are now working in the electronics industry too? Amazing.

Even the electronics industry can't predict what is coming in
25 years from now.

>I'll bet you don't even know what a "Scotty" does?

In reference to what? A Scotsman? A doggie? An old tissue?

Maybe you've been into the Black and White too much and
are seeing a future that isn't there...like in the year 2030.

Don't drink and derive.

>Again, no surprise if you don't. A
>quick Yahoo search to save face if you do.

I care nothing about your "quizzes."

You aren't into the NCVEC proposal, just your own nasty little ego
wanting vengence for perceived past wrongs in a newsgroup.

Did you ever get a chance to see a U.S. Army Regimental Signal
Center in operation when you were employed by the Army?
I'll bet you didn't and probably didn't even try.

Did you ever get a chance to look at FM 24-24 back when you
were an Army dick? [excuse me, "investigator"] I guess not.

We could have had a decent, civil discussion back then but, no,
you had to assert yourself and make like an "expert" with all the
"Army uses CW" talk. Tsk, tsk, tsk...all that time and wounds

still fester in you.

LHA / WMD

1376. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013311.01632.00001405@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89390

In article <UfCdnX6xwJtnicDdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Jim Hampton wrote:
>
>> BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors
>> in this newsgroup ...
>
>Were you ever at a party and trying to talk to the adults while some 5
>year old was running around pestering people just to get attention?

That was the 5-year-old General, wasn't it? Kid had lots of QSL
cards, yammering that "Australia came in so LOUD last night!"

You should have taken kid aside and Elmered the 5-year-old into
an Extra upgrade.

LHA / WMD

1377. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013311.01632.00001406@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89393

In article <tp87c.233$gc4.27@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Len,
>
>It wasn't the lack of a back-up generator that brought the police tower
>down - it was *ICE*. Ice destroyed the antenna.

Thank you for the clarification.

>Immediately after the attack on the WTC, everyone in Rochester that was on
>AT&T worldnet lost our internet. Funny how that happened. We had
>telephone, but no dial-up internet. I suspect there were major switching
>operations where the attack occurred.

No loss of AOL here. Nor of broadcast TV feeds from NYC on
the major networks.

>As far as the ice storm, I was lucky. It did not get this far west. It was
>the Eastern half of NYS.

I'm sorry you had problems. Others in here have not been sorry
that the southwestern USA has experienced several spectacular
emergencies with losses of life. Some were actually overjoyed
that we had problems...such as the 1994 Northridge Earthquake
that killed over 50 people and got us an in-person Presidential
visit. Some easterners are very parochial and consider our "west"
to be not of the Union. [search Google for examples]

In such an environment of truly rude and obnoxious newsgroupies,
it is difficult to be Their kind of "civil" and support their bigoted
opinions. My apologies for slighting anyone in the NY state
area suffering winter ice storms and prolonged power outages.
I have friends in NY state too. They don't work in communications.

>BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors
>in this newsgroup ...

I am sure you do. :-)

Independent thought is a terrible thing to some. They can't stand
it and fight with might against it. "Ein volk, ein Reich!" (sound
familiar?) :-)

See the title of this particular thread. One individual seeks to
harass and intimidate another amateur...on baseless "charges"
that the individual manufactured out of spite and/or illness.

Do you approve of such behavior?

LHA / WMD

1378. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013313.01632.00001407@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89388

In article <lJednUJ98tYBk8Dd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 knocked the little old lady resthome resident from in front
>of the computer, grabbed the keybord and blathered:

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Tuff Tawk already in "reply?" :-)

My home is quite restful, thank you. My wife likes it, too. But,
it is not a "resthome"...2000 square feet, 1/3 acre, worth at
least $350K on the market. My wife and I have three PCs at
our disposal, all working, and that's not counting two older,
smaller ones in the workshop (the indoor one, not the garage).

>No, ham radio does not "save the day" in every emergency, although it
>has at times, nor does every ham claim to be a hero, although some have
>gone above and beyond just like a lot of other good folks.

Good sign. You are beginning to see reality.

>Not often
>does ham radio become *the* major means of communications in a disaster
>situation, but it has in the past and likely will again in the future.

When in the past?

When in the future? You mean when aliens from outer space
attack us and you morsemen save the planet? (Hollywood
already did that)

>Not in every disaster is ham radio called upon to help and supplement
>other official comms, but it has in the past and likely will in the future.

I'm sure.

>Poor old senile lennieboy, he just can't bring himself to admit that ham
>radio has and will play a vital part in emergency communications, and he
>can't be a part of it because he can't pass the test.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You've been on the same stuff that the gunnery nurse
takes?

Try not to sprinkle in so many insults. They don't work and all it
does is make you look puerile (as in wise-ass adolescent).

>The military, Homeland Defense, and other civil officials recgonize the
>value that ham radio can be in times of emergencies, they intergrate it
>in their disaster planning, but they wouldn't give you the time of day
>lennieboy.

The time of day arrives accurately from WWVB over our two radio clocks. I can depend on it. If they fail to work there is always WWV on HF. No problem.

The military, "Homeland Defense" (isn't that "Homeland Security?") is not the place to get "time of day." Neither is my civil official government high-sounding title administration. But the city of Los Angeles has an excellent, tried and proven Emergency Command Center...I'm very familiar with that.

>Grinds your hemorrhoids dosen't it?

No. Why the concern over my medical condition? Do you have a pile problem? See a medical doctor for treatment if so.

>Now go back to pestering the little old ladies in the sitting room.

My wife is watching television right now. In the family room. She's the only other human living in this house. She is of average size, not "little."

We aren't needing to take in boarders, income is quite comfortable, thank you.

Try at least to be civil if you won't identify yourself. You are behaving like Broose and the gunnery nurse.

LHA / WMD

1379. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013314.01632.00001408@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89392

In article <5c01b95b.0403201638.32d3ffaa@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>>
>> > > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service
>has
>> played
>> > > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
>> > > >> > >
>> > > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
>> > > >> > > compliant devices?
>> > > >> >
>> > > >> > Sure. Why not?
>
>> The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS,
>> MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in
>> ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.
>
>> As I stated in another thread, I had the chance to spend the day
>in the TEMA/FEMA facility in Nashville.

Couldn't make it out of state? :-)

> The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
>phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.

"Unsecure?!?" You saw KY-98s in that facility? KY-57s?

Playing war games were you?

> I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
>ROLE"...?!?!
>
> Putz.

Yup, rude and obnoxious, comes unglued on the slightest disagreement. Well, at least that is consistent with previous behavior of yours.

LHA / WMD

1380. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013316.01632.00001409@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89396

In article <5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...
>
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>
>> > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
>> played
>> > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
>> > >> > >
>> > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
>> > >> > > compliant devices?
>> > >> >
>> > >> > Sure. Why not?
>> > >>
>> > >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
>> > >> played a major role in emergency comms".
>> > >>
>> > >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
>> > >> services" playing a "major role".
>> > >>
>> > >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
>> > >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
>> > >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
>> > >>
>> > >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
>> > >> pertinent examples.
>> > >>
>> > >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
>> > >>
>> > >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell
>phones
>> > >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>> > >>
>> > >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
>> > >>
>> > >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
>> > >> substantiate.
>> > >>
>> > >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
>> > >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???

>> >
>> > You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single
>bit
>> > of it...even facetiously...
>> >
>> > Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
>> > argument and lack of cajones to do so...
>> >
>> > Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in
>disaster
>> > and/or emergency communications.
>> >
>> > So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average
>calling
>> > 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
>> >
>> > I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in
>disaster
>> > mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
>> >
>> > Thanks.
>>
>> Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
>> obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
>> to you.
>
> "Tone it down a bit"...?!?!

Yes. You go off on an emotional tirade whenever someone has
a contrary opinion to your own.

> YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major"
>role in emergency comms".

Brian did not use those words.

> I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your
>claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you
>several times.

You've demanded, taken things out of context, edited words
to suit your "charges."

> You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.

You are.

> You call ME "bizarre", yet you make outlandish assertions in a
>public forum, then dodge all requests to "prove", at any level, your
>claims.

See? There you go again, coming unglued.

Get someone to help you find better glue. Have someone
tell you that your "commands" don't need to be followed in
here.

Remember that you get all kinds of questions in return that
you never answer? You usually reply by a lot of insults and
other accusations without ever addressing the question.

> I believe you to be a chronic liar. You have been "called" on
>several occassions to back up your assertions, but then use this ruse
>to try and avoid taking responsibility for your own actions.

You believe anyone is a "chronic liar" if they have opinions
contrary to your own.

> Call me rude and obnoxious if you think it deflects attention from
>you, but I can assure you that it does nothing of the sort. If
>anything, childish dodges like this only highlight YOUR bizarre
>behaviour.

In America it is spelled "behavior." Are you in peerage?

You are rude and obnoxious, almost constantly. Saying so
is not bizarre. It is evident to anyone who can read in here.

> The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS,
>MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in
>ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.

Only among your circle of acquaintences.

> I certainly do in as much as I am INVOLVED with "emergency comms"
>on SEVERAL levels, not all of which involve the Amateur Radio or CAP.
>Most everyone else in this forum knows these things to be true too.

Name them. The ones not specifically ham or CAP.

> You and Lennie seem to be the only ones in this forum who think
>that if you keep repeating the same lame, untrue "stuff" that it will
>somehow manifest a thread of truth. Sorry...that doesn't work.

Tsk, tsk. You are looking into a mirror again.

You top this anamalous anonymous "JJ" in repeating myths and
cliches, waving self-patriotic bunting around like a suit of armor.

> Now...PLEASE try and exceed my expectations with the next post
>and pony-up some cajones to either admit you are either blatantly
>lying, making wild guesses, or just trolling for the sake of making
>arguments that you obviously can't support.

Oh, my, almost textbook psychosis complete with spicing of
macho sexual terms. "Cojones?" Quien sabe? :-)

> Or REALLY try something new and discuss something you have some
>EXPERIENCE in...THAT would be refreshing.

Go play with your ham radios. That way you could get some fun
out of life instead of coming in here and fighting with anyone who
has independent thought unlike your own. Make the newsgroup a
better place by your absence.

LHA / WMD

1381. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013320.01632.00001410@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89394

In article <4gmp505gf6ueool1s0cckrnbtmm1ebncs3@4ax.com>, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> writes:

>In <kPqdnUTCzbJQSsHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>>> In <gobble-de-guke@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>> Hehe, cute one Frank!
>
>Well, I thought the original mess of letters might have been what prevented my
>first reply from getting through to the server. It's happened before.
>
>
>>> I did my homework long before this thread was started. The rule is clear.
Any
>>> attempt to pin a different interpretation on it is no better than illegal
CBers
>>> claiming that CB rules are not laws, or any of the other cock-and-bull
excuses
>>> they make.
>>
>> But you didn't do enough nmework to see that you are wrong....
>
>What law releases a ham from the legal responsibility of a violation of their
>own rule against interference just because the device that is interfered with
is
>of "poor design"? Why can't you answer the question, Mike? Why do you continue
>with this prolonged song and dance routine?

He is trying out for show biz? :-)

Prime rule of this newsgroup: Only PCTAs are allowed to survive as
regulars; NCTAs are shot on sight, but seldom hit. Coslo is PCTA.

First rule after prime: Licensed amateurs are allowed any level of
comment from civil to rude, obnoxious, insulting; unlicensed others
must be respectful, bow their heads to high-test hams, and say Sir
like in the Real service (the military). They can't enforce that and it
makes them outraged and switch to sarcasm and/or pejoratives.

Never consider that they will actually LOOK UP anything you point
out. They are too outraged by unservile behavior to bother with that.

Inhabitants of this din of inequity would rather fight with NCTAs than take any action on Access BPL. They feel their "honor" must be avenged before considering their own HF playground in the near future. Discussion and independent thought is impossible. PCTA regulars have only ONE opinion...theirs...all others are <ptui>.

Just a few observations from the last seven years in here...:-)

LHA / WMD

1382. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:33:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321013321.01632.00001411@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89389

In article <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>
>> > ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
>> > in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is
>just
>> > so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
>> > eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
>> > NOT leave.
>>
>> And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
>> abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
>> your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.
>>
>> Fair enough...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.

It's about the size of an Archie comic book. Not as big as a
regular edition of Reader's Digest. Familiar territory for the
gunnery nurse? :-)

LHA / WMD

1383. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:51:01 UTC
From: Mark <merees@suny.nospam.edu>
Message-ID: <f16e5$405d3b56$d1cc5755$4305@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89397
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

PROGRAM IS ON THE AIR RIGHT NOW AS I TYPE THIS POSTING!

Link to an audio stream is here: www.coasttocoastam.com

"Kevin O'Neill" <onekev@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:A8KdnSwitZcmtMDdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
> Thanks for announcing this.

1384. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:51:13 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3je0m$282434$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89398

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

The rest of Leonard's usual drivel snipped ...

"You are now working in the electronics industry too? Amazing."

What? The amazing Leonard not familiar with current technology? I'm shocked. You mean to tell me that this lowly Amateur Radio Op knows more about cutting edge technology than the Wizard of Electronics? Say it ain't so, Leonard.

Arnie -

1385. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 06:57:05 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3jebl$26eeai$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89399

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

> Work on your SSB equipment some more. You couldn't reach Iowa.

Only God can improve atmospheric conditions. That's why we used CW. We
couldn't reach squat on SSB that day. Next test might show an improvement
in SSB capability. Sure hope so, it is our primary Ham mode.

> Riiight...you got it through the bureaocracy. :-)
>
> Is the General Accounting Office (GAO) staffed with radio experts?
>
Actually, they have some very knowledgeable folks in their tech area.
Thanks for asking.

Arnie -

1386. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 10:14:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403210214.690c2365@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89400

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<lJednX198tY0ksDd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > As I stated in another thread, I had the chance to spend the day
> > in the TEMA/FEMA facility in Nashville.
> >
> > The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
> > phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.
> >
> > I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
> > ROLE"...?!?!
>
> Steve, are you trying to tell us that the facility did *not* have a
> specially dedicated cell phone just for disaster emergency comms?

Not unless it was being carried by one of the T/FEMA personnel.

All phones I saw in the EOC, othr than the aforementioned
"cordless" phones were hardline.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1387. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 10:22:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403210222.7cae2920@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89501

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040320184824.12501.00006886@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Hello, Steve
> >
> >I think I have figured out the real problem behind most of the flames both
> >in this group and rec.radio.cb. I might be wrong, but it appears everyone
> >is trying to defend that their particular turf is "important" and someone
> >else's is not.
>
> ...more likely just defending their own pesonna, but why spoil your
> nice rant?

Now Lennie get's to tell us how Jim's comments, otehr than not
being approved by him, are a "rant"...

> >Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
> >reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
> >needs cb?"
> >
> >A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a hobby.
>
> Amateurs are all there to SERVE as "emergency minutemen!"
>
> Right.

Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...

How perculiar.

> >Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
> >telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected.
>
> Riiight...on 11 Sep 01 the entire borough of Manhattan went down
> after the Attack on the WTC towers...?
>
> Ham radio was Johnny-on-the-spot immediately notifying all?

Lennie...Jim said "the infrastructure is ftagile".

It's already been proven as just that.

Can YOU "prove" otherwise, other than making snide or insinuating
personal swipes at the folks commementing here...!??!

> >That nasty
> >ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?) affected areas for hundreds of
> >miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after
> >power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for
> >hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat,
> >power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!
>
> Upstate New York is YOUR "turf," right?
>
> Was anyone knocking the state of New York? (or New Yourk?)
>
> I don't think so.

You have. You've "knocked" everything west of the Owens Valley.

> >One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know
> >if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to
> >the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator
> >backup with a *lot* of fuel available.
>
> Did the nasty police engineer get fired because he didn't specify
> emergency power for the "police repeater?"

Does it matter?

Does it change the fact that the incident happened and that it as
documented in the media, Lennie?

> >I don't think it is as important "how" something is done as opposed to the
> >fact that it gets done. If someone is assisting at a shelter cooking meals,
> >that individual is *doing* something. That, to me, is more important than
> >all of the useless crying that goes on around these parts from time to time
>
> Right...I'm going to need a ham license in order to volunteer serving
> at homeless shelters? They do serve ham. Quite good, tastes like
> chicken...wonder who it was?

Where did Jim make such a statement, Lennie?

> >BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries,
> >flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur
> >operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over
> >100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on
> >VHF/UHF or cb.
>
> Did New York state close down all its National Guard units? Air
> Guard? Political disagreement between NY Governor and the
> White House? Was FEMA on vacation? No aid available for NY
> state? Terrible situation!
>
> Well, next time that happens, send me an aid request via NTS.
> I'll put together a CARE package for you with an extra can of
> Sterno so you won't be too cold. Ought to arrive in two months;

> takes 7 weeks to get the NTS message through...allow for
> sufficient time.
>
> Anything to help.

You wouldn't help your wife by passing in a roll of toilet paper,
Lennie.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1388. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 10:30:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403210230.394fab29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89502

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<tp87c.233$gc4.27@news01.roc.ny>...

> BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors
> in this newsgroup ...

I don't think anyone who posts anything about Lennie in what he'd
perceive as a "negative light" is "detract(ing)" anything from him,
Jim.

Leonard H. Anderson is his own worst enemy...His foul mouth and
his arrogant, "I Know Better Than You" personality
more-than-adequately demonstrate the true nature of his "character".

Now...I wonder why Brian Burke can't/won't answer the core
question of this thread, that being where's his validation of his
assertion that "licenseless services" play a "major role" (his choice
of adjectives, not mine...) in "emergency comms".

Even his cellphone operates, ultimately, under a license whether
he realizes it or not.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1389. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 11:51:10 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <na0r50dss9np8gk4inrc5q46h6571ghdsh@4ax.com>
Source record: 89503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <B7CdnduQvfu4ucDdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>
>>
>> Nothing is "turned around". Everything is as clear and concise as 97.101(d). Why
>> don't you find yourself a lawyer and have him/her try to find the answer you
>> can't find yourself -- which law exempts hams from 97.101(d) when the device
>> receiving the interference is a "poor design"?
>>
>
>According to your warped logic, if a commercial broadcast station is
>comming in on a nearby neighbor's crappy stereo, and the neighbor has
>been made aware that they are interfering with his stereo, and the
>broadcast station continues to broadcast, now knowing they are
>interfering, then the broadcast station is legally at fault.
>If a police or fire department base station is interfering with someones
>television due to front end overload because the poor design of the set
>prevents it from rejecting out of band signals, and the person notifies
>the police or fire department of the interference, and if the police or
>fire department continue to use their radios, even though they are clean
>of harmonics, spurious signals, and the problem is the fault of the
>television set, then the police and fire department are legally at fault.
>NOT!!!!!!

"NOT" is correct, but not for the reasons you assume. Let's break this down into
bites small enough for you to swallow.....

"PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE"

That doesn't say "PART 73--RADIO BROADCAST SERVICES", or "PART 20--COMMERCIAL
MOBILE RADIO SERVICES", does it?

"Sec. 97.101"

That should be a good clue that the rule belongs under Part 97.

" (d) No amateur operator...."

Does that say "commercial broadcast station" or "police or fire department base
station"? No. It says "amateur operator".

>Same for any ham radio station.

They are not the same, in case you hadn't noticed. Hams are, by definition, amateurs, which is a definition you should never forget.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1390. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 11:57:39 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <4f0r505pcmem55fqfrhrhfd77k8pe6n5go@4ax.com>
Source record: 89504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <iqSdnXooy7jfhcDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

> Frank, there is a thread on rra.misc you should be in on. It's where
>some dude has done an interpretation on f.c.c rules, and now argues that
>jamming cell phones is legal. Sounds like a discussion that you would
>have a lot to contribute to. You might want to get on over there and
>participate! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I can see from your response that you are unable to answer the standing
question, which is no suprise because there -is no law- excusing hams from
violating 97.101(d) because of 'poor design' of consumer devices. Nor is it
suprising that you are unwilling to admit that fact.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1391. Re: Phone Jammer Transmitter Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 12:57:53 UTC
From: Marv <marv@radpairman.net>
Message-ID: <c3k3cvcsp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 89505
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Gary" <grweiler@fuse.net> wrote in message
news:405d8b7d$0$73108$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net...
> Do these things work? Plus, is there any real difference in coverage area
at
> this frequency between 200 mw and 1 watt? http://www.phonejammer.com/
> See the low power one and the high power one.
>
>

I saw these devices for sale at a hamfest in San Antonio and several
hamfests throughout Florida. Every time I've seen them at hamfests
they were selling them in the boneyard and doing a booming business.
One guy had a trailer and must have had at least a hundred or more
of these devices. He told me he sold out and had more on order
from his suppliers.

Marv
Tampa, Florida

1392. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 13:43:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040321084349.23307.00007420@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 89506

In article <5c01b95b.0403210230.394fab29@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Leonard H. Anderson is his own worst enemy...His foul mouth and
>his arrogant, "I Know Better Than You" personality
>more-than-adequately demonstrate the true nature of his "character".

Then why bother with him, Steve?
>
> Now...I wonder why Brian Burke can't/won't answer the core
>question of this thread, that being where's his validation of his
>assertion that "licenseless services" play a "major role" (his choice
>of adjectives, not mine...) in "emergency comms".

Isn't it obvious? In the case you cite, "won't" means "can't".

Why bother with him, Steve?

You know the nature of the responses you will receive, so why spend the time on folks who are not at all serious about amateur radio, or related policy issues? Their hobby is wasting time. Your time.

If you're interested in amateur radio policy matters, there's the BPL NPRM to comment on, plus three restructuring petitions (FAR, ARRL, NCVEC) that will probably get RM numbers soon.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1393. K4YZ/CAP Approval Rating

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 15:32:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403210732.738f0ed7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89507

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040321013311.01632.00001406@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <tp87c.233$gc4.27@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

> >BTW, I am beginning to understand how you manage to have so many detractors
> >in this newsgroup ...
>
> I am sure you do. :-)
>
> Independent thought is a terrible thing to some. They can't stand
> it and fight with might against it. "Ein volk, ein Reich!" (sound
> familiar?) :-)
>
> See the title of this particular thread. One individual seeks to
> harass and intimidate another amateur...on baseless "charges"
> that the individual manufactured out of spite and/or illness.
>
> Do you approve of such behavior?
>
> LHA / WMD

I disapprove. I think he's nuts.

1394. K4YZ/CAP Approval Rating

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 15:47:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403210747.523a40cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89508

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040321013316.01632.00001409@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major"
> >role in emergency comms".
>
> Brian did not use those words.
>
> > I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your
> >claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you
> >several times.
>
> You've demanded, taken things out of context, edited words
> to suit your "charges."
>
> > You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.
>
> You are.

and emotionally unbalanced.

1395. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 16:12:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403210812.320be946@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89509

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3j2rg$28he3j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "William" wrote ...
>
> > Wow. Warms the heart to see such humanity on the group.
>
> Apparently you've never been on the end of a personal attack from Leonard.
> I have. He deserves a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his way.

Perhaps. Hang in there with your semi-civil tongue. We may yet get
to civil debate.

> > It would certainly be
> > > an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.
> > >
> > > Arn, ever see what Steve posts?
> >
> > Sure. They are usually in response to a first strike from Leonard. What's
> > your point?

No, no, no. You're just enabling Steve with such a an attitude.

Others in here appear to be able to withstand a "first strike" from
Len. Let's use you as an example. You said above that "He deserves a
lot harsher language than I have ever sent his way." So why didn't
you?

Do you have self-control? Self-respect?

Are you emotionally balanced?

Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent
his way?"

> > > BTW, we put our Amateur Radio gear on-line for the first time in the
> > Mobile
> > > > Incident Command Center the other day.
> > >
> > > But 9/11 was more than 2.5 years ago.
> >
> > We've had plenty of comms ability since then, but put the gear in the MICP
> > as a means of improvement. Improvement of comms systems is a good thing,
> > right William?

Always.

> > First contact was via CW with a
> > > station in Iowa.
> >
> > Was it Iowa that you needed to contact? I'm trying to think what an
> > East Coast military installation might need with Iowa? Looking for
> > obsolete Collins parts?
> >
> > Conditions for SSB were just not up to par.
> >
> > For a contact with Iowa? Did you try a band higher? Did you try a
> > band lower? Again, what was the reason Iowa was needed for a contact?
>
> We tested the gear on ALL bands (and both modes). And Iowa was the place we
> happened to contact first.

And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
Emergency Comms!

> If I need to contact FEMA via HF in another
> state (including IOWA) I think I have proven that it can be done by this
> test. And that, after all, was the purpose to begin with.

I don't. The true measure of a test is the test. As an IG augmentee,
I lay down a card, and Capt Soso reads it and say, "I can do that."

Do I mark down 100% on his say so, or do I say, "So let me see you do
it, Capt Soso."

> > We just love
> > > having all those tools in our communications kit.
> >
> > Wow. Me too.
> >
> > > We also tested our state of the art sat-phone/VTCs and wireless VOIP
> > > network. They worked flawlessly -- what wonderful pieces of gear. We
> are
> > > now completely wireless (including phone lines) so we can go wherever
> > > needed.
> >
> > So you really didn't need to contact Iowa with amateur radio. I was
> > wondering about that.
> >
> Sure we did. The Ham gear is for redundancy.

Sort of. It's there for when your primary and secondary gear doesn't
do what its supposed to do. You still have a mission, and it's not
talking to a ham in Iowa.

That's why we have it. A
> test of it's HF capability was important. Test complete, test successful.

In other words, you tested that the radio worked. You could have done
that with a dummy load and not wasted that Iowa ham's time.

Next time you inadvertantly contact an amateur in another state, ask
him to phone patch you through to that state's EMA or State Police.
That at least would be worth noting.

> > > 21st Century comms at its best -- which means a mixture of the old
> > > and new together to give us the strongest redundancy possible.
> >
> > Strong redundancy equals GAO audits. They don't like redundancy even
> > if it means survivability. They'd rather have the money spent on food
> > stamps and WIC.
>
> Strong redundancy equals uninterrupted communications in an emergency. The
> GAO cares not as long as we spend the money appropriately. Since the
> purchases were pre-approved, I guess we already did that.

Which model HF radio did you get?

> > Arnie, its always great to read one of you posts. Thanks for stopping
> > in.
>
> And you too William.
>
> Arnie -

1396. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 16:22:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zLCdnUbu5PbVXMDdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>
>>
>> Nothing is "turned around". Everything is as clear and concise as
>> 97.101(d). Why
>> don't you find yourself a lawyer and have him/her try to find the
>> answer you
>> can't find yourself -- which law exempts hams from 97.101(d) when the
>> device
>> receiving the interference is a "poor design"?
>>
>
> According to your warped logic, if a commercial broadcast station is
> comming in on a nearby neighbor's crappy stereo, and the neighbor has
> been made aware that they are interfering with his stereo, and the
> broadcast station continues to broadcast, now knowing they are
> interfering, then the broadcast station is legally at fault.
> If a police or fire department base station is interfering with someones
> television due to front end overload because the poor design of the set
> prevents it from rejecting out of band signals, and the person notifies
> the police or fire department of the interference, and if the police or
> fire department continue to use their radios, even though they are clean
> of harmonics, spurious signals, and the problem is the fault of the
> television set, then the police and fire department are legally at fault.
> NOT!!!!!!
> Same for any ham radio station.

This is another case of pick 'n choose rules logic. It's a strange little subset of people that try to interpret rules in a different manner than everyone else, or come up with oddball scenarios in which the rules "don't apply" or fail. They are like the neighbors dog that can't resist chasing cars.

Any reasonable person has to take the written rules, and look at what they are intended to do, the spirit of the rules so to speak:

Licensed service equipment has a priority over unlicensed equipment.

Licensed service equipment may at times interfere with unlicensed equipment. Unlicensed equipment does not enjoy this.

Manufacturers should use good manufacturing practices to avoid being interefered with or to interfere with licensed services.

The extension of the spirit of the rules is that the amateur is expected to work with a person that is getting interference from the amateur's equipment, even though the responsibility is the person being interfered with. But if the mitigating work fails, then it is ultimately the part 15 device owners problem. All this assumes a clean signal on the Amateurs side.

All the civil suits posted as eveidence to the contrary are clearly cases where a person has been in violation of some other rules also, such as profanity, and possibly running illegal amplifiers. Almost certainly there was an antagonistic relationship between the two parties in each case also. IIRC, there was a charming "99 bottles of beer" singing as part of the wrongdoing.

The F.C.C. is not going to stand up for a person doing illegal things to begin with.

But there you have it, an extrapolation of a case from the way they really are to "licensed services must not interfere with unlicensed ones."

- Mike KB3EIA -

ps. and we won't be able to convince him otherwise..

1397. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 16:30:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403210830.68f8431b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89511

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<juCdnUnHndDOScHdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >>>emergency.
> >>
> >>Hint: They will if it is useful for them to do so. Should the
> >>network fail, they will resort to other means.
>
> The military and civil authorities don't even consider the cell network
> in there emergency communications plans, they know it is too unreliable,
> they do consider Amateur Radio.

How do the civil and military authorities intend to be initially
notified that there is an emergency?

Send a runner?

I always had to carry a pager. Cellular telephones have mostly
replaced pagers.

1398. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 16:38:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <L6udnX-wgJtgWcDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89512
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <iqSdnXooy7jfhcDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> Frank, there is a thread on rra.misc you should be in on. It's where
>>some dude has done an interpretation on f.c.c rules, and now argues that
>>jamming cell phones is legal. Sounds like a discussion that you would
>>have a lot to contribute to. You might want to get on over there and
>>participate! 8^)
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
> I can see from your response that you are unable to answer the standing
> question, which is no suprise because there -is no law- excusing hams from
> violating 97.101(d) because of 'poor design' of consumer devices. Nor is it
> suprising that you are unwilling to admit that fact.

Frank, That post was an aside. But it is an example of what your interpretative game is doing.

Amateurs are expected by the spirit of the law to help with the mitigation process, which includes ensuring that they have a clean signal, and to work with the person being interfered with.

But they are not required to foot the bill for modifications to the interferees' equipment, and ultimately, if the interferee's equipment is not designed well, the amateur, as well as any licensed service, (police, local emergency services, etc.) is not responsible for the interference.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1399. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 17:00:31 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <5mgr50h8uo0iesf6jgstqpt33lbdk1t4jd@4ax.com>
Source record: 89513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <zLCdnUbu5PbVXMDdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>
>
>JJ wrote:
>> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>> Nothing is "turned around". Everything is as clear and concise as
>>> 97.101(d). Why
>>> don't you find yourself a lawyer and have him/her try to find the
>>> answer you
>>> can't find yourself -- which law exempts hams from 97.101(d) when the
>>> device
>>> receiving the interference is a "poor design"?
>>>
>>
>> According to your warped logic, if a commercial broadcast station is
>> comming in on a nearby neighbor's crappy stereo, and the neighbor has
>> been made aware that they are interfering with his stereo, and the
>> broadcast station continues to broadcast, now knowing they are
>> interfering, then the broadcast station is legally at fault.
>> If a police or fire department base station is interfering with someones
>> television due to front end overload because the poor design of the set
>> prevents it from rejecting out of band signals, and the person notifies
>> the police or fire department of the interference, and if the police or
>> fire department continue to use their radios, even though they are clean
>> of harmonics, spurious signals, and the problem is the fault of the
>> television set, then the police and fire department are legally at fault.
>> NOT!!!!!!
>> Same for any ham radio station.
>
> This is another case of pick 'n choose rules logic. It's a strange
>little subset of people that try to interpret rules in a different
>manner than everyone else, or come up with oddball scenarios in which
>the rules "don't apply" or fail. They are like the neighbors dog that
>can't resist chasing cars.

I agree 100%. The scenarios posted by JJ are an attempt to interpret the ham
rule against causing interference by equating amateur radio with broadcast and
emergency commercial services. This law is so simple and easy to understand it's
pathetic that anyone could possibly misinterpret it's meaning, although some

people must do their best to try.

> Any reasonable person has to take the written rules, and look at what
>they are intended to do, the spirit of the rules so to speak:

Again, I agree 100%:

> Licensed service equipment has a priority over unlicensed equipment.

Absolutely.

> Licensed service equipment may at times interfere with unlicensed
>equipment. Unlicensed equipment does not enjoy this.

True story.

> Manufacturers should use good manufacturing practices to avoid being
>interefered with or to interfere with licensed services.

Yep.

> The extension of the spirit of the rules is that the amateur is
>expected to work with a person that is getting interference from the
>amateur's equipment, even though the responsibility is the person being
>interfered with. But if the mitigating work fails, then it is ultimately
>the part 15 device owners problem. All this assumes a clean signal on
>the Amateurs side.

Wrong-O! Your "spirit of the rules" had several omissions that make this statement absolutely false. First, while licensed services may at times interfere with unlicensed devices, amateurs are not permitted to interfere with radio communications or signals according to 97.101(d). The 'spirit' here is that commercial and broadcast services have priority over amateurs, and when a ham causes interference to a broadcast receiver they are not just interfering with unlicensed equipment, they are in fact interfering with the television or radio signal; i.e, the broadcast transmitter which is -not- an unlicensed device! After all, it takes both a transmitter and a receiver to complete any communication. And while manufacturers are "advised" to design unlicensed equipment to be as RFI-resistant as practical, they are under no legal obligation to do so. This is -not- the case with amateur radio rules, which -specifically- state that causing interference is illegal. Therefore, the legal responsibility for causing interference rests solely with the ham, -not- the manufacturer, and -not- the victim of the ham's interference.

> All the civil suits posted as eveidence to the contrary are clearly
>cases where a person has been in violation of some other rules also,
>such as profanity, and possibly running illegal amplifiers. Almost
>certainly there was an antagonistic relationship between the two parties
>in each case also. IIRC, there was a charming "99 bottles of beer"
>singing as part of the wrongdoing.
>
> The F.C.C. is not going to stand up for a person doing illegal things
>to begin with.

Sure they do. They stick up for interference-causing hams all the time. If they didn't they would be overwhelmed with RFI complaints.

> But there you have it, an extrapolation of a case from the way they
>really are to "licensed services must not interfere with unlicensed ones."
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>ps. and we won't be able to convince him otherwise..

The rule stands on it's own, regardless of whatever warped interpretation you wish to place upon it.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1400. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 17:07:50 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <6lir50ltheqi50kgt7r2bdoj8lahim0aos@4ax.com>
Source record: 89514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <L6udnX-wgJtgWcDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>
>
>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> In <iqSdnXooy7jfhcDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Frank, there is a thread on rra.misc you should be in on. It's where
>>>some dude has done an interpretation on f.c.c rules, and now argues that
>>>jamming cell phones is legal. Sounds like a discussion that you would
>>>have a lot to contribute to. You might want to get on over there and
>>>participate! 8^)
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>
>> I can see from your response that you are unable to answer the standing
>> question, which is no suprise because there -is no law- excusing hams from
>> violating 97.101(d) because of 'poor design' of consumer devices. Nor is it
>> suprising that you are unwilling to admit that fact.
>
> Frank, That post was an aside. But it is an example of what your
>interpretative game is doing.

I see. Still no answer. Ok.

> Amateurs are expected by the spirit of the law to help with the
>mitigation process, which includes ensuring that they have a clean
>signal, and to work with the person being interfered with.

The letter of the law is very, very clear. Invoking the 'spirit' only weakens
your position, as I have outlined in my other reply on the subject.

> But they are not required to foot the bill for modifications to the
>interferees' equipment, and ultimately, if the interferee's equipment is
>not designed well, the amateur, as well as any licensed service,
>(police, local emergency services, etc.) is not responsible for the
>interference.

I guess this will be another standing question (that will most likely go unanswered as well): What laws mirror 97.101(d) under Parts 20 and 73?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1401. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 17:54:18 UTC
From: Ian Jackson <REMOVE-THIS-BIT@g3ohx.demon.co.uk>
Message-ID: <i2EIcRAKbdXAFw1m@g3ohx.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 89515
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

In message <f16e5$405d3b56$d1cc5755$4305@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
Mark <merees@suny.nospam.edu> writes
>PROGRAM IS ON THE AIR RIGHT NOW AS I TYPE THIS POSTING!
>
>Link to an audio stream is here: www.coasttocoastam.com
>
>
>"Kevin O'Neill" <onekev@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:A8KdnSwitZcmtMDdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>> Thanks for announcing this.
>

Pah! You have to PAY for it!
At least you can get the BBC free!
http://www.bbc.co.uk/
Ian.

--

1402. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 19:42:46 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89516

"William" wrote in part ...

Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his way?"

WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
>
> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
> Emergency Comms!
>
I think you are missing the point here, William. I said that Iowa was the first station that we contacted. You are making a huge presumption here that it is the only station that we contacted. Do you really think that we would contact one station, declare victory, then call it a day? You know better than that. We made multiple contacts during the day as we switched from band to band.

> Next time you inadvertantly contact an amateur in another state, ask
> him to phone patch you through to that state's EMA or State Police.
> That at least would be worth noting.
>
Actually, not a bad idea; however, this was a function test of equipment in preparation for an exercise later this month. When we activate that exercise, we will be contacting those types of agencies directly (including out of state) We didn't want to have to coordinate that contact in advance because it would take away from the realism of the upcoming exercise and give them a "heads up". Part of the exercise is to see how quickly they will respond in a "no warning" situation -- or if they respond at all.

> Which model HF radio did you get?

Kenwood TS 570D(s) and
Kenwood TM 261A (VHF)

Arnie -

1403. Re: Phone Jammer Transmitter Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 19:53:53 UTC
From: Marv <marv@radpairman.net>
Message-ID: <c3krou$c40$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 89517
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I see them being used by restaurants, especially in large cities.
I saw them in use in New York and LA.

Marv

"Eddie Haskel" <wiseguy@clever.com> wrote in message
news:fri7c.12914$Fq1.8236@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com...
> They are basically "white noise" generators at 880 and 1900Mhz. Depends on
> how strong the cell site's signal is in that area. They DO work pretty
well
> inside buildings and inside commuter trains .....Eddie
>
> "Gary" <grweiler@fuse.net> wrote in message
> news:405d8b7d$0$73108$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net...
> > Do these things work? Plus, is there any real difference in coverage
area
> at
> > this frequency between 200 mw and 1 watt? http://www.phonejammer.com/
> > See the low power one and the high power one.
> >
> >
>
>

1404. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 20:47:31 UTC
From: Steven B <no_spam@spam.com>
Message-ID: <8N6dnXwcA6-TncPdRVn-vA@giganews.com>
Source record: 89518
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
> "Dave Holford" <mylastname@.deletethis.sympatico.ca> wrote in message
> news:405B3D38.D9AB6E9E@.deletethis.sympatico.ca...
>
>>
>>Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>Gernsback and Green have/had two things in common.
>>>Both sold cleverly veiled bullshit which was *dressed up*
>>>as valid future science to geeks, nerds and fools. Modern day
>>>PT Barnum's who wrap their circus act in 5-point colored
>>>paper. Noorey and Bell do the same thing by giving them
>>>and their ilk an occasional microphone today. If they
>>>were not in print media or broadcasting, they all most certanly
>>>would be selling pre-owned automobiles someplace, or perhaps
>>>partners with shady local politicians.
>>
>>
>>Aha, you've been reading his editorials, not his magazines.
>>That is the difference between entertainment and information.
>>
>>Dave
>
>
> I taped the show last night.
> Guess what folks..!
>
> BOTH Wayne and that GOLD PLATED KOOK David
> were booted off of the show last night by Noorey!
> Seems that Booth did not want to talk about *anything*
> and all that Green seemed to want to do was shill for
> Booth and his crap for sale. After wasting ONE HOUR of
> airtime (..on 500+ AM stations and XM Sat Radio live)
> and logging THOUSANDS of listener complain e-mails
> that they were cheated, Noorey booted both these
> jerks off the program!
>
> BAAAAAAAAAAAAA
> HAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!
> Just what these two carnival circuis
> sideshow barkers needed! Booth made a
> total schmuck of himself and Green sat there

> grinning like a cheshire cat with a microphone
> inserted up it's anus.....all on live AM Radio.
>
> Here's the official release from C to C AM:
>
> Meeting with Lucia?
>
> Returning to the show, precognitive David Booth
> was joined by author Wayne Green to ostensibly
> discuss his recent meeting with Lucia, witness to
> the Miracles of Fatima in 1917. Booth had been
> invited to meet with Sister Lucia, presumably
> because of the apocalyptic visions he had in
> 2003.
>
> Booth said he met Sister Lucia, now 97, at a
> Carmelite convent in Portugal and held a
> private conversation with her for five minutes.
> He would only reveal that he was told that
> a "new star" that had been prophesized
> about would begin to shine. Because Booth
> had been booked on the show to discuss
> his meeting with Lucia, and refused to elaborate
> further upon it, the interview was cut short, and
> the last 90 minutes of the program was
> reserved for Open Lines.
>
> --
>

The story doesn't end there. Apparently after booting Green and Booth off the show, Noory had his producers check with the Carmelites of the convent where the nun lives. They were told she is very old and frail and has not had visitors for a long time! Noory discussed all this on Friday nights show.

The whole thing was obviously a scam from the start. Green and Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of David Booth or his apocalyptic dreams. They are pandering to the end of the world crowd claiming that 97% of the people on Earth would die this year.

Anyone up for a good tar and feathering?

S

1405. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 20:58:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040321155848.15923.00004457@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89520

In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>If you go back into the 50s and 60s, amateur radio served quite well for
>long-haul phone patches and in emergencies.

Service in emergencies goes back much farther, of course.

>Very localized emergencies,
>such as an auto accident would largely be reported by normal telephone.

Also by hams equipped with mobile rigs if telephone was not immediately
available.. This is documented all the way back to the beginning of mobile
operation by hams. Of course, the number of mobile-equipped hams limited the
chances that there would be a ham in the area when such a localized emergency
happened.

>In
>the 70s, the cb craze took hold and certainly I would expect that cb was
>sometimes used to report the accidents. The small number of amateurs would
>preclude them being involved very often in such a situation.

I disagree on that last point. That same time period was the boom time for
amateur repeaters and autopatching. At least in the areas I'm familiar with,
such service by hams was very common.

>Voilla, cb is
>more important than ham radio.
>
Certainly more numerous in those times. Questionable today, though.

>Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
>reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
>needs cb?"

As long as the cell phones are avaialble, they are obviously the preferred
method because anyone so equipped can push 911 and report directly.

>A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a hobby.

That's a roundabout way of saying that a bunch of things.
>
>Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
>telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected. That nasty
>ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?)

Yes

>affected areas for hundreds of
>miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after
>power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for
>hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat,
>power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!

That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
getting fuel for generators very difficult.
>
>One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know
>if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to
>the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator
>backup with a *lot* of fuel available.

If it happens, it must be possible.
>
>I don't think it is as important "how" something is done as opposed to the
>fact that it gets done. If someone is assisting at a shelter cooking meals,
>that individual is *doing* something. That, to me, is more important than
>all of the useless crying that goes on around these parts from time to time
>;)

I agree 100%!

But some folks deny *any* significant contribution by amateurs.
>
>BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries,
>flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur
>operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over
>100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on
>VHF/UHF or cb.
>
And during that storm, significant traffic was passed by CW because it was the
only available mode that would get through.

Some more data points from this area (suburban Philadelphia):

- A heavy snowstorm dumped about a foot of snow on the area one day. The
weatherfolk simply messed up, and did not predict anything like what really
happened. While there were no major problems involving loss of life or
property, many vehicles and people were stuck or seriously delayed, including
school buses full of kids. One of the first "casualties" of the storm was cell
phones, which were simply overwhelmed by the enormous volume of calls.

- Hurricane Isabel pounded through here some months ago and left hundreds of
thousands without power, and in some cases telephone service. Some if us were
out for days. The interesting thing about Isabel was that the outages were very
local in nature - one side of the street had power, the other did not, etc.
Some folks lost power *after* the storm because repair crews had to turn off
the power to a larger area to fix downed poles and lines. Cell phone coverage
was better than during the snow storm but unreliable. Again, no major problems
involving loss of life or property, but the cell system capacity was
overwhelmed at times.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1406. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 20:58:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040321155849.15923.00004458@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89519

In article <UfCdnX6xwJtnicDdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Were you ever at a party and trying to talk to the adults while some 5
>year old was running around pestering people just to get attention?

Sure. And such behavior is not limited to 5 year olds, either.

Giving such behavior adult attention reeards it, and the result will be more of
the same. That's true whether the behavior is by a 5 year old or someone 14.2
times 5 years old.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1407. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:04:25 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tb2dnW-p6Z4ZmcPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89521

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> My home is quite restful, thank you. My wife likes it, too. But,
> it is not a "resthome"...2000 square feet, 1/3 acre, worth at
> least $350K on the market.

If that's all you can get for $350k no wonder you are in such a snit all
the time.

1408. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:06:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tb2dnW6p6Z5tmcPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89522

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>
> All phones I saw in the EOC, othr than the aforementioned
> "cordless" phones were hardline.

Must come as quite a shock to lennyboy and willie, especially since
Amateur Radio seems to occupy a prominent place.

1409. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:27:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tcidnWWEk60xl8PdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89523

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> In <zLCdnUbu5PbVXMDdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> The extension of the spirit of the rules is that the amateur is
>>expected to work with a person that is getting interference from the
>>amateur's equipment, even though the responsibility is the person being
>>interfered with. But if the mitigating work fails, then it is ultimately
>>the part 15 device owners problem. All this assumes a clean signal on
>>the Amateurs side.
>
>
>
> Wrong-O! Your "spirit of the rules" had several omissions that make this
> statement absolutely false. First, while licensed services may at times
> interfere with unlicensed devices, amateurs are not permitted to interfere with
> radio communications or signals according to 97.101(d). The 'spirit' here is
> that commercial and broadcast services have priority over amateurs, and when a
> ham causes interference to a broadcast receiver they are not just interfering
> with unlicensed equipment, they are in fact interfering with the television or
> radio signal; i.e, the broadcast transmitter which is -not- an unlicensed
> device! After all, it takes both a transmitter and a receiver to complete any
> communication. And while manufacturers are "advised" to design unlicensed
> equipment to be as RFI-resistant as practical, they are under no legal
> obligation to do so. This is -not- the case with amateur radio rules, which
> -specifically- state that causing interference is illegal. Therefore, the legal
> responsibility for causing interference rests solely with the ham, -not- the
> manufacturer, and -not- the victim of the ham's interference.

RIGHT-O!!! If the ham station is clean, not transmitting excessive
harmonics, spurious emissions, ect., and the device that is being
interfered with, such as a tv experiencing fundemental overload because
it cannot reject out of band signals, or a stereo system that is acting
like a receiver by picking up the signals on the speaker wires, feeding
into some device that is rectifying the signal, ect., the ham is not at
fault and is perfectly within his right to continue operation and the
problem is with the party with the devices that cannot reject the
unwanted signals. The ham *IS NOT* causing illegal interference. This
has happened many times in the past where the FCC has told the party
experiencing the interferenc it is not the fault of ham but the fault of
the equipment being interfered with. It happend to me personally and the
FCC told the lady to eight put up with it or get another TV.
No you go on about how if the ham, now knowning he is causing

interference, that he is now maliciously causing interference and you keep blabbing about the rule against malicious interference and so the ham is illegal. Well not quite. The ham is not maliciously causing interference, when he gets on the air his intent is not to interfer but to simply communicate with other hams, so there is no malicious intent to cause interference. The fact that the devices cannot reject his signals is not his problem. Now if he gets on the air with the intent to cause such interference, then the rule would apply, but to simply excersize his right to communicate on the ham bands according to his license is no way maliciously interfering. If a ham on purpose transmits on top of another licensed signal, that is
You have your head stuck way up your you-know-what to far. Now go blabber this nonsense to the cb crowd but it dosen't fly hear.

>
> Sure they do. They stick up for interference-causing hams all the time. If they
> didn't they would be overwhelmed with RFI complaints.

Because the hams are not maliciously causing interference, they are operating completely within the FCC rules and according to their license. You must be lennyboys twin brother, you both have a hard on for hams.

1410. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:46:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lPidna1RisooksPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89528

Frank Gilliland blabberd again:

>
> Wrong-O! Your "spirit of the rules" had several omissions that make this
> statement absolutely false. First, while licensed services may at times
> interfere with unlicensed devices, amateurs are not permitted to interfere with
> radio communications or signals according to 97.101(d). The 'spirit' here is
> that commercial and broadcast services have priority over amateurs, and when a
> ham causes interference to a broadcast receiver they are not just interfering
> with unlicensed equipment, they are in fact interfering with the television or
> radio signal; i.e, the broadcast transmitter which is -not- an unlicensed
> device! After all, it takes both a transmitter and a receiver to complete any
> communication. And while manufacturers are "advised" to design unlicensed
> equipment to be as RFI-resistant as practical, they are under no legal
> obligation to do so. This is -not- the case with amateur radio rules, which
> -specifically- state that causing interference is illegal. Therefore, the legal
> responsibility for causing interference rests solely with the ham, -not- the
> manufacturer, and -not- the victim of the ham's interference.

WRONG-O again!! Talk about skewing the rules to your interpertation.

What Mike said is RIGHT-O!!! If the ham station is clean, not
transmitting excessive harmonics, spurious emissions, ect., and the
device that is being interfered with, such as a tv experiencing
fundemental overload because it cannot reject out of band signals, or a
stereo system that is acting like a receiver by picking up the signals
on the speaker wires, feeding into some device that is rectifying the
signal, ect., the ham is not at fault and is perfectly within his right
to continue operation and the problem is with the party who owns the
devices that cannot reject the unwanted signals. The ham *IS NOT*
causing illegal interference. This has happened many times in the past
where the FCC has told the party experiencing the interferenc it is not
the fault of ham but the fault of the device being interfered with. It
happend to me personally and the FCC told the lady, in no uncertain
terms, to either put up with it or get another TV...period.
No you go on about how if the ham, now knowning he is causing
interference, that he is now maliciously causing interference and you
keep blabbing about the rule against malicious interference and so the
ham is illegal. Well not quite. The ham is not *maliciously* causing
interference, when he gets on the air. There is no *malicious* intent,
his intent is not to interfer but to simply communicate with other hams,
so there is no *malicious intent* to cause interference. The fact that
the devices cannot reject his signals is not the hams problem. Now if he
gets on the air with the *intent* to cause such interference, then the
rule would apply, but to simply excersize his right to communicate on

the ham bands according to his license, when he is not transmitting harmonics or spurious out-of-band signals is in no way *maliciously* interfering.

>
> Sure they do. They stick up for interference-causing hams all the time. If they
> didn't they would be overwhelmed with RFI complaints.

Because the hams are not maliciously causing interference, their intent is not to interfer but to communicate with other hams. They are operating completely within the FCC rules and according to the conditions of their license. You keep blabbing about your interpertation of this rule, well, the FCC who is the final authority does not agree with you so what you claim is exists only in your wild dreams.

You have your head stuck way up your you-know-what to far. Now go blabber this nonsense to the cb crowd but it dosen't fly hear.

1411. Re: Phone Jammer Transmitter Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:47:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lPidnaxRisp3ksPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89529
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Marv wrote:

> I see them being used by restaurants, especially in large cities.
> I saw them in use in New York and LA.
>
> Marv

Gee, would that be malicious interference?

1412. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:53:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.huxvhlb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89524

On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 14:04:25 -0700, JJ wrote:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>
>> My home is quite restful, thank you. My wife likes it, too. But,
>> it is not a "resthome"...2000 square feet, 1/3 acre, worth at
>> least $350K on the market.
>
>If that's all you can get for $350k no wonder you are in such a snit all
>the time.

In that part of L.A. one is lucky to get a two-hole outhouse for
$350K.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1413. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:53:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.huxvq9c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89525

On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 14:06:00 -0700, JJ wrote:

>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
>
>>
>> All phones I saw in the EOC, othr than the aforementioned
>> "cordless" phones were hardline.
>
>Must come as quite a shock to lennyboy and willie, especially since
>Amateur Radio seems to occupy a prominent place.

'specially since in all the command post exercises that our area
hospitals have run in the last few years both landline and regular
commercial radio circuits are turned off for at least an hour and
ham rado - voice, packet, and SSTV - carried the load.

Very successfully, may I add.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1414. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:53:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.huxw0sd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89527

On 21 Mar 2004 20:58:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
>getting fuel for generators very difficult.

Was the "Piped" natural gas delivery interrupted? I'm a huge fan of
"piped gas" fueled gensets rather than stored propane, CNG, or diesel.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1415. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:53:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.huxwbse.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89526

On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 14:42:46 -0500, Arnie Macy wrote:

>Part of the exercise is to see how quickly they
>will respond in a "no warning" situation -- or if they respond at all.

"Goofball, Goofball, this is Zoomer with a No Notice Test Message".

We used to just LOVE those..... <ggg> (The remote deskset was on
my desk....)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

1416. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 21:55:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89530

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 14:06:00 -0700, JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>> All phones I saw in the EOC, othr than the aforementioned
>>>"cordless" phones were hardline.
>>
>>Must come as quite a shock to lennyboy and willie, especially since
>>Amateur Radio seems to occupy a prominent place.
>
>
> 'specially since in all the command post exercises that our area
> hospitals have run in the last few years both landline and regular
> commercial radio circuits are turned off for at least an hour and
> ham rado - voice, packet, and SSTV - carried the load.
>
> Very successfully, may I add.

There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to get a license, so the best they can do is attempt to discredit what they can't be a part of.

1417. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 22:04:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <FdedneAt-6nuicPdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89531

Frank Gilliland wrote:

>
> I can see from your response that you are unable to answer the standing
> question, which is no suprise because there -is no law- excusing hams from
> violating 97.101(d) because of 'poor design' of consumer devices. Nor is it
> suprising that you are unwilling to admit that fact.
>

There is no law that states that if I am operating my ham station
according to the FCC rules and terms of my license that I must cease
transmitting because some device is picking up my ham signals because it
cannot reject out-of-band signals it is not supposed to pick up. Now
blabber the "malicious" interference thing again. If I continue to get
on the air, I have no "malicious intent" to intefer, my only intent is
to excersize the privledges of my license and communicate with other
hams, I have no "intent" to cause interference to any other service so
there is no malice involved. Because the device cannot reject my signals
is not my problem, and the FCC will agree with me, not you. They have
agreed with me in such a situation in the past.

1418. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 22:07:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <FdedneMt-6nEiMPdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89532

William wrote:

> In other words, you tested that the radio worked. You could have done
> that with a dummy load and not wasted that Iowa ham's time.

Just to enlighten you, the radio is not the entire system, the antenna
system needs to be tested also.

1419. Re: Phone Jammer Transmitter Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 22:38:02 UTC
From: Gary <clearchannelsucks@cc.com>
Message-ID: <405e194d$0$73090$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>
Source record: 89533
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ah...malicious from the inconsiderate, self important cell user or the
blocker. Depends on your view. Seems like the cell users who insist on
annoying people with their inability to turn their phone to 'vibrate' are
the malicious ones.
Ohh ya, you are right - since the cell companies paid millions for those
frequencies, but, striking a balance may take some time.
"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:lPidnaxRisp3ksPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Marv wrote:
>
> > I see them being used by restaurants, especially in large cities.
> > I saw them in use in New York and LA.
> >
> > Marv
>
> Gee, would that be malicious interference?
>

1420. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 22:50:04 UTC
From: Norman Cats <plinge4cat@amishonline.com>
Message-ID: <eb1a9$405e1c1d$d1cc566e$20154@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89534

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040320184824.12501.00006886@mb-m04.aol.com...

> Well, next time that happens, send me an aid request via NTS.
> I'll put together a CARE package for you with an extra can of
> Sterno so you won't be too cold. Ought to arrive in two months;
> takes 7 weeks to get the NTS message through...allow for
> sufficient time.

Baaaaaaaaa Ha Ha Ha Ha!!!!

Even Glen "Bullshitter" Baxter's IARN is faster than NTS.

Send in those IARN jump teams boys! -and while your
at it, we have this new Membership premium for
just $49.95....and if you act now, we'll throw in a
bamboo steamer too as our free gift to U !

1421. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:11:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Gip7c.2415$V66.665@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89535
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040320203152.583$Ri@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Why, is your disability contagious, freeloader?

Don't think so....but it certainly does not effect my ability to put the
round where it needs to be.

Dan/W4NTI

1422. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:29:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321182908.25815.00007197@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89539

In article <1e4e3692.0403210830.68f8431b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<juCdnUnHndDOScHdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> >>>emergency.
>> >>
>> >>Hint: They will if it is useful for them to do so. Should the
>> >>network fail, they will resort to other means.
>>
>> The military and civil authorities don't even consider the cell network
>> in there emergency communications plans, they know it is too unreliable,
>> they do consider Amateur Radio.
>
>How do the civil and military authorities intend to be initially
>notified that there is an emergency?

There are several ways for military authorities to notify military
units. For long-distance notification there are "hard" circuits
which route through very dedicated, few-user systems via
military satellites, fiber-optic lines, copper lines, or microwave
radio relay. The VLF alert system for submarines is one such,
not using any morse code but rather encrypted data means.
The USAF has its own network as does the USN and USA.

Lower-level alerts can be issued through the DSN or Digital
Switched Network, in clear or encrypted, voice or data, to most
parts of the world where fixed or semi-fixed bases exist. Most
of the operation and maintenance of the DSN is done by USAF
and USA Signal units. DSN is a combination of plain old
telephone system (POTS in the unofficial acronym) and an
Internet-like data exchange. DSN is what fiction author Tom
Clancy calls "the invisible second telephone system." In that
regard the label is very close to the truth except that it is not
"invisible" on any military base or larger government installations.
Older DSN number directories appear on the civilian Internet
and DSN contact numbers are published openly on military and
government websites. DSN telephones and terminals can call
out to the commercial-civil telephone system with setup
authorization and firmware authenticators but the reverse is
seldom implemented.

NORAD has its own hardened system tied to many and
varied sensors, plus the DSN, as a specific example. Details
on the North American Defense Command are sensitive.

For civilian notification there are many and varied means,
beginning with the commercial-civil telephone infrastructure.
Beyond that is a very large assortment of communications
capabilities that varies with the urban complex arrangement
and local government organization. The fire departments of
the Greater Los Angeles area (all 24/7 professionals) have
dedicated circuits bypassing switch centers to each fire
house carrying alarm signals, voice, and some data to back
up voice sent as primary mode (time, destination, etc.).
Police departments in this Greater LA area also have
dedicated circuits not passing through telephone switch
centers, are not blocked by sudden telephone use.
>
>Send a runner?

In the military that is still the final back-up "system." :-)

A form of this, ususally via land vehicle, has been done in
civilian sections. In the Northridge Earthquake here ten years
ago, utility companies had to send company cars to workers'
homes located in areas of severe damage since the POTS
lines were damaged; many off-duty utility workers were needed
for a quick, massive repair task of restoring utilities. A few
police cars aided in such "runner" duty. Notification that an
earthquake had occurred was NOT needed, however. :-)

Public safety vehicles equipped with PA (all police patrol cars
in this area, the PA also being the siren) are useable as wide-
area, mass notification. Most fire department engines also have
PA facilities onboard. That was done in 1971 in the San
Fernando Valley of Los Angeles after the Sylmar quake to warn
residents in the "downhill" side of the Van Norman Reservoir
to evacuate; officials feared the three earthen-wall reservoirs
might be breached by aftershocks and inundate a large area.

The old, "classical" means of widespread notification through
broadcast stations is still done. Both civil airways FAA centers
and USCG plus Harbor Control bases have done announcements
to all aircraft in the vicinity or all watercraft in the harbor area.
There are several private communications networks of larger
corporations here which can be used for alerting distant
locations of their installations and have done so in the past.
As an example, Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International
had several kinds of links to the Santa Susanna Field
Laboratories (mostly for test telemetry) as well as to Atomics
International (plant a few miles away plus labs also at Santa
Susanna).

>I always had to carry a pager. Cellular telephones have mostly
>replaced pagers.

That depends on the local area. Here there is a mixture of both
plus private/commercial paging services. Pager base stations
are relatively narrowband and semi-automated, are relatively easy
to equip with uninterruptible power supplies. Those are quite
common in larger companies that have employees who must
normally work in many areas of a building complex.

Teledyne Electronics in Newbury Park, CA, was (still is,
presumably) rather far northwest along Highway 101 and had
capability to tie into the beginning of the big Condor Net in
1977-1978 on the 222 MHz ham band. Ostensibly that was
for "fire (brush firestorms) safety of the company" but the two
hams (John Memmen, manager, Harry Terraneau, Sr. Tech)
really had "other" uses for the several HTs. :-) That Net
had non-computer tone signalling and switching-routing, still
does. Harry had at least one HT on-charge with the receiver
open some of the time.

HTs in PDs and utilities are quite numerous and some of those
have varied alerting means such as tone signalling or actual data
sent over mobile terminals. The LAPD here has an "extension"
of patrol car radios in the personal body-worn HT with combination
speaker-mike sometimes clipped near the collar. Many LAPD
patrol cars carry data terminals for long, detailed announcements.
Usually used in ID of vehicles and drivers, those are useful for any
information that needs to be kept handy for referral.

Back a few decades when RCA Corporation was still in existance,
they had dedicated corporate lines locally tying four local RCA
complexes, one of them NBC western headquarters in Burbank.
Those were used for Teletype and a special PBX tie-in to the
telephone system for communications with RCA locations in the
eastern USA. Since RCA was also under contract to Bank of
America for data handling, they also had dedicated lines to San
Francisco B of A Hq. "Dedicated" lines do not pass through the
switch centers of POTS. That was in 1975 and some time in the
past but other corporations of today have extensive private
network facilities that are all useful for notification in real
emergencies. The General Motors assembly plant (last used
for Camaros and Firebirds) in the middle of Van Nuys, CA, had
its own network to component assembly plants elsewhere in order
to expedite manufacturing logistics. [closure by GM was due to
other economic reasons, nothing to do with communications, the
location is now a new mall area referred to as "the plant" - :-)]

The number and variety of communications means, all useful in
an emergency of today is large and extensive. Details of the
civilian side of it can be discovered by anyone who cares to look.
The Auxilliary Communications Service (ACS) of the California
state Office of Emergency Services takes that into account as

does the OES itself. Any and all means of communications that survive the onset of any emergency are all useful.

LHA / WMD

1423. Re: K4YZ/CAP Approval Rating

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:29:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321182909.25815.00007198@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89537

In article <1e4e3692.0403210747.523a40cc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040321013316.01632.00001409@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major"
>> >role in emergency comms".
>>
>> Brian did not use those words.
>>
>> > I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your
>> >claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you
>> >several times.
>>
>> You've demanded, taken things out of context, edited words
>> to suit your "charges."
>>
>> > You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.
>>
>> You are.
>
>and emotionally unbalanced.

That's unfortunate. All of the "communications" in this newsgroup
have become a battleground of personal egos of the regulars. Many
come unglued at the slightest hint of disagreement with their
postings.

Any time an actual subject of "amateur radio policy" comes up, the
ones with personal opinions MUST be taken as the ultimate truth
of the matter. Anyone with different ideas are damned and persons
insulted for not agreeing with them. It's a constant verbal firefight
with large depots of outrage ammunition fired at will (and any other
name). Then they become oh-so-badly "wounded" when subjected
to return fire. Some remain "wounded" for years and constantly
butt in to seek retribution. The subjects are long lost in the mis-
direction of satisfying their personal vengence.

It sure as heck is no recruiting station for support or growth of
amateur radio. Maybe for the WWF? :-)

LHA / WMD

1424. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:29:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321182910.25815.00007199@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89536

In article <c3jebl$26eeai$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>> Work on your SSB equipment some more. You couldn't reach Iowa.
>
>Only God can improve atmospheric conditions. That's why we used CW.

Of course. SHARES uses CW all the time? Military HF radio?

Back a half century ago, the ACAN used SSB on a 24/7 basis as
primary mode of long-distance communications..."long" as in
500 to 8000 miles over water or land.

>We
>couldn't reach squat on SSB that day. Next test might show an improvement
>in SSB capability. Sure hope so, it is our primary Ham mode.

You really ought to consult with Army Signal Corps folks on how
to do SSB on HF from true emergency condition locations. Ask
for "Nevis." :-)

Signal Corps has some neat portable-mobile-fixed relatively low-
power HF radios that Get Through on SSB. Hughes Aircraft
(Ground division) designed and made some of it in the 1980s.
You can really "fly" with some of that. :-)

Fort Gordon, GA. They're in the DSN directory. They're on the
Internet. Signal Corps center. Good smarts there.

>> Riiight...you got it through the bureaocracy. :-)
>>
>> Is the General Accounting Office (GAO) staffed with radio experts?
>>
>Actually, they have some very knowledgeable folks in their tech area.
>Thanks for asking.

You cannot answer a specific question with a specific answer?

Does the GAO have RADIO EXPERTS?

Ask your "Nevis."

LHA / WMD

1425. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:29:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321182911.25815.00007200@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89538

In article <c3je0m$282434$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>The rest of Leonard's usual drivel snipped ...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still using pejoratives to open a message?

>"You are now working in the electronics industry too? Amazing."
>_____
>
>What? The amazing Leonard not familiar with current technology?

I'm familiar with current...and voltage...and lots of things in the
whole field of electronics (radio is a part of that whole). But,
electronics technology keeps advancing. I'm still learning and
I started learning about it 57 years ago.

I can measure current in many and different ways, including
non-intrusive means at DC, AC, and RF. Do you wish to know
more about current? Please consult an electronics text or the
application notes of some electronics instrument manufacturers.

>I'm shocked.

Safety first...use proper precautions around live conductors.

Do not let your train of thought become derailed.

>You mean to tell me that this lowly Amateur Radio Op knows more
>about cutting edge technology than the Wizard of Electronics?

I'm not a "wizard" nor have I claimed to be. After retiring (only from
regular hours of work) from a career as an electronics design
engineer, I've accumulated some amount of knowledge and
experience in several disciplines of electronics. I'm still learning
and working and designing and not afraid of jumping into venues
populated (as this one) by a number of egocentric amateurs with
delusions of expertise, trying to put down others who have the
actual experience and knowledge. Your sarcasm (with overtones
of spite if not spittle) is noted.

>Say it ain't so, Leonard.

I am trying to discuss subjects in here, not personalities. People
like yourself don't want to do that, are intent on promoting only
themselves and their alleged expertise in communications.

This particular thread was another's egoboo challenge about some
NCVEC petition (actually two of them, the second only a plan).
To be gracious and civil, you could have at least recognized that.
Instead, you started in with your first public posting in here after a
long absence as nothing but a direct personal attack on myself.

If you wish to do nothing but make personal attacks, you are free
to start other threads with nothing but personal condemnation of
whomever you choose to target. This newsgroup is open to all and
not moderated; not moderated except in the minds of some PCTAs.

The immediate future for U.S. amateur radio is some kind of change
in licensing regulations which may or may not eliminate the
International Morse Code test from examinations. That immediate
future also has the spectre of wide-range, wide-bandwidth noise
on most of HF through low VHF from Access BPL. In essence,
Access BPL implementation may cause EVERYONE's HF through
low VHF receiver to kiss their sensitivity ratings goodbye...the QRM
may prohibit any sort of low-level reception by anyone in an urban
or suburban location.

If you wish to continue personal attacks on individuals just to ease
your perceived past woundings in this newsgroup, go ahead. Such
seems petty and vindictive on your part.

There's a very distinct possibility of an emergency in radio reception
quality of the future that isn't coming from overt attackers on the US
or any terrorists wanting any religious jihad or any imaginary threats
to Homeland Security. It exists in the homeland itself.

It is more constructive to fight against threats as a concerted group
instead of playing verbal paintball of individual on individual for petty
personal reasons. Your choice.

LHA / WMD

1426. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:29:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321182914.25815.00007201@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89540

In article <5c01b95b.0403210222.7cae2920@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040320184824.12501.00006886@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>> >Hello, Steve
>> >
>> >I think I have figured out the real problem behind most of the flames both
>> >in this group and rec.radio.cb. I might be wrong, but it appears everyone
>> >is trying to defend that their particular turf is "important" and someone
>> >else's is not.
>>
>> ...more likely just defending their own pesonna, but why spoil your
>> nice rant?
>
> Now Lennie get's to tell us how Jim's comments, otehr than not
>being approved by him, are a "rant"...
>
>> >Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
>> >reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
>> >needs cb?"
>> >
>> >A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a
>hobby.
>>
>> Amateurs are all there to SERVE as "emergency minutemen!"
>>
>> Right.
>
> Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
>actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...
>
> How perculiar.

Perambulate your personal perspective, but don't pester us
particularly with poorly percolated petty pesterings promoted as
a perspicatious presentation when it is really perseverance of
persiflage. Ptui.

"Perculiar" indeed. :-)

>> >Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
>> >telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected.
>>
>> Riiight...on 11 Sep 01 the entire borough of Manhattan went down
>> after the Attack on the WTC towers...?
>>
>> Ham radio was Johnny-on-the-spot immediately notifying all?
>
> Lennie...Jim said "the infrastructure is ftagile".
>
> It's already been proven as just that.
>
> Can YOU "prove" otherwise, other than making snide or insinuating
>personal swipes at the folks commementing here...!??!

I already have, re the 11 Sep 01 Attack on America, in specific the partial destruction of both the Manhattan Emergency Communication Center and part of the telephone trunk lines adjacent to the WTC towers. Regardless, the entire telephone system (cellular telephone included) of the borough of Manhattan was NOT shut down.

At the Pentagon in Washington, DC, the third hijacked aircraft crash did not disrupt any cellular telephone system in DC. The crash did inflict great damage to one-fifth of the Pentagon along with much loss of life, but the architecture of the Pentagon is low relative to the WTC towers and personal escape routes are much shorter for near-crash-site inhabitants. The Pentagon's internal fire and damage control network (installed the year before) worked well from a planned alternate control point to shut off utilities and thus restrain any further spread of fire damage. Such a system was not possible in the WTC towers when the entire structure was put at overstress.

All of the above information has been widely published in the popular press. So too are general informations about the telephone infra-structure with associated cellular telephone service -

Telephone circuits for conventional subscription service route through switch centers. Switch centers permit a subscriber to "dial" direct to any other telephone; several centers are involved in "dialings" out-side of area codes or to other countries. Switching is limited by economic factors to a fraction of the maximum possible subscriber base, somewhere just less than ten percent for older, obsolete electromechanical switching; maximum may be larger in ESS or Electronic Switching System central offices. Ergo, all subscribers cannot be on-line at the same time; switch centers refuse to accept off-hook (handset lifted or cell phone On/Talk) subscribers on exceedance of maximum numbers. Reaching exceedance of maximums does not cause an ESS to fail; normal operation returns automatically when fewer subscribers access the system. Telephone central offices have had emergency electrical power facilities since before WW2 in the USA; such emergency power is not limitless in operating time and is, like switch traffic capacity, governed by

economics in normal operation.

In the old "Bell System" monopoly (a most generous one despite the complaints and government actions for so long), the technical excellence and robustness of the U.S. telephone infrastructure was exceptional - and known worldwide. Cellular sites for the cellular telephone service are themselves small extensions of each central office complex. Running (usually) unattended, they also have emergency electrical power backup. Again, like the central office, such emergency electrical power capacity and life is limited by economic factors of normal use. As Phil Kane pointed out, the deregulation of the U.S. telephone system resulted in several local telephone companies downgrading capacity and service of certain types of emergency power, particularly at cell sites. Cellular telephone service arrived after the big telephone deregulation so there is no example of comparison as to what it might have been had the old Bell System remained a virtual monopoly.

NO structure is immune to physical damage whether from fire or ice-accumulation or collision. That includes both governmental structures as well as individual amateur radio station locations. In general, the government structures are designed to be more robust than residences so, on the whole, they can withstand more environmental abuse. In the old Bell System, most equipment, including overhead cables was designed, made, and installed for a minimum working life of two decades. Some things for longer. Such telephone life expectancy has been proven in-use several times over. This does not apply to subscriber terminal equipment which can be (optionally after deregulation) of consumer electronics quality. However, the state of the art of solid-state electronic devices has increased the mean time between failure rates of complex consumer electronics devices...it is no longer possible to judge electronics devices' life merely by physical appearance to the naked eye.

Cell sites service areas are located and designed to overlap adjacent cells. The amount of overlap depends on decisions in intial location plus uncontrollable changes in structures and, sometimes, rarely, in earth moving within a service area. Cellular service is not guaranteed to be perfect as in wireline telephony but it is quite good considering the frequency (1 GHz) and quite low power of a cell handset. Those handsets are basically little two-way radios. Just the same, their usefulness in normal life has been proven to the extent that more than 100 million cellular service subscriptions had been taken out by users in 2003 according to the Census Bureau's interim report of early 2004. That is approximately one cell phone per every three citizens.

Depending on a particular telephone company, cell sites can be arranged to automatically change over to link with a different

central office or to connect with their main through microwave radio relay (some are linked only by microwave). There is no set rule on that and it is dependent on the local telephone company. As it is, they are quite reliable, almost to the extent of the wireline POTS (Plain Old Telephone System). Reliability of cell handsets is left up to individual subscribers.

All in all, the amazing growth of cellular telephony in the last quarter century is phenomenal, especially considering the operating frequency (low L-Band) and the cost reduction, typically below that of an amateur average HT. It is not a perfect solution to emergency communications but it is used daily throughout the USA for many and varied small emergencies. To discount it or sneer at its usefulness is folly.

>> Was anyone knocking the state of New York? (or New Yourk?)
>>
>> I don't think so.
>
> You have. You've "knocked" everything west of the Owens Valley.

No. I've tried to point out that the population of the United States also exists in the western states. The center of population has been steadily moving westward since 1790 (then somewhere in Maryland) and in 1990 was located 9.7 miles NW of Steelville, Missouri (source: U.S. Census Bureau). That point is west of the Mississippi river.

I tend to promote California, yes, for several reasons: It is the most populous state of the Union as well as being in the top 10 for land area (size is 9/10ths that of Sweden and full auto trip north-south takes two 7-hour driving days to complete); this state has an operating budget larger than many foreign countries and is dynamic in commerce and trade as the main U.S. gateway to Asia for that; the major aircraft and solid-state electronics corporations started here and most prospered (see Lockheed, North American, Ryan, Douglas, Vultee, Northrup complexes here plus the "Silicon Valley" and Hewlett-Packard and Intel for electronics).

> You wouldn't help your wife by passing in a roll of toilet paper,
>Lennie.
>
> Putz.

Is being insulting, rude, obnoxious, and resorting to toilet humor considerd "civil amateur behavior?" Certainly not, yet you seem to do nothing else in here.

LHA / WMD

1427. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-21 23:32:47 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040321183247.244$Wi@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20040320203152.583$Ri@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Why, is your disability contagious, freeloader?
>
> Don't think so....but it certainly does not effect my ability to put the
> round where it needs to be.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Put it in your mouth a squeeze the trigger, the world will be
a better place, loser.
```

1428. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 00:32:19 UTC
From: Leonard Martin <lmarti49NOSPAM@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <lmarti49NOSPAM-164742.18321921032004@bignews.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <8N6dnXwcA6-TncPdRVn-vA@giganews.com>,
Steven B <no_spam@spam.com> wrote:

>Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
>> "Dave Holford" <mylastname@.deletethis.sympatico.ca> wrote in message
>> news:405B3D38.D9AB6E9E@.deletethis.sympatico.ca...
>>
>>>
>>>Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>>Gernsback and Green have/had two things in common.
>>>>Both sold cleverly veiled bullshit which was *dressed up*
>>>>as valid future science to geeks, nerds and fools. Modern day
>>>>PT Barnum's who wrap their circus act in 5-point colored
>>>>paper. Noorey and Bell do the same thing by giving them
>>>>and their ilk an occasional microphone today. If they
>>>>were not in print media or broadcasting, they all most certanly
>>>>would be selling pre-owned automobiles someplace, or perhaps
>>>>partners with shady local politicians.
>>>
>>>
>>>Aha, you've been reading his editorials, not his magazines.
>>>That is the difference between entertainment and information.
>>>
>>>Dave
>>
>>
>> I taped the show last night.
>> Guess what folks..!
>>
>> BOTH Wayne and that GOLD PLATED KOOK David
>> were booted off of the show last night by Noorey!
>> Seems that Booth did not want to talk about *anything*
>> and all that Green seemed to want to do was shill for
>> Booth and his crap for sale. After wasting ONE HOUR of
>> airtime (..on 500+ AM stations and XM Sat Radio live)
>> and logging THOUSANDS of listener complain e-mails
>> that they were cheated, Noorey booted both these
>> jerks off the program!
>>
>> BAAAAAAAAAAAAA
>> HAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!

>> Just what these two carnival circuis
>> sideshow barkers needed! Booth made a
>> total schmuck of himself and Green sat there
>> grinning like a cheshire cat with a microphone
>> inserted up it's anus.....all on live AM Radio.
>>
>> Here's the official release from C to C AM:
>>
>> Meeting with Lucia?
>>
>> Returning to the show, precognitive David Booth
>> was joined by author Wayne Green to ostensibly
>> discuss his recent meeting with Lucia, witness to
>> the Miracles of Fatima in 1917. Booth had been
>> invited to meet with Sister Lucia, presumably
>> because of the apocalyptic visions he had in
>> 2003.
>>
>> Booth said he met Sister Lucia, now 97, at a
>> Carmelite convent in Portugal and held a
>> private conversation with her for five minutes.
>> He would only reveal that he was told that
>> a "new star" that had been prophesized
>> about would begin to shine. Because Booth
>> had been booked on the show to discuss
>> his meeting with Lucia, and refused to elaborate
>> further upon it, the interview was cut short, and
>> the last 90 minutes of the program was
>> reserved for Open Lines.
>>
>> --
>>
>
>The story doesn't end there. Apparently after booting Green and
>Booth off the show, Noory had his producers check with the
>Carmelites of the convent where the nun lives. They were told she
>is very old and frail and has not had visitors for a long time!
>Noory discussed all this on Friday nights show.
>
>The whole thing was obviously a scam from the start. Green and
>Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of David
>Booth or his apocalyptic dreams. They are pandering to the end of
>the world crowd claiming that 97% of the people on Earth would
>die this year.
>
>Anyone up for a good tar and feathering?
>
>S

My goodness! Snoory gets a spine!
My impression has been that since he took over he's been afraid to rock the boat by thoroughly interviewing any guest, lest some of the credulous listeners be lost. Meanwhile Art, appearing on the weekend and with nothing to lose anymore, dared to actually call into question some of the nonsense. Now it's Snoory too!
That show could really be fun if some of those money-grubbing liars who appear on it were asked a few probing questions from time to time.

Leonard

--
"Everything that rises must converge"
--Flannery O'Connor

1429. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 00:52:13 UTC
From: Harold Burton <hwburton@cableone.net>
Message-ID: <105se14iar7jte0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89543
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Leonard Martin" <lmarti49NOSPAM@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:lmarti49NOSPAM-164742.18321921032004@bignews.bellsouth.net...
> In article <8N6dnXwcA6-TncPdRVn-vA@giganews.com>,
> Steven B <no_spam@spam.com> wrote:
>
> >Beerbarrel Boomer wrote:
> >> "Dave Holford" <mylastname@.deletethis.sympatico.ca> wrote in message
> >> news:405B3D38.D9AB6E9E@.deletethis.sympatico.ca...
>They are pandering to the end of
>the world crowd claiming that 97% of the people on Earth would
> >die this year.
> >
> >Anyone up for a good tar and feathering?
>
> Leonard

Maybe we ought to wait until the end of the year and see if
there are enough people left to make up a proper mob.(G)

HWB
(Collum Puniceus)

1430. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:03:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403211703.391dcf3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89544

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "William" wrote in part ...
>
> Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
> way?"
>
> WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.

I don't even remember anything about Mark. But I do remember Steve
getting his hemorrhoid tied up in knots over him.

> > And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
> > the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
> > Emergency Comms!
> >
> I think you are missing the point here, William. I said that Iowa was the
> first station that we contacted. You are making a huge presumption here
> that it is the only station that we contacted. Do you really think that we
> would contact one station, declare victory, then call it a day? You know
> better than that. We made multiple contacts during the day as we switched
> from band to band.

Presumption? Perhaps.

If I dial home, and I get Iowa, then my comms failed.

You need to have a goal before you ever switch the radio on.

Let's say that your goal is the Military Police desk at Ft. Riley,
Kansas.

You get on the radio and "Viola," you got Iowa. Great. Good first
step. Ask that Iowa amateur to dial the Military Police desk at Ft.
Riley, Kansas (333-444-5555). Hmmmmm, who's gonna pay the $0.07/per
minute charges? Iowa ham won't do it. Iowa was a failure. Try
Nebraska if prop holds.

Make up your own scenario. Don't count off this ex-IG augmentee to
create your exercise scenario for you.

> > Next time you inadvertantly contact an amateur in another state, ask
> > him to phone patch you through to that state's EMA or State Police.
> > That at least would be worth noting.
> >
> Actually, not a bad idea; however, this was a function test of equipment in
> preparation for an exercise later this month. When we activate that

> exercise, we will be contacting those types of agencies directly (including
> out of state)

OK, you are going to contact the EMA and State Police *_directly_*
with amateur radio? Cool. How are you going to do that?

> We didn't want to have to coordinate that contact in advance
> because it would take away from the realism of the upcoming exercise and
> give them a "heads up".

Right. No prior coordination. But...

> Part of the exercise is to see how quickly they
> will respond in a "no warning" situation -- or if they respond at all.

No.

1. You state a requirement for them (your ham volunteers) to be able
to do such things. Your MOU is a place to state broad requirements.
The SOP or Instructions cover the specifics.

2. You train them to do such things.

3. You then give them a no warning exercise scenario where they have
to do what they (1) have a requirement to do, and (2) have been
trained to do.

That is how it's done in the military. Really.

Does your military installation have a MARS base support team?

> > Which model HF radio did you get?
>
> Kenwood TS 570D(s) and
> Kenwood TM 261A (VHF)

Excellent choices. Simple and capable.

bb

1431. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:08:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403211708.69802033@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89545

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403190536.489b36ac@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319024112.06889.00000007@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >
> > Oh NO, Brain, I am quite clearly #2
>
> I never doubted it.

What? No argument?

1432. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:14:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89546

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<7fKdnU6agNFNXcHdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Zr-dnWY6uZOPAsbdRVn-sw@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>William wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<_smdnVssidk5ysfdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>William wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>I would hazard a quess that the average American Citizen DOES know
> >>>>>>>someone with a cell phone. Cell phones are almost ubiquitous, so much
> >>>>>>>so that they are annoyances. 100 million subscriptions, 265 million
> >>>>>>>people. You do the math.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>And the network becomes useless in an emergency,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Stop right there.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>In every emergency ever, the cell network always becomes useless?
> >>>>
> >>>>As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
> >>>>emergency comms... a big *yes*.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?

> >>>
> >>>You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
> >>>
> >>>That makes it grafitti.
> >>
> >>I suggest you call NORAD/NORTHCOM, FEMA, The Red Cross, Civil
> >>Defense,and other emergency agencies and ask them how much weight they
> >>place on the cell phone system for emergency comms in times of a major
> >>disaster.
> >
> >
> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>
> Where did I speak of the average citizen?

That's who I've been speaking of all along. Do try to keep up.

> > Until they buy into your argument in large numbers, cellular
> > telephones will continue to eclipse amateur radio for Average Citizens
> > emergency communications.
>
> So they may, but in times of emergency, the military and other civil
> authorites will not rely on cell phones to handle major emergency
> communications.

And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?

I am no longer an instrument of national policy. Are you?

> They will rely on Amateur Radio if the need arises and
> AR can supplement military or other civil emergency comms, but they will
> not rely on the cell network.

They do and will continue to rely upon cellular telephones and pagers
for notification. Get used to it.

1433. K4YZ/CAP Approval Rating

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:33:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403211733.334d6804@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89547

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040321084349.23307.00007420@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403210230.394fab29@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > Leonard H. Anderson is his own worst enemy...His foul mouth and
> >his arrogant, "I Know Better Than You" personality
> >more-than-adequately demonstrate the true nature of his "character".
>
> Then why bother with him, Steve?

TAFKARJ approves of Ranting Steve.

> > Now...I wonder why Brian Burke can't/won't answer the core
> >question of this thread, that being where's his validation of his
> >assertion that "licenseless services" play a "major role" (his choice
> >of adjectives, not mine...) in "emergency comms".
>
> Isn't it obvious? In the case you cite, "won't" means "can't".

Is that like, "I can't edit Kim's posts," or "I won't edit Kim's
posts."

> Why bother with him, Steve?
>
> You know the nature of the responses you will receive, so why spend the time on
> folks who are not at all serious about amateur radio, or related policy issues?

I'm quite serious ambout amateur radio.

> Their hobby is wasting time. Your time.

No. Steve's hobby is wasting time.

> If you're interested in amateur radio policy matters, there's the BPL NPRM to
> comment on,

As Len has reminded you.

plus three restructuring petitions (FAR, ARRL, NCVEC) that will
> probably get RM numbers soon.

As Len has reminded you.

So happy you're paying attention.

So unhappy that you approve of Steve's rantings. But that appears to
be the direction you've been heading lately - extreme.

1434. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:37:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403211737.5ed08c92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89548

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403210222.7cae2920@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040320184824.12501.00006886@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
> >
> > >Hello, Steve
> > >
> > >I think I have figured out the real problem behind most of the flames both
> > >in this group and rec.radio.cb. I might be wrong, but it appears everyone
> > >is trying to defend that their particular turf is "important" and someone
> > >else's is not.
> >
> > ...more likely just defending their own pesonna, but why spoil your
> > nice rant?
>
> Now Lennie get's to tell us how Jim's comments, otehr

1

than not
> being approved by him, are a "rant"...
>
> > >Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
> > >reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
> > >needs cb?"
> > >
> > >A lot of folks state that amateur radio isn't a service; it's just a hobby.
> >
> > Amateurs are all there to SERVE as "emergency minutemen!"
> >
> > Right.
>
> Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
> actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...
>
> How perculiar.

2

> > >Few take into account how fragile that infrastructure of cell phones,
> > >telephones, and internet can be when a large area is affected.
> >
> > Riiight...on 11 Sep 01 the entire borough of Manhattan went down

> > after the Attack on the WTC towers...?
> >
> > Ham radio was Johnny-on-the-spot immediately notifying all?
>
> Lennie...Jim said "the infrastructure is ftagile".

3

> It's already been proven as just that.
>
> Can YOU "prove" otherwise, other than making snide or insinuating
> personal swipes at the folks commementing here...!??!
>
> > >That nasty
> > >ice storm in the North East (was it 1997?) affected areas for hundreds of
> > >miles. There were no cell phones as the cell phone towers went silent after
> > >power had been out for days. No electricty, no heat, no telephones for
> > >hundreds of miles. A relative of mine in Gouverneur, NY, had no heat,
> > >power, or telephone for two *weeks*!!!
> >
> > Upstate New York is YOUR "turf," right?
> >
> > Was anyone knocking the state of New York? (or New Yourk?)
> >
> > I don't think so.
>
> You have. You've "knocked" everything west of the Owens Valley.
>
> > >One amateur repeater was pressed into service for the police. I do not know
> > >if the repeater was reprogrammed or they simply moved the police repeater to
> > >the amateur site. The amateur site withstood the ice and they had generator
> > >backup with a *lot* of fuel available.
> >
> > Did the nasty police engineer get fired because he didn't specify
> > emergency power for the "police repeater?"
>
> Does it matter?
>
> Does it change the fact that the incident happened and that it as
> documented in the media, Lennie?

4

> > >I don't think it is as important "how" something is done as opposed to the
> > >fact that it gets done. If someone is assisting at a shelter cooking meals,
> > >that individual is *doing* something. That, to me, is more important than
> > >all of the useless crying that goes on around these parts from time to time
> >
> > Right...I'm going to need a ham license in order to volunteer serving
> > at homeless shelters? They do serve ham. Quite good, tastes like
> > chicken...wonder who it was?

>
> Where did Jim make such a statement, Lennie?
>
> > >BTW, during that ice storm, the calls were going out for batteries,
> > >flashlights, generators, blankets, food, coffee, and mobile amateur
> > >operators with HF capabilities. If you have nothing working for well over
> > >100 miles in the N.E. U.S. and Canada, you will likely not get it done on
> > >VHF/UHF or cb.
> >
> > Did New York state close down all its National Guard units? Air
> > Guard? Political disagreement between NY Governor and the
> > White House? Was FEMA on vacation? No aid available for NY
> > state? Terrible situation!
> >
> > Well, next time that happens, send me an aid request via NTS.
> > I'll put together a CARE package for you with an extra can of
> > Sterno so you won't be too cold. Ought to arrive in two months;
> > takes 7 weeks to get the NTS message through...allow for
> > sufficient time.
> >
> > Anything to help.
>
> You wouldn't help your wife by passing in a roll of toilet paper,
> Lennie.
>
> Putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

1435. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:39:34 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <qtr7c.4059$tY6.119114@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 89549
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Leonard Martin" <lmarti49NOSPAM@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:lmarti49NOSPAM-164742.18321921032004@bignews.bellsouth.net...

[snip]

> That show could really be fun if some of those money-grubbing liars who
> appear on it were asked a few probing questions from time to time.
>
> Leonard
>

Probing questions won't happen to entertaining guests, no matter how
fraudulent they may be. Booth got every break imaginable from Noory,
including Noory's frequent repetition of Booth's claims about his "O'hare
crash vision" and the interview with the Fatima witness. But Booth
continued to evade Noory's softball questions.

Uri Geller will be next Thursday night's guest. Let's see how long Noory's
integrity attack lasts.

Frank Dresser

1436. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:42:17 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3lg9c$297ncc$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89550

"William" wrote in part ...

If I dial home, and I get Iowa, then my comms failed. You need to have a goal before you ever switch the radio on.

Our goal was to check the functionality of the HF gear. We made multiple contacts on multiple bands -- making contacts throughout the day. Those were the parameters of the test. Test successful. We have written MOAs with the stations that we intend to contact during the exercise, so they completely understand the nature of the "no-warning" scenario. We also ran functionality tests on the VTC/SAT and VOIP equipment. It was a busy day.

As you know, all major exercises have an extensive OPORD that directs us before anything begins. Ours has been in place for months. All T's crossed.

> Does your military installation have a MARS base support team?

We do not use MARS for multiple reasons. All of our ops are civil service and FCC Licensed Hams. This gives us much greater latitude in the equipment, modes, and frequencies available to us. The EM operation is a completely civilian one. Sorry if I didn't make that clear before. Of course, we had to clear the frequency use with the folks at the installation DOIM, but that was just a formality.

Arnie -

1437. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321204504.03292.00000129@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89456

In article <FdedneMt-6nEiMPdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> In other words, you tested that the radio worked. You could have done
>> that with a dummy load and not wasted that Iowa ham's time.
>
>Just to enlighten you, the radio is not the entire system, the antenna
>system needs to be tested also.

Ask your Nevis.

:-)

LHA / WMD

1438. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321204505.03292.00000131@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89453

In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxvq9c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>> All phones I saw in the EOC, othr than the aforementioned
>>> "cordless" phones were hardline.
>>
>>Must come as quite a shock to lennyboy and willie, especially since
>>Amateur Radio seems to occupy a prominent place.
>
> 'specially since in all the command post exercises that our area
> hospitals have run in the last few years both landline and regular
> commercial radio circuits are turned off for at least an hour and
> ham rado - voice, packet, and SSTV - carried the load.
>
> Very successfully, may I add.

Good for your area! At least that was a practical test with results,
not some pointing-finger posturing.

LHA / WMD

1439. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321204505.03292.00000130@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89455

In article <lPidna1RisooksPd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>You have your head stuck way up your you-know-what to far. Now go
>blabber this nonsense to the cb crowd but it dosen't fly hear.

Why are you talking about a fly's hearing?

LHA / WMD

1440. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321204506.03292.00000132@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89452

In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxvhlb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 14:04:25 -0700, JJ wrote:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>> My home is quite restful, thank you. My wife likes it, too. But,
>>> it is not a "resthome"...2000 square feet, 1/3 acre, worth at
>>> least $350K on the market.
>>
>>If that's all you can get for $350k no wonder you are in such a snit all
>>the time.
>
> In that part of L.A. one is lucky to get a two-hole outhouse for
> $350K.

More toilet humor, Phil? :-)

Where do you think "this part of L.A." actually is? It is far from Brentwood or Beverly Hills. Try Zip code 91352.

So, while your attention is here, why does the FCC have TWO docket places for NPRM 04-29...04-29 and 04-37? How come the comments on 03-104 have Sunshine notices only for the period 6 Feb through 20 Feb. All the FCC feeds me is boiler-plate Q&A files. Maybe you can shed some light on that?

LHA / WMD

1441. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040321204506.03292.00000133@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 89454

In article <20040321155849.15923.00004458@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>Sure. And such behavior is not limited to 5 year olds, either.
>
>Giving such behavior adult attention reeards it, and the result will be more of
>the same. That's true whether the behavior is by a 5 year old or someone 14.2
>times 5 years old.

Poor baby. Someone got you in a spiteful state, did they? :-)

Did you get your just "reeards?"

LHA / WMD

1442. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:45:56 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3lgg7$285m9j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89451

"JJ" wrote ...

Just to enlighten you, the radio is not the entire system, the antenna system needs to be tested also.

I was going to mention that, JJ. But I think William probably realized that after he wrote his response. This was not just a check of the "HF radio" but of the entire EM comms system. Our MICP is run by a gas generator, and part of the test was to see if we could run "all" of our equipment at the same time without a drop in available regulated power. Test successful there as well.

Arnie -

1443. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 01:52:49 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3lgt4$25usps$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89457

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

Rest of drivel snipped (as usual)

> I'm not a "wizard" nor have I claimed to be. After retiring (only from
> regular hours of work) from a career as an electronics design
> engineer, I've accumulated some amount of knowledge and
> experience in several disciplines of electronics. I'm still learning
> and working and designing and not afraid of jumping into venues
> populated (as this one) by a number of egocentric amateurs with
> delusions of expertise, trying to put down others who have the
> actual experience and knowledge. Your sarcasm (with overtones
> of spite if not spittle) is noted.

So, bottom line is that you do NOT know what I am talking about. I guess this accounts for your reclama that you are still learning. As to actual experience -- in this area, I obviously have more than you. But I'm sure you would never be able to bring yourself to the point of admitting that. After all, you are the GREAT Leonard. Master of the 1950s "current".

Arnie -

1444. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 02:41:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <yfCdnW-5HJoFysPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89459

William wrote:

>
>
> And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?

That is who will be handling the major comms during a major emergency,
not the AC with a cell phone on his hip.

>
> They do and will continue to rely upon cellular telephones and pagers
> for notification. Get used to it.

But they will not rely on cell phones to carry communications during a
major emergency, but they may rely on ham radio if needed, get used to it.

1445. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 03:03:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ceydncpw0OQNysPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89458

N2EY wrote:
> In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
>
>>If you go back into the 50s and 60s, amateur radio served quite well for
>>long-haul phone patches and in emergencies.
>
>
> Service in emergencies goes back much farther, of course.
>
>
>>Very localized emergencies,
>>such as an auto accident would largely be reported by normal telephone.
>
>
> Also by hams equipped with mobile rigs if telephone was not immediately
> available.. This is documented all the way back to the beginning of mobile
> operation by hams. Of course, the number of mobile-equipped hams limited the
> chances that there would be a ham in the area when such a localized emergency
> happened.
>
>
>>In
>>the 70s, the cb craze took hold and certainly I would expect that cb was
>>sometimes used to report the accidents. The small number of amateurs would
>>preclude them being involved very often in such a situation.
>
>
> I disagree on that last point. That same time period was the boom time for
> amateur repeaters and autopatching. At least in the areas I'm familiar with,
> such service by hams was very common.
>
>
>>Voilla, cb is
>>more important than ham radio.
>>
>
> Certainly more numerous in those times. Questionable today, though.
>
>
>>Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
>>reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
>>needs cb?"

>
>
> As long as the cell phones are avaialble, they are obviously the preferred
> method because anyone so equipped can push 911 and report directly.

I think this may be the confusion here also. A cell phone is great for localized small-scale problems. If everyone has one, then of course they will be great for calling 911. An accident happens and likely the next person ther will have a cell phone. One of the best reasons for having one of the otherwise evil little devices.

As the scale of problems gets bigger, then they become of less use, their usefulness being inversely proportional to the scale of the problem.

Eventually, the cellular concept falls apart because of the massive support structure needed for the instruments use, and that often the same disasters that make emergency comms necessary take out that infrastucture.

I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1446. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 04:47:34 UTC
From: melvincreep@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <811235ad.0403212047.1d57fbe3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Steven B <no_spam@spam.com> wrote in message news:<8N6dnXwcA6-TncPdRVn-vA@giganews.com>...
>
> The story doesn't end there. Apparently after booting Green and
> Booth off the show, Noory had his producers check with the
> Carmelites of the convent where the nun lives. They were told she
> is very old and frail and has not had visitors for a long time!
> Noory discussed all this on Friday nights show.
>
> The whole thing was obviously a scam from the start. Green and
> Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of David
> Booth or his apocalyptic dreams. They are pandering to the end of
> the world crowd claiming that 97% of the people on Earth would
> die this year.
++
Interesting but you need to elaborate and clarify. Did Noory flat out
state that Booth did not meet with Sister Lucia? Also, your sentence
"Green and Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of
David Booth or his apocalyptic dreams" doesn't make sense in context.
If she never heard of him how could she request a visit from him? Why
would Booth make that claim? It would undermine his claim that the
meeting took place. Clarify please.
Melvin

1447. Re: Wayne Green (kicked off !!) C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 08:24:51 UTC
From: Steven B <no_spam@spam.com>
Message-ID: <npWdnbtBrrQRPsPdRVn_iw@giganews.com>
Source record: 89461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Melvin Creep wrote:
> Steven B <no_spam@spam.com> wrote in message
news:<8N6dnXwcA6-TncPdRVn-vA@giganews.com>...
>
>>The story doesn't end there. Apparently after booting Green and
>>Booth off the show, Noory had his producers check with the
>>Carmelites of the convent where the nun lives. They were told she
>>is very old and frail and has not had visitors for a long time!
>>Noory discussed all this on Friday nights show.
>>
>>The whole thing was obviously a scam from the start. Green and
>>Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of David
>>Booth or his apocalyptic dreams. They are pandering to the end of
>>the world crowd claiming that 97% of the people on Earth would
>>die this year.
>
> ++
> Interesting but you need to elaborate and clarify. Did Noory flat out
> state that Booth did not meet with Sister Lucia? Also, your sentence
> "Green and Booth had claimed that Sister Lucia had never heard of
> David Booth or his apocalyptic dreams" doesn't make sense in context.
> If she never heard of him how could she request a visit from him? Why
> would Booth make that claim? It would undermine his claim that the
> meeting took place. Clarify please.
> Melvin

Noory stated that the morning after the show his producers called
the convent and were told that Sister Lucia had not had any
visitors.

Probably what made him and the producers suspicious was the
strange claim that the last Fatima nun, Sister Lucia would call
Booth to come meet with her when she had never heard of booth or
his dreams 25 years ago of a plane crash. You are correct, that
makes no sense.

Noory threw plenty of softballs to Booth, but even with Noory's
help his story didn't make sense. Booth and Green had nothing to
say except promote book sales and they were booted and Noory said
that neither would be welcome on C2C again.

That's all I know since that's all Noory said on Friday's show.

S

1448. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 11:27:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403220327.727d51f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89462

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<yfCdnW-5HJoFysPdRVn_iw@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?
>
> That is who will be handling the major comms during a major emergency,
> not the AC with a cell phone on his hip.

For what purpose are they handling the major comms?

> > They do and will continue to rely upon cellular telephones and pagers
> > for notification. Get used to it.
>
> But they will not rely on cell phones to carry communications during a
> major emergency, but they may rely on ham radio if needed, get used to it.

I've been used to that. But there's a new technology on board now. Get used to it.

1449. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 13:49:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322084955.20899.00000138@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89463

>Subject: Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO
>NPRM ON BPL
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191624.3f093566@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319102154.17665.00000024@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>> I wonder how long it will take some idiot to read that and then try to
>> plug thier line feed to the AC directly...?!?! =)

>What idiot would even think such a thing?

Good question. Probably the same kind of idiot that makes wierd assertions like " You just can't accept that unlicensed radio services have a MAJOR ROLE in emergency comms" and then won't back it up with some sort of validation, even after being asked that question directly several days in a row.

Steve, K4YZ

1450. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 13:58:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322085816.20899.00000139@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89464

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191621.78d5d75a@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>> > But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by
>Amateur
>> > Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other
>services
>> > of having to worry about that.
>>
>> Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
>> relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
>> relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
>> radio.
>> Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
>> military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
>> communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.
>
>JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
>trained.

You are licensed. The FCC says so.

You may have equipment. Anyone can buy it.

From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any training
you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".

>I am available should the need arise.

I will go to bed comforted tonight knowing you're out there, Brain.

>I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.

That is not the truth. You've made grossly disparaging remarks in this
forum on several occassions.

>Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
>made on emergency communications.

The point remains: The "emergency agencies" continue to make plans for the use of Amateur Radio to help provide communication needs in the advent of loss of regular telephony services...Not to use telephony if Amateur Radio fails.

Steve, K4YZ

1451. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 14:42:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322094243.20899.00000143@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89465

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <guCdnR-NV86vPcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
>
>William wrote:

>> Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
>> made on emergency communications.
>
>Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
>network will be, far all practical purposes, useless. The emergency
>officials will not rely on the cell network for major comms during an
>emergency. In addition to the communication ability of military and
>civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed, and
>Amateur Radio will be there if needed. If a service is needed to
>suplement other comms, they will not call on or count on the cell phone
>network, they will call on Amateur Radio.

I just spent my weekend sitting in the TEMA/FEMA EOC in Nashville

All I can say is...WHEW!

I know Brainless and Lennie will discount any likelyhood of my
objectivity, however I was impressed with TEMA's communications facilities.

Yes, the FEMA folks each carry a cellphone with them. There are NO
seperate cellphone facilities in the EOC, however.

The EOC has the capability of accessing any frequency from 1.8MHz to 2GHz
in a plethora of modes, secure and unsecure, to include military if necessary.
Many commercial assets can be accessed if required. Off-site remotes are
situated with almost all of the same capabilites in case of an attack or other
loss of use of the prime EOC.

There is a dedicated Amateur Radio packet station, HF station, two V/UHF
operating positions and third UHF position dedicated to the MTEARS net (Middle
Tennessee Emergency Amateur Radio Service) which is directly tied to NOAA and
carries the bulk of SKYWARN traffic in western and middle Tennessee.

Thier own HF facilites include operating positions for SHARES, FEMA's own
nets,

A dedicated position for CAP (Civil Air Patrol) is being added to "the
pit". Communications assets for CAP will eventually include HF, VHF,
air-to-ground, and a digital imaging site for the HSI (Hyper Spectral Imaging)
package CAP aircraft are being equipped with, as well as VHF slow scan video.

With the exception of two "cordless" telephones, a handful of TV remotes, and three ISR (Intra Squad Radios, the federal version of FRS) HT's used to talk to the guard shack and garage, there are NO "unlicensed" devices on the facility. (The only "major" role the ISR radios might play is if they are used by a commissioned O-4 in the Armed Forces.)

Speaking of "TV remotes", this place would put a lot of those "every channel of sports" sports bars to shame! They even had channels dedicated to foreign news services running.

When I asked about "CB" radio or "GMRS", I was told that there were no plans to use either, that there was not even a usable GMRS repeater in the area. Any REACT group that presented itself would be "tasked under the ARES EC, however we would not allow anyone coming here on the heels of something major to try an wiggle in to an existing plan. We've pretty well got our plans in place, and there's NO plan for CB radio.

The gentleman that I spent most of these two days with is a member of the board of APCO, or Association of Public-safety Communications Officials, so I think I can reasonably assume him to be a bit more knowledgeable than certain posters in this forum on the subject of "emergency comms"...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1452. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 14:44:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322094420.20899.00000144@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89466

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
>

>Because all emergencies are Huge!

They are if they are happening to you.

Steve, K4YZ

1453. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 14:49:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322094943.20899.00000146@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89467

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/20/2004 4:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040320175906.21955.00001082@mb-m20.aol.com>

>>> Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
>>> network will be, far all practical purposes, useless.
>>
>>You have only one size of emergency: Huge!
>>
>>That's laughable.
>
> It may be all he has that is huge...

Ahhhhh, yes...Lennie fires an opening volley of "personal perjorative",
the nature of which had certain underlying innuendo that he-himself has decried
others using in numerous past posts.

>> In addition to the communication ability of military and
>>> civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed,
>>
>>So Amateur Radio isn't their first choice? How sad.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another Legend of the Airwaves down in flames.

It wasn't a legend to start with.

The "legend" status was bestowed by you. The rest is archived history.

Obviously one that is sufficiently true enough for CURRENT emergency
planners to continue to rely upon.

Steve, K4YZ

1454. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:00:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405EFF77.5050801@psu.edu>
Source record: 89468
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> The rule stands on it's own, regardless of whatever warped interpretation you
> wish to place upon it.

Indeed! now if we can only convince you of that.

- mike KB3EIA -

1455. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:05:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89469

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>

>> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
>> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>>
>> Where did I speak of the average citizen?
>
>That's who I've been speaking of all along. Do try to keep up.

JJ...please take CAREEFUL note.

YOU were talking about disaster preparedness, those sets of plans in place by your local or state EMA, FEMA, etc. And in the overall scheme of things, you (and I) are correct.

Brain, on the other hand, having been UNABLE to successfully argue against the value of Amateur Radio in those plans, has shifted his definition of "emergency comms" to those of STRICTLY "the average citizen".

In the very narrow slice of "emergency comms" that Brian the Brainless has wedged himself into, yes, John Q Public is going to whip out the old cellphone and call 9-1-1 to get a cop, report a fire, or request EMS for an accident or medical emergency...Just like he would have dialed a payphone 5 years ago.

In a true "disaster preparedness" mode, cellphones may suffer all of the bad things that you and I have said they will.

THAT assertion is made upon the evidence that such incidents have ALREADY HAPPENED, and those occurences have been sufficient to impress the REAL "emergency comms" planners to continue to incorporate Amateur Radio in a wide range of plans.

This is not "urban legend" or based upon some " feel good news release of the ARRL" as Lennie the Loser would have us believe. Real, front-page news stuff. Sorry he won't admit it, but that only helps to substantiate MY claims about his "superior intellect".

>> So they may, but in times of emergency, the military and other civil
>> authorites will not rely on cell phones to handle major emergency
>> communications.
>
>And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?

Uhhhhhhh....Brain....Other than "military" or "civilian", what other categories are there?

>I am no longer an instrument of national policy. Are you?

As long as my Right to Vote has not been revoked, you're danged tooting I am!

Try again, blockhead.

Steve, K4YZ

1456. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:07:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322100730.20899.00000153@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89470

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191609.2d43e810@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...

>> As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
>> emergency comms... a big *yes*.
>
>Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
>
>You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
>
>That makes it grafitti.

He needs to be a governmenal official to paint now?

Steve, K4YZ

1457. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:11:27 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <sdut50hqn89nu3t0rnlmmme47ianci2pm4@4ax.com>
Source record: 89471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 19 Mar 2004 11:02:46 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
><snip>
>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>>
>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>>rights people would love your attitude.
>
>
>The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
>Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".

No, you misunderstood me. I'm not saying that radio operation is a
civil right. Rather I was reflecting on your attitude that since
consumers outnumber hams by 3000:1, that hams don't deserve
consideration. I was then drawing a comparison to those who opposed
civil rights based on the notion that the people calling for those
changes were only a small minority.

>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>
>>Not if his station is clean.
>
>
>Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?

Nowhere. But nowhere in the rules does it specify otherwise, and the
implication is that the ham is responsible for HIS station, not
everyone else's receivers.

>>>97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
>>>cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>>
>>That does not apply to RFI, it applies to on-channel stations.
>
>
>Again, where does it say that?

Nowhere does it say that it applies to RFI either.

You are asking me to prove a negative. As a general rule, that which
is not expressly prohibited, is automatically assumed to be permitted.

But you might wish to consider this:

ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.

(a) "If the operation of an amateur station causes general
interference to the reception of transmissions from stations operating
in the domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering
design, including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to
receive such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur
station licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the
hours from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created".

The FCC recognizes the interference potential which can arise from
these cases, and has legislation in place to address this. But the
caveat is that the receivers must be deemed as "good engineering
design". So in other words, the FCC has stated (paraphrasing) that if
the radio or TV is junk, all bets are off.

(b)" In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize
interference to stations operating in other services may be required
after investigation by the FCC".

So until that time, a radio station (such as yours) has no authority
to do anything other than report the problem. The FCC will take any
action that they feel is appropriate. If the amateur station can
demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the FCC, that they've taken the
necessary steps to minimize the problem, the FCC will usually impose
no mandatory restrictions.

>> IOW no
>>ham may deliberately interfere with another licensed service, which
>>occupies the same frequency including, but not limited to, 40 meter
>>broadcast stations, stations with secondary authorization, or other
>>hams etc.
>
>
>Where did you find that in the rules? I can't find that anywhere. Got a link or
>citation?

It's implied. If you were a ham, you'd understand the purpose of the
rules.

>>>Notice that it doesn't exempt Part 15 devices or Sony televisions, it doesn't
>>>release the ham of responsibility just because he tried and failed to prevent
>>>the interference, and it doesn't specify where or how that interference occurs.
>>
>>Because it doesn't apply to RFI.
>
>

>The law says "interference", doesn't it? Isn't RFI one cause of interferece? Did
>you all-of-a-sudden forget that RFI stands for....
>
>..... Radio Frequency Interference?

What's one man's interference..... We're back to subjectivity again.

>>And Part 15 itself puts the burden on the device's user when it states
>>that "this device must not create harmful interference, and must
>>accept any interference, including that which may cause improper
>>operation".
>
>
>Not all Part 15 devices are communication devices, and not all RFI comes from
>communication devices. Regardless, a television transmitter is -not- a Part 15
>device.

But a television RECEIVER is, and as such must accept any interference
that it may get under Part 15 rules.

>>>The fact is that if you know your transmission is interfering with the audio,
>>>distorting the picture (distortion = interference, Blackburn v. Doubleday
>>>Broadcasting Co., Minn. 1984), or crashing someone's wireless palm-pilot, only
>>>YOU are at fault. Sony is not responsible for your transmissions and subsequent
>>>interference, nor is Zenith, Motorola, or even the poor schmuck who paid too
>>>much for an El Cheapo TV that even picks up his coffee maker.... if you know
>>>that you are causing interference, you are legally responsible. Period. But you
>>>knew that already, right?
>>
>>I do not agree with your draconian interpretation. If that were the
>>case, practically every ham (or commercial operator) would be forced
>>off the air, as a result of RFI complaints.
>
>
>Hardly! There are PLENTY of hams, probably the vast majority of them, that don't
>cause interference.

I would be willing to make a gentleman's bet with you that the vast
majority of HF operating hams, who live in a fairly dense (suburban or
municipal) population area, will cause some sort of RFI interference
to at least one neighbor. The sheer volume of poorly designed consumer
junk pretty much assures it.

>This is pointless. You can make all the excuses you want.

The facts are hardly excuses. The facts are that most ham stations are
not being forced off the air for RFI issues. The FCC tends to side
with hams on all but the most uncooperative and belligerent cases.

> Our station will
>continue to put the kybosh on uncooperative radio operators that cause
>interference to our signal, regardless of whether they are licensed or not, and
>we are well within our legal rights to do so.

You have no power to shut down anyone. You can only report them to the
FCC, and wait until THEY investigate, if and when they choose to.

>Maybe someday a broadcast station
>in your locality will take the same course of action as us. And maybe they won't
>be so nice about it. Like it or not, that's the way it is.

I would welcome the challenge. As GWB is fond of saying "Bring it on!"
I won't be so nice either..... And I have the equipment and the
expertise to back it up, as well as a pool of experienced
communications lawyers who I can tap for guidance.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1458. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:12:50 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <1f0u509sdso54ni1sdn3hrg0tg7c88hjiu@4ax.com>
Source record: 89472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <405EFF77.5050801@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> The rule stands on it's own, regardless of whatever warped interpretation you
>> wish to place upon it.
>
>
> Indeed! now if we can only convince you of that.

You can convince me by citing any law that exempts a ham from a violation of
97.101(d) when the interference is to a device of 'poor design'.

Well?

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1459. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:14:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322101424.20899.00000155@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89473

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/19/2004 11:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <APmdnYHQg7CQrcbdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>>
>> TAFKARJ claims that "CB" originated in 1946...except that
>> "11 meters" is not at 465 MHz. :-)
>
>There was a band at that frequency that citizens could apply for and
>use, thus a "citizens band" or "cb".

JJ...you'll have to forgive Lennie...He get's caught up in his own
rantings from time to time.

Even the 11 meter allocation was "officially" called the "Citizen's Radio
Service". The term "Citizen's Band" came much later.

Yes, "CB" generally refers to the 11 meter allocation, however Class D CB
>>IS<< afterall, just one subpart of Part 95. >>>Your emergency plan scenario
that you are acting out this weekend is

>>>that cell phones won't be working.
>>>
>>>Am I wrong?
>
>As far as using the cell network for official emergency comms, you can
>consider it not working. In times of a major emergency it becomes
>useless for anything but attempting to make a call.

Not in all cases, of course, but enough of them that the Big Dogs of
"emergency comms" plan for it's demise and have plans ready to implement in
case it happens.

It just eats away at Lennie and Brain's rants that those plans include
Amateur Radio to the degree that they do. No problem...Just makes them look
that much more foolish.

As if they NEEDED to look more foolish!

Steve, K4YZ

1460. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:17:03 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <em0u50pasu938vvtamikdanmnsej33dls2@4ax.com>
Source record: 89474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 20 Mar 2004 05:12:20 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <D%M6c.503$V66.259@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
><snip>
>>I don't have the FCC comments in front of me. Since you are the blowhard
>>here I'll let you find them.
>
>
>Why should I? My case is solid.
>
>
>> But sometime back, and I don't remember how
>>far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically told the
>>manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most' cases the
>>receiving equipment was at fault.
>
>
>Once again, where in the rules is that opinion incorporated so as to vindicate a
>ham from violating 97.101(d)?

This one:

ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.
(a) If the operation of an amateur station causes general interference
to the reception of transmissions from stations operating in the
domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering design,
including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to receive
such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur station
licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the hours
from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created.

(b) In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize
interference to stations operating in other services may be required
after investigation by the FCC.

The FCC has stipulated the conditions which would require that a ham
stop transmitting. Unless these conditions are met, the ham is not
required to do anything other than to make sure that his own station
is clean.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1461. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:36:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322103623.20899.00000156@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89475

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040319202143.02537.00003564@mb-m23.aol.com>

> In the WTC Attack during 11 Sep 01, the NYC Emergency
> Communications Center (in an adjacent building) was largely
> destroyed by falling debris, also severing many trunk lines
> of the telephone system. NYC police and fire units did work-
> arounds using their own radios in a relay system to several
> centrals, calling in other agencies as well as special units to
> help. Some cell phone service did work, regardless of myth to
> the contrary and some wired phone service still worked, used
> by almost anyone on the WTC Attack scene. Amateur radio
> did not play any significant part (if any at all) during the few
> hours after the Attack on the WTC.

However Amateur Radio DID play a "major role" in the following DAYS of post-incident recovery.

Not even the most 'diehard' Amateur Radio supporter suggests that Amateur Radio is the "primary" source of emergency communications unless a ham just happens to be "in the middle" of it and uses a radio to "call it in".

That HAS happened and CONTINUES to happen on a fairly regular basis., especially wilderness areas that have more trees than cellsites.

>>Which one, I have several, what are the odds they are all down at the
>>same time? How many cell phones do you have?
>
> Since neither you nor your equipment is identified and we don't
> know the working status of your "several" radios, the above is
> just a brag claim of no intrinsic value.

Just as are YOUR numerous claims of having some sort of "monitoring station" set up at home. Beyond a cordless telephone, TV, and TV remote, I seriously doubt you to have anything capable of converting RF to AF.

I am far more likely to accept JJ's claims than yours. Especially since I've enver seen him post anything that can be called anything even close to untrue.

YOU, on the otherhand, are a bit on the "prolific" side of mistruthful.......

>>As far as using the cell network for official emergency comms, you can
>>consider it not working. In times of a major emergency it becomes

>>useless for anything but attempting to make a call.
>
> That is a popular myth but it remains only a myth.

It is not a myth. It has happened.

Anything that HAS occured is NOT a myth.

> The cellular telephone network is part of the telephone infrastructure
> and is intimately connected with the local exchange's switching unit.
> That switching unit is designed to handle only a fraction of installed
> numbers, both wireline and cell phone. But the switch itself is also
> backed up by battery supplies "riding on" the primary power; also
> true for cell sites themselves.

And for those cellsites that were in the path of an oncoming tornado?
Where is all that electrical energy going to, Lennie...???

> During any sudden event there WILL be a flurry of telephone calls
> made and that MAY overtax the limited number-handling capability
> of the switch. ...(SNIP)

There HAVE been and HAS overtaxed...

> The onset of the 11 Sep 01 Attack by four hijacked airliners was not
> only sudden but unprecedented, without any possible warning. The
> subsequent crash of two airliners into the WTC towers did destroy a
> portion of the lower Manhattan telephone system wiring but did NOT
> destroy or disable the entire Manhattan telephone infrastructure.

Just a signifcant part of the commercial wireless network and an entire
OES center...Ya know...the SMALL stuff...

> The onset of a fire storm, typically in dry open country, is not sudden
> and may take literal days from ignition start to reaching fire storm
> conditions. There is plenty of warning time using conventional
> communications means to begin fighting that.

Then why, if it's so "gradual" in evolution, does the CDF still employ
Amateurs to help them out..?!?!

(For everyone else, "CDF" is the California Department of Forestry...since
Lennie likes to brag on how avante garde Kalifonication is, I always like to
feed it back to him when the opportunity arises!)

> Hurricanes are known and predicted from NOAA tracking, allow days
> for all in the path to prepare. Again, communications may be done
> by conventional means. Tornados are more sudden but allow hours
> of preparation from first sighting. Storm and flood conditions allow
> hours to days of preparation, again using conventional
> communications to effect that.

Two major points:

NOAA, despite tons and tons of technology, STILL depends on hundreds of Amateur Radio volunteers in it's SKYWARN program to provide real-time reports to it's centers...To the point of spending a LOT of money to train Amateur volunteers and to deploy facilities cap[able of communicating with them, both on HF, V/UHF, and digital modes.

> There is no reported evidence of amateur radio ever stopping an
> earthquake, hurricane, tornado, flood, storm, or aircraft hijacking.

No, there's not.

However there ARE tons of articles on how Amateur Radio has been part-and-parcel of the recovery phases of ALL of those various senarios...

Steve, K4YZ

1462. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:49:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322104926.20899.00000157@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89476

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040319202147.02537.00003567@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>writes:

>>Sure they do, but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
>>pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
>>the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.
>
> Not always true.
>
> You want to select the 11 September 2001 Attack on America as
> a typical emergency but that was a very UNtypical emergency
> that no one could foresee or plan for. In the "9/11" incident ALL
> methods of communications were strained.

A point we can agree on.

> There are NO verifiable stories about amateur radio doing anything
> to aid anyone in the first few hours of the Attack in New York City
> on 11 Sep 01. Conversely, even though the NYC Emergency
> Center was almost destroyed in that Attack, police and fire
> department personnel were in constant communications before and
> immediately after the Attack in and around the World Trade Center.
> Add to that the medical people, NYC officials, and various utilities
> and other businesses who got into immediate action. All of that is
> quite well documented in many and various media outside of
> hobby groups.

Now THAT we CAN'T.

There have already been a half dozen recriminating "inquests" as to why
various communications failures occured with FDNY, NYPD, PAPF, EMS and othr
agencies.

THAT has been reported in "USA Today" and other nationwide media sources.

>>If they are licensed hams they might have. Why would they if they were
>>not licensed? Face it billyboy, for the real comms needed in an
>>emergency situation, the cell network is not considered by emergency
>>officials to be of use, they do consider ham radio.
>

> "Officials" who have already been through emergencies of many kinds
> consider and plan for ANY kind of communications in ANY kind of
> emergency or disaster situation.

Yep.

And almost every plan from the Department of Defense on down to "Podunk
Hollow USA" have some provision for including (or at least considering)
implementing Amateur Radio as a recourse.

> A case in point is the "other" "9/11" Attack on the Pentagon in DC....(Snip
to....)
> After crash fire control and search and rescue was coordinated by on-
> site military and civilian communications, not by amateur radio.

Lennie...why do you keep trying to make a point of this?

No one here has even remotely suggested that it was otherwise.

> There are no viable
> reports of amateur radio being used while that most definite
> emergency situation was happening. (In reference to the 4th hijacking...SR)

No, there wasn't.

However Amateur Radio WAS employed in the post-incident recovery at the
site.

> The "9/11" Attack is popular to espouse because of the enormous
> emotional impact to all Americans. But, it was an ATTACK done
> by other humans against all of us and definitely NOT some kind of
> natural event emergency or disaster. The "kamikazi" nature of
> this suicide attack was NOT anticipated by anyone and all were
> in surprise and all had to work through the immediate aftermath
> with whatever reseources were available.

Oh...so as long as the causal effect was "intentional", then we can
discount using Amateur Radio to receover from teh post incident effects,
Lennie...?!?!

> Amateur radio is in the
> tertiary level lumped in with CB, FRS, GMRS, and other private
> radios...seldom organized to work with primary and secondary
> levels and not depended upon as reliable for anything but health
> and welfare (psychological reassurance) messaging for victims
> after an emergency has occurred.

Ooooooooooooh! Lennie caught lying AGAIN!
> It does no good to express outrage and perceived insult the radios
> in an essentially-recreational activity isn't venerated or rewarded
> for exaggerated tales of heroism and good deeds. That only shows
> an emotional instability that refuses to consider the vast infra-
> structure of communications that exists and is robust enough to
> have survived many disasters and emergencies of the past.

>
> If cell phones work in some future emergency, they WILL be used.
> There are just too many of them, the cell infrastructure too large to
> overlook them. Public Service radios are already organized and
> backed up, networked, planned, trained to work in emergency
> conditions. Those will bear the brunt of future emergency
> communications as they have successfully in the past. In the USA
> there exist many and varied wired and fiber communications means,
> locally to nationally...plus a variety of frequencies, modes, and
> methods already in-place with the military and national guards
> units, able to use equipment designed and proven to work through
> the harshest of all enviornments: Warfare. Everything that can
> work is useable and has been used, emergency planners and
> coordinators already well aware of what is available and reliable.
>
> This isn't the 1920s when "radio" was not widespread nor
> technologically advanced, suitable only for some broadcasting
> and on-off keying mode communications. This is 80 years later,
> over three generations of time, and "radios" are numerous in the
> governmental and commercial infrastructure. It would be best to
> stop the self-perceived outrage at your hobby being slighted to
> educate yourself on the entire world of "radio," what is there and
> how it is being used and planned-for in real emergencies.
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1463. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:52:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322105233.20899.00000158@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89477

>rom: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 6:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200446.1ab880b0@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<p5udnWPAIbBjRsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > Since the
>> > hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane,
>> > the only available means of communications for the passengers
>> > was by cell phone. Those calls got through.
>>
>> Of course those calls got through
>
>And that is the point. An emergency call got through. They get
>through every day using cellular phones.
>
>> dimwit,
>
>Interesting how you smart guys always end up calling people names.
>That usually happens about the time they run out of valid arguments

Well, you DO try a bit harder than the average "dimwit", Brain...

You DO try to skew the discussion into parameters that acutally FIT your rant, even if the original discussion did not include them!

It's rather apparent and foolish since you usually get caught, but I give you an "A" for effort!

Steve, K4YZ

1464. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 15:57:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322105734.20899.00000159@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89478

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/19/2004 7:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040319202151.02537.00003568@mb-m23.aol.com>

> The unfortunate part is that his lack of emotional control in post
> after post makes the hobby look bad to others. He can't see
> that and refuses to recognize it, so we all get to see the name-
> calling and damning epithets directed against others.

No "epithets' , damning or otherwise being directed here, Lennie.

Your personal marionette made a claim that the "unlicensed" services play
a "major role" (his adjectives, not mine) in "emergency comms".

I've asked him repeatedly to validate his claims with SOME form of proof.
He has failed to do so.

No proof = intentional mistruth.

Steve, K4YZ

1465. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:03:47 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <fr0u50l2kgbtg6905p974rkbtcdgn01l09@4ax.com>
Source record: 89479
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <sdut50hqn89nu3t0rnlmmme47ianci2pm4@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Fri, 19 Mar 2004 11:02:46 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>
>>In <564m5052luh2i121tt6s2gll6ekthg9r3m@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
>><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>>
>><snip>
>>>>Where does this "burden" lie? The consumers outnumber the hams 3000 to 1.
>>>
>>>So that means that hams deserve no consideration? I'm sure the civil
>>>rights people would love your attitude.
>>
>>
>>The operation of a ham radio is not a "civil right". Again, you sound like
>>Twisty when he says that radio piracy is an "essential freedom".
>
>No, you misunderstood me. I'm not saying that radio operation is a
>civil right. Rather I was reflecting on your attitude that since
>consumers outnumber hams by 3000:1, that hams don't deserve
>consideration. I was then drawing a comparison to those who opposed
>civil rights based on the notion that the people calling for those
>changes were only a small minority.

That's fine, but nobody suggested the hams are not deserving of due
consideration. The fact that the amateur service exists is proof of this.

>>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>>
>>>Not if his station is clean.
>>
>>
>>Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?
>
>Nowhere. But nowhere in the rules does it specify otherwise,

Yes it does. 97.101(d).

> and the
>implication is that the ham is responsible for HIS station, not
>everyone else's receivers.

The ham is responsible for his station. He is not responsible for anyone else's receiver. But he -IS- responsible for any -interference- he causes to anyone else's receiver.

>>>>97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
>>>>cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>>>
>>>That does not apply to RFI, it applies to on-channel stations.
>>
>>
>>Again, where does it say that?
>
>Nowhere does it say that it applies to RFI either.

RFI = Radio Frequency Interference

>You are asking me to prove a negative. As a general rule, that which
>is not expressly prohibited, is automatically assumed to be permitted.

But it -IS- prohibited, and it is -EXPRESSLY- prohibited!!!

>But you might wish to consider this:
>
>ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.
>
>(a) "If the operation of an amateur station causes general
>interference to the reception of transmissions from stations operating
>in the domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering
>design, including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to
>receive such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur
>station licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the
>hours from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
>additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
>frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created".

The problem here is that the ham can simply declare the receiver to be of 'poor design' and work the protected hours anyway, which is exactly what happens. IOW, the rule is far to subjective for it to ever be enforced -- in fact, it isn't enforced at all by the FCC. Also, 97.121 does not exempt a ham from a violation of 97.101(d) because, even in a best-case scenario, the former can be considered to be in conflict with the latter. However the rule -does- reflect the priority that broadcast services have over the amateur service.

>The FCC recognizes the interference potential which can arise from
>these cases, and has legislation in place to address this. But the
>caveat is that the receivers must be deemed as "good engineering
>design". So in other words, the FCC has stated (paraphrasing) that if
>the radio or TV is junk, all bets are off.

The FCC has no specifications or minimum requirements for the engineering quality of any broadcast receiver. So who makes the determination as to which receiver is 'junk' and which one is not? The ham? That's like letting the defendant of a murder trial decide what can or can't be submitted as evidence!

>(b)" In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize
>interference to stations operating in other services may be required
>after investigation by the FCC".
>
>So until that time, a radio station (such as yours) has no authority
>to do anything other than report the problem. The FCC will take any
>action that they feel is appropriate. If the amateur station can
>demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the FCC, that they've taken the
>necessary steps to minimize the problem, the FCC will usually impose
>no mandatory restrictions.

In most cases we have worked with the ham (and some keyclowns, too) to clean up the interference. In only three cases have we been forced to file a complaint with the FCC under 97.101(d). In all three cases the ham was sent a letter by the FCC and the interference stopped. No, the station has no authority to do anything at all -- the FCC has that authority, and it's clear (to us, at least) that they will exercise that authority should there be a violation of 97.101(d).

>>> IOW no
>>>ham may deliberately interfere with another licensed service, which
>>>occupies the same frequency including, but not limited to, 40 meter
>>>broadcast stations, stations with secondary authorization, or other
>>>hams etc.
>>
>>
>>Where did you find that in the rules? I can't find that anywhere. Got a link or
>>citation?
>
>It's implied.

97.101(d) is not implied, it is explicit.

> If you were a ham, you'd understand the purpose of the
>rules.

I suppose you might be right. After 5 years of college and 25 years experience in the field of radio communication, I should consider becoming a ham if I ever want to understand the purpose of the rules......

=>-PLONK-<=

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1466. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:07:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322110700.20899.00000160@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89480

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 6:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200449.5ba4f542@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040319202151.02537.00003568@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >
>> >Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
>> >obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
>> >to you.
>>
>> He can't tone it down. No control there. Obsessive personal
>> necessity to go off on an emotional bender every time someone
>> hints at disagreeing with him and his "pride" about his personal
>> activities which he deems far superior to what others do.
>>
>> The unfortunate part is that his lack of emotional control in post
>> after post makes the hobby look bad to others. He can't see
>> that and refuses to recognize it, so we all get to see the name-
>> calling and damning epithets directed against others.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Being a Nurse, he probably has an excellent health plan that he could
>use to get well. But admitting a problem is the first step.

What problem?

Not tolerating liars and fools?

Brain...YOU made an assertion of fact.

I have asked you (several times) to validate it. You have refused or
ignored it.

Your only "response" is to insinuate that I am "out of control" or
otherwise being "obnoxious".

I guess if I were making as equally assinine assertions in a public forum
and then being tasked to prove my "facts' and was unable, I'd be as equally
anxious to get the tiger off my tail too!

As far as I am concerned we can go ahead and drop it at this point. Your obfuscation and attempts to dodge taking responsibility have only proven MY contention that you are neither a knowledgeable person when it comes to Amateur Radio, but that you are purposefully mistruthful.

You have made assertions that you cannot substantiate.

People who ARE in a position to know better know that your suggerstion of "unlicensed" services playing some "major role" in "emergency comms" is laughable at best.

Coming from Amateur Radio's OTHER court jester, I'd expect nothing less.
You and Lennie make a cute couple!

Steve, K4YZ

No problem.

Steve, K4YZ

1467. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:09:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322110942.20899.00000161@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89481

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/19/2004 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <iNOdnZF1jcap1sbdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring
>>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>>Date: 3/19/2004 6:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>

>> What I am wondering is why everyone wants to set these power levels
>low to
>> avoid testing on questions about SAFETY!
>
>Here is an answer that seems to fit the equation, Steve:
>
>I have noted that many people that are in favor of removing Element 1
>from the tests are also in favor of this removal of safety questions, or
>whatever gets those tests down to an elementary school level. This is
>despite protestations from some that they would NEVER support reductions
>like that. My disappointment is immense that I trusted them and that
>they were inaccurate in their dealings with me. Whatever, I'm sure that
>means nothing to them.
>
>Drawing from that experience, I can safely conclude that they are
>willing to chip away at any part of the test that they can, and that no
>level of simplicity is too simple for them.
>
> And they have no intention of stopping there.
>
>
> D'Zat work?

Uhhhh....Yep!

>> We're talking about requiring some knowledge that might prevent the
>person
>> from hurting himself or others. Why are we so anxious to avoid them..?!?!
>
> Knowledge is BAD!

BAD knowledge! BAD!

73

Steve, K4YZ

=)

1468. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:14:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F10E9.40809@psu.edu>
Source record: 89484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> I guess this will be another standing question (that will most likely go
> unanswered as well): What laws mirror 97.101(d) under Parts 20 and 73?

Frank, if you really need the question answered, I suggest you go to the F.C.C. and see what they have to say.

They would probably have a more definitive answer than any I can give you.

If you need a few more rules based windmills to tilt at, I suggest you try invalidating a high percentage of amateurs licenses because we didn't take a Morse code sending test, as required by part 97:

7.503 Element standards.

(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in the international Morse code at not less than the prescribed speed, using all the letters of the alphabet, numerals 0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK. Element 1: 5 words per minute.

Oh Oh! thousands and thousands of Amateurs are licensed and operating in direct non compliance with a specifically worded rule in part 97!!!! Somewhere along the way, someone interpreted the rule to end the sending tests. It's just how it works, man.

Now back to the "problem at hand"

97.101 General standards.

(a) In all respects not specifically covered by FCC Rules each amateur station must be operated in accordance with good engineering and good amateur practice.

(b) Each station licensee and each control operator must cooperate in selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use of the amateur service frequencies. No frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station.

(c) At all times and on all frequencies, each control operator must give priority to stations providing emergency communications, except to stations transmitting communications for training drills and tests in RACES.

(d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.

Seems like a good sort of rule to have. Makes sense too. We don't want people jamming each other, or harassing each other or their neighbors with their radios.

And what does part 15 have to say?

ï¿½ 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.

(a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to consider the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-geostationary mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S. Government radio stations, which could include high-powered radar systems, when choosing operating frequencies during the design of their equipment so as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful interference. Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be obtained by consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in ï¿½ 2.106 of this chapter.

Most Part 15 devices require a label attesting to the potential for interference and to the responsibility of the device operator. The following sections from the rules provide an examples of the labeling requirements:

ï¿½ 15.19 labeling requirements.

(a) In addition to the requirements in part 2 of this chapter, a device subject to certification, notification, or verification shall be labeled as follows:

(3) All other devices shall bear the following statement in a conspicuous location on the device:

This device complies with part 15 of the FCC Rules. Operation is subject to the following two conditions: (1) This device may not cause harmful interference, and (2) this device must accept any interference received, including interference that may cause undesired operation.

And:

ï¿½15.105--Information to the user.

(a) For a Class A digital device or peripheral, the instructions furnished the user shall include the following or similar statement, placed in a prominent location in the text of the manual:

This equipment has been tested and found to comply with the limits for a Class A digital device, pursuant to part 15 of the FCC Rules. These limits are designed to provide reasonable protection against harmful interference when the equipment is operated in a commercial environment. This equipment generates, uses, and can radiate radio frequency energy and, if not installed and used in accordance with the instruction manual, may cause harmful interference to radio communications. Operation of this equipment in a residential area is likely to cause harmful interference in which case the user will be required to correct the interference at his own expense.

(b) For a Class B digital device or peripheral, the instructions furnished the user shall include the following or similar statement, placed in a prominent location in the text of the manual:

This equipment has been tested and found to comply with the limits for a Class B digital device, pursuant to part 15 of the FCC Rules. These limits are designed to provide reasonable protection against harmful interference in a residential installation. This equipment generates, uses and can radiate radio frequency energy and, if not installed and used in accordance with the instructions, may cause harmful interference to radio communications. However, there is no guarantee that interference will not occur in a particular installation. If this equipment does cause harmful interference to radio or television reception, which can be determined by turning the equipment off and on, the user is encouraged to try to correct the interference by one or more of the following measures:

* Reorient or relocate the receiving antenna.
* Increase the separation between the equipment and receiver.
* Connect the equipment into an outlet on a circuit different from that to which the receiver is connected.
* Consult the dealer or an experienced radio/TV technician for help

As far as I can see what you are saying is that if the Amateur knows that his or her station is causing interference, if they continue to operate, they are doing so willfully and maliciously. This is your interpretation, and it is incorrect.

You should try a test case, Frank!

The way I would interpret the rules is that the amateur radio licensee is required to have a clean signal, as is also referenced in part 97.

With a complying clean signal, they now have the right or privilege to operate, always in compliance as regarding bands, power, content, etc, basically just following the rules.

Beyond the rules:

The neighbor has an interference complaint, and does so. In looking into the problem, the amateur will suggest, but is no no way required to pay for, mitigating the interference. Often the amateur works to help the neighbor install the needed devices.

most of that stuff just falls in the "being a good neighbor" category.

Your interpretation that the amateur knows s/he is interfering, and is therefore willing and malicious, just won't hold up. I've heard only to the contrary for as long as I've been a ham. Do you have specific legal rulings supporting your interpretation?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1469. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:15:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322111534.20899.00000162@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89483

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191614.540c796b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319031245.06889.00000012@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>
>> But I wonder how he'd react to reading posts written by a like-named
>> person who tries to embellish his military "career" by associating himself
>with
>> men who were KIA 3 years before you were in the Armed Forces...?!?!
>
>It isn't called the "Armed Forces" for nothing. It is the nature of
>what we do that associates us with KIA.

Only a callous idiot like you would try to rationalize what Lennie did as
"OK".

Claiming some fraternalism or professing to not break the chain of trust
and honor among Soliders is one thing...THAT is part of the Armed Forces.

Trying to embellish one's own personal "achivements" (or lack thereof)
based upon someone else's sacrifices is absolutely callous and cruel.

Steve, K4YZ

1470. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:15:47 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <so3u50d8fh5vgbu0ubmi0g1mfp26agt0vr@4ax.com>
Source record: 89482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <em0u50pasu938vvtamikdanmnsej33dls2@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:

>On Sat, 20 Mar 2004 05:12:20 -0800, Frank Gilliland
><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>
>>In <D%M6c.503$V66.259@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
>>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>><snip>
>>>I don't have the FCC comments in front of me. Since you are the blowhard
>>>here I'll let you find them.
>>
>>
>>Why should I? My case is solid.
>>
>>
>>> But sometime back, and I don't remember how
>>>far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically told the
>>>manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most' cases the
>>>receiving equipment was at fault.
>>
>>
>>Once again, where in the rules is that opinion incorporated so as to vindicate a
>>ham from violating 97.101(d)?
>
>This one:
>
>ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.
>(a) If the operation of an amateur station causes general interference
>to the reception of transmissions from stations operating in the
>domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering design,
>including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to receive
>such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur station
>licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the hours
>from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
>additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
>frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created.
>
>(b) In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize
>interference to stations operating in other services may be required
>after investigation by the FCC.
>

>
>The FCC has stipulated the conditions which would require that a ham
>stop transmitting. Unless these conditions are met, the ham is not
>required to do anything other than to make sure that his own station
>is clean.

I plonked you after this message was downloaded, but you are still plonked. The only reason I am replying is to point out that this rule also reflects the fact that the FCC recognizes the ham's responsibility to prevent interference that can be caused by the ham, which is what I have been saying all along.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1471. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:17:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322111712.20899.00000163@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89485

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191616.2a113a7a@posting.google.com>

>I know only one Steve Roberson and he's nuts.

Well..."Steve Roberson" MAY be nuts.

I am not.

YOU, on the other hand, are not truthful.

Steve, K4YZ

1472. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:22:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F12B1.5080502@psu.edu>
Source record: 89486

JJ wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>>
>> I can see from your response that you are unable to answer the standing
>> question, which is no suprise because there -is no law- excusing hams from
>> violating 97.101(d) because of 'poor design' of consumer devices. Nor
>> is it
>> suprising that you are unwilling to admit that fact.
>>
>
> There is no law that states that if I am operating my ham station
> according to the FCC rules and terms of my license that I must cease
> transmitting because some device is picking up my ham signals because it
> cannot reject out-of-band signals it is not supposed to pick up. Now
> blabber the "malicious" interference thing again. If I continue to get
> on the air, I have no "malicious intent" to intefer, my only intent is
> to excersize the privledges of my license and communicate with other
> hams, I have no "intent" to cause interference to any other service so
> there is no malice involved. Because the device cannot reject my signals
> is not my problem, and the FCC will agree with me, not you. They have
> agreed with me in such a situation in the past.

Frank is right about nothing in 97.101(d) not having anything about
poorly designed consumer electronics.

But that particular rule *shouldn't* have anything about consumer
devices, because that are not supposed to be in that section of the
rules. If the rules had to be changed every time some amateur rules
expert came along with a new twist, the rules would be the length of an
encyclopedia.

He's just saying that knowledge of interference equates to willful and
malicious interference. That is an incorrect interpretation.

- mike KB3EIA -

1473. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:36:19 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <rn4u50pd6diilbhki0qfi9vcvrq5c7norp@4ax.com>
Source record: 89487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <405F10E9.40809@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> I guess this will be another standing question (that will most likely go
>> unanswered as well): What laws mirror 97.101(d) under Parts 20 and 73?
>
>
> Frank, if you really need the question answered, I suggest you go to
>the F.C.C. and see what they have to say.
>
> They would probably have a more definitive answer than any I can give you.

Obviously.

> If you need a few more rules based windmills to tilt at, I suggest you
>try invalidating a high percentage of amateurs licenses because we
>didn't take a Morse code sending test, as required by part 97:
>
>7.503 Element standards.
>
>(a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the
>examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive
>correctly by ear texts in the international Morse code at not less than
>the prescribed speed, using all the letters of the alphabet, numerals
>0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK.
>Element 1: 5 words per minute.
>
>
>Oh Oh! thousands and thousands of Amateurs are licensed and operating in
>direct non compliance with a specifically worded rule in part 97!!!!
>Somewhere along the way, someone interpreted the rule to end the sending
>tests. It's just how it works, man.

97.503 defines the -standards- (notice the title?) by which a testing element is
administered. It does -not- establish the -requirement- of the code element, or
any other element, for any class of amateur license. That rule is 97.501, which
you already knew.

And for that intentional distortion, plus your repetition of old and lame
arguments in the rest of your post, you too get plonked.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1474. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:37:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F1647.8070005@psu.edu>
Source record: 89488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

>>>Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?
>>
>>And where in the rules does it say it is the ham is legally at fault?
>
>
>
> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>
> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But however
> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the interference
> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the category of
> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants to play
> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as to who is
> legally responsible.

You are the one playing semantic games, Frank. Your entire paragraph
below the part 97 excerpt is an interpretation, and not a very good one
at that. I've never seen an application of 97.101d to make an amateur
stop interfering with a part 15 device because of inadvertent interference.

You are making an extraordinary claim. I trust you have proof of
enforcement actions that support your exceptionally broad interpretation?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1475. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:42:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F1783.1020007@psu.edu>
Source record: 89489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>>I have been following the arguement with interest. Are you saying that no
>>matter what the reason for the alleged interference, that if the ham knows
>>he is interfering, then it is the hams fault?
>
>
>
> That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the rules.
> And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
> amateur radio service.

No matter how many times you repeat i, it won't be correct.

>
>>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>
>
>
> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules?

They didn't have to.

> Does the rule say,
> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."?

It doesn't have to. part 97 does not need to address part 15 devices

> Or, "....unless the receiver is
> suseptible to radio frequency interference."?

It doesn't have to. part 97 does not need to address part 15 devices

> No. And I think I have explained the reasons why to the point of excess.

It doesn't have to and that is why it doesn't. the rules are pretty
clear to me. That you have a problem with them indicates that perhaps
you should petition the f.c.c. for a rewrite if you feel strongly enough.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1476. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:46:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F184F.7070006@psu.edu>
Source record: 89490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> 97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously
>> interfere with or
>> cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>>
>> I doubt there are many hams that cause interference maliciously. But
>> however
>> unintentional as the interference may be, if a ham is aware of the
>> interference
>> that he causes whenever he keys up, that certainly falls under the
>> category of
>> 'willfully'. The rule looks pretty clear to me. Unless someone wants
>> to play
>> semantic games with the wording, I don't think there is any doubt as
>> to who is
>> legally responsible.
>
>
> If the ham's station is clean and the interference is caused by the
> device being interfered with due to poor design or a device that is not
> supposed to pick up radio waves, the ham has no legal responsibility. It
> is the responsibity of the owner of the device to fix the problem.

Ya would sure think so, JJ! So the F.C.C. and the rest of us have been
wrong all these years!!!

- mike KB3EIA -

1477. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:48:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F18C1.6010100@psu.edu>
Source record: 89491
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ wrote:
> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>
>>
>>
>>
>> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the
>> rule say,
>> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the
>> receiver is
>> suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
>> explained
>> the reasons why to the point of excess.
>
>
> In the case were the inteference is the fault of the device the FCC has
> many times told the complaing party the problem is theirs and not the
> Amateur's, and it is the complaintant's responsibilty to fix the problem.
> I will site a case that happened to me. When I was first licensed I
> liked to operate on the 15 meter band (21 mHz). A neighbor had a
> television that used 21 mHz for the Intermediate Frequency. Guess what?
> Every time I operated the tv IF picked up my signal just like a 15 meter
> receiver. She complained to the FCC. I was asked to responed to the FCC
> about the problem. When I explained the problem, the FCC told the
> neighbor it was her problem because her television was picking up
> signals it was not supposed to and I was under no responsibility to fix
> it or to stop operating on 15 meters.

Oh, sure, JJ! How can real-world experience trump creative rules
interpretation?

8^) - mike KB3EIA -

1478. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:55:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F1A87.4070607@psu.edu>
Source record: 89492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Frank Gilliland" <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote in message
> news:i8sm50tmvctaa3r7596c2lsbs2sko8g2tb@4ax.com...
>
>>In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>
> <w4nti@get
>
>>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
>
> rules.
>
>>And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
>>amateur radio service.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>>
>>
>>Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules? Does the rule
>
> say,
>
>>"....unless the receiver is of poor design."? Or, "....unless the receiver
>
> is
>
>>suseptible to radio frequency interference."? No. And I think I have
>
> explained
>
>>the reasons why to the point of excess.
>>
>
>
> Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
> aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they
> do, it is the fault of the receiver.

Frank is taking one sentence out of part 97, performing a creative interpretation on it, and trying to say that any knowledge of interference indicated "willful and malicious".

> If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
> signal, then he is not interfering with any service. Interference is
> transmitting on the same frequency as another service. We don't do that.

Very good point, Dee!

- Mike KB3EIA

1479. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:59:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040322115909.01019.00001003@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89493

In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxw0sd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 21 Mar 2004 20:58:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
>>getting fuel for generators very difficult.
>
> Was the "Piped" natural gas delivery interrupted? I'm a huge fan of
> "piped gas" fueled gensets rather than stored propane, CNG, or diesel.
>
It's my understanding that the natural gas kept flowing. But that solution only works if you are close enough to a gas main to make installation of a service practical and affordable, and if the disasters encountered do not disrupt service. In earthquake areas, for example, I doubt you'd ant to depend on underground gas supply for emergencies. SNow and ice storms are a different game.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1480. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 16:59:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040322115910.01019.00001004@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89494

In article <ceydncpw0OQNysPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> As long as the cell phones are avaialble, they are obviously the preferred
>> method because anyone so equipped can push 911 and report directly.
>
> I think this may be the confusion here also. A cell phone is great for
>localized small-scale problems. If everyone has one, then of course they
>will be great for calling 911. An accident happens and likely the next
>person ther will have a cell phone. One of the best reasons for having
>one of the otherwise evil little devices.

AH, Mike, I see where you're going with this. And I agree!
>
> As the scale of problems gets bigger, then they become of less use,
>their usefulness being inversely proportional to the scale of the problem.
>
> Eventually, the cellular concept falls apart because of the massive
>support structure needed for the instruments use, and that often the
>same disasters that make emergency comms necessary take out that
>infrastucture.

Even if the infrastructure is largely intact, it can be overwhelmed by the
unexpected demand.

> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing

>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.
>
Because they'd never encountered that behavior before.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1481. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:28:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <QIKdnV1GQ-KmvsLdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89495

William wrote:

>
> I've been used to that. But there's a new technology on board now. Get used to it.

Which isn't even a consideration in the military or civil authorities
plans for use in emergency comms during a major disaster...ham radio is.
Get used to it.

1482. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:33:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <fMydna9pBPDyucLdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89496

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>
> From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any training
> you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".

Not so, he has been trained to program every emergency number he could possibably need into his cell phone speed dial. However when the cell network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is over.

1483. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:44:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403220944.5eb2289b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89497

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040321013314.01632.00001408@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0403201638.32d3ffaa@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
> >phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.
>
> "Unsecure?!?" You saw KY-98s in that facility? KY-57s?

Did I say that, Lennie?

> Playing war games were you?

Nope. Participating in one of those drills you seem to think no
one needs to participate in.

> > I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
> >ROLE"...?!?!
> >
> > Putz.
>
> Yup, rude and obnoxious, comes unglued on the slightest
> disagreement. Well, at least that is consistent with previous
> behavior of yours.

And you're still a putz and Brain Burke has still not answered a
simple question in repsonse to assertions HE made...

No problem.

Steve, K4YZ

1484. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:46:14 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <gf8u50pbmv121j5dl7tuascnb32rross2v@4ax.com>
Source record: 89498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>>No, you misunderstood me. I'm not saying that radio operation is a
>>civil right. Rather I was reflecting on your attitude that since
>>consumers outnumber hams by 3000:1, that hams don't deserve
>>consideration. I was then drawing a comparison to those who opposed
>>civil rights based on the notion that the people calling for those
>>changes were only a small minority.
>
>
>That's fine, but nobody suggested the hams are not deserving of due
>consideration. The fact that the amateur service exists is proof of this.

But you are suggesting that manufacturers be excused from their
responsibility to design a product to reject unwanted signals, due to
the fact that hams are a small minority and instead placing the burden
of appeasement squarely on the shoulders of hams, who have neither the
means, the legal resources, or the financial backing to make a poorly
designed product reject the signals that he may be emitting. The
obvious remaining alternative then becomes the cessation of all
transmissions. That's not an acceptable compromise.

>
>
>>>>>And legally, if a ham knows he is interfering with a radio or television signal,
>>>>>or even a cordless phone, it is the HAM who is at fault....
>>>>
>>>>Not if his station is clean.
>>>
>>>
>>>Where in the rules, or any part of the code, does it say anything like that?
>>
>>Nowhere. But nowhere in the rules does it specify otherwise,
>
>
>Yes it does. 97.101(d).

I think I see now what your issue might be.
If you look at the wording of subpart (d) again:

(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with
or cause interference to any radio communication or signal".

You are confusing the term SIGNAL with the term DEVICE. You are
correct that a ham station may not interfere with any signal,
broadcast or otherwise. But where you got it wrong is that most RFI is
not a case of a ham's signal overriding a broadcast station's signal

into a specific receiver. Rather, it's the case of a poorly designed
receiver receiving a stronger local signal on another frequency, which
it's not supposed to receive, which then blanks the receiver's ability
to receive the desired broadcast signal. If another receiver, which is
designed better, can be placed next to the affected receiver, and it
plays the broadcast signal unaffected, then no interference exists.
The "interference" only exists inside the electronics of the poorly
designed receiver. In other words, the ham is not interfering with
your station.

>
>
>> and the
>>implication is that the ham is responsible for HIS station, not
>>everyone else's receivers.
>
>
>The ham is responsible for his station. He is not responsible for anyone else's
>receiver. But he -IS- responsible for any -interference- he causes to anyone
>else's receiver.
>
>
>>>>>97.101(d) "No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
>>>>>cause interference to any radio communication or signal."
>>>>
>>>>That does not apply to RFI, it applies to on-channel stations.
>>>
>>>
>>>Again, where does it say that?
>>
>>Nowhere does it say that it applies to RFI either.
>
>
>RFI = Radio Frequency Interference
>
>
>>You are asking me to prove a negative. As a general rule, that which
>>is not expressly prohibited, is automatically assumed to be permitted.
>
>
>But it -IS- prohibited, and it is -EXPRESSLY- prohibited!!!
>
>
>>But you might wish to consider this:
>>
>>ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.
>>
>>(a) "If the operation of an amateur station causes general
>>interference to the reception of transmissions from stations operating
>>in the domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering

>>design, including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to
>>receive such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur
>>station licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the
>>hours from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
>>additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
>>frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created".
>
>
>The problem here is that the ham can simply declare the receiver to be of 'poor
>design' and work the protected hours anyway, which is exactly what happens. IOW,
>the rule is far to subjective for it to ever be enforced -- in fact, it isn't
>enforced at all by the FCC. Also, 97.121 does not exempt a ham from a violation
>of 97.101(d) because, even in a best-case scenario, the former can be considered
>to be in conflict with the latter. However the rule -does- reflect the priority
>that broadcast services have over the amateur service.
>
>
>>The FCC recognizes the interference potential which can arise from
>>these cases, and has legislation in place to address this. But the
>>caveat is that the receivers must be deemed as "good engineering
>>design". So in other words, the FCC has stated (paraphrasing) that if
>>the radio or TV is junk, all bets are off.
>
>
>The FCC has no specifications or minimum requirements for the engineering
>quality of any broadcast receiver. So who makes the determination as to which
>receiver is 'junk' and which one is not? The ham? That's like letting the
>defendant of a murder trial decide what can or can't be submitted as evidence!

The FCC. They have the final say whether or not the device meets
minimum technical standards.

>>(b)" In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize
>>interference to stations operating in other services may be required
>>after investigation by the FCC".
>>
>>So until that time, a radio station (such as yours) has no authority
>>to do anything other than report the problem. The FCC will take any
>>action that they feel is appropriate. If the amateur station can
>>demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the FCC, that they've taken the
>>necessary steps to minimize the problem, the FCC will usually impose
>>no mandatory restrictions.
>
>
>In most cases we have worked with the ham (and some keyclowns, too) to clean up
>the interference. In only three cases have we been forced to file a complaint
>with the FCC under 97.101(d). In all three cases the ham was sent a letter by
>the FCC and the interference stopped.

I received a letter from the FCC once too. When I replied that I was a
ham, they referred me to a RFI committee. They never followed up after

the initial contact. The problem went away on its own.

> No, the station has no authority to do
>anything at all -- the FCC has that authority, and it's clear (to us, at least)
>that they will exercise that authority should there be a violation of 97.101(d).

Until you understand that 97.101 does not cover faulty devices, you'll
continue to believe that hams are under more responsibility than they
actually are.

>>>> IOW no
>>>>ham may deliberately interfere with another licensed service, which
>>>>occupies the same frequency including, but not limited to, 40 meter
>>>>broadcast stations, stations with secondary authorization, or other
>>>>hams etc.
>>>
>>>
>>>Where did you find that in the rules? I can't find that anywhere. Got a link or
>>>citation?
>>
>>It's implied.
>
>
>97.101(d) is not implied, it is explicit.

It's not as explicit as you think as you've implied that the term
"signal" extends to cover "receiving devices" as well.

>> If you were a ham, you'd understand the purpose of the
>>rules.
>
>
>I suppose you might be right. After 5 years of college and 25 years experience
>in the field of radio communication, I should consider becoming a ham if I ever
>want to understand the purpose of the rules......

Don't purport to judge a man until you walk a mile in his shoes. That
25 years of experience doesn't mean that you know anything about the
amateur radio service.

Does the fact that I've had 30+ years of experience in 2-way radio
communication mean that I can step in and do your job?

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1485. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:48:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403220948.37b62326@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89499

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040321182914.25815.00007201@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> > Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
> >actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...
> >
> > How perculiar.
>
> Perambulate your personal perspective, but don't pester us
> particularly with poorly percolated petty pesterings promoted as
> a perspicatious presentation when it is really perseverance of
> persiflage. Ptui.
>
> "Perculiar" indeed.

My typo notwithstanding, the questions remain:

What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency comms?
>
> Is being insulting, rude, obnoxious, and resorting to toilet humor
> considerd "civil amateur behavior?" Certainly not, yet you seem
> to do nothing else in here.

What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency comms"?

Continued delaying tactics and obfuscation are admissions of lying.

Steve, K4YZ

1486. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:50:03 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <LfmdnYyIeYfntcLdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> I guess this will be another standing question (that will most likely go
>> unanswered as well): What laws mirror 97.101(d) under Parts 20 and 73?
>
>
>
> Frank, if you really need the question answered, I suggest you go to
> the F.C.C. and see what they have to say.
>
> They would probably have a more definitive answer than any I can
> give you.
>
>
> If you need a few more rules based windmills to tilt at, I suggest
> you try invalidating a high percentage of amateurs licenses because we
> didn't take a Morse code sending test, as required by part 97:
>
> 7.503 Element standards.
>
> (a) A telegraphy examination must be sufficient to prove that the
> examinee has the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive
> correctly by ear texts in the international Morse code at not less than
> the prescribed speed, using all the letters of the alphabet, numerals
> 0-9, period, comma, question mark, slant mark and prosigns AR, BT and SK.
> Element 1: 5 words per minute.
>
>
> Oh Oh! thousands and thousands of Amateurs are licensed and operating in
> direct non compliance with a specifically worded rule in part 97!!!!
> Somewhere along the way, someone interpreted the rule to end the sending
> tests. It's just how it works, man.
>
>
>
> Now back to the "problem at hand"
>
>
>
> 97.101 General standards.
>

> (a) In all respects not specifically covered by FCC Rules each amateur
> station must be operated in accordance with good engineering and good
> amateur practice.
>
> (b) Each station licensee and each control operator must cooperate in
> selecting transmitting channels and in making the most effective use of
> the amateur service frequencies. No frequency will be assigned for the
> exclusive use of any station.
>
> (c) At all times and on all frequencies, each control operator must give
> priority to stations providing emergency communications, except to
> stations transmitting communications for training drills and tests in
> RACES.
>
> (d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere with or
> cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
>
> Seems like a good sort of rule to have. Makes sense too. We don't
> want people jamming each other, or harassing each other or their
> neighbors with their radios.
>
> And what does part 15 have to say?
>
>
> ï¿½ 15.17 Susceptibility to interference.
>
> (a) Parties responsible for equipment compliance are advised to consider
> the proximity and the high power of non-Government licensed radio
> stations, such as broadcast, amateur, land mobile, and non-geostationary
> mobile satellite feeder link earth stations, and of U.S. Government
> radio stations, which could include high-powered radar systems, when
> choosing operating frequencies during the design of their equipment so
> as to reduce the susceptibility for receiving harmful interference.
> Information on non-Government use of the spectrum can be obtained by
> consulting the Table of Frequency Allocations in ï¿½ 2.106 of this chapter.
>
> Most Part 15 devices require a label attesting to the potential for
> interference and to the responsibility of the device operator. The
> following sections from the rules provide an examples of the labeling
> requirements:
>
> ï¿½ 15.19 labeling requirements.
>
> (a) In addition to the requirements in part 2 of this chapter, a device
> subject to certification, notification, or verification shall be labeled
> as follows:
>
> (3) All other devices shall bear the following statement in a
> conspicuous location on the device:
>

> This device complies with part 15 of the FCC Rules. Operation is subject
> to the following two conditions: (1) This device may not cause harmful
> interference, and (2) this device must accept any interference received,
> including interference that may cause undesired operation.
>
> And:
>
> ï¿½15.105--Information to the user.
>
> (a) For a Class A digital device or peripheral, the instructions
> furnished the user shall include the following or similar statement,
> placed in a prominent location in the text of the manual:
>
> This equipment has been tested and found to comply with the limits for a
> Class A digital device, pursuant to part 15 of the FCC Rules. These
> limits are designed to provide reasonable protection against harmful
> interference when the equipment is operated in a commercial environment.
> This equipment generates, uses, and can radiate radio frequency energy
> and, if not installed and used in accordance with the instruction
> manual, may cause harmful interference to radio communications.
> Operation of this equipment in a residential area is likely to cause
> harmful interference in which case the user will be required to correct
> the interference at his own expense.
>
> (b) For a Class B digital device or peripheral, the instructions
> furnished the user shall include the following or similar statement,
> placed in a prominent location in the text of the manual:
>
> This equipment has been tested and found to comply with the limits for a
> Class B digital device, pursuant to part 15 of the FCC Rules. These
> limits are designed to provide reasonable protection against harmful
> interference in a residential installation. This equipment generates,
> uses and can radiate radio frequency energy and, if not installed and
> used in accordance with the instructions, may cause harmful interference
> to radio communications. However, there is no guarantee that
> interference will not occur in a particular installation. If this
> equipment does cause harmful interference to radio or television
> reception, which can be determined by turning the equipment off and on,
> the user is encouraged to try to correct the interference by one or more
> of the following measures:
>
> * Reorient or relocate the receiving antenna.
> * Increase the separation between the equipment and receiver.
> * Connect the equipment into an outlet on a circuit different from
> that to which the receiver is connected.
> * Consult the dealer or an experienced radio/TV technician for help
>
>
>
> As far as I can see what you are saying is that if the Amateur knows

> that his or her station is causing interference, if they continue to
> operate, they are doing so willfully and maliciously. This is your
> interpretation, and it is incorrect.
>
> You should try a test case, Frank!
>
>
> The way I would interpret the rules is that the amateur radio
> licensee is required to have a clean signal, as is also referenced in
> part 97.
>
> With a complying clean signal, they now have the right or privilege
> to operate, always in compliance as regarding bands, power, content,
> etc, basically just following the rules.
>
>
> Beyond the rules:
>
> The neighbor has an interference complaint, and does so. In looking
> into the problem, the amateur will suggest, but is no no way required to
> pay for, mitigating the interference. Often the amateur works to help
> the neighbor install the needed devices.
>
> most of that stuff just falls in the "being a good neighbor" category.
>
> Your interpretation that the amateur knows s/he is interfering, and
> is therefore willing and malicious, just won't hold up. I've heard only
> to the contrary for as long as I've been a ham. Do you have specific
> legal rulings supporting your interpretation?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

If the rule is as Frankie states, why did not the FCC did not put me off
the air or require me to stop using 15 meters in the case of the lady
with the tv that used a 21 mHz IF that picked up my 15 meter
transmissions? Why did they tell her to either put up with it or get a
new tv? She even called the TV station who also complained to the FCC.
Wonder why the FCC told the TV station the same thing?
Frankie can interpet the rule any way he likes, the ruling authority is
the FCC and their interpertation and in the case of a device not being
able to reject a ham's signals, the FCC generally rules in favor of the
ham, thus making Frankie's interpertation invalid.

1487. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 17:57:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403220957.3792aa51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89551

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403191850.7706c801@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...

Snipped.

Here we are four days after I posted the original thread, and so
far the only "answer" to the question as to why Brain cannot answer
questions about assertions HE made have been a concerted effort by he
and Lennie to mount a
flood the NG with rhetoric" campaign.

Oh well.

Brain makes assertions of "fact", then calls those who call his
"facts" into question "obnoxious", "nuts" or other perjoratives" that
I am sure Lennie is feeding him.

Brain Burke...class clown...with no class.

Brain likes to make claims and assertions about Amateur Radio or
other radio related topics that he can't/won't validate...Worse yet is
taht most of those "assertions" are easily disproven.

Oh well...that's how he "earned" the playful moniker "Brain".

OK.

Steve, K4YZ

1488. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 18:04:17 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <bq9u50972l6crarpnjpiu4e66n0vbbn8vh@4ax.com>
Source record: 89552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 22 Mar 2004 08:15:47 -0800, Frank Gilliland
<sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:

>In <em0u50pasu938vvtamikdanmnsej33dls2@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> wrote:
>
>>On Sat, 20 Mar 2004 05:12:20 -0800, Frank Gilliland
>><sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net> wrote:
>>
>>>In <D%M6c.503$V66.259@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get
>>>rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>>>
>>><snip>
>>>>I don't have the FCC comments in front of me. Since you are the blowhard
>>>>here I'll let you find them.
>>>
>>>
>>>Why should I? My case is solid.
>>>
>>>
>>>> But sometime back, and I don't remember how
>>>>far. Sometime in the 70s or 80s sounds right, the FCC basically told the
>>>>manufactures to clean up their equipment. And that in 'most' cases the
>>>>receiving equipment was at fault.
>>>
>>>
>>>Once again, where in the rules is that opinion incorporated so as to vindicate a
>>>ham from violating 97.101(d)?
>>
>>This one:
>>
>>ï¿½97.121 Restricted operation.
>>(a) If the operation of an amateur station causes general interference
>>to the reception of transmissions from stations operating in the
>>domestic broadcast service when receivers of good engineering design,
>>including adequate selectivity characteristics, are used to receive
>>such transmissions, and this fact is made known to the amateur station
>>licensee, the amateur station shall not be operated during the hours
>>from 8 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., local time, and on Sunday for the
>>additional period from 10:30 a.m. until 1 p.m., local time, upon the
>>frequency or frequencies used when the interference is created.
>>
>>(b) In general, such steps as may be necessary to minimize

>>interference to stations operating in other services may be required
>>after investigation by the FCC.
>>
>>
>>The FCC has stipulated the conditions which would require that a ham
>>stop transmitting. Unless these conditions are met, the ham is not
>>required to do anything other than to make sure that his own station
>>is clean.
>
>
>I plonked you after this message was downloaded, but you are still plonked.

Why is that? You afraid of a little spirited debate? Hell, you never
"plonked" Twisty. Do you actually like arguing with his nonsense? Yet
someone else mounts a logical challenge to your dogmatic notions, and
you close the door? Don't worry, I'm not about to accuse you of having
a "communications deficit".

>The
>only reason I am replying is to point out that this rule also reflects the fact
>that the FCC recognizes the ham's responsibility to prevent interference that
>can be caused by the ham, which is what I have been saying all along.

Yes! And this rule (97.121) outlines the conditions by which a ham may
be legally forced to cease transmissions. And it specifically calls
attention to the fact that not all receivers, which are involved in
RFI cases, are build with good engineering practice in mind. The FCC
specified this so as not to hold the ham responsible for those cases
where the device is of a design not consistent with good engineering
practice, which would therefore place an undue burden on the ham in
order for him to continue participating in the amateur service.

In other words, if a ham station is emitting harmonics or spurs which
would then meet the conditions of 97.101, then this rule would come
into effect. But if the ham station does not emit any spurs, and the
"interference" is only within a device which has inadequate RFI
shielding, then the ham, in the eyes of the FCC, is not responsible.

If the FCC's intention were to make hams ultimately responsible for
any and all cases of RFI, then they would not have added this section
which codifies these specific conditions by which a ham can consider
himself "off the hook" so to speak. 97.121 would therefore be
superfluous

By your absolute interpretation of 97.101, there would be no need for
97.121. But the fact that 97.121 exists, in itself, should indicate to
you that your interpretation of 97.101 is flawed to some degree.

Dave
"Sandbagger"
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

1489. Re: Art Bell to discuss BPL on C-to-C AM TONIGHT (??) 3/20/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 18:35:42 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <405f31a8.8443562@news.individual.de>
Source record: 89553
Cross-posted to: alt.astronomy,alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

>In message <f16e5$405d3b56$d1cc5755$4305@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
>Mark <merees@suny.nospam.edu> writes
>>PROGRAM IS ON THE AIR RIGHT NOW AS I TYPE THIS POSTING!
>>
>>Link to an audio stream is here: www.coasttocoastam.com
>>
>>
>>"Kevin O'Neill" <onekev@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:A8KdnSwitZcmtMDdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>>> Thanks for announcing this.
>>
On Sun, 21 Mar 2004 17:54:18 +0000, Ian Jackson
<REMOVE-THIS-BIT@g3ohx.demon.co.uk> wrote:
>Pah! You have to PAY for it!
>At least you can get the BBC free!

Well, don't UK licensed radio users pay for the BBC?

In any event, Replay Radio offers Coast-to-Coast for download without going through the show's website. Yes, Replay Radio is also not free, but it is reasonably priced and offers hundreds of other shows.

--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

1490. Re: The Politically Correct Leftwing Liberal Handbook

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 18:36:22 UTC
From: JackGibson@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <72e86d08.0403221036.2aace36f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89554

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message news:<KEN6c.44993$1p.646788@attbi_s54>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20040319041334.21955.00001070@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > Jack Gibson wrote:
> >
> >
> > > I do not fucking live in the fucking U.S., nor am I a fucking
> > > U.S. fucking citizen.
> > >
> > > So fucking there.
>
>
> I thought that we in the good old USA were the sole proprietorship of the
> bum society. It appears not. The liberal use of the universal "sentence
> enhancer" in the above post reflects nicely upon the intelligence of the
> poster. As an old black minister said in a sermon ....people who use that
> language should have their mouths washed out by their mamas with Bowlene.
>
> Please send me your name and address and I will gladly forward a thesaurus
> of the English language so you can find and use the appropriate adjectives.
>
> God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

Here in Elbonia we view irony as the highest form of
humor. I'm sorry to have confused you with humor that
was clearly beyond you.

Why not try a holiday in Elbonia? In addition to
furry animals, well-trained moose and our telephone
system, we have nice mud.

- Jack

1491. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 18:58:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221058.1da6c815@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89555

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322084955.20899.00000138@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO
> >NPRM ON BPL
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:24 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191624.3f093566@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040319102154.17665.00000024@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> >> I wonder how long it will take some idiot to read that and then try to
> >> plug thier line feed to the AC directly...?!?! =)
>
> >What idiot would even think such a thing?
>
> Good question.

Probably your kind.

Probably the same kind of idiot that makes wierd
> assertions like " You just can't accept that unlicensed radio services have a
> MAJOR ROLE in emergency comms" and then won't back it up with some sort of
> validation, even after being asked that question directly several days in a
> row.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, here's your validation.

"Thanks for coming clean and acknowledging that cellular telephones
have played a huge role in emergency response communications."

Steve, if you are going to paraphrase, state so. We will expect it to
be inaccurate due to the very nature of your brain squirming like a
toad.

If you are going to quote, do so very accurately.

But if you are going to change what I said, then claim I said it, you
would be guilty of lying.

How plead thee?

bb

1492. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 19:57:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <405F4519.31BED886@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89556

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxw0sd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On 21 Mar 2004 20:58:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
> >>getting fuel for generators very difficult.
> >
> > Was the "Piped" natural gas delivery interrupted? I'm a huge fan of
> > "piped gas" fueled gensets rather than stored propane, CNG, or diesel.
> >
> It's my understanding that the natural gas kept flowing. But that solution only
> works if you are close enough to a gas main to make installation of a service
> practical and affordable, and if the disasters encountered do not disrupt
> service. In earthquake areas, for example, I doubt you'd ant to depend on
> underground gas supply for emergencies. SNow and ice storms are a different
> game.

I don't live in an area which is prone to earthquakes. I weighed likely scenarios and noted that in many emergencies, gasoline and diesel fuel are the not always easily obtained. In some instances they are hoarded and the prices can skyrocket. In a prolonged power outage, many station have no power to pump the fuel.

My solution was to buy a 3.5 KW gasoline generator and to purchase a kit to convert it to natural gas or propane operation. The generator is a Craftsman with a Briggs and Stratton engine. The conversion kit was only eighty dollars. It cost me another 30 dollars to purchase a high pressure rubber hose with brass pipe fittings on each end to avoid transmitting the vibration of the generator back to the house. This is much cheaper than purchasing a generator specifically made for use with natural gas.

A major factor in making my decision is that I pay nothing for natural gas.

Dave K8MN

1493. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:01:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322150141.01530.00000186@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89557

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/19/2004 6:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191627.3c994d9a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040319101832.17665.00000023@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>> No...becasue that blithering idiot likes to make up his OWN rules as he
>> goes in order to vindicate his rants.
>>
>> He's a fool, Brain, and you're his bagboy. What does that say about
>> you...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>What do posts like this say about you?
>
>Three words come to mind: Rude, Obnoxious, Nuts.

Sure beats "Liar", "Antagonist", and "Surrogate"

Steve, K4YZ

1494. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:16:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322151601.01530.00000188@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89558

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>

>Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
>himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
>post a retraction of his statement above?

There's nothing to retract, Brain.

I have no doubt Lennie can recite the words, inside-out even.

But it's just like learning songs in grade school in other languages...You
sing the song, but what did you just say?

Lennie's already demonstrated that he knows the words, but doesn't
understand what he's reading.

>I find it interesting that Steve, having supposedly served in seven
>hostile actions, never served in a unit with a single KIA, present or
>past.

Oh, but I have. I never said that I didn't

Thier sacrifices were thiers to make, and it is upon them that the respect
and dignity should be appreciated.

Scumbag Extrodinaire Leonard H. Anderson thinks it's OK to somehow "use"
someone else's sacrifices to make himself look good.

If you somehow find it "OK" for him to do that, it makes YOU a scumbag
too.

>Even though I was in the USAF, I served the Second Infantry Division.
>It has a proud history and I was proud to serve it. Though
>hostilities were low due to the cease fire of 1954, I would like to
>think that having competant armed forces facing the enemy along the
>DMZ helped maintain that cease fire.

No doubt it did and still does. That is not at issue.

What's at issue is someone taking credit for something someone else did.

>> The problem is that U.S. amateur radio is NOT a military service
>> nor even a paramilitary service. It is basically a hobby, a
>> recreational activity involving radio. It is, by default, a hobby
>> because federal regulations forbid monetary compensation for
>> any radio communications rendered.

>
>Though monetary compensation is forbidden, it often occurs. Some call
>them "repeater dues."
>
>Be that as it may, the Amateur Service has been useful and probably
>will continue to be useful in emergency communications when other
>comms fail.

Well...gee whiz...I guess this is as close as we will ever get to Brain
acknowledging that his "unlicensed services play a major role in emergency
comms".

>> There is the common thread among the "tribal rule" individuals that
>> no one unlicensed in amateur radio can possibly know anything
>> about amateur radio, therefore they should be silent. Preposterous
>> since U.S. amateur radio activity is widely publicized (among those
>> who care to find out) and federal regulations forbid any secrecy in
>> amateur communications.
>
>I've seen it bragged on here that the ARRL Amateur Handbook is found
>in professional radio engineers library shelves. Must be a one way
>street.

By whom?

>> No one on the staff of the FCC or the Commissioners themselves
>> are required to have any amateur radio licenses, yet the FCC has
>> the lawful duty to regulate amateur radio and mitigate interference
>> matters, up to and including imposing fines and calling on U.S.
>> Marshals to arrest extreme miscreants. That rather destroys their
>> concept that "only other amateurs can tell them what to do."
>
>I hope someone in authority is watching the nutty one. He really
>spooks me.

You spook yourself, Brain? Kinda hard making that midnight head call,
isn't it?

>> Amateur radios operate by exactly the same physics as radios in
>> all other radio services. Propagation of radio waves occurs in
>> exactly the same way as for all other radio services. There are
>> no exceptions despite some odd ideas and strange misconceptions
>> among certain radio amateurs.
>
>Might be because they do not understand other radio services and think
>amateur radio is special.

Amateur Radio >>IS<< special.

No other radio service "bestows" the priviledges upon it's licensees that
Part 97 does.

That Lennie continues to try and make some lame argument about how the physics of radio is diffrent for Amateurs-vs-other radio users is, well...lame!

>> It is impossible to rationally discuss anything with certain people
>> (such as Robeson) since they are too emotionally-driven and too
>> prideful in their concept of their personal hobby involvement. They
>> must - absolutely - have their way or all are treated to personally
>> abusive remarks from them.
>
>I tire of him. He's irrational.

No, Brain. That falls to you.

You blatantly utter assertions you claim as fact in a public forum then claim ofhers as "nuts" or "irrational" when they "call" you to prove them.

I know you won't accept it, but it's yours to live with.

>> The above is representative of their non-reasoning in demanding a
>> morse code test for all new amateurs...pure emotional basis on
>> what they had to endure long ago (and probably resent).
>
>uphill both ways. bb

And I find it even more humorous that you claim me "irrational" and "nuts" all the while signing posts "billybeeper" when everyone knows who you are.

And WHAT you are...

Steve, K4YZ

1495. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:20:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322152005.01530.00000189@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89559

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 8:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>
>> > ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
>> > in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is
>just
>> > so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
>> > eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
>> > NOT leave.
>>
>> And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
>> abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
>> your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.
>>

>Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.

If you need a good laugh, Brain, I'd suggest going back and re-reading
some of the lengthy posts that you and the other pathological liar have flooded
the NG with...Especially those about your skill as a DXer from entities wherein
you were not authorized to operate.

And I don't remember saying how big Part 97 is, Brain...I said what Lennie
doesn't know about it could fill libraries.

Try to get THAT straigt too, Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1496. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:21:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F4AE2.4080409@psu.edu>
Source record: 89560
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Frank Gilliland wrote:

> 97.503 defines the -standards- (notice the title?) by which a testing element is
> administered. It does -not- establish the -requirement- of the code element, or
> any other element, for any class of amateur license. That rule is 97.501, which
> you already knew.

So let me get this straight - interpretations on non specific words
such as willful and malicious must be stringently enforced, but specific
and completely unambiguously worded statements do not?

Fascinating!

> And for that intentional distortion, plus your repetition of old and lame
> arguments in the rest of your post, you too get plonked.

Alas, I have received my comeuppance! 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

1497. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:25:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322152540.01530.00000190@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89562

>ubject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/20/2004 8:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403201833.1ecd007c@posting.google.com>
>
>"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:<c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...

> It would certainly be
>> an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.
>
>Arn, ever see what Steve posts?

You mean one of the one's wherein I ask you to provide some validation of
assertions YOU made, Brain...?!?!

Yep...pretty rough, getting your nose tweaked over your OWN mistruths, eh,
Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

1498. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:26:08 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ac95c2644dcc3f998968c@news.east.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89561

In article <405F4519.31BED886@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxw0sd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> > <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
> >
> > >On 21 Mar 2004 20:58:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > >>That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
> > >>getting fuel for generators very difficult.
> > >
> > > Was the "Piped" natural gas delivery interrupted? I'm a huge fan of
> > > "piped gas" fueled gensets rather than stored propane, CNG, or diesel.
> > >
> > It's my understanding that the natural gas kept flowing. But that solution only
> > works if you are close enough to a gas main to make installation of a service
> > practical and affordable, and if the disasters encountered do not disrupt
> > service. In earthquake areas, for example, I doubt you'd ant to depend on
> > underground gas supply for emergencies. SNow and ice storms are a different
> > game.
>
> I don't live in an area which is prone to earthquakes. I weighed likely
> scenarios and noted that in many emergencies, gasoline and diesel fuel
> are the not always easily obtained. In some instances they are hoarded
> and the prices can skyrocket. In a prolonged power outage, many station
> have no power to pump the fuel.
>
> My solution was to buy a 3.5 KW gasoline generator and to purchase a kit
> to convert it to natural gas or propane operation. The generator is a
> Craftsman with a Briggs and Stratton engine. The conversion kit was
> only eighty dollars. It cost me another 30 dollars to purchase a high
> pressure rubber hose with brass pipe fittings on each end to avoid
> transmitting the vibration of the generator back to the house. This is
> much cheaper than purchasing a generator specifically made for use with
> natural gas.
>
> A major factor in making my decision is that I pay nothing for natural
> gas.
>
> Dave K8MN

Aren't those 1/8th royalties great.

1499. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:32:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89563

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
>Date: 3/21/2004 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
>
>"William" wrote in part ...
>
>Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
>way?"
>
>WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
>>
>> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
>> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
>> Emergency Comms!
>>
>I think you are missing the point here, William.

Hey Arnie...

Brian Burke, AKA "Billy Beeper" AKA "William" accused you of "enabling" me over my refusal to be bowled over by Lennie's arrogance.

Don't let him make YOU an "enabler" by acknowledging his alter-ego. BillyBeeper/William is Brain Burke, taking a lesson from Lennie in how to disperse his foolheartiness over several screen names.

73

Steve, K4YZ

PS: Welcome back!

1500. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 20:53:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <405F5231.E147FEDA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 89564

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" wrote:
>
> In article <405F4519.31BED886@earthlink.net>, k8mn@earthlink.net says...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <xnfcneeyarg.huxw0sd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> > > <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
> > >
> > > >On 21 Mar 2004 20:58:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> > > >
> > > >>That storm also involved damage that close roads and made simple things like
> > > >>getting fuel for generators very difficult.
> > > >
> > > > Was the "Piped" natural gas delivery interrupted? I'm a huge fan of
> > > > "piped gas" fueled gensets rather than stored propane, CNG, or diesel.
> > > >
> > > It's my understanding that the natural gas kept flowing. But that solution only
> > > works if you are close enough to a gas main to make installation of a service
> > > practical and affordable, and if the disasters encountered do not disrupt
> > > service. In earthquake areas, for example, I doubt you'd ant to depend on
> > > underground gas supply for emergencies. SNow and ice storms are a different
> > > game.
> >
> > I don't live in an area which is prone to earthquakes. I weighed likely
> > scenarios and noted that in many emergencies, gasoline and diesel fuel
> > are the not always easily obtained. In some instances they are hoarded
> > and the prices can skyrocket. In a prolonged power outage, many station
> > have no power to pump the fuel.
> >
> > My solution was to buy a 3.5 KW gasoline generator and to purchase a kit
> > to convert it to natural gas or propane operation. The generator is a
> > Craftsman with a Briggs and Stratton engine. The conversion kit was
> > only eighty dollars. It cost me another 30 dollars to purchase a high
> > pressure rubber hose with brass pipe fittings on each end to avoid
> > transmitting the vibration of the generator back to the house. This is
> > much cheaper than purchasing a generator specifically made for use with
> > natural gas.
> >
> > A major factor in making my decision is that I pay nothing for natural
> > gas.

> Aren't those 1/8th royalties great.

Some folks took royalties and some took free gas, Steve. Whoever owned
this place way back, took the free gas though it has a limit of 300,000

cubic feet yearly. We heat the barn through the winter and still have about 120,000 cubic feet left each year. The natural gas generator and the greenhouse lean-to we're putting on the back of the barn will help eat up some of that unused allotment.

Now if I could just find a natural gas compressor, I'd work on converting the riding mower...

Dave K8MN

1501. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 21:07:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322160751.01530.00000193@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89565

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 3/22/2004 2:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <405F5231.E147FEDA@earthlink.net>

>Now if I could just find a natural gas compressor, I'd work on
>converting the riding mower...

I know where you can find a natural gas disperser in Ohio, if you need
one, Dave...

nyuknyuknyuk....

73

Steve, K4YZ

1502. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 21:24:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <405F59A3.4020404@psu.edu>
Source record: 89566

N2EY wrote:
> In article <ceydncpw0OQNysPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>As long as the cell phones are avaialble, they are obviously the preferred
>>>method because anyone so equipped can push 911 and report directly.
>>
>> I think this may be the confusion here also. A cell phone is great for
>>localized small-scale problems. If everyone has one, then of course they
>>will be great for calling 911. An accident happens and likely the next
>>person ther will have a cell phone. One of the best reasons for having
>>one of the otherwise evil little devices.
>
>
> AH, Mike, I see where you're going with this. And I agree!
>
>> As the scale of problems gets bigger, then they become of less use,
>>their usefulness being inversely proportional to the scale of the problem.
>>
>> Eventually, the cellular concept falls apart because of the massive
>>support structure needed for the instruments use, and that often the
>>same disasters that make emergency comms necessary take out that
>>infrastucture.
>
>
> Even if the infrastructure is largely intact, it can be overwhelmed by the
> unexpected demand.

Correct! Which makes it not a likely candidate for emergency services.
If it works to let people know you're still alive or need help or
whatever, of course you use it. But it is still very much a point to
point solution. Which is to say, not a solution for large scale disasters.

>
>> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing
>
>
>>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.
>>
>
> Because they'd never encountered that behavior before.

Indicative on not knowing how the little things work. No tower or power, no cell.

- mike KB3EIA -

1503. Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:26:23 UTC
From: Paul B <pbarris@no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 89567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to pay for the BPL investment.

(See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)

So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.

1504. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:31:24 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040322183124.195$SB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040320203152.583$Ri@newsreader.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > > Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > Why, is your disability contagious, freeloader?
> >
> > Don't think so....but it certainly does not effect my ability to put
> > the round where it needs to be.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Put it in your mouth a squeeze the trigger, the world will be
> a better place, loser.
>
I retract that, Dan. I thought about it today, and realized our
little feud ain't worth that kind of lingo. <sorry>
```

1505. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:32:52 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <c3nq8vakd1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 89569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Paul B" <pbarris@no.spam> wrote in message
news:8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
> $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
> pay for the BPL investment.
>
> (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
>
> So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
> walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues
> to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.

The idea of a boycott is not a bad one.. but there is the unfortunate
circumstance that in a large number of small and medium sized communities,
EarthStink is the only game in town..

1506. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:33:56 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040322183356.428$An@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89570
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:>
> If the rule is as Frankie states, why did not the FCC did not put me off
> the air or require me to stop using 15 meters in the case of the lady
> with the tv
>
Stop picking on little old ladys, JJ. :)

1507. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:39:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iPK7c.3675$HP.827@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote in message
news:c3nq8vakd1@news1.kornet.net...
>
> "Paul B" <pbarris@no.spam> wrote in message
> news:8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> > On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
> > $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
> > pay for the BPL investment.
> >
> > (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
> >
> > So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
> > walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues
> > to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.
>
> The idea of a boycott is not a bad one.. but there is the unfortunate
> circumstance that in a large number of small and medium sized communities,
> EarthStink is the only game in town..
>
>
>
So, write them a nasty letter telling them where you stand...and where they
should stand.

Dan/W4NTI

1508. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-22 23:42:00 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <c3nqq4$bk4$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 89572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:iPK7c.3675$HP.827@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote in message
> news:c3nq8v$akd$1@news1.kornet.net...
> >
> > "Paul B" <pbarris@no.spam> wrote in message
> > news:8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> > > On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
> > > $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
> > > pay for the BPL investment.
> > >
> > > (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
> > >
> > > So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
> > > walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he
continues
> > > to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.
> >
> > The idea of a boycott is not a bad one.. but there is the unfortunate
> > circumstance that in a large number of small and medium sized
communities,
> > EarthStink is the only game in town..
> >
> >
> >
> So, write them a nasty letter telling them where you stand...and where
they
> should stand.
>

Agreed.. I've already dropped my EarthStink stateside account anyway.. for
other reasons. This only helps me retain my decision to never use them
again.
```

1509. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:09:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221609.746707e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89573

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322111534.20899.00000162@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191614.540c796b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040319031245.06889.00000012@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >
> >> But I wonder how he'd react to reading posts written by a like-named
> >> person who tries to embellish his military "career" by associating himself
> with
> >> men who were KIA 3 years before you were in the Armed Forces...?!?!
> >
> >It isn't called the "Armed Forces" for nothing. It is the nature of
> >what we do that associates us with KIA.
>
> Only a callous idiot like you would try to rationalize what Lennie did as
> "OK".

Your brain is squirming like a toad thinking up ways to discredit Len.

> Claiming some fraternalism or professing to not break the chain of trust
> and honor among Soliders is one thing...THAT is part of the Armed Forces.

Congrations, we are in complete agreement somehow.

> Trying to embellish one's own personal "achivements" (or lack thereof)
> based upon someone else's sacrifices is absolutely callous and cruel.

Yet you do everything possible to get back into some kind, any kind, of uniform.

Why?

Do you think that it will embellish one's own personal achievements?

1510. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:26:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221626.5451b3ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89574

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<fMydna9pBPDyucLdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any training
> > you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".
>
> Not so, he has been trained to program every emergency number he could
> possibably need into his cell phone speed dial.

Good grief! Why wouldn't I just dial 911?

However when the cell
> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting
> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call
> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is
> over.

Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?

Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur
volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.

1511. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:29:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221629.f63c821@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89575

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<QIKdnV1GQ-KmvsLdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >
> > I've been used to that. But there's a new technology on board now. Get used to it.
>
> Which isn't even a consideration in the military or civil authorities
> plans for use in emergency comms during a major disaster

It must be or they wouldn't have a cellphone hanging off every hip.

1512. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:32:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221632.23e4577a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89576

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322105233.20899.00000158@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >rom: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 6:46 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200446.1ab880b0@posting.google.com>
> >
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<p5udnWPAIbBjRsbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > Since the
> >> > hijackers had control of civil airways radios on that fourth plane,
> >> > the only available means of communications for the passengers
> >> > was by cell phone. Those calls got through.
> >>
> >> Of course those calls got through
> >
> >And that is the point. An emergency call got through. They get
> >through every day using cellular phones.
> >
> >> dimwit,
> >
> >Interesting how you smart guys always end up calling people names.
> >That usually happens about the time they run out of valid arguments
>
> Well, you DO try a bit harder than the average "dimwit", Brain...
>
> You DO try to skew the discussion into parameters that acutally FIT your
> rant, even if the original discussion did not include them!
>
> It's rather apparent and foolish since you usually get caught, but I give
> you an "A" for effort!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You've been busted.

You're the one who """quotes""" people, but rewrites the quote to
serve your misguided purposes.

1513. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:43:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221643.1096a11d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89577

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
>
> >> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
> >> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
> >>
> >> Where did I speak of the average citizen?
> >
> >That's who I've been speaking of all along. Do try to keep up.
>
> JJ...please take CAREEFUL note.
>
> YOU were talking about disaster preparedness, those sets of plans in place
> by your local or state EMA, FEMA, etc. And in the overall scheme of things,
> you (and I) are correct.

You both couldn't be more wrong.

What you are describing is disaster planning by government agencies.

Disaster -preparedness- is taking action to make sure that personnel,
equipment and supplies are in-place in the event of a disaster.

However, you should note on the FEMA and State EMA websites that they
ask for the Average Citizen to make plans -and- preparations in the
event of a disaster.

While I realize that a family planning for disaster doesn't get to be
on a recall roster at the State Police or ARC, they don't get armbands
and it's not glamorous and they don't get awards and citations for it,
EVERY FAMILY IN A DISASTER AREA WHO DOES NOT DRAIN STATE AND FEDERAL
EMERGENCY RESOURCES IS AN ASSET IN THAT EMERGENCY.

Emergencies aren't just about continuity of government for crying out
loud!

1514. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:47:15 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403221647.7beba0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89578
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20040320203152.583$Ri@newsreader.com...
>> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>> > > > Hey Steveo.......bring your own body bag.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > >
>> > > Why, is your disability contagious, freeloader?
>> >
>> > Don't think so....but it certainly does not effect my ability to
put
>> > the round where it needs to be.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> Put it in your mouth a squeeze the trigger, the world will be
>> a better place, loser.
>>
>I retract that, Dan. I thought about it today, and realized our
>little feud ain't worth that kind of lingo. <sorry>

Check the archves Dan you'll see Steveos first response to every
situation is violence

>come over I'll beat you senseless

>they should be shot

>put it in your mouth and squeeze the trigger

>I'll punch you in the face

etc etc

He's an angerholic LOL

1515. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:53:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221653.ba9def3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89579

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
> >
> >And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?
>
> Uhhhhhhh....Brain....Other than "military" or "civilian", what other
> categories are there?

Steve, please notice the correct quote would be, "And it's always
about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?"

Please notice the word, "authorities" in my statement.

Your brain is squirming like a toad. You twist my words as you do
soooooooo many other things.

Your correct paraphrase should be (if you were an honest person),

"""Uhhhhhhh....Brain....Other than "military authorities" or "civilian
authorities", what other categories are there?"""

I reply, The citizens. WE THE PEOPLE! Ever heard of them?

1516. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:53:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040322195349.264$CO@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> He's an angerholic LOL
>
I make you jump right up and start humping my leg, everytime
I post tho.

It was an honest apology, but you had to add your slober to
it. You need to check yourself man.

1517. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 00:58:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040322195846.15923.00004477@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89581

In article <405F59A3.4020404@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Even if the infrastructure is largely intact, it can be overwhelmed by the
>> unexpected demand.
>
> Correct! Which makes it not a likely candidate for emergency services.
>If it works to let people know you're still alive or need help or
>whatever, of course you use it. But it is still very much a point to
>point solution. Which is to say, not a solution for large scale disasters.

Or even for localized disasters in high density areas.
>>> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing
>>>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>>>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.

>> Because they'd never encountered that behavior before.

> Indicative on not knowing how the little things work. No tower or
>power, no cell.

Of course. It's also possible that the system was being overwhelmed. Doesn't
really matter, if something is unavailable, the cause doesn't matter too much
except as an an indicator of when service might return, and as a lesson in what
to do different next time.

The ignorance of things technical is nothing new, of course. In some ways,
industries promote technical ignorance by using new terms (like "wireless" and
"cordless" rather than "radio") which make the technology actually used less
than clear.

--

You might also enjoy this site:

http://www.fybush.com/site-021219.html

Interesting history of W2XMN, the past, present and future of a famous site.
Click on the links to see how far ignorance can go.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1518. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 01:02:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221702.3a1ed731@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89582

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322110700.20899.00000160@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 6:49 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200449.5ba4f542@posting.google.com>
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040319202151.02537.00003568@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >> >
> >> >Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> >> >obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> >> >to you.
> >>
> >> He can't tone it down. No control there. Obsessive personal
> >> necessity to go off on an emotional bender every time someone
> >> hints at disagreeing with him and his "pride" about his personal
> >> activities which he deems far superior to what others do.
> >>
> >> The unfortunate part is that his lack of emotional control in post
> >> after post makes the hobby look bad to others. He can't see
> >> that and refuses to recognize it, so we all get to see the name-
> >> calling and damning epithets directed against others.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Being a Nurse, he probably has an excellent health plan that he could
> >use to get well. But admitting a problem is the first step.
>
> What problem?
>
> Not tolerating liars and fools?
>
> Brain...YOU made an assertion of fact.
>
> I have asked you (several times) to validate it. You have refused or
> ignored it.

No, Steve, I have responded to your twisted up "quote" of me. It
shows you to be the liar that you are and shows that you manipulated
my statement in a deliberate and deceitful way.

Then you make accusations based upon your misquote, and attack, attack, attack.

You've done it again more recently.

You take the prize.

I have shown you to be that which you loathe.

Self-hatred is an unhealthy thing. Think about counseling.

1519. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 01:07:19 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403221707.42477a4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89583
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040321183247.244$Wi@newsreader.com>...
>iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> He's an angerholic LOL
> >
>I make you jump right up and start humping my leg, everytime
>I post tho.
>
>It was an honest apology, but you had to add your slober to
>it. You need to check yourself man.

Typical Steveo threaten someone with a bullet or a beating then
apologize YOU better check youself dude LOL some day you will go too
far and wind up as the sperm receptacle of cellblock C

1520. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 01:16:34 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040322201634.978$Ks@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040321183247.244$Wi@newsreader.com>...
> >iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> He's an angerholic LOL
> > >
> >I make you jump right up and start humping my leg, everytime
> >I post tho.
> >
> >It was an honest apology, but you had to add your slober to
> >it. You need to check yourself man.
>
> Typical Steveo threaten someone with a bullet or a beating then
> apologize YOU better check youself dude LOL some day you will go too
> far and wind up as the sperm receptacle of cellblock C
>
>
...and you'll be my bitch...

1521. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 01:58:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1NqdnY15gewnBMLdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89585

N2EY wrote:

> In article <405F59A3.4020404@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>>Even if the infrastructure is largely intact, it can be overwhelmed by the
>>>unexpected demand.
>>
>> Correct! Which makes it not a likely candidate for emergency services.
>>If it works to let people know you're still alive or need help or
>>whatever, of course you use it. But it is still very much a point to
>>point solution. Which is to say, not a solution for large scale disasters.
>
>
> Or even for localized disasters in high density areas.
>
>>>> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing
>>>>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>>>>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.
>
>
>
>>>Because they'd never encountered that behavior before.
>
>
>> Indicative on not knowing how the little things work. No tower or
>>power, no cell.
>
>
> Of course. It's also possible that the system was being overwhelmed. Doesn't
> really matter, if something is unavailable, the cause doesn't matter too much
> except as an an indicator of when service might return, and as a lesson in what
> to do different next time.
>
> The ignorance of things technical is nothing new, of course. In some ways,
> industries promote technical ignorance by using new terms (like "wireless" and
> "cordless" rather than "radio") which make the technology actually used less
> than clear.

I sometimes wonder what these people "do" spend their time thinking about.

> You might also enjoy this site:
>
> http://www.fybush.com/site-021219.html
>

> Interesting history of W2XMN, the past, present and future of a famous site.
> Click on the links to see how far ignorance can go.

Cool! I just heard about the tower this past weekend, and here you come along with a link to it Good timing, Jim. It's a little scary at first sight, but a magnificent structure nonetheless.

As for the concerned residents of Alpine, they might want to chuck their cell phones if they are so worried about RF exposure - though of course I'm sure they never use them! 8^)

But frankly, they strike mer as being less than smart. And I do like the term "McMansion"!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1522. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 01:58:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040322205849.05539.00004858@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89586

In article <40579ADA.FA9E01FD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <4056346C.9B96AB5E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>
>> >If someone like him moved next
>> >door to me, I'd give serious thought to planting a "For Sale" sign on my
>> >lawn--or maybe I'd just paint my house lavender and put in a yard full
>> >of pink plastic flamingos.
>> >
>> Did you ever see the John Waters film by that name?
>
>No.

Not for those with weak tummies!

> Then again, I was away for a long time.
>
Glad to have you back, Dave.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1523. rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 02:22:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89587

I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until Dayton!

Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.

Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some people to show up!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1524. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 02:47:25 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <H4Cdnf5AZMUGO8LdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89588
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dave Hall wrote:

>
> In other words, if a ham station is emitting harmonics or spurs which
> would then meet the conditions of 97.101, then this rule would come
> into effect. But if the ham station does not emit any spurs, and the
> "interference" is only within a device which has inadequate RFI
> shielding, then the ham, in the eyes of the FCC, is not responsible.

And it is the eyes of the FCC that are the final authority of the rule,
not how Frankie interprets the rule.

1525. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 02:52:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <H4CdnflAZMVxOsLdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89590

Steveo wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:>
>
>>If the rule is as Frankie states, why did not the FCC did not put me off
>>the air or require me to stop using 15 meters in the case of the lady
>>with the tv
>>
>
> Stop picking on little old ladys, JJ. :)

Hey, I did agree to not operate during her favorite program, Bonanza.

1526. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 02:57:14 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KeKdnb-5-bGINMLdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89592

William wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<QIKdnV1GQ-KmvsLdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I've been used to that. But there's a new technology on board now. Get used to it.
>>
>>Which isn't even a consideration in the military or civil authorities
>>plans for use in emergency comms during a major disaster
>
>
> It must be or they wouldn't have a cellphone hanging off every hip.

They are not going to rely on that cell phone for their major comms
during an emergency. The cell network is not included in disaster plans
as a viable means for emergency comms during a major disaster by the
military and civil emergency authorities, ham radio is.

1527. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 02:58:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221858.6e6fd831@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89589

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3lg9c$297ncc$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "William" wrote in part ...
>
> If I dial home, and I get Iowa, then my comms failed. You need to have a
> goal before you ever switch the radio on.
>
> Our goal was to check the functionality of the HF gear. We made multiple
> contacts on multiple bands -- making contacts throughout the day. Those
> were the parameters of the test. Test successful.

Your initial post didn't make it appear that way.

We have written MOAs
> with the stations that we intend to contact during the exercise, so they
> completely understand the nature of the "no-warning" scenario. We also ran
> functionality tests on the VTC/SAT and VOIP equipment. It was a busy day.

Sounds good.

> As you know, all major exercises have an extensive OPORD that directs us
> before anything begins. Ours has been in place for months. All T's
> crossed.

And you've trained your volunteers to some standard?

> > Does your military installation have a MARS base support team?
>
> We do not use MARS for multiple reasons. All of our ops are civil service
> and FCC Licensed Hams. This gives us much greater latitude in the
> equipment, modes, and frequencies available to us.

That's too bad. Military communications has a specialized function
for such purposes.

The EM operation is a
> completely civilian one. Sorry if I didn't make that clear before. Of
> course, we had to clear the frequency use with the folks at the installation
> DOIM, but that was just a formality.
>
> Arnie -

Always is.

Best of luck.

1528. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:00:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221900.326651bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89591

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
> >Date: 3/21/2004 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
> >
> >"William" wrote in part ...
> >
> >Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
> >way?"
> >
> >WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
> >>
> >> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
> >> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
> >> Emergency Comms!
> >>
> >I think you are missing the point here, William.
>
> Hey Arnie...

Anyone that puts up with your twisted """quotes""" is an enabler.

1529. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:09:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221909.5ae42271@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89593

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322152005.01530.00000189@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 8:43 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
> >> > in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is
> just
> >> > so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
> >> > eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
> >> > NOT leave.
> >>
> >> And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
> >> abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
> >> your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.
> >>
>
> >Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.
>
> If you need a good laugh, Brain, I'd suggest going back and re-reading
> some of the lengthy posts that you and the other pathological liar have flooded
> the NG with...Especially those about your skill as a DXer from entities wherein
> you were not authorized to operate.

Now you're lying again. Why didn't you put it in your famous
"""quotation marks""" so we'd all know it was yet another lie?

> And I don't remember saying how big Part 97 is,

Only because you don't know.

> Brain...I said what Lennie
> doesn't know about it could fill libraries.

Ever been to a library?

WRT Part 97, what Len may or may not know about Part 97 cannot be
greater than the total volume of Part 97. That happens to be one
small book. One small book cannot fill a single library, let alone

multiple libraries.

Them's the Facts.

Unless the laws of physics work differently for amateur radio.

> Try to get THAT straigt too, Putz.

As an arrow.

1530. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:12:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221912.3fd2dddc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89594

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040321013321.01632.00001411@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> > ...and because it doesn't matter what anything Heil says about me
> >> > in here. I'm going to continue posting as *I* see fit and Heil is
> just
> >> > so much QRM to work through...until the morse code test is
> >> > eliminated. Of course, by that time, I might change my mind and
> >> > NOT leave.
> >>
> >> And as long as what you "see fit" to publish is so flagrantly
> >> abusive and obviously in error, we will take great pleasure in rubbing
> >> your nose (and that of your favorite marionette) in your foolishness.
> >>
> >> Fair enough...?!?!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.
>
> It's about the size of an Archie comic book. Not as big as a
> regular edition of Reader's Digest. Familiar territory for the
> gunnery nurse? :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Let's give Quixoterobeson the benefit of a doubt and go with the Large
Print edition of Reader's Digest.

1531. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:13:56 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <vKydnfXrs9HWMMLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89596

William wrote:

>
> While I realize that a family planning for disaster doesn't get to be
> on a recall roster at the State Police or ARC, they don't get armbands
> and it's not glamorous and they don't get awards and citations for it,
> EVERY FAMILY IN A DISASTER AREA WHO DOES NOT DRAIN STATE AND FEDERAL
> EMERGENCY RESOURCES IS AN ASSET IN THAT EMERGENCY.
>
> Emergencies aren't just about continuity of government for crying out
> loud!

Every family should have a disaster kit, the FEMA site list those items that should be included in the kit. They list a portable, battery-powered radio or television and extra batteries.
Nowhere do they list a cell phone, though they do state you should have a list of phone numbers of places you could go to. I would certainly think one would take their cell phone in an emergency. Families or individuals will be using the cell phone for their own purposes, the military and civil emergency authorities will not be relying on the cell network as their primary, secondary or even third source for emergency comms as the cell network will, it it is working, be overloaded by those families and other individuals try to figure out where they should go, what they should do, calling relatives and friends to see if they are OK, ect.
If an emergency official can use his cell phone to communicate he will, but he is not going to count on it as his primary ability to communicate with other emergency personel.
The cell network may well play an important part for communication for the AC, but not for military and civil emergency comms. Ham radio can and will it needed.

1532. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:19:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403221919.17f41978@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89595

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322151601.01530.00000188@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>
>
> >Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
> >himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
> >post a retraction of his statement above?
>
> There's nothing to retract, Brain.

But there is. You stated that what Len doesn't know about Part 97
could fill libraries.

That is patently false. If Len knew nothing at all about Part 97 it
could not fill more than a single copy of Part 97, which is quite
small. Avail yourself to the USGPO or the ARRL Bookstore if you dare.

You exaggerate.

You bully.

You twist people's words and you edit their statements to fit your
rude and obnoxious rantings.

Back under your slimy rock.

1533. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:47:11 UTC
From: Opus Penguin <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam>
Message-ID: <3rO7c.28222$vT.2151@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo wrote:
> iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
>> He's an angerholic LOL
>>
> I make you jump right up and start humping my leg, everytime
> I post tho.
>
> It was an honest apology, but you had to add your slober to
> it. You need to check yourself man.

With that fat gut, he hasn't "checked himself" in decades.

--

_____
Pear pimples for hairy fishnuts?

1534. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 03:51:28 UTC
From: Maximus <nomail@here.com>
Message-ID: <4vO7c.52777$aT1.9519@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Remember the scene in "Braveheart" ? The scotts just annihilated 300 heavy horse and riders and the commander of the british tells his subordinate "YOU lead them". If we followed your logic, every person who was personally responsible for sending jobs overseas should be executed. So you do it. There would be a lot of blood all over the place because to many corporate pukes WANT the damn BPL, no matter how many were wiped out. Similarly, no matter how many people take exception to the current administration, it will continue because so many want it, no matter what it does to our country or the world. However, in the case of the current administration, there is an active resistance who would have absolutely no qualms about liquidating the opposition. Perhaps you might join them - they would love to destroy our infrastructure.

"Strength and Honor"

"Paul B" <pbarris@no.spam> wrote in message
news:8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
> $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
> pay for the BPL investment.
>
> (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
>
> So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
> walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues
> to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.

1535. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 04:32:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3oekq$2876hf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89599

"William" wrote ...

> And you've trained your volunteers to some standard?

Our "volunteers" are government employees who have this duty assigned to them as part of their employment, and they are well trained in EM. All of the angencies that support us have trained their volunteers via either RACES or ARES in EM. Of course, that training varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but there is little we can do to enforce our standards on them.

> > > Does your military installation have a MARS base support team?
> >
> > We do not use MARS for multiple reasons. All of our ops are civil service
> > and FCC Licensed Hams. This gives us much greater latitude in the
> > equipment, modes, and frequencies available to us.
>
> That's too bad. Military communications has a specialized function
> for such purposes.
>

I agree that the specialized function it provides could have assisted us -- and we too a long look at that when we were planning. But in reviewing all COAs, the cost-benefit just wasn't there. Since we are primarily in contact with civilian agencies (both state and federal) during emergencies, it made better sense to utilize the cilvilian HAM radio assets we had in place. We have plenty of standard military comms available other than MARS HF. The Amateur radio piece is for redundancy purposes -- not as a primary means of communication. For example, all of our VHF is military and of course the SAT and wireless is run on military net/satilites for security purposes.

Arnie -

1536. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 04:35:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3oer8$2914le$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89600

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" wrote ...

Brian Burke, AKA "Billy Beeper" AKA "William" accused you of "enabling" me over my refusal to be bowled over by Lennie's arrogance. Don't let him make YOU an "enabler" by acknowledging his alter-ego. BillyBeeper/William is Brain Burke, taking a lesson from Lennie in how to disperse his foolheartiness over several screen names.

Thanks for the info, Steve. You don't have to tell me about Leonard's arrogance -- we've all had to live with it for years. "The great white current chaser" and "Legend in his own mind".

Arnie -

1537. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 04:54:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322235431.17834.00000188@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89601

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 6:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221609.746707e3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322111534.20899.00000162@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:14 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191614.540c796b@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040319031245.06889.00000012@mb-m16.aol.com>...

>> Only a callous idiot like you would try to rationalize what Lennie did
>as
>> "OK".
>
>Your brain is squirming like a toad thinking up ways to discredit Len.

"Your brain is squirming like a toad"...?!?!

You're going to have to do better than that, Brain. Day-tripping back to
the 60's again...?!?!

Lennie discredited himself...I didn't have to put ANY effort into it at
all.

>> Claiming some fraternalism or professing to not break the chain of
>trust
>> and honor among Soliders is one thing...THAT is part of the Armed Forces.
>
>Congrations, we are in complete agreement somehow.

Obviously not, otherwise you wouldn't have pulled that "squirming"
silliness out of one orifice or another...

>> Trying to embellish one's own personal "achivements" (or lack thereof)
>> based upon someone else's sacrifices is absolutely callous and cruel.
>
>Yet you do everything possible to get back into some kind, any kind, of
>uniform.

Everyone wears a uniform of some kind, Brain. I can't think of too many
jobs that don't have dress code of one form or another.

>Why?

Why not? There is something wrong with any of the organizations I belong to?

Better yet...What organizations do YOU belong to, Brain?

Who pulls your strings when Lennie isn't pulling them?

>Do you think that it will embellish one's own personal achievements?

Unlike Lennie, the "embellishments" are my own. I don't need to stand on anyone's grave.

Do you?

Steve, K4YZ

1538. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 04:59:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89602

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 6:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221626.5451b3ec@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<fMydna9pBPDyucLdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>...
>> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>> >
>> > From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any
>training
>> > you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".
>>
>> Not so, he has been trained to program every emergency number he could
>> possibably need into his cell phone speed dial.
>
>Good grief! Why wouldn't I just dial 911?

Because 9-1-1 (...>>NOT<< "911") is not always who you need to call.

Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.

Do you know the difference? Do you KNOW what's an "emergency" as opposed
to urgent or routine...?!?!

> However when the cell
>> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting
>> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call
>> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is
>> over.
>
>Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?
>
>Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur
>volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.

Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and radios
on...No cellphone necessary.

Steve, K4YZ

1539. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:09:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323000944.17834.00000190@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89603

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221632.23e4577a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322105233.20899.00000158@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >rom: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/20/2004 6:46 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200446.1ab880b0@posting.google.com>

>> It's rather apparent and foolish since you usually get caught, but I
>give
>> you an "A" for effort!
>
>You've been busted.
>
>You're the one who """quotes""" people, but rewrites the quote to
>serve your misguided purposes.

The only things "busted" here, Brain, are your lame attempts to deflect
from your glaring misrepresentations of truth and assinine offerings of
allegiance to a person known for chronic lying.

I am truly sorry that you cannot keep up with current events, Brain, but
your suggestion that I somehow plagerized anything the Left Coast Creep did
is...well...lame.

Now...If you care to spend the effort to do so, you can try and "prove"
that I plagarized Lennie, especially with the "typo = rage" silliness that you
two seem to think is appropriate.

Then I will produce numerous posts, with all pertinent headers, wherein I
explicitly made reference to Lennie in throwing the typo silliness back at you.
I will THEN have even MORE "ammunition" with which to tweak your nose,
Brain....(Not that I need any more, but if you insist on giving it to me, I
will use it...)

Steve, K4YZ

1540. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:22:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323002219.17834.00000192@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89604

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 6:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221643.1096a11d@posting.google.com>

>Emergencies aren't just about continuity of government for crying out
>loud!

Oh?

Brain, WHO, in the advent of a major disaster, is going to make sure that food get's delivered, that the lights are back on ASAP, or that the water supply is protected...?!?! Who's going to make sure the hospital has resources, or that the police or other security services are going to be there to protect your home? (yeahyeah...I know you're gonna give me that "dead, cold fingers" routine about personal firearms...I have a couple, but I can only hit so many targets so quickly and for so long...)

Just one more example of what you DON'T know about emergency preparedness, Brain, altho I will marginally agree with your comment that those who don't drain disaster assets are themself an asset.

>However, you should note on the FEMA and State EMA websites that they
>ask for the Average Citizen to make plans -and- preparations in the
>event of a disaster.

Yes, they do...

And except for Mormons and the reasonably "well off", I don't know of too many people who can stockpile food for more than a week's rations or can leave the disaster area for the cottage in the mountains so as to NOT be a drain on those assets.

But since you brought it up, Brain, if "the big one" (enter any disaster of your choice shy of total destruction here:_____) should hit YOUR town, how many hours/days/weeks can you keep YOUR family from needing ANY of those services?

Your turn.

Steve, K4YZ

1541. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:29:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323002929.17834.00000193@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89605

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 6:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221653.ba9def3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?
>>
>> Uhhhhhhh....Brain....Other than "military" or "civilian", what other
>> categories are there?
>
>Steve, please notice the correct quote would be, "And it's always
>about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?"
>
>Please notice the word, "authorities" in my statement.
>
>Your brain is squirming like a toad. You twist my words as you do
>soooooooo many other things.

I don't need to "twist (your) words", Brain. They speak for themselves.
If you find that I am tripping you up with them, perhaps you should choose them
more carefully?

>Your correct paraphrase should be (if you were an honest person),
>
>"""Uhhhhhhh....Brain....Other than "military authorities" or "civilian
>authorities", what other categories are there?"""

Honesty is not a problem in this case, Brain.

Having once again exposed your failings, you look for a scapegoat. Look
in the mirror.

>I reply, The citizens. WE THE PEOPLE! Ever heard of them?

Yep...I'm one of them.

So, now you're going to make this a debate over Constitutional
definitions?

Unable to make headway here, so you're shifting gears again? OK...If not for the elected government or the Armed Forces, who should be responsible for community-wide emergency preparedness? I already agree that each family should take it's own initiative...we're talking about restoring the lights, providing fresh water, making sure that the community is secure...

Steve, K4YZ

1542. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:38:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323003817.17834.00000194@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89606

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 7:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221702.3a1ed731@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322110700.20899.00000160@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/20/2004 6:49 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200449.5ba4f542@posting.google.com>

>> I have asked you (several times) to validate it. You have refused or
>> ignored it.
>
>No, Steve, I have responded to your twisted up "quote" of me. It
>shows you to be the liar that you are and shows that you manipulated
>my statement in a deliberate and deceitful way.

Untrue, Brain.

You've not responded to the SPECIFIC question of what MAJOR role the
unlicensed services play in "emergency comms"

That's a very specific question, one you've NOT addressed.

There's nothing twisted or manipulated...YOU said that these other
services "play a major role"...I've asked you to provide specifics.

You haven't.

I even created a specific thread trying to prompt you to answer it.

All you do is call me names and accuse me of being "nuts".

>Then you make accusations based upon your misquote, and attack,
>attack, attack.

There's no "attack", Brain. You make assertions you can't/won't back up
with some sort of corroboration.

If you are tired of getting your toes stepped on, perhaps you shouldn't be
sticking them out where they can get stepped on...?!?!

>You've done it again more recently.
>
>You take the prize.
>

>I have shown you to be that which you loathe.
>
>Self-hatred is an unhealthy thing. Think about counseling.

It's "counselling", Brain, and what I loathe are people like you and Lennie.

Try again, PuppetBoy.

Perhaps you'll come up with something believeable this time.....

Steve, K4YZ

1543. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:46:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323004603.17834.00000196@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89607

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221909.5ae42271@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322152005.01530.00000189@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/20/2004 8:43 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403201843.69136d8a@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0403170625.e190219@posting.google.com>...
>> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> news:<20040316224739.12501.00006783@mb-m04.aol.com>...

>> >Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.
>>
>> If you need a good laugh, Brain, I'd suggest going back and
>re-reading
>> some of the lengthy posts that you and the other pathological liar have
>flooded
>> the NG with...Especially those about your skill as a DXer from entities
>wherein
>> you were not authorized to operate.
>
>Now you're lying again. Why didn't you put it in your famous
>"""quotation marks""" so we'd all know it was yet another lie?

There's no lie here, Brain.

You've indulged your fantasies in this NG with your exploits in Somalia
without providing one bit of corroborating documentation...not even one
callsign you "worked".

>> And I don't remember saying how big Part 97 is,
>
>Only because you don't know.

Sure I do. I've pulled the rug out from under Lennie over misquotes or
misinterpretations of Part 97 more than once!

>> Brain...I said what Lennie
>> doesn't know about it could fill libraries.
>

>Ever been to a library?

Sure...You ever been to one that had more than one door and a roll of paper next to your "seat"...?!?!

>WRT Part 97, what Len may or may not know about Part 97 cannot be
>greater than the total volume of Part 97. That happens to be one
>small book. One small book cannot fill a single library, let alone
>multiple libraries.
>
>Them's the Facts.

I see...

Only you and Lennie can speak exponentially.

I forgot myself...Please forgive me!

>Unless the laws of physics work differently for amateur radio.
>
>> Try to get THAT straight too, Putz.
>
>As an arrow.

Hardly. Unless you were AIMING for your foot, that is...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1544. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:50:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323005046.17834.00000199@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89608

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 9:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221919.17f41978@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322151601.01530.00000188@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/20/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
>> >himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
>> >post a retraction of his statement above?
>>
>> There's nothing to retract, Brain.
>
>But there is. You stated that what Len doesn't know about Part 97
>could fill libraries.
>
>That is patently false. If Len knew nothing at all about Part 97 it
>could not fill more than a single copy of Part 97, which is quite
>small. Avail yourself to the USGPO or the ARRL Bookstore if you dare.
>
>You exaggerate.
>
>You bully.
>
>You twist people's words and you edit their statements to fit your
>rude and obnoxious rantings.
>
>Back under your slimy rock.

As I said...I forgot myself...ONLY you and Lennie can speak
exponentially...

Forgive me!

As for "bullying", I am sorry that you find it "painful" that I insist on
getting some sort of "proof" from you for YOUR many exaggerations. Like how
the "unlicensed" radio services play a "major role" in "emergency comms"...

Still waiting on THAT one...I've given up on any "proof" about your
Somalia claims.

Steve, K4YZ

1545. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:52:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323005219.17834.00000200@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89609

>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/22/2004 8:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
>
>I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
>Dayton!
>
> Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
>thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
>
> Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some

>people to show up!

I'm game!

I'll even buy Lennie the first THREE rounds if he makes it! (That's money
I can spend elsewhere!)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1546. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 05:54:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323005459.17834.00000201@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89610

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/22/2004 9:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221900.326651bc@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
>> >Date: 3/21/2004 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
>> >
>> >"William" wrote in part ...
>> >
>> >Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
>> >way?"
>> >
>> >WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
>> >>
>> >> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
>> >> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
>> >> Emergency Comms!
>> >>
>> >I think you are missing the point here, William.
>>
>> Hey Arnie...
>
>Anyone that puts up with your twisted """quotes""" is an enabler.

Nothing I've "quoted" is twisted, Brain.

That you don't like being tasked with actually PROVING what you claim is
not my problem.

Sorry about that.

Steve, K4YZ

1547. FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 09:54:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 89611

RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516083735

RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516082208

RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6515783299

73 de Jim, N2EY

1548. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 10:31:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323053113.20278.00001792@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89612

>Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/16/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403160404.32bfb2c5@posting.google.com>

>Hang in there while the last cold snap blows thru. Here, schools are
>closed and we have to go downtown to refinance today - with the kids.

Perhaps you will raise them to be a bit more forthcoming with facts than
you've been?

Steve, K4YZ

1549. Re: Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 10:46:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323054643.20278.00001793@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89613

>Subject: Re: Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>Date: 3/4/2004 9:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5c01b95b.0403040732.51e3e639@posting.google.com>

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040303211146.23307.00007086@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403031539.2ecdfc44@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Notice that the gunnery nurse will slowly crib my phrases and words,
>> just like he does with yours, then claim them to be his own.
>
> OK, Lennie...
>
> We already have adequate suspicion that a lot of YOUR alleged
>work is plagerized, but now you spread it around...
>
> YOU get to provide some relevent examples of "phrases" I have
>"crib(ed)" from you. Go ahead...we'll wait right here...

Almost three weeks ago Lennie accused me of "cribbing (his) phrases and words" in order to "claim them as (my) own"...

I asked him to provide some examples.

None were forthcoming.

Thanks, Lennie. Proved my assumptions about your lack of honesty or character...Again.

Steve, K4YZ

1550. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 12:22:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403230422.3c343ab4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89614

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3oer8$2914le$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...

> Thanks for the info, Steve. You don't have to tell me about Leonard's
> arrogance -- we've all had to live with it for years. "The great white
> current chaser" and "Legend in his own mind".

No problem, Arnie. Welcome back to the fray.

Current Lennie/Brain practice is to make assertions they know are
either false or area at least dubiously true and then call you "nuts"
when you ask them to validate thier assertions.

Brain's most recent NG faux pas was to claim that the unlicensed
radio services (Class D CB, FRS, MURS, Part 15) "play a major role in
emergency comms".

I've quoted Brain word-for-word several times and asked him to
please provide some examples, but so far he's only gotten as far as
calling me "obnoxious", etc. His recent "Quioterobeson" is
cute...even imaginitive.. now if I could just get a straight answer
out of him!

A neverending task, but I am hopeful!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1551. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 12:38:38 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040323073838.333$5k@newsreader.com>
Source record: 89615
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Opus Penguin" <OpusPenguin@BloomCounty.nospam> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> >> He's an angerholic LOL
> >>
> > I make you jump right up and start humping my leg, everytime
> > I post tho.
> >
> > It was an honest apology, but you had to add your slober to
> > it. You need to check yourself man.
>
> With that fat gut, he hasn't "checked himself" in decades.
>
Maybe that's why he's always posting about blumpkins.

1552. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 13:30:46 UTC
From: Paul B <pbarris@no.spam>
Message-ID: <8701ETL7833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 89616
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

```
On Tue, 23 Mar 2004 03:51:28 GMT, Maximus <nomail@here.com> wrote:
> Message-ID: <4vO7c.52777$aT1.9519@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> Organization: EarthLink Inc. -- http://www.EarthLink.net
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

'Nuff said.
```

1553. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 14:20:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89617

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>
> RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6516083735
>
>
>
>
> RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6516082208
>
>
>
> RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6515783299
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It demonstrates a lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do exactly nothing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1554. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 14:41:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323094146.08979.00001950@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 89618

>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 3/23/2004 8:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize
>that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It demonstrates a
>lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
>exactly nothing.

Naaaaaa.....They'll do "something", mostly because it's expected of them,
not because it's necessarilly needed or appropriate to do so.

The smartest thing they COULD have done was defuse all the controversy in
the first place and "suspend" further code testing when S25.5 was
modified...especially since that was the way they were already leaning in the
first place, public opinon notwithstanding.

And the second smartest thing they could have done was meld the Novice and
Advanced Class licenses into the three remaining classes. The whole purpose
of "Restructuring" was to administratively streamline the FCC's
workload...Sooooooooo...Why leave two whole classes of licenses out there with
no possibility of making new ones? They should have just taken a one-time
swipe at clearing the database then.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1555. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:04:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40605210.6070406@psu.edu>
Source record: 89619

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>>Date: 3/23/2004 8:20 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
>
>
>>How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize
>>that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It demonstrates a
>>lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
>>exactly nothing.
>
>
> Naaaaaa.....They'll do "something", mostly because it's expected of them,
> not because it's necessarilly needed or appropriate to do so.
>
> The smartest thing they COULD have done was defuse all the controversy in
> the first place and "suspend" further code testing when S25.5 was
> modified...especially since that was the way they were already leaning in the
> first place, public opinon notwithstanding.

All of which is refreshingly like my "as little as needed" suggestion.

> And the second smartest thing they could have done was meld the Novice and
> Advanced Class licenses into the three remaining classes. The whole purpose
> of "Restructuring" was to administratively streamline the FCC's
> workload...Sooooooooo...Why leave two whole classes of licenses out there with
> no possibility of making new ones? They should have just taken a one-time
> swipe at clearing the database then.

Maybe I should write up and add my ides to the mix.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1556. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:10:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BrY7c.15130$t16.8565394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89620

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040323094146.08979.00001950@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
> >From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
> >Date: 3/23/2004 8:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
>
> >How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize
> >that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
demonstrates a
> >lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
> >exactly nothing.
>
> Naaaaaa.....They'll do "something", mostly because it's expected of
them,
> not because it's necessarilly needed or appropriate to do so.
>
> The smartest thing they COULD have done was defuse all the
controversy in
> the first place and "suspend" further code testing when S25.5 was
> modified...especially since that was the way they were already leaning in
the
> first place, public opinon notwithstanding.
>
> And the second smartest thing they could have done was meld the
Novice and
> Advanced Class licenses into the three remaining classes. The whole
purpose
> of "Restructuring" was to administratively streamline the FCC's
> workload...Sooooooooo...Why leave two whole classes of licenses out there
with
> no possibility of making new ones? They should have just taken a one-time
> swipe at clearing the database then.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Keeping the classes has the advantage that they could easily be re-opened if they should decide that they made a mistake. It's happened in the past. With today's computerized databases, it just isn't that difficult to keep the "orphaned" classes. I suspect within the next few years, the Novice licenses will diminish greatly anyway due to lack of renewal.

The simplest thing would have been to simply decide how many, if any,
classes would keep the code and leave the structure otherwise unchanged.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1557. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:23:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wDY7c.49311$pU1.10073762@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 89621

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize
> that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It demonstrates
a
> lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
> exactly nothing.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Gee Dee, you say that as if that's a bad thing. Perhaps that's the idea. ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1558. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:34:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40605910.1060206@psu.edu>
Source record: 89622

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>>
>>RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
>>ent=6516083735
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
>>ent=6516082208
>>
>>
>>
>>RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
>>ent=6515783299
>>
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people realize
> that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It demonstrates a
> lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
> exactly nothing.

All things I had taken into account in my prediction! I remember how incredulous some were at my idea of how long it would take. My "4 years to change" may have even been optimistic!

And yes, there is a decided lack of consensus in the Amateur community, especially when a sizable percentage of us (perhaps even a majority) prefer that Morse testing be kept, in direct opposition to the way things are likely to go!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1559. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:45:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <aYY7c.15141$t16.8570583@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 89624

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:wDY7c.49311$pU1.10073762@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people
realize
> > that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
demonstrates
> a
> > lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
> > exactly nothing.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Gee Dee, you say that as if that's a bad thing. Perhaps that's the idea.
;-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

I want a decision to be made one way or the other. Hanging in limbo does none of us any good. Regardless of the FCC's decision, I will continue to encourage and support the study of code. As my own experience and abilities grow in its use, I find it ever more worthwhile. I just wish I had the discipline to carve out more time for it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1560. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 15:46:23 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <55d060t3gp5f265sata5n0p7l2j0tk9nci@4ax.com>
Source record: 89623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In <LfmdnYyIeYfntcLdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:

>If the rule is as Frankie states, why did not the FCC did not put me off
>the air or require me to stop using 15 meters in the case of the lady
>with the tv that used a 21 mHz IF that picked up my 15 meter
>transmissions? Why did they tell her to either put up with it or get a
>new tv? She even called the TV station who also complained to the FCC.
>Wonder why the FCC told the TV station the same thing?

Did they? Got the correspondance?

>Frankie can interpet the rule any way he likes, the ruling authority is
>the FCC and their interpertation and in the case of a device not being
>able to reject a ham's signals, the FCC generally rules in favor of the
>ham, thus making Frankie's interpertation invalid.

It's not 'my' interpretation -- the rule is short, simple, written using simple terms, and its meaning is easily understood by anyone capable of reading it. But if you -still- can't understand it, let's break it down again:

========
PART 97--AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE--Table of Contents
Subpart B--Station Operation Standards
Sec. 97.101 General standards.
....
(d) No amateur operator shall willfully or maliciously interfere
with or cause interference to any radio communication or signal.
========

(1) The rule is written as a subparagraph in a section of the part that applies exclusively to the Amateur Radio Service. Therefore, if you are licensed under that service, this rule applies to you. It does not apply to any other service, such as the Broadcast or Commercial services -- they have their own rules and are not subject to the rules for the Amateur Radio service.

(2) The rule 97.101(d) says specifically, "No amateur operator". This can be interpreted in no other way than to mean that there are no exceptions to this rule -- it is to be obeyed by -all- hams. According to the FCC, "Section 97.101 applies to all amateur stations at all times." If these rules apply to -all- amateurs then there is no amateur who is exempt. Therefore, there can be no circumstance where an amateur can be excepted from these rules.

(3) By the FCC's own interpretation above, if the rule applies at -all- times then there is no time, day or night, when these rules do -not- apply.

(4) The two words in the phrase "willfully or maliciously" are seperated by the logical operator "or", which means that the rule is valid even if only one of those words are applicable.

The word "willfully" has also been defined by the FCC and the federal courts in the vast numbers of NALs that have been issued over the years. In almost every NAL it is pointed out that its recipient had been given notice that his/her actions were a violation of law, and that he/she continued to violate the law after such notice was given. This demonstrates that the violation was done "willfully" -- not necessarily with the intent to violate the law, but with the knowledge that the law was being violated by his/her actions. Reading 97.101(d) using this interpretation of "willfully", which is the same interpretation accepted by the FCC and the federal courts, an amateur that knows his/her station is causing interference, yet continues to operate, is therefore "willfully" causing interference.

The word "maliciously" is easily defined as 'having bad intent', which the FCC usually determines by the nature of the interference.

(5) Once again, the word "interference" is defined by the FCC:

========
PART 2--FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS--Table of Contents
Subpart A--Terminology
Sec. 2.1 Terms and definitions.
.....
(a) Where a term or definition appears in this part of the Commission's Rules, it shall be the definitive term or definition and shall prevail throughout the Commission's Rules.
.....
(c) The following terms and definitions are issued:
.....
Interference. The effect of unwanted energy due to one or a combination of emissions, radiations, or inductions upon reception in a radiocommunication system, manifested by any performance degradation, misinterpretation, or loss of information which could be extracted in the absence of such unwanted energy.
========

Paragraph (a) declares that the definitions in this section are applicable to all of Title 47, including Part 97. Interference is specifically defined as "The effect... upon reception in a radiocommunication system". This clearly means the interference is manifested in the -receiver-. Also notice that interference is determined by the fact that information in the radio communication is lost, -not- by the manner in which that loss occured. I.e, the definition of 'interference' does not make exclusions: it does -not- exclude receiver overload; it does -not- exclude intermediate frequencies; it does -not- exclude equipment of 'poor design'; it makes -no distinction- between fundamentals or harmonics.

(6) The phrase "to any" uses the word "any", not 'some' or 'most', 'licensed' or 'unlicensed', or even 'legal' or 'illegal'. The word 'any' is a simple word to understand. It has a universal understanding to the level where the FCC did not

feel the need to define it any other way. Therefore, it is not to be defined in any other way by anyone else, not even by a few hams looking for an excuse to circumvent the rule.

(7) The term "radio communication" is also defined by the FCC in 2.1(c). Under that section a 'radiocommunication' is "telecommunication by means of radio waves." A radio communication is therefore the -information- that is carried by radiocommunication.

Let's put this all together:

Under the laws regulating the Amateur Radio Service(1), no licensed Amateur Radio Operator(2) may operate his/her station at any time(3) when he/she knows that the operation is causing(4) the loss of information being received(5) in any(6) radiocommunication system(7).

That is the FCC's interpretation as referenced point by point. If you have a problem with that, take it up with them.

Now. It's absolutely pathetic that there are hams who try to spin their own interpretations on such a simple rule, especially when some of them criticize CBers and keyclowns for the same behavior -- warping legal interpretations for their own benefit. And the "spirit of the law" is even simpler: Do what you want as long as it doesn't bother anybody else. Yet some hams seem to think that they have some sort of legal right to ignore that axiom by virtue of a license. They probably think that a driver's license gives them the right to throw litter on the side of the road and that it's everyone else's responsibility to pick it up. It isn't. You throw the garbage, you clean it up. It's that simple.

And no, the FCC doesn't like enforcing their own laws, especially that one. It's a fair guess that their decision has less to do with legalities as it does with politics, logistics, and probably a few kickbacks from special interests. But that's not a suprise where the FCC is concerned. Regardless, until the courts rule differently or the FCC changes that law, it still stands as it was written.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1561. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 16:58:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040323115844.00545.00004963@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89625

In article <1NqdnY15gewnBMLdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <405F59A3.4020404@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>>Even if the infrastructure is largely intact, it can be overwhelmed by the
>>>>unexpected demand.
>>>
>>> Correct! Which makes it not a likely candidate for emergency services.
>>>If it works to let people know you're still alive or need help or
>>>whatever, of course you use it. But it is still very much a point to
>>>point solution. Which is to say, not a solution for large scale disasters.
>>
>>
>> Or even for localized disasters in high density areas.
>>
>>>>>> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing
>>>>>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>>>>>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.
>>
>>
>>
>>>>>>Because they'd never encountered that behavior before.
>>
>>
>>> Indicative on not knowing how the little things work. No tower or
>>>power, no cell.
>>
>>
>> Of course. It's also possible that the system was being overwhelmed.
>Doesn't
>> really matter, if something is unavailable, the cause doesn't matter too
>much
>> except as an an indicator of when service might return, and as a lesson in
>what
>> to do different next time.
>>
>> The ignorance of things technical is nothing new, of course. In some ways,
>> industries promote technical ignorance by using new terms (like "wireless"
>and
>> "cordless" rather than "radio") which make the technology actually used

>less
>> than clear.
>
>I sometimes wonder what these people "do" spend their time thinking about.

Other things! Isn't modern life complex enough?

>> You might also enjoy this site:

>> http://www.fybush.com/site-021219.html
>>
>> Interesting history of W2XMN, the past, present and future of a famous
>> site. Click on the links to see how far ignorance can go.
>
> Cool! I just heard about the tower this past weekend, and here you come

>along with a link to it Good timing, Jim.

bwaahaahaa

...ze barracuda knowz whean to sterike...

>It's a little scary at first
>sight, but a magnificent structure nonetheless.

I've seen it from a distance but never up close. It's on the list. (I've been
to W1AW and operated there. Also visited NIST in Boulder and the WWV/WWVB
transmitter site in Fort Collins.)
>
> As for the concerned residents of Alpine, they might want to chuck
>their cell phones if they are so worried about RF exposure - though of
>course I'm sure they never use them! 8^)

"Inverse square law? What's that?"

> But frankly, they strike mer as being less than smart.

Do not underestimate folks like that. Look at the BPL mess. Did you see the
Wall Street Journal article?

Remember that whenever someone describes ham radio as "a hobby", they are
giving the BPL folks an argument against us. If amateur radio is "just a
hobby", then why should it be any more important than anyone else's hobby, such
as downloading pr0n via BPL?

>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>
We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly by
cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1562. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 18:15:19 UTC
From: L <lll@lradionets.net>
Message-ID: <c3puo3$v0m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 89626

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
> I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
> Dayton!
>
> Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
> thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
>
> Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some
> people to show up!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Good Idea! You could call it a gathering of Phil & His Freaks,
all five of you, a real Freak Show.

L

1563. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 18:29:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Cm%7c.4735$HP.199@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89627

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:BrY7c.15130$t16.8565394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

> Keeping the "orpahned" classes has the advantage
> that they could easily be re-opened if
> they should decide that they made a mistake.

Three classes is plenty and I doubt there's
any regrets at reducing the number of licenses.
It remains now as to what the best three are
to be as per the RRL and NCVEC which are
pretty much unified as to eliminating Tech and
Advanced. Does any other country also have
three classes?

> With today's computerized databases, it just isn't that difficult
> to keep the "orphaned" classes.

It isn't just record keeping...it is also about keeping
the rules and regs that are unique to those two
classes on the books and subject to enforcement.
Of course, another means is to leave Advanced and,
rather than a free upgrade, just indicate that the
privieges for Advanced are now identical to
Extra.

> I suspect within the next few years, the Novice
> licenses will diminish greatly anyway due to lack of renewal.

There are only about 32K now.

> The simplest thing would have been to simply decide how many, if any,
> classes would keep the code and leave the structure otherwise unchanged.

That has been done by ARRL (three classes and
only Extra would be code tested) and NCVEC (three
licenses and NO code test at all).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1564. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 18:31:13 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc610kf.3hm.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 89628

In article <20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com>, N2EY wrote:
>
>
> RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6516083735
>
>
>
>
> RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6516082208
>
>
>
> RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> ent=6515783299
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Actually they assigned numbers to 4 petitions, you missed this one
RM-10869 - K4SX 18 September 2003
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6515285430

Brief summary follows --

RM-10867 ARRL Petition
Auto upgrade Technician and Novice to General
Auto upgrade Advanced to Extra
Create a new no-code beginner class with limited HF priveleges
Drop code requirements for General
Retain 5 WPM code for Extra

RM-10868 AG4RQ Petition
Merge Novice and Technician classes keeping priveleges of both
Upgrade Advanced to Extra
Retain 5 WPM code for General and Extra

RM-10869 K4SX Petition
Retains no-code Technician as is

Retains 5 WPM General
Increases Extra class to 13 WPM
no mention of Novice or Advanced class elimination

RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code requirement for Extras also.

FWIW, I think the best possible result would be a combination of the ARRL and AG4RQ versions -- merge Novice and Technician classes and priveleges. Drop the code for General. Upgrade Advanced to Extra, and keep 5 WPM for Extra.

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

1565. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 18:44:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wA%7c.4751$HP.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89629

"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
news:slrnc610kf.3hm.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
> In article <20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com>, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >
> > RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
> >
> >
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> > ent=6516083735
> > --
> >
> > RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
> >
> >
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> > ent=6516082208
> > --
> >
> > RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
> >
> >
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docum
> > ent=6515783299
> > --
>
> Actually they assigned numbers to 4 petitions, you missed this one
> RM-10869 - K4SX 18 September 2003
>
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_documen
t=6515285430
>
> Brief summary follows --
>
> RM-10867 ARRL Petition
> Auto upgrade Technician and Novice to General

Wrong. The auto upgrade is Tech only to General.
Novice stays as Novice.

> Auto upgrade Advanced to Extra
> Create a new no-code beginner class with limited HF priveleges

Which is what the existing Novices go to.

> Drop code requirements for General
> Retain 5 WPM code for Extra
> ---
> RM-10868 AG4RQ Petition
> Merge Novice and Technician classes keeping priveleges of both
> Upgrade Advanced to Extra
> Retain 5 WPM code for General and Extra
> ---
> RM-10869 K4SX Petition
> Retains no-code Technician as is
> Retains 5 WPM General

Not likly.

> Increases Extra class to 13 WPM

Never happen

> no mention of Novice or Advanced class elimination
> ---
> RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
> Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code
requirement
> for Extras also.

Also includes a "commercial only" transmitter rule for
Communicator (Novice)
Also includes power limit for Communicator/Novice

> FWIW, I think the best possible result would be a combination of the ARRL
> and AG4RQ versions -- merge Novice and Technician classes and priveleges.
> Drop the code for General. Upgrade Advanced to Extra, and keep 5 WPM for
> Extra.

I expect to see the ARRL petition win out, but they'll
lose on keeping any code. The code war was lost and
so noted in 98-143 R&O (6 years ago). Nothing
has changed, nor has there been any new arguments
that have been made to retain code testing at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1566. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 19:20:37 UTC
From: Alex Flinsch <alex@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc613h4.3j9.alex@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 89630

In article <wA%7c.4751$HP.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Bill Sohl wrote:
>> Auto upgrade Technician and Novice to General
>
> Wrong. The auto upgrade is Tech only to General.
> Novice stays as Novice.
>
>> Auto upgrade Advanced to Extra
>> Create a new no-code beginner class with limited HF priveleges
>
> Which is what the existing Novices go to.

oops, you are correct, my error.

>> --
>> RM-10869 K4SX Petition
>> Retains no-code Technician as is
>> Retains 5 WPM General
>
> Not likly.
>
>> Increases Extra class to 13 WPM
>
> Never happen

Agreed, this one just makes things more complicated, but then this is the US
government we are talking about, so who can tell...

>
>> no mention of Novice or Advanced class elimination
>> --
>> RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
>> Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code
> requirement
>> for Extras also.
>
> Also includes a "commercial only" transmitter rule for
> Communicator (Novice)
> Also includes power limit for Communicator/Novice

The same power limits are defined in the ARRL proposal also. The 100/50 watt
limits proposed are set so they would be below the RF environmental
evaluation required levels.

> --
>> FWIW, I think the best possible result would be a combination of the ARRL
>> and AG4RQ versions -- merge Novice and Technician classes and priveleges.

>> Drop the code for General. Upgrade Advanced to Extra, and keep 5 WPM for
>> Extra.
>
> I expect to see the ARRL petition win out, but they'll
> lose on keeping any code. The code war was lost and
> so noted in 98-143 R&O (6 years ago). Nothing
> has changed, nor has there been any new arguments
> that have been made to retain code testing at all.

That's what I expect to happen also, although I think that the merger that I mentioned above would keep more existing (coded) hams happy. Personally I see no real reason to keep any code testing requirement.

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

1567. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 19:51:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323145101.08979.00001959@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 89631

>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40605210.6070406@psu.edu>

> Maybe I should write up and add my ides to the mix.

Why not, Mike...It >>IS<< March, ya know...! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

1568. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 20:03:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406097FC.4070607@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89632

N2EY wrote:

>RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516083735
<
>
>
>
>
>RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516082208
<
>
>
>
>RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>
>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6515783299
<
>
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
Use > and < to keep the links from getting screwed up.

1569. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 20:19:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <a9GdnSziCNHFAP3d4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89633

Gillilan blustered again:
> In <LfmdnYyIeYfntcLdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>
>
>>If the rule is as Frankie states, why did not the FCC did not put me off
>>the air or require me to stop using 15 meters in the case of the lady
>>with the tv that used a 21 mHz IF that picked up my 15 meter
>>transmissions? Why did they tell her to either put up with it or get a
>>new tv? She even called the TV station who also complained to the FCC.
>>Wonder why the FCC told the TV station the same thing?
>
>
>
> Did they?

Yes they did,

Got the correspondance?

No I don't, that was in 1962.

>
> It's not 'my' interpretation -- the rule is short, simple, written using simple
> terms, and its meaning is easily understood by anyone capable of reading it. But
> if you -still- can't understand it, let's break it down again:

Break it down as many times as you want to Gillieboy, but the FCC is the
final authority on the subject and if the ham station is clean and the
fault lies with the device being interfered with, the FCC says the ham
is not at fault. Now regardless how *you* interpert the rule the FCC
interperts it differently and that makes your interpertation worthless.
No go bother the cb folks, you may get more support over there for you
rantings.

1570. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 21:03:15 UTC
From: Bonzi <s@asds.com>
Message-ID: <bf9160pj9tbrv9fmmvifl9fdeopu6srsmp@4ax.com>
Source record: 89634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 23 Mar 2004 08:32:52 +0900, "Brenda Ann"
<brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote:

>
>"Paul B" <pbarris@no.spam> wrote in message
>news:8701ETH7833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
>> On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
>> $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
>> pay for the BPL investment.
>>
>> (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
>>
>> So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
>> walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues
>> to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.
>
>The idea of a boycott is not a bad one.. but there is the unfortunate
>circumstance that in a large number of small and medium sized communities,
>EarthStink is the only game in town..
>
>
Earthstink is being bought out as we speak.

1571. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 21:44:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4060AFA9.70507@psu.edu>
Source record: 89635

N2EY wrote:
> In article <1NqdnY15gewnBMLdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<some snippage>

>>I sometimes wonder what these people "do" spend their time thinking about.
>
>
> Other things! Isn't modern life complex enough?

True! like who's on "The Simple Life" tonight, or that insulting talent
search show - lotsa important stuff like that.

Modern life has always been complex enough, always has been and always
will be!

>>>You might also enjoy this site:
>>
>
>
>>>http://www.fybush.com/site-021219.html
>>>
>>>Interesting history of W2XMN, the past, present and future of a famous
>>>site. Click on the links to see how far ignorance can go.
>>
>> Cool! I just heard about the tower this past weekend, and here you come
>
>
>>along with a link to it Good timing, Jim.
>
>
> bwaahaahaa
>
> ...ze barracuda knowz whean to sterike...
>
>
>>It's a little scary at first
>>sight, but a magnificent structure nonetheless.
>
>
> I've seen it from a distance but never up close. It's on the list. (I've been
> to W1AW and operated there. Also visited NIST in Boulder and the WWV/WWVB
> transmitter site in Fort Collins.)
>
>> As for the concerned residents of Alpine, they might want to chuck

>>their cell phones if they are so worried about RF exposure - though of
>>course I'm sure they never use them! 8^)
>
>
> "Inverse square law? What's that?"
>
>
>> But frankly, they strike mer as being less than smart.

hehe, nothing like me talking about people being stupid and making my
own typo in the sentence!!! 8^)

>
> Do not underestimate folks like that. Look at the BPL mess. Did you see the
> Wall Street Journal article?

No I didn't.

Education and intelligence does not make a person smart. I always
thought that one of the things that makes for smart decisions is to be
able to extrapolate consequences.

> Remember that whenever someone describes ham radio as "a hobby", they are
> giving the BPL folks an argument against us. If amateur radio is "just a
> hobby", then why should it be any more important than anyone else's hobby, such
> as downloading pr0n via BPL?

>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>>
>
> We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly by
> cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.

The average mobile home has better construction methods, and often
better hardware, cabinets, etc. than those conspicuous consumption hovels.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1572. ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:12:11 UTC
From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20040323171211.29922.00000244@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 89636

If you or anyone you know, has had or has had trouble with the
ARRL's QSL burro, Please e-mail me ASAP.

I'm getting jerked around and my section manager is dodging me.

I wanna send a complaint to Jim Haynie.

and I need help.

Thanks,

NIW

1573. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:16:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4060B74D.7090900@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>Earthstink is being bought out as we speak.
>
>

Seems that I'm that small fish in that food chain diagram. My ISP,
netcom (one of the earliest subscription flat rate ISP's on the 'net)
got swallowed by Mindspring, then that swallowed by Earthlink.

Even with support for bpl, it's still a step above aol.... ;-)

1574. ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro Screwing NON ARRL members!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:29:01 UTC
From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20040323172901.08432.00000239@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 89638

K8CPA has personally given me permission to post this here:

enjoy...

==========

From: "chuck" <k8cpa@comcast.net>
To: <n8cxq@arrl.net>; <k4zle@arrl.net>; <k8je@arrl.org>
Subject: Envalope
Date: Monday, March 22, 2004 8:25 PM

Greetings,

Did you ever come across my envelope, for my Cards?

73 de K8CPA

-Chuck Adkins

P.S. I know it's been long enough, it's been almost 11 months since I sent the thing.
===
To: <jjslough@fuse.net>,<n8cxq@arrl.net>,<k8je@arrl.org>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: Envalope
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20040323014425.VEUW1963.smtp3.fuse.net@smtp.fuse.net>
References:

Hello Jay,

I'm not quite sure what to make of that reply. However, I did get a e-mail saying I did have cards a while back and that he needed two dollers and some change worth of stamps and a envelope, which I did send to him almost 11 months ago, last I checked, no one had seen the envelope, now, I'm not blaming you all for this, if it got lost, then, it got lost, I'll just have to send another one, might send it certified, to make sure it makes it.

I just want to get my cards, that's all, a nasty attitude, is something I really don't need.

Thank You.

-Chuck K8CPA

At 08:44 PM 3/22/2004 -0500, jjslough@fuse.net wrote:
>Jim,

>If you have an envelope for K8CPA, please send it to him immediately with
however many cards you may have for him, even if it is 1 or less.
>
>Thanks,
>Jay, K4ZLE
>==
>From: "chuck" <k8cpa@comcast.net>
>Date: 2004/03/22 Mon PM 08:25:26 EST
>To: <n8cxq@arrl.net>, <k4zle@arrl.net>, <k8je@arrl.org>
>Subject: Envalope
>
>Greetings,
>
>Did you ever come across my envelope, for my Cards?
>
>73 de K8CPA
>
>-Chuck Adkins
>
>P.S. I know it's been long enough, it's been almost 11 months since I sent the
thing.
>
>
>
>==
>
>
>
===

To: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope
Cc:
Bcc: k8cpa@comcast.net
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <00f801c4108a$64dbbc70$0100a8c0@MYCOMPUTER>
References: <000c01c41075$b8e96ca0$6401a8c0@weirdoj443bz6j>

At 10:53 PM 3/22/2004 -0500, James Weaver wrote:
>

Look Jim, I'm gonn say this one time and one time only, I DO NOT WANT YOUR
MEMBERSHIP OK? I want my cards, if I don't not recieve my card with the next 7
days, I AM going to get a attorney and file a lawsuit in small claims court
against the League for the loss of money, I'm getting stinking sick and tired
of getting the damn run around with you jack asses, and if I don't get what I
want, I'll get it in a court of law!

Now get me my damn cards!

and quit the damn stallin'

-Chuck K8CPA

P.S. I got an e-mail from n8cxq saying I had cards, I sent envelopes and postage and the damn things never made it, this was over 11 months ago, there's NO EXCUSE FOR THIS AT ALL!!!!! someone ain't doing their job right or the post office lost them, way I see it, I should get a check from the ARRL for the envelopes lost and the postage. and Get my cards sent to ME on YOUR Organzations Dime!
and this is what I will seek in court, if this doesn't happen. I'm tired of the games Jim and if it don't stop, I'll take it to court. Consider yourself warned.

=========

To: Jay Slough <jjslough@fuse.net>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: Envalope
Cc: n8cxq@arrl.net, k8je@arrl.org
Bcc: k8cpa@comcast.net
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <406041EE.1080909@fuse.net>
References: <3.0.6.32.20040322211054.00b52248@mail.comcast.net>

.Chuck,
.This is my last message on this subject. I depart the area for several .weeks and will not be answering anymore bureau correspondence .until I return. However, I meant what I said. You provided no data for .me to know what had transpired previously. I get many inquiries .about bureau status and do not maintain a file of past .correspondence, assuming you did send me something on this .previously. Since you said something about 11 months ago and I .was not the manager 11 months ago, my assumption is that we had .not corresponded before. Since I read your message as, "Where are .my cards?", I responded to the letter manager to send you anything .he had, including an empty envelope so you would know there was .nothing for you. The bureau is a service provided by volunteers. We .do the best we can to serve all amateurs with an 8 in their call.

I understand your position, and I in no way wanted to start a pissing contest... however, I do believe you were in the position you were in, and I remember e-mailing a while back, say 2-3 months ago, and asked where my cards where and all I got was, ZERO response from you or the person doing your job, and a bleeding heart plea from the Michigan section manager to join the ARRL. Which I have not the means to do, Nor do I have the interest in belonging to a organzation that puts the interest of the radio manufactures first and THEN the hams, if the ARRL is going to get my money, the good ol' boys, need to make alot of Changes in the way they handle things. But, that isn't the point here, the point is, my envalope just disappeared from sight, and no one seems to give a S### about it, or me, because, I'm not a member of the "Good ol' Boys Club", Well, that's fine, when my attorney contacts the "Boy's" in CT, we'll see who's gonna blow who off... :-)

.Now, lets examine your situation in a bit more depth.

Sure. I'm good for a fight, no problem...

.FACTS:
.You received notification that you had cards at the bureau and no .envelopes on file.

Yes, your doing good so far.

.You sent the requested envelope but did not receive your cards after ." x " amount of time.

Yes, like 5 months... and I asked, and got the same ol' B.S. message and bleeding heart plea to join an organization. WHICH I DON'T HAVE THE MEANS TO DO SO, AT THE MOMENT AND REALLY DON'T CARE TO DO!!! and now, 11 months later, I ask again and get the same thing....

.You made a query to someone, maybe me, about the status and .were informed that no one had seen your envelope

Yes, and recieved no answer from the 8th area manager.
and N8CXQ said he had not seen my envalope. What I wanna know is, where did it go??? Did you all even see it?

.Now, "y " time later, you send an email out of the blue asking if we .have received your envelope yet with no explanation of past history.
.You say you might need to send a new envelope via certified mail.
.You say you just want your cards, not an attitude

I explaned my past history over and over and over and over and ALL I GET IS THE FLIPPING BLEEDING F'ING HEART PLEA TO JOIN THE ARRL, I DON'T WANT TO JOIN THE GODDAMNED ARRL, IF I DID I WOULD HAVE ALREADY DO SO, JUST SEND ME MY DAMN CARDS! WHY IN THE HELL IS IT SO FLIPPING HARD FOR YOU PEOPLE TO UNDERSTAND THIS, MY ENVALOPE GOT LOST. CAN'T YOU PEOPLE JUST PICK UP ANOTHER ENVALOPE AND PUT A FEW STAMPS ON IT AND SEND MY CARDS TO ME?????!?!?!?!?!?!? IS IT THAT SO HARD?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!?!

I hate to start swearing, but I can't seem to get anyone to understand anything, it's like dealing with a bunch of damn retards!

.RESPONSE:
.If you really wanted your cards why didn't you have envelopes on file .before you were notified?

Simple. Money issues! ever think that there is people out that, that CANNOT AFFORD TO HAVE CARDS ON FILE???? HUH? NEVER THOUGHT OF THAT DID YOU????

.No mention is made of timing between when you were notified and .when you responded. - If you did not respond within 90 days there is .a fair chance your cards were returned or destroyed before an .envelope arrived.

I responded right away, this isn't the issue, the issue is you guys LOST my envalope or tossed it in the trash, because you all got a axe to grind with me, because I happen to think the Michigan section is run by a bunch of LIDS, NO-CODE Idiots, and you all know this and wanna give me a hard time. well, fine, do it, but when my attorney gets done with you all, there won't be a

ARRL!

.If the timing was sufficient between when you sent the envelope and .you were told it had not arrived, why did you not assume it was lost in .the process someplace and that you needed to send another .envelope then?

again, MONEY ISSUES! I'm out of work, and I had to barrow money from my parents. is that a good enough answer for you?

.If you think I have an attitude, I appologize. I put in over 8 hours a

Yeah, yeah, yeah.... don't patronize me with your crap. just get me my cards or I'll sue the league in court.

.week doing bureau business. For this I receive nothing except .reimbursement for direct out-of-pocket expenses and grief from .people complaining that we are not meeting their .needs/wants/desires/expectations.

Well, cry me river guy, if you can't handle the position then quit and let someone else do it.

.What do you do for the hobby?

I operate. good enough for me, and honestly, I don't have an interest in the league. too many idiots in power.

.If you choose to send a new envelope to the central bureau via .certified mail, it will only sit at the post office until I return. It will not .be sent to your letter manager until the next cycle mailing which will .probably be in May, as I am attempting to get a mailing to them .before I leave this week. (Do they hold certified mail for 2 plus .weeks?) You may send direcly to your letter manager.

Well, the way I see you all owe me a 2.65 for the postage you all tossed in the trash can, and for the envalopes sent to N8CXQ, that never made it. That makes like 3.50 or so... it's a small amout, I know, but it's the point... you all lost my stuff, and even if you didn't couldn't you all just grab a envalope and put some stamps on it and send it, on your guys dime? or is the league that broke? Hmmmmm...

.I sincerely am not trying to be mean-spirited or display an attitude.

could have fooled me.

.I will not enter into a spitting contest with you.

I won't either, but if my cards aren't in my hands in the next 7 days, my attorney will be contacting someone at the league. I'm tired of being lied to, and being put off.

.I will not respond to any further correspondence with you until I return .in mid-April. Our desire is to deliver bureau cars in as timely a .manner as should be expected for bureau cards. To do this we need .your cooperation and you need ours. I pledge ours. Part of what is .expected from you is that we not have to chase you down to remind .you that you need to send us envelopes.

Well, you can BLOW ME OFF, like your pallys here in Michigan or you all can talk turkey. and send me my cards on your dime, seeing you all threw my stuff away. otherwise, my Lawyer will be in touch.

.73,
.Jay, K4ZLE

Yeah, sure.

-Chuck K8CPA
==========

X-Originating-IP: [204.127.198.35]
X-Sender: k8cpa@mail.comcast.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32) Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2004 07:20:14 -0500
To: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope

At 10:53 PM 3/22/2004 -0500, James Weaver wrote:
>

Look Jim, I'm gonn say this one time and one time only, I DO NOT WANT YOUR MEMBERSHIP OK? I want my cards, if I don't not recieve my card with the next 7 days, I AM going to get a attorney and file a lawsuit in small claims court against the League for the loss of money, I'm getting stinking sick and tired of getting the damn run around with you jack asses, and if I don't get what I want, I'll get it in a court of law!

Now get me my damn cards!

and quit the damn stallin'

-Chuck K8CPA

P.S. I got an e-mail from n8cxq saying I had cards, I sent envelopes and postage and the damn things never made it, this was over 11 months ago, there's NO EXCUSE FOR THIS AT ALL!!!!! someone ain't doing their job right or the post office lost them, way I see it, I should get a check from the ARRL for the envelopes lost and the postage. and Get my cards sent to ME on YOUR Organzations Dime!
and this is what I will seek in court, if this doesn't happen. I'm tired of the games Jim and if it don't stop, I'll take it to court. Consider yourself warned.

========

Received: from mallard.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.48])
by sccrmxc16.comcast.net (sccrmxc16) with ESMTP
id <20040323200748s1600c4q69e>; Tue, 23 Mar 2004 20:07:48 +0000
X-Originating-IP: [207.217.120.48]
Received: from user240.net633.oh.sprint-hsd.net ([65.41.54.240]
helo=MYCOMPUTER)
by mallard.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)

id 1B5sBc-0000D3-00; Tue, 23 Mar 2004 12:07:45 -0800 From: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
To: "'chuck'" <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2004 15:07:53 -0500
Organization: ARRL
Message-ID: <003b01c41112$86fa2340$0100a8c0@MYCOMPUTER> MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="----=_NextPart_000_003C_01C410E8.9E241B40" X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.4510 X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165 In-Reply-To:
<3.0.6.32.20040323072014.00b77b40@mail.comcast.net> Importance: Normal

Whoa, Chuck,

I'm not stalling. I don't have your cards. I've never had your cards. The Bureau manager is checking with your letter manager to see what has happened. Whatever it is I don't know, but it is being determined.

You can sue all you want, but there is no guarantee whatsoever that you will collect anything. As a matter of fact, I'll bet you wouldn't. This aside, no one wants to get messed up in a drawn out lawsuit that gains no one but the attorney anything.

The rules of the Bureau are that it is not necessary for the Bureau folks to keep cards when an amateur does not have envelopes and adequate postage on file. Simple. If you didn't have an envelope and adequate postage, the Bureau folks did not owe you anything. I'd say this is especially true when one considers that you are not supporting the operation of the Bureau. Why is it that nonmembers seem to be the people who make the greatest demands on something they are receiving out of the kindness of members? Lets face it, if you don't like the Bureau rules, there are other sources through which you can get your reply QSLs. I'm sure we'd be just as happy to have you choose to spend a few bucks to some guy to manage your QSLs and quit aggravating our Bureau people as we are happy to help you at no charge.

Now, then, I'm not angry with you, but there was no reason for your attack on me. I've done nothing to you. Your conduct is certainly no way to "win friends and influence (favorably) people."

Lets get back to where we are all fellow amateurs who are pursuing in the case of DXing the hobby aspects of Amateur Radio and quit acting as though you have been bilked out of millions of dollars by some con artists. Can we?

73,

Jim
========

To: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope

Cc: k8cpa@comcast.net
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <003b01c41112$86fa2340$0100a8c0@MYCOMPUTER>
References: <3.0.6.32.20040323072014.00b77b40@mail.comcast.net>

...Whoa, Chuck,

You riding a horse?

.I'm not stalling. I don't have your cards. I've never had your cards.

I never said you did.

.The
.Bureau manager is checking with your letter manager to see what .has
.happened. Whatever it is I don't know, but it is being determined.

I know this, I called N8CXQ, I got his answering machine. I left a message. My question is why wasn't this answered the first time I checked, instead of me getting the don't worry about it and join the ARRL please, type message. I'd join tommmrow, but I cannot afford it.
and BTW, *YOUR* letter manager, not mine, I'm not a member, remember?, told me he was leaving out of town, *I* checked with N8CXQ, I've yet to hear from HIM as well...

.You can sue all you want, but there is no guarantee whatsoever that .you will
.collect anything. As a matter of fact, I'll bet you wouldn't. This aside,
.no one wants to get messed up in a drawn out lawsuit that gains no .one but
.the attorney anything.

It isn't the money, it's the point. The point is I asked about this 5 months ago or so and I got the cold shoulder, got blowed off, whatever you wanna call it. which is pretty typical for the Michigan section when it relates to me. I just wanna know what became of my envalope, if it didn't make it to N8CXQ, I tend to believe it got tossed in the trash by someone who's got a problem with me.

.The rules of the Bureau are that it is not necessary for the Bureau .folks to
.keep cards when an amateur does not have envelopes and adequate .postage on
.file. Simple. If you didn't have an envelope and adequate postage, .the
.Bureau folks did not owe you anything. I'd say this is especially true .when
.one considers that you are not supporting the operation of the .Bureau. Why
.is it that nonmembers seem to be the people who make the greatest .demands on
.something they are receiving out of the kindness of members? Lets .face it,
.if you don't like the Bureau rules, there are other sources through .which
.you can get your reply QSLs. I'm sure we'd be just as happy to have .you
.choose to spend a few bucks to some guy to manage your QSLs and .quit
.aggravating our Bureau people as we are happy to help you at no .charge.

Now, you've totally missed my message, I SENT THE ENVALOPE! WITH THE POSTAGE! AND I NEVER GOT MY CARDS! and I haven't heard anything from CXQ at all,as if it arrived, last I checked 5 months ago, he never seen it, where did it go? and

what the heck does this have to do with membership, you're mixing two totally different issues up! you people offer a service and when I send my envelopes, they are missing? and as for the RULES of the burro, yes, I got a problem with them and YES, I am going to complain and bring this to light in the Internet newsgroups and let PEOPLE KNOW NOT USE THE ARRL QSL BURRO AS IT IS A RIP OFF! and if they lose your envelope, YOU GOTTA PAY AGAIN AND THEY WON'T DO A THING TO HELP!

.Now, then, I'm not angry with you, but there was no reason for your .attack .on me. I've done nothing to you. Your conduct is certainly no way to ."win .friends and influence (favorably) people."

I attacked you because YOU FLATLY REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE, INSTEAD YOU WANTED TO SELL ME A ARRL MEMBERSHIP! I want my cards, if I don't get them, I'll NEVER JOIN the ARRL! You think I just supposed to sit back and shut up and not care what happened to my 2.75 cents or so worth of pastage, plus the monies spent on the Envelopes?!?!?! Heck Yes I am going to Complain, I've even called K1MAN and informed him of the goings on here in the Michigan area, Why can't the area manager go to the post office and find out, did they have a envalope from Lincoln Park, Michigan 48146 come through and maybe it was lost, why can't something be done? to insure this NEVER happens again?

.Lets get back to where we are all fellow amateurs who are pursuing .in the .case of DXing the hobby aspects of Amateur Radio and quit acting as .though .you have been bilked out of millions of dollars by some con artists. .Can .we?

I'm sorry, but No I cannot just sit by idle and forget the fact the ARRL's incoming QSL Burro LOST my envelope and REFUSES to do anything about it. TALK ABOUT BAAAD PR!

Have a nice day, usless OM.

-Chuck ADKINS K8CPA

==========

X-Originating-IP: [207.217.120.48]
From: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
To: "'chuck'" <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2004 16:39:34 -0500
Organization: ARRL
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.4510 X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165 Importance: Normal

Chuck,

You missed my point. The point is that unless YOU have an envelope and postage at the Bureau when YOUR cards come in, there is no requirement that the Bureau folks bust their chops to hunt you down to deliver YOUR cards.
The point is that you failed to comply with the rules of the Bureau which are

and have been publicly published for years. Quit trying to place the blame on someone else for what you did. Become a man and accept that you screwed up and that whatever the snafu is that resulted in you not getting any cards there may be or may have been on file with your letter sorter is because of your screw-up.

A second point is that you totally failed to communicate your need in your initial E-mail of a few days ago and, instead of communicating your need, you tore into a fellow who probably is at least twice the man that you are or will be. Frankly, in my opinion, you insult the Christ you proclaim to believe in by your fully un-Christian manner of confronting your fellow man.

'Nuf said? Grow up. If you truly profess Christ as your Savior, show it and quit acting as though you follow Beelzebub! As an aside, you might learn to spell, as well.

Jim

========

To: "James Weaver" <k8je@arrl.org>
From: chuck <k8cpa@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Envalope
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <009201c4111f$55b77000$0100a8c0@MYCOMPUTER>
References: <3.0.6.32.20040323153828.00b69ca0@mail.comcast.net>

All this, including your last will be available on my website as well as printed to the newsgroups and K1MAN

73 and enjoy the fallout.

-Chuck K8CPA

==========

Chuck K8CPA Sends a envalope and THEY lose it, and just because he's not a member, because he's unenployed. they want to screw him and not send his cards..

and they wonder why *I* won't join...

NIW

1575. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M in BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:37:24 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aI-dnUQidv6iIf3dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Paul B wrote:

> On top of a $500,000 investment, Earthlink has just invested another
> $3.5 million. You folks who are Earthlink subscribers are helping to
> pay for the BPL investment.
>
> (See http://www.dslreports.com/shownews/41140)
>
> So why don't you put some action behind your anti-BPL rhetoric and
> walk away from Earthlink? Any ham who opposes BPL while s/he continues
> to use Earthlink as an ISP has to be viewed as a very large hypocrite.

Yes, but at the same time, Earthlink is spending millions to bring suit against spammers. Don't toss them off the truck just yet. I think they can be redeemed.

I'm 100% against BPL. Let's convince Earthlink to be the same.

Earthlink will do what is popular, legal, and profitable. The big question is: How do we let them know that what they are doing with BPL is not going to work?

I have to say that if you only post here, they won't hear your complaint. Have any of you contacted Earthlink yet about BPL? Hmmm?

73,

Dave
KZ1O

1576. Re: Attention Earthlink users: Earthlink invests another US$3.5M

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:39:04 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aI-dnUcidv45If3dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey wrote:

(pardon my quoting - db)
>>
>> Earthstink is being bought out as we speak.

>
> Seems that I'm that small fish in that food chain diagram. My ISP,
> netcom (one of the earliest subscription flat rate ISP's on the 'net)
> got swallowed by Mindspring, then that swallowed by Earthlink.
> Even with support for bpl, it's still a step above aol.... ;-)
>

A string and a tin-can is a small step below AOL.

Maybe.

1577. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuring

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 22:59:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040323175917.23171.00004776@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 89641

In article <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>>>sense.
>>
>>>>Mike,
>>>>
>>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>>>>license:
>>>>
>>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>>>>run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't
>need
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>be tested on it)
>>>
>>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>>
>>
>>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>>giving the tests are being overburdened?
>>
>> It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
>> privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?
>
> Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
>eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
>appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
>connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
>licensed contractors.

There are some folks who would like to do just that!

> I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
>it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
>privileges right out from under our feet.

Which is what those "it's just a hobby" folks are doing, whether they realize
it or not.

>
> I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
>is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
>only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
>seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.

I know exactly what you mean. However, note that for over half a century we've
had license classes with reduced power privileges and it hasn't led us down the
slippery slope.
>
>Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
>Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?

Because under certain circumstances those levels of power are inadequate.

>> However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed -
>> just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must
>> then migrate to the next-higher class of license.
>
> If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all?

It's not dangerous if proper precautions are taken.

>For
>anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
>not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
>Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
>those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
>those self destructive hams from themselves.

The point of license testing is not to protect someone from their own
ignorance, but to protect others from it.

>Just like cigarette smokers.

Cigarette smoking is much more hazardous than RF.

>And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
>of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?

Now *that's* a valid point, as verified by the Alpine tower folks...
>
>> So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the next-level
>> test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff removed.
>> Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>

> Nope.

That tells ya something.
>
>>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
>>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>>bother to upgrade?)
>>
>>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>>>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>>
>> Here's the problem:
>>
>> What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges
>> are
>> very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from
>> HF/MF.This
>> means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.
>
>> And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and
>> almost certainly with manufactured equipment.
>>
>> The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in
>> very
>> little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those
>> questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not.
>> After
>> all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained
>> an entry-level amateur license?
>>
>> Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a
>> balanced
>> mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges,
>> coupled
>> with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can
>> sample more of what ham radio has to offer.
>
> Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
>worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade.

That's you.

>In
>addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
>from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
>have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
>them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.

Maybe. But if that's so, why aren't the repeaters busy 24/7?
>
> I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
>HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
>privileges.

Well, I have to disagree. I say it's an artificial division foisted upon us by a few people who clamored for a nocodetest license as the savior of amateur radio. Hasn't happened.

>It also makes for less of a class system.

Go down that road far enough, and you'll have a one class system.

>If the Tech has
>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>there, then it's a great thing.

Seems to me that it would make more sense to offer a wider sampling.

>> For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore
>> old
>> gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
>> realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which do
>> you
>> think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?
>
>Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's.

Which is why those scenarios are not good ideas.

>I'd certainly like that myself.

Then let's go for it.
>
>> Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
>> beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?
>
>> That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're really
>> trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was
>> to
>> have a very limited license to get people started, so they could
>> learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham radio.

>>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>>
>> I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other
>> factors.
>>
>> But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let
>> everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise
>> in
>> the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once

>> and
>> for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be
>> very upset.....
>
> comments:
>
> We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!

Of course.
>
>> Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another
>> NPRM
>> cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just
>> about 4
>> years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...
>>
>>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>>accomplishment. "Class"
>>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>>
>>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>>mind! ;^)
>>
>> Very bad karma!
>>
>> Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot
>> change.
>> That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>>
>>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important
>>>>part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>>
>>> Agreed 100 percent!
>>
>> This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it
>> must be
>> opposed. No good can come of such requirements.
>
> And How!

They're open for comments now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1578. Wall Street Journal front page BPL story Tuesday 23 Mar 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:03:30 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <4060c0ad.24008625@news.individual.de>
Source record: 89642

Today's (Tuesday 23 March 2004) Wall Street Journal, Page One story
Above the fold, single column story, titled

"In This Power Play, High-Wire Act Riles Ham-Radio Fans
New Use for Lines Sparks Tension With Operators; 'Firestorm in Penn Yan.'

About 26 column inches in all, not counting head, jump page head and illo.

Analysis to follow at
http://huntforsm.cjb.net
but definite inaccuracies and unbalanced portrayal of amateur community.
Omits skip issue entirely as well as the international allocation of
frequencies and federal emergency reliance on medium and short wave bands.

Good news: They do document multiple instances of interference, even one
case where power company caught lying.

<snip>
"We haven't seen the sun darken and everything electrical turn to
white noise and haze during a deployment," says Matt Oja, an executive at
Progress Energy, whose test Mr. Powell visited. "This is a fairly vocal
group that has been whipped into a frenzy by their organization."
<snip>
To become a fully licensed ham operator, people still need to learn
Morse code, though that requirement likely will be dropped soon after more
than a decade of debate.
<snip>
Ed Thomas, the FCC's chief engineer, says the commission has spent a
year listening to the hams' concerns about power lines and is getting
frustrated. "Why is this thing a major calamity?" he says. "And honestly,
I'd love the answer to that."
<snip>
Companies such as Con Ed and Progress note that current FCC
regulations call for systems to be shut down if they interfere with hams.
The radio operators agree the rules are clear, but they fear they will be
rescinded or not enforced.

Con Ed says its system in Briarcliff Manor (poster's note: Westchester Co.,
NY) doesn't interfere with the hams and maintains that, in two years of
testing, it hasn't received one complaint. But the American Radio Relay
League says it did mention this system in its letters to the FCC, and it
has been complaining about it on its Web site.
<snip>

--
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard

Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

1579. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:28:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403231528.3ba424dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89643

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403230422.3c343ab4@posting.google.com>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3oer8$2914le$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>
> > Thanks for the info, Steve. You don't have to tell me about Leonard's
> > arrogance -- we've all had to live with it for years. "The great white
> > current chaser" and "Legend in his own mind".
>
> No problem, Arnie. Welcome back to the fray.
>
> Current Lennie/Brain practice is to make assertions they know are
> either false or area at least dubiously true

Huh?

and then call you "nuts"
> when you ask them to validate thier assertions.

No. I call you nuts when you act crazy, which is a lot.

Changing my words, putting them in quotation marks and saying they're
mine, and then asking me to validate them is a lose/lose proposition.

I cannot validate what I didn't say.

1580. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:30:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403231530.535bc243@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89644

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322152540.01530.00000190@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >ubject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 8:33 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403201833.1ecd007c@posting.google.com>
> >
> >"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> >news:<c3i4nr$28jjer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>
> > It would certainly be
> >> an improvement over what we've seen here from you in the past.
> >
> >Arn, ever see what Steve posts?
>
> You mean one of the one's wherein I ask you to provide some validation of
> assertions YOU made, Brain...?!?!
>
> Yep...pretty rough, getting your nose tweaked over your OWN mistruths, eh,
> Brain?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

No mistruth in what I said. Much mistruth in what you """quoted."""

Once and I would call it an honest mistake.

Again and again?

I call that nuts.

1581. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:34:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403231534.3f7baa61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89645

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323005459.17834.00000201@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/22/2004 9:00 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221900.326651bc@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >> >From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
> >> >Date: 3/21/2004 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
> >> >
> >> >"William" wrote in part ...
> >> >
> >> >Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
> >> >way?"
> >> >
> >> >WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
> >> >>
> >> >> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
> >> >> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
> >> >> Emergency Comms!
> >> >>
> >> >I think you are missing the point here, William.
> >>
> >> Hey Arnie...
> >
> >Anyone that puts up with your twisted """quotes""" is an enabler.
>
> Nothing I've "quoted" is twisted, Brain.
>
> That you don't like being tasked with actually PROVING what you claim is
> not my problem.
>
> Sorry about that.

Me too. I cannot validate what you claim I said because I didn't say
it.

You putting it in """quotation marks""" doesn't mean I said it.

You putting anything in quotation marks makes me very suspicious
because I've seen you try this before. Then you repeat it and repeat

it and repeat it until even you believe your own lies.

You're nuts.

1582. Re: Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:47:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403231547.35f7870@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89646

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323054643.20278.00001793@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> Thanks, Lennie. Proved my assumptions about your lack of honesty or
> character...Again.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, you need to find a truth broker and buy some.

1583. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:50:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403231550.63b464b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89647

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323053113.20278.00001792@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/16/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403160404.32bfb2c5@posting.google.com>
>
> >Hang in there while the last cold snap blows thru. Here, schools are
> >closed and we have to go downtown to refinance today - with the kids.
>
> Perhaps you will raise them to be a bit more forthcoming with facts than
> you've been?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I don't think your children fair game on the web, so try to
muster up your last ounce of courage and self-respect and leave mine
out of it.

1584. Re: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro Screwing NON ARRL members!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:52:14 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com>
Message-ID: <O448c.43183$P45.43006@fe1.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 89651

What a jerk.
If I were the buro I'd burn your cards and mail you the ashes.

You want to sue over a few dollars from a service that is free.
You must be a Democrat. LOL

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.588 / Virus Database: 372 - Release Date: 2/13/2004

1585. Re: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:53:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323185333.18008.00000264@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89648

>Subject: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!
>From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW)
>Date: 3/23/2004 4:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323171211.29922.00000244@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>If you or anyone you know, has had or has had trouble with the
>ARRL's QSL burro, Please e-mail me ASAP.
>
>I'm getting jerked around and my section manager is dodging me.
>
>I wanna send a complaint to Jim Haynie.
>
>and I need help.

Then send him a complaint and quit the anonymous cloak-and-dagger crap.

No death squad is going to appear at your door because you told the guy
you're not happy.

I've used both the incoming and out-going buro's for years, and within the
scope of thier capabilites, have done well.

Steve, K4YZ

1586. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:56:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323185641.18008.00000265@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89649

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/23/2004 5:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231528.3ba424dd@posting.google.com>

>Changing my words, putting them in quotation marks and saying they're
>mine, and then asking me to validate them is a lose/lose proposition.

So is asking you a direct question, it appears.

>I cannot validate what I didn't say.

No one expects you to, Brian, but I DO expect you to answer the question
"what "major role" do the unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms"".

Otherwise, it just appears as though you are again lying in order to dodge
taking responsibility for your own silly assertions.

Steve, K4YZ

1587. Re: NCVEC files license restructuring proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-23 23:59:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040323185907.08626.00003704@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89650

In article <hK-dnXttjJ_FlMTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <40585D40.9060807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <LMGdnUIkntDpTcrdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>>>In addition, the NCVEC proposed mandatory low
>>>>>voltage to the final transmitter amplifier stage
>>
>>>>How odd! Are the newbies going to not be allowed to use antennas like
>>>>Magloops?
>
>>>Or dipoles? Or antenna tuners? Or line-powered power supplies?
>>>
>>>>These people have it SO WRONG! Presumably thay are admitting that there
>>>>are safety issues involved, which there are. Then teach the newbies
>>>>safety, don't avoid the issue, teach them Safety!!
>
>>>There's a logical inconsistency in this requirement. The purpose of safety
>>>questions in the written test is not so much to protect an amateur from
>the
>>>consequences of his/her own ignorance as to protect *others*.
>
>>> Sure. And there is no logical argument that can convince me that safety
>>>shouldn't be practiced from the start. It doesn't have to be safety
>>>officer level, but it has to be there, and it has to be there from the
>>>start.

>> I agree 100%. Even back in my Novice days there were safety questions on
>> the test.
>>
>>>>> I find that the pussyfooting around safety, where these proposals to
>>>>limit power are made, is verging on criminal negligence.
>>>>
>>>Consider this: In most areas that I know of, a homeowner can work on
>>>his/her
>>>electrical wiring without a license or test of any kind. Same for
>>>plumbing.
>>>Just can't do it to somebody else's house as a "professional" - meaning

>>>>for money.
>>>>
>>>>So a Communicator could legally wire or re-wire his/her entire house, but
>>>>could
>>>>not legally *operate* a TS-520. Or even a solid-state rig with 48 volt
>>>>finals....because he/she might hurt themselves!
>>>
>>> That's why they shouldn't be allowed to have electrical tools! ;^)

>> HAW!
>>
>> But it just points out how ridiculous that part of the NCVEC proposal
>> really is.
>>
>> Here's two more:
>>
>> 1) Audiophiles and radio restorers build and work on all sorts of
>> high-voltage
>> electronics without any test. Why is a ham transmitter so dangerous if it
>> has
>> more than 30 volts, but not a ham receiver or a stereo amplifier?
>>
>> 2) Low voltage is no guarantee of safety. A 100 watt transceiver powered by
>> 13.8 volts will typically require 20 A or more to transmit full power. 35 A
>> and
>> 50 A supplies are common. Don't get your rig across those terminals...
>
>I know what you mean. One of my jobs in the deep past involved working
>around 5 Volt power supplies. Problem was they were many hundreds of
>amps! I couldn't wear my wedding ring or any jewelry, and they bought me
>a pair of non-conductive glasses. No metal belt buckles, etc.

But it was only 5 volts!

Or consider this setup that I was once resonsible for:

Individual lead-acid batery cells rated at 420 AH. Sixty of them in series,
with very heavy jumper straps. Oddly enough, the charger was a very small unit
that used a pair of thyratrons and put out maybe 5 amps, tops on a good day.

Getting across *one* cell was hazardous, due to the enormous short-circuit
current of the big cells and the possibility of a battery explosion from the
hydrogen. I don't want to think about the consequences of shorting the entire
bus.
>
>>>>>>and that only commercially
>>>>>>manufactured transmitters be used by Communicator Class licensees.
>>>>>
>>>>> This is illogical! What purpose would forcing an amateur to use a
>>>>>commercially built product be?
>>>>
>>>>1) To sell more commercially built products (read the "21st Century" paper

>>>>- it
>>>>talks about how we need more hams or the ham equipment manufacturers will
>>>>close
>>>>up shop).
>>>>
>>>>2) To get new hams in the habit of buying, not building
>>>>
>>>>3) To eliminate even more theory from the written test
>>>
>>> zzzzzzzzzz..... now *that* sounds like a much fun as a stick in the
>>
>> eye.
>>
>> It's what NCVEC is trying to sell. Some folks here seem to be buying it. I
>> don't.
>>
>> Some of the main Basis and Purposes of the ARS are technical education,
>> experimentation, and related stuff. Limiting *any* class of ham license to
>> manufactured gear and so many final volts directly contradicts those B&P.
>
> Agreed!

And so we must fight it tooth-and-nail.
>
>>>>>The main reason I am in Amateur radio at
>>>>>all is for the homebrewing and restoring of radio equipment.
>>>>
>>>>More to the point: How many hams do we lose each year to electrocution
>from
>>>>their transmitters? How many hams cause serious interference problems with
>>>>their home-brew or restored rigs?
>>
>>>>> I propose an addition to the proposal in which Hams of all classes must
>>>>>drink only Pepsi or Coke, whichever company donates more to the BPL
>>>>>defense fund.
>>>
>>>>The Dr. Pepper contingent will have a fit!
>>>
>>>If they provide enough money, then maybe they will be the one!
>>
>> I prefer Sprite or 7Up, myself. Better yet, a Yuengling Black & Tan or a
>> Guiness Stout.
>
> I believe that is *2* Guiness Stout's! For some reason you're supposed
>to have 2. I won't argue! Happy St Paddy's day BTW

Only 2?
>
>>>>>The communicators should also not be allowed to own a soldering iron or
>>>>>electronic tools This will keep them out of their commercially built
>>>>>transcievers, and keep them safe from booboo's that they might get from

>>>>>foolishly messing with electronics, where they might get shocked or
>>>>>something
>>>>
>>>>But they would legally be allowed to build power supplies for their
>>>>commercially built rigs....
>>>
>>> Right! we'll have to work on that! The goal is no booboo's. We have to
>>>protect the new hams from themselves. So I would amend the proposal to
>>>not allow Communicator's to use ANY voltages over 48 volts.
>
>> No power tools, no vacuum cleaners..oh wait, what about the CRT in the
>>computer
>> monitor? Or the ATX power supply in the computer! Oh the humanity!
>>
>>> Maybe they should wear aluminum foil hats too?
>>
>> Seriously, I think such rules insult those we are trying to attract.
>
>Not that we're arguing, but I'll give you Game, Set, and Match on that
>comment.
>
I think I'll use it in my comments to FCC...

>>>>>> Communicator Class licensees must pass a simple 20 question
>>>>>>multiple-choice written exam and will be required to obtain, read and
>>>>>>certify their understanding of the Part 97 rules. The VECs Question Pool
>>>>>>Committee feels that it is impossible to cover the FCC rules in what
>would
>>>>>>be a relatively few questions. The ARRL proposed 25 examination
>>questions.
>>>
>>>>> Cannot a person of even limited intelligence take a test of more than
>>>>>25 questions? I took bigger tests in grade school.
>>>>
>>>>Me too. You should see the tests they give second-graders here.
>>>
>>>>The old Novice test was originally 20 questions, then 25, then 30. Most of
>>>>the
>>>>added questions were concerned with safety and the expanded privileges.
>>>>Novices
>>>>are allowed to homebrew anything they can legally use on the air.
>>>
>>> I have always though that having more questions on a test made the test
>>
>>
>>>easier! If you have a twenty question test, you don't have to miss many
>>>to get a failing grade.
>>>
>>
>> That's one way to look at it.

>>
>>
>>>>> What this is doing is alarmingly like the citizens band radio I bought
>>>>>in I think the late 70's or early 80's. At this point, the F.C.C. was
>>>>>still lamely trying to have some kind of callsign and "rules". I "had"
>>>>>to read a little pamphlet, and assign myself a callsign by some strange
>>>>>method that I forget at the moment. Even had places for me to sign.
>
>>>>Where do you think NCVEC got the idea about the rules?
>>>
>>> But didn't learn much else. Maybe they should check the aftermath of
>>>that example.
>>
>> Maybe it's what they want!
>
> rrrgh, (twitching a bit here)

Note how there are some people here who will criticize practically everything
ARRL does, but who never have a bad word for NCVEC or Fast Fred?

>>>>> If a person can certifiy that they have read and understand part 97,
>>>>>there is no reason at all that they shouldn't just say they read a book
>>>>>about the whole process and sign for that.

>>>>BINGO!
>>>
>>> Testing would certainly be easier!
>>
>> One wonders what would be left to test!
>>
>> And here's the bottom line:
>>
>> If there is *anything* that *must* be part of testing for a ham license of
>> *any* class, it's safety and the rules and regulations. No exceptions, no
>> signed statements.
>>
>> What you are seeing is exactly what I predicted about the anticodetest
>> arguments being used against the written test.
>
> Yup! Remember, the tests cannot be simple enough for some people.

Too true. The same arguments used against the code test....

>>>>Check this out:
>>>>
>>>>From the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>>>>
>>>>NOVICE (1976)
>>>>
>>>>Study Question #31:
>>>> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following
>components:

>>>>(a) battery with internal resistance, (b) resistive load, (c) voltmeter,
>>>>(d) ammeter.
>>>>
>>>>Study Question #32:
>>>> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
>>>>the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
>>>>by the load be determined?
>>>>
>>>>Study Question #33:
>>>> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
>>>>order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
>>>>
>>>>Study Question #34:
>>>> Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>following components: (a) triode vacuum tube, (b) pi-network output tank,
>>>
>>>(c)
>>>
>>>>high voltage source, (d) plate-current meter, (e) plate-voltage meter, (f)
>>>>rf chokes, (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>>>>
>>>>Study Question #35:
>>>> What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>>>>
>>>>The actual exam was multiple choice, and would show a schematic of the
>>>>amplifier circuit - close, but not exactly like the one shown inthe
>license
>>>>manual - and had 5 of the components labelled "a" thru "e". The question
>>>
>>>would
>>>
>>>>be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf
>>>
>>>chokes?"
>>>
>>>> "what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>>>>
>>>>That was for a Novice!
>>>
>>> Good questions! And actually not all that hard.
>>
>>
>> Not for you and not for me. Even when I was a 13 year old Novice-to-be
>> those
>> questions were not "hard". Some folks here are obviously stumped by them,
>> though..
>

>>>Sounds like an enjoyable test to take.

>> Challenge is the word I'd use.
>
> I like a challenge! Some people do not. I think that one of the most
>damning things about the age that we live in is that somehow, some way,
>those who want no challenges are in their ascendancy.
>
Or standards. Remember that when you see the phrase "it's only a hobby" or
"it's just a hobby", etc. What some folks really mean by those words is don't
expect anything resembling standards, or knowledge, or skill from the person
using the phrase.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1588. Re: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:00:28 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ua48c.130320$rB4.107214@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89652

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040323185333.18008.00000264@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Subject: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!
> >From: niw2004@aol.comnojunk (NIW)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 4:12 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040323171211.29922.00000244@mb-m19.aol.com>
> >
> >If you or anyone you know, has had or has had trouble with the
> >ARRL's QSL burro, Please e-mail me ASAP.
> >
> >I'm getting jerked around and my section manager is dodging me.
> >
> >I wanna send a complaint to Jim Haynie.
> >
> >and I need help.
>
> Then send him a complaint and quit the anonymous cloak-and-dagger
crap.
>
> No death squad is going to appear at your door because you told the
guy
> you're not happy.
>
> I've used both the incoming and out-going buro's for years, and
within the
> scope of thier capabilites, have done well.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yeah, Those "Burros" do tend to be stubborn and slow!
LOL!

(burro=donkey)

Jerry (just funnin')

\
\
>
>
>
>
>
>

1589. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:05:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323190557.18008.00000268@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89653

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/23/2004 5:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231530.535bc243@posting.google.com>

>
>No mistruth in what I said. Much mistruth in what you """quoted."""
>
>Once and I would call it an honest mistake.
>
>Again and again?
>
>I call that nuts.

I see......

You didn't lie, but what I quoted, which WAS what you said, IS a
lie...?!?!

You've got some real brass cajones to make an assinine statement like
that, Brain!

I've asked you the same question over and over in response to YOUR
assertion that "unlicensed services" play a "major role" (YOUR ADJECTIVES) in
"emergency comms"...WHERE is the proof...?!?!

You can call me "nuts" if you care to. YOUR words are archived in this
forum and have been quoted verbatim on numerous occassions.

You have purposely misrepresented the truth. THAT is lying.

Sorry if you think it's "nuts" to think so. Webster refers.

Steve, K4YZ

1590. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:11:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <UtGdnVv8e5CIT_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89654

L wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
>>Dayton!
>>
>>Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
>>thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
>>
>>Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some
>>people to show up!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>
> Good Idea! You could call it a gathering of Phil & His Freaks,
> all five of you, a real Freak Show.

So you're coming too?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1591. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:12:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323191229.18008.00000269@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89655

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/23/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231534.3f7baa61@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040323005459.17834.00000201@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/22/2004 9:00 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221900.326651bc@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>...

>> >Anyone that puts up with your twisted """quotes""" is an enabler.
>>
>> Nothing I've "quoted" is twisted, Brain.
>>
>> That you don't like being tasked with actually PROVING what you claim
>is
>> not my problem.
>>
>> Sorry about that.
>
>Me too. I cannot validate what you claim I said because I didn't say
>it.

Yes, you did. You directed it to Dee, and it's been quoted verbatim at
least a dozen times in the last 5 days.

>You putting it in """quotation marks""" doesn't mean I said it.

But quoting your posts from Google does.

>You putting anything in quotation marks makes me very suspicious
>because I've seen you try this before. Then you repeat it and repeat
>it and repeat it until even you believe your own lies.

I haven't lied.

YOU stated that the unlicensed services provide a "major role" in
"emergency comms".

I asked you to prove it.

You've wallowed around for days now trying to dodge the question.

I am sorry that you can't/won't be a man and either pony up an answer or admit that you were carried away with the moment and exaggerated the alleged importance of the aforementioned "unlicensed services".

>You're nuts.

And you're a lying coward. So I guess that balances things out, huh...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1592. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:17:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323191751.18008.00000270@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89656

>Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/23/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231550.63b464b0@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I don't think your children fair game on the web, so try to
>muster up your last ounce of courage and self-respect and leave mine
>out of it.

The kids are not the issue.

Your willingness to be forthcoming with responses to questions posed to you in direct response to posts made by you is.

What "major role" in "emergency comms" do the unlicensed radio services play, Brain?

YOU said it was "major"...that's an adjective used BY YOU in response to a post exchanged with Dee.

Now...an answer...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1593. Brain's Own Words...Now Who's Lying...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:41:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403231641.606add8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89657

I did a bit of research here, Brain, and, as usual, YOUR words are
going to come back to haunt you.

Once again, Brain...Once again...

QUOTE:

Search Result 1
From: Steve Robeson, K4CAP (k4yz@aol.com)
Subject: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
View: Complete Thread (49 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 18:50:48 PST

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > >> > >
> > >> > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > >> > compliant devices?
> > >> >
> > >> Sure. Why not?

UNQUOTE

Well, Brain...There ya go. This was only four days ago. There's
more, but do I really need to rub your nose in it THAT hard?

You can follow the original URL's if you care to. Just as anyone
ELSE here who cares to figure out who's lying and who's not....

QUOTE

> > >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> > >> played a major role in emergency comms".
> > >>
> > >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> > >> services" playing a "major role".
> > >>
> > >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> > >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> > >> a meaningful, positive outcome.

> > >>
> > >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> > >> pertinent examples.
> > >>
> > >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
> > >>
> > >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

UNQUOTE

Here YOU put words in MY mouth, alledging I "acknowledged taht
mere cellphones play a major role in disaster communications".

Of course you then buffered it with "Or did you?", but the seed
wasa planted.

Nice try. Didn't work then either.

QUOTE

> > >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
> > >>
> > >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> > >> substantiate.
> > >>
> > >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> > >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
> >
> > You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single bit
> > of it...even facetiously...
> >
> > Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
> > argument and lack of cajones to do so...
> >
> > Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in disaster
> > and/or emergency communications.
> >
> > So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average calling
> > 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
> >
> > I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in disaster
> > mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
> >
> > Thanks.
>
> Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> to you.

UNQUOTE

At this point you refuse to answer the questions put to you about assertions YOU made, calling my questions "insanity" and insinuating I was being "rude and obnoxious"

Again...didn't work then, doesn't work now.

I'll finish the rest of the post I am quoting as it is in the original post (you can check the URL yourself, if you need to) since it's just as applicable today as a week ago.

Nice try getting out of this one, Putz.

QUOTE

"Tone it down a bit"...?!?!

YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major" role in emergency comms".

I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you several times.

You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.

You call ME "bizarre", yet you make outlandish assertions in a public forum, then dodge all requests to "prove", at any level, your claims.

I believe you to be a chronic liar. You have been "called" on several occassions to back up your assertions, but then use this ruse to try and avoid taking responsibility for your own actions.

Call me rude and obnoxious if you think it deflects attention from you, but I can assure you that it does nothing of the sort. If anything, childish dodges like this only highlight YOUR bizarre behaviour.

The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS, MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.

I certainly do in as much as I am INVOLVED with "emergency comms" on SEVERAL levels, not all of which involve the Amateur Radio or CAP. Most everyone else in this forum knows these things to be true too.

You and Lennie seem to be the only ones in this forum who think that if you keep repeating the same lame, untrue "stuff" that it will somehow manifest a thread of truth. Sorry...that doesn't work.

Now...PLEASE try and exceed my expectations with the next post and pony-up some cajones to either admit you are either blatantly lying, making wild guesses, or just trolling for the sake of making arguments that you obviously can't support.

Or REALLY try something new and discuss something you have some
EXPERIENCE in...THAT would be refreshing.

Steve, K4YZ

UNQUOTE

1594. Brain's Own Words...Now Who's Lying...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 00:43:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323194310.18008.00000271@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89658

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Brain's Own Words...Now Who's Lying...?!?!
NNTP-Posting-Host: 67.32.198.9
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403231641.606add8e@posting.google.com>

I did a bit of research here, Brain, and, as usual, YOUR words are
going to come back to haunt you.

Once again, Brain...Once again...

QUOTE:

Search Result 1
From: Steve Robeson, K4CAP (k4yz@aol.com)
Subject: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
View: Complete Thread (49 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-19 18:50:48 PST

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has
played
> > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > >> > > compliant devices?
> > >> >
> > >> > Sure. Why not?

UNQUOTE

Well, Brain...There ya go. This was only four days ago. There's
more, but do I really need to rub your nose in it THAT hard?

You can follow the original URL's if you care to. Just as anyone
ELSE here who cares to figure out who's lying and who's not....

QUOTE

> > >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> > >> played a major role in emergency comms".
> > >>

> > >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> > >> services" playing a "major role".
> > >>
> > >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> > >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> > >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
> > >>
> > >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> > >> pertinent examples.
> > >>
> > >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
> > >>
> > >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?

UNQUOTE

Here YOU put words in MY mouth, alledging I "acknowledged taht
mere cellphones play a major role in disaster communications".

Of course you then buffered it with "Or did you?", but the seed
wasa planted.

Nice try. Didn't work then either.

QUOTE

> > >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
> > >>
> > >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> > >> substantiate.
> > >>
> > >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> > >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
> > >
> > > You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single
bit
> > > of it...even facetiously...
> > >
> > > Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
> > > argument and lack of cajones to do so...
> > >
> > > Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in
disaster
> > > and/or emergency communications.
> > >
> > > So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average
calling
> > > 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
> > >
> > > I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in
disaster

> > mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
> >
> > Thanks.
>
> Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> to you.

UNQUOTE

At this point you refuse to answer the questions put to you about assertions YOU made, calling my questions "insanity" and insinuating I was being "rude and obnoxious"

Again...didn't work then, doesn't work now.

I'll finish the rest of the post I am quoting as it is in the original post (you can check the URL yourself, if you need to) since it's just as applicable today as a week ago.

Nice try getting out of this one, Putz.

QUOTE

"Tone it down a bit"...?!?!

YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major" role in emergency comms".

I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you several times.

You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.

You call ME "bizarre", yet you make outlandish assertions in a public forum, then dodge all requests to "prove", at any level, your claims.

I believe you to be a chronic liar. You have been "called" on several occassions to back up your assertions, but then use this ruse to try and avoid taking responsibility for your own actions.

Call me rude and obnoxious if you think it deflects attention from you, but I can assure you that it does nothing of the sort. If anything, childish dodges like this only highlight YOUR bizarre behaviour.

The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS, MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.

I certainly do in as much as I am INVOLVED with "emergency comms" on SEVERAL levels, not all of which involve the Amateur Radio or CAP. Most everyone else in this forum knows these things to be true too.

You and Lennie seem to be the only ones in this forum who think
that if you keep repeating the same lame, untrue "stuff" that it will
somehow manifest a thread of truth. Sorry...that doesn't work.

Now...PLEASE try and exceed my expectations with the next post
and pony-up some cajones to either admit you are either blatantly
lying, making wild guesses, or just trolling for the sake of making
arguments that you obviously can't support.

Or REALLY try something new and discuss something you have some
EXPERIENCE in...THAT would be refreshing.

Steve, K4YZ

UNQUOTE

1595. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 01:35:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ucCdne8YC6i0e_3dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89659

"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
news:slrnc613h4.3j9.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
> In article <wA%7c.4751$HP.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Bill Sohl
wrote:
[snip]
> >> RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
> >> Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code
> > requirement
> >> for Extras also.
> >
> > Also includes a "commercial only" transmitter rule for
> > Communicator (Novice)
> > Also includes power limit for Communicator/Novice
>
> The same power limits are defined in the ARRL proposal also. The 100/50
watt
> limits proposed are set so they would be below the RF environmental
> evaluation required levels.

The power limits make sense. Disallowing homebrew is counter to the purpose
of the ARS and should not be enacted.
However, in addition to the "commercial only" rule, the NCVEC proposal calls
for a low voltage limit, which would also keep new hams from taking
advantage of hamfest bargains on older rigs with tube finals, like the
venerable FT-101, TS-520/820, etc. This is an unnecessary impediment to new
hams getting a "starter" HF rig at affordable prices.

I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC proposal -
"communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional "novice" name, which is
recognized around the world (and has been used in other countries as well).

73,
Carl - wk3c

1596. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 01:46:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <vL58c.59882$pU1.11857406@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 89660

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:UtGdnVv8e5CIT_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>
> L wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
> >>Dayton!
> >>
> >>Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
> >>thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
> >>
> >>Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some
> >>people to show up!
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> > Good Idea! You could call it a gathering of Phil & His Freaks,
> > all five of you, a real Freak Show.
>
> So you're coming too?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Sounds kewl to me, Mike. On a slightly different vein, how about the
resurrection of the r.r.a.p net? 7037 kHz, if I remember correctly. Not a
ragchew, mind you, but just a simple weekly QNI.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1597. Re: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro Screwing NON ARRL members!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 02:44:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <wKudncZgCP_0av3dRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89661

Maybe you should join the W5 QSL burro. I haven't had an envelope on
file there for many many years, yet I recently received a QSL from an OH
station I worked September 26, *1981*. Better late than never.

1598. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:19:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89662

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
> news:slrnc613h4.3j9.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
>
>>In article <wA%7c.4751$HP.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Bill Sohl
>
> wrote:
> [snip]
>
>>>>RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
>>>>Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code
>>>
>>>requirement
>>>
>>>>for Extras also.
>>>
>>>Also includes a "commercial only" transmitter rule for
>>>Communicator (Novice)
>>>Also includes power limit for Communicator/Novice
>>
>>The same power limits are defined in the ARRL proposal also. The 100/50
>
> watt
>
>>limits proposed are set so they would be below the RF environmental
>>evaluation required levels.
>
>
> The power limits make sense.

Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
the same power privileges as the rest of us.

I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
and electrical safety is not very responsible.

The whole concept of lower power limits for the newbies just seems
punitive to me.

> Disallowing homebrew is counter to the purpose
> of the ARS and should not be enacted.

Agreed.

> However, in addition to the "commercial only" rule, the NCVEC proposal calls
> for a low voltage limit, which would also keep new hams from taking
> advantage of hamfest bargains on older rigs with tube finals, like the
> venerable FT-101, TS-520/820, etc. This is an unnecessary impediment to new
> hams getting a "starter" HF rig at affordable prices.

I very much agree with that. It is such a strange proposal, and doesn't
make much sense really. We allow our children to sit at computers with
monitors running at higher voltages.

> I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC proposal -
> "communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional "novice" name, which is
> recognized around the world (and has been used in other countries as well).

Novice is a fine name. I like it, and it has a historical precedence.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1599. Re: Lennie Steps In His Own Excrement Once Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224711.22081.00004746@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89668

In article <20040323054643.20278.00001793@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Almost three weeks ago Lennie accused me of "cribbing (his) phrases and >words" in order to "claim them as (my) own"...
>
> I asked him to provide some examples.
>
> None were forthcoming.
>
> Thanks, Lennie. Proved my assumptions about your lack of honesty or >character...Again.

Google is the archive. It is all there.

Nowhere here or on Google is the Where and When of your supposed "hostile actions" in the U.S. military.

Get some mental health counseling. Or counselling. It will help you.

LHA / WMD

1600. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224712.22081.00004747@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89665

In article <40605210.6070406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Maybe I should write up and add my ides to the mix.

Just copy what the ARRL says. :-)

Meanwhile, NPRM 04-29 is alive and open for Comments. The
HF to low-VHF noise from Access BPL may make ALL low-signal
reception impossible, affecting both coders and no-coders.

Think of THAT idea.

LHA / WMD

1601. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224712.22081.00004748@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89679

In article <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>How many petitions does that make altogether.

Three currently. The other 14 are way past their Comment ending date.

3 + 14 = 17 for 2003 to 2004.

>Don't these people realize
>that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process?

Why do you argue against the ARRL? That is the home of your Church of St. Hiram. Have you been excommunicated?

Why do you argue with the NCVEC? Do you think you will never again be examined for your amateur radio license?

>It demonstrates a
>lack of consensus in the ham community, which could cause the FCC to do
>exactly nothing.

There *is* a lack of consensus. Don't try to hide it. You can't "plonk" that no matter how you try. Accept it and work with it. Denial is wrong.

You can't keep holding to the standards and practices of the 1930s in amateur radio forever. The FCC knows that.

Morse code testing WILL be eliminated. Entirely. It's only a matter of time. Accept the inevitable. Not even the ARRL can change that.

LHA / WMD

1602. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224713.22081.00004750@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89669

In article <20040322152005.01530.00000189@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> And I don't remember saying how big Part 97 is, Brain...I said what
>Lennie doesn't know about it could fill libraries.

...and infinite number of infinitely large libraries.

> Try to get THAT straigt too, Putz.

Try to remember that the word "straight" has an H in it and that the verb transitive form of "counsel" has either one or two Ls in it, choice optional.

GET some mental health counsel. Any number of Ls. That will cure you of your personal Ls your mind lives in...

LHA / WMD

1603. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224713.22081.00004749@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89670

In article <1e4e3692.0403221912.3fd2dddc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Steve, tell us again how big Part 97 is. I need a good laugh.
>>
>> It's about the size of an Archie comic book. Not as big as a
>> regular edition of Reader's Digest. Familiar territory for the
>> gunnery nurse? :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Let's give Quixoterobeson the benefit of a doubt and go with the Large
>Print edition of Reader's Digest.

Plus a gift subscription to Psychology Today magazine? :-)

He won't go to counseling (or even couselling) so maybe that
will bring some to him.

LHA / WMD

1604. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224714.22081.00004751@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89682

In article <20040322151601.01530.00000188@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/20/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
>>himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
>>post a retraction of his statement above?
>
> There's nothing to retract, Brain.

Okay, leave your landing gear down...you aren't paying for the aviation gasoline, are you? :-)

> I have no doubt Lennie can recite the words, inside-out even.

I don't - and never did - memorize the entirety of all five volumes of Title 47 C.F.R. That's why they are on the bookshelf for reference. That's why I have the bookmark for the FCC website on the PC...to check revisions from last issuance, if any.

> But it's just like learning songs in grade school in other
>languages...You sing the song, but what did you just say?

Only for seven-year-old Extras still in public school...and fortysomething Extras who haven't been to a school in years and think their memorizing of QST ads is "knowing all about ham radio equipment." :-)

> Lennie's already demonstrated that he knows the words, but doesn't
>understand what he's reading.

Sorry, sweatbreath, but I'm not going to give in to your weird idea that your ham radio is "different" in your imaginary universe.

Try not to lie so much. It looks unbecoming on-screen.

>>I find it interesting that Steve, having supposedly served in seven
>>hostile actions, never served in a unit with a single KIA, present or
>>past.
>
> Oh, but I have. I never said that I didn't

Where and when? You've never given any details whatsoever.

> Thier sacrifices were thiers to make, and it is upon them that the
>respect and dignity should be appreciated.

"Their." Remember also that the verb transitive of "counsel" can
have either one or two Ls in it.

> Scumbag Extrodinaire Leonard H. Anderson thinks it's OK to somehow "use"
>someone else's sacrifices to make himself look good.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...more personal insults.

Such "use" wasn't done. I honor the servicemen of the 8235th Army
Unit as well as all servicemembers of the United States Army.

I was assigned to that Signal Battalion and so were 23 others who
were killed in the line of duty. I was billeted in Hardy Barracks,
named for one of those killed, Corporal Elmer Hardy. I lived in what
was named Camp Tomlinson, the entire site of the FEC Sig Svc Bn
transmitter site for Army station ADA. Tomlinson was a lieutenant
in the same Signal group of 20 that died in the crash of a C-54 on
1 Jul 50 in Korea. I am proud to have served in that Battalion and
continue to be, even of the 78th Signal Battalion in Camp Zama,
Japan, the descendant of the original 71st Signal Service Battalion
formed in 1945. I am proud to have been interviewed by the Pacific
Stars and Stripes service newspaper for a memorial issue containing
a two-page article on Hardy Barracks of a half century ago.

None of that is fictional. I was there, in that HF communications
unit, in that signal battalion. I know the dates, I know where, I am
proud to say where I was and what I did. No fiction necessary.

> If you somehow find it "OK" for him to do that, it makes YOU a scumbag
>too.

I will remember your words next time I visit a veterans' cemetary
for services honoring the veterans who never finished their tour of
duty. I'll tell all around me that Steve Robeson, supposedly another
veteran of the U.S. military calls me and all of them "scumbags."

You are really one sicko. Get help.

LHA / WMD

1605. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224715.22081.00004752@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89663

In article <20040322150141.01530.00000186@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>What do posts like this say about you?
>>
>>Three words come to mind: Rude, Obnoxious, Nuts.
>
> Sure beats "Liar", "Antagonist", and "Surrogate"

All six apply to you...

LHA / WMD

1606. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224715.22081.00004753@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89674

In article <20040322084955.20899.00000138@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>What idiot would even think such a thing?
>
> Good question. Probably the same kind of idiot that makes wierd
>assertions like " You just can't accept that unlicensed radio services have a
>MAJOR ROLE in emergency comms" and then won't back it up with some sort of
>validation, even after being asked that question directly several days in a
>row.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...YOU haven't yet justifed, validated, or stamped approved anything outside of Newington that proves amateur radio "played a MAJOR ROLE in emergency communications."

Lots of implicitness, inuendo, and selective editing from a single source, but you seem satisfied in your "loathing."

When off-duty (not in a uniform), do you wear "loathfers" on your feet? Have you ever visited "West Loathian?" Slice a "loath" of bread? :-)

Get some counseling (or counselling) and a new dictionary. We will all be helped, you included.

LHA / WMD

1607. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224716.22081.00004755@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89667

In article <20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and
>radios on...No cellphone necessary.

What are the names of those two people?

LHA / WMD

1608. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89673

In article <20040323003817.17834.00000194@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>I have shown you to be that which you loathe.
>>
>>Self-hatred is an unhealthy thing. Think about counseling.
>
> It's "counselling", Brain, and what I loathe are people like you and
>Lennie.

Then wave your arms around, invoke the magic incantation, and
the world will be remade entirely to your desires.

Your imaginary world will be even better than you dreamed!

Meanwhile, back in REALITY, you will find that Webster's New
World Compact School and Office Dictionary allows the spelling
of the verb transitive form of "counsel" to be either 'counselling'
or 'counseling.' One or two Ls.

Either way, try to get some...mental health counsel.

You and the rest of us will be aided by such.

Go waste someone else's time if you don't.

LHA / WMD

1609. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224717.22081.00004757@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89664

In article <KeKdnb-5-bGINMLdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>They are not going to rely on that cell phone for their major comms
>during an emergency. The cell network is not included in disaster plans
>as a viable means for emergency comms during a major disaster by the
>military and civil emergency authorities, ham radio is.

When amateurs are needed in a real emergency, will you be
called via 411 instead of 911? :-)

LHA / WMD

1610. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224717.22081.00004756@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89666

In article <20040322235431.17834.00000188@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Unlike Lennie, the "embellishments" are my own. I don't need to stand >on anyone's grave.

You embellish enough to embarrass. Naughty, naughty.

You are only standing on your own grave when you relish all that embellish. Get help.

LHA / WMD

1611. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224718.22081.00004758@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89678

In article <1e4e3692.0403221609.746707e3@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Trying to embellish one's own personal "achivements" (or lack thereof)
>> based upon someone else's sacrifices is absolutely callous and cruel.
>
>Yet you do everything possible to get back into some kind, any kind, of
>uniform.
>
>Why?
>
>Do you think that it will embellish one's own personal achievements?

We are waiting for details on those "hostile actions" such as
when and where the gunnery nurse was "in" those. :-)

He spends an afternoon in another TN city and now becomes an
experienced emergency expert knowing everything and anything
about emergency communications, "proving" that all those who
disagree with him are "wrong." :-)

He wastes everyone's time waving around that roll of Soldier of
Fortune, Guns and Ammo, Flying magazines wrapped around
a QST core. He ought to read "Geek Boy Times" published by
the USMC. :-)

LHA / WMD

1612. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224719.22081.00004759@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89684

In article <20040322104926.20899.00000157@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>In article <ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ
>><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>>writes:
>
>>>Sure they do, but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
>>>pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
>>>the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.
>>
>> Not always true.
>>
>> You want to select the 11 September 2001 Attack on America as
>> a typical emergency but that was a very UNtypical emergency
>> that no one could foresee or plan for. In the "9/11" incident ALL
>> methods of communications were strained.
>
> A point we can agree on.

That isn't up for any discussion.

>> There are NO verifiable stories about amateur radio doing anything
>> to aid anyone in the first few hours of the Attack in New York City
>> on 11 Sep 01. Conversely, even though the NYC Emergency
>> Center was almost destroyed in that Attack, police and fire
>> department personnel were in constant communications before and
>> immediately after the Attack in and around the World Trade Center.
>> Add to that the medical people, NYC officials, and various utilities
>> and other businesses who got into immediate action. All of that is
>> quite well documented in many and various media outside of
>> hobby groups.
>
> Now THAT we CAN'T.
>
> There have already been a half dozen recriminating "inquests" as to why
>various communications failures occured with FDNY, NYPD, PAPF, EMS and othr
>agencies.

Exactly who was "recriminated?" There were investigations, yes, but
"inquests" also?

Recrimination is the act answering an accuser by accusing them
in return. That is what you do to others in here. Who and where
were the agencies doing this "recrimination?"

An inquest is specifically a judicial inquiry, as before a jury. Which agency appeared at any inquest and at what time? What was the ruling?

> THAT has been reported in "USA Today" and other nationwide media
>sources.

I don't read USA Today, only the Los Angeles and New York Times, Time magazine, Newsweek, and sometimes the Wall Street Journal and Variety. I don't recall the "inquests" or "recriminations" you allege. Please supply details on specifics.

> And almost every plan from the Department of Defense on down to "Podunk
>Hollow USA" have some provision for including (or at least considering)
>implementing Amateur Radio as a recourse.

As a secondary, not a primary use.

The Auxilliary Communications Service of the state of California accepts volunteers with or without amateur license and doesn't even consider amateur radio as a primary fall-back medium for large-scale emergencies.

>> A case in point is the "other" "9/11" Attack on the Pentagon in
>> DC....(Snip to....)
>> After crash fire control and search and rescue was coordinated by on-
>> site military and civilian communications, not by amateur radio.
>
> Lennie...why do you keep trying to make a point of this?
>
> No one here has even remotely suggested that it was otherwise.

YOU have.

>> There are no viable
>> reports of amateur radio being used while that most definite
>> emergency situation was happening. (In reference to the 4th
>> hijacking...SR)

"SR?" That wasn't in my post. Why are you adding things?

> However Amateur Radio WAS employed in the post-incident recovery at the
>site.

In WHAT NTSB "recovery?" The NTSB has its own investigators and recovery procedures, such procedures limited to hired salvage operators and military personnel.

Describe this "post-incident recovery" and tell us what the NTSB has documented and where we might find all that for reference.

>> The "9/11" Attack is popular to espouse because of the enormous
>> emotional impact to all Americans. But, it was an ATTACK done
>> by other humans against all of us and definitely NOT some kind of
>> natural event emergency or disaster. The "kamikazi" nature of

>> this suicide attack was NOT anticipated by anyone and all were
>> in surprise and all had to work through the immediate aftermath
>> with whatever reseources were available.
>
> Oh...so as long as the causal effect was "intentional", then we can
>discount using Amateur Radio to receover from teh post incident effects,
>Lennie...?!?!

No...because the amateur radio assistance was quite small
compared to the overall task of recovery, including the assistance
of other volunteer groups who aided the city of New York.

The National Transportation and Safety Board does not "train
radio amateurs" to recover crash evidence. Try not to falsify your
exaggerations by spouting lies and assorted untruths.

LHA / WMD

1613. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224722.22081.00004760@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89688

In article <20040322103623.20899.00000156@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> In the WTC Attack during 11 Sep 01, the NYC Emergency
>> Communications Center (in an adjacent building) was largely
>> destroyed by falling debris, also severing many trunk lines
>> of the telephone system. NYC police and fire units did work-
>> arounds using their own radios in a relay system to several
>> centrals, calling in other agencies as well as special units to
>> help. Some cell phone service did work, regardless of myth to
>> the contrary and some wired phone service still worked, used
>> by almost anyone on the WTC Attack scene. Amateur radio
>> did not play any significant part (if any at all) during the few
>> hours after the Attack on the WTC.
>
> However Amateur Radio DID play a "major role" in the following DAYS of
>post-incident recovery.

Incorrect. NOT a "major role." NYC handled its own debris removal from the crash site plus coordination of search teams looking for victims with the aid of other cities' search teams and facilities. Identification of victims, both found and not found, was handled by other volunteer groups. Local medical facilities set up their temporary aid stations and were able to communicate adequately with their own resources. Local volunteers set up all sorts of aid for crash site workers in the way of some food and some clothing (little was needed). All that was documented on the news media.

Had amateur radio been such a "major" role-player in the recovery, the news media would have featured them. Network news did not to other parts of the country.

The U.S. government and Washington, DC, government handled the relatively small (compared to WTC towers) Pentagon crash site adequately with their own resources. Again, that was featured on the news media. Again, network news did not pick up on any "major" aid by amateur radio in/around the Pentagon.

Yes, amateur radio HELPED with more incidental messaging from the NYC and Washington crash sites, as indicated by ARRL "news reports" but not to any extent that could possibly be called "major."

> Not even the most 'diehard' Amateur Radio supporter suggests that Amateur
>Radio is the "primary" source of emergency communications unless a ham just
>happens to be "in the middle" of it and uses a radio to "call it in".

Then you should stop with the implication that it is so important.

> That HAS happened and CONTINUES to happen on a fairly regular basis.,
>especially wilderness areas that have more trees than cellsites.

Not yet. Three years ago in the state of Washington, a stranded climbing team on Mount Ranier were alerted by a call for help heard by a young teen age girl using an FRS handset. The team was rescued and the details made public in northwestern states' newspapers and broadcasting. [there were neither trees nor cell sites in that area of Mt. Ranier]

There are many and varied forms of radio available to the public that don't require amateur radio licenses or equipment. For example, there are approximately 170 thousand communications radios in and on the railroads (source: NTIA report of 2002). The railroads frequently traverse land having neither trees nor cell sites. You take no notice of (but do pejorate) CB mobile radios that number in excess of a million in use on major road routes, are used daily around the clock by truck shipping ON the allocated legal CB channels.

>>>Which one, I have several, what are the odds they are all down at the
>>>same time? How many cell phones do you have?
>>
>> Since neither you nor your equipment is identified and we don't
>> know the working status of your "several" radios, the above is
>> just a brag claim of no intrinsic value.
>
> Just as are YOUR numerous claims of having some sort of "monitoring
>station" set up at home. Beyond a cordless telephone, TV, and TV remote, I
>seriously doubt you to have anything capable of converting RF to AF.

I've never claimed any "monitoring station" at either home.

I have HF and VHF receivers (four in all) which are largely disused in "monitoring" U.S. ham bands. Nothing much of interest to me there. Only the little Icom R-70 is used for anything, largely for occasional SW BC listening and WWV-WWVH time checking of the two WWVB radio clocks. The old Regency civil airways receiver, useful only for local aviation communications, is in the inside workshop but may expire from accumulated dust loading, not from use. There is now a very narrowband 60 KHz receiver which is part of a very accurate frequency standard system (goal of 1 PPB accuracy) with a home-made shielded loop antenna but its bandwidth is only about 20 Hz and quite unsuitable for "AF." My wife and I carry a cellular handset in the car for any emergencies as well as car-to-home calls (used twice for troubles, once by a car battery failure and once to aid another motorist, both calling the AAA). The cordless telephone down south is at 2.4 GHz, the one up north is at 900 MHz. We have AM/FM BC receivers for entertainment purposes at both houses as well as television receivers (digital service by cable in the south, analog service by cable in the north).

None of that is what anyone could call any sort of "monitoring"
use. All is for casual entertainment purposes, except the cell
phone carried in the car not yet used for any "real emergency."
The little old Icom R-70 serves as an HF-range spectrum
analyzer surrogate for occasional electronics work (it has been
measured-calibrated additionally for that). The people I some-
times work for and work with have TRUE monitoring facilities
but I seldom avail myself of anything like that other than the work
necessity monitoring (none of it involving ham bands except
where amateur radio is secondary in allocated use).

> I am far more likely to accept JJ's claims than yours. Especially since
>I've enver seen him post anything that can be called anything even close to
>untrue.

"JJ" has "enver" been identified. His claims are not referencible as
either true or untrue. You would "identify" with anyone anonymous
in a vague attempt at "getting even" with an "opponent" in this
newsgroup...and have.

> YOU, on the otherhand, are a bit on the "prolific" side of
>mistruthful.......

Incorrect again. I've given references for corroboration of what I've
said. Continued insistance that what I write about factual data
as "untrue" is wrong.

>>>As far as using the cell network for official emergency comms, you can
>>>consider it not working. In times of a major emergency it becomes
>>>useless for anything but attempting to make a call.
>>
>> That is a popular myth but it remains only a myth.
>
> It is not a myth. It has happened.

As an absolute statement it is a myth. Except for physical damage
(as reported by Jim Hampton on a "police repeater" in NY state as
an example), the "failure" of any part of the telephone system is due
to too many subscribers accessing the system at once. When the
access overload ceases, the telephone system automatically
returns to normal.

> Anything that HAS occured is NOT a myth.

I am still waiting for aliens to arrive from outer space so that morse
code can be used to defeat them.

I am still waiting for amateurs to prove that CW can get through
when Access BPL noise is 40 db above a received CW signal.

I am still waiting for your proof that amateur radio has played a
"major role" in any real large-scale emergency in the United
States in the last half century.

>> The cellular telephone network is part of the telephone infrastructure
>> and is intimately connected with the local exchange's switching unit.
>> That switching unit is designed to handle only a fraction of installed
>> numbers, both wireline and cell phone. But the switch itself is also
>> backed up by battery supplies "riding on" the primary power; also
>> true for cell sites themselves.
>
> And for those cellsites that were in the path of an oncoming tornado?
>Where is all that electrical energy going to, Lennie...???

To power up the gassing that all the amateur radio locations in the
same path will miraculously survive the same tornado (or hurricane
or firestorm or flood or prolonged snowfall).

>> During any sudden event there WILL be a flurry of telephone calls
>> made and that MAY overtax the limited number-handling capability
>> of the switch. ...(SNIP)
>
> There HAVE been and HAS overtaxed...

So, how has your vaunted amateur radio saved that? Or aided
that? Or supplanted that?

The minimum-access-number design of all telephone systems has
been known for as long as automatic switching has been used
there. That time is over a half century.

The access overload clears itself automatically once the number
of subscribers accessing it is reduced. Nothing was "damaged"
or "failed." That's designed into the system and was so from Day
One.

During any sudden emergency event in the last half century in
the United States, there is no record of amateur radio
communications notifying anyone. Radio amateurs have, indeed,
helped in many instances for POST-onset communications; they
are on record as having helped in small emergency situations
such as piracy and wounding on the open sea happening on a
private water vessel.

>> The onset of the 11 Sep 01 Attack by four hijacked airliners was not
>> only sudden but unprecedented, without any possible warning. The
>> subsequent crash of two airliners into the WTC towers did destroy a
>> portion of the lower Manhattan telephone system wiring but did NOT
>> destroy or disable the entire Manhattan telephone infrastructure.
>
> Just a signifcant part of the commercial wireless network and an entire
>OES center...Ya know...the SMALL stuff...

The operations center for NYC, not all the emergency facilities. NYC
has alternates. Damage was to lower Manhattan borough telephone
trunk lines, not the entirety of Manhattan and certainly not to Queens,
Staten Island, Brooklyn, Long Island, etc. The NYC general vicinity
is densely populated.

Just the same the NYC infrastructure continued to operate with work-arounds, alternates, summoning more police, more firemen, equipment to clear and remove many tons of debris, getting additional help from elsewhere, all using undamaged communications.

>> The onset of a fire storm, typically in dry open country, is not sudden
>> and may take literal days from ignition start to reaching fire storm
>> conditions. There is plenty of warning time using conventional
>> communications means to begin fighting that.
>
> Then why, if it's so "gradual" in evolution, does the CDF still employ
>Amateurs to help them out..?!?!

It's largely political reasons in many areas of the USA but it may sometimes be necessary for economic reasons. I don't know the budget details for the California Department of Forestry (CDF) but they DO have their own radios and radio equipment and they DO have volunteers in some lookout stations but those volunteers do NOT have to be licensed radio amateurs.

If amateurs are "employed" by anyone for their amateur radio communications activity, that is a distinct violation of federal law. Amateurs are quite allowed to work for communications facilities but they cannot use amateur radio bands for that purpose.

> (For everyone else, "CDF" is the California Department of
Forestry...since
>Lennie likes to brag on how avante garde Kalifonication is, I always like to
>feed it back to him when the opportunity arises!)

Research your French terms. Wrong use of "avante garde." Wrong spelling of "Kalifonication." If you do not know French and cannot spell, try to write English better.

> Two major points:
>
> NOAA, despite tons and tons of technology, STILL depends on hundreds of
>Amateur Radio volunteers in it's SKYWARN program to provide real-time reports
>to it's centers...To the point of spending a LOT of money to train Amateur
>volunteers and to deploy facilities cap[able of communicating with them, both
>on HF, V/UHF, and digital modes.

Define "LOT." Reference what you say by the actual, specialized-activity dollar amounts to the overall NOAA budget allowance. Describe the actual training and equipment NOAA "gives" to amateur volunteers (but not to non-amateur-radio volunteers). Are the only volunteers in "SKYWARN" just radio amateurs?

What are these "deployed facilities" to amateurs? Are those "deployed" to other volunteers?

Does NOAA reject input from existing public safety units or average citizens? Has their weather satellite system been modified or taken away such that NOAA can only find and track

hurricanes but not tornados?

>> There is no reported evidence of amateur radio ever stopping an
>> earthquake, hurricane, tornado, flood, storm, or aircraft hijacking.
>
> No, there's not.

At least that response is rational. :-)

> However there ARE tons of articles on how Amateur Radio has been
>part-and-parcel of the recovery phases of ALL of those various senarios...

...and all seemingly written by only the ARRL. Interesting. :-)

Where is Point Two of your "explanation?" It is missing.

You still haven't identified the location or date of those "hostile actions"
(seven?) you were in while in the U.S. military. Were those also
written up by the ARRL? Or in your daydreaming?

LHA / WMD

1614. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224723.22081.00004761@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89676

In article <20040322101424.20899.00000155@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> It just eats away at Lennie and Brain's rants that those plans include >Amateur Radio to the degree that they do. No problem...Just makes them look >that much more foolish.

Not at all. Both Brian and I have explained what is actually used in emergency communications and by what means.

The "degree to which amateur radio is used" is a secondary role, one of several fall-back methods to use in case of loss of one or more of the primaries. The primary method is use of existing infrastructure and public safety services' communications already in existance.

What is "foolish" is all the preening and posturing about your self-defined "importance in emergencies" from having been granted a license in what is basically an avocational radio activity, a hobby.

I would suggest a check of your vision. You have lost perspective in viewing amateur radio in the very large picture of other radio services. You are exhibiting mental tunnel vision. Not good for you.

LHA / WMD

1615. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224725.22081.00004762@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89689

In article <20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
>
>>> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
>>> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>>>
>>> Where did I speak of the average citizen?
>>
>>That's who I've been speaking of all along. Do try to keep up.
>
> JJ...please take CAREEFUL note.
>
> YOU were talking about disaster preparedness, those sets of plans in
>place by your local or state EMA, FEMA, etc. And in the overall scheme
> of things, you (and I) are correct.

Brian is correct. You are not.

The scope of operations by the larger emergency agencies in the
United States are available for viewing on the Internet.

> Brain, on the other hand, having been UNABLE to successfully argue
against
>the value of Amateur Radio in those plans, has shifted his definition of
>"emergency comms" to those of STRICTLY "the average citizen".

Again incorrect. Brian Burke has stated the obvious condition of
emergency situations which affect ALL citizens, "average" to
the self-posturing, self-important minority who think only they are
right and "superior" to the average.

> In the very narrow slice of "emergency comms" that Brian the Brainless
has
>wedged himself into, yes, John Q Public is going to whip out the old cellphone
>and call 9-1-1 to get a cop, report a fire, or request EMS for an accident or
>medical emergency...Just like he would have dialed a payphone 5 years ago.

That is more like "dialing a 'payphone' [sic] 25 years ago."

Try to keep up with urban conditions and the number of pay telephones
versus cellular handsets and subscriptions for same.

There is NO "Brian the Brainless" in here. Try to hold down the
insulting behavior.

The 911 Emergency Number plan has been in existance for far more
that "5 years." It is a national plan. It was implemented primarily
to handle the small-scale emergencies common everywhere in this
United States. Such calls are the majority of situations, not "a
very narrow slice" as you incorrectly state.

> In a true "disaster preparedness" mode, cellphones may suffer all of the
>bad things that you and I have said they will.

Incorrect again. In a "true disaster" SITUATION (not a 'mode') the
telephone system may be overloaded. However, the same thing
may be said of all amateur radio in that same situation. Hypothetical
situations are merely hypothetical, not real things.

Hypotheses should reflect on objective consideration of the entire
situation and its infrastructure. Hypotheses should not be subjective
conjecture based on personal desires, thoughts or preferences. You
are guilty of subjective conjecture in your disordered hypothesis.

> THAT assertion is made upon the evidence that such incidents have ALREADY
>HAPPENED, and those occurences have been sufficient to impress the REAL
>"emergency comms" planners to continue to incorporate Amateur Radio in a wide
>range of plans.

The "real emergency communications planners" are no doubt very
well aware that the telephone system can become overloaded with
callers at the onset of any large emergency. However, such
overloads affect only the switch capabilities of most subscribers,
not the users of leased lines which do not route through switches
(broadcast stations' audio, fire department station alert circuits).

Large-scale emergencies do not require "notification" of an event's
occurrance in most cases. An earthquake is most definitely felt
over a large geographical area. A tall skyscraper pair hit by
hijacked airliners is visible to tens of thousands of city dwellers.
A raging firestorm creates enough smoke to be seen to the
visible horizon. A hurricane or tornado is preceded by spectacular
(and unfortunately familiar to long-time dwellers) cloud conditions;
some tornados and nearly all hurricanes are spotted by weather
satellites and tracked, with public notifications, by NOAA. Floods
are nearly all preceded by high rainfall storms. Such "real"
emergency conditions may result in destruction of amateur radio
capabilities as well as commercial or government communiations.

Reiterating from another thread, the major emergency agencies all
have websites for easy access to their organization and policy.
Information from them is public and accessible on request.

Is there some agency that has amateur radio as a prime method
of emergency communications by any emergency agency in the
United States? I think not. Plans and policies of the "real"

emergency agencies will place amateur radio as a secondary,
or fall-back method of communications. First choice is the
existing public safety agency communications and
communications service providers such as telephone companies.

> This is not "urban legend" or based upon some " feel good news release of
>the ARRL" as Lennie the Loser would have us believe. Real, front-page news
>stuff. Sorry he won't admit it, but that only helps to substantiate MY claims
>about his "superior intellect".

Personal pejoratives against another do not win your argument.

The information about "real" emergency agencies is out there for
all to see. If all you can see is what you want to see, then you
can only be accused of narrow mental tunnel vision.

>>> So they may, but in times of emergency, the military and other civil
>>> authorites will not rely on cell phones to handle major emergency
>>> communications.
>>
>>And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?

>>I am no longer an instrument of national policy. Are you?
>
> As long as my Right to Vote has not been revoked, you're danged tooting
>I am!

Brian used the term "instrument of national policy" as a euphemism
for military service. In this case he indicated he was no longer IN
the military service.

Voting Rights are guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and are NOT
restricted to military service personnel. Review Amendments 15, 17,
19, 24, and 26 to see Voting Rights for United States citizens.

If you have been discharged from military service in the United States
then you are no longer in that military service.

> Try again, blockhead.

I am a veteran of U.S. Army service, 1952 to 1960. My Honorable
Discharge was granted in April, 1960. I have always been a citizen
of the United States and have managed to vote in every election
in my residence location since 1956. Regardless, you tried to
prevent my communications with my government over federal law
pending on 25 January 1999 (see FCC ECFS 98-143 for that date).

You cannot deny the above since your attempt is public information
and available for all to see.

Why do you assume "power" that you do not have?

Why do you continue to post petty personal pejoratives against
those who disagree with you?

Seek mental health therapy. It will improve your thinking and be
better for all of us.

LHA / WMD

1616. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224726.22081.00004764@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89671

In article <20040322094420.20899.00000144@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/20/2004 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
>>
>
>>Because all emergencies are Huge!
>
> They are if they are happening to you.

Please discontinue mirroring what I wrote in here previously as your own words.

LHA / WMD

1617. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224726.22081.00004763@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89681

In article <20040322094943.20899.00000146@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/20/2004 4:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040320175906.21955.00001082@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>>>> Because in a major disaster calling for emergency comms, the cell
>>>> network will be, far all practical purposes, useless.
>>>
>>>You have only one size of emergency: Huge!
>>>
>>>That's laughable.
>>
>> It may be all he has that is huge...
>
> Ahhhhh, yes...Lennie fires an opening volley of "personal perjorative",
>the nature of which had certain underlying innuendo that he-himself has
>decried others using in numerous past posts.

Do you interpret the quoted sentence as "personal pejorative?"

What am I writing about that is "huge?" Your erected antenna?
Your powerful rig? Or just your imagination?

None of us can know your thought processes occuring your
reading of general subjects. If you put a personal interpretation
on something and become offended by it, then the only person
hurt is your own ego in conflict with your own thought processes.

>>> In addition to the communication ability of military and
>>>> civil services, they will rely on Amateur Radio if it is needed,
>>>
>>>So Amateur Radio isn't their first choice? How sad.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...another Legend of the Airwaves down in flames.
>
> It wasn't a legend to start with.

That's true. It is a myth, but the myth has become legion, not
legend.

Amateur radio is NOT the first choice for radio communications
during the onset and immediate aftermath of emergency situations.
The first choice is the existing infrastructure. In nearly all

communities that is the public safety agencies equipped with
Public Safety Radio Service radios.

The above statement is qualified by the history of the last half
century documented by news services and historians. The myth
was created by selective editing of certain historical events'
information by organizations for their organizational use.

> The "legend" status was bestowed by you. The rest is archived history.
>
> Obviously one that is sufficiently true enough for CURRENT emergency
>planners to continue to rely upon.

Amateur radio is useful AS an emergency communications medium
but emergency agencies relegate it to a secondary level, an option.
Primary choice is the existing infrastructure of Public Safety Radio
Service users as well as landline communications providers, utility
and private business companies having radio equipment...and, if in
a region, military bases and installations who have extensive,
flexible-mode communications equipment.

Trying to imply that amateur radio is the prime selection for any
emergency communications is self-deceptive, self-defined
posturing, regardless of the number of afternoons spent visiting
some distant emergency site undergoing a drill.

LHA / WMD

1618. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224728.22081.00004765@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89680

In article <20040322085816.20899.00000139@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/19/2004 6:21 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191621.78d5d75a@posting.google.com>
>>
>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>news:<VYudnRybY8Xbr8bdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>>> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>>
>>> > But NOT for the types of communications that were supported by
>>Amateur
>>> > Radio...that's the PURPOSE of Amateur Radio...to relieve those other
>>services
>>> > of having to worry about that.
>>>
>>> Lets see if in the next emergency when another service is needed to
>>> relieve other services, which the emergency officials call on first for
>>> relief, lenny and witless william with their gameboy cell phones, or ham
>>> radio.
>>> Try as they may to discredit ham radio's usefullness in such times, the
>>> military and civil authorities consider ham radio to be viable means of
>>> communications in emergencies, but not the cell network.
>>
>>JayJay, I happen to be an amateur. I have equipment. I have been
>>trained.
>
> You are licensed. The FCC says so.

But only within the specific limitations of a radio service requiring
that particular license.

In REAL emergencies there is no need for operators to have a
license. Ask the FCC. They put it in Title 47 C.F.R.

> You may have equipment. Anyone can buy it.

Even I can (and have)! :-) What is your point on that sentence?

> From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any
training
>you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".

Is spending an afternoon in another city for a "drill" considered
adequate "training?" :-)

>>I am available should the need arise.
>
> I will go to bed comforted tonight knowing you're out there, Brain.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still wanting to reply to answers with snarly
personal commentary?

>>I do not discredit amateur radio's usefulness in such times.
>
> That is not the truth. You've made grossly disparaging remarks in this
>forum on several occassions.

Incorrect. Google has it all.

>>Yet you greatly discredit the impact that cellular telephones have
>>made on emergency communications.
>
> The point remains: The "emergency agencies" continue to make plans for
>the use of Amateur Radio to help provide communication needs in the advent of
>loss of regular telephony services...Not to use telephony if Amateur Radio
>fails.

Where is it written anywhere that everyone "not use telephony if
amateur radio fails?" That is something you manufactured. :-)

The FIRST radio communications during the onset of any emergency
will be the existing infrastructure of public safety agencies and
communications service providers. That has been so for the last
half century in the United States, including the 11 Sep 01 Attack on
America. By all the news sources and historians...except those
few sources who wish to selectively edit such history to suit their
particular purpose.

Note: "Telephony" is a very general term referring to voice
communication over a relatively long distance. To be specific and
understandable it needs a definite preceding word such as in
"radio telephony" or "wireline telephony." Try not to be just phony.

While amateur radio exists and can be useful, actual emergency
communications services relegate amateur radio communications
as a secondary, fall-back medium. In general, based on the history
of all real emergencies in the United States of the past half
century, such amateur radio use has been of the "health and
welfare" variety, indirectly of value only to survivors of some
emergency.

Amateur radio is not per se qualified or trained as an emergency
communications service as a whole. That it "can" be used is
not a pro forma definition that it "is" an emergency
communications service. Trying to imply that it "is" an emergency
service is nothing but personal self-agrandizement and daydreaming,

regardless of the rage and anger felt when others do not believe you.

Public safety radio communications services ARE defined as
handling emergency situations whether those situations are for
one individual or a whole community.

LHA / WMD

1619. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224729.22081.00004766@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89683

In article <405F1A87.4070607@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
>> aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If they
>> do, it is the fault of the receiver.

THAT is interpretation of the rules. Not very creative, though.

> Frank is taking one sentence out of part 97, performing a creative
>interpretation on it, and trying to say that any knowledge of
>interference indicated "willful and malicious".

And you are doing as creative an interpretation but your righteousness
compels you to say your side is "correct."

>> If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>> signal, then he is not interfering with any service. Interference is
>> transmitting on the same frequency as another service. We don't do that.
>
> Very good point, Dee!

Broadcasting is also a SERVICE. Don't forget that.

If a neighborhood radio amateur wants to fire up a full gallon Tx next
door to someone using their $4000 plasma screen TV to watch an
important NHL game...with other neighbors...and the TV has its
signal blocked from RFI overload...are you going to claim all that
righteousness and "law-abiding activity" is somehow correct?

Explain that to the court when you are an "expert witness" in a
civil suit brought by the blocked-TV neighbor...and his friends.
Is all that righteousness worth it for the immediate legal billings
of the kilowatt-wieiding ham?

First of all, as an "expert witness" you have to prove - by lab
test results - that the kilowatt rig is truly "clean" and within FCC
specifications. QST advertisements and pre-incident ARRL Lab
reviews will be meaningless. Then, again as the "expert witness"
you have to prove - by lab test results - that the $4K plasma TV
(the one that got blocked) is "worthless" for out-of-channel RF
input. You might also need to (expertly, as the witness for the
defense) demonstrate the actual RF level of the amateur radio
signal causing the interference.

It may be that the irate TV viewers will eventually lose and the ham
wins...but that isn't a guarantee that all those billings and lab fees
are going to be covered by the litigant in a civil court ruling. What

will quite probably happen is that the radio amateur has caused severe enmity in his/her neighborhood from all the immediate neighbors. As just an "expert witness" you won't be living in that neighborhood. But, you can be very content in your righteousness and pride in being "correct" and (probably) very "superior." The ham is stuck living in that angry neighborhood.

If the ham loses, then he/she is stuck with costs of the litigation (you really don't want to know some of the dollar amounts). As "expert witness" you won't be stuck with any of that. The FCC isn't going to step in and pay some of those costs and probably won't have any law on regulations to do anything to either side.

You can posture afterwards on your righteousness, obeying the law, etc., but are you really "right" in the broader sense? Common sense says otherwise.

The thread title includes the word "BPL." Access BPL is still open for comment on NPRM 04-29 to set standards for incidental RF radiation (and measurement thereof) in the HF to low VHF EM spectrum. That poses a real threat to RF incoming propagation in the very near future for EVERY HF to low VHF receiver user, amateur or otherwise, in EVERY urban U.S. region that has an Access BPL system.

Are you or other righteous, "we are in the clear because of the law" amateurs imagining it will go away magically because you are all so "right?" NPRM 04-29 is one of the hottest buttons for every HF user to push right now.

It won't matter if the code test goes away or stays there, Access BPL will truly render weak-signal CW superiority myths as impossible. Manual morse will NOT get through at 40 db under the ambient noise level possible with Access BPL right in front of your QTH.

LHA / WMD

1620. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224730.22081.00004768@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89672

In article <405EFF77.5050801@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>
>> The rule stands on it's own, regardless of whatever warped interpretation
>> you wish to place upon it.
>
> Indeed! now if we can only convince you of that.

You can't convince yourself, so how can you expect others to? :-)

The NPRM on Access BPL is still active. Have you yet tried
to "convince" the FCC on their "warped interpretation?"

I don't see your name in the ECFS on any Dockets, 04-37, 04-29,
or 03-104. My name is in there on all three.

Or do you just prefer to stay in here and jabber back and forth,
not taking any action to show your dedication and committment
to the "amateur community?"

LHA / WMD

1621. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224730.22081.00004767@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89677

In article <405F1783.1020007@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> In <LbK6c.371$V66.239@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@get
>> rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>>I have been following the arguement with interest. Are you saying that no
>>>matter what the reason for the alleged interference, that if the ham knows
>>>he is interfering, then it is the hams fault?
>>
>> That's what I have repeated half-a-dozen times. Hey, I didn't write the
>rules.
>> And don't forget that this is a Part 97 rule written specifically for the
>> amateur radio service.
>
> No matter how many times you repeat i, it won't be correct.
>
>>>Have you considered 'poor design' of the receiver? The FCC has.
>>
>> Then why didn't they include such an exception in the rules?
>
> They didn't have to.
>
>> Does the rule say,
>> "....unless the receiver is of poor design."?
>
> It doesn't have to. part 97 does not need to address part 15 devices
>
>> Or, "....unless the receiver is
>> suseptible to radio frequency interference."?
>
>It doesn't have to. part 97 does not need to address part 15 devices
>
>> No. And I think I have explained the reasons why to the point of excess.
>
> It doesn't have to and that is why it doesn't. the rules are pretty
>clear to me. That you have a problem with them indicates that perhaps
>you should petition the f.c.c. for a rewrite if you feel strongly enough.

Perhaps you and the other personal-battle "fighters" should
comment on Access BPL to the FCC instead of playing verbal
paintball in a newsgroup?

Or do you accept the existing Part 15 rules on incidental RF radiation?

There is a very strong possibility that, if Access BPL spreads, the incidental RF radiation from the system will cause enough HF through low VHF random noise that it will eliminate any low-level reception for anyone in that part of the EM spectrum.

In other words, all of those expensive, super-sensitive HF receivers can kiss their sensitivity ratings goodbye.

Those ratings will only be laboratory measurement values that will be useless in practical amateur radio locations. Everyone on HF through low VHF will be reduced to the same level as low-quality consumer electronics radios.

Righteousness in some opinion position may look good on a screen but it is only posturing in a newsgroup if you don't back it up in communicating directly to the regulation makers.

LHA / WMD

1622. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224731.22081.00004769@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89686

In article <5c01b95b.0403220948.37b62326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040321182914.25815.00007201@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
>> > Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
>> >actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...
>> >
>> > How perculiar.
>>
>> Perambulate your personal perspective, but don't pester us
>> particularly with poorly percolated petty pesterings promoted as
>> a perspicatious presentation when it is really perseverance of
>> persiflage. Ptui.
>>
>> "Perculiar" indeed.
>
> My typo notwithstanding, the questions remain:
>
> What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency comms?
>>
>> Is being insulting, rude, obnoxious, and resorting to toilet humor
>> considerd "civil amateur behavior?" Certainly not, yet you seem
>> to do nothing else in here.
>
> What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency
>comms"?
>
> Continued delaying tactics and obfuscation are admissions of lying.

None. Quit trying to assume a "command" role. You don't have the authority.

Neither do you have the details of When and Where for your supposed "hostile actions" while in the military.

Get mental health help.

LHA / WMD

1623. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224732.22081.00004770@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89685

In article <5c01b95b.0403220944.5eb2289b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040321013314.01632.00001408@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0403201638.32d3ffaa@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
>> >phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.
>>
>> "Unsecure?!?" You saw KY-98s in that facility? KY-57s?
>
> Did I say that, Lennie?

I ASKED that. Do you know what they are? I don't think so.

Hint: It has nothing to do with KY jelly. :-)

>> Playing war games were you?
>
> Nope. Participating in one of those drills you seem to think no
>one needs to participate in.

I'm a strong advocate of emergency preparedness drilling, training,
planning. Said so in here before, say so still.

Why do you LIE about what I've written and is on archive at Google?

>> > I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
>> >ROLE"...?!?!
>> >
>> > Putz.
>>
>> Yup, rude and obnoxious, comes unglued on the slightest
>> disagreement. Well, at least that is consistent with previous
>> behavior of yours.
>
> And you're still a putz and Brain Burke has still not answered a
>simple question in repsonse to assertions HE made...

Sorry, your personal insult manner just wastes everyone's time
and does not change anything or anyone's opinion of yourself.

You are NOT any authority who can demand answers from anyone.

I will remind everyone that YOU have not supplied ANY details on your claims of "being in hostile actions" while in the military. NO details as to When or Where...after many months since that first claim and thousands of personal insults leveled against others.

Not only are you rude, obnoxious, a name-caller, an insulter, but you are also a lying bullshitter, making claims YOU can't substantiate.

Get some mental health help.

LHA / WMD

>
> No problem.

1624. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224733.22081.00004771@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89687

In article <ceydncpw0OQNysPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <a237c.195$1n4.26@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>If you go back into the 50s and 60s, amateur radio served quite well for
>>>long-haul phone patches and in emergencies.
>>
>>
>> Service in emergencies goes back much farther, of course.
>>
>>
>>>Very localized emergencies,
>>>such as an auto accident would largely be reported by normal telephone.
>>
>>
>> Also by hams equipped with mobile rigs if telephone was not immediately
>> available.. This is documented all the way back to the beginning of mobile
>> operation by hams. Of course, the number of mobile-equipped hams limited
>the
>> chances that there would be a ham in the area when such a localized
>emergency
>> happened.
>>
>>
>>>In
>>>the 70s, the cb craze took hold and certainly I would expect that cb was
>>>sometimes used to report the accidents. The small number of amateurs would
>>>preclude them being involved very often in such a situation.
>>
>>
>> I disagree on that last point. That same time period was the boom time for
>> amateur repeaters and autopatching. At least in the areas I'm familiar
>with,
>> such service by hams was very common.
>>
>>
>>>Voilla, cb is
>>>more important than ham radio.
>>>
>>

>> Certainly more numerous in those times. Questionable today, though.
>>
>>
>>>Fast-forward to today. Cell phones are likely the primary means of
>>>reporting those accidents. Who needs the hams? Some hams will say "who
>>>needs cb?"
>>
>>
>> As long as the cell phones are avaialble, they are obviously the preferred
>> method because anyone so equipped can push 911 and report directly.
>
> I think this may be the confusion here also. A cell phone is great for
>localized small-scale problems. If everyone has one, then of course they
>will be great for calling 911. An accident happens and likely the next
>person ther will have a cell phone. One of the best reasons for having
>one of the otherwise evil little devices.
>
> As the scale of problems gets bigger, then they become of less use,
>their usefulness being inversely proportional to the scale of the problem.
>
> Eventually, the cellular concept falls apart because of the massive
>support structure needed for the instruments use, and that often the
>same disasters that make emergency comms necessary take out that
>infrastucture.
>
> I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing

>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.

I was IN some of those San Diego wildfire areas and didn't "see"
what you saw. Also using a cell phone. It worked fine.

Now tell us all what amateur radio really DID do there that couldn't
be done by the regular telephone infrastructure. Be specific. Try
to avoid subjective "interpretation."

LHA / WMD

1625. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040323224734.22081.00004772@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89675

In article <c3oer8$2914le$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" wrote ...
>
>Brian Burke, AKA "Billy Beeper" AKA "William" accused you of "enabling" me
>over my refusal to be bowled over by Lennie's arrogance. Don't let him make
>YOU an "enabler" by acknowledging his alter-ego. BillyBeeper/William is
>Brain Burke, taking a lesson from Lennie in how to disperse his
>foolheartiness over several screen names.
>____
>
>Thanks for the info, Steve. You don't have to tell me about Leonard's
>arrogance -- we've all had to live with it for years. "The great white
>current chaser" and "Legend in his own mind".

Save the vituperation and concentrate on your fabulous emergency
work for Homeland Security.

Tell us all about TCL and the Scotty. Show us where that is applied
so much in other radio communications.

Have you any experience in metrology? (not meteorology) I know
how to measure current, voltage, wattage, resistance, inductance,
capacitance very well and to small tolerances. Spent two years
working in a Calibration Laboratory. Do you wish to make fun of
that and denigrate that with more name-calling like "Great White
Current Chaser?"

Why do you apply labels that were never claimed? I happen to have
been in electronics and radio for a long time, beginning with primary
communications on HF. That's not "legendary." It is just was is.
If you wish to be petulant and abusive because you haven't had
that experience or accumulated as much knowledge, that is your
problem, not mine.

You might try for some mental health counseling, too. It would cure
you of what appears to be a radio inferiority complex.

LHA / WMD

1626. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends on where you are at

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:49:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89690

N2EY wrote:

> In article <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make some
>>>>>>sense.
>>>
>>>>>Mike,
>>>>>
>>>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry level
>>>>>license:
>>>>>
>>>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you can't
>>>>>run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't
>>
>>need
>>
>>>to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>be tested on it)
>>>>
>>>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>>>
>>>
>>>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>>>giving the tests are being overburdened?

>>>
>>>
>>>It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
>>>privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?
>>
>> Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
>>eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
>>appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
>>connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
>>licensed contractors.
>
>
> There are some folks who would like to do just that!
>
>
>> I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
>>it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
>>privileges right out from under our feet.
>
>
> Which is what those "it's just a hobby" folks are doing, whether they realize
> it or not.

Those people are a shortsighted as the people proposing the "no homebrew" rules. Your wording "avocation" is the proper term AFAIAC. I practive my "hamliness" that way. Is it a hobby to work with disaster preparedness teams? If so we are the only ones classed that way in the group. Is it a hobby to be a part of the Skywarn system? Is it a hobby to volunteer time for public events such as the NYC or LA marathons, or bike races or local charity events?

DO some hams practice this as a hobby? Sure. But that doesn't make it a hobby. In the overall, it is a service.

>
>> I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
>>is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
>>only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
>>seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.
>
>
> I know exactly what you mean. However, note that for over half a century we've
> had license classes with reduced power privileges and it hasn't led us down the
> slippery slope.

But we haven't had people suggesting that we have a commercial equipment requirement, we haven't had a commissh that we are annoying with our so called silly concerns about BPL, and concerns for our "safety". Cell phones and HF rigs both use RF correct? So why do hams get to use 1.5 thousand watts of power while those poor cell phone users have to get by on less than a watt? If RF is dangerous, it is dangerous,

....right? Even though I'm being facetious, I can garuntee that I can
sell 9 out of 10 non-ham friends I know *that* argument.

>>Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
>>Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?
>
>
> Because under certain circumstances those levels of power are inadequate.

Then just call them on the cell phone if you need to get through that
bad! 8^)

>
>>>However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed -
>>>just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must
>>>then migrate to the next-higher class of license.
>>
>> If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all?
>
>
> It's not dangerous if proper precautions are taken.

Bingo! Part of the preocess is education, and the tests show that
unless the applicant has cheated, they have picked up *something* in the
way of safety knowledge.

>>For
>>anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
>>not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
>>Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
>>those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
>>those self destructive hams from themselves.
>
> The point of license testing is not to protect someone from their own
> ignorance, but to protect others from it.

Mostly, but RF safety is one exception. The danegrs of high power RF
and High voltages in general is mostly a danger to the operator.

>
>>Just like cigarette smokers.
>
>
> Cigarette smoking is much more hazardous than RF.

Sure, but you do know what my point is, don't you?

>>And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
>>of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?
>
>
> Now *that's* a valid point, as verified by the Alpine tower folks...
>

>>>So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the next-level
>>>test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff removed.
>>>Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>>
>> Nope.
>
>
> That tells ya something.
>
>>>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a higher
>>>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>>>bother to upgrade?)
>>>
>>>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>>>>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>>>
>>>Here's the problem:
>>>
>>>What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges
>>>are
>>>very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from
>>>HF/MF.This
>>>means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.
>>
>>>And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and
>>>almost certainly with manufactured equipment.
>>>
>>>The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in
>>>very
>>>little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those
>>>questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not.
>>>After
>>>all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained
>>>an entry-level amateur license?
>>>
>>>Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a
>>>balanced
>>>mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges,
>>>coupled
>>>with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can
>>>sample more of what ham radio has to offer.
>>
>> Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
>>worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade.
>
>
> That's you.

Of course that's me. Does it make as much sense as *protecting* the
newbies from High power RF by not allowing them high power, as compared
to the alternative of giving them the knowledge?

>>In
>>addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
>>from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
>>have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
>>them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.
>
>
> Maybe. But if that's so, why aren't the repeaters busy 24/7?

Depends. Our local club repeater is pretty busy most of the time. Others
aren't so busy. I know I've been given a lecture on occasion while
traveling by some disgruntled ham when I've called that I'm listening
and he comes back with "This is a private repeater - don't use it any
more". No mention of the private repeater in the book. Who the heck is
going to use that!

>
>> I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
>>HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
>>privileges.
>
>
> Well, I have to disagree. I say it's an artificial division foisted upon us by
> a few people who clamored for a nocodetest license as the savior of amateur
> radio. Hasn't happened.

Perhaps you don't agree with my conclusion, but the propagation
differences are pretty much demarcated between HF and VHF

>>It also makes for less of a class system.
>
>
> Go down that road far enough, and you'll have a one class system.

I don't propose that, but even THAT is better than what the NCVEC proposes.

>>If the Tech has
>>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>>there, then it's a great thing.
>
> Seems to me that it would make more sense to offer a wider sampling.
>
>>>For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore
>>>old
>>>gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
>>>realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which do
>>>you
>>>think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?
>>

>>Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's.
>
>
> Which is why those scenarios are not good ideas.
>
>
>>I'd certainly like that myself.
>
>
> Then let's go for it.
>
>>>Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
>>>beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?
>>
>>>That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're really
>>>trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was
>>>to
>>>have a very limited license to get people started, so they could
>>>learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham radio.
>
>
>
>>>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>>>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>>>
>>>I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other
>>>factors.
>>>
>>>But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let
>>>everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise
>>>in
>>>the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once
>>>and
>>>for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be
>>>very upset.....
>>
>> comments:
>>
>> We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!
>
>
> Of course.
>
>>>Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another
>>>NPRM
>>>cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just
>>>about 4
>>>years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...
>>>
>>>

>>>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>>>accomplishment. "Class"
>>>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>>>
>>>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>>>mind! ;^)
>>>
>>>Very bad karma!
>>>
>>>Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot
>>>change.
>>>That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an important
>>>>>part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>>>
>>>> Agreed 100 percent!
>>>
>>>This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it
>>>must be
>>>opposed. No good can come of such requirements.
>>
>> And How!
>
>
> They're open for comments now.

Yup, - Mike KB3EIA -

1627. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 03:51:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <1YadnQPFGIGclPzdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89691

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The "degree to which amateur radio is used" is a secondary role,
> one of several fall-back methods to use in case of loss of one or
> more of the primaries. The primary method is use of existing
> infrastructure and public safety services' communications already
> in existance.

And that is exactly as it should be, but ham radio is there to perform that secondary role if need be, although it has performed the primary roll at times.

> What is "foolish" is all the preening and posturing about your
> self-defined "importance in emergencies" from having been granted
> a license in what is basically an avocational radio activity, a hobby.

The military and civil emergency authorities think it is important enough to include ham radio in their emergency planning. I don't see them including you and your self proclaimed professional radio status in their plans.
>
> I would suggest a check of your vision. You have lost perspective
> in viewing amateur radio in the very large picture of other radio
> services. You are exhibiting mental tunnel vision. Not good for you.

Maybe you need to have your tired old eyes checked, I am sure the nurse at the home there can set up an appointment for you. Have you noticed that you are less than nothing in the scheme of amateur radio and emergency comms?

1628. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 09:03:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324040325.20240.00001678@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89692

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224715.22081.00004752@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322150141.01530.00000186@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>What do posts like this say about you?
>>>
>>>Three words come to mind: Rude, Obnoxious, Nuts.
>>
>> Sure beats "Liar", "Antagonist", and "Surrogate"
>
> All six apply to you...

I am sure you wish they did.

Steve, K4YZ

1629. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 09:19:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324041915.20240.00001679@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89693

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224714.22081.00004751@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322151601.01530.00000188@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 3/20/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200527.1848d98f@posting.google.com>
>>
>>>Len, in your best judgement, would you think that Steve could avail
>>>himself to the services of the USGPO and USPS, learn the truth, then
>>>post a retraction of his statement above?
>>
>> There's nothing to retract, Brain.
>
> Okay, leave your landing gear down...you aren't paying for the
> aviation gasoline, are you? :-)
>
>> I have no doubt Lennie can recite the words, inside-out even.
>
> I don't - and never did - memorize the entirety of all five volumes
> of Title 47 C.F.R. That's why they are on the bookshelf for
> reference. That's why I have the bookmark for the FCC website
> on the PC...to check revisions from last issuance, if any.

I am sure you haven't.

Cut-and-paste technology make it even easier for the patently lazy to not
HAVE to "remember" anything.

>> But it's just like learning songs in grade school in other
>>languages...You sing the song, but what did you just say?
>
> Only for seven-year-old Extras still in public school...and
> fortysomething Extras who haven't been to a school in years
> and think their memorizing of QST ads is "knowing all about
> ham radio equipment."

No one here that I am aware of EVER stated knowing "all about" ham radio
equipment.

However, since I do tend to use it a bit more often than you do, I dare say that I DO know more about some of it than you do or ever eill, OTHER than those same aforementioned ads!

>> Lennie's already demonstrated that he knows the words, but doesn't
>>understand what he's reading.
>
> Sorry, sweatbreath, but I'm not going to give in to your weird idea
> that your ham radio is "different" in your imaginary universe.

Amateur Radio >>IS<< different...And it's hardly "imaginary". Of course YOU keep trying to argue that some of us are somehow insinuating that the PHYSICS of radio is different.

That is not truthful. It's the applications that are different, and in the VERY REAL world of the Federal Communications Commisssion, the Amateur Radio Service >>IS<< "different".

So sayeth the unlicensed commissioners.

> Try not to lie so much. It looks unbecoming on-screen.

You'll please cite a "lie" that I allegedly uttered, Scummy One...?!?!

>>>I find it interesting that Steve, having supposedly served in seven
>>>hostile actions, never served in a unit with a single KIA, present or
>>>past.
>>
>> Oh, but I have. I never said that I didn't
>
> Where and when? You've never given any details whatsoever.

Brain said that I never stated that I've served in a unit that had KIA's past or present.

I have.

I also named some of the units to which I have been assigned when you and I first tangled. You are free to research some of those exchanges, Lennie. They are not pertinent to this forum, nor is my association with any of the Marines in those units pertinent here. I choose to NOT "be you".

>> Thier sacrifices were thiers to make, and it is upon them that the
>>respect and dignity should be appreciated.
>
> "Their." Remember also that the verb transitive of "counsel" can
> have either one or two Ls in it.
>
>> Scumbag Extrodinaire Leonard H. Anderson thinks it's OK to somehow "use"
>>someone else's sacrifices to make himself look good.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...more personal insults.

It's not an insult if it's true, Lennie.

And believe me, it's true you are a scumbag.

> Such "use" wasn't done. I honor the servicemen of the 8235th Army
> Unit as well as all servicemembers of the United States Army.
>
> I was assigned to that Signal Battalion and so were 23 others who
> were killed in the line of duty. I was billeted in Hardy Barracks,
> named for one of those killed, Corporal Elmer Hardy. I lived in what
> was named Camp Tomlinson, the entire site of the FEC Sig Svc Bn
> transmitter site for Army station ADA. Tomlinson was a lieutenant
> in the same Signal group of 20 that died in the crash of a C-54 on
> 1 Jul 50 in Korea. I am proud to have served in that Battalion and
> continue to be, even of the 78th Signal Battalion in Camp Zama,
> Japan, the descendant of the original 71st Signal Service Battalion
> formed in 1945. I am proud to have been interviewed by the Pacific
> Stars and Stripes service newspaper for a memorial issue containing
> a two-page article on Hardy Barracks of a half century ago.

Congratulations, Lennie...You've managed to interject fifty-year old Army history again, spun to meet your needs. Of course this forum is not about the Army or about you, your efforts to make it so notwithstanding.

Heaven forbid, however, if a Licensed Amateur mentions anything more than a week old about Amateur Radio lest YOU start in about how Amateur Radio is allegedly stuck in the 1930's.

> None of that is fictional. I was there, in that HF communications
> unit, in that signal battalion. I know the dates, I know where, I am
> proud to say where I was and what I did. No fiction necessary.

Only parts that you have previously used to try and embellish your own service with.

>> If you somehow find it "OK" for him to do that, it makes YOU a scumbag
>>too.
>
> I will remember your words next time I visit a veterans' cemetary
> for services honoring the veterans who never finished their tour of
> duty. I'll tell all around me that Steve Robeson, supposedly another
> veteran of the U.S. military calls me and all of them "scumbags."

And in that one sentence you will have commited yet another lie to your list of lies.

You just keep digging yourself in deeper, don't you?

> You are really one sicko. Get help.

Whew...coming from you, Lennie, I find that a bit, well....humorous.

Steve, K4YZ

1630. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 09:19:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324041955.20240.00001680@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89694

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004755@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and
>>radios on...No cellphone necessary.
>
> What are the names of those two people?

One of them is NOT Leonard H. Anderson.

Steve, K4YZ

1631. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 09:22:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324042242.20240.00001681@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89695

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224726.22081.00004763@mb-m17.aol.com>

> Amateur radio is useful AS an emergency communications medium
> but emergency agencies relegate it to a secondary level, an option.
> Primary choice is the existing infrastructure of Public Safety Radio
> Service users as well as landline communications providers, utility
> and private business companies having radio equipment...and, if in
> a region, military bases and installations who have extensive,
> flexible-mode communications equipment.
>
> Trying to imply that amateur radio is the prime selection for any
> emergency communications is self-deceptive, self-defined
> posturing, regardless of the number of afternoons spent visiting
> some distant emergency site undergoing a drill.

Lennie, NO ONE in this forum, least of all me, has evr stated Amateur
Radio was a "prime selection" for disaster/emergency communications.

Back up...try again. This time, try truth.

Steve, K4YZ

1632. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:31:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324053146.03164.00000001@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89696

>Subject: Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224730.22081.00004768@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <405EFF77.5050801@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>>> The rule stands on it's own, regardless of whatever warped interpretation
>>> you wish to place upon it.
>>
>> Indeed! now if we can only convince you of that.
>
> You can't convince yourself, so how can you expect others to?
>
> The NPRM on Access BPL is still active. Have you yet tried
> to "convince" the FCC on their "warped interpretation?"
>
> I don't see your name in the ECFS on any Dockets, 04-37, 04-29,
> or 03-104. My name is in there on all three.

Congratulations.

That, $7.00 and 30 minutes at a VE session will get you an Amateur Radio
license. Then you can begin to REALLY appreciate the exchanges going on.

> Or do you just prefer to stay in here and jabber back and forth,
> not taking any action to show your dedication and committment
> to the "amateur community?"

They have until May, Lennie...What's the rush?

Steve, K4YZ

1633. Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:36:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324053616.03164.00000002@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89697

>Subject: Re: Outcome of CB/Utility BPL Dispute
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224729.22081.00004766@mb-m17.aol.com>

A very well stated point in all regards. Well done, Len.

73

Steve, K4YZ

>In article <405F1A87.4070607@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>> Go read Part 15 !! The FCC has specifically said that commercial devices
>>> aren't supposed to act as receivers of signals outside their bands. If
>they
>>> do, it is the fault of the receiver.
>
> THAT is interpretation of the rules. Not very creative, though.
>
>> Frank is taking one sentence out of part 97, performing a creative
>>interpretation on it, and trying to say that any knowledge of
>>interference indicated "willful and malicious".
>
> And you are doing as creative an interpretation but your righteousness
> compels you to say your side is "correct."
>
>>> If the ham is transmitting on his own frequency with a legal and clean
>>> signal, then he is not interfering with any service. Interference is
>>> transmitting on the same frequency as another service. We don't do that.
>>
>> Very good point, Dee!
>
> Broadcasting is also a SERVICE. Don't forget that.
>
> If a neighborhood radio amateur wants to fire up a full gallon Tx next
> door to someone using their $4000 plasma screen TV to watch an
> important NHL game...with other neighbors...and the TV has its
> signal blocked from RFI overload...are you going to claim all that
> righteousness and "law-abiding activity" is somehow correct?
>
> Explain that to the court when you are an "expert witness" in a
> civil suit brought by the blocked-TV neighbor...and his friends.
> Is all that righteousness worth it for the immediate legal billings
> of the kilowatt-wieiding ham?

>
> First of all, as an "expert witness" you have to prove - by lab
> test results - that the kilowatt rig is truly "clean" and within FCC
> specifications. QST advertisements and pre-incident ARRL Lab
> reviews will be meaningless. Then, again as the "expert witness"
> you have to prove - by lab test results - that the $4K plasma TV
> (the one that got blocked) is "worthless" for out-of-channel RF
> input. You might also need to (expertly, as the witness for the
> defense) demonstrate the actual RF level of the amateur radio
> signal causing the interference.
>
> It may be that the irate TV viewers will eventually lose and the ham
> wins...but that isn't a guarantee that all those billings and lab fees
> are going to be covered by the litigant in a civil court ruling. What
> will quite probably happen is that the radio amateur has caused
> severe enmity in his/her neighborhood from all the immediate
> neighbors. As just an "expert witness" you won't be living in that
> neighborhood. But, you can be very content in your righteousness
> and pride in being "correct" and (probably) very "superior." The ham
> is stuck living in that angry neighborhood.
>
> If the ham loses, then he/she is stuck with costs of the litigation
> (you really don't want to know some of the dollar amounts). As
> "expert witness" you won't be stuck with any of that. The FCC
> isn't going to step in and pay some of those costs and probably
> won't have any law on regulations to do anything to either side.
>
> You can posture afterwards on your righteousness, obeying the
> law, etc., but are you really "right" in the broader sense?
> Common sense says otherwise.
>
> -------
>
> The thread title includes the word "BPL." Access BPL is still
> open for comment on NPRM 04-29 to set standards for
> incidental RF radiation (and measurement thereof) in the HF
> to low VHF EM spectrum. That poses a real threat to RF
> incoming propagation in the very near future for EVERY
> HF to low VHF receiver user, amateur or otherwise, in EVERY
> urban U.S. region that has an Access BPL system.
>
> Are you or other righteous, "we are in the clear because of the
> law" amateurs imagining it will go away magically because
> you are all so "right?" NPRM 04-29 is one of the hottest
> buttons for every HF user to push right now.
>
> It won't matter if the code test goes away or stays there, Access
> BPL will truly render weak-signal CW superiority myths as
> impossible. Manual morse will NOT get through at 40 db under
> the ambient noise level possible with Access BPL right in

> front of your QTH.
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>
>
>
>

1634. Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO NPRM ON BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:40:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324054009.03164.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89698

>Subject: Re: AMATEUR RADIO ENTHUSIASTS COME OUT SWINGING IN OPPOSITION TO
>NPRM ON BPL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224715.22081.00004753@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322084955.20899.00000138@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>What idiot would even think such a thing?
>>
>> Good question. Probably the same kind of idiot that makes wierd
>>assertions like " You just can't accept that unlicensed radio services have
>a
>>MAJOR ROLE in emergency comms" and then won't back it up with some sort of
>>validation, even after being asked that question directly several days in a
>>row.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...YOU haven't yet justifed, validated, or stamped
> approved anything outside of Newington that proves amateur radio
> "played a MAJOR ROLE in emergency communications."

I don't have to, Lennie.

The Department of Defense has already done that...As has the Department of State, FEMA, The American Red Cross, The Salvation Army, numerous state's governors, etc.

> Lots of implicitness, inuendo, and selective editing from a single
> source, but you seem satisfied in your "loathing."

No innuendo necessary. Brain has made an assertion of fact. I have asked him (repeatedly) to back it up with some example of fact. He has not.

> When off-duty (not in a uniform), do you wear "loathfers" on your
> feet? Have you ever visited "West Loathian?" Slice a "loath" of
> bread?

You are a bit off kilter here, Lennie...You alright? Need an ambulance?

> Get some counseling (or counselling) and a new dictionary. We
> will all be helped, you included.

I am not the one in need of counselling, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

1635. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:44:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324054437.03164.00000004@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89699

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224734.22081.00004772@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <c3oer8$2914le$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
><kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
>>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" wrote ...
>>
>>Brian Burke, AKA "Billy Beeper" AKA "William" accused you of "enabling" me
>>over my refusal to be bowled over by Lennie's arrogance. Don't let him make
>>YOU an "enabler" by acknowledging his alter-ego. BillyBeeper/William is
>>Brain Burke, taking a lesson from Lennie in how to disperse his
>>foolheartiness over several screen names.
>>____
>>
>>Thanks for the info, Steve. You don't have to tell me about Leonard's
>>arrogance -- we've all had to live with it for years. "The great white
>>current chaser" and "Legend in his own mind".
>
> Save the vituperation and concentrate on your fabulous emergency
> work for Homeland Security.

Lennie, please tell us about YOUR "fabulous emergency work for Homeland
Security"...

Participation in REACT? A member or DMAT? Heck, have you even donated a
unit of blood?

> Tell us all about TCL and the Scotty. Show us where that is applied
> so much in other radio communications.
>
> Have you any experience in metrology? (not meteorology) I know
> how to measure current, voltage, wattage, resistance, inductance,
> capacitance very well and to small tolerances. Spent two years
> working in a Calibration Laboratory. Do you wish to make fun of
> that and denigrate that with more name-calling like "Great White
> Current Chaser?"

Hooooeee! TWO YEARS on a bench, eh?

> Why do you apply labels that were never claimed? I happen to have
> been in electronics and radio for a long time, beginning with primary
> communications on HF. That's not "legendary." It is just was is.
> If you wish to be petulant and abusive because you haven't had

> that experience or accumulated as much knowledge, that is your
> problem, not mine.

"Petulant"...?!?!

Now who's putting himself on top of the hill...?!?!

> You might try for some mental health counseling, too. It would cure
> you of what appears to be a radio inferiority complex.

Everyone that dares to cross you needs mental health counselling in your estimation, Lennie...

Why is that? I know...do you...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1636. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:47:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324054717.03164.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89700

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224718.22081.00004758@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403221609.746707e3@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>> Trying to embellish one's own personal "achivements" (or lack
>thereof)
>>> based upon someone else's sacrifices is absolutely callous and cruel.
>>
>>Yet you do everything possible to get back into some kind, any kind, of
>>uniform.
>>
>>Why?
>>
>>Do you think that it will embellish one's own personal achievements?
>
> We are waiting for details on those "hostile actions" such as
> when and where the gunnery nurse was "in" those.
>
> He spends an afternoon in another TN city and now becomes an
> experienced emergency expert knowing everything and anything
> about emergency communications, "proving" that all those who
> disagree with him are "wrong."

Sorry, Lennie...

My "experience" in Amateur Radio (and other) emeregency services
communicatioons goes back three decades. This weekend was nothing new.

> He wastes everyone's time waving around that roll of Soldier of
> Fortune, Guns and Ammo, Flying magazines wrapped around
> a QST core. He ought to read "Geek Boy Times" published by
> the USMC.

Sorry that I've "been there-done that" more often than you, Lennie. It
just happens that way sometimes.

Steve, K4YZ

1637. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:54:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89801

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040323003817.17834.00000194@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>I have shown you to be that which you loathe.
>>>
>>>Self-hatred is an unhealthy thing. Think about counseling.
>>
>> It's "counselling", Brain, and what I loathe are people like you and
>>Lennie.
>
> Then wave your arms around, invoke the magic incantation, and
> the world will be remade entirely to your desires.
>
> Your imaginary world will be even better than you dreamed!

I again ask you as to which "imaginary" world you refer...?!?!

The one in which I am a licensed Amateur Radio operator? (oooopps! FCC says I AM a licensed Amateur operator)

Or the one in which I am a licensed aviator? (oooop again! The FAA says I got one of them, too!)

Perhaps you meant the imaginary world where I am a licensed nurse? (DRAT! Got one active and two inactive licenses which says THAT'S true too!) I also have the documents attesting to my participation in EMS (including past licenses from California) and current endorsements in Advanced Cardiac Life Support and Pediatric Advanced Life Support.

Anything else...?!?!

> Meanwhile, back in REALITY, you will find that Webster's New
> World Compact School and Office Dictionary allows the spelling
> of the verb transitive form of "counsel" to be either 'counselling'
> or 'counseling.' One or two Ls.
>
> Either way, try to get some...mental health counsel.

Either way YOU care to spell it, Lennie, I am not the one in this forum that is in need of it. That would be reserved for the guy who has no vested

interest in the Amateur Radio Service (or claims he doesn't, anyway) yet persists in antagonizing those who do.

> You and the rest of us will be aided by such.
>
> Go waste someone else's time if you don't.

Remind me of your Amateur licensure again, Lennie?

WHOSE time is being wasted here?

Steve, K4YZ

1638. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:57:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324055704.03164.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89802

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224731.22081.00004769@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <5c01b95b.0403220948.37b62326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040321182914.25815.00007201@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>>
>>> > Lennie the Loser is trying to argue a point Jim's making that
>>> >actually echoes some of HIS sentiments...
>>> >
>>> > How perculiar.
>>>
>>> Perambulate your personal perspective, but don't pester us
>>> particularly with poorly percolated petty pesterings promoted as
>>> a perspicatious presentation when it is really perseverance of
>>> persiflage. Ptui.
>>>
>>> "Perculiar" indeed.
>>
>> My typo notwithstanding, the questions remain:
>>
>> What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency
>comms?
>>>
>>> Is being insulting, rude, obnoxious, and resorting to toilet humor
>>> considerd "civil amateur behavior?" Certainly not, yet you seem
>>> to do nothing else in here.
>>
>> What "MAJOR" role do the "unlicensed" services play in "emergency
>>comms"?
>>
>> Continued delaying tactics and obfuscation are admissions of lying.
>
> None. Quit trying to assume a "command" role. You don't have the
> authority.

There's no "command" role here, Lennie.

Your boy has made assertions of fact in a public forum.

He can't/won't corroborate them.

> Neither do you have the details of When and Where for your supposed
> "hostile actions" while in the military.

What I did in the military is not pertinent here. This is a forum about
Amateur Radio communications.

> Get mental health help.

After you, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

1639. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 10:59:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040324055908.00150.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89803

In article <ucCdne8YC6i0e_3dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Alex Flinsch" <alex@localhost.localdomain> wrote in message
>news:slrnc613h4.3j9.alex@homer.linux1.lan...
>> In article <wA%7c.4751$HP.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Bill Sohl
>wrote:
>[snip]
>> >> RM-10870 NCVEC Petition
>> >> Essentially the same as the ARRL petition, but removes the code
>> > requirement
>> >> for Extras also.
>> >
>> > Also includes a "commercial only" transmitter rule for
>> > Communicator (Novice)
>> > Also includes power limit for Communicator/Novice
>>
>> The same power limits are defined in the ARRL proposal also. The 100/50
>> watt
>> limits proposed are set so they would be below the RF environmental
>> evaluation required levels.
>
>The power limits make sense.

They're similar to what has existec in the past.

>Disallowing homebrew is counter to the purpose
>of the ARS and should not be enacted.

I agree 100%.

>However, in addition to the "commercial only" rule, the NCVEC proposal calls
>for a low voltage limit, which would also keep new hams from taking
>advantage of hamfest bargains on older rigs with tube finals, like the
>venerable FT-101, TS-520/820, etc. This is an unnecessary impediment to new
>hams getting a "starter" HF rig at affordable prices.

Again I agree. Also, it's unenforceable, and open to contradiction. For
example, could a "Communicator" build a power supply for his/her manufactured
rig? Any such supply that uses house current would pose at least as much of a
shock hazard as, say, a TS-520. But the Communicator would be allowed to build
such a supply, but not to buy a TS-520. Or, rather, he/she could *buy* the
TS-520, but could not *transmit* with it. Makes no sense at all.
>
>I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC proposal -
>"communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional "novice" name, which is

>recognized around the world (and has been used in other countries as well).
>
How about "Basic"?

What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather than have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool, that they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement that they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide by it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool can be made smaller.

Is that a good idea?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1640. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:06:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324060614.03164.00000008@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89804

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224732.22081.00004770@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <5c01b95b.0403220944.5eb2289b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040321013314.01632.00001408@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>> In article <5c01b95b.0403201638.32d3ffaa@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>> > The ONLY "unlicensed" devices in the facility were two cordless
>>> >phones, both of which were part of unsecure phone lines.
>>>
>>> "Unsecure?!?" You saw KY-98s in that facility? KY-57s?
>>
>> Did I say that, Lennie?
>
> I ASKED that. Do you know what they are? I don't think so.

Yes, Lennie...I am very familiar with crypto gear.

> Hint: It has nothing to do with KY jelly.

Why would you be thinking of KY jelly, Lennie? Gonna have breakfast at the
stables?

>>> Playing war games were you?
>>
>> Nope. Participating in one of those drills you seem to think no
>>one needs to participate in.
>
> I'm a strong advocate of emergency preparedness drilling, training,
> planning. Said so in here before, say so still.
>
> Why do you LIE about what I've written and is on archive at Google?

YOU just stated a few days ago that Californians did not need to practice
since you have "the real thing", Lennie. Shall I recover THAT quote and rub
your nose in it...?!?!

>>> > I am wondering, Brain, is THAT what YOU call a "MAJOR
>>> >ROLE"...?!?!
>>> >

>>> > Putz.
>>>
>>> Yup, rude and obnoxious, comes unglued on the slightest
>>> disagreement. Well, at least that is consistent with previous
>>> behavior of yours.
>>
>> And you're still a putz and Brain Burke has still not answered a
>>simple question in repsonse to assertions HE made...
>
> Sorry, your personal insult manner just wastes everyone's time
> and does not change anything or anyone's opinion of yourself.

I could care less about anyone's opinion of me, Lennie.

Like me or not, facts are facts, and I have not overtly (or covertly)
tried to misrepresent the character of Amateur Radio in a public forum, such as
yourself.

> You are NOT any authority who can demand answers from anyone.

I "demand" no more or no less that YOU "demand" from anyone, Lennie.

YOU have BLATANTLY "demanded" information from Jim Miccolis, Dave Heil,
myself and otehrs in this forum, so I'd be real careful about climbing up on
THAT "hollier-than-thou pedestle, Oh Putzy One.

> I will remind everyone that YOU have not supplied ANY details on
> your claims of "being in hostile actions" while in the military. NO
> details as to When or Where...after many months since that first
> claim and thousands of personal insults leveled against others.

And having even brought it up in the heat of our "exchanges" was an error
on my part. It has no pertinence in this forum. I allowed myself to sink to
your level. My bad.

> Not only are you rude, obnoxious, a name-caller, an insulter, but
> you are also a lying bullshitter, making claims YOU can't
> substantiate.

Ahhhh...more profanity. Didn't take long, did it, Lennie?

As for the "name-caller" and "insulter", I'd guess you have a very
personal inside view on that regard, don't you?

> Get some mental health help.

Why?

Steve, K4YZ

1641. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:09:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324060918.03164.00000009@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89805

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224733.22081.00004771@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <ceydncpw0OQNysPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>I recall the pictures from the wildfires in San Diego last year showing
>>people trying to use their cell phones without success. The look on many
>>faces was one of surprise that the things weren't working.
>
> I was IN some of those San Diego wildfire areas and didn't "see"
> what you saw. Also using a cell phone. It worked fine.
>
> Now tell us all what amateur radio really DID do there that couldn't
> be done by the regular telephone infrastructure. Be specific. Try
> to avoid subjective "interpretation."

What interpretation is needed?

Even the press stated that cellphone coverage was lost in many areas.

And what were you doing in a wildfire area, Lennie?

Playing with matches?

Steve, K4YZ

1642. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:17:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324061730.03164.00000010@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89806

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224723.22081.00004761@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322101424.20899.00000155@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> It just eats away at Lennie and Brain's rants that those plans include
>>Amateur Radio to the degree that they do. No problem...Just makes them look
>>that much more foolish.
>
> Not at all. Both Brian and I have explained what is actually used
> in emergency communications and by what means.

No, what Brain has "explained" is nothing at all.

Brain has asserted that the unlicensed radio services play a "major role"
in "emergency comms", but ahs yet to provide even the first example or
reference of thier use.

> The "degree to which amateur radio is used" is a secondary role,
> one of several fall-back methods to use in case of loss of one or
> more of the primaries. The primary method is use of existing
> infrastructure and public safety services' communications already
> in existance.

Yep. No one has claimed otherwise.

> What is "foolish" is all the preening and posturing about your
> self-defined "importance in emergencies" from having been granted
> a license in what is basically an avocational radio activity, a hobby.

There's not "preening" or "posturing" here, Lennie.

> I would suggest a check of your vision. You have lost perspective
> in viewing amateur radio in the very large picture of other radio
> services. You are exhibiting mental tunnel vision. Not good for you.

What I "saw" (or rather DIDN'T see..) was that neither Leonard H. Anderson
or Brian Burke were participants or consultants at Heartland Response 04. This
was a major effort put on by FEMA and TEMA and did involve several radio
services or nets, including Civil Air Patrol, ARES and SHARES. It included
agencies from four states and had observers from both the Pentagon and the
White House in addition to those agencies already cited.

Good for me since I was in the middle of it and had one heck of a good time.

Steve, K4YZ

1643. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:22:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403240322.6df7df5e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89807

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323185641.18008.00000265@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231528.3ba424dd@posting.google.com>
>
> >Changing my words, putting them in quotation marks and saying they're
> >mine, and then asking me to validate them is a lose/lose proposition.
>
> So is asking you a direct question, it appears.
>
> >I cannot validate what I didn't say.
>
> No one expects you to, Brian,

You do.

but I DO expect you to answer the question
> "what "major role" do the unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms"".

See what I mean?

Go get the proper, accurate quote.

Best of Luck, because at this point you really do believe I said that.
That's what I meant by you repeating a lie over and over again until
even you believe it.

1644. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:23:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324062305.03164.00000011@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89808

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1YadnQPFGIGclPzdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> I would suggest a check of your vision. You have lost perspective
>> in viewing amateur radio in the very large picture of other radio
>> services. You are exhibiting mental tunnel vision. Not good for you.
>
>Maybe you need to have your tired old eyes checked, I am sure the nurse
>at the home there can set up an appointment for you. Have you noticed
>that you are less than nothing in the scheme of amateur radio and
>emergency comms?

Unfortunately, JJ, he hasn't.

Lennie still perceives himself as an "associate editor" of a long-since failed Amateur Radio magazine, and assumes since he once shared coffee with people who ARE licensed Amateurs that he somehow posseses practical skills and knowledge that they do.

He reminds me of the folks who occassionally show up in the emergency room and presume themselves to know something about emergency medicine or nursing based upon watching re-runs of "E.R."...

Close...no cigar...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1645. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:26:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89809

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3oekq$2876hf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "William" wrote ...
>
> > And you've trained your volunteers to some standard?
>
> Our "volunteers" are government employees who have this duty assigned to
> them as part of their employment, and they are well trained in EM. All of
> the angencies that support us have trained their volunteers via either RACES
> or ARES in EM. Of course, that training varies from jurisdiction to
> jurisdiction, but there is little we can do to enforce our standards on
> them.

I could be wrong, but I think only school teachers and the ARRL's W1AW
Operator are allowed to be paid while using amateur radio.

> > > > Does your military installation have a MARS base support team?
> > >
> > > We do not use MARS for multiple reasons. All of our ops are civil
> service
> > > and FCC Licensed Hams. This gives us much greater latitude in the
> > > equipment, modes, and frequencies available to us.
> >
> > That's too bad. Military communications has a specialized function
> > for such purposes.
> >
>
> I agree that the specialized function it provides could have assisted us --
> and we too a long look at that when we were planning. But in reviewing all
> COAs, the cost-benefit just wasn't there. Since we are primarily in contact
> with civilian agencies (both state and federal) during emergencies, it made
> better sense to utilize the cilvilian HAM radio assets we had in place. We
> have plenty of standard military comms available other than MARS HF. The
> Amateur radio piece is for redundancy purposes -- not as a primary means of
> communication. For example, all of our VHF is military and of course the
> SAT and wireless is run on military net/satilites for security purposes.
>
> Arnie -

Fair enough.

1646. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:51:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324065140.03164.00000012@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89810

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224719.22081.00004759@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322104926.20899.00000157@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>In article <ooydnYbfDoDYqcbd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ
>>><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>>>writes:
>>
>>>>Sure they do, but in the case of a 9/11 emergency they would be hard
>>>>pressed to use them. Cell phone are great during the planning, but when
>>>>the real emergency comes, they become useless for emergency comms.
>>>
>>> Not always true.
>>>
>>> You want to select the 11 September 2001 Attack on America as
>>> a typical emergency but that was a very UNtypical emergency
>>> that no one could foresee or plan for. In the "9/11" incident ALL
>>> methods of communications were strained.
>>
>> A point we can agree on.
>
> That isn't up for any discussion.

OW!...Lennie can't stand being agreed with!

THAT had to hurt!

>>> There are NO verifiable stories about amateur radio doing anything
>>> to aid anyone in the first few hours of the Attack in New York City
>>> on 11 Sep 01. Conversely, even though the NYC Emergency
>>> Center was almost destroyed in that Attack, police and fire
>>> department personnel were in constant communications before and
>>> immediately after the Attack in and around the World Trade Center.
>>> Add to that the medical people, NYC officials, and various utilities
>>> and other businesses who got into immediate action. All of that is
>>> quite well documented in many and various media outside of
>>> hobby groups.
>>
>> Now THAT we CAN'T.
>>

>> There have already been a half dozen recriminating "inquests" as to why
>>various communications failures occured with FDNY, NYPD, PAPF, EMS and othr
>>agencies.
>
> Exactly who was "recriminated?" There were investigations, yes, but
> "inquests" also?

Too bad you don't subscribe to any EMS/Rescue journals, Lennie...Ya might learn something about radio other than what you spew about in here.....It's a bitter subject within Fire/EMS circles right now.

> Recrimination is the act answering an accuser by accusing them
> in return. That is what you do to others in here. Who and where
> were the agencies doing this "recrimination?"

New York. NYPD. The Port Authority. FDNY. NYOES.

> An inquest is specifically a judicial inquiry, as before a jury. Which
> agency appeared at any inquest and at what time? What was the
> ruling?
>
>> THAT has been reported in "USA Today" and other nationwide media
>>sources.
>
> I don't read USA Today, only the Los Angeles and New York Times,
> Time magazine, Newsweek, and sometimes the Wall Street
> Journal and Variety. I don't recall the "inquests" or "recriminations"
> you allege. Please supply details on specifics.

Perhaps you should read some Amateur publications. Even THEY have made reference to some of the "boards" that have been called.

>> And almost every plan from the Department of Defense on down to "Podunk
>>Hollow USA" have some provision for including (or at least considering)
>>implementing Amateur Radio as a recourse.
>
> As a secondary, not a primary use.

Lennie...

Only YOU and Brain keep trying to insinuate that Amateur Radio would be "primary" communicaitons source.

And PLEASE note MY comment where I SPECIICALLY STATED "...implementing Amateur Radio as a recourse"...Or do I need to define "recourse" for you?

> The Auxilliary Communications Service of the state of California
> accepts volunteers with or without amateur license and doesn't
> even consider amateur radio as a primary fall-back medium for
> large-scale emergencies.

You had better reassess using that "doesn't even consider amateur radio" comment vis-a-vis ACS.

According to one of APCO's vice presidents (who happened to be at HR04),
ACS very thoroughly utilizes Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio operators.

Since he was part-and-parcel of the organization of ACS, I'd assume he
knows...

>>> A case in point is the "other" "9/11" Attack on the Pentagon in
>>> DC....(Snip to....)
>>> After crash fire control and search and rescue was coordinated by on-
>>> site military and civilian communications, not by amateur radio.
>>
>> Lennie...why do you keep trying to make a point of this?
>>
>> No one here has even remotely suggested that it was otherwise.
>
> YOU have.

No, I've not. I've not made a single reference to the activities at the
Pentagon as it pertains to the events of Spetember 11th.

You will please cite the quote that you suggests that I did?

>>> There are no viable
>>> reports of amateur radio being used while that most definite
>>> emergency situation was happening. (In reference to the 4th
>>> hijacking...SR)
>
> "SR?" That wasn't in my post. Why are you adding things?

I "added" a clarification that you were refering to the fourth hijacking.

I stated that clearly and added my initials as evidence that it was I, not
you that put that there.

If you are so feeble as to not be able to follow that without having to
requote the ENTIRE post, then I will, but it will just eat up bandwidth.

I don't think you are THAT idiotic, but if I need to do it to help keep
you focused, I'll be glad to do it in the future.

>> However Amateur Radio WAS employed in the post-incident recovery at the
>>site.
>
> In WHAT NTSB "recovery?" The NTSB has its own investigators
> and recovery procedures, such procedures limited to hired salvage
> operators and military personnel.
>
> Describe this "post-incident recovery" and tell us what the NTSB
> has documented and where we might find all that for reference.

Try the press, Lennie.

Try the Pennsylvania Office of Emergency Services.

Try the Office of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who
issued a letter of appreciation to ARES for thier service at the site.

>>> The "9/11" Attack is popular to espouse because of the enormous
>>> emotional impact to all Americans. But, it was an ATTACK done
>>> by other humans against all of us and definitely NOT some kind of
>>> natural event emergency or disaster. The "kamikazi" nature of
>>> this suicide attack was NOT anticipated by anyone and all were
>>> in surprise and all had to work through the immediate aftermath
>>> with whatever reseources were available.
>>
>> Oh...so as long as the causal effect was "intentional", then we can
>>discount using Amateur Radio to receover from teh post incident effects,
>>Lennie...?!?!
>
> No...because the amateur radio assistance was quite small
> compared to the overall task of recovery, including the assistance
> of other volunteer groups who aided the city of New York.

And you base this "small" quantification upon what reference? You having
not read about it in the LA Times?

> The National Transportation and Safety Board does not "train
> radio amateurs" to recover crash evidence. Try not to falsify your
> exaggerations by spouting lies and assorted untruths.

The "mistruth" here, Lennie H is that you alledge that I suggested that
Amateurs "recover crash evidence."

You now have yet another lie to apologize for, Lennie.

And you can, in the same effort, cite where I allegedly said that Amateurs
were involved in "crash evidence" recovery.

Quick Lennie...an excuse...quick!

Steve, K4YZ

1647. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:57:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324065719.03342.00000001@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89811

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224722.22081.00004760@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322103623.20899.00000156@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> In the WTC Attack during 11 Sep 01, the NYC Emergency
>>> Communications Center (in an adjacent building) was largely
>>> destroyed by falling debris, also severing many trunk lines
>>> of the telephone system. NYC police and fire units did work-
>>> arounds using their own radios in a relay system to several
>>> centrals, calling in other agencies as well as special units to
>>> help. Some cell phone service did work, regardless of myth to
>>> the contrary and some wired phone service still worked, used
>>> by almost anyone on the WTC Attack scene. Amateur radio
>>> did not play any significant part (if any at all) during the few
>>> hours after the Attack on the WTC.
>>
>> However Amateur Radio DID play a "major role" in the following DAYS of
>>post-incident recovery.
>
> Incorrect. NOT a "major role." NYC handled its own debris removal.
(SNIP)

No need in trying to respond to the rest of your verbose obfuscations,
Lennie...Not when you try to go directly from Amateur Radio's role in
communicaitons to discussing "debris removal", none of which had anything to do
with the topic being discussed.

Nice dodge.

Steve, K4YZ

1648. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 11:58:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89812

In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
> radio environment.

Generally agreed by whom?

The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.

The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all "civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.

And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural locations which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide service not available from other technologies?

How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have not agreed with the calculations and first hand-observations of others?

Sure, a lot of us will file comments. Maybe they'll do some good. But just because you were finally convinced of the BPL threat, don;t be surprised if the "professionals" don't agree.

1649. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 12:21:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89813

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040323224725.22081.00004762@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040322100511.20899.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 3/21/2004 7:14 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403211714.4469df54@posting.google.com>
>>
>>>> > I suggest you tell Average Citizen that he or she needs to have an
>>>> > amateur radio operator strapped to their hip for emergency purposes.
>>>>
>>>> Where did I speak of the average citizen?
>>>
>>>That's who I've been speaking of all along. Do try to keep up.
>>
>> JJ...please take CAREEFUL note.
>>
>> YOU were talking about disaster preparedness, those sets of plans in
>>place by your local or state EMA, FEMA, etc. And in the overall scheme
>> of things, you (and I) are correct.
>
> Brian is correct. You are not.

I am sure you think so.

FEMA and TEMA officials tend to think otherwise, and for SOME reason, I
value THIER opinons more than I do yours, Lennie........

> The scope of operations by the larger emergency agencies in the
> United States are available for viewing on the Internet.

Yes, they are.

And for those who care to be INVOLVED in those opertions, know that that
the "scope of operations" exceeds the PR spin provided on those websites.

You really do need to get Mrs Putz to let you out more, Sir Scummy.

>> Brain, on the other hand, having been UNABLE to successfully argue
>against

>>the value of Amateur Radio in those plans, has shifted his definition of
>>"emergency comms" to those of STRICTLY "the average citizen".
>
> Again incorrect. Brian Burke has stated the obvious condition of
> emergency situations which affect ALL citizens, "average" to
> the self-posturing, self-important minority who think only they are
> right and "superior" to the average.

I am not "superior", however in this case I AM right.

>> In the very narrow slice of "emergency comms" that Brian the Brainless
>has
>>wedged himself into, yes, John Q Public is going to whip out the old
>cellphone
>>and call 9-1-1 to get a cop, report a fire, or request EMS for an accident
>or
>>medical emergency...Just like he would have dialed a payphone 5 years ago.
>
> That is more like "dialing a 'payphone' [sic] 25 years ago."
>
> Try to keep up with urban conditions and the number of pay telephones
> versus cellular handsets and subscriptions for same.
>
> There is NO "Brian the Brainless" in here. Try to hold down the
> insulting behavior.

Sure there is...Just like there's a "Dill Sergeant", "Reverend Jimmy", etc
etc etc.

There's even a Lennie the Liar.

> The 911 Emergency Number plan has been in existance for far more
> that "5 years." It is a national plan. It was implemented primarily
> to handle the small-scale emergencies common everywhere in this
> United States. Such calls are the majority of situations, not "a
> very narrow slice" as you incorrectly state.

Less than 40% of ACTUAL CALLS to 9-1-1 services are bonafide
"emergencies", big or small.

In some cases the number drops to 20%.

These numbers per APCO and subject to on-going sampling.

9-1-1 has become the de facto "police" or "ambulance" number, whether or
not an emergency exists.

>> In a true "disaster preparedness" mode, cellphones may suffer all of
>the
>>bad things that you and I have said they will.
>
> Incorrect again. In a "true disaster" SITUATION (not a 'mode') the
> telephone system may be overloaded. However, the same thing

> may be said of all amateur radio in that same situation. Hypothetical
> situations are merely hypothetical, not real things.

If every Amateur licensee was on-the-air during an "emergency" occupying a discreet channel of his/her choice, over 80% of all available Amateur frequencies would be empty.

It's highly unlikely that "Amateur Radio" will be "overloaded".

> Hypotheses should reflect on objective consideration of the entire
> situation and its infrastructure. Hypotheses should not be subjective
> conjecture based on personal desires, thoughts or preferences. You
> are guilty of subjective conjecture in your disordered hypothesis.

Nope.

Cellphone and hardline common carrier services HAVE suffered network-wide failures in a number of different disaster situations.

This is not a "hypothesis" or "conjecture", Lennie.

It's happened.

>> THAT assertion is made upon the evidence that such incidents have
>ALREADY
>>HAPPENED, and those occurences have been sufficient to impress the REAL
>>"emergency comms" planners to continue to incorporate Amateur Radio in a
>wide
>>range of plans.
>
> The "real emergency communications planners" are no doubt very
> well aware that the telephone system can become overloaded with
> callers at the onset of any large emergency. However, such
> overloads affect only the switch capabilities of most subscribers,
> not the users of leased lines which do not route through switches
> (broadcast stations' audio, fire department station alert circuits).

Not all of which enjoy such dedicated lines.

And when teh switch itself becomes incapacitated, then it doesn't matter HOW "dedicated" the line is...broke is broke.

> Large-scale emergencies do not require "notification" of an event's
> occurrance in most cases. An earthquake is most definitely felt
> over a large geographical area. A tall skyscraper pair hit by
> hijacked airliners is visible to tens of thousands of city dwellers.
> A raging firestorm creates enough smoke to be seen to the
> visible horizon. A hurricane or tornado is preceded by spectacular
> (and unfortunately familiar to long-time dwellers) cloud conditions;
> some tornados and nearly all hurricanes are spotted by weather
> satellites and tracked, with public notifications, by NOAA. Floods
> are nearly all preceded by high rainfall storms. Such "real"
> emergency conditions may result in destruction of amateur radio
> capabilities as well as commercial or government communiations.

And they have. Thankfully, ARES and other agencies have made
accomodations for being able to pack in back-up equipment, mobile repeaters,
etc.

Not "imagined" equipment. REAL equipment.

> Reiterating from another thread, the major emergency agencies all
> have websites for easy access to their organization and policy.
> Information from them is public and accessible on request.

And your point is...?!?!

> Is there some agency that has amateur radio as a prime method
> of emergency communications by any emergency agency in the
> United States? I think not. Plans and policies of the "real"
> emergency agencies will place amateur radio as a secondary,
> or fall-back method of communications. First choice is the
> existing public safety agency communications and
> communications service providers such as telephone companies.

Lennie WHO said Amateur Radio is a "PRIME" method, other than YOU...?!?!

>> This is not "urban legend" or based upon some " feel good news release
>of
>>the ARRL" as Lennie the Loser would have us believe. Real, front-page news
>>stuff. Sorry he won't admit it, but that only helps to substantiate MY
>claims
>>about his "superior intellect".
>
> Personal pejoratives against another do not win your argument.

No, but your failings to substantiate anything you've asserted do.

> The information about "real" emergency agencies is out there for
> all to see. If all you can see is what you want to see, then you
> can only be accused of narrow mental tunnel vision.

Sorry, Your Putziness...I am INVOLVED with many of these agencies.

Regardless of what some PR-intense website may or maynot say, it's what
they can actaully DO that counts.

>>>> So they may, but in times of emergency, the military and other civil
>>>> authorites will not rely on cell phones to handle major emergency
>>>> communications.
>>>
>>>And it's always about the military and civil authorities, isn't it?
>
>
>>>I am no longer an instrument of national policy. Are you?
>>
>> As long as my Right to Vote has not been revoked, you're danged tooting
>>I am!
>
> Brian used the term "instrument of national policy" as a euphemism

> for military service. In this case he indicated he was no longer IN
> the military service.

Regardless of what methodology he insinutated, Your Scumminess, I am as
much an "instrument of national policy" as long as I participate in the
programs dictated by that policy, and as long as I have a vote in it, my status
as a member of the Armed Forces not withstanding.

BTW: The Armed Forces are an instrument of FOREIGN policy...Posse
Commitatus refers.

> Voting Rights are guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and are NOT
> restricted to military service personnel. Review Amendments 15, 17,
> 19, 24, and 26 to see Voting Rights for United States citizens.
>
> If you have been discharged from military service in the United States
> then you are no longer in that military service.

I never said I was.

Only YOU keep trying to amke some inference that I am, Lennie.

>> Try again, blockhead.
>
> I am a veteran of U.S. Army service, 1952 to 1960. My Honorable
> Discharge was granted in April, 1960. I have always been a citizen
> of the United States and have managed to vote in every election
> in my residence location since 1956. Regardless, you tried to
> prevent my communications with my government over federal law
> pending on 25 January 1999 (see FCC ECFS 98-143 for that date).
>
> You cannot deny the above since your attempt is public information
> and available for all to see.
>
> Why do you assume "power" that you do not have?

I "assumed" nothing.

You are free to say what you want.

I am free to counter it with my own opinion.

THAT is a guarantee of the same governmental documents that you like to
cite...remember...?!?!

> Why do you continue to post petty personal pejoratives against
> those who disagree with you?

Perhaps becasue of the same "petty personal pejoratives" who disagree with
me, Lennie...

> Seek mental health therapy. It will improve your thinking and be
> better for all of us.

Seek it yourself, Lennie.

Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me. And if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...

Steve, K4YZ

1650. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 12:26:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324072644.03342.00000004@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89814

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 5:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240322.6df7df5e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040323185641.18008.00000265@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:28 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231528.3ba424dd@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Changing my words, putting them in quotation marks and saying they're
>> >mine, and then asking me to validate them is a lose/lose proposition.
>>
>> So is asking you a direct question, it appears.
>>
>> >I cannot validate what I didn't say.
>>
>> No one expects you to, Brian,
>
>You do.
>
> but I DO expect you to answer the question
>> "what "major role" do the unlicensed radio services play in "emergency
>comms"".
>
>See what I mean?
>
>Go get the proper, accurate quote.
>
>Best of Luck, because at this point you really do believe I said that.
> That's what I meant by you repeating a lie over and over again until
>even you believe it.

No problem, Brain.

By now you've seen the other thread I opened wherein I SPECIFICALLY quoted the post you made wherein you DID make the assertion.

It's not about what I believe...

It's about what YOU said.

Now you have to back it up...sorry you don't have the facts with which to do it. Kinda left yourself hanging out there. I've tried to "throw you a

rope" a couple times, but you keep tying it around your neck...Sorry about that!

Steve, K4YZ

1651. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 12:28:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324072852.03342.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89815

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 5:26 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
>
>"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:<c3oekq$2876hf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> "William" wrote ...
>>
>> > And you've trained your volunteers to some standard?
>>
>> Our "volunteers" are government employees who have this duty assigned to
>> them as part of their employment, and they are well trained in EM. All of
>> the angencies that support us have trained their volunteers via either
>RACES
>> or ARES in EM. Of course, that training varies from jurisdiction to
>> jurisdiction, but there is little we can do to enforce our standards on
>> them.
>
>I could be wrong, but I think only school teachers and the ARRL's W1AW
>Operator are allowed to be paid while using amateur radio.

And for once you'd be right. Congratulations.

>> I agree that the specialized function it provides could have assisted us --
>
>> and we too a long look at that when we were planning. But in reviewing all
>> COAs, the cost-benefit just wasn't there. Since we are primarily in
>contact
>> with civilian agencies (both state and federal) during emergencies, it made
>> better sense to utilize the cilvilian HAM radio assets we had in place. We
>> have plenty of standard military comms available other than MARS HF. The
>> Amateur radio piece is for redundancy purposes -- not as a primary means of
>> communication. For example, all of our VHF is military and of course the
>> SAT and wireless is run on military net/satilites for security purposes.

>Fair enough.

It only took you three days.

Steve, K4YZ

1652. Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 15:08:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4061A457.6050600@psu.edu>
Source record: 89816

For those that might be interested, here is some info from the NCVEC proposal:

From Part II (Proposal), section 19. (basic framework of the new entry level license) Paragraph d.

Power limits. Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all frequencies below 24 mHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 mhz. This allows enough power for adequate communication under most circumstances, and matches the nominal power output of the largest number of commercially available transmitters and transceivers available as of this writing.

The use of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for RF safety evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated threshold values for the frequencies concerned.

(end paragraph d)

Okay, so the NCVEC petition *does* specifically ask for restricted power on their "communicator" class license.

First, I like Carl's note on the name. Novice is so much better. It is a time honored name, and although some may think this superfluous, it looks good in print, and sounds good too. I like having just two easy to say syllables, instead of 5!

Second, there is enough bad about this proposal that I pretty much reject it out of hand.

- mike KB3EIA -

1653. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 16:26:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4061B6A0.7050303@psu.edu>
Source record: 89817

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:UtGdnVv8e5CIT_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>L wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
>>>>Dayton!
>>>>
>>>>Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
>>>>thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
>>>>
>>>>Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get some
>>>>people to show up!
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Good Idea! You could call it a gathering of Phil & His Freaks,
>>>all five of you, a real Freak Show.
>>
>>So you're coming too?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Sounds kewl to me, Mike. On a slightly different vein, how about the
> resurrection of the r.r.a.p net? 7037 kHz, if I remember correctly. Not a
> ragchew, mind you, but just a simple weekly QNI.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Seems okay to me, though I might put people to sleep with my CW (or else
keep 'em awake laughing!

- mike KB3EIA -

1654. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 17:18:25 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Bpj8c.71980$pU1.14240865@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 89818

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4061B6A0.7050303@psu.edu...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:UtGdnVv8e5CIT_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>
> >>L wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:BJGdnTQXTZrwAsLdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I got to looking at the calendar, and it's only a couple months until
> >>>>Dayton!
> >>>>
> >>>>Now that we are getting close, I wanted to get an idea of people that
> >>>>thought they might be able to make the first rrap get together.
> >>>>
> >>>>Heck, I might be able to put up some web pages on it if we can get
some
> >>>>people to show up!
> >>>>
> >>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Good Idea! You could call it a gathering of Phil & His Freaks,
> >>>all five of you, a real Freak Show.
> >>
> >>So you're coming too?
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Sounds kewl to me, Mike. On a slightly different vein, how about the
> > resurrection of the r.r.a.p net? 7037 kHz, if I remember correctly. Not
a
> > ragchew, mind you, but just a simple weekly QNI.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >

> >
>
> Seems okay to me, though I might put people to sleep with my CW (or else
> keep 'em awake laughing!
>
> - mike KB3EIA -

That's ok, you've got a comic partner in me, Mike. Besides, if there's anything I've learned on the CW bands...it's that nobody seems to laugh at anybody's code. Quite the contrary, they all just want to help put a newbie at ease.

I happened upon a station that was working a contest one morning and I figured "what the heck, I'll give 'em a call. (Mind you that I had no idea he was working a "test" as it was 4 AM and the band was still empty.) Well, when I realized and expressed concern about wasting his valuable contesting time just to say hi, he replied (nice and slowly) "always time to welcome a newcomer."

73 de Bert
WA2SI

BTW, I'm halfway through toward my WAS...with 5 Watts, amazing!

1655. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 19:51:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89819

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > The power limits make sense.
>
> Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>
> I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> and electrical safety is not very responsible.

The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.

We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
that
I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
"dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
incentive
(gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to Morse
proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.

[snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]

73,
Carl - wk3c

1656. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 20:52:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241252.acaff25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89820

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323191229.18008.00000269@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231534.3f7baa61@posting.google.com>
>
> >You're nuts.
>
> And you're a lying coward. So I guess that balances things out, huh...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I don't think so. Mother Theresa couldn't balance you out.

1657. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 20:54:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324155420.05715.00000002@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89822

In article <20040323224712.22081.00004748@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>How many petitions does that make altogether.
>
> Three currently. The other 14 are way past their Comment ending
> date.
>
> 3 + 14 = 17 for 2003 to 2004.

I correct myself. There are FOUR RMs released.

RM-10869 is a page and a half proposing to reinstitute morse code
testing by Ronald Lowrance, K4SX.

RM-10867 is from the beloved ARRL...
RM-10868 is from the "grassroots organization" Radio Amateur
Foundation...
RM-10869 is from K4SX representing (apparently) himself...
RM-10870 is from the NCVEC.

LHA / WMD

1658. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 20:54:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324155421.05715.00000003@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89823

In article <20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(BPL is Good For You!) writes:

>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>> radio environment.
>
>Generally agreed by whom?

ARRL, FEMA, NTIA, the remaining amateur radio publications, just
for starters. :-)

>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.

Capitalists first. They want their slice of the "broadband" pie.

Why are you trolling like you WANT Access BPL?

Did you change professions into the Access BPL arena?

>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.

Incorrect. See the Communications Act of 1934 and the Tele-
communications Act of 1996 as to exactly what the FCC can
regulate.

Unless an Access BPL system goes across state borders, about
all that the FCC can regulate is the incidental RF radiation from
the system. Incidental RF radiation is a main subject in Part 15,
Title 47 C.F.R. Part 15 doesn't deal in "communications" systems
and NPRM 04-29 is only about revisions to Part 15.

>And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural locations
>which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide service not
>available from other technologies?

"Suburbia" is a part of the urban environment.

Try not to hurt yourself playing little trolling word games.

Feel free to list all the rural areas in the United States along with all
the inhabitants thereof. That's only about 3% of the population, should
not take you too long in here. :-)

Where are the existing Access BPL test sites now? Are those in
"rural areas?" [no, they are not out there]

>How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access BPL will
be
>a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have not agreed with the
>calculations and first hand-observations of others?

You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in
here. In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)

You are rejecting the ARRL Laboratory findings on Access BPL test
sites. You are rejecting several commenters on 03-104 who have,
independently shown calculations based on their own thinking.
You are rejecting the feelings of - literally - thousands of other U.S.
radio amateurs who think that Access BPL is going to be BAD for
their residential and mobile amateur radio operations.

Why do you want to sit back and welcome BPL?

Don't you want to "work" the HF ham bands from 80 meters and
up?

I guess not.

All you want to do is sit in here and troll for newsgroup word fights.

Not nice dedication to your "amateur community."

LHA / WMD

1659. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 20:54:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324155422.05715.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 89821

In article <4061A457.6050600@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Second, there is enough bad about this proposal that I pretty much
>reject it out of hand.

You can troll here or you can submit Comments to the FCC on
RM-10870. Which will be the more effective on the "amateur
community?" :-)

Since the NCVEC petition rejects the morse code test for all
classes, that should be an excellent reason for you to reject it.
[you are PCTA]

You might consider a Comment on Petition RM-10869 [by K4SX]
whose primary proposal is to have morse code testing for all
amateurs. It's only a page and half out of the ECFS.

LHA / WMD

1660. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 20:58:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241258.61fab06c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89824

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323190557.18008.00000268@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:30 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231530.535bc243@posting.google.com>
>
> >
> >No mistruth in what I said. Much mistruth in what you """quoted."""
> >
> >Once and I would call it an honest mistake.
> >
> >Again and again?
> >
> >I call that nuts.
>
> I see......
>
> You didn't lie, but what I quoted, which WAS what you said, IS a
> lie...?!?!

You did not quote what I said.

> You've got some real brass cajones to make an assinine statement like
> that, Brain!

Make up your mind(s). Either I have none or I have brass ones.

> I've asked you the same question over and over in response to YOUR
> assertion that "unlicensed services" play a "major role" (YOUR ADJECTIVES) in
> "emergency comms"...WHERE is the proof...?!?!

Yes, you have. Unfortunately one of your adjectives is incorrect.

> You can call me "nuts" if you care to. YOUR words are archived in this
> forum and have been quoted verbatim on numerous occassions.

My posts are archived and my words have been quoted verbatim on numerous occassions.

But unfortunately for you, this is not one of those time.

Best of luck.

1661. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 21:00:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241300.4c7d6d2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89825

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322100730.20899.00000153@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191609.2d43e810@posting.google.com>
> >
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>
>
> >> As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
> >> emergency comms... a big *yes*.
> >
> >Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
> >
> >You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
> >
> >That makes it grafitti.
>
> He needs to be a governmenal official to paint now?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

He has no authority to speak for the DoD and FEMA.

1662. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 22:49:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <XPednQE6nJGTjP_dRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 89826

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4061B6A0.7050303@psu.edu...
>
> Seems okay to me, though I might put people to sleep with my CW (or else
> keep 'em awake laughing!
>

Don't even worry about it. I often choke in my sending.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1663. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 22:52:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com>
Source record: 89827

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > The power limits make sense.
> >
> > Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> > should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> > the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> >
> > I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> > and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>
> The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
> This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> "beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>
> We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
> small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
> that
> I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
> "dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
> beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
> incentive
> (gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
Morse
> proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
>
> [snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]

The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to bypass
the Novice. People are strange.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1664. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 22:55:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Tlo8c.573$%x5.358@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 89828

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com...

>
> Generally agreed by whom?
>
> The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>
> The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
> "civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>
> And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural
locations
> which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide service not
> available from other technologies?
>
> How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access BPL
will be
> a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have not agreed with
the
> calculations and first hand-observations of others?
>
> Sure, a lot of us will file comments. Maybe they'll do some good. But just
> because you were finally convinced of the BPL threat, don;t be surprised
if the
> "professionals" don't agree.

Hello, Jim

Well, let's find out how well BPL works with 100 to 200 watts (don't need a
KW +) into a dipole in an urban environment. It will be *their* problem.
The sword cuts both ways ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.642 / Virus Database: 410 - Release Date: 3/24/04

1665. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:11:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324181111.20107.00000026@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 89829

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241258.61fab06c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040323190557.18008.00000268@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:30 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231530.535bc243@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >
>> >No mistruth in what I said. Much mistruth in what you """quoted."""
>> >
>> >Once and I would call it an honest mistake.
>> >
>> >Again and again?
>> >
>> >I call that nuts.
>>
>> I see......
>>
>> You didn't lie, but what I quoted, which WAS what you said, IS a
>> lie...?!?!
>
>You did not quote what I said.

Uh huh.

>> You've got some real brass cajones to make an assinine statement like
>> that, Brain!
>
>Make up your mind(s). Either I have none or I have brass ones.
>
>> I've asked you the same question over and over in response to YOUR
>> assertion that "unlicensed services" play a "major role" (YOUR ADJECTIVES)
>in
>> "emergency comms"...WHERE is the proof...?!?!
>
>Yes, you have. Unfortunately one of your adjectives is incorrect.
>
>> You can call me "nuts" if you care to. YOUR words are archived in
>this
>> forum and have been quoted verbatim on numerous occassions.

>
>My posts are archived and my words have been quoted verbatim on numerous
>occassions.
>
>But unfortunately for you, this is not one of those time.
>
>Best of luck.

Forunately (for me) I don't need luck. I have your own words in Google.

Idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

1666. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:13:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040324181337.05025.00000015@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89830

In article <4061A457.6050600@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>For those that might be interested, here is some info from the NCVEC
>proposal:
>
> From Part II (Proposal), section 19. (basic framework of the new entry
>level license) Paragraph d.
>
>Power limits. Limit transmitter output power levels to 100 watts on all
>frequencies below 24 mHz, and 50 watts on all frequencies above 24 mhz.
>This allows enough power for adequate communication under most
>circumstances, and matches the nominal power output of the largest
>number of commercially available transmitters and transceivers available
>as of this writing.
>
> The use of these suggested power levels also removes the necessity for
>RF safety evaluations, as the power levels are below the stated
>threshold values for the frequencies concerned.
>
>(end paragraph d)
>
>
> Okay, so the NCVEC petition *does* specifically ask for restricted
>power on their "communicator" class license.

Yep - just like I posted here back on March 18.
>
> First, I like Carl's note on the name. Novice is so much better.

I prefer "Basic". Descriptive, new, fits in the class structure (Basic,
General, Extra) and avoids confusion with the existing Novice class.

>It is
>a time honored name, and although some may think this superfluous, it
>looks good in print, and sounds good too.

Some folks might thing we're trying to recruit nuns.

> I like having just two easy to say syllables, instead of 5!

Ba-sic
>
>Second, there is enough bad about this proposal that I pretty much
>reject it out of hand.

Yep:

- No homebrewing from scratch
- No rigs with more than 30 volts on the finals
- "Signed stament" instead of regs testing

73 de Jim, N2EY

1667. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:14:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324181415.20107.00000027@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 89831

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 3:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241300.4c7d6d2b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322100730.20899.00000153@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191609.2d43e810@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> >news:<VYudnR-bY8WhrsbdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>...
>>
>>
>> >> As far as millitary and civil authorities are concerned for official
>> >> emergency comms... a big *yes*.
>> >
>> >Are you the SECDEF? Are you the Director of FEMA?
>> >
>> >You paint with a broad brush and without authority.
>> >
>> >That makes it grafitti.
>>
>> He needs to be a governmenal official to paint now?

>He has no authority to speak for the DoD and FEMA.

Neither JJ nor I have "(spoke) for the DoD and FEMA.".

We have made observations based upon publically available resources.

In my case I've made comments based upon practical experience AND
publically avaiable resources.

Sorry you don't agree.

Steve, K4YZ

1668. Re: Brain's Own Words...Now Who's Lying...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:18:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0403241518.408ece68@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89832

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0403231641.606add8e@posting.google.com>...
> I did a bit of research here, Brain, and, as usual, YOUR words are
> going to come back to haunt you.
>
> Once again, Brain...Once again...
>
> QUOTE:
>
> Search Result 1
> From: Steve Robeson, K4CAP (k4yz@aol.com)
> Subject: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> View: Complete Thread (49 articles)
> Original Format
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2004-03-19 18:50:48 PST
>
>
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403191000.76d3432e@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040319040604.06889.00000017@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > > >> > > > You and Dee simply cannot accept that an unlicensed service has played
> > > > >> > > > a major role in emergency comms.
> > > > >> > >
> > > > >> > > What "unlicensed service"...?!?! CB? FRS? MURS? Part 15
> > > > >> > > compliant devices?
> > > > >> >
> > > > >> > Sure. Why not?
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> Well, Brain...There ya go. This was only four days ago. There's
> more, but do I really need to rub your nose in it THAT hard?
>
> You can follow the original URL's if you care to. Just as anyone
> ELSE here who cares to figure out who's lying and who's not....
>
> QUOTE
>
> > > > >> OK, Brain...YOUR "scenario" was "that an unlicensed service has
> > > > >> played a major role in emergency comms".
> > > > >>

> > > >> Now...provide me with some example of one of those "unlicensed
> > > >> services" playing a "major role".
> > > >>
> > > >> To ME, at least, "major role" means that SOME sort of crucial
> > > >> event was dependent upon one of those "services" being able to render
> > > >> a meaningful, positive outcome.
> > > >>
> > > >> So...YOU put it out there, let's see you come up with some
> > > >> pertinent examples.
> > > >>
> > > >> And remember, Brain, "major" was YOUR adjective...NOT mine.
> > > >>
> > > >> > I'm just so happy that you finally acknowledged that mere cell phones
> > > >> > play a major role in disaster communications. Or did you?
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> Here YOU put words in MY mouth, alledging I "acknowledged taht
> mere cellphones play a major role in disaster communications".
>
> Of course you then buffered it with "Or did you?", but the seed
> wasa planted.
>
> Nice try. Didn't work then either.
>
> QUOTE
>
> > > >> I said they played a role...just like Amateur Radio does.
> > > >>
> > > >> Now...You made some silly assertions that I've asked you to
> > > >> substantiate.
> > > >>
> > > >> You got the cajones to come up with valid answers, or are we to
> > > >> be treated to more of your lame sandlot excuses...???
> > > >
> > > You completely quoted all of that, Brain, but didn't answer a single bit
> > > of it...even facetiously...
> > >
> > > Ya did a GOOD JOB of validating my assumption of your lack of valid
> > > argument and lack of cajones to do so...
> > >
> > > Remember, Brain...we're using YOUR adjectives of "MAJOR ROLE" in disaster
> > > and/or emergency communications.
> > >
> > > So far, the only "role" you've been able to cite is Joe Average calling
> > > 9-1-1 to report an emergency. That is NOT "emergency comms".
> > >
> > > I WANT TO KNOW what >>ROLE<< those unlicensed services play in disaster
> > > mitigation EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS....
> > >

> > > Thanks.
> >
> > Steve, you need to tone it down a bit. You're being rude and
> > obnoxious. I'll not respond to your insanity in-kind. Best of luck
> > to you.
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> At this point you refuse to answer the questions put to you about
> assertions YOU made, calling my questions "insanity" and insinuating I
> was being "rude and obnoxious"
>
> Again...didn't work then, doesn't work now.
>
> I'll finish the rest of the post I am quoting as it is in the
> original post (you can check the URL yourself, if you need to) since
> it's just as applicable today as a week ago.
>
> Nice try getting out of this one, Putz.
>
> QUOTE
>
> "Tone it down a bit"...?!?!
>
> YOU made the assertion that "unlicensed services play a "major"
> role in emergency comms".
>
> I've asked you three or four times now to substantiate your
> claims. YOUR claims, Brain...cited word-for-word, repeated by you
> several times.
>
> You "respond" by telling me I am rude and obnoxious.
>
> You call ME "bizarre", yet you make outlandish assertions in a
> public forum, then dodge all requests to "prove", at any level, your
> claims.
>
> I believe you to be a chronic liar. You have been "called" on
> several occassions to back up your assertions, but then use this ruse
> to try and avoid taking responsibility for your own actions.
>
> Call me rude and obnoxious if you think it deflects attention from
> you, but I can assure you that it does nothing of the sort. If
> anything, childish dodges like this only highlight YOUR bizarre
> behaviour.
>
> The FACTS are that the "unlicensed" services (11 meter CB, FRS,
> MURS and Part 15) provide NOTHING more than an ancilliary function in
> ANY "emergency comms" and you know this to be true.
>

> I certainly do in as much as I am INVOLVED with "emergency comms"
> on SEVERAL levels, not all of which involve the Amateur Radio or CAP.
> Most everyone else in this forum knows these things to be true too.
>
> You and Lennie seem to be the only ones in this forum who think
> that if you keep repeating the same lame, untrue "stuff" that it will
> somehow manifest a thread of truth. Sorry...that doesn't work.
>
> Now...PLEASE try and exceed my expectations with the next post
> and pony-up some cajones to either admit you are either blatantly
> lying, making wild guesses, or just trolling for the sake of making
> arguments that you obviously can't support.
>
> Or REALLY try something new and discuss something you have some
> EXPERIENCE in...THAT would be refreshing.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
> UNQUOTE

.

1669. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:23:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241523.5b49c02d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89833

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > The power limits make sense.
> > >
> > Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> > should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> > the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> >
> > I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> > and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>
> The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
> This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> "beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>
> We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
> small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
> that
> I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
> "dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
> beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
> incentive
> (gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to Morse
> proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
>
> [snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

I agree with making priveleges granted keyed to tested knowledge.
Arbitrary requirements were always an embarassment to try to justify.
I felt so sorry for all the feeble attempts of the PCTA to try to do
so.

bb

1670. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:28:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241528.424b6be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89834

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324072644.03342.00000004@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:22 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240322.6df7df5e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040323185641.18008.00000265@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231528.3ba424dd@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Changing my words, putting them in quotation marks and saying they're
> >> >mine, and then asking me to validate them is a lose/lose proposition.
> >>
> >> So is asking you a direct question, it appears.
> >>
> >> >I cannot validate what I didn't say.
> >>
> >> No one expects you to, Brian,
> >
> >You do.
> >
> > but I DO expect you to answer the question
> >> "what "major role" do the unlicensed radio services play in "emergency
> >comms"".
> >
> >See what I mean?
> >
> >Go get the proper, accurate quote.
> >
> >Best of Luck, because at this point you really do believe I said that.
> > That's what I meant by you repeating a lie over and over again until
> >even you believe it.
>
> No problem, Brain.

Probably not.

> By now you've seen the other thread I opened wherein I SPECIFICALLY quoted
> the post you made wherein you DID make the assertion.

Would you happen to recall which thread that might be in? You've started so many and they all read about the same.

> It's not about what I believe...

It is, but shouldn't be.

> It's about what YOU said.

It's about what you believe I said.

Best of Luck.

1671. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:35:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241535.64414c6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89835

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323005459.17834.00000201@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/22/2004 9:00 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221900.326651bc@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040322153205.01530.00000192@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >> >From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
> >> >Date: 3/21/2004 1:42 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <c3kr79$28bq9n$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
> >> >
> >> >"William" wrote in part ...
> >> >
> >> >Did Mark Morgan "deserve a lot harsher language than I have ever sent his
> >> >way?"
> >> >
> >> >WOW, I haven't heard that name in a long time.
> >> >>
> >> >> And that is the amateur's attitude to communications. I flipped on
> >> >> the radio and talked to Costa Rica! Everythings great, I got
> >> >> Emergency Comms!
> >> >>
> >> >I think you are missing the point here, William.
> >>
> >> Hey Arnie...
> >
> >Anyone that puts up with your twisted """quotes""" is an enabler.
>
> Nothing I've "quoted" is twisted, Brain.

Almost. Just the lie part.

> That you don't like being tasked with actually PROVING what you claim is
> not my problem.

Yet you make it your problem. Not my problem either

> Sorry about that.

Yeh, Mark Morgan never claimed to be in 7 hostile actions.

1672. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:40:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241540.b6f2b89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89836

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> I am not "superior", however in this case I AM right.

You are "right" in your statement that you are not superior.

You are also right in your claim that you are #2.

See how those go hand in hand?

Now excuse me while I go #1.

1673. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:46:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89837

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me. And
> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

More untruths.

Mark Morgan

RRAP is littered with people you hate.

1674. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:47:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241547.6c850e41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89838

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323002219.17834.00000192@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/22/2004 6:43 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221643.1096a11d@posting.google.com>
>
> >Emergencies aren't just about continuity of government for crying out
> >loud!
>
> Oh?

Right. Get a clue.

1675. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-24 23:57:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241557.3f578996@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89839

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322094420.20899.00000144@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/20/2004 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
>
> >Because all emergencies are Huge!
>
> They are if they are happening to you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, sorry to bust another one of your rants.

The emergencies that could have been huge were mitigated by proper
planning and preparedness.

1676. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 00:04:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241604.a98ef2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89840

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/22/2004 6:26 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403221626.5451b3ec@posting.google.com>
> >
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<fMydna9pBPDyucLdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>...
> >> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >> >
> >> > From the nature of the posts you have made ehre, I doubt that any
> training
> >> > you have had has been anything anyone would call "adequate".
> >>
> >> Not so, he has been trained to program every emergency number he could
> >> possibably need into his cell phone speed dial.
> >>
> >Good grief! Why wouldn't I just dial 911?
>
> Because 9-1-1 (...>>NOT<< "911") is not always who you need to call.

Steve, perhaps it's """9-1-1""" on your telephone, but when I enter 9
dash 1 dash one, I get a recording saying that the number I dialed is
not in service.

> Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.

It is here.

> Do you know the difference? Do you KNOW what's an "emergency" as opposed
> to urgent or routine...?!?!

All of your posts are emergencies.

Lots of ALLCAPS, """QUOTES""", """ACCUSATIONS""", and """DEMANDS"""

> > However when the cell
> >> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting
> >> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call
> >> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is
> >> over.
> >>
> >Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?
> >
> >Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur

> >volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.
>
> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and radios
> on...No cellphone necessary.

Gosh. You don't say?

I'll bet they got cell phones, too.

1677. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 00:08:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241608.3796bbc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89841

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040322111712.20899.00000163@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191616.2a113a7a@posting.google.com>
>
> >I know only one Steve Roberson and he's nuts.
>
> Well..."Steve Roberson" MAY be nuts.
>
> I am not.
>
> YOU, on the other hand, are not truthful.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I stand corrected.

Steve Robeson is nuts.

1678. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 00:14:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241614.327dc1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89842

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323005046.17834.00000199@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> Still waiting on THAT one...I've given up on any "proof" about your
> Somalia claims.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Still waiting on your Seven Hostile Actions.

Whatta blowhard.

1679. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 00:19:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403241619.1b0c7c8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89843

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040323191751.18008.00000270@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231550.63b464b0@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, I don't think your children fair game on the web, so try to
> >muster up your last ounce of courage and self-respect and leave mine
> >out of it.
>
> The kids are not the issue.

Then there was no reason for you to post about them.

You'll kindly never bring them up again. Thank you.

1680. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 01:27:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ibKcnb0UdoVCqP_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89844

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040324055908.00150.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com...
[snipped stuff where we seem to be in agreement]
> >I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC
proposal -
> >"communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional "novice" name, which
is
> >recognized around the world (and has been used in other countries as
well).
> >
> How about "Basic"?

I still prefer "Novice" ... anyone who's more than a beginner technically
will
probably go straight through to General, or even Extra, in one sitting.
Anyone
who's truly a technical "newbie" and needs to learn more should not be
offended
by the class name Novice.

It's been around a long time, still fits, and is recognized worldwide - some
other
countries even have a beginner class called Novice.

> What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather than
have a
> lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool, that they be
> *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement that they have
obtained
> a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide by it. This is proposed so
that
> the "Communicator" test and its pool can be made smaller.
>
> Is that a good idea?

It's clearly a "learn as you go" proposition any way you look at it ...
NOBODY knows
everything there is to know from day one.

Since the rules can be looked up (just as one can use a "crib sheet" to
remember sub-band
edges) it seems to me that its not an unreasonable proposition. I'd rather
have someone
know a bit more about radio and operating and have to refer to the rules as
they learn to
make sure they did things "by the book" than to shortcut the *basic* theory

and operating
practices.

However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal to the NCVEC one
for the following reasons:

1) less conversion of CW/data space to SSB
2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition because it unnecessarily
discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have *always* been allowed (and
encouraged by 97.1) to do.
3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition, because it precludes the new
ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101, TS-520/820, etc. for no good
reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC or 220VAC on the
primaries, so what's the sense in this proposal.
and,
4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with a special, never-used
callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are disgruntled with ANY change.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1681. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 01:35:47 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3td1i$29l7g5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89845

"William" wrote ...

I could be wrong, but I think only school teachers and the ARRL's W1AW
Operator are allowed to be paid while using amateur radio.
_____

I understand your point, but the intent of this section in the FCC rules was
to stop Ham radio from being used for commercial purposes, not to prohibit
emergency communications. Nothing in the rules prohibits use of this
equipment during an emergency by any licensed person. Or for that matter,
any person whatever. As I said, our Ham equipment is being used for
redundancy, so for all practical purposes, it will never be used for routine
communication -- other than testing to ensure it is working properly.

Arnie -

ary communications has a specialized function
> > > for such purposes.
> > >
> >
> > I agree that the specialized function it provides could have assisted
us --
> > and we too a long look at that when we were planning. But in reviewing
all
> > COAs, the cost-benefit just wasn't there. Since we are primarily in
contact
> > with civilian agencies (both state and federal) during emergencies, it
made
> > better sense to utilize the cilvilian HAM radio assets we had in place.
We
> > have plenty of standard military comms available other than MARS HF.
The
> > Amateur radio piece is for redundancy purposes -- not as a primary means
of
> > communication. For example, all of our VHF is military and of course
the
> > SAT and wireless is run on military net/satilites for security purposes.
> >
> > Arnie -
>
> Fair enough.

1682. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 01:48:08 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3tdoo$2cg8v8$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89846

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> Save the vituperation and concentrate on your fabulous emergency
> work for Homeland Security.
>
> Tell us all about TCL and the Scotty. Show us where that is applied
> so much in other radio communications.
>
> Have you any experience in metrology? (not meteorology) I know
> how to measure current, voltage, wattage, resistance, inductance,
> capacitance very well and to small tolerances. Spent two years
> working in a Calibration Laboratory. Do you wish to make fun of
> that and denigrate that with more name-calling like "Great White
> Current Chaser?"
>
> Why do you apply labels that were never claimed? I happen to have
> been in electronics and radio for a long time, beginning with primary
> communications on HF. That's not "legendary." It is just was is.
> If you wish to be petulant and abusive because you haven't had
> that experience or accumulated as much knowledge, that is your
> problem, not mine.
>
> You might try for some mental health counseling, too. It would cure
> you of what appears to be a radio inferiority complex.

If I wanted your resume, I would have asked for it, Leonard. It seems any time that someone challenges your 1950s understanding of electricity, you break out that tired old resume. (yawn)Who cares what you did in 1950? -- I sure don't. For your information (since you apparently don't know) the VTC/Scotty is applied across the military services in a wide variety of applications. I don't suppose you know what a "Blackberry" is either. Oh, wait --- I'm sure you do since you are so up to snuff on all the new technology. Oh that's right, they didn't have that kind of technology in 1950. Well, I guess you'll just have to continue "astounding" us with ancient electrical theory.

Arnie -

1683. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 02:07:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040324210727.08988.00000015@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89847

In article <w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >
>> > The power limits make sense.
>>
>> Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
>> should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
>> the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>>
>> I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
>> and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>
>The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
>This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
>"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.

There may still need to be *some* evaluation done even at the 100/50W power
level, but they are simplified compared to what needs to be known for the whole
raneg of amateur power/frequencies.
>
>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>can get on the air

I agree 100%! That's the whole point of multiple license classes. It's not in
the best interests of amateur radio to require all newcomers to pass the Extra
just to get started.

>... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
>that I and many others took those many years ago

No it's not clear at all! In fact, it's an apples and oranges comparison.
Here's why:

Books like "Now You're Talking" are meant to be stand-alone study guides. They
contain the entire question pool, with explanations of each question and how to
get the answer. And much more.

The old License Manuals were not meant to be "one stop" books. They focused on
the license process only - where the tests were held, the process, etc. The

"study guides" were *not* the actual Q&A, but rather *essay* questions intended to indicate the areas to be tested.

If you really want to make a comparison, take an old ARRL License Manual, add on "How To Become A Radio Amateur", "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code" and "Understanding Amateur Radio" and you'll begin to have an apples-to-apples comparison.

Or consider these questions from the 1976 ARRL License Manual:

Study Question #31:
Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
(a) battery with internal resistance,
(b) resistive load,
(c) voltmeter,
(d) ammeter.

Study Question #32:
From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed by the load be determined?

Study Question #33:
In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?

Study Question #34:
Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having the following components:
(a) triode vacuum tube,
(b) pi-network output tank,
(c) high voltage source,
(d) plate-current meter,
(e) plate-voltage meter,
(f) rf chokes,
(g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.

Study Question #35:
What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?

The above were just *some* of the study questions for the *Novice* exam of 1976. Took up less than a page. How many pages of explanation would it take to teach the above material?

The actual exam did not use these questions. Instead, it might show, for example, a schematic of the amplifier circuit similar to, but not exactly like the one shown in the license manual, with 5 of the components labeled "a" thru "e". The question would be something like, "which is the coupling capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?" "what is function of the capacitor labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"

And that's at the *Novice* level.

Does anyone think that the current entry-level exams are tougher than that?

> ... the proposal is not a
>"dumbing down" for the entry level ...

The NCVEC proposal definitely *is* a dumbing down. The ARRL proposal is much better because it does not set a precedent of no homebrewing, etc.

The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really bad.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1684. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 02:40:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <rEr8c.5378$V66.966@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89848

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > >
> > > > The power limits make sense.
> > >
> > > Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> > > should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> > > the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> > >
> > > I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> > > and electrical safety is not very responsible.
> >
> > The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
> > This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> > "beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
> >
> > We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> > can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
> > small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> > to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> > that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level
tests
> > that
> > I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
> > "dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
> > beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
> > incentive
> > (gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
> Morse
> > proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
> >
> > [snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
>
> The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
> much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners

> themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
bypass
> the Novice. People are strange.
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

They didn't bypass Novice since they had to pass the written before
2000. The testing to get to tech was divided into two written elements.
What many bypassed was the code test. If Novice was nocode with
VHF access, especially to 2m, I'd bet there wouldn't have been anywhere
near the number of techs we have today.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1685. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 02:48:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B6DDC546F57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89849

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...
>>
>>
>> RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>>
>> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>> cum ent=6516083735
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>>
>> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>> cum ent=6516082208
>>
>>
>>
>> RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>>
>> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>> cum ent=6515783299
>>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people
> realize that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
> demonstrates a lack of consensus in the ham community, which could
> cause the FCC to do exactly nothing.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

That's probably what some of the old guard are trying to do. They are most
likely filing spurious petitions to delay the inevitable.

1686. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 02:49:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <SMr8c.5392$V66.4924@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89850

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040324210727.08988.00000015@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> >> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >> >
> >> > The power limits make sense.
> >>
> >> Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> >> should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> >> the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> >>
> >> I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> >> and electrical safety is not very responsible.
> >>
> >The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
> >This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> >"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>
> There may still need to be *some* evaluation done even at the 100/50W
power
> level, but they are simplified compared to what needs to be known for the
whole
> raneg of amateur power/frequencies.
> >
> >We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> >can get on the air
>
> I agree 100%! That's the whole point of multiple license classes. It's not
in
> the best interests of amateur radio to require all newcomers to pass the
Extra
> just to get started.
>
> >... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
> >small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> >to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> >that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
> >that I and many others took those many years ago
>
> No it's not clear at all! In fact, it's an apples and oranges comparison.

> Here's why:
>
> Books like "Now You're Talking" are meant to be stand-alone study guides.
They
> contain the entire question pool, with explanations of each question and h
ow to
> get the answer. And much more.
>
> The old License Manuals were not meant to be "one stop" books. They
focused on
> the license process only - where the tests were held, the process, etc.
The
> "study guides" were *not* the actual Q&A, but rather *essay* questions
intended
> to indicate the areas to be tested.

Wrong...see below.

> If you really want to make a comparison, take an old ARRL License Manual,

The "old ARRL License Manual" was all anyone needed to pass the
tests in the late 50s. Novice material was covered in 4 or 5 pages and
General/Tech was about 12/16 pages. NO other info or books
were needed.

add
> on "How To Become A Radio Amateur", "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code" and
> "Understanding Amateur Radio" and you'll begin to have an apples-to-apples
> comparison.
>
> Or consider these questions from the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>
> Study Question #31:
> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following
components:
> (a) battery with internal resistance,
> (b) resistive load,
> (c) voltmeter,
> (d) ammeter.

AND the study guide included the diagram. I memorized all 15 "draw a
diagram"
answers for the General written. 5 of those EXACT questions were on the
General written I took in 1958.

> Study Question #32:
> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
> the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
> by the load be determined?

All you needed to know was the formula...and that was in the study guide.

> Study Question #33:
> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
> order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?

Anyway...you get the picture.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1687. Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 02:54:08 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324215408.09636.00000035@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 89751

I am glad for this comment period with the FCC. I hope everyone will make a comment, I know I am!

I will be so happy to get my HF Ham access. I have tried many time to learn code, without any suceess.

I think it's time it was given to me.

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

1688. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 03:06:58 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B6E0F2B528Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89752

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
news:ibKcnb0UdoVCqP_dUSdV9g@ptd.net:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040324055908.00150.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com...
> [snipped stuff where we seem to be in agreement]
>> >I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC
>> >proposal - "communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional
>> >"novice" name, which is recognized around the world (and has been
>> >used in other countries as well).
>> >
>> How about "Basic"?

Why not? It's good enough for the Canadians, eh!

>
> I still prefer "Novice" ... anyone who's more than a beginner
> technically will
> probably go straight through to General, or even Extra, in one sitting.
> Anyone
> who's truly a technical "newbie" and needs to learn more should not be
> offended
> by the class name Novice.
>
> It's been around a long time, still fits, and is recognized worldwide -
> some other
> countries even have a beginner class called Novice.

The word Novice still makes me think of nuns before I think of amateur
radio!

>
>> What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather than
>> have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool, that
>> they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement that
>> they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide by
>> it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool can
>> be made smaller.
>>
>> Is that a good idea?
>
> It's clearly a "learn as you go" proposition any way you look at it ...
> NOBODY knows
> everything there is to know from day one.
>

> Since the rules can be looked up (just as one can use a "crib sheet" to
> remember sub-band
> edges) it seems to me that its not an unreasonable proposition. I'd
> rather have someone
> know a bit more about radio and operating and have to refer to the
> rules as they learn to
> make sure they did things "by the book" than to shortcut the *basic*
> theory and operating
> practices.

Sorry, but I think they should have to learn both. If you have a ham
licence you should _know_ the rules at least for your own class of licence,
period.

>
> However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal
> to the NCVEC one
> for the following reasons:
>
> 1) less conversion of CW/data space to SSB

But it still falls well short of the amount of phone allowed in the IARU
Region 2 (North and South America) bandplan. Try reading that particular
document. You may find that it's an eye opener.

> 2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition
> because it unnecessarily
> discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have
> *always* been allowed (and
> encouraged by 97.1) to do.

Agreed, but the test needs to cover basic electronics theory accordingly

> 3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition,
> because it precludes the new
> ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101,
> TS-520/820, etc. for no good
> reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC
> or 220VAC on the
> *primaries*, so what's the sense in this proposal.
> and,

Agreed, but the appropriate safety guidelines should be in the test

> 4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with
> a special, never-used
> callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are
> disgruntled with ANY change.
>

Agreed, but _only_ if they don't get to take a new ultra-lame theory test

> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1689. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 03:18:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <bvadnWx1bKCEzf_d4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 89753

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:rEr8c.5378$V66.966@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > > > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > The power limits make sense.
> > > >
> > > > Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe
they
> > > > should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should
have
> > > > the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> > > >
> > > > I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of
RF
> > > > and electrical safety is not very responsible.
> > >
> > > The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the
evaluations.
> > > This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> > > "beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
> > >
> > > We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> > > can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with
their
> > > small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> > > to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> > > that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level
> tests
> > > that
> > > I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
> > > "dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
> > > beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
> > > incentive
> > > (gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
> > Morse

> > > proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
> > >
> > > [snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
> >
> > The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> > technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> > studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than
the
> > much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
> > themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
> bypass
> > the Novice. People are strange.
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> They didn't bypass Novice since they had to pass the written before
> 2000. The testing to get to tech was divided into two written elements.
> What many bypassed was the code test. If Novice was nocode with
> VHF access, especially to 2m, I'd bet there wouldn't have been anywhere
> near the number of techs we have today.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I said they elected to use the no-code Technician as their entry to ham radio rather than the Novice license. Yes they took the Novice written but not the code. Thus they "bypassed" the Novice license in the sense that they never held a Novice license. They had basically two choices to enter ham radio (unless of course they chose to do additional study and sit for higher class tests at the same time).

1) They could take (and pass) the Novice written plus 5wpm and get a Novice license.
2) They could take (and pass) the Novice written and Tech written and get a no-code Tech license.

The prospective ham generally took the route 2 to enter ham radio rather than route 1. Thus by that choice, the people themselves made the Tech no-code the entry level license despite the fact that it was more difficult than earning the Novice license. The restructuring in 2000 merely formalized what had already occurred.

Having earned my initial license in 1992 (Tech with HF), I'm quite familiar with what was going on. The majority of people sitting for their first license took the Tech no-code route to put off learning the code not because of its two meter and VHF access. Prior to on-air experience, they simply were not personally familiar enough with various ham activities to select their entry route on the basis of the desireability of having 2m access.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1690. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 03:20:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <DeOdnVT63Is8zf_dRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 89754

```
"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94B6DDC546F57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >>
> >>
> >> RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
> >>
> >> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
> >> cum ent=6516083735
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
> >>
> >> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
> >> cum ent=6516082208
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
> >>
> >> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
> >> cum ent=6515783299
> >>
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people
> > realize that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
> > demonstrates a lack of consensus in the ham community, which could
> > cause the FCC to do exactly nothing.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> That's probably what some of the old guard are trying to do. They are most
> likely filing spurious petitions to delay the inevitable.
```

Oh I doubt that. It's more likely that everyone knows a change is coming one way or another and views this as an opportunity to shape the requirements to their own individual visions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1691. Re: Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:11:01 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1acc25e16f5e120e98988c@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 89755

In article <20040324215408.09636.00000035@mb-m24.aol.com>, daviesl2003
@aol.com says...
> I am glad for this comment period with the FCC. I hope everyone will make a
> comment, I know I am!
>
> I will be so happy to get my HF Ham access. I have tried many time to learn
> code, without any suceess.
>
> I think it's time it was given to me.

Now I can legitimately bitch and complain. I went the Element 1C route,
passed it and got my Extra and access to everything. I guarantee the
voice bands will be filled with nitwits who can pass the theory exams by
rote memorization should they completely eliminate the code requirement.

Doesn't really matter anyhow. Amateur Radio as we know it is under
serious threat from any number of sources. And it has become easier to
communicate with someone via a cable modem or phone line. I regularly
correspond with people in Asia and Europe on the net and it's reliable.

So enjoy it while you can. It won't last long.

1692. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:18:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40625D90.5060908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89756

N2EY wrote:

>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>
>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>> radio environment.
>>
>>
>
>Generally agreed by whom?
>
>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>
Sure, they were by investors told to build something that could get
digital information over
power cables. The fact that it will radiate was not an issue for them.
But a big
issue for us.

>
>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>
Bullshjt, they're just brearucrats who are lawyers and not engineers.
They probably
figure that they can sue whatever out of existance to solve problems....

>
>
>

1693. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:45:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324234544.17713.00000010@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89757

In article <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>>
>> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me.
>And
>> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
>> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>More untruths.
>
>Mark Morgan
>
>RRAP is littered with people you hate.

Ahem...the sentence got mixed up.

RRAP is littered with his hatreds.

Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali? :-)

LHA / WMD

1694. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:45:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324234546.17713.00000011@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89759

In article <c3tdoo$2cg8v8$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> Save the vituperation and concentrate on your fabulous emergency
>> work for Homeland Security.
>>
>> Tell us all about TCL and the Scotty. Show us where that is applied
>> so much in other radio communications.
>>
>> Have you any experience in metrology? (not meteorology) I know
>> how to measure current, voltage, wattage, resistance, inductance,
>> capacitance very well and to small tolerances. Spent two years
>> working in a Calibration Laboratory. Do you wish to make fun of
>> that and denigrate that with more name-calling like "Great White
>> Current Chaser?"
>>
>> Why do you apply labels that were never claimed? I happen to have
>> been in electronics and radio for a long time, beginning with primary
>> communications on HF. That's not "legendary." It is just was is.
>> If you wish to be petulant and abusive because you haven't had
>> that experience or accumulated as much knowledge, that is your
>> problem, not mine.
>>
>> You might try for some mental health counseling, too. It would cure
>> you of what appears to be a radio inferiority complex.
>____
>
>If I wanted your resume, I would have asked for it, Leonard. It seems any
>time that someone challenges your 1950s understanding of electricity, you
>break out that tired old resume. (yawn)Who cares what you did in 1950? -- I
>sure don't.

1960s, Arnie. Actually I don't care what you did before since it
wasn't much to do with electronics (which includes radio).

Oh my, give you a Title and you really become difficult, don't you?

>For your information (since you apparently don't know) the
>VTC/Scotty is applied across the military services in a wide variety of
>applications.

Video Tape Cassette?

Show us the references where we all might learn of these
"new revelations" for a "wide variety of applications" in
Communications. Give us TM numbers, FM numbers, etc.

>I don't suppose you know what a "Blackberry" is either.

If you mean the little palmtop unit favored in Europe and the UK,
I do.

Do you know what a "raspberry" is? Here, have one from me
to you.

>Oh,
>wait --- I'm sure you do since you are so up to snuff on all the new
>technology.

A lot more than you ever to admit...or concede.

>Oh that's right, they didn't have that kind of technology in
>1950.

True enough. The transistor was invented in 1947, took a half
decade or so before they became practical enough to use.

Faster than the vacuum tube invention to practical, useable
tubes, all without some fantastic improvements in metalurgy
and quality control required in solid-state electronics.

>Well, I guess you'll just have to continue "astounding" us with
>ancient electrical theory.

You would be "astounded" to learn Ohm's Law well enough to
apply a resistor in an electrical circuit. Ohm theorized his Law
of Resistance (often misused as "Ohm's Law") way back in time,
probably before radio was first demonstrated as a communications
medium.

James Clerk Maxwell and Oliver Heaviside formulated enough laws
to later explain radio propagation, also before 1896. How about
Ampere' and Volta? Or even James Watt? Heinrich Hertz?
All "ancient" in your terms of reference. All RELEVANT TODAY.

Prove those fundamental laws don't apply today because you
don't like "ancient" stuff.

Go ahead, call a ham in Iowa on CW. Maybe he can help you.

Then QRT.

LHA / WMD

1695. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:45:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324234546.17713.00000012@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89760

In article <DeOdnVT63Is8zf_dRVn-tA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>> That's probably what some of the old guard are trying to do. They are most
>> likely filing spurious petitions to delay the inevitable.
>
>Oh I doubt that. It's more likely that everyone knows a change is coming
>one way or another and views this as an opportunity to shape the
>requirements to their own individual visions.

Yes, isn't that strange?

Some folks just don't like to be tied down to 1930s standards and
practices, wanting to live in this new millenium rather than the old.

LHA / WMD

1696. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:45:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324234547.17713.00000013@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 89758

In article <2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays66@comcast.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > >
>> > > The power limits make sense.
>> >
>> > Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
>> > should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
>> > the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>> >
>> > I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
>> > and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>>
>> The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
>> This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
>> "beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>>
>> We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>> can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>> small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>> to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>> that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
>> that
>> I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
>> "dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
>> beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
>> incentive
>> (gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
>Morse
>> proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
>>
>> [snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
>
>
>The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
>technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
>studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
>much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners

>themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to bypass
>the Novice. People are strange.

Yes. For decades I've worked with people who were interested in
electronics and radio, so interested that they made that their
career choice and never once tried to get an amateur license.

Isn't that strange to you? I'm sure it is...

LHA / WMD

1697. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:48:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4062648E.50209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89761

>
>
>>
>>
>
>It's clearly a "learn as you go" proposition any way you look at it ...
>NOBODY knows
>everything there is to know from day one.
>
>Since the rules can be looked up (just as one can use a "crib sheet" to
>remember sub-band
>edges) it seems to me that its not an unreasonable proposition. I'd rather
>have someone
>know a bit more about radio and operating and have to refer to the rules as
>they learn to
>make sure they did things "by the book" than to shortcut the *basic* theory
>and operating
>practices.
>
Back in the olden days before Bash published his books, I imagine that
some ham clubs
had compiled remembered questions from FCC tests. To help members
upgrade. And
I suppose someone had snuck a peek at those mail in novice and tech
tests before the FCC
said everyone had to test at a field office (Early 1976 they decreed
that, so I had to test
at the FCC).

>
>However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal to the
>NCVEC one
>for the following reasons:
>
>
>2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition
>because it unnecessarily
>discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have *always*
>been allowed (and
>encouraged by 97.1) to do.
>3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition, because
>it precludes the new
>ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101,
>TS-520/820, etc. for no good

>reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC or
>220VAC on the
>*primaries*, so what's the sense in this proposal.
>
A few questions on electrical safety and procedures on the test should
address this issue.
Besides, other than an FCC inspector paying a visit, how could be
enforced? The FCC
doesn't have the budget for that. Output power can be limited to say
100W. Easier to
enforce, as signal strength can be measured remotely (not foolproof,
maybe his beam is
aimed right at you). The power limit would avoid the RF exposure issue.

>and,
>4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with a
>special, never-used
>callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are
>disgruntled with ANY change.
>
The old Novice licensees got WN#XXX callsigns to designate them as
novices. Other than a
few bozos, everyone accepted them as legit hams. When you upgraded to
general, the FCC
replaced the N with A or B in your callsign. The FCC must have had an
internal use only
note as to which you'd get when they issued your novice call. Today, you
could get a vanity callsign with the
WN if you want, even if you're an extra. Wonder if WN2ISE was ever
issued? Someone did
have WA2ISE before I was issued it in 1976, as a tech (general written
and 5wpm).

>
>
>
>

1698. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:52:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ha2dnem0T_Pu-P_dRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89762

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>
>>>>The power limits make sense.
>>>
>>>Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
>>>should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
>>>the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>>>
>>>I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
>>>and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>>
>>The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
>>This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
>>"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>>
>>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>>can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
>>that
>>I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
>>"dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
>>beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
>>incentive
>>(gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
>
> Morse
>
>>proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
>>
>>[snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
>
>
>
> The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of

> studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
> much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
> themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to bypass
> the Novice. People are strange.

I took the Technician test because it had the access that I wanted.
Until I went to a few club functions and started working contests with
the higher licensed hams, I was VHF-centric.

This is part of my thoughts on the natural divide between MF/HF and
VHF/UHF. I noted that divide before I ever took a test, and many of the
Technicians I know seem to have that impression also.

And finally, Exactly WHO is the Technician test too hard for? I hear
and see people talking about this, but I really want to know who it is
too hard for?

And with the Morse test going, who is the General or Extra test too
hard for?

I find it very interesting that the NCVEC does not produce one bit of
evidence for the failure rate among those tested. If the tests are too
hard, there should be a percentage of testees that fail the tests. That
might go a long way in convincing me that they are too hard. Instead, we
hear the tests are too hard, but no hard evidence whatsoever.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1699. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 04:58:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040324235834.08081.00000014@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89763

In article <40625D90.5060908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>>> radio environment.
>>>
>>
>>Generally agreed by whom?
>>
>>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>>
>Sure, they were by investors told to build something that could get
>digital information over
>power cables. The fact that it will radiate was not an issue for them.
> But a big
>issue for us.
>
>>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
>>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>>
>Bullshjt, they're just brearucrats who are lawyers and not engineers.
> They probably
>figure that they can sue whatever out of existance to solve problems....

The FCC also created the six-tiered amateur license structure
prior to R&O 99-412 and established 13 and 20 WPM morse
code rates. :-)

ARRL didn't do a thing, did they? :-)

LHA / WMD

1700. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 05:05:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <dvadnQ7J_68d9f_dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89764

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040324055908.00150.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com...
> [snipped stuff where we seem to be in agreement]
>
>>>I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC
>
> proposal -
>
>>>"communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional "novice" name, which
>
> is
>
>>>recognized around the world (and has been used in other countries as
>
> well).
>
>>How about "Basic"?
>
>
> I still prefer "Novice" ... anyone who's more than a beginner technically
> will
> probably go straight through to General, or even Extra, in one sitting.
> Anyone
> who's truly a technical "newbie" and needs to learn more should not be
> offended
> by the class name Novice.
>
> It's been around a long time, still fits, and is recognized worldwide - some
> other
> countries even have a beginner class called Novice.
>
>
>>What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather than
>
> have a
>
>>lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool, that they be
>>*replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement that they have
>
> obtained
>
>>a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide by it. This is proposed so

>
> that
>
>>the "Communicator" test and its pool can be made smaller.
>>
>>Is that a good idea?
>
>
> It's clearly a "learn as you go" proposition any way you look at it ...
> NOBODY knows
> everything there is to know from day one.
>
> Since the rules can be looked up (just as one can use a "crib sheet" to
> remember sub-band
> edges) it seems to me that its not an unreasonable proposition. I'd rather
> have someone
> know a bit more about radio and operating and have to refer to the rules as
> they learn to
> make sure they did things "by the book" than to shortcut the *basic* theory
> and operating
> practices.
>
> However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal to the
> NCVEC one
> for the following reasons:
>
> 1) less conversion of CW/data space to SSB
> 2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition
> because it unnecessarily
> discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have *always*
> been allowed (and
> encouraged by 97.1) to do.
> 3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition, because
> it precludes the new
> ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101,
> TS-520/820, etc. for no good
> reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC or
> 220VAC on the
> *primaries*, so what's the sense in this proposal.

This is very important. New is very cool, and fun. But so is the
vintage stuff sometimes. Those old tube rigs are very cool, most perform
pretty well, and of course many are real bargains, and allow a new ham
to get on the air for very little money. The relative simplicity also
acts as a classroom for the new ham, in which s/he can learn some RF
basics. It would be sad to give the new licensees access to HF, and not
allow them to access some of the cooler (IMO) rigs out there.

Heh, guess I'm waxing a little technonostalgic here!

> 4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with a
> special, never-used
> callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are
> disgruntled with ANY change.

Never though of that, but I agree.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1701. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 05:19:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <uqKdnQt_LqVw9v_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89765

N2EY wrote:

> In article <w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>
>>>>The power limits make sense.
>>>
>>>Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
>>>should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
>>>the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>>>
>>>I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
>>>and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>>
>>The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
>>This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
>>"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>
>
> There may still need to be *some* evaluation done even at the 100/50W power
> level, but they are simplified compared to what needs to be known for the whole
> raneg of amateur power/frequencies.

I don't think that safety stops at the "station evaluation level.

One of the things that will probably happen if we get out of the mode
that makes us even think of doing safety evaluations is that the new
hams may not be thinking about RF safety at all.

"Remember, don't put the antenna of your handy talkie in the puppy's
mouth and press the talk button".

I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing for
the introductory license.

If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the power to
something like 5 watts or so.

>>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>>can get on the air
>
>
> I agree 100%! That's the whole point of multiple license classes. It's not in
> the best interests of amateur radio to require all newcomers to pass the Extra
> just to get started.

Sure. I'm just pretty bullish on the safety requirements.

>
>>... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level tests
>>that I and many others took those many years ago
>
>
> No it's not clear at all! In fact, it's an apples and oranges comparison.
> Here's why:
>
> Books like "Now You're Talking" are meant to be stand-alone study guides. They
> contain the entire question pool, with explanations of each question and how to
> get the answer. And much more.
>
> The old License Manuals were not meant to be "one stop" books. They focused on
> the license process only - where the tests were held, the process, etc. The
> "study guides" were *not* the actual Q&A, but rather *essay* questions intended
> to indicate the areas to be tested.
>
> If you really want to make a comparison, take an old ARRL License Manual, add
> on "How To Become A Radio Amateur", "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code" and
> "Understanding Amateur Radio" and you'll begin to have an apples-to-apples
> comparison.
>
> Or consider these questions from the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>
> Study Question #31:
> Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following components:
> (a) battery with internal resistance,
> (b) resistive load,
> (c) voltmeter,
> (d) ammeter.
>
> Study Question #32:
> From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how can
> the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power consumed
> by the load be determined?
>
> Study Question #33:
> In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be in
> order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?

>
> Study Question #34:
> Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having the
> following components:
> (a) triode vacuum tube,
> (b) pi-network output tank,
> (c) high voltage source,
> (d) plate-current meter,
> (e) plate-voltage meter,
> (f) rf chokes,
> (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>
> Study Question #35:
> What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>
> The above were just *some* of the study questions for the *Novice* exam of
> 1976. Took up less than a page. How many pages of explanation would it take to
> teach the above material?
>
> The actual exam did not use these questions. Instead, it might show, for
> example, a schematic of the amplifier circuit similar to, but not exactly like
> the one shown in the license manual, with 5 of the components labeled
> "a" thru "e". The question would be something like, "which is the coupling
> capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?" "what is function of the capacitor
> labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>
> And that's at the *Novice* level.
>
> Does anyone think that the current entry-level exams are tougher than that?

You know, I can't answer that question very easily. I don't believe
that more questions makes for a harder test. And although I wasn't
raised on hollow state, I figured out the questions you posed after a
little enjoyable study.

>
>>... the proposal is not a
>>"dumbing down" for the entry level ...
>
>
> The NCVEC proposal definitely *is* a dumbing down. The ARRL proposal is much
> better because it does not set a precedent of no homebrewing, etc.

The NCVEC proposal is just plain Dumb.

And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.

> The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really bad.

Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1702. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 05:22:47 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <n7udnfFftpwX7P_dRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89767

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
> about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing for
> the introductory license.
>
> If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the power
> to something like 5 watts or so.
>

People are more at risk from RF exposure using their cell phones on a
daily basis, operating at very high frequencies, where the antenna is
less than an inch from their brain than they ever will be from any ham
radio transmissions.

1703. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 05:23:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ePKdndXR0txQ8f_dRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89766

Alun wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...
>>
>>>
>>>RM-10867 - ARRL, 18 March 2004
>>>
>>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>>>cum ent=6516083735
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>RM-10870 - NCVEC, 3 March 2004
>>>
>>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>>>cum ent=6516082208
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>RM-10868 - AG4RQ, 18 March 2004
>>>
>>>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_do
>>>cum ent=6515783299
>>>
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people
>>realize that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
>>demonstrates a lack of consensus in the ham community, which could
>>cause the FCC to do exactly nothing.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>
>
> That's probably what some of the old guard are trying to do. They are most

> likely filing spurious petitions to delay the inevitable.

Bad form, Alun. One petition I have seen is of the "old guard type". The others are eliminating Morse code testing (or keeping it for the highest class, making the testing regimen easier. Seems like most of them are along the lines of what you want, not the old guard.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1704. Re: ARRL's Incoming QSL Burro!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 11:52:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0403251152120.643@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 89768

That's what you get for hiring a mule: Half-assed answers.

1705. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 12:59:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89769

In article <20040324155421.05715.00000003@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO writes:
>
>>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>>> radio environment.
>>
>>Generally agreed by whom?
>
> ARRL, FEMA, NTIA, the remaining amateur radio publications, just
> for starters. :-)

But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or the Commissioners....;-) ;-)

>>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>
> Capitalists first.

Aren't you also a capitalist, Len? Or are you something else?

>They want their slice of the "broadband" pie.

They want the money. That's the essential definition of "professional" - getting paid.

> Why are you trolling like you WANT Access BPL?

I don't want Access BPL. I'm simply trying to figure out how to fight it. You don't seem to have any answers besides "comment to the FCC". I already knew that.

> Did you change professions into the Access BPL arena?

Nope, I'm still an *amateur* in the field of HF radio communications. And I don;t have anyhting to do with BPL "professionally".

>>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all >>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>
> Incorrect.

They're not professionals? They don't get paid for what they do? I think you are mistaken.

> See the Communications Act of 1934 and the Tele-
> communications Act of 1996 as to exactly what the FCC can
> regulate.

Irrelevant to the BPL situation. FCC could prevent BPL from going forward if they wanted to.

> Unless an Access BPL system goes across state borders, about
> all that the FCC can regulate is the incidental RF radiation from
> the system. Incidental RF radiation is a main subject in Part 15,
> Title 47 C.F.R. Part 15 doesn't deal in "communications" systems
> and NPRM 04-29 is only about revisions to Part 15.

Again, irrelevant. And probably incorrect. The noise from BPL systems will clearly cross state lines.

>>And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural locations
>>which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide service not
>>available from other technologies?
>
> "Suburbia" is a part of the urban environment.

No, it isn't.
>
> Try not to hurt yourself playing little trolling word games.

Not me - you're the one who does that. I'm simply truying to figure out how to defeat BPL. You're avoiding the central issue: How can *amateurs* prevail when *professionals* are pushing BPL?

> Feel free to list all the rural areas in the United States along with all
> the inhabitants thereof.

You first, Len. My amateurish work would not meet your professional standards. ;-)

> That's only about 3% of the population, should
> not take you too long in here. :-)

If you know the answer, why do you ask the question? ;-) ;-) ;-)

> Where are the existing Access BPL test sites now?

Look them up on the ARRL website.

> Are those in "rural areas?" [no, they are not out there]
>
>>How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access BPL will
>>be
>>a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have not agreed with
>>the calculations and first hand-observations of others?
>
> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in

> here.

I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would think that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed experience would know the answer, but I guess you don't.

> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)

Oh no, not me. I leave that to professionals like you, Len. Wasting other people's time is something you are realy, really good at.
>
> You are rejecting the ARRL Laboratory findings on Access BPL test
> sites.

Not me. I've read them, accepted them, met and talked with people who put them together. I've commented to FCC on the issue and will do so again

It's the FCC, BPL companies, and similar *professionals* who reject them. Even *you* questioned them at first.

> You are rejecting several commenters on 03-104 who have,
> independently shown calculations based on their own thinking.

Not me. I find all of those calculations and observations to be convincing. FCC apparently doesn't. A good number of your fellow "professionls" don't, either.

> You are rejecting the feelings of - literally - thousands of other U.S.
> radio amateurs who think that Access BPL is going to be BAD for
> their residential and mobile amateur radio operations.

"Feelings"?

You've got it backwards, Len. You're wrong again!
>
> Why do you want to sit back and welcome BPL?

I don't. I've been working against it since before you even thought it was a problem.
>
> Don't you want to "work" the HF ham bands from 80 meters and
> up?

I already do. You don't.
>
> I guess not.
>
> All you want to do is sit in here and troll for newsgroup word fights.

Not me, Len. That's what you do.
>
It's clear you don't know how to convince those "professionals" any more than anyone else. You don't have any new or different arguments or evidence. You just want to lecture and criticize.

Now you'll probably respond with a lot of diversions into irrelevant minutiae, name-calling, inaccurate information, insults, shouting, excessive emoticons, your resume from a half-century ago and the rest of your usual, "professional" bag of tricks, in a vain attempt to get me to reply in kind. Wrong again, Len!

1706. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 13:04:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403250504.52f029c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89770

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040324234544.17713.00000010@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me.
> And
> >> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
> >> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >More untruths.
> >
> >Mark Morgan
> >
> >RRAP is littered with people you hate.
>
> Ahem...the sentence got mixed up.
>
> RRAP is littered with his hatreds.
>
> Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
> is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
> could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali? :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

A fight with Muhammed Ali?

I think a debate between Muhammed and Steve would be more balanced and entertaining.

1707. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 13:59:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325085912.17909.00000059@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89771

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 5:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241528.424b6be@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message

>> It's about what YOU said.
>
>It's about what you believe I said.
>
>Best of Luck.

No luck needed.

I've quoted EXACTLY what you've said.

Denying it makes you a liar.

Well...I guess it just exacerbates an existing problem, when I think about
it...

Steve, K4YZ

1708. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:03:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325090319.17909.00000060@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89772

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>>
>> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me.
>And
>> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
>> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>More untruths.
>
>Mark Morgan
>
>RRAP is littered with people you hate.

Mark's not here anymore.

Mark, like you, was a chronic liar.

Mark isn't here anymore because he got wise when we kept re-quoting those
things he insisted he didn't say, yet was right in front of him. In THAT
regard, it was the only wise thing he ever did (ie: leave)

Like I said...I don't tolerate liars. Mark was proven to be a liar.
Lennie's been proven to be a lair, and now you are.

Wadda ya know!

Steve, K4YZ

1709. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:06:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325090607.17909.00000061@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89773

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/24/2004 10:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040324234544.17713.00000010@mb-m28.aol.com>

> RRAP is littered with his hatreds.

Only as long as you continue to tell tales that are easily proven to be
false.

> Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
> is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
> could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali?

There are a lot of things I'd rather do than fight.

In this case, I am not "fighting". All I am doing is airing out YOUR (and
Brain's) dirty laundry.

Fail to tell the truth and have it found out, and it WILL come back to
haunt you.

Steve, K4YZ

1710. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:08:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325090814.17909.00000062@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89774

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241557.3f578996@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322094420.20899.00000144@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/20/2004 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Because all emergencies are Huge!
>>
>> They are if they are happening to you.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, sorry to bust another one of your rants.
>
>The emergencies that could have been huge were mitigated by proper
>planning and preparedness.

Brain, do you READ what you post before you post it?

Steve, K4YZ

1711. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:13:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325091309.17909.00000063@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89775

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 6:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241604.a98ef2a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>> Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.
>
>It is here.

Then you obviously don't know about tiered dispatching. (Why am I not surprised?)

Also, most 9-1-1 centers are trying to make it well known that they want people to use 9-1-1 for TRUE emergencies...bleeding, robbery-in-progress, smoke/fire, etc...The cat in the tree or the broken window don't rate a Code 3 response.

>> Do you know the difference? Do you KNOW what's an "emergency" as
>opposed
>> to urgent or routine...?!?!
>
>All of your posts are emergencies.
>
>Lots of ALLCAPS, """QUOTES""", """ACCUSATIONS""", and """DEMANDS"""

I guess that's what it takes to get a reply from you.

Not that you'd answer any of it honestly anyway.

>> > However when the cell
>> >> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting
>> >> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call
>> >> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is
>> >> over.
>> >
>> >Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?
>> >
>> >Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur
>> >volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.
>>
>> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and
>radios
>> on...No cellphone necessary.

>
>Gosh. You don't say?
>
>I'll bet they got cell phones, too.

Some do.

Steve, K4YZ

1712. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:17:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325091701.17909.00000064@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89776

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 6:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241608.3796bbc0@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040322111712.20899.00000163@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:16 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191616.2a113a7a@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >I know only one Steve Roberson and he's nuts.
>>
>> Well..."Steve Roberson" MAY be nuts.
>>
>> I am not.
>>
>> YOU, on the other hand, are not truthful.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>I stand corrected.
>
>Steve Robeson is nuts.

You've made another assertion of fact, Brain.

That assertion would be, in most cases, the rendering of a diagnosis,
which requires a degree as a medical doctor.

Are you now telling us that you are a medical doctor?

Please cite what criteria you base this diagnosis on?

That I have labled you a liar after having presented you with your own
words only to have you try and deny it...?!?!

Or that I have labeled you a liar becasue you've made OTHER assertions of
fact for which you refuse to corroborate with some reasonably valid
documentation?

Steve, K4YZ

1713. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:22:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325092209.17909.00000065@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89777

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 6:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241614.327dc1b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040323005046.17834.00000199@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>> Still waiting on THAT one...I've given up on any "proof" about your
>> Somalia claims.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Still waiting on your Seven Hostile Actions.
>
>Whatta blowhard.

I already stated that I won't give it here. It's not pertient to the forum.

You, on the other hand, have made statements of fact in this forum about topics relative to the forum, yet refuse to corroborate.

You've even had the cajones to deny you've made statements even when provided with the verbatim quotes. Now that's REALLY stupid, but it's status quo for you.

Now...WHAT "major role" do the unlicensed services provide in "emergency comms"...?!?!

Or are you the liar I have asserted that you are?

Steve, K4YZ

1714. Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 14:23:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325092334.17909.00000066@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89778

>Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically Humiliated...Again...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/24/2004 6:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241619.1b0c7c8c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040323191751.18008.00000270@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why Does Lennie Enjoy Being Publically
>Humiliated...Again...?!?!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/23/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403231550.63b464b0@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Steve, I don't think your children fair game on the web, so try to
>> >muster up your last ounce of courage and self-respect and leave mine
>> >out of it.
>>
>> The kids are not the issue.
>
>Then there was no reason for you to post about them.
>
>You'll kindly never bring them up again. Thank you.

Then YOU will "kindly" answer the folowing question...

"What "major role" do the unlicensed radio services play in "emergency
comms"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1715. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 15:33:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4062FBE5.4080807@psu.edu>
Source record: 89779

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>>news:w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>The power limits make sense.
>>>>
>>>>Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
>>>>should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
>>>>the same power privileges as the rest of us.
>>>>
>>>>I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
>>>>and electrical safety is not very responsible.
>>>
>>>The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
>>>This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
>>>"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
>>>
>>>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>>>can get on the air ... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>>>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>>>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>>>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level
>>
> tests
>
>>>that
>>>I and many others took those many years ago ... the proposal is not a
>>>"dumbing down" for the entry level ... it's an attempt to rationalize
>>>beginner level tests and beginner level privileges, while providing an
>>>incentive
>>>(gee, I hate to use that word, since the incentive used to be keyed to
>>
>>Morse
>>
>>>proficiency more than anything else) to learn and advance.
>>>

>>>[snipped the rest where we seem to be in fundamental agreement]
>>
>>The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
>>technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
>>studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
>>much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
>>themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
>
> bypass
>
>>the Novice. People are strange.
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> They didn't bypass Novice since they had to pass the written before
> 2000. The testing to get to tech was divided into two written elements.
> What many bypassed was the code test. If Novice was nocode with
> VHF access, especially to 2m, I'd bet there wouldn't have been anywhere
> near the number of techs we have today.

Even with an Element 1 test, there would probably be a lot more novices
if there had been VHF access. Conjecture of course.

- mike KB3EIA -

1716. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 15:40:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4062FD69.6000203@psu.edu>
Source record: 89780

JJ wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>
>> I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
>> about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing
>> for the introductory license.
>>
>> If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the
>> power to something like 5 watts or so.
>>
>
> People are more at risk from RF exposure using their cell phones on a
> daily basis, operating at very high frequencies, where the antenna is
> less than an inch from their brain than they ever will be from any ham
> radio transmissions.
>

No argument there. I hope that newcomers won't try to use their HT's
like they do a cell phone, presses up against the ear.

Maybe *another* safety question?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1717. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 15:52:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325105251.22051.00000080@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 89781

>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 3/25/2004 9:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4062FBE5.4080807@psu.edu>

>> They didn't bypass Novice since they had to pass the written before
>> 2000. The testing to get to tech was divided into two written elements.
>> What many bypassed was the code test. If Novice was nocode with
>> VHF access, especially to 2m, I'd bet there wouldn't have been anywhere
>> near the number of techs we have today.
>
> Even with an Element 1 test, there would probably be a lot more novices

>if there had been VHF access. Conjecture of course.

I dunno, Mike...

Novices were given 220MHz priviledges along with some (dubiously) adequate
10 meter phone priviledges and it sputtered to a halt almost as quickly as it
started.

I was in SoCal when "Novice Enhancement" took effect, and one can hardly
argue that there is a dearth of repeaters on that band in that region...even
that, very little additional activity was heard. I think I worked a half dozen
Novices on 220 in the year after it was implemented.

HF is the spectrum everyone wants to play on, all of the wizz-bang
technology that's sprouting up on V/UHF notwithstanding.

Any carrots we wish to put in front of the new-licensee cart are going to
have to be 1.8 to 29.7MHz flavored carrots, I think!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1718. Re: Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 16:17:46 UTC
From: Arnold <pigs@pink.floyd>
Message-ID: <KCD8c.15058$tP4.1139258@twister.southeast.rr.com>
Source record: 89782

On 25 Mar 2004 02:54:08 GMT, Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord stood up and said:
> I am glad for this comment period with the FCC. I hope everyone will make a
> comment, I know I am!
>
> I will be so happy to get my HF Ham access. I have tried many time to learn
> code, without any suceess.
>
> I think it's time it was given to me.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

Wow. What a troll. This is sure to generate a huge thread.

1719. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 16:39:13 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <c3v1vh$m8b$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 89783

The fact of the matter is, there are only a super
small percentage of truckers on hammie bands.
They are not responsible for any enforcement
"emphasis". In fact, the only "emphasis" appears
to stem from self appointed radio kopps on patrol.

There is no real "emphasis" on anything at the FCC.
Compare the stats from last year, or the year before,
or the year before that. The hammie busts are the
same, the unlicensed busts didn't budge,
and the only FCC radio related enforcements that
have increase in any manner is the amount of fines
levied against commercial radio stations.

Freebanders do not intrude on hammie bands.
Since there are so many hellbent on painting
freebanders with a wide brush, this
would be a good time to educate you on that of
which you are so deluded. Freebanders, at least
the ones I have come across and associated with
since the seventies, are for the most part,
meticulous operators who are very polite and are
comprised of operators, both licensed and
non-licensed, from around the world.

They are for the most part, courteous and
non-intrusive and do NOT intrude on hammie bands,
despite your best attempts at presenting them in
the same light as hammie band invaders.

Parts of 11 meter ARE licensed to various entities
who have chosen to abandon their choice of spectrum.

Same as a vacant lot..cops drive by and see a
bunch of kids playing football or baseball in a vacant
lot,,,yes, the cops know they can technically arrest
the kids for trespassing, yet they use their sound
judgement, as the children are not damaging
anything andthe owner did not compaint, no
action is taken.

You are akin to the little old lady who watches
unsupervised children playing a sandlot game and
continuously calls the cops about the noise
they are making (children laughing) and the
remote possibility that your window MAY get broken.

Thank GOD the FCC adopted a sane approach to
such activities and does not share your position.

The 'cancer" is in self-appointed monitors like
yourself. You're still pissed 'cause we can DX
HF and you're stuck on your self-ruined freqs.

Twistedhed
Unit RS1175
FLA, USA

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Thu Mar 25 17:39:13 2004 depuis l'IP : ac8940e8.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

1720. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 16:49:21 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Md-dnbrHNe8BkP7dRVn-hw@crocker.com>
Source record: 89784

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:c3v1vh$m8b$1@news.x-echo.com...
> The 'cancer" is in self-appointed monitors like
> yourself. You're still pissed 'cause we can DX
> HF and you're stuck on your self-ruined freqs.
>
> Twistedhed
> Unit RS1175
> FLA, USA

'your' frequencies aren't all that great the last time i listened either,
lots of intentional qrm and other nasty stuff... and at least i can dx and
not have to hide behind some fake 'callsign' or dumb handle.

1721. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:00:39 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89785

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com:

> In article <20040324155421.05715.00000003@mb-m25.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>,
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any
>>>>urban radio environment.
>>>
>>>Generally agreed by whom?
>>
>> ARRL, FEMA, NTIA, the remaining amateur radio publications, just for
>> starters. :-)
>
> But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or
> the Commissioners....;-) ;-)
>>
>>>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>>
>> Capitalists first.
>
> Aren't you also a capitalist, Len? Or are you something else?
>
>>They want their slice of the "broadband" pie.
>
> They want the money. That's the essential definition of "professional"
> - getting paid.
>
>> Why are you trolling like you WANT Access BPL?
>
> I don't want Access BPL. I'm simply trying to figure out how to fight
> it. You don't seem to have any answers besides "comment to the FCC". I
> already knew that.
>>
>> Did you change professions into the Access BPL arena?
>
> Nope, I'm still an *amateur* in the field of HF radio communications.
> And I don;t have anyhting to do with BPL "professionally".

>>
>>>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of
>>>all "civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>>
>> Incorrect.
>
> They're not professionals? They don't get paid for what they do? I
> think you are mistaken.
>
>> See the Communications Act of 1934 and the Tele-
>> communications Act of 1996 as to exactly what the FCC can regulate.
>
> Irrelevant to the BPL situation. FCC could prevent BPL from going
> forward if they wanted to.
>
>> Unless an Access BPL system goes across state borders, about
>> all that the FCC can regulate is the incidental RF radiation from
>> the system. Incidental RF radiation is a main subject in Part 15,
>> Title 47 C.F.R. Part 15 doesn't deal in "communications" systems
>> and NPRM 04-29 is only about revisions to Part 15.
>
> Again, irrelevant. And probably incorrect. The noise from BPL systems
> will clearly cross state lines.
>
>>>And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural
>>>locations which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide
>>>service not available from other technologies?
>>
>> "Suburbia" is a part of the urban environment.
>
> No, it isn't.
>>
>> Try not to hurt yourself playing little trolling word games.
>
> Not me - you're the one who does that. I'm simply truying to figure out
> how to defeat BPL. You're avoiding the central issue: How can
> *amateurs* prevail when *professionals* are pushing BPL?
>
>> Feel free to list all the rural areas in the United States along
>> with all the inhabitants thereof.
>
> You first, Len. My amateurish work would not meet your professional
> standards. ;-)
>
>> That's only about 3% of the population, should not take you too long
>> in here. :-)
>
> If you know the answer, why do you ask the question? ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>> Where are the existing Access BPL test sites now?

>
> Look them up on the ARRL website.
>
>> Are those in "rural areas?" [no, they are not out there]
>>
>>>How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access
>>>BPL will be a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have
>>>not agreed with the calculations and first hand-observations of
>>>others?
>>
>> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in
>> here.
>
> I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would
> think that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed
> experience would know the answer, but I guess you don't.
>
>> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)
>
> Oh no, not me. I leave that to professionals like you, Len. Wasting
> other people's time is something you are realy, really good at.
>>
>> You are rejecting the ARRL Laboratory findings on Access BPL test
>> sites.
>
> Not me. I've read them, accepted them, met and talked with people who
> put them together. I've commented to FCC on the issue and will do so
> again
>
> It's the FCC, BPL companies, and similar *professionals* who reject
> them. Even *you* questioned them at first.
>
>> You are rejecting several commenters on 03-104 who have,
>> independently shown calculations based on their own thinking.
>
> Not me. I find all of those calculations and observations to be
> convincing. FCC apparently doesn't. A good number of your fellow
> "professionls" don't, either.
>
>> You are rejecting the feelings of - literally - thousands of other
>> U.S. radio amateurs who think that Access BPL is going to be BAD for
>> their residential and mobile amateur radio operations.
>
> "Feelings"?
>
> You've got it backwards, Len. You're wrong again!
>>
>> Why do you want to sit back and welcome BPL?
>
> I don't. I've been working against it since before you even thought it

> was a problem.
>>
>> Don't you want to "work" the HF ham bands from 80 meters and up?
>
> I already do. You don't.
>>
>> I guess not.
>>
>> All you want to do is sit in here and troll for newsgroup word
>> fights.
>
> Not me, Len. That's what you do.
>>
> It's clear you don't know how to convince those "professionals" any
> more than anyone else. You don't have any new or different arguments or
> evidence. You just want to lecture and criticize.
>
> Now you'll probably respond with a lot of diversions into irrelevant
> minutiae, name-calling, inaccurate information, insults, shouting,
> excessive emoticons, your resume from a half-century ago and the rest
> of your usual, "professional" bag of tricks, in a vain attempt to get
> me to reply in kind. Wrong again, Len!
>
>
>
>

Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?

1722. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:10:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403250910.479c380b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89786

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ePKdndXR0txQ8f_dRVn-sw@adelphia.com>...
> Alun wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> > news:HIX7c.15120$t16.8558920@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >>news:20040323045452.25517.00004878@mb-m15.aol.com...

> >>How many petitions does that make altogether. Don't these people
> >>realize that the plethora of petitions will drag out the process? It
> >>demonstrates a lack of consensus in the ham community, which could
> >>cause the FCC to do exactly nothing.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> > That's probably what some of the old guard are trying to do.

The facts speak differently.

> > They are most
> > likely filing spurious petitions to delay the inevitable.

Hardly "spurious". Hardly inevitable, either.
>
> Bad form, Alun. One petition I have seen is of the "old guard type".
> The others are eliminating Morse code testing (or keeping it for the
> highest class, making the testing regimen easier. Seems like most of
> them are along the lines of what you want, not the old guard.

In fact, some of them are either redundant or followups. Note that the
No Code International and NCVEC petitions that have closed are
virtually identical. Why didn't NCVEC wait until they had all their
ideas together and submit just one petition? That's what ARRL did ;-)

Hans, K0HB may yet submit a petition, too. It won't be an "old guard"
type.

It should be noted that there is plenty of precedent for this, too.
There were no less than *11* petitions that got RM numbers way back in
the 1960s, leading up to "incentive licensing".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1723. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:13:03 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_oE8c.3719$b_2.2050@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89787

"Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:Md-dnbrHNe8BkP7dRVn-hw@crocker.com...
>
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:c3v1vh$m8b$1@news.x-echo.com...
> > The 'cancer" is in self-appointed monitors like
> > yourself. You're still pissed 'cause we can DX
> > HF and you're stuck on your self-ruined freqs.
> >
> > Twistedhed
> > Unit RS1175
> > FLA, USA
>
> 'your' frequencies aren't all that great the last time i listened either,
> lots of intentional qrm and other nasty stuff... and at least i can dx and
> not have to hide behind some fake 'callsign' or dumb handle.

Reckon FCC thinks THIS is important? LOL!

J

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
ENFORCEMENT BUREAU
ATLANTA OFFICE

March 19, 2004

CB Sales and Service
FILE No.: EB-04-AT-024
ATTN: Mr. Jim Norton
Sent via Certified
190E Lenlock Lane
Return Receipt requested and
Anniston, AL 36206
First Class mail

CITATION
No.: C200432480001 Released: March 19, 2004
By the Enforcement Bureau, Atlanta Office

1. This is an Official Citation issued pursuant to
Section 503(b) of The Communications Act of 1934, as amended
(``Act''', 1 to Mr. Jim Norton, owner of CB Sales and
Service, Anniston, Alabama, for violation of Section 302(b)
of the Act, 2 and Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Commission's
Rules.3

2. An investigation by the FCC's Atlanta Office revealed that on March 11, 2004, you offered for sale at your retail store located at 190E Lenlock Lane, Anniston, Alabama, eight models of non-certified Citizens Band transceivers, namely, a Galaxy model DX66V, a Galaxy model DX 73V, a Galaxy model 48T Big Rig Series, a Galaxy model DX88HL, and a Galaxy model DX77HML, a Galaxy DX44V, Galaxy DX33HML, and Galaxy model DX99V. According to Commission's records, these devices have not received an FCC equipment authorization which is required for Citizens Band transmitters marketed in the United States. Furthermore, these devices bore no FCC equipment authorization labeling that is required for Citizens Band transceivers marketed in the United States.4

3. Section 302(b) of the Act provides ``{n}o person shall manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship devices or home electronic equipment and systems, or use devices, which fail to comply with regulations promulgated pursuant to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules provides that ``...no person shall sell or lease, or offer for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease), or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to certification, such device has been authorized by the Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and is properly identified and labeled...''
Jim Norton's CB Sales and Service's offer for sale of these devices violates both sections.

4. Additionally, dual use CB and amateur radios of the kind at issue here may not be certificated under the Commission's rules. Section 95.655(a) of the rules states: ``...
({CB} Transmitters with frequency capability for the Amateur Radio Services....will not be
certificated.)'' See also FCC 88-256, 1988 WL 488084 (August 17, 1988). This clarification was added to explicitly foreclose the possibility of certification of dual use CB and amateur radios, see id., and thereby deter use by CB operators of frequencies allocated for amateur radio use. Five of the Galaxy model CB transceivers previously mentioned were identified as having the modification done to enable dual use of CB and amateur frequencies. These units were Galaxy DX66V; Galaxy DX73V; Galaxy DX48T; Galaxy DX88HL; and Galaxy DX77HML.

5. Furthermore, the Commission has revised Section 2.1204(a)(5) of its rules to prohibit all marketing and/or offering for sale in the United States of such devices even when the purchaser(s) had provided assurances that the transceivers are being bought solely for export. ALL

DOMESTIC MARKETING OF SUCH DEVICES VIOLATES THE
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, AND THE COMMISSION'S
RULES.

6. Subsequent violations of the Communications Act or
of the Comission's Rules may subject the violator to
substantial monetary forfeitures not to exceed $11,000
foreach such violation or each day of a continuing violation,
seizure of equipment through in rem forfeiture action, and
criminal sanctions including imprisonment.

7. Mr. Jim Norton may request a personal interview at
the closest FCC location to its place of business, namely:

Federal Communications Commission
3575 Koger Blvd., Suite 320
Duluth, GA 30096

which can be contacted by telephone at 770-935-3370. Any
written statement should specify what actions have been taken
to correct the violation outlined above. When corresponding
with the Commission, case number EB-04-AT-024 should be
referenced.

8. Any statement or information provided may be used by
the Commission to determine if further enforcement action is
required. Any knowingly or willfully false statement made in
reply to this notice is punishable by fine or imprisonment.
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Fred Broce
District Director, Atlanta Office

1 47 U.S.C. § 503(b)(5)
2 47 U.S.C. § 302a(b)
3 47 C.F.R. § 2.803(a)(1)
4 See 47 C.F.R. §§ 95.409(a) & 2.925(a)
==========

>
>

1724. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:13:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403250913.99c52e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89788

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<Tlo8c.573$%x5.358@news01.roc.ny>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040324065845.03825.00000007@mb-m27.aol.com...
>
> > >
> > > Generally agreed by whom?
> > >
> > > The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
> > >
> > > The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
> > > "civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
> > >
> > > And why just an "urban environment"? What about suburbia? Or rural
> locations
> > > which will supposedly be the places where BPL will provide service not
> > > available from other technologies?
> > >
> > > How will you or anyone else convince these *professionals* "Access BPL
> will be
> > > a bad thing in any urban radio environment" when they have not agreed with
> the
> > > calculations and first hand-observations of others?
> > >
> > > Sure, a lot of us will file comments. Maybe they'll do some good. But just
> > > because you were finally convinced of the BPL threat, don;t be surprised
> if the
> > > "professionals" don't agree.
>
> Hello, Jim

Hello Jim
>
> Well, let's find out how well BPL works with 100 to 200 watts (don't need a
> KW +) into a dipole in an urban environment. It will be *their* problem.
> The sword cuts both ways ;)

I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
interference is to be mitigated.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1725. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:22:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403250922.6ea74076@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89789

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040324155422.05715.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> You might consider a Comment on Petition RM-10869 [by K4SX]
> whose primary proposal is to have morse code testing for all
> amateurs.

Wrong *again*, Len!

The K4SX proposal does *not* propose "morse code testing for all
amateurs".

It proposes no code test for Tech, 5 wpm for General, 13 wpm for
Extra.

>It's only a page and half out of the ECFS.

And yet you mis-state what it proposes. Unless you don't consider
Techs to be amateurs....

1726. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 17:50:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <9didnQrrufW8gP7dRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89790

Twistedhed wrote:
> The fact of the matter is, there are only a super
> small percentage of truckers on hammie bands.
> They are not responsible for any enforcement
> "emphasis". In fact, the only "emphasis" appears
> to stem from self appointed radio kopps on patrol.

Yep, and we will keep after them till they are gone.

1727. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 18:46:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89792

In article <4062648E.50209@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>Back in the olden days before Bash published his books, I imagine that
>some ham clubs
>had compiled remembered questions from FCC tests.

Beginning in the early 1950s there were several hardcover
"Q & A" books published on ALL the FCC license exams
plus several other areas of licensing exams by other
agencies. Those had "typical" exam questions in them
including some "typical" schematics required to be drawn
during FCC exams.

A bookstore in my home town had amateur radio Q&A books
but not the Commercial radio license variety back in 1956.
I skimmed through one a friend had, saw enough to decide
that the theory part wasn't needed and didn't buy one. I
borrowed the loose-leaf-bound FCC rules from a nice person
at a broadcast station over a weekend and crammed,
memorizing the regulatory parts which were new to me.
Not a problem. Passed the two-hour test in one sitting
at the Chicago FCC field office. Four written examination
parts in successive order, a general sort of test first for
FCC organization and scope (rather short), followed by
successive parts for Third, Second, and finally First
Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) Radio Operator.
Radiotelegraph written test was about the same; three
in the office were taking that plus the annoying, audible
code cognition tests in the same room at the same time.

Back then all the FCC regulations came in loose-leaf form
with extra revision-subscriptions, all available from the
Government Printing Office. Took at least a week to get
a surface mail order back from DC. No Internet then, no
"free downloads" from GPO within seconds. No instant
test results forwarded direct to DC either...went by surface
mail from field offices and DC sent licenses back. Slow
movements in all directions.

The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one). The
surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
frustration those people have. Oddly, no one seems to bash
the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material

long before the Bash company did its thing.

LHA / WMD

1728. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 18:46:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325134610.08081.00000031@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89791

In article <20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in
>> here.
>
>I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would think
>that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed experience would
>know the answer, but I guess you don't.
>
>> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)

NOBODY has EVER worked with ANY sort of "antenna" that
stretches for miles...and has randomly-distributed "feed points"
from discontinuities all along both overhead and underground
electric power lines. That would be the case for Access BPL.

That observation isn't rocket science. It can be done by anyone
in the vicinity of overhead power lines...and trying to find a
reference to such long-stretching antennas in the best library
anywhere (nothing there).

Trying to come close to a computer model, even with Roy
Lewallen's excellent EZNEC might be done...but only for one
specific community area. THINK. The electric power lines
WERE NEVER DESIGNED AS HF-VHF TRANSMISSION
LINES. They work okay at 60 Hz. 60 Hz doesn't worry about
VSWR or discontinuities and those lines only need to worry
if a splice or other connection conducts and that everything is
insulated that should be insulated.

The electric power distribution lines don't even come close to
having any sort of constant impedance. LOOK. THINK about
observated spacings in overhead systems you can see at any
time there is sufficient light. Do you see uniformity? None
there. Go to another location and observe. Do you see any
uniformity to the first location? Maybe. Try another community.
Is that uniform? ELECTRIC POWER DISTRIBUTION LINES IN
CITIES WERE NEVER DESIGNED AS HF-VHF TRANSMISSION
LINES. THERE IS NO ELECTRIC STANDARD ANYWHERE
THAT SAYS THOSE MUST BE RF TRANSMISSION LINES.

If you can't understand that, then you are just wasting time for
everyone with trying to troll for arguments in here.

Now pull out your two degrees, wipe the dead ivy leaves from them and show how YOUR "professionalism" says the Access BPL will be safe and amateurs (or anyone else) won't have to worry...go ahead, make everyone's day...

LHA / WMD

1729. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 19:01:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325140100.12501.00006941@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89793

In article <c2356669.0403250922.6ea74076@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040324155422.05715.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>
>> You might consider a Comment on Petition RM-10869 [by K4SX]
>> whose primary proposal is to have morse code testing for all
>> amateurs.
>
>Wrong *again*, Len!
>
>The K4SX proposal does *not* propose "morse code testing for all
>amateurs".
>
>It proposes no code test for Tech, 5 wpm for General, 13 wpm for
>Extra.
>
>>It's only a page and half out of the ECFS.
>
>And yet you mis-state what it proposes. Unless you don't consider
>Techs to be amateurs....

Hah! As expected. All you want to do is argue minutae.

You are wasting my time trying to provoke a word fight.

Pizza off.

LHA / WMD

1730. CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 20:06:50 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <458ae69c716d53bcd7619ac3e881da26@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 89794

The CCR (radio commission) has adopted the
new ART text allowing technicians on HF.
The text will be published in the
Journal Officiel within the next weeks.

You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
HF. Happy DXing with France.

1731. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 20:20:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251220.17dfd2b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89795

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<n7udnfFftpwX7P_dRVn-uA@gbronline.com>...

> People are more at risk from RF exposure using their cell phones on a
> daily basis, operating at very high frequencies, where the antenna is
> less than an inch from their brain than they ever will be from any ham
> radio transmissions.

Cell on VHF? Must be something new.

1732. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 20:22:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251222.5fb780c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89796

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325092209.17909.00000065@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 6:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241614.327dc1b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040323005046.17834.00000199@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Still waiting on THAT one...I've given up on any "proof" about your
> >> Somalia claims.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Still waiting on your Seven Hostile Actions.
> >
> >Whatta blowhard.
>
> I already stated that I won't give it here. It's not pertient to the
> forum.
>
> You, on the other hand, have made statements of fact

If they are statements of fact, you'll just have to accept them.

Best of Luck

1733. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 20:25:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251225.2dcbeee4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89797

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325091701.17909.00000064@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 6:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241608.3796bbc0@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040322111712.20899.00000163@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/19/2004 6:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403191616.2a113a7a@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >I know only one Steve Roberson and he's nuts.
> >>
> >> Well..."Steve Roberson" MAY be nuts.
> >>
> >> I am not.
> >>
> >> YOU, on the other hand, are not truthful.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >I stand corrected.
> >
> >Steve Robeson is nuts.
>
> You've made another assertion of fact, Brain.
>
> That assertion would be, in most cases, the rendering of a diagnosis,
> which requires a degree as a medical doctor.
>
> Are you now telling us that you are a medical doctor?
>
> Please cite what criteria you base this diagnosis on?

You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.

But you're still nuts.

1734. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:01:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325160156.16601.00000107@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89798

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 2:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251222.5fb780c3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040325092209.17909.00000065@mb-m03.aol.com>...

>If they are statements of fact, you'll just have to accept them.
>
>Best of Luck

I guess "just have to accept them" is OK for you and your co-liar but not for anyone else.

And sorry, I don't....Because I know better, and so do you.

It's been proven, Brain...You're lying. Everything else is downhill from here.

No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.

Nice job.

Steve, K4YZ

1735. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:09:05 UTC
From: koolones <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com>
Message-ID: <f0022$40634e28$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89702

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:_oE8c.3719$b_2.2050@bignews4.bellsouth.net...

> Reckon FCC thinks THIS is important? LOL!

(..snipped fcc report to save bandwidth)

Mr Norton's problem was he should have sold
these on e-Bay like everyone else does instead
of having them sitting there behind a glass case
in his store. I mean, how stupid can someone be?

1736. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:09:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325160956.16601.00000108@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 89799

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251225.2dcbeee4@posting.google.com>

>You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
>is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
>
>But you're still nuts.

But you've not explained why.

You've again made an assertion of fact without explaining what those facts supposedly are.

I, on the other hand, have repeatedly re-posted YOUR words from these threads proving that you DID say what you alledge you DIDN'T say.

In other words, you've been caught lying, and now you're digging yourself in deeper.

You've proven yourself to not be truthful.

In light of this, how is anyone to accept anything else you say as being valid unless you provide adequate validation at the time you say it?

Your only "proof" that I am "nuts" is that I keep insisting that you stand up like a man, admit your error and take what's coming to you.

I guess you're just too stubborn or proud (both?) to realize just how far up your "stock" would go, having already been proven to be incorrent, if you'd just do the right thing.

But you won't. I guess I AM nuts for hoping you'd be "a stand-up guy".

Steve, K4YZ

1737. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:20:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89800

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
[snip]

> The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
> much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
> themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
bypass
> the Novice. People are strange.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much to
the
vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with digital
modes, etc.

Carl - wk3c

1738. BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:24:44 UTC
From: koolones <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com>
Message-ID: <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 89701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)

It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.

Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
thunderstorm rolls thru...????

Think of it 4 a moment.............

It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!

BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"

(..and I will bet you dimes to doughnuts that the local utility
will bury a tough *non-liability clause* into the 2mm tall fine print when
they sign up for BPL internet service, absolving themselves for all surge
related damage because the average person will think they are "safe".
when that happens, watch everyone dump BPL like it's a used ford car)

1739. Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 21:39:52 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <kSmdnSUBWKyFz_7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89703

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
> sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?

Gentlemen (and other denizens of RRAP :-)

Suggestions of deliberate interference to ANYTHING (including BPL, which under the
law has no right to protection from licensed services) will NOT make any friends for us
at the FCC, on Capital Hill, or in the court of public opinion ...
especially when all of
those venues are mostly ill-informed on the real nature of the problem ...

If these suggestions, even if offered in jest, get into the hands of the BPL spin doctors,
they will not hesitate to publicly tar and feather the amateur radio service, at the FCC,
to Congresspersons, and as widely as possible in the press (and we know how the press
likes a controversial story, don't we?)

PLEASE, I implore you - drop these concepts from public venues like usenet! You will
do FAR more harm than good.

We MUST "take the high road" on the BPL issue ... that doesn't mean rolling over and
taking it ... but it does mean not shooting ourselves in the foot with such irresponsible talk.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1740. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:07:10 UTC
From: mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Message-ID: <c3vl6e$3gk$3@puck.litech.org>
Source record: 89704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com> (rec.radio.amateur.misc), koolones wrote:

> It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
> at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
> other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
> above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
> out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!

A friend got to see something of this sort about 20 years back, at one of the federal labs (Berkeley or Livermore) in California.

The campus had a big ring of 3-phase HV distribution lines, with feeders out to xfmrs for each building. When Ethernet came along, some bright spark laid it in the same ring.

So here are these two Very Large 1-turn transformers, one turn being as much as 33KV (or so) away from ground and carrying Lots Of Current. Mostly the phases are balanced so not much current gets induced in the other turn.

Until, that is, one phase of the 33KV faults to ground and the currents get Extremely Unbalanced for a few hundred milliseconds, and most or all of the Ethernet adapters get tested for 33KV tolerance.

Fire came out of lots of equipment.

--
Another of my pet peeves is the use of random special characters in names, e.g. SQL*Forms. I pronounce that one "squeal splat forms" - sort of sounds like roadkill, doesn't it?
-- Charlie Gibbs

1741. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:24:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv1vyh4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89705

On 23 Mar 2004 16:58:44 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>>
>We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly by
>cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.

We call them "tract mansions"..... <ggg>

We have a half-dozen of them going up near here in an area that was
last developed twenty years ago. Just for yah-yahs I'm going to
check out the CC&Rs after they are open for sale.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1742. Re: CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:26:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040325172659.11965.00000059@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89706

>You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
>HF. Happy DXing with France.
>

Breaker Breaker F1 and F4, you got your ears on GOODBUDDY?

1743. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:27:55 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <dLKdncbV2Otowf7dRVn-hQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 89707
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"koolones" <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com> wrote in message
news:1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
>
> It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
>
> Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> thunderstorm rolls thru...????
>
> Think of it 4 a moment.............
>
> It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
> at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
> other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
> above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
> out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!
>
> BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
> ....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"
>
> (..and I will bet you dimes to doughnuts that the local utility
> will bury a tough *non-liability clause* into the 2mm tall fine print when
> they sign up for BPL internet service, absolving themselves for all surge
> related damage because the average person will think they are "safe".
> when that happens, watch everyone dump BPL like it's a used ford car)
>
it won't be any worse than the hits that modems already take from phone
lines, or that cable modems get from their systems, or that computers
without surge protectors get hit with now... it may even be better as they
are likely designed with that in mind anyway. the one that will be more fun
will be to watch the bpl tech try to diagnose a problem in the neighborhood
when a m/m contest station fires up at 0000z on friday night and shuts down
the whole area.

1744. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:35:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40635EC8.7080209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89708
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

koolones wrote:

>Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
>freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
>Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
>
>It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
>
>Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
>and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
>for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
>thunderstorm rolls thru...????
>
>Think of it 4 a moment.............
>
>It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
>at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
>other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
>above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
>out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!
>
>
>
Similar issues with dial-up modems on the phone line have existed for
years. Lightning
gets on the phone line also. Besides a spike that can blow up a BPL
modem would
likely fry the PC power supply anyway.

The RFI from thunderstorms should make life interesting for BPL users....

BPL is the most evil thing to come along since communism!

1745. How secure is BPL anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:40:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40635FE9.3090706@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89709

Are the BPL provides going to encrypt their signals? It is
possible that these bozos, thinking that there is no "significant"
leakage, are not going to do encryption.

Best tell potential users that BPL is not a secure system, and that
someone could find out your credit card numbers and such if
you order something on line.... Because it "broadcasts" that
info into the air.

1746. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:44:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406360CE.3020603@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89710

William wrote:

>>
>>
>
>
>Cell on VHF? Must be something new.
>
>
Some company wanted to do that with low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites a few years ago. They were eyeing 2m and 222 and 70cm, as well as other spectra.

1747. Re: CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:46:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40636160.50505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89711

Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

>The CCR (radio commission) has adopted the
>new ART text allowing technicians on HF.
>The text will be published in the
>Journal Officiel within the next weeks.
>
>You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
>HF. Happy DXing with France.
>
>
>
>
On all HF ham spectra, or just some subbands?

1748. Re: How secure is BPL anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 22:54:47 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1acd2d47c60fb336989892@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 89712

In article <40635FE9.3090706@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> Are the BPL provides going to encrypt their signals? It is
> possible that these bozos, thinking that there is no "significant"
> leakage, are not going to do encryption.
>
> Best tell potential users that BPL is not a secure system, and that
> someone could find out your credit card numbers and such if
> you order something on line.... Because it "broadcasts" that
> info into the air.

It will be a shared medium, just like cable provided internet service.
As such they can implement Baseline Privacy and encrypt the downstream
to a specific modem. Don't know if it allows for encryption on the
upstream.

1749. r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 23:12:46 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89713

Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037 kHz?
Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly way to make
contact other than on the newsgroup.

It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
8-wpm...Farnsworth?)

Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
around these parts.)

Format?

CQ CQ CQ de rrap rrap

QNI? K

WA2SI Bert K
KB3EIA Mike K
N2EY Jim K
N8UZE Dee K
etc...

QNI?

GN de rrap rrap 73 73

Suggestions?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1750. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 23:57:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251557.d55f227@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89714

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325091309.17909.00000063@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 6:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241604.a98ef2a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> >> Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.
> >
> >It is here.
>
> Then you obviously don't know about tiered dispatching. (Why am I not
> surprised?)

My mistake. I misread you statement.

Every emergency call here is handled by 911 operators.

> Also, most 9-1-1 centers are trying to make it well known that they want
> people to use 9-1-1 for TRUE emergencies...bleeding, robbery-in-progress,
> smoke/fire, etc...The cat in the tree or the broken window don't rate a Code 3
> response.
>
> >> Do you know the difference? Do you KNOW what's an "emergency" as
> opposed
> >> to urgent or routine...?!?!
> >
> >All of your posts are emergencies.
> >
> >Lots of ALLCAPS, """QUOTES""", """ACCUSATIONS""", and """DEMANDS"""
>
> I guess that's what it takes to get a reply from you.

You're more likely not to get a reply with that tactic.

> Not that you'd answer any of it honestly anyway.

Not that you target minutia and then demand retribution.

> >> > However when the cell
> >> >> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone attempting
> >> >> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a call
> >> >> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency is

> >> >> over.
> >> >
> >> >Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?
> >> >
> >> >Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur
> >> >volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.
> >>
> >> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and
> radios
> >> on...No cellphone necessary.
> >
> >Gosh. You don't say?
> >
> >I'll bet they got cell phones, too.
>
> Some do.

Most of the people I know have cell phones.

1751. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 23:58:17 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c3vrmp0iao@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89721

hi leland..i like twistedhed but you must love him to forge him like this..

In article <c3v1vh$m8b$1@news.x-echo.com>, Twistedhed says...
>
>The fact of the matter is, there are only a super
>small percentage of truckers on hammie bands.
>They are not responsible for any enforcement
>"emphasis". In fact, the only "emphasis" appears
>to stem from self appointed radio kopps on patrol.
>
>There is no real "emphasis" on anything at the FCC.
>Compare the stats from last year, or the year before,
>or the year before that. The hammie busts are the
>same, the unlicensed busts didn't budge,
>and the only FCC radio related enforcements that
>have increase in any manner is the amount of fines
>levied against commercial radio stations.
>
>Freebanders do not intrude on hammie bands.
>Since there are so many hellbent on painting
>freebanders with a wide brush, this
>would be a good time to educate you on that of
>which you are so deluded. Freebanders, at least
>the ones I have come across and associated with
>since the seventies, are for the most part,
>meticulous operators who are very polite and are
>comprised of operators, both licensed and
>non-licensed, from around the world.
>
>They are for the most part, courteous and
>non-intrusive and do NOT intrude on hammie bands,
>despite your best attempts at presenting them in
>the same light as hammie band invaders.
>
>Parts of 11 meter ARE licensed to various entities
>who have chosen to abandon their choice of spectrum.
>
>Same as a vacant lot..cops drive by and see a
>bunch of kids playing football or baseball in a vacant
>lot,,,yes, the cops know they can technically arrest
>the kids for trespassing, yet they use their sound
>judgement, as the children are not damaging
>anything andthe owner did not compaint, no
>action is taken.

>
>You are akin to the little old lady who watches
>unsupervised children playing a sandlot game and
>continuously calls the cops about the noise
>they are making (children laughing) and the
>remote possibility that your window MAY get broken.
>
>Thank GOD the FCC adopted a sane approach to
>such activities and does not share your position.
>
>The 'cancer" is in self-appointed monitors like
>yourself. You're still pissed 'cause we can DX
>HF and you're stuck on your self-ruined freqs.
>
>Twistedhed
>Unit RS1175
>FLA, USA
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Thu Mar 25 17:39:13 2004 depuis l'IP : ac8940e8.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>532284301978]

you ask w

1752. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-25 23:58:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251558.fb3f2ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89715

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325090814.17909.00000062@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241557.3f578996@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040322094420.20899.00000144@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/20/2004 7:06 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403200506.2966b027@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Because all emergencies are Huge!
> >>
> >> They are if they are happening to you.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, sorry to bust another one of your rants.
> >
> >The emergencies that could have been huge were mitigated by proper
> >planning and preparedness.
>
> Brain, do you READ what you post before you post it?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, do you post what you post? Which one of you did it this time?

1753. leland c scott

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:00:43 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <Busch@home.nut>
Message-ID: <c3vrrb0ioi@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 89722

leland is forging twistedhed again.

In article <9didnQrrufW8gP7dRVn-gg@gbronline.com>, JJ says...
>
>Twistedhed wrote:
>> The fact of the matter is, there are only a super
>> small percentage of truckers on hammie bands.
>> They are not responsible for any enforcement
>> "emphasis". In fact, the only "emphasis" appears
>> to stem from self appointed radio kopps on patrol.
>
>Yep, and we will keep after them till they are gone.
>

1754. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:00:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251600.204a0f42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89716

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
> >
> >
> > Then wave your arms around, invoke the magic incantation, and
> > the world will be remade entirely to your desires.
> >
> > Your imaginary world will be even better than you dreamed!
>
> I again ask you as to which "imaginary" world you refer...?!?!

How many imaginary worlds do you have?

1755. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:01:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040325190114.12501.00006943@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89718

In article <20040325134610.08081.00000031@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in
>>> here.
>>
>>I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would
>>think
>>that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed experience would
>>know the answer, but I guess you don't.
>>
>>> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)
>
> NOBODY has EVER worked with ANY sort of "antenna" that
> stretches for miles..

Yes, they have. One type is called a Beverage antenna, after its inventor,
H.H.Beverage.

> and has randomly-distributed "feed points"
> from discontinuities all along both overhead and underground
> electric power lines. That would be the case for Access BPL.

That part is unique.
>
> That observation isn't rocket science. It can be done by anyone
> in the vicinity of overhead power lines...and trying to find a
> reference to such long-stretching antennas in the best library
> anywhere (nothing there).

Look under "Beverage" ;-)
>
> Trying to come close to a computer model, even with Roy
> Lewallen's excellent EZNEC might be done...but only for one
> specific community area.

Then go ahead and do it.

> THINK. The electric power lines
> WERE NEVER DESIGNED AS HF-VHF TRANSMISSION
> LINES.

Why are you shouting, Len?

> They work okay at 60 Hz. 60 Hz doesn't worry about
> VSWR or discontinuities and those lines only need to worry
> if a splice or other connection conducts and that everything is
> insulated that should be insulated.
>
> The electric power distribution lines don't even come close to
> having any sort of constant impedance. LOOK. THINK about
> observated spacings in overhead systems you can see at any
> time there is sufficient light. Do you see uniformity? None
> there. Go to another location and observe. Do you see any
> uniformity to the first location? Maybe. Try another community.
> Is that uniform? ELECTRIC POWER DISTRIBUTION LINES IN
> CITIES WERE NEVER DESIGNED AS HF-VHF TRANSMISSION
> LINES. THERE IS NO ELECTRIC STANDARD ANYWHERE
> THAT SAYS THOSE MUST BE RF TRANSMISSION LINES.

I know all that, Len. I knew it way back in my Novice days, I knew it when I first read about the BPL concept.

The question isn't *why* BPL is a bad idea. The question is how *amateurs* are supposed to convince the *professionals* that BPL is a bad idea.

Should we do it by the methods you demonstrate, including the shouting (all capitals)? Is that the way you professionals interact?
>
> If you can't understand that, then you are just wasting time for
> everyone with trying to troll for arguments in here.

I understand why BPL is a bad idea, Len. That's not the problem.

The problem is how to convince the FCC. For example, consider these quotes from the Wall street Journal:

"The FCC and the utilities say new technologies have eliminated the interference and accuse the hams of exploiting the issue for their own gains."

'"We haven't seen the sun darken and everything electrical turn to white noise and haze during a deployment," says Matt Oja, an executive at Progress Energy, whose test Mr. Powell visited. "This is a fairly vocal group that has been whipped into a frenzy by their organization." (ARRL).'

Or how about this one:

'Ed Thomas, the FCC's chief engineer, says the commission has spent a year listening to the hams' concerns about power lines and is getting frustrated. "Why is this thing a major calamity?" he says. "And honestly, I'd love the answer to that."'

That's the *chief engineer* of the FCC saying that. Here it is again:

"Why is this thing a major calamity? And honestly, I'd love the answer to that."

How do *amateurs* convince Mr. Thomas that BPL *is* a major calamity?
>
> Now pull out your two degrees, wipe the dead ivy leaves from
> them and show how YOUR "professionalism" says the Access
> BPL will be safe and amateurs (or anyone else) won't have to
> worry...go ahead, make everyone's day...

I've never claimed anything of the sort, Len. You're wrong - again...

1756. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:01:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040325190115.12501.00006944@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89717

In article <20040325140100.12501.00006941@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0403250922.6ea74076@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040324155422.05715.00000004@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>>
>>> You might consider a Comment on Petition RM-10869 [by K4SX]
>>> whose primary proposal is to have morse code testing for all
>>> amateurs.
>>
>>Wrong *again*, Len!
>>
>>The K4SX proposal does *not* propose "morse code testing for all
>>amateurs".
>>
>>It proposes no code test for Tech, 5 wpm for General, 13 wpm for
>>Extra.
>>
>>>It's only a page and half out of the ECFS.
>>
>>And yet you mis-state what it proposes. Unless you don't consider
>>Techs to be amateurs....
>
> Hah! As expected. All you want to do is argue minutae.

It's not minutiae, Len. Your statement indicated that *all* amateurs would have to pass a code test ubder the K4SX proposal. The reality is far different.

> You are wasting my time trying to provoke a word fight.

I'm simply correcting your mistakes. You made a real whopper there, on the K4SX proposal. Very unprofessional.

> Pizza off.

What does that mean? Sounds like you're telling me to shut up. Very unAmerican of you, Len, telling someone to shut up when they correct your mistakes.

I make a pretty good homemade pizza - sauce *and* crust. No, you can't have any.

1757. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:02:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251602.559a6f94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89719

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325085912.17909.00000059@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> Well...I guess it just exacerbates an existing problem, when I think about
> it...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yep. It exasperates you.

1758. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:07:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403251607.12eaac50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89720

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324072852.03342.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:26 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Fair enough.
>
> It only took you three days.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Is there now a time limit on replying?

1759. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:43:12 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3vuau$2d3ofj$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89723

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> 1960s, Arnie. Actually I don't care what you did before since it
> wasn't much to do with electronics (which includes radio).
>

My apologies, 1960s electrical theory

> Oh my, give you a Title and you really become difficult, don't you?
>
> >For your information (since you apparently don't know) the
> >VTC/Scotty is applied across the military services in a wide variety of
> >applications.
>
> Video Tape Cassette?
>
> Show us the references where we all might learn of these
> "new revelations" for a "wide variety of applications" in
> Communications. Give us TM numbers, FM numbers, etc.
>

Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies heavily on commercially available gear. The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone. The FAR "requires" that we use commercial gear when available, or modify it where possible for that use. "A key goal of federal aquisition reform is to maximize the use of commercial supplies and services. the FAR requires activities to explore the use of commercial items to meet their needs." I learned this when I was being certified as a COR on a 6 million dollar contract. Nearly everything that we aquired for use in EM was either strictly commercial gear, or adapted from commercial gear. (as per the rewuirements of the FAR)

The VTC is video teleconferencing. And a very good place to start would be:

http://www.msua.org/docs/mss_in_sept.htm

> >I don't suppose you know what a "Blackberry" is either.
>
> If you mean the little palmtop unit favored in Europe and the UK,
> I do.
>

WOW, I'm impressed. Leonard has made it out of the 1960s. Very good. BTW, it's also favored in the Pentagon.

> Do you know what a "raspberry" is? Here, have one from me
> to you.

For someone that eschews personal attack so often, you seem to be very good at it.

Arnie -

1760. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 00:47:06 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89724

"Arnie Macy" wrote ...

> I understand your point, but the intent of this section in the FCC rules
was
> to stop Ham radio from being used for commercial purposes, not to prohibit
> emergency communications. Nothing in the rules prohibits use of this
> equipment during an emergency by any licensed person. Or for that matter,
> any person whatever. As I said, our Ham equipment is being used for
> redundancy, so for all practical purposes, it will never be used for
routine
> communication -- other than testing to ensure it is working properly.
>

I just wanted to add that there are always exceptions to the rule. Two that I can think of, right off hand, would be the Space Shuttle Crew (obviously government employees) and Federal, State, and local EM directors and staff (many of whom are Hams). Do you really think either of the aforementioned would not be allowed to use their privileges because of part 97?

Arnie -

1761. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 01:38:47 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403251738.44f3ad23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89725

WA3MOJ Busch@home.nut wrote:
>hi leland..i like twistedhed but you must love him to forge him like
this.

It's no forgery, he posted it, he wrote it.

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: FCC Cites "Export" Seller and fines another company for
Unlicen... ï¿½
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2004-03-25 07:05:02

Jim(3carroll@optonline noticed:
i didn't see any reference to freeband freq's just mention of amateur
freq's. wonder if the the fcc is avoiding the gray area concerning
freebanding in this case.

That wouldn't make any difference, would it?

-
joxendi@bellsouth.net (Jerry) replied:

>They are making their case against the sale
>and use of these so-called "export" radios
>inside the USA. Actually, it WAS the issue of
>unlicensed users of the Amateur bands that
>caused the curent enforcement emphasis.

Actually, Riley was a quoted on several occasions as saying hammie
complaints and local jurisdictions (in regards to HR #whatever)
being
informed of their ability to react to interference was the catalyst. I
know you have this thing about truckers interfering on hammie bands,
but
the fact of the matter is, a super small percentage of truckers on
hammie bands
was not responsible for any enforcement "emphasis". In fact, the only
"emphasis" appears to stem from self appointed radio kopps on patrol.
The FCC merely follows up on well worded complaints that have shown
good
cause. In fact, there is no real "emphasis" on anything at the FCC,
despite your recent contributions. Compare the stats from last year,
or
the year before, or the year before that. The hammie busts are the
same,

the unlicensed busts didn't budge, and the only FCC radio related enforcements that have increase in any manner is the amount of fines levied against commercial radio stations.

> Had the "freebanders" stayed out of the ham
>bands, I doubt there would be an eyebrow
>raised.

Your hardon for freebanders is showing, Jerry. Freebanders do not intrude on hammie bands,,,in the same manner you are loathe to call one
who has a nocode call and acts the ass on usenet and on the air a true hammie, many operate and feel the same for the term of freebander, myslef included. Since there are so many, yourself at the foreforont, hellbent on painting freebanders with a wide brush, this would be a good
time to educate you on that of which you are so deluded.
Freebanders, at least the ones I have come across and associated with since the seventies, are for the most part, meticulous operators who are
very polite and are comprised of operators, both licensed and non-licensed, from around the world. They are for the most part, courteous and non-intrusive. and do NOT intrude on hammie bands, despite
your best attempts at presenting them in the same light as hammie band invaders. Shame on you for your intentional deceit. You seem a little put out lately, Jerry. Everything ok?

> When the folks start
>treading on licensed spectrum, THAT is what
>causes the ruckus.
>Jerry

Balderdash. Parts of 11 meter ARE licensed to various entities who have
chosen to abandon their choice of spectrum. Same as a vacant lot..cops drive by and see a bunch of kids playing football or baseball in a vacant lot,,,yes, the cops know they can technically arrest the kids for
trespassing, yet they use their sound judgement, as the children are not
damaging anything andthe owner did not compaint, no action is taken.
You are akin to the little old lady who watches unsupervised children playing a sandlot game and continuolusly calls the cops about the noise
they are making (children laughing) and the remote possibility that your
window MAY get broken.
Thank GOD the FCC adopted a sane approach to such activities and does not share your position.

1762. Re: Truckers on 10 meters not a problem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 02:07:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <nPidnRrT_9fuD_7dRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89728

koolones wrote:
> "Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:_oE8c.3719$b_2.2050@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
>
>>Reckon FCC thinks THIS is important? LOL!
>
>
> (..snipped fcc report to save bandwidth)
>
> I mean, how stupid can someone be?

Well, he deals in cb stuff dosen't he?

1763. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 02:12:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hkM8c.783$NL4.123@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"koolones" <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com> wrote in message
news:1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
>
> It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
>
> Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> thunderstorm rolls thru...????
>
> Think of it 4 a moment.............
>
> It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
> at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
> other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
> above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
> out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!
>
> BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
> ....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"
>
> (..and I will bet you dimes to doughnuts that the local utility
> will bury a tough *non-liability clause* into the 2mm tall fine print when
> they sign up for BPL internet service, absolving themselves for all surge
> related damage because the average person will think they are "safe".
> when that happens, watch everyone dump BPL like it's a used ford car)
>

Dang>>>>>I believe he has a handle on it. My oh my.

Dan/W4NTI

1764. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 02:14:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CmM8c.785$NL4.694@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:dLKdncbV2Otowf7dRVn-hQ@crocker.com...
>
> "koolones" <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com> wrote in message
> news:1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> > Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> > freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> > Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
> >
> > It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
> >
> > Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> > and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> > for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> > thunderstorm rolls thru...????
> >
> > Think of it 4 a moment.............
> >
> > It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
> > at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
> > other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
> > above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
> > out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!
> >
> > BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
> > ....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"
> >
> > (..and I will bet you dimes to doughnuts that the local utility
> > will bury a tough *non-liability clause* into the 2mm tall fine print
when
> > they sign up for BPL internet service, absolving themselves for all
surge
> > related damage because the average person will think they are "safe".
> > when that happens, watch everyone dump BPL like it's a used ford car)
> >
> it won't be any worse than the hits that modems already take from phone
> lines, or that cable modems get from their systems, or that computers
> without surge protectors get hit with now... it may even be better as they
> are likely designed with that in mind anyway. the one that will be more
fun
> will be to watch the bpl tech try to diagnose a problem in the
neighborhood
> when a m/m contest station fires up at 0000z on friday night and shuts

down
> the whole area.
>
>

Or someone runs a 1KW beacon.

Dan/W4NTI

1765. Re: CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 02:22:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_tM8c.792$NL4.366@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89729

"Tarapia Tapioco" <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it> wrote in message
news:458ae69c716d53bcd7619ac3e881da26@firenze.linux.it...
>
> The CCR (radio commission) has adopted the
> new ART text allowing technicians on HF.
> The text will be published in the
> Journal Officiel within the next weeks.
>
> You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
> HF. Happy DXing with France.
>
>

Gee, if its dead in France, please explain all those French stations in the
contests?

Dan/W4NTI

1766. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 02:28:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jzM8c.796$NL4.125@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89730

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com...
> Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037 kHz?
> Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly way to make
> contact other than on the newsgroup.
>
> It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
> overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
> 8-wpm...Farnsworth?)
>
> Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> around these parts.)
>
> Format?
>
> CQ CQ CQ de rrap rrap
>
> QNI? K
>
> WA2SI Bert K
> KB3EIA Mike K
> N2EY Jim K
> N8UZE Dee K
> etc...
>
> QNI?
>
> GN de rrap rrap 73 73
>
> Suggestions?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Great idea.....but I can't copy 5 wpm.

Dan/W4NTI

1767. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 03:11:45 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86isgs5mku.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 89731

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Bert" == Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.net> writes:

Bert> Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037
Bert> kHz? Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly
Bert> way to make contact other than on the newsgroup.

Bert> It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
Bert> overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
Bert> 8-wpm...Farnsworth?)

I like the idea, but I'm afraid I don't know much more Morse than CQ, my
callsign and my name, so no trick questions. :-)

Bert> Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening
Bert> at 8 PM around these parts.)

That sounds good to me.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAY592GPFSfAB/ezgRAgXVAKD8TpCHv2eJSkxkjMJY0Sr3NKtHKQCg6caI
9z5USP/Zajhn0Jm780W5pMQ=
=CRNJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1768. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 03:21:03 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1acd41797fe0fd159896c3@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 89732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com says...

> Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
>
> It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
>
> Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> thunderstorm rolls thru...????

<snip>

Lightning is non-discriminatory. ANYthing that's plugged into a
power outlet during a lightning storm stands a good chance of getting
fried from a near or direct strike.

Personally, I'm waiting for the first incidence of BPL interfering
with HF communications from FEMA, the Coast Guard, the FAA, ARINC, or
other federally-related HF/VHF radio services.

It's only going to take one failure to get a VIP's message through
to shut the whole thing down cold, methinks.

In other words, just give it time. I think the whole BPL thing's
going to blow up in Michael Powell's face, and I sincerely hope someone
catches a nice photo when it does.

--
Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
with surreal ports?"

1769. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 03:41:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <PaidnYOlvO2mOv7dRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 89733

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com...
> Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037 kHz?
> Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly way to make
> contact other than on the newsgroup.
>
> It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
> overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
> 8-wpm...Farnsworth?)
>
> Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> around these parts.)
>
> Format?
>
> CQ CQ CQ de rrap rrap
>
> QNI? K
>
> WA2SI Bert K
> KB3EIA Mike K
> N2EY Jim K
> N8UZE Dee K
> etc...
>
> QNI?
>
> GN de rrap rrap 73 73
>
> Suggestions?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Sorry, got community band practice that night.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1770. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 04:20:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv5dhx5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89735

On 24 Mar 2004 11:58:45 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Sure, a lot of us will file comments. Maybe they'll do some good. But just
>because you were finally convinced of the BPL threat, don;t be surprised if the
>"professionals" don't agree.

If "they" don't agree it won't be the first stupid regulatory action
that "they" have taken lately.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1771. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 04:20:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv5e1i6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89734

On 25 Mar 2004 09:13:23 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
>interference is to be mitigated.

That's because there are less and less "old timers" on the staff who know how to chase down and evaluate such interference and a general reluctance of the non-field people to shut someone off the air because of same.

The long slippery slope started when the agency started privatizing things such as frequency coordination and interference resolution in the mid 1980s.....

It wouldn't surprise me at all if the old standard of Part 15 devices having to tolerate interception of lawful signals gets thrown in the trashcan. That's what having policy set on less-than-technically-knowlegeable grounds can result in. It's the equivalent of ordering that all antennas be installed underground to preserve aesthetic standards.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1772. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 04:20:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv5fm28.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89736

On 24 Mar 2004 10:59:08 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather
>than have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool,
>that they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement
>that they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide
>by it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool
>can be made smaller.

>Is that a good idea?

I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.

Whether one compllies with the Rules is another matter.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1773. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 04:20:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv5f4t7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89737

On 25 Mar 2004 12:59:21 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>>>> radio environment.
>>>
>>>Generally agreed by whom?
>>
>> ARRL, FEMA, NTIA, the remaining amateur radio publications, just
>> for starters. :-)
>
>But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or the
>Commissioners....;-) ;-)

Both the Commissioners and the Chief of the Office of Science and
Technology dance to the tune of the politicians who control them.
It embarasses the hell out of me.....

>Irrelevant to the BPL situation. FCC could prevent BPL from going forward if
>they wanted to.
>
>> Unless an Access BPL system goes across state borders, about
>> all that the FCC can regulate is the incidental RF radiation from
>> the system. Incidental RF radiation is a main subject in Part 15,
>> Title 47 C.F.R. Part 15 doesn't deal in "communications" systems
>> and NPRM 04-29 is only about revisions to Part 15.
>
>Again, irrelevant. And probably incorrect. The noise from BPL systems will
>clearly cross state lines.

The "it doesn't cross state lines" argument was tried by the CBers
and it failed in court on the "effects are able to cross state
lines" theory. To avoid such hassles again, The Congress amended
the Comm Act (Section 301) to give the FCC authority over all
(non-US government) radiofrequency signals or energy transmitted
(intentionally or incidentally) at any place in the US and received
at any other place in the US regardless of intrastate or interstate
considerations.

Now ----

Are you aware than an entrepreneur in RURAL eastern Oregon has set
up a 600-square-mile system of "Wi-Fi" wireless access points to
bring high-speed broadband internet service to an area whose main
activities are ranching, a rail yard (Hermiston, OR) and the
wide-open spaces of the US Army's Umatilla Chemical Weapons Depot.
Not exactly "high-density urban population".....and he expects to

recoup his investment with no problem.

This was reported in The Oregonian (Portland, OR) newspaper last week.

So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1774. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 05:21:57 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B83B077C4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89738

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
news:kSmdnSUBWKyFz_7dUSdV9g@ptd.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
>> sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?
>
> Gentlemen (and other denizens of RRAP :-)
>
> Suggestions of deliberate interference to ANYTHING (including BPL,
> which under the
> law has no right to protection from licensed services) will NOT make
> any friends for us
> at the FCC, on Capital Hill, or in the court of public opinion ...
> especially when all of
> those venues are mostly ill-informed on the real nature of the problem
> ...
>
> If these suggestions, even if offered in jest, get into the hands of
> the BPL spin doctors,
> they will not hesitate to publicly tar and feather the amateur radio
> service, at the FCC,
> to Congresspersons, and as widely as possible in the press (and we know
> how the press
> likes a controversial story, don't we?)
>
> PLEASE, I implore you - drop these concepts from public venues like
> usenet! You will
> do FAR more harm than good.
>
> We MUST "take the high road" on the BPL issue ... that doesn't mean
> rolling over and
> taking it ... but it does mean not shooting ourselves in the foot with
> such irresponsible talk.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
>
>

What's irresponsible about excercising our privileges on our frequencies.
How could it be jamming when BPL isn't a radio transmission? I have not and
would never advocate jamming.

1775. Re: CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 05:23:55 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B84064DBC5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89739

Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it> wrote in
news:458ae69c716d53bcd7619ac3e881da26@firenze.linux.it:

>
> The CCR (radio commission) has adopted the
> new ART text allowing technicians on HF.
> The text will be published in the
> Journal Officiel within the next weeks.
>
> You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
> HF. Happy DXing with France.
>
>

Vive la France!

1776. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 09:41:07 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <TUS8c.31994$LX.4602333@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 89740

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:jzM8c.796$NL4.125@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com...
> > Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037 kHz?
> > Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly way to make
> > contact other than on the newsgroup.
> >
> > It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
> > overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
> > 8-wpm...Farnsworth?)
> >
> > Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> > around these parts.)
> >
> > Format?
> >
> > CQ CQ CQ de rrap rrap
> >
> > QNI? K
> >
> > WA2SI Bert K
> > KB3EIA Mike K
> > N2EY Jim K
> > N8UZE Dee K
> > etc...
> >
> > QNI?
> >
> > GN de rrap rrap 73 73
> >
> > Suggestions?
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Great idea.....but I can't copy 5 wpm.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I'll be glad to send at about 15 to 20-wpm, Dan. ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1777. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 10:57:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 89741

In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
>around these parts.)
>
Works for me!

7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST

BCNU

73 de Jim, N2EY

1778. F1 and F4 technicians on all HF bands soon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 12:49:45 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <050a6c70e2697015795e16c4e315c677@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 89742

There are 3 classes of ham-radio operators in France :

F0 : novice (no HF access, 10 W VHF)

F1-F4 : Technicians (old CEPT B)

F2-F3-F5-F6-F8-F9 : Coders (old CEPT A)
but only 5 per cent know really CW
because they get their certificate by
corruption.

The mean age of hams operators in France is 75 years (really a band of young !).
It remains about 16000 hams in France
(More than a half are no-coders).

Now that the CEPT has merged the A and
B classes (see T/R 61-01 and T/R 61-02
recommendations at http://www.ero.dk
click "Deliverables"), the regulatory
agency ART (http://www.art-telecom.fr)
has edited a new text giving full HF
privileges to F1 and F4 operators
(like other european countries did it
previously like Belgium, Swiss, etc ...)

This new text has been adopted by
unanimity on Wednesday, March 24 2004 by the CCR radio commission The text is
expected to be signed by the minister and published officially soon.

Later, the text defining the actual
3 classes of hams will be deeply
modified.

Italy seems to follow the same way ...

1779. Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 14:11:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <406439F9.9030801@psu.edu>
Source record: 89743

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>>Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
>>sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?
>
>
> Gentlemen (and other denizens of RRAP :-)
>
> Suggestions of deliberate interference to ANYTHING (including BPL, which
> under the law has no right to protection from licensed services) will NOT make any
> friends for us at the FCC, on Capital Hill, or in the court of public opinion ...
> especially when all of those venues are mostly ill-informed on the real nature of the
> problem ...
>
> If these suggestions, even if offered in jest, get into the hands of the BPL
> spin doctors, they will not hesitate to publicly tar and feather the amateur radio
> service, at the FCC, to Congresspersons, and as widely as possible in the press (and we
know how
> the press likes a controversial story, don't we?)
>
> PLEASE, I implore you - drop these concepts from public venues like usenet!
> You will do FAR more harm than good.
>
> We MUST "take the high road" on the BPL issue ... that doesn't mean rolling
> over and taking it ... but it does mean not shooting ourselves in the foot with such
> irresponsible talk.

I changed the thread to get away from that talk.

Agreed! This brings up the chance to relate this thread to the recent
one where a poster here made the assertion that if we know our
transmissions will cause disruption to BPL access, then simply
transmitting at all would constitute willful and malicious interference.
Or at least willful.

IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
constitute that willful interference?

I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.

Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?

I would predict before this is all over, someone or group will call for the elimination of Amateur radio, or at least it's access to HF frequencies, in order to serve the greater good, so that we may allow millions of Americans access to the internet through BPL.

Not that that is likely to happen, but I'll bet someone comes up with the suggestion.

Disturbing thoughts indeed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1780. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 14:17:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40643B89.3030405@psu.edu>
Source record: 89744

Phil Kane wrote:
> On 25 Mar 2004 09:13:23 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
>>interference is to be mitigated.
>
>
> That's because there are less and less "old timers" on the staff who
> know how to chase down and evaluate such interference and a general
> reluctance of the non-field people to shut someone off the air
> because of same.
>
> The long slippery slope started when the agency started privatizing
> things such as frequency coordination and interference resolution in
> the mid 1980s.......
>
> It wouldn't surprise me at all if the old standard of Part 15
> devices having to tolerate interception of lawful signals gets
> thrown in the trashcan. That's what having policy set on
> less-than-technically-knowlegeable grounds can result in. It's the
> equivalent of ordering that all antennas be installed underground
> to preserve aesthetic standards.

There would almost have to be a exemption specifically for BPL access, because if the whole of part 15 was chucked, then the part 15 devices would be able to interfere with each other, but nothing could be done about it.

All the things that can radiate in the HF spectrum and interfere with or be interfered with by BPL are a large list. And if part 15 is gone, then they won't have to worry about RFI protection in design any more so the list will grow...

- Mike KB3EIA -

1781. Re: How secure is BPL anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 14:33:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40643F34.4010403@psu.edu>
Source record: 89745

Robert Casey wrote:
> Are the BPL provides going to encrypt their signals? It is
> possible that these bozos, thinking that there is no "significant"
> leakage, are not going to do encryption.
> Best tell potential users that BPL is not a secure system, and that
> someone could find out your credit card numbers and such if
> you order something on line.... Because it "broadcasts" that
> info into the air.
>

You mean you want a secure signal? C'mon man. This is about access choices! 8^)

Related issue:

In the early years of Cable tv, the systems were notorious for being very leaky. People came up with ingenious ad pretty simple ways to tap into this leakage and get cable for free. kind of a early wireless system if you will! I remember years ago we could get most of the cable signals then offered with just rabbit ears. We got cable anyway because the quality was better than the leakage signal.

With a signal that isn't even going over coax, the situation can only be worse.

- Mike KB3EIA

1782. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 15:19:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40644A1E.3000507@psu.edu>
Source record: 89746

Jim, with each others help, we can avoid feeding the trolls! 8^)

ahem!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1783. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 15:34:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40644D96.7050901@psu.edu>
Source record: 89748

N2EY wrote:

> I make a pretty good homemade pizza - sauce *and* crust. No, you can't have
> any.

Did you know they still make Chef Boyardee Pizza kits Jim?

- mike KB3EIA -

1784. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 15:34:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89747

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:uqKdnQt_LqVw9v_d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <w2SdnVJB7umsevzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > >
> > >
> > >>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > >>news:JdidnSxfyqfHY_3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > >>
> > >>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>>The power limits make sense.
> > >>>
> > >>>Do you support not teaching newcomers about RF safety? I believe they
> > >>>should be, and as long as they know the fundamentals, they should have
> > >>>the same power privileges as the rest of us.
> > >>>
> > >>>I'll say right out that not teaching new people the fundamentals of RF
> > >>>and electrical safety is not very responsible.
> > >>
> > >>The power limit is about RF exposure and the need to do the evaluations.
> > >>This is something that I think can reasonably be considered beyond the
> > >>"beginner" level, as it requires a foundation in a number of areas.
> > >
> > > There may still need to be *some* evaluation done even at the 100/50W
power
> > > level, but they are simplified compared to what needs to be known for
the whole
> > > raneg of amateur power/frequencies.
> >
> > I don't think that safety stops at the "station evaluation level.

Agee 100%

> One of the things that will probably happen if we get out of the mode
> that makes us even think of doing safety evaluations is that the new
> hams may not be thinking about RF safety at all.

As a novice in the late 50s, RF safety wasn't very much a part
of my understanding...beyong the concept of not touching
electrical or RF conductors. The "unseen" RF in the air wasn't
really the focus of the Novice syllabus either. But then too,
Novice was limited then to 75w as measured by plate power.

> "Remember, don't put the antenna of your handy talkie in the puppy's
> mouth and press the talk button".

Yet we put that antenna within less than an inch of our own brain
when we transmit.

> I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
> about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing for
> the introductory license.

I agree and also believ that safety (electrical, RF and mechanical)
should be a fundamental part of novice understanding.

> If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the power to
> something like 5 watts or so.

Better to keep testing on safety.

> >>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
> >>can get on the air
> >
> > I agree 100%! That's the whole point of multiple license classes. It's
not in
> > the best interests of amateur radio to require all newcomers to pass the
Extra
> > just to get started.
>
> Sure. I'm just pretty bullish on the safety requirements.

I agree.

> >>... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
> >>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
> >>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
> >>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level
tests
> >>that I and many others took those many years ago
> >
> > No it's not clear at all! In fact, it's an apples and oranges
comparison.
> > Here's why:
> >
> > Books like "Now You're Talking" are meant to be stand-alone study
guides. They
> > contain the entire question pool, with explanations of each question and
how to
> > get the answer. And much more.
> >
> > The old License Manuals were not meant to be "one stop" books. They
focused on
> > the license process only - where the tests were held, the process, etc.
The
> > "study guides" were *not* the actual Q&A, but rather *essay* questions
intended

> > to indicate the areas to be tested.
> >
> > If you really want to make a comparison, take an old ARRL License
Manual, add
> > on "How To Become A Radio Amateur", "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code"
and
> > "Understanding Amateur Radio" and you'll begin to have an
apples-to-apples
> > comparison.
> >
> > Or consider these questions from the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
> >
> > Study Question #31:
> > Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following
components:
> > (a) battery with internal resistance,
> > (b) resistive load,
> > (c) voltmeter,
> > (d) ammeter.
> >
> > Study Question #32:
> > From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how
can
> > the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power
consumed
> > by the load be determined?
> >
> > Study Question #33:
> > In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be
in
> > order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
> >
> > Study Question #34:
> > Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having
the
> > following components:
> > (a) triode vacuum tube,
> > (b) pi-network output tank,
> > (c) high voltage source,
> > (d) plate-current meter,
> > (e) plate-voltage meter,
> > (f) rf chokes,
> > (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
> >
> > Study Question #35:
> > What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
> >
> > The above were just *some* of the study questions for the *Novice* exam
of
> > 1976. Took up less than a page. How many pages of explanation would it

take to
> > teach the above material?
> >
> > The actual exam did not use these questions. Instead, it might show, for
> > example, a schematic of the amplifier circuit similar to, but not
exactly like
> > the one shown in the license manual, with 5 of the components labeled
> > "a" thru "e". The question would be something like, "which is the
coupling
> > capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?" "what is function of the
capacitor
> > labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
> >
> > And that's at the *Novice* level.
> >
> > Does anyone think that the current entry-level exams are tougher than
that?
>
> You know, I can't answer that question very easily. I don't believe
> that more questions makes for a harder test. And although I wasn't
> raised on hollow state, I figured out the questions you posed after a
> little enjoyable study.
>
> >
> >>... the proposal is not a
> >>"dumbing down" for the entry level ...
> >
> >
> > The NCVEC proposal definitely *is* a dumbing down. The ARRL proposal is
much
> > better because it does not set a precedent of no homebrewing, etc.
>
> The NCVEC proposal is just plain Dumb.

Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
with which I agree.

> And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
>
> > The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
bad.
>
> Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
> C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.

I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I

have agreed on for a long time.

One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license class. I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are for HF if I was asked. Better to know the person can read and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1785. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 15:44:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <BdY8c.1418$yN6.686@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89749

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:4062FD69.6000203@psu.edu...
> JJ wrote:
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >> I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
> >> about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing
> >> for the introductory license.
> >>
> >> If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the
> >> power to something like 5 watts or so.
> >
> > People are more at risk from RF exposure using their cell phones on a
> > daily basis, operating at very high frequencies, where the antenna is
> > less than an inch from their brain than they ever will be from any ham
> > radio transmissions.
>
> No argument there. I hope that newcomers won't try to use their HT's
> like they do a cell phone, presses up against the ear.

But when transmitting with an HT, the antenna IS right in front of
the ham's forehead...unless one is using a separate microphone.
And many HTs have power output above 5w
In contrast, cellphones automatically adjust their power
output as needed depending on signaling
protocols between the cellphone and the cell site.
Most cellphones aren't operating anywhere
near their full power which, is below 5w.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1786. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:17:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403260917.56ebf866@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89750

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hv5f4t7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 25 Mar 2004 12:59:21 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
> >>>> radio environment.
> >>>
> >>>Generally agreed by whom?
> >>
> >> ARRL, FEMA, NTIA, the remaining amateur radio publications, just
> >> for starters. :-)
> >
> >But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or the
> >Commissioners....;-) ;-)
>
> Both the Commissioners and the Chief of the Office of Science and
> Technology dance to the tune of the politicians who control them.

But Phil - they're "professionals", just like Len!

> It embarasses the hell out of me.....

Why? You don't work for FCC any more, Phil.
>
> >Irrelevant to the BPL situation. FCC could prevent BPL from going forward if
> >they wanted to.
> >
> >> Unless an Access BPL system goes across state borders, about
> >> all that the FCC can regulate is the incidental RF radiation from
> >> the system. Incidental RF radiation is a main subject in Part 15,
> >> Title 47 C.F.R. Part 15 doesn't deal in "communications" systems
> >> and NPRM 04-29 is only about revisions to Part 15.
> >
> >Again, irrelevant. And probably incorrect. The noise from BPL systems will
> >clearly cross state lines.
>
> The "it doesn't cross state lines" argument was tried by the CBers
> and it failed in court on the "effects are able to cross state
> lines" theory. To avoid such hassles again, The Congress amended
> the Comm Act (Section 301) to give the FCC authority over all
> (non-US government) radiofrequency signals or energy transmitted
> (intentionally or incidentally) at any place in the US and received
> at any other place in the US regardless of intrastate or interstate
> considerations.

Thanks, Phil.

So Len is wrong - *again*.
>
> Now ----
>
> Are you aware than an entrepreneur in RURAL eastern Oregon has set
> up a 600-square-mile system of "Wi-Fi" wireless access points to
> bring high-speed broadband internet service to an area whose main
> activities are ranching, a rail yard (Hermiston, OR) and the
> wide-open spaces of the US Army's Umatilla Chemical Weapons Depot.
> Not exactly "high-density urban population".....and he expects to
> recoup his investment with no problem.

No, Iwas not aware of that! Details, links, please? Being able to
point to such an installation would be an asset in comments to FCC.
>
> This was reported in The Oregonian (Portland, OR) newspaper last week.

Somebody should tell WSJ.
>
> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".

Indeed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1787. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123453.05025.00000039@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89853

In article <MPG.1acd41797fe0fd159896c3@192.168.42.131>, Dr. Anton T. Squeegee <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> writes:

> Personally, I'm waiting for the first incidence of BPL interfering
>with HF communications from FEMA, the Coast Guard, the FAA, ARINC, or
>other federally-related HF/VHF radio services.
>
> It's only going to take one failure to get a VIP's message through
>to shut the whole thing down cold, methinks.

Look down the list of documents on docket 03-104 in the ECFS.
You will see one sent by the Federal Communications Commission.
That is a public statement snarling back at ARINC about their
"alleged" problem of being interfered with at one station and the
FCC techs couldn't find evidence of it. Kind of a long one.

By the 26th it might be around 50 to 100 messages back from the
most current document. There were 5,813 documents in the ECFS
on 03-104 at the close of business on the 25th of March.

LHA / WMD

1788. Re: How secure is BPL anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123453.05025.00000038@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89854

In article <40635FE9.3090706@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Are the BPL provides going to encrypt their signals? It is
>possible that these bozos, thinking that there is no "significant"
>leakage, are not going to do encryption.
>
>Best tell potential users that BPL is not a secure system, and that
>someone could find out your credit card numbers and such if
>you order something on line.... Because it "broadcasts" that
>info into the air.

Access BPL is a digital system. If your browser has the
many-bit encryption it will be secure both ways.

Hacker razzbonyas don't have supercomputers at their disposal
to crack even 128-bit encryption used on the Internet a couple
years ago.

Encrypted digital signals going out as incidental RF radiation
are nothing but NOISE to those without the decryption softstuff.

Of course, if you are REALLY paranoid, please remember that
some of "those out there" might really be following you... :-)

LHA / WMD

1789. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123454.05025.00000040@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89852

In article <c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>I just wanted to add that there are always exceptions to the rule. Two that
>I can think of, right off hand, would be the Space Shuttle Crew (obviously
>government employees) and Federal, State, and local EM directors and staff
>(many of whom are Hams). Do you really think either of the aforementioned
>would not be allowed to use their privileges because of part 97?

Government employees engaged in government activities would be
under regulations from the NTIA, not the FCC.

Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R. applies to civil (and rrap) U.S. radio
amateurs. Title 47 C.F.R. applies only to civil U.S. radio services.
Have you got the distinction clear yet?
Hello?

Plonk

LHA / WMD

1790. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123455.05025.00000041@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89856

In article <c3vuau$2d3ofj$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> 1960s, Arnie. Actually I don't care what you did before since it
>> wasn't much to do with electronics (which includes radio).
>
>My apologies, 1960s electrical theory

You are still WRONG. THEORY doesn't go out of date unless a
new theory is shown and agreed to replace it.

If you ever got into the guts of anything electronic, you would know
that. But, you apparently don't know that because you don't go
into electronics innards.

Labels and cute names and acronyms applied to something do
NOT change theory.

>> Oh my, give you a Title and you really become difficult, don't you?
>>
>> >For your information (since you apparently don't know) the
>> >VTC/Scotty is applied across the military services in a wide variety of
>> >applications.
>>
>> Video Tape Cassette?
>>
>> Show us the references where we all might learn of these
>> "new revelations" for a "wide variety of applications" in
>> Communications. Give us TM numbers, FM numbers, etc.
>
>Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics
>anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies
>heavily on commercially available gear.

Are you sleeping on your COTS?

>The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone.

Bravo Sierra. Those are still here. So are Military Specifications,
abbreviated "Mil Spec" among those of us who still have to use
them.

Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.

>The FAR "requires" that we use commercial gear when
>available, or modify it where possible for that use. "A key goal of federal
>aquisition reform is to maximize the use of commercial supplies and
>services. the FAR requires activities to explore the use of commercial
>items to meet their needs." I learned this when I was being certified as a
>COR on a 6 million dollar contract.

Wow, the "Six Million Dollar Ham!" "...We have the technology, we
can rebuild Arnie..." Cut to promo, voice-over "Coming to your
favorite channel any day now...!", up exciting music bkgd, take
title...

When are you being awarded a medal for that? Will it be on CSPAN?

Got both CSPAN channels here.

>Nearly everything that we aquired for
>use in EM was either strictly commercial gear, or adapted from commercial
>gear. (as per the rewuirements of the FAR)
>
>The VTC is video teleconferencing.

Old stuff, senior. I was teleconferencing back in 1981, four locations
tied in, two with audio-video, two with only audio. In 1955 I was in a
two-location teleconference between two ACAN stations, the TTY page
opaque-projected on a screen with a voice circuit in parallel for all the
brass (as lowest rank with three-up and one down I was there only for
any operational specifics but was never called up).

Fancy acronyms you've picked up is just a form of name-dropping.
You can try sprinkling them into casual conversation to impress
friends and neighbors, but that doesn't mean you've DONE those
things.

>> If you mean the little palmtop unit favored in Europe and the UK,
>> I do.
>
>WOW, I'm impressed. Leonard has made it out of the 1960s. Very good. BTW,
>it's also favored in the Pentagon.

Wow, implying you haunt the hallowed hauls, I mean, halls of the
Big 5 Building? How many stars you wearing now?

>> Do you know what a "raspberry" is? Here, have one from me
>> to you.
>
>For someone that eschews personal attack so often, you seem to be very good
>at it.

Your first post in here after a long absence was nothing but a
direct personal attack on me. You want to attack, then expect
lots of return fire. Not my problem. Got more ammo for that
than you realize.

You got any raspberries? If so, take one. EAT IT.

Plonk

LHA / WMD

1791. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123456.05025.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89855

In article <20040325190114.12501.00006943@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040325134610.08081.00000031@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com>, >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO >>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in >>>> here.
>>>
>>>I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would >>>think >>>that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed experience would >>>know the answer, but I guess you don't.
>>>
>>>> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)
>>
>> NOBODY has EVER worked with ANY sort of "antenna" that
>> stretches for miles..
>
>Yes, they have. One type is called a Beverage antenna, after its inventor, >H.H.Beverage.

Old Bev NEVER tried any "antenna" that can go MILES in mutually perpendicular directions using MANY different and randomly-varying paths in each direction. You should get to a community's civil engineering office and look at the various electric line routings.

If you can't get out and LOOK at the surroundings where you are, that's not my problem. The evidence is right in front of you, above you, maybe below you. Old history books won't help you there.

I'd suggest you get a strong beverage, one that will relax you first before trying to pull off that "ancient wisdom" dums**t again.

You waste too much of too many folks' time with arguments over semantic minutae.

Plonk

LHA / WMD

1792. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:34:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326123457.05025.00000043@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 89851

In article <20040325190115.12501.00006944@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>> Pizza off.
>
>What does that mean? Sounds like you're telling me to shut up. Very unAmerican
>of you, Len, telling someone to shut up when they correct your mistakes.

You got pizza now? EAT IT.

LHA / WMD

1793. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:39:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403260939.fa8ba9d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89857

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94B6E0F2B528Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
> news:ibKcnb0UdoVCqP_dUSdV9g@ptd.net:

> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040324055908.00150.00000001@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > [snipped stuff where we seem to be in agreement]
> >> >I also dislike the entry level class name proposed by the NCVEC
> >> >proposal - "communicator" - I prefer retaining the traditional
> >> >"novice" name, which is recognized around the world (and has been
> >> >used in other countries as well).
> >> >
> >> How about "Basic"?
>
> Why not? It's good enough for the Canadians, eh!

Exactly!
>
> > I still prefer "Novice" ... anyone who's more than a beginner
> > technically will
> > probably go straight through to General, or even Extra, in one sitting.

That depends on what is in those tests.

> > Anyone
> > who's truly a technical "newbie" and needs to learn more should not be
> > offended by the class name Novice.

But what if they are? You're telling other people how they should
feel, what they should like...

> > It's been around a long time, still fits, and is recognized worldwide -
> > some other
> > countries even have a beginner class called Novice.

Some other countries have a beginner class called Basic.

> The word Novice still makes me think of nuns before I think of amateur
> radio!

Me too. It's an embarassing name for a license.
>
> >> What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather than
> >> have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool, that
> >> they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement that
> >> they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide by

> >> it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool can
> >> be made smaller.
> >>
> >> Is that a good idea?
> >
> > It's clearly a "learn as you go" proposition any way you look at it ...
> > NOBODY knows everything there is to know from day one.

I'm not asking that anyone know everything from day one, just that
they be tested on the rules for the license they are granted. That's
reasonable.
> >
> > Since the rules can be looked up (just as one can use a "crib sheet" to
> > remember sub-band
> > edges) it seems to me that its not an unreasonable proposition.

From the experience of Phil Kane and others, it's just not a good idea
at all. Anyone who is a newbie to amateur radio regulations should not
have any trouble passing a few questions on the regulations.

> > I'd
> > rather have someone
> > know a bit more about radio and operating and have to refer to the
> > rules as they learn to
> > make sure they did things "by the book" than to shortcut the *basic*
> > theory and operating practices.

Why? If they can look up the rules, why can't they look up the other
things as well?

> Sorry, but I think they should have to learn both. If you have a ham
> licence you should _know_ the rules at least for your own class of licence,
> period.

I agree with Alun 100%. The rules are the one thing that every
licensee *HAS* to know *BEFORE* the license is granted.

Look at the enforcement letters of FCC, and you'll see that the vast
majority of alleged violations by hams are violations of operating
rules, not technical violations.

> > However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal
> > to the NCVEC one
> > for the following reasons:
> >
> > 1) less conversion of CW/data space to SSB
>
> But it still falls well short of the amount of phone allowed in the IARU
> Region 2 (North and South America) bandplan. Try reading that particular
> document. You may find that it's an eye opener.

Izzat the one that gives CW and digital about 10-15% of the available
HF amateur spectrum?

>
> > 2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition
> > because it unnecessarily
> > discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have
> > *always* been allowed (and
> > encouraged by 97.1) to do.
>
> Agreed, but the test needs to cover basic electronics theory accordingly

Only after it covers the rules.

> > 3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition,
> > because it precludes the new
> > ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101,
> > TS-520/820, etc. for no good
> > reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC
> > or 220VAC on the
> > *primaries*, so what's the sense in this proposal.
> > and,
>
> Agreed, but the appropriate safety guidelines should be in the test

Ditto.

We're not talking a lot, here. The "old" Novice covered all that. No
reason the new one can't.
>
> > 4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with
> > a special, never-used
> > callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are
> > disgruntled with ANY change.
>
> Agreed, but _only_ if they don't get to take a new ultra-lame theory test
>
It adds an unnecessary level of regs and no real benefits.

Instead, just do this:

1) Basic/Novice: Six-character callsigns (including vanity) in 2x3
format.

2) General: Six- or five-character callsigns (including vanity) in
2x3, 1x3, or 2x2 format.

3) Extra: Six-, five- or four-character callsigns (including vanity)
in 2x3, 1x3, 2x2, 1x2 or 2x1 format.

Nobody in any license class has to give up a callsign they hold now.
Closed-off license classes can choose future vanity calls from the
groups for the next-lowest license class.

Simple, universal, gives an incentive and no "mark".

73 de Jim, N2EY

1794. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:44:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89858

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040324235834.08081.00000014@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <40625D90.5060908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
> >>> radio environment.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Generally agreed by whom?
> >>
> >>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
> >>
> >Sure, they were by investors told to build something that could get
> >digital information over
> >power cables. The fact that it will radiate was not an issue for them.
> > But a big
> >issue for us.
> >
> >>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
> >>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
> >>
> >Bullshjt, they're just brearucrats who are lawyers and not engineers.

They're "professionals, though. Just like Len!

> > They probably
> >figure that they can sue whatever out of existance to solve problems....
>
> The FCC also created the six-tiered amateur license structure
> prior to R&O 99-412 and established 13 and 20 WPM morse
> code rates. :-)

Yep, back when the agency was run by technically knowledgeable people
who would have laughed BPL right out the door.

Six classes of license dates back to 1951.
13 wpm code test dates back to 1936
20 wpm code test dates back to the early 1920s

Tell us, Len - how do we *amateurs* fight something the
professionals say is a good thing? How do we convicne them it *is* a
"major calamity"?

Or don't you know how to do that?

1795. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:59:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326125934.20920.00000040@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89859

In article <40644A1E.3000507@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Jim, with each others help, we can avoid feeding the trolls! 8^)
>
>ahem!

Yes, secure this Chat Room for your own private little klatch.

Send a memo to that Schleck guy and close it off so you won't
be disturbed.

Plonk

LHA / WMD

1796. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 17:59:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326125934.20920.00000039@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89860

In article <40643B89.3030405@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> All the things that can radiate in the HF spectrum and interfere with
>or be interfered with by BPL are a large list. And if part 15 is gone,
>then they won't have to worry about RFI protection in design any more so
>the list will grow...

You can continue to argue among yourselves in here on the subject,
or you can put forth some effort for your "amateur community"
(which shows your dedication and committment) by communicating
with the FCC. See docket 04-37 in the FCC ECFS.

LHA / WMD

1797. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 18:28:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040326132800.21825.00000023@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 89861

In article <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (The
Confrontational Newsgroupie Amateur
Formerly Known As Reverend Jim puts on his cammies, locks
and loads 22 shorts) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040324235834.08081.00000014@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> In article <40625D90.5060908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> >>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >>
>> >>>It's generally agreed that Access BPL will be a bad thing in any urban
>> >>> radio environment.
>> >>
>> >>Generally agreed by whom?
>> >>
>> >>The BPL developers don't agree. And they're professionals.
>> >>
>> >Sure, they were by investors told to build something that could get
>> >digital information over
>> >power cables. The fact that it will radiate was not an issue for them.
>> > But a big
>> >issue for us.
>> >
>> >>The FCC doesn't agree. They're professionals too, and regulators of all
>> >>"civilian" radio and wire communications in the USA.
>> >>
>> >Bullshjt, they're just brearucrats who are lawyers and not engineers.
>
>They're "professionals, though. Just like Len!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...skipping someone in the attributions, are you?

Now you are acting like an adolescent trolling for a FIGHT!

>> > They probably
>> >figure that they can sue whatever out of existance to solve problems....
>>
>> The FCC also created the six-tiered amateur license structure
>> prior to R&O 99-412 and established 13 and 20 WPM morse

>> code rates. :-)
>
>Yep, back when the agency was run by technically knowledgeable people
>who would have laughed BPL right out the door.
>
>Six classes of license dates back to 1951.
>13 wpm code test dates back to 1936
>20 wpm code test dates back to the early 1920s

Still chanting Morse Code Uber Alles are you? :-)

Poor baby.

3 classes of new licenses dates back to 2000.

5 words per minute singular code test rate dates back to 2000.

This year is 2004.

>Tell us, Len - how do we *amateurs* fight something the
>*professionals* say is a good thing? How do we convicne them it *is* a
>"major calamity"?
>
>Or don't you know how to do that?

I don't know how to "convicne" them or what that word means.

As to CONVINCING any group, all I can suggest is communicating your grievances to your government. If you are a United States citizen, then you are given that right by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

For grievances about Access BPL and NPRM 04-29 concerning amendments to Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R., for Access BPL, you have three very quick access routes through the FCC website at dockets 04-27, 04-29, 03-104 which can all be made through the FCC Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS). If you don't know how to use that route, the FCC has made a good Help page available to all. You may alternately or simultaneously choose to comment via other media. The methods for that are also explained on an FCC Help page available to all.

As of the close of FCC office hours on 25 March 2004, there were 108 documents filed under docket 04-37, 6 documents under docket 04-29, 5813 documents under docket 03-104. I have made my comments to the FCC on all three dockets plus I am finishing surface mail correspondence with my federal Senator and federal Representative in reference to NPRM 04-29 and Access BPL.

You are welcome to do nothing but sit in here and pick verbal bar fights with others if you wish. That is a free option but it doesn't make any sort of communications to federal regulators about Access BPL one way or the other. Your choice.

Plonk

LHA / WMD

1798. Re: CW is dead in France since yesterday

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 18:46:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zU_8c.1320$NL4.812@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89862

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94B84064DBC5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it> wrote in
> news:458ae69c716d53bcd7619ac3e881da26@firenze.linux.it:
>
> > > The CCR (radio commission) has adopted the
> > > new ART text allowing technicians on HF.
> > > The text will be published in the
> > > Journal Officiel within the next weeks.
> > >
> > > You will hear F1 and F4 prefixs soon on
> > > HF. Happy DXing with France.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Vive la France!

I only talk to French stations for a contest point. I still boycott all
things French. Vive la France! my ass.

Dan/W4NTI

1799. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 18:58:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <v3%8c.1334$NL4.1225@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89863

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:TUS8c.31994$LX.4602333@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:jzM8c.796$NL4.125@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com...
> > > Anybody in favor of conducting a brief weekly check-in on 7037 kHz?
> > > Not a 'War and Peace' ragchewing session, just a friendly way to make
> > > contact other than on the newsgroup.
> > >
> > > It might encourage newbies to check in and would probably help
> > > overcome any trepidation and build confidence. (5 to
> > > 8-wpm...Farnsworth?)
> > >
> > > Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> > > around these parts.)
> > >
> > > Format?
> > >
> > > CQ CQ CQ de rrap rrap
> > >
> > > QNI? K
> > >
> > > WA2SI Bert K
> > > KB3EIA Mike K
> > > N2EY Jim K
> > > N8UZE Dee K
> > > etc...
> > >
> > > QNI?
> > >
> > > GN de rrap rrap 73 73
> > >
> > > Suggestions?
> > >
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> >
> > Great idea.....but I can't copy 5 wpm.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I'll be glad to send at about 15 to 20-wpm, Dan. ;-)

>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Sounds good to me.

Dan/W4NTI

1800. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 19:37:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv6ye5h.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89864

On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 09:11:05 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

>IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
>HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
>signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
>constitute that willful interference?
>
> I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.
>
> Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?

This attorney says that if you are operating within the FCC Rule
requirements then any interception by a system which is not intended
to receive those signals - be it an audio device or a BPL system -
is the problem of the affected system operator and not of the
transmitter operator or licensee.

In communications regulatory law, "willful" is defined as knowing
that you are doing an act regardless of the intent of doing that act
or its effects - it is the opposite of "accidental".

For example, operating a transmitter is a willful act - you know
that you are operating a transmitter. If operation of that
transmitter is a violation (such as on an unauthorized frequency)
that is a willful violation regardless of any intent to violate FCC
rules.

Operating a radio transmitter in full compliance with the terms of
license and FCC rules is not "in violation".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1801. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 19:37:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv6xyxg.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89865

On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 05:35:02 -0000, Keith wrote:

>Consumers Internet Federation Oppose Ham Radio Operators Potential
>Interference to BPL
>
>San Francisco, CA - CIF today asked Congress to pass legislation
>to protect Broadband over Power Lines (BPL) users from interference
>by misguided ham radio operators. The ham radio operators through
>email lists and newsgroups are making plans to disrupt the critical
>infrastructure of the Internet in a terrorist like movement.
>These acts will dramatically impact Internet users'
>rights to access to the Internet. Legislation would require
>anyone who interferes with a BPL system to immediately cease
>all ham radio or CB operations until they no longer interfere
>with a BPL users business or home system.
> BPL promises Internet users a Broadband Nirvana and is endorsed by
>FCC Chairman Michael Powell as a solution to the lack of broadband
>choices for consumers.

Pardon me while I barf.

Then again, "interfere" and "interference" have specific definitins
in both national and international communications law which refer to
interruptions of LICENSED communication services.......of which BPL
is most assuredly not.

No one is disputing that BPL is a Part 15 "unintentional radiator"
which is not protected. The dispute is over the level of allowable
signal or noise permitted under rules pertaining to said applications.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1802. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 20:11:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv70gpl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89866

On 26 Mar 2004 09:17:15 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>> >But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or the
>> >Commissioners....;-) ;-)
>>
>> Both the Commissioners and the Chief of the Office of Science and
>> Technology dance to the tune of the politicians who control them.
>
>But Phil - they're "professionals", just like Len!
>
>> It embarasses the hell out of me.....
>
>Why? You don't work for FCC any more, Phil.

Loyalty and respect die hard......I spent a lot of years there at a
time when the agency had national and international respect for
doing things right and put a lot of effort into carrying my share of
that load.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1803. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 20:17:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40648FEE.3010908@psu.edu>
Source record: 89867

N2EY wrote:

>> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".

Did anyone actually say that? It's highly inaccurate if they did. I think there is a vision of just sending the signals over the power lines and boy howdy, an instant nationwide network, everywhere there is a power line, "you have mail!"

In truth, a fiber has to be run to somewhere near the house that is going to be served, so that means that rural areas will not be any easier to serve than they are now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1804. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 20:21:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <406490E5.4050204@psu.edu>
Source record: 89868

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Plonk

Finally! Thank you!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1805. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 20:38:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403261238.24039c21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89869
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dr. Anton T. Squeegee <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1acd41797fe0fd159896c3@192.168.42.131>...
> In article <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
> rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com says...
>
> > Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> > freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> > Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
> >
> > It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.
> >
> > Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> > and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> > for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> > thunderstorm rolls thru...????
>
> <snip>
>
> Lightning is non-discriminatory. ANYthing that's plugged into a
> power outlet during a lightning storm stands a good chance of getting
> fried from a near or direct strike.
>
> Personally, I'm waiting for the first incidence of BPL interfering
> with HF communications from FEMA, the Coast Guard, the FAA, ARINC, or
> other federally-related HF/VHF radio services.
>
> It's only going to take one failure to get a VIP's message through
> to shut the whole thing down cold, methinks.
>
> In other words, just give it time. I think the whole BPL thing's
> going to blow up in Michael Powell's face, and I sincerely hope someone
> catches a nice photo when it does.

That would work for me but my bet is that the shutdown of BPL will
come via it's economics and it'll become a latter-day Nasdaq dot.bomb.

w3rv

1806. I NEED YOUR HELP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 21:37:05 UTC
From: "Gary C. Cash" <cash@in-tch.com>
Message-ID: <c427nomjl1@news.tamerica.net>
Source record: 89870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,tnn.radio.a

TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS:

I, ALONG WITH A FRIEND OF MINE, W7ARO (Ed Bodenberger), ARE TRYING TO COMPILE A LIST OF AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS AND THEIR CALLSIGNS FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING NAMES ARE THOSE OF SILENT KEYS FOR WHICH WE HAVE NO CALLSIGN AVAILABLE AND ALL ARE FROM MONTANA. IF YOU HAVE AT SOMETIME WORKED ANY OF THESE INDIVIDUALS AND HAVE RECORD OF A CALLSIGN YOU RESPONSE WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

TOM GIBSON
HAROLD PETERSON
ED BINGLER
RON WRIGHT
BILL MONEYSMITH
PHIL HAGMAN
OSCAR RICE

73's
GARY
WQ7S
cash@in-tch.com

1807. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 22:01:36 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0403261401.4c9eda0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89871

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> >around these parts.)
> >
> Works for me!
>
> 7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST
>
> BCNU
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Sounds great! And once again, just to reiterate, this should not be a
pressure thing. If someone knows how to send their callsign plus QNI
and a K, then you've successfully "touched base" and said "hi."

Now, if some nice Elmer-type frequent R.R.A.Per who happens to have a
webpage would like to have a small section called 'R.R.A.P Net
Roster'...well, that'd be just swell. Hmmm...womder who'd be the best
candidate? 0:-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1808. Re: I NEED YOUR HELP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 22:54:41 UTC
From: K3HVG <jeepp@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <keOdnaZWPtwNLvndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89872
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,tnn.radio.a

I'm not certain, maybe just a coincidence, but there's a Tom Gibson I know/met who's has some ties to Montana. He may have worked up there for some time. This fellow was also a maritime operator and is currently (I hope!) an officer on the museum ship John Brown (Liberty Ship in Baltimore). Last time I saw Tom was aboard last year. Might this be the same person?

Gary C. Cash wrote:
> TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS:
>
> I, ALONG WITH A FRIEND OF MINE, W7ARO (Ed Bodenberger), ARE TRYING TO
> COMPILE A LIST OF AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS AND THEIR CALLSIGNS FOR HISTORICAL
> PURPOSES. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING NAMES ARE THOSE OF SILENT KEYS FOR WHICH WE
> HAVE NO CALLSIGN AVAILABLE AND ALL ARE FROM MONTANA. IF YOU HAVE AT SOMETIME
> WORKED ANY OF THESE INDIVIDUALS AND HAVE RECORD OF A CALLSIGN YOU RESPONSE
> WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.
>
> TOM GIBSON
> HAROLD PETERSON
> ED BINGLER
> RON WRIGHT
> BILL MONEYSMITH
> PHIL HAGMAN
> OSCAR RICE
>
> 73's
> GARY
> WQ7S
> cash@in-tch.com
>
>
>
>

1809. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 23:46:45 UTC
From: Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you>
Message-ID: <Fh39c.1825$u_2.1656@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 89873
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Q_09c.21065$fl6.731@bignews1.bellsouth.net...

><snip>

I'll bet you run into the crapper & whack off every time you get a sniff of
this kind of stuff, huh Oxendorf?

Since you want to keep up with your worthless crap in the trucking
newsgroup, let's discuss some of those pedophiles that play on their ham
radios !

Hell, I'll even post some stuff from the crap that you've posted in MTT.

Must get pretty lonely yakking on those radios all night !!

"In the below cases, licensees' names match FCC license records. Preliminary
information indicates that the subject is the same person listed in our
database. The inquiry seeks first to establish whether that is the case, and
second, to determine what effect the offense has on the individual's
qualifications to remain a Commission licensee. "

Lowell, Arizona....General.. Ten-year sentence, sexual abuse
Riverdale, Georgia.....Technician Plus..... Life sentence, murder,
Peachtree City, Georgia.......Extra......Child molestation
Battleboro, North Carolina.....General......Felony sexual offense
High Point, North Carolina.....Extra......Sexual offense
Cuba, New York.....General......Sexual offense
Hanahan, South Carolina.......Technician.........Sexual exploitation of
minor; SC Sex Offender Registration List

Tom

1810. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-26 23:55:40 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <4064C2FC.11693774@nospam.net>
Source record: 89874
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Skateboard'n wrote:

> "Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:Q_09c.21065$fl6.731@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
>
> ><snip>
>
> I'll bet you run into the crapper & whack off every time you get a sniff of
> this kind of stuff, huh Oxendorf?
>
> Since you want to keep up with your worthless crap in the trucking
> newsgroup, let's discuss some of those pedophiles that play on their ham
> radios !
>
> Hell, I'll even post some stuff from the crap that you've posted in MTT.
>
> Must get pretty lonely yakking on those radios all night !!
>
> "In the below cases, licensees' names match FCC license records. Preliminary
> information indicates that the subject is the same person listed in our
> database. The inquiry seeks first to establish whether that is the case, and
> second, to determine what effect the offense has on the individual's
> qualifications to remain a Commission licensee. "
>
> Lowell, Arizona....General.. Ten-year sentence, sexual abuse
> Riverdale, Georgia.....Technician Plus..... Life sentence, murder,
> Peachtree City, Georgia.......Extra......Child molestation
> Battleboro, North Carolina.....General......Felony sexual offense
> High Point, North Carolina.....Extra......Sexual offense
> Cuba, New York.....General......Sexual offense
> Hanahan, South Carolina.......Technician........Sexual exploitation of
> minor; SC Sex Offender Registration List
>
> Tom

What! no one in Louisville, KY? Oh yeah, that's right, he doesn't have a
license!

1811. Re: Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 01:16:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%B49c.2356$Dv2.2274@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89875

Dump Huck Davies wrote

| I think it's time it was given to me.

It's guys like you who make me wish there was a minimum acceptable IQ
requirement to obtain an amateur license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1812. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 01:47:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <eladnVwRJ-0dQ_nd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89877

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 09:11:05 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
>>HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
>>signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
>>constitute that willful interference?
>>
>> I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.
>>
>> Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?
>
>
> This attorney says that if you are operating within the FCC Rule
> requirements then any interception by a system which is not intended
> to receive those signals - be it an audio device or a BPL system -
> is the problem of the affected system operator and not of the
> transmitter operator or licensee.
>
> In communications regulatory law, "willful" is defined as knowing
> that you are doing an act regardless of the intent of doing that act
> or its effects - it is the opposite of "accidental".
>
> For example, operating a transmitter is a willful act - you know
> that you are operating a transmitter. If operation of that
> transmitter is a violation (such as on an unauthorized frequency)
> that is a willful violation regardless of any intent to violate FCC
> rules.
>
> Operating a radio transmitter in full compliance with the terms of
> license and FCC rules is not "in violation".

You obviously haven't be paying attention to the group official rules
interpreter, Frankie Gilligan. According to him that would be malicious
interference and would completely be the hams fault and the ham would be
operating illegally.

1813. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 01:50:10 UTC
From: Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you>
Message-ID: <m559c.1888$u_2.645@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 89876
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:sO49c.10689
> Your feeble attempts to discredit me fall on deaf ears. Those people you
> mention have nothing to do with me.

And your worthless post's have posted in the trucking newsgroup have the
same merit with me.

> Isn't it pathetic that people have such a base mentality that
> they can only resort to sexual innuendo in order to make a
> point?

Where's the "sexual innuendo", Oxendorf? Like you, I just posted some F.C.C.
news, I can't help that there seems to be a big connection with sexual
deviant child molesting freaks & ham radios!

Kind of like your NARROW minded stereotyping of truck drivers..... yet you
keep coming back to the trucking newsgroup with your crap.

> If just being quiet is what you are after, then I can do that.

Yeah.... right ! Your worthless post prove otherwise.

> But
> it won't change a thing! LOL! (BIG Snicker). Those drivers are going to
> continue to be hit with warnings, citations, and even fines.

Yep....just like you & your proven pedophile friends losing their license.

> I remember a couple years when I said it was coming, oh BOY! It was
> HAHAHAHAHAHAHA! Never happen.
> FCC got too many other things to take care of. FCC don't got the money.
> FCC ain't gonna come after no trucker a-talkin' on the "hammie" bands. Now
> that it IS
> coming true, you cry FOWL! No FAIR!

LMAO.... obsessions isn't pretty, Oxendorf !

> The solution is so simple it even escapes the simplest mind. Stay OUT of
> the licensed bands and you got no
> probs. Period!

Stop molesting little kids & we won't see ham operators losing their
licensees for fondling infants & " you got no probs." "Period !"

Tom

1814. Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 01:54:35 UTC
From: Kim_Jong_Il@volcanomail.com
Message-ID: <26a0f230.0403261754.1561309d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Please excuse me for posting a message that actually deals with
shortwave and amateur radio.

http://www.guardian.co.uk/uslatest/story/0,1282,-3907889,00.html

>>
Bush Touts High-Speed Internet Access Plan

Saturday March 27, 2004 12:01 AM

By SCOTT LINDLAW
Associated Press Writer

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
by 2007.
....

In an outdoor speech here, the president stopped short of promising he
would reach the goal by 2007, saying instead that ``we ought to have''
cheap high-speed access everywhere. Nor did he offer a detailed plan
on how he hoped to achieve it.

But his administration has been working at it behind the scenes. Last
month, the Federal Communication Commission voted to write rules for a
third way to bring high-speed Internet service to homes: through
conventional electric lines, where a homeowner could plug a modem into
an electrical outlet.
....
<<

1815. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 02:00:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040326210020.18733.00000033@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 89879

In article <6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
>[snip]
>
>> The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
>> technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
>> studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
>> much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
>> themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
>bypass
>> the Novice. People are strange.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much to
>the
>vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with digital
>modes, etc.

That's one way to look at it. Here's another:

After 1991, newcomers had a choice of two entry licenses (meaning (obtainable
with the minimum amount of testing).

They could choose the Novice, which required a written test and a 5 wpm code
test. This license gave them some HF privileges (mostly but not exclusively
Morse Code) and some privileges on VHF/UHF. But they were kept off the most
popular amateur VHF/UHF bands (2 meters, 6 meters and 440 MHz) and got
six-character callsigns.

OR

They could choose the Technician, which required two similar written tests but
no code test. This license gave them no HF privileges but *all* privileges on
VHF/UHF. In many areas they got five-character callsigns, or could get them via
the vanity program. And if/when they passed the 5 wpm code test, the HF
privileges of the Novice class would be added on.

Which is easier to study for: two multiple-choice written tests that are highly
similar to each other, or two tests that require completely different study
methods?

Even before 1987, many if not most new hams bypassed the Novice and went straight for Tech - in large part because they wanted VHF/UHF privileges right off. Particularly 2 meters and/or 440.

It should be noted that in the past 4 years the number of new hams has not increased dramatically, even though the code test has been reduced to 5 wpm for all classes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1816. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 02:06:51 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <gf59c.21242$fl6.4126@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 89880
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Skateboard'n" <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you> wrote in message
news:m559c.1888$u_2.645@nwrddc01.gnilink.net...
> "Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:sO49c.10689
> > Your feeble attempts to discredit me fall on deaf ears. Those people
you
> > mention have nothing to do with me.
>
> And your worthless post's have posted in the trucking newsgroup have the
> same merit with me.
>
> > Isn't it pathetic that people have such a base mentality that
> > they can only resort to sexual innuendo in order to make a
> > point?
>
> Where's the "sexual innuendo", Oxendorf? Like you, I just posted some
F.C.C.
> news, I can't help that there seems to be a big connection with sexual
> deviant child molesting freaks & ham radios!
>
> Kind of like your NARROW minded stereotyping of truck drivers..... yet you
> keep coming back to the trucking newsgroup with your crap.
>
> > If just being quiet is what you are after, then I can do that.
>
> Yeah.... right ! Your worthless post prove otherwise.
>
> > But
> > it won't change a thing! LOL! (BIG Snicker). Those drivers are going to
> > continue to be hit with warnings, citations, and even fines.
>
> Yep....just like you & your proven pedophile friends losing their license.
>
> > I remember a couple years when I said it was coming, oh BOY! It was
> > HAHAHAHAHAHAHA! Never happen.
> > FCC got too many other things to take care of. FCC don't got the money.
> > FCC ain't gonna come after no trucker a-talkin' on the "hammie" bands.
Now
> > that it IS
> > coming true, you cry FOWL! No FAIR!
>
> LMAO.... obsessions isn't pretty, Oxendorf !
>
> > The solution is so simple it even escapes the simplest mind. Stay OUT

of
> > the licensed bands and you got no
> > probs. Period!
>
> Stop molesting little kids & we won't see ham operators losing their
> licensees for fondling infants & " you got no probs." "Period !"
>
>
>
>
> Tom

Bud, that group doesn't apply to me, OK? Now, if I wanted to, I could go
out and find just as many CB types
getting in trouble for the same thing--as if ANY of it was
relevant to the topic at hand.

J
>
>

1817. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 02:22:41 UTC
From: Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you>
Message-ID: <Rz59c.1902$u_2.556@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 89881
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:gf59c.21242
> Bud, that group doesn't apply to me, OK? Now, if I wanted to, I could go
> out and find just as many CB types
> getting in trouble for the same thing--as if ANY of it was
> relevant to the topic at hand.

<SIGH>

You just don't get it, do you Oxendorf ? You have to be one humongous ass...
plain & simple !

The crap you keep posting in Misc.Transport.Trucking doesn't apply to me,
either..... yet you keep posting it.

Soooooooooo.... using your principles & the way you constantly TROLL MTT
with your bullshit, my post's would be accurate. With the way you stereotype
truck drivers & their radios..... my stereotyping child molesting ham
operators would be accurate !! Thank you.

Heck, after all, it's in the report from the F.C.C., you should know, you
keep posting the reports..... you sexual deviant !

Tom

1818. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 02:41:01 UTC
From: Murray <muff@jathrewit.org>
Message-ID: <c42pg1gfl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 89882
Cross-posted to: misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
///drivelsnipped///

Hey Oxymoron, did you ever repair the leaks in that filthy
stinking trailer you live in? And did you ever clear that mountain
of trash and beer cans in front of your mobile home? What a
loser!

Muff

1819. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 02:48:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <KqqdnfDrlaEPdvndRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89883

JJ wrote:
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 09:11:05 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>
>>> IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
>>> HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
>>> signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
>>> constitute that willful interference?
>>>
>>> I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.
>>>
>>> Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?
>>
>>
>>
>> This attorney says that if you are operating within the FCC Rule
>> requirements then any interception by a system which is not intended
>> to receive those signals - be it an audio device or a BPL system -
>> is the problem of the affected system operator and not of the
>> transmitter operator or licensee.
>>
>> In communications regulatory law, "willful" is defined as knowing
>> that you are doing an act regardless of the intent of doing that act
>> or its effects - it is the opposite of "accidental".
>>
>> For example, operating a transmitter is a willful act - you know
>> that you are operating a transmitter. If operation of that
>> transmitter is a violation (such as on an unauthorized frequency)
>> that is a willful violation regardless of any intent to violate FCC
>> rules.
>>
>> Operating a radio transmitter in full compliance with the terms of
>> license and FCC rules is not "in violation".
>
>
> You obviously haven't be paying attention to the group official rules
> interpreter, Frankie Gilligan. According to him that would be malicious
> interference and would completely be the hams fault and the ham would be
> operating illegally.

Hehe, too bad Frank seems to have disappeared. I would have like to see
how he would have fared against Phil! I think Phil's opinion holds a bit

more authority, no?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1820. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:29:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261929.7e816ebf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89884

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Arnie Macy" wrote ...
>
> > I understand your point, but the intent of this section in the FCC rules
> was
> > to stop Ham radio from being used for commercial purposes, not to prohibit
> > emergency communications. Nothing in the rules prohibits use of this
> > equipment during an emergency by any licensed person. Or for that matter,
> > any person whatever. As I said, our Ham equipment is being used for
> > redundancy, so for all practical purposes, it will never be used for
> routine
> > communication -- other than testing to ensure it is working properly.
> >
>
> I just wanted to add that there are always exceptions to the rule. Two that
> I can think of, right off hand, would be the Space Shuttle Crew (obviously
> government employees) and Federal, State, and local EM directors and staff
> (many of whom are Hams). Do you really think either of the aforementioned
> would not be allowed to use their privileges because of part 97?
>
> Arnie -

Arnie, please don't ask me to bless what others do on amateur radio.
I've been heavily criticized for a couple of positions that I've taken
wrt a literal "interpretation" of Part 97.

1. The no monetary rule, and repeater owners charging "dues" for
repeater use.

2. Administering a Farnsworth exam when Part 97 clearly states "Morse
Code."

I don't make the rules, and I don't take it upon myself to interpret
workarounds to what Part 97 states.

I leave that sort of work to the experts on RRAP and the FCC.

bb

1821. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:38:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261938.4387c38e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89885

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325090319.17909.00000060@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me.
> And
> >> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
> >> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >More untruths.
> >
> >Mark Morgan
> >
> >RRAP is littered with people you hate.
>
> Mark's not here anymore.
>
> Mark, like you, was a chronic liar.
>
> Mark isn't here anymore because he got wise when we kept re-quoting those
> things he insisted he didn't say, yet was right in front of him. In THAT
> regard, it was the only wise thing he ever did (ie: leave)
>
> Like I said...I don't tolerate liars. Mark was proven to be a liar.
> Lennie's been proven to be a lair, and now you are.
>
> Wadda ya know!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

When you take a dislike to someone, you accuse them, villify them,
make them liars, stalk them, attack them, and start numerous smear
threads about them.

RRAP is littered with people you hate.

You have yet to prove that I've lied a single time. Just repeating it over and over doesn't make it so.

But it does make you look nuts.

1822. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:39:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89886

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325160956.16601.00000108@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/25/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251225.2dcbeee4@posting.google.com>
>
> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
> >
> >But you're still nuts.
>
> But you've not explained why.

Yes I have.

1823. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:42:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261942.76f3c5e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89887

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040324054717.03164.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040323224718.22081.00004758@mb-m17.aol.com>

> > He ought to read "Geek Boy Times" published by
> > the USMC.
>
> Sorry that I've "been there-done that" more often than you, Lennie. It
> just happens that way sometimes.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

No doubt.

Are you still #2?

1824. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:46:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261946.3adbd094@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89888

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...

> There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to
> get a license,

Brave words from a guy w/o a license.

1825. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:50:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261950.6ce3c5d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89889

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
> [snip]
>
> > The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> > technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> > studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
> > much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
> > themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
> bypass
> > the Novice. People are strange.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much to
> the
> vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with digital
> modes, etc.
>
> Carl - wk3c

I'm just amazed at how easily some can brush aside the monumental
waste of time learning the Morse Code and become.

Probably someone without a job, on disability, or retired.

1826. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:53:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <iO6dnewQw8uTY_ndRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89891

Wee Willie Winky wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
>
>>There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to
>>get a license,
>
>
> Brave words from a guy w/o a license.

Sorry to dissappoint you willieboy, but I have an advanced. Took my exam
in front of an FCC examiner.

1827. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 03:57:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89890

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040325160156.16601.00000107@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/25/2004 2:22 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251222.5fb780c3@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040325092209.17909.00000065@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> >If they are statements of fact, you'll just have to accept them.
> >
> >Best of Luck
>
> I guess "just have to accept them" is OK for you and your co-liar but not
> for anyone else.

You have to accept facts, don't you?

Were they or weren't they statements of fact?

If they weren't statements of fact, why did you call them that in the
last 60 posts or so?

> And sorry, I don't....Because I know better, and so do you.

I only know that your nuts. Again and again.

> It's been proven, Brain...You're lying. Everything else is downhill from
> here.

So where is the proof?

> No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.
>
> Nice job.

Dunno, Steve, you're the one calling them statements of fact. You're
the navigator. You're the skillful one. Pffft.

Everyone else on here knows that much of what is posted is called
"opinion."

Best of luck.

1828. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 05:58:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327005820.23344.00000046@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 89892

In article <406490E5.4050204@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Plonk
>
> Finally! Thank you!

Plink.

LHA / WMD

1829. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:21:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89893

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>

>> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
>> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
>> >
>> >But you're still nuts.
>>
>> But you've not explained why.
>
>Yes I have.

No, you've not....other than to say I'm "nuts" becasue I dare to question
you.

And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions about
YOUR assertions.

Liar AND coward. Nice combo, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

1830. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:39:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327023923.29966.00000197@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89894

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251557.d55f227@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040325091309.17909.00000063@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/24/2004 6:04 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241604.a98ef2a@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.
>> >
>> >It is here.
>>
>> Then you obviously don't know about tiered dispatching. (Why am I not
>> surprised?)
>
>My mistake. I misread you statement.
>
>Every emergency call here is handled by 911 operators.

Must be nice to have a tax base that supports having 911 oerators.

We have about 7 operators at our 9-1-1 dispatch facility.

>> Also, most 9-1-1 centers are trying to make it well known that they
>want
>> people to use 9-1-1 for TRUE emergencies...bleeding, robbery-in-progress,
>> smoke/fire, etc...The cat in the tree or the broken window don't rate a
>Code 3
>> response.
>>
>> >> Do you know the difference? Do you KNOW what's an "emergency" as
>> opposed
>> >> to urgent or routine...?!?!
>> >
>> >All of your posts are emergencies.
>> >
>> >Lots of ALLCAPS, """QUOTES""", """ACCUSATIONS""", and """DEMANDS"""
>>

>> I guess that's what it takes to get a reply from you.
>
>You're more likely not to get a reply with that tactic.

What "tactic", Brain?

Firts of all I don't reply in "ALLCAPS". I do use specific words capiltalized for emnphasis, and this only becuase it seems that YOU require the mephasis in order to understand what's being said.

Secondly, if I put something in "quotes", it's again to specifically emphasize the word or to make it apparent that I am repating someone elses words.

Third, I only make "ACCUSSATIONS" when there is some proof that I am correct.

So far you spent about 10 days dodging an explanation to questions about YOUR assertion that unlicensed radio services play a "major role" (your adjectives) in "emergency comms" (your "term")

Lastly, the "damands" only seem like "demands" when YOU are hard-pressed to respond because you know that some soft, tender part of your anatomy is in the vise.

Sorry, PuppetBoy...you put them there...Ya shouldn't have put them there if getting them squeezed was against your nature.

>> Not that you'd answer any of it honestly anyway.
>
>Not that you target minutia and then demand retribution.

If I wanted "retribution", I
d have it.

AS for "target(ing) minutia", this IS a forum about communications, and you've made an assertion of fact about emergency communications that I am asking you to substantiate.

So far you've refused, choosing, rather, to make assertions of mental instability or other allegations that are so obviosly a childish, sandlot dodge...Not that I'd expect anything else from Lennie's "mentor"...

>> >> > However when the cell
>> >> >> network is either down or so overloaded because of everyone
>attempting
>> >> >> to call home to say, "I'm ok turn on your tv", that he can't get a
>call
>> >> >> through, he can use his cell phone to play games until the emergency
>is
>> >> >> over.
>> >> >
>> >> >Ever notice how immense those pyramid alert rosters get at the bottom?
>> >> >

>> >> >Actually, the network goes down trying to notify enough amateur
>> >> >volunteers who signed on but really aren't available.
>> >>
>> >> Most of the "amateur volunteers" I know have scanners, pagers and
>> radios
>> >> on...No cellphone necessary.
>> >
>> >Gosh. You don't say?
>> >
>> >I'll bet they got cell phones, too.
>>
>> Some do.
>
>Most of the people I know have cell phones.

And your point is....?!?!

Most of the people I know are capable of lying, too, but most of them
don't. Why do you?

Steve, K4YZ

1831. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:42:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327024248.29966.00000198@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89895

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251600.204a0f42@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
>> >
>> >
>> > Then wave your arms around, invoke the magic incantation, and
>> > the world will be remade entirely to your desires.
>> >
>> > Your imaginary world will be even better than you dreamed!
>>
>> I again ask you as to which "imaginary" world you refer...?!?!
>
>How many imaginary worlds do you have?

Only the one where-in Brittany Spears shows up at my front door with
round-trip tickets to Tahiti begging me to go with her.

OIther than that, I've pretty well got you and Lennie by the cajones...As
hard as it is to hold on to something that small.

Steve, K4YZ

1832. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:45:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327024528.29966.00000199@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89896

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 6:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251602.559a6f94@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040325085912.17909.00000059@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>> Well...I guess it just exacerbates an existing problem, when I think
>about
>> it...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Yep. It exasperates you.

Yes, Brain...You "exasperate" me. Liars do.

And your on-going trolling and misrepresentation of truth still exacerbate
a larger problem.

Steve, K4YZ

1833. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:46:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327024658.29966.00000200@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89897

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/25/2004 6:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251607.12eaac50@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040324072852.03342.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:26 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >Fair enough.
>>
>> It only took you three days.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Is there now a time limit on replying?

Oh no, Brain...You go right on spinning your spin and dancing your dance.

I'll keep pointing out how silly you look going around in circles.

Steve, K4YZ

1834. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:54:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327025444.29966.00000201@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89898

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/26/2004 9:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261929.7e816ebf@posting.google.com>
>
>"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:<c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> "Arnie Macy" wrote ...
>>
>> > I understand your point, but the intent of this section in the FCC rules
>> was
>> > to stop Ham radio from being used for commercial purposes, not to
>prohibit
>> > emergency communications. Nothing in the rules prohibits use of this
>> > equipment during an emergency by any licensed person. Or for that
>matter,
>> > any person whatever. As I said, our Ham equipment is being used for
>> > redundancy, so for all practical purposes, it will never be used for
>> routine
>> > communication -- other than testing to ensure it is working properly.
>> >
>>
>> I just wanted to add that there are always exceptions to the rule. Two
>that
>> I can think of, right off hand, would be the Space Shuttle Crew (obviously
>> government employees) and Federal, State, and local EM directors and staff
>> (many of whom are Hams). Do you really think either of the aforementioned
>> would not be allowed to use their privileges because of part 97?
>>
>> Arnie -
>
>Arnie, please don't ask me to bless what others do on amateur radio.
>I've been heavily criticized for a couple of positions that I've taken
>wrt a literal "interpretation" of Part 97.
>
>1. The no monetary rule, and repeater owners charging "dues" for
>repeater use.

What "interpretation" did YOU make, Brain?

The FCC itself has issued several "clarifications" on these very specific
topoics that you've cited here. What interpretation was left to be made?

>2. Administering a Farnsworth exam when Part 97 clearly states "Morse
>Code."

There is no such thing as a "Farnsworth" exam, Brain.

>I don't make the rules, and I don't take it upon myself to interpret
>workarounds to what Part 97 states.

What "workarounds"...?!?! The FCC had already "interpreted" the specific items you've mentioned in this post, Brain.

Or are you simply voicing your disagreement with thier position on those specifics?

>I leave that sort of work to the experts on RRAP and the FCC.

The "experts" in RRAP are one thing....

The FCC staffers, on the otherhand, >>ARE<< the "experts". Even your "mentor" says so. Do you disagree?

Steve, K4YZ

1835. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:58:46 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.03.27.07.58.46.630412@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 89899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 01:50:10 +0000, Skateboard'n wrote:

>
> Where's the "sexual innuendo", Oxendorf? Like you, I just posted some
> F.C.C. news, I can't help that there seems to be a big connection with
> sexual deviant child molesting freaks & ham radios!
can you quote the actual statistics for that? or are you just pulling a
figure out of the hat and calling it fact?

FYI, pedophiles exist at all layers and in all walks of life in all
countries. Fact is, ham radio has a lot less of the deviants than the
statistical norm for a population of a given country. Care to explain that
one Tom?

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

1836. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 07:59:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327025908.29966.00000202@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89900

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/26/2004 11:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040326123456.05025.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040325190114.12501.00006943@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:

> I'd suggest you get a strong beverage, one that will relax you first
> before trying to pull off that "ancient wisdom" dums**t again.
>
> You waste too much of too many folks' time with arguments
> over semantic minutae.

Jim...is it just me, or does Lennie switch to profanity (actual or
ins*nu*ated) or suggest dropping to killfile ("plonk") when he's getting backed
into a corner by someone who can argue with him and make him look
silly....again...?

Seems he's been doing both a lot lately...

Steve, K4YZ

1837. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:05:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89901

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040324235834.08081.00000014@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> In article <40625D90.5060908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>> >N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> >>In article <20040314185605.05539.00004761@mb-m16.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >>(Len Over 21) writes:

>> >Bullshjt, they're just brearucrats who are lawyers and not engineers.
>
>They're "professionals, though. Just like Len!

I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember ahving been
taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.

Must be a night-school engineer's course.

>> > They probably
>> >figure that they can sue whatever out of existance to solve problems....
>>
>> The FCC also created the six-tiered amateur license structure
>> prior to R&O 99-412 and established 13 and 20 WPM morse
>> code rates. :-)
>
>Yep, back when the agency was run by technically knowledgeable people
>who would have laughed BPL right out the door.

Those days left with Jimmy Carter's administration.

>Six classes of license dates back to 1951.
>13 wpm code test dates back to 1936
>20 wpm code test dates back to the early 1920s
>
>Tell us, Len - how do we *amateurs* fight something the
>*professionals* say is a good thing? How do we convicne them it *is* a
>"major calamity"?
>
>Or don't you know how to do that?

Sure...you bombard newsgroups for which you have no vested interest with years of aggitation, argument and profanity.

Steve, K4YZ

1838. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:06:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327030644.29966.00000204@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89902

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/26/2004 12:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040326132800.21825.00000023@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>In article <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(The
>Confrontational Newsgroupie Amateur
>Formerly Known As Reverend Jim puts on his cammies, locks
>and loads 22 shorts) writes: (SNIP)

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"

Leonard H. Anderson, alleged retired professional engineer.

1839. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:25:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89903

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/26/2004 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261938.4387c38e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040325090319.17909.00000060@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...

>> Mark isn't here anymore because he got wise when we kept re-quoting
>those
>> things he insisted he didn't say, yet was right in front of him. In THAT
>> regard, it was the only wise thing he ever did (ie: leave)
>>
>> Like I said...I don't tolerate liars. Mark was proven to be a liar.
>> Lennie's been proven to be a lair, and now you are.

>When you take a dislike to someone, you accuse them, villify them,
>make them liars, stalk them, attack them, and start numerous smear
>threads about them.

A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the intent
to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted, Brain.

WHAT about any of my exchanges with "Mark Morgan" were not true? Mark
misrepresented himslef to be a commissioned field grade officer in the Armed
Forces of the United States. He made other accusations and statements of fact
that were each, in turn, proven to be untrue.

>RRAP is littered with people you hate.

Nope. Just a FEW people proven to be mistruthful. You would be one of
them.

WHAT about my exchanges with Lennie are not true? Lennie is unlicensed in
the Amateur Radio service. He has made numerous assertions of fact that have
been disproven by myeslf and others in this forum. He has made statements
which validate MY assertion that his lack of practical experience in Amateur
Radio PRACTICE leave him poorly prepared to make INFORMED opinions about the
Amateur Radio service.

WHAT about my exchanges with YOU are not true? You have made numerous assertions of fact about operating from a U.N.-controlled area of the world and have yet to provide any validation of your legitimacy in doing so. You can't/won't even provide the callsign of ONE station you "worked" while operating from there You have further made assertions of fact pertaining to emergency copmmunications practice and application that I've asked you to substantiate, yet you've spent almost two weeks spinning and dancing around THAT.

>You have yet to prove that I've lied a single time. Just repeating it
>over and over doesn't make it so.

I HAVE proven you've lied, Brain. YOU have asserted that you never said that the unlicensed radio services "play a "major role" in emergency comms".

I have repeated the very same quote a couple of times THIS WEEK. THAT was just ONE of them...I can eat up bandwidth all day re-quoting your dodges if it's necessary, but why?

You made an assertion. I asked you to back it up. You then claimed you never made the assertion but then I showed you did. You've now lied about that.

>But it does make you look nuts.

Uh huh. Right. The only thing that might make me look nuts is my steadfast expectation that you will manifest enough internal fortitude to be stand-up enough to answer the questions put to you over YOUR assertions.

Steve, K4YZ

1840. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:29:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327032928.29966.00000206@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89904

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/26/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040325160156.16601.00000107@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/25/2004 2:22 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251222.5fb780c3@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040325092209.17909.00000065@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>> >If they are statements of fact, you'll just have to accept them.
>> >
>> >Best of Luck
>>
>> I guess "just have to accept them" is OK for you and your co-liar but
>not
>> for anyone else.
>
>You have to accept facts, don't you?
>
>Were they or weren't they statements of fact?
>
>If they weren't statements of fact, why did you call them that in the
>last 60 posts or so?
>
>> And sorry, I don't....Because I know better, and so do you.
>
>I only know that your nuts. Again and again.
>
>> It's been proven, Brain...You're lying. Everything else is downhill
>from
>> here.
>
>So where is the proof?

The "proof" is in your steadfast refusal to answer the question "What
"major role" do unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms""...?!?!

>> No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.
>>

>> Nice job.
>
>Dunno, Steve, you're the one calling them statements of fact. You're
>the navigator. You're the skillful one. Pffft.

Only "skillful" in that I keep trying to straighten out the spin you keep trying to put on answering ONE question, Brain...

>Everyone else on here knows that much of what is posted is called
>"opinion."
>
>Best of luck.

No luck needed. Still waiting on the answer, Brain...

Or are you admitting your mistruthfulness in your silence?

Steve, K4YZ

1841. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:32:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89905

```
>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 3/27/2004 1:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327023923.29966.00000197@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/25/2004 5:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251557.d55f227@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040325091309.17909.00000063@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >Date: 3/24/2004 6:04 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241604.a98ef2a@posting.google.com>
>>> >
>>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040322235925.17834.00000189@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>>
>>> >> Not every call to Fire, Police or EMS rates a 9-1-1 response.
>>> >
>>> >It is here.
>>>
>>> Then you obviously don't know about tiered dispatching. (Why am I
>not
>>> surprised?)
>>
>>My mistake. I misread you statement.
>>
>>Every emergency call here is handled by 911 operators.
>
> Must be nice to have a tax base that supports having 911 oerators.

Excuse me..."operators".

And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain? We only
need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone and
one on the radio...

Steve, K4YZ

Steve, K4YZ
```

1842. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:58:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327035808.12851.00000060@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89907

In article <40644D96.7050901@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> I make a pretty good homemade pizza - sauce *and* crust. No, you can't have
>> any.
>
>
> Did you know they still make Chef Boyardee Pizza kits Jim?
>
There are all sorts of products out there which claim to be food, Mike. A few
of them are actually worth eating.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1843. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:58:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327035809.12851.00000062@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89906

In article <20040326123457.05025.00000043@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040325190115.12501.00006944@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>> Pizza off.
>>
>>What does that mean? Sounds like you're telling me to shut up. Very
>>unAmerican
>>of you, Len, telling someone to shut up when they correct your mistakes.
>
> You got pizza now?

Not tonight, wasn't very hungry. Had a ham and cheese on home made whole wheat.

> EAT IT.

Is that your "professional" way of acknowledging your mistakes, Len?

1844. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 08:58:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327035809.12851.00000061@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89908

In article <20040326123456.05025.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040325190114.12501.00006943@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040325134610.08081.00000031@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040325075921.08988.00000025@mb-m02.aol.com>,
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>>>> You seem heck-bent on starting some more internecine warfare in
>>>>> here.
>>>>
>>>>I'm simply asking a question. You are avoiding that question. One would
>>>>think
>>>>that a "radio electronics professional" with your claimed experience would
>>>>know the answer, but I guess you don't.
>>>>
>>>>> In that case you are wasting everyone's time. :-)
>>>
>>> NOBODY has EVER worked with ANY sort of "antenna" that
>>> stretches for miles..
>>
>>Yes, they have. One type is called a Beverage antenna, after its inventor,
>>H.H.Beverage.
>
> Old Bev NEVER tried any "antenna" that can go MILES in mutually
> perpendicular directions using MANY different and randomly-
> varying paths in each direction. \

How do you know, Len? Did you know Mr. Beverage?

> You should get to a community's
> civil engineering office and look at the various electric line routings.

Why? Anyone can see where they run, just by looking.
>
> If you can't get out and LOOK at the surroundings where you are,
> that's not my problem. The evidence is right in front of you, above
> you, maybe below you. Old history books won't help you there.

What is your point, Len? I know what power lines look like, how they work,
voltage levels, etc. In fact I probably know more about the electric power

distribution network than you do, particularly at the medium-voltage level.

You keep ducking the question of *how* to convince the "professionals" at FCC and the BPL companies that BPL is not a good idea.
>
> I'd suggest you get a strong beverage, one that will relax you first
> before trying to pull off that "ancient wisdom" dums**t again.

You don't really know how to convince them, do you, Len?
>
> You waste too much of too many folks' time with arguments
> over semantic minutae.

Not me, Len. You're the absolute master of that sort of debate. You post here more often, and at greater length, than anyone else. Yet you actually say little or nothing of practical value. You're full of criticism for others, particularly the ARRL, but can't take even the most well-mannered criticism or disagreement on any issue.

You've waved your "professional" credentials here innumerable times, but you can't tell us how to convince FCC of something that's blaringly obvious to even us poor dumb amateurs.

> Plonk

I don't think so.

1845. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1389 – March 26, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 09:21:18 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327042118.03342.00000138@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 89909

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1389 – March 26, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1389 with a release date of Friday, March 26th, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a QST. A popular talk show host says “No” to BPL and REACT gives its support to the Amber Alert system. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1389 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: ART BELL W6OBB VS. BPL.

If it did not know before, a large portion of the American public is now keenly aware of the danger that Broadband Over Powerline Internet access poses to the nation's emergency communications infrastructure. And you can thank radio talk show host Art Bell, W6OBB, and ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, for bringing it to everyone's attention. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, had an opportunity to speak with the internationally famous radio talker and has the rest of the story:

--

From the high desert in the great American Southwest, a call to arms has been sounded.

From his home base in Pahrump, Nevada, W6OBB - better known to millions of commercial radio listeners as Art Bell - has called on America to stand up and fight what he charges is the greatest threat to the nation's security - Broadband Over Powerline.

Bell charges BPL will cripple the nation's emergency communications backbone - striking at the heart of homeland security.

Bell picked up the charge against BPL during his radio show broadcast Saturday, March 20 in which he introduced ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP to his audience.

Haynie and Bell pointed out the BPL interference threat extends far beyond the amateur bands. Both Haynie and Bell warned that many police and fire companies, federal disaster agencies and the FBI and the military would be rendered helpless if BPL is rolled out across the nation.

Bell says he's especially worried about the potential of another major attack against the United States and what BPL would do to our nation's ability to communicate.

"The emergency communications, my God, aircraft, amateur radio, FEMA, any other emergency agencies that are going to have to rely on HF communications," Bell says.

"We certainly can't depend on satellites. As a matter of fact, if we should get into a conflict, some sort of major conflict the satellites will be the very first thing that will go. And minus satellites for communications, we're dependent on the good old-fashioned shortwave bands, VHF, UHF, the whole schmear to keep our nation talking. And in a time of national emergency we need to be able to talk to each other."

Bell says he's appalled at the behavior of the Federal Communications Commission. He says they're acting like cheerleaders instead of regulators. He charges corporate greed is driving BPL and ignoring the studies showing the technology - as proposed on the HF bands - won't work without causing massive interference.

"I've always had the deepest respect for the Federal Communications Commission," he says. "However, I think in recent years, there've been a lot of changes at the FCC that include the fact that there aren't so many engineers at the commission any longer, but there are a lot of bureaucrats."

Bell says he believed after reading the Federal Emergency Management Agency's assessment of BPL that the findings would have been enough to shut it down.

"The FEMA filing was very strong," Bell says. "They essentially said, 'Look, our receivers and transmitters are not going to be able to function with BPL in place.' And, they specified the power levels they would have to go to continue to communicate and suggested the taxpayers can't, wouldn't be able to afford such changes.

"So, with that kind of filing, frankly when it came out I thought BPL was dead. Boy was I wrong!"

After doing more research, Bell says he decided to take the case to his listeners. And he says the only way to do it is to point out the risk to their safety.

"I don't think we're going to combat it by saying, 'Save ham radio." The public doesn't care enough and I'm sorry to have to say that, but that's what I believe," Bell says.

"I love ham radio. It's been my life. I've been a ham since I was 12. But the greater, larger American public just doesn't care enough about ham radio.

"And if they think they can plug in their computer to the wall and have instant internet, that's a more attractive idea to them than the guy down the block with a tower in the air."

Bell says his mission is clear: "I do a radio program on 500 radio stations nationwide, including the top 50 markets in the U.S., " Bell says. "And I'm going to do everything I can to drive this home as hard as I can that communications, and certainly ham radio is part of that emergency communications chain, there's no question about that.

"But emergency communications across the board are threatened by BPL."

Bell says all hams need to wake up and heed his call to action.

"We have to get to the larger media in America and, as hams, we have to make the general public, underline the word general public, aware that our emergency communications are threatened," Bell says. "The American public remembers 9-11. The American public knows what the continuing threat is.

"We've declared war against terrorism and why would we want to turn around and cripple our effective ability to wage war? And that's exactly what BPL is going to do."

Bell says if energized with information about BPL's risks to national security, millions of Americans can quickly become allies.

"We need to get the word out to the general public and begin to have them write to their congressmen, their senator," Bell says. "And that's the only approach that I see at this point with the juggernaut that is presently underway from the Federal Communications Commission and the (BPL) industry, the only way we're going to stop it is to make the general public aware of the threat."

Bell says there are other issues, including interference to TV channels 2 through 6, residual noise to the AM radio bands and virtual loss of CB bands used by the many truckers who listen to his show. He says there are also privacy issues, especially the potential of the government and large companies to track people and their habits and choices on a BPL system.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V in Philadelphia.

--

Bell currently hosts the weekend edition of the Coast to Coast AM. He also indicates that his presentation on Saturday, March 20th was only round one. He is lining up other guests to talk about the BPL issues in the near future. To find out when, keep checking the shows website at www.coasttocoastam.com. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: HAM RADIO VS. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Meantime, a story in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal about Amateur Radio’s stand against BPL is raising the eyre off many in the nations ham radio community. The item appears to take the position that radio amateurs are alone in opposing BPL. Also, that their doing do is holding back the flow of progress in technology.

You can judge for yourself by taking your web browser to http://tinyurl.com/357ye. That is if its still there by the time this newscast goes to air. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RFI: ELECTRIC BLANKETS - A NEW CHAPTER FOR AN OLD PROBLEM

As if BPL was not enough, now there's another source of RFI to worry about. Its things that keep us warm.

According to Roy Trumbull writing in the CGC Communicator, RF interference from electric blankets is another problem that can be added to a history of similar events. The ones caused by heating pad thermostats and the class of transformers used for door bells. Turnbull says that RFI from these devices can affect AM reception for quite a distance from the source.

Turnbull also adds this interesting aside concerning electric blanket safety. He says a little noted change in product design took place when there was that firestorm some years ago over magnetic fields from power lines. The electric blanket makers got a jump on things by switching to twisted pair wiring. This says Turnbull solved the problem of the significant magnetic fields that were produced by the earlier blanket design. (CGC)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the KB3FCZ repeater serving White Oak Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: REACT AND THE AMBER ALERT PROGRAM

Ham radio appears to be leaving itself behind in the area of responding to notices of kidnapped children called Amber Alerts. Meantime REACT and other citizens radio organizations are taking the point position in spreading word of these vital searches. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, takes a look at how REACT has gotten involved:

--

Nobody seems to know why hams appear to have no interest in the Amber Alert program, but other civic minded radio services are not standing still. And the April issue of Popular Communications magazine is highliting REACT as being one of those jumping in to providing communications for these alerts and searches.

The magazines Info Central column highlights the activities of REACT teams across Ontario Canada and the northern United States. This, as they responded to an Amber Alert issued by the Ontario police after Cecelia Zhang was abducted in Toronto.

Ron McCracken who is past President of REACT told Pop Comm that they were given details of the alert and were asked to broadcast it on C-B channel 19 to truckers passing along the highways. The alert included details of the kidnap vehicle and the victim along with the suspects.

The broadcasts began at about 5:30 in the evening and went on through midnight. McCracken says that CB radio was combined with computers and e-mail to spread the word far and wide in a very short time. This allowed truck drivers all

along the border to keep an eye out for both the little Cecilia and her abductor.

According to McCracken, this was REACT’s first response to an Amber Alert and in his estimation it went very well. You can read the full story starting on page 5 of the April issue of Popular Communications magazine.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

The Amber Alert was created in 1997 as a tribute to 9-year-old Amber Hagerman. She was kidnapped and brutally murdered while riding her bicycle in her hometown of Arlington, Texas.

If you want to know more about how you can start an Amber Alert Plan in your area and involve your radio hobby, it can be found by taking your web browser to www.missingkids.com. Then click on the words Amber Plan. (PopComm, ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: SAN MARINO AND NORWAY EXPAND 40 METERS

Two more nations have gained spectrum at 7 MHz. Both are in Europe. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham in the UK has more:

--

Two more European countries have gained access to the 7100 to 7200 kHz segment of the 40-metre band. San Marino, T7, has authorised amateur radio operation in the 7100 - 7200 kHz band on a Secondary non-interference basis, with effect from the 25th of February.

The Norwegian Post and Telecommunications Authority has also announced that Norwegian radio amateurs can use frequencies in the segment 7100 - 7200 kHz with secondary status starting from the 1st of April.

This is in addition to the existing segment 7000 - 7100 kHz where radio amateurs have primary status. The maximum transmitter output power in the 7100 - 7200 segment will be 100 watts in Norway, and the maximum bandwidth 6kHz.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

Croatia was the first European country to expand its 40 meter band. That happened last December. (GB2RS)

**

RESTRUCTURING: ARRL AND NCVEC PETITIONS ASSIGNED RM’S

Here in the U-S, our FCC has assigned rulemaking numbers to separate petitions for license restructuring and changes in code requirements filed by the ARRL and the National Council of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators. The ARRL petition

has been designated RM-10867 while the NCVEC petition is now RM-10870.

Two other petitions were released for comment at the same time - RM-10868 was filed by the Radio Amateur Foundation, and RM-10869 by Ronald Lowrance of Georgia. Both also seek changes in amateur licensing requirements, particularly with relation to the code exam.

All petitions are available online via the FCC's Electronic Comment Filing System website. The comment deadline on all four petitions is April 24, with reply comments due 15 days later. (CQ, W2VU)

**

ENFORCEMENT: WARNINGS TO TWO TRUCKING FIRMS ABOUT 10 METER OPS

The FCC has warned the owners of a Bristol Pennsylvania trucking company to get their personnel off of the 10 meter Amateur band or face some expensive consequences. In a letter to Cassidy's Express the FCC says that it has information that one of the company’s tractors pulling a "CAI" trailer on Interstates 476 N and 76W in Pennsylvania, was the source of unlicensed radio transmissions on the 10 meters.

The incident took place last October 9th between 8 AM and 8:30 AM local time. The Commission has informed Cassidy's Express that operation of radio transmitting equipment without a license is a violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act. That it could and will subject the operator to fine or imprisonment, as well as seizure of any non-certified radio transmitting equipment.

For those not aware, unlicensed operation carries a fine of $7,500 to $10,000 for each instance charged. A similar letter was sent to CLR Transport of Saluda, North Carolina warning of unlicensed 10 meter operation from one of their trucks on Interstate 85 between Gastonia and Kings Mountain, North Carolina on July 14, 2003. (FCC)

**

THE CLUB SCENE: USS HORNET ARC NOT DISBANDED

Contrary to rumors, the Amateur Radio club that supports museum ship U-S-S Hornet has not been disbanded. This, according to Tom McGlinn, KO6HA who is the trustee for the NB6GC callsign and the new president of the USS Hornet Amateur Radio Club.

Writing on the QRZ.com websire, McGlin says the original story of the club being dissolved is untrue. He says that the group is still active and aboard the USS Hornet and that all QSL requests will be handled as in the past. Please direct any inquiries concerning the USS Hornet ARC QSL program to ko6ha@earthlink.net (QRZ.com)

**

ON THE WEB: BIG UPGRADE AT QRZ.COM

The servers that provide you the QRZ.com website have been relocated to the company's hosting facility in Phoenix, Arizona. The new location affords QRZ.com with 24 hour a day, 7 days a week backup power and a very fast 10 Megabit connection directly to the Internet backbone.

QRZ.com owner and administrator Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ, gave special thanks to Chris Radicke, N7TWW and Mark Krotz, N7MK, who assisted him in transporting the computers, building the cabinet shelves, pulling cables, and in generally making the transition go as smooth as silk. Lloyd says that thanks to some great prepatory work QRZ.com was out for no more than 2 hours during the location changeover. (QRZ.com)

**

ON THE WEB: WWW.SCOTHAM.NET

WWW.SCOTHAM.NET is a new Internet portal concerning ham radio in Scotland. The aim of the site is to further the interests of Scottish hams in all aspects of Amateur Radio. The portal also presents an interesting view of life in Scotland as it pertains to ham radio. Again that U-R-L is WWW.SCOTHAM.NET and you will find it on the World-Wide-Web. (MM0DFV)

**

WITH THE HANDI-HAMS: 3905 QSL BUREAU

The Board of Directors of the 3905 Century Club has unanimously approved the establishment of a QSL Bureau and Manager. This, to support any Handi-Ham members that wish to participate in the club's nets.

Handi-Ham members can use the bureau a number of ways. This includes the actual completion of cards for the contacts they make on 3905 Century Club nets.

The 3905 Century Club has nets on four bands and all modes including SSB, CW and Digital. More information, including net schedules can be found at www.3905.com. (Handi-Hams)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: ARRL AT NAB IN APRIL

Turning to the ham radio social circuit, the ARRL will be visible at the upcoming National Association of Broadcasters convention. Amateurs visiting the exhibits at the Las Vegas Convention Center are invited to stop by Lobby Booth 9 where the ARRL will be exhibiting its latest publications and other materials related to the hobby.

The booth will be staffed by ARRL national officers and volunteers from the Las Vegas area headed up by Bill and Carolyn Cornelius. They are K8XC and K9XC respectively. The booth will also be able to provide information on the April 21st NAB Ham Radio Reception sponsored by Heil Sound.

Bill Cornelius does have a limited number of complimentary VIP Exhibits Passes. Requests for them go by e-mail to k8xc@aol.com. (K8XC)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: EMCOMMWEST IN MAY

And word that the combined EMCOMMWEST 2004 conference and the Reno Spring Hamswap is slated for the weekend of May 22nd to the 23rd. This years theme is Amateur Radio Emergency Communications in the 21st Century and will feature appearances by knowledgable guests that include Dan Miller, N-3-U-F-G from ARRL Headquarters. His presentation will include information on the ARRL Emergency Communications on-line courses as well as an overview of how amateur radio interfaces with The Office of Homeland Security.

For complete up to date information, location and on-line registration for EMCOMMWEST and the Reno Spring Hamswap, take your web browser over to www.emcommwest.org. Planners say that the site will be updated frequently with new information as it becomes available. (Emmcom West)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: PROFESSOR SAYS ISP’S SHOULD POLICE CONTENT

A new cyberspace business plan from a legal scholar says that Internet Service Providers should become cyber cops and force everyone to pay a royalty fee for every song, movie or book they download to their personal computers. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the details:

--

Lon Sobel is a professor at Loyola Law School and an expert on copyright and entertainment law. He says that Internet service providers such as America Online and Earthlink must become digital police and send customers monthly bills based on how much copyrighted material they download.

Under Sobel’s plan, consumers who download expensive software such as Adobe Photoshop could pay as much as $600, while someone who grabs a single song could be charged as little as 49 or 50 cents. These charges would be in addition to the usual dial-up or broadband monthly connection fees.

Critics of the plan include computer experts, Internet service providers and -- believe it or not -- the entertainment industry. Bob Blakley, a computer scientist and security expert at IBM, says that a clever hacker could write computer code that would attaches itself to every piece of copyrighted content on the Internet. Then it could funnel some of the cost of the download to the hackers personal bank account.

Blakley and others say peoples attitudes is one of the biggest challenges in digital rights management . That an entire generation of consumers has become used to free music and other content posted on the Internet. He says that they will do anything it takes to get content for free. This includes breaking the law to avoid paying $10 to $20 for a compact disc, DVD or electronic book.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

A senior executive at Verizon Communications is quoted as saying that Internet service providers will reject the plan noting that few companies could keep track of every downloaded item or determine the value of every file passing through their system. (Published news reports)

**

WORLDBEAT - CANADA: NEW CONTEST MANAGERS

Radio Amateurs of Canada has announced the appointment of Sam Ferris VE5SF, Bart Ritchie VE5CPU and Bruce Rattray VE5RC as managers for the Canada Winter and Canada Day contests. They replace retiring managers David Shipman, VE7CFD and the Moncton Seniors Amateur Radio Club who have performed this duty for the past several years. (RAC)

**

WORLDBEAT -NEW ZEALAND: NZART COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

NZART President Peter Norden, ZL2SJ, has announced the appointment of Noel Rowe, ZL3GR, to society's Council. Rove is a second term councilor having served previously in the 1990's. He replaces Ted Minchin, ZL1MT, who resigned for personal reasons.

Another Council appointment is that of Joe Reed, ZL2AH who volunteered to take on the tasks of Reciprocal License Bureau Manger. He replaces the late Russ Garlick, ZL3AAA. (NZART)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: K6DUE MEMORIAL ARISS EVENT QSL CARD UPDATE

Hams waiting for QSL cards from the K6DUE Memorial operating event, please listen up. Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, who is ARISS International Chairman says in order to save postage costs, the process being used for the special event certificates is this. The various regions such as Europe, Canada, USA, Russia and
Japan are collecting the QSLs and generating compiled lists of names and callsigns. These lists are then used to print the certificates and return them to the regions for direct distribution. Bauer asks that everyone be patient, indicating that it will be well worth the wait. (KA3HDO)

**

DX

In D-X, three German operators will be active as A35DA, A35DH and A35DJ from Fafa Island in Tonga through the 29th of March. Activity is on all bands from 80 to 10 meters on SSB, PSK 31 and RTTY. QSL as directed on the air.

Also, word that KE2SP is active on 10 through 20 meters from the island of Hydra. This, as SV8 stroke KE2SP. He will be there until the 15th of June. The island counts as EU-075 for the Islands on the Air awards program.

And the Ohio Penn D-X Newsletter reports that ZL1CT is planning to be active fro Chatham as ZL7V. This, from July 5th to the 15th. Activity will be on 80, 40, 30 and 20 meters using CW and SSB. QSL this one via N3SL.

(Above from various DX news sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A HAMVENTION 2004 RADIO ROAD INFORMATION SERVICE

And finally this week, if you plan to drive to this years Hamvention, there will be a special service to make your trip a bit more pleasant. This as Information Radio in Dayton, Ohio announces plans to provide Road to Hamvention announcements on Highway Radio 1610 AM. As you might expect, 1610 Kiloherrtz is the frequency and the person behind the idea is Norm Schrein, KA8PGJ.

--

Schrein" "For Hamvention, we are planning on putting some information in regard to directions to the Hara and hours of the hamfest itself. People coming into town can obviously get information via the ham repeaters, but we may be hitting people who aren't hams at all or who do not have Amateur Radio equipment but who will pick this up in the loop and take in the hamfest."

--

Information Radio is a service provided by the Emergency Communications Center Incorporated. This is a not for profit organization with which Schrein is associated. He says that stations like this are a lot more common than many people realize:

--

Schrein: "530 Khz is where to find a lot of the stations like this and then about 1610 through about 1700 Khz you will find a lot of these travelers information stations as well. A lot of them tend to be site specific. That is, if you go through Pennsylvania, you may hear something about one of the state or national parks or involving the roadways if its run by the Dept. of Transportation. Where ours is a little unique is that it is kind of all encompassing. It covers everything happening in the Dayton area from local parks and recreationb to people having a parade to events like the Hamvention."

--

Schrein says that anytime you are headed to the Dayton area be sure to tune your car radio to 1610 kilohertz. Whether its trying to find your way into town or heading to the HARA Arena for Hamvention 2004, Information Radio will

be there to serve you.

More information on information radio stations can be heard on this weeks Rain Report. Its at www.rainreport.com or landline at 847-827-7246. (ARNewsline (TM))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Damron, N8TMW, and I;m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

1846. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 12:45:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <epudnagNXvsp5fjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 89910

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403261950.6ce3c5d1@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
> > [snip]
> >
> > > The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> > > technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> > > studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than
the
> > > much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the
beginners
> > > themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
> > bypass
> > > the Novice. People are strange.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much
to
> > the
> > vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with
digital
> > modes, etc.
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> I'm just amazed at how easily some can brush aside the monumental
> waste of time learning the Morse Code and become.
>
> Probably someone without a job, on disability, or retired.

Boy you certainly know how to jump to erroneous conclusions. I work a full time job, which also entails travel further limiting my time. I found learning Morse to be no more of a waste of time than studying theory. They both take time and both are worthwhile.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1847. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 13:15:55 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c43uq6$2deekc$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 89911

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> >Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics
> >anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies
> >heavily on commercially available gear.
>
> Are you sleeping on your COTS?
>
> >The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone.
>
> Bravo Sierra. Those are still here. So are Military Specifications,
> abbreviated "Mil Spec" among those of us who still have to use
> them.
>

The Bravo Sierra is yours, Leonard. Since you don't actually work with the
military anymore, you are forced to search things out on the net and hope
they are up to date. OTOH, I work IN the system and understand how it
ACTUALLY is quite well. I quoted from the FAR and you still sit there and
argue with me. What part of FACT don't you get?

> Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.
>
> >The FAR "requires" that we use commercial gear when
> >available, or modify it where possible for that use. "A key goal of
federal
> >aquisition reform is to maximize the use of commercial supplies and
> >services. the FAR requires activities to explore the use of commercial
> >items to meet their needs." I learned this when I was being certified as
a
> >COR on a 6 million dollar contract.
>
> Wow, the "Six Million Dollar Ham!" "...We have the technology, we
> can rebuild Arnie..." Cut to promo, voice-over "Coming to your
> favorite channel any day now...!", up exciting music bkgd, take
> title...
>

Say what you want, but I have the EXPERIENCE with the contract and KNOW what
I'm talking about. All you have is an internet search tool, and "Old"
knowledge concerning how the aquisition system works.

> When are you being awarded a medal for that? Will it be on CSPAN?
>
> Got both CSPAN channels here.
>

> >Nearly everything that we aquired for
> >use in EM was either strictly commercial gear, or adapted from commercial
> >gear. (as per the rewuirements of the FAR)
> >
> >The VTC is video teleconferencing.
>
> Old stuff, senior. I was teleconferencing back in 1981, four locations
> tied in, two with audio-video, two with only audio. In 1955 I was in a
> two-location teleconference between two ACAN stations, the TTY page
> opaque-projected on a screen with a voice circuit in parallel for all
the
> brass (as lowest rank with three-up and one down I was there only for
> any operational specifics but was never called up).

New stuff, Leonard. Doesn't even remotely resemble what you did in 1955. I
gave you the web site to research. What, did the BIG words stump you?
>
> Fancy acronyms you've picked up is just a form of name-dropping.
> You can try sprinkling them into casual conversation to impress
> friends and neighbors, but that doesn't mean you've DONE those
> things.
>
>
> >> If you mean the little palmtop unit favored in Europe and the UK,
> >> I do.
> >
> >WOW, I'm impressed. Leonard has made it out of the 1960s. Very good.
BTW,
> >it's also favored in the Pentagon.
>
> Wow, implying you haunt the hallowed hauls, I mean, halls of the
> Big 5 Building? How many stars you wearing now?
>
> >> Do you know what a "raspberry" is? Here, have one from me
> >> to you.
> >
> >For someone that eschews personal attack so often, you seem to be very
good
> >at it.
>
> Your first post in here after a long absence was nothing but a
> direct personal attack on me. You want to attack, then expect
> lots of return fire. Not my problem. Got more ammo for that
> than you realize.
>
> You got any raspberries? If so, take one. EAT IT.
>

You don't have the brain power to have any ammo of consequence, Leonard.

> Plonk
>
> LHA / WMD

1848. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 13:23:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327082309.12528.00000232@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89912

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 3/27/2004 2:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327035809.12851.00000062@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040326123457.05025.00000043@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:

>> EAT IT.
>
>Is that your "professional" way of acknowledging your mistakes, Len?

He's gone "high-tech", Jim...

He's got a puppet to do his dirty work for him these days!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1849. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 13:27:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327082724.12528.00000233@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 89913

>Subject: Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>Date: 3/27/2004 6:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <epudnagNXvsp5fjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
>
>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403261950.6ce3c5d1@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>...

>> I'm just amazed at how easily some can brush aside the monumental
>> waste of time learning the Morse Code and become.
>>
>> Probably someone without a job, on disability, or retired.
>
>Boy you certainly know how to jump to erroneous conclusions. I work a full
>time job, which also entails travel further limiting my time. I found
>learning Morse to be no more of a waste of time than studying theory. They
>both take time and both are worthwhile.

It's no more a "monumental waste of time" than learning another language,
Dee...yet the same "arguments" against learning another language are employed
by those who just don't want to leanr Morse Code.

It'a actually easier to do, but then hey, they don'[t want to hear THAT,
either...

73

Steve, K4YZ

1850. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 13:58:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 89914

In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> One of the things that will probably happen if we get out of the mode
>> that makes us even think of doing safety evaluations is that the new
>> hams may not be thinking about RF safety at all.
>
>As a novice in the late 50s, RF safety wasn't very much a part
>of my understanding...beyong the concept of not touching
>electrical or RF conductors. The "unseen" RF in the air wasn't
>really the focus of the Novice syllabus either.

RF exposure wasn't part of *any* license syllabus until relatively recently.

>But then too,
>Novice was limited then to 75w as measured by plate power.

Which effectively meant about50 watts max output.
>
>> "Remember, don't put the antenna of your handy talkie in the puppy's
>> mouth and press the talk button".
>
>Yet we put that antenna within less than an inch of our own brain
>when we transmit.

HAW!
>
>> I'm no genius (ask Len) and yet I don't understand what is so hard
>> about RF safety that we need to almost eliminate it from the testing for
>> the introductory license.
>
>I agree and also believ that safety (electrical, RF and mechanical)
>should be a fundamental part of novice understanding.

I agree 100%. That and the regulations.
>
>> If we really should eliminate it, we probably should limit the power to
>> something like 5 watts or so.
>
>Better to keep testing on safety.
>
>> >>We can't expect the newcomer to learn EVERYTHING before then
>> >>can get on the air
>> >
>> > I agree 100%! That's the whole point of multiple license classes. It's
>not in

>> > the best interests of amateur radio to require all newcomers to pass the
>Extra
>> > just to get started.
>>
>> Sure. I'm just pretty bullish on the safety requirements.
>
>I agree.
>
>> >>... compare the Novice tests of years past with their
>> >>small number of questions and study guides with a dozen or less pages
>> >>to "Now You're Talking," which contains 200-some pages and it's clear
>> >>that "the bar" for entry has increased greatly from the entry level
>tests
>> >>that I and many others took those many years ago
>> >
>> > No it's not clear at all! In fact, it's an apples and oranges
>comparison.
>> > Here's why:
>> >
>> > Books like "Now You're Talking" are meant to be stand-alone study
>guides. They
>> > contain the entire question pool, with explanations of each question and
>how to
>> > get the answer. And much more.
>> >
>> > The old License Manuals were not meant to be "one stop" books. They
>focused on
>> > the license process only - where the tests were held, the process, etc.
>The
>> > "study guides" were *not* the actual Q&A, but rather *essay* questions
>intended
>> > to indicate the areas to be tested.
>> >
>> > If you really want to make a comparison, take an old ARRL License
>Manual, add
>> > on "How To Become A Radio Amateur", "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code"
>and
>> > "Understanding Amateur Radio" and you'll begin to have an
>apples-to-apples
>> > comparison.
>> >
>> > Or consider these questions from the 1976 ARRL License Manual:
>> >
>> > Study Question #31:
>> > Draw a schematic diagram of a circuit having the following
>components:
>> > (a) battery with internal resistance,
>> > (b) resistive load,
>> > (c) voltmeter,
>> > (d) ammeter.

>> >
>> > Study Question #32:
>> > From the values indicated by the meters in the above circuit, how
>can
>> > the value of the resistive load be determined? How can the power
>consumed
>> > by the load be determined?
>> >
>> > Study Question #33:
>> > In the above circuit, what must the value of the resistive load be
>in
>> > order for the maximum power to be delivered from the battery?
>> >
>> > Study Question #34:
>> > Draw the schematic diagram of an RF power amplifier circuit having
>the
>> > following components:
>> > (a) triode vacuum tube,
>> > (b) pi-network output tank,
>> > (c) high voltage source,
>> > (d) plate-current meter,
>> > (e) plate-voltage meter,
>> > (f) rf chokes,
>> > (g) bypass capacitors, coupling capacitor.
>> >
>> > Study Question #35:
>> > What is the proper tune-up procedure for the above circuit?
>> >
>> > The above were just *some* of the study questions for the *Novice* exam
>of
>> > 1976. Took up less than a page. How many pages of explanation would it
>take to
>> > teach the above material?
>> >
>> > The actual exam did not use these questions. Instead, it might show, for
>> > example, a schematic of the amplifier circuit similar to, but not
>exactly like
>> > the one shown in the license manual, with 5 of the components labeled
>> > "a" thru "e". The question would be something like, "which is the
>coupling
>> > capacitor?" "which is an rf chokes?" "what is function of the
>capacitor
>> > labelled ''d' in the circuit above?"
>> >
>> > And that's at the *Novice* level.
>> >
>> > Does anyone think that the current entry-level exams are tougher than
>that?
>>
>> You know, I can't answer that question very easily. I don't believe

>> that more questions makes for a harder test. And although I wasn't
>> raised on hollow state, I figured out the questions you posed after a
>> little enjoyable study.

The current testing emphasizes knowing a little bit about a whole lot of
subjects. The old testing emphasized knowing fewer subjects in some depth.

>> >>... the proposal is not a
>> >>"dumbing down" for the entry level ...

>> > The NCVEC proposal definitely *is* a dumbing down. The ARRL proposal is
>much
>> > better because it does not set a precedent of no homebrewing, etc.
>>
>> The NCVEC proposal is just plain Dumb.
>
>Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
>a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
>with which I agree.

When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind up
with the ARRL proposal.
>
>> And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
>>
>> > The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
>bad.
>>
>> Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
>> C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
>
>I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
>tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
>2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
>a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
>in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
>have agreed on for a long time.

Exactly. Will be in my comments.
>
>One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
>privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart
>being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
>questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
>class.

Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such a chart
available, it needs to be tested.

>I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
>for HF if I was asked.

But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to know the band and mode subband limits..

>Better to know the person can read
>and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.

See above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1851. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 13:58:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327085809.03943.00000026@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 89915

In article <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>
>>>>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make
>some
>>>>>>>sense.
>>>>
>>>>>>Mike,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry
>level
>>>>>>license:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you
>can't
>>>>>>run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't
>>>
>>>need
>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>be tested on it)
>>>>>
>>>>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>>>giving the tests are being overburdened?

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
>>>>privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?
>>>
>>> Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
>>>eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
>>>appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
>>>connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
>>>licensed contractors.

>> There are some folks who would like to do just that!

>>> I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
>>>it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
>>>privileges right out from under our feet.
>>
>> Which is what those "it's just a hobby" folks are doing, whether they
>> realize it or not.
>
> Those people are a shortsighted as the people proposing the "no
>homebrew" rules. Your wording "avocation" is the proper term AFAIAC. I
>practive my "hamliness" that way. Is it a hobby to work with disaster
>preparedness teams? If so we are the only ones classed that way in the
>group. Is it a hobby to be a part of the Skywarn system? Is it a hobby
>to volunteer time for public events such as the NYC or LA marathons, or
>bike races or local charity events?

Of course it isn't. And that's why some people deny that hams are a significant
part of such activities.
>
>DO some hams practice this as a hobby? Sure. But that doesn't make it a
>hobby. In the overall, it is a service.

Or to put it another way, it's a nonprofit, volunteer activity.

>>> I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
>>>is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
>>>only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
>>>seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.

>> I know exactly what you mean. However, note that for over half a century
>> we've
>> had license classes with reduced power privileges and it hasn't led us down
>> the slippery slope.
>
> But we haven't had people suggesting that we have a commercial
>equipment requirement, we haven't had a commissh that we are annoying
>with our so called silly concerns about BPL, and concerns for our
>"safety". Cell phones and HF rigs both use RF correct? So why do hams
>get to use 1.5 thousand watts of power while those poor cell phone users
>have to get by on less than a watt? If RF is dangerous, it is dangerous,

>....right? Even though I'm being facetious, I can garuntee that I can
>sell 9 out of 10 non-ham friends I know *that* argument.

Yet we have power limits on *all* hams in certain subbands today.

>>>Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
>>>Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?

>> Because under certain circumstances those levels of power are inadequate.

>Then just call them on the cell phone if you need to get through that
>bad! 8^)

Actually, you have just expressed the fundamental image problem that Amateur
Radio faces in the 21st century. Many people, including some hams, don't really
"get" what Amateur Radio is all about.

Here's my definition:

Amateur Radio is fundamentally about radio as an end in itself, rather than as
a means to another end.

Otherwise, might as well use a cell phone or email.
>
>>>>However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed
>-
>>>>just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must
>>>>then migrate to the next-higher class of license.
>>>
>>> If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all?
>
>> It's not dangerous if proper precautions are taken.
>
> Bingo! Part of the preocess is education, and the tests show that
>unless the applicant has cheated, they have picked up *something* in the
>way of safety knowledge.
>
And that's why it should be in the test, and why the bad parts of the NCVEC
proposal must be opposed.

>>>For
>>>anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
>>>not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
>>>Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
>>>those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
>>>those self destructive hams from themselves.
>>
>> The point of license testing is not to protect someone from their own
>> ignorance, but to protect others from it.
>
> Mostly, but RF safety is one exception. The danegrs of high power RF
>and High voltages in general is mostly a danger to the operator.

I disagree in part. The danger of RF exposure is to anyone in the RF field.
>
>>>Just like cigarette smokers.

>> Cigarette smoking is much more hazardous than RF.
>
> Sure, but you do know what my point is, don't you?

Not really. There's no safe nonzero exposure level to cigarette smoking.
>
>>>And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
>>>of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?
>>
>> Now *that's* a valid point, as verified by the Alpine tower folks...
>>
>>>>So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the
>next-level
>>>>test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to contain the stuff
>removed.
>>>>Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>>>
>>> Nope.

>> That tells ya something.
>>
>>>>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a
>higher
>>>>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>>>>bother to upgrade?)
>>>>
>>>>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>>>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>>>>>are happy to just ve on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>>>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>>>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>>>>
>>>>Here's the problem:
>>>>
>>>>What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges
>>>>are
>>>>very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from
>>>>HF/MF.This
>>>>means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.
>>>
>>>>And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and
>>>>almost certainly with manufactured equipment.
>>>>
>>>>The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in
>>>>very
>>>>little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those
>>>>questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not.
>>>>After

>>>>all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained
>>>>an entry-level amateur license?
>>>>
>>>>Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a
>>>>balanced
>>>>mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF privileges,
>>>>coupled
>>>>with a test that matches the privileges granted? That way, new hams can
>>>>sample more of what ham radio has to offer.
>>>
>>> Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
>>>worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade.

>> That's you.
>
> Of course that's me. Does it make as much sense as *protecting* the
>newbies from High power RF by not allowing them high power, as compared
>to the alternative of giving them the knowledge?

It makes more sense to me that new hams have a sampling of all bands (I'd give
them a lot more HF/MF than bits of 80/40/15/10) than to restrict HF and allow
full power at "meat cooking frequencies" (tip of the hat to WK3C for that
phrase)

Which do you think is more common: hams on HF or hams running high power?

>>>In
>>>addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
>>>from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
>>>have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
>>>them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.

>> Maybe. But if that's so, why aren't the repeaters busy 24/7?
>
>Depends. Our local club repeater is pretty busy most of the time. Others
>aren't so busy. I know I've been given a lecture on occasion while
>traveling by some disgruntled ham when I've called that I'm listening
>and he comes back with "This is a private repeater - don't use it any
>more". No mention of the private repeater in the book. Who the heck is
>going to use that!

Funny, I've never run into that. If someone told me a repeate was private, I'd
simply say it's not in the book and try a different freq.

>>> I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
>>>HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
>>>privileges.

>> Well, I have to disagree. I say it's an artificial division foisted upon us
>> by
>> a few people who clamored for a nocodetest license as the savior of amateur
>> radio. Hasn't happened.
>

> Perhaps you don't agree with my conclusion, but the propagation
>differences are pretty much demarcated between HF and VHF

All depends on the sunspot cycle. When the spots are down, bands as low as 15
become like VHF/UHF. At the peak, 6 is more like 10. A lot depends on your
operating time-of-day, too.

>>>It also makes for less of a class system.
>
>> Go down that road far enough, and you'll have a one class system.
>
>I don't propose that, but even THAT is better than what the NCVEC proposes.
>
I almost have to agree.

>>>If the Tech has
>>>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>>>there, then it's a great thing.
>>
>> Seems to me that it would make more sense to offer a wider sampling.

Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and
arguments?
>>
>>>>For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore
>>>>old
>>>>gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
>>>>realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which
>do
>>>>you
>>>>think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?
>>>
>>>Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's.
>>
>> Which is why those scenarios are not good ideas.

>>>I'd certainly like that myself.
>
>> Then let's go for it.
>>
>>>>Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
>>>>beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?
>>>
>>>>That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're
>really
>>>>trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice concept was
>>>>to
>>>>have a very limited license to get people started, so they could
>>>>learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they liked ham
>radio.
>
>>>>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle

>>>>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>>>>
>>>>I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other
>>>>factors.
>>>>
>>>>But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let
>>>>everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise
>>>>in
>>>>the number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove, once
>>>>and
>>>>for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks would be
>>>>very upset.....
>>>
>>> comments:
>>>
>>> We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!
>
>> Of course.
>>
>>>>Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another
>>>>NPRM
>>>>cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just
>>>>about 4
>>>>years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...

>>>>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>>>>accomplishment. "Class"
>>>>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>>>>
>>>>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>>>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>>>>mind! ;^)
>>>>
>>>>Very bad karma!
>>>>
>>>>Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot
>>>>change.
>>>>That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.

>>>>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an
>important
>>>>>>part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>>>>
>>>>> Agreed 100 percent!
>>>>
>>>>This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it
>>>>must be
>>>>opposed. No good can come of such requirements.
>>>

>>> And How!
>
>> They're open for comments now.
>
>
> Yup,

Once you take the really bad stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind up with the ARRL proposal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>

1852. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:08:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <KMmdnZ5W-M7UEfjdRVn-hA@comcast.com>
Source record: 89916

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040327085809.03943.00000026@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> [snip to following sentence about previous Tech privilege discussion]
> Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and
> arguments?

How many of these petitions were actually filed by Technicians rather than people who purport to speak for them? Do the filers really know whether the Techs are happy with the current privileges. Afterall those who really wanted more privileges went ahead and upgraded.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1853. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:39:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327093932.08277.00000222@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89917

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <KMmdnZ5W-M7UEfjdRVn-hA@comcast.com>
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040327085809.03943.00000026@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>> [snip to following sentence about previous Tech privilege discussion]
>> Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and
>> arguments?
>
>How many of these petitions were actually filed by Technicians rather than
>people who purport to speak for them? Do the filers really know whether the
>Techs are happy with the current privileges. Afterall those who really
>wanted more privileges went ahead and upgraded.

BAM!

(sound of hammer hitting nail on the head!)

73

Steve, K4YZ

1854. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:46:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270646.dd2e042@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89918

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>

> I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember ahving been
> taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.

How did you make it through the U.S. Marine Corp without ever meeting a sailor?

1855. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:48:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Jn2dnSISMaf8CfjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89919

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94B83B077C4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> What's irresponsible about excercising our privileges on our frequencies.
> How could it be jamming when BPL isn't a radio transmission? I have not
and
> would never advocate jamming.

Alun,

I did not suggest that *you* were advocating operations designed to
intentionally disrupt BPL.

However, I have seem some comments that, if they don't outright advocate it,
come so close
that the BPL spin doctors could clearly make them look so.

We do have a right to use our frequencies in legitimate ways that our
licenses permit.

All I am saying is that discussing - even if in jest - operations designed
specifically to disrupt
BPL are a VERY bad idea and will harm our cause.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1856. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:50:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <q3ydnfWtKpabCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89920

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@spam.858c7d95> wrote in message
news:1067g86t5mru798@corp.supernews.com...
> On Thu, 25 Mar 2004 21:39:52 -0000,
> Carl R. Stevenson <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
> >> sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?
> >
> > Gentlemen (and other denizens of RRAP :-)
> >
> > Suggestions of deliberate interference to ANYTHING (including BPL, which
> > under the
> > law has no right to protection from licensed services) will NOT make any
> > friends for us
> > at the FCC, on Capital Hill, or in the court of public opinion ...
> > especially when all of
> > those venues are mostly ill-informed on the real nature of the problem
...
> >
> > If these suggestions, even if offered in jest, get into the hands of the
BPL
> > spin doctors,
> > they will not hesitate to publicly tar and feather the amateur radio
> > service, at the FCC,
> > to Congresspersons, and as widely as possible in the press (and we know
how
> > the press
> > likes a controversial story, don't we?)
> >
> > PLEASE, I implore you - drop these concepts from public venues like
usenet!
> > You will
> > do FAR more harm than good.
> >
> > We MUST "take the high road" on the BPL issue ... that doesn't mean
rolling
> > over and
> > taking it ... but it does mean not shooting ourselves in the foot with
such
> > irresponsible talk.
> >

> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
> >
> >
>
> : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .
>
>
> Consumers Internet Federation Oppose Ham Radio Operators Potential
> Interference to BPL
>
> San Francisco, CA - CIF today asked Congress to pass legislation
> to protect Broadband over Power Lines (BPL) users from interference
> by misguided ham radio operators. The ham radio operators through
> email lists and newsgroups are making plans to disrupt the critical
> infrastructure of the Internet in a terrorist like movement.
> These acts will dramatically impact Internet users'
> rights to access to the Internet. Legislation would require
> anyone who interferes with a BPL system to immediately cease
> all ham radio or CB operations until they no longer interfere
> with a BPL users business or home system.
> BPL promises Internet users a Broadband Nirvana and is endorsed by
> FCC Chairman Michael Powell as a solution to the lack of broadband
> choices for consumers.
>
> : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.
> Replace spam.858c7d95 with wvi dot com & del _

While I haven't searched the net and there is no URL given, and I believe
that the above "article"
is contrived - I think it PERFECTLY illustrates the point I was trying to
make.

Carl - wk3c

1857. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:50:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <q3ydnfStKpaaCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89921

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@spam.858c7d95> wrote in message
news:1067g86t5mru798@corp.supernews.com...
> On Thu, 25 Mar 2004 21:39:52 -0000,
> Carl R. Stevenson <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94B77A26098B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> Maybe we could come up with a certificate for operating from BPL test
> >> sites, with endorsements for 500W, 1kW and 1.5kW?
> >
> > Gentlemen (and other denizens of RRAP :-)
> >
> > Suggestions of deliberate interference to ANYTHING (including BPL, which
> > under the
> > law has no right to protection from licensed services) will NOT make any
> > friends for us
> > at the FCC, on Capital Hill, or in the court of public opinion ...
> > especially when all of
> > those venues are mostly ill-informed on the real nature of the problem
...
> >
> > If these suggestions, even if offered in jest, get into the hands of the
BPL
> > spin doctors,
> > they will not hesitate to publicly tar and feather the amateur radio
> > service, at the FCC,
> > to Congresspersons, and as widely as possible in the press (and we know
how
> > the press
> > likes a controversial story, don't we?)
> >
> > PLEASE, I implore you - drop these concepts from public venues like
usenet!
> > You will
> > do FAR more harm than good.
> >
> > We MUST "take the high road" on the BPL issue ... that doesn't mean
rolling
> > over and
> > taking it ... but it does mean not shooting ourselves in the foot with
such
> > irresponsible talk.
> >

> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
> >
> >
>
> : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .
>
>
> Consumers Internet Federation Oppose Ham Radio Operators Potential
> Interference to BPL
>
> San Francisco, CA - CIF today asked Congress to pass legislation
> to protect Broadband over Power Lines (BPL) users from interference
> by misguided ham radio operators. The ham radio operators through
> email lists and newsgroups are making plans to disrupt the critical
> infrastructure of the Internet in a terrorist like movement.
> These acts will dramatically impact Internet users'
> rights to access to the Internet. Legislation would require
> anyone who interferes with a BPL system to immediately cease
> all ham radio or CB operations until they no longer interfere
> with a BPL users business or home system.
> BPL promises Internet users a Broadband Nirvana and is endorsed by
> FCC Chairman Michael Powell as a solution to the lack of broadband
> choices for consumers.
>
> : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : . : .
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.
> Replace spam.858c7d95 with wvi dot com & del _

While I haven't searched the net and there is no URL given, and I believe
that the above "article"
is contrived - I think it PERFECTLY illustrates the point I was trying to
make.

Carl - wk3c

1858. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:52:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89922

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...

> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?

I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.

We only
> need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone and
> one on the radio...

How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?

> Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, K4YZ

bb

bb

1859. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:54:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 89923

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hv5fm28.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 24 Mar 2004 10:59:08 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather
> >than have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool,
> >that they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement
> >that they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide
> >by it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool
> >can be made smaller.
>
> >Is that a good idea?
>
> I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
> enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
> licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
> part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
> licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.
>
> Whether one compllies with the Rules is another matter.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over the
NCVEC plan
for a number of reasons.

Carl - wk3c

1860. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:56:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270656.1b7c8bb4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89924

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403250504.52f029c2@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040324234544.17713.00000010@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > >news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > >>
> > >> Seems to me that it's just you and Brain that have a problem with me.
> And
> > >> if you'd stop lying and misrepresenting the character and facts relative to
> > >> Amateur Radio, you wouldn't even have that...
> > >>
> > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >More untruths.
> > >
> > >Mark Morgan
> > >
> > >RRAP is littered with people you hate.
> >
> > Ahem...the sentence got mixed up.
> >
> > RRAP is littered with his hatreds.
> >
> > Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
> > is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
> > could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali? :-)
> >
> > LHA / WMD
>
> A fight with Muhammed Ali?
>
> I think a debate between Muhammed and Steve would be more balanced and entertaining.

Spelling B?

1861. Re: Wall Street Journal: Obsolescent, quirky hams oppose BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:56:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327095624.08277.00000223@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89925

My e-mail letter to Mr. Brown:

73

Steve, K4YZ

QUOTE

Dear Mr. Brown,

While I found a great bit of interest in your article, you seem to single out hams a "quirky" over thier defense of parts of the spectrum.

BPL, or Broadband over Power Lines, will not only affect Amateur Radio operators. Depspite the proliferation of satellite systems for ships, the HF, or shortwave, bands still carry a large part of ship-to-shore communications.

Other organizations such as the Civil Air Patrol, still depend heavily on HF as a primary means of conducting emergency communications.

BPL also has the potential of creating interference up into the VHF, or very high frequency part of the spectrum, creating difficulties for certain police, fire and EMS communications, along with "unlicensed" resources such as cordless telephones, CB radio, and even baby monitors.

The proliferation of the power distribution network certainly lays a golden egg for those who see it as yet another service to sell for Internet users, but this golden egg is only plated...It tarnishes easily under scrutiny.

The problem is even further exacerbated when one realizes that much of the EXISTING power distribution infrastructure is itself aging and in need of repair or replacement...Every dirty or rusting cable or connection is yet another opportunity for compromise of the integrity of the signal applied to it, making the potential interference one of phenominal magnitude.

There exists, in the future, a potential to use some of the existing infrastructure for distributing the Internet to a wider customer base, but under existing conditions and circumstances is nothing but potential for great harm.

Thank-you for your time.

Steven J Roeson, LPN

UNQUOTE

1862. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:58:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327095822.08277.00000224@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89927

>ect: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270646.dd2e042@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
>
>> I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember ahving
>been
>> taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.
>
>How did you make it through the U.S. Marine Corp without ever meeting a
>sailor?

What does having served in the U. S. Marine Corps or meeting sailors have to do with my training and education as a Nurse, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

1863. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 14:58:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327095826.12501.00006977@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 89926

In article <20040325105251.22051.00000080@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Even with an Element 1 test, there would probably be a lot more novices
>>if there had been VHF access. Conjecture of course.

> I dunno, Mike...
>
>Novices were given 220MHz priviledges along with some (dubiously)
>adequate
>10 meter phone priviledges and it sputtered to a halt almost as quickly as it
>started.
>
The problem was that 220 isn't 2 meters.

Way back in the bad old days, Novices had 145-147 MHz privs. But they were phased out in the late '60s early '70s, just as amateur repeaters became very common.

> I was in SoCal when "Novice Enhancement" took effect, and one can hardly
>argue that there is a dearth of repeaters on that band in that region...even
>that, very little additional activity was heard. I think I worked a half
>dozen Novices on 220 in the year after it was implemented.
>
That's because "everybody" was on 2 meters. Or 440.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1864. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:01:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89928

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
> >> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
> >> >
> >> >But you're still nuts.
> >>
> >> But you've not explained why.
> >
> >Yes I have.
>
> No, you've not....other than to say I'm "nuts" becasue I dare to question
> you.

Question me? Is >>>THAT<<< what *#*YOU*#* Call it?!?

Interrogation is more like it. And I've told you that time and again.

Get a grip, man.

That's why I think you're nuts.

Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.

It just isn't going to work.

You'll never make me love Morse Code.

> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions about
> YOUR assertions.

Yup, rumming and hiding.

> Liar AND coward. Nice combo, Brain.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Nuts.

1865. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:06:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327100602.08277.00000225@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89929

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:52 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
>
>I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
>acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
>Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.

What "90%" Brain?

ALL of the 9-1-1 calls get answered where I live.

NOT all of the calls warrant a Code 3 response.

> We only
>> need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone
>and
>> one on the radio...
>
>How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?

Hmmmmm...there are several ways.

First of all is to use the autopatch if a licensed Amateur.

Second is to be an authorized user of the county dispatch network (which I
am)

Third is to...never mind...I could be at this all day...

But in the CONTEXT which I made the comment, one 9-1-1 operator handles an
RFS (request-for-service) on the phone with the RP (reporting party) while
another monitors the phone call and dispatches the appropriate assets.

Somehow I think you knew that, so I'll just cut your trolling line right
here.

Steve, K4YZ

1866. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:12:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327101214.08277.00000226@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 89930

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:01 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
>> >> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
>> >> >
>> >> >But you're still nuts.
>> >>
>> >> But you've not explained why.
>> >
>> >Yes I have.
>>
>> No, you've not....other than to say I'm "nuts" becasue I dare to
>question
>> you.
>
>Question me? Is >>>THAT<<< what *#*YOU*#* Call it?!?
>
>Interrogation is more like it. And I've told you that time and again.
>
>Get a grip, man.
>
>That's why I think you're nuts.

You think I am nuts becasue I won't let you get away with stupid
assertions that you can't/won't back up with some valid facts.

>Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
>
>It just isn't going to work.
>
>You'll never make me love Morse Code.

I don't care if you ever do or not. I'd just as well keep idiots like you
out of the narrowband parts of the spectrum.

I just want you to answer "What "major role" do the unlicensed radio
services play in "emergency comms", as you ahve suggested they do.

>> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions
>about
>> YOUR assertions.
>
>Yup, rumming and hiding.

My bad on the typo, but I think you got the idea.
>
>> Liar AND coward. Nice combo, Brain.
>
>Nuts.

If you insist....You're a liar, a coward, AND nuts.

Steve, K4YZ

1867. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:14:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270714.719da57e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89931

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327024248.29966.00000198@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251600.204a0f42@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Then wave your arms around, invoke the magic incantation, and
> >> > the world will be remade entirely to your desires.
> >> >
> >> > Your imaginary world will be even better than you dreamed!
> >>
> >> I again ask you as to which "imaginary" world you refer...?!?!
> >
> >How many imaginary worlds do you have?
>
> Only the one where-in Brittany Spears shows up at my front door with
> round-trip tickets to Tahiti begging me to go with her.

Huh? She'll just waste your time.

Try this instead:

Snipped from ARRL site

"Visitors to French Polynesia must send in or bring in:

Copy of current Amateur License
Current passport
List of equipment brought with serial numbers
Copy of itinerary showing location from which they will be operating
Thanks to Bob, N1RA for this update:
Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 11:50:15 -0400
Subject: Fo0, French Polynesia

French Polynesia, FO0, Address: Cellule P & T du Haut Commissariat de
la Republique
(HCR-CPT)

BP 115
98713 - Papeete, Tahiti, French Polynesia

Telephone: 011 689 46 8630
Fax: 011 689 46 86 33
E-Mail : her.ept.jde@mail.pf [after July 1, 2003]

IMPORTANT: You must have an interpreter or speak French. They do not speak or read English. Correspondence must be in French also.

Personal notes from David Rosenthal, N6TST, February 2002:

Proceed to the High Commissioners Office in Papeete and ask for Mr. Sylvain Affinito (he was there in February 2002) in the office of the Celle PTT. He will examine your paperwork and have you fill out a form applying for your temporary permit. They should issue you an FO0 license either on the spot or by the next business day since the documents have to be stamped and signed by an approving official. This license will be good for 90 days, which is the maximum time a visitor may stay in French Polynesia. There is no charge for the license.

Note that CEPT Class 2 licenses, are NOT authorized in French Polynesia, i.e., there is no equivalent to a "codeless Tech" license there.

For Maritime mobiles sailing into French waters you must have a valid license to operate within the territory. Upon making your first port of call, simply call the PTT office with the above information plus the usual boat info. Your license can be preprocessed and if you call back the next day he will give you your call letters and you can pick up your license when you reach Tahiti.

Phone number for this PTT is 46-86-32, the fax is 46-86-33

Phone cards are now needed to access pay telephones and these cards are available at most stores. They cost XPF 1,000 (about US$8) but you can also use a major credit card in the phone.

The correct Celle PTT office is HARD to find in Papeete (there are several) and few people know anything about amateur radio. Streets in French Polynesia are poorly marked and address numbers virtually unknown. Basic maps, however, are available free from tourist brochure displays located in most stores. I've also included my own map showing the exact location of the Celle PTT office.

Follow Avenue Bruat inland to where it ends at the entrance of the Gendarmarie, a large police compound. Turn left before entering the Gendarmarie gate and follow the small street about 100 feet or so where you'll find a driveway entrance to what appears to be a two-story apartment building. The Celle PTT office is the last one on the ground floor and has a blue sign with white script lettering above the door reading "Cellule des Postes et Tï¿½lï¿½communications."

Thanks to David Rosenthal, N6TST for this update.

Additional comments: "Having experienced considerable difficulty
locating the PTT office in Papeete (Tahiti), I added correct street
directions to find the right building as well as producing a map
graphic which I included as a JPEG with this message. This map, though
small, can printed out and easily matched to many readily available
free maps on the island. Perhaps you could paste it into the page as
well since that might be the best way for folks to find their way to
the office. Anyway, I hope you find this helpful and, if I can answer
any questions or provide more information, please feel free to contact
me either via e-mail or at 760 939-5467."
For more information, contact the French Polynesian IARU."

> OIther than that, I've pretty well got you and Lennie by the cajones...As
> hard as it is to hold on to something that small.

See what I mean? Brittany could fall into your lap and you'd just be
thinking about some guys reproductive equipment. Huge waste of time
in my book.

1868. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:25:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270725.45b1dfec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89932

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327032928.29966.00000206@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>

> >> It's been proven, Brain...You're lying. Everything else is downhill
> from
> >> here.
> >
> >So where is the proof?
>
> The "proof" is in your steadfast refusal to answer the question "What
> "major role" do unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms""...?!?!

Refusing to answer the questions of a belligerant is "proof?"

You keep proving that your nuts.

> >> No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.
> >>
> >> Nice job.
> >
> >Dunno, Steve, you're the one calling them statements of fact. You're
> >the navigator. You're the skillful one. Pffft.
>
> Only "skillful" in that I keep trying to straighten out the spin you keep
> trying to put on answering ONE question, Brain...

You had a whole list of questions. Now you have only "ONE."

Were you lying then, or are you lying now?

> >Everyone else on here knows that much of what is posted is called
> >"opinion."
> >
> >Best of luck.
>
> No luck needed. Still waiting on the answer, Brain...

Do you have gray hair yet?

> Or are you admitting your mistruthfulness in your silence?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

That's what Assuming Steve assumes.

1869. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:30:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Wbqdneah4ri7A_jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89933

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/26/2004 11:34 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040326123456.05025.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040325190114.12501.00006943@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>
>
>> I'd suggest you get a strong beverage, one that will relax you first
>> before trying to pull off that "ancient wisdom" dums**t again.
>>
>> You waste too much of too many folks' time with arguments
>> over semantic minutae.
>
>
> Jim...is it just me, or does Lennie switch to profanity (actual or
> ins*nu*ated) or suggest dropping to killfile ("plonk") when he's getting backed
> into a corner by someone who can argue with him and make him look
> silly....again...?

Who cares, as long as I stay plonked! 8^)

- Always wondered why that one kept responding to my posts when he knew
I read them and replied only to that which deserved reply.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1870. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:31:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WbqdneGh4rjOA_jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89934

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <406490E5.4050204@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Plonk
>>
>> Finally! Thank you!

I though you plonked me, kind sir?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1871. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:35:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WbqdneCh4rjOAvjd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89935

Keith wrote:

> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 19:37:31 GMT,
> Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
>>On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 09:11:05 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
>>>HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
>>>signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
>>>constitute that willful interference?
>>>
>>> I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.
>>>
>>> Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?
>>
>> This attorney says that if you are operating within the FCC Rule
>> requirements then any interception by a system which is not intended
>> to receive those signals - be it an audio device or a BPL system -
>> is the problem of the affected system operator and not of the
>> transmitter operator or licensee.
>
>
> That isn't the point Phil, these emails and newsgroup posts could
> be presented to the FCC and Congress to prove that all the interference
> to BPL is intentional by ham radio operators and that the government
> should stop the hams from destroying the Internet or whatever
> argument the deep pockets of the BPL industry want to use
> to stop complaints by ham radio operators.

Though it would probably be a Pandoras box to try to use newsgroup
postings as evidence!!!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1872. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:39:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270739.6ac0fa6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89936

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327025444.29966.00000201@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261929.7e816ebf@posting.google.com>
> >
> >"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> >news:<c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> >> "Arnie Macy" wrote ...
> >>
> >> > I understand your point, but the intent of this section in the FCC rules
> was
> >> > to stop Ham radio from being used for commercial purposes, not to
> prohibit
> >> > emergency communications. Nothing in the rules prohibits use of this
> >> > equipment during an emergency by any licensed person. Or for that
> matter,
> >> > any person whatever. As I said, our Ham equipment is being used for
> >> > redundancy, so for all practical purposes, it will never be used for
> routine
> >> > communication -- other than testing to ensure it is working properly.
> >> >
> >>
> >> I just wanted to add that there are always exceptions to the rule. Two
> that
> >> I can think of, right off hand, would be the Space Shuttle Crew (obviously
> >> government employees) and Federal, State, and local EM directors and staff
> >> (many of whom are Hams). Do you really think either of the aforementioned
> >> would not be allowed to use their privileges because of part 97?
> >>
> >> Arnie -
> >
> >Arnie, please don't ask me to bless what others do on amateur radio.
> >I've been heavily criticized for a couple of positions that I've taken
> >wrt a literal "interpretation" of Part 97.
> >
> >1. The no monetary rule, and repeater owners charging "dues" for
> >repeater use.
>
> What "interpretation" did YOU make, Brain?

I put interpretation in "" because it is a literal reading of the
rules. Everyone else who has taken me to task calls it an

interpretation.

> The FCC itself has issued several "clarifications" on these very specific
> topoics that you've cited here. What interpretation was left to be made?

You must post those at once or you are a liar. You have 12 hours to
do so.

> >2. Administering a Farnsworth exam when Part 97 clearly states "Morse
> >Code."
>
> There is no such thing as a "Farnsworth" exam, Brain.

Then no dash-dot exams have been given by the ARRL VEC since 1988.

Which is it? Has the ARRL given dash-dot exams or haven't they?

Huh? Huh?? Huh???

> >I don't make the rules, and I don't take it upon myself to interpret
> >workarounds to what Part 97 states.
>
> What "workarounds"...?!?! The FCC had already "interpreted" the specific
> items you've mentioned in this post, Brain.

Then it is imperative that you post such documents.

> Or are you simply voicing your disagreement with thier position on those
> specifics?

Their position is stated in Part 97. Even though you think it may
take many libraries to hold all of the content of Part 97, you might
try embarking on such a reading journey. It might take you the
remainder of your natural life to get through it all, but it is worth
the effort.

Hey, I managed to get through it, and so can you.

> >I leave that sort of work to the experts on RRAP and the FCC.
>
> The "experts" in RRAP are one thing....

Correct. They are one thing, one mind, lock step.

> The FCC staffers, on the otherhand, >>ARE<< the "experts". Even your
> "mentor" says so. Do you disagree?

>>>SORRY<<< to BUST YOUR RANT!!!

That is why I deferred to their document when Arnie asked me to
provide a workaround to the monetary rule. I cannot do so.

1873. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:40:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270740.5902c1e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89937

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327024658.29966.00000200@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:07 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251607.12eaac50@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040324072852.03342.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:26 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >Fair enough.
> >>
> >> It only took you three days.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Is there now a time limit on replying?
>
> Oh no, Brain...You go right on spinning your spin and dancing your dance.
>
> I'll keep pointing out how silly you look going around in circles.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You keep making yourself look silly, and nuts.

1874. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:42:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327104256.18619.00000156@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89939

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:14 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270714.719da57e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327024248.29966.00000198@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251600.204a0f42@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>

>> Only the one where-in Brittany Spears shows up at my front door with
>> round-trip tickets to Tahiti begging me to go with her.
>
>Huh? She'll just waste your time.
>
>Try this instead:
>
>Snipped from ARRL site
>---
>"Visitors to French Polynesia must send in or bring in:

BIG SNIP

>> OIther than that, I've pretty well got you and Lennie by the
>cajones...As
>> hard as it is to hold on to something that small.
>
>See what I mean? Brittany could fall into your lap and you'd just be
>thinking about some guys reproductive equipment. Huge waste of time
>in my book.

In YOUR book, perhaps.

An assumption on YOUR part that I don't speak at least competent
tourist-level French would be a foolish one.

Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a fool out of yourself...again...?

Steve, K4YZ

1875. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:43:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89938

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327024528.29966.00000199@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:02 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251602.559a6f94@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040325085912.17909.00000059@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Well...I guess it just exacerbates an existing problem, when I think
> about
> >> it...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Yep. It exasperates you.
>
> Yes, Brain...You "exasperate" me. Liars do.
>
> And your on-going trolling and misrepresentation of truth still exacerbate
> a larger problem.

Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
unfair.

1876. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:46:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327104627.18619.00000157@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89940

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270725.45b1dfec@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327032928.29966.00000206@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>

>> The "proof" is in your steadfast refusal to answer the question "What
>> "major role" do unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms""...?!?!
>
>Refusing to answer the questions of a belligerant is "proof?"
>
>You keep proving that your nuts.

No.

I keep proving you are a lair. Well...>>I<< don't prove it...YOU do.

>> >> No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.
>> >>
>> >> Nice job.
>> >
>> >Dunno, Steve, you're the one calling them statements of fact. You're
>> >the navigator. You're the skillful one. Pffft.
>>
>> Only "skillful" in that I keep trying to straighten out the spin you
>keep
>> trying to put on answering ONE question, Brain...
>
>You had a whole list of questions. Now you have only "ONE."
>
>Were you lying then, or are you lying now?

Wasn't lying in either case.

I've narrowed it down to only one at present, and you STILL can't give a
straight answer.

>> >Everyone else on here knows that much of what is posted is called
>> >"opinion."
>> >

>> >Best of luck.
>>
>> No luck needed. Still waiting on the answer, Brain...
>
>Do you have gray hair yet?

Quite a few. None due to you...matter of fact, the fun I ahve here
probably defers quite a few of them! You DO make it soooooooooo easy, Brain!

>> Or are you admitting your mistruthfulness in your silence?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>That's what Assuming Steve assumes.

That's what Brainless Brian proves.

Steve, K4YZ

1877. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:46:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403270746.1f707d7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89941

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<iO6dnewQw8uTY_ndRVn-ug@gbronline.com>...
> Wee Willie Winky wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >
> >>There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to
> >>get a license,
> >
> >
> > Brave words from a guy w/o a license.
>
> Sorry to dissappoint you willieboy, but I have an advanced. Took my exam
> in front of an FCC examiner.

Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a verifiable call
sign your claims just cannot be believed.

The rule around here is "proof." The alternative to proof is called
"lying."

Not my rules, but that's how this is played. Best of Luck.

1878. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:48:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327104859.18619.00000158@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89942

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:31 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <WbqdneGh4rjOA_jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
>
>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <406490E5.4050204@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Plonk
>>>
>>Finally! Thank you!
>
>
>I though you plonked me, kind sir?

You expected him to acutally DO what he said?

The 'old timers' here are still waiting for him to get his "Extra Lite out
of the box".

The box has been open for three years now.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1879. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 15:58:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Kwh9c.2173$yN6.2162@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89943

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
<SNIP of lots of stuff we agree on....
> >Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
> >a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
> >with which I agree.
>
> When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind
up
> with the ARRL proposal.

Great observation.

> >> And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
> >>
> >> > The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
> >bad.
> >>
> >> Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
> >> C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
> >
> >I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
> >tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
> >2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
> >a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
> >in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
> >have agreed on for a long time.
>
> Exactly. Will be in my comments.

More agreement....wow, we're on a roll.

> >One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
> >privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart
> >being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
> >questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
> >class.
>
> Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such a
chart
> available, it needs to be tested.

Let me ask you a specific question: Do you know
(i.e. memorized) all the oiperating priveleges for your
own license class and modes allowed for every band?

> >I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
> >for HF if I was asked.
>
> But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to
know the
> band and mode subband limits..

As above, have you memorized them all?

> >Better to know the person can read
> >and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.
>
> See above.

We disagreee then on that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1880. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:15:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327111543.18619.00000159@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89944

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270739.6ac0fa6@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327025444.29966.00000201@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:29 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261929.7e816ebf@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<c3vui8$2bi7c9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> >> "Arnie Macy" wrote ...

>> What "interpretation" did YOU make, Brain?
>
>I put interpretation in "" because it is a literal reading of the
>rules. Everyone else who has taken me to task calls it an
>interpretation.

I have no "task" to take you to over Part 97 rules.

They are pretty clear. Not a whole lot of "interpretation" required there. You either do (or don't do, as may be the case) what they say, or be held liable for fines.

>> The FCC itself has issued several "clarifications" on these very
>specific
>> topoics that you've cited here. What interpretation was left to be made?
>
>You must post those at once or you are a liar. You have 12 hours to
>do so.

I didn't post them in the first place, Brain.

They were not assertions of mine.

There ARE public resources to validate the FCC previous "positions" on rulings. I suggest that you use them.

On the otherhand, YOU are the ONLY person who can "validate" assertions YOU make. And "we" are still waiting for you to answer the question "What "major role" in "emergency comms" do unlicensed radio services play...???

>> >2. Administering a Farnsworth exam when Part 97 clearly states "Morse
>> >Code."
>>
>> There is no such thing as a "Farnsworth" exam, Brain.
>
>Then no dash-dot exams have been given by the ARRL VEC since 1988.
>
>Which is it? Has the ARRL given dash-dot exams or haven't they?
>
>Huh? Huh?? Huh???

The VEC's have not administred any "dot-dash" exams, either.

They have, however, administered thousands of Element 1 Morse Code tests.

These tests were administered in accordance with FCC parameters and
approval.

UNLESS, of course, you can provide some reference to some FCC rule or
regulation that mandates a "Farnsworth" test or a "dot-dash" test...?!?!

>> >I don't make the rules, and I don't take it upon myself to interpret
>> >workarounds to what Part 97 states.
>>
>> What "workarounds"...?!?! The FCC had already "interpreted" the
>specific
>> items you've mentioned in this post, Brain.
>
>Then it is imperative that you post such documents.

Which documents would you like posted, Brain? A simple Google search for
"Part 97" or "Amateur Radio Rules" will deliver tons of links to FCC comments
on the topic, and since they will come from a third party, it will deny you or
Lennie the opportunity to claim I either "editied" the find or drew solely upon
ARRL resources to provide them.

>> Or are you simply voicing your disagreement with thier position on
>those
>> specifics?
>
>Their position is stated in Part 97. Even though you think it may
>take many libraries to hold all of the content of Part 97, you might
>try embarking on such a reading journey. It might take you the
>remainder of your natural life to get through it all, but it is worth
>the effort.

The FCC has issued many "interpretations" on "pecuniary interest" since I
was first licensed in 1972, from "absolutely not", to "It's OK under these
restrictions..."

Do you REALLY need over 30 years of FCC comments to wade through?

You can't even handle ONE question asked of you in the last hour...How are
you going to proceess THAT amount of data...?!?!

>Hey, I managed to get through it, and so can you.

I have noting to "get through", Brain...I just don't use Amateur Radio to make ANY business related communicaitons. Period. What anyone else does is at the peril of THIER license, not mine.

>> >I leave that sort of work to the experts on RRAP and the FCC.
>>
>> The "experts" in RRAP are one thing....
>
>Correct. They are one thing, one mind, lock step.

If you think that, you've not been paying attention.

That you and I are at odds is living proof of that.

>> The FCC staffers, on the otherhand, >>ARE<< the "experts". Even your
>> "mentor" says so. Do you disagree?
>
>>>>SORRY<<< to BUST YOUR RANT!!!
>
>That is why I deferred to their document when Arnie asked me to
>provide a workaround to the monetary rule. I cannot do so.

What "rant", Brainless One?

Do you disagree that the FCC staffers are the defacto "experts" on radio regulations?

Yes or no.

Brain, it's obvious that getting your nose rubbed in your own newsgroup excrement is beginning to cause you to act in an unstable manner.

I am sorry that you find it offensive that you are being required to take responsiblity for your own actions, but most of us ARE required to do that...or at least expected to...

That you were not rasied that way is not my problem. But you are over 18 now and it IS expected of you.

That you are incapable is obvious.

Steve, K4YZ

1881. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:17:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327111718.18619.00000160@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89945

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:40 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270740.5902c1e1@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327024658.29966.00000200@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:07 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251607.12eaac50@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040324072852.03342.00000005@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:26 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403240326.4c45545c@posting.google.com>
>> >> >
>> >> >Fair enough.
>> >>
>> >> It only took you three days.
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Is there now a time limit on replying?
>>
>> Oh no, Brain...You go right on spinning your spin and dancing your
>dance.
>>
>> I'll keep pointing out how silly you look going around in circles.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>You keep making yourself look silly, and nuts.

And I will keep on making you look like a liar.

Now...WHAT "major role" do teh "unlicensed services" play in "emergency
comms"...??

Do I need to RE-quote the post that you stated that this is so?

Steve, K4YZ

1882. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:19:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327111914.18619.00000161@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89946

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327024528.29966.00000199@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:02 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251602.559a6f94@posting.google.com>

>Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
>suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
>unfair.

I am neither bullying you nor am being "suckered" into anything.

I am showing you to be the liar that I have claimed you to be.

Sorry that you can't see that. It IS rather obvious.

Steve, K4YZ

1883. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:20:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327112029.18619.00000162@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89947

>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327104627.18619.00000157@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/27/2004 9:25 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270725.45b1dfec@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040327032928.29966.00000206@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
>>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>> The "proof" is in your steadfast refusal to answer the question "What
>>> "major role" do unlicensed radio services play in "emergency
>comms""...?!?!
>>
>>Refusing to answer the questions of a belligerant is "proof?"
>>
>>You keep proving that your nuts.
>
> No.
>
> I keep proving you are a lair.

My bad.

But you ARE a "LIAR".

Steve, K4YZ

1884. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:28:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327112837.18619.00000163@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 89948

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 9:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270746.1f707d7f@posting.google.com>
>
>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<iO6dnewQw8uTY_ndRVn-ug@gbronline.com>...
>> Wee Willie Winky wrote:
>> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>> >
>> >
>> >>There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to
>> >>get a license,
>> >
>> >
>> > Brave words from a guy w/o a license.
>>
>> Sorry to dissappoint you willieboy, but I have an advanced. Took my exam
>> in front of an FCC examiner.
>
>Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a verifiable call
>sign your claims just cannot be believed.
>
>The rule around here is "proof." The alternative to proof is called
>"lying."
>
>Not my rules, but that's how this is played. Best of Luck.

There's no "rules" here, Brain.

You simply made an assertion which was, on the face of it, false.

It was obvious to anyone who is actually INVOLVED in ANY aspect of
"emergency comms", but since you've made a point of trying to claim you DIDN'T
say it when in fact you did, well, I justr could't pass up the opportunity to
rub your nose in it.

The end result is that you've stretched out a personally embarrassing
whomping that you could have ended almost as soon as you started it by just
adding "in my opinion",.

Of course you could have provided us some sort of reference that actually
validated your assertion, but you and I both know that THAT wasn't possible.

So...here we are, two weeks later, and you've made a complete and utter fool of yourself trying to squeeze out from under the rock that you got yourself under.

And for what?

Steve, K4YZ

1885. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:57:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <OL2dnZ2jlpVlLvjdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 89952

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403270739.6ac0fa6@posting.google.com...
>
> Then no dash-dot exams have been given by the ARRL VEC since 1988.
>
> Which is it? Has the ARRL given dash-dot exams or haven't they?
>
> Huh? Huh?? Huh???
>

What the HECK is a dash-dot exam?? They have NEVER given dash-dot exams. They've only given Morse code receiving and/or sending exams as far as I am aware of. Since it is far easier to copy using Farnsworth spacing at 5wpm than other spacing methods, that is what they use.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1886. Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:58:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89950

In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
> the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).

Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and arguably illegal at the time.

> The
> surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
> need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
> frustration those people have.

Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and arguably illegal at the time.

Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office and copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.

> Oddly, no one seems to bash
> the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
> long before the Bash company did its thing.

That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that would be on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along with other information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All with FCC knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source of the study guides.

Bash obtained his materials by other methods, and his books did not explain how the material was obtained.

In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.

1887. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:58:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327115819.12851.00000072@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89951

In article <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:xnfcneeyarg.hv5fm28.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>> On 24 Mar 2004 10:59:08 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather
>> >than have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool,
>> >that they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement
>> >that they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide
>> >by it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool
>> >can be made smaller.
>>
>> >Is that a good idea?
>>
>> I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
>> enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
>> licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
>> part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
>> licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.
>>
>> Whether one compllies with the Rules is another matter.....
>>
>> --
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over the
>NCVEC plan for a number of reasons.

I'll take that to mean you do not support the "signed statement" idea, Carl.

What's interesting about the NCVEC proposal is that if you remove the "signed
statement" bad idea, and the "no homebrew/30 volt final" bad ideas, and the
"additional unnecessary widening of the phone bands at the expense of CW/data"
bad idea, and the "special beginner callsign" bad idea, you wind up with a
proposal that's pretty darn close to the ARRL one. (Yeah, I know about the 5
wpm for Extra thing)/

Personally, I think many of the provisions of the NCVEC proposal actually
insult beginners.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1888. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 16:58:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327115820.12851.00000073@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 89949

In article <KMmdnZ5W-M7UEfjdRVn-hA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040327085809.03943.00000026@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>> [snip to following sentence about previous Tech privilege discussion]
>> Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and
>> arguments?
>
>How many of these petitions were actually filed by Technicians rather than
>people who purport to speak for them?
>Do the filers really know whether the
>Techs are happy with the current privileges. Afterall those who really
>wanted more privileges went ahead and upgraded.

omigawsh, Dee, you just hit the nail and drove it straight through the board!

I agree 100%

73 de Jim, N2EY

1889. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 18:25:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4065C700.4040604@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 89953

>
>
>
>
>
>>>I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
>>>for HF if I was asked.
>>>
>>>
>>But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to
>>
>>
>know the
>
>
>>band and mode subband limits..
>>
>>
>
>As above, have you memorized them all?
>
Well, extras can use any ham frequency. But you still need to know what
modes go in what subbands.

>
>
>
>>>Better to know the person can read
>>>and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.
>>>
>>>
>>See above.
>>
>>
>
>We disagreee then on that.
>
>
>
I use a chart when using an unfamiliar band. The concept that you can
operate
whatever mode you happen to hear on whatever frequency doesn't always
work. Like on 80 and 40.

>
>
>

1890. Re: When Was CB Created?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 18:38:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271038.687b0904@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89954

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327104627.18619.00000157@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270725.45b1dfec@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327032928.29966.00000206@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: When Was CB Created?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261957.737a0e97@posting.google.com>
>
> >> The "proof" is in your steadfast refusal to answer the question "What
> >> "major role" do unlicensed radio services play in "emergency comms""...?!?!
> >
> >Refusing to answer the questions of a belligerant is "proof?"
> >
> >You keep proving that your nuts.
>
> No.
>
> I keep proving you are a lair. Well...>>I<< don't prove it...YOU do.

Refusing to answer the questions of a belligerant is "proof?"

You keep proving that you're nuts.

> >> >> No "luck" needed. You skillfully navigated yourself into that one.
> >> >>
> >> >> Nice job.
> >> >
> >> >Dunno, Steve, you're the one calling them statements of fact. You're
> >> >the navigator. You're the skillful one. Pffft.
> >>
> >> Only "skillful" in that I keep trying to straighten out the spin you
> keep
> >> trying to put on answering ONE question, Brain...
> >
> >You had a whole list of questions. Now you have only "ONE."
> >
> >Were you lying then, or are you lying now?
>
> Wasn't lying in either case.

>
> I've narrowed it down to only one at present, and you STILL can't give a
> straight answer.

So you are lying now. You do have more than "ONE" question.

1891. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 18:47:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89955

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327104256.18619.00000156@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:14 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270714.719da57e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327024248.29966.00000198@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:00 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251600.204a0f42@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040324055426.03164.00000006@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >> >Date: 3/23/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <20040323224716.22081.00004754@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
> >> Only the one where-in Brittany Spears shows up at my front door with
> >> round-trip tickets to Tahiti begging me to go with her.
> >
> >Huh? She'll just waste your time.
> >
> >Try this instead:
> >
> >Snipped from ARRL site
> >--
> >"Visitors to French Polynesia must send in or bring in:
>
> BIG SNIP
>
> >> OIther than that, I've pretty well got you and Lennie by the
> cajones...As
> >> hard as it is to hold on to something that small.
> >
> >See what I mean? Brittany could fall into your lap and you'd just be
> >thinking about some guys reproductive equipment. Huge waste of time
> >in my book.
>
> In YOUR book, perhaps.

So you value thinking about some other guys reproductive equipment higher than you value thinking about Brittany Spears? Eeeewww!

> An assumption on YOUR part that I don't speak at least competent
> tourist-level French would be a foolish one.

An assumption on your part that there is an assumption on my part is part of your assuming induced downfall.

No one even cares if you can speak tourist-level French. You are a fool to think they do.

But with Brittany Spears in your lap, all you can think about is Len's testicles and my testicles?

Definitely nuts.

> Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a fool
> out of yourself...again...?

Exactly what are you squeezing, Steve?

Whatever it is, keep it away from me and quit being so gay.

1892. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 18:59:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327135940.20806.00000025@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 89956

In article <20040327104859.18619.00000158@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>I though you plonked me, kind sir?
>
>You expected him to acutally DO what he said?

Hope springs eternal.
>
>The 'old timers' here are still waiting for him to get his "Extra Lite
>out of the box".
>
> The box has been open for three years now.
>
Four years, two months and eight days as of today, actually.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1893. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 19:30:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <mNOdnTWa99agRfjdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89957

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<iO6dnewQw8uTY_ndRVn-ug@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Wee Willie Winky wrote:
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<lPidna9Risqej8Pd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>There now you go, upsetting all the anti-ham crowd who can't manage to
>>>>get a license,
>>>
>>>
>>>Brave words from a guy w/o a license.
>>
>>Sorry to dissappoint you willieboy, but I have an advanced. Took my exam
>>in front of an FCC examiner.
>
>
> Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a verifiable call
> sign your claims just cannot be believed.
>
> The rule around here is "proof." The alternative to proof is called
> "lying."
>
> Not my rules, but that's how this is played. Best of Luck.

And your call is?

1894. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 19:58:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040327145827.08081.00000054@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 89958

In article <Kwh9c.2173$yN6.2162@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
><SNIP of lots of stuff we agree on....
>> >Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
>> >a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
>> >with which I agree.
>>
>> When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind
>> up with the ARRL proposal.
>
>Great observation.
>
Thank you.

>> >> And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
>> >>
>> >> > The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
>> >> > bad.
>> >>
>> >> Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
>> >> C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
>> >
>> >I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
>> >tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
>> >2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
>> >a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
>> >in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
>> >have agreed on for a long time.
>>
>> Exactly. Will be in my comments.
>
>More agreement....wow, we're on a roll.

I've always said that, on policy issues, we agree on much more than we
disagree.

>> >One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
>> >privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart

>> >being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
>> >questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
>> >class.

>> Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such a
>> chart available, it needs to be tested.
>
>Let me ask you a specific question: Do you know
>(i.e. memorized) all the oiperating priveleges for your
>own license class and modes allowed for every band?

Sure. But that's just me.

Please understand that I'm *not* saying that subbands should be a go/nogo test element. They're just one small part of the regs, and should not be over- or under-emphasized.
>
>> >I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
>> >for HF if I was asked.
>>
>> But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to
>> know the band and mode subband limits..
>
>As above, have you memorized them all?
>
Sure. Just like Ohm's Law and such. In fact I regularly take practice exams online just to make sure I'm up on the current rules.

To make it more of a sporting course, I don't allow myself a calculator or even scratch paper. One time I passed the Extra in seven minutes thirty seconds just to see if I could.

>> >Better to know the person can read
>> >and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.
>>
>> See above.
>
>We disagreee then on that.

The main point is that if you start accepting the idea of lookup charts for the subbands, why not formula charts for the theory? Or a copy of Part 97?

You don't have to go down that road very far before a case is made to allow a copy of "Now You're Talking" or its equivalent at the exam session.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1895. Re: I NEED YOUR HELP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:02:07 UTC
From: "J. Yazel" <jyazel@netset.com>
Message-ID: <srqb6093v1d0lg7t4othdl09ud1fq6076d@4ax.com>
Source record: 89959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,tnn.radio.a

On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 14:37:05 -0700, "Gary C. Cash" <cash@in-tch.com> wrote:

>TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS:
>
>I, ALONG WITH A FRIEND OF MINE, W7ARO (Ed Bodenberger), ARE TRYING TO
>COMPILE A LIST OF AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS AND THEIR CALLSIGNS FOR HISTORICAL
>PURPOSES. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING NAMES ARE THOSE OF SILENT KEYS FOR WHICH WE
>HAVE NO CALLSIGN AVAILABLE AND ALL ARE FROM MONTANA. IF YOU HAVE AT SOMETIME
>WORKED ANY OF THESE INDIVIDUALS AND HAVE RECORD OF A CALLSIGN YOU RESPONSE
>WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.
>
>TOM GIBSON
>HAROLD PETERSON
>ED BINGLER
>RON WRIGHT
>BILL MONEYSMITH
>PHIL HAGMAN
>OSCAR RICE
>
>73's
>GARY
>WQ7S
>cash@in-tch.com
> ==

Hi Gary,

I can't help you yet, but in the meantime, please don't use
all capital letters. It is considered to be shouting.

Thanks and 73s.

Jack W8RAG

1896. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:02:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <JZl9c.2439$yN6.2087@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89960

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:4065C700.4040604@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >>>I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands
> >>>are for HF if I was asked.
> >>>
> >>But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill!
> >>You just need to know the
> >>band and mode subband limits.
> >
> >As above, have you memorized them all?
> >
> Well, extras can use any ham frequency.
> But you still need to know what
> modes go in what subbands.

Exactly my point.

> >>>Better to know the person can read
> >>>and use the frequency chart because
> >>> it does change over time.
> >>>
> >>See above.
> >
> >We disagreee then on that.
>
> I use a chart when using an unfamiliar band.

As do I. Additionally, as we have all seen too,
band edges for modes of operation can and do
change. Memorized spectrum or band edges
by mode today may not be accurate tomorrow.

> The concept that you can operate
> whatever mode you happen to hear on
> whatever frequency doesn't always
> work. Like on 80 and 40.

Agree 100%.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1897. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:11:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <56m9c.2444$yN6.2238@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89961

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040327145827.08081.00000054@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <Kwh9c.2173$yN6.2162@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> ><SNIP of lots of stuff we agree on....
> >> >Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
> >> >a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
> >> >with which I agree.
> >>
> >> When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you
wind
> >> up with the ARRL proposal.
> >
> >Great observation.
> >
> Thank you.
>
> >> >> And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
> >> >>
> >> >> > The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really,
really
> >> >> > bad.
> >> >>
> >> >> Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
> >> >> C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
> >> >
> >> >I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all
other
> >> >tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
> >> >2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
> >> >a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
> >> >in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
> >> >have agreed on for a long time.
> >>
> >> Exactly. Will be in my comments.

> >
> >More agreement....wow, we're on a roll.
>
> I've always said that, on policy issues, we agree on much more than we
> disagree.
>
> >> >One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
> >> >privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart
> >> >being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
> >> >questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
> >> >class.
>
> >> Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such
a
> >> chart available, it needs to be tested.
> >
> >Let me ask you a specific question: Do you know
> >(i.e. memorized) all the oiperating priveleges for your
> >own license class and modes allowed for every band?
>
> Sure. But that's just me.
>
> Please understand that I'm *not* saying that subbands should be a go/nogo
test
> element. They're just one small part of the regs, and should not be over-
or
> under-emphasized.
> >
> >> >I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
> >> >for HF if I was asked.
> >>
> >> But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to
> >> know the band and mode subband limits..
> >
> >As above, have you memorized them all?
> >
> Sure. Just like Ohm's Law and such. In fact I regularly take practice
exams
> online just to make sure I'm up on the current rules.
>
> To make it more of a sporting course, I don't allow myself a calculator or
even
> scratch paper. One time I passed the Extra in seven minutes thirty seconds
just
> to see if I could.

You must have nothing else to do...where do you
get all the time? :-) :-)

> >> >Better to know the person can read
> >> >and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.

> >>
> >> See above.
> >
> >We disagreee then on that.
>
> The main point is that if you start accepting the idea of lookup charts
for the
> subbands, why not formula charts for the theory? Or a copy of Part 97?

Formulas don't change over time. Band edges and modes sub-bands
have a long history of change.

> You don't have to go down that road very far before a case is made to
allow a
> copy of "Now You're Talking" or its equivalent at the exam session.

Did you memorize logaritms tables? Just because you were
allowed a table of log values (or tables for sine, cosin, tan, etc)
didn't force the instructor to allow a full open book testing
scenario.

I look at band edges, as the same as speed limits. Drivers
aren't expected to memorize speedlimits and hams need
not memorize band edges (or intra-band mode limits by
frequency). Drivers are expected to follow "posted"
speed limits. Hams should have a current frequency chart
available to them to stay informed. If a ham operates
frequently on 40m, that ham will eventually know the
mode limits by memorization,,,but I see no need to
memorize ALL mode/frequency limits.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1898. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161847.00150.00000017@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89969

In article <20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
>> the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>
>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and >arguably illegal at the time.

So did the Q&A book folks.

>> The
>> surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
>> need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
>> frustration those people have.
>
>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and >arguably illegal at the time.

So did the Q&A book folks.

>Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office and >copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.

So did the Q&A book folks.

>> Oddly, no one seems to bash
>> the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
>> long before the Bash company did its thing.
>
>That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC >published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that would be >on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along with other >information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All with FCC >knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source of >the study guides.

The Church of St. Hiram is sacrosanct, can do no wrong.

>Bash obtained his materials by other methods, and his books did not explain >how the material was obtained.

So did the Q&A book folks.

>In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.

Poor baby. You are mad as heck and you can't stand it anymore!

Take Bash to civil court then, nothing stopping you from trying.

Avenge all foes! Sound the hue and cry!! Love the ARRL!!!

That done, maybe you can fight against "J. K. Lasser's Your Income Tax" annual publications.

I really think you ought to review Title 17, USC, Copyrights. If you do, you will find that the United States government cannot copyright its own works. That's been in the United States Code for quite a while. The ARRL did not need to "seek any permission" for republishing any FCC public material. They still don't need to, just repro it and mention the source. No fees, nothing. Anyone can.

There's a legal area that is a "grey area" for many on what constitutes "ownership" of test materials. I'll leave that up to attorneys and judges to thrash out...not to omniscient wanna-be gurus who spout off on everything because they have an Extra license and are good at morse code. :-)

LHA / WMD

1899. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161848.00150.00000018@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89963

In article <KMmdnZ5W-M7UEfjdRVn-hA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>How many of these petitions were actually filed by Technicians rather than
>people who purport to speak for them?

None of the four current petitions.

Folks in the back of the bus aren't allowed to speak for the bus
company.

>Do the filers really know whether the
>Techs are happy with the current privileges.

Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
an dancin, eatin watermelon...

>Afterall those who really
>wanted more privileges went ahead and upgraded.

Right. We didn't need any of those Civil Rights laws, either, did
we?

LHA / WMD

1900. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161849.00150.00000019@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89962

In article <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over the
>NCVEC plan for a number of reasons.

Right. You are already an Extra and none of your amateur privileges
will be changed by any of the 4 new proposals. Not to worry.

But, only the NCVEC petition calls for total elimination of the morse
code test. How does that square with the NCI position on code?

LHA / WMD

1901. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161850.00150.00000021@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89965

In article <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
>suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
>unfair.

Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
god-hood.

LHA / WMD

1902. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161850.00150.00000020@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89967

In article <20040327035809.12851.00000061@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>You've waved your "professional" credentials here innumerable times, but you >can't tell us how to convince FCC of something that's blaringly obvious to >even us poor dumb amateurs.

I'm sorry to hear you have such a low self-image.

You can't bolster that low self-image by attempting to force others into answering your questions...those usually a set-up for an expected reply...:-)

But, on the thread SUBJECT...the FCC cannot directly stop Access BPL. It doesn't have the direct legal authority to do so. All the FCC can do right now is to set standards on the levels of incidental RF radiation from an Access BPL system. That is what NPRM 04-29 is all about.

So far, literally thousands of amateurs have complained bitterly about Access BPL to the FCC on proceedings 03-104, 04-37, and 04-29. They've demanded that the FCC "stop" it. The FCC cannot "stop" it. All the FCC can do is set standards for incidental RF radiation from Access BPL systems. Very, very few, if any, amateurs have suggested ANY levels of such RF radiation limits other than zero as in stopping Access BPL entirely.

Since the FCC has NO power to "stop" any Access BPL now, the thousands of amateurs complaining about it aren't going to be at all effective in stopping it. All that proceedings 04-37, 03-104, and 04-29 in the ECFS are seemingly good for is a place to vent steam generated by whatever frustrations all those thousands of amateurs must have.

Anyone who really wants to "stop" Access BPL would have better luck contacting their federal congressperson or senator and tell Congress to stop it. The FCC doesn't have the legal power to stop Access BPL; all the FCC can do right now is to set regulations for incidental RF radiation levels.

I've made my comments on all three proceedings. That's in the public record. Maybe it is effective, maybe not. The point is that I and all of us can DO it. We have the direct input to the FCC and the congresspersons have web addresses and postal addresses. I am NOT going to do anyone's work for them. I sure as heck can't tell anyone in this newsgrope what to do, can I? :-)

Besides, argumentative one, you've implied so many times that you "know" what the FCC thinks. That's a key to get them to "stop" Access BPL, isn't it? Why don't you spread around that information for all to share? Show your dedication and committment to the "amateur community."

LHA / WMD

1903. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161852.00150.00000022@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89970

In article <c43uq6$2deekc$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> >Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics
>> >anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies
>> >heavily on commercially available gear.
>>
>> Are you sleeping on your COTS?
>>
>> >The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone.
>>
>> Bravo Sierra. Those are still here. So are Military Specifications,
>> abbreviated "Mil Spec" among those of us who still have to use
>> them.
>
>The Bravo Sierra is yours, Leonard. Since you don't actually work with the
>military anymore, you are forced to search things out on the net and hope
>they are up to date.

Actually, I'm working for a company that is contracting to another
company who has a contract to supply electronics for the DoD.
Not full time. But the MIL STDs of many kinds are in both places
with many different dash number "Mil Specs" called out.

Note: "Mil Specs" is an old term for MILITARY STANDARDS of
many kinds, informal. They have all sorts of effective dates to
them but I'm trusting another to keep them all current and also do
all the bookkeeping on checking document call-outs, to see we
all have the standard specified on-hand.

>OTOH, I work IN the system and understand how it
>ACTUALLY is quite well.

Okay, tell us which ring at the Pentagon your office is located and
I may get a chance to look you up...

>I quoted from the FAR and you still sit there and
>argue with me. What part of FACT don't you get?

My organization didn't get that particular document so I can't
verify it. :-)

I'm sure that you need only imply you always tell the truth
in here and that is the Final Word. :-)

>> Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.

COTS = Commercial Off The Shelf.

Been around for over a decade now. It applies to specialized things
such as the three principal ICs found in the R/T for the AN/PRC-119.
ITT and GD make a quarter million of those sets between 1989 and
2003. It's the standard small-unit (battalion and down) radio for U.S.
military land forces.

>> >COR on a 6 million dollar contract.
>>
>> Wow, the "Six Million Dollar Ham!" "...We have the technology, we
>> can rebuild Arnie..." Cut to promo, voice-over "Coming to your
>> favorite channel any day now...!", up exciting music bkgd, take
>> title...
>
>Say what you want, but I have the EXPERIENCE with the contract and KNOW >what
I'm talking about. All you have is an internet search tool, and "Old"
>knowledge concerning how the aquisition system works.

Righto, Col. Steve Austin, your bionics make you superior everywhere.

"Millions" in contract awards have been awarded since WW2. The
dollar amounts, normalized for the COLA, serve only to indicate the
size of a particular project. That's a manager and bean-counter
thing; us folks with the dirtier hands concentrate on the works of a
project in order to fulfill a contract.

>New stuff, Leonard. Doesn't even remotely resemble what you did in 1955. I
>gave you the web site to research. What, did the BIG words stump you?

"BIG" is also an acronym now? [what will they think of next?]

Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious? Antidisestablishmentarianism?

I'm working with HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP devices. For radio
purposes...and some of that will bleed over to WiFax, one of the
IEEE 802 standard systems for broadband (it ain't "Wi-Fi" but one
of the families within the standard). DoD will own the plans per
terms of the overall contract, but the techniques and notebook
data aren't owned by da gubmint.

Now you shoulder your FAR away VTC and bravely defend the
Homeland Security by shouting and hollering your magnificence
in this newsgrope. That means all of us on the project can
finish and get final payment.

>You don't have the brain power to have any ammo of consequence, Leonard.

Whatever you say, Steve Austin. :-)

You are the one with morse code expertise and the bionic VTC.

We will all sleep safely on our COTS at night knowing the USA is
guarded by such knowledgeable superiors.

Plank

LHA / WMD

1904. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161853.00150.00000024@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89966

In article <1e4e3692.0403270656.1b7c8bb4@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> > Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
>> > is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
>> > could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali? :-)
>> >
>> > LHA / WMD
>>
>> A fight with Muhammed Ali?
>>
>> I think a debate between Muhammed and Steve would be more balanced and
>entertaining.
>
>Spelling B?

"Float like madam butterfly, sting like a spelling bee..."

Two disabled has-beens "fighting" one another. Not good show biz.

LHA / WMD

1905. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161853.00150.00000023@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89968

In article <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
>> >> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
>> >> >
>> >> >But you're still nuts.
>> >>
>> >> But you've not explained why.
>> >
>> >Yes I have.
>>
>> No, you've not....other than to say I'm "nuts" becasue I dare to
>question
>> you.
>
>Question me? Is >>>THAT<<< what *#*YOU*#* Call it?!?
>
>Interrogation is more like it. And I've told you that time and again.
>
>Get a grip, man.
>
>That's why I think you're nuts.
>
>Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
>
>It just isn't going to work.
>
>You'll never make me love Morse Code.
>
>> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions
>about
>> YOUR assertions.
>
>Yup, rumming and hiding.
>
>> Liar AND coward. Nice combo, Brain.

>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Nuts.

"Nuts" was good enough on the radio as a reply during the Battle
of the Bulge in the winter of '44-'45. :-)

Macauliffe prevailed and won for our side. :-)

And cashews are the chief export of Guinea-Bisseau.

LHA / WMD

1906. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:18:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327161854.00150.00000025@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 89964

In article <WbqdneGh4rjOA_jd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <406490E5.4050204@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>> Plonk
>>>
>>> Finally! Thank you!
>
> I though you plonked me, kind sir?

Not in the browser settings here...:-)

A "Plink" restores everything. It's what is done with 22s. :-)

Besides, the gunnery nurse keeps hollering "HE LIES, HE LIES!"

Feels like kindly magnanimity to fabricate a situation where it
is true! :-)

Just think, "true lies." Could be a great motion picture title!

Plank

LHA / WMD

1907. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:20:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wem9c.2449$yN6.784@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89971

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
> > the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>
> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical

In your opinion, anyway.

> and arguably illegal at the time.

a legal argument in academic concept only. Since the FCC
never tested the legality, the legal issue is moot.

> > The
> > surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
> > need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
> > frustration those people have.
>
> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and
> arguably illegal at the time.

Ditto my last.

> Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office and
> copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.

Not at all. Itwould be the equivalent of a techer using the SAME
test questions over and over again and in recognition of same, a
frat house eventually compiles a list of those questions based on the
memory of those frats that had taken the tests before. Nothing
about what bash did is equivalent to sneaking into the teacher's
office.

> > Oddly, no one seems to bash
> > the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
> > long before the Bash company did its thing.
>
> That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC
> published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that
would be
> on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along with
other

> information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All with
FCC
> knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source of
the
> study guides.

In the end it made no difference.

> Bash obtained his materials by other methods,

And those methods were NEVER chalenged as to the
means being legal or not.

> and his books did not explain how
> the material was obtained.

As if anyone buying the Bash books cared.

> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.

In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
receiving stolen goods.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1908. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:27:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vkm9c.2452$yN6.1220@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 89972

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040327115819.12851.00000072@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:xnfcneeyarg.hv5fm28.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> >> On 24 Mar 2004 10:59:08 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> >What do you think of this idea, Carl: NCVEC proposes that, rather
> >> >than have a lot of regulations questions in the "Communicator" pool,
> >> >that they be *replaced* by having each Communicator sign a statement
> >> >that they have obtained a copy of Part 97, have read it and will abide
> >> >by it. This is proposed so that the "Communicator" test and its pool
> >> >can be made smaller.
> >>
> >> >Is that a good idea?
> >>
> >> I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
> >> enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
> >> licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
> >> part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
> >> licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.
> >>
> >> Whether one compllies with the Rules is another matter.....
> >> --
> >> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over
> the
> >NCVEC plan for a number of reasons.
>
> I'll take that to mean you do not
> support the "signed statement" idea, Carl?
>
> What's interesting about the NCVEC
> proposal is that if you remove the "signed
> statement" bad idea, and the "no home-
> brew/30 volt final" bad ideas, and the
> "additional unnecessary widening of the
> phone bands at the expense of CW/data"
> bad idea, and the "special beginner
> callsign" bad idea, you wind up with a
> proposal that's pretty darn close to the

> ARRL one. (Yeah, I know about the 5
> wpm for Extra thing).

As to support of ARRL petition...
I'll let Carl speak for himself (although I believe we both agree).
Specifically, I support the ARRL petition almost 100%.
The ONLY aspect of the ARRL petition I disagree with is
(as you know already) the retention of a code test for Extra.

> Personally, I think many of the provisions
> of the NCVEC proposal actually insult beginners.

I agree completely.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1909. Re: Wall Street Journal: Obsolescent, quirky hams oppose BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 21:52:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271352.5a6230fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89973

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327095624.08277.00000223@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
> Steven J Roeson, LPN

Steve who?

1910. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 23:09:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <_vudnXnkOfUrlPvdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89974

N2EY wrote:

> In article <NMSdnTVezeT6mPzd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <0uednRdTBp3QWMbdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>>>>In article <6YSdnR_Rib8ac8fdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
>>>>>>>In article <40586436.2040505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>>>Now that the element 1 requirement is likely to go away, why do NCVEC,
>>
>>>>>>>>ARRL, and even Hans' proposals simply set up a new caste system? There
>>>>>>>>is nothing wrong with levels of certification, but they should make
>>>>>>>>some sense.
>>>>>>>Mike,
>>>>>>>There are two reasons for low power/limited privileges for the entry
>>>>>>level license:
>>>>>>>1) To simplify the tests needed for the entry-level license (if you
>>>>>>>can't run more than X watts, or are not allowed on a certain band, you don't
>>>>>>>need to be tested on it)

>>>>>> Sure, but I'm not even close to convinced that any tests need or should
>>>>>>be simplified. I wonder if anyone can provide evidence that the those
>>>>>>giving the tests are being overburde

>>>>>It's not about being overburdened, but about matching the test to the
>>>>>privileges. Why test for 1500 W safety if only 100 W is allowed?

>>>>
>>>> Well then, why not just limit ALL classes to those low powers an
>>>>eliminate (mostly) the so called safety problem altogether. Make all
>>>>appliance equipment mandatory and pot the innards. Make new foolproof
>>>>connectors, and require all antennas to be installed by properly
>>>>licensed contractors.

>>>There are some folks who would like to do just that!

>>>> I know answering a question with a question is bad form, but frankly,
>>>>it isn't much of a leap of imagination to rationalize our cherished
>>>>privileges right out from under our feet.
>>>
>>>Which is what those "it's just a hobby" folks are doing, whether they
>>>realize it or not.
>>
>> Those people are as shortsighted as the people proposing the "no
>>homebrew" rules. Your wording "avocation" is the proper term AFAIAC. I
>>practive my "hamliness" that way. Is it a hobby to work with disaster
>>preparedness teams? If so we are the only ones classed that way in the
>>group. Is it a hobby to be a part of the Skywarn system? Is it a hobby
>>to volunteer time for public events such as the NYC or LA marathons, or
>>bike races or local charity events?
>
>
> Of course it isn't. And that's why some people deny that hams are a significant
> part of such activities.

I have letters attesting that those people are wrong. I have experience
with a group trying to replace us with cell phones and failing at it.
The list goes on and on!

>>DO some hams practice this as a hobby? Sure. But that doesn't make it a
>>hobby. In the overall, it is a service.
>
>
> Or to put it another way, it's a nonprofit, volunteer activity.
>
>
>>>> I assume that you have been in group meetings, where the original idea
>>>>is mutated beyond recognition? I see it happen all the time. This is
>>>>only one more reason why I don't like these proposals *at all*. They
>>>>seem a bit of a Pandora's box IMO.
>
>
>>>I know exactly what you mean. However, note that for over half a century
>>>we've
>>>had license classes with reduced power privileges and it hasn't led us down
>>>the slippery slope.
>>
>> But we haven't had people suggesting that we have a commercial

>>equipment requirement, we haven't had a commissh that we are annoying
>>with our so called silly concerns about BPL, and concerns for our
>>"safety". Cell phones and HF rigs both use RF correct? So why do hams
>>get to use 1.5 thousand watts of power while those poor cell phone users
>>have to get by on less than a watt? If RF is dangerous, it is dangerous,
>>....right? Even though I'm being facetious, I can garuntee that I can
>>sell 9 out of 10 non-ham friends I know *that* argument.
>
>
> Yet we have power limits on *all* hams in certain subbands today.

Of course! if there are no limits, then we'll have a few hams trying to
use broadcast station powers.

>>>>Give me a good argument why Hams should need to run power over 100
>>>>Watts, 50 Watts, 5 Watts?
>
>
>
>>>Because under certain circumstances those levels of power are inadequate.
>
>
>>Then just call them on the cell phone if you need to get through that
>>bad! 8^)
>
>
> Actually, you have just expressed the fundamental image problem that Amateur
> Radio faces in the 21st century. Many people, including some hams, don't really
> "get" what Amateur Radio is all about.
>
> Here's my definition:
>
> Amateur Radio is fundamentally about radio as an end in itself, rather than as
> a means to another end.
>
> Otherwise, might as well use a cell phone or email.
>
>>>>>However, this does not mean that *all* safety questions should be removed
>>>>>just those connected with high power. And those high power questions must
>>>>>then migrate to the next-higher class of license.
>>>>
>>>> If high power RF is dangerous, why should it be allowed at all?

>>>It's not dangerous if proper precautions are taken.
>>
>> Bingo! Part of the preocess is education, and the tests show that
>>unless the applicant has cheated, they have picked up *something* in the
>>way of safety knowledge.
>>
>
> And that's why it should be in the test, and why the bad parts of the NCVEC

> proposal must be opposed.
>
>
>>>>For
>>>>anyone. If we wanna start that game, that question WILL be asked. Do you
>>>>not talk all over the world with qrp power? I myself have talked to
>>>>Australia on 10 watts. No record, but just a personal best. They hear
>>>>those stories, and suddenly it looks like that might be able to protect
>>>>those self destructive hams from themselves.
>>>
>>>
>>>The point of license testing is not to protect someone from their own
>>>ignorance, but to protect others from it.
>>
>> Mostly, but RF safety is one exception. The danegrs of high power RF
>>and High voltages in general is mostly a danger to the operator.

> I disagree in part. The danger of RF exposure is to anyone in the RF field.

Yes, but that old inverse square law coupled with the hidh voltages
being on the equipment that the ham operates means that they are the
most likely to suffer harm.

>>>>Just like cigarette smokers.
>
>>>Cigarette smoking is much more hazardous than RF.
>>
>> Sure, but you do know what my point is, don't you?
>
> Not really. There's no safe nonzero exposure level to cigarette smoking.

Wrong part to make the analogy from. A long time ago when I originally
made the analogy, I was addressing the 'guvmint's proponsity for
protecting us from ourselves.

>>>>And with the efforts to lower cell phone power going on, plenty
>>>>of non-technical regulator types will think this is a good idea, no?
>>>
>>>Now *that's* a valid point, as verified by the Alpine tower folks...
>>>
>>>>>So it makes sense that if the entry-level test gets smaller, the
>>>>>next-level test (General) must, of necessity, get bigger to
>>>>>contain the stuff removed.
>>
>>>>>Does the NCVEC petiton even mention this?
>>>>
>>>> Nope.
>
>>>That tells ya something.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>2) To give an incentive (challenge) to learn more and qualify for a

>>>>>>>higher
>>>>>>>class license. (If the entry-level license conveys all privileges, why
>>>>>>>bother to upgrade?)
>>>>>
>>>>>> But my idea, or non-idea does just that, without punitive power
>>>>>>restrictions based on what I consider bogus rationale. For those that
>>>>>>are happy to just be on VHF and above, the Technician ticket is just the
>>>>>>thing. Want HF access? Take the General test! Without Element one, there
>>>>>>isn't anything to hold ya back.
>>>>>
>>>>>Here's the problem:
>>>>>
>>>>>What we have now is a VHF-UHF-centric entry level license. The privileges
>>>>>are very heavily weighted towards the bands above 30 MHz and away from
>>>>>HF/MF.This means that most new hams will start off on VHF/UHF.
>>>>>And that means they will also start off with a local/regional focus, and
>>>>>almost certainly with manufactured equipment.
>>>>>
>>>>>The current Tech Q&A pool contains a wide variety of subjects - covered in
>>>>>very little depth. The wide variety of privileges granted requires all those
>>>>>questions. You and I may find them trivial, but some beginners may not.
>>>>>After all, don't you know at least one "professional" who has not even obtained
>>>>>an entry-level amateur license?
>>>>>
>>>>>Wouldn't it make more sense for the entry-level license to contain a
>>>>>balanced mix of privileges, including significant HF as well as VHF/UHF
>>>>>privileges, coupled with a test that matches the privileges granted?
>>>>>That way, new hams can sample more of what ham radio has to offer.
>>>>
>>>> Actually, I find the differences between local/regional, (V/UHF) and
>>>>worldwide (H/MF) to be one mighty and fine incentive to upgrade.
>
>>>That's you.
>>
>> Of course that's me. Does it make as much sense as *protecting* the
>>newbies from High power RF by not allowing them high power, as compared
>>to the alternative of giving them the knowledge?
>
> It makes more sense to me that new hams have a sampling of all bands (I'd give
> them a lot more HF/MF than bits of 80/40/15/10) than to restrict HF and allow
> full power at "meat cooking frequencies" (tip of the hat to WK3C for that
> phrase)

I cooked a little bit of meat on my finger one day with somewhere
around 50 watts power. People concerned with this should collect stamps.
My point is that 50 watts can hurt you, so if you are worried about
safety, you better lower it below that, and not cap it at 100.

Safety note addendum:
I just read the part of the ARRL 2003 handbook regarding RF and
electrical safety. Those who want to limit the voltages on the finals

better lower that nomber to 24 volts. Chapter 9 page 19 is my reference.

After all they only have safety in mind, gotta protect the newbies!

> Which do you think is more common: hams on HF or hams running high power?

Of corse there are more hams on HF.

>>>>In
>>>>addition, given the results of the way the Technician license evolved,
>>>>from a experimenter's license to the real entry level license, I would
>>>>have to say that many many hams are happy to stay right there. Many of
>>>>them only want the type of coverage that the Tech license gives.
>
>>>Maybe. But if that's so, why aren't the repeaters busy 24/7?
>>

>>Depends. Our local club repeater is pretty busy most of the time. Others
>>aren't so busy. I know I've been given a lecture on occasion while
>>traveling by some disgruntled ham when I've called that I'm listening
>>and he comes back with "This is a private repeater - don't use it any
>>more". No mention of the private repeater in the book. Who the heck is
>>going to use that!
>
> Funny, I've never run into that. If someone told me a repeate was private, I'd
> simply say it's not in the book and try a different freq.

Sure, and that's what I did. My point is that just because you don't
hear anyone on it doesn't mean there aren't hams that "might" use it.

>
>>>> I believe that the propagation differences between the VHF and up, and
>>>>HF and down make a natural and rational dividing line between
>>>>privileges.
>
>>>Well, I have to disagree. I say it's an artificial division foisted upon us
>>>by a few people who clamored for a nocodetest license as the savior of amateur
>>>radio. Hasn't happened.

>> Perhaps you don't agree with my conclusion, but the propagation
>>differences are pretty much demarcated between HF and VHF
>
>
> All depends on the sunspot cycle. When the spots are down, bands as low as 15
> become like VHF/UHF. At the peak, 6 is more like 10. A lot depends on your
> operating time-of-day, too.
>
>
>>>>It also makes for less of a class system.
>>
>>>Go down that road far enough, and you'll have a one class system.
>>
>>I don't propose that, but even THAT is better than what the NCVEC proposes.

>>
>
> I almost have to agree.

As long as it isn't the debacle they propose to foist upon the newbies!

>>>>If the Tech has
>>>>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>>>>there, then it's a great thing.
>>>
>>>Seems to me that it would make more sense to offer a wider sampling.
>
> Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and
> arguments?

I don't know that any of these petitions are sponsored by Technicians
or Novices. Seems to me that this started when the requirement for
Element 1 testing was made voluntary, and all the worms started crawling
out of the woodwork so to speak.

All the proposals were made by Extras, AFAIK.

>>>>>For example, imagine the prospective ham who wants to build kits, restore
>>>>>old gear or even homebrew from scratch. Which do you think would be a more
>>>>>realistic first project - a simple HF rig or a simple VHF/UHF one? Which
>>>>>do you
>>>>>think will result in more QSOs and more "reward" for the builder?

>>>>Well that isn't going to happen under some of the scenario's.
>>>
>>>Which is why those scenarios are not good ideas.
>
>>>>I'd certainly like that myself.
>>
>>>Then let's go for it.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Yes, it's possible to work the world on VHF/UHF, but isn't it easier for a
>>>>>beginner to do so on HF? Particularly with limited antennas?
>>>>
>>>>>That's the basic thinking behind many of the proposals. What they're
>>>>really trying to do is to reinvent the old Novice license. The Novice
>>>>concept was to have a very limited license to get people started, so
>>>>they could learn-by-doing, see what was what and then upgrade if they
>>>>liked ham radio.
>>
>>>>>> From what I see, simply removing Element 1 and letting the dust settle
>>>>>>is a better plan than either the NCVEC or ARRL plans.
>>>>>
>>>>>I think way too much is made of Element 1 and way too little of other
>>>>>factors.
>>>>>But consider this: Suppose FCC did just that (dropped Element 1 and let

>>>>>everything else alone). And suppose we did *not* see a big sustained rise
>>>>>inthe number of new hams and the number of upgrades. That would prove,
>>>>>once and for all, that Element 1 was *not* the problem at all! Some folks
>>>>>would be very upset.....
>>>>
>>>> comments:
>>>>
>>>> We would not, yes it would, and yes they would!
>>
>>>Of course.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Plus if that were done, it would be years before FCC got around to another
>>>>>NPRM cycle. Remember all that "biennial review" stuff? Well, it's been just
>>>>>about 4 years since the 2000 restructuring took effect...
>
>>>>>>>The term "caste" isn't really accurate, though. "Caste" is something a
>>>>>>>person is born into and cannot escape, regardless of personal
>>>>>>>accomplishment. "Class"
>>>>>>>would be more accurate, because upward mobility is possible.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The term caste is used mainly for the class aspect, not based on the
>>>>>>religion aspect. Evil Extra's being reincarnated as CB'ers comes to
>>>>>>mind! ;^)
>>>>>
>>>>>Very bad karma!
>>>>>
>>>>>Point is, however, that "caste" implies something that a person cannot
>>>>>change. That's simply not true of the situation we're describing.
>
>>>>>>>The limitations on homebrewing and final voltage proposed by NCVEC are
>>>>>>>unenforceable, pointless and would cut off Communicators from an
>>>>>>important part of amateur radio for no justifiable reason.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Agreed 100 percent!
>>>>>
>>>>>This is a prime difference between the ARRL and NCVEC proposals. And it
>>>>>must be opposed. No good can come of such requirements.
>>>>
>>>> And How!
>>
>>>They're open for comments now.
>>
>>
>> Yup,
>
>
> Once you take the really bad stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind up with
> the ARRL proposal.

Which still doesn't float my boat.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1911. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 23:14:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <_vudnXjkOfUql_vdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89975

William wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>
>> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
>
>
> I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
> acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
> Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
>
> We only
>
>>need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone and
>>one on the radio...
>
>
> How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?

I press 911 on my HT.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1912. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 23:25:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327182526.01536.00000218@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 89976

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 3/27/2004 12:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327135940.20806.00000025@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040327104859.18619.00000158@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>I though you plonked me, kind sir?
>>
>>You expected him to acutally DO what he said?
>
>Hope springs eternal.
>>
>>The 'old timers' here are still waiting for him to get his "Extra Lite
>>out of the box".
>>
>> The box has been open for three years now.
>>
>Four years, two months and eight days as of today, actually.

Ooooooops...so it is.

I stand corrected. Time flies while having fun.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1913. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-27 23:29:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040327182959.01536.00000219@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 89977

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>

>But with Brittany Spears in your lap, all you can think about is Len's
>testicles and my testicles?
>
>Definitely nuts.
>
>> Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a
>fool
>> out of yourself...again...?
>
>Exactly what are you squeezing, Steve?
>
>Whatever it is, keep it away from me and quit being so gay.

You're the one who keeps signing posts "nuts" yet you accumse me opf being
gay.

Now that's cute.

And the ONLY way I think of your "testicles" (I think we can call them
that, as small as they must be) is in the provrbial vise.

And they obviously ARE being squeezed, because you keep hollering at me.

Sucks to be you, I guess.

Steve, K4YZ

1914. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 00:58:35 UTC
From: Martin <admin@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <c4593i$ev5$1$8300dec7@news.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 89978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> BPL is the most evil thing to come along since communism!
>
Honestly was Marx that bad ?
I now his brothers made bad films but really communism Vs BPL !

1915. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 01:22:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RuGdnV_DbdB6tfvdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89979

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>>In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>
> Sohl"
>
>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>
> <SNIP of lots of stuff we agree on....
>
>>>Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
>>>a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
>>>with which I agree.
>>
>>When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind
>
> up
>
>>with the ARRL proposal.
>
>
> Great observation.
>
>
>>>>And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
>>>
>>>bad.
>>>
>>>>Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
>>>>C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
>>>
>>>I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
>>>tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
>>>2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
>>>a separately scored subsection with a passing score required
>>>in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
>>>have agreed on for a long time.

>>
>>Exactly. Will be in my comments.
>
>
> More agreement....wow, we're on a roll.
>
>
>>>One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
>>>privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart
>>>being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
>>>questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
>>>class.
>>
>>Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such a
>
> chart
>
>>available, it needs to be tested.
>
>
> Let me ask you a specific question: Do you know
> (i.e. memorized) all the oiperating priveleges for your
> own license class and modes allowed for every band?

I keep "the Chart" at every rig I use. I'd be more than willing to
sacrifice every band edge question on the test for more pertinent
questions.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1916. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 01:31:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <P7-dnTPu-q57t_vdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 89980

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Kwh9c.2173$yN6.2162@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>news:20040327085806.03943.00000025@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <C4Y8c.1416$yN6.1318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>
>>Sohl"
>>
>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>
>><SNIP of lots of stuff we agree on....
>>
>>>>Well certain aspects certainly are. There are, however,
>>>>a number of identical proposals in NCVEC to the ARRL
>>>>with which I agree.
>>>
>>>When you take the *really* dumb stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind
>>>up with the ARRL proposal.
>>
>>Great observation.
>>
>
> Thank you.
>
>
>>>>>And I think it is also insulting toward the lowest license class.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>The "signed statement" thing of the NCVEC proposal is really, really
>>>>>>bad.
>>>>>
>>>>>Just like the weird thing I was supposed to sign when I bought that
>>>>>C.B. rig right about the time they gave up on licensing.
>>>>
>>>>I agree also. I would favor three aspects to the Novice (and all other
>>>>tets too): 1 - Some basic electrical/electronic/RF knowledge,
>>>>2 - Safety knowledge and 3 - Rules/regs. Each part should be
>>>>a separately scored subsection with a passing score required

>>>>in each subsection. This is a point I think Jim N2EY and I
>>>>have agreed on for a long time.
>>>
>>>Exactly. Will be in my comments.
>>
>>More agreement....wow, we're on a roll.
>
>
> I've always said that, on policy issues, we agree on much more than we
> disagree.
>
>
>>>>One aspect of the rules/regs questions could deal with operating
>>>>privileges...BUT I'd suggest that be done with a frequency chart
>>>>being provided to each test taker to then use to answer specific
>>>>questions. I see no need to memorize band slots by license
>>>>class.
>
>
>>>Since it cannot be guaranteed that every license would always have such a
>>>chart available, it needs to be tested.
>>
>>Let me ask you a specific question: Do you know
>>(i.e. memorized) all the oiperating priveleges for your
>>own license class and modes allowed for every band?
>
>
> Sure. But that's just me.
>
> Please understand that I'm *not* saying that subbands should be a go/nogo test
> element. They're just one small part of the regs, and should not be over- or
> under-emphasized.
>
>>>>I sure couldn't parrot what the exclusive Extra sub-bands are
>>>>for HF if I was asked.
>>>
>>>But as an Extra, you don't *need* to know that, Bill! You just need to
>>>know the band and mode subband limits..
>>
>>As above, have you memorized them all?
>>
>
> Sure. Just like Ohm's Law and such. In fact I regularly take practice exams
> online just to make sure I'm up on the current rules.
>
> To make it more of a sporting course, I don't allow myself a calculator or even
> scratch paper. One time I passed the Extra in seven minutes thirty seconds just
> to see if I could.
>
>

>>>>Better to know the person can read
>>>>and use the frequency chart because it does change over time.
>>>
>>>See above.
>>
>>We disagreee then on that.
>
>
> The main point is that if you start accepting the idea of lookup charts for the
> subbands, why not formula charts for the theory? Or a copy of Part 97?

I don't find the subband charts to be a slippery slope thing at all. I
look at them as guide or a map that I use to keep myself in the right
area. If I'm in a contest moving frequencies all over the place, they
are a good thing to look at so I'm sure I don't go where I shouldn't.

> You don't have to go down that road very far before a case is made to allow a
> copy of "Now You're Talking" or its equivalent at the exam session.

I disagree. I have charts all over my walls. Some of them are operating
aids, like my subband chart, a USA grid square map, and the PSK
suggested frequencies. Those are real time lookup tables so to speak,
and memorizing them does not make me a proper ham, like learning part 97
or safety or theory.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1917. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:25:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv9c78o.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89981

On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 21:27:17 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>As to support of ARRL petition...
>I'll let Carl speak for himself (although I believe we both agree).
>Specifically, I support the ARRL petition almost 100%.
>The ONLY aspect of the ARRL petition I disagree with is
>(as you know already) the retention of a code test for Extra.

That's where I stand as well.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1918. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:25:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv9bn6n.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89982

On 27 Mar 2004 08:05:03 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Yep, back when the agency was run by technically knowledgeable people
>>who would have laughed BPL right out the door.
>
> Those days left with Jimmy Carter's administration.

Y'know, you're right.

Until Carter got in, the Chairman was Dick Wiley, an extremely knowledgeable comm lawyer who could understand things technical without any problem and knew what the Commission was supposed to do. Very impressive.

Carter replaced him with Charlie Ferris, Tip O'Neill's bag-carrier, in a patently political payback. Ferris brought in the economists and the consumer-ists for top management and policy-setting positions and the slippery slope started.

In the Reagan-Bush_I years that followed Carter, there were a succession of lightweight Chairmen epitomized by "Madman Mark" Fowler, a comm lawyer who couldn't get a significant law partnership after he was replaced by Reed Hundt - the guy who took the field apart because he didn't understand what enforcement was all about and why the agency had to do it - when Clinton got in. Hundt was followed by Bill Kenard, whose greatest achievement was to make the spectrum auction system work. Bush_II brought us Michael Powell, the cheerleader of BPL.

And Jim wonders why I'm embarrassed ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1919. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:36:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271836.8d69e51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89983

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327182959.01536.00000219@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>
>
> >But with Brittany Spears in your lap, all you can think about is Len's
> >testicles and my testicles?
> >
> >Definitely nuts.
> >
> >> Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a
> fool
> >> out of yourself...again...?
> >
> >Exactly what are you squeezing, Steve?
> >
> >Whatever it is, keep it away from me and quit being so gay.
>
>
> You're the one who keeps signing posts "nuts" yet you accumse me opf being
> gay.

Are you in a rage? Why don't I just accuse you of being a poor typist.

> And the ONLY way I think of your "testicles" (I think we can call them
> that, as small as they must be) is in the provrbial vise.

Those darned provrbial vises.

> And they obviously ARE being squeezed, because you keep hollering at me.

Ooh, Ouch, Ooh, Ouch!

No, no, not the jumper cables.

The LPN of Torture is putting it to me. Ooh, Ouch.

hihi

You're nuts.

1920. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:37:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271837.799c2ef5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89984

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:38 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261938.4387c38e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040325090319.17909.00000060@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/24/2004 5:46 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403241546.162e3b33@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040324072124.03342.00000003@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> >> Mark isn't here anymore because he got wise when we kept re-quoting
> those
> >> things he insisted he didn't say, yet was right in front of him. In THAT
> >> regard, it was the only wise thing he ever did (ie: leave)
> >>
> >> Like I said...I don't tolerate liars. Mark was proven to be a liar.
> >> Lennie's been proven to be a lair, and now you are.
>
> >When you take a dislike to someone, you accuse them, villify them,
> >make them liars, stalk them, attack them, and start numerous smear
> >threads about them.
>
> A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the intent
> to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted, Brain.

That is correct. That would be you.

1921. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:44:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271844.4269507e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89985

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327101214.08277.00000226@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:01 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >You must understand something, Steve. "Nuts" is not a medical term,
> >> >> >is not a diagnosis, and does not need a medical license to utter.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >But you're still nuts.
> >> >>
> >> >> But you've not explained why.
> >> >
> >> >Yes I have.
> >>
> >> No, you've not....other than to say I'm "nuts" becasue I dare to
> question
> >> you.
> >
> >Question me? Is >>>THAT<<< what *#*YOU*#* Call it?!?
> >
> >Interrogation is more like it. And I've told you that time and again.
> >
> >Get a grip, man.
> >
> >That's why I think you're nuts.
>
> You think I am nuts becasue I won't let you get away with stupid
> assertions that you can't/won't back up with some valid facts.

No. Read it again (and again if you have to). I think you're nuts
because you act nuts.

> >Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
> >
> >It just isn't going to work.
> >

> >You'll never make me love Morse Code.
>
> I don't care if you ever do or not. I'd just as well keep idiots like you
> out of the narrowband parts of the spectrum.
>
> I just want you to answer "What "major role" do the unlicensed radio
> services play in "emergency comms", as you ahve suggested they do.

You tell me.

> >> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions
> about
> >> YOUR assertions.
> >
> >Yup, rumming and hiding.

> My bad on the typo, but I think you got the idea.

Dunno if I do or not.

Am I hidden well enough for you to keep from finding me?

Oh darn, you keep finding me right after I reply to you! How do you
do it?

You are so good at this, and you're nuts.

1922. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:51:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271851.3ef1fce3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89986

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327100602.08277.00000225@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:52 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >
> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
> >
> >I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
> >acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
> >Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
>
> What "90%" Brain?

Now dammit, Steve, you're the one who wanted to know why it takes a
911 operator to handle every 911 call.

See above. Retract your idiotic comment or forever be known as a
liar.

> ALL of the 9-1-1 calls get answered where I live.

Whoa! Here too.

> NOT all of the calls warrant a Code 3 response.

Do all calls warrant being answered?

> > We only
> >> need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone
> and
> >> one on the radio...
> >
> >How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>
> Hmmmmm...there are several ways.
>
> First of all is to use the autopatch if a licensed Amateur.
>
> Second is to be an authorized user of the county dispatch network (which I
> am)
>

> Third is to...never mind...I could be at this all day...

I'll bet you could. Nuts.

1923. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:53:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271853.4d0249ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89987

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<_vudnXjkOfUql_vdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >
> >
> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
> >
> >
> > I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
> > acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
> > Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
> >
> > We only
> >
> >>need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone and
> >>one on the radio...
> >
> >
> > How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>
> I press 911 on my HT.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I'll try it with my handheld before I turn in this evening.

1924. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:56:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hv9dcbp.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 89988

On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 21:20:28 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
>
>In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
>argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
>FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
>receiving stolen goods.

Not for the lack of us around whose office he lurked wanting that
action taken.....

Need we rehash this again ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1925. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 02:59:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271859.1d440e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89989

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040327161854.00150.00000025@mb-m11.aol.com>...

>
> Besides, the gunnery nurse keeps hollering "HE LIES, HE LIES!"
>

He's nuts. Pay no attention.

1926. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 03:04:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271904.77fb60d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89990

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327082309.12528.00000232@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 2:58 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040327035809.12851.00000062@mb-m06.aol.com>
> >
> >Is that your "professional" way of acknowledging your mistakes, Len?
>
> He's gone "high-tech", Jim...
>
> He's got a puppet to do his dirty work for him these days!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Oh look, its TAFKARJ and Quixoterobeson. The dynamited duo.

1927. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 03:16:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271916.751a7520@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89991

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327111914.18619.00000161@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:43 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327024528.29966.00000199@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/25/2004 6:02 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403251602.559a6f94@posting.google.com>
>
> >Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
> >suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
> >unfair.
>
> I am neither bullying you nor am being "suckered" into anything.

But you are.
>
> I am showing you to be the liar that I have claimed you to be.

What lie have I told?

> Sorry that you can't see that. It IS rather obvious.

The only thing obvious is that you're nuts. That and you behave very badly.

1928. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 03:21:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271921.2b5b0774@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89992

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040327161850.00150.00000021@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
> >suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
> >unfair.
>
> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
> god-hood.
>
> LHA / WMD

I don't know if Lee Majors can behave that badly, even if he's just
acting.

About the other one, I have no doubt.

Maybe they can do something with the "Good Cop, Bad Cop" routine, but
with ham radio instead of police work.

1929. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 03:34:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271934.38d1f232@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89993

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327112837.18619.00000163@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
> There's no "rules" here, Brain.

Actually, Steve, you couldn't be more wrong.

There are two sets of rules.

1930. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 03:35:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403271935.54b16c35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 89994

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<mNOdnTWa99agRfjdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
>
> And your call is?

Are you that stoopid?

You first. Hihi

1931. Re: Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 04:00:02 UTC
From: N0FQN <n0fqn@charter.net>
Message-ID: <106cje2319nkkac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89995

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040324215408.09636.00000035@mb-m24.aol.com...
> I am glad for this comment period with the FCC. I hope everyone will make
a
> comment, I know I am!
>
> I will be so happy to get my HF Ham access. I have tried many time to
learn
> code, without any suceess.
>
> I think it's time it was given to me.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

1932. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 04:04:30 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B9EAA06754Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89996

Keith <kilo_watt_radio@spam.cd869fed> wrote in news:106acqfbbo6k117
@corp.supernews.com:

> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 19:37:31 GMT,
> Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 09:11:05 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>>IOW, if I know my neighbor has BPL access, does my continued use of my
>>>HF amateur privileges when I know that tests show that the only HF
>>>signal that did not knock a BPL signal out was at the QRP level
>>>constitute that willful interference?
>>>
>>> I say no, but the other side has an interesting interpretation.
>>>
>>> Maybe Phil could weigh in on this one too?
>>
>> This attorney says that if you are operating within the FCC Rule
>> requirements then any interception by a system which is not intended
>> to receive those signals - be it an audio device or a BPL system -
>> is the problem of the affected system operator and not of the
>> transmitter operator or licensee.
>
> That isn't the point Phil, these emails and newsgroup posts could
> be presented to the FCC and Congress to prove that all the interference
> to BPL is intentional by ham radio operators and that the government
> should stop the hams from destroying the Internet or whatever
> argument the deep pockets of the BPL industry want to use
> to stop complaints by ham radio operators.
>
>

All I advocate is that we excercise our privileges. As Phil points out, the law is on our side. For the record, I only have a 600W linear and it doesn't even work!

From a serious angle (and you can start a new thread if you really want to play ostrich and bury your head in the sand!) we do in fact need to demonstrate what 1500 W at close proximity will do to BPL. If in fact it does wipe it out (which wouldn't be surprising, but which we don't really know for sure) then Mr Powell really does need to find that out, and sooner rather than later. It can't do us the least bit of good for the FCC to discover that only after BPL has been rolled out nationwide. Intervening to bring those circumstances about before that is not intentional interference, at least not from a legal point of view. The right word for it is testing.

1933. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 04:05:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <NJ-dnVffWrf2yfvdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 89999

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<mNOdnTWa99agRfjdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>And your call is?
>
>
> Are you that stoopid?
>
> You first. Hihi

And you wrote: > Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a
verifiable call
> sign your claims just cannot be believed.

So in the absence of a verifiable call sign (yours) your claims just
cannot be believed.

1934. Re: Morse Code is evil!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 04:06:23 UTC
From: N0FQN <n0fqn@charter.net>
Message-ID: <106cjpu6m3sm4a2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 89997

Ham radio was never intended for eveyone. Yet, today everyone wants it to conform to thier wishes. Of course I don't give much creedence to the "new" testing scheme. You can flash card an idiot and they can pass any exam. The commercial radiotelephone license has been this way since the 70s that I know of. Of course all testing has been prosituted in the name of "convience".

73 Dan N0FQN
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040324215408.09636.00000035@mb-m24.aol.com...
> I am glad for this comment period with the FCC. I hope everyone will make a
> comment, I know I am!
>
> I will be so happy to get my HF Ham access. I have tried many time to learn
> code, without any suceess.
>
> I think it's time it was given to me.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

1935. Re: Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 04:14:27 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94B9EC501F21Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 89998

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
news:Jn2dnSISMaf8CfjdUSdV9g@ptd.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94B83B077C4Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> What's irresponsible about excercising our privileges on our
>> frequencies. How could it be jamming when BPL isn't a radio
>> transmission? I have not and would never advocate jamming.
>
> Alun,
>
> I did not suggest that *you* were advocating operations designed to
> intentionally disrupt BPL.
>
> However, I have seem some comments that, if they don't outright
> advocate it, come so close
> that the BPL spin doctors could clearly make them look so.
>
> We do have a right to use our frequencies in legitimate ways that our
> licenses permit.
>
> All I am saying is that discussing - even if in jest - operations
> designed specifically to disrupt
> BPL are a VERY bad idea and will harm our cause.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>
>

I disagree. I consider it to be valid testing. The ARRL has been active in looking at what would be radiated by UPL, but those who propose it don't care about that. If, OTOH, it can be shown that BPL falls over when exposed to licenced services, they will care about that. Our position is stronger now than it would be with millions of entrenched BPL users in place.

1936. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004545.12501.00006981@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90051

In article <1e4e3692.0403271934.38d1f232@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327112837.18619.00000163@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>>
>> There's no "rules" here, Brain.
>
>Actually, Steve, you couldn't be more wrong.
>
>There are two sets of rules.

Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler... :-)

LHA / WMD

1937. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90055

In article <NJ-dnVffWrf2yfvdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>William wrote:
>> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<mNOdnTWa99agRfjdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
>>
>>>And your call is?
>>
>> Are you that stoopid?
>>
>> You first. Hihi
>
>And you wrote: > Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a
>verifiable call
>> sign your claims just cannot be believed.
>
>So in the absence of a verifiable call sign (yours) your claims just
>cannot be believed.

Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?

Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta

Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.

Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.

You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.

Plank

LHA / WMD

1938. Re: Wall Street Journal: Obsolescent, quirky hams oppose BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004546.12501.00006982@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90000

In article <1e4e3692.0403271352.5a6230fc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327095624.08277.00000223@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>>
>> Steven J Roeson, LPN
>
>Steve who?

I guess the quote should now read "float like a madam butterfly,
sting like a spelling."

He need B ware.

LHA / WMD

1939. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004547.12501.00006984@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90052

In article <1e4e3692.0403271859.1d440e4@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040327161854.00150.00000025@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>> Besides, the gunnery nurse keeps hollering "HE LIES, HE LIES!"
>
>He's nuts. Pay no attention.

I don't...but it's like QRM, there, noisy, with no intelligence content
and it distracts from real discussions. :-)

LHA / WMD

1940. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004547.12501.00006983@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90054

In article <1e4e3692.0403271921.2b5b0774@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040327161850.00150.00000021@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0403270743.4fd462f7@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Poor, Steve. The RRAP Bully now thinks he's being picked on and
>> >suckered into looking foolish and behaving badly. It's just so very
>> >unfair.
>>
>> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
>> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
>> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
>> god-hood.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I don't know if Lee Majors can behave that badly, even if he's just
>acting.
>
>About the other one, I have no doubt.
>
>Maybe they can do something with the "Good Cop, Bad Cop" routine, but
>with ham radio instead of police work.

Rumor has it that it will premiere on the Garden Channel as
"Lawn Order, SVU (Special VTC Unit)." Variety and Hollywood
Reporter newspapers aren't talking...it might be a "Shield" spin-
off with the gunnery nurse as another Mackey (they are waiting
for the hair loss to be complete).

I'll ask around...

LHA / WMD

1941. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:45:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328004548.12501.00006985@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90053

In article <1e4e3692.0403271853.4d0249ea@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<_vudnXjkOfUql_vdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
>> William wrote:
>>
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
>> >
>> > I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
>> > acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
>> > Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
>> >
>> > We only
>> >
>> >>need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone
>and
>> >>one on the radio...
>> >
>> > How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>>
>> I press 911 on my HT.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>I'll try it with my handheld before I turn in this evening.

I think Mike needs to consult one of his many charts. He seems
to be confusing his HT with his cell phone. :-)

LHA / WMD

1942. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 05:50:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <406667B8.5EE71F59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 90056

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
> an dancin, eatin watermelon...

What's it to you? You're some guy standing on the sidewalk, watching
the bus go by.

Dave K8MN

1943. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 07:05:43 UTC
From: reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com>
Message-ID: <bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90057
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> by 2007.

Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot Act II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a population as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter after all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells them to.

1944. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 08:22:49 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c4620h$2emt0c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90058

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> >"Len Over 21" wrote ...
> >
> >> >Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics
> >> >anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies
> >> >heavily on commercially available gear.
> >>
> >> Are you sleeping on your COTS?
> >>
> >> >The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone.
> >>
> >> Bravo Sierra. Those are still here. So are Military
Specifications,
> >> abbreviated "Mil Spec" among those of us who still have to use
> >> them.
> >
> >The Bravo Sierra is yours, Leonard. Since you don't actually work with
the
> >military anymore, you are forced to search things out on the net and hope
> >they are up to date.
>
> Actually, I'm working for a company that is contracting to another
> company who has a contract to supply electronics for the DoD.
> Not full time. But the MIL STDs of many kinds are in both places
> with many different dash number "Mil Specs" called out.
>

Then you should know that if the product (or service) cannot be obtained
commercially, even the components should be commercial or adapted for
military use. As you know, many "commercial" products already meet or
exceed what we would commonly refer to as Milspec.

> Note: "Mil Specs" is an old term for MILITARY STANDARDS of
> many kinds, informal. They have all sorts of effective dates to
> them but I'm trusting another to keep them all current and also do
> all the bookkeeping on checking document call-outs, to see we
> all have the standard specified on-hand.
>
> >OTOH, I work IN the system and understand how it
> >ACTUALLY is quite well.
>
> Okay, tell us which ring at the Pentagon your office is located and
> I may get a chance to look you up...
>

> >I quoted from the FAR and you still sit there and
> >argue with me. What part of FACT don't you get?
>
> My organization didn't get that particular document so I can't
> verify it. :-)
>

The FAR is the Federal Aquisition Regulation (15 and 42) and the DFAR is the defense version. If you are a contractor and or sub-contractor on a government contract, you are required to be familiar with it. Seriously, you might want to tell your employer to supply you a copy since you and I both are bound by what it says.

> I'm sure that you need only imply you always tell the truth
> in here and that is the Final Word. :-)
>
> >> Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.
>
> COTS = Commercial Off The Shelf.

I'm quite familiar with the term COTS. I didn't respond because it was a moronic question to ask someone who works in the system.
>
> Been around for over a decade now. It applies to specialized things
> such as the three principal ICs found in the R/T for the AN/PRC-119.
> ITT and GD make a quarter million of those sets between 1989 and
> 2003. It's the standard small-unit (battalion and down) radio for U.S.
> military land forces.
>
>
> >> >COR on a 6 million dollar contract.
> >>
> >> Wow, the "Six Million Dollar Ham!" "...We have the technology, we
> >> can rebuild Arnie..." Cut to promo, voice-over "Coming to your
> >> favorite channel any day now...!", up exciting music bkgd, take
> >> title...
> >
> >Say what you want, but I have the EXPERIENCE with the contract and KNOW
>what
> I'm talking about. All you have is an internet search tool, and "Old"
> >knowledge concerning how the aquisition system works.
>
> Righto, Col. Steve Austin, your bionics make you superior everywhere.
>
> "Millions" in contract awards have been awarded since WW2. The
> dollar amounts, normalized for the COLA, serve only to indicate the
> size of a particular project. That's a manager and bean-counter
> thing; us folks with the dirtier hands concentrate on the works of a
> project in order to fulfill a contract.

And as the COR, I make sure that you do.

The COR (Contract Officer Representative or COTR (technical added)) IS the
person in the weeds, Leonard. We surveille, inspect, rate, and coordinate
with the contractor concerning every aspect of the contract for the CO. The
6 million dollar contract (for which I am still the COR) extends over a
period of 2 years. We are only 3 months into it at this point, and have
just completed our first quarterly performance rating for them. They did
quite well.
>
>
> >New stuff, Leonard. Doesn't even remotely resemble what you did in 1955.
I
> >gave you the web site to research. What, did the BIG words stump you?
>
> "BIG" is also an acronym now? [what will they think of next?]
>
> Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious? Antidisestablishmentarianism?
>
> I'm working with HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP devices. For radio
> purposes...and some of that will bleed over to WiFax, one of the
> IEEE 802 standard systems for broadband (it ain't "Wi-Fi" but one
> of the families within the standard). DoD will own the plans per
> terms of the overall contract, but the techniques and notebook
> data aren't owned by da gubmint.

I bet you a dollar to a donut that the military specific application of that
technology is quite proprietary.
>
> Now you shoulder your FAR away VTC and bravely defend the
> Homeland Security by shouting and hollering your magnificence
> in this newsgrope. That means all of us on the project can
> finish and get final payment.
>
> >You don't have the brain power to have any ammo of consequence, Leonard.
>
> Whatever you say, Steve Austin. :-)
>
> You are the one with morse code expertise and the bionic VTC.
>
> We will all sleep safely on our COTS at night knowing the USA is
> guarded by such knowledgeable superiors.
>

Actually, yes you will.

1945. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 08:25:31 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c4625j$2drtkf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90059

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
> god-hood.
>

I just have to laugh. This very same technology that you make fun of (I presume because you don''t have a clue) is the same technology that might very well save your butt some day.

Arnie -

1946. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 12:52:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <p5mdnYx_97ACVvvdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> > by 2007.
>
> Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
Act
> II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
population
> as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
after
> all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
them
> to.
>

Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even via a
wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used alone,
means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).

I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1947. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 12:58:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328075832.03825.00000037@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90061

In article <_vudnXnkOfUrlPvdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>Those people are as shortsighted as the people proposing the "no
>>>homebrew" rules. Your wording "avocation" is the proper term AFAIAC. I
>>>practive my "hamliness" that way. Is it a hobby to work with disaster
>>>preparedness teams? If so we are the only ones classed that way in the
>>>group. Is it a hobby to be a part of the Skywarn system? Is it a hobby
>>>to volunteer time for public events such as the NYC or LA marathons, or
>>>bike races or local charity events?

>> Of course it isn't. And that's why some people deny that hams are a
>> significant part of such activities.

>I have letters attesting that those people are wrong. I have experience
>with a group trying to replace us with cell phones and failing at it.
>The list goes on and on!

Of course! But some people just don't like facts.

>>>DO some hams practice this as a hobby? Sure. But that doesn't make it a
>>>hobby. In the overall, it is a service.

>> Or to put it another way, it's a nonprofit, volunteer activity.

>> Yet we have power limits on *all* hams in certain subbands today.
>
>Of course! if there are no limits, then we'll have a few hams trying to
>use broadcast station powers.

"Tetrode with handles", anyone?

>> Actually, you have just expressed the fundamental image problem that
>> Amateur Radio faces in the 21st century. Many people, including some hams,
>> don't really "get" what Amateur Radio is all about.
>>
>> Here's my definition:
>>
>> Amateur Radio is fundamentally about radio as an end in itself, rather than
>> as a means to another end.
>>
>> Otherwise, might as well use a cell phone or email.

>>>>The point of license testing is not to protect someone from their own
>>>>ignorance, but to protect others from it.
>>>
>>> Mostly, but RF safety is one exception. The danegrs of high power RF

>>>and High voltages in general is mostly a danger to the operator.
>
>> I disagree in part. The danger of RF exposure is to anyone in the RF field.

> Yes, but that old inverse square law coupled with the hidh voltages
>being on the equipment that the ham operates means that they are the
>most likely to suffer harm.

In the case of RF, it's distance to the antenna. Which may be closer to a neighbor than the ham himself. PArticularly at VHF/UHF where the gain of even a "small" directional array can be over 10 dB. Pump, say, 500 W into a 432 MHz array with 16 dB gain...
>
>>>>>Just like cigarette smokers.
>>
>>>>Cigarette smoking is much more hazardous than RF.
>>>
>>> Sure, but you do know what my point is, don't you?
>>
>> Not really. There's no safe nonzero exposure level to cigarette smoking.
>
> Wrong part to make the analogy from. A long time ago when I originally
>made the analogy, I was addressing the 'guvmint's proponsity for
>protecting us from ourselves.

Oh, OK.

Is that really a bad thing, in the case of cigarettes? The data clearly shows the health effects. And remember that those health care costs wind up being paid by all of us, in a variety of ways. Smokers and nonsmokers don't pay different Medicare/Medicaid taxes nor get different benefits. Etc.

OTOH, there was a report from some Eastern European country (Czech?) a while back that touched off a bit of a scandal. Said that smoking was actually *good* for their benefits system because, while it raised the health care costs, it also reduced the life expectancy so much that the reduction in old-age pension payments more than compensated. Of course their health care costs are much lower than in the USA.

>>> Of course that's me. Does it make as much sense as *protecting* the
>>>newbies from High power RF by not allowing them high power, as compared
>>>to the alternative of giving them the knowledge?
>>
>> It makes more sense to me that new hams have a sampling of all bands (I'd
>> give them a lot more HF/MF than bits of 80/40/15/10) than to restrict HF and
>> allow full power at "meat cooking frequencies" (tip of the hat to WK3C for
that
>> phrase)
>
> I cooked a little bit of meat on my finger one day with somewhere
>around 50 watts power. People concerned with this should collect stamps.
>My point is that 50 watts can hurt you, so if you are worried about

>safety, you better lower it below that, and not cap it at 100.

Point is that the hazard from 1500 W is much greater.
>
>Safety note addendum:
> I just read the part of the ARRL 2003 handbook regarding RF and
>electrical safety. Those who want to limit the voltages on the finals
>better lower that nomber to 24 volts. Chapter 9 page 19 is my reference.

bwaahaahaa

>After all they only have safety in mind, gotta protect the newbies!

>> Which do you think is more common: hams on HF or hams running high >> power?
>
>Of corse there are more hams on HF.

There ya go!

>>>Depends. Our local club repeater is pretty busy most of the time. Others
>>>aren't so busy. I know I've been given a lecture on occasion while
>>>traveling by some disgruntled ham when I've called that I'm listening
>>>and he comes back with "This is a private repeater - don't use it any
>>>more". No mention of the private repeater in the book. Who the heck is
>>>going to use that!
>>
>> Funny, I've never run into that. If someone told me a repeate was private,
>> I'd simply say it's not in the book and try a different freq.
>
>Sure, and that's what I did. My point is that just because you don't
>hear anyone on it doesn't mean there aren't hams that "might" use it.
>
Ah.

>>>>>It also makes for less of a class system.
>>>
>>>>Go down that road far enough, and you'll have a one class system.
>>>
>>>I don't propose that, but even THAT is better than what the NCVEC proposes.
>>
>> I almost have to agree.
>
>As long as it isn't the debacle they propose to foist upon the newbies!
>
Hans is just biding his time, waiting for the right moment...

>>>>>If the Tech has
>>>>>the power and privileges for their respective bands, and they are happy
>>>>>there, then it's a great thing.
>>>>
>>>>Seems to me that it would make more sense to offer a wider sampling.
>>
>> Also, if they were happy with it, would there be so many petitions and

>> arguments?
>
>I don't know that any of these petitions are sponsored by Technicians
>or Novices. Seems to me that this started when the requirement for
>Element 1 testing was made voluntary, and all the worms started crawling
>out of the woodwork so to speak.

Whatever the cause, you can see the "slippery slope" effect. Remember when I pointed out how the anticode arguments could be used against much of the writtens? Well, here we are with a major proposal that wants to dump a significant part of the writtens because they're allegedly "too hard"...
>
> All the proposals were made by Extras, AFAIK.
>
There you have it!

>> Once you take the really bad stuff out of the NCVEC proposal, you wind up
>> with the ARRL proposal.
>
> Which still doesn't float my boat.
>
Lesser of two evils?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1948. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 13:42:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
>>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
>>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
>>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
>>>by 2007.
>>
>>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
>
> Act
>
>>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
>>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
>>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
>
> population
>
>>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
>
> after
>
>>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
>>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
>
> them
>
>>to.
>>
>
>
> Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even via a
> wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used alone,
> means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
>
> I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.

As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives, I wonder how
this will be funded? There are large parts of the country that will
require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1949. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 13:49:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <J9adnQGi-P2YRfvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90063

If a ham punches in 911 on his or her HT on our local repeater system,
the call will indeed be patched into the local 911 center.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1950. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 13:58:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328085836.04942.00000076@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90065

In article <40643B89.3030405@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>> On 25 Mar 2004 09:13:23 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
>>>interference is to be mitigated.
>>
>>
>> That's because there are less and less "old timers" on the staff who
>> know how to chase down and evaluate such interference and a general
>> reluctance of the non-field people to shut someone off the air
>> because of same.
>>
>> The long slippery slope started when the agency started privatizing
>> things such as frequency coordination and interference resolution in
>> the mid 1980s.......
>>
>> It wouldn't surprise me at all if the old standard of Part 15
>> devices having to tolerate interception of lawful signals gets
>> thrown in the trashcan. That's what having policy set on
>> less-than-technically-knowlegeable grounds can result in. It's the
>> equivalent of ordering that all antennas be installed underground
>> to preserve aesthetic standards.
>
>
> There would almost have to be a exemption specifically for BPL access,
>because if the whole of part 15 was chucked, then the part 15 devices
>would be able to interfere with each other, but nothing could be done
>about it.

Isn't that the case now? If my computer monitor interferes with my cordless
phone, can I insist that FCC fix the problem? Just try!
>
> All the things that can radiate in the HF spectrum and interfere with
>or be interfered with by BPL are a large list. And if part 15 is gone,
>then they won't have to worry about RFI protection in design any more so
>the list will grow...

But will a device that meets Part 15 "30 meter" specifications interfere with
BPL? I don't think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

1951. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 13:58:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328085837.04942.00000077@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90064

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv5e1i6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 25 Mar 2004 09:13:23 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>>I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
>>interference is to be mitigated.
>
> That's because there are less and less "old timers" on the staff who
> know how to chase down and evaluate such interference and a general
> reluctance of the non-field people to shut someone off the air
> because of same.

Uh-oh...
>
> The long slippery slope started when the agency started privatizing
> things such as frequency coordination and interference resolution in
> the mid 1980s.......

"Getting the government off our backs"...

> It wouldn't surprise me at all if the old standard of Part 15
> devices having to tolerate interception of lawful signals gets
> thrown in the trashcan. That's what having policy set on
> less-than-technically-knowlegeable grounds can result in. It's the
> equivalent of ordering that all antennas be installed underground
> to preserve aesthetic standards.
>
And even if BPL is not deployed on a wide scale, setting that precedent makes
the *next* battle that much less winnable.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1952. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:01:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328090156.18008.00000508@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90066

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327161848.00150.00000018@mb-m11.aol.com>

> Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
> an dancin, eatin watermelon...

Again with racial epithets.

What a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1953. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:04:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328090421.18008.00000509@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90067

>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327161849.00150.00000019@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>In article <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>>I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over the
>>NCVEC plan for a number of reasons.
>
> Right. You are already an Extra and none of your amateur privileges
> will be changed by any of the 4 new proposals. Not to worry.

Amateurs thought that once before...remember...!??!

In any case, any changes to Amateur Radio Service rules or regulations
>>DO<< affect >>ANY<< licensee, regardless of class or years licensed.

> But, only the NCVEC petition calls for total elimination of the morse
> code test. How does that square with the NCI position on code?

Why does it matter to you?

You are not an Amateur Radio licesee and anything that DOES happen will
not affect you in ANY case...

Steve, K4YZ

1954. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:07:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328090712.18008.00000510@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90068

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040327161850.00150.00000020@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040327035809.12851.00000061@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>You've waved your "professional" credentials here innumerable times, but you
>>can't tell us how to convince FCC of something that's blaringly obvious to
>>even us poor dumb amateurs.
>
> I'm sorry to hear you have such a low self-image.
>
> You can't bolster that low self-image by attempting to force others
> into answering your questions...those usually a set-up for an
> expected reply...
>
> But, on the thread SUBJECT...the FCC cannot directly stop Access
> BPL. It doesn't have the direct legal authority to do so. All the FCC
> can do right now is to set standards on the levels of incidental RF
> radiation from an Access BPL system. That is what NPRM 04-29
> is all about.

Sure it can.

The second a complaint is filed by an FCC licensee they ahve the authority
to stop it.

> So far, literally thousands of amateurs have complained bitterly
> about Access BPL to the FCC on proceedings 03-104, 04-37,
> and 04-29. They've demanded that the FCC "stop" it. The FCC
> cannot "stop" it. All the FCC can do is set standards for incidental
> RF radiation from Access BPL systems. Very, very few, if any,
> amateurs have suggested ANY levels of such RF radiation limits
> other than zero as in stopping Access BPL entirely.

Sure they can "stop it".

Steve, K4YZ

1955. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:10:19 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <f1B9c.29671$tY6.876648@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 90069
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com...

>
> As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives, I wonder how
> this will be funded?

We could always borrow the money. Foriegn banks are just bursting with
American cash, due to our industrial trade imbalance.

> There are large parts of the country that will
> require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

If we buy foriegn made fiber cable, we can borrow the money back to pay the
rest of the bills. This could be "self-funding".

Frank Dresser

1956. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:10:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328091052.18008.00000511@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90070

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328004548.12501.00006985@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403271853.4d0249ea@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:<_vudnXjkOfUql_vdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
>>> William wrote:
>>>
>>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...

>>> > How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>>>
>>> I press 911 on my HT.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>I'll try it with my handheld before I turn in this evening.
>
> I think Mike needs to consult one of his many charts. He seems
> to be confusing his HT with his cell phone.

I think Lennie is making more assinine statements without the knowledge to back it up.

One of the repeaters in my area also responds directly to a 9-1-1 input on DTMF. No other "access tones" or anything else necessary...Of course you get the 9-1-1 operator for that prefix, but it's a 10 second delay awaiting the hand-off.

Once again, Lennie.......

Ya PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

1957. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:16:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328091628.18008.00000512@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90071

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271851.3ef1fce3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327100602.08277.00000225@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:52 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
>> >
>> >I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
>> >acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
>> >Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
>>
>> What "90%" Brain?
>
>Now dammit, Steve, you're the one who wanted to know why it takes a
>911 operator to handle every 911 call.

That's not what you wrote, Brain.

Shall I back up a couple posts, RE-POST what was written, and ONCE AGAIN have two-weeks worth of your newsgroup excrement in which to rub YOUR nose...?!?!

>See above. Retract your idiotic comment or forever be known as a
>liar.

Best back up, PuppetBoy. If I re-post the complete, IN-CONTEXT post, you're gonna look stupid...AGAIN...

>> ALL of the 9-1-1 calls get answered where I live.
>
>Whoa! Here too.

Glad to hear it. Ohio always has had a great emergency response reputation, even before 9-1-1 was implemented.

>> NOT all of the calls warrant a Code 3 response.
>
>Do all calls warrant being answered?

Did I say otherwise...?!?! If so, please cite the post wherein I did say otherwise.

>> > We only
>> >> need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone
>> and
>> >> one on the radio...
>> >
>> >How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>>
>> Hmmmmm...there are several ways.
>>
>> First of all is to use the autopatch if a licensed Amateur.
>>
>> Second is to be an authorized user of the county dispatch network
>(which I
>> am)
>>
>> Third is to...never mind...I could be at this all day...
>
>I'll bet you could. Nuts.

Yes, you are.

And you're digging yourself in deeper with every post every day.

I'd have thought you'd have learned by now.

Does your WIFE read your antics? Does she know how thoroughly you humiliate your family name?

Steve, K4YZ

1958. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:18:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328091851.18008.00000513@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90072

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271836.8d69e51@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327182959.01536.00000219@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >But with Brittany Spears in your lap, all you can think about is Len's
>> >testicles and my testicles?
>> >
>> >Definitely nuts.
>> >
>> >> Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a
>> fool
>> >> out of yourself...again...?
>> >
>> >Exactly what are you squeezing, Steve?
>> >
>> >Whatever it is, keep it away from me and quit being so gay.
>>
>>
>> You're the one who keeps signing posts "nuts" yet you accumse me opf
>being
>> gay.
>
>Are you in a rage? Why don't I just accuse you of being a poor typist.

Well well...you'd FINALLY have one right. Only took you three years,
Brain

>> And the ONLY way I think of your "testicles" (I think we can call them
>> that, as small as they must be) is in the provrbial vise.
>
>Those darned provrbial vises.

As opposed to the vices you prefer, no doubt.

>> And they obviously ARE being squeezed, because you keep hollering at
>me.
>

>Ooh, Ouch, Ooh, Ouch!
>
>No, no, not the jumper cables.
>
>The LPN of Torture is putting it to me. Ooh, Ouch.
>
>hihi
>
>You're nuts.

After reading what you just posted, Brain, who do you think would get THAT vote...?!?!

"I am laughing at the superior intellect".

Steve, K4YZ

1959. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:23:53 UTC
From: RadioGuy <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <ZdB9c.56648$PY1.1038270@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 90073
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> > by 2007.
>
> Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
Act
> II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
population
> as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
after
> all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
them
> to.

Hardly... I see broadband as another step toward Total Information Access...

RG

1960. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:23:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328092357.18008.00000514@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90074

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271837.799c2ef5@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>...

>> A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the
>intent
>> to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted, Brain.
>
>That is correct. That would be you.

Nope.

So far, other than correctly pointing out that I make occassional typos,
you've not been able to successfully disprove anything I've claimed about you.

It's not a "smear" if it's true. So far you've not produced anything that
would validate anything YOU have said, nor have you produced anything that
would DISprove anything I have said.

Sucks to be you, PuppetBoy.

Steve, K4YZ

1961. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:26:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IgB9c.3230$yN6.2814@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90075

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hv9dcbp.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 21:20:28 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
> > >
> > >In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
> > >argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
> > >FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
> > >receiving stolen goods.
> >
> > Not for the lack of us around whose office he lurked wanting that
> > action taken.....
> >
> > Need we rehash this again ??

What for...by your own statements you admit nothing
was done by the FCC? The fact that one or more
FCC attorneys may have wanted action taken doesn't
validate anything other than those FCC folks that
wanted action couldn't convince their management
that the case either had merit or was worth the time
and expense.
.
All the academic discussion of what may have been
the legal outcome had Bash been challenged means
nothing in the end.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1962. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:30:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328093019.18008.00000515@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90076

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/27/2004 8:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271844.4269507e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327101214.08277.00000226@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:01 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>

>> You think I am nuts becasue I won't let you get away with stupid
>> assertions that you can't/won't back up with some valid facts.
>
>No. Read it again (and again if you have to). I think you're nuts
>because you act nuts.

I've read it thoroughly. Repeatedly, even.

Again, the onlything "nuts" I see in >>MY<< behaviour is demonstrating any
expectation that YOU would actually do any of the things asked of you.

THAT is nuts.

>> >Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
>> >
>> >It just isn't going to work.
>> >
>> >You'll never make me love Morse Code.
>>
>> I don't care if you ever do or not. I'd just as well keep idiots like
>you
>> out of the narrowband parts of the spectrum.
>>
>> I just want you to answer "What "major role" do the unlicensed radio
>> services play in "emergency comms", as you have suggested they do.
>
>You tell me.

It's not my assertion, Brain. I KNOW what "major role" they play...None. YOU made the assertion they did. You were wrong. That was simple enough to admit. But then you LIED about having said it. THAT was foolish.

And I am wondering WHERE you "saw" me with "jumper cables and "sodium penethol", Brain? Hallucinations ARE evidence of being delusional, what the "lay" person WOULD call "nuts".

>> >> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions
>> about
>> >> YOUR assertions.
>> >
>> >Yup, rumming and hiding.
>
>> My bad on the typo, but I think you got the idea.
>
>Dunno if I do or not.

Lack of situational awareness. Another symptom of possible delusional circumstances.

>Am I hidden well enough for you to keep from finding me?

Nope.

>Oh darn, you keep finding me right after I reply to you! How do you
>do it?

I follow the stench.

>You are so good at this, and you're nuts.

I follow the brown streak and you wish I was...

Sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

1963. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:34:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328093412.18008.00000516@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90077

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328004547.12501.00006984@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403271859.1d440e4@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040327161854.00150.00000025@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>>> Besides, the gunnery nurse keeps hollering "HE LIES, HE LIES!"
>>
>>He's nuts. Pay no attention.
>
> I don't...but it's like QRM, there, noisy, with no intelligence content
> and it distracts from real discussions.

In the last four years, I have seen you post exactly THREE posts that I would classify as "real discussions", Lennie. The last one being this past week on the importance of filing comments with the FCC on BPL.

The rest are your ususal smatterings of rhetorical antagonism, spiced with profanity and "personal perjorative".

Same Putzy Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

1964. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:37:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328093710.18008.00000517@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90078

>ubject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: "Arnie Macy" kt4stnospam@csam.net
>Date: 3/28/2004 2:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c4625j$2drtkf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
>
>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
>> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
>> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
>> god-hood.
>>
>
>I just have to laugh. This very same technology that you make fun of (I
>presume because you don''t have a clue) is the same technology that might
>very well save your butt some day.

Actually, I hope one of them has an AMI while I am near...Wouldn't THAT be ironic!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1965. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:43:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90079

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <NJ-dnVffWrf2yfvdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>writes:

>>So in the absence of a verifiable call sign (yours) your claims just
>>cannot be believed.
>
> Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
>
> Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
>
> Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
>
> Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.

I wonder, Lennie...In as much as you are not a licensee, HOW were you able to ascertain that Brain is a "good ham"...?!?!

The only way to know for sure is to "work" him on the air.

And based upon his avowed "padawan" status to you and his obvious inability to tell the truth, I'd be reeeeeeeeeeeal shy about stating how "independent" a "thinker" he is. So far he's got the Lennie-the-Liar program down to a science.

> You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.

Let's change one or two letters and see if we can come up with one about LENNIE.....

You (s)houldn't be (s)uch a (s)tinker.

Yep! It worked!

Steve, K4YZ

1966. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 14:54:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403280654.4ed44bc5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90080

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<NJ-dnVffWrf2yfvdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>...
> William wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<mNOdnTWa99agRfjdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>And your call is?
> >
> >
> > Are you that stoopid?
> >
> > You first. Hihi
>
> And you wrote: > Sorry to disappoint you, JJ, but in the absence of a
> verifiable call
> > sign your claims just cannot be believed.
>
> So in the absence of a verifiable call sign (yours) your claims just
> cannot be believed.

Nope. You first.

1967. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 15:06:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403280706.2e94c4a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90081

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<epudnagNXvsp5fjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403261950.6ce3c5d1@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
> > > [snip]
> > >
> > > > The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
> > > > technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
> > > > studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than
> the
> > > > much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the
> beginners
> > > > themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
> bypass
> > > > the Novice. People are strange.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > >
> > > Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much
> to
> > > the
> > > vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with
> digital
> > > modes, etc.
> > >
> > > Carl - wk3c
> >
> > I'm just amazed at how easily some can brush aside the monumental
> > waste of time learning the Morse Code and become.
> >
> > Probably someone without a job, on disability, or retired.
>
> Boy you certainly know how to jump to erroneous conclusions.

Welp, we had a sailor on here long ago who insisted that everyone else
devote as much time as it took to learn the code or stay the hell out
of ham radio.

Where did he learn the code? The Navy taught it to him while he
earned 3 hots and a cot, plus a paycheck.

I work a full
> time job, which also entails travel further limiting my time.

So did I at the time I was learning the code. Lots of frustrating
work.

Payoff? I don't use it.

I found
> learning Morse to be no more of a waste of time than studying theory.

I do. So much so that I used the description, "monumental waste of
time."

They
> both take time and both are worthwhile.

Not to me.

1968. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 15:31:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <JuqdnR0toKhsbfvdRVn-vw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> > news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> >>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> >>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> >>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> >>>by 2007.
> >>
> >>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> >
> > Act
> >
> >>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> >>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> >>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> >
> > population
> >
> >>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> >
> > after
> >
> >>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> >>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> >
> > them
> >
> >>to.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> > Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even
via a
> > wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used
alone,
> > means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
> >
> > I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
>

> As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives, I wonder how
> this will be funded? There are large parts of the country that will
> require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

The rural areas will be neglected as always. There aren't enough voters to make a difference there anyway, at least in the politician's eyes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1969. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 15:35:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <V72dnXh3xNhBbPvd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:ZdB9c.56648$PY1.1038270@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> > > by 2007.
> >
> > Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> Act
> > II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> > that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> > widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> population
> > as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> after
> > all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> > flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> them
> > to.
>
> Hardly... I see broadband as another step toward Total Information
Access...
>
> RG

Do not confuse Broadband with BPL. Broadband access can be achieved without
BPL.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1970. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 16:10:34 UTC
From: RadioGuy <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <_NC9c.57119$PY1.1048415@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 90084
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dee D. Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:V72dnXh3xNhBbPvd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>
> "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:ZdB9c.56648$PY1.1038270@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> >
> > reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> > news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > > > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > > > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet
access
> > > > by 2007.
> > >
> > > Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since
Patriot
> > Act
> > > II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol
Hill
> > > that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> > > widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> > population
> > > as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> > after
> > > all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving
their
> > > flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government
tells
> > them
> > > to.
> >
> > Hardly... I see broadband as another step toward Total Information
> Access...
> >
> > RG
>
> Do not confuse Broadband with BPL. Broadband access can be achieved
without
> BPL.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I don't... I view broadband as large quantities of data accessed in short periods of time.

RG

1971. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 16:32:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <f6D9c.3296$yN6.412@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90085
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> > news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> >>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> >>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> >>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> >>>by 2007.
> >>
> >>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> >
> > Act
> >
> >>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> >>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> >>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> >
> > population
> >
> >>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> >
> > after
> >
> >>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> >>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> >
> > them
> >
> >>to.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> > Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even
via a
> > wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used
alone,
> > means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
> >
> > I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
>

> As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives, I wonder how
> this will be funded? There are large parts of the country that will
> require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

What really needs to be done is at the point of end of the line, simply go with RF. Works for cellular quite well. Small low power 'nodes'. Linked by fiber and/or wire. No RFI, better security, and a dang lot easier to run and keep working.

Dan/W4NTI

1972. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 16:34:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <O8D9c.3301$yN6.3165@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:ZdB9c.56648$PY1.1038270@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> > > by 2007.
> >
> > Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> Act
> > II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> > that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> > widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> population
> > as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> after
> > all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> > flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> them
> > to.
>
> Hardly... I see broadband as another step toward Total Information
Access...
>
> RG
>
>
BPL will be a god send for the FBI. All they will need to do is plug in and
listen. Probably won't even need a piece of paper. Since its all over the
HF spectrum anyway. So much for secure connections. Now do you all
understand what is REALLY going on?

Dan/W4NTI

1973. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 17:06:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BY-cnSK09-j_m_rdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90087

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Vkm9c.2452$yN6.1220@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040327115819.12851.00000072@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <e3ydnTM9AZ1oCPjdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
[snip]
> > >
> > >I've already gone on record as *personally* favoring the ARRL plan over
> the
> > >NCVEC plan for a number of reasons.
> >
> > I'll take that to mean you do not
> > support the "signed statement" idea, Carl?

Correct ... there is much about the NCVEC proposal that I don't like.

> > What's interesting about the NCVEC
> > proposal is that if you remove the "signed
> > statement" bad idea, and the "no home-
> > brew/30 volt final" bad ideas, and the
> > "additional unnecessary widening of the
> > phone bands at the expense of CW/data"
> > bad idea, and the "special beginner
> > callsign" bad idea, you wind up with a
> > proposal that's pretty darn close to the
> > ARRL one. (Yeah, I know about the 5
> > wpm for Extra thing).

I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't think
it
has a snowball's chance in hell of getting approved by the FCC.

> As to support of ARRL petition...
> I'll let Carl speak for himself (although I believe we both agree).
> Specifically, I support the ARRL petition almost 100%.
> The ONLY aspect of the ARRL petition I disagree with is
> (as you know already) the retention of a code test for Extra.

Ditto ...

> > Personally, I think many of the provisions
> > of the NCVEC proposal actually insult beginners.

Ditto ...

> I agree completely.

Ditto ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

1974. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 17:14:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040328121438.05025.00000093@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 90088

>Pervez talks, then Julie firmly opens a heavy game for Marwan's
>spring. Atiqullah! You'll pull lentils. Well, I'll irritate the
>ball. While clouds wanly learn porters, the cases often lift
>in front of the new goldsmiths. No distant bad tree rejects
>candles on Lisette's pathetic envelope. The pear for the sick
>sign is the sticker that nibbles grudgingly. We look subtly, unless
>Henry calls buttons around Catherine's potter. He'll be receiving
>beside cosmetic Hakeem until his powder dreams unbelievably. Get your
>strongly teasing tyrant in my ceiling. She may move the younger
>draper and irrigate it near its market. No sour gardners change
>Youssef, and they frantically converse Taysseer too. Do not
>comb a pumpkin! Will you help beneath the satellite, if Norma
>nearly fears the boat? My lost puddle won't join before I care it.
>He should quietly jump bizarre and climbs our dull, clever dusts
>beneath a island.
>
>I was recollecting to pour you some of my filthy tickets. Well,
>Jimmy never excuses until Ahmed wanders the blank pool virtually.
>Well, carrots answer throughout stupid cellars, unless they're
>ugly. Who will we believe after Michael arrives the smart sunshine's
>coffee? Don't seek the dryers lazily, improve them tamely. They are
>measuring among the lane now, won't play bushs later. She will
>order brave sauces, do you creep them? You won't scold me explaining
>over your durable hall. All strange wet disks will wrongly walk the
>tailors. Try covering the college's upper jug and Rifaat will
>behave you! I was shouting aches to fat Charlie, who's cleaning
>on the tag's window. Some grocers judge, expect, and depart. Others
>freely cook.
>
>Orin, through bandages active and tired, lives with it, hating
>hatefully. Kristen attempts the floor before hers and rigidly
>recommends. No hot solid frogs weakly attack as the polite ointments
>solve.

Don't look now, but this makes more sense than just about anything I've
read on this newsgroup lately!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1975. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 19:52:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90089

On Sun, 28 Mar 2004 14:26:48 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>What for...by your own statements you admit nothing
>was done by the FCC? The fact that one or more
>FCC attorneys may have wanted action taken doesn't
>validate anything other than those FCC folks that
>wanted action couldn't convince their management
>that the case either had merit or was worth the time
>and expense.
>..
>All the academic discussion of what may have been
>the legal outcome had Bash been challenged means
>nothing in the end.

Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
that the act didn't take place.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1976. Re: Ineteesting concept was Ham interference TO BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 19:52:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvaomzs.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90090

On 28 Mar 2004 04:04:30 GMT, Alun wrote:

>From a serious angle (and you can start a new thread if you really want to
>play ostrich and bury your head in the sand!) we do in fact need to
>demonstrate what 1500 W at close proximity will do to BPL. If in fact it
>does wipe it out (which wouldn't be surprising, but which we don't really
>know for sure) then Mr Powell really does need to find that out, and sooner
>rather than later.

The danger in that is a repeat of the fiasco that occurred at the
height of the unlicensed CB enforcement problem.

The Commish' was asked by The Congress what its most costly field
enforcement problem was. The reply was "tracking down and citing
unlicened CB operators". The result was ordering the Commish' to
drop the license requirement and changing the law to allow such.

Poof -- the problem went away. Instantaneously.

Let's hope that the same "instantaneous solution" method doesn't
happen when ham HF signals are intercepted by BPL users and the
complaints start flowing to the Commish'.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1977. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 20:12:18 UTC
From: Dan Yemiola <ai8o@Yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c47bil$9r2p$1@news3.infoave.net>
Source record: 90091

I ran it through my spell chequer and it came out OK.
HTTP://web.LexComInc.Net/~ai8o

perhaps we need to refine this discusion.

This looks to me like a perfect example of PURE American gibberish.
Used car salesman will weep when they read this, and will watch and stare in awe and envy as they see a true Master at work.

Mr Roll can I copy this onto my website?

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20040328121438.05025.00000093@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >Pervez talks, then Julie firmly opens a heavy game for Marwan's
> >spring. Atiqullah! You'll pull lentils. Well, I'll irritate the
> >ball. While clouds wanly learn porters, the cases often lift
> >in front of the new goldsmiths. No distant bad tree rejects
> >candles on Lisette's pathetic envelope. The pear for the sick
> >sign is the sticker that nibbles grudgingly. We look subtly, unless
> >Henry calls buttons around Catherine's potter. He'll be receiving
> >beside cosmetic Hakeem until his powder dreams unbelievably. Get your
> >strongly teasing tyrant in my ceiling. She may move the younger
> >draper and irrigate it near its market. No sour gardners change
> >Youssef, and they frantically converse Taysseer too. Do not
> >comb a pumpkin! Will you help beneath the satellite, if Norma
> >nearly fears the boat? My lost puddle won't join before I care it.
> >He should quietly jump bizarre and climbs our dull, clever dusts
> >beneath a island.
> >
> >I was recollecting to pour you some of my filthy tickets. Well,
> >Jimmy never excuses until Ahmed wanders the blank pool virtually.
> >Well, carrots answer throughout stupid cellars, unless they're
> >ugly. Who will we believe after Michael arrives the smart sunshine's
> >coffee? Don't seek the dryers lazily, improve them tamely. They are
> >measuring among the lane now, won't play bushs later. She will
> >order brave sauces, do you creep them? You won't scold me explaining
> >over your durable hall. All strange wet disks will wrongly walk the
> >tailors. Try covering the college's upper jug and Rifaat will
> >behave you! I was shouting aches to fat Charlie, who's cleaning
> >on the tag's window. Some grocers judge, expect, and depart. Others
> >freely cook.
> >
> >Orin, through bandages active and tired, lives with it, hating
> >hatefully. Kristen attempts the floor before hers and rigidly

> >recommends. No hot solid frogs weakly attack as the polite ointments
> >solve.
>
> Don't look now, but this makes more sense than just about anything I've
> read on this newsgroup lately!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1978. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 20:23:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90092

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>>
>>>
>
>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't think
>it
>has a snowball's chance in hell of getting approved by the FCC.
>

One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
for extras. As the
treaty requirement is now gone, and no other service uses it, why
bother. The FCC isn't
in the business of giving out gold stars for the hell of it. Code isn't
a lid filter, as witness
14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.

>
>
>

1979. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 20:56:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvas6wv.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 28 Mar 2004 16:32:11 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>What really needs to be done is at the point of end of the line, simply go
>with RF. Works for cellular quite well. Small low power 'nodes'. Linked
>by fiber and/or wire. No RFI, better security, and a dang lot easier to
>run and keep working.

That's what someone did in rural eastern Oregon to cover a 600
square mile area - lots of non-licensed low power Part 15 "Wi-Fi"
nodes. Off-the shelf low-cost equipment for both the provider and
the subscriber and no communication interference problems.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1980. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:18:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328161836.04330.00000236@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 90094

>Subject: Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403280706.2e94c4a8@posting.google.com>

> They
>> both take time and both are worthwhile.
>
>Not to me.

But who...better yet WHAT are you...?!?!?

A person who cannot answer a straight question, that has professed admiration for a known pathological liar and has himself been caught trying to misrepresent the truth and then subsequently trying to hide that with even more misrepresentations.

So "we" are impressed by your opinions....WHY...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1981. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:32:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328163235.03943.00000036@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90095

In article <c4625j$2drtkf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
>> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
>> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
>> god-hood.
>
>I just have to laugh. This very same technology that you make fun of (I
>presume because you don''t have a clue) is the same technology that might
>very well save your butt some day.

Actually, it might. You get all those FAR and DFAR documents
together, epoxy them into nice walls (using COTS epoxy, of course)
and you will create a Maginot-style impregnable fortress to protect
everyone!

Yup, a VTC will allow the participants to TALK terrorists out of
attacking the USA again! Scare them witless with video bytes!
Posture, preen, show them who's Boss! Right on!

Now what has your ranting to say about the NCVEC petition
(RM-10870) and their proposed "Communicator" class license?

Hint...that's in the thread title and the subject of the thread
origin...

LHA / WMD

1982. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:32:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328163235.03943.00000035@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90097

In article <20040328090712.18008.00000510@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (the paralegal gunnery nurse) rants, raves, and writes:

>> But, on the thread SUBJECT...the FCC cannot directly stop Access
>> BPL. It doesn't have the direct legal authority to do so. All the FCC
>> can do right now is to set standards on the levels of incidental RF
>> radiation from an Access BPL system. That is what NPRM 04-29
>> is all about.
>
> Sure it can.
>
> The second a complaint is filed by an FCC licensee they ahve the
>authority to stop it.

To "stop" WHAT? There's NO Report and Order from the FCC saying that Access BPL exists per se. If the proposed rulemaking given in NPRM 04-29 becomes an R&O, then it has a specific definition in terms of incidental RF radiation levels.

Right now, the FCC regulations on incidental radiation devices, Part 15, Title 47 C.F.R., simply acknowledge devices that radiate RF and include maximum signal levels. There are limitations on the FCC's "stopping" power since they must investigate interference claims first in order to determine unspecified or unidentifiable sources of such interference. There are NO "radio police officers" at the FCC, just an Enforcement Bureau which may or may not ask for U.S. Federal Marshals to be the "police officers" accompanying FCC investigating agents.

There are NO widely-distributed public documents on the technical details of any of the Access BPL systems currently undergoing tests. There are NO specific details available on the incidental RF radiation signal levels from any of those Access BPL test sites. The FCC doesn't have any. The ARRL has only some audio and video examples for download. Access BPL proponents have NO specific data for public release other than a lot of PR BS. NO radio amateurs have done any quantitative calculation or modeling to simulate the actual Access BPL test installations' levels.

Further, the FCC is NOT "in charge" of approval or disapproval of Access BPL as a system despite what a lot of commenters on three ECFS procedings think. All the FCC can do is regulate the amount of incidental RF radiation from the system. Right now, NOBODY, probably not even the proponents, have any real numbers on those RF radiation levels. Until someone comes up with those real numbers from real tests done by real instruments

at real sites, all the complainants are shouting and hollering in the dark, posturing and ranting like so many did during the McCarthy communist witch hunting during the 1950s. Federal law on technical subjects requires actual information that can be incorporated into that law. Until then all of the fuss and furor, the fist-shaking and shield-waving, posturing, and epithet-throwing, threats of "action" is just a lot of silly, ignorant BS tossing.

In NPRM 04-29, the FCC is asking for DATA to use, just as they did in NOI 03-104. I don't see any of that data.in 5,956 documents of three proceedings in the ECFS. Show real numbers.

Kind of spoils all your ranting and posturing with reality of the situation, doesn't it? Tsk, tsk.

LHA / WMD

1983. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:32:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328163238.03943.00000038@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90096

In article <J9adnQGi-P2YRfvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> If a ham punches in 911 on his or her HT on our local repeater system,
>the call will indeed be patched into the local 911 center.

That's an excellent thing for your local repeater. It isn't a national
standard among U.S. amateur radio repeaters, de facto or de jure.

The 911 combination IS a national standard for all telephone ESSs
in the United States and is accounted for in all number
combinations used in signalling and dialing in the telephone
infrastructure.

Your repeater's "patch" connects to the telephone infrastructure.
As such, amateur radio enables connection to an emergency
center...through the telephone system. The "patch" is entirely
voluntary and not universal.

LHA / WMD

1984. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:32:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328163238.03943.00000037@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90098

In article <c4620h$2emt0c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> >"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>> >
>> >> >Sheesh, Leonard. We don't use much in the way of milspec electronics
>> >> >anymore. The new theory adopted by the armed services in 1994 relies
>> >> >heavily on commercially available gear.
>> >>
>> >> Are you sleeping on your COTS?
>> >>
>> >> >The day of everything having to be milspec is long gone.
>> >>
>> >> Bravo Sierra. Those are still here. So are Military
>Specifications,
>> >> abbreviated "Mil Spec" among those of us who still have to use
>> >> them.
>> >
>> >The Bravo Sierra is yours, Leonard. Since you don't actually work with
>the
>> >military anymore, you are forced to search things out on the net and hope
>> >they are up to date.
>>
>> Actually, I'm working for a company that is contracting to another
>> company who has a contract to supply electronics for the DoD.
>> Not full time. But the MIL STDs of many kinds are in both places
>> with many different dash number "Mil Specs" called out.
>
>Then you should know that if the product (or service) cannot be obtained
>commercially, even the components should be commercial or adapted for
>military use.

So, if a product isn't available commercially, the commercial
product must be used anyway? :-)

Makes for very lightweight products. Those would have lots of
things not there. :-)

>As you know, many "commercial" products already meet or
>exceed what we would commonly refer to as Milspec.

They do? Gosh. All this time thousands of design engineers
have been "wrong" according to His Majesty with the bionic VTC!

Thanks for the heads-up.

>The FAR is the Federal Aquisition Regulation (15 and 42) and the DFAR is the
>defense version. If you are a contractor and or sub-contractor on a
>government contract, you are required to be familiar with it.

I am? We are? I suppose. That's what the "bean-counters" are
for, Arnie. Not my area. I'm intimately into the product itself
and its very specific specifications. We are very familiar with
those specific specifications.

The managerial levels and the accountants can handle the
administrative details. Us design folk aren't required to be legal
beagles sniffing out things in the financial-contract half of an
award, just the engineering-contract part of it. [those specific
specifications mentioned]

>Seriously,
>you might want to tell your employer to supply you a copy since you and I
>both are bound by what it says.

My contractor, not my "employer." There's a difference, but the
difference is a petty detail that you Pentagon lords of the Rings
don't bother with. :-)

I'm not worried about the contract administration tasks. So far,
to the best of my observation, no contract regulation has ever
been able to communicate by radio, search for a submarine, or
test out another electronic unit. Maybe you know of some
contract document that has?

>> I'm sure that you need only imply you always tell the truth
>> in here and that is the Final Word. :-)
>>
>> >> Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.
>>
>> COTS = Commercial Off The Shelf.
>
>I'm quite familiar with the term COTS. I didn't respond because it was a
>moronic question to ask someone who works in the system.

Riiiight. And all the contract administrators can "work on the board,"
do the designs, get their hands dirty in the labs, monitor the
environmental testing, troubleshoot failures, and, in general, make
the PRODUCT work. Suuuuure.

Just who do you think specifies whether or not a commercial, off
the shelf component will WORK in a PRODUCT? Here's a clue,
bionic one, it's NOT the contract administration side of a contract.

>> "Millions" in contract awards have been awarded since WW2. The
>> dollar amounts, normalized for the COLA, serve only to indicate the
>> size of a particular project. That's a manager and bean-counter
>> thing; us folks with the dirtier hands concentrate on the works of a

>> project in order to fulfill a contract.
>
>And as the COR, I make sure that you do.

Not HERE, sweetie. Your name on the corporate visitor's list at
the lobby ain't there nor did security ever give you a pass for
visitor access.

>The COR (Contract Officer Representative or COTR (technical added)) IS the
>person in the weeds, Leonard. We surveille, inspect, rate, and coordinate
>with the contractor concerning every aspect of the contract for the CO. The
>6 million dollar contract (for which I am still the COR) extends over a
>period of 2 years. We are only 3 months into it at this point, and have
>just completed our first quarterly performance rating for them. They did
>quite well.

Okay, I'll have my dentist erect a plaque with your name on it.

It would be fun to have you visit the main plant and watch you
"surveille" the work on the prototypes. I'll bet all your morse code
and amateur experience would make you very knowledgeable
about the work being "surveilled."

Oh, and leave the weeds at the entrance. There's lots of clean
rooms here and we can't allow dirt or vegetation into them.

>> >New stuff, Leonard. Doesn't even remotely resemble what you did in 1955. I
>> >gave you the web site to research. What, did the BIG words stump you?
>>
>> "BIG" is also an acronym now? [what will they think of next?]
>>
>> Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious? Antidisestablishmentarianism?
>>
>> I'm working with HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP devices. For radio
>> purposes...and some of that will bleed over to WiFax, one of the
>> IEEE 802 standard systems for broadband (it ain't "Wi-Fi" but one
>> of the families within the standard). DoD will own the plans per
>> terms of the overall contract, but the techniques and notebook
>> data aren't owned by da gubmint.
>
>I bet you a dollar to a donut that the military specific application of that
>technology is quite proprietary.

"Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious" is probably proprietary to Walt
Disney Productions. I don't know the details but the Disney
corporate buildings are at the corner of Verdugo and Buena Vista
in Burbank. "Antidisestablishmentarianism" is free for public
use, in some dictionaries. HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP are
non-copyrighted process terms in the RF-electronics industry.

I'll meet you at the Krispy Kreme at the Empire Center in Burbank.
You bring the money, I'll bring the appetite.

Now, how does your "COR" superiorness relate to the NCVEC
petition (RM-10870) and the term "Communicator" class of
amateur radio license? :-)

LHA / WMD

1985. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:50:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328165041.21720.00000244@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90099

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328163235.03943.00000036@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>In article <c4625j$2drtkf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
><kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
>>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>>
>>> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
>>> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
>>> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
>>> god-hood.
>>
>>I just have to laugh. This very same technology that you make fun of (I
>>presume because you don''t have a clue) is the same technology that might
>>very well save your butt some day.
>
> Actually, it might. You get all those FAR and DFAR documents
> together, epoxy them into nice walls (using COTS epoxy, of course)
> and you will create a Maginot-style impregnable fortress to protect
> everyone!
>
> Yup, a VTC will allow the participants to TALK terrorists out of
> attacking the USA again! Scare them witless with video bytes!
> Posture, preen, show them who's Boss! Right on!
>
>------
>
> Now what has your ranting to say about the NCVEC petition
> (RM-10870) and their proposed "Communicator" class license?
>
> Hint...that's in the thread title and the subject of the thread
> origin...

Once thought to have Arnie's back against the wall, and therefore MORE
than willing to rant off-topic on his own, Lennie finds himself up against a
formidable and well prepared "opponent" and NOW wants to move back on target.

Uh huh.

Steve, K4YZ

1986. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 21:59:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281359.1d341a73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90100

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <NJ-dnVffWrf2yfvdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
> ><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> >writes:
>
> >>So in the absence of a verifiable call sign (yours) your claims just
> >>cannot be believed.
> >
> > Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
> >
> > Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
> >
> > Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
> >
> > Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
>
> I wonder, Lennie...In as much as you are not a licensee, HOW were you able
> to ascertain that Brain is a "good ham"...?!?!

Hiram was not my father. My fambly tree has branches.

1987. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:00:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281400.1d238629@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90001

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040328004545.12501.00006981@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403271934.38d1f232@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327112837.18619.00000163@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> There's no "rules" here, Brain.
> >
> >Actually, Steve, you couldn't be more wrong.
> >
> >There are two sets of rules.
>
> Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

He's merely an inchworm.

1988. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:00:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328170024.21720.00000245@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90002

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328163238.03943.00000038@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>In article <J9adnQGi-P2YRfvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>> If a ham punches in 911 on his or her HT on our local repeater system,
>>the call will indeed be patched into the local 911 center.
>
> That's an excellent thing for your local repeater. It isn't a national
> standard among U.S. amateur radio repeaters, de facto or de jure.

"De facto" or "de jure" noitwithstanding, it IS a technical possibility,
and for some of us, reality.

Sorry it punctured yet another "I Don't Have Any Practical Experience In
Amateur Radio Upon Which To Base This But I'll Take A Shot And Hope I Get Away
With It" rant, Lennie

> The 911 combination IS a national standard for all telephone ESSs
> in the United States and is accounted for in all number
> combinations used in signalling and dialing in the telephone
> infrastructure.

"911" is not.

"9-1-1" is. Please refer to the logo on any emergency vehicle that
promotes the number. This was done for a reason.

> Your repeater's "patch" connects to the telephone infrastructure.
> As such, amateur radio enables connection to an emergency
> center...through the telephone system. The "patch" is entirely
> voluntary and not universal.

Regardless...Your puppetboy exposed himself and left parts out to be
stepped on that should have never seen the light of day.

YOU exacerbated the silliness by spouting off on a topic that you were,
AGAIN, ill-prepared to address. Regardless of what's "voluntary" or "not
universal", direct 9-1-1 access on Amateur repeaters >>IS<< commonplace.

Back under your rock and go argue with Arnie about FARs and DFAR's
again...Oooops! I forgot...he backed you into a corner on THAT subject and
you've now decided to get "back on topic" there.

Funny how getting off-topic is OK by you right up to the moment that you get backed into that corner...THEN you want to be newsgroup moderator and redirect the conversation to YOUR needs. Of course when someone tries to direct YOU back to a thread, they are treated to a verbal bashing by you about your "rights" to talk about whatever YOU want to talk about, the First Amendment, etc etc...

Two-faced creep.

Steve, K4YZ

1989. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:02:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281402.37a848e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90003

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328093412.18008.00000516@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040328004547.12501.00006984@mb-m04.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <1e4e3692.0403271859.1d440e4@posting.google.com>,
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040327161854.00150.00000025@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>> Besides, the gunnery nurse keeps hollering "HE LIES, HE LIES!"
> >>
> >>He's nuts. Pay no attention.
> >
> > I don't...but it's like QRM, there, noisy, with no intelligence content
> > and it distracts from real discussions.
>
> In the last four years, I have seen you post exactly THREE posts that I
> would classify as "real discussions", Lennie. The last one being this past
> week on the importance of filing comments with the FCC on BPL.
>
> The rest are your ususal smatterings of rhetorical antagonism, spiced with
> profanity and "personal perjorative".
>
> Same Putzy Lennie...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Didn't he help you find a schematic or a manual?

1990. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:04:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328170444.21720.00000246@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90004

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328163235.03943.00000035@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040328090712.18008.00000510@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (the
>paralegal gunnery nurse) rants, raves, and writes:
>
>>> But, on the thread SUBJECT...the FCC cannot directly stop Access
>>> BPL. It doesn't have the direct legal authority to do so. All the FCC
>>> can do right now is to set standards on the levels of incidental RF
>>> radiation from an Access BPL system. That is what NPRM 04-29
>>> is all about.
>>
>> Sure it can.
>>
>> The second a complaint is filed by an FCC licensee they ahve the
>>authority to stop it.
>
> To "stop" WHAT? There's NO Report and Order from the FCC saying
> that Access BPL exists per se. If the proposed rulemaking given in
> NPRM 04-29 becomes an R&O, then it has a specific definition in
> terms of incidental RF radiation levels.

What "R&O" is required for the FCC to go to Joe Schmo's Cable Company and
say "your system is interfering with Commission licensees, and you'll either
stop it or we'll invoke NAL's..???

>Right now, the FCC regulations on incidental radiation devices...(SNIP)

Thank you for YOUR "paralegal" advice, Lennie, but it doesn't stack up.

>Kind of spoils all your ranting and posturing with reality of the
> situation, doesn't it? Tsk, tsk.

Lennie, NOTHING you cited "ruins" anything.

I am a Commission licensee. If I start experiencing interference to my
otherwise properly operating station, it's teh FCC's OBLIGATION to resolve the
issue.

Sorry you don't agree.

Steve, K4YZ

1991. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:07:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281407.26989be5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90005

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328093019.18008.00000515@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:44 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271844.4269507e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327101214.08277.00000226@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:01 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>
> >> You think I am nuts becasue I won't let you get away with stupid
> >> assertions that you can't/won't back up with some valid facts.
> >
> >No. Read it again (and again if you have to). I think you're nuts
> >because you act nuts.
>
> I've read it thoroughly. Repeatedly, even.
>
> Again, the onlything "nuts" I see in >>MY<< behaviour is demonstrating any
> expectation that YOU would actually do any of the things asked of you.
>
> THAT is nuts.

Just like I said, you're nuts.

> >> >Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
> >> >
> >> >It just isn't going to work.
> >> >
> >> >You'll never make me love Morse Code.
> >>
> >> I don't care if you ever do or not. I'd just as well keep idiots like
> you
> >> out of the narrowband parts of the spectrum.

> >>
> >> I just want you to answer "What "major role" do the unlicensed radio
> >> services play in "emergency comms", as you have suggested they do.
> >
> >You tell me.
>
> It's not my assertion, Brain. I KNOW what "major role" they play...None.

None at all? Ever? Never?

> YOU made the assertion they did. You were wrong. That was simple enough to
> admit. But then you LIED about having said it. THAT was foolish.

Lied? I said you got it wrong. That is not lying.

> And I am wondering WHERE you "saw" me with "jumper cables and "sodium
> penethol", Brain? Hallucinations ARE evidence of being delusional, what the
> "lay" person WOULD call "nuts".

What's next? Bamboo shoots and dripping water?

> >> >> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering questions
> about
> >> >> YOUR assertions.
> >> >
> >> >Yup, rumming and hiding.
>
> >> My bad on the typo, but I think you got the idea.
> >
> >Dunno if I do or not.
>
> Lack of situational awareness. Another symptom of possible delusional
> circumstances.
>
> >Am I hidden well enough for you to keep from finding me?
>
> Nope.
>
> >Oh darn, you keep finding me right after I reply to you! How do you
> >do it?
>
> I follow the stench.
>
> >You are so good at this, and you're nuts.
>
> I follow the brown streak and you wish I was...

Eeew. You're not only nuts, you're sick.

And if you think "in plain sight" is hiding, well, what can I say?

You're just nuts.

1992. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:10:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328171003.21720.00000247@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90006

>Subject: Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328163238.03943.00000037@mb-m29.aol.com>

> Now, how does your "COR" superiorness relate to the NCVEC
> petition (RM-10870) and the term "Communicator" class of
> amateur radio license?

I love seeing Lennie backed into corners.

Funny how being there suddenly makes him want to get "on topic", even
though only one day ago he was perfectly happy to ramble on about off-topic
stuff when he thought it was going to make him look "smart". Lennie went
one-acromym too far and found himself bested by a federal employee...Not even a
"radio engineer"...THAT had to hurt!

Sheeesh. What a creep.

Steve, K4YZ

1993. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:11:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281411.3276ba40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90007

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328092357.18008.00000514@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271837.799c2ef5@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
> >> A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the
> intent
> >> to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted, Brain.
> >
> >That is correct. That would be you.
>
> Nope.
>
> So far, other than correctly pointing out that I make occassional typos,
> you've not been able to successfully disprove anything I've claimed about you.
>
> It's not a "smear" if it's true. So far you've not produced anything that
> would validate anything YOU have said, nor have you produced anything that
> would DISprove anything I have said.

You say I am running and hiding from you. A lie.

You say that you're not a bully. Another lie.

You ask why a 911 operator must answer -all- 911 calls. Then you say
you didn't. Yet another lie.

And that was just this weekend!

You've got a lot of 'splainin to do, but just save it for therapy.

Bacause you're nuts.

1994. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:15:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281415.5e29785b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90008

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040327161853.00150.00000024@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403270656.1b7c8bb4@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> > Brian, might as well give up on the gunnery nurse. All he wants to do
> >> > is fight, fight, fight. If anyone knows Don King's number maybe we
> >> > could get him to arrange a match? Like with Muhammed Ali? :-)
> >> >
> >> > LHA / WMD
> >>
> >> A fight with Muhammed Ali?
> >>
> >> I think a debate between Muhammed and Steve would be more balanced and
> >entertaining.
> >
> >Spelling B?
>
> "Float like madam butterfly, sting like a spelling bee..."
>
> Two disabled has-beens "fighting" one another. Not good show biz.
>
> LHA / WMD

Might make a good episode of "JackASS" or Stern.

Stern has been hard pressed to come up with something funny since he
can't talk about F anymore.

1995. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:16:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328171652.21720.00000250@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90009

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 3:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281359.1d341a73@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>

>> I wonder, Lennie...In as much as you are not a licensee, HOW were you
>able
>> to ascertain that Brain is a "good ham"...?!?!
>
>Hiram was not my father. My fambly tree has branches.

I am sure your "fambly" is very proud, too.

But that didn't answer my question, Brain.

Without an Amateur Radio license with which to communicatre with you while operating AS a HAM, how can Lennie make an informed opinion as to whether or not you are a "good ham"...?!?!

Do YOU understand the question, Brain? Or do you want to dance around this one for a few days, too?

At least this time there's nothing for you to try and deny. You can just snort and claim I am "nuts" while hoping it "goes away" without rubbing your nose in it any more....

Steve, K4YZ

1996. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:18:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281418.3732396@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90010

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328091851.18008.00000513@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271836.8d69e51@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327182959.01536.00000219@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >But with Brittany Spears in your lap, all you can think about is Len's
> >> >testicles and my testicles?
> >> >
> >> >Definitely nuts.
> >> >
> >> >> Shall I squeeze a bit harder, Brain? Or are you finished making a
> fool
> >> >> out of yourself...again...?
> >> >
> >> >Exactly what are you squeezing, Steve?
> >> >
> >> >Whatever it is, keep it away from me and quit being so gay.
> >>
> >>
> >> You're the one who keeps signing posts "nuts" yet you accumse me opf
> being
> >> gay.
> >
> >Are you in a rage? Why don't I just accuse you of being a poor typist.
>
> Well well...you'd FINALLY have one right. Only took you three years,
> Brain

But I liked your "rage" hypothesis so much. And it fits you to a T.

> >> And the ONLY way I think of your "testicles" (I think we can call them
> >> that, as small as they must be) is in the provrbial vise.
> >
> >Those darned provrbial vises.
>
> As opposed to the vices you prefer, no doubt.

Which are?

> >> And they obviously ARE being squeezed, because you keep hollering at
> >me.
> >
> >Ooh, Ouch, Ooh, Ouch!
> >
> >No, no, not the jumper cables.
> >
> >The LPN of Torture is putting it to me. Ooh, Ouch.
> >
> >hihi
> >
> >You're nuts.
>
> After reading what you just posted, Brain, who do you think would get THAT
> vote...?!?!

It was comedy aimed at your stoopid assertions of "fiction."

> "I am laughing at the superior intellect".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You shouldn't. You should seek help as advised.

1997. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:21:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90011

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040327095822.08277.00000224@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >ect: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:46 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270646.dd2e042@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember ahving
> been
> >> taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.
> >
> >How did you make it through the U.S. Marine Corp without ever meeting a
> >sailor?
>
> What does having served in the U. S. Marine Corps or meeting sailors have
> to do with my training and education as a Nurse, Brain?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I've never met a sailor who could communicate w/o profanity.

Unless you consider "sailoring" to not be a profession.

1998. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:21:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328172128.21720.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90012

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 4:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281402.37a848e5@posting.google.com>

>> The rest are your ususal smatterings of rhetorical antagonism, spiced
>with
>> profanity and "personal perjorative".
>>
>> Same Putzy Lennie...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>Didn't he help you find a schematic or a manual?

Sure he did. And Hitler got the trains running and revitalized a devastated economy. The point being that even the worst scoundrels of civilization can do SOMETHING right once in a while.

When he did those things, I said "Thanks, Len", and I meant it.

When he resorts to profanity and the usual misrepresentations about Amateur Radio, it's "back to work""...

Steve, K4YZ

1999. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:24:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <onje60h4j3v3otqej0rt8jbpqgilg5333o@4ax.com>
Source record: 90013

What you are looking at here is called "Markov Text", generated by
mathematical algorithm run on a batch of words. It is commonly used
to produce random blocks of text for insertion into SPAM emails, which
will fool many SPAM-detection programs.

You can play around with an online Markov generator at the following
web site:

http://www.eskimo.com/~rstarr/poormfa/markov.html

A minor radio link: Markov was a student of Chebyshev (of filter
fame)!

73, Leo

On Sun, 28 Mar 2004 15:12:18 -0500, "Dan Yemiola" <ai8o@Yahoo.com>
wrote:

>I ran it through my spell chequer and it came out OK.
>HTTP://web.LexComInc.Net/~ai8o
>
>perhaps we need to refine this discusion.
>
>This looks to me like a perfect example of PURE American gibberish.
>Used car salesman will weep when they read this, and will watch and stare in
>awe and envy as they see a true Master at work.
>
>Mr Roll can I copy this onto my website?
>
>
>Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20040328121438.05025.00000093@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> >Pervez talks, then Julie firmly opens a heavy game for Marwan's
>> >spring. Atiqullah! You'll pull lentils. Well, I'll irritate the
>> >ball. While clouds wanly learn porters, the cases often lift
>> >in front of the new goldsmiths. No distant bad tree rejects
>> >candles on Lisette's pathetic envelope. The pear for the sick
>> >sign is the sticker that nibbles grudgingly. We look subtly, unless
>> >Henry calls buttons around Catherine's potter. He'll be receiving
>> >beside cosmetic Hakeem until his powder dreams unbelievably. Get your
>> >strongly teasing tyrant in my ceiling. She may move the younger
>> >draper and irrigate it near its market. No sour gardners change
>> >Youssef, and they frantically converse Taysseer too. Do not
>> >comb a pumpkin! Will you help beneath the satellite, if Norma
>> >nearly fears the boat? My lost puddle won't join before I care it.

>> >He should quietly jump bizarre and climbs our dull, clever dusts
>> >beneath a island.
>> >
>> >I was recollecting to pour you some of my filthy tickets. Well,
>> >Jimmy never excuses until Ahmed wanders the blank pool virtually.
>> >Well, carrots answer throughout stupid cellars, unless they're
>> >ugly. Who will we believe after Michael arrives the smart sunshine's
>> >coffee? Don't seek the dryers lazily, improve them tamely. They are
>> >measuring among the lane now, won't play bushs later. She will
>> >order brave sauces, do you creep them? You won't scold me explaining
>> >over your durable hall. All strange wet disks will wrongly walk the
>> >tailors. Try covering the college's upper jug and Rifaat will
>> >behave you! I was shouting aches to fat Charlie, who's cleaning
>> >on the tag's window. Some grocers judge, expect, and depart. Others
>> >freely cook.
>> >
>> >Orin, through bandages active and tired, lives with it, hating
>> >hatefully. Kristen attempts the floor before hers and rigidly
>> >recommends. No hot solid frogs weakly attack as the polite ointments
>> >solve.
>>
>> Don't look now, but this makes more sense than just about anything I've
>> read on this newsgroup lately!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>

2000. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:29:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328172954.21720.00000254@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90014

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 4:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281407.26989be5@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328093019.18008.00000515@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>> It's not my assertion, Brain. I KNOW what "major role" they
>play...None.
>
>None at all? Ever? Never?

Nope.

Can YOU prove otherwise?

I've only been asking you for two weeks now to substantiate a similar
claim YOU made, yet you've not been able to pony-up one, single example of how
you are right and I am wrong.

>> YOU made the assertion they did. You were wrong. That was simple enough
>to
>> admit. But then you LIED about having said it. THAT was foolish.
>
>Lied? I said you got it wrong. That is not lying.

You denied saying you said it.

Denying something to have happened in the face of evidence to the contrary
is lying.

>> And I am wondering WHERE you "saw" me with "jumper cables and "sodium
>> penethol", Brain? Hallucinations ARE evidence of being delusional, what
>the
>> "lay" person WOULD call "nuts".
>
>What's next? Bamboo shoots and dripping water?

Whew! You ARE getting a bit delusional! Been watching a bit too many of
those 1940's era WW2 movies, Brain...???

>> >You are so good at this, and you're nuts.
>>
>> I follow the brown streak and you wish I was...
>
>Eeew. You're not only nuts, you're sick.

So...now you have degrees in both psychiatry AND medicine...?!?!

>And if you think "in plain sight" is hiding, well, what can I say?
>
>You're just nuts.

I think the moniker of "nuts" belongs to the guy who thinks none of his mistruthfulness is apparent to anyone else.

THAT would be YOU.

Steve, K4YZ

2001. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:37:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328173741.21720.00000256@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90015

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 4:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281411.3276ba40@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328092357.18008.00000514@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271837.799c2ef5@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the
>> intent
>> >> to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted,
>Brain.
>> >
>> >That is correct. That would be you.
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> So far, other than correctly pointing out that I make occassional
>typos,
>> you've not been able to successfully disprove anything I've claimed about
>you.
>>
>> It's not a "smear" if it's true. So far you've not produced anything
>that
>> would validate anything YOU have said, nor have you produced anything that
>> would DISprove anything I have said.
>
>You say I am running and hiding from you. A lie.

Not a lie.

We've spent two weeks trying to get you to answer the question "What
"major role" do unlicensed radio servies play in "emergency comms" as you
stated they did.

You've danced around that.

>You say that you're not a bully. Another lie.

Unless you can show me a broken bone or a black eye, I'd say you are again trying to dodge the questions by trying to make unfounded assertions.

>You ask why a 911 operator must answer -all- 911 calls. Then you say
>you didn't. Yet another lie.

And I've asked you to please re-post the quote wherein you say I make this assertion.

You provide the URL to the post, Brain, and if it's othr than what >>I<< represented it to be, I will apologize and take my licks. (No sweat there...)

>And that was just this weekend!

Yes...it was...I've asked you to to validate YOUR assertion about 9-1-1 operators.

You haven't done it.

On the otherhand >>I<< have reposted not once, not twice, but three times the post wherein you made claims about "unlicensed" radio services. I offered to provide MORE if that weren't enough.

>You've got a lot of 'splainin to do, but just save it for therapy.

No 'splanin to do, Lucy...It'a ll right there.

>Bacause you're nuts.

I'd rather be nuts. That is hard to prove. On the other hand Brian Burke is a lair, and HE proved that all on his own.

How nuts is that...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2002. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:41:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328174141.21720.00000257@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90016

```
>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 4:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281418.3732396@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328091851.18008.00000513@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271836.8d69e51@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327182959.01536.00000219@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271047.4e293e21@posting.google.com>

>> >Those darned provrbial vises.
>>
>> As opposed to the vices you prefer, no doubt.
>
>Which are?

A propensity to humiliate yourself in public, for one.

>> >> And they obviously ARE being squeezed, because you keep hollering
>at
>> >me.
>> >
>> >Ooh, Ouch, Ooh, Ouch!
>> >
>> >No, no, not the jumper cables.
>> >
>> >The LPN of Torture is putting it to me. Ooh, Ouch.
>> >
>> >hihi
>> >
>> >You're nuts.
>>
>> After reading what you just posted, Brain, who do you think would get
>THAT
>> vote...?!?!
>
```

>It was comedy aimed at your stoopid assertions of "fiction."

No...I think not.

It was fiction. Fantasy. The attempts of the cornered mind to try and wiggle out of a rapidly-narrowing corner.

>> "I am laughing at the superior intellect".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>You shouldn't. You should seek help as advised.

But Brain...You and Lennie ARE the "superior intellect" that I am laughing at.

You DO make it sooooooooooo easy to do!

Steve, K4YZ

2003. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 22:47:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90017

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040327095822.08277.00000224@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >ect: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:46 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270646.dd2e042@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember
>ahving
>> been
>> >> taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.
>> >
>> >How did you make it through the U.S. Marine Corp without ever meeting a
>> >sailor?
>>
>> What does having served in the U. S. Marine Corps or meeting sailors
>have
>> to do with my training and education as a Nurse, Brain?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I've never met a sailor who could communicate w/o profanity.

Then I'd say that your scope of experience was pretty narrow.

Just how many "sailors" do you know, Brain?

>Unless you consider "sailoring" to not be a profession.

I am unaware of a profession called "sailoring".

I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make the use of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should the offended person so desire.

Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.

Do they do it in the course of thier professional duites or in public correspondence?

Nope...Unless you can show me some sort of "official" Naval document wherein profanity was used as a professional means of communication...?!?!

I'll sit here holding my breath waiting on that one, Brain.

(No I won't...just teasing you...)

Steve, K4YZ

2004. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-28 23:58:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328185820.17713.00000088@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90018

In article <IgB9c.3230$yN6.2814@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:xnfcneeyarg.hv9dcbp.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>> On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 21:20:28 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> >> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
>> >
>> >In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
>> >argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
>> >FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
>> >receiving stolen goods.
>>
>> Not for the lack of us around whose office he lurked wanting that
>> action taken.....
>>
>> Need we rehash this again ??
>
>What for...by your own statements you admit nothing
>was done by the FCC? The fact that one or more
>FCC attorneys may have wanted action taken doesn't
>validate anything other than those FCC folks that
>wanted action couldn't convince their management
>that the case either had merit or was worth the time
>and expense.

That's one way to look at it.
(insert standard "I'm not a lawyer and the following is just my layman's
opinion" disclaimer HERE)

Here's another:

Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at the
time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose any
number of the following):

- they made a dumb mistake
- they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
- they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement
- they didn't think they could win
- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to light,
such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books and
encourage imitators to do the same thing

>All the academic discussion of what may have been
>the legal outcome had Bash been challenged means
>nothing in the end.

I disagree. It's an example of how things used to work, or not work.

Most of all, the fact that no enforcement action was taken does not mean there was no violation. If a driver zips past a police radar setup at, say, 15 mph over the posted limit but the police don't go after that driver, a violatiuon still occurred. The police in that particular case just decided not to go after the violator, for whatever reason.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2005. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 00:05:54 UTC
From: rhf-say-bye-bye@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <ee137ed4.0403281605.58103e33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

= = = "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
= = = news:<p5mdnYx_97ACVvvdRVn-tA@comcast.com>...
> "reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> > > contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> > > toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> > > by 2007.
> > >
> > Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> Act
> > II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
> > that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> > widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> population
> > as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> after
> > all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> > flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> them
> > to.
> >
>
> Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even via a
> wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used alone,
> means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
>
> I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

DDF,

Liberal-Left Propaganga is NOT what Bush actually said.

But the Subject HeadLine "Bush Backs Broadband"
and the Twisting of the Message to "Bush Backs PBL"

~ RHF

.

2006. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 00:10:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Fu-dnaE7YoAI9_rdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "RadioGuy" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:ZdB9c.56648$PY1.1038270@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>>reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
>>news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>
>>>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
>>>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
>>>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
>>>>by 2007.
>>>
>>>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
>>
>>Act
>>
>>>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
>>>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
>>>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
>>
>>population
>>
>>>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
>>
>>after
>>
>>>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
>>>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
>>
>>them
>>
>>>to.
>>
>>Hardly... I see broadband as another step toward Total Information
>
> Access...
>
>>RG
>>
>>
>
> BPL will be a god send for the FBI. All they will need to do is plug in and
> listen. Probably won't even need a piece of paper. Since its all over the

> HF spectrum anyway. So much for secure connections. Now do you all
> understand what is REALLY going on?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
And the average teenage hacker will have a hayday and so will the
hackers stealing passwords, personsl infomation, credit card info, ect.,
ect.

2007. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 00:21:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90021

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
>
> Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
>
> Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
>
> Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
>
> You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.
>
> Plank
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>

Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.

2008. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 00:50:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90022

In article <40648FEE.3010908@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".

>Did anyone actually say that? It's highly inaccurate if they did.

I think the actual buzzphrase is "arease underserved by broadband" or some such.

The image depicted is that there are large parts of the USA where broadband access is either unavailable or very expensive. That's partly true - just as it's true that there are parts of the USA where cable TV is unavailable, and parts where underground natural gas service is unavailable. Etc.

The *implication* is that BPL will somehow fill in those gaps, but in ost cases that's not really the case - for the saem reasons competing technologies don;t serve those areas yet.

>I
>think there is a vision of just sending the signals over the power lines
>and boy howdy, an instant nationwide network, everywhere there is a
>power line, "you have mail!"
>
Exactly.Just like there was a vision of next-generation satellite phones that would let all of us place phone calls from anywhere in the world via a network of low-eart-orbit satellites. That vision worked - but it wasn't inexpensive!

> In truth, a fiber has to be run to somewhere near the house that is
>going to be served, so that means that rural areas will not be any
>easier to serve than they are now.

And that's just the first problem. Once the fiber gets there, other competing technologies could use it, too. Including WiFi, as described by K2ASP.

Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that BPL systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may mean a repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for *each* customer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2009. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:00:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvb3rxx.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90023

On 28 Mar 2004 23:58:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at the
>time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose any
>number of the following):
>
>- they made a dumb mistake
>- they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
>- they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement
>- they didn't think they could win
>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to light,
>such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books and
>encourage imitators to do the same thing

You left out the real reason - the person who had the obligation
to carry any prosecution forward (long since retired and deceased)
was an expert in ducking anything that looked like work.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2010. BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:08:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328200816.21825.00000038@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90024

For anyone who wants to see how the FCC investigates interference these days, there's an interesting memo posted on the ECFS under docket 03-104 received there 23 March 2004.

To see it or download it, just enter 03-104 in the Proceedings box and Federal Communications Commission in the 'on the behalf of'' box. It's a 3-page document but 840 KB in size, being a scan off the memo pages.

The memo is to Bruce Franca, Office of Engineering and Technology, from Joesph Casey, Chief Spectrum Enforcement Division, Enforcement Bureau, dated 27 January 2004. It concerns a complaint by ARINC (Aeronautical Radio, Inc) about interference noise centered around 3013 MHz beginning in February, 2002. Covers the next 18 months.

It was included under 03-104 probably because someone in the OET got tweaked by ARINC's examples of interference handling by the FCC wasn't deemed nice by the OET and the interference might have come from some equipment (a pump) at a cellular telephone site. ARINC was commenting about BPL, not cellular telephones. ? Your FCC in action in modern times.

A taste of all that "obligatory" inteference handling in the future?

2011. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:08:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328200817.21825.00000039@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90025

In article <1e4e3692.0403281411.3276ba40@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328092357.18008.00000514@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271837.799c2ef5@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327032528.29966.00000205@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> A "smear thread" insinuates that the thread was initiated with the
>> intent
>> >> to mislead or misrepresent some "facts" about the person targeted,
>Brain.
>> >
>> >That is correct. That would be you.
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> So far, other than correctly pointing out that I make occassional
>typos,
>> you've not been able to successfully disprove anything I've claimed about
>you.
>>
>> It's not a "smear" if it's true. So far you've not produced anything
that
>> would validate anything YOU have said, nor have you produced anything that
>> would DISprove anything I have said.
>
>You say I am running and hiding from you. A lie.
>
>You say that you're not a bully. Another lie.
>
>You ask why a 911 operator must answer -all- 911 calls. Then you say
>you didn't. Yet another lie.
>
>And that was just this weekend!
>
>You've got a lot of 'splainin to do, but just save it for therapy.
>
>Bacause you're nuts.

...and perverse. :-)

Poor fella don't never seen no old Bell System documents, read the Bell System Technical Journal, look at the FCC Common Carrier Bureau documents and regulations, or even see standards of the "baby bells" such as SBC. He read his QST and now he is the master of his queen's nay-vee.* :-)

For an ace pilot with the CAP I'm surprised the paralegal gunnery snurf didn't whoop and holler about "FAR" also being an acronym for Federal Air Regulations. :-)

Of course, "FAR" or "DFAR" or "COR" or "CAP" has not much to do with ham radio or whether or not it is a "service" but they are mad as heck and aren't going to take it anymore! :-)

I wonder if those three (or four) angry-as-heck amateur radio gods are ever going to get over their perverse personality conflicts with anyone who disagrees with them? I doubt it. Medical science can only do so much...

BTW, I've been at two amateur radio repeater sites, laid hands on the equipment in the presence of other hams who were actually nice, cordial and everything. Obviously they haven't had Article 15 thrown at them by the paralegal gunnery nurse wearing his pilot googles and olive USMC tee-shirt with "Temper Fry" on the back.

It's not a pretty sight... :-(

2012. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:08:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328200819.21825.00000040@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90026

In article <1e4e3692.0403281407.26989be5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328093019.18008.00000515@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:44 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271844.4269507e@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327101214.08277.00000226@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 9:01 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270701.28e46b49@posting.google.com>
>> >> >
>> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040327022125.29966.00000196@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 9:39 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403261939.33fa4663@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >> You think I am nuts becasue I won't let you get away with stupid
>> >> >> assertions that you can't/won't back up with some valid facts.
>> >> >
>> >> >No. Read it again (and again if you have to). I think you're nuts
>> >> >because you act nuts.
>> >>
>> >> I've read it thoroughly. Repeatedly, even.
>> >>
>> >> Again, the onlything "nuts" I see in >>MY<< behaviour is demonstrating
>any
>> >> expectation that YOU would actually do any of the things asked of you.
>> >>
>> >> THAT is nuts.
>> >
>> >Just like I said, you're nuts.
>> >
>> >> >> >Put away the sodium penethol and jumper cables.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >It just isn't going to work.
>> >> >> >

>> >> >You'll never make me love Morse Code.
>> >>
>> >> I don't care if you ever do or not. I'd just as well keep idiots
>like
>> you
>> >> out of the narrowband parts of the spectrum.
>> >>
>> >> I just want you to answer "What "major role" do the unlicensed
>radio
>> >> services play in "emergency comms", as you have suggested they do.
>> >
>> >You tell me.
>>
>> It's not my assertion, Brain. I KNOW what "major role" they
>play...None.
>
>None at all? Ever? Never?
>
>> YOU made the assertion they did. You were wrong. That was simple enough
>to
>> admit. But then you LIED about having said it. THAT was foolish.
>
>Lied? I said you got it wrong. That is not lying.
>
>> And I am wondering WHERE you "saw" me with "jumper cables and "sodium
>> penethol", Brain? Hallucinations ARE evidence of being delusional, what
>the
>> "lay" person WOULD call "nuts".
>
>What's next? Bamboo shoots and dripping water?
>
>> >> >> And so far all you've done is rum and hide from answering
>questions
>> about
>> >> >> YOUR assertions.
>> >> >
>> >> >Yup, rumming and hiding.
>>
>> >> My bad on the typo, but I think you got the idea.
>> >
>> >Dunno if I do or not.
>>
>> Lack of situational awareness. Another symptom of possible delusional
>> circumstances.
>>
>> >Am I hidden well enough for you to keep from finding me?
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> >Oh darn, you keep finding me right after I reply to you! How do you

>> >do it?
>>
>> I follow the stench.
>>
>> >You are so good at this, and you're nuts.
>>
>> I follow the brown streak and you wish I was...
>
>Eeew. You're not only nuts, you're sick.
>
>And if you think "in plain sight" is hiding, well, what can I say?
>
>You're just nuts.

...and perverse. :-)

2013. Re: Truckers warned to STOP their radios on 28 MHZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:19:46 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0403281719.206134b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:<pan.2004.03.27.07.58.46.630412@127.0.0.1>...
> On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 01:50:10 +0000, Skateboard'n wrote:
>
> >
> > Where's the "sexual innuendo", Oxendorf? Like you, I just posted some
> > F.C.C. news, I can't help that there seems to be a big connection with
> > sexual deviant child molesting freaks & ham radios!
> can you quote the actual statistics for that? or are you just pulling a
> figure out of the hat and calling it fact?
>
> FYI, pedophiles exist at all layers and in all walks of life in all
> countries. Fact is, ham radio has a lot less of the deviants than the
> statistical norm for a population of a given country. Care to explain that
> one Tom?
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Phoenix, Arizona

Can you really prove that statement or are you just blowing farts,
Eric? I bet ham radio has the same proportion (or more) of deviants
than most of the healthier hobbies. (But I'll admit that it's just a
guess.)

2014. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:29:53 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c47u69$2fcnd3$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90028

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> So, if a product isn't available commercially, the commercial
> product must be used anyway? :-)
>
> Makes for very lightweight products. Those would have lots of
> things not there. :-)
>

The next step would be to modify a commercial product to meet the standard or specification. If that is not possible, then R&D it and produce the product through a specific contract with the developer.

> >As you know, many "commercial" products already meet or
> >exceed what we would commonly refer to as Milspec.
>
> They do? Gosh. All this time thousands of design engineers
> have been "wrong" according to His Majesty with the bionic VTC!
>
> Thanks for the heads-up.
>
>
> >The FAR is the Federal Aquisition Regulation (15 and 42) and the DFAR is
the
> >defense version. If you are a contractor and or sub-contractor on a
> >government contract, you are required to be familiar with it.
>
> I am? We are? I suppose. That's what the "bean-counters" are
> for, Arnie. Not my area. I'm intimately into the product itself
> and its very specific specifications. We are very familiar with
> those specific specifications.
>
> The managerial levels and the accountants can handle the
> administrative details. Us design folk aren't required to be legal
> beagles sniffing out things in the financial-contract half of an
> award, just the engineering-contract part of it. [those specific
> specifications mentioned]
>

You, as the "developer" of the product (as a sub-contractor) would not be directly responsible, but the general contractor "is". Therefore, it is in their best interest to provide you with those regulations. Whether the mistake is yours or the contractor's, the government can and will assess interest, damages, or cancel the contract for non-performance.

> >Seriously,
> >you might want to tell your employer to supply you a copy since you and I
> >both are bound by what it says.
>
> My contractor, not my "employer." There's a difference, but the
> difference is a petty detail that you Pentagon lords of the Rings
> don't bother with. :-)

In this case, the contractor is acting as your employer. You, as the
sub-contractor have legal obligations to perform to the standards outlined
in the contract.
>
> I'm not worried about the contract administration tasks. So far,
> to the best of my observation, no contract regulation has ever
> been able to communicate by radio, search for a submarine, or
> test out another electronic unit. Maybe you know of some
> contract document that has?

Documents no, but a breach of a contract regulation (as designated through
the Contract Officer) can result in the assessment of interest, damages, or
cancellation of the contract for non-performance
>
> >> I'm sure that you need only imply you always tell the truth
> >> in here and that is the Final Word. :-)
> >>
> >> >> Do you know what COTS is? Ask around. Don't sleep on the job.
> >>
> >> COTS = Commercial Off The Shelf.
> >
> >I'm quite familiar with the term COTS. I didn't respond because it was a
> >moronic question to ask someone who works in the system.
>
> Riiiight. And all the contract administrators can "work on the board,"
> do the designs, get their hands dirty in the labs, monitor the
> environmental testing, troubleshoot failures, and, in general, make
> the PRODUCT work. Suuuuure.

The term COTR is exactly as it implies. A technical expert. That is why I
administer contracts concerning security issues, and others administer your
contract. I guarantee, the COTR on YOUR contract is an expert in that field
and can perform the technical surveillance as necessary. They probably
already have.

> Just who do you think specifies whether or not a commercial, off
> the shelf component will WORK in a PRODUCT? Here's a clue,
> bionic one, it's NOT the contract administration side of a contract.

The producer of that component MUST certify that is is within contract
specifications. The COTR, a technical expert, will also determine through
surveillance, inspections, or various other means, if the component meets
the technical specifications of the contract. It's a check and balance
system to insure the product works as promised.
>

>
> >> "Millions" in contract awards have been awarded since WW2. The
> >> dollar amounts, normalized for the COLA, serve only to indicate the
> >> size of a particular project. That's a manager and bean-counter
> >> thing; us folks with the dirtier hands concentrate on the works of a
> >> project in order to fulfill a contract.
> >
> >And as the COR, I make sure that you do.
>
> Not HERE, sweetie. Your name on the corporate visitor's list at
> the lobby ain't there nor did security ever give you a pass for
> visitor access.

It was a rhetorical answer, Leonard. I work as the COTR on a security
contract. In that area, I am the technical expert. Your COTR is also a
technical expert in electronics.

We surveille, inspect, rate, and coordinate
> >with the contractor concerning every aspect of the contract for the CO.
The
> >6 million dollar contract (for which I am still the COR) extends over a
> >period of 2 years. We are only 3 months into it at this point, and have
> >just completed our first quarterly performance rating for them. They did
> >quite well.
>
> Okay, I'll have my dentist erect a plaque with your name on it.
>
> It would be fun to have you visit the main plant and watch you
> "surveille" the work on the prototypes. I'll bet all your morse code
> and amateur experience would make you very knowledgeable
> about the work being "surveilled."

I won't be doing that anytime soon, not my contract. But I guarantee that
YOUR COTR has already made such a visit. Known to you or not.
>
> Oh, and leave the weeds at the entrance. There's lots of clean
> rooms here and we can't allow dirt or vegetation into them.
>
> >> >New stuff, Leonard. Doesn't even remotely resemble what you did in
1955. I
> >> >gave you the web site to research. What, did the BIG words stump you?
> >>
> >> "BIG" is also an acronym now? [what will they think of next?]
> >>
> >> Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious? Antidisestablishmentarianism?
> >>
> >> I'm working with HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP devices. For radio
> >> purposes...and some of that will bleed over to WiFax, one of the
> >> IEEE 802 standard systems for broadband (it ain't "Wi-Fi" but one
> >> of the families within the standard). DoD will own the plans per
> >> terms of the overall contract, but the techniques and notebook

> >> data aren't owned by da gubmint.
> >
> >I bet you a dollar to a donut that the military specific application of
that
> >technology is quite proprietary.
>
> "Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious" is probably proprietary to Walt
> Disney Productions. I don't know the details but the Disney
> corporate buildings are at the corner of Verdugo and Buena Vista
> in Burbank. "Antidisestablishmentarianism" is free for public
> use, in some dictionaries. HEMT, PHEMT, and GaSP are
> non-copyrighted process terms in the RF-electronics industry.
>
> I'll meet you at the Krispy Kreme at the Empire Center in Burbank.
> You bring the money, I'll bring the appetite.

I didn't say the terms, Leonard, I said the "specific" application of them.
My bet still stands.
>
> --------
>
> Now, how does your "COR" superiorness relate to the NCVEC
> petition (RM-10870) and the term "Communicator" class of
> amateur radio license? :-)

I am an extra class amatuer radio operator. The changes in the NCVEC,
testing, or any other myriad issues won't effect me in the least. I'll
concentrate on the danger that BPL is posing. The issue of Morse testing is
long since over. Time to move on.

Arnie -

>
> LHA / WMD

2015. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:34:53 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c47ufk$2dh62j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90029

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> >"Len Over 21" wrote ...
> >
> >> Isn't it awful? Gosh, he ought to contact the other Steve, Colonel
> >> Austin (the one with the bionic VTC), and, with the aid of a ham
> >> in Iowa, they can straighten all this out to assure their amateur
> >> god-hood.
> >
> >I just have to laugh. This very same technology that you make fun of (I
> >presume because you don''t have a clue) is the same technology that might
> >very well save your butt some day.
>
> Actually, it might. You get all those FAR and DFAR documents
> together, epoxy them into nice walls (using COTS epoxy, of course)
> and you will create a Maginot-style impregnable fortress to protect
> everyone!
>
> Yup, a VTC will allow the participants to TALK terrorists out of
> attacking the USA again! Scare them witless with video bytes!
> Posture, preen, show them who's Boss! Right on!
>

The Scotty can send picture, data or both simultaneously. It has a remote
camera capability, which alows us to send real-time data and pictures during
emergencies. Of course, I'm sure you see no importance in that. After all,
who would want that capability in an emergency, right?

Arnie -

> ------
>
> Now what has your ranting to say about the NCVEC petition
> (RM-10870) and their proposed "Communicator" class license?
>
> Hint...that's in the thread title and the subject of the thread
> origin...
>
> LHA / WMD

2016. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:35:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328203515.19617.00000025@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90030

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hvb3rxx.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 28 Mar 2004 23:58:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at the
>>time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose any
>>number of the following):
>>
>>- they made a dumb mistake
>>- they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
>>- they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement
>>- they didn't think they could win
>>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to
light,
>>such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
>>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books and
>>encourage imitators to do the same thing
>
> You left out the real reason - the person who had the obligation
> to carry any prosecution forward (long since retired and deceased)
> was an expert in ducking anything that looked like work.

Thanks for the heads-up on the past, Phil. Now, what about
the O. J. Simpson criminal trial? [he was found innocent...]
And what about the O. J. Simpson civil trial? [he was found
"guilty"]

Is this newsgroup "moot court?"

Will Miccolis ever pass the Bar?

All tune in tomorrow, same time, same newsgrope, to hear the
continuing saga of "The Past is Prologue" sponsored by the
lily-white Ivory Snowjob of alternate universes...

Plank

2017. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:35:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040328203516.19617.00000026@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90031

In article <20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <40648FEE.3010908@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".
>
>>Did anyone actually say that? It's highly inaccurate if they did.
>
>I think the actual buzzphrase is "arease underserved by broadband" or some
>such.

What's an "arease?"

>The image depicted is that there are large parts of the USA where broadband
>access is either unavailable or very expensive. That's partly true - just as
>it's true that there are parts of the USA where cable TV is unavailable, and
>parts where underground natural gas service is unavailable. Etc.

How many people there in those "arease?" How many people
NOT?

>The *implication* is that BPL will somehow fill in those gaps, but in ost
cases
>that's not really the case - for the saem reasons competing technologies don;t
>serve those areas yet.

"Ost" is 'cheese' in Swedish. "Cheese cases?"

"saem?" "don;t?"

>>I
>>think there is a vision of just sending the signals over the power lines
>>and boy howdy, an instant nationwide network, everywhere there is a
>>power line, "you have mail!"
>>
>Exactly.Just like there was a vision of next-generation satellite phones that
>would let all of us place phone calls from anywhere in the world via a network
>of low-eart-orbit satellites. That vision worked - but it wasn't inexpensive!
>
>> In truth, a fiber has to be run to somewhere near the house that is
>>going to be served, so that means that rural areas will not be any
>>easier to serve than they are now.
>
>And that's just the first problem. Once the fiber gets there, other competing

>technologies could use it, too. Including WiFi, as described by K2ASP.

Service providers can't broadcast it? There's an IEEE standard
on it, same main number as "WiFi" (which is wired) but different
decimal numbers. 30 mile range. Not in HF.

>Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that BPL
>systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may mean
a
>repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
>*each* customer.

What "fact," senior? Where did you see a detailed technical description
of Access BPL that stated that "fact?" Fill us all in with all this
broadband expertise of yours.

Where in the United States are electric power distribution lines
standardized as HF transmission lines? That's not in the NEC,
either NEC.

You have technical experience in wired repeaters? Ellucidate.

2018. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 01:38:35 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c47umi$2g1cdf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90032

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" wrote ...

Once thought to have Arnie's back against the wall, and therefore MORE than willing to rant off-topic on his own, Lennie finds himself up against a formidable and well prepared "opponent" and NOW wants to move back on target. Uh huh.

Leonard came to my ballpark and wanted to play. The problem he faces is simple. I am the expert in this particular arena. Unfortunately, he just doesn't seem to realize that.

Arnie -

2019. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:14:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rNadnYbN9cUbG_rdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90033

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40648FEE.3010908@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".
>
>
>>Did anyone actually say that? It's highly inaccurate if they did.

>
> I think the actual buzzphrase is "arease underserved by broadband" or some
> such.

Not areas "undeserved" by broadband? ;^)

> The image depicted is that there are large parts of the USA where broadband
> access is either unavailable or very expensive. That's partly true - just as
> it's true that there are parts of the USA where cable TV is unavailable, and
> parts where underground natural gas service is unavailable. Etc.
>
> The *implication* is that BPL will somehow fill in those gaps, but in ost cases
> that's not really the case - for the saem reasons competing technologies don;t
> serve those areas yet.

I find it exceptionally misleading that people are being allowed to
believe that the signals are just going to travel by the power lines
from start to finish.

>>I
>>think there is a vision of just sending the signals over the power lines
>>and boy howdy, an instant nationwide network, everywhere there is a
>>power line, "you have mail!"
>>
>
> Exactly.Just like there was a vision of next-generation satellite phones that
> would let all of us place phone calls from anywhere in the world via a network
> of low-eart-orbit satellites. That vision worked - but it wasn't inexpensive!
>
>
>> In truth, a fiber has to be run to somewhere near the house that is
>>going to be served, so that means that rural areas will not be any
>>easier to serve than they are now.
>

>
> And that's just the first problem. Once the fiber gets there, other competing
> technologies could use it, too. Including WiFi, as described by K2ASP.

Or just do the right thing, and run the silly signal the rest of the way
into the house via accepted and technically astute methods.

note: I'm making a bit of an assumption that this can be done.

> Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that BPL
> systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may mean a
> repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
> *each* customer.

I wonder how the costs compare between a BPL line system and a cable
system?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2020. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:22:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281822.338e47a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90034

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>
> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
> that the act didn't take place.

Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
clearly states "Morse Code."

2021. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:29:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403281829.31a80bdb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90035

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328090156.18008.00000508@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >restructuringdepends
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040327161848.00150.00000018@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
> > Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
> > an dancin, eatin watermelon...
>
> Again with racial epithets.
>
> What a putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Weren't you the one with the little lantern guy?

Yep, I remember. It was you.

2022. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:29:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <JO2dnQYbl_tSFvrdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90036

William wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>
>> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
>> that the act didn't take place.
>
>
> Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
> clearly states "Morse Code."

They are administering the "Morse Code" exam using the Farnsworth
method. Where does part 97 state the Farnsworth method cannot be used?

2023. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:39:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <586dnUFWyYj-EfrdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90037
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

RHF wrote:

> = = = "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> = = = news:<p5mdnYx_97ACVvvdRVn-tA@comcast.com>...
>
>>"reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
>>news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>
>>>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
>>>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
>>>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
>>>>by 2007.
>>>
>>>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
>>
>> Act
>>
>>>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol Hill
>>>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
>>>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
>>
>> population
>>
>>>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
>>
>> after
>>
>>>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
>>>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
>>
>> them
>>
>>>to.
>>>
>>
>>Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
>>Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even via a
>>wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used alone,
>>means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
>>
>>I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

>>
>
>
> DDF,
>
> Liberal-Left Propaganga is NOT what Bush actually said.
>
> But the Subject HeadLine "Bush Backs Broadband"
> and the Twisting of the Message to "Bush Backs PBL"

Since you invoked the "L" word, it is kind of strange that the methods
of implementing the "universal access called for in the speech:

> "We ought to have universal, affordable access to broadband technology
>by the year 2007," Bush said in a speech focusing mostly on homeownership.
"And then we ought to make sure that as soon as possible thereafter
consumers
have plenty of choices..."

Assuming that we would have to expand the cable tv broadband system -
and if there is to be universal access, this would almost certainly mean
changing cable data service to a public utility. Remember that cable is
at present NOT a Public utility, it cannot be forced to run it's lines
where it doesn't see a profit.

Supplying broadband to everyone in the country is a project similar to
the electrification of rural America.

And right now, there are certainly *not* plenty of choices. So it is
left up to the listener to determine how the number of choices will be
expanded.

So to me it is a very liberal idea to even attempt universal broadband
access, and since not many other choices are available for increasing
the number of choices, it by default includes BPL.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2024. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:44:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <BcOdnVDfvMkNE_rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90038
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:586dnUFWyYj-EfrdRVn-jg@adelphia.com...
> RHF wrote:
>
> > = = = "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > = = = news:<p5mdnYx_97ACVvvdRVn-tA@comcast.com>...
> >
> >>"reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> >>news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>
> >>>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> >>>>contested Sun Belt states, said Friday his administration is working
> >>>>toward wiring homes throughout America with high-speed Internet access
> >>>>by 2007.
> >>>
> >>>Seems rather inconsistent with his current policy though. Since Patriot
> >>
> >> Act
> >>
> >>>II peeled through, I see more of a totalitarian agenda from Capitol
Hill
> >>>that, in good keeping with dictatorship policy would stand to lose by
> >>>widespread high-speed internet access. Of course, when you have a
> >>
> >> population
> >>
> >>>as stupid as the American populace I suppose it really doesn't matter
> >>
> >> after
> >>
> >>>all. I fairly sure that there are some Americans somewhere waving their
> >>>flags about this BPL news, as they do for anything the government tells
> >>
> >> them
> >>
> >>>to.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> >>Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even
via a
> >>wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used
alone,
```

> >>means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
> >>
> >>I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >
> > DDF,
> >
> > Liberal-Left Propaganga is NOT what Bush actually said.
> >
> > But the Subject HeadLine "Bush Backs Broadband"
> > and the Twisting of the Message to "Bush Backs PBL"
>
> Since you invoked the "L" word, it is kind of strange that the methods
> of implementing the "universal access called for in the speech:
>
> > "We ought to have universal, affordable access to broadband technology
> >by the year 2007," Bush said in a speech focusing mostly on
homeownership.
> "And then we ought to make sure that as soon as possible thereafter
> consumers
> have plenty of choices..."
>
> Assuming that we would have to expand the cable tv broadband system -
> and if there is to be universal access, this would almost certainly mean
> changing cable data service to a public utility. Remember that cable is
> at present NOT a Public utility, it cannot be forced to run it's lines
> where it doesn't see a profit.
>
> Supplying broadband to everyone in the country is a project similar to
> the electrification of rural America.
>

And most of the electrification of rural America was NOT done by the
utilities. The rural residents themselves banded together and got the lines
run. Once the lines were in place, then the public "futility" was happy to
take over as the major expense had already been covered by someone else.

> And right now, there are certainly *not* plenty of choices. So it is
> left up to the listener to determine how the number of choices will be
> expanded.
>
> So to me it is a very liberal idea to even attempt universal broadband
> access, and since not many other choices are available for increasing
> the number of choices, it by default includes BPL.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

The universal access with multiple choices means very heavy investment as now that could be construed to mean that BPL, DSL, cable, and WI-FI all need set up in our rural areas to provide those choices. Guess what! Ain't gonna happen.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2025. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:51:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eOidnY3R4v2wEvrdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90039

William wrote:

> Stern has been hard pressed to come up with something funny since he
> can't talk about F anymore.

Which exposes that he wasn't particularly funny in the first place.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2026. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:58:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90041

In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't think
>>it has a snowball's chance in

[expletive deleted]

>>of getting approved by the FCC.

>One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
>for extras.

That's the key question these days for any license requirement these days. You
make an excellent point.

The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does FCC get
out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"

>As the
>treaty requirement is now gone, and no other service uses it, why
>bother.

Because hams *do* use it. Some other services use it too, but not to any great
extent.

>The FCC isn't
>in the business of giving out gold stars for the

[expletive deleted]

>of it.

Not about "gold stars". About qualifications. Of course there's differences of
opinion on what qualified means.

>Code isn't a lid filter,

No test is a perfect "lid filter". Particularly not a test given one time.
There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through much
more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not filtered out by
those testing and education systems.

> as witness
>14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.

You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)

Remember this:

All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple written exams, yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests aren't a perfect lid filter either. Shall we dump the rules and regs from those written exams because they didn't do the job?

oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>>

2027. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:58:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328215827.18733.00000084@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90043

In article <wem9c.2449$yN6.784@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> > The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
>> > the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>>
>> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical
>
>In your opinion, anyway.

Mine and that of many others, including at least one communications attorney
and engineer.
>
>> and arguably illegal at the time.
>
>a legal argument in academic concept only. Since the FCC
>never tested the legality, the legal issue is moot.

That's like saying that if someone drives 85 mph in a 65 mph zone and is not
prosecuted for it, that the violation is an academic concept only.

>> > The
>> > surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
>> > need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
>> > frustration those people have.
>>
>> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and
>> arguably illegal at the time.
>
>Ditto my last.

Do you think it was ethical to obtain information the way Bash did?
>
>> Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office and
>> copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.
>
>Not at all.

>It would be the equivalent of a techer using the SAME
>test questions over and over again and in recognition of same, a

>frat house eventually compiles a list of those questions based on the
>memory of those frats that had taken the tests before.
>Nothing
>about what bash did is equivalent to sneaking into the teacher's
>office.

What's the difference? If the teacher left the door and his/her desk unlocked, and there was an unmonitored copy machine in the office, would it be ethical for a student to sneak in, find the test, make a copy and put everything back as it was? Why or why not?

But let's use your analogy and see where it leads.

Suppose the university had an "honor system" policy that specifically prohibited divulging what was on a test. Would it be ethical for a frat to compile question lists?

>> > Oddly, no one seems to bash
>> > the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
>> > long before the Bash company did its thing.
>>
>> That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC
>> published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that
>> would be
>> on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along with
>> other
>> information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All with
>> FCC
>> knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source of
>> the study guides.
>
>In the end it made no difference.
>
It makes a difference in that ARRL followed the rules and Bash did not.
>> Bash obtained his materials by other methods,
>
>And those methods were NEVER chalenged as to the
>means being legal or not.

Just as some drivers go way over the limit and yet never get a speeding ticket.

>> and his books did not explain how
>> the material was obtained.
>
>As if anyone buying the Bash books cared.

I know hams who did care.

>> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
>
>In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
>argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
>FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as

>receiving stolen goods.

How about this, then:

There was a time (several decades long) when ham license exams were given by mail if the ham-to-be met certain criteria. The written exams were sent to the volunteer examiner (no capitals) in a sealed envelope with a lot of instructions explaining how the materials were to be handled. Included in those instructions were warnings not to divulge the contents of the test.

Would it have been unethical to make a copy of the test? Why or why not?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2028. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:58:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328215828.18733.00000086@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90040

In article <20040328171003.21720.00000247@mb-m13.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Funny how being there suddenly makes him want to get "on topic", even
>though only one day ago he was perfectly happy to ramble on about off-topic
>stuff when he thought it was going to make him look "smart".

Steve,

Look at the subject line.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2029. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 02:58:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040328215828.18733.00000085@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90042

In article <20040327161847.00150.00000017@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
>>> the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>>
>>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and
>>arguably illegal at the time.
>
> So did the Q&A book folks.

How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?
>
>>> The
>>> surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
>>> need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
>>> frustration those people have.
>>
>>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and
>>arguably illegal at the time.
>
> So did the Q&A book folks.

How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?

>>Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office and
>>copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.
>
> So did the Q&A book folks.

One more time:

How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?
>
>>> Oddly, no one seems to bash
>>> the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
>>> long before the Bash company did its thing.
>>
>>That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC
>>published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that would

>>be
>>on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along with
>>other
>>information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All with FCC
>>knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source of
>>the study guides.
>
> The Church of St. Hiram is sacrosanct, can do no wrong.

If you say so, Len ;-)
>
>>Bash obtained his materials by other methods, and his books did not explain
>>how the material was obtained.
>
> So did the Q&A book folks.
>
How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?

>>In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
>
>Poor baby. You are mad as heck and you can't stand it anymore!

I'm simply stating an opinion on what Dick Bash did. Do you think his actions
were legal? Do you think they were in the best interests of amateur radio?
>
> Take Bash to civil court then, nothing stopping you from trying.

Actually, there is:

- Statute of limitations
- Rules changes since then
>
> Avenge all foes! Sound the hue and cry!! Love the ARRL!!!

Well, you're staying right on topic, Len. You're wrong yet again.

> That done, maybe you can fight against "J. K. Lasser's Your Income
> Tax" annual publications.

Why?
>
> I really think you ought to review Title 17, USC, Copyrights. If you
> do, you will find that the United States government cannot
> copyright its own works.

It's not about copyrights at all.

> That's been in the United States Code
> for quite a while. The ARRL did not need to "seek any permission"
> for republishing any FCC public material. They still don't need to,
> just repro it and mention the source. No fees, nothing. Anyone
> can.

Then what's your problem?
>
> There's a legal area that is a "grey area" for many on what
> constitutes "ownership" of test materials. I'll leave that up to
> attorneys and judges to thrash out...

In the instructions for the by-mail test I took for Novice, their were explicit directions not to copy or divulge the contents of the test. The signatures of the applicant and the volunteer examiner certified compliance with all of those instructions. Most of us took them very seriously. Bash didn't.

Of course you wouldn't know about that, never having had an amateur license of any type...

2030. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 03:32:16 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403281932.6e32ae25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90044
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.

Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend

"no person"

-that means no person - not even hams.

3. Section 302(b) of the Act provides ``{n}o person
> shall manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship
> devices or home electronic equipment and systems, or use
> devices, which fail to comply with regulations promulgated
> pursuant to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules
> provides that ``...no person shall sell or lease, or offer
> for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease),
> or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or
> leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency
> device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to
> certification, such device has been authorized by the
> Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and
> is properly identified and labeled...''
> Jim Norton's CB Sales and Service's offer for sale of these
> devices violates both sections.
>
> 4. Additionally, dual use CB and amateur radios of the
> kind at issue here may not be certificated under the
> Commission's rules. Section 95.655(a) of the rules states:
> ``...
> ({CB} Transmitters with frequency capability for the Amateur
> Radio Services....will not be
> certificated.)'' See also FCC 88-256, 1988 WL 488084 (August
> 17, 1988). This clarification was added to explicitly
> foreclose the possibility of certification of dual use CB and
> amateur radios, see id., and thereby deter use by CB
> operators of frequencies allocated for amateur radio use.
> Five of the Galaxy model CB transceivers previously mentioned
> were identified as having the modification done to enable
> dual use of CB and amateur frequencies. These units were
> Galaxy DX66V; Galaxy DX73V; Galaxy DX48T; Galaxy DX88HL; and
> Galaxy DX77HML.
>

> 5. Furthermore, the Commission has revised Section
> 2.1204(a)(5) of its rules to prohibit all marketing and/or
> offering for sale in the United States of such devices even
> when the purchaser(s) had provided assurances that the
> transceivers are being bought solely for export. ALL
> DOMESTIC MARKETING OF SUCH DEVICES VIOLATES THE
> COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, AND THE COMMISSION'S
> RULES.

"dual use CB and amateur radios"

-if it operates on cb it is illegal to use and sell

> ({CB} Transmitters with frequency capability for the Amateur
> Radio Services....will not be
> certificated.)''
> This clarification was added to explicitly
> foreclose the possibility of certification of dual use CB and
> amateur radios, see id., and thereby deter use by CB
> operators of frequencies allocated for amateur radio use.

-so calling it a 10 meter radio won't work anymore the FCC closed that loophole, Sorry Cranus LOL!

> NAME MODEL PRICE DESCRIPTION
> Connex 4800 DXL $289.99 12 Bands of 40 Channels
> Connex 4400 High Power $219.99 8 Bands
> of 40 Channels
> Connex 3300 High Power $199.99 Range
> 25.615 - 28.305
> Connex 3300 $179.99 Range 25.615 - 28.305
> Connex Patriot $199.99 Range 25.615 - 28.305
> Connex Deer Hunter $139.99 Can be converted to
> operate on 120 Chan.
> Connex 3300 LE $179.99 Range 25.615 - 28.305
> Connex 3300 HP LE $199.99 Range 25.615 - 28.305
> Connex 3300 Coyote Hunter $169.99 . . . CB
> band, with . . . 120 channels below
> Galaxy DX99V $329.99 Robot Talk, Voice Changer
> Galaxy DX 93T $429.99 Echo with dual controls
> Galaxy DX88HL $314.99 Dual-Control Echo,
> Talkback
> Galaxy DX77HML $219.99 6 bands of 40Ch.
> Galaxy DX66V $234.99 Dual Control Echo,
> Talkback
> Galaxy DX55V $164.99 equipped as an ideal
> multi-band radio
> NAME MODEL PRICE DESCRIPTION
> Galaxy 48T $369.99 Deluxe Export Radio
> Galaxy DX45-MP $249.99 Export Radios
> Galaxy DX44V $189.99 Dual control echo/reverb
> Galaxy DX33HML $159.99 dual control echo/reverb,

> Talkback
> General Lee $199.99 6 Bands of 40 Channels
> General A.P. Hill $169.99 6 Bands of 40 Channels
> General Grant $399.99 12 Bands of 40 Channels
> ? ? ?
> General Longstreet $229.99 6 Bands of 40 Channels
> Magnum 257 $179.99 10 bands of channels
> Ranger 6900F-25 $289.99 . . . 12-band segments
> Ranger 6900F-150 $409.99 . . . 24.2650 - 29.6650
> MHz
> Ranger 6900FTB-refurbished $369.99 Export
> Radios
> Ranger 6300F-25 $269.99 . . . 12-band segments
> Ranger 6300F-150 $389.99 Export Radios
> Ranger 2995DX $549.99 Export Base Station
> Ranger 2985DX $439.99 Export Base Station
> Ranger 2980WX $409.99 Export Base Station
> Ranger 2970DX $399.99 Export Radios
> Ranger 2950DX $269.99 Export Radios
> Superstar 3900HP-Gold $239.99 6 Bands 240 Channels
> Superstar Grant $179.99 120 Channels
> Superstar 121 $129.99 CB features...with...Upper
> and Lower Freq

2031. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 03:35:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <WamdnfkC4ZmaAfrdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>
>
> And most of the electrification of rural America was NOT done by the
> utilities. The rural residents themselves banded together and got the lines
> run. Once the lines were in place, then the public "futility" was happy to
> take over as the major expense had already been covered by someone else.
>
Most of the electrification of rural America was accomplished via the
Rural Electrification Authority aka REA. There had to be so many houses
per mile to justify the cost of running the lines and you had to be
within a certain distance of the right-of-way to get service or pay for
the cost of the line to be run to your residence.

2032. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:06:31 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c487bu$2fcgls$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90046

"N2EY" wrote ...

Look at the subject line.

I understand that. But isn't it a bit curious that Leonard just "now"
decided to get back on task?

Arnie -

2033. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:15:04 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4067A2C6.3070707@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90047

>
>
>>
>>
>
> Thanks for the heads-up on the past, Phil. Now, what about
> the O. J. Simpson criminal trial? [he was found innocent...]
> And what about the O. J. Simpson civil trial? [he was found
> "guilty"]
>
That means that OJ did it quite civially.... :-)

>
>
>

2034. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:23:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1cednSw4DYEwOfrdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90048

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040328004548.12501.00006985@mb-m04.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <1e4e3692.0403271853.4d0249ea@posting.google.com>,
>>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:<_vudnXjkOfUql_vdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
>>>
>>>>William wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>>
>>>news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>
>>>>>How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
>>>>
>>>> I press 911 on my HT.
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>I'll try it with my handheld before I turn in this evening.
>>
>> I think Mike needs to consult one of his many charts. He seems
>> to be confusing his HT with his cell phone.
>
>
> I think Lennie is making more assinine statements without the knowledge to
> back it up.
>
> One of the repeaters in my area also responds directly to a 9-1-1 input on
> DTMF. No other "access tones" or anything else necessary...Of course you get
> the 9-1-1 operator for that prefix, but it's a 10 second delay awaiting the
> hand-off.

Our repeater has better coverage than cell phones in the area and
covers much area that doesn't have cell phone coverage *at all*. It's a
very advanced system, with several sites that poll each other for the

best signal from you, and send the strongest to the main repeater site. So if you want to be prepared to call 911 from a wireless system in our area, you are much better off to use our repeater system.

The only disadvantage is that the phone identifies itself to the operator as being at the location of the repeater, so you have to identify your position.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2035. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:25:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1cednS84DYHPOPrdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90049

JJ wrote:

> William wrote:
>
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>>
>>> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
>>> that the act didn't take place.
>>
>>
>>
>> Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
>> clearly states "Morse Code."
>
>
> They are administering the "Morse Code" exam using the Farnsworth
> method. Where does part 97 state the Farnsworth method cannot be used?

Don't do it, JJ! Brian will argue that one for weeks!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2036. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:52:10 UTC
From: mzenier@eskimo.com
Message-ID: <fb4d4101.0403282052.38b801cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "reasonable doubt" <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com> wrote in message
> > news:bPu9c.116944$LX.12110199@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> >>>ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (AP) - President Bush, hunting for votes in hotly
> ...
> As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives, I wonder how
> this will be funded? There are large parts of the country that will
> require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Which means that if you really want to fight BPL, you need to go to
the stock market analysts and point out what a bad investment it may
be, and probably more effectivly, your states utility regulators (if
they have any of them left) to make sure that the power companies
don't use funds from a regulated service to set themselves up as
ISPs. Using Montana Power as an example, ISPs and Power companies
don't mix very well.

Mark Zenier mzenier@eskimo.com

2037. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 04:59:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8-idnQ-c7IJELfrdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90102

Mike Coslo wrote:

> JJ wrote:
>
>> William wrote:
>>
>>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>>> news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>>>
>>>> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
>>>> that the act didn't take place.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
>>> clearly states "Morse Code."
>>
>>
>>
>> They are administering the "Morse Code" exam using the Farnsworth
>> method. Where does part 97 state the Farnsworth method cannot be used?
>
>
> Don't do it, JJ! Brian will argue that one for weeks!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

A lot of people like to argue a point even if they are wrong.

2038. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 05:00:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4067AD87.2070907@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90101

N2EY wrote:

>In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't think
>>>it has a snowball's chance in
>>>
>>>
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>
Okay, didn't think that word was that expletive. The FCC allows it.
And heard it
in church today....

>
>
>>>of getting approved by the FCC.
>>>
>>>
>
>
>
>>One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
>>for extras.
>>
>>
>
>That's the key question these days for any license requirement these days. You
>make an excellent point.
>
>The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does FCC get
>out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
>
Was going to say "less heat from congressmen", but the BPL lobby will

take care of that....

>
>
>
>>As the
>>treaty requirement is now gone, and no other service uses it, why
>>bother.
>>
>>
>
>Because hams *do* use it. Some other services use it too, but not to any great
>extent.
>
If a ham decides to use it, he can then learn it. Perhaps some of the
old novice subbands
can be informally reserved for fumbling beginners to QSO with elmers
willing to train
them. They may need to use phone on another frequency to assist the
learning process.
Shouldn't be a problem as long as one doesn't talk *and* send code at
the same exact
time (there's a rule saying not to use more than one slice of bandwidth
(frequency) at a time).
Split band and split mode is okay.

>
>
>
>>The FCC isn't
>>in the business of giving out gold stars for the
>>
>>
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>
>
>>of it.
>>
>>
>
>Not about "gold stars". About qualifications. Of course there's differences of
>opinion on what qualified means.
>
Also what qualifications are really needed for the license. As if I
need more knowledge to
operate on 14.155 vs 14.277MHz.... Knowledge of rules, electrical and
RF safety, how
to identify and resolve RFI problems (which includes transmitter and
receiver theory), knowing

what constitutes intentional interference vs accidental QRM, what
"Pecuniary interest" means
and that that rule actually protects the ham bands from being invaded by
business users....

VHF and above users have limited range, and thus cannot cause global
disruption. HF
users can. So maybe that's an argument to restrict novices to VHF and
above, or low
power HF.

As the FCC allows us to take the covers off our transmitters, and lets
us homebrew
them as well, we should be expected to pass a test to demonstrate basic
knowledge
of how this stuff works, and what sort of problems can be caused by mis
designed or
mis adjusted equipment.

>
>
>
>>Code isn't a lid filter,
>>
>>
>
>*No* test is a perfect "lid filter". Particularly not a test given one time.
>There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through much
>more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not filtered out by
>those testing and education systems.
>
>
>
>>as witness
>>14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
>>
>>
>
>You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
>
>Remember this:
>
>All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that
>included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple written exams,
>yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests aren't a
>perfect lid filter either. Shall we dump the rules and regs from those written
>exams because they didn't do the job?
>
Those clowns knew full well that they were breaking rules. "Oh, you
mean I can't use expletives,
maliciously interfere, and not ID?" I don't know the answer as to how

to construct a lid filter
in the license testing process. But the FCC said itself that things did
not degrade after restructuring
(5wpm generals and extras set loose on HF). Once everyone learned to
fix their newbie type errors.

>
>
>
>
>
>

2039. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 07:09:13 UTC
From: rhf-say-bye-bye@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <ee137ed4.0403282309.804a7d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90103
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

= = = Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
= = = news:<4OGdne8Yz4LBS_vdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...

- - - - - S N I P - - - - -

> > Broadband doesn't always mean BPL. You are getting confused here.
> > Broadband can be via cable modem such as I just signed up for or even via a
> > wireless system. Do not assume that the term Broadband, when used alone,
> > means BPL (Broadband over Power Line).
> >
> > I saw the news clip and BPL was not mentioned, only Broadband.
>
> As one of the endangered species of fiscal conservatives,
> I wonder how this will be funded ?
>
> There are large parts of the country that will
> require many many miles of fiber to reach one family.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

The Funding is already there . . .
The Gore TAX for School Internet Connection.

Run the Main BPL Trunk-Lines and Distribution Points to the
Schools and have the Federal Government pay for that with
the existing Gore TAX.

WHY - BPL Broadband In Every Class Room - How Can Anyone Say NO To That !

Once Neighborhood Schools become the Distribution Points and the
BPL Broadband a 'low cost' BPL Broadband "Product" can be offered
within the neighborhood for home use.

~ RHF

.

2040. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 07:53:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329025329.08141.00000292@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90104

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 7:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328203515.19617.00000025@mb-m20.aol.com>

> Thanks for the heads-up on the past, Phil. Now, what about
> the O. J. Simpson criminal trial? [he was found innocent...]
> And what about the O. J. Simpson civil trial? [he was found
> "guilty"]
>
> Is this newsgroup "moot court?"
>
> Will Miccolis ever pass the Bar?
>
> All tune in tomorrow, same time, same newsgrope, to hear the
> continuing saga of "The Past is Prologue" sponsored by the
> lily-white Ivory Snowjob of alternate universes...

And your chief bottle washer and puppetboy has the cajones to call ME
"nuts"....?!?!

Mrs. Correspondence Course needs to get YOU on the couch for a few hours!

Steve, K4YZ

2041. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 07:56:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329025640.08141.00000293@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90105

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/28/2004 8:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <JO2dnQYbl_tSFvrdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
>
>William wrote:
>
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>>
>>> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
>>> that the act didn't take place.
>>
>>
>> Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
>> clearly states "Morse Code."
>
>They are administering the "Morse Code" exam using the Farnsworth
>method. Where does part 97 state the Farnsworth method cannot be used?

Forget it, JJ...

Brain will never get it...He never HAS "got it", and no amount of
elementary school-level explanations could ever get it through to him.

He's one of those "I know what I know and the facts shall not deter me"
types....Just like his mentor, Lennie the Lame.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2042. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:02:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329030217.08141.00000294@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90106

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/28/2004 10:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <8-idnQ-c7IJELfrdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
>
>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> JJ wrote:

>> Don't do it, JJ! Brian will argue that one for weeks!
>
>A lot of people like to argue a point even if they are wrong.

Some "argue" it just in hopes of burying thier mistakes. That makes them
DOUBLY wrong!

A man's character stock goes WAYYYYYYY up when he's got the cajones to
just say "ooops, I was wrong", rather than play the games Brain and Lennie do.

Not that I'd ever expect them to...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2043. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:07:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329030728.08141.00000295@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90107

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: JJ radiobuff0@mailcity.moc
>Date: 3/28/2004 6:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>
>>
>> Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
>>
>> Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
>>
>> Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
>>
>> Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
>>
>> You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.

>Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
>that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
>billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
>any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
>He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
>sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
>So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
>here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.

Brain claims it's just to deter spam.

He could just use a spam filter or a "...remove NOSPAM from e mail" type
block, but he has to create some new personna to "hide" from the spam.

Yeah...right.

What he DID was create "billybeeper" to artificially create a Lennie
fan...yet got a bit too proud of himself one day and signed his real "name" to
the end of the post....BUSTED!

Oh well.....

Steve, K4YZ

2044. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:10:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329031038.08141.00000296@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90108

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 7:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328200819.21825.00000040@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403281407.26989be5@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>>And if you think "in plain sight" is hiding, well, what can I say?
>>
>>You're just nuts.
>
> ...and perverse.

"Perverse"...?!?!

I'm not the one leaving the brown streaks in public, Lennie...Your
puppetboy is.

Come to think of it...Isn't that about where your hand slides in to work
the head and jaw...?!?!

Don't eat before you wash that hand!

Steve, K4YZ

2045. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:13:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329031329.08141.00000297@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90109

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/28/2004 7:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040328200817.21825.00000039@mb-m13.aol.com>

> BTW, I've been at two amateur radio repeater sites, laid hands on
> the equipment in the presence of other hams who were actually
> nice, cordial and everything. Obviously they haven't had Article 15
> thrown at them by the paralegal gunnery nurse wearing his pilot
> googles and olive USMC tee-shirt with "Temper Fry" on the back.

What an imagination, Lennie...

Or is it delusional...?!?!

(I particularly like the "laid hands on" part...A bit of the Jim Bakker syndrome, no doubt...)

> It's not a pretty sight...

You mean seeing what an alleged professional has turned into in his waning yeas...?!?!

For once you'd be right.

Steve, K4YZ

2046. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:18:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329031822.08141.00000298@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90110

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/28/2004 8:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281829.31a80bdb@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328090156.18008.00000508@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>> >restructuringdepends
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040327161848.00150.00000018@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>
>> > Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
>> > an dancin, eatin watermelon...
>>
>> Again with racial epithets.
>>
>> What a putz.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Weren't you the one with the little lantern guy?
>
>Yep, I remember. It was you.

And too bad your selective memory doesn't remember WHO it was that
suggested it originally, PuppetBoy.

Sir Scummy interjected such a suggestion some months ago when he described
what the typical "ham QTH" must look like, with the aforementioned lanternboy
adorning the driveway and towers in the back yard.

Sheeeeesh. Can't you get ANYTHING right...?!?! Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2047. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:22:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329032207.08141.00000299@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90111

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/28/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <eOidnY3R4v2wEvrdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
>
>William wrote:
>
>
>> Stern has been hard pressed to come up with something funny since he
>> can't talk about F anymore.
>
>Which exposes that he wasn't particularly funny in the first

BAM! Hammer on head.

If you get rid of the "f" word and any ribald reference to the female form, and Howard Stern is just another baritone late night oldies DJ.

Funny, though, that most of the people who are NOW dropping the hammer on him are the SAME people who laughed at him a 10-15 years ago, but NOW have children of thier own and don't want THEM exposed to that kind of filth ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

2048. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 08:26:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329032656.08141.00000300@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90112

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 3/28/2004 10:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1cednSw4DYEwOfrdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
>
> Our repeater has better coverage than cell phones in the area and
>covers much area that doesn't have cell phone coverage *at all*. It's a
>very advanced system, with several sites that poll each other for the
>best signal from you, and send the strongest to the main repeater site.
>So if you want to be prepared to call 911 from a wireless system in our
>area, you are much better off to use our repeater system.
>
> The only disadvantage is that the phone identifies itself to the
>operator as being at the location of the repeater, so you have to
>identify your position.

I agree.

Our local ARES and Amateur clubs have a great raport with local 9-1-1 services and are regulars at their in-services to discuss what we can/cannot do, etc. All of the local 9-1-1 operators know that if the caller ID's as "via Ham Radio" that the call is from a remote location other than the number calling.

That's a part of that "training" thing some posters here say doesn't happen.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2049. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 11:58:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040329065818.21825.00000048@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90113

In article <c487bu$2fcgls$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote ...
>
> Look at the subject line.
>____
>
>I understand that. But isn't it a bit curious that Leonard just "now"
>decided to get back on task?

He never got off, task, Arnie.

Every time you read his posts in this thread, don't you immeidately think:
"Wrong again, Len!"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2050. Cranus the anus warned to STOP his gay stuff in NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 12:16:31 UTC
From: nostoppinakc@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8fe0c09a.0403290416.1a5803b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90114
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) femininely mewled in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281719.206134b@posting.google.com>...
> I Can you really prove the statement that I am a queerboy. I am just
> blowing cocks, 24/7.
> I pray that ham radio has the same proportion (or more) of deviants
> than most of the healthier hobbies. I want to lick their pekkers
> I think I have blown at least 2000 weenies.(But I'll admit that it's just a
> guess.)

2051. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 12:23:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ZDCdnbxyb4HhiPXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90115

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com...
>
> Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that
BPL
> systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may
mean a
> repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
> *each* customer.

The slides I've seen presented by BPL marketing fluff folks show repeaters
every
300 meters ... that's a hell of a lot of repeaters to "serve rural America"
... yet they
claimed in the same presentation that it was "low cost because no
infrastructure was
required because the wires were already (presumably) there."

I pointed to their block diagrams with fiber to the area, "head-ends" to go
from fiber
to the MV/HV lines, repeaters every 300 meters, couplers, etc. and asked
"How can
you claim with a straight face that this "doesn't require the installation
of infrastructure?""

Carl - wk3c

2052. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 12:31:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <jyydnbOtYYnoivXdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90116

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
think
> >>it has a snowball's chance in
>
> [expletive deleted]

Since when is "hell" (as refering to the place?) an "expletive"????

> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
>
> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
> >for extras.
>
> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these days.
You
> make an excellent point.
>
> The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does FCC
get
> out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
>
> >As the
> >treaty requirement is now gone, and no other service uses it, why
> >bother.
>
> Because hams *do* use it. Some other services use it too, but not to any
great
> extent.
>
> >The FCC isn't
> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
>
> [expletive deleted]

Bob can defend his own use of the word "hell" :-)

> >of it.
>

> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications. Of course there's
differences of
> opinion on what qualified means.
>
> >Code isn't a lid filter,
>
> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter". Particularly not a test given one
time.
> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
much
> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not filtered
out by
> those testing and education systems.
>
> > as witness
> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
>
> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
>
> Remember this:
>
> All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that
> included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple written
exams,
> yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests aren't a
> perfect lid filter either. Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
written
> exams because they didn't do the job?

The written tests are not, and have never intended to be, a "lid filter."
ALL that they are meant to do is assess the applicant's basic level of
competence in the material the test covers ... they don't mean the applicant
is an "expert" in the field (not even the Extra test ...) ... they JUST are
a demonstration of the MINIMUM level of knowledge required for ENTRY into
whatever class license/privileges the test is for ...

I don't recall anyone claiming the written tests were a "lid filter" ...
however, many people asserted that the Morse test was (though the FCC
debunked that idea
back in 1989 or 1990 ...)

> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!

I don't favor the NCVEC proposal either (I prefer the ARRL proposal).

Carl - wk3c

2053. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:13:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290513.4893b6cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90117

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328161836.04330.00000236@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403280706.2e94c4a8@posting.google.com>
>
> > They
> >> both take time and both are worthwhile.
> >
> >Not to me.
>
> But who...better yet WHAT are you...?!?!?>
> So "we" are impressed by your opinions....WHY...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I'm not impressed by your opinions either, but I don't stalk you all over rrap.

2054. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:15:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290515.5b03b0b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90118

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328172128.21720.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:02 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281402.37a848e5@posting.google.com>
>
> >> The rest are your ususal smatterings of rhetorical antagonism, spiced
> with
> >> profanity and "personal perjorative".
> >>
> >> Same Putzy Lennie...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >Didn't he help you find a schematic or a manual?
>
> Sure he did. And Hitler got the trains running and revitalized a
> devastated economy.

Wow. I think you've just compared Len to Hitler.

I thought that wasn't allowed on here?

Oh, wait a sec, two sets of rules.

2055. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:16:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290516.4a27cc2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90119

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<onje60h4j3v3otqej0rt8jbpqgilg5333o@4ax.com>...
> What you are looking at here is called "Markov Text", generated by
> mathematical algorithm run on a batch of words. It is commonly used
> to produce random blocks of text for insertion into SPAM emails, which
> will fool many SPAM-detection programs.
>
> You can play around with an online Markov generator at the following
> web site:
>
> http://www.eskimo.com/~rstarr/poormfa/markov.html
>
> A minor radio link: Markov was a student of Chebyshev (of filter
> fame)!
>
> 73, Leo

Thought it was developed for encryption.

2056. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:20:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290520.2181c6fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90120

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328171652.21720.00000250@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281359.1d341a73@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
> >> I wonder, Lennie...In as much as you are not a licensee, HOW were you
> able
> >> to ascertain that Brain is a "good ham"...?!?!
> >
> >Hiram was not my father. My fambly tree has branches.
>
> I am sure your "fambly" is very proud, too.

Yup.

> But that didn't answer my question, Brain.

But you only had "ONE" question, and that wasn't it.

Are you lying again?

> Without an Amateur Radio license with which to communicatre with you while
> operating AS a HAM, how can Lennie make an informed opinion as to whether or
> not you are a "good ham"...?!?!
>
> Do YOU understand the question, Brain? Or do you want to dance around
> this one for a few days, too?

Amateur Communications are secure. No unworthy shortwave or scanner
enthusiast can hear them...

...thinks Quixoterobeson.

> At least this time there's nothing for you to try and deny. You can just
> snort and claim I am "nuts" while hoping it "goes away" without rubbing your
> nose in it any more....

You are nuts.

2057. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:21:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290521.ca65c9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90121

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>
> >
> > Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
> >
> > Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
> >
> > Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
> >
> > Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
> >
> > You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.
> >
> > Plank
> >
> > LHA / WMD
> >
> >
>
> Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
> that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
> billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
> any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
> He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
> sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
> So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
> here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.

So JJ doesn't have a name or a callsign?

No credibility.

2058. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:28:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290528.5c1c1611@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90122

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327095822.08277.00000224@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >> >ect: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:46 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270646.dd2e042@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040327030503.29966.00000203@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >> >> >Date: 3/26/2004 11:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0403260944.3e291b71@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> I consider myself a "professional" too, but I don't remember
> ahving
> been
> >> >> taught that profanity is an effective means of communication.
> >> >
> >> >How did you make it through the U.S. Marine Corp without ever meeting a
> >> >sailor?
> >>
> >> What does having served in the U. S. Marine Corps or meeting sailors
> have
> >> to do with my training and education as a Nurse, Brain?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >I've never met a sailor who could communicate w/o profanity.
>
> Then I'd say that your scope of experience was pretty narrow.
>
> Just how many "sailors" do you know, Brain?
>
> >Unless you consider "sailoring" to not be a profession.
>
> I am unaware of a profession called "sailoring".

>
> I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make the use
> of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should the
> offended person so desire.

Too bad we don't have a "conduct unbecoming" regulation.

You'd spend all of your time at Captain's Mast rather than harassing
and stalking others.
>
> Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.

Tell me about that misister's non-judicial punishment.

No, document it.

> Do they do it in the course of thier professional duites or in public
> correspondence?

Yes. No.

> Nope...Unless you can show me some sort of "official" Naval document
> wherein profanity was used as a professional means of communication...?!?!

You don't show verbal comments, they are not official navy
"documents."

> I'll sit here holding my breath waiting on that one, Brain.
>
> (No I won't...just teasing you...)

darn

2059. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:44:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90123

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328170024.21720.00000245@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> Regardless...Your puppetboy exposed himself and left parts out to be
> stepped on that should have never seen the light of day.

Darn! I didn't realize that I had exposed myself.

I apologize. No offense meant (dear God, hope it didn't turn him on).

But I did punch in 911 on my radio and nothing happened.

> YOU exacerbated the silliness by spouting off on a topic that you were,
> AGAIN, ill-prepared to address. Regardless of what's "voluntary" or "not
> universal", direct 9-1-1 access on Amateur repeaters >>IS<< commonplace.

But isn't what you are talking about tied to wires?

So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

2060. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:48:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290548.46a753ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90124

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328091628.18008.00000512@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271851.3ef1fce3@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327100602.08277.00000225@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:52 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >> >
> >> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call, Brain?
> >> >
> >> >I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
> >> >acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
> >> >Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
> >>
> >> What "90%" Brain?
> >
> >Now dammit, Steve, you're the one who wanted to know why it takes a
> >911 operator to handle every 911 call.
>
> That's not what you wrote, Brain.

Correct. It's what >>>you<<< wrote.

> Shall I back up a couple posts, RE-POST what was written, and ONCE AGAIN
> have two-weeks worth of your newsgroup excrement in which to rub YOUR
> nose...?!?!

Yup.

> >See above. Retract your idiotic comment or forever be known as a
> >liar.
>
> Best back up, PuppetBoy. If I re-post the complete, IN-CONTEXT post,
> you're gonna look stupid...AGAIN...
>
> >> ALL of the 9-1-1 calls get answered where I live.

> >
> >Whoa! Here too.
>
> Glad to hear it. Ohio always has had a great emergency response
> reputation, even before 9-1-1 was implemented.

Thank you.

> >> NOT all of the calls warrant a Code 3 response.
> >
> >Do all calls warrant being answered?
>
> Did I say otherwise...?!?! If so, please cite the post wherein I did say
> otherwise.

You can capture it again when you back up. But don't go changing anything.

> >> > We only
> >> >> need one, maybe two on any call, if you allow for one being on the phone
> and
> >> >> one on the radio...
> >> >
> >> >How does a citizen call a 911 operator on a radio?
> >>
> >> Hmmmmm...there are several ways.
> >>
> >> First of all is to use the autopatch if a licensed Amateur.
> >>
> >> Second is to be an authorized user of the county dispatch network
> (which I
> >> am)
> >>
> >> Third is to...never mind...I could be at this all day...
> >
> >I'll bet you could. Nuts.
>
> Yes, you are.
>
> And you're digging yourself in deeper with every post every day.
>
> I'd have thought you'd have learned by now.
>
> Does your WIFE read your antics? Does she know how thoroughly you
> humiliate your family name?

First you want to pick on my kids, now you want to pick on my wife.

No wonder you said you've been divorced so many times.

2061. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 13:52:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403290552.e786c15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90125

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328170024.21720.00000245@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040328163238.03943.00000038@mb-m29.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <J9adnQGi-P2YRfvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> ><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >> If a ham punches in 911 on his or her HT on our local repeater system,
> >>the call will indeed be patched into the local 911 center.
> >
> > That's an excellent thing for your local repeater. It isn't a national
> > standard among U.S. amateur radio repeaters, de facto or de jure.
>
> "De facto" or "de jure" noitwithstanding, it IS a technical possibility,
> and for some of us, reality.
>
> Sorry it punctured yet another "I Don't Have Any Practical Experience In
> Amateur Radio Upon Which To Base This But I'll Take A Shot And Hope I Get Away
> With It" rant, Lennie
>
> > The 911 combination IS a national standard for all telephone ESSs
> > in the United States and is accounted for in all number
> > combinations used in signalling and dialing in the telephone
> > infrastructure.
>
> "911" is not.
>
> "9-1-1" is. Please refer to the logo on any emergency vehicle that
> promotes the number. This was done for a reason.

Please refer to any telephone key pad. There are no dashes on them.

2062. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 14:14:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40682F4B.2040305@psu.edu>
Source record: 90126

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40643B89.3030405@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>>On 25 Mar 2004 09:13:23 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>I hope that's true. Note how vague the NPRM language is about how
>>>>interference is to be mitigated.
>>>
>>>
>>> That's because there are less and less "old timers" on the staff who
>>> know how to chase down and evaluate such interference and a general
>>> reluctance of the non-field people to shut someone off the air
>>> because of same.
>>>
>>> The long slippery slope started when the agency started privatizing
>>> things such as frequency coordination and interference resolution in
>>> the mid 1980s.......
>>>
>>> It wouldn't surprise me at all if the old standard of Part 15
>>> devices having to tolerate interception of lawful signals gets
>>> thrown in the trashcan. That's what having policy set on
>>> less-than-technically-knowlegeable grounds can result in. It's the
>>> equivalent of ordering that all antennas be installed underground
>>> to preserve aesthetic standards.
>>
>>
>> There would almost have to be a exemption specifically for BPL access,
>>because if the whole of part 15 was chucked, then the part 15 devices
>>would be able to interfere with each other, but nothing could be done
>>about it.
>
>
> Isn't that the case now? If my computer monitor interferes with my cordless
> phone, can I insist that FCC fix the problem? Just try!

I read them as both part 15 devices, and they have to put up with each
other's interference. Hopefully the manufacturers making the junk will
either redesign or go out of business.

>> All the things that can radiate in the HF spectrum and interfere with
>>or be interfered with by BPL are a large list. And if part 15 is gone,
>>then they won't have to worry about RFI protection in design any more so
>>the list will grow...
>
>
> But will a device that meets Part 15 "30 meter" specifications interfere with
> BPL? I don't think so.

Not sure here Jim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2063. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 14:32:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40683368.70402@psu.edu>
Source record: 90127

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com...
>
>>Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that
>
> BPL
>
>>systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may
>
> mean a
>
>>repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
>>*each* customer.
>
>
> The slides I've seen presented by BPL marketing fluff folks show repeaters
> every
> 300 meters ... that's a hell of a lot of repeaters to "serve rural America"
> ... yet they
> claimed in the same presentation that it was "low cost because no
> infrastructure was
> required because the wires were already (presumably) there."
>
> I pointed to their block diagrams with fiber to the area, "head-ends" to go
> from fiber
> to the MV/HV lines, repeaters every 300 meters, couplers, etc. and asked
> "How can
> you claim with a straight face that this "doesn't require the installation
> of infrastructure?""

Good work!

Right there is the evidence that the proponents are being less than
accurate in their portrayal of BPL.

Since BPL is slower than some other broadband services, and the
infrastructure appears to be similar to running fiber, is the slowing
attributed to the "existing infrastructure" part of the line?

I'm ignorant of the finer details of BPL, so I may be way off here.

Seems like if they have to run fiber, and do all the repeaters, etc.
why not just..... run fiber and put the signals into the houses as
they should be?

Any good sources of the nitty-gritty of BPL technology?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2064. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 14:34:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <406833EE.7060308@psu.edu>
Source record: 90128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dee D. Flint wrote:

<snippage>

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

>>So to me it is a very liberal idea to even attempt universal broadband
>>access, and since not many other choices are available for increasing
>>the number of choices, it by default includes BPL.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> The universal access with multiple choices means very heavy investment as
> now that could be construed to mean that BPL, DSL, cable, and WI-FI all need
> set up in our rural areas to provide those choices. Guess what! Ain't
> gonna happen.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Isn't that the truth!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2065. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 16:30:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40684F08.6030905@psu.edu>
Source record: 90130

William wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<6yydnYNdSZ850P7dUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays66@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:2JidnXa63ZI6jP_dRVn-tw@comcast.com...
>>[snip]
>>
>>
>>>The real oddity is how this situation came about. Once the no-code
>>>technician license was introduced, people chose to take the route of
>>>studying the 200 page book to get the no-code tech license rather than the
>>>much simpler Novice written and simple 5wpm test. It was the beginners
>>>themselves who changed the Tech to a beginner license by choosing to
>>
>> bypass
>>
>>>the Novice. People are strange.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>
>>Just goes to show you that Morse only privs on HF don't appeal very much to
>>the
>>vast majority of people who want to talk, learn and experiment with digital
>>modes, etc.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>
> I'm just amazed at how easily some can brush aside the monumental
> waste of time learning the Morse Code and become.
>
> Probably someone without a job, on disability, or retired.

There is an amazing irony about one of the rrap regulars going on about
"a monumental waste of time", don't you think Brian?

Of course we are all experts in the matter! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2066. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 16:34:18 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <30kg60lokagsnro7papu2lbv5f7g85otsr@4ax.com>
Source record: 90129
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:

>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>
>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>
>"no person"
>
>-that means no person - not even hams.
>

Read this dimbulb:

Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed within the United States, but transceivers for other services, including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.

Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.

Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe "10-meter" transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for importation or marketing into/within the United States.

Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is illegal to sell in the United States?

2067. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 17:49:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <8dng60het4akb41kho7v289h9778cubbt9@4ax.com>
Source record: 90131

Encryption would be one possible application for Markov's algorithms - although that wasn't his original goal. He was developing formulae to attempt to explain the random motion of particles in liquids (aka Brownian motion), and various other stochastic processes. His algorithm is most loved by spammers, who use it to create blocks of text which pass right through spam filters. Apparently, some artists have used it to write song lyrics and prose....

73, Leo

On 29 Mar 2004 05:16:30 -0800, billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<onje60h4j3v3otqej0rt8jbpqgilg5333o@4ax.com>...
>> What you are looking at here is called "Markov Text", generated by
>> mathematical algorithm run on a batch of words. It is commonly used
>> to produce random blocks of text for insertion into SPAM emails, which
>> will fool many SPAM-detection programs.
>>
>> You can play around with an online Markov generator at the following
>> web site:
>>
>> http://www.eskimo.com/~rstarr/poormfa/markov.html
>>
>> A minor radio link: Markov was a student of Chebyshev (of filter
>> fame)!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>Thought it was developed for encryption.

2068. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 18:34:07 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403291034.573eca4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>
>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>
>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>
>>"no person"
>>
>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>
>
>Read this dimbulb:
>
>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.
>
>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.

where

>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe "10-meter"
>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
importation
>or marketing into/within the United States.

correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site does
not certify it

>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is illegal
>to sell in the United States?

where did I say that?

2069. All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 18:52:53 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90133

All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!

#MSG ADDRESS %ofRRAP

JAN top 10

[99] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 9.9%
[91] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 9.1%
[62] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 6.2%
[49] Leo <nomail@noway.com> 4.9%
[47] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 4.7%
[44] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 4.4%
[43] Hans K0HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 4.3%
[43] Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com> 4.3%
[35] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 3.5%
[32] Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> 3.2%

FEB top 10

[189] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 13.2%
[122] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.5%
[113] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 7.9%
[106] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 7.4%
[77] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 5.4%
[53] Leo <nomail@noway.com> 3.7%
[46] Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> 3.2%
[43] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> 3.0%
[43] Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> 3.0%
[36] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 2.5%

MAR top 10

[270] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 12.8%
[253] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.0%
[229] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 10.9%
[113] N2EY <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> 5.4%
[103] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 4.9%
[96] JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> 4.6%
[69] CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com> 3.3%
[66] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 3.1%
[60] Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> 2.9%
[56] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> 2.7%
[47] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 2.2%

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2070. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 19:16:58 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <2ctg605fet6lncl95umeggm3hf51u75bab@4ax.com>
Source record: 90134
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:

>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>>
>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>>
>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>>
>>>"no person"
>>>
>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>>
>>
>>Read this dimbulb:
>>
>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.
>>
>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>
>where
>
>>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe "10-meter"
>>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
>importation
>>or marketing into/within the United States.
>
>correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site does
>not certify it
>
>>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is illegal
>>to sell in the United States?
>
>where did I say that?

Your reply to Richard. You made it sound like "all" 10 meter radios
where illegal.

2071. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 19:20:21 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <lltg60h00o0097kphac90ka78ain5rjnmd@4ax.com>
Source record: 90135
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:

>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>>
>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,

Right here--^

>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>>
>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>>
>>>"no person"
>>>
>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>>
>>
>>Read this dimbulb:
>>
>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.
>>
>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>
>where

See above..

2072. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 19:28:20 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0403291128.500b9367@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90136
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
>George) wrote:
>
>>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>>>
>>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to
own,
>>>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>>>
>>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>>>
>>>>"no person"
>>>>
>>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Read this dimbulb:
>>>
>>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission
approval.
>>>
>>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>>
>>where
>>
>>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe
"10-meter"
>>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
>>importation
>>or marketing into/within the United States.
>>
>>correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site
does
>>not certify it
>>
```

>>>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is
illegal
>>>to sell in the United States?
>>
>>where did I say that?
>
>Your reply to Richard. You made it sound like "all" 10 meter radios
>where illegal.

this is a CB radio newsgroup dipshit we are not talking about hams
using 10 meters the subject is export cb radios. Sound like you are
trying to confuse people like the export dealers do by calling them 10
meter radios LOL

2073. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 19:34:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <f6qdnfEztvvc5_XdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90137

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 3/28/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <eOidnY3R4v2wEvrdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
>>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Stern has been hard pressed to come up with something funny since he
>>>can't talk about F anymore.
>>
>>Which exposes that he wasn't particularly funny in the first
>
>
> BAM! Hammer on head.
>
> If you get rid of the "f" word and any ribald reference to the female
> form, and Howard Stern is just another baritone late night oldies DJ.
>
> Funny, though, that most of the people who are NOW dropping the hammer on
> him are the SAME people who laughed at him a 10-15 years ago,

Yup...

> but NOW have
> children of thier own and don't want THEM exposed to that kind of filth ! ! ! !

And they will fail to protect *their* children just as their parents
did! 8^)

Oh well, I have mixed thoughts on the "new censorship " going on. I
prefer the airways cleaned up, but I would just as soon have Howard
removed from them because he stinks than for his profanity.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2074. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:03:40 UTC
From: Lancer
Message-ID: <7uvg605pbfcsp70v99pfimc7mmo50baqs3@4ax.com>
Source record: 90138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 29 Mar 2004 11:28:20 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
George) wrote:

>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
>>George) wrote:
>>
>>>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>>>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to
>own,
>>>>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>>>>
>>>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>>>>
>>>>>"no person"
>>>>>
>>>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Read this dimbulb:
>>>>
>>>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>>>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>>>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>>>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission
>approval.
>>>>
>>>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>>>
>>>where
>>>
>>>>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe
>"10-meter"
>>>>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
>>>importation
>>>>or marketing into/within the United States.
>>>
>>>correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site

>does
>>>not certify it
>>>
>>>>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is
>illegal
>>>>to sell in the United States?
>>>
>>>where did I say that?
>>
>>Your reply to Richard. You made it sound like "all" 10 meter radios
>>where illegal.
>
>
>this is a CB radio newsgroup dipshit we are not talking about hams
>using 10 meters the subject is export cb radios. Sound like you are
>trying to confuse people like the export dealers do by calling them 10
>meter radios LOL

Funny, your response to him was about a licensed amateur owning,
using, and selling a ten meter radio. And if you will check your
headers, you will see that this is not only posted to rec.radio.cb,
but also to rec.radio.amateur.policy. Sounds like you are the one
thats confused, try to keep up with the thread, dipshit. LOL

2075. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:19:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403291219.cb35cb8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90139

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329031822.08141.00000298@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >restructuringdepends
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/28/2004 8:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281829.31a80bdb@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328090156.18008.00000508@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >> >restructuringdepends
> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <20040327161848.00150.00000018@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
> >> > Right. All them folks in de back o de bus be happy, singin
> >> > an dancin, eatin watermelon...
> >>
> >> Again with racial epithets.
> >>
> >> What a putz.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Weren't you the one with the little lantern guy?
> >
> >Yep, I remember. It was you.
>
> And too bad your selective memory doesn't remember WHO it was that
> suggested it originally, PuppetBoy.
>
> Sir Scummy interjected such a suggestion some months ago when he described
> what the typical "ham QTH" must look like, with the aforementioned lanternboy
> adorning the driveway and towers in the back yard.
>
> Sheeeeesh. Can't you get ANYTHING right...?!?! Putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

There you go assuming again. I read few of Len's posts. So when I
see you using reverse psychology on Len, it just looks like your
original idea.

2076. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:24:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152458.12851.00000105@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90143

In article <1e4e3692.0403290515.5b03b0b8@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328172128.21720.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:02 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281402.37a848e5@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> The rest are your ususal smatterings of rhetorical antagonism,
>spiced
>> with
>> >> profanity and "personal perjorative".
>> >>
>> >> Same Putzy Lennie...
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Didn't he help you find a schematic or a manual?
>>
>> Sure he did. And Hitler got the trains running and revitalized a
>> devastated economy.
>
>Wow. I think you've just compared Len to Hitler.

Actually, Mussolini promised to "get the trains running on time." :-)

Hitler killed 7 million in concentration camps.

The gunnery nurse got his ego tweaked so everyone that does
that is a "war criminal!" :-)

>I thought that wasn't allowed on here?
>
>Oh, wait a sec, two sets of rules.

The set is elastomeric...rubber, stretches to include any sort of
hatred in the heart of hot-dog heavy heurisitic hitters such as the
Doctor Dill Instructor from the "ER." :-)

He's nuts.

LHA / WMD

2077. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:24:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152459.12851.00000106@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90142

In article <1e4e3692.0403290521.ca65c9f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
>> >
>> > Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
>> >
>> > Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
>> >
>> > Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
>> >
>> > You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.
>> >
>> > Plank
>> >
>> > LHA / WMD
>>
>> Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
>> that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
>> billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
>> any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
>> He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
>> sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
>> So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
>> here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.
>
>So JJ doesn't have a name or a callsign?
>
>No credibility.

All he is is the equivalent of heavy breathing at the other end of
an obscene phone call.

Maybe it's just some AI program? Lots of Artificiality in that
"Intelligence"... :-)

LHA / WMD

2078. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:25:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90144

In article <8-idnQ-c7IJELfrdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> JJ wrote:
>>
>>> William wrote:
>>>
>>>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>>>> news:<xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>>>>
>>>>> Not being prosecuted or otherwise punished for an act doesn't mean
>>>>> that the act didn't take place.
>>>>
>>>> Such as the ARRL VEC administering Farnsworth exams when Part 97
>>>> clearly states "Morse Code."
>>>
>>> They are administering the "Morse Code" exam using the Farnsworth
>>> method. Where does part 97 state the Farnsworth method cannot be used?
>>
>> Don't do it, JJ! Brian will argue that one for weeks!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>A lot of people like to argue a point even if they are wrong.

Such as yourself.

The subject of "spacing" in telegraphy tests was long and drawn
out in the past postings on this newsgrope.

Part 97 did not, and still does not, describe International Morse
Code directly, nor does it define the equivalent word rate for same.
The only reference to International Morse Code is a CCITT
document found at the International Telecommunications Union,
itself having been replaced by an ITU document number some
years ago. I have that document. So does Brian Burke. No one
else in here has admitted having that document.

The "CCITT" (a French acronym translating to "International
Communications Consultative Committee') was formed many
years ago and was concerned primarily with wired commercial
communications systems. Cooperative regulatory actions in that
field are handled now by the ITU-T, the "-T" referring to Tele-
communications. Cooperative regulatory actions in radio are

handled by the ITU-R, the "-R" referring to radiocommunications. The ITU is a United Nations body, has no separate "police" functions, and all agreements are based on "good faith" of diplomacy among all member nations.

In the CCITT document - a very long one, only part of which is concerned with telegraphy - the character set coding of International Morse Code is described in relative terms such as ratio of length of dot to dash to character space to word space. It does NOT include any definition of "word" in telegraphy nor does it define specifically any word rate per unit time.

The "Farnsworth" method is, effectively, a two-rate system with characters transmitted at a higher rate than "word" rate so that is a distortion of the ratio specifications of the CCITT document cited by the FCC in Part 97.

A "word" in telegraphy is - by common convention - taken to be 5 characters plus a space interval. That is NOT defined specifically in the regulations of any Part within Title 47, C.F.R. A telegraphy "word" of 5 characters plus space dates back well before radio existed and was common convention in commercial wired telegraphy communications. The "word" definitions have fallen out of regulatory text concerning telegraphy. The insistence of "we've always done it that way" is extremely arguable in legal situations and is not a per se definition for laws, rules, and regulations.

Farnsworth spacing has been approved for U.S. amateur radio telegraphy testing by the FCC in writing. That came some time AFTER its practice had been done by some VE teams. It has NOT been legally defined in detail by the FCC in regulations.

Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing, however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE. It required a specific document (separate from published regulations) from the FCC to permit its use years after it was begun by Volunteer Examiners.

The argument raged in here due to the overtly sensitive psyches of certain licensed amateurs who stated they were "right" because they were licensed, tested, etc., etc., yet none of them were involved in setting regulations for any radio service and certainly had no power to enforce any beyond whining and crying in this newsgrope. The only "regular" who had actual, legal experience in communications law stayed away from the main argument.

LHA / WMD

2079. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:25:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152501.12851.00000108@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90140

In article <20040328215828.18733.00000085@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040327161847.00150.00000017@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>> The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
>>>> the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>>>
>>>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and
>>>arguably illegal at the time.
>>
>> So did the Q&A book folks.
>
>How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?

By all the time-honored practices used in college and
university written exam "cheat sheets" well before there
were any radio regulating agencies.

Stop trolling for an argument subject. The practice is
well known in many activities. It has been explained
by others in here. Dick Bash was a late-comer in the
FCC examination "typical test question-answer" area
in the USA. Many others were ahead of his company.

You waste our time, my time, everyone's time.

LHA / WMD

2080. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:25:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152502.12851.00000109@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90141

In article <c47umi$2g1cdf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" wrote ...
>
>Once thought to have Arnie's back against the wall, and therefore MORE than
>willing to rant off-topic on his own, Lennie finds himself up against a
>formidable and well prepared "opponent" and NOW wants to move back on
>target. Uh huh.
>____
>
>Leonard came to my ballpark and wanted to play. The problem he faces is
>simple. I am the expert in this particular arena. Unfortunately, he just
>doesn't seem to realize that.

Incorrect. This is not a ballpark, not a government contract discussion
forum, and Macy is vainly trying to exact retribution for perceived
personal affronts long ago in the past. Not only that, he ventures far
from the general subject of this newsgroup which is concerned with
amateur radio policy.

Macy acts the petulant little child, whining and crying because he
is not honored and revered because he exists. Puerile behavior.

He tries to play games. Unfortunately he has struck out. Long ago.

LHA / WMD

2081. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:25:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329152503.12851.00000110@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90145

In article <40683368.70402@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> news:20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com...
>>
>>>Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that
>>
>> BPL
>>
>>>systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may
>>
>> mean a
>>
>>>repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
>>>*each* customer.
>>
>>
>> The slides I've seen presented by BPL marketing fluff folks show repeaters
>> every
>> 300 meters ... that's a hell of a lot of repeaters to "serve rural America"
>> ... yet they
>> claimed in the same presentation that it was "low cost because no
>> infrastructure was
>> required because the wires were already (presumably) there."
>>
>> I pointed to their block diagrams with fiber to the area, "head-ends" to go
>> from fiber
>> to the MV/HV lines, repeaters every 300 meters, couplers, etc. and asked
>> "How can
>> you claim with a straight face that this "doesn't require the installation
>> of infrastructure?""
>
>
> Good work!
>
> Right there is the evidence that the proponents are being less than
>accurate in their portrayal of BPL.

Actually, no more "inaccurate" than any other MARKETING and PR
group for any communications carrier service.

There is NO factual, detailed technical description available in the
electronics or communications industry trade publications about any
proposed or in-test Access BPL system.

The public doesn't know the conducted BPL signal levels, doesn't know the (presumably) tested losses along electric power distribution lines, the BPL coupler and other interface equipment losses. Nor is there any specific data on the range of impedance/admittance of installed electric power lines throughout the USA. Those electric power lines were NEVER standardized to be RF transmission lines.

Without detailed information to make judgements from, there is no telling what the RF radiation levels might be. It is obvious from monitoring installed test systems that it DOES radiate RF over a broad spectrum.

> Since BPL is slower than some other broadband services, and the
>infrastructure appears to be similar to running fiber, is the slowing
>attributed to the "existing infrastructure" part of the line?

Not a good question since there is not enough detail to determine any data rate.

Access BPL is essentially a very new way to distribute data. From the allegedly-needed bandwidth requirements covering most of HF and part of VHF spectrum, the fastest data rate could be greater than 10 Megabits per second, certainly faster than a T1 line at 1.54 MBPS. Without any detailed system information it is very broad conjecture.

> I'm ignorant of the finer details of BPL, so I may be way off here.

So are we all. :-(

> Seems like if they have to run fiber, and do all the repeaters, etc.
>why not just........ run fiber and put the signals into the houses as
>they should be?

Good question.

> Any good sources of the nitty-gritty of BPL technology?

Look at the websites for industry magazines EDN, Electronic Design, and RFDESIGN, even Microwaves & RF. I get all four and there's not been any nitty-gritty data yet. Lots of PR generalities.

As an IEEE Life Member, I get their membership magazine free each month and SPECTRUM is well-regarded as giving detailed explains on many electronic systems. Excellent articles, informative. None there yet. The SPECTRUM is on-line and with free access at www.ieee.org.

A website search turns up most of the BPL proponents' sites but you won't find any details there, just the same PR slide-show material they showed to the FCC.

The FCC Office of Engineering and Technology isn't telling. They might not know any more than anyone else, hence their NOI of last year.

Access BPL is going to be bad for HF. We just don't know HOW bad. Kiss your HF receiver sensitivity ratings goodbye...it won't matter if BPL goes past your house.

LHA / WMD

2082. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:34:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90146

>Subject: All that flappin'
>From: "Gri¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
Gri¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
>
>Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!

And your point is...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2083. Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:35:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329153534.19505.00000279@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90147

>Subject: Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290513.4893b6cb@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328161836.04330.00000236@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Dee's comments on Novice vs. Tech
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403280706.2e94c4a8@posting.google.com>
>>
>> > They
>> >> both take time and both are worthwhile.
>> >
>> >Not to me.
>>
>> But who...better yet WHAT are you...?!?!?>
>> So "we" are impressed by your opinions....WHY...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I'm not impressed by your opinions either, but I don't stalk you all over
>rrap.

So who's stalking?

This is a public forum, Brain.

Don't want to get your nose tweaked? Don't make stupid, easily disproved
assertions.

Steve, K4YZ

2084. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:38:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329153825.19505.00000280@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90149

>Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:15 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290515.5b03b0b8@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328172128.21720.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>...

>> Sure he did. And Hitler got the trains running and revitalized a
>> devastated economy.
>
>Wow. I think you've just compared Len to Hitler.
>
>I thought that wasn't allowed on here?
>
>
>Oh, wait a sec, two sets of rules.

Nope. Just one major example that you can take anyone, regardless of how terrible they may be, and under the right "spin", made to look "acceptable".

I am sure that Lennie doesn't look good in jackboots and swatikas.

Steve, K4YZ

2085. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:38:28 UTC
From: reasonable doubt <nonetospeakof@nosuchplace.com>
Message-ID: <8P%9c.147557$LX.17856277@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90148
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> HF spectrum anyway. So much for secure connections. Now do you all
> understand what is REALLY going on?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

You betcha, though it's ironic how few Americans in this "well informed" environment have any inkling as to what's actually happening in this good 'ole USofA. Reliable news feeds are available and anyone can look, but it's remarkable how few people can connect the dots. History is repeating itself. Problem is, it's only been 50 years since the fall of the Reich; way too short a time for an encore, but here we are.

Read and be educated, folks...

http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/index.html

http://www.fromthewilderness.com/

http://www.truthout.com/

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.644 / Virus Database: 412 - Release Date: 3/26/04

2086. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:40:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329154020.19505.00000281@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90150

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290520.2181c6fa@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328171652.21720.00000250@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:59 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281359.1d341a73@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>

>> At least this time there's nothing for you to try and deny. You can
>just
>> snort and claim I am "nuts" while hoping it "goes away" without rubbing
>your
>> nose in it any more....
>
>You are nuts.

And you're still a liar...and you STILL ahven't answered the question.

Steve, K4YZ

2087. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:43:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <sMadnQIbzNOwEPXdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90154

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>> Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
>>>
>>> Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
>>>
>>> Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
>>>
>>> Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
>>>
>>> You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.
>>>
>>> Plank
>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
>>that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
>>billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
>>any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
>>He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
>>sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
>>So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
>>here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.
>
>
> So JJ doesn't have a name or a callsign?
>
> No credibility.

Every one who knows me call me JJ, I do have a callsign, on the other
hand you go by several names here and not being sure of just who you
really are, you probably don't have a call sign.

No, none, nada, credibility.

2088. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:44:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329154444.19505.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90151

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290528.5c1c1611@posting.google.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>

>> I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make the
>use
>> of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should the
>> offended person so desire.
>
>Too bad we don't have a "conduct unbecoming" regulation.

Yes. I'd take great pleasure in seeing you adn Lennie prosecuted under it.

>You'd spend all of your time at Captain's Mast rather than harassing
>and stalking others.
>>
>> Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.
>
>Tell me about that misister's non-judicial punishment.
>
>No, document it.

How can a civilian be "punichsed" under military law, Brain?

I did NOT state is was a military person. We were discussing profanity.

>> Do they do it in the course of thier professional duites or in public
>> correspondence?
>
>Yes. No.
>
>> Nope...Unless you can show me some sort of "official" Naval document
>> wherein profanity was used as a professional means of communication...?!?!
>
>You don't show verbal comments, they are not official navy
>"documents."

Ahhhhhh....so no "verbal comments" of a Naval officer have ever been
"documented"...?!?! Those comments were never "credited" to a person in an

official position?

>> I'll sit here holding my breath waiting on that one, Brain.
>>
>> (No I won't...just teasing you...)
>
>darn

Glad to disappoint you again.

Steve, K4YZ

2089. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:46:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <sMadnT0bzNNTEPXdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90156

Lancer wrote:

> On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
> George) wrote:
>
>
>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>
>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>
>>"no person"
>>
>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>
>
>
> Read this dimbulb:
>
> Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
> require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
> within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
> including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.
>
> Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>
> Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe "10-meter"
> transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for importation
> or marketing into/within the United States.
>
> Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is illegal
> to sell in the United States?

You have to consider the source, dickyboy crainiumless can't even find
the 10 meter band.

2090. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:46:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90152

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>

>So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.

Steve, K4YZ

2091. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:51:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329155135.19505.00000287@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90153

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290548.46a753ca@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328091628.18008.00000512@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403271851.3ef1fce3@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040327100602.08277.00000225@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 8:52 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403270652.2b7ebc9@posting.google.com>
>> >> >
>> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040327033217.29966.00000207@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> >> And WHY does it take 911 operators to handle "every" call,
>Brain?
>> >> >
>> >> >I might have been wrong. Perhaps answering 90% of 911 calls is
>> >> >acceptable practice in some localities. "Good enuf 4 Gubmn't Work."
>> >> >Like the 911 operator that kept hanging up on "sniper" Lee Malvo.
>> >>
>> >> What "90%" Brain?
>> >
>> >Now dammit, Steve, you're the one who wanted to know why it takes a
>> >911 operator to handle every 911 call.
>>
>> That's not what you wrote, Brain.
>
>Correct. It's what >>>you<<< wrote.

You've already been asked once to cite the post wherein you claim I said
that.

You haven't doen THAT yet either.

>> Glad to hear it. Ohio always has had a great emergency response
>> reputation, even before 9-1-1 was implemented.

>
>Thank you.

Are YOU taking credit for this system, Brain?

>> Does your WIFE read your antics? Does she know how thoroughly you
>> humiliate your family name?
>
>First you want to pick on my kids, now you want to pick on my wife.
>
>No wonder you said you've been divorced so many times.

I'm not "picking" on your wife, Blockhead.

I ASKED if she "...read your antics?" and further asked if she was aware how you "thoroughly humiliate your family name?"

Since YOU already quoted it in this same post, I need not go back for that one.

Thanks. (...you really do make this a lot easier than you realize!)

Steve, K4YZ

2092. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:55:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329155537.19505.00000288@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90155

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 7:52 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290552.e786c15@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040328170024.21720.00000245@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040328163238.03943.00000038@mb-m29.aol.com>

>> > The 911 combination IS a national standard for all telephone ESSs
>> > in the United States and is accounted for in all number
>> > combinations used in signalling and dialing in the telephone
>> > infrastructure.
>>
>> "911" is not.
>>
>> "9-1-1" is. Please refer to the logo on any emergency vehicle that
>> promotes the number. This was done for a reason.
>
>Please refer to any telephone key pad. There are no dashes on them.

No, there's not.

Neither is "911"

Acting on recommendations from APCO (Lennie can tell you who THEY are...)
it was encouraged that the national emergency number be depicted as three
discreet numbers, ie: 9-1-1. Please refer to the logo on almost any emergency
vehicle in the United States.

If it would be any easier for you, I can use 9.1.1., but there are no
periods on the phone either.

Steve, K4YZ

2093. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 20:59:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040329155938.19505.00000289@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90157

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/29/2004 2:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403291219.cb35cb8@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040329031822.08141.00000298@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>> >restructuringdepends
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/28/2004 8:29 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281829.31a80bdb@posting.google.com>

>> Sir Scummy interjected such a suggestion some months ago when he
>described
>> what the typical "ham QTH" must look like, with the aforementioned
>lanternboy
>> adorning the driveway and towers in the back yard.
>>
>> Sheeeeesh. Can't you get ANYTHING right...?!?! Putz.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>There you go assuming again. I read few of Len's posts. So when I
>see you using reverse psychology on Len, it just looks like your
>original idea.

If you want to think that, go right ahead. You've obviously read too FEW
of "Len's" posts. Or you simply choose to ignore the one's that again make a
fool of your and he. (Which are a fair share)

I am sure it will salve your concious to NOT think that YOUR mentor was so
creepy as to have suggested it in the first place.

Sorrry for you...Sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K3YZ

2094. Re: When You Hear The Heavy Accent & The Poor Phone Connection... HANG UP!!! ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 21:38:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40689746.3000406@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90158

Dan Yemiola wrote:

>I ran it through my spell chequer and it came out OK.
>HTTP://web.LexComInc.Net/~ai8o
>
>perhaps we need to refine this discusion.
>
>This looks to me like a perfect example of PURE American gibberish.
>
Reminds me of that scene from _Blazing Saddles_, where the frontierman
mumbles and rants
on at that town meeting at the church. And someone else follows up
with "Who can argue
with that! A prime example of American gibberish and I'm glad these
fine childern were
here to witness it"......

>Used car salesman will weep when they read this, and will watch and stare in
>awe and envy as they see a true Master at work.
>

>
>

2095. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-29 23:49:37 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <IC2ac.126247$u_5.40947@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 90159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0403291128.500b9367@posting.google.com...
> Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
> >On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
> >George) wrote:
> >
> >>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
> >>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
> >>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
> >>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to
> own,
> >>>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
> >>>>
> >>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
> >>>>
> >>>>"no person"
> >>>>
> >>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Read this dimbulb:
> >>>
> >>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
> >>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
> >>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
> >>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission
> approval.
> >>>
> >>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
> >>
> >>where
> >>
> >>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe
> "10-meter"
> >>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
> >>importation
> >>or marketing into/within the United States.
> >>
> >>correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site
> does

> >>not certify it
> >>
> >>>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is
> illegal
> >>>to sell in the United States?
> >>
> >>where did I say that?
> >
> >Your reply to Richard. You made it sound like "all" 10 meter radios
> >where illegal.
>
>
> this is a CB radio newsgroup dipshit we are not talking about hams
> using 10 meters the subject is export cb radios. Sound like you are
> trying to confuse people like the export dealers do by calling them 10
> meter radios LOL

Makes me wanna go fire up the ol' Icom "export cb radio".

2096. Re: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 00:01:15 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c4adc1$2fedqo$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90160

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> Incorrect. This is not a ballpark, not a government contract
discussion
> forum, and Macy is vainly trying to exact retribution for perceived
> personal affronts long ago in the past. Not only that, he ventures far
> from the general subject of this newsgroup which is concerned with
> amateur radio policy.
>
> Macy acts the petulant little child, whining and crying because he
> is not honored and revered because he exists. Puerile behavior.
>
> He tries to play games. Unfortunately he has struck out. Long ago.
>
> LHA / WMD
>

Being on the losing end of a discussion is a real bitch, ain't it? Well, get used to it. I will never treat you with kid gloves again. If this is the best you can do, you might want to consider retiring from RRAP.

Arnie -

2097. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 00:03:21 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c4adfv$2hek8g$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90161

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

> The set is elastomeric...rubber, stretches to include any sort of
> hatred in the heart of hot-dog heavy heurisitic hitters such as the
> Doctor Dill Instructor from the "ER." :-)

Now you have steve training pickles? Who exactly is "Nuts" here again?

Arnie -

2098. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 00:58:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040329195836.01766.00000089@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 90162

In article <20040329152501.12851.00000108@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040328215828.18733.00000085@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040327161847.00150.00000017@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com>, >>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>, >>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>>> The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
>>>>> the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
>>>>
>>>>Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical and >>>>arguably illegal at the time.
>>>
>>> So did the Q&A book folks.
>>
>>How did the "Q&A book folks" gather their information?
>
> By all the time-honored practices used in college and
> university written exam "cheat sheets" well before there
> were any radio regulating agencies.

How do you know this?

I never saw any "cheat sheets" in my undergraduate or graduate schools. Not one, in any subject. You obviously have far more experience with that sort of thing than I.

>
> Stop trolling for an argument subject.

I'm simply asking questions, Len. You're doing all the arguing, name calling, etc.

> The practice is well known in many activities.

Not to me. I've never even seen a "Bash book", nor any form of professional study guide derived by methods such as Bash used.

> It has been explained
> by others in here.

You seem very familiar with the process.

> Dick Bash was a late-comer in the
> FCC examination "typical test question-answer" area
> in the USA. Many others were ahead of his company.

Such as?
>
> You waste our time, my time, everyone's time.

How? All I did was ask some questions. You don't have to answer them. But for some reason you are compelled to argue with anyone who does not agree with everything you post.

2099. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 01:46:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8k4ac.4620$NL4.1364@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90163

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hvap8ft.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 28 Mar 2004 14:26:48 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >What for...by your own statements you admit nothing
> >was done by the FCC? The fact that one or more
> >FCC attorneys may have wanted action taken doesn't
> >validate anything other than those FCC folks that
> >wanted action couldn't convince their management
> >that the case either had merit or was worth the time
> >and expense.
> >..
> >All the academic discussion of what may have been
> >the legal outcome had Bash been challenged means
> >nothing in the end.
>
> Not being prosecuted or otherwise
> punished for an act doesn't mean
> that the act didn't take place.

True, and it is equally valid that...
Not being prosecuted for an act
doesn't mean that the individual
would have been found
guilty of the act had he actually
been prosecuted.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2100. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 01:54:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <jr4ac.4626$NL4.745@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90164

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040328185820.17713.00000088@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <IgB9c.3230$yN6.2814@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >news:xnfcneeyarg.hv9dcbp.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> >> On Sat, 27 Mar 2004 21:20:28 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >> >> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
> >> >
> >> >In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
> >> >argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
> >> >FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
> >> >receiving stolen goods.
> >>
> >> Not for the lack of us around whose office he lurked wanting that
> >> action taken.....
> >>
> >> Need we rehash this again ??
> >
> >What for...by your own statements you admit nothing
> >was done by the FCC? The fact that one or more
> >FCC attorneys may have wanted action taken doesn't
> >validate anything other than those FCC folks that
> >wanted action couldn't convince their management
> >that the case either had merit or was worth the time
> >and expense.
>
> That's one way to look at it.
> (insert standard "I'm not a lawyer and the following is just my layman's
> opinion" disclaimer HERE)
>
> Here's another:
>
> Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at
the
> time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose any
> number of the following):
>
> - they made a dumb mistake
> - they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
> - they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement

> - they didn't think they could win
> - they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to
light,
> such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
> - they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books
and
> encourage imitators to do the same thing

Perhaps...and that is exactly my point. We will never
know because the opportunity to have prosecuted
is long gone and all this comes down to is academic
discussion or a BS session over a couple of beers.

> >All the academic discussion of what may have been
> >the legal outcome had Bash been challenged means
> >nothing in the end.
>
> I disagree. It's an example of how things used to work, or not work.

I'll give you that. My point had to do with the legality
or illegality of what Bash did.

> Most of all, the fact that no enforcement action was taken does not mean
there
> was no violation. If a driver zips past a police radar setup at, say, 15
mph
> over the posted limit but the police don't go after that driver, a
violatiuon
> still occurred. The police in that particular case just decided not to go
after
> the violator, for whatever reason.

But even in the case you site, the driver, if actually
prosecuted (given a ticket for 15 over) might be
found not guilty for any of a number of reasons.
Martha Stewart was NOT prosecuted for insider trading.
Was she guilty of insider trading? Many people
believe so...but apparently the prosecution didn't
believe their case strong enough to win and only
went after the lieing to federal investigators.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2101. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 01:58:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040329205846.00150.00000063@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 90165

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hvb3rxx.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 28 Mar 2004 23:58:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at the
>>time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose any
>>number of the following):
>>
>>- they made a dumb mistake
>>- they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
>>- they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement
>>- they didn't think they could win
>>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to
>light,
>>such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
>>- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books and
>>encourage imitators to do the same thing
>
> You left out the real reason - the person who had the obligation
> to carry any prosecution forward (long since retired and deceased)
> was an expert in ducking anything that looked like work.
>
Wouldn't that come under "wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement" (ones
that required no work) and "made a dumb mistake" ?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2102. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:09:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IF4ac.4640$NL4.2732@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90166

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hvb3rxx.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 28 Mar 2004 23:58:20 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Perhaps what Bash did *was* illegal, and prosecutable under the rules at
the
> >time. Maybe the top folks decided not to go after Bash because (choose
any
> >number of the following):
> >
> >- they made a dumb mistake
> >- they were planning to publicize the Q&A anyhow
> >- they wanted to focus on other areas of enforcement
> >- they didn't think they could win
> >- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would bring other things to
light,
> >such as the limited size of the pool actually in use
> >- they were concerned that prosecuting Bash would sell more of his books
and
> >encourage imitators to do the same thing
>
> You left out the real reason - the person who had the obligation
> to carry any prosecution forward (long since retired and deceased)
> was an expert in ducking anything that looked like work.

Too late now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2103. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:09:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KF4ac.4641$NL4.1137@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90167

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040328215827.18733.00000084@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <wem9c.2449$yN6.784@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040327115818.12851.00000071@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >> In article <20040325134609.08081.00000030@mb-m18.aol.com>,
> >lenover21@aol.com
> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >> > The Dick Bash printing organization was a late-comer among
> >> > the general "Q&A" publishing group (never a large one).
> >>
> >> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical
> >>
> >In your opinion, anyway.
>
> Mine and that of many others, including at least one communications
attorney
> and engineer.
> >
> >> and arguably illegal at the time.
> >>
> >a legal argument in academic concept only. Since the FCC
> >never tested the legality, the legal issue is moot.
>
> That's like saying that if someone drives 85 mph in a 65 mph zone and is
not
> prosecuted for it, that the violation is an academic concept only.

Speeding, especially 85 in a 65, is much more of a black & white
issue. What Bash did could easily be a very grey area with multiple
defenses (e.g. 1st amendment, etc).

> >> > The
> >> > surname has emotional connotations handy for those who
> >> > need to have something, anyone to "bash" due to whatever
> >> > frustration those people have.
> >>
> >> Bash obtained the material in his books by methods that were unethical
and
> >> arguably illegal at the time.
> >>

> >Ditto my last.
>
> Do you think it was ethical to obtain information the way Bash did?

I have no problem with what Bash did.

> >> Bash's actions were the equivalent of sneaking into a teacher's office
and
> >> copying tests before they were given, then selling the copies.
> >
> >Not at all.
>
> >It would be the equivalent of a techer using the SAME
> >test questions over and over again and in recognition of same, a
> >frat house eventually compiles a list of those questions based on the
> >memory of those frats that had taken the tests before.
> >Nothing
> >about what bash did is equivalent to sneaking into the teacher's
> >office.
>
> What's the difference?

In the "sneak in" case, there is actual illegal activity...
not so with just memorizing questions and writing them
done later at the frat house.

> If the teacher left the door and his/her desk unlocked,
> and there was an unmonitored copy machine in the office, would it be
ethical
> for a student to sneak in, find the test, make a copy and put everything
back
> as it was? Why or why not?

You keep attempting to create an analogy to an
actual "covert" action by a student rather than
simply memorizing question 1 and writing it down
later. You are compariing apples and oranges.

> But let's use your analogy and see where it leads.
>
> Suppose the university had an "honor system" policy that specifically
> prohibited divulging what was on a test. Would it be ethical for a frat to
> compile question lists?

Don't know the validity of such an honor code and
or violation of that specifically. In the Bash case, however,
you are not dealing with any academic scenario...you are
dealing with a fedreal agency. Every day, there are 100s
of leaks, etc of federal memos, etc woth no one seeming
to care, prosecute, etc.

> >> > Oddly, no one seems to bash
> >> > the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material

> >> > long before the Bash company did its thing.
> >>
> >> That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC
> >> published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that
> >> would be
> >> on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along
with
> >> other
> >> information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All
with
> >> FCC
> >> knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source
of
> >> the study guides.
> >
> >In the end it made no difference.
> >
> It makes a difference in that ARRL
> followed the rules and Bash did not.

What specific rules?

> >> Bash obtained his materials by other methods,
> >
> >And those methods were NEVER chalenged as to the
> >means being legal or not.
>
> Just as some drivers go way over the
> limit and yet never get a speeding ticket.

Not the same. There are millions of cases which
show that speeding can and is prosecuted. There
is NO example case that shows Bash would have actually
been convicted had the FCC pursued it.

> >> and his books did not explain how
> >> the material was obtained.
> >
> >As if anyone buying the Bash books cared.
>
> I know hams who did care.

Some do, I don't.

> >> In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
> >
> >In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
> >argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
> >FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
> >receiving stolen goods.
>
> How about this, then:

>
> There was a time (several decades long) when ham license exams were given
by
> mail if the ham-to-be met certain criteria. The written exams were sent to
the
> volunteer examiner (no capitals) in a sealed envelope with a lot of
> instructions explaining how the materials were to be handled. Included in
those
> instructions were warnings not to divulge the contents of the test.
>
> Would it have been unethical to make a copy of the test? Why or why not?

Again, you change the facts. If the test giver copied the test, I agree
it would have been a violation. BUT, if the test taker memorized
question 3 on that test and sent it to Bash after taking the test,
then I see no violaution or ethical issue.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2104. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:18:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94BBD8B339199elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90168
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote in
news:c034bd2.0403291128.500b9367@posting.google.com:

> Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>On 29 Mar 2004 10:34:07 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not
>>George) wrote:
>>
>>>Lancer lancer@rock..com wrote:
>>>>On 28 Mar 2004 19:32:16 -0800, iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
>>>>(I Am Not George) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
>>>>>news:<c5ecbb69.0403281001.5b3a80e1@posting.google.com>...
>>>>>>Ten meter radios are perfectly legal for licensed amateurs to own,
>>>>>>use, and sell to other licensed amateurs.
>>>>>
>>>>>Read this dimbulb and try and comprehend
>>>>>
>>>>>"no person"
>>>>>
>>>>>-that means no person - not even hams.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Read this dimbulb:
>>>>
>>>>Transceivers used in the Amateur Radio Service below 30 MHz do not
>>>>require FCC authorization prior to being imported into or marketed
>>>>within the United States, but transceivers for other services,
>>>>including the CB Radio Service (CB), do require Commission approval.
>>>>
>>>>Note: He did say ten Meter Radio.
>>>
>>>where
>>>
>>>Dual use radios (CB and Ham) will not be certified. Tthe "10-meter"
>>>transceivers that are on the "list" are not acceptable for
>>>importation or marketing into/within the United States.
>>>
>>>correct, just calling something a a ten meter radio on a web site does
>>>not certify it
>>>
>>>Now tell us again how a Radio Shack HTX-10 10 meter radio is illegal
>>>to sell in the United States?

>>>
>>>where did I say that?
>>
>>Your reply to Richard. You made it sound like "all" 10 meter radios
>>where illegal.
>
>
> this is a CB radio newsgroup dipshit we are not talking about hams
> using 10 meters the subject is export cb radios. Sound like you are
> trying to confuse people like the export dealers do by calling them 10
> meter radios LOL
>

This is being crossposted to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where a 10 meter radio really is a 10 meter radio. Too much to expect you to check the header I suppose.

2105. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:27:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <vW4ac.4662$NL4.940@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90169

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
think
> >>it has a snowball's chance in
>
> [expletive deleted]
>
> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
>
> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
> >for extras.
>
> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these days.
You
> make an excellent point.

Good...so far.

> The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does FCC
get
> out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"

Then will we expect you to make that argument to the
FCC when you comment?

> >As the
> >treaty requirement is now gone,
> > and no other service uses it, why bother.
>
> Because hams *do* use it.

Yet hams do NOT need to pass a CW test to be
allowed to use morse. If a "no-code" tech decides to operate
morse on VHF, they are free to do so without ever being
tested. If the ARRL proposal gets the nod, the same would
be true for Novice and Generals on HF also.

> Some other services use it too, but not to any great
> extent.

And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
any ham to need to know code to read or operate
with nay of those other services. By the way...what
other services are you thinking of?

> >The FCC isn't
> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
>
> [expletive deleted]

Jim, even I am not offended by "hell"

> >of it.
>
> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications.
> Of course there's differences of
> opinion on what qualified means.

The retention of a 5 wpm test for Extra in light of no
code for all others makes even less sense.

> >Code isn't a lid filter,
>
> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter".

No test is in any way a lid filter...as you note below.

> Particularly not a test given one time.
> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
much
> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not filtered
out by
> those testing and education systems.

I repeat...NO test is a lid filter.

> > as witness
> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
>
> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)

Are you assuming all the 14.313 loonies had code medical
waivers?

> Remember this:
>
> All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that
> included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple written
exams,
> yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests aren't a
> perfect lid filter either. Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
written
> exams because they didn't do the job?
>
> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!

A point we agree on.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2106. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:30:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4068DBCB.9030308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>
>This is being crossposted to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where a 10 meter
>radio really is a 10 meter radio.
>
Some "10 meter radios" have strange features like echo boxes, roger
beeps, and channelized
tuning that no normal HF ham radio set ever has.

It's perfectly fine if a ham takes a CB set and modifies it for use on
10 meters. But
it can no longer be used on the CB band, so adding a switch to create a
dual band
dual service radio is not allowed.

2107. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:30:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <jZ4ac.1173$IE.1154@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:BcOdnVDfvMkNE_rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...
>
> The universal access with multiple choices means very heavy investment as
> now that could be construed to mean that BPL, DSL, cable, and WI-FI all
need
> set up in our rural areas to provide those choices. Guess what! Ain't
> gonna happen.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee, correct me if I'm wrong. Isn't there available direct satellite internet available? As long as one has an unobstructed view to the Southwestern sky? (I subscribe to Direct TV - but use DSL as it only costs me $29.95 per month). I think it runs $49.95 per month (the same as DSL costs in Sun City, Florida). As far as broadband over powerline, we all know it isn't going to happen in rural areas. I'm really curious about those broadcasters with deep pockets and what will happen to channel 2 and 3 television. Of course, analog tv is on its' way out which will probably save BPLs real quick demise .... maybe.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.645 / Virus Database: 413 - Release Date: 3/28/04

2108. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:35:46 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <625ac.7725$lt2.6349@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90172

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com...
: >Subject: All that flappin'
: >From: "Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533;"
Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
: >
: >Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
: >Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
: >
: >All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!
:
: And your point is...?!?!
:

My POINT (and I'm not astounded that it escaped your understanding) is that
you and an insignificant handload of others (or is it a handload of
insignificant others) are sending here a POINTless load of nothing more but
than mutual insults and the sound of flapping orifices.

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2109. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 02:54:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4068E15B.6020804@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90173

>
>
>>
>>
>
>You keep attempting to create an analogy to an
>actual "covert" action by a student rather than
>simply memorizing question 1 and writing it down
>later. You are compariing apples and oranges.
>
Presumidly the teacher or prof doesn't use the same test year after year,
or even more than one session. So the memorizing and writing out the
test questions after the test is over has no effect, as that test will never
be given again. Now, if that test is actually used again next year, it
implies that the teacher or prof doesn't really care. Or too lazy to
bother. (Most tenured college profs consider teaching an undergraduate
class the equivalent of taking out the garbage, or just a big pain and waste
of time they would rather use writing up National Science Foundation grant
proposals or writing research papers to get published in some journal.
Profs are judged on how many papers they get published, not how well
they taught a class. And how many profs will just issue a grade of "C" to
someone he suspects downloaded the paper off the 'net rather than go thru
the trouble of accusing the student of that. He likely just wants to
get that
grading chore done so he can get back to the research.).

So that upper level person at the FCC who wanted to avoid the work
probably figured that Bash didn't matter anyway. Ham radio tests aren't
the same as say the state medical board tests in the sense that someone who
"cheated" isn't going to put a patient at risk.

>
>
>
>>But let's use your analogy and see where it leads.
>>
>>Suppose the university had an "honor system" policy that specifically
>>prohibited divulging what was on a test. Would it be ethical for a frat to
>>compile question lists?
>>
>>
>
>Don't know the validity of such an honor code and
>or violation of that specifically. In the Bash case, however,
>you are not dealing with any academic scenario...you are

>dealing with a fedreal agency. Every day, there are 100s
>of leaks, etc of federal memos, etc woth no one seeming
>to care, prosecute, etc.
>
>
>
>>>>> Oddly, no one seems to bash
>>>>> the ARRL for publishing essentially the same sort of material
>>>>> long before the Bash company did its thing.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>That's because ARRL obtained its material through proper channels. FCC
>>>>published a study guide of questions that indicated the mateiral that
>>>>would be
>>>>on the tests (but not the actual Q&A), and ARRL reprinted it, along
>>>>
>>>>
>with
>
>
>>>>other
>>>>information useful to someone seeking an amateur radio license. All
>>>>
>>>>
>with
>
>
>>>>FCC
>>>>knowledge and approval. In fact, the License Manuals explain the source
>>>>
>>>>
>of
>
>
>>>>the study guides.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>In the end it made no difference.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>It makes a difference in that ARRL
>>followed the rules and Bash did not.
>>
>>
>
>What specific rules?
>
>
>

>>>>Bash obtained his materials by other methods,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>And those methods were NEVER chalenged as to the
>>>means being legal or not.
>>>
>>>
>>Just as some drivers go way over the
>>limit and yet never get a speeding ticket.
>>
>>
>
>Not the same. There are millions of cases which
>show that speeding can and is prosecuted. There
>is NO example case that shows Bash would have actually
>been convicted had the FCC pursued it.
>
>
>
>>>>and his books did not explain how
>>>>the material was obtained.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>As if anyone buying the Bash books cared.
>>>
>>>
>>I know hams who did care.
>>
>>
>
>Some do, I don't.
>
>
>
>>>>In a way, buying a Bash book was akin to receiving stolen property.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>In your opinion anyway. Again, no such claim or
>>>argument was ever leveled against Bash as violating any
>>>FCC rules...much less any "criminal act" such as
>>>receiving stolen goods.
>>>
>>>
>>How about this, then:
>>
>>There was a time (several decades long) when ham license exams were given
>>
>>
>by
>

>
>>mail if the ham-to-be met certain criteria. The written exams were sent to
>>
>>
>the
>
>
>>volunteer examiner (no capitals) in a sealed envelope with a lot of
>>instructions explaining how the materials were to be handled. Included in
>>
>>
>those
>
>
>>instructions were warnings not to divulge the contents of the test.
>>
>>Would it have been unethical to make a copy of the test? Why or why not?
>>
>>
>
>Again, you change the facts. If the test giver copied the test, I agree
>it would have been a violation. BUT, if the test taker memorized
>question 3 on that test and sent it to Bash after taking the test,
>then I see no violaution or ethical issue.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>
>

2110. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 03:03:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4068E399.1040307@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90174

>
>
>>
>>
>
>And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
>any ham to need to know code to read or operate
>with nay of those other services. By the way...what
>other services are you thinking of?
>
IIRC, there are some nav beacons and automatic IDers used on taxi dispatcher systems and such using Morse code. But nothing I know of that sends out "real" information using Morse code anymore.

I wonder if a commrecial broadcast radio station could legally ID using Morse
code, or use phonetics. "Whiskey Alpha Bravo Charlie New York"

>
>
>

2111. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 03:37:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <cKWdnUkjnIsfcfXdRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:jZ4ac.1173$lE.1154@news02.roc.ny...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:BcOdnVDfvMkNE_rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...
> >
> > The universal access with multiple choices means very heavy investment
as
> > now that could be construed to mean that BPL, DSL, cable, and WI-FI all
> need
> > set up in our rural areas to provide those choices. Guess what! Ain't
> > gonna happen.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Dee, correct me if I'm wrong. Isn't there available direct satellite
> internet available? As long as one has an unobstructed view to the
> Southwestern sky? (I subscribe to Direct TV - but use DSL as it only
costs
> me $29.95 per month). I think it runs $49.95 per month (the same as DSL
> costs in Sun City, Florida). As far as broadband over powerline, we all
> know it isn't going to happen in rural areas. I'm really curious about
> those broadcasters with deep pockets and what will happen to channel 2 and
3
> television. Of course, analog tv is on its' way out which will probably
> save BPLs real quick demise .... maybe.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

I imagine it is available in some areas. However I was attempting to make
the point that it will not be economically feasible to provide the same wide
variety of choices to a rural area as a metropolitan area. A rural area
will be more limited in the internet access choices to pick from.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2112. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 09:58:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94BC329917C9Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90176
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in news:4068DBCB.9030308
@ix.netcom.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>This is being crossposted to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where a 10 meter
>>radio really is a 10 meter radio.
>>
> Some "10 meter radios" have strange features like echo boxes, roger
> beeps, and channelized
> tuning that no normal HF ham radio set ever has.

I know. However, it's confusing to post to both groups and use a term that
means different things in each place.

>
> It's perfectly fine if a ham takes a CB set and modifies it for use on
> 10 meters. But
> it can no longer be used on the CB band, so adding a switch to create a
> dual band
> dual service radio is not allowed.
>
>
I confess I didn't know that. I own a Ham Major M588 that someone else
converted from CB to 10m, but it doesn't cover anything below 28 MHz now,
so I guess it's OK. Mind you, it's rated at 10W on AM/FM and 20W on SSB, so
it wasn't legal before it was converted! I think it originally had 'high'
channels too.

2113. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 10:37:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90177
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:cKWdnUkjnIsfcfXdRVn-hg@comcast.com:

>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:jZ4ac.1173$lE.1154@news02.roc.ny...
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:BcOdnVDfvMkNE_rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...
>> >
>> > The universal access with multiple choices means very heavy
>> > investment as now that could be construed to mean that BPL, DSL,
>> > cable, and WI-FI all need set up in our rural areas to provide those
>> > choices. Guess what! Ain't gonna happen.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> Dee, correct me if I'm wrong. Isn't there available direct satellite
>> internet available? As long as one has an unobstructed view to the
>> Southwestern sky? (I subscribe to Direct TV - but use DSL as it only
>> costs me $29.95 per month). I think it runs $49.95 per month (the
>> same as DSL costs in Sun City, Florida). As far as broadband over
>> powerline, we all know it isn't going to happen in rural areas. I'm
>> really curious about those broadcasters with deep pockets and what
>> will happen to channel 2 and 3 television. Of course, analog tv is on
>> its' way out which will probably save BPLs real quick demise ....
>> maybe.
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>>
>
> I imagine it is available in some areas. However I was attempting to
> make the point that it will not be economically feasible to provide the
> same wide variety of choices to a rural area as a metropolitan area. A
> rural area will be more limited in the internet access choices to pick
> from.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is $40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and setup is $600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband being available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some people sell it when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the setup fee is still $240. That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not $24.

In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side of the street! One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows someone who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi, but says they lose the connection when it rains!

BPL is set to cost only about as much as DSL and maybe nothing to install. Some people would go for it just because they don't have a spare 600 bucks to buy and set up a satellite system. I would almost be tempted if it wasn't for ham radio. Cable Internet is $55/mo here. That includes $15/mo for basic cable TV, whether you want it or not. DSL is $35/mo. I am sure that some people would try BPL instead, as it doesn't need extra wires or Wi-Fi.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2114. Re: export cb radios

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 11:44:58 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330064458.316$9O@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90178
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
> iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote in
> > this is a CB radio newsgroup dipshit we are not talking about hams
> > using 10 meters the subject is export cb radios. Sound like you are
> > trying to confuse people like the export dealers do by calling them 10
> > meter radios LOL
> >
>
> This is being crossposted to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where a 10 meter
> radio really is a 10 meter radio. Too much to expect you to check the
> header I suppose.
>
That's wa3moj, the resident CB group dipshit troll. He only posts
in rec.radio.cb to flame CBer's.

2115. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:20:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90179

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>
> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE. It required a specific document
> (separate from published regulations) from the FCC to permit its
> use years after it was begun by Volunteer Examiners.
>
> The argument raged in here due to the overtly sensitive psyches
> of certain licensed amateurs who stated they were "right" because
> they were licensed, tested, etc., etc., yet none of them were
> involved in setting regulations for any radio service and certainly had
> no power to enforce any beyond whining and crying in this
> newsgrope. The only "regular" who had actual, legal experience in
> communications law stayed away from the main argument.
>
> LHA / WMD

Those VE's sure are a lawless bunch. And the rest of the PCTA are enablers.

2116. Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:27:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300527.21228f37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90180

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329153825.19505.00000280@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Clarification, was: Wrong Again, Len! (Communicator Power)
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:15 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290515.5b03b0b8@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328172128.21720.00000253@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
> >> Sure he did. And Hitler got the trains running and revitalized a
> >> devastated economy.
> >
> >Wow. I think you've just compared Len to Hitler.
> >
> >I thought that wasn't allowed on here?
> >
> >
> >Oh, wait a sec, two sets of rules.
>
> Nope. Just one major example that you can take anyone, regardless of how
> terrible they may be, and under the right "spin", made to look "acceptable".
>
> I am sure that Lennie doesn't look good in jackboots and swatikas.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

And the spin that you give yourself?

...isn't nearly enough to keep you from looking terrible except in your own mind.

2117. Re: Cranus the anus warned to STOP his gay stuff in NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:33:59 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0403300533.3d7ce74f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

nostartinakc@yahoo.com (DouGay Adair Is A Moron) wrote in message
news:<8fe0c09a.0403290416.1a5803b4@posting.google.com>...
> richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) femininely mewled in message
> news:<c5ecbb69.0403281719.206134b@posting.google.com>...
> > I Can you really prove the statement that I am a queerboy. I am just
> > blowing cocks, 24/7.
> > I pray that ham radio has the same proportion (or more) of deviants
> > than most of the healthier hobbies. I want to lick their pekkers
> > I think I have blown at least 2000 weenies.(But I'll admit that it's just a
> > guess.)

I'm so glad you cross-posted this crap in several of the amateur
newsgroups, DouGay Adair N8WWM of Toledo, OH. Now everyone can see
what a fruitcake you are. As usual, all you can do is broadcast your
own perversion and lamely attempt to project it on others.

Heck, you couldn't even answer an innoculous question about Grounding
an antenna, fer cryin' out loud. And you're (allegedly) a licensed
ham? No wonder nobody will talk to you on the air. LOL!!

2118. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:39:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300539.557a0050@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90182

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329155938.19505.00000289@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >restructuringdepends
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 2:19 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403291219.cb35cb8@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040329031822.08141.00000298@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >> >restructuringdepends
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 8:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281829.31a80bdb@posting.google.com>
>
> >> Sir Scummy interjected such a suggestion some months ago when he
> described
> >> what the typical "ham QTH" must look like, with the aforementioned
> lanternboy
> >> adorning the driveway and towers in the back yard.
> >>
> >> Sheeeeesh. Can't you get ANYTHING right...?!?! Putz.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >There you go assuming again. I read few of Len's posts. So when I
> >see you using reverse psychology on Len, it just looks like your
> >original idea.
>
> If you want to think that, go right ahead.

My privelege.

You've obviously read too FEW
> of "Len's" posts.

How many of Len's posts am I supposed to read?

Or you simply choose to ignore the one's that again make a
> fool of your and he. (Which are a fair share)

There you go assuming again.

> I am sure it will salve your concious to NOT think that YOUR mentor was so
> creepy as to have suggested it in the first place.

It's just wrong that what you claim is creepy is repeated by you so often, without attributing its origin.

As if you were stealing intellectual property.

You're not right in the head.

2119. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:43:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300543.5949a65c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90183

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329155537.19505.00000288@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:52 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290552.e786c15@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328170024.21720.00000245@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:32 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <20040328163238.03943.00000038@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
> >> > The 911 combination IS a national standard for all telephone ESSs
> >> > in the United States and is accounted for in all number
> >> > combinations used in signalling and dialing in the telephone
> >> > infrastructure.
> >>
> >> "911" is not.
> >>
> >> "9-1-1" is. Please refer to the logo on any emergency vehicle that
> >> promotes the number. This was done for a reason.
> >
> >Please refer to any telephone key pad. There are no dashes on them.
>
> No, there's not.
>
> Neither is "911"
>
> Acting on recommendations from APCO (Lennie can tell you who THEY are...)
> it was encouraged that the national emergency number be depicted as three
> discreet numbers, ie: 9-1-1. Please refer to the logo on almost any emergency
> vehicle in the United States.
>
> If it would be any easier for you, I can use 9.1.1., but there are no
> periods on the phone either.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Why do you insist on inserting superfluous characters in the string?

Probably the same reason why you insisted the FCC keep superfluous
requirements in amateur radio testing.

Do you enjoy being wrong so often?

Has this become a part-time job for you?

Doesn't pay much, does it?

2120. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 13:45:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300545.4e946282@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90184

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>
> >So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>
> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at
> talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.

How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

2121. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 15:42:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40699570.3020605@psu.edu>
Source record: 90185

Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½ wrote:
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com...
> : >Subject: All that flappin'
> : >From: "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
> Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
> : >
> : >Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
> : >Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> : >
> : >All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!
> :
> : And your point is...?!?!
> :
>
> My POINT (and I'm not astounded that it escaped your understanding) is that
> you and an insignificant handload of others (or is it a handload of
> insignificant others) are sending here a POINTless load of nothing more but
> than mutual insults and the sound of flapping orifices.

Grï¿½mwï¿½tch! How ya doin'? Long time no post.

Of course, it might be pointed out that the effort to count our posts
is a bit of a waste of time too, but you probably already knew that.

You should stick around, I like your sense of humor!

- mike KB3EIA -

2122. Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 16:49:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330114951.07198.00000281@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90186

Picked this up from "QRZ.COM".

Perhaps, Brain, you can get ahold of this fellow and volunteer to tag along. He might (but I doubt it...) be able to help you understand how to go about getting your Amateur Radio license for Somalia.

QUOTE:

Posted: Mar. 26 2004,19:16

VK2BVS

After a fantastic 6 months in Somalia last year its about to happen again. My departure to Somalia is on 15April 2004.

I am looking for a team to work together to help Somali hams join the airwaves. There are 13 Somali hams but none has a transceiver....(SNIP)

UNQUOTE

Steve, K4YZ

2123. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 16:55:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90187

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>>
>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE. It required a specific document
>> (separate from published regulations) from the FCC to permit its
>> use years after it was begun by Volunteer Examiners.
>>
>> The argument raged in here due to the overtly sensitive psyches
>> of certain licensed amateurs who stated they were "right" because
>> they were licensed, tested, etc., etc., yet none of them were
>> involved in setting regulations for any radio service and certainly had
>> no power to enforce any beyond whining and crying in this
>> newsgrope. The only "regular" who had actual, legal experience in
>> communications law stayed away from the main argument.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Those VE's sure are a lawless bunch. And the rest of the PCTA are enablers.

Sure would be nice if Lennie or Brain could produce a specification
document from the FCC that delineates what the "spacing" should be.

I know it probably won't happen, but it sure will be fun watching the
excuses fly as they try to dodge THIS "demand".

Steve, K4YZ

2124. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:01:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330120124.07406.00000323@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90188

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
>
>Date: 3/29/2004 8:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <625ac.7725$lt2.6349@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com...
>: >Subject: All that flappin'
>: >From: "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
>Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
>: >
>: >Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
>: >Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>: >
>: >All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!
>:
>: And your point is...?!?!
>:
>
>My POINT (and I'm not astounded that it escaped your understanding) is that
>you and an insignificant handload of others (or is it a handload of
>insignificant others) are sending here a POINTless load of nothing more but
>than mutual insults and the sound of flapping orifices.

And >>MY<< point, you sarcastic putz, is that nothing ever DOES "get done"
in this forum.

Myself and several others have, on several occassions, tried to get some
number of the "members" of this forum to move forward on important issues (ie:
spectrum protection), only to be immediately pulled back into the "Morse Code
Test" issue.

As for what YOU find (or may NOT find) astounding, I am sure that a
cowardly, spineless putz like you finds any numer of things astounding...Like
knowing the name of at least ONE of your birth parents..

Shrivvel up, dweeb.

Steve, K4YZ

2125. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:12:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90189

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/30/2004 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300539.557a0050@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040329155938.19505.00000289@mb-m03.aol.com>...

>> >There you go assuming again. I read few of Len's posts. So when I
>> >see you using reverse psychology on Len, it just looks like your
>> >original idea.
>>
>> If you want to think that, go right ahead.
>
>My privelege.

I am sure you meant priviledge, but that's OK...

> You've obviously read too FEW
>> of "Len's" posts.
>
>How many of Len's posts am I supposed to read?

All of them, Brainless One.

Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
"respect" he THINKS he does.

>Or you simply choose to ignore the one's that again make a
>> fool of your and he. (Which are a fair share)
>
>There you go assuming again.

No "assumption", Brain. It's evidenced in your posts.

>> I am sure it will salve your concious to NOT think that YOUR mentor
>was so
>> creepy as to have suggested it in the first place.
>
>It's just wrong that what you claim is creepy is repeated by you so
>often, without attributing its origin.

Had you been paying attention, you'd know.

>As if you were stealing intellectual property.

Brain, there is absolutely NOTHING "intellectual" about either you OR Lennie.

>You're not right in the head.

Still waiting on you to provide for me the nature of your medical or psychiatric education or licensure that qualifies you to make that statement in a public forum.

I, on the otherhand, HAVE had training and education that, while not allowing me to make a diagnosis, would allow me to determine that you are suffering from some of your OWN mental health abberations that would warrant medical or psychiatric intervention...even in Ohio.

Steve, K4YZ

2126. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:18:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <TZhac.5078$NL4.3953@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90190

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:4068E15B.6020804@ix.netcom.com...
> >You keep attempting to create an analogy to an
> >actual "covert" action by a student rather than
> >simply memorizing question 1 and writing it down
> >later. You are compariing apples and oranges.
> >
> Presumidly the teacher or prof doesn't use the same test year after year,
> or even more than one session. So the memorizing and writing out the
> test questions after the test is over has no effect, as that test will
never
> be given again. Now, if that test is actually used again next year, it
> implies that the teacher or prof doesn't really care. Or too lazy to
> bother.

Not an unusual situation in many campuses.

> (Most tenured college profs consider teaching an undergraduate
> class the equivalent of taking out the garbage, or just a big pain and
waste
> of time they would rather use writing up National Science Foundation grant
> proposals or writing research papers to get published in some journal.
> Profs are judged on how many papers they get published, not how well
> they taught a class. And how many profs will just issue a grade of "C" to
> someone he suspects downloaded the paper off the 'net rather than go thru
> the trouble of accusing the student of that. He likely just wants to
> get that
> grading chore done so he can get back to the research.).

Which is pretty pathetic for US academia.

> So that upper level person at the FCC who wanted to avoid the work
> probably figured that Bash didn't matter anyway. Ham radio tests aren't
> the same as say the state medical board tests in the sense that someone
who
> "cheated" isn't going to put a patient at risk.

But again, we'll never know. We can speculate till hell
freezes over and we'll never know.

(big snip)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2127. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:21:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330122109.07406.00000325@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90191

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/30/2004 7:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300543.5949a65c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040329155537.19505.00000288@mb-m03.aol.com>...

>> Acting on recommendations from APCO (Lennie can tell you who THEY
>are...)
>> it was encouraged that the national emergency number be depicted as three
>> discreet numbers, ie: 9-1-1. Please refer to the logo on almost any
>emergency
>> vehicle in the United States.
>>
>> If it would be any easier for you, I can use 9.1.1., but there are no
>> periods on the phone either.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Why do you insist on inserting superfluous characters in the string?

So...the recommendation of one of this nation's most respected professional
communicators association is, in YOUR estimation, "superflous"...?!?!

Maybe that's why we "lovingly" call you "Brain"...as in lack of...

>Probably the same reason why you insisted the FCC keep superfluous
>requirements in amateur radio testing.

What's "superflous"...?!?!

If you mean Morse Code testing, neither you nor Lennie have shown me where
the Morse Code is "superflous" to Amateur Radio practice.

>Do you enjoy being wrong so often?

So far, the only thing I've done "wrong" is to mention some parts of my
military servcie where it was not pertinent...My bad.

As far as Morse Code utilization in the Amateur Radio Service goes, I
wholeheartedly recommend that YOU take some time to cruise the narrowband parts
of the HF Amateur allocations.

>Has this become a part-time job for you?
>
>Doesn't pay much, does it?

You mean getting to rub your nose in your lies, Brain?

It's worth it just to see you fidgit and tap-dance around your own silliness.

Steve, K4YZ

PS...For what I make in my "real" job, I can write this off as entertainment! I ought to send you an IRS form 1099 this year.

2128. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:26:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330122656.07406.00000326@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90192

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/30/2004 7:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300545.4e946282@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>>
>> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty
>good at
>> talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
>
>How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

Probably the same way the 910 and the 912 operator does.

Why would the 9-1-1 operator WANT to talk to you?

Did YOU initiate the RFS via autopatch? If not, they have nothing to say
to you...9-1-1 operators wait for you to call them, not vice-versa.

And if you DID initiate the call, I imagine they talk to you the same way
they'd talk to me...In English. If you DIDN'T initiate the call, I guess the
9-1-1 operator isn't GOING to talk to you.

I am wondering where you're trying to take this and what point you're
trying to save from all of this spinning, Brain. If you don't initiate the
call, they aren't going to talk to you...REGARDLESS if the call came via
hardline, wireless or Amateur Radio autopatch.

I realize that there's a bit of common sense in that that's hard for you
to assimilate, but it's true.

Steve, K4YZ

2129. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:47:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300947.355e5f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90193

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154020.19505.00000281@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290520.2181c6fa@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328171652.21720.00000250@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 3:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281359.1d341a73@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040328094320.18008.00000518@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
> >> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >> >Date: 3/27/2004 11:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <20040328004545.12501.00006980@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
> >> At least this time there's nothing for you to try and deny. You can
> just
> >> snort and claim I am "nuts" while hoping it "goes away" without rubbing
> your
> >> nose in it any more....
> >
> >You are nuts.
>
> And you're still a liar...and you STILL ahven't answered the question.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Ahem, not so fast Slick Quixoterobeson.

Back up and reply to the previous post.

If you don't or won't, then you just deal in untruths.

2130. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:52:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300952.7cc20f94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90194

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154444.19505.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290528.5c1c1611@posting.google.com>
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make the
> use
> >> of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should the
> >> offended person so desire.
> >
> >Too bad we don't have a "conduct unbecoming" regulation.
>
> Yes. I'd take great pleasure in seeing you adn Lennie prosecuted under it.
>
> >You'd spend all of your time at Captain's Mast rather than harassing
> >and stalking others.
> >>
> >> Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.
> >
> >Tell me about that misister's non-judicial punishment.
> >
> >No, document it.
>
> How can a civilian be "punichsed" under military law, Brain?
>
> I did NOT state is was a military person. We were discussing profanity.

Many ministers wear the uniform. You brought in the minister and the
UCMJ. Why would you bring in someone not subject to the UCMJ, then
start backpeddling?

> >> Do they do it in the course of thier professional duites or in public
> >> correspondence?
> >
> >Yes. No.
> >

> >> Nope...Unless you can show me some sort of "official" Naval document
> >> wherein profanity was used as a professional means of communication...?!?!

Steve is saying that all professional communications must be written.

> >You don't show verbal comments, they are not official navy
> >"documents."
>
> Ahhhhhh....so no "verbal comments" of a Naval officer have ever been
> "documented"...?!?! Those comments were never "credited" to a person in an
> official position?

Hmmm? You tell me.

> >> I'll sit here holding my breath waiting on that one, Brain.
> >>
> >> (No I won't...just teasing you...)
> >
> >darn
>
> Glad to disappoint you again.

Steve, you've been a monumental disappointment, and probably not just
to me.

2131. Re: Wall Street Journal: Obsolescent, quirky hams oppose BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 17:56:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403300956.376e7b04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90195

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040328004546.12501.00006982@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403271352.5a6230fc@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040327095624.08277.00000223@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Steven J Roeson, LPN
> >
> >Steve who?
>
> I guess the quote should now read "float like a madam butterfly,
> sting like a spelling."
>
> He need B ware.
>
> LHA / WMD

So by sending this to the WSJ, and not gettting his own name right, he
is playing into the concept that hams are ~"obsolete and quirky."~

Some posterboy.

Now he'll want to beat me up for his stupidity.

2132. Re: I NEED YOUR HELP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 18:19:09 UTC
From: bunnydawg <r.heenan@sympatico.ca>
Message-ID: <X5jac.47295$1A6.879529@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 90196
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,tnn.radio.a

Gary are you related to Bill Turner by chance ?
Yep all capital letters is considered yelling and quite rude.
Robert
VE3 something or other
"J. Yazel" <jyazel@netset.com> wrote in message
news:srqb6093v1d0lg7t4othdl09ud1fq6076d@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 26 Mar 2004 14:37:05 -0700, "Gary C. Cash" <cash@in-tch.com>
wrote:
>
> >TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS:
> >
> >I, ALONG WITH A FRIEND OF MINE, W7ARO (Ed Bodenberger), ARE TRYING TO
> >COMPILE A LIST OF AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS AND THEIR CALLSIGNS FOR
HISTORICAL
> >PURPOSES. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING NAMES ARE THOSE OF SILENT KEYS FOR WHICH
WE
> >HAVE NO CALLSIGN AVAILABLE AND ALL ARE FROM MONTANA. IF YOU HAVE AT
SOMETIME
> >WORKED ANY OF THESE INDIVIDUALS AND HAVE RECORD OF A CALLSIGN YOU
RESPONSE
> >WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.
> >
> >TOM GIBSON
> >HAROLD PETERSON
> >ED BINGLER
> >RON WRIGHT
> >BILL MONEYSMITH
> >PHIL HAGMAN
> >OSCAR RICE
> >
> >73's
> >GARY
> >WQ7S
> >cash@in-tch.com
> > ==========
>
> Hi Gary,
>
> I can't help you yet, but in the meantime, please don't use
> all capital letters. It is considered to be shouting.
>

> Thanks and 73s.
>
> Jack W8RAG
>
>

2133. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 20:41:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4069DB89.6676D238@earthlink.net>
Source record: 90197

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½" wrote:
>
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com...
> : >Subject: All that flappin'
> : >From: "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
> Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
> : >
> : >Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
> : >Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> : >
> : >All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!
> :
> : And your point is...?!?!
> :
>
> My POINT (and I'm not astounded that it escaped your understanding) is that
> you and an insignificant handload of others (or is it a handload of
> insignificant others) are sending here a POINTless load of nothing more but
> than mutual insults and the sound of flapping orifices.

Why should that bother you? You are, after all, self-described as
"unflappable".

Dave K8MN

2134. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 20:52:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330155229.22481.00000346@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 90198

```
>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/30/2004 11:52 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300952.7cc20f94@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040329154444.19505.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290528.5c1c1611@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make
>the
>> use
>> >> of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should
>the
>> >> offended person so desire.
>> >
>> >Too bad we don't have a "conduct unbecoming" regulation.
>>
>> Yes. I'd take great pleasure in seeing you adn Lennie prosecuted under
>it.
>>
>> >You'd spend all of your time at Captain's Mast rather than harassing
>> >and stalking others.
>> >>
>> >> Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.
>> >
>> >Tell me about that misister's non-judicial punishment.
>> >
>> >No, document it.
>>
>> How can a civilian be "punichsed" under military law, Brain?
>>
>> I did NOT state is was a military person. We were discussing
>profanity.
```

>
>Many ministers wear the uniform. You brought in the minister and the
>UCMJ. Why would you bring in someone not subject to the UCMJ, then
>start backpeddling?

No backpeddling, Brain.

I am very, VERY sorry that you can't/won't keep up, but do I REALLY need to
spoon feed each and ever answer to you?

Are you REALLY that childish and inept, or is it just an act?

>> >> Do they do it in the course of thier professional duites or in
>public
>> >> correspondence?
>> >
>> >Yes. No.
>> >
>> >> Nope...Unless you can show me some sort of "official" Naval document
>> >> wherein profanity was used as a professional means of
>communication...?!?!
>
>Steve is saying that all professional communications must be written.

In 18 years of service in the USMC, I can honestly say I NEVER head ANY
USMC or USN officer use "profanity" in thier official capacity. As I
said...did I hear any of them EVER swear? Of course, but NOT in order to do
thier jobs, communicate a point or otherwise use it to try an effectively
express themselves.

It wasn't necessary.

>> >You don't show verbal comments, they are not official navy
>> >"documents."
>>
>> Ahhhhhh....so no "verbal comments" of a Naval officer have ever been
>> "documented"...?!?! Those comments were never "credited" to a person in an
>> official position?
>
>Hmmm? You tell me.

Sorry, Brain. You were, again, the one making an unenable assertion.

You're up again, PutzBoy.

>> >> I'll sit here holding my breath waiting on that one, Brain.
>> >>
>> >> (No I won't...just teasing you...)
>> >
>> >darn
>>
>> Glad to disappoint you again.
>

>Steve, you've been a monumental disappointment, and probably not just
>to me.

I am sure you'd like to think so.

I have correspondence to the contrary on many numerous counts.

Sorry. Sucks to be you...Again.

Steve, K4YZ

2135. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-30 20:54:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040330155418.22481.00000347@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 90199

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 3/30/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4069DB89.6676D238@earthlink.net>
>
>"Gri¿½mwi¿½tch thi¿½ i¿½nfli¿½ppi¿½bli¿½" wrote:
>>
>> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20040329153402.19505.00000278@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> : >Subject: All that flappin'
>> : >From: "Gri¿½mwi¿½tch thi¿½ i¿½nfli¿½ppi¿½bli¿½"
>> Gri¿½mwi¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
>> : >
>> : >Date: 3/29/2004 12:52 PM Central Standard Time
>> : >Message-id: <9g_9c.5755$Dv2.827@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>> : >
>> : >All that flapping, and nobody said anything new!
>> :
>> : And your point is...?!?!
>> :
>>
>> My POINT (and I'm not astounded that it escaped your understanding) is that
>> you and an insignificant handload of others (or is it a handload of
>> insignificant others) are sending here a POINTless load of nothing more but
>> than mutual insults and the sound of flapping orifices.
>
>Why should that bother you? You are, after all, self-described as
>"unflappable".

Never expect an idiot to be accurate...even when describing
themselves...ESPECIALLY when discussing themselves, actually!

Steve, K4YZ

2136. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 00:30:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2dWdnRvMFeKjjPfdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90200

William wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
>>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>>So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>>
>> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at
>>talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
>
> How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

Brian, for what its worth, in my area, a 9-1-1 call on our repeater is going to get through more reliably than a cell phone call, and we can access the repeater in places in which no cell phone is going to get through. The repeater system covers our county, which is mountainous and has many area where the nearest cell phone tower is many miles away.

Is this available everywhere? No, it sure isn't. But neither is cell phone service. But since it is, we use it. If I'm in my area, and I witness an emergency and NEED to get 9-1-1 immediately, I'll reach for my HT or mobile rig before I pick up the cell phone.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2137. WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 00:33:48 UTC
From: "Jerry O. Defense Fund" <stayoff10meters@ratyouout.com>
Message-ID: <c4d3lc$l0c$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 90251
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV

long file but worth it.
a cber discussing his new Superstar 3900
export CB radio:

"I dont know what frequency its on, Im just
flipping switches and turning knobs"

"channel 1 through channel 14 aint nuthin
but morse code"

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Wed Mar 31 02:33:47 2004 depuis l'IP : ac925b38.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2138. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 00:58:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90252

In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>>>
>>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
>>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
>>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.

Actually, it did have a legal basis.

The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were no dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.

In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their test need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.

Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of Farnsworth spacing.

2139. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:26:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406A1E2C.2010808@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90253

Jerry O. Defense Fund wrote:

>http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV
>
>long file but worth it.
>a cber discussing his new Superstar 3900
>export CB radio:
>
>"I dont know what frequency its on, Im just
>flipping switches and turning knobs"
>
>"channel 1 through channel 14 aint nuthin
>but morse code
>
"Whats my QR8?"
"Bunch of numbers and shjt..."
"At nightime ain't nobody on at all" "they must be restricted when they
can talk on..." :-)
"Up somewhere of the middle of 28 Mhz is where they start talking phone.."

Made it into an mp3 file, find it in a.b.p.radio

2140. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:31:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403301731.103e9f5e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90254

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0403261401.4c9eda0e@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> > In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> > (Bert Craig) writes:
> >
> > >Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> > >around these parts.)
> > >
> > Works for me!
> >
> > 7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST
> >
> > BCNU
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Sounds great! And once again, just to reiterate, this should not be a
> pressure thing. If someone knows how to send their callsign plus QNI
> and a K, then you've successfully "touched base" and said "hi."
>
> Now, if some nice Elmer-type frequent R.R.A.Per who happens to have a
> webpage would like to have a small section called 'R.R.A.P Net
> Roster'...well, that'd be just swell. Hmmm...womder who'd be the best
> candidate? 0:-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

OK, so what happened? Who showed up, actually did some real radio and worked who?

w3rv

2141. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:42:46 UTC
From: "lol..." <doh@yikes.net>
Message-ID: <od8k60l9p2en1riv8m3mqsr0sijrcerrp1@4ax.com>
Source record: 90255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

typical of CB Radio, nowadays.

this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
Licensing requirements.

But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.

On 31 Mar 2004 00:33:48 GMT, Jerry O. Defense Fund
<stayoff10meters@ratyouout.com> wrote:

>http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV
>
>long file but worth it.
>a cber discussing his new Superstar 3900
>export CB radio:
>
>"I dont know what frequency its on, Im just
>flipping switches and turning knobs"
>
>"channel 1 through channel 14 aint nuthin
>but morse code"
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr

>Le : Wed Mar 31 02:33:47 2004 depuis l'IP : ac925b38.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2142. Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:47:53 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330204753.230$ga@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90256

Another ham radio operator busted:

March 3, 2004

Mr. Mark A. Glover
10632 Artcraft Avenue
Garden Grove, CA 92640

RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice

Dear Mr. Glover:

In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to you requesting that you not use the repeater.

Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater association to make such a request. If there are any further questions, please feel free to contact us.

If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures are provided in such matters.

Enclosure: 1

CC: FCC Western Regional Director
Catalina Island Repeater Association

2143. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:50:00 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330205000.771$GI@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

yipe@bark.net wrote:
> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
>
> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
> Licensing requirements.
>
> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
>
You don't speak for either, fatboy.

2144. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:55:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90259

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>>>
> >>>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
> >>>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
> >>>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
>
> Actually, it did have a legal basis.
>
> The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of
other
> standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were
no
> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>
> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
test
> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>

Just one caveat. They probably need to request it in advance of the test
date as the VE team will probably have to order a special tape. I doubt
that the teams keep this on hand.

>
> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
> Farnsworth spacing.
>

>

Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier to copy than using slow letters.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2145. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 01:55:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330205505.100$ZI@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> Another ham radio operator busted:
>
> March 3, 2004
>
> Mr. Mark A. Glover
> 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> Garden Grove, CA 92640
>
> RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
>
> Dear Mr. Glover:
>
> In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to you
> requesting that you not use the repeater.
>
> Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
> please feel free to contact us.
>
> If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
> free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures are
> provided in such matters.
>
> Enclosure: 1
>
> CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> Catalina Island Repeater Association
>
Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.

ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland, indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited information that the licensee "failed to identify and used a disguised voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the type described "will not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee contact him to discuss the matter.

BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that information before the Commission indicates the licensee has been "deliberately interfering with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information that the licensee "failed to identify, identified by call signs not your own, and have made threats to other licensees." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Marshott that operation of the type described "will not be tolerated" and could result in a fine and revocation proceedings. Hollingsworth requested the licensee contact him to discuss the matter.

CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie H. Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a Technician license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's General license, N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by January 31, as requested December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said it was setting aside Allen's most recent Amateur Radio grant "due to allegations that raise questions about your qualifications to hold an Amateur Radio license." The FCC said that Allen took a Technician examination March 4 under the supervision of a W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner team. For now, that application will revert to pending status. Hollingsworth said the FCC would write Allen within two weeks "requesting a response to complaints about the operation of N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned Allen that, in the meantime, he has no authority to operate radio transmitting equipment.

SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr, N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other frequencies and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting the Commission's certification standards" over the air on those frequencies. The FCC said its information indicates the licensee has been using FM and LSB on 27.320 and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at power limits above those authorized for the Citizens Band. The FCC said operating uncertificated equipment at excessive power levels constitutes unlicensed radio operation and jeopardizes Reynolds' ham ticket. "Such operation will subject you to criminal prosecution and in rem seizure of transmitting equipment," the FCC warned. The FCC gave Reynolds 20 days to respond to the allegations and said the information he submits will be used to determine what action, if any, to take in the matter. In late February, the FCC wrote nearly identical letters to three other amateur licensees in Salisbury.

2146. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:08:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406A281F.3070900@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90260
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

>
>
>
>
>ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur
>Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from the
>FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
>indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
>operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
>March, 2, 2000."
>
>BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
>Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY,
>

My word! And these guys were a pre-restructuring Extra and an Advanced,
both of
whom passed a high speed code test.....

++++++++++++++++==========++++++++++++++++++++++++
"I'm having roast rabbit for Easter Dinner" :-)

>
>

2147. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:11:27 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330211127.159$aB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90261
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > Another ham radio operator busted:
> >
> > March 3, 2004
> >
> > Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > Garden Grove, CA 92640
> >
> > RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> >
> > Dear Mr. Glover:
> >
> > In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> > Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> > you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> >
> > Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> > association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
> > please feel free to contact us.
> >
> > If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
> > free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures
> > are provided in such matters.
> >
> > Enclosure: 1
> >
> > CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > Catalina Island Repeater Association
> >
> Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
>
> ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur
> Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from
> the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
> March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited information that the licensee "failed
> to identify and used a disguised voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
> Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the
> type described "will not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee
> contact him to discuss the matter.

>
> BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that information
> before the Commission indicates the licensee has been "deliberately
> interfering with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information that the licensee
> "failed to identify, identified by call signs not your own, and have made
> threats to other licensees." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Marshott that operation of the
> type described "will not be tolerated" and could result in a fine and
> revocation proceedings. Hollingsworth requested the licensee contact him
> to discuss the matter.
>
> CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie H.
> Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a Technician
> license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's General
> license, N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by January 31, as
> requested December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said it was setting aside Allen's most
> recent Amateur Radio grant "due to allegations that raise questions about
> your qualifications to hold an Amateur Radio license." The FCC said that
> Allen took a Technician examination March 4 under the supervision of a
> W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner team. For now, that application will revert
> to pending status. Hollingsworth said the FCC would write Allen within
> two weeks "requesting a response to complaints about the operation of
> N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned Allen that, in the meantime, he has no
> authority to operate radio transmitting equipment.
>
> SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the
> licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other
> frequencies and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting the
> Commission's certification standards" over the air on those frequencies.
> The FCC said its information indicates the licensee has been using FM and
> LSB on 27.320 and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at power limits above those
> authorized for the Citizens Band. The FCC said operating uncertificated
> equipment at excessive power levels constitutes unlicensed radio
> operation and jeopardizes Reynolds' ham ticket. "Such operation will
> subject you to criminal prosecution and in rem seizure of transmitting
> equipment," the FCC warned. The FCC gave Reynolds 20 days to respond to
> the allegations and said the information he submits will be used to
> determine what action, if any, to take in the matter. In late February,
> the FCC wrote nearly identical letters to three other amateur licensees
> in Salisbury.
>
Hey Jerry, have you seen this too?

http://exax.net/fcc.htm

2148. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:13:30 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com>
Message-ID: <ePpac.94643$8G2.90034@fe3.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 90262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry O. Defense Fund" <stayoff10meters@ratyouout.com> wrote in message
news:c4d3lc$l0c$1@news.x-echo.com...
> http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV
>
Sounds like normal talk on most 2M repeaters.

They are the new W5YI Hams.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.588 / Virus Database: 372 - Release Date: 2/13/2004

2149. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:25:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330212507.257$Tt@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90263
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

WHO could forget this clown getting spanked by Charlie!?!

N8WWM guilty of FCC violations. According to the FCC, N8WWM, Dog Adair committed several violations over the air at the expense of the Toledo Amateur Radio Club by utilizing their repeater to break the law. The amateur club received a warning letter from the FCC concerning Adair's violations and were told to take steps to make certain the violations by Adair will not be repeated. Adair not only hurt the entire image of amateur radio with his inexcusable behavior, but damaged the reputation of yet another entity trying to further the good of amateur radio. It's a shame when bad apples like these make it so clubs can't even trust their own users to abide by the rules they were sworn to uphold. Adair is also an infamous presence on the internet. A google search of "N8WWM" reveals a peek into the world of the individual identified as Adair. In addition to FCC violations, Adair has, in the past, been accused of being a prolific spammer, breaking several internet laws and violating several terms of service agreements with internet providers.

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > > Another ham radio operator busted:
> > >
> > > March 3, 2004
> > >
> > > Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > > 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > > Garden Grove, CA 92640
> > >
> > > RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> > >
> > > Dear Mr. Glover:
> > >
> > > In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> > > Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> > > you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> > >
> > > Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> > > association to make such a request. If there are any further
> > > questions, please feel free to contact us.
> > >
> > > If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
> > > are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing

> > > procedures are provided in such matters.
> > >
> > > Enclosure: 1
> > >
> > > CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > > Catalina Island Repeater Association
> > >
> > Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
> >
> > ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > Amateur Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that
> > information from the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> > Columbia, Maryland, indicates that the licensee "deliberately
> > interfered with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> > 20-meter amateur band on March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited
> > information that the licensee "failed to identify and used a disguised
> > voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> > Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the type described "will
> > not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee contact him to discuss
> > the matter.
> >
> > BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that
> > information before the Commission indicates the licensee has been
> > "deliberately interfering with the radio operations of other licensed
> > amateurs on the 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information
> > that the licensee "failed to identify, identified by call signs not
> > your own, and have made threats to other licensees." FCC Special
> > Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned
> > Marshott that operation of the type described "will not be tolerated"
> > and could result in a fine and revocation proceedings. Hollingsworth
> > requested the licensee contact him to discuss the matter.
> >
> > CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie
> > H. Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a
> > Technician license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's
> > General license, N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by
> > January 31, as requested December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for
> > Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said it was setting aside
> > Allen's most recent Amateur Radio grant "due to allegations that raise
> > questions about your qualifications to hold an Amateur Radio license."
> > The FCC said that Allen took a Technician examination March 4 under the
> > supervision of a W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner team. For now, that
> > application will revert to pending status. Hollingsworth said the FCC
> > would write Allen within two weeks "requesting a response to complaints
> > about the operation of N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned Allen that, in the
> > meantime, he has no authority to operate radio transmitting equipment.
> >
> > SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> > N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the

> > licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other
> > frequencies and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting
> > the Commission's certification standards" over the air on those
> > frequencies. The FCC said its information indicates the licensee has
> > been using FM and LSB on 27.320 and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at
> > power limits above those authorized for the Citizens Band. The FCC said
> > operating uncertificated equipment at excessive power levels
> > constitutes unlicensed radio operation and jeopardizes Reynolds' ham
> > ticket. "Such operation will subject you to criminal prosecution and in
> > rem seizure of transmitting equipment," the FCC warned. The FCC gave
> > Reynolds 20 days to respond to the allegations and said the information
> > he submits will be used to determine what action, if any, to take in
> > the matter. In late February, the FCC wrote nearly identical letters to
> > three other amateur licensees in Salisbury.
> >
> Hey Jerry, have you seen this too?
>
> http://exax.net/fcc.htm

2150. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:29:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330212907.402$hV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90264
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> >Amateur Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that
> >information from the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> >Columbia, Maryland, indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered
> >with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter
> >amateur band on March, 2, 2000."
> >
> >BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> >Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY,
> >
>
> My word! And these guys were a pre-restructuring Extra and an Advanced,
> both of
> whom passed a high speed code test.....
>
> ++++++++++++++++==========++++++++++++++++==========
> "I'm having roast rabbit for Easter Dinner" :-)
>
I'm having pork. :)

2151. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:35:14 UTC
From: "lol..." <doh@yikes.net>
Message-ID: <thbk60116bc5d68ugp1ac7vlaspopv2k8i@4ax.com>
Source record: 90265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 31 Mar 2004 01:50:00 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
wrote:

>yipe@bark.net wrote:
>> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
>>
>> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
>> Licensing requirements.
>>
>> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
>> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
>>
>You don't speak for either, fatboy.

Neither do you, moron.

go back and molest your teen daughter some more, and leave me be.

Nuff Said.

-Me

2152. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:45:19 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330214519.583$Gg@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90266
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

yipe@bark.net wrote:
> On 31 Mar 2004 01:50:00 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
> wrote:
>
> >yipe@bark.net wrote:
> >> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
> >>
> >> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
> >> Licensing requirements.
> >>
> >> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
> >> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
> >>
> >You don't speak for either, fatboy.
>
> Neither do you, moron.
>
> go back and molest your teen daughter some more, and leave me be.
>
> Nuff Said.
>
> -Me
>
Hey lard-ass, I don't have a daughter. Go wash the gravy off of
your chubby face, move out of your moms basement, and change
your crusty sweat pants. Get a job too.

2153. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 02:58:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040330215832.27920.00000092@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90267

In article <d22b54c3.0403301731.103e9f5e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
>news:<b7d1465c.0403261401.4c9eda0e@posting.google.com>...
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> > In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>,
>wa2si@arrl.net
>> > (Bert Craig) writes:
>> >
>> > >Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
>> > >around these parts.)
>> > >
>> > Works for me!
>> >
>> > 7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST
>> >
>> > BCNU
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Sounds great! And once again, just to reiterate, this should not be a
>> pressure thing. If someone knows how to send their callsign plus QNI
>> and a K, then you've successfully "touched base" and said "hi."
>>
>> Now, if some nice Elmer-type frequent R.R.A.Per who happens to have a
>> webpage would like to have a small section called 'R.R.A.P Net
>> Roster'...well, that'd be just swell. Hmmm...womder who'd be the best
>> candidate? 0:-)
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>
>OK, so what happened? Who showed up, actually did some real radio and worked
>who?
>
Didn't start yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2154. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 03:49:01 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <yqKdndT9-vpG3ffdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90268

Steveo wrote:
> Another ham radio operator busted:
>
> March 3, 2004
>
>
> Mr. Mark A. Glover
> 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> Garden Grove, CA 92640
>
>
> RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
>
>
> Dear Mr. Glover:
>
>
> In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to you
> requesting that you not use the repeater.
>
>
> Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
> please feel free to contact us.
>
>
> If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
> free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures are
> provided in such matters.
>
>
> Enclosure: 1
>
>
> CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> Catalina Island Repeater Association

Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.

2155. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 03:50:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <yqKdndf9-vqv3PfdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

Steveo wrote:

>
> Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
>
>
> ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur
> Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from the
> FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
> March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited information that the licensee "failed
> to identify and used a disguised voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
> Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the
> type described "will not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee
> contact him to discuss the matter.
>
> BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that information
> before the Commission indicates the licensee has been "deliberately
> interfering with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information that the licensee
> "failed to identify, identified by call signs not your own, and have made
> threats to other licensees." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Marshott that operation of the type
> described "will not be tolerated" and could result in a fine and revocation
> proceedings. Hollingsworth requested the licensee contact him to discuss
> the matter.
>
> CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie H.
> Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a Technician
> license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's General license,
> N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by January 31, as requested
> December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> Hollingsworth said it was setting aside Allen's most recent Amateur Radio
> grant "due to allegations that raise questions about your qualifications to
> hold an Amateur Radio license." The FCC said that Allen took a Technician
> examination March 4 under the supervision of a W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner
> team. For now, that application will revert to pending status.
> Hollingsworth said the FCC would write Allen within two weeks "requesting a
> response to complaints about the operation of N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned
> Allen that, in the meantime, he has no authority to operate radio
> transmitting equipment.

>
> SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the
> licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other frequencies
> and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting the Commission's
> certification standards" over the air on those frequencies. The FCC said
> its information indicates the licensee has been using FM and LSB on 27.320
> and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at power limits above those authorized for
> the Citizens Band. The FCC said operating uncertificated equipment at
> excessive power levels constitutes unlicensed radio operation and
> jeopardizes Reynolds' ham ticket. "Such operation will subject you to
> criminal prosecution and in rem seizure of transmitting equipment," the FCC
> warned. The FCC gave Reynolds 20 days to respond to the allegations and
> said the information he submits will be used to determine what action, if
> any, to take in the matter. In late February, the FCC wrote nearly
> identical letters to three other amateur licensees in Salisbury.

And this is what helps keep the ham bands from becoming the sewer pit of
communications like the cb band.

2156. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 03:55:00 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90270

Hi Brian,

I actually showed up late for my own party. At 0110, I got home and tined in to find two stations in QSO. I dropped down a few kHz and gave Jim a call as I figured he'd be one of the sure bets. No dice. I'm pretty sure he was about, just not where I was at a given time or he/I got lost in the QSB.

I'd sure like to give it a go again, perhaps a different day/time that'd work for most here. (Thinkin' about ya, Dee.) I recently checked into the Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0403301731.103e9f5e@posting.google.com...
> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0403261401.4c9eda0e@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> > > In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>,
wa2si@arrl.net
> > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > >
> > > >Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8
PM
> > > >around these parts.)
> > > >
> > > Works for me!
> > >
> > > 7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST
> > >
> > > BCNU
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Sounds great! And once again, just to reiterate, this should not be a
> > pressure thing. If someone knows how to send their callsign plus QNI
> > and a K, then you've successfully "touched base" and said "hi."
> >
> > Now, if some nice Elmer-type frequent R.R.A.Per who happens to have a
> > webpage would like to have a small section called 'R.R.A.P Net
> > Roster'...well, that'd be just swell. Hmmm...womder who'd be the best
> > candidate? 0:-)

> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> OK, so what happened? Who showed up, actually did some real radio and
worked who?
>
> w3rv

2157. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 03:58:11 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330225811.711$3o@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90271

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > Another ham radio operator busted:
> >
> > March 3, 2004
> >
> >
> > Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > Garden Grove, CA 92640
> >
> >
> > RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> >
> >
> > Dear Mr. Glover:
> >
> >
> > In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> > Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> > you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> >
> >
> > Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> > association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
> > please feel free to contact us.
> >
> >
> > If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
> > free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures
> > are provided in such matters.
> >
> >
> > Enclosure: 1
> >
> >
> > CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > Catalina Island Repeater Association
>
> Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
> jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
> between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
>
Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand

dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
rec.radio.cb.

Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?

2158. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 04:05:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330230520.785$lz@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90272
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> >
> > Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
> >
> >
> > ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > Amateur Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that
> > information from the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> > Columbia, Maryland, indicates that the licensee "deliberately
> > interfered with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> > 20-meter amateur band on March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited
> > information that the licensee "failed to identify and used a disguised
> > voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> > Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the type described "will
> > not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee contact him to discuss
> > the matter.
> >
> > BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that
> > information before the Commission indicates the licensee has been
> > "deliberately interfering with the radio operations of other licensed
> > amateurs on the 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information
> > that the licensee "failed to identify, identified by call signs not
> > your own, and have made threats to other licensees." FCC Special
> > Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned
> > Marshott that operation of the type described "will not be tolerated"
> > and could result in a fine and revocation proceedings. Hollingsworth
> > requested the licensee contact him to discuss the matter.
> >
> > CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie
> > H. Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a
> > Technician license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's
> > General license, N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by
> > January 31, as requested December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for
> > Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said it was setting aside
> > Allen's most recent Amateur Radio grant "due to allegations that raise
> > questions about your qualifications to hold an Amateur Radio license."
> > The FCC said that Allen took a Technician examination March 4 under the
> > supervision of a W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner team. For now, that
> > application will revert to pending status. Hollingsworth said the FCC
> > would write Allen within two weeks "requesting a response to complaints

> > about the operation of N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned Allen that, in the
> > meantime, he has no authority to operate radio transmitting equipment.
> >
> > SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> > N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the
> > licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other
> > frequencies and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting
> > the Commission's certification standards" over the air on those
> > frequencies. The FCC said its information indicates the licensee has
> > been using FM and LSB on 27.320 and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at
> > power limits above those authorized for the Citizens Band. The FCC said
> > operating uncertificated equipment at excessive power levels
> > constitutes unlicensed radio operation and jeopardizes Reynolds' ham
> > ticket. "Such operation will subject you to criminal prosecution and in
> > rem seizure of transmitting equipment," the FCC warned. The FCC gave
> > Reynolds 20 days to respond to the allegations and said the information
> > he submits will be used to determine what action, if any, to take in
> > the matter. In late February, the FCC wrote nearly identical letters to
> > three other amateur licensees in Salisbury.
>
> And this is what helps keep the ham bands from becoming the sewer pit of
> communications like the cb band.
>
So you enjoy reading -all- the enforcement archives here? Jerry Ox has
taken it upon himself to post -all- the CB enforcement to rec.radio.cb.

The best part is, it's totally on topic for rec.radio.amateur.policy,
when you tight ass hams get ran.

2159. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 04:07:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <yqKdndH9-vrH2PfdRVn-vw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jerry O. Defense Fund wrote:

> http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV
>
> long file but worth it.
> a cber discussing his new Superstar 3900
> export CB radio:
>
> "I dont know what frequency its on, Im just
> flipping switches and turning knobs"
>
> "channel 1 through channel 14 aint nuthin
> but morse code"

Just the typical brain dead cb truckers.

2160. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 04:14:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040330231402.081$Wh@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Jerry O. Defense Fund wrote:
>
> > http://s87707867.onlinehome.us/watergate/second.WAV
> >
> > long file but worth it.
> > a cber discussing his new Superstar 3900
> > export CB radio:
> >
> > "I dont know what frequency its on, Im just
> > flipping switches and turning knobs"
> >
> > "channel 1 through channel 14 aint nuthin
> > but morse code"
>
> Just the typical brain dead cb truckers.
>
You bit the hook.
```

2161. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 04:38:46 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <jVrac.165539$rB4.40332@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90275

The rule at the time was you were supposed to change the call to where you lived. Even had to notify the gummit when you were on the move.

Wayne came up with a novel approach to the problem, but most people couldn't use that solution.

It's just that once it became ok to take your call with you, it was one less thing to have as an issue in 73.

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20040320224918.05539.00004832@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <Bn27c.120239$rB4.104671@bignews6.bellsouth.net>, "Bill Newkirk"
> <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> >Plus he didn't have any idea on what to do once a lot of his "issues" were
> >addressed (such as holding W2NSD when living in 1 land)...
>
> Bill:
>
> What's wrong with holding an out-of-area call sign? I spent seven years as
> N3CRA while stationed in Germany and New York, and subsequently spent
> six years as WR2F while stationed in Colorado and Delaware. Holding an
> out-of-area call sign has been "legal" for at least as long as I've been a ham,
> and that's over 23 years now.
>
> >Wayne now seems to be a sucker for every half-baked idea that comes along.
> >(heard the program, sad.)
>
> I heard the broadcast myself, in it's entirety. It made me cringe. If I had
> not been
> reading his "Never Say Die" Editorials (purely for fun) in 73 Magazine for
> years, I
> would have thought that this guy was a total fruitcake, and so must be everyone
> else who claims to be a "ham radio" operator. I'm concerned that a lot of
> non-ham listeners may have reached that very conclusion, but then again, those
> who listen to "Coast to Coast" are probably already predisposed in that
> direction. The only reason I listened was that I was taking a long

night-drive
> from Delaware to New York, and that W2NSD just happened to be the "Guest
> Nutcase" that evening.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2162. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 04:56:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406A4F77.6000108@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90276

>
>
>
>
>
>>Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
>>Farnsworth spacing.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier to
>copy than using slow letters.
>
>
>
>
Also you become able to do higher speeds sooner.

++++==================+++====================++++==============++++
I'm having roast rabbit for Easter Dinner.... :-)

>
>

2163. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 05:40:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <x6SdnZTy0O_-xvfd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90277

```
Steveo wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>Steveo wrote:
>>
>>>Another ham radio operator busted:
>>>
>>>March 3, 2004
>>>
>>>
>>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
>>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
>>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
>>>
>>>
>>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
>>>
>>>
>>>Dear Mr. Glover:
>>>
>>>
>>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
>>>Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
>>>you requesting that you not use the repeater.
>>>
>>>
>>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
>>>association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
>>>please feel free to contact us.
>>>
>>>
>>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
>>>free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures
>>>are provided in such matters.
>>>
>>>
>>>Enclosure: 1
>>>
>>>
>>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
>>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
>>
>>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
>>jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
```

>>between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
>>
>
> Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
> dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
> rec.radio.cb.
>
> Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?

He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old to explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
are provided in such matters."

2164. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 05:47:37 UTC
From: "Dr. Death" <nospam.vacuumtubenut@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <106kms0jdvllr0f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"lol..." <doh@yikes.net> wrote in message
news:od8k60l9p2en1riv8m3mqsr0sijrcerrp1@4ax.com...
> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
>
> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
> Licensing requirements.
>
> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.

Don't blame licensing requirements. It was enforcement that was the problem. Back in the day I "paid" for my license and there were people using reverbs, amps, homemade noise toys, and YES there were people with extra channels. A law is not a law if it's not enforced. It wasn't enforced then nor is it now.

2165. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 05:58:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040331005854.472$CY@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90279

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >>>Another ham radio operator busted:
> >>>
> >>>March 3, 2004
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
> >>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
> >>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Dear Mr. Glover:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> >>>Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> >>>you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> >>>association to make such a request. If there are any further
> >>>questions, please feel free to contact us.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
> >>>are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing
> >>>procedures are provided in such matters.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Enclosure: 1
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> >>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
> >>
> >>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to

> >>jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
> >>between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
> >>
> >
> > Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
> > dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
> > rec.radio.cb.
> >
> > Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?
>
> He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it
> plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater
> owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old to
> explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
> are provided in such matters."
>
Heh, so unless you're busted and fined you haven't broken
any rules. You running two meters now, dipshit?

2166. Re: Wayne Green on C to C AM Thursday 3/18

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 06:16:43 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c4dnob$555$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 90280

"Bill Newkirk" (wnewkirk@bellsouth.net) writes:
> The rule at the time was you were supposed to change the call to where you
> lived. Even had to notify the gummit when you were on the move.
>
> Wayne came up with a novel approach to the problem, but most people couldn't
> use that solution.
>
What was his solution? I know he grumbled about being issued a new
callsign just as he was ready to move yet again, but I don't recall
how he got around it. Well, of course once he moved to New Hampshire
and stopped moving around, he kept W2NSD and operated portable. I believe
he said that he couldn't get W1NSD (though he had had "NSD" in various
districts), so he just kept W2NSD. I can't remember how he kept being
able to get "NSD" either.

I believe he used his parents address in NYC as his mailing address,
but were they around up till the time the rule about needing a callsign
to match the district disappeared?

Kids today, they don't know what it was like in the old days. Having
to log everything, and having to notify their governing when they moved.
If I'm remembering, here in Canada you even had to notify if it was
a relatively short move, like operating from a country house for
two months in the summer. Little or no choice in what callsign you
were issued.

Michael VE2BVW

2167. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 06:55:23 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86isglijz8.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 90281

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

I'm on the road next Monday so I'll have to wait for the following
Monday.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAamtgGPFSfAB/ezgRAosIAKDN50wYpNJMV24SE+u/ONyvIt4fSACg7yZz
5igCKS8PO7eVZZJ7oHzUnhM=
=5hRs
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2168. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:12:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0403310512.5f30763d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90282

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> Hi Brian,
>
> I actually showed up late for my own party. At 0110, I got home and tined in
> to find two stations in QSO. I dropped down a few kHz and gave Jim a call as
> I figured he'd be one of the sure bets. No dice. I'm pretty sure he was
> about, just not where I was at a given time or he/I got lost in the QSB.

I was there from 0055 to 0110, just missed ya.
>
> I'd sure like to give it a go again, perhaps a different day/time that'd
> work for most here. (Thinkin' about ya, Dee.) I recently checked into the
> Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately
> after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)

Condx on 40 were quite good - heard a guy running QRPP on 7039 - 50
milliwatts. He was about S7 and good solid copy here. The Type 7
doesn't miss much!

Next Monday will *not* be good for me, tho.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2169. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:40:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310540.1b8919ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90283

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
> >>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
> >>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
>
> Actually, it did have a legal basis.
>
> The FCC was informed

By whom?

of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
> standard practices of the VE teams.

"Standard practices?"

Wow!!! A wasted piece of correspondence if there were ever one!

"I hereby inform the FCC that I am using standard, good amateur
practices. Does the FCC agree or disagree? You have 72 hours to
respond. Without a dissenting opinion, this standard, good amateur
practice becomes law."

Hihi!

Why would the VEC's have to inform the FCC of standard, good amateur
practice???

Because they weren't standard?

Because they were at variance with the regulations?

How long after the fact of implementing these "standard practices" did
the VEC's notify the FCC?

FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams.

Can you document that the FCC even received such a notification?

Therefore, the use of
> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>
> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their test
> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.

Hmmm? Wonder what a person would call "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse
Code?

> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
> Farnsworth spacing.

Really?

Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
choked on the exam.

Just FYI, the "non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code" is referred to as
Morse Code. You will find references to it in Part 97, but you will
find no reference to "Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code."

Considering the number of times that Part 97 has been toyed with, you
would think that the FCC could make a mention of it. But they
haven't. So much for your "legal basis."

All you repeat again and again is the "non-dissenting FCC opinion."
So what is the date of this correspondence?

2170. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:42:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90284

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> > >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> > >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
> > >
> > >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> > >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> > >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
> > >>
> > >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >>
> > >>>
> > >>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
> > >>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
> > >>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
> > >
> > Actually, it did have a legal basis.
> >
> > The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of
> other
> > standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were
> no
> > dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
> > Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
> >
> > In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
> test
> > need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
> >
>
> Just one caveat. They probably need to request it in advance of the test
> date as the VE team will probably have to order a special tape. I doubt
> that the teams keep this on hand.

Order a special tape???

Just whip out your trusty knee-key and send it.

> > Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
> > Farnsworth spacing.
>
> Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier to
> copy than using slow letters.

Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.

2171. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:47:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90285

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<2dWdnRvMFeKjjPfdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >
> >>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>>Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >>
> >> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at
> >>talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
> >>
> >>Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
> >
> > How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>
>
> Brian, for what its worth, in my area, a 9-1-1 call on our repeater is
> going to get through more reliably than a cell phone call, and we can
> access the repeater in places in which no cell phone is going to get
> through. The repeater system covers our county, which is mountainous and
> has many area where the nearest cell phone tower is many miles away.
>
> Is this available everywhere? No, it sure isn't. But neither is cell
> phone service. But since it is, we use it. If I'm in my area, and I
> witness an emergency and NEED to get 9-1-1 immediately, I'll reach for
> my HT or mobile rig before I pick up the cell phone.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

When was the last time you availed your amateur radio transceiver to a
non-amateur for emergency purposes? You, your license, and your
equipment isn't there when they need it, is it?

I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency

communications for the average citizen.

2172. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:51:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310551.13d3b21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90286

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330122656.07406.00000326@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/30/2004 7:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300545.4e946282@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >>
> >> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty
> good at
> >> talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
> >
> >How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>
> Probably the same way the 910 and the 912 operator does.
>
> Why would the 9-1-1 operator WANT to talk to you?

Keep tap dancing. It's funny.

> Did YOU initiate the RFS via autopatch? If not, they have nothing to say
> to you...9-1-1 operators wait for you to call them, not vice-versa.

You forget so quickly.

> And if you DID initiate the call, I imagine they talk to you the same way
> they'd talk to me...In English. If you DIDN'T initiate the call, I guess the
> 9-1-1 operator isn't GOING to talk to you.

How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

> I am wondering where you're trying to take this and what point you're
> trying to save from all of this spinning, Brain.

No spinning. You made a statement. Now explain it.

If you don't initiate the
> call, they aren't going to talk to you...REGARDLESS if the call came via
> hardline, wireless or Amateur Radio autopatch.
>
> I realize that there's a bit of common sense in that that's hard for you
> to assimilate, but it's true.

Steve has no explanation for thie things he says (statements of fact).
So he tries to clown his way out of it. Whatta Bozo.

2173. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:57:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310557.7afb41be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90287

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330122109.07406.00000325@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
> PS...For what I make in my "real" job, I can write this off as entertainment!
> I ought to send you an IRS form 1099 this year.

Please, no. No direct correspondence with you.

If we had ever QSO'd, I would recommend you use the buro.

And don't brag and gloat about the high cost of health care. John
Kerry will change all that if he gets in office.

2174. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 13:58:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310558.e98dd22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90288

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<f6qdnfEztvvc5_XdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...

> Oh well, I have mixed thoughts on the "new censorship " going on. I
> prefer the airways cleaned up, but I would just as soon have Howard
> removed from them because he stinks than for his profanity.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Few practice personal responsibility.

My rule is that if its indecent for children, its indecent for adults.

2175. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 14:02:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310602.48a59e05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90289

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330155418.22481.00000347@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> Never expect an idiot to be accurate...even when describing
> themselves...ESPECIALLY when discussing themselves, actually!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Like your claim to sanity?

2176. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 14:18:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90290

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >restructuringdepends
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/30/2004 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300539.557a0050@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040329155938.19505.00000289@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> >> >There you go assuming again. I read few of Len's posts. So when I
> >> >see you using reverse psychology on Len, it just looks like your
> >> >original idea.
> >>
> >> If you want to think that, go right ahead.
> >
> >My privelege.
>
> I am sure you meant priviledge, but that's OK...

Yes, that is what I meant. Thank you.

> > You've obviously read too FEW
> >> of "Len's" posts.
> >
> >How many of Len's posts am I supposed to read?
>
> All of them, Brainless One.

Nope.

> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
> "respect" he THINKS he does.

I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
the art and science of radio.

When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
because there is something to be learned.

I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
retired a long time ago.

Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service, radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements, or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur license. And in America, every citizen has a voice. Those who are tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an assinine view.

So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed Sheriff and him barking at each other.

2177. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 14:22:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90291

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330114951.07198.00000281@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> Picked this up from "QRZ.COM".
>
> Perhaps, Brain, you can get ahold of this fellow and volunteer to tag
> along. He might (but I doubt it...) be able to help you understand how to go
> about getting your Amateur Radio license for Somalia.
>
> QUOTE:
>
> Posted: Mar. 26 2004,19:16
>
> VK2BVS
>
> ---
> ------
> After a fantastic 6 months in Somalia last year its about to happen again. My
> departure to Somalia is on 15April 2004.
>
> I am looking for a team to work together to help Somali hams join the airwaves.
> There are 13 Somali hams but none has a transceiver....(SNIP)
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.

Your turn, Mr. Seven Hostile Actions.

2178. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 14:59:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <406ADCD4.1090107@psu.edu>
Source record: 90292

William wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<2dWdnRvMFeKjjPfdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>>Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>>>>
>>>> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at
>>>>talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
>>>>
>>>>Steve, K4YZ
>>>
>>>
>>>Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
>>>
>>>How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>>
>>
>> Brian, for what its worth, in my area, a 9-1-1 call on our repeater is
>>going to get through more reliably than a cell phone call, and we can
>>access the repeater in places in which no cell phone is going to get
>>through. The repeater system covers our county, which is mountainous and
>>has many area where the nearest cell phone tower is many miles away.
>>
>> Is this available everywhere? No, it sure isn't. But neither is cell
>>phone service. But since it is, we use it. If I'm in my area, and I
>>witness an emergency and NEED to get 9-1-1 immediately, I'll reach for
>>my HT or mobile rig before I pick up the cell phone.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

> When was the last time you availed your amateur radio transceiver to a
> non-amateur for emergency purposes? You, your license, and your
> equipment isn't there when they need it, is it?

Never have, and since I'd be the control op, I'd not be likely to.

> I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
> and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
> communications for the average citizen.

Of course the cellphone is a good thing for reporting emergencies. And if I have one, I'll use it if I'm out of my repeater area. The nearly universal use of the things almost guarantees *someone* will pass by that can call emergency services.

I doubt that Amateur radio ever filled that local "see an accident and call 911" niche. Of course the ham could call using autopatch, but there just weren't enough people to give such a coverage as cellphones could.

But at least in our area, I can better contact emergency services through my HT than I can my cell phone. So that is what I use. Those with only cell phone access can try to use that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2179. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 15:11:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0403310711.1cabd1fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90293

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040330215832.27920.00000092@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0403301731.103e9f5e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
> >news:<b7d1465c.0403261401.4c9eda0e@posting.google.com>...
> >> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20040326055739.27920.00000016@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >> > In article <b7d1465c.0403251512.6743d5a5@posting.google.com>,
> wa2si@arrl.net
> >> > (Bert Craig) writes:
> >> >
> >> > >Tuesday mornings at say...0100z? (Relax, that's Monday evening at 8 PM
> >> > >around these parts.)
> >> > >
> >> > Works for me!
> >> >
> >> > 7037 plus-minus QRM, 8 PM EST
> >> >
> >> > BCNU
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> Sounds great! And once again, just to reiterate, this should not be a
> >> pressure thing. If someone knows how to send their callsign plus QNI
> >> and a K, then you've successfully "touched base" and said "hi."
> >>
> >> Now, if some nice Elmer-type frequent R.R.A.Per who happens to have a
> >> webpage would like to have a small section called 'R.R.A.P Net
> >> Roster'...well, that'd be just swell. Hmmm...womder who'd be the best
> >> candidate? 0:-)
> >>
> >> 73 de Bert
> >> WA2SI
> >
> >OK, so what happened? Who showed up, actually did some real radio and worked
> >who?
> >
> Didn't start yet.

. . uh-huh . . . bzzzzzt.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2180. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 15:36:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90294

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 7:40 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310540.1b8919ab@posting.google.com>
>
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>> >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
>> >
>> >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >>>
>> >>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
>> >>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
>> >>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
>>
>> Actually, it did have a legal basis.
>>
>> The FCC was informed
>
>By whom?

Does it matter?

The FCC has placed "ringers" in VE tests before and has never...not even
once...questioned the validity, quality or method of delivery of Element 1.

> of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
>> standard practices of the VE teams.
>
>"Standard practices?"
>
>Wow!!! A wasted piece of correspondence if there were ever one!
>

>"I hereby inform the FCC that I am using standard, good amateur
>practices. Does the FCC agree or disagree? You have 72 hours to
>respond. Without a dissenting opinion, this standard, good amateur
>practice becomes law."
>
>Hihi!
>
>Why would the VEC's have to inform the FCC of standard, good amateur
>practice???
>
>Because they weren't standard?
>
>Because they were at variance with the regulations?
>
>How long after the fact of implementing these "standard practices" did
>the VEC's notify the FCC?

Brain, you really are stretching for a "pont" to make, aren't you?

>FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
>> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams.
>
>Can you document that the FCC even received such a notification?

Can you document they ahven't?

> Therefore, the use of
>> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>>
>> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
>test
>> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>
>Hmmm? Wonder what a person would call "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse
>Code?

Indeed. Does it matter? The FCC itself ahs no argument with it.

>> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
>> Farnsworth spacing.
>
>Really?

Really.

I understand Morse Code perfectly (to about 40WPM in contests...25WPM in
"routine" QSO's...I have no problem with it at all.

>Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
>to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
>unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
>and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
>choked on the exam.

Oh?

You have some "scientific" studies that valiate this asertion, Brain?

You've done a side-by-side comparison of different methodologies to validate this?

>Just FYI, the "non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code" is referred to as
>Morse Code. You will find references to it in Part 97, but you will
>find no reference to "Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code."

There is NO reference to spacing techniques in Part 97 for Morse Code.

There is no "technical specification" for Morse Code in any federal regulation that I am aware of. Post one and I will acknowledge it publically.

Post it, show me a federal law that says THIS is the "Morse Code" that MUST be used and I will send you a Savings Bond for $100.

>Considering the number of times that Part 97 has been toyed with, you
>would think that the FCC could make a mention of it. But they
>haven't. So much for your "legal basis."

English jurisprudence has established that those things not specifically prohibited or regulated by law are not illegal...Therefore ARE "legal".

>All you repeat again and again is the "non-dissenting FCC opinion."
>So what is the date of this correspondence?

Has the FCC "dissented" to the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code?

Has it not had the opportunity to intervene if it DID think that it was improper or illegal to use?

Have you not yet found any evidence to support YOUR assertion that unlicensed radio services play a "major role" in "emergency comms"...?!?!

Inquiring minds WANT to know!

Steve, K4YZ

2181. Where's The Specification, Brain?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 15:42:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331104256.03625.00000379@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90295

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 7:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com>

>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...

>> > Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
> >> Farnsworth spacing.
>
>> Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier to
> >copy than using slow letters.

>Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
>regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.

Brain, WHERE in ANY FCC regulation is a "technical standard" for Morse
Code expressed?

Now...HERE WE GO AGAIN: You, Brian "billybeeper" Burke, have made an
assertion that a person may be "prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
regulation..."

I am ASKING YOU, WHERE in PART 97 or ANY FCC regulation, does a
'specification' or 'technical standard' for the spacing of Morse Code
characters exist?

Inquiring minds.......

Steve, K4YZ

2182. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 15:46:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331104623.03625.00000380@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90296

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 7:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com>

>I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
>and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
>communications for the average citizen.

In as much as you are obviously narrowing your scope to "the average citizen" making what would be considered a "routine" 9-1-1 call under "normal" circumstances you'd be correct.

In the scope of "emergency communications" as it pertains to the Amateur Radio Service and within the scope of discussion OF "emergency communications, you ae still trying to compare apples and oranges.

Your bad. Try again.

Steve, K4YZ

2183. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 15:50:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331105015.03625.00000381@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90297

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 7:51 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310551.13d3b21@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040330122656.07406.00000326@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/30/2004 7:45 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300545.4e946282@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>> >>
>> >> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty
>> good at
>> >> talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
>> >
>> >How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
>>
>> Probably the same way the 910 and the 912 operator does.
>>
>> Why would the 9-1-1 operator WANT to talk to you?
>
>Keep tap dancing. It's funny.

I am not the one dancing, PuppetBoy.

>> Did YOU initiate the RFS via autopatch? If not, they have nothing to
>say
>> to you...9-1-1 operators wait for you to call them, not vice-versa.
>
>You forget so quickly.

Nope. Just pointing out how you keep trying to dodge the point.

>> And if you DID initiate the call, I imagine they talk to you the same
>way
>> they'd talk to me...In English. If you DIDN'T initiate the call, I guess
>the
>> 9-1-1 operator isn't GOING to talk to you.
>
>How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?

What 911 operator? You mean the 9-1-1 operator? He/She uses the same hardline telephone or dispatch console they use every day...THAT is connected via hardline to the repeater site. Then they are put ON-THE-AIR via your repeater.

>> I am wondering where you're trying to take this and what point you're
>> trying to save from all of this spinning, Brain.
>
>No spinning. You made a statement. Now explain it.

I have and I have.

> If you don't initiate the
>> call, they aren't going to talk to you...REGARDLESS if the call came via
>> hardline, wireless or Amateur Radio autopatch.
>>
>> I realize that there's a bit of common sense in that that's hard for
>you
>> to assimilate, but it's true.
>
>Steve has no explanation for thie things he says (statements of fact).
> So he tries to clown his way out of it. Whatta Bozo.

Like I've said...better anything else than a liar, Brian, and you've proven yourself that.

Nice job.

Steve, K4YZ

2184. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 16:02:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90298

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 7:57 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310557.7afb41be@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040330122109.07406.00000325@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>>
>> PS...For what I make in my "real" job, I can write this off as
>entertainment!
>> I ought to send you an IRS form 1099 this year.
>
>Please, no. No direct correspondence with you.

Oh no, Brain...I'll send the 1099 direct to Uncle Sam...

>If we had ever QSO'd, I would recommend you use the buro.

In as much as you ahve yet to prove you've ever made a single QSO from a location from which I could USE a buro, I would.

>And don't brag and gloat about the high cost of health care. John
>Kerry will change all that if he gets in office.

I am the LAST one to "brag" about the "high cost of health care", Your Putziness.

I think it sucks.

And if John Kerry makes it to the White House, his "health care reform" will likely be no more successful that Hillary Rotten Clinton's was, and will undoubedly be nothing more than "tax 'em till they choke" to pay for it. It will, like other Democratic suggestions, look grand and compassionate while still in the wrapping, yet will wilt rapidly when expeosed to the daylight of scrutiny of the bean counters.

"Health Care's" high costs are principally due to this Nation's inability (and unwillingness) to overcome lobbyists and the Trial Lawyer's Association. Put caps on rediculous lawsuits and absolutely astronomical lawyers fees and incentives and "health care" costs will become more manageable in short order.

Let hospitals and other health care professionals start counter-suing everytime a frivilous suit is brought against us and pretty soon the word will get around that if you don't have a VERY valid claim, you'd best think twice.

Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS

personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.

Now...care to discuss a topic for which you may be adequately informed and prepared?

We've pretty well ruled out health care issues and Amateur Radio.
Meterology, perhasp?

Steve, K4YZ

2185. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 16:03:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331110357.03625.00000383@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90299

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 8:02 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310602.48a59e05@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040330155418.22481.00000347@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> Never expect an idiot to be accurate...even when describing
>> themselves...ESPECIALLY when discussing themselves, actually!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Like your claim to sanity?

Oh, I've NEVER said that I am "sane", Brain. I just said I am not nuts.

Steve, K4YZ

2186. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 16:15:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331111544.03625.00000384@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90300

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 8:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>...

>> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
>> "respect" he THINKS he does.
>
>I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
>the art and science of radio.

Len served in the Armed Forces. Bully for him.

His "service" to the "radio profession" has yet to be established by any
source other than himself.

>When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
>because there is something to be learned.

How can you know if he's saying anything of value if you don't read all
his posts?

>I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
>long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
>should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
>retired a long time ago.

Lennie's "views" are based upon some personal expression of anger and
angst AGAINST Amateur Radio.

Lennie has absolutely ZERO-POINT-SQUAT minutes of operating an Amateur
Radio Station from which to make an informed opinion.

>Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
>radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
>or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
>based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
>make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
>license. And in America, every citizen has a voice. Those who are
>tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
>must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
>assinine view.

We "exclude" Lennie becasue Lennie only assumes himself to be "qualified" to discuss anything related to radio since he was an alleged "professional".

Also, his irreverent use of profanity and personal insults against anything that is "not Lennie" does little to endear him to folks here, even those who may be predisposed to agree with his "opinion" on Morse Code testing. No one likes to be associated with a foul-mouthed liar.

>So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
>Sheriff and him barking at each other.

I am not "barking" at him.

I rub his nose in his frequent newsgroup errors.

Just like I do you.

Steve, K4YZ

2187. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 16:17:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90201

>Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>

>I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.

Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you risked even more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not true.

Steve, K4YZ

2188. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 17:36:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90202

In article <20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
>standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
>dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
>Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.

AFTER the fact.

VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
by the Commission.

>In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
test
>need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.

Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
had any legal basis.

>Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
>Farnsworth spacing.

Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
had any legal basis.

LHA / WMD

2189. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 20:01:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331150100.16977.00000083@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90205

In article <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> >How many of Len's posts am I supposed to read?
>>
>> All of them, Brainless One.
>
>Nope.
>
>> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
>> "respect" he THINKS he does.
>
>I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
>the art and science of radio.

Thank you, Brian. I respect your military service also.

>When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
>because there is something to be learned.

It is very rare that the technology of radio is brought up in here,
quite possibly because so few have bothered to learn about it
or practice it...everyone is all concerned with operating and the
state of the art of rank-status-privilege, their collection of old
QST magazines, and the importance of obeying everything that
the ARRL commands them to do.

There is an (unfortunate for all) spitefulness that someone who
has worked IN radio-electronics for over a half century and for
money (gasp!) can possibly comment on anything "amateur."
The spiteful are angry and outraged that anyone disturbs their
pipe dreams of honor and glory and national service of an
essentially avocational activity carried on for personal enjoyment.
They must spin tales, tails twirling, of their "national need" and
medal-worthy imagination of saving future civilization through
heroic fantasy stories about morsemanship in speculative
futures.

>I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
>long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
>should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
>retired a long time ago.

Irrelevant to the long-timers, the self-professed "leaders" of the
"amateur community" who wish to dictate to others that what
they enjoy must be practiced by all others...because they alone

are the imaginary spirit of amateur radio, the ones carrying the symbolic torch of championship of the radio arts and "necessary" communications modes. They have placed their symbolic laurel wreaths (of expertise) on themselves, bravely defending their alleged rights to be better than others in rank-status-privilege. These "experts" disallow any dissent of their god-like opinions for they are above any discussion with mere mortals like you and me.

Meanwhile they are not cognizant that the FCC is still defining International Morse Code to an obsolete ITU-T (not ITU-R) document, CCITT Recommendation F.1 (1984) Division B, I. Morse Code. That was still in the very official regulations' definitions at 94.3 (a) (27) as of 1 October 2003. They don't know what is contained within that Recommendation because it is only available from the ITU and for a fee...or that it has been superseded in nomenclature and some changes (other than the astounding and oh-so-important addition of the @ character to the standard set) by the ITU-T; the CCITT itself has been superseded entire by the ITU-T. The CCITT document never defined a telegraphic "word" either in size or for rate, it only defined the relative length of dot, dash, and spacings. [you know this because I e-mailed a direct copy of my ITU-T document file to you as a favor] Instead, the arguments in here have raged on solely on the basis of "everyone knows this!" as if all law and regulations are based on some paranormal common knowledge.

>Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
>radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
>or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
>based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
>make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
>license.

Irrelevant to the self-professed "leaders" and gods of amateurism. Reality has no place in imaginary fantasyland imaginations of glory and honor and national service through amateurism.

>And in America, every citizen has a voice.

The First Amendment Rights have been overruled by these self-professed "leaders." Evidence of that exists in the public view on proceeding 98-143 for 25 January 1999.

>Those who are
>tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
>must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
>assinine view.

Independent thought is not allowed in here. All must obey the dictates of the self-professed "leaders" of amateurism in radio.

These "leaders" are without fault...all who disagree with them
are rewarded by a barrage of personal insults instead of
addressing the subject under discussion. The "leaders" rule
by barbarian warlord tactics of neighborhood gangsterism in
messaging.

>So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
>Sheriff and him barking at each other.

That is how it should be.

A problem for casual readers in here is that the "leaders" cannot
survive arguments on the subject which contradict their cherished
myths and fables. The end result is much wasted time of these
individual "message warlords" competeting for personal status
as newsgroup "leaders." Among these regular "leaders" it doesn't
matter whether the subject is about amateur radio, it is all
concerned with the righteousness of their personal opinion
triumphing for them in any way possible. Amateur radio policy
is far down on the list topped by their Need To Be RIGHT!.

And that is how it is.

LHA / WMD

2190. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 20:01:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331150101.16977.00000084@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90203

In article <1e4e3692.0403310602.48a59e05@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040330155418.22481.00000347@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> Never expect an idiot to be accurate...even when describing
>> themselves...ESPECIALLY when discussing themselves, actually!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Like your claim to sanity?

Brian, by the gunnery nurse's own admission, he is a "health care
professional" with a half-million-dollar-premium malpractice
insurance, and has been in "seven hostile actions" as well as an
expert on engineering processes in commercial electronics (by
virtue of short employment as a purchasing agent in a modem
and set-top-box maker's company).

That he doesn't look at himself in the mirror may be due to not
seeing any reflection there... :-)

LHA / WMD

2191. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 20:01:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040331150102.16977.00000085@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90204

In article <1e4e3692.0403310540.1b8919ab@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>> >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
>> >
>> >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >>>
>> >>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
>> >>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
>> >>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
>>
>> Actually, it did have a legal basis.
>>
>> The FCC was informed
>
>By whom?
>
> of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
>> standard practices of the VE teams.
>
>"Standard practices?"
>
>Wow!!! A wasted piece of correspondence if there were ever one!
>
>"I hereby inform the FCC that I am using standard, good amateur
>practices. Does the FCC agree or disagree? You have 72 hours to
>respond. Without a dissenting opinion, this standard, good amateur
>practice becomes law."
>
>Hihi!

>
>Why would the VEC's have to inform the FCC of standard, good amateur
>practice???
>
>Because they weren't standard?
>
>Because they were at variance with the regulations?
>
>How long after the fact of implementing these "standard practices" did
>the VEC's notify the FCC?
>
>FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
>> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams.
>
>Can you document that the FCC even received such a notification?

He will mention the appropriate ARRL news item or notice. :-)

ARRL is a Final Authority, oracle of all amateur radio.

[as of the end of 2003, ARRL membership had shrunk to 21.3%
of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs}

>> Therefore, the use of
>> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.

But only AFTER the FCC approval.

There was NOT any specific definition of "word rate" either stated
or referenced in Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R., before, during, or after
that "approval" by the FCC. There still isn't.

>> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
test
>> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>
>Hmmm? Wonder what a person would call "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse
>Code?
>
>> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
>> Farnsworth spacing.
>
>Really?
>
>Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
>to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
>unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
>and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
>choked on the exam.
>
>Just FYI, the "non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code" is referred to as
>Morse Code. You will find references to it in Part 97, but you will

>find no reference to "Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code."

The only reference to International Morse Code standards is given
in 97.3 (a) (27). That standard does not define "word rate."

>Considering the number of times that Part 97 has been toyed with, you
>would think that the FCC could make a mention of it. But they
>haven't. So much for your "legal basis."
>
>All you repeat again and again is the "non-dissenting FCC opinion."
>So what is the date of this correspondence?

"Barracks lawyers" are found everywhere, even if they haven't
served or been in seven hostile actions. :-)

LHA / WMD

2192. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 21:07:04 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406B32F5.5050904@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90206

Phil Kane wrote:

>>
>>
>
> I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
> enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
> licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
> part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
> licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.
>
Nowadays one can download a copy off the 'net. Of course one needs to know what
"pecuniary" means, and such. Which means that you can't use a 2 meter repeater to
dispatch taxi cabs, or if you're a real estate agent to auto-patch call your office to
work a house sale. Nowadays with cell phones, I doubt anyone would consider
doing this. This rule is a good one; it keeps businesses from invading our bands
and taking over (lawsuits over QRM, anyone?).

Ever enforcement action anyone who truly didn't know that they were violating
some rule? I'm sure everyone who ever maliciously QRMed someone knew full
well that that is against the rules. Maybe once in a great while you find someone
who say set up a reverse autopatch on their repeater to respond to incoming
calls from the phone company. Heard someone did that and thought it was okay if
the machine just said "incoming call, press * to allow caller's voice to be transmitted".
Seems that there was still the problem that an unlicensed caller could do something
to make a ham transmitter key up even though they couldn't talk over it yet.

>
> Whether one complies with the Rules is another matter.....
>
>--
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

>

2193. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:08:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403311408.65dff9a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90207

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040331104623.03625.00000380@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 7:47 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com>
>
> >I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
> >and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
> >communications for the average citizen.
>
> In as much as you are obviously narrowing your scope to "the average
> citizen"

Deal with it.

That was the context in which I made my statement, Steve.

making what would be considered a "routine" 9-1-1 call under "normal"
> circumstances you'd be correct.

Steve, what 911 calls are made under normal, routine circumstances?

> In the scope of "emergency communications" as it pertains to the Amateur
> Radio Service and within the scope of discussion OF "emergency communications,
> you ae still trying to compare apples and oranges.

Nope. Amateur radio emergency communications are not limited to
Continuity of Government operations only.

> Your bad. Try again.

You're bass ackwards. Again.

2194. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:36:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <X_mdnQ1kp7IA1fbdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90208

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403310540.1b8919ab@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
> Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
> to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
> unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
> and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
> choked on the exam.
>

All currently available study guides, commercial tapes and CDs and software
trainers, and almost all shareware/freeware software trainers specifically
tell the prospective student that the exams are given using the Farnsworth
spacing for the 5wpm test. There is NO excuse for not knowing this.
Training tapes and records using 5wpm letter speeds would have to be quite
old.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2195. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:38:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90209

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> >
> > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier
to
> > copy than using slow letters.
>
> Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
> regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.

No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
information has set themselves up for failure.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2196. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:40:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <SeOdnRX6sKlb1PbdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90210

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com...
> I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
> and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
> communications for the average citizen.

Everyone has indicated that it's great for the individualized emergency instances like a car accident, etc. But it has no place in widespread emergencies like hurricanes, earthquakes and so on as it simply can't be counted on under that type of condition.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2197. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:45:18 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90212

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>
> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>

Is that per staff member? I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
it's not really clear.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2198. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:48:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403311448.304f9bba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90211

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<406ADCD4.1090107@psu.edu>...
> William wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<2dWdnRvMFeKjjPfdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>>>Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >>>>
> >>>> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty good at
> >>>>talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
> >>>>
> >>>>Steve, K4YZ
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
> >>>
> >>>How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >>
> >>
> >> Brian, for what its worth, in my area, a 9-1-1 call on our repeater is
> >>going to get through more reliably than a cell phone call, and we can
> >>access the repeater in places in which no cell phone is going to get
> >>through. The repeater system covers our county, which is mountainous and
> >>has many area where the nearest cell phone tower is many miles away.
> >>
> >> Is this available everywhere? No, it sure isn't. But neither is cell
> >>phone service. But since it is, we use it. If I'm in my area, and I
> >>witness an emergency and NEED to get 9-1-1 immediately, I'll reach for
> >>my HT or mobile rig before I pick up the cell phone.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

> >
> > When was the last time you availed your amateur radio transceiver to a
> > non-amateur for emergency purposes? You, your license, and your
> > equipment isn't there when they need it, is it?
>
> Never have, and since I'd be the control op, I'd not be likely to.

I've allowed not amateurs to use my station, and I'm still the control
op. That's the law.

> > I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
> > and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
> > communications for the average citizen.
>
> Of course the cellphone is a good thing for reporting emergencies. And
> if I have one, I'll use it if I'm out of my repeater area. The nearly
> universal use of the things almost guarantees *someone* will pass by
> that can call emergency services.

Thank you for noticing that. It has been missed by Robo-nurse and the
unlicensed JJ.

> I doubt that Amateur radio ever filled that local "see an accident and
> call 911" niche. Of course the ham could call using autopatch, but there
> just weren't enough people to give such a coverage as cellphones could.

Prior to decent cell coverage, that's exactly how it was done. Of
course, lots of people bled to death, too. Still do.

> But at least in our area, I can better contact emergency services
> through my HT than I can my cell phone. So that is what I use. Those
> with only cell phone access can try to use that.

Agreed. And some will get through and some will not. Many
non-amateurs actually realize that their cordless telecommunications
device may actually work better by changing position, going outdoors,
or going to a higher elevation, just like in the commercial, "Can you
hear me now?"

But unlicensed JJ and Steve are so certain that everyone else is
stupid.

bb

2199. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:58:42 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <S0Iac.367$xW1.50@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

Well? They got what they deserved, right? Do the crime,
pay the fine, etc. It suits me.....

Jerry
"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040330205505.100$ZI@newsreader.com...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > Another ham radio operator busted:
> >
> > March 3, 2004
> >
> > Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > Garden Grove, CA 92640
> >
> > RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> >
> > Dear Mr. Glover:
> >
> > In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> > Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
you
> > requesting that you not use the repeater.
> >
> > Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> > association to make such a request. If there are any further questions,
> > please feel free to contact us.
> >
> > If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you are
> > free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures
are
> > provided in such matters.
> >
> > Enclosure: 1
> >
> > CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > Catalina Island Repeater Association
> >
> Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
>
>
> ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur
> Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from

the
> FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
> March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited information that the licensee "failed
> to identify and used a disguised voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
> Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the
> type described "will not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee
> contact him to discuss the matter.
>
> BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that information
> before the Commission indicates the licensee has been "deliberately
> interfering with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information that the licensee
> "failed to identify, identified by call signs not your own, and have made
> threats to other licensees." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Marshott that operation of the type
> described "will not be tolerated" and could result in a fine and
revocation
> proceedings. Hollingsworth requested the licensee contact him to discuss
> the matter.
>
> CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie H.
> Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a Technician
> license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's General license,
> N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by January 31, as requested
> December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley
> Hollingsworth said it was setting aside Allen's most recent Amateur Radio
> grant "due to allegations that raise questions about your qualifications
to
> hold an Amateur Radio license." The FCC said that Allen took a Technician
> examination March 4 under the supervision of a W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner
> team. For now, that application will revert to pending status.
> Hollingsworth said the FCC would write Allen within two weeks "requesting
a
> response to complaints about the operation of N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned
> Allen that, in the meantime, he has no authority to operate radio
> transmitting equipment.
>
> SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the
> licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other
frequencies
> and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting the Commission's
> certification standards" over the air on those frequencies. The FCC said
> its information indicates the licensee has been using FM and LSB on 27.320
> and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at power limits above those authorized for
> the Citizens Band. The FCC said operating uncertificated equipment at
> excessive power levels constitutes unlicensed radio operation and

> jeopardizes Reynolds' ham ticket. "Such operation will subject you to
> criminal prosecution and in rem seizure of transmitting equipment," the
FCC
> warned. The FCC gave Reynolds 20 days to respond to the allegations and
> said the information he submits will be used to determine what action, if
> any, to take in the matter. In late February, the FCC wrote nearly
> identical letters to three other amateur licensees in Salisbury.

2200. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 22:59:58 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <02Iac.368$xW1.135@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90214
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:406A281F.3070900@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to Amateur
> >Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from
the
> >FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> >indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> >operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
> >March, 2, 2000."
> >
> >BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> >Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY,
> >
>
> My word! And these guys were a pre-restructuring Extra and an Advanced,
> both of
> whom passed a high speed code test.....

And your point? They were doing wrong, they got caught.

J

>
> ++++++++++++++++==============++++++++++++++++===========
> "I'm having roast rabbit for Easter Dinner" :-)
>
> >
> >
>

2201. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 23:02:21 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <g4Iac.369$xW1.45@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040330211127.159$aB@newsreader.com...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > > Another ham radio operator busted:
> > >
> > > March 3, 2004
> > >
> > > Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > > 10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > > Garden Grove, CA 92640
> > >
> > > RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> > >
> > > Dear Mr. Glover:
> > >
> > > In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> > > Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> > > you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> > >
> > > Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> > > association to make such a request. If there are any further
questions,
> > > please feel free to contact us.
> > >
> > > If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
are
> > > free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures
> > > are provided in such matters.
> > >
> > > Enclosure: 1
> > >
> > > CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > > Catalina Island Repeater Association
> > >
> > Here's a few more Jerry..it's a friggin' scroll of abuse reports.
> >
> > ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
Amateur
> > Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from
> > the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> > indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> > operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on

> > March, 2, 2000." The FCC also cited information that the licensee
"failed
> > to identify and used a disguised voice." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
> > Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Brown that operation of the
> > type described "will not be tolerated," and he requested the licensee
> > contact him to discuss the matter.
> >
> > BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY, to advise him that information
> > before the Commission indicates the licensee has been "deliberately
> > interfering with the radio operations of other licensed amateurs on the
> > 75-meter band." The FCC also said it has information that the licensee
> > "failed to identify, identified by call signs not your own, and have
made
> > threats to other licensees." FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> > Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth warned Marshott that operation of the
> > type described "will not be tolerated" and could result in a fine and
> > revocation proceedings. Hollingsworth requested the licensee contact him
> > to discuss the matter.
> >
> > CRANE, MO [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote former Amateur Radio licensee Lonnie
H.
> > Allen on March 15, 2000, setting aside the March 8 grant of a Technician
> > license, KC0HJP. On February 23, the FCC canceled Allen's General
> > license, N0TBO, after he failed to appear for retesting by January 31,
as
> > requested December 6, 1999. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> > Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said it was setting aside Allen's most
> > recent Amateur Radio grant "due to allegations that raise questions
about
> > your qualifications to hold an Amateur Radio license." The FCC said that
> > Allen took a Technician examination March 4 under the supervision of a
> > W5YI-VEC volunteer examiner team. For now, that application will revert
> > to pending status. Hollingsworth said the FCC would write Allen within
> > two weeks "requesting a response to complaints about the operation of
> > N0TBO." Hollingsworth warned Allen that, in the meantime, he has no
> > authority to operate radio transmitting equipment.
> >
> > SALISBURY, NC: The FCC wrote Technician licensee Thomas F. Reynolds Sr,
> > N4TFR, on March 14, citing information before the Commission that the
> > licensee has been using ham gear on the Citizens Band and other
> > frequencies and has been selling "transmitting equipment not meeting the
> > Commission's certification standards" over the air on those frequencies.
> > The FCC said its information indicates the licensee has been using FM
and
> > LSB on 27.320 and 27.375 MHz and transmitting at power limits above
those
> > authorized for the Citizens Band. The FCC said operating uncertificated
> > equipment at excessive power levels constitutes unlicensed radio
> > operation and jeopardizes Reynolds' ham ticket. "Such operation will

> > subject you to criminal prosecution and in rem seizure of transmitting
> > equipment," the FCC warned. The FCC gave Reynolds 20 days to respond to
> > the allegations and said the information he submits will be used to
> > determine what action, if any, to take in the matter. In late February,
> > the FCC wrote nearly identical letters to three other amateur licensees
> > in Salisbury.
> >
> Hey Jerry, have you seen this too?
>
> http://exax.net/fcc.htm

They'll get theirs soon.

J

2202. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 23:09:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90216

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 7:40 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310540.1b8919ab@posting.google.com>
> >
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040330115546.07406.00000322@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >> >Date: 30 Mar 2004 16:55:46 GMT
> >> >
> >> >>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >>Date: 3/30/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300520.1d34b3d6@posting.google.com>
> >> >>
> >> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >>news:<20040329152500.12851.00000107@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Essentially, the VE team practice of using Farnsworth spacing,
> >> >>> however convenient for all involved, DID NOT HAVE A LEGAL
> >> >>> BASIS FOR THAT PRACTICE.
> >>
> >> Actually, it did have a legal basis.
> >>
> >> The FCC was informed
> >
> >By whom?
>
> Does it matter?

Do you matter?

> The FCC has placed "ringers" in VE tests before and has never...not even
> once...questioned the validity, quality or method of delivery of Element 1.
>
> > of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
> >> standard practices of the VE teams.
> >

> >"Standard practices?"
> >
> >Wow!!! A wasted piece of correspondence if there were ever one!
> >
> >"I hereby inform the FCC that I am using standard, good amateur
> >practices. Does the FCC agree or disagree? You have 72 hours to
> >respond. Without a dissenting opinion, this standard, good amateur
> >practice becomes law."
> >
> >Hihi!
> >
> >Why would the VEC's have to inform the FCC of standard, good amateur
> >practice???
> >
> >Because they weren't standard?
> >
> >Because they were at variance with the regulations?
> >
> >How long after the fact of implementing these "standard practices" did
> >the VEC's notify the FCC?
>
> Brain, you really are stretching for a "pont" to make, aren't you?

Stretching usually isn't necessary to punt.

> >FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
> >> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams.
> >
> >Can you document that the FCC even received such a notification?
>
> Can you document they ahven't?

I'm not the one making the claim of such correspondence.

> > Therefore, the use of
> >> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
> >>
> >> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
> test
> >> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
> >
> >Hmmm? Wonder what a person would call "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse
> >Code?
>
> Indeed. Does it matter? The FCC itself ahs no argument with it.

Lots of typos today, Steve. Time to check your digital pill minder.

> >> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use of
> >> Farnsworth spacing.
> >
> >Really?

>
> Really.
>
> I understand Morse Code perfectly (to about 40WPM in contests...25WPM in
> "routine" QSO's...I have no problem with it at all.

What you understand is immaterial. We are talking about newcomers to
the service taking their first exam. It's not as if they have a lot
of experience at it.

> >Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
> >to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
> >unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
> >and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
> >choked on the exam.
>
> Oh?
>
> You have some "scientific" studies that valiate this asertion, Brain?

Did you mean "assertion, Brian?"

> You've done a side-by-side comparison of different methodologies to
> validate this?

Those who've studied Farnsworth Code pass Farnsworth Exams.

Those who've studied Morse Code typically do not pass Farnsworth
Exams.

> >Just FYI, the "non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code" is referred to as
> >Morse Code. You will find references to it in Part 97, but you will
> >find no reference to "Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code."
>
> There is NO reference to spacing techniques in Part 97 for Morse Code.

You are a genius.

> There is no "technical specification" for Morse Code in any federal
> regulation that I am aware of. Post one and I will acknowledge it publically.

You said you know Morse Code to 40wpm in contests, and to 25wpm in
routine QSO's.

How can you make that statement?

> Post it, show me a federal law that says THIS is the "Morse Code" that
> MUST be used and I will send you a Savings Bond for $100.

Please send me nothing directly.

> >Considering the number of times that Part 97 has been toyed with, you
> >would think that the FCC could make a mention of it. But they
> >haven't. So much for your "legal basis."
>

> English jurisprudence has established that those things not specifically
> prohibited or regulated by law are not illegal...Therefore ARE "legal".

Thus, you find Morse Code required for Exams.

In plain terms, that would be Morse Code.

> >All you repeat again and again is the "non-dissenting FCC opinion."
> >So what is the date of this correspondence?
>
> Has the FCC "dissented" to the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code?

That is what I asked.

> Has it not had the opportunity to intervene if it DID think that it was
> improper or illegal to use?

I believe that the FCC is unaware.

2203. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 23:13:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <d8ednQCJL6XlzPbdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90217

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com...
> > Has the FCC "dissented" to the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code?
>
> That is what I asked.
>
> > Has it not had the opportunity to intervene if it DID think that it
was
> > improper or illegal to use?
>
> I believe that the FCC is unaware.

After nearly 20 years or so, the FCC is unaware?? Not hardly.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2204. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-03-31 23:29:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Dvlac.276$fg4.13@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90218
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20040330230520.785$lz@newsreader.com...
> So you enjoy reading -all- the enforcement archives here? Jerry Ox has
> taken it upon himself to post -all- the CB enforcement to rec.radio.cb.
>
> The best part is, it's totally on topic for rec.radio.amateur.policy,
> when you tight ass hams get ran.

Hi gang!

Jerry has a legitimate concern, but I think he misses a point. I honestly believe (and I may take flak) that most folks are reasonably law abiding. Whether hams or cbers, it isn't unlike the traffic situation here. Most folks are reasonably law abiding. By reasonably, I mean most folks stop or slow down to 1 or 2 mph for a stop sign. If it is a rolling stop and no one is coming, is it really wrong to continue? Then there are the flaming idiots like the guy who nearly hit me yesterday. There were problems with a couple of intersections at a bridge connecting the expressway a few years back. People would go into the intersection on yellow even though there was no place to go (cars backed at the second intersection). Consequently, gridlock occured. They fixed that about three years ago with left turn signals, allowing the traffic to clear from the bridge. Now (like the idiot yesterday), some folks stop, see the light also red at the sidestreet, and then gun it and go through the intersection (never mind the fact that the other traffic has a green left turn arrow on). This stupid mentality goes on in our society regardless of a license (amateur or driver) and I would not paint all drivers as stupid or inconsiderate just because of that one licensed driver. Neither would I paint all cbers or amateurs the same way because of the actions of a few.

I suspect I'll be pushing up daisies, however, long before the flames die out around here LOL.

Hope you all have a great day!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.647 / Virus Database: 414 - Release Date: 3/29/04

2205. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:07:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406A19A2.6000906@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90219

>
>
>>
>>
>
>
>And your point? They were doing wrong, they got caught.
>
>
>
They shoulda known better, if they could do high speed code..... ;-)

2206. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:10:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lbmdnU2ClJzK8PbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90220

Steveo wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>Steveo wrote:
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Steveo wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Another ham radio operator busted:
>>>>>
>>>>>March 3, 2004
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
>>>>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
>>>>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Dear Mr. Glover:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
>>>>>Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
>>>>>you requesting that you not use the repeater.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
>>>>>association to make such a request. If there are any further
>>>>>questions, please feel free to contact us.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
>>>>>are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing
>>>>>procedures are provided in such matters.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Enclosure: 1
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
>>>>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
>>>>
>>>>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
>>>>jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
>>>>between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
>>>dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
>>>rec.radio.cb.
>>>
>>>Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?
>>
>>He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it
>>plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater
>>owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old to
>>explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
>>are provided in such matters."
>>
>
> Heh, so unless you're busted and fined you haven't broken
> any rules. You running two meters now, dipshit?

Maybe if I type r e a l s l o w you might be able to understand. The
ham in question did not break any FCC rules, he had a problem with the
repeater owner who requested he not use the repeater anymore. The FCC in
their letter to the ham plainly states the problem is between the ham
and the repeater owner, there were no FCC rules broken. Again, the ham
was not "busted" because he broke no FCC rules.
Is that too hard for you to understand dipwad? It must be, evidently I
am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple thing.

2207. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:12:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lbmdnUyCIJx18PbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90221

William wrote:

>
> I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,

But not much.

2208. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:19:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lbmdnU-CIJwv8vbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90222

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>
> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
>
>>>Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier
>
> to
>
>>>copy than using slow letters.
>>
>>Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
>>regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
>
>
> No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
> Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
> information has set themselves up for failure.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Len couldn't learn and pass the code test no matter what method was
used, that is what chaps his rear so much.

2209. My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:28:13 UTC
From: bullmordt@yahoo.co.nz
Message-ID: <3ff97a0d.0403311728.7020532@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90223

I think itï¿½s possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and collects their brains.

What can I do?

2210. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:31:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <goqdnYbuwaB17Pbd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90225

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:lbmdnU2CIJzK8PbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> Steveo wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Steveo wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>>Another ham radio operator busted:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>March 3, 2004
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
> >>>>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
> >>>>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Dear Mr. Glover:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
> >>>>>Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
> >>>>>you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
> >>>>>association to make such a request. If there are any further
> >>>>>questions, please feel free to contact us.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
> >>>>>are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing
> >>>>>procedures are provided in such matters.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>

> >>>>>Enclosure: 1
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> >>>>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
> >>>>
> >>>>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
> >>>>jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
> >>>>between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
> >>>dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
> >>>rec.radio.cb.
> >>>
> >>>Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?
> >>
> >>He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it
> >>plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater
> >>owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old to
> >>explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
> >>are provided in such matters."
> >>
> >
> > Heh, so unless you're busted and fined you haven't broken
> > any rules. You running two meters now, dipshit?
>
> Maybe if I type r e a l s l o w you might be able to understand. The
> ham in question did not break any FCC rules, he had a problem with the
> repeater owner who requested he not use the repeater anymore. The FCC in
> their letter to the ham plainly states the problem is between the ham
> and the repeater owner, there were no FCC rules broken. Again, the ham
> was not "busted" because he broke no FCC rules.
> Is that too hard for you to understand dipwad? It must be, evidently I
> am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple thing.
>

He broke the rule of "no malicious interference". However the FCC at this
particular moment simply chose to issue a warning rather than "bust him".
The enforcing agency always has the choice of how far to go in "busting"
someone. The FCC also made it quite clear that the repeater owner has every
right to bar him from the repeater and further that if he continues he will
be subject to enforcement actions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2211. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:35:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040331203505.260$GT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90224

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> evidently I
> am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple thing.
>
You're not a ham. What's your call?

2212. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 01:37:35 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040331203735.984$6M@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90226

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:lbmdnU2CIJzK8PbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> > Steveo wrote:
> > > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > >
> > >>Steveo wrote:
> > >>
> > >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>Steveo wrote:
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>Another ham radio operator busted:
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>March 3, 2004
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
> > >>>>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
> > >>>>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Dear Mr. Glover:
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning
> > >>>>>the Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter
> > >>>>>sent to you requesting that you not use the repeater.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the
> > >>>>>repeater association to make such a request. If there are any
> > >>>>>further questions, please feel free to contact us.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner,
> > >>>>>you are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing
> > >>>>>procedures are provided in such matters.
> > >>>>>

> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Enclosure: 1
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
> > >>>>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go
> > >>>>to jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage
> > >>>>is between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
> > >>>>
> > >>>
> > >>>Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
> > >>>dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
> > >>>rec.radio.cb.
> > >>>
> > >>>Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?
> > >>
> > >>He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it
> > >>plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater
> > >>owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old
> > >>to explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
> > >>are provided in such matters."
> > >>
> > >
> > > Heh, so unless you're busted and fined you haven't broken
> > > any rules. You running two meters now, dipshit?
> > >
> > Maybe if I type r e a l s l o w you might be able to understand. The
> > ham in question did not break any FCC rules, he had a problem with the
> > repeater owner who requested he not use the repeater anymore. The FCC
> > in their letter to the ham plainly states the problem is between the
> > ham and the repeater owner, there were no FCC rules broken. Again, the
> > ham was not "busted" because he broke no FCC rules.
> > Is that too hard for you to understand dipwad? It must be, evidently I
> > am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple
> > thing.
> >
>
> He broke the rule of "no malicious interference". However the FCC at
> this particular moment simply chose to issue a warning rather than "bust
> him". The enforcing agency always has the choice of how far to go in
> "busting" someone. The FCC also made it quite clear that the repeater
> owner has every right to bar him from the repeater and further that if he
> continues he will be subject to enforcement actions.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
Don't bother trying to explain anything to JJ, he's a CBer wannabe.

2213. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:06:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nOKac.6178$NL4.5708@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90227
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking

AC5IU was exonerated. Tapes were being played of him, and the 'highly
trained FCC personel' couldn't tell the diff.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:02Iac.368$xW1.135@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:406A281F.3070900@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >ALBUQUERQUE, NM: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
Amateur
> > >Extra licensee Dean M. Brown, AC5IU, advising him that information from
> the
> > >FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Columbia, Maryland,
> > >indicates that the licensee "deliberately interfered with the radio
> > >operations of other licensed amateurs on the 20-meter amateur band on
> > >March, 2, 2000."
> > >
> > >BERKELEY HEIGHTS, NJ: The FCC sent a Warning Notice March 14, 2000, to
> > >Advanced licensee Ronald Marshott, N2NGY,
> > >
> >
> > My word! And these guys were a pre-restructuring Extra and an Advanced,
> > both of
> > whom passed a high speed code test.....
>
>
> And your point? They were doing wrong, they got caught.
>
> J
>
>
> >
> > ++++++++++++++++++++==========+++++++++++++++++++==========
> > "I'm having roast rabbit for Easter Dinner" :-)
> >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >

>
>

2214. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90229

In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of
>>other
>>standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were
>>no
>>dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
>>Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>
> AFTER the fact.

So what?
>
> VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
> by the Commission.

How do you know?
>
>>In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
>>test need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>
> Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
> had any legal basis.

How do you know that FCC was not contacted by the VECs? How do you know what
method of code testing was used by FCC when they gave the tests?
>
>>Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use >>of
Farnsworth spacing.
>
> Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
> had any legal basis.
>
Do you have any proof of that claim?

I didn't think so.

2215. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:07:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040331210711.15123.00000112@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90231

In article <406B32F5.5050904@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:

>> I can't speak for Carl, but having worked for a long time in
>> enforcement of regulations which included the requirement that the
>> licensee obtain, read, and retain a copy of the applicable Rule
>> part, I feel that it is no substitute for demonstrating that the
>> licensee has a working knowledge of the Rules.

>Nowadays one can download a copy off the 'net. Of course one needs to
>know what
>"pecuniary" means, and such. Which means that you can't use a 2 meter
>repeater to
>dispatch taxi cabs, or if you're a real estate agent to auto-patch call
>your office to
>work a house sale. Nowadays with cell phones, I doubt anyone would consider
>doing this. This rule is a good one; it keeps businesses from invading
>our bands and taking over (lawsuits over QRM, anyone?).

The FCC recently issued an NAL to the owner of a restaurant in Westville, New Jersey, for the use of a "cordless phone" that operated in the 2 meter band. The owner used it to coordinate take-out deliveries without the cost of a cell phone. FCC had earlier warned the restaurant owner, who stopped using the setup for a time and tried FRS/GMRS. But the FRS/GMRS sets had insufficient range and unreliable coverage, so he went back to using the "cordless phone".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2216. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:07:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040331210712.15123.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90228

In article <oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>I recently checked into the
>Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately
>after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)

From Long Isalnd, no less.

And this was on what band, mode, rig and antenna? ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2217. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:07:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040331210713.15123.00000115@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90230

In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>
>> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
>> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
>> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>>
>
>Is that per staff member?

Yes.

>I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
>it's not really clear.

Ask any licensed, currently practicing health care professional. Many carry
more, and some specialties (like obstetrics) carry a lot more. Such coverage is
not inexpensive, and in some areas medical care providers are simply closing
down or moving because of the high cost of malpractice insurance. It is one of
the reasons (not the only one) for the high cost of medical care in the USA.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2218. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:13:50 UTC
From: CitizenSnips <nobody@home.com>
Message-ID: <xVKac.36125$_U.14769@lakeread05>
Source record: 90232

"G.K. Konnig" <bullmordt@yahoo.co.nz> wrote in message
news:3ff97a0d.0403311728.7020532@posting.google.com...
> I think it's possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
> collects their brains.
>
> What can I do?

More crack.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.647 / Virus Database: 414 - Release Date: 3/29/2004

2219. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:16:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <HXKac.147$Xu7.30@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:g4Iac.369$xW1.45@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> They'll get theirs soon.
>
>
> J

Hello, Jerry and all

I had previous problems with tires being dumped in the yard of the house behind mine. Repeated calls to the city resulted in nothing - until I obtained the services of an attourney. Within a week, the city cleaned up the mess and billed the owner. ;)

Lately, the city has become *much* more responsive. I suspect the FCC may as well, what with the Janet Jackson debacle. I sent a couple of emails concerning a *lot* of activity next door. Cars stopping, someone going to the house and then leaving withing 60 to 90 seconds. Hmmmm .... one day I saw three cars stopped. Then a van. Then the marked cars pulled up on both sides of the street. I could hear the banging as they searched the house. Flashes as pictures were taken. Three people did not pass go. They did not collect $200.00 LOL. Guess where they went?

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.647 / Virus Database: 414 - Release Date: 3/29/04

2220. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:36:08 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <F-qdndz_7r05H_bdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90235

Steveo wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>evidently I
>>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple thing.
>>
>
> You're not a ham. What's your call?

Make up your mind, first you say I am not a ham, then you ask for my
call. I am a ham and my call is non of your business.

2221. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:38:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404010239570.1993@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90234

On Thu, 31 Mar 2004, G.K. Konnig wrote:
> I think it´s possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
> collects their brains.
>
> What can I do?

Your radio ran out of squelch. You need to go to your local radio store and buy a replacement can.

2222. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:54:38 UTC
From: nostoppinakc@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <8fe0c09a.0403311854.6c2a9956@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lol... <doh@yikes.net> wrote in message
news:<thbk60116bc5d68ugp1ac7vlaspopv2k8i@4ax.com>...
> On 31 Mar 2004 01:50:00 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
> wrote:
>
> >yipe@bark.net wrote:
> >> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
> >>
> >> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
> >> Licensing requirements.
> >>
> >> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
> >> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
> >>
> >You don't speak for either, fatboy.
>
>
> Neither do you, moron.
>
> go back and molest your teen daughter some more, and leave me be.
>
> Nuff Said.
>
> -Me

Ahh, the false Christian showing how much he loves God. One more post
for alt.bible, chukkeesukkee. There aint nothin' ya can do about it
either. You just can't help yourself.

2223. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 02:59:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <D62dndS4RrRVFfbdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90237

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:lbmdnU2CIJzK8PbdRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
>
>>Steveo wrote:
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Steveo wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Steveo wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Another ham radio operator busted:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>March 3, 2004
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Mr. Mark A. Glover
>>>>>>>10632 Artcraft Avenue
>>>>>>>Garden Grove, CA 92640
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>RE: Amateur Radio License KE6TTL: Warning Notice
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Dear Mr. Glover:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>In reference to your letter dated February 26, 2004, concerning the
>>>>>>>Catalina Amateur Repeater Association, enclosed is the letter sent to
>>>>>>>you requesting that you not use the repeater.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Our letter of February 2, 2004, explained the right of the repeater
>>>>>>>association to make such a request. If there are any further

>>>>>>>questions, please feel free to contact us.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If you have an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, you
>>>>>>>are free to pursue legal action locally. No Commission hearing
>>>>>>>procedures are provided in such matters.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Enclosure: 1
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>CC: FCC Western Regional Director
>>>>>>>Catalina Island Repeater Association
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Just how is this ham busted? Did he receive a NAL, get a fine, go to
>>>>>>jail? No, the FCC just stated the problem is of repeater usage is
>>>>>>between this amateur radio operator and the repeater owner.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Some of you ham boys call an nal an automatic multi-thousand
>>>>>dollar fine, when you try your bullshit scare tactics in
>>>>>rec.radio.cb.
>>>>>
>>>>>Do you know the outcome of his nal, JJ?
>>>>
>>>>He did not get a NAL twit, he just got a letter from the FCC and it
>>>>plainly stated that the problem was between the ham and the repeater
>>>>owner. Here is the last sentence of the letter, get some six year old to
>>>>explain it to you. "No Commission hearing procedures
>>>>are provided in such matters."
>>>>
>>>
>>>Heh, so unless you're busted and fined you haven't broken
>>>any rules. You running two meters now, dipshit?
>>
>>Maybe if I type r e a l s l o w you might be able to understand. The
>>ham in question did not break any FCC rules, he had a problem with the
>>repeater owner who requested he not use the repeater anymore. The FCC in
>>their letter to the ham plainly states the problem is between the ham
>>and the repeater owner, there were no FCC rules broken. Again, the ham
>>was not "busted" because he broke no FCC rules.
>>Is that too hard for you to understand dipwad? It must be, evidently I
>>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple thing.
>>
>
>
> He broke the rule of "no malicious interference". However the FCC at this
> particular moment simply chose to issue a warning rather than "bust him".
> The enforcing agency always has the choice of how far to go in "busting"
> someone. The FCC also made it quite clear that the repeater owner has every

> right to bar him from the repeater and further that if he continues he will
> be subject to enforcement actions.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I did not see anything in the letter metioning malicious interference.
Where did the FCC make state there could possibably be enforcement
actions? They plainly state to the amateur, "you are free to pursue
legal action locally. No Commission hearing procedures are provided in
such matters."

2224. Farnsworth Follies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 03:37:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YeCdnUymX9MYE_bdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90238

Let's start a poll on how many years we will be talking about
Farnsworth vs "straight" morse after Element one goes away.

I predict that Farnsworth arguments will be going on around here at
least once per year for at least 10 years after element one disappears.

Len busts our chops about our proclivity to argue trivialities. He's
right about that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2225. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 04:00:59 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040331230059.155$r5@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90239

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>evidently I
> >>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple
> >>thing.
> >>
> >
> > You're not a ham. What's your call?
>
> Make up your mind, first you say I am not a ham, then you ask for my
> call. I am a ham and my call is non of your business.
>
BZZZT, wrong answer. No call means you're not a ham, but a CBer
wannabe.

2226. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 04:55:05 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <JgNac.1620$Nu3.719207@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90241

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040331210712.15123.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >I recently checked into the
> >Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately
> >after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)
>
> From Long Island, no less.
>
> And this was on what band, mode, rig and antenna? ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

7045 kHz, CW, Elecraft K1, and a 40-meter dipole... and luv'n it!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2227. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 05:20:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <-cKdnbv49eynNfbdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90240

Steveo wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>Steveo wrote:
>>
>>
>>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>evidently I
>>>>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple
>>>>thing.
>>>>
>>>
>>>You're not a ham. What's your call?
>>
>>Make up your mind, first you say I am not a ham, then you ask for my
>>call. I am a ham and my call is non of your business.
>>
>
> BZZZT, wrong answer. No call means you're not a ham, but a CBer
> wannabe.

Believe whatever floats your boat steveie, it bothers me not one whit.

2228. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 11:39:08 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0404010339.47dc286c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90242

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040331210713.15123.00000115@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
> >> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
> >> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
> >>
> >
> >Is that per staff member?
>
> Yes.
>
> >I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
> >it's not really clear.
>
> Ask any licensed, currently practicing health care professional. Many carry
> more, and some specialties (like obstetrics) carry a lot more. Such coverage is
> not inexpensive, and in some areas medical care providers are simply closing
> down or moving because of the high cost of malpractice insurance. It is one of
> the reasons (not the only one) for the high cost of medical care in the USA.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Witness the relatively recent job action by Doctors in Northern NJ.
IIRC, they refused to provide service for one day and publically
protested about that very issue. Many could not understand what "such
well paid" folks could possibly protest over and were visibly put off
on TV news interviews. Sometimes the overhead is simply overlooked.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2229. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 12:30:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404010430.162edd6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90243

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<-cKdnbv49eynNfbdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>...
> Steveo wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>evidently I
> >>>>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple
> >>>>thing.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>You're not a ham. What's your call?
> >>
> >>Make up your mind, first you say I am not a ham, then you ask for my
> >>call. I am a ham and my call is non of your business.
> >>
> >
> > BZZZT, wrong answer. No call means you're not a ham, but a CBer
> > wannabe.
>
> Believe whatever floats your boat steveie, it bothers me not one whit.

He's not a ham. Where JJ hails from, they are called "agitators."

2230. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 12:43:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404010443.6bda1e22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90244

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >(N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of
> >>other
> >>standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there were
> >>no
> >>dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
> >>Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
> >
> > AFTER the fact.
>
> So what?

So all those years that it was in use WITHOUT a legal basis, that's
what.

> > VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
> > by the Commission.
>
> How do you know?

Why don't you know?

> >>In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for their
> >>test need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
> >
> > Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
> > had any legal basis.
>
> How do you know that FCC was not contacted by the VECs? How do you know what
> method of code testing was used by FCC when they gave the tests?

If the FCC is going to require an exam for licensure, shouldn't the
public know what the requirements are?

> >>Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use >>of
> Farnsworth spacing.
> >
> > Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
> > had any legal basis.

> >
> Do you have any proof of that claim?
>
> I didn't think so.

We've been through this before.

2231. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 14:53:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401095352.12182.00000539@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90245

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 3/31/2004 2:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040331150100.16977.00000083@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>> >How many of Len's posts am I supposed to read?
>>>
>>> All of them, Brainless One.
>>
>>Nope.
>>
>>> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
>>> "respect" he THINKS he does.
>>
>>I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
>>the art and science of radio.
>
> Thank you, Brian. I respect your military service also.

Where did he say "military service"...???

>>When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
>>because there is something to be learned.
>
> It is very rare that the technology of radio is brought up in here,
> quite possibly because so few have bothered to learn about it
> or practice it...everyone is all concerned with operating and the
> state of the art of rank-status-privilege, their collection of old
> QST magazines, and the importance of obeying everything that
> the ARRL commands them to do.

Conjecture at best.

> There is an (unfortunate for all) spitefulness that someone who
> has worked IN radio-electronics for over a half century and for
> money (gasp!) can possibly comment on anything "amateur."
> The spiteful are angry and outraged that anyone disturbs their
> pipe dreams of honor and glory and national service of an
> essentially avocational activity carried on for personal enjoyment.
> They must spin tales, tails twirling, of their "national need" and
> medal-worthy imagination of saving future civilization through

> heroic fantasy stories about morsemanship in speculative
> futures.

Your dissertations on the theoretical aspects of radio communications are
robust, even entertaining at times.

Your RANTINGS about Amatuer licensing, practive and programs are, in a
word, WEAK.

>>I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
>>long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
>>should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
>>retired a long time ago.
>
> Irrelevant to the long-timers, the self-professed "leaders" of the
> "amateur community" who wish to dictate to others that what
> they enjoy must be practiced by all others...because they alone
> are the imaginary spirit of amateur radio, the ones carrying the
> symbolic torch of championship of the radio arts and "necessary"
> communications modes. They have placed their symbolic laurel
> wreaths (of expertise) on themselves, bravely defending their
> alleged rights to be better than others in rank-status-privilege.
> These "experts" disallow any dissent of their god-like opinions
> for they are above any discussion with mere mortals like you
> and me.

Rhetorical balderdash, it ate up bandwith and let you show off your
vocabulary,

Otherwise it was yet another venomous swipe at Amateur Radio....the same
kind of stugg that earns you your own rank-status-priviledge as King-of-the
Hill of mudslinging.

> Meanwhile they are not cognizant that the FCC is still defining
> International Morse Code to an obsolete ITU-T (not ITU-R)
> document, CCITT Recommendation F.1 (1984) Division B,
> I. Morse Code. That was still in the very official regulations'
> definitions at 94.3 (a) (27) as of 1 October 2003. They don't
> know what is contained within that Recommendation because
> it is only available from the ITU and for a fee...or that it has
> been superseded in nomenclature and some changes (other
> than the astounding and oh-so-important addition of the @
> character to the standard set) by the ITU-T; the CCITT itself
> has been superseded entire by the ITU-T. The CCITT
> document never defined a telegraphic "word" either in size or
> for rate, it only defined the relative length of dot, dash, and
> spacings. [you know this because I e-mailed a direct copy
> of my ITU-T document file to you as a favor] Instead, the
> arguments in here have raged on solely on the basis of
> "everyone knows this!" as if all law and regulations are based
> on some paranormal common knowledge.

Regardless of your interpretations of how the FCC is defining Morse Code
requirements, the fact is that it's being dealt with.

>>Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
>>radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
>>or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
>>based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
>>make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
>>license.
>
> Irrelevant to the self-professed "leaders" and gods of amateurism.
> Reality has no place in imaginary fantasyland imaginations of
> glory and honor and national service through amateurism.

The "glory and honor (of) national service through amateurism (sic)" is
not one proffed by the Amateru community itself...It comes from countless
private and governmental agencies.

>>And in America, every citizen has a voice.
>
> The First Amendment Rights have been overruled by these
> self-professed "leaders." Evidence of that exists in the public
> view on proceeding 98-143 for 25 January 1999.

Too bed that those 14 years of night school didn't teach you about the
Bill of Rights, Lennie.

You need to re-read them and see to whom the amendment applies. (hint:
it prevents the federal government from interfereing with the press...it does
not address private citizens.)

>>Those who are
>>tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
>>must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
>>assinine view.
>
> Independent thought is not allowed in here. All must obey the
> dictates of the self-professed "leaders" of amateurism in radio.
> These "leaders" are without fault...all who disagree with them
> are rewarded by a barrage of personal insults instead of
> addressing the subject under discussion. The "leaders" rule
> by barbarian warlord tactics of neighborhood gangsterism in
> messaging.

Yeah...I see that "independent thought" with you hand up Brain's backside
to manipulate his mouth for you. Do you really try the "ventrilloquist" trick,
or do you use a tape recorder?

>>So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
>>Sheriff and him barking at each other.
>
> That is how it should be.

Actually it allows Brainless to formulate "opinions" based upon
less-than-consistent rantings from his "mentor". Unfortunately for the two of
you (and Brain moreso than Lennie), you are the only one's who can't appreciate
the humor of Brian's posts as he tries to follow in Lennie's "footsteps"...

> A problem for casual readers in here is that the "leaders" cannot
> survive arguments on the subject which contradict their cherished
> myths and fables. The end result is much wasted time of these
> individual "message warlords" competeting for personal status
> as newsgroup "leaders." Among these regular "leaders" it doesn't
> matter whether the subject is about amateur radio, it is all
> concerned with the righteousness of their personal opinion
> triumphing for them in any way possible. Amateur radio policy
> is far down on the list topped by their Need To Be RIGHT!.
>
> And that is how it is.

No, it's yet another Amateur-bashing free-for-all by a person known for
inaccuracies and intentional mistruths, embellished with an overactive
vocabulary and overly self impressed opinion of himself.

Not that Lennie leaves us much else to deal with.

Steve, K4YZ
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>
>
>
>
>

2232. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 14:55:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401095506.12182.00000540@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90246

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 3/31/2004 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:

>> VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
>> by the Commission.
>
>How do you know?

Ouiji Board.

Steve, K4YZ

2233. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 15:15:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401101502.12182.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90247

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 5:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>...

>> Does it matter?
>
>Do you matter?

Of course I do. Just like you matter.

>> The FCC has placed "ringers" in VE tests before and has never...not
>even
>> once...questioned the validity, quality or method of delivery of Element 1.
>>
>> > of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of other
>> >> standard practices of the VE teams.
>> >
>> >"Standard practices?"
>> >
>> >Wow!!! A wasted piece of correspondence if there were ever one!
>> >
>> >"I hereby inform the FCC that I am using standard, good amateur
>> >practices. Does the FCC agree or disagree? You have 72 hours to
>> >respond. Without a dissenting opinion, this standard, good amateur
>> >practice becomes law."
>> >
>> >Hihi!
>> >
>> >Why would the VEC's have to inform the FCC of standard, good amateur
>> >practice???
>> >
>> >Because they weren't standard?
>> >
>> >Because they were at variance with the regulations?
>> >
>> >How long after the fact of implementing these "standard practices" did
>> >the VEC's notify the FCC?
>>
>> Brain, you really are stretching for a "pont" to make, aren't you?
>
>Stretching usually isn't necessary to punt.

Sure it is...But you're STILL stretching to make a POINT.

>> >FCC took no exceptions, and there were no
>> >> dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams.
>> >
>> >Can you document that the FCC even received such a notification?
>>
>> Can you document they ahven't?
>
>I'm not the one making the claim of such correspondence.
>
>> > Therefore, the use of
>> >> Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>> >>
>> >> In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for
>their
>> test
>> >> need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>> >
>> >Hmmm? Wonder what a person would call "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse
>> >Code?
>>
>> Indeed. Does it matter? The FCC itself ahs no argument with it.
>
>Lots of typos today, Steve. Time to check your digital pill minder.

Redirect from the topic to the typos noted.

Also noted, and even more glaringly obvious, is any lack of response on
YOU part to the issues discussed.

Casught with no valid response to the topic being discussed, Brain tries
to duck out with a childish reference to "typos".

>> >> Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use
>of
>> >> Farnsworth spacing.
>> >
>> >Really?
>>
>> Really.
>>
>> I understand Morse Code perfectly (to about 40WPM in contests...25WPM
>in
>> "routine" QSO's...I have no problem with it at all.
>
>What you understand is immaterial. We are talking about newcomers to
>the service taking their first exam. It's not as if they have a lot
>of experience at it.

No, they don't. But they, like any other adult in the United States, do
have an obligation to inform themselves of the testing criteria, potential
pitfalls, and their rights under FCC and/or other U.S.Government regulations.

>> >Those who study "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code may not know enough
>> >to ask for "non-Farnsworth-spaced" Morse Code. They will be
>> >unprepared for the significantly faster delivery of Farnsworth Code -
>> >and they fail. They go home scratching their head wondering why they
>> >choked on the exam.
>>
>> Oh?
>>
>> You have some "scientific" studies that valiate this asertion, Brain?
>
>Did you mean "assertion, Brian?"
>
>> You've done a side-by-side comparison of different methodologies to
>> validate this?
>
>Those who've studied Farnsworth Code pass Farnsworth Exams.
>
>Those who've studied Morse Code typically do not pass Farnsworth
>Exams.
>
>> >Just FYI, the "non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code" is referred to as
>> >Morse Code. You will find references to it in Part 97, but you will
>> >find no reference to "Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code."
>>
>> There is NO reference to spacing techniques in Part 97 for Morse Code.
>
>You are a genius.

Thank-you for stating the obvious.

Now allow me to return the favor.

You're an ill-informed, arrogant, rheorical little toad with little if any
appreciation for ANY of the topic material of which you attempt to engage
others in in this forum.

There. We're even.

>> There is no "technical specification" for Morse Code in any federal
>> regulation that I am aware of. Post one and I will acknowledge it
>publically.
>
>You said you know Morse Code to 40wpm in contests, and to 25wpm in
>routine QSO's.
>
>How can you make that statement?

Becasue I know how to determine the speed at which I am sending. Comes
with PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE.

>> Post it, show me a federal law that says THIS is the "Morse Code" that
>> MUST be used and I will send you a Savings Bond for $100.
>

>Please send me nothing directly.

I'll do as I please.

Is this an acceptance of the challenge, or do you conceede that no such
document exists?

>> >Considering the number of times that Part 97 has been toyed with, you
>> >would think that the FCC could make a mention of it. But they
>> >haven't. So much for your "legal basis."
>>
>> English jurisprudence has established that those things not
>specifically
>> prohibited or regulated by law are not illegal...Therefore ARE "legal".
>
>Thus, you find Morse Code required for Exams.

I find Morse Code required for the General Class and the Amateur Extra
based upon FCC rules and regulations, and in appreciation for the on-going
"discussion' in public forums to determine if it will remain a requirement in
the future.

Do you disagree that FCC rules and regulations dictate the demonstration
of Morse Code proficiency skills in ELement 1?

>In plain terms, that would be Morse Code.

No kiddin', eh...?!?! I figgered you were just pulling that one out of
your hat.

>> >All you repeat again and again is the "non-dissenting FCC opinion."
>> >So what is the date of this correspondence?
>>
>> Has the FCC "dissented" to the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code?
>
>That is what I asked.

And you were told....repeatedly.

>> Has it not had the opportunity to intervene if it DID think that it
>was
>> improper or illegal to use?
>
>I believe that the FCC is unaware.

I believe you're an idiot. It's been well documented in this forum form
the last couple of weeks. Nice job.

Steve, K4YZ

2234. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 15:35:40 UTC
From: "lol..." <doh@yikes.net>
Message-ID: <3kdo609asmhpj6cdmltlg5thhctmn5l9fe@4ax.com>
Source record: 90248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 31 Mar 2004 18:54:38 -0800, nostoppinakc@yahoo.com (Keyclowns Are
On Notice) wrote:

>lol... <doh@yikes.net> wrote in message
news:<thbk60116bc5d68ugp1ac7vlaspopv2k8i@4ax.com>...
>> On 31 Mar 2004 01:50:00 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >yipe@bark.net wrote:
>> >> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
>> >>
>> >> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
>> >> Licensing requirements.
>> >>
>> >> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
>> >> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
>> >>
>> >You don't speak for either, fatboy.
>>
>>
>> Neither do you, moron.
>>
>> go back and molest your teen daughter some more, and leave me be.
>>
>> Nuff Said.
>>
>> -Me
>
>Ahh, the false Christian showing how much he loves God. One more post
>for alt.bible, chukkeesukkee. There aint nothin' ya can do about it
>either. You just can't help yourself.

Yeah, right. I checked Alt.bible, you ain't posted jack, so go find
something to do... little man...

2235. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 18:07:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011007.28ec8df2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90249

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in message
news:<b7d1465c.0404010339.47dc286c@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040331210713.15123.00000115@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> > In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> > <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
> >
> > >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > >>
> > >> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
> > >> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
> > >> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Is that per staff member?
> >
> > Yes.
> >
> > >I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
> > >it's not really clear.
> >
> > Ask any licensed, currently practicing health care professional. Many carry
> > more, and some specialties (like obstetrics) carry a lot more. Such coverage is
> > not inexpensive, and in some areas medical care providers are simply closing
> > down or moving because of the high cost of malpractice insurance. It is one of
> > the reasons (not the only one) for the high cost of medical care in the USA.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Witness the relatively recent job action by Doctors in Northern NJ.
> IIRC, they refused to provide service for one day and publically
> protested about that very issue. Many could not understand what "such
> well paid" folks could possibly protest over and were visibly put off
> on TV news interviews. Sometimes the overhead is simply overlooked.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Sometimes we focus on the wrong things. Medical malpractice kills
more people than guns.

2236. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 18:10:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011010.56a0beca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90250

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<SeOdnRX6sKlb1PbdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com...
> > I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
> > and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
> > communications for the average citizen.
>
> Everyone has indicated that it's great for the individualized emergency
> instances like a car accident, etc.

No, they haven't. Please refer to any and all JJ posts.

He has an axe to grind, and he'll go down with his boat on this one.

But it has no place in widespread
> emergencies like hurricanes, earthquakes and so on as it simply can't be
> counted on under that type of condition.

No place at all?

Sounds like you're going down on JJ's boat.

2237. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 18:32:20 UTC
From: AB2RC <AB2RC@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc6oo5m.qrb.AB2RC@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 90301

In article <3ff97a0d.0403311728.7020532@posting.google.com>, G.K. Konnig wrote:
> I think itï¿½s possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
> collects their brains.
>
> What can I do?

Interesting problem....

This is a common problem with some radios. The radio is sending out
invisible electromagnetic rays which suck the brains out of people. In
most parts of the world there is a easy solution to this problem, it simply
involves disconnecting the power source (the battery or the electric socket).

However I noticed that you were posting from a New Zealand address. This
complicates matters, since you are on the underside of the world, certain
physical laws work differently.

The first thing you need to do is to turn your radio off.

The next thing you need to do is to protect yourself from the harmful rays.
Fortunately these rays are easily blocked by simple shielding, so get a
baseball cap, and line it with aluminium foil and wear it. This will prevent
any reverse waves from getting into your brain.

After shielding your brain, you will need to reverse the power connection to
the radio. This can easily be accomplished by inserting the line cord into
socket upside down, reversing the polarity of the batteries, or swapping the
red and black wires coming out of the back of the radio around. Make sure
the radio is off when you do this.

After reversing the power connections, you will need to submerge the radio's
antenna into a bucket of beer. This will allow the radio to extract the
essential life fluids from the brew and retransmit it to the people whose
brains were extracted.

After placing the radio into the bucket, drink any remaining beer that you
might have lying about. This is an important step, as it will flood your
body with additional essential fluids.

The final step is to reach into the bucket and turn the radio on. After
doing this the radio should restore all of the brains that it has stolen. If
this step is not successful, you must have done something incorrect so check
your wiring and repeat from the reverse polarity step.

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl

Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

2238. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 18:35:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90302

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> > >
> > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier
> to
> > > copy than using slow letters.
> >
> > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
> > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
>
> No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
> Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
> information has set themselves up for failure.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
they were doing so.

2239. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 18:41:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011041.64dca3ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90303

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
>
> >I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.
>
> Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you risked even
> more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not true.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You are the only one who thinks that. Too bad for you.

Now what about you serving in Somalia? You up to it?

2240. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:19:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <406C793D.2010201@psu.edu>
Source record: 90305

N2EY wrote:
> In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>
>>> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
>>>dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
>>>personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>>>
>>
>>Is that per staff member?
>
>
> Yes.
>
>
>>I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
>>it's not really clear.
>
>
> Ask any licensed, currently practicing health care professional. Many carry
> more, and some specialties (like obstetrics) carry a lot more. Such coverage is
> not inexpensive, and in some areas medical care providers are simply closing
> down or moving because of the high cost of malpractice insurance. It is one of
> the reasons (not the only one) for the high cost of medical care in the USA.

Or a person making decisions for a youth sports organization. when I
was the president of the local hockey club, I was insured for multiple
millions of dollars. When you have to deal with two or more sets of
rabid parents, each threatening to sue if the decision you make is not
in their favor, you get to appreciate the insurance.

When Mr and Mrs Smith are absolutely certain that little Johnny isn't
going to go to the NHL because your coach isn't playing them every other
shift and not putting him on the first line, and Mr and Mrs Johnson are
certain of the same thing, which of course interferes with the Smith's
up and coming Hockey star's High school hockey career, you get a bit jaded.

- mike KB3EIA -

2241. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:22:55 UTC
From: silicoal@aol.com
Message-ID: <b95d0dbb.0404011222.38da92a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lol... <doh@yikes.net> wrote in message
news:<3kdo609asmhpj6cdmltlg5thhctmn5l9fe@4ax.com>...
> On 31 Mar 2004 18:54:38 -0800, nostoppinakc@yahoo.com (Keyclowns Are
> On Notice) wrote:
>
> >lol... <doh@yikes.net> wrote in message
news:<thbk60116bc5d68ugp1ac7vlaspopv2k8i@4ax.com>...
> >> On 31 Mar 2004 01:50:00 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >yipe@bark.net wrote:
> >> >> typical of CB Radio, nowadays.
> >> >>
> >> >> this is why all the old timer CB'ers were against the FCC dropping the
> >> >> Licensing requirements.
> >> >>
> >> >> But it happened and now we've got these kind of operators. trouble is,
> >> >> now they're wanting to do the same thing to Amateur Radio.
> >> >>
> >> >You don't speak for either, fatboy.
> >>
> >>
> >> Neither do you, moron.
> >>
> >> go back and molest your teen daughter some more, and leave me be.
> >>
> >> Nuff Said.
> >>
> >> -Me
> >>
> >Ahh, the false Christian showing how much he loves God. One more post
> >for alt.bible, chukkeesukkee. There aint nothin' ya can do about it
> >either. You just can't help yourself.
>
>
> Yeah, right. I checked Alt.bible, you ain't posted jack, so go find
> something to do... little man...

get lost fat boy,go hide under your mommys skirt

2242. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:43:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401154345.12501.00007065@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90306

In article <20040331210713.15123.00000115@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
><deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>>
>>> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
>>> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
>>> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>>>
>>
>>Is that per staff member?
>
>Yes.
>
>>I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
>>it's not really clear.
>
>Ask any licensed, currently practicing health care professional. Many carry
>more, and some specialties (like obstetrics) carry a lot more. Such coverage
>is
>not inexpensive, and in some areas medical care providers are simply closing
>down or moving because of the high cost of malpractice insurance. It is one
>of
>the reasons (not the only one) for the high cost of medical care in the USA.

Dr. Jimmy, did you learn that in the ARRL Study Guide?
Bash book?

What does MALPRACTICE really mean?

Does it have "Farnsworth spacing?"

My diagnosis is that this topic doesn't belong in this newsgroup.
Sue my insurance carrier if you don't like that opinion... :-)

My prognosis is a lot of Chat Room nattering by the regulars.

LHA / WMD

2243. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:43:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401154346.12501.00007066@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90309

In article <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>
>> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
>> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
>> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>
>Is that per staff member? I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
>it's not really clear.

His "seven hostile actions" encountered during military service
has muddied his thinking...and ability to cohere....here.

LHA / WMD

2244. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:43:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401154347.12501.00007068@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90307

In article <d8ednQCJL6XlzPbdRVn-jg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com...
>> > Has the FCC "dissented" to the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code?
>>
>> That is what I asked.
>>
>> > Has it not had the opportunity to intervene if it DID think that it
>was
>> > improper or illegal to use?
>>
>> I believe that the FCC is unaware.
>
>After nearly 20 years or so, the FCC is unaware?? Not hardly.

Unaware? I'd say so just on the Commissioners' statements
whooping and hollering about Access BPL at the back end of
NPRM 04-29. They are UNAWARE of the most basic things
about RF transmission lines. QED.

LHA / WMD

2245. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 20:43:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401154347.12501.00007067@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 90308

In article <1e4e3692.0404010443.6bda1e22@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20040330195833.05305.00000071@mb-m05.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> >(N2EY) writes:
>> >
>> >>The FCC was informed of the use of Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code, and of
>> >>other
>> >>standard practices of the VE teams. FCC took no exceptions, and there
>were
>> >>no
>> >>dissenting opinions in the FCC or the VE teams. Therefore, the use of
>> >>Farnsworth spaced Morse Code had a legal basis.
>> >
>> > AFTER the fact.
>>
>> So what?
>
>So all those years that it was in use WITHOUT a legal basis, that's
>what.
>
>> > VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
>> > by the Commission.
>>
>> How do you know?
>
>Why don't you know?
>
>> >>In addition, anyone who prefers non-Farnsworth-spaced Morse Code for
>their
>> >>test need merely request it and the VE team will provide it.
>> >
>> > Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
>> > had any legal basis.
>>
>> How do you know that FCC was not contacted by the VECs? How do you know
>what

>> method of code testing was used by FCC when they gave the tests?
>
>If the FCC is going to require an exam for licensure, shouldn't the
>public know what the requirements are?
>
>> >>Those who understand how Morse Code works have no problem with the use
>>>of
>> Farnsworth spacing.
>> >
>> > Regardless of that, the Farnsworth spacing was used BEFORE it
>> > had any legal basis.
>> >
>> Do you have any proof of that claim?
>>
>> I didn't think so.
>
>We've been through this before.

Jimmy likes to go over and over and over and over old subjects.
Maybe he figures he might win one of them during reruns... :-)

LHA / WMD

2246. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 21:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401165523.04427.00000450@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90310

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 4:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311408.65dff9a7@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040331104623.03625.00000380@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 7:47 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
>> >and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
>> >communications for the average citizen.
>>
>> In as much as you are obviously narrowing your scope to "the average
>> citizen"
>
>Deal with it.

There's nothing to "deal with, Brain.

"We" were discussing Amateur Radio's role in emeergency communications.\

For what ever reason, you were trying to trivialize that role by
representing "cellphones" and "unlicensed servcies" as playing a "major role"
in "emergency comms", but only within the scope of "Joe Average" calling for
help on his cellphone under what one can call "routine" circumstances.

No problem. You were trying to make the circumstances fit your rant. It
didn't work and you got your nose tweaked in the process.

>That was the context in which I made my statement, Steve.

After a weeks worth of trying to wriggle out from under the stone YOU had
crawled under, Brain.

> making what would be considered a "routine" 9-1-1 call under "normal"
>> circumstances you'd be correct.
>
>Steve, what 911 calls are made under normal, routine circumstances?

I've never made 911 calls in a day.

I've made calls to the 9-1-1 center though, and to "me", a person who
WORKS in the 9-1-1 enviroment, car accidents, lost persons, shots fired, etc

are "routine" calls.

Loss of communicaitons due to wild fire, flood, tornadoes, etc, are not.
I've tried to differentiate the difference to you, but you keeep wanting to
ONLY define your scope of discussion to that which supports your ranting and
which would, on the face of it, trivialize Amateur Radio's role.

It didn't work.

>> In the scope of "emergency communications" as it pertains to the
>Amateur
>> Radio Service and within the scope of discussion OF "emergency
>communications,
>> you ae still trying to compare apples and oranges.
>
>Nope. Amateur radio emergency communications are not limited to
>Continuity of Government operations only.
>
>> Your bad. Try again.
>
>You're bass ackwards. Again.

Hardly.

I am discussing TRUE "major role" emergency communications. YOU are
talking about Joe Average neding a cop for an accident or reporting a dumpster
fire.

As usual, you're out-of-step with current events.

Try again, PuppetBoy.

Steve, K4YZ

2247. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 21:56:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401165654.04427.00000451@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90311

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011010.56a0beca@posting.google.com>

>Sounds like you're going down on JJ's boat.

At least we can throw him a life preserver.

You, on the otherhand, are going down on Lennie.

That we can't help you with.

Enjoy.

Steve, K4YZ

2248. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 22:02:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401170210.04427.00000452@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90312

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 3/31/2004 4:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311448.304f9bba@posting.google.com>
>
>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<406ADCD4.1090107@psu.edu>...

>> Of course the cellphone is a good thing for reporting emergencies. And
>> if I have one, I'll use it if I'm out of my repeater area. The nearly
>> universal use of the things almost guarantees *someone* will pass by
>> that can call emergency services.
>
>Thank you for noticing that. It has been missed by Robo-nurse and the
>unlicensed JJ.

No I've not.

YOU have been trying to limit the scope of "emergency comms" to that of
Joe Average reporting an accident or calling the FD for a dumpster fire.

In the context of "emergency comms" wherein Amateur Radio plays a role is
a far greater scoe of impact on the community involved.

You just needed to make the circumstances fir the rant, Brain.

It didn't work.

>But unlicensed JJ and Steve are so certain that everyone else is
>stupid.

Not "everyone else", Brain.

Just you. You have, afterall, provided so much evidence in support of my
allegations.

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

2249. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 22:03:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401170356.04427.00000453@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90313

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>Date: 3/31/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
>>
>> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a half-million
>> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and EMS
>> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
>>
>
>Is that per staff member? I think it's implied in the way you phrase it but
>it's not really clear.

Yep...that's about right.

Remember, there can be multiple suits involving different complaintants.

OB-GYN docs especially are dropping like flies due to the insurance. It's
tragic.

Steve, K4YZ

2250. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 22:08:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040401170826.04427.00000454@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90314

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig)
>Date: 4/1/2004 5:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <b7d1465c.0404010339.47dc286c@posting.google.com>

> Many could not understand what "such
>well paid" folks could possibly protest over and were visibly put off
>on TV news interviews. Sometimes the overhead is simply overlooked.

While in SoCal, one of thje ER docs I worked with showed us his dilemma...

Before taxes (1988) he was making almost $2M between his practice, his ER coverage and his investments.

Malpractice ALONE (and this was an MD NEVER sued before) was over $70,000.

That sucks.

Steve, K4YZ

2251. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 23:03:04 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040401180304.038$Ho@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90315

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>Steveo wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>evidently I
> >>>>am expecting too much of you as a cber to understand such a simple
> >>>>thing.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>You're not a ham. What's your call?
> >>
> >>Make up your mind, first you say I am not a ham, then you ask for my
> >>call. I am a ham and my call is non of your business.
> >>
> >
> > BZZZT, wrong answer. No call means you're not a ham, but a CBer
> > wannabe.
>
> Believe whatever floats your boat steveie, it bothers me not one whit.
>
Ok'y dok'y JJ. See you in rec.radio.cb as usual.

ps. you don't need a call there, as you well know.

2252. Re: Farnsworth Follies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-01 23:32:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0404011532.79d1aca1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90316

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<YeCdnUymX9MYE_bdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...
> Let's start a poll on how many years we will be talking about
> Farnsworth vs "straight" morse after Element one goes away.
>
> I predict that Farnsworth arguments will be going on around here at
> least once per year for at least 10 years after element one disappears.
>
> Len busts our chops about our proclivity to argue trivialities. He's
> right about that.

Well geez of course, he sets the standard in the field.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

2253. Re: WAv file of illegal cbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 00:01:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040401190102.893$aU@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > Just the typical brain dead cb truckers.
> >
> You bit the hook.
>
Hey JJ, did you get your handle form 'kid dynomite'!? lol

2254. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 00:58:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040401195851.05715.00000110@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 90318

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of March 31, 2004:

Novice - 32,247 (decrease of 17,082)
Technician - 262,370 (increase of 56,976)
Technician Plus - 60,885 (decrease of 67,975)
General - 140,768 (increase of 28,091)
Advanced - 80,922 (decrease of 18,810)
Extra - 105,152 (increase of 26,402)
Total - 682,344 (increase of 7,552)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2255. BPL put on hold?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 01:04:22 UTC
From: shifyin <squidward2@yahoonospam.com>
Message-ID: <b6ea5$406cbc28$d1cc50e0$15385@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 90319

BPL to be put on hold?

Story here: http://www.algonet.se/~datacaf1/details1.html

2256. Re: BPL put on hold?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 01:26:45 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <pj3bc.399$xo7.297@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90320

Ya got me! :)

That was good .... very good. And less than three hours to go too .... LOL

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"shifyin" <squidward2@yahoonospam.com> wrote in message
news:b6ea5$406cbc28$d1cc50e0$15385@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
> BPL to be put on hold?
>
> Story here: http://www.algonet.se/~datacaf1/details1.html

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.648 / Virus Database: 415 - Release Date: 3/31/04

2257. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 02:21:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040401212152.20920.00000199@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90321

In article <JgNac.1620$Nu3.719207@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040331210712.15123.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> In article <oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert
>Craig"
>> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>>
>> >I recently checked into the
>> >Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately
>> >after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)
>>
>> From Long Island, no less.
>>
>> And this was on what band, mode, rig and antenna? ;-)
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>7045 kHz, CW, Elecraft K1, and a 40-meter dipole... and luv'n it!
>
And that's what it's all about!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2258. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 02:34:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90322

William wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<SeOdnRX6sKlb1PbdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
>
>>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:1e4e3692.0403310547.38ed5c4a@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>I still think that cellular telephones is a lot better than nothing,
>>>and their widespread use had made huge inroads in providing emergency
>>>communications for the average citizen.
>>
>>Everyone has indicated that it's great for the individualized emergency
>>instances like a car accident, etc.
>
>
> No, they haven't. Please refer to any and all JJ posts.

>
> He has an axe to grind, and he'll go down with his boat on this one.
>
> But it has no place in widespread

Please site a post where I stated cell phone were not good for the
individualized emergency.
>
>>emergencies like hurricanes, earthquakes and so on as it simply can't be
>>counted on under that type of condition.
>
>
> No place at all?
>
> Sounds like you're going down on JJ's boat.

He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.

2259. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 02:45:30 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040401214530.347$nT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90323

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
>
rec.radio.cb in your case, jj no call. (junior jackass?)

2260. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 02:58:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011858.18b8561a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90324

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040401101502.12182.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 5:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
> >> Does it matter?
> >
> >Do you matter?
>
> Of course I do. Just like you matter.

Now you're lying again. You've treated a whole parade of people on
rrap as if they were chewing gum or worse stuck to the sole of your
jump boots.

2261. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:02:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011902.6f3023cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90325

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040331105015.03625.00000381@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 7:51 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310551.13d3b21@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040330122656.07406.00000326@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/30/2004 7:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300545.4e946282@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040329154613.19505.00000286@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290544.4a3ad798@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >So again, how does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >> >>
> >> >> I am sure it's something like "goo goo gaaa gaaa". They are pretty
> good at
> >> >> talking to a person on thier level without talking down to them.
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >Typical response of someone who got his tie stuck in his zipper.
> >> >
> >> >How does the 911 operator with the radio talk to >>>me<<<?
> >>
> >> Probably the same way the 910 and the 912 operator does.
> >>
> >> Why would the 9-1-1 operator WANT to talk to you?
> >
> >Keep tap dancing. It's funny.
>
> I am not the one dancing, PuppetBoy.

I'll have to agree that it can hardly be called dancing, but you're
making one valiant attempt at it.

2262. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:05:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Dp-dnV5OiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90326

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404011007.28ec8df2@posting.google.com...
>
> Sometimes we focus on the wrong things. Medical malpractice kills
> more people than guns.

But is it medical malpractice when one out of a million dies from a vaccination? How can a physician predict who that might be? Should he be sued over it? These days he can and for a huge sum. He's following the best medical practices yet he is held liable when that one of a million occurs.

In some states, you can know longer get your child's immunizations administered at your pediatrician's office for this very reason. Instead you have to go to the county board of health and sign a form that says you have been told that there are occasional deaths and you can't sue the government.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2263. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:07:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Dp-dnVlOiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90327

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> > > >
> > > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much
easier
> > to
> > > > copy than using slow letters.
> > >
> > > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
> > > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
> >
> > No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
> > Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
> > information has set themselves up for failure.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
> they were doing so.

Sorry but it was published. If you missed it, that's your problem.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2264. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:09:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <XZ6dncYfqubYR_HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90328

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040401170356.04427.00000453@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
> >Date: 3/31/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <A9SdnQlK9NBu1_bdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
> >
> >
> >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040331110245.03625.00000382@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Most hospitals have to carry malpractice liability of a
half-million
> >> dollars for most of it's licensed staff (Nurses, techs, therapists and
EMS
> >> personnel) and sometimes as much as 20 times that for physicians.
> >>
> >
> >Is that per staff member? I think it's implied in the way you phrase it
but
> >it's not really clear.
>
> Yep...that's about right.
>
> Remember, there can be multiple suits involving different
complaintants.
>
> OB-GYN docs especially are dropping like flies due to the insurance.
It's
> tragic.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

And I've heard that in the OB-GYN category that it is nearly impossible to
find one who will accept a high risk client these days.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2265. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:11:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <QcKdnQjbxp1PR_HdRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90329

```
"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
>
> He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
>

Need to pay more attention to the newsgroup. I am not a "he".
```

2266. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:17:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011917.46b8ff7b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90330

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040331111544.03625.00000384@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
> >restructuringdepends
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:18 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
> >> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
> >> "respect" he THINKS he does.
> >
> >I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
> >the art and science of radio.
>
> Len served in the Armed Forces. Bully for him.

Bully for you. He paved the way for your lame self.

> His "service" to the "radio profession" has yet to be established by any
> source other than himself.

His detractors have established his service. They fear his knowledge.

Why are they so upset?

> >When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
> >because there is something to be learned.
>
> How can you know if he's saying anything of value if you don't read all
> his posts?

Luck of the click?

> >I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
> >long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
> >should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
> >retired a long time ago.
>
> Lennie's "views" are based upon some personal expression of anger and
> angst AGAINST Amateur Radio.

Some are. His view of retiring the Morse or Farnsworth Exams are not.
They are widely held views by amateurs who have passed such exams and
those who have not.

You'll just have to get over it.

> Lennie has absolutely ZERO-POINT-SQUAT minutes of operating an Amateur
> Radio Station from which to make an informed opinion.

So you say the physics of amateur radio are something special and
unique.

> >Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
> >radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
> >or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
> >based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
> >make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
> >license. And in America, every citizen has a voice. Those who are
> >tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
> >must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
> >assinine view.
>
> We "exclude" Lennie becasue Lennie only assumes himself to be "qualified"
> to discuss anything related to radio since he was an alleged "professional".

See???

"Len is not an amateur, therefore Len can know nothing about amateur
radio."

Why do you insist on being wrong all of the time?

Do you enjoy being that kook ex-Marine that everyone thinks has
post-traumatic stress syndrome?

But never saw combat.

> Also, his irreverent use of profanity

Now there is a reverent use of profanity?

and personal insults against anything
> that is "not Lennie" does little to endear him to folks here, even those who
> may be predisposed to agree with his "opinion" on Morse Code testing. No one
> likes to be associated with a foul-mouthed liar.

You do nothing to endear yourself to folks here, either.

You behave badly. You are an embarassment to the amateur community
and to RRAP.

> >So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
> >Sheriff and him barking at each other.
>
> I am not "barking" at him.

Oh, my. I guess since I'm not a dog I cannot recognize barking?

> I rub his nose in his frequent newsgroup errors.

As I rub your nose in every carpet stain that you leave here.

> Just like I do you.

So you say.

2267. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:20:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011920.7447e1e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90331

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040331150101.16977.00000084@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403310602.48a59e05@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040330155418.22481.00000347@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Never expect an idiot to be accurate...even when describing
> >> themselves...ESPECIALLY when discussing themselves, actually!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Like your claim to sanity?
>
> Brian, by the gunnery nurse's own admission, he is a "health care
> professional" with a half-million-dollar-premium malpractice
> insurance, and has been in "seven hostile actions" as well as an
> expert on engineering processes in commercial electronics (by
> virtue of short employment as a purchasing agent in a modem
> and set-top-box maker's company).
>
> That he doesn't look at himself in the mirror may be due to not
> seeing any reflection there... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

He's made several claims on here that he is selective who he would
treat in an emergency. No wonder they have to pay so much in
insurance premiums on kooks like him. No wonder there are so many law
suits.

2268. Re: Attention, Jerry Oxendine (on topic)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:20:58 UTC
From: Skateboard'n <trashysteelhauler@amillnear.you>
Message-ID: <u_4bc.15466$BE3.6555@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 90332
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:S0Iac.367$xW1.50@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> Well? They got what they deserved, right? Do the crime,
> pay the fine, etc. It suits me.....................

Well hell Oxenduff, why not give equal time to all & repetitively troll
about it in the appropriate newsgroups like you do your stereotypical
truckdriver crap in this newsgroup?

Maybe alt.psychotic.dipshit.radio.asskissers is even a better newsgroup for
you to spend time in?

Tom

2269. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:24:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404011924.67f47840@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90333

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040330155229.22481.00000346@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 3/30/2004 11:52 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403300952.7cc20f94@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040329154444.19505.00000285@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/29/2004 7:28 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403290528.5c1c1611@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040328174700.21720.00000258@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 3/28/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403281421.5846cd6b@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> I AM aware of SPECIFIC Naval and Marine Corps regulations that make
> the
> use
> >> >> of profanity "conduct unbecomming", and punishable by Article 15 should
> the
> >> >> offended person so desire.
> >> >
> >> >Too bad we don't have a "conduct unbecoming" regulation.
> >>
> >> Yes. I'd take great pleasure in seeing you adn Lennie prosecuted under
> it.
> >>
> >> >You'd spend all of your time at Captain's Mast rather than harassing
> >> >and stalking others.
> >> >>
> >> >> Does it happen? Sure it happens....I've heard ministers swear.
> >> >
> >> >Tell me about that misister's non-judicial punishment.
> >> >
> >> >No, document it.
> >>
> >> How can a civilian be "punichsed" under military law, Brain?
> >>

> >> I did NOT state is was a military person. We were discussing
> >profanity.
> >
> >Many ministers wear the uniform. You brought in the minister and the
> >UCMJ. Why would you bring in someone not subject to the UCMJ, then
> >start backpeddling?
>
> No backpeddling, Brain.
>
> I am very, VERY sorry that you can't/won't keep up, but do I REALLY need to
> spoon feed each and ever answer to you?
>
> Are you REALLY that childish and inept, or is it just an act?

Look, kook, you're the one who thought them relative and necessary to
make your point. But they apparently didn't make your point nor were
they necessary or even related to your point.

Just don't go taking it out on me for your pointless mention of the
UCMJ and ministers.

Not my problem.

2270. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 03:43:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <K76dncybh5HNefHdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90334

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
>
>>He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
>>
>
>
> Need to pay more attention to the newsgroup. I am not a "he".
>

Apology issued.

2271. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 04:35:48 UTC
From: bonesboy <revearwaxIII9@shimlands.tv>
Message-ID: <eae30$406d5417$d1cc57f6$18578@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 90338

"G.K. Konnig" <bullmordt@yahoo.co.nz> wrote in message
news:3ff97a0d.0403311728.7020532@posting.google.com...
> I think iti¿½s possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
> collects their brains.
>
> What can I do?

Sell it to Brother Stair in South Carolina asap.
He's lookin for a new angle to get more suckers
to send him money to buy airtime on WBCQ.

www.thenetteam.net

2272. Re: BPL put on hold?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 04:58:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406CF2E4.50904@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90335

Jim Hampton wrote:

>Ya got me! :)
>
>That was good .... very good. And less than three hours to go too .... LOL
>
>
>
Me too. :-) Shoulda known.... As if the FCC might do something
sensible.

2273. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 05:38:47 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040402003847.298$PZ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90336

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Need to pay more attention to the newsgroup. I am not a "he".
> >
>
> Apology issued.
>
Dumbass alert.

2274. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 07:03:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402020349.17713.00000148@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90337

In article <1e4e3692.0404011917.46b8ff7b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040331111544.03625.00000384@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>> >restructuringdepends
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:18 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> Perhaps you might discover why it is that he does not warrant the
>> >> "respect" he THINKS he does.
>> >
>> >I respect Len for his service, and I respect Len for his knowledge of
>> >the art and science of radio.
>>
>> Len served in the Armed Forces. Bully for him.
>
>Bully for you. He paved the way for your lame self.

Tsk, tsk. Steamy wasn't born yet when I fired up on HF for the
first time. Full KW output it was, too. :-)

>> His "service" to the "radio profession" has yet to be established by
>> any source other than himself.
>
>His detractors have established his service. They fear his knowledge.
>
>Why are they so upset?

...because the gunnery nurse didn't check out my references given
in here. :-) [Especially so when three of them are long-time
licensed radio amateurs with web addresses].

But...if I give that brief listing of employers, the gunnery nurse bitches
and moans and carries on about "'we' don't want to see your #$%^!!!
'curriculum vitae!'" :-)

He should have said 'resume' not any c.v.

>> >When Len is given the opportunity to speak about radio, I listen in
>> >because there is something to be learned.

>>
>> How can you know if he's saying anything of value if you don't read
>>all his posts?
>
>Luck of the click?
>
>> >I also share Len's view that the Morse Code Exam requirement has long,
>> >long since served its usefulness to the Amateur Radio community, and
>> >should be retired as a licensing requirement. Should have been
>> >retired a long time ago.
>>
>> Lennie's "views" are based upon some personal expression of anger and
>> angst AGAINST Amateur Radio.
>
>Some are. His view of retiring the Morse or Farnsworth Exams are not.
> They are widely held views by amateurs who have passed such exams and
>those who have not.

Poor steamy. He still thinks He 'represents' all of hum radio and,
therefore, anything said contrary to hisself is "anger against hams!"
:-)

>You'll just have to get over it.

Don't put any bets out about it...steamy is into his rants too deep
to pull out now.

>> Lennie has absolutely ZERO-POINT-SQUAT minutes of operating an Amateur
>> Radio Station from which to make an informed opinion.
>
>So you say the physics of amateur radio are something special and
>unique.

Poor guy knows only the physics of hum radio, therefore all radios
are hum radios. Hummmmmm.

>> >Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
>> >radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
>> >or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
>> >based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
>> >make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
>> >license. And in America, every citizen has a voice. Those who are
>> >tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
>> >must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
>> >assinine view.
>>
>> We "exclude" Lennie becasue Lennie only assumes himself to be
"qualified"
>> to discuss anything related to radio since he was an alleged "professional".
>
>See???
>

>"Len is not an amateur, therefore Len can know nothing about amateur
>radio."

Ackshully, by the steamy one's "logic," absolutely nobody could get
their first amateur radio license. "They don't know anything about it!"
They wouldn't be able to pass any tests. No get license from FCC.

>Why do you insist on being wrong all of the time?

Steam-inflated ego does it for him.

>Do you enjoy being that kook ex-Marine that everyone thinks has
>post-traumatic stress syndrome?

I don't know what he got, but whatever it is nobody should have!

He done got a medical discharge he say. But, he say he got
a pilot license and derefour he done pass a flight physical.

>But never saw combat.

Hey! He done say he got "SEVEN HOSTILE ACTIONS" in da
military! He no say where or when, but dat be "irreverent."

>> Also, his irreverent use of profanity
>
>Now there is a reverent use of profanity?

It must be those ministers he hang out wid.

> and personal insults against anything
>> that is "not Lennie" does little to endear him to folks here, even those who
>> may be predisposed to agree with his "opinion" on Morse Code testing. No
one
>> likes to be associated with a foul-mouthed liar.
>
>You do nothing to endear yourself to folks here, either.

Understatement, Brian, understatement. :-)

>You behave badly. You are an embarassment to the amateur community
>and to RRAP.

Steamy one done represent ALL hum raddio amatoors. He say dat
roun' a bout.

>> >So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
>> >Sheriff and him barking at each other.
>>
>> I am not "barking" at him.
>
>Oh, my. I guess since I'm not a dog I cannot recognize barking?

Not a Licensed Amateur Dog! To bark in this newsgrope ya gots ta
have a ARRL-approved license for amateur dogginess. Arf!.

>> I rub his nose in his frequent newsgroup errors.
>
>As I rub your nose in every carpet stain that you leave here.
>
>> Just like I do you.
>
>So you say.

Careful. With all this nose-rubbing some Eskimo may think
you two are getting it on... :-)

LHA / WMD

2275. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 15:57:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <M3gbc.8555$yN6.3825@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90339

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040401195851.05715.00000110@mb-m25.aol.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
> -------------
> As of March 31, 2004:
> Novice - 32,247 (decrease of 17,082)
> Technician - 262,370 (increase of 56,976)
> Technician Plus - 60,885 (decrease of 67,975)
> General - 140,768 (increase of 28,091)
> Advanced - 80,922 (decrease of 18,810)
> Extra - 105,152 (increase of 26,402)
> Total - 682,344 (increase of 7,552)

But compared to March 31 of 2003 when
the total was 685,432 we have a 12 month
decrease of 3000.

Additionally, there are some "heavy"
concentrations of license expirations coming up
in the next several months which, I think, will
see our total licenses drop below 680K and
maybe below the March 2000 number.

Cheersm
Bill K2UNK

2276. Re: r.r.a.p 40m CW Net

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 15:58:15 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0404020758.7f65c6d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90340

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040331210712.15123.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <oirac.164873$LX.23189917@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
> <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:
>
> >I recently checked into the
> >Elecraft net and was treated to working a Hawiian station immediately
> >after...on 4 Watts! (more'n halfway to WAS now!)
>
> From Long Isalnd, no less.
>
> And this was on what band, mode, rig and antenna? ;-)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

BTW, any AK stations out there want to set up a sked?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2277. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:30:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402113011.09718.00000396@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90341

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011858.18b8561a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040401101502.12182.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 5:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> Does it matter?
>> >
>> >Do you matter?
>>
>> Of course I do. Just like you matter.
>
>Now you're lying again. You've treated a whole parade of people on
>rrap as if they were chewing gum or worse stuck to the sole of your
>jump boots.

Too bad for you, Brain, that you can't see beyond your own wounded pride.

Of course it wouldn't BE wounded if you'd quit shooting yourself in the
foot in public all the time.

But you STILL matter, whether you beleive it or not.

Steve, K4YZ

2278. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:31:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402113146.09718.00000397@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90342

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 12:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com>
>
>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
>> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
>> > >
>> > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much easier
>> to
>> > > copy than using slow letters.
>> >
>> > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
>> > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
>>
>> No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
>> Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
>> information has set themselves up for failure.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
>they were doing so.

In which FCC or other pertient federal law or regulation were they
obligated to announce that they were, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

2279. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:47:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402114700.09718.00000399@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90343

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 9:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011917.46b8ff7b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040331111544.03625.00000384@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>> >restructuringdepends
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:18 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310618.6da5279b@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040330121226.07406.00000324@mb-m18.aol.com>...

>> Len served in the Armed Forces. Bully for him.
>
>Bully for you. He paved the way for your lame self.

Lennie didn't "pave the way" for ANYthing I did in the Armed Forces,
Brain.

Different branches...Different motivations for serving...Different
MOS's...

>His detractors have established his service. They fear his knowledge.

Let's get one thing straight, PuppetBoy...

If you and Sir Scummy pulled up in fornt of my home with an Abrams tank,
locked, loaded and at point-blank-range, I'd STILL not have anything to fear
from either of you.

>Why are they so upset?

Because we don't tolerate liars and people who intentionally misrepresent
something we clearly know to be not true.

>> Lennie's "views" are based upon some personal expression of anger and
>> angst AGAINST Amateur Radio.
>
>Some are. His view of retiring the Morse or Farnsworth Exams are not.
> They are widely held views by amateurs who have passed such exams and
>those who have not.

...and absolutely no practical experience in Amateur Radio on which to
determine if the opinions of others are valid or not.

>You'll just have to get over it.

Get over what?

That he's talking out of the wrong orifice? Or that YOU are?

I hardly think so!

>> Lennie has absolutely ZERO-POINT-SQUAT minutes of operating an Amateur
>> Radio Station from which to make an informed opinion.
>
>So you say the physics of amateur radio are something special and
>unique.
>
>> >Unfortunately, there are some here that don't value Len's service,
>> >radio knowledge, or opinion of amateur radio licensing requirements,
>> >or all of the above. They want to exclude Len from the discussion
>> >based upon no amateur license. As pointed out repeatedly, those who
>> >make and enforce the regulations are not required to hold an amateur
>> >license. And in America, every citizen has a voice. Those who are
>> >tyrants do not believe this, and when they try to silence Len, they
>> >must be willing to accept any and all repercussions of holding such an
>> >assinine view.
>>
>> We "exclude" Lennie becasue Lennie only assumes himself to be
>"qualified"
>> to discuss anything related to radio since he was an alleged
>"professional".
>
>See???

See what?

That Lennie has, BY HIS OWN ADMISSION, no practical experience in Amateur
Radio?

>"Len is not an amateur, therefore Len can know nothing about amateur
>radio."
>
>Why do you insist on being wrong all of the time?

I am not wrong.

Lennie knows lots-and-lots about radio THEORY.

He knows almost NOTHING of APPLICATION as it pertains to AMATEUR RADIO.

>Do you enjoy being that kook ex-Marine that everyone thinks has
>post-traumatic stress syndrome?

OK, Brain...

YOU made another assertion of fact.

From what source did you obtain THAT suggestion, OTHER than to make it up.

>But never saw combat.

Sorry for you, Brain...Been there...Done that.

>> Also, his irreverent use of profanity
>
>Now there is a reverent use of profanity?

Nope.

> and personal insults against anything
>> that is "not Lennie" does little to endear him to folks here, even those
>who
>> may be predisposed to agree with his "opinion" on Morse Code testing. No
>one
>> likes to be associated with a foul-mouthed liar.
>
>You do nothing to endear yourself to folks here, either.

But I don't lie and I don't misrepresent things that are KNOWN to be
otherwise, Brain.

That you and your scumbag "mentor" find that makes you uncomfortable is
YOUR tough luck...Not mine.

>You behave badly. You are an embarassment to the amateur community
>and to RRAP.

Uh huh...Right.

>> >So I don't read all of Lens posts because its just some self-appointed
>> >Sheriff and him barking at each other.
>>
>> I am not "barking" at him.
>
>Oh, my. I guess since I'm not a dog I cannot recognize barking?

What "barking", Brain.

Nothing of what I see here comes even close to what my Webster's defines
as "barking".

>> I rub his nose in his frequent newsgroup errors.
>
>As I rub your nose in every carpet stain that you leave here.

Such as..?!?! All the stories I've told about operating illegally from
Somalia? The unfounded assertions I've made about "emergency comms"...?!?!

>> Just like I do you.
>
>So you say.

So I've proved. Again.

Steve, K4YZ

2280. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:49:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402114935.09718.00000400@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90344

>Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 12:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011041.64dca3ac@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.
>>
>> Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you risked
>even
>> more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not true.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>You are the only one who thinks that. Too bad for you.

Oh?

I don't see "everyone" tripping over themselves to "cover your back".

>Now what about you serving in Somalia? You up to it?

Sure. Are you? I might even get in some LEGAL operating time, Brain.
You could too, if you follow instructions.

Steve, K4YZ

2281. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:55:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90345

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 9:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011920.7447e1e0@posting.google.com>

>He's made several claims on here that he is selective who he would
>treat in an emergency. No wonder they have to pay so much in
>insurance premiums on kooks like him. No wonder there are so many law
>suits.

EVERY nurse or paramedic is "selective (in) who he would treat in an
emergency".

It's called "triage".

You'll find the term in any medical discitonary, Your Putziness. Buy
one...then you can pretend to engage me on yet another topic for which you have
no practical experience.

Steve, K4YZ

2282. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:59:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402115903.09718.00000402@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90346

>Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/1/2004 9:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011924.67f47840@posting.google.com>

>> I am very, VERY sorry that you can't/won't keep up, but do I REALLY
>need to
>> spoon feed each and ever answer to you?
>>
>> Are you REALLY that childish and inept, or is it just an act?
>
>Look, kook, you're the one who thought them relative and necessary to
>make your point. But they apparently didn't make your point nor were
>they necessary or even related to your point.
>
>Just don't go taking it out on me for your pointless mention of the
>UCMJ and ministers.
>
>Not my problem.

Brain...it IS >>YOUR<< problem when you can't keep your stories straight, present some valid corroboration of your assertions, or be stand-up enough to admit that you've been mistruthful when it's proven that you WERE mistruthful.

I just have a great time watching you do it.

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

2283. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:59:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402115911.08988.00000207@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90348

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv9bn6n.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 27 Mar 2004 08:05:03 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
>>>Yep, back when the agency was run by technically knowledgeable people
>>>who would have laughed BPL right out the door.
>>
>> Those days left with Jimmy Carter's administration.
>
> Y'know, you're right.
>
> Until Carter got in, the Chairman was Dick Wiley, an extremely
> knowledgeable comm lawyer who could understand things technical
> without any problem and knew what the Commission was supposed to do.
> Very impressive.
>
> Carter replaced him with Charlie Ferris, Tip O'Neill's bag-carrier,
> in a patently political payback. Ferris brought in the economists
> and the consumer-ists for top management and policy-setting positions
> and the slippery slope started.

Which was recognized by only a few at the time.
>
> In the Reagan-Bush_I years that followed Carter, there were a
> succession of lightweight Chairmen epitomized by "Madman Mark"
> Fowler, a comm lawyer who couldn't get a significant law partnership
> after he was replaced by Reed Hundt - the guy who took the field
> apart because he didn't understand what enforcement was all about
> and why the agency had to do it - when Clinton got in. Hundt was
> followed by Bill Kenard, whose greatest achievement was to make the
> spectrum auction system work. Bush_II brought us Michael Powell, the
> cheerleader of BPL.

Republicans and Democrats both. Let's see - Carter plus Clinton is 12 years,
Reagan plus Bushes is 16 years. Pretty balanced.
>
> And Jim wonders why I'm embarrassed ??
>
Not any more.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2284. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:59:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402115912.08988.00000208@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90347

In article <Dp-dnV5OiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>But is it medical malpractice when one out of a million dies from a
>vaccination?

Some people say yes. I say no.

>How can a physician predict who that might be? Should he be
>sued over it? These days he can and for a huge sum. He's following the
>best medical practices yet he is held liable when that one of a million
>occurs.

And even if he/she wins, the lawyers have to be paid.

Add to that the fact that many malpractice suits go after everyone that was anywhere near the patient - doctors, nurses, techs, the hospital or medical group itself, etc. Even if they all win they have to defend themselves.

Yes, there *are* some incompetent health care providers out there making mistakes that injure and kill people. They are few, but their mistakes raise the cost of every provider's malpractice insurance. And regardless of actual income, health care providers and their insurers are often seen as "deep pockets".
>
>In some states, you can know longer get your child's immunizations
>administered at your pediatrician's office for this very reason. Instead
>you have to go to the county board of health and sign a form that says you
>have been told that there are occasional deaths and you can't sue the
>government.

I hadn't heard that one, Dee. A true Catch-22 situation, because many immunizations are required by law in order for a kid to go to school.

And from a medical and scientific standpoint, the risk of the disease is far worse than the risk of the immunization.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2285. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 16:59:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zP6dnYCWNMSKAPDd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90349

Steveo wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>>news:RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Need to pay more attention to the newsgroup. I am not a "he".
>>>
>>
>>Apology issued.
>>
>
> Dumbass alert.

You don't have to alert us, we already know you're a dumbass, mr.
non-ham cber.

2286. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 17:05:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402120540.09718.00000403@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90350

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 4/2/2004 10:55 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>

> You'll find the term in any medical discitonary...(SNIP)

My bad.

Dictionary.

SR/K4YZ

2287. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 18:04:13 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040402130413.939$Bx@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90351

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >>>news:RJydnVHhgMgfT_HdRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>He knows which boat is going to stay afloat.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Need to pay more attention to the newsgroup. I am not a "he".
> >>>
> >>
> >>Apology issued.
> >>
> >
> > Dumbass alert.
>
> You don't have to alert us, we already know you're a dumbass, mr.
> non-ham cber.
>
JJ the no-call ham.

2288. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 18:55:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90352

Dave Heil wrote:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>>In article <403E2B04.1806A537@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>> I'll just put you down in the same emotional category as other
>>>> emotionally-seven-year-old Extras.
>>>>
>>>> Those are very "involved" as long as their attention spans last... :-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>They are as involved as they'd like to be. You are as involved as you
>>>can be.
>>>
>>>
>> Poor baby. Still INVOLVED with tossing personal insults and nasty
>> comments to others that don't agree with your views.
>>
>>
>
>Poor Leonard. Unable to accept a simple statement of fact. It would
>make no difference if you agreed with my views. You'd still have no
>involvement in amateur radio.
>
>
>
>> Your behavior remains constant at emotional tantrum level equal to
>> the average seven-year-old.
>>
>>
>
>Leonard, meet Leonard.
>
>
>
>> Try addressing SUBJECTS instead of the personalities who comment
>> against your views. Few care one whit about your perceived personal
>> affronts or the emotional injuries you seem to suffer while reading
>> these posts. Grow thicker skin.

>>
>>
>
>So I'm to do as you say and not as you do. Is that it?
>
>
>
>> Now go sit down in front of your tansceiver and have an oriongasm.
>>
>>
>
>I'll sit in front of it or not as I choose. I'll excercise the
>privileges granted by my license or I won't given my mood. I'll do as I
>like; you do as you can.
>
>Dave K8MN
>
>
Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.

bijan.hakimi@intel.com

2289. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 21:42:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <SYOdnYVQyc4MQvDdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90353

Steveo wrote:

>
> JJ the no-call ham.

Again, make up you feeble mind, you say I am a ham but I have no call.
Care to explain that since if I am a ham that means I have a call. Never
mind, what else would one expect from a stupid cber?

2290. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 21:52:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <GdednUceW-nQffDdRVn-tw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90354

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040402115912.08988.00000208@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <Dp-dnV5OiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
> [snip]
> >In some states, you can no longer get your child's immunizations
> >administered at your pediatrician's office for this very reason. Instead
> >you have to go to the county board of health and sign a form that says
you
> >have been told that there are occasional deaths and you can't sue the
> >government.
>
> I hadn't heard that one, Dee. A true Catch-22 situation, because many
> immunizations are required by law in order for a kid to go to school.
>
> And from a medical and scientific standpoint, the risk of the disease is
far
> worse than the risk of the immunization.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I don't know when this started but I know that this was the case in Ohio in 1987 when my younger daughter was born. The fact that states require the immunizations for school is why the county boards of health were required to make the shots available to all at cost. While they were actually cheaper via the county board of health, there was often no physician on hand in case of problems.

Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these diseases. For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was 50%.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2291. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 22:19:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 90355

In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.

I know "rocket science" after working three years at
Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).

I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.

[Rev. Jim don' lak no cuss words in heah, he say dat...]

Over a half century ago I was OPERATING on HF with not
one, but 43 transmitters each 8 hour shift...plus the VHF,
UHF, and microwave radio relay equipment associated
with it.

At no time in my career have I been required to know or to
use morse code to legally transmit on HF. In order to
transmit on HF in the U.S. ham bands I MUST test for that.
Why? No other radio service requires anything of the kind.

This newsgroup isn't moderated, doesn't have restricted
access. No ham license (from either FCC or FDA) is
required in here. It sounds fishy that you have a beef with
someone in here and I'd say y'all just laid a aig.

Until you close off this place to any but "your own kind,"
I be here when _I_ want to be here. You can bet your
[expletive deleted] [expletive deleted] on that, [expletive
deleted] !

Have fun with all the rest of the mental seven-year-old
extras.

LHA / WMD

2292. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 22:47:29 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040402174729.044$Vw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90356

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> >
> > JJ the no-call ham.
>
> Again, make up you feeble mind, you say I am a ham but I have no call.
> Care to explain that since if I am a ham that means I have a call. Never
> mind, what else would one expect from a stupid cber?
>
You're not a ham, you're a CBer wannabe.

2293. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 23:27:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402182731.00150.00000107@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 90357

In article <GdednUceW-nQffDdRVn-tw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>I don't know when this started but I know that this was the case in Ohio in
>1987 when my younger daughter was born. The fact that states require the
>immunizations for school is why the county boards of health were required to
>make the shots available to all at cost. While they were actually cheaper
>via the county board of health, there was often no physician on hand in case
>of problems.

Amazing.
>
>Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these diseases.
>For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was
>50%.

I didn't know it was that bad.

There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations are
somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have shown
no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
immunizations.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2294. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-02 23:51:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 90358

>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
>
> I know "rocket science" after working three years at
> Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
> of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
> engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).

I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier ashtrays
and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably even
picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long enough to
get his pants off....

>I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.

The best [expletive deleted] radio licenses money could buy.

But none of them an Amateur Radio license.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2295. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:02:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021702.392ed3d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90359

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040401165654.04427.00000451@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/1/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011010.56a0beca@posting.google.com>
>
> >Sounds like you're going down on JJ's boat.
>
> At least we can throw him a life preserver.
>
> You, on the otherhand, are going down on Lennie.

You always say the most perverted things.

> That we can't help you with.

Right. Pffft. Whacko.

bb

2296. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:05:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021705.5fc35731@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90360

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040402130413.939$Bx@newsreader.com>...
> >
> JJ the no-call ham.

No Call = No Ham

2297. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:09:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021709.461f5617@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90361

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Dp-dnV5OiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0404011007.28ec8df2@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Sometimes we focus on the wrong things. Medical malpractice kills
> > more people than guns.
>
> But is it medical malpractice when one out of a million dies from a
> vaccination? How can a physician predict who that might be? Should he be
> sued over it? These days he can and for a huge sum. He's following the
> best medical practices yet he is held liable when that one of a million
> occurs.

The bean counters at Lily figure in the cost of a human life into
their sales.

The attorneys at Lilly manage to cut that cost in half.

> In some states, you can know longer get your child's immunizations
> administered at your pediatrician's office for this very reason. Instead
> you have to go to the county board of health and sign a form that says you
> have been told that there are occasional deaths and you can't sue the
> government.

Then there are other attorneys that say you can sue the governemnt not
matter what form you sign.

2298. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:13:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <G5KdnWEwza8fkvPdRVn_iw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90362

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040402182731.00150.00000107@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <GdednUceW-nQffDdRVn-tw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >I don't know when this started but I know that this was the case in Ohio
in
> >1987 when my younger daughter was born. The fact that states require the
> >immunizations for school is why the county boards of health were required
to
> >make the shots available to all at cost. While they were actually
cheaper
> >via the county board of health, there was often no physician on hand in
case
> >of problems.
>
> Amazing.
> >
> >Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these
diseases.
> >For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was
> >50%.
>
> I didn't know it was that bad.
>

Yup. Like you, most people don't know how high the fatality rate was. The reason is simple. Whooping cough, the Pertussis in DPT, was a very serious disease. However very, very few people have ever seen a case. It was pretty much brought under control 50 years or more ago. People have seen the wide variety of stuff lumped under "croup" and have mis-applied the term whooping cough to various severe coughs but they are not the same thing.

> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
are
> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
shown
> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first
definitive
> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
> immunizations.
>

Even if there were a causal effect, the odds of this happening are so very much lower than the odds of dying should the child contract Whooping Cough that it's far better to get the immunizations.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2299. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:19:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021719.696ae7b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90363

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: All that flappin'
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/1/2004 9:20 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011920.7447e1e0@posting.google.com>
>
> >He's made several claims on here that he is selective who he would
> >treat in an emergency. No wonder they have to pay so much in
> >insurance premiums on kooks like him. No wonder there are so many law
> >suits.
>
> EVERY nurse or paramedic is "selective (in) who he would treat in an
> emergency".
>
> It's called "triage".

Back peddle. Tap dance. Cover up what you know you meant.

You really should stop making stupid statements concerning who you
would and would not treat in your profession.

You might goof one day and this stuff comes back to haunt you.

2300. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:25:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021725.602297d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90364

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402115903.09718.00000402@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/1/2004 9:24 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011924.67f47840@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I am very, VERY sorry that you can't/won't keep up, but do I REALLY
> need to
> >> spoon feed each and ever answer to you?
> >>
> >> Are you REALLY that childish and inept, or is it just an act?
> >
> >Look, kook, you're the one who thought them relative and necessary to
> >make your point. But they apparently didn't make your point nor were
> >they necessary or even related to your point.
> >
> >Just don't go taking it out on me for your pointless mention of the
> >UCMJ and ministers.
> >
> >Not my problem.
>
> Brain...it IS >>YOUR<< problem when you can't keep your stories straight,

It wasn't my story to keep straight, you kook, it was yours.

> present some valid corroboration of your assertions, or be stand-up enough to
> admit that you've been mistruthful when it's proven that you WERE mistruthful.

You were "mistruthful" with your minister and UCMJ nonsense. Either
it was or it was not relevant.

You bring it up as if it were relevant, then when I address it, you
say it wasn't relevant.

You just talk nonsense, day after day.

2301. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:33:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021733.20a7eb20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90365

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402114935.09718.00000400@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/1/2004 12:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011041.64dca3ac@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.
> >>
> >> Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you risked
> even
> >> more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not true.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >You are the only one who thinks that. Too bad for you.
>
> Oh?
>
> I don't see "everyone" tripping over themselves to "cover your back".
>
> >Now what about you serving in Somalia? You up to it?
>
> Sure. Are you? I might even get in some LEGAL operating time, Brain.
> You could too, if you follow instructions.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Congratulations, kook.

You've never been to Saomalia.

You've never been to a country without a government.

But now you're an instant expert. There were other instant experts on
here, some even with vast, vast years experience operating from
countries -with- viable governments, who were proven wrong.

Instead of having learned something, you puff out your chest and give advice.

Hi hi.

Next thing you know you'll be sending out QSL cards, having never set foot in-country. Just like your coveted box full of military medals that you didn't earn. Walter Kooky style.

bb

2302. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:35:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402203514.15123.00000151@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90366

In article <M3gbc.8555$yN6.3825@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040401195851.05715.00000110@mb-m25.aol.com...
>> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>> Novice - 49,329
>> Tech - 205,394
>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>> General - 112,677
>> Advanced - 99,782
>> Extra - 78,750
>> Total - 674,792
>> -------------
>> As of March 31, 2004:
>> Novice - 32,247 (decrease of 17,082)
>> Technician - 262,370 (increase of 56,976)
>> Technician Plus - 60,885 (decrease of 67,975)
>> General - 140,768 (increase of 28,091)
>> Advanced - 80,922 (decrease of 18,810)
>> Extra - 105,152 (increase of 26,402)
>> Total - 682,344 (increase of 7,552)
>
>But compared to March 31 of 2003 when
>the total was 685,432 we have a 12 month
>decrease of 3000.

Actually a tad more than 3000, Bill.
>
>Additionally, there are some "heavy"
>concentrations of license expirations coming up
>in the next several months which, I think, will
>see our total licenses drop below 680K and
>maybe below the March 2000 number.

Time will tell. The renewal rules confuse the situation because you cannot
renew more than 90 days before expiration, but you can let the license expire
and then renew in the 2 year grace period.

The big question is: why such slow growth even after the restructuring of 2000?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2303. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:44:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021744.d595ce3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90367

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040402020349.17713.00000148@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0404011917.46b8ff7b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040331111544.03625.00000384@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> >> I rub his nose in his frequent newsgroup errors.
> >
> >As I rub your nose in every carpet stain that you leave here.
> >
> >> Just like I do you.
> >
> >So you say.
>
> Careful. With all this nose-rubbing some Eskimo may think
> you two are getting it on... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Now that's funny.

2304. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:48:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021748.726f977a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90368

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402114700.09718.00000399@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> But I don't lie and I don't misrepresent things that are KNOWN to be
> otherwise, Brain.

You lie to yourself. You believe your own lies. Ergo, no conflict
with lying to others.

2305. Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:48:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90369

I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
rag on each other endlessly.alt"
and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
amateur radio regulatory and policy
issues ...

I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
OT and doesn't belong here ...
most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
be for because of the volume
of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...

Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
provide a place for the serious
regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
fest that you guys have going on here ...

OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...

Carl - wk3c

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >
> >>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
> >
> > I know "rocket science" after working three years at
> > Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
> > of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
> > engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
>
> I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier
ashtrays
> and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably
even

> picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long
enough to
> get his pants off....
>
> >I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.
>
> The best [expletive deleted] radio licenses money could buy.
>
> But none of them an Amateur Radio license.
>
> Putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2306. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:50:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021750.50c75af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90370

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Dp-dnVlOiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> > > > >
> > > > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much
> easier
> to
> > > > > copy than using slow letters.
> > > >
> > > > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
> > > > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
> > >
> > > No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
> > > Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
> > > information has set themselves up for failure.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
> > they were doing so.
>
> Sorry but it was published.

Years later.
```

2307. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:51:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404021751.320ce14a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90371

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402113146.09718.00000397@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> In which FCC or other pertient federal law or regulation were they
> obligated to announce that they were, Brain?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What?

What are you talking about?

2308. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:56:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <eLKdnY888uwthPPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90372

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040402203514.15123.00000151@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <M3gbc.8555$yN6.3825@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040401195851.05715.00000110@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >>
> >> As of May 14, 2000:
> >>
> >> Novice - 49,329
> >> Tech - 205,394
> >> Tech Plus - 128,860
> >> General - 112,677
> >> Advanced - 99,782
> >> Extra - 78,750
> >> Total - 674,792
> >> -------------
> >> As of March 31, 2004:
> >> Novice - 32,247 (decrease of 17,082)
> >> Technician - 262,370 (increase of 56,976)
> >> Technician Plus - 60,885 (decrease of 67,975)
> >> General - 140,768 (increase of 28,091)
> >> Advanced - 80,922 (decrease of 18,810)
> >> Extra - 105,152 (increase of 26,402)
> >> Total - 682,344 (increase of 7,552)
> >
> >But compared to March 31 of 2003 when
> >the total was 685,432 we have a 12 month
> >decrease of 3000.
>
> Actually a tad more than 3000, Bill.
> >
> >Additionally, there are some "heavy"
> >concentrations of license expirations coming up
> >in the next several months which, I think, will
> >see our total licenses drop below 680K and
> >maybe below the March 2000 number.
>
> Time will tell. The renewal rules confuse the situation because you cannot
> renew more than 90 days before expiration, but you can let the license

expire
> and then renew in the 2 year grace period.
>
> The big question is: why such slow growth even after the restructuring of
2000?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Just an FYI. Any license that is expired but still in the grace period is
not listed as expired until after the grace period is over.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2309. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 01:58:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <j9ydnQ37rcljhPPdRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90373

```
"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404021750.50c75af@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Dp-dnVlOiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
> > > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much
> > easier
> > to
> > > > > > copy than using slow letters.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in
the
> > > > > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is
predictable.
> > > > >
> > > > No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
> > > > Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores
that
> > > > information has set themselves up for failure.
> > > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
> > they were doing so.
> >
> Sorry but it was published.
>
> Years later.

Nope published from the beginning. You just didn't look the right places.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
```

2310. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 02:13:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <cb7s60d1qckt68se9u37b93a6cmuqotu4j@4ax.com>
Source record: 90374

Well said, Carl.

73, Leo

On Sat, 3 Apr 2004 01:48:34 -0000, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:

>I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
>rag on each other endlessly.alt"
>and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
>amateur radio regulatory and policy
>issues ...
>
>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>be for because of the volume
>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
>Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
>rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
>this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
>provide a place for the serious
>regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
>sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
>fest that you guys have going on here ...
>
>OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
>deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
>Carl - wk3c
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
>> >
>> >In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
>> >

>> > I know "rocket science" after working three years at
>> > Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
>> > of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
>> > engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
>>
>> I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier
>ashtrays
>> and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably
>even
>> picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long
>enough to
>> get his pants off....
>>
>> >I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.
>>
>> The best [expletive deleted] radio licenses money could buy.
>>
>> But none of them an Amateur Radio license.
>>
>> Putz.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>

2311. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 02:15:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90375

N2EY wrote:
> In article <GdednUceW-nQffDdRVn-tw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>
>>I don't know when this started but I know that this was the case in Ohio in
>>1987 when my younger daughter was born. The fact that states require the
>>immunizations for school is why the county boards of health were required to
>>make the shots available to all at cost. While they were actually cheaper
>>via the county board of health, there was often no physician on hand in case
>>of problems.
>
>
> Amazing.
>
>>Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these diseases.
>>For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was
>>50%.
>
>
> I didn't know it was that bad.
>
> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations are
> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have shown
> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
> immunizations.

The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"

Stupid logic, but there are some pretty stupid people out there.

If they think immunizations are bad, they should see how bad not
immunization is.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2312. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 02:44:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90376

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
> OT and doesn't belong here ...
> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
> be for because of the volume
> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...

Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and avoid it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2313. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 02:59:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402215918.18733.00000182@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90377

In article <G5KdnWEwza8fkvPdRVn_iw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>> >Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these
>diseases.
>> >For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was
>> >50%.
>>
>> I didn't know it was that bad.
>>
>
>Yup. Like you, most people don't know how high the fatality rate was. The
>reason is simple. Whooping cough, the Pertussis in DPT, was a very serious
>disease. However very, very few people have ever seen a case. It was
>pretty much brought under control 50 years or more ago. People have seen
>the wide variety of stuff lumped under "croup" and have mis-applied the term
>whooping cough to various severe coughs but they are not the same thing.

Same for "flu" and "influenza". Etc.

I recall a documentary about Dr. Benjamin Spock, who was born in the year 1900.
At that time, the death rate for American babies was 10% in the first year -
that is, 1 in 10 babies born alive in the USA were dead before their first
birthday. I don't know the exact rate today but it's a lot lower.
>
>> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
>> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
>> are
>> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>> shown
>> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first
>> definitive
>> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>> immunizations.
>>
>
>Even if there were a causal effect, the odds of this happening are so very
>much lower than the odds of dying should the child contract Whooping Cough
>that it's far better to get the immunizations.
>
But that requires understanding the nature of risk and the consequences of the
various choices. And some math.

73 es stay healthy de Jim, N2EY

2314. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 02:59:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040402215919.18733.00000183@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90378

In article <eLKdnY888uwthPPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>> Time will tell. The renewal rules confuse the situation because you cannot
>> renew more than 90 days before expiration, but you can let the license
>expire
>> and then renew in the 2 year grace period.
>>
>> The big question is: why such slow growth even after the restructuring of
>2000?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Just an FYI. Any license that is expired but still in the grace period is
>not listed as expired until after the grace period is over.
>
That depends on how the data is compiled.

The numbers I post here do not include licenses in the grace period. Neither do
those on the AH0A website.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2315. sacnner online

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 07:53:08 UTC
From: "h.reijnierse" <reijnierse@home.nl>
Message-ID: <c4lqhiraf1@news3.tilbu1.nb.home.nl>
Source record: 90379

http://members.home.nl/reijnierse/

2316. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 11:59:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403065912.05025.00000179@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 90381

In article <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is
>$40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and setup is
>$600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband being
>available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some people sell it
>when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the setup fee is still $240.
>That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not $24.

When DSL first appeared, there were substantial setup and equipment fees. They
have pretty much gone by the wayside now.
>
>In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side of
>the street!

?? How wide is your street?

Or do your utilities run behind the houses, as they do here?

>One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my
>neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows someone
>who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi, but says they
>lose the connection when it rains!

Lot of new 802.11() systems that are a lot more robust than earlier ones.
>
>BPL is set to cost only about as much as DSL and maybe nothing to install.
>Some people would go for it just because they don't have a spare 600 bucks
>to buy and set up a satellite system. I would almost be tempted if it
>wasn't for ham radio. Cable Internet is $55/mo here. That includes $15/mo
>for basic cable TV, whether you want it or not. DSL is $35/mo. I am sure
>that some people would try BPL instead, as it doesn't need extra wires or
>Wi-Fi.
>
Some form of special modem is needed for BPL, and it is proprietary to the
particular system in use because they're all different. Your cable modem and
DSL prices are higher than we pay here ($43 and $30, respectively) and the
prices keep dropping. Verizon, for one, offers package deals where POTS, DSL
and cell phone service are all bundled together for a very reasonable price.

There are some new BPL articles on the ARRL website. Worth a read.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2317. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 11:59:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 90380

In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
>> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
>> are
>> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>> shown
>> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
>> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>> immunizations.
>
>The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
>controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
>diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"

Agreed. And of course the reason such diseases are almost gone is - universal
immunization.

>Stupid logic, but there are some pretty stupid people out there.
>
>If they think immunizations are bad, they should see how bad not
>immunization is.

Yep. This is one reason why the study of history - real history - is so
important.

--

It's also important to distinguish between "medical malpractice" and "medical
mistakes".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2318. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 12:59:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403075919.19617.00000080@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90382

In article <vW4ac.4662$NL4.940@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
>think
>> >>it has a snowball's chance in
>>
>> [expletive deleted]
>>
>> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
>>
>> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
>> >for extras.
>>
>> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these days.
>> You make an excellent point.
>
>Good...so far.
>
>> The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does FCC
>> get out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
>
>Then will we expect you to make that argument to the
>FCC when you comment?

HECK NO, BILL!

The answer to that question could very well be "Gee, we *don't* get anything
out of protecting hams from BPL - so we won't!".
>
>> >As the
>> >treaty requirement is now gone,
>> > and no other service uses it, why bother.
>>
>> Because hams *do* use it.
>
>Yet hams do NOT need to pass a CW test to be
>allowed to use morse.

> If a "no-code" tech decides to operate
>morse on VHF, they are free to do so without ever being
>tested. If the ARRL proposal gets the nod, the same would
>be true for Novice and Generals on HF also.
>
There are all sorts of things hams are allowed to do without being tested, or without being tested in depth. For example, a ham who passed the tests before, say, PSK-31 was invented is still allowed to use that mode without being tested. But that does not mean no test is needed, or that the current tests should not have PSK-31 in them because the old tests didn't.

>> Some other services use it too, but not to any great
>> extent.
>
>And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
>any ham to need to know code to read or operate
>with nay of those other services. By the way...what
>other services are you thinking of?

There is still some maritime Morse code use, and it is used for ID in some applications.
>
>> >The FCC isn't
>> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
>>
>> [expletive deleted]
>
>Jim, even I am not offended by "hell"
It was a joke, Bill ;-)
>
>> >of it.
>>
>> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications.
>> Of course there's differences of
>> opinion on what qualified means.
>
>The retention of a 5 wpm test for Extra in light of no
>code for all others makes even less sense.

I disagree. Morse code is the second most popular mode in amateur radio. For even the most privileged license to require no skill in its use makes no sense.
>
>> >Code isn't a lid filter,
>>
>> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter".
>
>No test is in any way a lid filter...as you note below.

You misunderstand what I wrote.

No test is a *perfect* lid filter.

>> Particularly not a test given one time.
>> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
>> much
>> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not filtered
>> out by those testing and education systems.
>
>I repeat...NO test is a lid filter.

If that's true, why have tests at all?

No test is a *perfect* lid filter.

>> > as witness
>> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
>>
>> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
>
>Are you assuming all the 14.313 loonies had code medical
>waivers?

Nope - but neither is it safe to assume that none of them did.
>
>> Remember this:
>>
>> All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that
>> included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple written
>> exams,
>> yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests aren't a
>> perfect lid filter either.

Note that I wrote "perfect lid filter".

>> Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
>> written exams because they didn't do the job?
>>
>> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!
>
>A point we agree on.
>
Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2319. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 13:34:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Q_mdnTcsIZaBIPPd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90383

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040403075919.19617.00000080@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <vW4ac.4662$NL4.940@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
> >think
> >> >>it has a snowball's chance in
> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
> >>
> >> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
> >>
> >> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
> >> >for extras.
> >>
> >> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these
days.
> >> You make an excellent point.
> >
> >Good...so far.
> >
> >> The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does
FCC
> >> get out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
> >
> >Then will we expect you to make that argument to the
> >FCC when you comment?
>
> HECK NO, BILL!
>
> The answer to that question could very well be "Gee, we *don't* get
anything
> out of protecting hams from BPL - so we won't!".
> >
> >> >As the

> >> >treaty requirement is now gone,
> >> > and no other service uses it, why bother.
> >>
> >> Because hams *do* use it.
> >
> >Yet hams do NOT need to pass a CW test to be
> >allowed to use morse.
> > If a "no-code" tech decides to operate
> >morse on VHF, they are free to do so without ever being
> >tested. If the ARRL proposal gets the nod, the same would
> >be true for Novice and Generals on HF also.
> >
> There are all sorts of things hams are allowed to do without being tested,
or
> without being tested in depth. For example, a ham who passed the tests
before,
> say, PSK-31 was invented is still allowed to use that mode without being
> tested. But that does not mean no test is needed, or that the current
tests
> should not have PSK-31 in them because the old tests didn't.
>
> >> Some other services use it too, but not to any great
> >> extent.
> >
> >And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
> >any ham to need to know code to read or operate
> >with nay of those other services. By the way...what
> >other services are you thinking of?
>
> There is still some maritime Morse code use, and it is used for ID in some
> applications.
> >
> >> >The FCC isn't
> >> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
> >
> >Jim, even I am not offended by "hell"
> It was a joke, Bill ;-)
> >
> >> >of it.
> >>
> >> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications.
> >> Of course there's differences of
> >> opinion on what qualified means.
> >
> >The retention of a 5 wpm test for Extra in light of no
> >code for all others makes even less sense.
>
> I disagree. Morse code is the second most popular mode in amateur radio.

For
> even the most privileged license to require no skill in its use makes no
sense.
> >
> >> >Code isn't a lid filter,
> >>
> >> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter".
> >
> >No test is in any way a lid filter...as you note below.
>
> You misunderstand what I wrote.
>
> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.
>
> >> Particularly not a test given one time.
> >> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
> >> much
> >> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not
filtered
> >> out by those testing and education systems.
> >
> >I repeat...NO test is a lid filter.
>
> If that's true, why have tests at all?
>
> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.
>
> >> > as witness
> >> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
> >>
> >> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
> >
> >Are you assuming all the 14.313 loonies had code medical
> >waivers?
>
> Nope - but neither is it safe to assume that none of them did.
> >
> >> Remember this:
> >>
> >> All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams
that
> >> included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple
written
> >> exams,
> >> yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests
aren't a
> >> perfect lid filter either.
>
> Note that I wrote "perfect lid filter".
>

> >> Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
> >> written exams because they didn't do the job?
> >>
> >> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!
> >
> >A point we agree on.
> >
> Exactly.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a means to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio. Further testing was intended to motivate people to expand their knowledge by awarding privileges to those who did undertake the self-learning and development.

This is why it is not necessary to have a direct tie between material tested and privileges awarded. Instead you tie the most desireable priviliges not to the type of material but to information and skills that they should have but don't want to learn. This is the way society, in general, works.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2320. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 14:10:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZAzbc.8775$NL4.3029@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90384

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040403075919.19617.00000080@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <vW4ac.4662$NL4.940@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
> >think
> >> >>it has a snowball's chance in
> >>
> >> [expletive deleted]
> >>
> >> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
> >>
> >> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
> >> >for extras.
> >>
> >> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these
days.
> >> You make an excellent point.
> >
> >Good...so far.
> >
> >> The problem is that it also applies in
> >> other areas, such as "what does FCC
> >> get out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
> >
> >Then will we expect you to make that argument to the
> >FCC when you comment?
>
> HECK NO, BILL!

Thought that'd be the case.

> The answer to that question could very well be
> "Gee, we *don't* get anything
> out of protecting hams from BPL - so we won't!".

Except they'd be violating there own charter to take
a totally hands off position.

> >> >As the
> >> >treaty requirement is now gone,
> >> > and no other service uses it, why bother.
> >>
> >> Because hams *do* use it.
> >
> >Yet hams do NOT need to pass a CW test to be
> >allowed to use morse.
> > If a "no-code" tech decides to operate
> >morse on VHF, they are free to do so without ever being
> >tested. If the ARRL proposal gets the nod, the same would
> >be true for Novice and Generals on HF also.
> >
> There are all sorts of things hams are allowed to do without being tested,
or
> without being tested in depth. For example, a ham who passed the tests
before,
> say, PSK-31 was invented is still allowed to use that mode without being
> tested. But that does not mean no test is needed, or that the current
tests
> should not have PSK-31 in them because the old tests didn't.

But the morse test is a skill test that someone can pass and
know nothing about the technical aspects of using morse
code. On a par with PSK-31, it would be like having
a keyboard test of sending PSK-31.

> >> Some other services use it too, but not to any great
> >> extent.
> >
> >And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
> >any ham to need to know code to read or operate
> >with nay of those other services. By the way...what
> >other services are you thinking of?
>
> There is still some maritime Morse code use,

And the liklihood of any ham needing or using morse
code to engage in a contact with such a morse
maritime operation is nil.

> and it is used for ID in some applications.

And why would any ham need to know morse to understand
such an ID?

> >> >The FCC isn't
> >> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
> >> >of it.
> >>

> >> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications.
> >> Of course there's differences of
> >> opinion on what qualified means.
> >
> >The retention of a 5 wpm test for Extra in light of no
> >code for all others makes even less sense.
>
> I disagree. Morse code is the second
> most popular mode in amateur radio. For
> even the most privileged license to require
> no skill in its use makes no sense.

WHY? No one is required to exhibiit ANY specific skill
in the USE of any other mode. The fact that hams around
the globe use languages other than English doesn't require
any specific ham to exhibit or show an ability to speak
English or any other language.

> >> >Code isn't a lid filter,
> >>
> >> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter".
> >
> >No test is in any way a lid filter...as you note below.
>
> You misunderstand what I wrote.
>
> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.

I repeat, no test in any way is a lid filter.

> >> Particularly not a test given one time.
> >> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
> >> much
> >> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not
filtered
> >> out by those testing and education systems.
> >
> >I repeat...NO test is a lid filter.
>
> If that's true, why have tests at all?

The tests for ham radio are NOT intended to ferret out
idiots and jerks who, having passed a test, decide they
don't want to operate within FCC rules or the rules
of common courtesy.

> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.

Ditto my prior comments again.

> >> > as witness
> >> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
> >>

> >> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
> >
> >Are you assuming all the 14.313 loonies had code medical
> >waivers?
>
> Nope - but neither is it safe to assume that none of them did.

Agreed, but as long as one passed a code test of 13 or even 20
wpm, then your comment about waivers is invalid. Yes, some
may have gotton there with a waiver...but not all.

> >> Remember this:
> >> All those folks on 14.313, 3950,
> >> W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams that
> >> included the rules and regulations.
> >> Most of them passed multiple written
> >> exams yet they broke the rules anyway.
> >> So obviously those written tests aren't a
> >> perfect lid filter either.
>
> Note that I wrote "perfect lid filter".

I repeat again, none of the ham tests today or in the
past ever had any expectation of keeping out 'lids'.
Knowledge of right and wrong itself has never
prevented some people from violating the law. We
see that everywhere...from petty criminals to such
well educated proffesions as legal, clergy, politics,
accountantants, medical...etc. No proffesion, regardless
of the knowledge one needs or is tested for to gain
entrance has ever been able to devise any specific
testing to exclude the equivalent of "lids." Perhaps
some professions (e.g. police) make a more concerted
effort via the use of pschological testing and evaluations
but even those don't screen all bad apples.

> >> Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
> >> written exams because they didn't do the job?
> >>
> >> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is
> >> proposing for the entry level!
> >
> >A point we agree on.
> >
> Exactly.

BUT, again, knowledge of rules has never, in itself, served
as a deterent to people who choose to deliberately (note
I said deliberately, not by virtue of lack of knowledge)
break the rules.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2321. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 14:20:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <EKzbc.8793$NL4.136@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90385

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040402215919.18733.00000183@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <eLKdnY888uwthPPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >> Time will tell. The renewal rules confuse the situation because you
cannot
> >> renew more than 90 days before expiration, but you can let the license
> >> expire and then renew in the 2 year grace period.
> >>
> >> The big question is: why such slow growth even after the restructuring
of
> >2000?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Just an FYI. Any license that is expired but still in the grace period
is
> >not listed as expired until after the grace period is over.
> >
> That depends on how the data is compiled.
>
> The numbers I post here do not include
> licenses in the grace period. Neither do
> those on the AH0A website.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim is 100% accurate on that.
Towards that point, if we add grace
period expirations to the 684K total it would probably
be over 800K hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2322. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 14:31:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90386

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>
> > I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that
is
> > OT and doesn't belong here ...
> > most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed
to
> > be for because of the volume
> > of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with
...
>
> Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
> affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
> avoid it.
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
posting that I used to.

I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.

Cheers to all who use common sense, logic and a few
ounces of forthought before posting :-)

Bill K2UNK

2323. Re: N5CEC and his anger problems

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 14:34:19 UTC
From: joe sixpack <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <WSzbc.4436$6D1.3288@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90387
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Poor N5CEC. Looks like he is the latest penis envy of the two drunk losers N9PGE and K9BSD. At least Mike has a wife. Maybe N9PGE and K9BSD could ask him how to keep a woman since they don't know how! Staying out of the gay bars would probaly be a good start!

joe@joe.com wrote:
>
> another Indiana drunk heard from. been fired again?

2324. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:01:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403100110.12182.00000656@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90388

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021702.392ed3d3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040401165654.04427.00000451@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/1/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011010.56a0beca@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Sounds like you're going down on JJ's boat.
>>
>> At least we can throw him a life preserver.
>>
>> You, on the otherhand, are going down on Lennie.
>
>You always say the most perverted things.

You forget, Brain...

It's YOU who provides me with the material...

>> That we can't help you with.
>
>Right. Pffft. Whacko.

Remind us again about your Somalia DX operation and please explain how
the "unlicensed radio services play a "major role" in emergency
communications...".

There's a "whacko" here, but it's not me.

Steve, K4YZ

2325. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:03:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90389

>Subject: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest
>Extra')
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
>
>I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
>rag on each other endlessly.alt"
>and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
>amateur radio regulatory and policy
>issues ...
>
>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>be for because of the volume
>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
>Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
>rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
>this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
>provide a place for the serious
>regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
>sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
>fest that you guys have going on here ...
>
>OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
>deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Thank-you for having expressed your God Given Opinon in accordance with
your Constitutional Rights, Carl.

Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2326. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:13:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90390

```
>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: "Bill Sohl" billsohl@mindspring.com
>Date: 4/3/2004 8:31 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>> > I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that
>is
>> > OT and doesn't belong here ...
>> > most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed
>to
>> > be for because of the volume
>> > of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with
>...
>>
>> Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>> affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>> avoid it.
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>posting that I used to.
>
>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>
>Cheers to all who use common sense, logic and a few
>ounces of forthought before posting.

Gentlemen, your comments are well spoken and have much merit.

I wonder why, however, many of you selectively decide when to complain
about the "noise".

Myself and others have "sponsored" many-a-thread championing spectrum
protection, VE testing integrity and other "on topic" (ie: policy subjects)
only to have most of you presently commenting (with the exception of Mike
```

Coslo) pulling the "topics" into the usual 'know code/no code' silliness and worn out rhetoric, often deteriorating into the "stupid bickering about individual and personalities" that you presently lament.

I do believe it to be a bit of hypocracy, Gentlemen.

We'll see.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2327. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:15:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403101528.12182.00000659@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90391

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021719.696ae7b3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>...

>> EVERY nurse or paramedic is "selective (in) who he would treat in an
>> emergency".
>>
>> It's called "triage".
>
>Back peddle. Tap dance. Cover up what you know you meant.

And YOU "know" what I meant, Brain?

You don't even know what YOU mean...

>You really should stop making stupid statements concerning who you
>would and would not treat in your profession.

There's nothing "stupid" about it. Black, Red, Yellow or Green. You get
treated accordingly.

Steve, K4YZ

2328. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:23:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403102339.12182.00000660@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90392

>Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021733.20a7eb20@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040402114935.09718.00000400@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/1/2004 12:41 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011041.64dca3ac@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.
>> >>
>> >> Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you
>risked
>> even
>> >> more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not
>true.
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >You are the only one who thinks that. Too bad for you.
>>
>> Oh?
>>
>> I don't see "everyone" tripping over themselves to "cover your back".
>>
>> >Now what about you serving in Somalia? You up to it?
>>
>> Sure. Are you? I might even get in some LEGAL operating time,
>Brain.
>> You could too, if you follow instructions.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Congratulations, kook.

I am not the one professing to have "operated" from Somalia...Nor am I the one professing admiration for a known liar or making assinine statements about "emergency comms" I can't back up.

>You've never been to Saomalia.

I dare say you haven't either, "Brain".

>You've never been to a country without a government.

And you know this...how?

>But now you're an instant expert. There were other instant experts on
>here, some even with vast, vast years experience operating from
>countries -with- viable governments, who were proven wrong.

I am not an "instant" anything.

YOU have made assertions over the past two years you STILL haven't validated.

>Instead of having learned something, you puff out your chest and give
>advice.

"...learned something"...?!?!

What?

How to lie? How to make a fool of myself in a public forum?

If I've "puffed out (my) chest" it's been from laughning so hard.

>Hi hi.

A bit more enthusiastically than that, Brain.

>Next thing you know you'll be sending out QSL cards, having never set
>foot in-country.

I've never sent a QSL card from a locale I didn't have authorization to operate from, Brain, including the high seas.

>Just like your coveted box full of military medals
>that you didn't earn. Walter Kooky style.

A "box full of medals" collected...never worn. Just like some people collect patches from police or fire departments.

But that was clearly stated then too.

Your creep factor just edged a bit higher, Brain.

Nice try, but lackluster as usual.

See you at Dayton this year?

Steve, K4YZ

2329. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:24:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403102429.12182.00000661@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90393

>Subject: Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license
>restructuringdepends
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021748.726f977a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040402114700.09718.00000399@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
>> But I don't lie and I don't misrepresent things that are KNOWN to be
>> otherwise, Brain.
>
>You lie to yourself. You believe your own lies. Ergo, no conflict
>with lying to others.

Uh huh...Riiiiiiiiiiiiiight.

Steve, K4YZ

2330. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:28:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403102850.12182.00000662@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90394

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021750.50c75af@posting.google.com>
>
>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:<Dp-dnVlOiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com...
>> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
>> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
>> > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much
>> easier
>> to
>> > > > > copy than using slow letters.
>> > > >
>> > > > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
>> > > > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is predictable.
>> > >
>> > > No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
>> > > Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
>> > > information has set themselves up for failure.
>> > >
>> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>> > The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
>> > they were doing so.
>>
>> Sorry but it was published.
>
>Years later.

Brain, you have yet to answer my question as to WHAT FCC or federal law mandated any "declaration" about using Farnsworth methodology for code test preparation.

You DO have an answer, don't you?

I've read Part 97 a couple times and find nothing there that mandates it.

And I am also awaiting your answer as to WHAT "specification" exists for "Morse Code".

More assertions without validation? Or is it OPINION, expressed just because you like to see your name in print...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2331. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:34:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403103420.12182.00000663@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90395

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/2/2004 7:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021751.320ce14a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040402113146.09718.00000397@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
>> In which FCC or other pertient federal law or regulation were they
>> obligated to announce that they were, Brain?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>What?
>
>What are you talking about?

You're harrassing Dee about some perceived failure of the ARRL to
"announce" that they used "Farnsworth" methodology for code test preparation.

I want you to please provide some reference to a law, regulation or other
federal mandate that directed them to do so.

Also, since you are insinuating that some 'specification' has not been
met, I'd like for you to provide us with a URL or other reference to said
'specification' as to HOW a code test should be prepared.

Steve, K4YZ

2332. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 15:58:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403105852.17713.00000174@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90396

In article <Q_mdnTcsIZaBIPPd4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a means
>to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio.

I guess it all depends on how we define "lid filter".

If it means that some sort of test is supposed to guarantee that everyone who passes it will somehow be a fully qualified, skilled, courteous, law-abiding radio amateur who will advance the state of the art, then there is no such test and no test was ever intended to do that job.

But if it means that the test will help to insure that those who pass it have at least some minimum level of qualifications (knowledge and skill) to be hams....

It all boils down to what constitutes "basic knowledge to allow people into [amateur] radio". For some that includes a basic test of Morse code skill, for some others it does not. For some it includes technical and regulatory knowledge and for others it does not.

>Further
>testing was intended to motivate people to expand their knowledge by
>awarding privileges to those who did undertake the self-learning and
>development.

Agreed - all the way back into the 1930s, when the Class A license was invented. Or even earlier, if we count the old Amateur Extra First Class license.

>This is why it is not necessary to have a direct tie between material tested
>and privileges awarded. Instead you tie the most desireable priviliges not
>to the type of material but to information and skills that they should have
>but don't want to learn.

That's an excellent point, Dee. But it's exactly what some people call "jumping through hoops", "hazing rituals", "giving out gold stars" and such.

Now we see the same arguments that were used against the code test being used against the written test in the NCVEC proposal. How do we argue against it?

Unless I am mistaken, at least one of the folks behind the NCVEC petition was/is on the NoCode International board. And the whole thing was clearly laid out in the "21st Century" paper.

>This is the way society, in general, works.

Agreed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2333. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 16:03:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <W8OdnZS8b779ffPdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90397

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 4/2/2004 7:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021751.320ce14a@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040402113146.09718.00000397@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>
>>
>>> In which FCC or other pertient federal law or regulation were they
>>>obligated to announce that they were, Brain?
>>>
>>>Steve, K4YZ
>>
>>What?
>>
>>What are you talking about?
>
>
> You're harrassing Dee about some perceived failure of the ARRL to
> "announce" that they used "Farnsworth" methodology for code test preparation.
>
> I want you to please provide some reference to a law, regulation or other
> federal mandate that directed them to do so.
>
> Also, since you are insinuating that some 'specification' has not been
> met, I'd like for you to provide us with a URL or other reference to said
> 'specification' as to HOW a code test should be prepared.

As a point of historical comparison, Steve, I wonder if "back in the
good ol' days" the FCC itself tested using Farnsworth Morse? Anyone know?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2334. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 16:10:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YNGdnXMWeohhfPPdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90398

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Q_mdnTcsIZaBIPPd4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>
>>NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a means
>>to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio.
>
>
> I guess it all depends on how we define "lid filter".

I'm not necessarily looking for a "lid filter". But I do believe that having a certain minimum level of knowledge, be that Morse code testing or the written testing, makes for ensuring that the applicant really wants to be a ham and isn't just getting a license because they didn't have anything else to do one weekend.

Obviously others differ.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2335. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 16:50:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403115025.17713.00000175@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90399

In article <GdednUceW-nQffDdRVn-tw@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>Yes many people are unaware of the death rates from some of these diseases.
>For example, the death rate among children who caught whooping cough was
>50%.

And many are unaware of the mental death rate of intelligence due
to the intellectually-toxic effects of too much morse code.

By the way, this newsgroup is about amateur radio policy, not the
state of the medical or medicinal arts. The FCC doesn't regulate
medicine in the USA even though some of their regulations and
rulings are a bitter pill for some to swallow. :-)

Good luck on your search for the proper venue to lend your medical
expertise and needling to some other group.

LHA / WMD

2336. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 16:50:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403115028.17713.00000176@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90400

In article <20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (ugly little mentally-seven-year-old very-amateur extra) writes:

>>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>>>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
>>
>> I know "rocket science" after working three years at
>> Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
>> of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
>> engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
>
> I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier ashtrays
>and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably even
>picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long enough
>to get his pants off....

Tsk, tsk, tsk...ugly little comment from an ugly little person.

Members of the Technical Staff III didn't do janitorial services at Rocketdyne. That was my work title and may be checked by inquiry of Personell Department, Rocketdyne Division of Boeing Aircraft [Boeing purchased the Rocketdyne Division from Rockwell International after I left them]. My group was Electronic Instrumentation and assisted many different project groups. My tasks were with the instrumentation and sensor interface for the Deformable Mirror program (part of the "Star Wars" work spread all over the country); instrumentation for Solar One, the 50 MWe solar experimental power generation plant built at Barstow, CA, (McDonnell-Douglas, Huntington Beach, CA was prime contractor on instrumentation, Rocketdyne supplied the solar boiler and underground heat storage - for darkness periods); experimental liquid oxygen flow measurement for the SSME or Space Shuttle Main Engine (cannot yet be safely directly measured by any conventional flowmeter).

The Deformable Mirror program required actual deformation of the mirror surface by actuators altering the surface by nanometer distances accurately through an incorporated Bragg Cell dual

interferometer as the initial surface sensor and a phase-frequency detector comparing the two interferometer outputs with a 16-bit minicomputer program calculating the required mirror surface information and actuators' necessary motion to achieve a desired deformation. Deformable mirrors are now used in many astronomical observatories for both focus and astigmatic correction of distortion due to the earth atmosphere variability. My specific contribution - besides being part of the team that organized the electronics and computer interface - was a variation of the common phase-frequency detector of PLLs optimized for linearity and elimination of the very narrow "dead zone" at zero-phase. The Bragg Cell outputs were at 39 and 40 MHz, the mixer (after squaring) was digital. That was in 1980. The contractee was the Department of Defense.

Solar One was a "local" project sponsored by all the Greater Los Angeles electric power utilities. Rocketdyne's work with very high temperature alloys and cooling with rocket engine "bells" was a natural for the steam-generating boiler at the focus of hundreds of heliostats (moveable mirrors reflecting the sunlight to the single focus of the boiler). I got that assignment due to illness leave of another MTS and the ability to work with very-non-radio Piping and Instrumentation (in industrial applications) and the ubiquitous 4 to 20 mA wired sensor link systems and their subsequent interface to the MacDac control midicomputer (32-bit word length). That was in 1981.

The SSME LOX flow sensor project attempted to solve a very old problem with conventional flow meters in that liquid oxygen wants to "eat" any parts directly in the flow. Several attempts were made to use ultrasonic waves directed at a slant through the main LOX piping, that in the enormous high-level broadband noise environment when the throttleable SSME is at working thrust (350,000 pounds thrust at 110% throttle). After many firings at the Santa Susanna Field Laboratories' test stand "Coca" that proved unsuccessful. The method was eventually ruled out due to internal LOX density disturbances that negated any sort of induced wavefront rate. At present, LOX flow rate is inferred from relative temperature (non-contact) sensors into a strap-on, very-high-shock/vibration-rated computer mounted on each SSME. That same computer is the link to/from the shuttle pilots and flight computer to control the SSMEs. The thrust chamber of each SSME is about the size of a small beach ball yet can provide about 175 tons of push. Fuel is liquid hydrogen, rather more chilly than terrestrial surface fuels. That was in 1982.

There was no sexual involvement involved, only that of connector mating of male and female pins. To the best of my knowledge, no "hermaphroditic" contact pins were used in any connectors.

>>I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.
>
> The best [expletive deleted] radio licenses money could buy.

All obtained from the FCC at the FCC's normal fee rate at the
Chicago, IL, and Long Beach, CA, Field Offices.

Only the PLMRS station EQUIPMENT cost any real money,
later recouped on a dissolved partnership business auction.

> But none of them an Amateur Radio license.

Absolutely true...including two of the licenses then required
for Citizens Band in the 1960s. :-)

> Putz.

Absolutely untrue, meshugge goyim. Shalom.

I sing kaddish to the demise of your civility and sensibility.

LHA / WMD

2337. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 18:59:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403135924.05305.00000151@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90401

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv1vyh4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 23 Mar 2004 16:58:44 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>>>
>>We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly
>by
>>cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.
>
> We call them "tract mansions"..... <ggg>

HAW!
>
> We have a half-dozen of them going up near here in an area that was
> last developed twenty years ago. Just for yah-yahs I'm going to
> check out the CC&Rs after they are open for sale.

Probably don't allow you to have a pair of rabbit ears on the TV set.

What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised. Now they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here in the Philadelphia area.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2338. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142819.12769.00000115@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90406

In article <Q_mdnTcsIZaBIPPd4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040403075919.19617.00000080@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> In article <vW4ac.4662$NL4.940@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> >news:20040328215825.18733.00000083@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> >> In article <40673457.9000905@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> >> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >>I don't see the 5 wpm for Extra thing as a problem - because I don't
>> >think
>> >> >>it has a snowball's chance in
>> >>
>> >> [expletive deleted]
>> >>
>> >> >>of getting approved by the FCC.
>> >>
>> >> >One has to ask the question of what the FCC gets out of requiring code
>> >> >for extras.
>> >>
>> >> That's the key question these days for any license requirement these
>days.
>> >> You make an excellent point.
>> >
>> >Good...so far.
>> >
>> >> The problem is that it also applies in other areas, such as "what does
>FCC
>> >> get out of protecting hams from BPL interference?"
>> >
>> >Then will we expect you to make that argument to the
>> >FCC when you comment?
>>
>> HECK NO, BILL!
>>
>> The answer to that question could very well be "Gee, we *don't* get
>anything

>> out of protecting hams from BPL - so we won't!".
>> >
>> >> >As the
>> >> >treaty requirement is now gone,
>> >> > and no other service uses it, why bother.
>> >>
>> >> Because hams *do* use it.
>> >
>> >Yet hams do NOT need to pass a CW test to be
>> >allowed to use morse.
>> > If a "no-code" tech decides to operate
>> >morse on VHF, they are free to do so without ever being
>> >tested. If the ARRL proposal gets the nod, the same would
>> >be true for Novice and Generals on HF also.
>> >
>> There are all sorts of things hams are allowed to do without being tested,
>or
>> without being tested in depth. For example, a ham who passed the tests
>before,
>> say, PSK-31 was invented is still allowed to use that mode without being
>> tested. But that does not mean no test is needed, or that the current
>tests
>> should not have PSK-31 in them because the old tests didn't.
>>
>> >> Some other services use it too, but not to any great
>> >> extent.
>> >
>> >And certainly not to any extent that one would expect
>> >any ham to need to know code to read or operate
>> >with nay of those other services. By the way...what
>> >other services are you thinking of?
>>
>> There is still some maritime Morse code use, and it is used for ID in some
>> applications.
>> >
>> >> >The FCC isn't
>> >> >in the business of giving out gold stars for the
>> >>
>> >> [expletive deleted]
>> >
>> >Jim, even I am not offended by "hell"
>> It was a joke, Bill ;-)
>> >
>> >> >of it.
>> >>
>> >> Not about "gold stars". About qualifications.
>> >> Of course there's differences of
>> >> opinion on what qualified means.
>> >
>> >The retention of a 5 wpm test for Extra in light of no

>> >code for all others makes even less sense.
>>
>> I disagree. Morse code is the second most popular mode in amateur radio.
>For
>> even the most privileged license to require no skill in its use makes no
>sense.
>> >
>> >> >Code isn't a lid filter,
>> >>
>> >> *No* test is a perfect "lid filter".
>> >
>> >No test is in any way a lid filter...as you note below.
>>
>> You misunderstand what I wrote.
>>
>> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.
>>
>> >> Particularly not a test given one time.
>> >> There are bad doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc., who have been through
>> >> much
>> >> more extensive and rigorous testing and education, yet were not
>filtered
>> >> out by those testing and education systems.
>> >
>> >I repeat...NO test is a lid filter.
>>
>> If that's true, why have tests at all?
>>
>> No test is a *perfect* lid filter.
>>
>> >> > as witness
>> >> >14.313 back in the days of 13wpm to be allowed to operate there.
>> >>
>> >> You mean before 1990? (medical waivers)
>> >
>> >Are you assuming all the 14.313 loonies had code medical
>> >waivers?
>>
>> Nope - but neither is it safe to assume that none of them did.
>> >
>> >> Remember this:
>> >>
>> >> All those folks on 14.313, 3950, W6NUT, etc., passed *written* exams
>that
>> >> included the rules and regulations. Most of them passed multiple
>written
>> >> exams,
>> >> yet they broke the rules anyway. So obviously those written tests
>aren't a
>> >> perfect lid filter either.

>>
>> Note that I wrote "perfect lid filter".
>>
>> >> Shall we dump the rules and regs from those
>> >> written exams because they didn't do the job?
>> >>
>> >> oh wait, that's what NCVEC is proposing for the entry level!
>> >
>> >A point we agree on.
>> >
>> Exactly.
>>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a means
>to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio. Further
>testing was intended to motivate people to expand their knowledge by
>awarding privileges to those who did undertake the self-learning and
>development.

Radio licenses are just a regulatory tool used by the Commission.

Radio operator licenses were never, are still not any form of
academic certificates of achievement. The Commission is not
chartered by law to be an educational or academic agency.

Possession of a radio operator license, any kind, is proof only of
having passed a license test according to Commission regulations.

>This is why it is not necessary to have a direct tie between material tested
>and privileges awarded. Instead you tie the most desireable priviliges not
>to the type of material but to information and skills that they should have
>but don't want to learn. This is the way society, in general, works.

In our [USA] society, laws and regulations have been decided largely
by political and legislative actions. Learning ability and qualifications
in the same are tested and graded by academic organizations. The
FCC is not an academic organization.

There is no evidenciary Divine Law which dictates certain avocational
radio activity "must" be done in a certain way or that certain skills
and knowledge "must" be possessed, nor is there any Divine
Judgement which ascertains the sagacity of such "musts." There are
only self-righteous, sanctimonious self-styled "radio gods" who
demand obediance to certain "rules" because they think all should
think like they do. Through political pressure, many of those "rules"
make it into codified law...ergo, it is "right." :-)

Now back to more interesting amateur radio policy discussions concerning immunization, medicine, and urban myths concerning those, along with national policy on health care.

LHA / WMD

2339. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142820.12769.00000116@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90404

In article <20040403065912.05025.00000179@mb-m17.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is
>>$40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and setup is
>>$600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband being
>>available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some people sell it
>>when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the setup fee is still $240.
>>That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not $24.
>
>When DSL first appeared, there were substantial setup and equipment fees.
>They
>have pretty much gone by the wayside now.
>>
>>In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side of
>>the street!
>
>?? How wide is your street?
>
>Or do your utilities run behind the houses, as they do here?
>
>>One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my
>>neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows someone
>>who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi, but says they
>>lose the connection when it rains!
>
>Lot of new 802.11() systems that are a lot more robust than earlier ones.

IEEE 802.15 and IEEE 802.16 standards are for metropolitan
systems using wireless access.

Complete specifications are available to the public for download
at no charge.

The colloquial term "Wi-Fi" is for wired systems using other IEEE
802 standards.

LHA / WMD

2340. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142821.12769.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90403

In article <Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>> OT and doesn't belong here ...
>> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>> be for because of the volume
>> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
> Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>avoid it.

"Noise" can be much reduced by making and installing appropriate
shielding structures.

The key to happiness and nirvana would be a restricted-access
newsgroup, moderated so that all got along happily ever after.
That is the "shielding" which can be applied to keep out independent
thought, outside interference, and find sanctuary for all worshipping
the past of "the service" just like they had to do.

Of course someone who has bad screen days in here should
expend the effort to begin constructing such "shielding." Everyone
talks about it but no one is doing anything about it.

"Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain." - anon.

LHA / WMD

2341. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142822.12769.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90405

In article <20040403102850.12182.00000662@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 4/2/2004 7:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021750.50c75af@posting.google.com>
>>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:<Dp-dnVlOiYpfRPHdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
>>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>> news:1e4e3692.0404011035.44d6db4b@posting.google.com...
>>> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>> news:<j6adnfPW7KHc1PbdRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
>>> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>> > > news:1e4e3692.0403310542.64049c4f@posting.google.com...
>>> > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>> news:<jr-dncnZfL5uuPfdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>...
>>> > > > >
>>> > > > > Naturally. Farnsworth spaced code for slow word speeds is much
>>> easier
>>> to
>>> > > > > copy than using slow letters.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > Unnaturally. If the person prepared for Morse Code as stated in the
>>> > > > regulation, the Farnsworth Code will zip by. Failure is
>predictable.
>>> > >
>>> > > No current study materials omit explaining to the student that the
>>> > > Farnsworth spacing will be used in the test. Anyone who ignores that
>>> > > information has set themselves up for failure.
>>> > >
>>> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>> >
>>> > The ARRL used Farnsworth for years before publishing a notice that
>>> > they were doing so.
>>>
>>> Sorry but it was published.
>>
>>Years later.
>
> Brain, you have yet to answer my question as to WHAT FCC or federal law
>mandated any "declaration" about using Farnsworth methodology for code test
>preparation.

Brian did not bring this "declaration" up...that was another.

You are free to find your own sources of offical statements at the FCC
website using their own, publicly-available search facilities.

> You DO have an answer, don't you?

You CAN do your own searches, but contentiousness is so much
easier to do, a sort of instant satsifaction of personal irritation.

> I've read Part 97 a couple times and find nothing there that mandates it.
>
> And I am also awaiting your answer as to WHAT "specification" exists for
>"Morse Code".

97.3 (a) (27) - CCITT Recommendation F.1 (1984), Division B,
I. Morse code.

That is as stated in the 1 October 2003 printed form of Title 47 C.F.R.
available from the Government Printing Office. That same definition
existed in the October 2005 Code of Federal Regulations.

There are several adult education courses available in your area to
improve your personal reading comprehension skills.

> More assertions without validation? Or is it OPINION, expressed just
>because you like to see your name in print...?!?!

You have been repeatedly informed of the existing regulatory
specifications of and about International Morse Code. For years.

There is no point in you trying to argue the same subject with
constant obvious contentious behavior and trying to promote
verbal battles that irritate others.

It is much better to concentrate personal efforts on very real,
serious problems facing your remaining "service" days, such as
Access BPL and a possible future regulatory restructuring of
amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

2342. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142824.12769.00000119@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90407

In article <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
>rag on each other endlessly.alt"
>and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
>amateur radio regulatory and policy
>issues ...

Carl, I've made a suggestion repeatedly for at least six years in
here that it should be shut off from public access with only
"authorized access" and a moderator to attempt keeping the
peace. That way everyone can be "among their own kind," happy
and content, no evil independent thoughts intruding nirvana.

>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>be for because of the volume
>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...

I agree. But, having practiced computer-modem communications for
17+ years, slightly longer than that via time-share systems on the
old Arpanet, then Usenet, then BBSs, and finally the Internet after
1991, I'd say that human nature hasn't changed much. :-)

"Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain..." - anon.

For truly serious action on this, you should consult with Paul Schleck
on a "restructuring" of this newsgroup to make it closed-access.
Shut everyone out but your own kind. "Killfile" everyone that gives
you a bad screen day. Peace. Tranquility. Happy QSOs.

>Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
>rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
>this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
>provide a place for the serious
>regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
>sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
>fest that you guys have going on here ...

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Have you forgotten the immortal words of Jim Kehler
and his beloved "No SSB International" movement? Forgotten that
he loved to say (about Techs) "Gigahertz for gigasquirts?" :-)
KH2D = Jim Kehler, formerly high chieftan of hamminess on Guam.

Tell you what, Carl, let's see you hang in there with mild, civil manners as a model of compartment after another has threatened to abrogate your First Amendment rights in public, repeatedly called you "putz" (Yiddish for asshole), "scum" in various forms, "ignorant of everything in amateur radio," a "pathological liar," "dishonorable" towards the USA military after conjuring up obvious untruthful conditions...plus...various forms of personal insults including alleged homosexual acts, insulting my wife, my parents, my work experience, my education, educational institutions who provide college-credit courses away from normal hours.

Of course you've weathered those contentious conditions of an equal nature with the highest possible conduct befitting an executive directorship. All the PCTA have done equally calm, reasoned, civil replies in here, haven't they? :-)

>OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
>deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...

Wouldn't think of it. Heavens, no civilized person uses [expletive deleted] [expletive deleted] words in newsgroups...that's for the lower-class, inferior, non-amateur bourgoise, the riff-raff, the underbelly of society peasantry. Self-righteousness and sanctimonious behavior are the true rulers on an enlighted superior society.

Now back to the present-day amateur policy newsgroup where the main topics are immunization, diseases, past military experience, national policy, and - especially - much angst over long-past message exchanges which must be argued over and over and over and over and over again until the original non-winner considers they have "won."

Please excuse my absence. I am preparing some Replies to Comments to my government on federal regulations. No doubt I will once again by rewarded by an Amateur Extra licensee demanding I be censored and censured for exercising my First Amendment Rights to my government.

Censorship is wonderful, don't you wish everyone had it?

LHA / WMD

2343. Re: Why the caste system? was: NCVEC files license restructuringdepends

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 19:28:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403142825.12769.00000120@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90402

In article <20040403102429.12182.00000661@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>You lie to yourself. You believe your own lies. Ergo, no conflict
>>with lying to others.
>
> Uh huh...Riiiiiiiiiiiiight.

Good progress! Admission is the first step towards good mental health!

LHA / WMD

2344. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 20:46:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <MpmdndmuvPcnv_LdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90408

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>>>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>>>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>>>be for because of the volume
>>>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>>
>> Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>avoid it.
>
>
> "Noise" can be much reduced by making and installing appropriate
> shielding structures.

I read each and every one of your posts that I see in this group.
Wouldn't miss them. If Carl wants to avoid them, that is his business.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2345. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 20:51:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PradnU775f5DvvLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90409

N2EY wrote:

> In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv1vyh4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>
>>On 23 Mar 2004 16:58:44 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>>>>
>>>
>>>We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly
>>
>>by
>>
>>>cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.
>>
>> We call them "tract mansions"..... <ggg>
>
>
> HAW!
>
>> We have a half-dozen of them going up near here in an area that was
>> last developed twenty years ago. Just for yah-yahs I'm going to
>> check out the CC&Rs after they are open for sale.
>
>
> Probably don't allow you to have a pair of rabbit ears on the TV set.
>
> What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the
> McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised. Now
> they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here in the
> Philadelphia area.

Not uncommon at all, Jim. In my area, we have farmers that hve sold off land for development, after which the people that moved into the development sued to shut the farmer down because of the noxious smells emanating from the farm.

I don't blame it entirely on the people suing, the farmer had to be pretty stupid to not know that "development people don't like nature very much.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2346. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 21:50:22 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ul9u60te77hk0qa2dnh7ldqj3jlcu1h0n5@4ax.com>
Source record: 90410

On 03 Apr 2004 19:28:24 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>snip
>
> Please excuse my absence. I am preparing some Replies to
> Comments to my government on federal regulations.

Which is a very commendable and proactive thing to do - and is, as you know, the only effective method of advising the regulatory folks of valid objections to their proposed new rules and policies. The more cogent objections that they receive, the better.

Thank you, Len, for taking the time to do so. Your effort is appreciated.

I'm sure that you agree that those who do not see themselves as being part of the solution are usually part of the problem.....

> No doubt I
> will once again by rewarded by an Amateur Extra licensee
> demanding I be censored and censured for exercising my First
> Amendment Rights to my government.

Of course - more than one, most likely. And that syndrome is. I think, what annoyed Carl enough to prompt this posting (and he certainly ain't alone there...). For example, you post something, then several others jump on you to 'prove you wrong', then others jump on them to 'prove them wrong', etc. Newsgroup warriors (MinutiaeMen?) all, fighting a never-ending battle for something or other.....but the real issues, those which threaten the amateur radio hobby, will not be decided in this forum. Or in that manner.

It would be good to see some of that energy channeled into positive and proactive channels - such as replying to the FCC on issues which threaten the hobby. Which you, and a few others, have done and continue to do.

Others, unfortunately, don't see it that way.

In my opinion, it's similar to the election process - if some guy didn't take the time to go out and vote, who cares when he complains that the wrong guy won....TS, I say.

>
> Censorship is wonderful, don't you wish everyone had it?

Not censorship - perhaps initiative?

>
> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

2347. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 21:57:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zrGbc.9341$NL4.1069@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90411

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040403105852.17713.00000174@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Q_mdnTcsIZaBIPPd4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a
means
> >to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio.
>
> I guess it all depends on how we define "lid filter".

I define it to be someone who operates poorly or
illegally on a deliberate basis (emphasis on deliberate).

> If it means that some sort of test is supposed to guarantee that everyone
who
> passes it will somehow be a fully qualified, skilled, courteous,
law-abiding
> radio amateur who will advance the state of the art, then there is no such
test
> and no test was ever intended to do that job.

Agreed.

> But if it means that the test will help to insure that those who pass it
have
> at least some minimum level of qualifications (knowledge and skill) to be
> hams....

Which is the only purpose for the testing today and in
the past.

> It all boils down to what constitutes
> "basic knowledge to allow people into
> [amateur] radio". For some that includes
> a basic test of Morse code skill, for
> some others it does not.

Correct, and the FCC has been pretty clear on the
point that morse as a skill is NOT needed, except to
be compliant with the now vacated treaty code
requireent for HF.

> For some it includes technical and regulatory
> knowledge and for others it does not.

I am one that agrees there should be both technical
and regulatory knowledge.

> >Further
> >testing was intended to motivate people to expand their knowledge by
> >awarding privileges to those who did undertake the self-learning and
> >development.
>
> Agreed - all the way back into the 1930s, when the Class A license was
> invented. Or even earlier, if we count the old Amateur Extra First Class
> license.

No argument on that. It is clearly
the intent of incentive licensing.

> >This is why it is not necessary to have a direct tie between material
tested
> >and privileges awarded. Instead you tie the most desireable priviliges
not
> >to the type of material but to information and skills that they should
have
> >but don't want to learn.
>
> That's an excellent point, Dee. But it's exactly what some people call
"jumping
> through hoops", "hazing rituals", "giving out gold stars" and such.

BUT code testing is a motor skills test, not a technical
nor regulatory one. No other mode is tested at the
use level as is morse code.

> Now we see the same arguments that were used against the code test being
used
> against the written test in the NCVEC proposal. How do we argue against
it?

You just do on the belief the FCC won't buy the NCVEC
proposal on that point.

> Unless I am mistaken, at least one of the folks behind the NCVEC petition
> was/is on the NoCode International board. And the whole thing was clearly
laid
> out in the "21st Century" paper.

Fred W5YI is both NCVEC and an NCI Board Member.

For the record, I am also an NCI Bd member and I individually
oppose the NCVEC RM except as to it calling for a total
end to all code testing. On the NCVEC petition itself,
NCI, as an organization, has not taken any official
stand for or against.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2348. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 22:26:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031426.5c7d2eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90412

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
> >> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
> >> are
> >> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
> >> shown
> >> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
> >> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
> >> immunizations.
> >
> >The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
> >controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
> >diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"

TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
you tell me what caused it?

Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
it his own immunizations?

Do you know?

> Agreed.

Agreed to what??? Should I teach him Morris Code so he can
communicate with me?

And of course the reason such diseases are almost gone is - universal
> immunization.

My son is in a classroom of -all- autistic children in a small
community of less than 20,000.

> >Stupid logic, but there are some pretty stupid people out there.

Lots and lots of stupid people. Like those demanding continued Morse
Code exams.

Since you're a smart person, you have the answer.

What caused my son's autism?

> >If they think immunizations are bad, they should see how bad not
> >immunization is.

>
> Yep. This is one reason why the study of history - real history - is so
> important.

Someday someone will write the history of autism.

The real history. What causes it.

TAFKARJ and Mike won't be mentioned.

2349. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 22:32:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031432.798dd0c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90413

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0404021705.5fc35731@posting.google.com>...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20040402130413.939$Bx@newsreader.com>...
> > >
> > JJ the no-call ham.
>
> No Call = No Ham

JJ = No Ham

2350. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 22:35:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031435.41ccd153@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90414

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403310558.e98dd22@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<f6qdnfEztvvc5_XdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
>
> > Oh well, I have mixed thoughts on the "new censorship " going on. I
> > prefer the airways cleaned up, but I would just as soon have Howard
> > removed from them because he stinks than for his profanity.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Few practice personal responsibility.
>
> My rule is that if its indecent for children, its indecent for adults.

Mike, do you disagree? Stebe, ditto?

2351. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 22:37:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031437.de9f441@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90415

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040328174141.21720.00000257@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> But Brain...You and Lennie ARE the "superior intellect" that I am laughing
> at.

Which is what makes you so obviously crazy.

2352. kc8ldo trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:07:13 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <5a373dcfb8a9c6bc2ba310a8814db8fe@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 90417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Included Page: groups?selm=wQYz6.76224Y4.79704840nntp1.onemain.comoutput=gplain

2353. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:17:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406F4617.8020100@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90416

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>
>NONE of the tests were EVER intended to be "lid filters". They were a means
>to require a certain basic knowledge to allow people into radio. Further
>testing was intended to motivate people to expand their knowledge by
>awarding privileges to those who did undertake the self-learning and
>development.
>
>This is why it is not necessary to have a direct tie between material tested
>and privileges awarded. Instead you tie the most desirable privileges not
>to the type of material but to information and skills that they should have
>but don't want to learn. This is the way society, in general, works.
>
Who determines "skills they should have"? And why? And who says that
the FCC is to be
the enforcer? Things like "instrument ratings" for plane pilots from
the FAA make sense; that
you should prove that you know (via a test) that you know how to fly a
plane and land it
safely when it's foggy. Else you'll likely crash it and kill yourself
and all aboard. But requiring
extra knowledge of radio to be allowed to operate SSB on 14.160 vs
14.322 is kinda silly.
It's almost like forcing kids in high school to learn Spanish or French.
I had to take
Spanish in high school, and as I don't own a landscaping business or
such, it was a total
waste of time. Japanese or Chinese would have been a more useful
choice, but the
high school didn't offer those. Or better yet some form of technical
writing English class.
But writing was a real PITA back when I was in high school, no word
procesors or
computers then. or printers. How did people manage to bang out
typewritten papers
without errors?

>
>
>
>

>

2354. What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:30:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90418

So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?

As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.

Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.

electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).

Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
are crowded.

Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.

Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
screw up other users.

What else should be here?

2355. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:34:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403183434.11951.00000556@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90419

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again
, Len!
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/3/2004 10:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <W8OdnZS8b779ffPdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> Also, since you are insinuating that some 'specification' has not been
>> met, I'd like for you to provide us with a URL or other reference to said
>> 'specification' as to HOW a code test should be prepared.
>
> As a point of historical comparison, Steve, I wonder if "back in the
>good ol' days" the FCC itself tested using Farnsworth Morse? Anyone know?

Sure don't, Mike...I sat...they tested...I passed, that was all I was
concerned about! =)

I remember that it was "easy copy", and that's about it...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2356. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:43:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403184354.11951.00000557@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90420

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/3/2004 1:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040403142822.12769.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040403102850.12182.00000662@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Brain, you have yet to answer my question as to WHAT FCC or federal law
>>mandated any "declaration" about using Farnsworth methodology for code test
>>preparation.
>
> Brian did not bring this "declaration" up...that was another.

Not int eh current course of exchanges, it asn't.

> You are free to find your own sources of offical statements at the FCC
> website using their own, publicly-available search facilities.
>
>> You DO have an answer, don't you?
>
> You CAN do your own searches, but contentiousness is so much
> easier to do, a sort of instant satsifaction of personal irritation.

Sure I can.

But in these changes, Brain was making the assertion.

Or was that your hand up his backside making his mouth work again, Lennie?

>> I've read Part 97 a couple times and find nothing there that mandates
>it.
>>
>> And I am also awaiting your answer as to WHAT "specification" exists
>for
>>"Morse Code".
>
> 97.3 (a) (27) - CCITT Recommendation F.1 (1984), Division B,
> I. Morse code.
>
> That is as stated in the 1 October 2003 printed form of Title 47 C.F.R.
> available from the Government Printing Office. That same definition
> existed in the October 2005 Code of Federal Regulations.

October 2005?

What happened to 1984 when VE testing began?

> There are several adult education courses available in your area to
> improve your personal reading comprehension skills.

But why?

I read quite well, Lennie.

Well enough, in fact, ot ahve caught you and your surrogate in a number of
"newsgroup faux pas"

>> More assertions without validation? Or is it OPINION, expressed just
>>because you like to see your name in print...?!?!
>
> You have been repeatedly informed of the existing regulatory
> specifications of and about International Morse Code. For years.

But still you refuse to specifically cite it.

I have yet to see a single "specification" that dictates character
duration or spacing.

> There is no point in you trying to argue the same subject with
> constant obvious contentious behavior and trying to promote
> verbal battles that irritate others.

If one does not want to be irritated, Lennie, then perhaps thye shouldn't
be making dumb assertions they can't validate.

> It is much better to concentrate personal efforts on very real,
> serious problems facing your remaining "service" days, such as
> Access BPL and a possible future regulatory restructuring of
> amateur radio.

I dare say my "personal efforts" in Amateur Radio far outstrip the
comments you've ever posted to EFCS, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

2357. kc8ldo trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:50:06 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <2aeab0a3e43c688372a88d708a0a74cb@dizum.com>
Source record: 90421
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

groups?selm=b55A6.82024K54.40529540nntp3.onemain.comoutput=gplain
AO
groups?selm=b55A6.82024K54.40529540nntp3.onemain.comoutput=gplain

2358. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-03 23:50:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403185056.11951.00000558@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90422

>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/3/2004 10:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040403115028.17713.00000176@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (ugly
>little mentally-seven-year-old very-amateur extra) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
>>>
>>> I know "rocket science" after working three years at
>>> Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
>>> of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
>>> engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
>>
>> I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier
>ashtrays
>>and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably
>even
>>picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long enough
>>to get his pants off....
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...ugly little comment from an ugly little person.
>
> Members of the Technical Staff III didn't do janitorial services at
> Rocketdyne. That was my work title...(SNIP)

That >>IS<< what all your pontificating, strutting and crowing is ALL
about, Lennie...

Titles...

You belittle every licensed Radio Amateur for alledgedly being predisposed
with "rank, title and priviledge", yet it's your own "rank, title and
priviledge" that you want to talk about here.

Hot flash, Lennie...

All that spouting about Rocketdyne, your FCC first phone ticket, etc etc etc got you absolutely not ONE step closer to being a licensed Amateur.

Not one.

> The Deformable Mirror program...(SNIP)

...has absolutely nothing to do with Amateur Radio, BPL, Morse Code testing, my service in the Marines or your lack of any practical experience in the Amateur Radio Service, although I am sure it helped you vent a lot of frustration and made you feel like a big man for reciting it yet again...

And through ALL OF THAT, you're STILL a putz.

Sheeeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

2359. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:05:11 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94C0C21809B8Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90423

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040403142820.12769.00000116@mb-m16.aol.com:

> In article <20040403065912.05025.00000179@mb-m17.aol.com>,
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is
>>>$40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and
>>>setup is $600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband
>>>being available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some
>>>people sell it when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the
>>>setup fee is still $240. That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not
>>>$24.
>>
>>When DSL first appeared, there were substantial setup and equipment
>>fees. They
>>have pretty much gone by the wayside now.
>>>
>>>In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side
>>>of the street!
>>
>>?? How wide is your street?
>>
>>Or do your utilities run behind the houses, as they do here?
>>
>>>One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my
>>>neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows
>>>someone who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi,
>>>but says they lose the connection when it rains!
>>
>>Lot of new 802.11() systems that are a lot more robust than earlier
>>ones.
>
> IEEE 802.15 and IEEE 802.16 standards are for metropolitan
> systems using wireless access.
>
> Complete specifications are available to the public for download
> at no charge.
>
> The colloquial term "Wi-Fi" is for wired systems using other IEEE
> 802 standards.

>
> LHA / WMD
>

The point is do something cheaper than the satellite. Anything really
intended to work a block away probably wouldn't be.

2360. kc8ldo trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:07:25 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <3f12605d43fdf80c2cfe938c58466e9d@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 90425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Included Page: groups?selm=b55A6.82024K54.40529540nntp3.onemain.comoutput=gplain

2361. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:07:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <dV2dnaFZwZmXz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90424

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Subject: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
'Youngest
> >Extra')
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
> >Date: 4/2/2004 7:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
> >
> >I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
> >rag on each other endlessly.alt"
> >and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to
discuss
> >amateur radio regulatory and policy
> >issues ...
> >
> >I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that
is
> >OT and doesn't belong here ...
> >most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed
to
> >be for because of the volume
> >of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
> >
> >Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
> >rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
> >this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly -
to
> >provide a place for the serious
> >regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
> >sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
> >fest that you guys have going on here ...
> >
> >OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
> >deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Thank-you for having expressed your God Given Opinon in accordance
with
> your Constitutional Rights, Carl.
>
> Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve ... why the [expletive deleted for Jim's benefit] do you have to play
the "veterans" card?
I have an honorable discharge, too ... Vietnam era, though I never left the
states ... but I don't see a need to flaunt it ... why do you seem to play
on your military service when you don't have a good excuse for bad behavior?

Carl - wk3c

2362. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:11:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <-VydnYUm2-Vrz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90426

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >'Youngest Extra')
[snip]

> Gentlemen, your comments are well spoken and have much merit.
>
> I wonder why, however, many of you selectively decide when to complain
> about the "noise".

Steve,

The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have nothing to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal grudges and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally dominating the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.

I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't around any more because they got sick of wading through all of the extraneous crap ...
our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks' contributions to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...

Carl - wk3c

2363. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:29:17 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94C0C62D9C650elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90427

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040403065912.05025.00000179@mb-m17.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is
>>$40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and
>>setup is $600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband
>>being available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some people
>>sell it when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the setup fee is
>>still $240. That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not $24.
>
> When DSL first appeared, there were substantial setup and equipment
> fees. They have pretty much gone by the wayside now.

True enough. Maybe this will happen with satellite eventually. We may just
have to wait.

>>
>>In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side
>>of the street!
>
> ?? How wide is your street?

It's a main road, but not a divided highway. It's not particularly wide.
The houses on the other side have their back yards facing the main road and
they are in subdivisions. We are not in a subdivision and have no
neighbours. If we were, then we would have an antenna covenant! That is the
supreme irony, if we were across the road and could get broadband I
couldn't put up antennas. I think dial-up and antennas is the better
choice.

>
> Or do your utilities run behind the houses, as they do here?

The power lines run across my front yard, as does the cable from the cable
company. However, they wouldn't let the previous owner of this house have
cable TV service, saying that it is a main transmission cable not a
distribution cable! OTOH, the power lines are close enough that BPL is a
real worry. Still, they will be Part 15, so as a licenced user I will be
able to get them to shut their whole system down, right?

>
>>One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my
>>neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows

>>someone who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi,
>>but says they lose the connection when it rains!
>
> Lot of new 802.11() systems that are a lot more robust than earlier
> ones.
>>
>>BPL is set to cost only about as much as DSL and maybe nothing to
>>install. Some people would go for it just because they don't have a
>>spare 600 bucks to buy and set up a satellite system. I would almost be
>>tempted if it wasn't for ham radio. Cable Internet is $55/mo here. That
>>includes $15/mo for basic cable TV, whether you want it or not. DSL is
>>$35/mo. I am sure that some people would try BPL instead, as it doesn't
>>need extra wires or Wi-Fi.
>>
> Some form of special modem is needed for BPL, and it is proprietary to
> the particular system in use because they're all different. Your cable
> modem and DSL prices are higher than we pay here ($43 and $30,
> respectively) and the prices keep dropping. Verizon, for one, offers
> package deals where POTS, DSL and cell phone service are all bundled
> together for a very reasonable price.
>

We have Verizon here too. I don't think they charge everyone the same
prices, though.

> There are some new BPL articles on the ARRL website. Worth a read.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2364. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:39:37 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040403193937.27035.00000632@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90429

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 ï¿½ April 2, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1390 with a release date of Friday, April 2nd, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio helps with a rescue at sea, the Federal Emergency Management Agency clarifies its position on Broadband Over Powerlines as B-P-L technology brings lots of radio noise Manassas, Virginia. Hear it for yourself on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1390 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO

A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly, Australia picks up the story from here:

--

Bernie VK2ABN on March 4 was in QSO with VK2ABT/VK3ACA and heard a weak and distorted signal, KA7MWL Shawn, who was aboard a Ukrainian registered schooner sailing from Wellington NZ to Sydney Aust., sails had blown out and they were making slow progress just on 4 knots.

At that speed they had calculated that they would run out of fuel before reaching port. Bernie VK2ABN ascertained 6 people were on board, BUT NO EPIRB! All this information was relayed to Sea Safety Canberra.

With the schooners satellite communication system also out of action, the Ham aboard, Shawn KA7MWL operating around 5 watts on 7070 Khz was the only contact.

Sea Safety Canberra QSY'd from 8176 kHz to the 40 meter band but as their transmitter was in Charleville, SW Queensland, no contact could be established.

Bernie arranged a for sked in 24 hours time, this time things a lot better, radio and safety wise, the schooner expected in Sydney ahead of previously estimated time.

As Bernie said: "I hadn't realised you can now call MAYDAY on the various DISTRESS frequencies but nobody is listening any more. Since the advent of GMDSS a computer scans the frequencies looking for encoded tones. If it finds one it attracts human intervention."

VK2ABN Bernie says " It was a bit like the Tony Hancock Radio Ham Sketch in retrospect, anyway that's what his wife thought and our telephone sure ran hot for a couple days!"

--

According to Q-News, the Sydney Australia Water Police stayed in contact with VK2ABN to keep abreast of the situation. With no High Frequency facilities that could hear the stricken craft, they were totally reliant on ham radio. (Q-News)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: CLARIFYING FEMA'S CLARIFICATION ON BPL

The debate surrounding Broadband Over Powerline Internet access has taken a new twist. Opponents are now raising fears about the contents of a letter recently released in the FCC's BPL public comment files. It was sent by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's top administrator to FCC Chairman, Michael Powell. Opponents say the letter clearly shows FEMA is now reversing course on its vehement opposition to nationwide BPL deployment. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz NT3V has the very latest

--

The letter was written by Michael Brown, Undersecretary of Emergency Preparedness and Response in the Department of Homeland Security. That's where the Federal Emergency Management Agency was placed in President Bush's restructuring of agencies related to the security of the United States.

Brown's letter to Powell actually was briefly mentioned in February articles on the FCC's BPL action that were written for two nationally-circulated computer magazines. But it apparently got little notice and its contents were not fully detailed.

Now that the letter is part of the FCC BPL file, its contents are in the public arena.

Brown tells Powell in the letter dated January 8 that FEMA wants to clarify its December filing so it is "not misunderstood or misconstrued."

Brown goes on to say FEMA is aware that some of what he labels "distinct approaches" to BPL may cause interference to FEMA's H-F emergency communications network.

But then, and this is the section that has BPL opponents worried, Brown writes: "However, we continue to study the BPL proceeding and

have not concluded there is a material interference problem or that all of the distinct technological approaches to BPL pose risk of interference."

Compare that to the language in FEMA's December 2003 filing on BPL with the commission prepared by Barry West, FEMA's chief information officer.

West writes: "FEMA has grave concerns regarding the interference that likely would be caused to government communications by unlicensed BPL systems."

Or this comment: "This interference will severely impair FEMA's mission-essential HF radio operations in areas serviced by BPL technology."

In an interview with a Philadelphia radio station, a FEMA spokesman insisted there is no material change in the agency's position.

The spokesman says Brown's letter was sent to Chairman Powell to clarify that FEMA is still studying the issue and recognizes and supports the FCC's desire for a greater broadband capability for the nation.

The spokesman says Brown wants to see more studies on the interference issue and is working with other federal agencies.

However, the FEMA spokesman emphasized that any deployment of BPL should not pose an interference threat to the agency's H-F emergency communications network.

Those close to the BPL debate say Brown's letter, has only muddied the agency's position and sections could be embraced by both sides.

We'll let you decide.

Come to our website: www.arnewsline.org and click on this week's script and select the Text script and scroll to this report to find the internet U-R-Ls leading directly to Brown's letter and FEMA's original December filing.

(Letter from Michael Brown, Undersecretary of Emergency Preparedness and Response, FEMA. January 8, 2004)

<http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516083909>

(FEMA's December 2003 filing)

<http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6515292045>

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--
In a communication posted to members of its Public Relations Reflector, the American Radio Relay League suggests avoiding references to the FEMA position for now in any BPL discussions or comments. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: BIG NOISE IN MANASSAS

BPL has come to Manassas, Virginia and the hams there say that its not fun to listen to:

--

BPL audio

That's the racket being created by the latest of three Broadband Over Powerline or BPL installations opened in Manassas. This, as provided in a sound file on the www.W4OVH.org website, courtesy of George Tarnovsky, KE2AM. The interference level appears to be such that it would be all but impossible to hear a radio signal through it.

The kicker here is that this is reported to be an underground electrical feed that utilities claim are far less noisy than overhead wiring. However, having the wires underground does not seem to reduce the interference. At least not in this case.

And if you want to know more about the BPL hazard to America's communications, go get a copy of the of CQ. Joe Lynch, N6CL has an excellent analysis article in his "VHF Plus" column in the just out April issue of that magazine. (VHF Reflector, PR Reflector, W2VU)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: SOUTHERN OREGON GOES GLASS

Meantime, to the West in Oregon there's some good news on the BPL front. It comes from southern Oregon where the obnoxious radio pollution of BPL has lost out to quiet fiber optic delivery.

According to Doug Beck, K6ZX, in the town of Merlin, a private company, forming public and private partnerships with local government has wired the city of Ashland with what's called the Ashland Fiber Network. It has also extended fiber to the city of Medford with some 74 miles of glass cable connecting all schools to provide VOIP audio and video conferencing.

But that's not all. The partnership is also in the process of connecting to Grants Pass and will wire all the local schools and government offices as well. The best part is that all excess bandwidth is being made available to local citizens and wireless last mile technology is being explored to connect rural users.

Beck says over the VHF Reflector that the area is aiming to have a broadband connection available to all rural users without any Broadband over Powerlines in the area. (VHF Reflector)

**

Break 1

From beneath the Southern Cross in Auckland, New Zealand and from our studios in Los Angeles, California, this is the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Metro Atlanta Telephone Pioneer Amateur Radio Club net in Atlanta Georgia.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: SWEDEN GOES CODE FREE

It now looks likely that Swedish radio amateurs with a Class 2 license which is the equivalent of our code free Technician class, will be allowed to operate on the High Frequency bands as of early April. The decision to drop the Morse code requirement for an HF bands license in Sweden had been postponed from the 1st of January. A note in the March issue of QTC, the Swedish national society's magazine, suggested that on or about April 1st is when the change will be made. (GB2RS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NO "DELIVER IT" ON 2 METERS

Using an illegal long range cordless telephone to deliver culinary delights is going to cost a New Jersey Chinese restaurant a good part of its profits. This, after the FCC levies a $10,000 against the eatery for operating transmitting equipment on 2 meters without a license. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, has more:

--

Duckworth: "A Notice of Apparent Liability to Monetary Forfeiture in the amount of $10000 went to Best Wok of Westville, New Jersey. An agent of the Philadelphia office had DF'd the signal on 145.8376 MHz and inspected the base and mobile units. The restaurant manager stated that he had purchased the long range cordless telephone system in another country and brought it to the United States to operate at the restaurant."

--

The FCC citation issued to Best Wok indicated that the telephone in question is not FCC Part 15 certified and is illegal to use in the United States. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: IT AIN'T USER RIGHTS

A California ham is the latest to be told by the FCC that if he wants to challenge a repeater operators authority to kick him off a system, he will have to do it elsewhere. That the FCC will nor reconsider the matter.

The situation involves Mark A. Glover, KE6TTL of Garden Grove. Apparently, Glover has complained to the FCC about his being banned from using a repeater owned by the Catalina Repeater Association with the apparent blessing of the FCC. This in a letter from the regulatory agency to Glover back on February 2nd.

In responding to Glover's February 26th complaint, the FCC says that its letter of February 2nd explained the right of the repeater association to make such a request. Also, if Glover has an objection to the decision of the repeater owner, that he is free to pursue legal action locally. But says the FCC it won't be involved. There are no Commission hearing procedures are provided in such matters. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TWO PEOPLE - ONE CALL

The actions of a New York ham in obtaining a call sign have come under FCC scrutiny. Again, the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, N-N-Zero-W:

--

Duckworth: "A letter went to Frank C. Richards, KG2IJ, of Moers New York concerning an application filed in 1995 where he requested the call KB4VU be changed to the next systematically assigned, to change his address to New York, and to renew the license. Frank C. Richards of Ft. Meyers, Florida, claims that he is the real licensee of KB4VU, and filed no application for a call sign or address changes and has never lived in New York."

--

The FCC says that this raises questions about abuse of the licensing system and the agency is investigating. It has asked the New York Richards to provide documented information on where he previously lived in Florida, when he moved to New York and all FCC Amateur Service licenses that he previously held. (FCC, RAIN)

**

WITH NEWSLINE: MENTORING PROGRAM UNDERWAY

Joe Eisenberg, K0NEB, who is running the database for the Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project says that the first matches have been made. These are in California with one being an e-mail only contact due to distance.

Joe says more match-ups are on the way. Hopefully as the database builds we will be able to make all matches face to face.

If you want to volunteer for the program or are in need of an Elmer to help you learn more, just e-mail us. The address is mentor@arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAMFESTS: GAITHERSBERG - RIP

Some news from the hamfest circuit. After struggling to rebuild attendance from two moves the past four years, organizers in Maryland have canceled the 2004 descendant of what was once the popular "Gaithersburg Hamfest." This was a show that dated back to the 1950s. Amateur Radio Newsline's Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB reports from Annapolis:

--

"There appears to be no support for this event from the member clubs of the Foundation or their respective members," according to Dan Blasberg, KA8YPY, president of the Foundation for Amateur Radio (FAR).

The group consists of a coalition of ham radio clubs in the Maryland, Washington, and northern Virginia region, and has used hamfest revenue to fund scholarships. In recent years it co-sponsored the event with one of its member clubs, the Columbia Amateur Radio Association (CARA).

Expressing his dismay that only two people had stepped forward from FAR to help stage the hamfest that had been scheduled for Sept. 11th and 12th Blasburg, said the lack of volunteer help is "not fair" to "carry the burden of a project of this magnitude and scope."

Blasburg concluded "it has been decided by the leadership of FAR and CARA to cancel Fall-Fest 2004 (due) to lack of volunteer participation." His note initially went out on an email reflector and since has circulated widely.

Blasburg this past week was hopeful his note would prompt people to step forward to help, but then, on March 27th, hamfest officials were openly talking about the cancellation and the withdrawal of the site reservation in West Friendship, Maryland.

What used to be the popular Gaithersburg Hamfest relocated to a parking lot outside a baseball field in Bowie Maryland in 1999, struggling as a local fleamarket no where near the size of the original site. A move to the Howard County Fairgrounds in 2002 did not help matters much, with attendance gaining marginally.

With the old Gaithersburg Hamfest now GONE, the successor as the largest in the mid-Atlantic region may now be the Timonium Hamfests at the Maryland State Fairgrounds north of Baltimore, where two clubs

sponsor a Spring and a Fall Timonium

Paul Courson, WA3VJB, Annapolis reporting for Newsline.

--

Thanks Paul. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAMVENTION 2004: THE FCC WILL BE THERE

Some much more positive news comes from Dayton, Ohio. This with word that two of ham radio's most popular speakers will be back at Hamvention 2004. Of coarse we are talking about the FCC's chief ham radio rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, and FCC rules man Bill Cross, W3TN.

The two were missing from last years Hamvention due to a scheduling snafu. As planners put together this years outing, the duo was among the very first scheduled in. You will find them holding forth from on Saturday, May 15th from 10 a.m. to noon in Hara Arena Meeting Room 1. If you want to know exactly what's happening at the FCC and how it will affect ham radio, this is the event to be at. (ARNewsline (tm), Hamvention(r))

**

HAMFESTS: THE URUNGA RADIO CONVENTION

And speaking about hamfests, heres on that's a bit unusual. Its the annual Easter Convention scheduled for Saturday the 10th and Easter Sunday the 11th of April at the Senior Citizen's Hall in the city of Urunga, Uganda. Events include a 3.5 MHz mobile hunt, pedestrian on 2 meter T-Hunt, a 2 meter mobile multi transmitter hunt and lots more. Sunday will feature the famous Urunga scramble. A mini contest to see who can make the most contacts in 30 minutes. Its a great show, if you happen to be in Uganda an Easter weekend. (Q-News)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM HELP: GET WELL WALLY

Unless you live in the American West where this newscast is produced, you are not aware of the contributions of Wally Foster, N6CDJ. Those who do know that Wally has been a huge contributor to ham radio in the state of California.

Over the years, N6CDJ has been responsible for thousands of hours dedicated to installing the region's packet radio system. He has also introduced many to packet and APRS and volunteers a lot of time to emergency services, fundraising, climbing towers and doing a first-rate job with repeater and station installations.

Wally's in a tough personal battle right now. Please drop him a QSL with a "get well Wally" message top help keep his spirits up during a trying time. You can send your wishes to N6CDJ at his callbook address. (AA6JR)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: MESH NETWORKS RADIO RELAY SYSTEM

On the emerging technology front, Mesh Networks, whose emergency-response devices communicate through each other rather than through a centralized command is expanding its technology. This, to work on other kinds of wireless equipment including radios used by emergency service communicators. Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, has more:

--

Originally developed by the U.S. military, Mesh system of networking lets individual radios serve as repeaters and relay points. This means that a firefighter too far inside a building to reach his command post can communicate with a nearby firefighter, whose radio will then repeat the conversation to the next closest radio. This is similar to hams using a programmable mobile radio to extend the hand of their 2 meter or 70 centimeter H-T..

And just like hams have been experimenting, Mesh networks can transmit video, data and position information in addition to audio. But heres the departure fronm what radio amateurs are doing. The Mesh technology also has the ability to create super-sized Wi-Fi hot spots. This in itself gives the system wide utility in public service applications.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Rick Johnson, KA9VZD, reporting.

--

Mesh Networks says that it is recognized as the leading developer of high performance and scaleable mobile ad hoc networking technology. More about the company and its products is on-line at www.meshnetworks.com. (Press release)

**

HAM AWARDS: THE VP5 YOUNG CONTESTER

If you are age 18 or younger, a licensed radio amateur and have been dreaming about going on a D-X contest, listen up. This next story is for you.

For the second year in a row, a competition has been announced for keen young contest operators with just such a dream. The winner gets an all-expenses paid trip to the Turks and Caicos Islands to operate with the VP5X Contest Group in the CQ World Wide DX phone contest this October.

Applicants must send an essay of 500 words or more telling how they got started in ham radio. It also must describe the person who helped them get started in the hobby and why you should be selected for this contest DX'pedition to VP5.

The winner must have his or her parents' written permission to make the trip on their own. Parents may accompany the winner at their own expense. All entries should be sent by e-mail to contests@vp5x.com by the 31st of August. (GB2RS)

**

HAM AWARDS: 2004 YHOTY NOMINATIONS BEING SOUGHT

And while we are at it, its time to announce the opening of the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award. This program is open to any FCC licensed youngster age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states. One who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

As we have said in years past, this award is not a contest for a prize. The person selected "Young Ham of the Year" is judged on his or her contributions to society through Amateur Radio. By way of example, a youngster whose only claim to fame is that of being licensed as an Extra at age four would not necessarily be judge as having made a significant contribution to the Amateur Radio service. On the other hand, a 14 or 15 year old Novice or Technician running a net during a major disaster or crisis would definitely be given consideration.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st. (ARNewsline (tm))

**

DX

In D-X, W3EF reports that the 3B9C dxpedition has already made over 110,000 contacts and with any luck will soon be the biggest dxpedition in history. He says that besides the sheer volume, this has also been a carefully planned and executed operation with strict attention to details such as propagation on all bands to all

regions. W3EF says it has been an absolute blast with a wonderful team from all over the world. At airtime the 3B9C operation continues. (W3EF)

In other D-X news, word that K5CM, N5KW and W5AO plan to operate portable VP5 from North Caicos island through the 7th of April. The island counts as NA-002 for the IOTA awards. (GB2RS)

Also, F8DVD, will be active slash JW from Svalbard on 80 to 10 meters to the 10th of April. He says that although it will be very hard to make contacts on 80 meters due to the very short night, he will make several attempts to do so. (GB2RS)

Lastly, PA9JJ will be active as C56JJ from Gambia until the 5th of April. Look for him especially on the WARC bands and on RTTY and PSK 31. For all these operations, QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: FCC MAY MANDATE IONESPHERIC DELAY

And finally, a little-known provision of a bill to crack down on indecency on the airwaves may directly affect Amateur Radio. It went into effect at 00:01 UTC on April 1st. Roving reporter Pierre Pullinmyleg, F0OL, reports:

--

I'ts a rather -- er -- interesting -- audio only -- April 1st report. To hear it download the newscast MP3 file at http://www.arnewsline.org/quincy If you miss Pierre this week you will have to wait another year before he returns.

--

Thank you, Pierre, and we hope you can get back to warmer weather without any -- er -- long delay. (F0OL)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline. Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066 in the U-S-A.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, in Auckland, New Zealand, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

2365. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:39:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031639.42c8628a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90428

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<406360CE.3020603@ix.netcom.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> >Cell on VHF? Must be something new.
> >
> Some company wanted to do that with low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites a few
> years ago. They were eyeing 2m and 222 and 70cm, as well as other spectra.

Let's get Dyno-mite JJ's take on VHF cell phones.

2366. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 00:56:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031656.4b23922e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90430

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
> rag on each other endlessly.alt"
> and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
> amateur radio regulatory and policy
> issues ...
>
> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
> OT and doesn't belong here ...
> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
> be for because of the volume
> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
> Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
> rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
> this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
> provide a place for the serious
> regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
> sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
> fest that you guys have going on here ...
>
> OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
> deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

Carl, Steve needs professional help.

bb

2367. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:16:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031716.66739d75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90431

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402113011.09718.00000396@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/1/2004 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011858.18b8561a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040401101502.12182.00000543@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 3/31/2004 5:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403311509.fd4e2bb@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040331103636.03625.00000378@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> Does it matter?
> >> >
> >> >Do you matter?
> >>
> >> Of course I do. Just like you matter.
> >
> >Now you're lying again. You've treated a whole parade of people on
> >rrap as if they were chewing gum or worse stuck to the sole of your
> >jump boots.
>
> Too bad for you, Brain, that you can't see beyond your own wounded pride.

Why do you shit on your fellow amateurs?

2368. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:18:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031718.52b07ef0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90432

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040401095506.12182.00000540@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >> VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
> >> by the Commission.
> >
> >How do you know?
>
> Ouiji Board.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The Occult might be why you're so whacked out and angry with your fellow man.

I believe you to be dangerous.

2369. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:23:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031723.15bec9ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90433

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040403142821.12769.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> >> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
> >> OT and doesn't belong here ...
> >> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
> >> be for because of the volume
> >> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
> >
> > Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
> >affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
> >avoid it.
>
> "Noise" can be much reduced by making and installing appropriate
> shielding structures.
>
> The key to happiness and nirvana would be a restricted-access
> newsgroup, moderated so that all got along happily ever after.
> That is the "shielding" which can be applied to keep out independent
> thought, outside interference, and find sanctuary for all worshipping
> the past of "the service" just like they had to do.
>
> Of course someone who has bad screen days in here should
> expend the effort to begin constructing such "shielding." Everyone
> talks about it but no one is doing anything about it.
>
> "Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain." - anon.
>
> LHA / WMD

Maybe nocall JJ should be the moderator. He has shown a propensity to
know what is right and just, and having no call, could be a proponent
for the unlicensed and unwashed.

And if you don't believe me, just ask him.

bb

2370. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:26:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031726.5f07e9f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90434

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403300947.355e5f2@posting.google.com>...
>
> Ahem, not so fast Slick Quixoterobeson.
>
> Back up and reply to the previous post.
>
> If you don't or won't, then you just deal in untruths.

Steve, you still out there???

2371. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:29:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031729.13a4a5b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90435

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040329152459.12851.00000106@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0403290521.ca65c9f@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >news:<E_ednaWG3MzZ8PrdRVn-vg@gbronline.com>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> > Hello? What does "N-ZERO-IMD" look like written out?
> >> >
> >> > Hint: N0IMD. November Zero India Mama Delta
> >> >
> >> > Brian Burke. Check it out on QRZ.com.
> >> >
> >> > Brian been here for a while...good ham, independent thinker.
> >> >
> >> > You thoudn't be thuch a thinker.
> >> >
> >> > Plank
> >> >
> >> > LHA / WMD
> >>
> >> Hello? So why does he use the name William? Why not his real name if
> >> that is who he is? I don't know that William is Brian Burke or
> >> billybeeper or whatever other name he may post under, why should I place
> >> any stock in what he claims if he has to use so many names?
> >> He uses an id of juno.com, yet he is posting from google, that dosen't
> >> sound like one can put much stock in anything he says.
> >> So what's your call lennyboy? Oh, forgot, you can't pass the test so
> >> here you are a non-ham who has no credibility on a ham group.
> >
> >So JJ doesn't have a name or a callsign?
> >
> >No credibility.
>
> All he is is the equivalent of heavy breathing at the other end of
> an obscene phone call.
>
> Maybe it's just some AI program? Lots of Artificiality in that
> "Intelligence"... :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

JJ just leetle feesh in leetle pond. Got chased out of CB, so trying to make splash here. Say he speak for SecDEF and DirFEMA. I say he whacko.

2372. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:34:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031734.3d266e7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90436

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040403115028.17713.00000176@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (ugly

> >...Probably even picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a > >bar long enough to get his pants off....
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...ugly little comment from an ugly little person.

Steve really does have a predeliction for homosexual suggestion.

Wonder if he belongs to NAMBLA HAMS?

2373. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:39:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031739.e4ec8b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90437

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
> Putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Forever calling other people names.

2374. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:44:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <bdCdnTsgPbIK9fLdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90438

Radionews wrote:
> Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 ï¿½ April 2, 2004
>
>
> Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1390 with a release date of
> Friday, April 2nd, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.
>
> The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio helps with a rescue at sea, the
> Federal Emergency Management Agency clarifies its position on
> Broadband Over Powerlines as B-P-L technology brings lots of radio
> noise Manassas, Virginia. Hear it for yourself on Amateur Radio
> Newsline report number 1390 coming your way right now.
>
>
>
> (Billboard Cart Here)
>
> **
>
>
> RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
>
>
> A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
> lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
> Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
> stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
> Australia picks up the story from here:
>
>
> --
>
>
> Bernie VK2ABN on March 4 was in QSO with VK2ABT/VK3ACA and heard a
> weak and distorted signal, KA7MWL Shawn, who was aboard a Ukrainian
> registered schooner sailing from Wellington NZ to Sydney Aust.,
> sails had blown out and they were making slow progress just on 4
> knots.
>
>
> At that speed they had calculated that they would run out of fuel
> before reaching port. Bernie VK2ABN ascertained 6 people were on
> board, BUT NO EPIRB! All this information was relayed to Sea Safety
> Canberra.

>
>
> With the schooners satellite communication system also out of action,
> the Ham aboard, Shawn KA7MWL operating around 5 watts on 7070 Khz was
> the only contact.
>
>
> Sea Safety Canberra QSY'd from 8176 kHz to the 40 meter band but as
> their transmitter was in Charleville, SW Queensland, no contact
> could be established.
>
> Bernie arranged a for sked in 24 hours time, this time things a lot
> better, radio and safety wise, the schooner expected in Sydney ahead
> of previously estimated time.
>
>
> As Bernie said: "I hadn't realised you can now call MAYDAY on the
> various DISTRESS frequencies but nobody is listening any more. Since
> the advent of GMDSS a computer scans the frequencies looking for
> encoded tones. If it finds one it attracts human intervention."
>
>
> VK2ABN Bernie says " It was a bit like the Tony Hancock Radio Ham
> Sketch in retrospect, anyway that's what his wife thought and our
> telephone sure ran hot for a couple days!"
>
>
> --
>
>
> According to Q-News, the Sydney Australia Water Police stayed in
> contact with VK2ABN to keep abreast of the situation. With no High
> Frequency facilities that could hear the stricken craft, they were
> totally reliant on ham radio. (Q-News)
>

I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2375. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:46:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031746.77d6cac5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90439

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<XZ6dncYfqubYR_HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>...
>
> And I've heard that in the OB-GYN category that it is nearly impossible to
> find one who will accept a high risk client these days.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Its just awful. We do emergency comms for the continuity of
government, and those awful citizens are suing the nice doctors. As
soon as we nationalize health care, all these bad people will just
have to lump it or leave it.

2376. Re: K4KWH now synonymous with N8WWM KC8LDO WA3MOJ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:52:49 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <12e9bfb0074afdd220782dc92e6b92e0@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 90443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

:)

2377. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 01:58:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031758.634a7e25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90440

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040403102339.12182.00000660@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/2/2004 7:33 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021733.20a7eb20@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040402114935.09718.00000400@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 4/1/2004 12:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404011041.64dca3ac@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040331111742.03625.00000385@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:22 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0403310622.4d23a727@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >I think I've risked a lot already for the people of Somalia.
> >> >>
> >> >> Your service in the US Air Force notwithstanding, I think you
> risked
> even
> >> >> more by making statements in a public forum that were found to be not
> true.
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >You are the only one who thinks that. Too bad for you.
> >>
> >> Oh?
> >>
> >> I don't see "everyone" tripping over themselves to "cover your back".
> >>
> >> >Now what about you serving in Somalia? You up to it?
> >>
> >> Sure. Are you? I might even get in some LEGAL operating time,
> Brain.
> >> You could too, if you follow instructions.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ

> >
> >Congratulations, kook.
>
> I am not the one professing to have "operated" from Somalia...

Nor will you. Lots of people, you included, are too chicken $hit to
go out where the rubber meets the road.

2378. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 02:05:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90441

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040403101528.12182.00000659@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: All that flappin'
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/2/2004 7:19 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021719.696ae7b3@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
> >> EVERY nurse or paramedic is "selective (in) who he would treat in an
> >> emergency".
> >>
> >> It's called "triage".
> >
> >Back peddle. Tap dance. Cover up what you know you meant.
>
> And YOU "know" what I meant, Brain?

I said that >>>you<<< know what you meant.

> You don't even know what YOU mean...

I'll leave it to the trial lawyers when they drag your posts thru a
malpractice suit. Idiot.

> >You really should stop making stupid statements concerning who you
> >would and would not treat in your profession.
>
> There's nothing "stupid" about it. Black, Red, Yellow or Green. You get
> treated accordingly.

Sorry, Steve, but I'm neither black, red, nor yellow (who'se
green???). I'm caucasian like almost all hams. Do you refuse to
treat caucasians?

2379. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 02:09:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404031809.4b672de0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90442

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve abuses your sacrifice.

2380. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 02:32:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403213239.15123.00000165@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90444

In article <PradnU775f5DvvLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv1vyh4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
>> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>>
>>
>>>On 23 Mar 2004 16:58:44 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly
>>>
>>>by
>>>
>>>cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.
>>>
>>> We call them "tract mansions"..... <ggg>
>>
>>
>> HAW!
>>
>>> We have a half-dozen of them going up near here in an area that was
>>> last developed twenty years ago. Just for yah-yahs I'm going to
>>> check out the CC&Rs after they are open for sale.
>>
>>
>> Probably don't allow you to have a pair of rabbit ears on the TV set.
>>
>> What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the
>> McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised.
>Now
>> they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here in
>the
>> Philadelphia area.
>
> Not uncommon at all, Jim. In my area, we have farmers that hve sold off

>land for development, after which the people that moved into the
>development sued to shut the farmer down because of the noxious smells
>emanating from the farm.

Now that's dumb!
>
> I don't blame it entirely on the people suing, the farmer had to be
>pretty stupid to not know that "development people don't like nature
>very much.......
>
How would the farmer know?

This past Wednesday, I was in Lancaster County, PA. Amish/Mennonite country, although development is pushing many of the Old Order out. We stopped at the Wawa at the intersection of 30 and 896. In three directions there were outlet malls and retail stores. In the fourth direction was a working farm, and a farmer with a team of 6 horses cultivating. The smell was definitely rural but not unpleasant.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2381. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 02:47:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90445

William wrote:

> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
>>>>example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
>>>>are
>>>>somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>>>>shown
>>>>no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
>>>>signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>>>>immunizations.
>>>
>>>The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
>>>controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
>>>diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"
>
>
> TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
> you tell me what caused it?
>
> Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
> it his own immunizations?
>
> Do you know?

No I don't, and I'm sorry to hear that, Brian.

From what I have read, seen, and heard, I doubt it is chemicals put
into *you*. Most of that stuff is not good for you, though. And the rise
in autism doesn't correlate too well with immunizations IMO.

Here is my take on why a lot of children have developmental problems
that seem to be on the increase, per capita wise:

I think think there is a chemical problem in general. I think that
possibly a combination of food additives and chemicals that are making
people ill and interfering with proper development.

Here's an interesting link:

http://www.nontoxic.com/nontoxic/injured.html

lots of chemicals that we are using on a daily basis are not good for us at all.

and

http://www.edelsoncenter.com/aut_chem.htm

yet another link dealing with premature puberty:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/479363.stm

http://www.emagazine.com/november-december_1997/1197gl_health.html

The last links are here because kids are being exposed to these chemicals that mimic hormones and mess with their proper development.

<snippage>

There are so many chemicals that we are putting in our bodies, from the preservatives in vaccinations, to the carcinogens that we clean our carpets with, and then put our babies down on those same carpets thinking that they now have a clean healthy place to play in. We seal our houses tightly to save money on fuel, and then breathe formaldehyde contaminated air from the carpets, insulation, and paneling. We eat meat that has been raised with hormones and antibiotics so that it grows quicker. When I was a coach, an amazing amount of the kids playing on my teams had to use inhalers for their asthma. These are supposedly healthy kids - they are not.

How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is doing what?

What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2382. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 02:52:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lOOdnZ59mtTN5fLdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90446

William wrote:

> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0403310558.e98dd22@posting.google.com>...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<f6qdnfEztvvc5_XdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
>>
>>
>>> Oh well, I have mixed thoughts on the "new censorship " going on. I
>>>prefer the airways cleaned up, but I would just as soon have Howard
>>>removed from them because he stinks than for his profanity.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>Few practice personal responsibility.
>>
>>My rule is that if its indecent for children, its indecent for adults.
>
>
> Mike, do you disagree? Stebe, ditto?

I think that there is a difference between children and adults.
Obviously sexual activity is one difference. For kids, it isn't good,
but for adults, if it goes away, we are just like the Shakers. Humanity
goes away after a generation.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2383. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 03:03:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <neednUCP8P6R4vLdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90447

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>
> The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have nothing
> to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal grudges
> and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally dominating
> the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
>
> I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't around
> any more because they got sick of wading through all of the extraneous crap
> ...
> our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks' contributions
> to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

If you start ignoring lenny the lame, cber stevie the stupid, and wee
willie winkie, things get better.
>

2384. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 03:11:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <w8CdnX-23uLZHPLdRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90448

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
>
> I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I wondered the same thing Mike.

2385. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 03:38:45 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040403223845.788$AC@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90449

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >
> > The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have
> > nothing to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with
> > personal grudges and vendettas have reached a level where they are
> > almost totally dominating the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
> >
> > I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't
> > around any more because they got sick of wading through all of the
> > extraneous crap ...
> > our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks'
> > contributions to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> If you start ignoring lenny the lame, cber stevie the stupid, and wee
> willie winkie, things get better.
> >
>
Don't forget no-call JJ, he goes by kid dyno-mite on his cb.

2386. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 04:17:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90450

Radionews wrote:

>
> RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
>
>
> A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
> lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
> Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
> stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
> Australia picks up the story from here:

And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.

2387. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 04:21:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <wISdnT6Fu530DvLdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90451

Radionews wrote:

>
>
> But then, and this is the section that has BPL opponents worried,
> Brown writes: "However, we continue to study the BPL proceeding and
> have not concluded there is a material interference problem or that
> all of the distinct technological approaches to BPL pose risk of
> interference."
>

So looks like the BPL big money has gotten to Brown too. Wonder which
BPL provider he will be working for at a hugh salary when BPL gets rolling?

2388. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 04:59:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040403235905.10530.00000099@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 90452

In article <Xns94C0C62D9C650elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040403065912.05025.00000179@mb-m17.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns94BC39355DFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>The cheapest satellite Internet access in the US is Starband, which is
>>>$40/mo for 768k speed. However, the combined cost of equipment and
>>>setup is $600!!! This is why I still have dialup, no other broadband
>>>being available. It is possible to find the equipment used (some people
>>>sell it when they get DSL or cable in their area), but the setup fee is
>>>still $240. That's not a typo, it's $240 for setup, not $24.
>>
>> When DSL first appeared, there were substantial setup and equipment
>> fees. They have pretty much gone by the wayside now.
>
>True enough. Maybe this will happen with satellite eventually. We may just
>have to wait.

Or pay the $$ up front.
>
>>>In my case I think both DSL and cable are available on the other side
>>>of the street!
>>
>> ?? How wide is your street?
>
>It's a main road, but not a divided highway. It's not particularly wide.
>The houses on the other side have their back yards facing the main road and
>they are in subdivisions. We are not in a subdivision and have no
>neighbours. If we were, then we would have an antenna covenant! That is the
>supreme irony, if we were across the road and could get broadband I
>couldn't put up antennas. I think dial-up and antennas is the better
>choice.

Me too!

The main probelm with DSL is that the total cable length from your modem to the
telco's end is limited, and if you're too far away you cannot be served. Of
course they're building more infrastructure but that takes time and is focused
on the densest markets.
>
>> Or do your utilities run behind the houses, as they do here?

>
>The power lines run across my front yard, as does the cable from the cable
>company. However, they wouldn't let the previous owner of this house have
>cable TV service, saying that it is a main transmission cable not a
>distribution cable!

That may actually be true.

>OTOH, the power lines are close enough that BPL is a
>real worry. Still, they will be Part 15, so as a licenced user I will be
>able to get them to shut their whole system down, right?

That's what Mr. P says...
>
>>>One friend suggested I should get Wi-Fi and link into one of my
>>>neighbours, paying a cut towards their broadband bill. He knows
>>>someone who linked their house with their business premises by Wi-Fi,
>>>but says they lose the connection when it rains!
>>
>> Lot of new 802.11() systems that are a lot more robust than earlier
>> ones.
>>>
>>>BPL is set to cost only about as much as DSL and maybe nothing to
>>>install. Some people would go for it just because they don't have a
>>>spare 600 bucks to buy and set up a satellite system. I would almost be
>>>tempted if it wasn't for ham radio. Cable Internet is $55/mo here. That
>>>includes $15/mo for basic cable TV, whether you want it or not. DSL is
>>>$35/mo. I am sure that some people would try BPL instead, as it doesn't
>>>need extra wires or Wi-Fi.
>>>
>> Some form of special modem is needed for BPL, and it is proprietary to
>> the particular system in use because they're all different. Your cable
>> modem and DSL prices are higher than we pay here ($43 and $30,
>> respectively) and the prices keep dropping. Verizon, for one, offers
>> package deals where POTS, DSL and cell phone service are all bundled
>> together for a very reasonable price.
>
>We have Verizon here too. I don't think they charge everyone the same
>prices, though.

The prices quoted are for the Philadelphia metro area.
>
>> There are some new BPL articles on the ARRL website. Worth a read.
>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2389. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012232.20920.00000230@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90456

In article <1e4e3692.0404031729.13a4a5b6@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>JJ just leetle feesh in leetle pond. Got chased out of CB, so trying
>to make splash here. Say he speak for SecDEF and DirFEMA. I say he
>whacko.

No call = No ham

No JJ = No loss

LHA / WMD

2390. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012234.20920.00000231@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90455

In article <20040403184354.11951.00000557@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/3/2004 1:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040403142822.12769.00000118@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040403102850.12182.00000662@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Brain, you have yet to answer my question as to WHAT FCC or federal
>law
>>>mandated any "declaration" about using Farnsworth methodology for code test
>>>preparation.
>>
>> Brian did not bring this "declaration" up...that was another.
>
> Not int eh current course of exchanges, it asn't.
>
>> You are free to find your own sources of offical statements at the FCC
>> website using their own, publicly-available search facilities.
>>
>>> You DO have an answer, don't you?
>>
>> You CAN do your own searches, but contentiousness is so much
>> easier to do, a sort of instant satsifaction of personal irritation.
>
> Sure I can.

But you show NO sign of it. Saying you "can do something"
doesn't mean you CAN.

You want to be contentious, aggressive, and generally bad.
THAT you have proved over and over and over again.

> But in these changes, Brain was making the assertion.
>
> Or was that your hand up his backside making his mouth work again,
>Lennie?

See? There you go again with LIES and innuendo (apt homonym)
of homosexual behavior.

>>> I've read Part 97 a couple times and find nothing there that mandates
it.
>>>
>>> And I am also awaiting your answer as to WHAT "specification" exists
>>for
>>>"Morse Code".
>>
>> 97.3 (a) (27) - CCITT Recommendation F.1 (1984), Division B,
>> I. Morse code.
>>
>> That is as stated in the 1 October 2003 printed form of Title 47 C.F.R.
>> available from the Government Printing Office. That same definition
>> existed in the October 2005 Code of Federal Regulations.
>
> October 2005?

1 October 1995. Have to check out your responses, see if there's
any regress.

I have both year's printed copies. Paid for one, other was free.

> What happened to 1984 when VE testing began?

Did George Orwell write about it?

Or do you mean the CCITT document?

Check it out at the ITU website. You can order your own copy if
you wish. Lots of downloads there cost money and the revised
and re-nomenclatured document costs a moderate amount.

I have my copy. Paid for it.

Then you can find out exactly what the FCC definition reference
has in it.

If you do actually get one and read it, you will NOT find anything
describing "word rate." Indeed, you won't find a description of a
telegraphic "word."

>> There are several adult education courses available in your area to
>> improve your personal reading comprehension skills.
>
> But why?
>
> I read quite well, Lennie.
>
> Well enough, in fact, ot ahve caught you and your surrogate in a number
>of "newsgroup faux pas"

Of course...<snicker>...just like "ot ahve" that you wrote and did not
correct.

>>> More assertions without validation? Or is it OPINION, expressed just
>>>because you like to see your name in print...?!?!

>>
>> You have been repeatedly informed of the existing regulatory
>> specifications of and about International Morse Code. For years.
>
> But still you refuse to specifically cite it.
>
> I have yet to see a single "specification" that dictates character
>duration or spacing.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Not reading well at all.

The CCITT document referenced in 97.3 (a) (27) describes RELATIVE
dot-dash-spacing times.

Hello? Can you understand "relative?" Other than in a family way?

I've said two years ago that there's NO "word rate" or "word"
specification mentioned in Part 97, not even a reference to such
a document.

The latest print issue of Part 97 is 1 October 2003. You can get it
from the USGPO. Download on PDF is free, paper hardcopy costs
a bit. Ask around.

>> There is no point in you trying to argue the same subject with
>> constant obvious contentious behavior and trying to promote
>> verbal battles that irritate others.
>
> If one does not want to be irritated, Lennie, then perhaps thye
>shouldn't be making dumb assertions they can't validate.

"thye?"

>> It is much better to concentrate personal efforts on very real,
>> serious problems facing your remaining "service" days, such as
>> Access BPL and a possible future regulatory restructuring of
>> amateur radio.
>
> I dare say my "personal efforts" in Amateur Radio far outstrip the
>comments you've ever posted to EFCS, Lennie.

"EFCS?" Try Electronic Comment Filing System or ECFS.

Feel free to search the ECFS for how many comments I've actually
made and are on the public record. That is proof of filing, complete
to the entire contents.

Now go ahead and "prove" your "personal efforts" in amateur radio
so that there is no doubt of that effort. Sorry, you can't use the
general, no-detail, no-date "hostile actions" record...bragging is NO
proof.

And stay off the hundred-proof stuff. Don't drink and demod.

LHA / WMD

2391. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012234.20920.00000232@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90457

In article <406F4617.8020100@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>But writing was a real PITA back when I was in high school, no word
>procesors or
>computers then. or printers. How did people manage to bang out
>typewritten papers without errors?

You had PAPER?!?

LHA / WMD

2392. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012236.20920.00000233@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90454

In article <ul9u60te77hk0qa2dnh7ldqj3jlcu1h0n5@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 03 Apr 2004 19:28:24 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>snip
>>
>> Please excuse my absence. I am preparing some Replies to
>> Comments to my government on federal regulations.
>
>Which is a very commendable and proactive thing to do - and is, as you
>know, the only effective method of advising the regulatory folks of
>valid objections to their proposed new rules and policies. The more
>cogent objections that they receive, the better.

I've sent about 76 or so Comments to our FCC. Haven't made an
accurate tally lately but anyone can do it on the FCC ECFS
using just my legal signature name.

>Thank you, Len, for taking the time to do so. Your effort is
>appreciated.

Not everyone "appreciates" it. My first Comment was on FCC
98-143, the NPRM for Amateur Radio Restructuring. I was
quite busy with other things during 1998-1997 Holiday time
but got 14 text pages into the Commission a few days before
the official close of commentary (all paper, multiple copies, a
diskette, sent Express Mail registered).

12 days after my Comment appeared on the ECFS, the gunnery
nurse sent a "comment" which said absolutely nothing about
the contents of my text, just that "I had no business getting
involved in amateur radio matters because I had no license!"
[See proceedings 98-143 for 25 January 1999...still there]

Trying to cancel another citizen's basic First Amendment Right
is not to be taken lightly down in this country. There ARE self-
righteous SOBs here who think nothing of tramping all over
others' rights.

[SOB = Son Of Beeper in case Rev. Jim is listening in...]

Up to 3 years after that, a few in here wanted to ARGUE
that same Comment text content, extract several pounds of
flesh, etc., all at various times, just to make themselves feel
good, self-righteous, etc., etc. Necro-equine flaggelation.

But, that's all in the normal course of events. I've been doing
computer-modem communications for nearly 20 years and have
become rather thick skinned to all the yahoos who feel "safe"
cussing out other folks they don't like. :-)

["razzbonyas" = yahoos in some parts of Wisconsin, Minnesota]

>I'm sure that you agree that those who do not see themselves as being
>part of the solution are usually part of the problem.....

Actually, I don't. I see that some folks are just problems and the
subject matter is irrelevant as long as they have a Cuss Venue.

A few will actually take the time to discuss a subject civilly, but
that has always been rare.

>> No doubt I
>> will once again by rewarded by an Amateur Extra licensee
>> demanding I be censored and censured for exercising my First
>> Amendment Rights to my government.
>
>Of course - more than one, most likely. And that syndrome is. I
>think, what annoyed Carl enough to prompt this posting (and he
>certainly ain't alone there...). For example, you post something,
>then several others jump on you to 'prove you wrong', then others jump
>on them to 'prove them wrong', etc. Newsgroup warriors (MinutiaeMen?)
>all, fighting a never-ending battle for something or other.....but the
>real issues, those which threaten the amateur radio hobby, will not
>be decided in this forum. Or in that manner.

Heh heh heh..."MinutaeMen!" Apt. Bang-on as those in the UK say.

Decisions in here? Nil. But, checking the mail in here gives more
rounding to what two sides on an issue feel. Once in a rare while
there's a link to another site for information that may be useful.

"Link" other than the "go to ARRL website...worth a good read"
kind of imperative. :-)

Most of the heated battles that go on in any computer-modem
venue (regardless of subject) are almost entirely for attempts to
Get The Last Word Superiority Over Others...or to develop some
sort of Guru Image to Impress Others, get a "rep" or similar,
especially in a techie type of venue. Some of it is hilarious. :-)

It's been that way ever since Usenet got started decades ago,
got into BBS nets, and now infects all the newsgroups sooner
or later. There be a whole lot of murderous resentment by many
at being Talked Back To...their self-righteousness knows no
bounds!

My good buddy Patty once wrote a general remark when we co-moderated a BBS public board, "Sometimes the loudest sound you hear is your own mind screaming in the empty, silent room." That's poetic and to the point for much of it.

But, having said that, now watch someone try to butt in, making noises about intimations of misconduct with a "lady friend" even though we were good friends of opposite gender. Some live to throw dirt even if they are in a vast ocean. :-)

>It would be good to see some of that energy channeled into positive
>and proactive channels - such as replying to the FCC on issues which
>threaten the hobby. Which you, and a few others, have done and
>continue to do.

I totally agree. But, that takes actual WORK!

It's so much easier to sit back and toss [expletive deleteds] in a newsgroup, pull others' chains, and snicker in the safety of time and space isolation of network interchange delays. Some demand both invisibility in identity and respect for something they can't prove or reference. Marvelous. A fine catharsis for the timid.

>Others, unfortunately, don't see it that way.
>
>In my opinion, it's similar to the election process - if some guy
>didn't take the time to go out and vote, who cares when he complains
>that the wrong guy won....TS, I say.

Good point. But the complaining MUST go on...imperative...that's "only human." :-)

In two decades of modeming, I've worn out several TS Card punches, busy at clicking away at sooooo many cards! :-)

>> Censorship is wonderful, don't you wish everyone had it?
>
>Not censorship - perhaps initiative?

Good choice.

But, I was remarking in a much different semantic direction. :-)

LHA / WMD

2393. Re: Bush Backs Broadband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012237.20920.00000234@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90460

In article <Xns94C0C21809B8Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> IEEE 802.15 and IEEE 802.16 standards are for metropolitan
>> systems using wireless access.
>>
>> Complete specifications are available to the public for download
>> at no charge.
>>
>> The colloquial term "Wi-Fi" is for wired systems using other IEEE
>> 802 standards.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>The point is do something cheaper than the satellite. Anything really
>intended to work a block away probably wouldn't be.

One of the higher decimal number IEEE 802 Standards is for up
to 30 miles range. That might be a "Texas block" to some, but
most cities aren't 30 miles across. :-)

I have some of those 802 Standards but I'm not going to bother
with looking up any details for the regulars in here. Those (nearly
all PCTAs) will just tell me to go to the ARRL website for "a good
read." :-)

If you want the link to free IEEE 802 standards downloads, send
me e-mail.

LHA / WMD

2394. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012238.20920.00000236@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90453

In article <MpmdndmuvPcnv_LdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> I read each and every one of your posts that I see in this group.
>Wouldn't miss them.

Does the phrase "nobody's perfect" apply to you, Mike? :-)

LHA / WMD

2395. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012238.20920.00000235@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90458

In article <1e4e3692.0404031723.15bec9ba@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040403142821.12769.00000117@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <Q66dnZ_cKO6AuPPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>> >Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> >
>> >> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that
>is
>> >> OT and doesn't belong here ...
>> >> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed
>to
>> >> be for because of the volume
>> >> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with
>...
>> >
>> > Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>> >affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>> >avoid it.
>>
>> "Noise" can be much reduced by making and installing appropriate
>> shielding structures.
>>
>> The key to happiness and nirvana would be a restricted-access
>> newsgroup, moderated so that all got along happily ever after.
>> That is the "shielding" which can be applied to keep out independent
>> thought, outside interference, and find sanctuary for all worshipping
>> the past of "the service" just like they had to do.
>>
>> Of course someone who has bad screen days in here should
>> expend the effort to begin constructing such "shielding." Everyone
>> talks about it but no one is doing anything about it.
>>
>> "Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain." - anon.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Maybe nocall JJ should be the moderator. He has shown a propensity to
>know what is right and just, and having no call, could be a proponent
>for the unlicensed and unwashed.
>

>And if you don't believe me, just ask him.

If Nocall JJ were a proponent, we wouldn't have any way to
reference it. "Stealth" newsgrouping, ya know.

No call = No ham.

Meat service department = ham. [ring bell for service]

He mebbe go Somalia, do good deeds.

He mebbe do Seven Hostile Actions, be big hero.

No JJ = No loss.

LHA / WMD

2396. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 06:22:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404012240.20920.00000237@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90459

In article <20040403185056.11951.00000558@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/3/2004 10:50 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040403115028.17713.00000176@mb-m28.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(ugly
>>little mentally-seven-year-old very-amateur extra) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
>>>>
>>>> I know "rocket science" after working three years at
>>>> Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
>>>> of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage
>>>> engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
>>>
>>> I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier
>>ashtrays
>>>and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably
>>even
>>>picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long enough
>>>to get his pants off....
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...ugly little comment from an ugly little person.
>>
>> Members of the Technical Staff III didn't do janitorial services at
>> Rocketdyne. That was my work title...(SNIP)
>
> That >>IS<< what all your pontificating, strutting and crowing is ALL
>about, Lennie...

Now now...you were implying I was into homosexual activity
while working at Rocketdyne AND that I was a janitor.

I did neither and merely did a synopsis of slightly more than 3
years of real employment in an engineering group.

Note the years I included. A decade before the Internet went
public..a few years before the BBSs got into expansion.

> Titles...
>
> You belittle every licensed Radio Amateur for alledgedly being
predisposed
>with "rank, title and priviledge", yet it's your own "rank, title and
>priviledge" that you want to talk about here.

I'm not interested in talking about myself. I was answering your
ugly little charge of homosexual activity while doing janitor work
at Rocketdyne.

Feel free to contact Jim Hall, KD6JG. Jim was a Staff Engineer
at Rocketdyne and didn't retire from there until Boeing bought
the place from Rockwell International. Jim has been in amateur
radio as well as professional radio since before 1956. He will
tell you that I was an MTS at Rocketdyne...we worked in the same
department. Jim was also my immediate manager at RCA
Corporation for 5 years in the Postion Location Engineering group.

Feel free to contact Al Walston, W6MJN. Al and I shared an
office cubicle at RCA. Al was also Best Man at my wedding,
a wedding which was NOT "same sex."

> Hot flash, Lennie...
>
> All that spouting about Rocketdyne, your FCC first phone ticket, etc etc
>etc got you absolutely not ONE step closer to being a licensed Amateur.

I'm not interested in getting my very own amateur radio license.

I'm trying to talk about real POLICY issues, concentrating on the
elimination of the morse code test for any license examination.

All you want to do is make insults on others, charge them with
homosexual conduct, and say they've never done anything but
menial work. That's sickness on your part.

> Not one.
>
>> The Deformable Mirror program...(SNIP)
>
> ...has absolutely nothing to do with Amateur Radio, BPL, Morse Code
>testing, my service in the Marines or your lack of any practical experience in
>the Amateur Radio Service, although I am sure it helped you vent a lot of
>frustration and made you feel like a big man for reciting it yet again...

It doesn't "feel good" for me to sit here and refute a lot of LIES
you generate about my person.

Just the same, you feel you have a need to LIE about others, to
insult them every time you get the slightest negative response to
your postings.

Charging that I engaged in homosexual conduct while working as
a janitor at Rocketdyne is a double LIE.

Saying I engaged in homosexual activity at any time would be a LIE.

Saying I worked as a janitor at any place of employment is a LIE.

Saying my wife was a "correspondence school" graduate is a LIE.
My wife as Two Masters Degrees, both of which were granted
after taking formal classes at the University of Illinois. Prior to that
she got a BA from four years at a small college in Beloit,
Wisconsin, attending formal classes all four years.

Saying insults against my person as if they were factual is a LIE.

In general, you fabricate more LIES about others than you say
facts.

When you say you've done things, you don't give enough details
to prove anything to anyone...which is a form of LYING.

> And through ALL OF THAT, you're STILL a putz.
>
> Sheeeeesh.

You have enough demonstrated symptoms of mental illness from
all the public displays of inability to interface with other humans.
You should seek mental therapy to alleviate that. Do so.

Shalom, meshugge goyim.

LHA / WMD

2397. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 11:25:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0404040325.66216acb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90461

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<dV2dnaFZwZmXz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...

> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com...

> > >Subject: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> 'Youngest
> > >Extra')
> > >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
> > >Date: 4/2/2004 7:48 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>

> > Thank-you for having expressed your God Given Opinon in accordance
> with
> > your Constitutional Rights, Carl.
> >
> > Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.

> Steve ... why the [expletive deleted for Jim's benefit] do you have to play
> the "veterans" card?
> I have an honorable discharge, too ... Vietnam era, though I never left the
> states ... but I don't see a need to flaunt it ... why do you seem to play
> on your military service when you don't have a good excuse for bad behavior?

Carl, why do YOU seem to have a problem with me giving a nod to
veterans for having been able to provide you YOUR right to post your
uncensored opinion? Are you now insinuating that the sacrifices made
by veterans in defense of your freedom to do so was wrong?

Congrats on the Veteran status. After you're done brow-beating
me for having made an affirmative comment to Vets, reach around and
give yourself a pat on the back from me...You deserve it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2398. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 11:59:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404075902.09913.00000139@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 90462

In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>> affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>> avoid it.
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>posting that I used to.
>
>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.

Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.

But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>
>Cheers to all who use common sense, logic and a few
>ounces of forthought before posting :-)
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2399. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 11:59:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404075903.09913.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 90463

In article <-VydnYUm2-Vrz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have nothing
>to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal grudges
>and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally dominating
>the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
>
>I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't around
>any more because they got sick of wading through all of the extraneous crap
>...
>our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks' contributions
>to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...

I agree 100%, Carl.

So what should folks like you and I do about it?

In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong, should we
simply ignore it or challenge it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2400. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 12:14:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <sMucnWAex6z1YfLdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90464

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040404075903.09913.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <-VydnYUm2-Vrz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have
nothing
> >to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal
grudges
> >and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally
dominating
> >the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
> >
> >I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't
around
> >any more because they got sick of wading through all of the extraneous
crap
> >...
> >our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks'
contributions
> >to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...
>
> I agree 100%, Carl.
>
> So what should folks like you and I do about it?

Jim,

I hate to "kill-file" folks - they *might* just say something relevant at some point, but I'm considering it for a few individuals whose posts are mostly personal vendetta-like attacks and insults ...

> In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong,
should we simply ignore it or challenge it?

If we see it and know it to be wrong, I think we should challenge it. However, it is not my job (nor, I suspect yours) to wade through all of their drivel in search of a relevant, incorrect assertion so that it might be challenged.

I tend to think that most people will give little credence to whatever some of these folks say, just on the basis of the tone and content of most of their messages. I am just finding it annoying to have the newsgroup polluted with so much OT stuff - newsgroup BPL, I think Mike called it.

73,
Carl - wk3c

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2401. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 12:27:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <CsqcneOeUqUZYvLdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90465

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0404040325.66216acb@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<dV2dnaFZwZmXz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com...
>
> > > Thank-you for having expressed your God Given Opinon in
accordance
> > with
> > > your Constitutional Rights, Carl.
> > >
> > > Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.
>
> > Steve ... why the [expletive deleted for Jim's benefit] do you have to
play
> > the "veterans" card?
> > I have an honorable discharge, too ... Vietnam era, though I never left
the
> > states ... but I don't see a need to flaunt it ... why do you seem to
play
> > on your military service when you don't have a good excuse for bad
behavior?
>
> Carl, why do YOU seem to have a problem with me giving a nod to
> veterans for having been able to provide you YOUR right to post your
> uncensored opinion?

Because your "nod to veterans" was just an obviously insincere, self-serving
"shot" at me, and not a genuine "hats off" to those who made sacrifices.

> Are you now insinuating that the sacrifices made by veterans in defense
of your freedom to do so was wrong?

You have a perverse way of trying to twist things to your own purpose Steve
...

> Congrats on the Veteran status. After you're done brow-beating
> me for having made an affirmative comment to Vets, reach around and
> give yourself a pat on the back from me...You deserve it.

Had your "affirmative comments to Vets" been sincere and legitimate, rather
than a self-serving attempt at a cheap shot, I wouldn't have said anything.
But, I resent *your* constantly trying to suck some personal debating
advantage (not that you get it) or "holier than thoubrownie points" out of

your service ... why do you think Len refers to you as "the gunnery nurse?" (Hint - it's to emphasize the way you make a fool out of yourself by trying to "play the vet card.")

OK ... now you can call *me* a putz ... and you're at the top of the potential kill-file list - but I wish you'd give EVERYONE a break for the benefit of the newsgroup.

Carl - wk3c

2402. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:13:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404091341.17086.00000718@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90466

>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 4/3/2004 9:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040403213239.15123.00000165@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>In article <PradnU775f5DvvLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>> What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the
>>> McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised.
>>Now
>>> they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here in
>>the
>>> Philadelphia area.
>>
>> Not uncommon at all, Jim. In my area, we have farmers that hve sold off
>
>>land for development, after which the people that moved into the
>>development sued to shut the farmer down because of the noxious smells
>>emanating from the farm.
>
>Now that's dumb!

Even dumber...

It's now moot...but when I was at El Toro/Tustin in the 80's we'd routinely get phone calls at the abse complaining about the "[expletive] jet noise"...

I don't know how the one call got routed to the AeroClub this one Saturday morning, but the guy was P.O.ed that an A6 Intruder just flew by his new condo.

I asked him to give me his location so I could pass the info to Base Ops...Turns out he bout a condo for a quarter mill only 350 YARDS from the right-of-way corridor to the 34 duals at El Toro.

I asked him if he hadn't noticed all the jet traffic when he bought the place and he said no.

I told him that my pick-up truck, which cost less than a tenth of what he paid for his condo, had features on it I didn't care for, but I didn't fuss about them because I KNEW what I was buying before I signed on the dotted line!

I also pointed out that the base had been here since 1942 and flying jets since 1949. His condo was still dripping wet pain off the ceiling.

That's when I hung up on him.

>>I don't blame it entirely on the people suing, the farmer had to be
>>pretty stupid to not know that "development people don't like nature
>>very much.......
>>
>How would the farmer know?
>
>This past Wednesday, I was in Lancaster County, PA. Amish/Mennonite country,
>although development is pushing many of the Old Order out. We stopped at the
>Wawa at the intersection of 30 and 896. In three directions there were outlet
>malls and retail stores. In the fourth direction was a working farm, and a
>farmer with a team of 6 horses cultivating. The smell was definitely rural
>but not unpleasant.

Nothing like fresh tilled earth....But it's the freshly fertilized earth
(courtesy of the team of horses!) that set it apart!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2403. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:20:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404092047.17086.00000719@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90467

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/3/2004 2:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040403142824.12769.00000119@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>In article <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
>>rag on each other endlessly.alt"
>>and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
>>amateur radio regulatory and policy
>>issues ...
>
> Carl, I've made a suggestion repeatedly for at least six years in
> here that it should be shut off from public access with only
> "authorized access" and a moderator to attempt keeping the
> peace. That way everyone can be "among their own kind," happy
> and content, no evil independent thoughts intruding nirvana.

YOU wouldn't want a moderator here, Lennie.

>>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>>be for because of the volume
>>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
> I agree. But, having practiced computer-modem communications for
> 17+ years, slightly longer than that via time-share systems on the
> old Arpanet, then Usenet, then BBSs, and finally the Internet after
> 1991, I'd say that human nature hasn't changed much.

Ahhhhhh....some of that time-in-grade sets you apart, eh, Lennie?

> Tell you what, Carl, let's see you hang in there with mild, civil
> manners as a model of comportment after another has threatened
> to abrogate your First Amendment rights in public, repeatedly
> called you "putz" (Yiddish for asshole), "scum" in various forms,
> "ignorant of everything in amateur radio," a "pathological liar,"
> "dishonorable" towards the USA military after conjuring up obvious
> untruthful conditions...plus...various forms of personal insults
> including alleged homosexual acts, insulting my wife, my parents,

> my work experience, my education, educational institutions who
> provide college-credit courses away from normal hours.

Kinda miserable being treated in kind, isn't, Lennie?

Is the point getting across to you?

> Of course you've weathered those contentious conditions of an
> equal nature with the highest possible conduct befitting an
> executive directorship. All the PCTA have done equally calm,
> reasoned, civil replies in here, haven't they?
>
>>OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
>>deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
> Wouldn't think of it. Heavens, no civilized person uses [expletive
> deleted] [expletive deleted] words in newsgroups...that's for the
> lower-class, inferior, non-amateur bourgoise, the riff-raff, the
> underbelly of society peasantry. Self-righteousness and
> sanctimonious behavior are the true rulers on an enlighted
> superior society.

"Profanity is the adjective of the weak mind"...Anon.

Seems the FCC shares the same opinion, as do countless other organizations
that are pressing the government to make the airwaves more "family friendly".

Do you disagree with this concept, Lennie?

> Now back to the present-day amateur policy newsgroup where the
> main topics are immunization, diseases, past military experience,
> national policy, and - especially - much angst over long-past
> message exchanges which must be argued over and over and over
> and over and over again until the original non-winner considers they
> have "won."
>
> Please excuse my absence. I am preparing some Replies to
> Comments to my government on federal regulations. No doubt I
> will once again by rewarded by an Amateur Extra licensee
> demanding I be censored and censured for exercising my First
> Amendment Rights to my government.
>
> Censorship is wonderful, don't you wish everyone had it?

Funny how what is your "right" to comment on anything you desire
(regardless of who you hurt and why) is "censorship" when redirected at you,
Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

2404. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:41:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404094116.22051.00000583@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90468

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 5:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031426.5c7d2eb@posting.google.com>
>
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>> >> There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations.
>For
>> >> example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that
>immunizations
>> >> are
>> >> somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>> >> shown
>> >> no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first
>definitive
>> >> signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>> >> immunizations.
>> >
>> >The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
>> >controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
>> >diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"
>
>TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
>you tell me what caused it?
>
>Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
>it his own immunizations?

Autism predates the widespread use of immunizations, Brian.

It, like many other birth defects, are still non-specific in etiology. No
one can take a test to determine if some combination of DNA or enviromental
exposures will induce it.

My daughter's birth defects were >>generally<< attributed to aerially
deployed agricultural defoliants, but at the end of the day, the answer was a
shrugh and a "Who knows...!??!"

>Agreed to what??? Should I teach him Morris Code so he can
>communicate with me?

Many Autistic children show a predispostion to defered methods of communication, but I doubt Morse Code would be one of them.

> And of course the reason such diseases are almost gone is - universal
>> immunization.
>
>My son is in a classroom of -all- autistic children in a small
>community of less than 20,000.

Some current thinking on this is that it's not a necessarily wise thing to do. Behavioral modification is best thought to work when they are placed in "normal" enviroments. Unfortunately the realities of economics and minimal resources dictate otherwise.

>Lots and lots of stupid people. Like those demanding continued Morse
>Code exams.

You equate inequities of your child's birth defects with Morse Code testing?

>Since you're a smart person, you have the answer.
>
>What caused my son's autism?

Mother Nature sucks. What caused my daughter to be born with only 25% of her brain? All we can do is love them, care for them, and try our best to prepare them for when we're not here.

>> >If they think immunizations are bad, they should see how bad not
>> >immunization is.
>>
>> Yep. This is one reason why the study of history - real history - is so
>> important.
>
>Someday someone will write the history of autism.
>
>The real history. What causes it.

Let's hope it's real soon.

All of our newsgroup bantering aside, Brian, I have a significant amount of experience in developmental disorders of children. I am at your service if I can help. Nothing gets in the way of a child.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2405. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:45:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404094534.22051.00000584@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90469

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/4/2004 1:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040404012234.20920.00000231@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040403184354.11951.00000557@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Or was that your hand up his backside making his mouth work again,
>>Lennie?
>
> See? There you go again with LIES and innuendo (apt homonym)
> of homosexual behavior.

Lennie...YOU are the one with the "homosexual behavior" propensities...

I was refering to the hand placed in the back of a puppet as the puppeteer
makes his mouth and head work.

Rethink YOUR innuendo, Putzy One.

Steve, K4YZ

2406. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:47:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404094753.22051.00000585@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90470

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 8:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031716.66739d75@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040402113011.09718.00000396@mb-m24.aol.com>...

>> Too bad for you, Brain, that you can't see beyond your own wounded
>pride.
>
>Why do you s###### on your fellow amateurs?

I don't.

Why do you find it necessary to make false assertions and use profanity in
a public forum?

Steve, K4YZ

2407. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 13:50:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404095046.22051.00000586@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90471

>Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 8:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031718.52b07ef0@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040401095506.12182.00000540@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!
>> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>> >Date: 3/31/2004 8:07 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040331210711.15123.00000113@mb-m10.aol.com>
>> >
>> >In article <20040331123650.04942.00000117@mb-m01.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >> VEs had used Farnsworth spacing BEFORE it was acknowledged
>> >> by the Commission.
>> >
>> >How do you know?
>>
>> Ouiji Board.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>The Occult might be why you're so whacked out and angry with your fellow man.
>
>I believe you to be dangerous.

The only thing I can't argue with you over, Brian.. Only because you
FINALLY worded something accurately and without profane adjectives to embellish
it.

It's not true, but you expressed an opinion.

Please try to remember the difference in future postings.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2408. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:04:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404100420.22051.00000587@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90472

>Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/4/2004 1:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040404012240.20920.00000237@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040403185056.11951.00000558@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> You belittle every licensed Radio Amateur for alledgedly being
>predisposed
>>with "rank, title and priviledge", yet it's your own "rank, title and
>>priviledge" that you want to talk about here.
>
> I'm not interested in talking about myself. I was answering your
> ugly little charge of homosexual activity while doing janitor work
> at Rocketdyne.

WHOA!

Since when were YOU "not interested in talking about myself"...?!?!

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHA! ! ! ! ! ! !

> You have enough demonstrated symptoms of mental illness from
> all the public displays of inability to interface with other humans.
> You should seek mental therapy to alleviate that. Do so.

Now who's the order-giving "dill sergeant", Lennie?

I'll tell you what...

I'll spend an hour with a mental health counsellor just as soon as
evidence of YOUR having spent an hour at a VE session shows up in the FCC
database.

How's THAT for a deal...?!?!

Heck, Lennie...I'll even rebate you your exam fee with a PMO. How's THAT
for a deal?

Up to you, Lennie!

Steve, K4YZ

2409. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:11:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404101146.22051.00000588@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90473

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
>Date: 4/4/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <CsqcneOeUqUZYvLdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:5c01b95b.0404040325.66216acb@posting.google.com...

>> Carl, why do YOU seem to have a problem with me giving a nod to
>> veterans for having been able to provide you YOUR right to post your
>> uncensored opinion?
>
>Because your "nod to veterans" was just an obviously insincere, self-serving
>"shot" at me, and not a genuine "hats off" to those who made sacrifices.

Seems to me the "insincere, self serving shot" was yours...not mine,
especially since the exchange was initiated BY YOU, Carl.

>> Are you now insinuating that the sacrifices made by veterans in defense
>of your freedom to do so was wrong?
>
>You have a perverse way of trying to twist things to your own purpose Steve.

And you don't, Carl?

>> Congrats on the Veteran status. After you're done brow-beating
>> me for having made an affirmative comment to Vets, reach around and
>> give yourself a pat on the back from me...You deserve it.
>
>Had your "affirmative comments to Vets" been sincere and legitimate, rather
>than a self-serving attempt at a cheap shot, I wouldn't have said anything.
>But, I resent *your* constantly trying to suck some personal debating
>advantage (not that you get it) or "holier than thoubrownie points" out of
>your service ... why do you think Len refers to you as "the gunnery nurse?"
>(Hint - it's to emphasize the way you make a fool out of yourself by trying
>to "play the vet card.")

Hint, Carl...

Lennie has ALWAYS played the "vet card", even to the point of signing
posts with his former service number, claiming that his rear-area support
duties were somehow akin to having made the ultimate sacrifice in combat, and
having tried to embellish his own service with that of men who died three years
before he was even inducted.

And if Lennie has fun calling me the "gunnery nurse", so what?

>OK ... now you can call *me* a putz ... and you're at the top of the
>potential kill-file list - but I wish you'd give EVERYONE a break for the
>benefit of the newsgroup.

ARE you a putz, Carl? Would it make you feel better if I did? I don't
think you are, but you seem anxious for me to do so.

I don't care for many of your opinions or ideas, but overall I think
you're an OK guy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2410. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:12:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404101229.22051.00000589@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90474

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031809.4b672de0@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040403100353.12182.00000657@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>> Veterans, Take a bow. Carl made use of your sacrifices.
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve abuses your sacrifice.

Uh huh...riiiiiiiiiiiiiiiight.....

Steve, K4YZ

2411. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:13:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404101348.22051.00000590@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90475

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
>Date: 4/3/2004 7:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <-VydnYUm2-Vrz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>> >'Youngest Extra')
>[snip]
>
>> Gentlemen, your comments are well spoken and have much merit.
>>
>> I wonder why, however, many of you selectively decide when to complain
>> about the "noise".
>
>Steve,
>
>The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have nothing
>to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal grudges
>and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally dominating
>the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.

I see.

And you see my "crap" as being solely responsible.

Uh huh...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2412. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:19:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404101910.22051.00000591@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90476

>ubject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031758.634a7e25@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040403102339.12182.00000660@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>> I am not the one professing to have "operated" from Somalia...
>
>Nor will you. Lots of people, you included, are too chicken $hit to
>go out where the rubber meets the road.

I didn't get a chance to go to Somalia, Brian...I was already out of the Corps then.

But I had plenty of other opportunities to visit that part of the world...some when you were still in gradeschool.

And I see you're still having to resort to profane adjectives in order to try and express yourself.

Too bad.

Steve, K4YZ

2413. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 14:25:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404102521.22051.00000592@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90477

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/3/2004 9:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040403101528.12182.00000659@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/2/2004 7:19 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404021719.696ae7b3@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040402115547.09718.00000401@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> EVERY nurse or paramedic is "selective (in) who he would treat in
>an
>> >> emergency".
>> >>
>> >> It's called "triage".
>> >
>> >Back peddle. Tap dance. Cover up what you know you meant.
>>
>> And YOU "know" what I meant, Brain?
>
>I said that >>>you<<< know what you meant.

And HOW did you KNOW what I "meant"...???

>> You don't even know what YOU mean...
>
>I'll leave it to the trial lawyers when they drag your posts thru a
>malpractice suit. Idiot.

There's an idot here, Brian, but I am trying to not rub his nose in his
business again.

Carl says I am not playing nice. Lord knows I lose sleep at night
worrying about Carl's assessment of newsgroup behaviour.

>> >You really should stop making stupid statements concerning who you
>> >would and would not treat in your profession.
>>
>> There's nothing "stupid" about it. Black, Red, Yellow or Green. You
>get
>> treated accordingly.

>
>Sorry, Steve, but I'm neither black, red, nor yellow (who'se
>green???). I'm caucasian like almost all hams. Do you refuse to
>treat caucasians?

If you're ever a victim at a disaster scene, you WILL be one of those colors, regardless of your pigmentation.

73

Steve, K4YZ

BTW: You state that "almost all hams" are "caucasians". I suggest that you do a by-country census and figure out where the "most" of those "almost all" hams are, Brian. The figures don't support your assertion...Again...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2414. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 15:32:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90478

N2EY wrote:
> In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>>avoid it.
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>>posting that I used to.
>>
>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>
>
> Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
> regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
> inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>
> But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?

Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size of little willie to gargantuan proportions?

You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it. This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.

If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little easier to handle.

Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior? Or Steve or Brian's? Not hardly likely! I don't even want to. I like 'em all just the way they are. If a person has problems with what they post, they can avoid reading them. Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2415. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 15:48:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <i5OdnU92TIzGs-3dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90479

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/3/2004 9:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040403213239.15123.00000165@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <PradnU775f5DvvLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>>What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the
>>>>McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised.
>>>
>>>Now
>>>
>>>>they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here in
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>Philadelphia area.
>>>
>>> Not uncommon at all, Jim. In my area, we have farmers that hve sold off
>>
>>>land for development, after which the people that moved into the
>>>development sued to shut the farmer down because of the noxious smells
>>>emanating from the farm.
>>
>>Now that's dumb!
>
>
> Even dumber...
>
> It's now moot...but when I was at El Toro/Tustin in the 80's we'd routinely
> get phone calls at the abse complaining about the "[expletive] jet noise"...
>
> I don't know how the one call got routed to the AeroClub this one Saturday
> morning, but the guy was P.O.ed that an A6 Intruder just flew by his new condo.
>
> I asked him to give me his location so I could pass the info to Base
> Ops...Turns out he bout a condo for a quarter mill only 350 YARDS from the
> right-of-way corridor to the 34 duals at El Toro.
>
> I asked him if he hadn't noticed all the jet traffic when he bought the

> place and he said no.

He probably didn't! So many people manage to go through life with
amazingly little interface with the outside world. It's like I ask -
what do they spend all their time thinking about, if they are thinking
about anything.

One of the best education's I ever got was from a teacher in high
school that showed us exercises to increase our observational skills.

> I told him that my pick-up truck, which cost less than a tenth of what he
> paid for his condo, had features on it I didn't care for, but I didn't fuss
> about them because I KNEW what I was buying before I signed on the dotted line!
>
>
> I also pointed out that the base had been here since 1942 and flying jets
> since 1949. His condo was still dripping wet pain off the ceiling.
>
> That's when I hung up on him.
>
>
>>>I don't blame it entirely on the people suing, the farmer had to be
>>>pretty stupid to not know that "development people don't like nature
>>>very much.......
>>>
>>
>>How would the farmer know?
>>
>>This past Wednesday, I was in Lancaster County, PA. Amish/Mennonite country,
>>although development is pushing many of the Old Order out. We stopped at the
>>Wawa at the intersection of 30 and 896. In three directions there were outlet
>>malls and retail stores. In the fourth direction was a working farm, and a
>>farmer with a team of 6 horses cultivating. The smell was definitely rural
>>but not unpleasant.
>
>
> Nothing like fresh tilled earth....But it's the freshly fertilized earth
> (courtesy of the team of horses!) that set it apart!

It's all okay, except for the pig manure! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2416. evening

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 16:10:04 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <a461e88a53e01efaf2f2be83a7963b48@dizum.com>
Source record: 90480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

1. Re: 8674253 Geo blames Leland for the frenchy posts
Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The Google Groups account you reported for Usenet abuse will be suspended soon. We appreciate your assistance in keeping Google Groups as abuse-free as possible.
Regards,
The Google Team

2. Re: 8646883 K4KWH now synonymous with N8WWM, KC8LDO, WA3MOJ
Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The Google Groups account you reported for Usenet abuse will be suspended soon. We appreciate your assistance in keeping Google Groups as abuse-free as possible.
Regards,
The Google Team

3. Re: 8518160 A few auction ratouts Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The Google Groups account you reported for Usenet abuse will be suspended soon. We appreciate your assistance in keeping Google Groups as abuse-free as possible.
Regards,
The Google Team

4. Re: 8424672 Still A Twisted Clown Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The Google Groups account you reported for Usenet abuse will be suspended soon. We appreciate your assistance in keeping Google Groups as abuse-free as possible.
Regards,
The Google Team

2417. Re: K4KWH now synonymous with N8WWM KC8LDO WA3MOJ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 16:34:43 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <12e9bfb0074afdd220782dc92e6b92e0@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 90481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

:)

2418. FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Four New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 17:59:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404135922.20806.00000078@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 90482

In article <slrnc610kf.3hm.alex@homer.linux1.lan>, Alex Flinsch
<alex@localhost.localdomain> writes:

>Actually they assigned numbers to 4 petitions, you missed this one
>RM-10869 - K4SX 18 September 2003
>
>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docu
ment=6515285430
>

Thank you, I missed that one at first.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2419. Re: PEE PEE HOLIC GOBBLES DA TRUCKERS SPERM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 18:10:16 UTC
From: KC8LDO <leland@doug.nut>
Message-ID: <c4pj2802vb9@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

i swallow n8wwm

In article <c4pinv$3la$1@news.x-echo.com>, I Am Not Leland says...
>
>Please refer to the information below. This will assist
>you in becoming a legal <NON keyclown> CB'er.
>
>Have a nice day
>
>Part 95- FCC rules, amended to Communications
>act of 1934, prohibit communications beyond 153
>miles, a power level exceeding 4 watts AM, 12 watts
>SSB. Use of non type accepted equipment and
>transmissions out of band are also prohibited.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Sun Apr 4 20:04:47 2004 depuis l'IP : 172.135.72.175 [VIP 532284301978]

2420. Re: Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 18:37:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404143747.03943.00000120@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90484

In article <BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
>communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
>the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.

No call = No ham.

No JJ = No loss.

LHA / WMD

2421. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 18:37:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404143748.03943.00000121@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90485

In article <20040404075903.09913.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>So what should folks like you and I do about it?
>
>In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong, should we
>simply ignore it or challenge it?

Your first step is to PROVE your "information" is the "truth" that cannot ever be "flat out wrong."

You must separate your OPINION from so-called irrefutable "truth." Opinion is opinion, not some universal truth just because you think it is so.

After you've done all that, you have to consider that some folks will still be against you. That is the nature of the computer-modem beast. That will not change, not even if you think you speak the most truthful words possible by mortals. Get used to it.

Once adjusted to all those very real environmental conditions, but you still feel that your god-like words are irrefutable truisms, it is time to pack it in, quit the newsgroup, and perhaps establish yourself as a swami of a cult somewhere. That's much better than to hang in and constantly complaining that some just don't believe your truths to be self-evident and are so irreverent to your magnificent words. :-)

LHA / WMD

2422. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 18:37:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404143749.03943.00000122@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90486

In article <ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
>doing what?

Study both biology and chemistry.

> What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma
>cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through
>premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But
>something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.

Join the groups against use of DIHYDROGEN MONOXIDE.

If you can't find those sites, I'll give you some.

Their websites yield much good safety information on the danger
to humans from dihydrogen monoxide. At least one city
administration has tried to put that in city ordinances.

Meanwhile, I still think of amateur radio as a HOBBY, a fun,
interesting recreational activity involving radio arts which requires
regulation and mitigation due to the physics of radio itself.

Some misuse the word "service" as in a service to the nation as
if it were akin to a military service or noble cause for humanity.
However, in all of Title 47 C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory
term denoting the type and kind of radio activity; e.g., Citizens
Band Radio SERVICE.

LHA / WMD

2423. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 18:37:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404143750.03943.00000123@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90487

In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>>>avoid it.
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>>>posting that I used to.
>>>
>>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>>
>> Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
>> regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
>> inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>>
>> But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>
> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap

>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?
>
> You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.
>
> If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>easier to handle.
>
> Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?

Why do you think anyone's "behavior" needs modification?

Consider that the few clues of just written words are not always
interpreted the same by different human beans.

Some folks cannot write well. Others can. A very few others
have considerable practice with writing in many different venues.

Individual perception needs honing in written-only environments.

>Or Steve or
>Brian's? Not hardly likely! I don't even want to. I like 'em all just
>the way they are.

I don't think you "like" them, but that's beside the point. :-)

Since Arpanet started, since Usenet spun off of Arpanet, since
BBSs emulated both and, finally, Internet took over for the majority
of computer-modem communication, and the behavior patterns
have all been the same. Some folks think their magnificent
words are golden words of wisdom from veritable gods and are,
as Hans Brakob once pointed out, filled with murderous rage at
any who DARE challenge that magnificence! A verbal firefight
then erupts from the furious volcano of the noble slighted.

>If a person has problems with what they post, they can
>avoid reading them.

Extremely easy for normal folks. Most browsers will just skip
to the next message with the Enter/Return key.

Obsessive-compulsives with a Fight! attitude cannot skip them.

>Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing
>his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.

Anyone with some normal practice in reading can see the word,
phrase, syntactic structure of individuals and thus identify them.
[that's much easier than the alleged "fist" of telegraphers...
there are far more clues to identities with written languages]

However, individual emotions can override such identitification
clues, particularly true of obsessive-compulsives with some sort
of grudge bias...or they need the cathartic effects of safely tossing
snit on others as a relief from daily frustrations away from the
newsgroups. [time and distance separation insures no risk from
physical retribution, hence so many, usually new modemists,
will toss away normal social manners and let their inner rages
predominate] Those who've been members of social types of
Bulletin Board Systems will know this by experience of
comparing on-screen appearance with in-person identity clues
and spoken communication, the in-person identification offering
many more clues to the inside workings of others.

Meanwhile, back at the raunch, there's still 4 petitions alive for
comments at the FCC. While the ECFS is in standby over the
weekend, it's hard to see who contributed on Saturday or Sunday,

but I don't see many rrap-ers' names in the ECFS listings. Not
enough "dedication and committment to the amateur community?"
:-)

LHA / WMD

2424. warts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 19:17:34 UTC
From: KC8LDO <leland@doug.nut>
Message-ID: <c4pn0e0ae7@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

doug gave me warts on my pee pee.

2425. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 19:56:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40706854.5090001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90489

>
>
>
>
>>But writing was a real PITA back when I was in high school, no word
>>procesors or
>>computers then. or printers. How did people manage to bang out
>>typewritten papers without errors?
>>
>>
>
> You had PAPER?!?
>
I admit that I had better materials than Abe Linclon had (charred sticks
on slate). :-)

>
>
>
>
>
>

2426. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 19:58:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404155858.27920.00000172@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90492

In article <sMucnWAex6z1YfLdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> I agree 100%, Carl.
>>
>> So what should folks like you and I do about it?
>
>Jim,
>
>I hate to "kill-file" folks - they *might* just say something relevant at
>some point, but I'm considering it for a few individuals whose posts are
>mostly personal vendetta-like attacks and insults ...

Me, too. The amount of relevant stuff is overwhelmed by the nasty stuff. In
practice I often don't get past the first line or two before deleting because
of an author's demonstrated behavior here.
>
>> In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong,
>should we simply ignore it or challenge it?
>
>If we see it and know it to be wrong, I think we should challenge it.
>However, it is not my job (nor, I suspect yours) to wade through all of
>their drivel in search of a relevant, incorrect assertion so that it might
>be challenged.

Agreed. But sometimes the errors just leap out at you.
>
>I tend to think that most people will give little credence to whatever some
>of these folks say, just on the basis of the tone and content of most of
>their messages.

Hopefully.

>I am just finding it annoying to have the newsgroup
>polluted with so much OT stuff - newsgroup BPL, I think Mike called it.
>
That's an excellent term.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2427. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 19:58:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404155859.27920.00000173@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90490

In article <rNadnYbN9cUbG_rdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <40648FEE.3010908@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>> So much for "no other method to serve the unserved areas but BPL".

>>>Did anyone actually say that? It's highly inaccurate if they did.

>> I think the actual buzzphrase is "areas underserved by broadband" or some
>> such.
>
> Not areas "undeserved" by broadband? ;^)
>
>> The image depicted is that there are large parts of the USA where broadband
>> access is either unavailable or very expensive. That's partly true - just
>> as
>> it's true that there are parts of the USA where cable TV is unavailable,
>> and
>> parts where underground natural gas service is unavailable. Etc.
>>
>> The *implication* is that BPL will somehow fill in those gaps, but in ost
>> cases
>> that's not really the case - for the saem reasons competing technologies
>> don;t serve those areas yet.
>
> I find it exceptionally misleading that people are being allowed to
>believe that the signals are just going to travel by the power lines
>from start to finish.

Of course it's misleading, but that's nothing new. Notice how the word "radio"
is avoided by people pushing "new wireless technologies".
>
Remember, Mike, they're all "professionals". They must know what's best, right?

>>>I
>>>think there is a vision of just sending the signals over the power lines
>>>and boy howdy, an instant nationwide network, everywhere there is a
>>>power line, "you have mail!"

>> Exactly.Just like there was a vision of next-generation satellite phones
>> that
>> would let all of us place phone calls from anywhere in the world via a
>> network

>> of low-eart-orbit satellites. That vision worked - but it wasn't
>> inexpensive!

>>> In truth, a fiber has to be run to somewhere near the house that is
>>>going to be served, so that means that rural areas will not be any
>>>easier to serve than they are now.
>>
>> And that's just the first problem. Once the fiber gets there, other
>> competing
>> technologies could use it, too. Including WiFi, as described by K2ASP.
>
>Or just do the right thing, and run the silly signal the rest of the way
>into the house via accepted and technically astute methods.
>
>note: I'm making a bit of an assumption that this can be done.
>
Of course it can be done. But it costs $$ to do it, and the DSL and cablemodem folks don't see an adequate ROI. Yet.

This is the downside of "deregulation". Once upon a time, "the phone company" had to serve everyone pretty much equally, regardless of cost, in return for having a monopoly. Not true any more.

>> Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that
>> BPL
>> systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may
>> mean a
>> repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
>> *each* customer.
>
> I wonder how the costs compare between a BPL line system and a
> cable system?

Depends on the particular situation. If there is currently no cable system, the cost of running new cable and all that goes with it is quite high, compared to putting in a few BPL taps and repeaters. OTOH, if the infrastructure is in place it's a different story.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2428. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 19:59:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404155900.27920.00000174@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90491

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hv70gpl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 26 Mar 2004 09:17:15 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> >But not the Wall Street Journal, or the chief engineer of the FCC, or the
>>> >Commissioners....;-) ;-)
>>>
>>> Both the Commissioners and the Chief of the Office of Science and
>>> Technology dance to the tune of the politicians who control them.
>>
>>But Phil - they're "professionals", just like Len!
>>
>>> It embarasses the hell out of me.....
>>
>>Why? You don't work for FCC any more, Phil.
>
> Loyalty and respect die hard......I spent a lot of years there at a
> time when the agency had national and international respect for
> doing things right and put a lot of effort into carrying my share of
> that load.
>
I know exactly what you mean, Phil.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2429. Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 20:02:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407069E4.2070802@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90493

>
>
>
> Titles...
>
> You belittle every licensed Radio Amateur for alledgedly being
predisposed
>with "rank, title and priviledge", yet it's your own "rank, title and
>priviledge" that you want to talk about here.
>
It is getting pretty rank here.... :-)

>
>
>
>
>

2430. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 20:24:05 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <F9_bc.14910$Dv2.12638@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90494

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com...

: I'm caucasian like almost all hams.

From my view almost all hams are oriental, and the condition is not
treatable.

3333333, Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2431. I LOVE N8WWM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 21:26:43 UTC
From: KC8LDO <leland@doug.nut>
Message-ID: <c4puij011dr@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90496
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

can i get in on some of that action too?????????

In article <c4pu1r$jj6$1@news.x-echo.com>, Keykween Kontrol Unit says...
>
>keep on sukkin them truckers knobs!
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Sun Apr 4 23:17:47 2004 depuis l'IP : 172.174.109.99 [VIP 532284301978]

2432. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 21:49:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tp%bc.15756$lt2.9833@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90495

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

| I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve,
| Len, and a few others rag on each other endlessly.alt"
| and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really
| would like to discuss amateur radio regulatory and
| policy issues ...

I third the notion.

2433. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 21:53:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404041353.3cf04c0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90497

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040404102521.22051.00000592@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> Steve, K4YZ
>
> BTW: You state that "almost all hams" are "caucasians". I suggest that you do
> a by-country census and figure out where the "most" of those "almost all" hams
> are, Brian. The figures don't support your assertion...Again...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I want t hear the "pop" when you pull your head out.

"Ham " is uniquely American.

2434. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 21:59:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404175907.08988.00000255@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90498

In article <4060AFA9.70507@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>I sometimes wonder what these people "do" spend their time thinking about.

>> Other things! Isn't modern life complex enough?

>True! like who's on "The Simple Life" tonight, or that insulting talent
>search show - lotsa important stuff like that.

Exactly.

>Modern life has always been complex enough, always has been and always
>will be!

The question is whether the complexity makes life better or worse. Here's an example:

Suppose a person goes for a job interview and things go well. Usually the next step for the interviewee is to send a thank you letter to the interviewer. Pretty simple task, right? And it hasn't changed much for decades.

Many years ago, a handwritten letter would be appropriate. You had to know how to write legibly. And you needed pen, ink, and paper.

Then came typewriters, and for such business correspondence a typewritten letter was standard practice. You had to know how to type, even hunt-and-peck style. But typewriting did not replace writing legibly. You needed a typewriter and paper, which was more of an investment than pen and ink, but a typewriter lasts a very long time.

Then came personal computing, word processing, and printers. And the standard for the thank you business letter went up another notch, as did the necessary equipment to do the job. And the learning curve to use it all. Plus the PC did not eliminate the need to write legibly or type.

And the equipment's life cycle is much shorter - remember daisy-wheel printers? dot-matrix printers? fanfold paper with holes in the side? How many different computers, peripherals and software packages have come and gone in the past, say, 20 years?

Yet the basic function remains the same: Send a thank you letter. But now we need all this equipment.

Of course a PC is far more than just a word processor, but you see the point.
>
>>>>You might also enjoy this site:

>>>>http://www.fybush.com/site-021219.html
>>>>

>>>>Interesting history of W2XMN, the past, present and future of a famous
>>>>site. Click on the links to see how far ignorance can go.
>
>>>Cool! I just heard about the tower this past weekend, and here you come
>>>along with a link to it Good timing, Jim.

>> bwaahaahaa

>> ...ze barracuda knowz whean to sterike...

>>>It's a little scary at first
>>>sight, but a magnificent structure nonetheless.

>> I've seen it from a distance but never up close. It's on the list. (I've
>> been
>> to W1AW and operated there. Also visited NIST in Boulder and the
>> WWV/WWVB transmitter site in Fort Collins.)

>>> As for the concerned residents of Alpine, they might want to chuck
>>>their cell phones if they are so worried about RF exposure - though of
>>>course I'm sure they never use them! 8^)

>> "Inverse square law? What's that?"
>>
>>>But frankly, they strike mer as being less than smart.
>
>hehe, nothing like me talking about people being stupid and making my
>own typo in the sentence!!! 8^)

HAW!

>> Do not underestimate folks like that. Look at the BPL mess. Did you see the
>> Wall Street Journal article?

> No I didn't.

It was reprinted here. Might be a link on the ARRL website.
>
>Education and intelligence does not make a person smart. I always
>thought that one of the things that makes for smart decisions is to be
>able to extrapolate consequences.

That's one definition.

>> Remember that whenever someone describes ham radio as "a hobby", they >> are
giving the BPL folks an argument against us. If amateur radio is "just a
>> hobby", then why should it be any more important than anyone else's hobby,
>> such as downloading pr0n via BPL?
>
>>>And I do like the term "McMansion"!
>
>> We have some of them around here. Big houses, big price, tossed up quickly
>> by cheap nonunion labor. CC&Rs out the ying-yang.
>

>The average mobile home has better construction methods, and often
>better hardware, cabinets, etc. than those conspicuous consumption hovels.
>
You mean "manufactured housing", I think. And I agree.

Of course there *is* quality construction going on, but it's not cheap.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2435. Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 22:00:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404041400.61ef4c43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90499

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040404101910.22051.00000591@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >ubject: Re: Maybe THIS Time, Brain...?!?!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/3/2004 8:58 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404031758.634a7e25@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040403102339.12182.00000660@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> >> I am not the one professing to have "operated" from Somalia...
> >
> >Nor will you. Lots of people, you included, are too chicken $hit to
> >go out where the rubber meets the road.
>
> I didn't get a chance to go to Somalia, Brian...I was already out of the
> Corps then.
>
> But I had plenty of other opportunities to visit that part of the
> world...some when you were still in gradeschool.
>
> And I see you're still having to resort to profane adjectives in order to
> try and express yourself.
>
> Too bad.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

It's what you are, Steve.

And lots of people have opportunities. Opportunities that they don't take.

Best of luck.

2436. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 22:05:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404041405.5d65223d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90500

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>
> Gentlemen, your comments are well spoken and have much merit.
>
> I wonder why, however, many of you selectively decide when to complain
> about the "noise".
>
> Myself and others have "sponsored" many-a-thread championing spectrum
> protection, VE testing integrity and other "on topic" (ie: policy subjects)
> only to have most of you presently commenting (with the exception of Mike
> Coslo) pulling the "topics" into the usual 'know code/no code' silliness and
> worn out rhetoric, often deteriorating into the "stupid bickering about
> individual and personalities" that you presently lament.
>
> I do believe it to be a bit of hypocracy, Gentlemen.
>
> We'll see.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The many threads that you sponsor are usually titled, "Lend Steps in
own Feces" or some such other lunacy.

There is no selectivity. You bring criticism upon yourself for being
such a jerk.

2437. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 22:17:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404041417.632e5475@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90501

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message news:<20040404101348.22051.00000590@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> I see.
>
> And you see my "crap" as being solely responsible.
>
> Uh huh...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I hate to be the one to have to point this out to you, but you are personally responsible for 100% of what you post. Every bit of it.

Don't go whining and crying and saying, "He made me do it! I'm not really this way. It's him, it's all him! Whah, whah, whah."

Take a little personal responsibility for yourself.

2438. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 22:34:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404183409.12769.00000128@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90502

In article <F9_bc.14910$Dv2.12638@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Gri¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nfliï¿½ppï¿½bliï¿½" <Gri¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com...
>
>: I'm caucasian like almost all hams.
>
>From my view almost all hams are oriental, and the condition is not
>treatable.

It's just an occident that you got oriented that way.

The condition is treatable only by surgical removal of the 605
form growing on their ego.

>3333333, Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte

And seventy threes to you too, Barn.

Say hello to Dr. Dobbs for me.

<squeep>

LHA / WMD

2439. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 23:02:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404190251.08988.00000256@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90503

In article <4062648E.50209@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>Back in the olden days before Bash published his books, I imagine that
>some ham clubs
>had compiled remembered questions from FCC tests. To help members
>upgrade.

I never encountered anything like that in any ham club. Closest thing to it was
that some clubs would lend out the ARRL License Manual and Ameco study guides
to members.

>And
>I suppose someone had snuck a peek at those mail in novice and tech
>tests before the FCC
>said everyone had to test at a field office (Early 1976 they decreed
>that, so I had to test
>at the FCC).

I never encountered that, either.

>>However, having said that, I personally much prefer the ARRL proposal to the
>>NCVEC one for the following reasons:
>>
>>2) I don't like the "commercial gear only" part of the NCVEC petition
>>because it unnecessarily
>>discourages homebrew and tinkering - something that novices have *always*
>>been allowed (and
>>encouraged by 97.1) to do.
>>3) I don't like the "low voltage" only part of the NCVEC petition, because
>>it precludes the new
>>ham from getting a good hamfest deal on an older rig like FT-101,
>>TS-520/820, etc. for no good
>>reason (nothing stops them from building power supplies that use 110VAC or
>>220VAC on the
>>*primaries*, so what's the sense in this proposal.
>>
>A few questions on electrical safety and procedures on the test should
>address this issue.
>Besides, other than an FCC inspector paying a visit, how could be
>enforced? The FCC
>doesn't have the budget for that. Output power can be limited to say
>100W. Easier to
>enforce, as signal strength can be measured remotely (not foolproof,
>maybe his beam is
>aimed right at you). The power limit would avoid the RF exposure issue.

I agree 100%.

>>and,
>>4) I don't like the NCVEC to "put the mark of Cain" on the newbies with a
>>special, never-used
>>callsign block that makes them stand out as targets for those who are
>>disgruntled with ANY change.
>>
>The old Novice licensees got WN#XXX callsigns to designate them as
>novices.

In some areas WV prefixes were also used. I'm not sure why.

>Other than a
>few bozos, everyone accepted them as legit hams. When you upgraded to
>general, the FCC
>replaced the N with A or B in your callsign. The FCC must have had an
>internal use only
>note as to which you'd get when they issued your novice call.

It was the sequence.

First FCC issued all the W#xxx calls. Novices got WN#xxx or WV#xxx and when
they upgraded the letter was just dropped.

When those were gone, the same sequence was done with K#xxx calls.

Then came WA, WB, etc. Since the license was only good for 1 or 2 years until
the mid 1970s, there was no chance that the entire sequence would be run
through.

>Today, you
>could get a vanity callsign with the
>WN if you want, even if you're an extra. Wonder if WN2ISE was ever
>issued? Someone did
>have WA2ISE before I was issued it in 1976, as a tech (general written
>and 5wpm).
>
A lot of it has to do with the FCC computer systems and their ability to handle
changes. My info says the ARS callsign database was first computerized in 1964.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2440. Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 23:02:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404190252.08988.00000257@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90504

In article <20040404091341.17086.00000718@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Why Can't N-ZERO-IMD Validate His Own Claims...?!?!
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/3/2004 9:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040403213239.15123.00000165@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <PradnU775f5DvvLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>>> What I find most intriguing is that the tower was there long before the
>>>> McMansions were built, so the builders and the buyers were not surprised.
>>>> Now
>>>> they're all upset. Just like when the Blue Route was finally built here
>>>> in the Philadelphia area.
>>>
>>>Not uncommon at all, Jim. In my area, we have farmers that hve sold off
>>>land for development, after which the people that moved into the
>>>development sued to shut the farmer down because of the noxious smells
>>>emanating from the farm.
>>
>>Now that's dumb!
>
> Even dumber...
>
>It's now moot...but when I was at El Toro/Tustin in the 80's we'd
>routinely
>get phone calls at the abse complaining about the "[expletive] jet noise"...
>
>I don't know how the one call got routed to the AeroClub this one
>Saturday
>morning, but the guy was P.O.ed that an A6 Intruder just flew by his new
>condo.
>
>I asked him to give me his location so I could pass the info to Base
>Ops...Turns out he bout a condo for a quarter mill only 350 YARDS from the
>right-of-way corridor to the 34 duals at El Toro.
>
oh dear...

>I asked him if he hadn't noticed all the jet traffic when he bought the
>place and he said no.
>
>I told him that my pick-up truck, which cost less than a tenth of what he

>paid for his condo, had features on it I didn't care for, but I didn't fuss
>about them because I KNEW what I was buying before I signed on the dotted
>line!

Well there you have it.

>I also pointed out that the base had been here since 1942 and flying
>jets since 1949. His condo was still dripping wet pain off the ceiling.
>
>That's when I hung up on him.

Not nice!

>>>I don't blame it entirely on the people suing, the farmer had to be
>>>pretty stupid to not know that "development people don't like nature
>>>very much.......
>>>
>>How would the farmer know?
>>
>>This past Wednesday, I was in Lancaster County, PA. Amish/Mennonite
>>country,
>>although development is pushing many of the Old Order out. We stopped at the
>>Wawa at the intersection of 30 and 896. In three directions there were
>>outlet
>>malls and retail stores. In the fourth direction was a working farm, and a
>>farmer with a team of 6 horses cultivating. The smell was definitely rural
>>but not unpleasant.
>
> Nothing like fresh tilled earth....But it's the freshly fertilized earth
>(courtesy of the team of horses!) that set it apart!

Yep. Not a bad smell, either, and it won't hurt you.

Some would criticize the farmer using horses. But a tractor won't make little
tractors to replace itself when it's worn out. Most farmers cannot yet grow
tractor fuel (although biodiesel may change that) and tractor exhaust isn't
good for the field.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2441. Re: K4KWH now synonymous with N8WWM KC8LDO WA3MOJ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-04 23:40:03 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <6beb5421fa787d509aadff8af1738e26@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 90505
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Oxendine the brummy
```

2442. DISCIPLINARY HEARING AGAINST KC8QJP RESIDES WITH N8WWM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 00:00:01 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <728b51a3c97e965b8f47a34989556648@dizum.com>
Source record: 90506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

FORMAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING-KATHLEEN R. LEE
Chairman Woods noted that Kathleen Lee was issued CPA certificate 36,525 on July 15, 1998. The hearing was to consider disciplinary action against Ms. Lees CPA certificate pursuant to Ohio Revised Code section 4701.16(A)(5), conviction of a felony under the laws of any state or of the United States. Ms. Lee was convicted in the United States District Court, Northern District of Ohio of five counts of Aiding Assisting in Filing False Tax Returns, a violation of 26 USC 7206(2) Ms. Lee did not appear at the hearing. The Board agreed to deliberate the disciplinary action in a later executive session and
Lees CPA certificate was subsequently revoked.

2443. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 00:46:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404204623.08889.00000784@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90507

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/4/2004 1:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040404143750.03943.00000123@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.
>>
>> If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>>easier to handle.
>>
>> Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?
>
> Why do you think anyone's "behavior" needs modification?
>
> Consider that the few clues of just written words are not always
> interpreted the same by different human beans.
>
> Some folks cannot write well. Others can. A very few others
> have considerable practice with writing in many different venues.
>
> Individual perception needs honing in written-only environments.

Coming from someone who is always demanding that others "seek mental
health counselling", this was precious.

"Why", indeed, Lennie..."why" indeed...

Steve, K4YZ

2444. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 00:49:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404204924.08889.00000785@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90508

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/4/2004 5:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041405.5d65223d@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com>...

>The many threads that you sponsor are usually titled, "Lend Steps in
>own Feces" or some such other lunacy.
>
>There is no selectivity. You bring criticism upon yourself for being
>such a jerk.

(1) Who's "Lend"...?!?!

(2) If "Lend", or whoever, wasn't making so many stupid, easily refuted misrepresentations about Amateur Radio in general or certain persons in particular, threads like those you mention wouldn't show up.

(3) As for "selectivity", I believe I've been VERY selective. Unless you can prove differently?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2445. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 01:04:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404210429.08889.00000786@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90509

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/4/2004 4:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041353.3cf04c0e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040404102521.22051.00000592@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> BTW: You state that "almost all hams" are "caucasians". I suggest that
>you do
>> a by-country census and figure out where the "most" of those "almost all"
>hams
>> are, Brian. The figures don't support your assertion...Again...
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I want t hear the "pop" when you pull your head out.
>
>"Ham " is uniquely American.

If NOTHING ELSE ever proved to me that you have almost ZERO, >>IF ANY<<
experience operating from any foreign part of the world, THAT was it.

Amateur Radio >>IS<< "ham" radio all over the world.

Amateur Radio >>IS<< "ham" radio in ALL of Japan, Malaysia, the
Phillipines, Europe and Africa. It is also in common literature of most South
American Amateur Radio publications and newsletters.

The term "ham" radio is part-and-parcel of the cover of the most popular
Amateur Radio journal in Japan. I believe that other persons in this forum can
verify for you that Japan's Amateur census is far in excess of the United
States'.

Brian, I have been trying to give you an "out" for the last 24 hours since
everyone is making a lot of noise about "playing nice", but you keep making
really stupid assertions that are so easily refuted that I have to wonder what
your REAL problem is.

If you have any doubts about any of what I have said about the use of the
term "ham" being a "generic" and therefore worldwide reference to Amateur
Radio, then just ask...

Now...WHO can hear that "pop", Brian...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2446. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 01:07:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404210745.08889.00000787@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90510

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/4/2004 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041417.632e5475@posting.google.com>

>Take a little personal responsibility for yourself.

I do, Brian.

I accept responsibility for what I post. That's why when I post something that is later proven to be other than what I suggested it was I say "I stand corrected" or otherwise acknowledge my error.

You have yet to do that despite having been proven "wrong" over and over. You'd rather compound your humiliation with even more elaborate dodges.

Nice try.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2447. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 02:11:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xdidncnKqKTFXe3dRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90511

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
>>doing what?
>
>
> Study both biology and chemistry.

Unfortunately, the study includes case histories and unexpected
accidents such as chemical interactions that we find out about only
after damage is done.

A gentleman I once worked with used to claim that no restrictions on
chemical exposure or pollution were necessary. When I asked him how he
could propose such a thing, his answer was "We will just adapt to the
poisons". No doubt, but the process of adaptation is a lot easier to say
than it is to go through!

>
>> What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma
>>cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through
>>premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But
>>something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.
>
>
> Join the groups against use of DIHYDROGEN MONOXIDE.
>
> If you can't find those sites, I'll give you some.
>
> Their websites yield much good safety information on the danger
> to humans from dihydrogen monoxide. At least one city
> administration has tried to put that in city ordinances.

Ahh, the universal solvent! Breathing it can be very dangerous! 8^)

> Meanwhile, I still think of amateur radio as a HOBBY, a fun,
> interesting recreational activity involving radio arts which requires
> regulation and mitigation due to the physics of radio itself.
>
> Some misuse the word "service" as in a service to the nation as
> if it were akin to a military service or noble cause for humanity.
> However, in all of Title 47 C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory
> term denoting the type and kind of radio activity; e.g., Citizens

> Band Radio SERVICE.

Since you brought this back on-topic, I'll comment that I think perhaps confusion may result from the fact that hams may be "of service" under some circumstances. It is hard to think of 75 meter illness comparison nets as a service, or chasing QSL cards, but there are times when our assistance is not a bad thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2448. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 02:26:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mKWdnXGLENEnXu3dRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90512

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>
>>Sohl"
>>
>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>>>avoid it.
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>>>>posting that I used to.
>>>>
>>>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>>>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>>>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>>>
>>>Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
>>>regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
>>>inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>>>
>>>But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>>
>> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap
>
>
>>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
>>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
>>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?
>>
>> You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.

>>
>> If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>>easier to handle.
>>
>> Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?
>
>
> Why do you think anyone's "behavior" needs modification?

I don't. Do you think I do from what I posted?

> Consider that the few clues of just written words are not always
> interpreted the same by different human beans.
>
> Some folks cannot write well. Others can. A very few others
> have considerable practice with writing in many different venues.
>
> Individual perception needs honing in written-only environments.
>
>
>>Or Steve or
>>Brian's? Not hardly likely! I don't even want to. I like 'em all just
>>the way they are.
>
>
> I don't think you "like" them, but that's beside the point. :-)

Sorry, but I actually do like both of them. You too.`

- Mike KB3EIA -

2449. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 • April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 02:41:52 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <QH3cc.667$ZQ.400@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90513

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
> Radionews wrote:
>
>
> >
> > RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
> >
> >
> > A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
> > lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
> > Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
> > stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
> > Australia picks up the story from here:
>
>
> And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
> communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
> the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.
>
Yep, terrible. Not only that, no one thought to use CB either - or MURS,
FRS, or whatever else is the popular thing of the day ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (former WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX, N2JH - we won't delve into the
former and current commercial licenses)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.650 / Virus Database: 416 - Release Date: 4/4/04

2450. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 02:46:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040404224617.22336.00000759@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90514

>Subject: Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 ï¿½ April 2, 2004
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 4/4/2004 9:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <QH3cc.667$ZQ.400@news01.roc.ny>

>> And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
>> communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
>> the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.
>>
>Yep, terrible. Not only that, no one thought to use CB either - or MURS,
>FRS, or whatever else is the popular thing of the day ;)

WHAT...!??!

There were no CELL TOWERS nearby to relay thier "emergency comms"...?!?!

Holy Smokes! HOW will we EVER get out of the 21st Century alive if there
are NO CELL TOWERS at SEA...?!?!

Sheeesh...!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2451. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 02:59:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040404225927.18733.00000218@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90515

In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>>>avoid it.
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>>>posting that I used to.
>>>
>>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>>
>>
>> Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
>> regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
>> inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>>
>> But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>
> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap

>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?

You make an excellent point. I used to read that stuff, but soon got to the
point where I could tell from the subject line and sender that it was spam, and
I'd delete it unread.

>You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.

In my case it's lower - there is more signal and less noise in my personal
email than here. Part of that is due to the high volume of good stuff from the
various reflectors, though.

>
>If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>easier to handle.

Good point. I have been doing that for a while, without really thinking about
it.

>Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?

Only Len can do that.

>Or Steve or Brian's?

It's up to them.

>Not hardly likely!

Agreed.

> I don't even want to. I like 'em all just the way they are.

You like the noise? I don't.

And I agree with Carl that their behavior has helped drive away good people
like W1RFI.

>If a person has problems with what they post, they can
>avoid reading them. Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing
>his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.

Aside from Len's use of no less than five different screen names here:

nocwtest@aol.com
averyfine@aol.com
averyfineman@aol.com
lenof21@aol.com
lenover21@aol.com

that's pretty true.

Newsgrouo BPL - very descriptive.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2452. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 • April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 03:30:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Gp4cc.669$oF7.388@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90516

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040404224617.22336.00000759@mb-m13.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 • April 2, 2004
>
> WHAT...!??!
>
> There were no CELL TOWERS nearby to relay thier "emergency
comms"...?!?!
>
> Holy Smokes! HOW will we EVER get out of the 21st Century alive if
there
> are NO CELL TOWERS at SEA...?!?!
>
> Sheeesh...!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Don't worry, Steve!

Soon we'll all have BPL and our emergency comms will have finally arrived in
the 21st century :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(ps - 5 watts? I wonder how well that would have worked if BPL had been
active on the mainland where the reception was carried out?)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.650 / Virus Database: 416 - Release Date: 4/4/04

2453. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 03:55:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xZydndNrdvk2Re3dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90517

N2EY wrote:

> In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>
>>Sohl"
>>
>>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>>>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>>>>>avoid it.
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>>>>posting that I used to.
>>>>
>>>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>>>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>>>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>>>
>>>
>>>Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
>>>regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
>>>inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>>>
>>>But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>>
>> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap
>
>
>>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
>>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
>>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?
>
>
> You make an excellent point. I used to read that stuff, but soon got to the

> point where I could tell from the subject line and sender that it was spam, and
> I'd delete it unread.
>
>
>>You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.
>
>
> In my case it's lower - there is more signal and less noise in my personal
> email than here. Part of that is due to the high volume of good stuff from the
> various reflectors, though.

My big problem is that one of my addys is a .edu, and it has what many
places did at one time (perhaps some still do) my initials followed by a
number.

Many of the spammers simply use a random group of letters followed by a
semi-random group of numbers, and viola, "you have spam!"

It is chilling to think of how much bandwidth that wastes.

>>If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>>easier to handle.
>
>
> Good point. I have been doing that for a while, without really thinking about
> it.
>
>
>>Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?
>
>
> Only Len can do that.

And I think he is quite happy with the way he is!

>
>>Or Steve or Brian's?
>
>
> It's up to them.
>
>
>>Not hardly likely!
>
>
> Agreed.
>
>
>>I don't even want to. I like 'em all just the way they are.

>
>
> You like the noise? I don't.

Oh no! But I separate the noise from the person

> And I agree with Carl that their behavior has helped drive away good people
> like W1RFI.

That is too bad, but I liken the situation to stopping driving because
there are wild drivers out on the road.

Once I left a group because of problems with certain posters. It was an
amateur telescope making SIG. I was getting personal email nastygrams
from one member on every post I made, and a couple others seemed to
agree with him. So I left the group. A week after that, I found out the
person doing this had passed away. Turns out he was a terminal cancer
case, and was on a LOT of pain killing drugs. I felt pretty awkward for
being so p****d off at him earlier.

Point is, maybe some people are less than pleasant, but we aren't
always sure why.

>>If a person has problems with what they post, they can
>>avoid reading them. Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing
>>his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.
>
>
> Aside from Len's use of no less than five different screen names here:
>
> nocwtest@aol.com
> averyfine@aol.com
> averyfineman@aol.com
> lenof21@aol.com
> lenover21@aol.com
>
> that's pretty true.

Although I think that he always puts His name in the post somewhere.

> Newsgroup BPL - very descriptive.

I think so.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2454. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 06:04:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405020401.27920.00000207@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90518

In article <xdidncnKqKTFXe3dRVn-hg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
>>>doing what?
>>
>> Study both biology and chemistry.
>
>Unfortunately, the study includes case histories and unexpected
>accidents such as chemical interactions that we find out about only
>after damage is done.

There's no magic instruction manual for Life.

Even the ARRL website doesn't have a "good read" on that.

> A gentleman I once worked with used to claim that no restrictions on
>chemical exposure or pollution were necessary. When I asked him how he
>could propose such a thing, his answer was "We will just adapt to the
>poisons". No doubt, but the process of adaptation is a lot easier to say
>than it is to go through!

The LEAD in ordinary solder is now considered to be a no-no for
the environment and there is all sorts of whooping and hollering
for LEAD FREE solder. In large industrial quantities that can be
nasty on a small part of the environment, yes, but hardly a
DANGER in a home workshop or an electronics service shop.

I've never heard of anyone sucking on a soldering iron wiping
sponge...which might be worse for an individual.

The personal computer users who got all greenie in 1985
started whooping and hollering about color CRT RADIATION!
They didn't bother to look elsewhere such as in TV broadcasting
which had central control rooms full of RADIATING CRTs with
24 KV final accelerating anode potentials capable of generating
X-Rays! Like since 1955 with all kinds of folks sitting, walking
in front of them. So, now we've got little stickers on PC monitors
or somewhere warning us and some say "approved" to some
European country's standards. Color CRTs radiate light when
on...

The supposed DEADLY LONG-TERM RADIATION EXPOSURE
from cell phones is still alive and kicking as a "possible health
risk" even though the best smarts in medicine can't find a link
to verify that. Cell phones radiate little teeny amounts of RF...

There's the DANGER of RF RADIATION that is supposed to fry
neighbors or something and so there's lots of relatively new
rules in Part 97 about that. Is it needed? I doubt it. Hard to
separate the hysteria from the real thing.

Even the USAF School of Aero Medicine has a big bunch of
science types studying all kinds of RF radiation effects. It can't
find much evidence except for the already-legislated laws and
warnings about RADIATION!

>> Join the groups against use of DIHYDROGEN MONOXIDE.
>>
>> If you can't find those sites, I'll give you some.
>>
>> Their websites yield much good safety information on the danger
>> to humans from dihydrogen monoxide. At least one city
>> administration has tried to put that in city ordinances.
>
> Ahh, the universal solvent! Breathing it can be very dangerous! 8^)

In large quantities it can destroy crops, even vast tracts of
vegetation. The frozen form has been known to be a danger
to ships on the open ocean.

>> Meanwhile, I still think of amateur radio as a HOBBY, a fun,
>> interesting recreational activity involving radio arts which requires
>> regulation and mitigation due to the physics of radio itself.
>>
>> Some misuse the word "service" as in a service to the nation as
>> if it were akin to a military service or noble cause for humanity.
>> However, in all of Title 47 C.F.R., the word "service" is a regulatory
>> term denoting the type and kind of radio activity; e.g., Citizens
>> Band Radio SERVICE.
>
> Since you brought this back on-topic, I'll comment that I think perhaps

>confusion may result from the fact that hams may be "of service" under
>some circumstances. It is hard to think of 75 meter illness comparison
>nets as a service, or chasing QSL cards, but there are times when our
>assistance is not a bad thing.

Yes, that's true, but it is NOT the "basis and purpose" of why many
got into amateur radio. Nearly ALL hams got into amateur radio for
the hobby aspects, for personal recreation and enjoyment.

ANY citizen can, and many do perform real acts of service for their
communities. No ham license needed for that.

How many hams sit and monitor the ham bands strictly for emergency calls? Or even use a second receiver in a "guard" mode? Anyone monitor the old 500 KHz maritime distress frequency? The high-MF voice frequency? Anyone monitor the civil aviation distress frequency of 121.5 MHz?

Feel free to take your own poll on that. I doubt you will find ONE who will answer affirmative on any of them.

Those who want to be of REAL service can join the Peace Corps or something similar. No ham license needed there, either. Or volunteer working at a homeless shelter, or a shelter for battered women. LOTS of places can use volunteers doing a REAL service instead of prancing around saying "we're hams and we are basically an emergency service (and a noble credit to our community, etc.)."

Now, if you want to start a real ruckus, you can claim you got into ham radio just to "do a service for your country." If you do that, you will be telling an [expletive deleted] untruth. :-)

REALITY, folks, not false parading around on isolated stories of wonderfulness by others, waving your flags, etc.

LHA / WMD

2455. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 08:42:58 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050846100.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90519

On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
> rag on each other endlessly.alt"
> and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
> amateur radio regulatory and policy
> issues ...

rec.radio.amateur.bitchfest seems more appropriate - and better than .misc.

> I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
> OT and doesn't belong here ...
> most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
> be for because of the volume
> of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...
>
> Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
> rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
> this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
> provide a place for the serious
> regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
> sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
> fest that you guys have going on here ...
>
> OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
> deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040402185124.29433.00000631@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra'
> > >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >Date: 4/2/2004 4:19 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <20040402171909.01766.00000140@mb-m15.aol.com>
> > >
> > >In article <406DB71A.3090908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
> > >
> > >>Just get the damn license Len, it aint rocket science.
> > >
> > > I know "rocket science" after working three years at
> > > Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International, the makers
> > > of the Space Shuttle Main Engine and the F1 main-stage

> > > engines of the Saturn Rocket (Apollo Program lifter).
> >
> > I am sure that while cleaning the floors and emptying out thier
> ashtrays
> > and coffee cups, you got to know a LOT of "rocket scientists"...Probably
> even
> > picked up enough "lingo" to impress some "young thing" at a bar long
> enough to
> > get his pants off....
> >
> > >I've also had four other [expletive deleted] radio licenses.
> >
> > The best [expletive deleted] radio licenses money could buy.
> >
> > But none of them an Amateur Radio license.
> >
> > Putz.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

2456. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 09:03:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050853070.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90520

On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> Radionews wrote:
> > Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004
> >...
>
> I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)

Idiot. With responders like you, Pasternak will continue to spam this group with his drivel. Then again, this whole group is a collection of trolls.

[In case you weren't aware, the guidelines for the rec.radio hierarchy FORBID his weekly posting on "rec.radio.amateur.policy". The posts are permitted on "rec.radio.info" (because a specific request to do so was granted) and on "rec.radio.amateur.misc" (because it is not forbidden there), yet the jerk continues to post here, and it's assholes like you who respond to him (in any way) that will further encourage him to post here. Why does he need to post this here anyway - it's all up on his website?

In case you're unaware of Bill Pasternak's activities in producing "newsline," ask him why it costs $1,000.00/month (on average) to produce the news, while his competitors like "This Week in Amateur Radio"'s Community Video Associates or even the ARRL itself can do it for less than $100/month. Here's why: He's paying himself a salary - it's not a "not for profit" relationship. Then there's the matter of his clear BIAS in the news. For example, a few years ago, he did a series of stories about a Los Angeles area repeater (BP is in the Los Angeles area) and its problems with a system in Mexico, and Riley Hollingsworth's enforcement involvement with the interference complaints. Half of what he reported on about the situation was completely wrong, and the other half he made up. How do I know this? I know this because I personally know the trustees of that (now former) L.A. system, and I observed the disgruntled Mexicans lying to BP at a local amateur radio convention. BP made NO ATTEMPT to contact the L.A. trustees for their side of the story - he simply made up "facts" to fit. His "journalism" is right up there with the level expected of the "National Enquirer", the "Weekly World News", and other such tabloids - it is CRAP.]

2457. Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 09:22:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050922550.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90521

```
Date: 05 Apr 2004 02:46:17 GMT
From: Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject:
=?ISO-8859-1?B?UmU6IEFtYXRldXIgUmFkaW8gTmV3c2xpbmUodG0pIFJlcG9ydCAxMzkwIK0gQ
XByaWwgMiwgIDIwMDQ=?=

Nice title. WTF does it say? [Also, since the first 128 characters of this
character set happens to be the same as ASCII, why need encode it in the first
place?]

When will assholes learn that MIME encoded messages don't work on newsgroups.
This is right up there with the idiots that post in HTML.
```

2458. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 13:03:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4071591B.2000008@psu.edu>
Source record: 90522

D. Stussy wrote:
> On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Radionews wrote:
>>
>>>Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 ï¿½ April 2, 2004
>>>...
>>
>> I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
>
>
> Idiot. With responders like you, Pasternak will continue to spam this group
> with his drivel. Then again, this whole group is a collection of trolls.
>
> [In case you weren't aware, the guidelines for the rec.radio hierarchy FORBID
> his weekly posting on "rec.radio.amateur.policy". The posts are permitted on
> "rec.radio.info" (because a specific request to do so was granted) and on
> "rec.radio.amateur.misc" (because it is not forbidden there), yet the jerk
> continues to post here, and it's assholes like you who respond to him (in any
> way) that will further encourage him to post here. Why does he need to post
> this here anyway - it's all up on his website?

1. If he's doing something wrong, report it to his ISP abuse.

2. Think you are going to convert me to your cause by calling me names?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2459. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 14:04:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405100449.17874.00000666@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90523

>Subject: Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/5/2004 1:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040405020401.27920.00000207@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>In article <xdidncnKqKTFXe3dRVn-hg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>confusion may result from the fact that hams may be "of service" under
>>some circumstances. It is hard to think of 75 meter illness comparison
>>nets as a service, or chasing QSL cards, but there are times when our
>>assistance is not a bad thing.

> ANY citizen can, and many do perform real acts of service for their
> communities. No ham license needed for that.

Unless, of course, they choose to do that service as a control operator of
an Amatuer Radio Staton.

> How many hams sit and monitor the ham bands strictly for
> emergency calls? Or even use a second receiver in a "guard"
> mode? Anyone monitor the old 500 KHz maritime distress
> frequency? The high-MF voice frequency? Anyone monitor the
> civil aviation distress frequency of 121.5 MHz?

> Feel free to take your own poll on that. I doubt you will find ONE
> who will answer affirmative on any of them.

I use a Hamtronics receiver with ELT alarm function. I also monitor
military guard and maritime guard with EPIRB alarm. We have tone alerting for
ARES/SKYWARN locally.

> Those who want to be of REAL service can join the Peace Corps
> or something similar. No ham license needed there, either. Or
> volunteer working at a homeless shelter, or a shelter for battered
> women. LOTS of places can use volunteers doing a REAL
> service instead of prancing around saying "we're hams and we
> are basically an emergency service (and a noble credit to our
> community, etc.)."

Of course we have Lennie to depend upon to tell us what "real" service is.
Not that Lennie hiumslef has gotten himslef out of the house to do ANY kind of
service...Unless you consider LIP service...

> Now, if you want to start a real ruckus, you can claim you got
> into ham radio just to "do a service for your country." If you do
> that, you will be telling an [expletive deleted] untruth. :-)

>
> REALITY, folks, not false parading around on isolated stories
> of wonderfulness by others, waving your flags, etc.

REALITY, Lennie, are the reams of accolades bestowed to Amateur Radio by the governors of almost every state for various "Amateur Radio Weeks", all of which acknowledge the disaster relief and other public service activities of Amateur Radio.

REALITY are the words of praise read into the Federal Register by elected representitives in Congress, from various disaster relief agencies, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, etc etc etc that atest to Amateur Radio's value as a "valuable national resource".

REALITY, Lennie, is found in the Memorandums of Understanding by numerous private, civil and military agencies with the ARRL/ARES for rendering support in those very same scenarios.

REALITY, Lennie, is that you are a loud mouthed idiot with absolutely NO basis for your anti-Amateur rantings save for your own wonded ego that won't let you take an Amateur exam lest you admit that you ARE a mere mortal and must do what other mere mortals must do to possess an Amateur Radio license.

Sucks to be you, Putzy One.

Steve, K4YZ

2460. Re: Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 14:07:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405100739.17874.00000667@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90524

```
>Subject: =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Re=3A_Amateur_Radio_Newsline=28tm=29_Repo?=
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/5/2004 4:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050853070.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
>On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
>> Radionews wrote:
>> > Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 =AD April 2, 2004
>> >...
>>
>> =09I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
>
>Idiot. With responders like you, Pasternak will continue to spam this grou=
>p
>with his drivel. Then again, this whole group is a collection of trolls.

Hey Dieter. Seems to me that you're a regular, if not frequent, poster
here too.

Do you include yourself in that, or are you "above" off topic
conversations of ANY nature?

73

Steve, K4YZ
```

2461. Re: Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 14:09:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405100907.17874.00000668@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90525

```
>Subject: Message Titles
>From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
>Date: 4/5/2004 4:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050922550.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
>
>
>Date: 05 Apr 2004 02:46:17 GMT
>From: Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject:
>
>=?ISO-8859-1?B?UmU6IEFtYXRldXIgUmFkaW8gTmV3c2xpbmUodG0pIFJlcG9ydCAxMzkwIK0gQ
> XByaWwgMiwgIDIwMDQ=?=
>
>Nice title. WTF does it say? [Also, since the first 128 characters of this
>character set happens to be the same as ASCII, why need encode it in the
>first
>place?]
>
>When will assholes learn that MIME encoded messages don't work on newsgroups.
>This is right up there with the idiots that post in HTML.

Wasn't my doings, Dieter...chill out.

Steve, K4YZ
```

2462. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 15:59:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90526

In article <bvadnWx1bKCEzf_d4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>I said they elected to use the no-code Technician as their entry to ham
>radio rather than the Novice license. Yes they took the Novice written but
>not the code. Thus they "bypassed" the Novice license in the sense that
>they never held a Novice license. They had basically two choices to enter
>ham radio (unless of course they chose to do additional study and sit for
>higher class tests at the same time).
>
>1) They could take (and pass) the Novice written plus 5wpm and get a Novice
>license.
>2) They could take (and pass) the Novice written and Tech written and get a
>no-code Tech license.
>
>The prospective ham generally took the route 2 to enter ham radio rather
>than route 1. Thus by that choice, the people themselves made the Tech
>no-code the entry level license despite the fact that it was more difficult
>than earning the Novice license. The restructuring in 2000 merely
>formalized what had already occurred.

I agree except for one point: The decision was made by different people for a
number of factors, such as the *perceived* difficulty and the *perceived*
rewards.
>
>Having earned my initial license in 1992 (Tech with HF), I'm quite familiar
>with what was going on. The majority of people sitting for their first
>license took the Tech no-code route to put off learning the code not because
>of its two meter and VHF access. Prior to on-air experience, they simply
>were not personally familiar enough with various ham activities to select
>their entry route on the basis of the desireability of having 2m access.
>
Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech. This
was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440 access,
which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with a
2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and wind
up with a Tech. Code or no code.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2463. Re: Wrong Yet Again, Len!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:08:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0404050808.55b06e11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90527

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040401154347.12501.00007067@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0404010443.6bda1e22@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >We've been through this before.
>
> Jimmy likes to go over and over and over and over old subjects.
> Maybe he figures he might win one of them during reruns... :-)

Coming from a guy who's mentioned his 1950-s era Army postings
hundreds of times and finds it necessary to repost his CV (or parts
thereof) more times than anyone can keep track of, I don't believe you
have ANY room to talk about who likes to go "over and over" ANY
subject.

Steve, K4YZ

2464. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:09:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <5JCcnYjTMomCGOzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90528

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040404101348.22051.00000590@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >'Youngest Extra')
> >From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
> >Date: 4/3/2004 7:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <-VydnYUm2-Vrz_LdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
> >
> >
> >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >> >'Youngest Extra')
> >[snip]
> >
> >> Gentlemen, your comments are well spoken and have much merit.
> >>
> >> I wonder why, however, many of you selectively decide when to
complain
> >> about the "noise".
> >
> >Steve,
> >
> >The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have
nothing
> >to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal
grudges
> >and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally
dominating
> >the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
>
> I see.
>
> And you see my "crap" as being solely responsible.
>
> Uh huh...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not just
you ...

Carl - wk3c

2465. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:11:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404050811.51008174@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90529

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<xZydndNrdvk2Re3dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> >>N2EY wrote:
> >>>In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >>Sohl"
> >>
> >>>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

> >>>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
> >>>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
> >>>>>avoid it.
> >>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -

> >>>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
> >>>>posting that I used to.

> >>>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
> >>>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
> >>>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.

> >>>Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring certain
> >>>regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
> >>>inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.

> >>>But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not true?
>
> >> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap
> >>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
> >>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
> >>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?

> > You make an excellent point. I used to read that stuff, but soon got to the
> > point where I could tell from the subject line and sender that it was spam, > > and I'd
delete it unread.
> >
> >>You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
> >>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
> >>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
> >>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.

> > In my case it's lower - there is more signal and less noise in my personal
> > email than here. Part of that is due to the high volume of good stuff from > > the

various reflectors, though.
>
> My big problem is that one of my addys is a .edu, and it has what many
> places did at one time (perhaps some still do) my initials followed by a
> number.

Just askin' for it.
>
> Many of the spammers simply use a random group of letters followed by a
> semi-random group of numbers, and viola, "you have spam!"
>
> It is chilling to think of how much bandwidth that wastes.

Better than junkmail, though.
>
> >>If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
> >>easier to handle.

> > Good point. I have been doing that for a while, without really thinking
> > about it.

> >>Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?

> > Only Len can do that.
>
> And I think he is quite happy with the way he is!

He appears to be quite pleased with himself. And extremely critical,
insulting and condemnatory of anyone who dares to disagree with him or
prove him wrong about anything.

> >>Or Steve or Brian's?

> > It's up to them.

> >>Not hardly likely!

> > Agreed.

> >>I don't even want to. I like 'em all just the way they are.

> > You like the noise? I don't.
>
> Oh no! But I separate the noise from the person

In some cases if you separate the noise from the person there isn't
much left!

> > And I agree with Carl that their behavior has helped drive away good people
> > like W1RFI.
>
> That is too bad, but I liken the situation to stopping driving because
> there are wild drivers out on the road.

It's more like this: Stopping driving on certain roads because of the
wild drivers on those roads.

> Once I left a group because of problems with certain posters. It was an
> amateur telescope making SIG. I was getting personal email nastygrams
> from one member on every post I made, and a couple others seemed to
> agree with him. So I left the group. A week after that, I found out the
> person doing this had passed away. Turns out he was a terminal cancer
> case, and was on a LOT of pain killing drugs. I felt pretty awkward for
> being so p****d off at him earlier.

His behavior wasn't your doing, Mike.
>
> Point is, maybe some people are less than pleasant, but we aren't
> always sure why.

Very true. However, that does not mean we must accept their behavior
as "normal" or "acceptable".
>
> >>If a person has problems with what they post, they can
> >>avoid reading them. Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing
> >>his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.

Which is what I do much of the time.
> >
> > Aside from Len's use of no less than five different screen names here:
> >
> > nocwtest@aol.com
> > averyfine@aol.com
> > averyfineman@aol.com
> > lenof21@aol.com
> > lenover21@aol.com
> >
> > that's pretty true.
>
> Although I think that he always puts His name in the post somewhere.

No, he doesn't. In fact the reverse is true - most of Len's posts here
do not contain his name or other clear identifier. Of course he posts
here so much that if only 1 in 100 posts is clearly identified, it is
soon clear who is who.

> > Newsgroup BPL - very descriptive.
>
> I think so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2466. Re: DISCIPLINARY HEARING AGAINST KC8QJP RESIDES WITH N8WWM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:18:45 UTC
From: Andy 2LD751 <"2LD751 at COMCAST DOT NET">
Message-ID: <f6CdnT37j9XiG-zdRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I usually skip over this 8th grade BS but you really have no life. Just
thought I'd let ya know.

--
73! de Andy 2LD751
http://2ld751.tripod.com
AOL IM: AndyLD751
Support the "Alternate" Calling Freq 26.285 USB

2467. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:26:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405122614.16022.00000550@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90531

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>From: "Carl R. Stevenson" wk3cqth@wk3c.com
>Date: 4/5/2004 11:09 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5JCcnYjTMomCGOzdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040404101348.22051.00000590@mb-m22.aol.com...

>> >The endless bickering and personal attacks that fundamentally have
>nothing
>> >to do with amateur radio policy and everything to do with personal
>grudges
>> >and vendettas have reached a level where they are almost totally
>dominating
>> >the newsgroup on many, if not most, days.
>>
>> I see.
>>
>> And you see my "crap" as being solely responsible.
>>
>> Uh huh...
>
>You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not just
>you ...

I don't believe myself to be "twisting" anything, Carl, but I do see your
point, so I stand corrected.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2468. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:28:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405122841.16022.00000551@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90532

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/5/2004 11:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0404050811.51008174@posting.google.com>
>
>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<xZydndNrdvk2Re3dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...

>> Although I think that he always puts His name in the post somewhere.
>
>No, he doesn't. In fact the reverse is true - most of Len's posts here
>do not contain his name or other clear identifier. Of course he posts
>here so much that if only 1 in 100 posts is clearly identified, it is
>soon clear who is who.

Or he let's his ego override his situational awareness and signs his name
to a post under one of his nomme-de guerre's and let's it slip who he is...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2469. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:39:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404050839.7aa856d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90533

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >
> >>In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> >><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
> >>>>example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
> >>>>are
> >>>>somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
> >>>>shown
> >>>>no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
> >>>>signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
> >>>>immunizations.
> >>>
> >>>The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
> >>>controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
> >>>diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"
> >>
> >>
> > TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
> > you tell me what caused it?
> >
> > Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
> > it his own immunizations?
> >
> > Do you know?
>
> No I don't, and I'm sorry to hear that, Brian.

I don't know either, and I'm also sorry to read that. I have some
slight layman's experience with such disorders.
>
> From what I have read, seen, and heard, I doubt it is chemicals put
> into *you*. Most of that stuff is not good for you, though. And the rise
> in autism doesn't correlate too well with immunizations IMO.
>
> Here is my take on why a lot of children have developmental problems
> that seem to be on the increase, per capita wise:

>
> I think think there is a chemical problem in general. I think that
> possibly a combination of food additives and chemicals that are making
> people ill and interfering with proper development.

That's certainly a very logical theory. Here are some other factors:

1) Certain chemicals and other environmental factors, by themselves, may not cause measurable problems. But in combination the total effects may be quite pronounced. Most product testing is single-factor.

2) A product that is "safe" in its original state may break down in the environment into waste products that are not.

3) Individuals have varying levels of genetic predisposition. Almost everyone has, and remembers, an "Uncle Charlie" who worked with toxic materials all his life, smoked 3 packs of Dromedaries a day, drank a quart of John Daniels and died at the age of 95 in a freak hang-gliding accident while on vacation with his 30 year old wife. But there's also "Aunt Ethel" who died of a rare malady at the age of 32 even though she never drank, smoked, or was knowingly exposed to anything more toxic than Ivory soap.

4) Health care professionals are getting better at diagnosis. Years ago, many developmental disorders (such as autism) were not differentiated from mental retardation.

>
> Here's an interesting link:
>
> http://www.nontoxic.com/nontoxic/injured.html
>
> lots of chemicals that we are using on a daily basis are not good for us
> at all.
>
> and
>
> http://www.edelsoncenter.com/aut_chem.htm
>
> yet another link dealing with premature puberty:
>
> http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/479363.stm
>
> http://www.emagazine.com/november-december_1997/1197gl_health.html
>
> The last links are here because kids are being exposed to these
> chemicals that mimic hormones and mess with their proper development.
>
> <snippage>
>
> There are so many chemicals that we are putting in our bodies, from the
> preservatives in vaccinations, to the carcinogens that we clean our

> carpets with, and then put our babies down on those same carpets
> thinking that they now have a clean healthy place to play in. We seal
> our houses tightly to save money on fuel, and then breathe formaldehyde
> contaminated air from the carpets, insulation, and paneling. We eat
> meat that has been raised with hormones and antibiotics so that it grows
> quicker. When I was a coach, an amazing amount of the kids playing on my
> teams had to use inhalers for their asthma. These are supposedly healthy
> kids - they are not.
>
> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
> doing what?

We don't. But if we protest, we are derided as "luddites" and
"anti-progress".

> What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma
> cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through
> premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But
> something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.

I agree, Mike. At the very least, the testing done on chemical
products is woefully inadequate.

At the same time, it's important to focus on solid scientific
information. Repeated tests have shown no causal link between the
tested immunizations and autism. Then there's the "facilitated
communications" fiasco of some years back.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2470. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:48:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90534

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040404143748.03943.00000121@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <20040404075903.09913.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >So what should folks like you and I do about it?
> >
> >In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong, should
> we
> >simply ignore it or challenge it?
>
> Your first step is to PROVE your "information" is the "truth" that
> cannot ever be "flat out wrong."

Why? You don't do that, Len. Why should others have to meet a standard
that you don't meet yourself?

> You must separate your OPINION from so-called irrefutable
> "truth."

Why? You don't do that, Len. Why should others have to meet a standard
that you don't meet yourself?

> Opinion is opinion, not some universal truth just because
> you think it is so.

That's true. Which is why it's important to clearly state when
something is an opinion and when it's a provable or disprovable fact.

> After you've done all that, you have to consider that some folks
> will still be against you. That is the nature of the computer-modem
> beast. That will not change, not even if you think you speak the
> most truthful words possible by mortals. Get used to it.

> Once adjusted to all those very real environmental conditions, but
> you still feel that your god-like words are irrefutable truisms, it is
> time to pack it in, quit the newsgroup, and perhaps establish
> yourself as a swami of a cult somewhere. That's much better
> than to hang in and constantly complaining that some just don't
> believe your truths to be self-evident and are so irreverent to
> your magnificent words. :-)

You should re-read those statements and act on them, Len.

So here's a challenge for you, Len:

Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.

And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or disproves some claim you make here.

Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7 years or so, I'll just ignore you.

2471. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 16:55:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Obgcc.15855$Dv2.2753@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90535

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

|
| You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not
just
| you ...
|
| Carl - wk3c

Carl,

They've dragged you down into their same insult-match.

Never wrestle with a pig. You get covered with mud and pig shit, and
the pig enjoys the company.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2472. Re: Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 17:15:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40719414.3040209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90536

D. Stussy wrote:

>Date: 05 Apr 2004 02:46:17 GMT
>From: Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject:
> =?ISO-8859-1?B?UmU6IEFtYXRldXIgUmFkaW8gTmV3c2xpbmUodG0pIFJlcG9ydCAxMzkwIK0gQ
> XByaWwgMiwgIDIwMDQ=?=
>
>Nice title. WTF does it say? [Also, since the first 128 characters of this
>character set happens to be the same as ASCII, why need encode it in the first
>place?]
>
>
>
It's an encode of some language that is not normally supported by ASCII,
like Chinese
or Japanese. "ISO-8859" is likely the spec for what the code means.

I get a lot of spam that looks like this. I suppose the spambots can't
tell what
ethnic group I belong to from my email address. "wa2ise" isn't a normal
name,
and the spambots don't know about ham call signs.

Likely its a Ponzi scheme to sell Viagra perscriptions to spend $5 to
make $5M. ;-)

2473. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 17:22:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405132254.16022.00000552@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90537

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/5/2004 11:48 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040404143748.03943.00000121@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> Once adjusted to all those very real environmental conditions, but
>> you still feel that your god-like words are irrefutable truisms, it is
>> time to pack it in, quit the newsgroup, and perhaps establish
>> yourself as a swami of a cult somewhere. That's much better
>> than to hang in and constantly complaining that some just don't
>> believe your truths to be self-evident and are so irreverent to
>> your magnificent words. :-)
>
>You should re-read those statements and act on them, Len.

SURELY you're not going to hold your breath waiting for THAT to happen!

>So here's a challenge for you, Len:
>
>Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no
>name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license
>classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite
>modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.

What...?!?!

That would be akin to forcing a mime to sit on his hands! ! ! ! ! !

>And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or
>disproves some claim you make here.

Now you're REALLY hoping aginst hope!

>Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you
>choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7
>years or so, I'll just ignore you.

And I'll follow Jim's lead.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2474. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 17:23:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405132352.16022.00000553@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90538

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/5/2004 11:55 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Obgcc.15855$Dv2.2753@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>They've dragged you down into their same insult-match.

So which are you, Hans? The pig or the company?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2475. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 17:24:43 UTC
From: joe sixpack <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <7ygcc.504$ZJ6.83@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90539

Register with the Democratic party.

G.K. Konnig wrote:
> I think iti¿½s possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
> collects their brains.
>
> What can I do?

2476. Re: Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 17:36:41 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1adb6338aaa4af6f9898f9@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 90540

```
In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050922550.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>,
kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org says...
>
> Date: 05 Apr 2004 02:46:17 GMT
> From: Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject:
> =?ISO-8859-1?B?UmU6IEFtYXRldXIgUmFkaW8gTmV3c2xpbmUodG0pIFJlcG9ydCAxMzkwIK0gQ
> XByaWwgMiwgIDIwMDQ=?=
>
> Nice title. WTF does it say? [Also, since the first 128 characters of this
> character set happens to be the same as ASCII, why need encode it in the first
> place?]
>
> When will assholes learn that MIME encoded messages don't work on newsgroups.
> This is right up there with the idiots that post in HTML.
>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=ISO-8859-1

It's because their new reader encodes the text using ISO standards. It
thinks every other newsreader out there understands it. They don't.

Why do I get the feeling that this is a new feature of MSOE.
```

2477. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:11:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4071A145.9090008@psu.edu>
Source record: 90541

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<xZydndNrdvk2Re3dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...

<snippage>

>> My big problem is that one of my addys is a .edu, and it has what many
>>places did at one time (perhaps some still do) my initials followed by a
>>number.
>
>
> Just askin' for it.

and they won't let me change it either! 8^(

<snippage>

> In some cases if you separate the noise from the person there isn't
> much left!

Okay, now that reminds me of one of my favorite jokes:

Q. What weighs 5 pounds and is obnoxious?

A. A (insert statehood of a person here) after an enema!

<snippage>

- Mike KB3EIA -

2478. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:13:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4071A1B6.3090100@psu.edu>
Source record: 90542

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> |
> | You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not
> just
> | you ...
> |
> | Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl,
>
> They've dragged you down into their same insult-match.
>
> Never wrestle with a pig. You get covered with mud and pig shit, and
> the pig enjoys the company.

Be kind to pigs, Hans.

- mike KB3EIA -

2479. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:45:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405144543.05305.00000176@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90543

In article <Obgcc.15855$Dv2.2753@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>| You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not just
>| you ...
>|
>| Carl - wk3c
>
>Carl,
>
>They've dragged you down into their same insult-match.
>
>Never wrestle with a pig. You get covered with mud and pig shit, and
>the pig enjoys the company.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Heh heh heh. Very apt, but now watch more murderous rage erupt
from the pig pen. :-)

LHA / WMD

2480. Re: Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:45:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405144544.05305.00000177@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90545

In article <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050922550.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>Date: 05 Apr 2004 02:46:17 GMT
>From: Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject:
>
>=?ISO-8859-1?B?UmU6IEFtYXRldXIgUmFkaW8gTmV3c2xpbmUodG0pIFJlcG9ydCAxMzkwIK0gQ
> XByaWwgMiwgIDIwMDQ=?=
>
>Nice title. WTF does it say? [Also, since the first 128 characters of this
>character set happens to be the same as ASCII, why need encode it in the
>first
>place?]
>
>When will assholes learn that MIME encoded messages don't work on newsgroups.
>This is right up there with the idiots that post in HTML.

That individual is too busy with all the "monitoring" activities on radio
to learn elementary principles of Internet messaging. :-)

LHA / WMD

2481. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:45:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405144546.05305.00000178@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90547

In article <c2356669.0404050811.51008174@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(Holy man, still mad as heck and not taking it
any more) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<xZydndNrdvk2Re3dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > In article <ab-dndsKRtw1t-3dRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>> >>N2EY wrote:
>> >>>In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>> >>Sohl"
>> >>
>> >>><billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>> >>>>Newsgroup BPL, Carl. If there is an upside to this sad state of
>> >>>>affairs, it is pretty easy to see who all is posting the acrimony and
>> >>>>avoid it.
>> >>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>> >>>I much agree...which is why I have stopped the
>> >>>posting that I used to.
>
>> >>>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>> >>>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>> >>>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>
>> >>>Agreed, Bill. I find myself deleting most posts here, adn ignoring
>certain
>> >>>regular posters because no matter how civilly they are approached, they
>> >>>inevitably resort to name calling, false information and insults.
>
>> >>>But what do we do about those who post information that is simply not
>true?
>>
>> >> Do you reply to all the spam email that you get that promises you cheap
>> >>prescription drugs, some poor schmedlock from Nigeria needs YOU to
>> >>participate in some weird scam he's pulling off, or to increase the size
>> >>of little willie to gargantuan proportions?
>
>> > You make an excellent point. I used to read that stuff, but soon got to
>the

>> > point where I could tell from the subject line and sender that it was
>spam, > > and I'd delete it unread.
>> >
>> >>You probably don't, I know I don't. Point is that 90 percent of the
>> >>email I get is worthless spam. I'm not going to control it, and my
>> >>option is therefore to opt out of email if I really can't handle it.
>> >>This newsgroup has a higher s/n ratio than my personal email.
>
>> > In my case it's lower - there is more signal and less noise in my
>personal
>> > email than here. Part of that is due to the high volume of good stuff
>from > > the various reflectors, though.
>>
>> My big problem is that one of my addys is a .edu, and it has what many
>> places did at one time (perhaps some still do) my initials followed by a
>> number.
>
>Just askin' for it.
>>
>> Many of the spammers simply use a random group of letters followed by a

>> semi-random group of numbers, and viola, "you have spam!"
>>
>> It is chilling to think of how much bandwidth that wastes.
>
>Better than junkmail, though.
>>
>> >>If we approach the newsgroup noise as spam, it might make it a little
>> >>easier to handle.
>
>> > Good point. I have been doing that for a while, without really thinking
>> > about it.
>
>> >>Do you think that any of us can modify Len's behavior?
>
>> > Only Len can do that.
>>
>> And I think he is quite happy with the way he is!
>
>He appears to be quite pleased with himself. And extremely critical,
>insulting and condemnatory of anyone who dares to disagree with him or
>prove him wrong about anything.
>
>> >>Or Steve or Brian's?
>
>> > It's up to them.
>
>> >>Not hardly likely!
>
>> > Agreed.

>
>> >>I don't even want to. I like 'em all just the way they are.
>
>> > You like the noise? I don't.
>>
>> Oh no! But I separate the noise from the person
>
>In some cases if you separate the noise from the person there isn't
>much left!
>
>> > And I agree with Carl that their behavior has helped drive away good
>people
>> > like W1RFI.
>>
>> That is too bad, but I liken the situation to stopping driving because
>> there are wild drivers out on the road.
>
>It's more like this: Stopping driving on certain roads because of the
>wild drivers on those roads.
>
>> Once I left a group because of problems with certain posters. It was an
>> amateur telescope making SIG. I was getting personal email nastygrams
>> from one member on every post I made, and a couple others seemed to
>> agree with him. So I left the group. A week after that, I found out the
>> person doing this had passed away. Turns out he was a terminal cancer
>> case, and was on a LOT of pain killing drugs. I felt pretty awkward for
>> being so p****d off at him earlier.
>
>His behavior wasn't your doing, Mike.
>>
>> Point is, maybe some people are less than pleasant, but we aren't
>> always sure why.
>
>Very true. However, that does not mean we must accept their behavior
>as "normal" or "acceptable".
>>
>> >>If a person has problems with what they post, they can
>> >>avoid reading them. Not a hard thing to do, as aside from Brian changing
>> >>his addy to avoid spam, they aren't disguising themselves.
>
>Which is what I do much of the time.
>> >
>> > Aside from Len's use of no less than five different screen names here:
>> >
>> > nocwtest@aol.com
>> > averyfine@aol.com
>> > averyfineman@aol.com
>> > lenof21@aol.com
>> > lenover21@aol.com
>> >

>> > that's pretty true.
>>
>> Although I think that he always puts His name in the post somewhere.
>
>No, he doesn't. In fact the reverse is true - most of Len's posts here
>do not contain his name or other clear identifier. Of course he posts
>here so much that if only 1 in 100 posts is clearly identified, it is
>soon clear who is who.

Forgive me, holiest of holy men of the Church of St. Hiram.

My name and current postal address has been given over two
dozen times in 5 electronics publications, a minimum printing of
over 50,000 per issue.

My name and current postal address appear the same on 90
documents on 22 different proceedings in the FCC Electronic
Comment Filing System.

Forgive me for the impertinence of appearing anonymous, your
emminence. I am but a humble servant of independent thought,
unable to bask in the etheral shining glow of your magnifence.

"Captain, I sense much hostility out there..." - Troi

LHA / WMD

2482. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:45:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405144547.05305.00000179@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90544

In article <20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
This
>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440 access,
>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with a
>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
wind
>up with a Tech. Code or no code.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
(FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
Communications Act of 1934.

The regulations covering civil radio and communications in the
United States is contained in Code of Federal Regulations, Title
47. The full-volume set or separate Parts may be ordered from
the United States Government Printing Office (USGPO) in paper
form or downloadable free from www.gpo.gov in either text or
scanned from printed form.

There you have it: A simple correction of your erroneous use of a
federal agency acronym. No acrimony, no name calling, the
names that of identification of the correct names and acronyms.
Plus a helpful suggestion for your self-education.

"Please state the nature of your medical emergency." - Zimmerman

LHA / WMD

2483. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 18:45:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040405144548.05305.00000180@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90546

In article <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(Holy man, mad as heck and not taking it anymore) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040404143748.03943.00000121@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040404075903.09913.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >So what should folks like you and I do about it?
>> >
>> >In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong,
>should
>> we
>> >simply ignore it or challenge it?
>>
>> Your first step is to PROVE your "information" is the "truth" that
>> cannot ever be "flat out wrong."
>
>Why? You don't do that, Len. Why should others have to meet a standard
>that you don't meet yourself?

There are standards?

Oh, yes...you set the standards by edict. Or is that papal encyclical?

All shall follow your lead, opinions, etc., in order to be "correct."

All who do not follow are incorrect. Of course.

Such is the catechism.

>> You must separate your OPINION from so-called irrefutable
>> "truth."
>
>Why? You don't do that, Len. Why should others have to meet a standard
>that you don't meet yourself?

There are standards?

Oh, yes...you set the standards by edict. Or is that papal encyclical?

All shall follow your lead, opinions, etc., in order to be "correct."

All who do not follow are incorrect. Of course.

Such is the catechism.

>> Opinion is opinion, not some universal truth just because
>> you think it is so.
>
>That's true. Which is why it's important to clearly state when
>something is an opinion and when it's a provable or disprovable fact.

You first, supreme newsgroup holiness. We hear and obey...

>
>> After you've done all that, you have to consider that some folks
>> will still be against you. That is the nature of the computer-modem
>> beast. That will not change, not even if you think you speak the
>> most truthful words possible by mortals. Get used to it.
>
>> Once adjusted to all those very real environmental conditions, but
>> you still feel that your god-like words are irrefutable truisms, it is
>> time to pack it in, quit the newsgroup, and perhaps establish
>> yourself as a swami of a cult somewhere. That's much better
>> than to hang in and constantly complaining that some just don't
>> believe your truths to be self-evident and are so irreverent to
>> your magnificent words. :-)
>
>You should re-read those statements and act on them, Len.

All is acting. Perhaps the world is a stage and you act upon it?

All shall follow your lead, opinions, etc., in order to be "correct."

All who do not follow are incorrect. Of course. Bad acting.

>So here's a challenge for you, Len:
>
>Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no
>name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license
>classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite
>modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.

Please give us the entire listing of what is correct.

Please issue the proper and correct stage directions so that
all may act upon it without error.

Please, your holiness, lead us not into temptation of the
terrible independent thought!

All shall be as you ordain, all shall be right with the world.

>And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or
>disproves some claim you make here.

Yea, verily we shall all strive to act in the manner you have
shown us as leadership, your holiness.

>Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you
>choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7

>years or so, I'll just ignore you.

Oh! Please! Not that! To be ignored by the Holiest of Holy Men!

I stand abshed with head bowed before your majestic divinity
and humbly ask forgiveness for having the temerity to express
independent thought.

Picard at the marriage bureau: "Engage!"

LHA / WMD

2484. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 19:57:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4071BA2F.7030204@psu.edu>
Source record: 90548

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>>In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations. For
>>>>>example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that immunizations
>>>>>are
>>>>>somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>>>>>shown
>>>>>no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first definitive
>>>>>signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>>>>>immunizations.
>>>>
>>>>The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
>>>>controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
>>>>diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"
>>>>
>>>
>>>TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
>>>you tell me what caused it?
>>>
>>>Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
>>>it his own immunizations?
>>>
>>>Do you know?
>>
>> No I don't, and I'm sorry to hear that, Brian.
>
>
> I don't know either, and I'm also sorry to read that. I have some
> slight layman's experience with such disorders.
>
>> From what I have read, seen, and heard, I doubt it is chemicals put
>>into *you*. Most of that stuff is not good for you, though. And the rise
>>in autism doesn't correlate too well with immunizations IMO.
>>

>> Here is my take on why a lot of children have developmental problems
>>that seem to be on the increase, per capita wise:
>>
>> I think think there is a chemical problem in general. I think that
>>possibly a combination of food additives and chemicals that are making
>>people ill and interfering with proper development.
>
>
> That's certainly a very logical theory. Here are some other factors:
>
> 1) Certain chemicals and other environmental factors, by themselves,
> may not cause measurable problems. But in combination the total
> effects may be quite pronounced. Most product testing is
> single-factor.

I have personal experience in the multiple chemical area. It is
recognized as a big problem by environment workers.

> 2) A product that is "safe" in its original state may break down in
> the environment into waste products that are not.
>
> 3) Individuals have varying levels of genetic predisposition. Almost
> everyone has, and remembers, an "Uncle Charlie" who worked with toxic
> materials all his life, smoked 3 packs of Dromedaries a day, drank a
> quart of John Daniels and died at the age of 95 in a freak
> hang-gliding accident while on vacation with his 30 year old wife. But
> there's also "Aunt Ethel" who died of a rare malady at the age of 32
> even though she never drank, smoked, or was knowingly exposed to
> anything more toxic than Ivory soap.
>
> 4) Health care professionals are getting better at diagnosis. Years
> ago, many developmental disorders (such as autism) were not
> differentiated from mental retardation.
>
>> Here's an interesting link:
>>
>>http://www.nontoxic.com/nontoxic/injured.html
>>
>>lots of chemicals that we are using on a daily basis are not good for us
>>at all.
>>
>>and
>>
>>http://www.edelsoncenter.com/aut_chem.htm
>>
>> yet another link dealing with premature puberty:
>>
>> http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/479363.stm
>>
>>http://www.emagazine.com/november-december_1997/1197gl_health.html
>>

>> The last links are here because kids are being exposed to these
>>chemicals that mimic hormones and mess with their proper development.
>>
>><snippage>
>>
>> There are so many chemicals that we are putting in our bodies, from the
>>preservatives in vaccinations, to the carcinogens that we clean our
>>carpets with, and then put our babies down on those same carpets
>>thinking that they now have a clean healthy place to play in. We seal
>>our houses tightly to save money on fuel, and then breathe formaldehyde
>> contaminated air from the carpets, insulation, and paneling. We eat
>>meat that has been raised with hormones and antibiotics so that it grows
>>quicker. When I was a coach, an amazing amount of the kids playing on my
>>teams had to use inhalers for their asthma. These are supposedly healthy
>>kids - they are not.
>>
>> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
>>doing what?
>
>
> We don't. But if we protest, we are derided as "luddites" and
> "anti-progress".

Uh-huh. And then when it is proven beyond a doubt that there IS a
problem, the same people will talk about "We just didn't know that it
was dangerous then!".

>> What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma
>>cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through
>>premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But
>>something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.
>
>
> I agree, Mike. At the very least, the testing done on chemical
> products is woefully inadequate.
>
> At the same time, it's important to focus on solid scientific
> information.

Absolutely! I have worked with some dangerous stuff over the years. But
what is needed is knowledge about what you are working with, and honesty
in it's effects.

> Repeated tests have shown no causal link between the
> tested immunizations and autism. Then there's the "facilitated
> communications" fiasco of some years back.

That was one of the sickest chapters in psycho-land. If you look at how
it was done, Facilitated communications is almost like the old Ouija
board. It mainly shows the mental state of the person that is "helping".
And lots of them were pretty sick...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2485. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 21:59:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040405175926.05025.00000215@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 90549

In article <20040405132254.16022.00000552@mb-m23.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>>'Youngest Extra')
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/5/2004 11:48 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040404143748.03943.00000121@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>>> Once adjusted to all those very real environmental conditions, but
>>> you still feel that your god-like words are irrefutable truisms, it is
>>> time to pack it in, quit the newsgroup, and perhaps establish
>>> yourself as a swami of a cult somewhere. That's much better
>>> than to hang in and constantly complaining that some just don't
>>> believe your truths to be self-evident and are so irreverent to
>>> your magnificent words. :-)
>>
>>You should re-read those statements and act on them, Len.
>
> SURELY you're not going to hold your breath waiting for THAT to happen!

It's just a suggestion, Steve. No need to get all excited.

>>So here's a challenge for you, Len:
>>
>>Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no
>>name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license
>>classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite
>>modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.
>
> What...?!?!

Just what it says, Steve.
>
> That would be akin to forcing a mime to sit on his hands! ! ! ! ! !

Can you meet the same challenge?
>
>>And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or
>>disproves some claim you make here.
>

> Now you're REALLY hoping aginst hope!

I'm simply offering a challenge. It's basically what Carl, WK3C is asking
people to do here.
>
>>Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you
>>choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7
>>years or so, I'll just ignore you.
>
> And I'll follow Jim's lead.

Why not lead the way, Steve?

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

2486. Re: Ham-radio is a hobby not a service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 22:59:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040405185906.19617.00000092@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90551

In article <4071BA2F.7030204@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<ec2dnVECf6K36vLdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>...
>>
>>>William wrote:
>>>
>>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040403065913.05025.00000180@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>>>>
>>>>>In article <b7CdnR0h3O6gg_PdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>There is also a lot of bad science out there involving immunizations.
>For
>>>>>>example, there are still folks trying to sell the idea that
>immunizations
>>>>>>are
>>>>>>somehow a cause of autism, even though repeated scientific studies have
>>>>>>shown
>>>>>>no causality. There *is* a sort of correlation in that the first
>definitive
>>>>>>signs of autism are usually observed about the age of many common
>>>>>>immunizations.
>>>>>>
>>>>>The very success of immunizations has been a big part of the
>>>>>controversy sround their continued use. "After all, no one gets these
>>>>>diseases anymore, so why should we immunize for them?"
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>TAFKA, Mike, my youngest son is autistic. He was immunizised. Can
>>>>you tell me what caused it?
>>>>
>>>>Was it all the crap they pumped into me before I went to Somalia? Was
>>>>it his own immunizations?
>>>>
>>>>Do you know?
>>>
>>> No I don't, and I'm sorry to hear that, Brian.
>>
>>
>> I don't know either, and I'm also sorry to read that. I have some
>> slight layman's experience with such disorders.

>>
>>> From what I have read, seen, and heard, I doubt it is chemicals put
>>>into *you*. Most of that stuff is not good for you, though. And the rise
>>>in autism doesn't correlate too well with immunizations IMO.
>>>
>>> Here is my take on why a lot of children have developmental problems
>>>that seem to be on the increase, per capita wise:
>>>
>>> I think think there is a chemical problem in general. I think that
>>>possibly a combination of food additives and chemicals that are making
>>>people ill and interfering with proper development.
>>
>>
>> That's certainly a very logical theory. Here are some other factors:
>>
>> 1) Certain chemicals and other environmental factors, by themselves,
>> may not cause measurable problems. But in combination the total
>> effects may be quite pronounced. Most product testing is
>> single-factor.
>
> I have personal experience in the multiple chemical area. It is
>recognized as a big problem by environment workers.

Then you know exactly what I'm talking about - and then some!
>
>> 2) A product that is "safe" in its original state may break down in
>> the environment into waste products that are not.
>>
>> 3) Individuals have varying levels of genetic predisposition. Almost
>> everyone has, and remembers, an "Uncle Charlie" who worked with toxic
>> materials all his life, smoked 3 packs of Dromedaries a day, drank a
>> quart of John Daniels and died at the age of 95 in a freak
>> hang-gliding accident while on vacation with his 30 year old wife. But
>> there's also "Aunt Ethel" who died of a rare malady at the age of 32
>> even though she never drank, smoked, or was knowingly exposed to
>> anything more toxic than Ivory soap.
>>
>> 4) Health care professionals are getting better at diagnosis. Years
>> ago, many developmental disorders (such as autism) were not
>> differentiated from mental retardation.
>>
>>> Here's an interesting link:
>>>
>>>http://www.nontoxic.com/nontoxic/injured.html
>>>
>>>lots of chemicals that we are using on a daily basis are not good for us
>>>at all.
>>>
>>>and
>>>

>>>http://www.edelsoncenter.com/aut_chem.htm
>>>
>>> yet another link dealing with premature puberty:
>>>
>>> http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/479363.stm
>>>
>>>http://www.emagazine.com/november-december_1997/1197gl_health.html
>>>
>>> The last links are here because kids are being exposed to these
>>>chemicals that mimic hormones and mess with their proper development.
>>>
>>><snippage>
>>>
>>> There are so many chemicals that we are putting in our bodies, from the

>>>preservatives in vaccinations, to the carcinogens that we clean our
>>>carpets with, and then put our babies down on those same carpets
>>>thinking that they now have a clean healthy place to play in. We seal
>>>our houses tightly to save money on fuel, and then breathe formaldehyde
>>> contaminated air from the carpets, insulation, and paneling. We eat
>>>meat that has been raised with hormones and antibiotics so that it grows
>>>quicker. When I was a coach, an amazing amount of the kids playing on my
>>>teams had to use inhalers for their asthma. These are supposedly healthy
>>>kids - they are not.
>>>
>>> How on earth do we know which chemical or combination of chemicals is
>>>doing what?
>>
>>
>> We don't. But if we protest, we are derided as "luddites" and
>> "anti-progress".
>
> Uh-huh. And then when it is proven beyond a doubt that there IS a
>problem, the same people will talk about "We just didn't know that it
>was dangerous then!".

And they're telling the truth. They didn't see the problem because they looked
at "Uncle Charlie" rather than "Aunt Ethel".

>>> What is going to happen to these children as they age? Are the asthma
>>>cases going to worsen? Probably will. These children going through
>>>premature puberty will probably age more rapidly - but who knows? But
>>>something is wrong, and I think it is a whole lot of different chemicals.
>
>> I agree, Mike. At the very least, the testing done on chemical
>> products is woefully inadequate.
>>
>> At the same time, it's important to focus on solid scientific
>> information.
>
>Absolutely! I have worked with some dangerous stuff over the years. But

>what is needed is knowledge about what you are working with, and honesty
>in it's effects.

That honesty can cost big money, though.

>> Repeated tests have shown no causal link between the
>> tested immunizations and autism. Then there's the "facilitated
>> communications" fiasco of some years back.
>
>That was one of the sickest chapters in psycho-land. If you look at how
>it was done, Facilitated communications is almost like the old Ouija
>board.

Yep. What I find most amazing is how widespread it got before serious testing was done. As I recall, the testing that disproved it was done by people trying to prove that it worked. The tests were elegantly simple and completely damning.

>It mainly shows the mental state of the person that is "helping".
>And lots of them were pretty sick...

Yep. And some people lost custody of their children and were accused of abuse based on "testimony" obtained through FC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2487. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 22:59:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040405185907.19617.00000093@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90550

In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
>
>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.

Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is enough?
>
>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.

Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>
>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).

Is the purpose of the safety questions to protect a ham from himself, or to
protect those around him?
>
>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
>are crowded.
>
>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.
>
>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
>screw up other users.

Agreed.

>What else should be here?

- Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for the
higher license levels.

- Operating skills and practices

- Morse code tests

73 de Jim, N2EY

2488. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-05 23:54:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qRicnakIHIK_b-zdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 90552

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Obgcc.15855$Dv2.2753@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> |
> | You're twisting again, Steve ... I clearly indicated that it was not
> just
> | you ...
> |
> | Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl,
>
> They've dragged you down into their same insult-match.
>
> Never wrestle with a pig. You get covered with mud and pig shit, and
> the pig enjoys the company.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I didn't insult anyone ... and I don't plan on following this any more ...
if the noise level continues, I will simply start to "kill-file" the
offending parties' posts.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2489. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 00:15:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4071F683.60104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90553

>
>
>
>
>
>>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
>>
>>
>This
>
>
>>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440 access,
>>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with a
>>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
>>
>>
>wind
>
>
>>up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>>
>>
>
> The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
> not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
> (FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
> Communications Act of 1934.
>
>
>
Gotcha! Here "EPA" means "Eastern Pennsylvania". I'm in "NNJ",
northern New Jersey.
The country is divided up into around a hundred zones by the ARRL. For
radio contesting
and reception reports.

==========
I'm having roast rabbit for Easter dinner. :-)

2490. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 02:34:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <JJ-dnbzohbNmi-_dRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90554

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bvadnWx1bKCEzf_d4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >I said they elected to use the no-code Technician as their entry to ham
> >radio rather than the Novice license. Yes they took the Novice written
but
> >not the code. Thus they "bypassed" the Novice license in the sense that
> >they never held a Novice license. They had basically two choices to
enter
> >ham radio (unless of course they chose to do additional study and sit for
> >higher class tests at the same time).
> >
> >1) They could take (and pass) the Novice written plus 5wpm and get a
Novice
> >license.
> >2) They could take (and pass) the Novice written and Tech written and get
a
> >no-code Tech license.
> >
> >The prospective ham generally took the route 2 to enter ham radio rather
> >than route 1. Thus by that choice, the people themselves made the Tech
> >no-code the entry level license despite the fact that it was more
difficult
> >than earning the Novice license. The restructuring in 2000 merely
> >formalized what had already occurred.
>
> I agree except for one point: The decision was made by different people
for a
> number of factors, such as the *perceived* difficulty and the *perceived*
> rewards.

Actually that was what I was trying to point out and you've clarified it
quite nicely.

> >
> >Having earned my initial license in 1992 (Tech with HF), I'm quite
familiar
> >with what was going on. The majority of people sitting for their first
> >license took the Tech no-code route to put off learning the code not
because
> >of its two meter and VHF access. Prior to on-air experience, they simply
> >were not personally familiar enough with various ham activities to select
> >their entry route on the basis of the desireability of having 2m access.

> >
> Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
This
> was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
access,
> which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham
with a
> 2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
wind
> up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I can see where that could easily be a dominant factor if the prospective
ham had some exposure to that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2491. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 03:42:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90555

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

| I will simply start to "kill-file" the
| offending parties' posts.
|
| 73,
| Carl - wk3c

It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here. Most of the messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2492. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 05:11:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406011153.21977.00000656@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90556

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/5/2004 10:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>| I will simply start to "kill-file" the
>| offending parties' posts.
>|
>| 73,
>| Carl - wk3c
>
>It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening
>protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here. Most of the
>messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.

So how do you see your own posts, Hans?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2493. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 05:16:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406011651.21977.00000657@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90557

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/5/2004 1:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040405144548.05305.00000180@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>In article <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(Holy man, mad as heck and not taking it anymore) writes:

>>So here's a challenge for you, Len:
>>
>>Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no
>>name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license
>>classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite
>>modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.
>
> Please give us the entire listing of what is correct.
>
> Please issue the proper and correct stage directions so that
> all may act upon it without error.
>
> Please, your holiness, lead us not into temptation of the
> terrible independent thought!
>
> All shall be as you ordain, all shall be right with the world.
>
>>And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or
>>disproves some claim you make here.
>
> Yea, verily we shall all strive to act in the manner you have
> shown us as leadership, your holiness.
>
>>Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you
>>choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7
>>years or so, I'll just ignore you.
>
> Oh! Please! Not that! To be ignored by the Holiest of Holy Men!
>
> I stand abshed with head bowed before your majestic divinity
> and humbly ask forgiveness for having the temerity to express
> independent thought.

Jim, I think this pretty well answered any "questions" about Lennie's ability or willinginess to be "civil". Not that anyone had any misconceptions about the loser.

Oh...I forgot...There was Brian...Brian says >>I<< am "whacko".

Sure glad Lennie set him straight.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2494. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 05:20:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406012045.21977.00000658@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90558

>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/5/2004 1:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040405144547.05305.00000179@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
>This
>>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
>access,
>>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with
>a
>>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
>wind
>>up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>
> The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
> not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
> (FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
> Communications Act of 1934.

SNIP.

What a putz.

One more example of NO practical experience in Amateur Radio practice.

One more time Lennie hangs it out only to have it trampled on, wondering
why we are not blinded with his infinite wisdom and wonderous revelations.

You're an IDIOT, Anderson. Thanks for making sure we don't forget.

Steve, K4YZ

2495. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 05:24:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406012421.21977.00000659@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90559

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>'Youngest Extra')
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 4/5/2004 4:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040405175926.05025.00000215@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040405132254.16022.00000552@mb-m23.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> SURELY you're not going to hold your breath waiting for THAT to happen!
>
>It's just a suggestion, Steve. No need to get all excited.

No excitement here, Jim, save for the new station stuff I'm assembling.

>> That would be akin to forcing a mime to sit on his hands! ! ! ! ! !
>
>Can you meet the same challenge?

I only need one finger to tap on the key with!

>> And I'll follow Jim's lead.
>
>Why not lead the way, Steve?

Why not?

Why not?

>73 de Jim, N2EY

>73 de Jim, N2EY

73

Steve, K4YZ

73

Steve, K4YZ

2496. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 11:59:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040406075905.03943.00000158@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 90560

In article <JJ-dnbzohbNmi-_dRVn-hg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>> I agree except for one point: The decision was made by different people
>> for a
>> number of factors, such as the *perceived* difficulty and the *perceived*
>> rewards.
>
>Actually that was what I was trying to point out and you've clarified it
>quite nicely.

Glad to help.

>> >Having earned my initial license in 1992 (Tech with HF), I'm quite
>> >familiar
>> >with what was going on. The majority of people sitting for their first
>> >license took the Tech no-code route to put off learning the code not
>> >because
>> >of its two meter and VHF access. Prior to on-air experience, they simply
>> >were not personally familiar enough with various ham activities to select
>> >their entry route on the basis of the desireability of having 2m access.
>> >
>> Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
>> This
>> was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
>> access,
>> which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham
>> with a
>> 2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
>> wind up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>>
>I can see where that could easily be a dominant factor if the prospective
>ham had some exposure to that.
>
At least here in EPA/SNJ/DEL/MDC, a lot of new hams started out with scanners.
They were a natural adjunct to a cb set in the late '70s and early '80s. And of
course they'd come upon ham repeaters and mobiles - all running 2 meters or
440. Indeed, many clubs in this area were organized around their repeater.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2497. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 13:03:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4072AAAA.1080705@psu.edu>
Source record: 90561

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>Date: 4/5/2004 10:42 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>| I will simply start to "kill-file" the
>>| offending parties' posts.
>>|
>>| 73,
>>| Carl - wk3c
>>
>>It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening
>>protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here. Most of the
>>messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.
>
>
> So how do you see your own posts, Hans?

Yah. I kind of miss how he used to call me stupid! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2498. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 13:53:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4072B66E.4070503@psu.edu>
Source record: 90562

N2EY wrote:
> In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
>>
>>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
>>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.
>
>
> Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is enough?

I think that "enough" is testing that will allow the prospective ham to
get enough knowledge to know where to start to get a station on the air.

And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
nothing, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even less
qualifications than we have now.

Is this doing them a service? That's what I wonder about. I doubt many
people would argue for turning out more Electrical engineers by
drastically reducing the requirements to be one. Yes I know that an
engineer is a professional, but my point stands. How does lowering
requirements improve something?

>>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.
>
>
> Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.

If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5 watts.
QRP level. I've done arm to myself at 50 watts, and

>>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
>>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
>>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).
>
>
> Is the purpose of the safety questions to protect a ham from himself, or to
> protect those around him?

The answer is yes.

>>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
>>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
>>are crowded.
>>
>>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
>>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.
>>
>>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
>>screw up other users.
>
>
> Agreed.
>
>
>>What else should be here?
>
>
> - Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for the
> higher license levels.
>
> - Operating skills and practices
>
> - Morse code tests

Oh-oh! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2499. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 14:30:57 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ucf57095qnl1k5lijk6qdgr10998ous5l2@4ax.com>
Source record: 90563

On 06 Apr 2004 05:20:45 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 4/5/2004 1:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040405144547.05305.00000179@mb-m05.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
>>This
>>>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
>>access,
>>>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with
>>a
>>>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
>>wind
>>>up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>>
>> The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
>> not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
>> (FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
>> Communications Act of 1934.
>
> SNIP.
>
> What a putz.
>
> One more example of NO practical experience in Amateur Radio practice.
>
> One more time Lennie hangs it out only to have it trampled on, wondering
>why we are not blinded with his infinite wisdom and wonderous revelations.

Y'dont think that the EPA comment might have been intended as wry
humour? hi hi

>
> You're an IDIOT, Anderson. Thanks for making sure we don't forget.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Well, the challenge of comminicating without name calling or
expletives didn't last long - Steve, you sure killed that one!

Way to go.

73, Leo

2500. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 15:16:44 UTC
From: AB2RC <AB2RC@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrnc75iea.km8.AB2RC@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 90564

In article <7ygcc.504$ZJ6.83@bignews5.bellsouth.net>, joe sixpack wrote:
> Register with the Democratic party.

I think you meant to say -- register the radio with the demoncratic party....

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

2501. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:10:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404060810.6c7782c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90565

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040406012421.21977.00000659@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> I only need one finger to tap on the key with!

Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
you don't tap on the key with one finger.

2502. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:12:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404060812.4ddbf01a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90566

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message news:<20040404210745.08889.00000787@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >'Youngest Extra')
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/4/2004 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041417.632e5475@posting.google.com>
>
> >Take a little personal responsibility for yourself.
>
> I do, Brian.
>
> I accept responsibility for what I post. That's why when I post something
> that is later proven to be other than what I suggested it was I say "I stand
> corrected" or otherwise acknowledge my error.

There is no evidence of that.

> You have yet to do that despite having been proven "wrong" over and over.

You say "proof," yet you have none.

2503. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:17:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404060817.22578ca6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90567

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040404204924.08889.00000785@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >'Youngest Extra')
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/4/2004 5:05 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041405.5d65223d@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> >The many threads that you sponsor are usually titled, "Lend Steps in
> >own Feces" or some such other lunacy.
> >
> >There is no selectivity. You bring criticism upon yourself for being
> >such a jerk.
>
>
> (1) Who's "Lend"...?!?!

obvious typo

> (2) If "Lend", or whoever, wasn't making so many stupid, easily refuted
> misrepresentations about Amateur Radio in general or certain persons in
> particular, threads like those you mention wouldn't show up.

You don't know who "Lend" is, but you're certain he's "...making so
many stupid, easily refuted misrepresentations...blah blah
horesecrap."

That makes you a liar. Again.

Suck it up, Steve. No dodges. Admit you were wrong.

> (3) As for "selectivity", I believe I've been VERY selective. Unless you
> can prove differently?

Yeh. Now you're going after a guy named, "Lend."

2504. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:25:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404060825.2be8b26b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90568

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040406012045.21977.00000658@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/5/2004 1:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040405144547.05305.00000179@mb-m05.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >(N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
> This
> >>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
> access,
> >>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham with
> a
> >>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
> wind
> >>up with a Tech. Code or no code.
> >
> > The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
> > not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
> > (FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
> > Communications Act of 1934.
>
> SNIP.
>
> What a putz.
>
> One more example of NO practical experience in Amateur Radio practice.
>
> One more time Lennie hangs it out only to have it trampled on, wondering
> why we are not blinded with his infinite wisdom and wonderous revelations.
>
> You're an IDIOT, Anderson. Thanks for making sure we don't forget.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I just scanned through the "FREQUENCY" database. I don't see the EPA
with a single amateur frequency listed. Hmmmm?

So, will the "Dynamited Duo," formerly known as TAFKARJ and Steve, not
to be confused with "Ren and Stimpy," please indicate what secret
Amateur Frequencies that the EPA has or uses.

Thanks.

2505. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:27:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404060827.5b74746@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90569

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040405115914.05305.00000175@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> >
> Here in EPA,

snip

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, do you work for the EPA?

2506. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 16:42:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404060842.194cccc7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90570

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040406011651.21977.00000657@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
> >'Youngest Extra')
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/5/2004 1:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040405144548.05305.00000180@mb-m05.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <c2356669.0404050848.7d8c0147@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >(Holy man, mad as heck and not taking it anymore) writes:
>
> >>So here's a challenge for you, Len:
> >>
> >>Let's see you set the example of "civil debate". That means no
> >>name-calling, no little digs at other people's jobs, names, license
> >>classes, ethnicities or religions, no making fun of their favorite
> >>modes. It also means clear distinctions between facts and opinions.
> >
> > Please give us the entire listing of what is correct.
> >
> > Please issue the proper and correct stage directions so that
> > all may act upon it without error.
> >
> > Please, your holiness, lead us not into temptation of the
> > terrible independent thought!
> >
> > All shall be as you ordain, all shall be right with the world.
> >
> >>And it means behaving that way even if someone disagrees with you, or
> >>disproves some claim you make here.
> >
> > Yea, verily we shall all strive to act in the manner you have
> > shown us as leadership, your holiness.
> >
> >>Go ahead, Len. Show us how it's done. I'll follow if you lead. If you
> >>choose to behave the way you typically have done here for the past 7
> >>years or so, I'll just ignore you.
> >
> > Oh! Please! Not that! To be ignored by the Holiest of Holy Men!
> >
> > I stand abshed with head bowed before your majestic divinity
> > and humbly ask forgiveness for having the temerity to express
> > independent thought.

>
> Jim, I think this pretty well answered any "questions" about Lennie's
> ability or willinginess to be "civil".

Steve,

The use of name-calling, insults, and other personal attacks is often an indication that the attacker does not have a counterargument. Rather than admit that he or she is mistaken, the attacker tries to divert attention from the facts. We see this in the very first line of Len's post:

"(Holy man, mad as heck and not taking it anymore)"

and continuing all through it.

Also, this sort of behavior tries to get the person attacked to reply in kind. If that happens, the attacker has "won" because he or she has dragged the attacked person down to the attacker's level, and has avoided the actual subject of discussion completely. The fact that the attacker was wrong is lost in the noise.

So your use of words like "Lennie", "putz", "loser", and "idiot" (to name just a few) actually gives Len exactly what he wants.

It's like the situation where a child argues with a parent over bedtime *at* bedtime. If the parent argues, the child "wins" because bedtime is, by definition, being extended by the time spent arguing. And the child will do more of the same, because it "works".

Replying to Len in kind teaches him that his methods "work". Indeed, replying to him at all teaches him that.

The solution is obvious.

PLONK

73 de Jim, N2EY

2507. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:41:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144134.18671.00000898@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90571

>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/6/2004 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4072AAAA.1080705@psu.edu>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

>> So how do you see your own posts, Hans?
>
>
>Yah. I kind of miss how he used to call me stupid! ;^)

Some folks have a very unique way of calling you or accusing you of something, all-the-while being up to thier necks in it themsleves, albeit in a more, uh..."subtle" way.

And they can call me anything they want as long as they don't call me later to dinner!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2508. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144417.15123.00000200@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90576

In article <ucf57095qnl1k5lijk6qdgr10998ous5l2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>>>>Here in EPA, after about 1980 the predominant entry license was the Tech.
>>>This
>>>>was true even before it lost its code test. The reason was 2 meter/440
>>>access,
>>>>which Novices didn't have. A prospective ham would see almost every ham
>with
>>>a
>>>>2 meter HT or mobile, ask "what license do I need to talk to you guys" and
>>>wind
>>>>up with a Tech. Code or no code.
>>>
>>> The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as a government entity, is
>>> not under any regulations of the Federal Communications Commission
>>> (FCC). EPA operating on amateur radio bands is a violation of the
>>> Communications Act of 1934.
>>
>> SNIP.
>>
>> What a putz.
>>
>> One more example of NO practical experience in Amateur Radio practice.
>>
>> One more time Lennie hangs it out only to have it trampled on,
>wondering
>>why we are not blinded with his infinite wisdom and wonderous revelations.
>
>Y'dont think that the EPA comment might have been intended as wry
>humour? hi hi

Ho ho. :-)

Perhaps their wry comes in a bottle?

>> You're an IDIOT, Anderson. Thanks for making sure we don't forget.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>Well, the challenge of comminicating without name calling or
>expletives didn't last long - Steve, you sure killed that one!
>
>Way to go.

Murderous rage is not a flavor of good humor...or Ben & Jerry.

They scream but not Ice cream. :-)

LHA / WMD

2509. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144418.15123.00000202@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90573

In article <yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>| I will simply start to "kill-file" the
>| offending parties' posts.
>|
>| 73,
>| Carl - wk3c
>
>It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening
>protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here. Most of the
>messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.

Question of the Day, oh noble sage of the brush: If "disciplined screening protocol" has been implemented, how do you know what is "noise" and what is not?

Are you reading by means of morse code?

Ahhhh, the world awaits enlightenment from your words...!

Oink.

LHA / WMD

2510. Re: FCC Assigns RM Numbers To Three New Restructuring Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144418.15123.00000201@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90574

In article <4071F683.60104@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>The country is divided up into around a hundred zones by the ARRL.

Really? Does the federal government know this? USC&GS?

USPS? How about 300 million of the citizenry?

>========================
>I'm having roast rabbit for Easter dinner. :-)

I'm having slow-cooked ham every day...sometimes they get
overheated by themselves... :-)

LHA / WMD

2511. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144419.15123.00000203@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90577

In article <1e4e3692.0404060817.22578ca6@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040404204924.08889.00000785@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>> >'Youngest Extra')
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/4/2004 5:05 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041405.5d65223d@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040403101330.12182.00000658@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>> >The many threads that you sponsor are usually titled, "Lend Steps in
>> >own Feces" or some such other lunacy.
>> >
>> >There is no selectivity. You bring criticism upon yourself for being
>> >such a jerk.
>>
>>
>> (1) Who's "Lend"...?!?!
>
>obvious typo
>
>> (2) If "Lend", or whoever, wasn't making so many stupid, easily
>refuted
>> misrepresentations about Amateur Radio in general or certain persons in
>> particular, threads like those you mention wouldn't show up.
>
>You don't know who "Lend" is, but you're certain he's "...making so
>many stupid, easily refuted misrepresentations...blah blah
>horesecrap."
>
>That makes you a liar. Again.
>
>Suck it up, Steve. No dodges. Admit you were wrong.
>
>> (3) As for "selectivity", I believe I've been VERY selective. Unless
>you
>> can prove differently?
>
>Yeh. Now you're going after a guy named, "Lend."

Freudian slip? From mortgage problems? Negative cash flow?

He needs to call "9-1-1" complete with all those dash numbers.

:-)

LHA / WMD

2512. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144420.15123.00000204@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90572

In article <1e4e3692.0404060812.4ddbf01a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040404210745.08889.00000787@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for
>> >'Youngest Extra')
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/4/2004 5:17 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041417.632e5475@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Take a little personal responsibility for yourself.
>>
>> I do, Brian.
>>
>> I accept responsibility for what I post. That's why when I post
>something
>> that is later proven to be other than what I suggested it was I say "I
>stand
>> corrected" or otherwise acknowledge my error.
>
>There is no evidence of that.
>
>> You have yet to do that despite having been proven "wrong" over and
>over.
>
>You say "proof," yet you have none.

He "has it in his wallet..."

He "has it right there..."

He "has it in his records..."

All safe and snug right there...except nobody can see any of it.

Must be the post-traumatic thing from his "seven hostile actions?"

:-)

LHA / WMD

2513. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:44:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406144420.15123.00000205@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90575

In article <1e4e3692.0404060810.6c7782c7@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040406012421.21977.00000659@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
>> I only need one finger to tap on the key with!
>
>Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
>you don't tap on the key with one finger.

I can see a QST cover award winning layout featuring that
tippy-tapping dancing entertainer Bojangles Robeson! :-)

LHA / WMD

2514. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 18:58:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404061058.263174b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90578

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4072AAAA.1080705@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: Proposal to rename RRAP
> >>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >>Date: 4/5/2004 10:42 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

> >>It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening
> >>protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here. Most of the
> >>messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.
> >
> >
> > So how do you see your own posts, Hans?
>
>
> Yah. I kind of miss how he used to call me stupid! ;^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I miss being his favorite "dump huck."

2515. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 19:22:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4073036B.8050609@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90579

>
>
>
>
>
>>What else should be here?
>>
>>
>
>- Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for the
>higher license levels.
>
>- Operating skills and practices
>
This would be an extension of distingushing between malacious
interefernce and
the "facts of life" on HF ham bands (that nobody has exclusive rights to
a specific
frequency and that both parties involved in QRM move away (up or down) in
frequency to clear each other. And that some bands have unexpected patterns
of propagation (like 10m has the usual circle of nearby coverage, then a
ring of
no coverage, and another ring of "skip". And thus you can QRM the reception
of a ham in the skip zone trying to copy someone you can't hear. So you
would
then understand why someone seems to be talking to himself.).

Also some basic knowledge of the "syntax" of a QSO. XX#XXX, this is WA2ISE.

>
>- Morse code tests
>
Why this today? Back in the vacuum tube era, morse code (CW)
transmitters and
receivers were simple but required human encode and decode. Today we have
digital technology and such for automated encode and decode of modes
more robust
than old fashined CW. Morse can be a fun mode for those interested,
but should
it be required?

>
>
>
>

>

2516. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 19:31:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4073057D.8060902@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90580

>
>
> And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
> access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
> about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
> access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
> *nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even
> less qualifications than we have now.

It's been done. Namely the old Novice on HF. Albeit at lower power, a
novice still had to
contend with TVI and RFI issues. Sometimes he had help from an Elmer.

>
>
>
>
>
>>
>>
>> Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>
>
> If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5
> watts. QRP level. I've done harm to myself at 50 watts

Except for unusual propagation, 5 watts won't go far. You won't be
heard and you
won't be able to play with the bigger dogs. That could be a serious
turn off to a
beginner. "Nobody will talk to me". Running 100w can still require
patience in
a crowded contest environment.

>
>
>
>

2517. Re: My radio is cursed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:03:51 UTC
From: yeltrabnhoj@email.com
Message-ID: <40730d09.16712296@news.individual.de>
Source record: 90581

On 31 Mar 2004 17:28:13 -0800, bullmordt@yahoo.co.nz (G.K. Konnig) wrote:

>I think it's possessed by an evil ghost because it kills people and
>collects their brains.
>
>What can I do?

Run for Parliament: Are you any good at fundraising?

--
John Bartley K7AAY http://celdata.cjb.net
This post quad-ROT-13 encrypted; reading it violates the DMCA.
Nobody but a fool goes into a federal counterrorism operation without duct tape - Richard Preston, THE COBRA EVENT.

2518. I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:31:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90582

New book:

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books

73 de Jim, N2EY

2519. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:38:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4073154D.6080703@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90583

N2EY wrote:

>New book:
>
>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>
>
>
So? The ARRL had training films that had smiley faces on electrons in
cartoons of radio circuits.

If this book can get newbies up to speed so that they don't make bonehead
errors on the air, then it's a good thing. The new ham can fill in
gaps of knowledge
as he goes along later.

>
>

2520. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:47:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40731775.8050404@psu.edu>
Source record: 90584

Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>> And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
>> access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
>> about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
>> access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
>> *nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even
>> less qualifications than we have now.
>
>
>
> It's been done. Namely the old Novice on HF. Albeit at lower power, a
> novice still had to
> contend with TVI and RFI issues. Sometimes he had help from an Elmer.
>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>>
>>
>>
>> If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5
>> watts. QRP level. I've done harm to myself at 50 watts
>
>
> Except for unusual propagation, 5 watts won't go far. You won't be
> heard and you
> won't be able to play with the bigger dogs. That could be a serious
> turn off to a
> beginner. "Nobody will talk to me". Running 100w can still require
> patience in
> a crowded contest environment.

Agreed, Robert. My actual position on the RF and high voltage is "test 'em for it, and let 'em play with it". If we don't test 'em for it, then we shouldn't let them play with *anything* they can hurt themselves with.

Some of the proposals want to limit the beginners power levels, ostensibly for safety reasons. They rationalize that if we reduce power

levels, or even have bizarre requirements such as a "voltage to the finals" limit for the newbies, this will even serve to reduce the questions needed on the test, making it easier to get a license.

I wonder how many prospective hams have ever stated "I was going to become a Ham, but a 50 question test? I absolutely refuse to take a test with more than 30 questions!"

oops, I digress.....

Hams should be taught from the get-go about RF and high voltage safety. We operate with high voltages, and if we homebrew (ohh noo, that is another thing some proposals want to eliminate for the young'uns) we will possibly have some serious voltage running around. And the transistor and IC generations should probably be reminded of that.

I think that elimination or even reduction of the number of test questions by eliminating the RF safety questions verges on criminal negligence by the parties involved. there has been a precedent set in what we have now. I wonder if the ARRL might feel itself at the pointy end of a lawsuit (remember, they are involved in the makeup of the tests) if it reduces that requirement. After all, someone at some point felt it was a good idea to put those questions in.

That is why I believe if we're putting them out to play without adequate learning, we must limit that power to something that is not likely at all to hurt them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2521. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:52:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404061252.3c281308@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90585

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4072B66E.4070503@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

> >>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
> >>
> >>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
> >>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
> >>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.

> > Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is enough?
>
> I think that "enough" is testing that will allow the prospective ham to
> get enough knowledge to know where to start to get a station on the air.
>
OK, fine. Pretty basic stuff like what a MHz is and such.

> And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
> access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
> about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
> access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
> *nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even less
> qualifications than we have now.

That all depends on what is actually in the tests. The old Novice test
was around for almost a half century and turned many, many hams loose
on HF - me included. With a 20-30 question written test and 5 wpm
Morse, often using homebrew, kit or converted-surplus gear.

And for most of that time, the new ham had to tune the gear up in
order to transmit, and had to figure out things like how to build a
transmit-receive system to go between the separate tx and rx.

We did OK.
>
> Is this doing them a service? That's what I wonder about. I doubt many
> people would argue for turning out more Electrical engineers by
> drastically reducing the requirements to be one. Yes I know that an
> engineer is a professional, but my point stands. How does lowering
> requirements improve something?

It only works if the privileges are reduced accordingly. Which is a
key part of the "NewNovice" concept.
>
> >>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.

>
> > Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>
> If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5 watts.
> QRP level. I've done arm to myself at 50 watts, and

In the bad old days I was turned loose with high voltages and up to 75
watts. I'm still here and the house didn't burn down.

> >>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
> >>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
> >>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).
>
> > Is the purpose of the safety questions to protect a ham from himself, or to
> > protect those around him?
>
> The answer is yes.
>
HAW!
>
> >>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
> >>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
> >>are crowded.
> >>
> >>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
> >>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.
> >>
> >>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
> >>screw up other users.

> > Agreed.
>
> >>What else should be here?
>
> > - Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for the
> > higher license levels.
> >
> > - Operating skills and practices
> >
> > - Morse code tests
>
> Oh-oh! ;^)

I miss Sam Kinison too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2522. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 20:55:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404061255.49da18bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90586

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<yGpcc.16604$Dv2.9987@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> | I will simply start to "kill-file" the
> | offending parties' posts.
> |
> | 73,
> | Carl - wk3c
>
> It works wonders, Carl. Since implementing a disciplined screening
> protocol the noise level has dropped about 30dB here.

Same here, Hans

> Most of the
> messages I see actually pertain to amateur radio policy.
>
Speaking of which, it now becomes apparent why your are waiting for
the right time to send your proposal to FCC. The others proposals are
functioning as "warm up acts" to your "main event".

Cool.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2523. Re: Message Titles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 21:11:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvrgfg1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90587

On Mon, 05 Apr 2004 17:36:41 GMT, Tony P. wrote:

>It's because their new reader encodes the text using ISO standards. It
>thinks every other newsreader out there understands it. They don't.
>
>Why do I get the feeling that this is a new feature of MSOE.

Give the man a see-gar.....

The EU and the US DOJ didn't seek the proper remedy against M$.
They should have insisted on a total recall of each and every copy
of Windoze/Internet Exploder/Micro$oft Orifice etc. sold, to be
replaced at M$'s expense with programs that are far more reliable
and far less buggy.

THAT would have been poetic justice.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

"Help Stamp Out BillyBloatWare"

2524. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 21:23:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404061323.3a71ad01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90588

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040404210429.08889.00000786@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: All that flappin'
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/4/2004 4:53 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404041353.3cf04c0e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040404102521.22051.00000592@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >>
> >> BTW: You state that "almost all hams" are "caucasians". I suggest that
> you do
> >> a by-country census and figure out where the "most" of those "almost all"
> hams
> >> are, Brian. The figures don't support your assertion...Again...
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >I want t hear the "pop" when you pull your head out.
> >
> >"Ham " is uniquely American.
>
> If NOTHING ELSE ever proved to me that you have almost ZERO, >>IF ANY<<
> experience operating from any foreign part of the world, THAT was it.

> Amateur Radio >>IS<< "ham" radio all over the world.
>
> Amateur Radio >>IS<< "ham" radio in ALL of Japan, Malaysia, the
> Phillipines, Europe and Africa. It is also in common literature of most South
> American Amateur Radio publications and newsletters.

> The term "ham" radio is part-and-parcel of the cover of the most popular
> Amateur Radio journal in Japan. I believe that other persons in this forum can
> verify for you that Japan's Amateur census is far in excess of the United
> States'.

So you want to jump up and down and cite Japanese Amateur Radio when
it suits your purpose, but when I told you 10 years ago that they have
a no-code HF license, you didn't want to talk about it. It wasn't
really an amateur license. It was like "CB Radio." Now we're all
brother "Hams." How nice.

> Brian, I have been trying to give you an "out" for the last 24 hours since
> everyone is making a lot of noise about "playing nice", but you keep making
> really stupid assertions that are so easily refuted that I have to wonder what
> your REAL problem is.

I didn't think that I had a real problem. I've always worked on the
assumption that my problems were fake.

> If you have any doubts about any of what I have said about the use of the
> term "ham" being a "generic" and therefore worldwide reference to Amateur
> Radio, then just ask...
>
> Now...WHO can hear that "pop", Brian...?!?!

I'm still waiting for you to pull your head out.

2525. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 21:31:18 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <ObCdnaOpLoYkte7d4p2dnA@crocker.com>
Source record: 90591

probably a good book for some of the people in this group!

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
> New book:
>
>
http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/
103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2526. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 21:43:21 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <ZvFcc.84605$K91.184926@attbi_s02>
Source record: 90589

Hello all ..... Anything that gives out good information and contributes to one's positive knowledge is good. The dummy series books have given a lot of people positive information ....ergo .....Now my American Lit instructor in highschool sort of looked down on my Classic Comic version of Moby Dick ....but the pictures were a lot better than the original ....I understand that Herman wasn't much of an artist.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2527. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 21:55:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nHFcc.17678$Dv2.8815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90590

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
| New book:
|
|
http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/
103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
|

I've ordered a copy for my 12-YO grandson, Tanner, soon to be a General.

N0AX is a gifted writer, humorist, radiosport contestant,
all-around-good-operator, and good-guy.

3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333,

Hans, K0HB

2528. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 22:20:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040406182029.04378.00000579@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90592

>Subject: Re: All that flappin'
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/6/2004 4:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404061323.3a71ad01@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040404210429.08889.00000786@mb-m02.aol.com>...

>> The term "ham" radio is part-and-parcel of the cover of the most
>popular
>> Amateur Radio journal in Japan. I believe that other persons in this forum
>can
>> verify for you that Japan's Amateur census is far in excess of the United
>> States'.
>
>So you want to jump up and down and cite Japanese Amateur Radio when
>it suits your purpose, but when I told you 10 years ago that they have
>a no-code HF license, you didn't want to talk about it. It wasn't
>really an amateur license. It was like "CB Radio." Now we're all
>brother "Hams." How nice.

I never said the Japanese low-power HF license was "like CB", Brian...Not
once, not at all.

Also, YOU said the term was "uniquely American". I proved you wrong so
you make accusations that are false. Nice try.

I'd ask you to provide a quote from a valid post, but since I know there's
none, why waste the bandwidth...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2529. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 23:08:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <g9OdndS8iZqvpe7d4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90593

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404060810.6c7782c7@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040406012421.21977.00000659@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
> > I only need one finger to tap on the key with!
>
> Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
> you don't tap on the key with one finger.

Actually I would have said you don't even need one. In an emergency, just about any part of the anatomy could be used. This is independent of what the normal operating practice might be.

Besides that one could easily build a key designed around the principle of being tapped if desired.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2530. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 23:13:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <PIadnapPktDbpO7d4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90594

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:4073036B.8050609@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >>What else should be here?
> >>
> >>
> >
> >- Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for
the
> >higher license levels.
> >
> >- Operating skills and practices
> >
> This would be an extension of distingushing between malacious
> interefernce and
> the "facts of life" on HF ham bands (that nobody has exclusive rights to
> a specific
> frequency and that both parties involved in QRM move away (up or down) in
> frequency to clear each other. And that some bands have unexpected
patterns
> of propagation (like 10m has the usual circle of nearby coverage, then a
> ring of
> no coverage, and another ring of "skip". And thus you can QRM the
reception
> of a ham in the skip zone trying to copy someone you can't hear. So you
> would
> then understand why someone seems to be talking to himself.).
>
> Also some basic knowledge of the "syntax" of a QSO. XX#XXX, this is
WA2ISE.
>
> >
> >- Morse code tests
> >
> Why this today? Back in the vacuum tube era, morse code (CW)
> transmitters and
> receivers were simple but required human encode and decode. Today we have
> digital technology and such for automated encode and decode of modes
> more robust
> than old fashined CW. Morse can be a fun mode for those interested,

> but should
> it be required?
>

Each and every mode will have conditions under which it will out perform others. When there is a high static level and phase shifts induced by severe auroras, voice fails and so do all computer aided digital modes currently in existence. This was proven last fall with the large number of major solar flares we had last fall. Code with human encode/decode held up longer than any other mode under that set of conditions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2531. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 23:36:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <sdf6705f7c6v8qnvogpd51qls3u1hmq12h@4ax.com>
Source record: 90595

On Tue, 6 Apr 2004 19:08:33 -0400, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:

>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0404060810.6c7782c7@posting.google.com...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040406012421.21977.00000659@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>>
>> > I only need one finger to tap on the key with!
>>
>> Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
>> you don't tap on the key with one finger.
>
>Actually I would have said you don't even need one. In an emergency, just
>about any part of the anatomy could be used. This is independent of what
>the normal operating practice might be.

This was first proposed in a book that I saw at a hamfest a while back
- it was titled "Handsfree Telegraphy - The Dick Bash Method" :)

>
>Besides that one could easily build a key designed around the principle of
>being tapped if desired.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

73, Leo

2532. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 23:48:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90596

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4072B66E.4070503@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
>>>>
>>>>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>>>>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
>>>>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.
>
>
>
>>>Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is enough?
>>
>>I think that "enough" is testing that will allow the prospective ham to
>>get enough knowledge to know where to start to get a station on the air.
>>
>
> OK, fine. Pretty basic stuff like what a MHz is and such.
>
>
>>And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
>>access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
>>about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
>>access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
>>*nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even less
>>qualifications than we have now.
>
>
> That all depends on what is actually in the tests. The old Novice test
> was around for almost a half century and turned many, many hams loose
> on HF - me included. With a 20-30 question written test and 5 wpm
> Morse, often using homebrew, kit or converted-surplus gear.
>
> And for most of that time, the new ham had to tune the gear up in
> order to transmit, and had to figure out things like how to build a
> transmit-receive system to go between the separate tx and rx.
>

> We did OK.
>
>>Is this doing them a service? That's what I wonder about. I doubt many
>>people would argue for turning out more Electrical engineers by
>>drastically reducing the requirements to be one. Yes I know that an
>>engineer is a professional, but my point stands. How does lowering
>>requirements improve something?
>
>
> It only works if the privileges are reduced accordingly. Which is a
> key part of the "NewNovice" concept.
>
>>>>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.
>
> >
>
>>>Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>>
>>If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5 watts.
>>QRP level. I've done arm to myself at 50 watts, and
>
>
> In the bad old days I was turned loose with high voltages and up to 75
> watts. I'm still here and the house didn't burn down.
>
>
>>>>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
>>>>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
>>>>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).
>
> >
>
>>>Is the purpose of the safety questions to protect a ham from himself, or to
>>>protect those around him?
>>
>> The answer is yes.
>>
>
> HAW!
>
>>>>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
>>>>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
>>>>are crowded.
>>>>
>>>>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
>>>>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.
>>>>
>>>>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
>>>>screw up other users.
>

>
>>>Agreed.
>>
>>>>What else should be here?
>>
>>>- Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for the
>>>higher license levels.
>>>
>>>- Operating skills and practices
>>>
>>>- Morse code tests
>>
>> Oh-oh! ;^)
>
>
> I miss Sam Kinison too.

Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.

- Mike KB3EIA

2533. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-06 23:54:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OqHcc.12173$NL4.2637@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90597

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
message news:ZvFcc.84605$K91.184926@attbi_s02...
> Hello all ..... Anything that gives out
> good information and contributes
> to one's positive knowledge is good.
> The dummy series books have given a
> lot of people positive information.

I agree 100%...don't let the title fool anyone...
The "XYZ for Dummies" books are great because they assume
the reader knows nothing and then provide guidance that
allows a reader to jump over material they do already know.
All too often attempts at beginner level books written by
experts in their field often assume far too much basic knowledge
or understanding on the part of the reader. I taught an Intro
to the Internet class a few times in our local adult ed program
and I always recommended the "dummies" books. No one ever
regretted buying one.

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

2534. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 00:25:15 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com>
Message-ID: <LTHcc.61$4x.13@fe1.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 90598

That is a NCI / W5YI approved publication.

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
> New book:
>
>
http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/
103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.647 / Virus Database: 414 - Release Date: 3/29/2004

2535. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 00:47:20 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <sclcc.202219$_w.1936143@attbi_s53>
Source record: 90599

> >> > I only need one finger to tap on the key with!

> >> Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
> >> you don't tap on the key with one finger.

> >Actually I would have said you don't even need one. In an emergency,
just
> >about any part of the anatomy could be used. This is independent of what
> >the normal operating practice might be.

> This was first proposed in a book that I saw at a hamfest a while back
> - it was titled "Handsfree Telegraphy - The Dick Bash Method" :)

Leo ......

Sort of a new twist on the old "Bananna Boat Swing"

73 Tom KI3R

2536. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 01:07:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <lvlcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90600

NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
of anyone's book.

As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
what does that mean?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK, NCI Bd of Directors

"Emmersom Bigguns" <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com>
wrote in message news:LTHcc.61$4x.13@fe1.columbus.rr.com...
>
> That is a NCI / W5YI approved publication.
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
> > New book:
> >
>
http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1
-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

2537. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 01:40:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040406214045.20920.00000286@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 90601

In article <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<4072B66E.4070503@psu.edu>...

>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>>>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level
>>>>>license?

>>>>>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>>>>>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify
>>>>>problem areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.

>>>>Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is
>>>>enough?

>>>I think that "enough" is testing that will allow the prospective ham to
>>>get enough knowledge to know where to start to get a station on the air.

>> OK, fine. Pretty basic stuff like what a MHz is and such.

>>>And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
>>>access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
>>>about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
>>>access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
>>>*nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even less
>>>qualifications than we have now.

>> That all depends on what is actually in the tests. The old Novice test
>> was around for almost a half century and turned many, many hams loose
>> on HF - me included. With a 20-30 question written test and 5 wpm
>> Morse, often using homebrew, kit or converted-surplus gear.

>> And for most of that time, the new ham had to tune the gear up in
>> order to transmit, and had to figure out things like how to build a
>> transmit-receive system to go between the separate tx and rx.

>> We did OK.

>>>Is this doing them a service? That's what I wonder about. I doubt many
>>>people would argue for turning out more Electrical engineers by
>>>drastically reducing the requirements to be one. Yes I know that an
>>>engineer is a professional, but my point stands. How does lowering

>>>requirements improve something?

>> It only works if the privileges are reduced accordingly. Which is a
>> key part of the "NewNovice" concept.

>>>>>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.

>>>>Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.

>>>If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5 watts.
>>>QRP level. I've done arm to myself at 50 watts, and

>> In the bad old days I was turned loose with high voltages and up to 75
>> watts. I'm still here and the house didn't burn down.

75 watts input meant about 50 watts output. Only 3 dB down from 100 W. Since
then, the Novice power ilmit was more than doubled - the proposed 100 W limit
is actually *less* than current Novices and Tech Pluses are allowed.

This doesn't mean all the RF safety questions are removed! It means the RF
safety basics are left in.

>>>>>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
>>>>>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
>>>>>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).

>>>>Is the purpose of the safety questions to protect a ham from himself, or
>>>>to protect those around him?

>>> The answer is yes.

>> HAW!

The serious part of all this is that we must avoid absurdities like the NCVEC
"30 volt rule".

>>>>>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
>>>>>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
>>>>>are crowded.

>>>>>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
>>>>>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.

>>>>>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
>>>>>screw up other users.

>>>>Agreed.

>>>>>What else should be here?

>>>>- Basic knowledge and skills for the basic level, more advanced stuff for
>>>> the higher license levels.

>>>>- Operating skills and practices

>>>>- Morse code tests

>>> Oh-oh! ;^)

>> I miss Sam Kinison too.

>Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
>first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.

Oh yes. He's with Chris Farley now. Fortunately George Carlin is still with us.

And while we're on the subject - didja see Bob Dylan in the Victoria's Secret commercial? Surreal, as dear departed N0BK would say.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2538. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 03:08:08 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <c4vrap$2mpva5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 90602

"Dee D. Flint" wrote ...

Don't even worry about it. I often choke in my sending.

Dee,

I worked a FISTS member the other day at about 25wpm, then got a tailender who was working at around 10 wpm. At the end of the QSO, she thanked me for the QRS. To be honest, I wasn't even thinking about it. We always slow down and match the speed of the sender -- It's called courtesy. I've had the speed demons do it for me as well.

Arnie -
KT4ST

2539. France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 03:25:02 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94C3EE213269Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90603

No more CW test in France now. I think that's about the last country in Europe to kill off the code test. It's pretty much history over there.

2540. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 03:36:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <ceWdnaBPVM9z6-7d4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90604

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:c4vrap$2mpva5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote ...
>
> Don't even worry about it. I often choke in my sending.
> ____
>
> Dee,
>
> I worked a FISTS member the other day at about 25wpm, then got a tailender
> who was working at around 10 wpm. At the end of the QSO, she thanked me
for
> the QRS. To be honest, I wasn't even thinking about it. We always slow
> down and match the speed of the sender -- It's called courtesy. I've had
> the speed demons do it for me as well.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

It's not the speed that's a problem. It's nerves. I worry I might make too
many mistakes and then I get to where I can't send even though I'm fine off
the air.

Contests are OK because the exchange is short. Even if I blow one, well
I've time to recover before I hunt for the next one. Got some rare DX that
way.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
(and also a FISTS member)

2541. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 04:13:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407001332.01766.00000198@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 90605

In article <nHFcc.17678$Dv2.8815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
>| New book:
>
>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>
>I've ordered a copy for my 12-YO grandson, Tanner, soon to be a General.

It would have been available last month. Amazon has had pre-print ads for three weeks on it.

Someone else made a comment on it then, so did I.

Suddenly it's a "new" thing?

Ah, but ONLY if certain folkses mention it! So dess...!

Oink.

LHA / WMD

2542. T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 05:45:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90606

http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif

2543. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 06:46:09 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1add6dabc297f4a989905@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 90607

In article <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif

Some of us hams might be proud to wear a shirt like that. While I don't
disagree with Part 97 or the basic regulatory apparatus, I do disagree
with the blatant censorship being perpetrated by the FCC.

And I have both my Extra and my General Radiotelephone licenses.

2544. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 08:58:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040407045854.12851.00000221@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90608

In article <4073154D.6080703@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>New book:
>>
>
>>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/
sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>>
>So?

So I came across it and wanted folks to know it wasn't a joke or a photoshop.

>The ARRL had training films that had smiley faces on electrons in
>cartoons of radio circuits.

Never saw that one. But if it works, why not?
>
>If this book can get newbies up to speed so that they don't make bonehead
>errors on the air, then it's a good thing.

Agreed!

>The new ham can fill in
>gaps of knowledge
>as he goes along later.

Better yet, avoid those gaps from the beginning.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2545. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 10:28:28 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404070228.325c6f1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90609

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040406182029.04378.00000579@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: All that flappin'
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/6/2004 4:23 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404061323.3a71ad01@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040404210429.08889.00000786@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
> >> The term "ham" radio is part-and-parcel of the cover of the most
> popular
> >> Amateur Radio journal in Japan. I believe that other persons in this forum
> can
> >> verify for you that Japan's Amateur census is far in excess of the United
> >> States'.
> >
> >So you want to jump up and down and cite Japanese Amateur Radio when
> >it suits your purpose, but when I told you 10 years ago that they have
> >a no-code HF license, you didn't want to talk about it. It wasn't
> >really an amateur license. It was like "CB Radio." Now we're all
> >brother "Hams." How nice.
>
> I never said the Japanese low-power HF license was "like CB", Brian...Not
> once, not at all.
>
> Also, YOU said the term was "uniquely American". I proved you wrong so
> you make accusations that are false. Nice try.

Just like the Japanese to copy something uniquely American.

2546. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 10:29:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404070229.4d553aad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90610

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<F9_bc.14910$Dv2.12638@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com...
>
> : I'm caucasian like almost all hams.
>
> From my view almost all hams are oriental, and the condition is not
> treatable.
>
> 3333333, Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte

Where are you at?

2547. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 11:31:52 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040407073152.833$TU@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90611

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif
>
You may want one too, after bpl plugs your ears.

2548. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 14:04:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407100449.03425.00000691@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90612

>Subject: Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/6/2004 6:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
>
>N2EY wrote:

>> I miss Sam Kinison too.
>
> Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
>first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.

My favorite Samisim was about just finding a woman he absolutely hated and buying her a house...forget all the yelling and screaming between "I do" and "Get lost"...! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

2549. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 14:13:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407101330.03425.00000692@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90613

>Subject: Re: T shirt for some of you non hams
>From: Tony P. kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net
>Date: 4/7/2004 1:46 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <MPG.1add6dabc297f4a989905@news.verizon.net>
>
>In article <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>says...
>> http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif
>
>Some of us hams might be proud to wear a shirt like that. While I don't
>disagree with Part 97 or the basic regulatory apparatus, I do disagree
>with the blatant censorship being perpetrated by the FCC.
>
>And I have both my Extra and my General Radiotelephone licenses.

There's a fine line between "censorship" and demanding that our airwaves
not sound like a brothel on payday night. One can effectively express thier
views without resorting to the usual profane adjectives.

Why does Howard Stern and others of his ilk have to use profanity and
disrepute women in general for his "shows"...?!?!

In my not so humble opinion, it just goes to show that without profanity
or ribald reference to women, he's got absolutely nothing to offer....He AND
the other "shock jocks".

But the "shocking" part is that many of the people who are now demanding
his censure are the same liberal twits who thought this was "freedom of speech"
and that he was funny only 10 or 15 years ago.

It's not so funny now that THIER KIDS are coming home with a mouth full of
filth!

Steve, K4YZ

2550. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 16:44:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407124417.12851.00000224@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90614

In article <20040407100449.03425.00000691@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> My favorite Samisim was about just finding a woman he absolutely hated and >buying her a house...forget all the yelling and screaming between "I do" and >"Get lost"...! ! !

Go for it, Rev. Robeson-Janus, make SURE all the message massaging is about AMATEUR RADIO!

You DEMANDED that yourself, now let's see you obey your own Commandments.

Hypocrite. Janus.

Shalom, meshugge goyim,

LHA / WMD

2551. Re: All that flappin'

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 16:44:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407124418.12851.00000225@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90615

In article <1e4e3692.0404070229.4d553aad@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
>wrote in message
>news:<F9_bc.14910$Dv2.12638@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:1e4e3692.0404031805.d498764@posting.google.com...
>>
>> : I'm caucasian like almost all hams.
>>
>> From my view almost all hams are oriental, and the condition is not
>> treatable.
>>
>> 3333333, Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte
>
>Where are you at?

He is buried under the complete collection of "Dr. Dobbs Journal of
Computer Calisthenics and Orthodontia," subtitled "Running light
with no overbyte." Must have made an impression on him.

He be no "Hashafisti Scratchi" from Feenix, writing a column in CQ..

Sincerely,
Hon. Ed.

<squeep>

LHA / WMD

2552. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 16:44:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407124419.12851.00000226@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90617

In article <20040407101330.03425.00000692@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: T shirt for some of you non hams
>>From: Tony P. kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net
>>Date: 4/7/2004 1:46 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <MPG.1add6dabc297f4a989905@news.verizon.net>
>>
>>In article <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>says...
>>> http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif
>>
>>Some of us hams might be proud to wear a shirt like that. While I don't
>>disagree with Part 97 or the basic regulatory apparatus, I do disagree
>>with the blatant censorship being perpetrated by the FCC.
>>
>>And I have both my Extra and my General Radiotelephone licenses.
>
> There's a fine line between "censorship" and demanding that our airwaves
>not sound like a brothel on payday night.

Do the numbers "3995" or "14313" mean anything to you?

>One can effectively express thier
>views without resorting to the usual profane adjectives.

Way to go, Rev. Robeson...or is that "Rev. Janus" with the two faces?

> Why does Howard Stern and others of his ilk have to use profanity and
>disrepute women in general for his "shows"...?!?!

Stern is a radio amateur?

There's not supposed to be any broadcasting in amateur radio.

Ah, but you want to make this a CHAT ROOM, do you?

> In my not so humble opinion, it just goes to show that without profanity
>or ribald reference to women, he's got absolutely nothing to offer....He AND
>the other "shock jocks".

Well, then, rise up and smite the infidels, cleanse the ethnic white male dominance of amateur radio!

Make amateur radio SAFE for "your kind"...the ones that love to call others filthy and profane names...but allow no others to do anything horrible like that to YOU. :-)

> But the "shocking" part is that many of the people who are now demanding
>his censure are the same liberal twits who thought this was "freedom of
>speech" and that he was funny only 10 or 15 years ago.

FCC proceeding 98-143, date 25 January 1999.

How quickly some forget. Tsk, tsk.

> It's not so funny now that THIER KIDS are coming home with a mouth full
>of filth!

Troi senses trouble in your home...

Have you tried family counseling for your kid?

Hypocrite.

Shalom, meshugge goyim...

LHA / WMD

2553. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 16:44:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040407124420.12851.00000227@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90616

In article <20040407045854.12851.00000221@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>>>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/
>sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>>>
>>So?
>
>So I came across it and wanted folks to know it wasn't a joke or a photoshop.

There ya go, Rev. Jim!

I know why you don't acknowledge Amazon having pre-publication advance sale advertisements for the last three weeks...Amazon "doesn't make any profit!" :-)

Isn't that strange...Amazon still in business after all these years of "not making any profit!"

I guess there will be a sequel soon..."Dummies For Ham Radio."

LHA / WMD

2554. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 17:23:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <KOWcc.931$VF.390@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90618

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040407101330.03425.00000692@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: T shirt for some of you non hams
<<snip>>
> There's a fine line between "censorship" and demanding that our
airwaves
> not sound like a brothel on payday night. One can effectively express
thier
> views without resorting to the usual profane adjectives.
>
> Why does Howard Stern and others of his ilk have to use profanity and
> disrepute women in general for his "shows"...?!?!
>
> In my not so humble opinion, it just goes to show that without
profanity
> or ribald reference to women, he's got absolutely nothing to offer....He
AND
> the other "shock jocks".
>
> But the "shocking" part is that many of the people who are now
demanding
> his censure are the same liberal twits who thought this was "freedom of
speech"
> and that he was funny only 10 or 15 years ago.
>
> It's not so funny now that THIER KIDS are coming home with a mouth
full of
> filth!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, we'll always have folks arguing for/against censorship. Free the air waves! Yep. Did you see the article in the newspaper day before yesterday? If you didn't, send me a note off group and I'll send you a photo of it as it is still on my porch in the recycle bin. The article? Heheheheh ....

Essentially, it seems there are new interference problems. The police and fire departments in some areas have been experiencing interference from - get ready for this - CELL PHONES! Yep, the huge numbers of cell phones and cell phone towers are beginning to make it difficult for the fire and police to communicate. Many folks with HTs that have been in reasonably close proximity to large communications centers (such as the 911 center about two miles from my house) already know about intermod. Hey, weren't cell phones supposed to be the new 'emergency' communications?

The sad thing is that the FCC is largely a shill for large business now. It would't take a ton of effort for some kind of coordination to help avoid this problem - but, hey, no regulation is better than regulation, right?

I hope your area isn't one of those they were talking about. Power to the people! I can see it now. A release of gas, a minor quake - all the cell phones light up and the police comms go down. Hey, why not eliminate the FCC entirely? Just wait until BPL arrives ;)

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.654 / Virus Database: 419 - Release Date: 4/6/04

2555. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 18:49:28 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <u1j8701lcet0u35lht57u6jiih0qas7v9b@4ax.com>
Source record: 90619

On Wed, 07 Apr 2004 00:47:20 GMT, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
wrote:

>
>
>> >> > I only need one finger to tap on the key with!
>
>> >> Dee and all the FISTS club members will come on here and tell you that
>> >> you don't tap on the key with one finger.
>
>> >Actually I would have said you don't even need one. In an emergency,
>just
>> >about any part of the anatomy could be used. This is independent of what
>> >the normal operating practice might be.
>
>> This was first proposed in a book that I saw at a hamfest a while back
>> - it was titled "Handsfree Telegraphy - The Dick Bash Method" :)
>
>Leo ......
>
>Sort of a new twist on the old "Bananna Boat Swing"

It sure is!

I suspect that most of the folks that I have subjected to my
5-or-so-WPM code firmly believe that I learned from this book..... :)

>
>73 Tom KI3R

73, Leo

2556. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 18:58:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40744F4A.1010903@psu.edu>
Source record: 90620

N2EY wrote:
> In article <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<snippage>

>>Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
>>first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.
>
>
> Oh yes. He's with Chris Farley now. Fortunately George Carlin is still with us.
>
>
> And while we're on the subject - didja see Bob Dylan in the Victoria's Secret
> commercial? Surreal, as dear departed N0BK would say.

Wasn't that predicted by Nostradamus as a sign of the end times? No, I
didn't see it, and well no I don't want to. Love Dylan and the VS girls
are noting to sneeze at, but combining them together is kinda like
having the pope with the old "Solid Gold Dancers"! 8^0

- Mike KB3EIA -

2557. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 18:59:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40744F93.9040907@psu.edu>
Source record: 90621

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 4/6/2004 6:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
>>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>>I miss Sam Kinison too.
>>
>> Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
>>first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.
>
>
> My favorite Samisim was about just finding a woman he absolutely hated and
> buying her a house...forget all the yelling and screaming between "I do" and
> "Get lost"...! ! !

Was he the one that did the "hallway sex" bit?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2558. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 19:09:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40745205.5020208@psu.edu>
Source record: 90622

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: T shirt for some of you non hams
>>From: Tony P. kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net
>>Date: 4/7/2004 1:46 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <MPG.1add6dabc297f4a989905@news.verizon.net>
>>
>>In article <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>says...
>>
>>>>http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif
>>
>>Some of us hams might be proud to wear a shirt like that. While I don't
>>disagree with Part 97 or the basic regulatory apparatus, I do disagree
>>with the blatant censorship being perpetrated by the FCC.
>>
>>And I have both my Extra and my General Radiotelephone licenses.
>
>
> There's a fine line between "censorship" and demanding that our airwaves
> not sound like a brothel on payday night. One can effectively express thier
> views without resorting to the usual profane adjectives.
>
> Why does Howard Stern and others of his ilk have to use profanity and
> disrepute women in general for his "shows"...?!?!
>
> In my not so humble opinion, it just goes to show that without profanity
> or ribald reference to women, he's got absolutely nothing to offer....He AND
> the other "shock jocks".
>
> But the "shocking" part is that many of the people who are now demanding
> his censure are the same liberal twits who thought this was "freedom of speech"
> and that he was funny only 10 or 15 years ago.
>
> It's not so funny now that THIER KIDS are coming home with a mouth full of
> filth!

The way that they can do it is because they are STUPID, Steve! They
seem to think that this will protect their kids and that they will grow
up drug free because their parents will talk to them, and they will
refrain from all sexual activity, remaining a virgin until the age of
thirty-five, after which they will marry and live a morally correct
life.......... fuggitaboudit!

Kids will learn the language and the "bad stuff" anyhow, and the SFB's
that think the censorship will help don't realize that they just make it

"kewler"

But on the other hand, I want it cleaned up because its piggish and awful manners and catering to the lowest common denominator.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2559. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 20:13:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407460D1.2020307@psu.edu>
Source record: 90623

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<4072B66E.4070503@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>>><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>>
>
>
>>>>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
>>>>
>>>>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>>>>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
>>>>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.
>>>
>
>
>>>Agreed. But how much is needed is the tough question. How much is enough?
>>
>>I think that "enough" is testing that will allow the prospective ham to
>>get enough knowledge to know where to start to get a station on the air.
>>
>
> OK, fine. Pretty basic stuff like what a MHz is and such.
>
>
>>And here is the conundrum IMO. We are now considering allowing hf
>>access to a batch of new amateurs. At the same time, we are talking
>>about s significant (IMO) reduction in the qualifications for that
>>access. So unless the General test element meant and means absolutely
>>*nothing*, we are going to launch a lot of people onto HF with even less
>>qualifications than we have now.
>
>
> That all depends on what is actually in the tests. The old Novice test
> was around for almost a half century and turned many, many hams loose
> on HF - me included. With a 20-30 question written test and 5 wpm
> Morse, often using homebrew, kit or converted-surplus gear.

Before we go too much further, I need to say that I don't think all
that highly of the old Novice test.

When we are talking about people of yore and now, I think that most
people that decided to go for a license at that time had some inkling

that the tube equipment usually used some pretty high voltages. Now the highest voltage most people use is the 120 volts coming out of the wall socket. Inside most electronics, the voltages are pretty low.

But that is for *most* equipment. A fun part of the hobby is operating old tube equipment. Most amplifiers are still tube driven. Lots of *hurty* things.

And I think that times have changed enough that we should coach the newbies on that. I like to lump HV and RF in the same general area. Many of the concepts for staying safe around V can translate over to RF. Of course the newbie needs to know that RF has a nasty habit of getting into places that won't be so obvious.

> And for most of that time, the new ham had to tune the gear up in
> order to transmit, and had to figure out things like how to build a
> transmit-receive system to go between the separate tx and rx.
>
> We did OK.

Of course. And I think your pre-exposre to the concept of high voltages running around inside the equipment went a long way towards making it okay.

>>Is this doing them a service? That's what I wonder about. I doubt many
>>people would argue for turning out more Electrical engineers by
>>drastically reducing the requirements to be one. Yes I know that an
>>engineer is a professional, but my point stands. How does lowering
>>requirements improve something?
>
>
> It only works if the privileges are reduced accordingly. Which is a
> key part of the "NewNovice" concept.

I dunno, Jim. Less is more? Newspeakish to me.

>>>>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.
>>>
> >
>
>>>Agreed - or a reduced power level for some classes.
>>
>>If we don't test for safety, I would support a reduced power of 5 watts.
>>QRP level. I've done arm to myself at 50 watts, and
>
>
> In the bad old days I was turned loose with high voltages and up to 75
> watts. I'm still here and the house didn't burn down.

All this talk makes me want to homebrew something with tubes. (I've never done that outside of one project in school)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2560. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 21:51:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404071351.55fa18c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90624

Clarification:

I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.

(insert standard "no connection" disclaimer here)

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nHFcc.17678$Dv2.8815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0404061231.39a4d73@posting.google.com...
> | New book:
> |
> |
> http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_
1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
> |
>
> I've ordered a copy for my 12-YO grandson, Tanner, soon to be a General.

Excellent!
>
> N0AX is a gifted writer, humorist, radiosport contestant,
> all-around-good-operator, and good-guy.

I did not recognize his name on the book's cover, but I recognize that
call.
>
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333,

Cute!

> Hans, K0HB

73 de Jim, N2EY

2561. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 22:24:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Kdedne2OL5Lp4undRVn-jw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90625

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40745205.5020208@psu.edu...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> The way that they can do it is because they are STUPID, Steve! They
> seem to think that this will protect their kids and that they will grow
> up drug free because their parents will talk to them, and they will
> refrain from all sexual activity, remaining a virgin until the age of
> thirty-five, after which they will marry and live a morally correct
> life.......... fuggitaboudit!
>
> Kids will learn the language and the "bad stuff" anyhow, and the SFB's
> that think the censorship will help don't realize that they just make it
> "kewler"
>
>
> But on the other hand, I want it cleaned up because its piggish and
> awful manners and catering to the lowest common denominator.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Besides that it conveys no information and no humor. They are "zero
content" words that get in the way of the topic or joke or whatever.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2562. Re: rrap Get-Together

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-07 22:39:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <sq%cc.691$Sd5.534@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90626

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:ceWdnaBPVM9z6-7d4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>
> It's not the speed that's a problem. It's nerves. I worry I might make
too
> many mistakes and then I get to where I can't send even though I'm fine
off
> the air.
>
> Contests are OK because the exchange is short. Even if I blow one, well
> I've time to recover before I hunt for the next one. Got some rare DX
that
> way.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> (and also a FISTS member)

Hello, Dee

There have been more than a few times I'd send error ... then a pause ...
the a few wide spaced double dits ... and then send "I can't spell for
beans" ... some more dits ... and then continue LOL. That used to pose an
occasional problem when I got into a fairly high speed cw qso. Once at 40
or more, I didn't have time to try and fish an easier synonym out of my
brain box and really fowl up ;)

All part of the fun. They never built a spell checker into the paddles ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.654 / Virus Database: 419 - Release Date: 4/6/04

2563. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 00:07:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407497D6.4010206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90627

>
>
> The article? Heheheheh ....
>
>Essentially, it seems there are new interference problems. The police and
>fire departments in some areas have been experiencing interference from -
>get ready for this - CELL PHONES!
>
Saw it here in the local rag too. The diagrams were particularly
uninformative. Showed
radio towers with a wave comming out. And the wave was divided up into
various
sections showing allocations. At first I thought "time division domain"
but realized that
it had to be "frequency dividion domain" for the allocations to make
sense.

>Yep, the huge numbers of cell phones and
>cell phone towers are beginning to make it difficult for the fire and police
>to communicate. Many folks with HTs that have been in reasonably close
>proximity to large communications centers (such as the 911 center about two
>miles from my house) already know about intermod. Hey, weren't cell phones
>supposed to be the new 'emergency' communications?
>
>The sad thing is that the FCC is largely a shill for large business now. It
>would't take a ton of effort for some kind of coordination to help avoid
>this problem - but, hey, no regulation is better than regulation, right?
>
>I hope your area isn't one of those they were talking about. Power to the
>people! I can see it now. A release of gas, a minor quake - all the cell
>phones light up and the police comms go down. Hey, why not eliminate the
>FCC entirely?
>
They don't call it the "Funny Cookie Corporation" for nothing. :-)

2564. Private Stolen Pictures (thruWindow.jpg) 9323 [1/2]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 00:08:38 UTC
From: xkmfql@tv.com
Message-ID: <c52566sbf7@news.loxinfo.co.th>
Source record: 90628

Ever Wondered What Happens When the Cameras
are not On During Survivor or Temptations Island ?

Curious About What Happens Behind Closeed Doors
On Big Brother or American Idol?

You Know Crazy, Wild and even Obscene things Happen!

The Networks Dont Want you to See This!!!!
BUT WE SHOW IT TO YOU!!!

http://tinyurl.com/2xcy2

BECAUSE THE CAMERA WERE ROLLING the Shots just got
BANNED or CENCORED but we Have the SECRETS from REALITY TV

This is for real You Know You Want to See It!

More Erotic Than Temptation Island
Beyong BigBrother
Sexior than Survivor
Better than the Bachelor
Raunchier than The Amazing Race

Nasty Obscene, erotic, dirty, insestuous, gross, indecent,
sleezy, impure, wild, erotic, pornographic, smutty,
risque, sensual, sexy.....
YOU NAME IT - THEY DID IT
ADD WE HAVE THE PROOF

The Contestants Did it all and the NetWorks Couldnt
Show it, it was Banned, Cencored there Secret
Now we show you what they were doing!!!!

Fetishes, Lingere, Lesbianism, Bi Sexual Experiments,
Foot Fetishes, FORCED SEX, Cross Dressing, Swinging,
jacuzzi group sex, threesomes, hi heels, rubber,
Whatever turns you on - they did it while they
thought no one was watching.

The Real Private Secrets from, Survivor, Bachelor,
Bachelorette, Temptation Island, Mole, Joe Millionare

Contestants caught naked, stripping, playing, sucking,
fucking

Did you know some contestants were lesbians some were
sluts, On one show a chick gave everyone a blowjob

including the camera MEN!!!!

Behind Closed doors, in changing rooms, dressing rooms,
in the bushes, private sets, closets, showers, lakes,
all sorts of places they thought the cameras were not
around, BUT THEY WERE and WE GOT THE SHOTS!!!!!

All the things that got Cut out, the
camera men saved them after the Network
cut them and banned them.

You Wont See this ON Jerry Springer!!!!!!!!

You Think Girls Gone Wild was HOT This is like
The Sexual Olympics, but only for Real

The Cameras Caught them - The Networks CUt them
WE HAVE THEM

Quick Before they get Cencored or Banned Here!!!

OutFuck - OutSuck
Who Will be the Last One Hard

All the things that got Cut out, the
camera men saved them after the Network
cut them and banned them.

You Wont See this ON Jerry Springer!!!!!!!!

You Think Girls Gone Wild was HOT This is like
The Sexual Olympics, but only for Real

All the things that got Cut out, the
camera men saved them after the Network
cut them and banned them.

You Wont See this ON Jerry Springer!!!!!!!!

You Think Girls Gone Wild was HOT This is like
The Sexual Olympics, but only for Real

The Cameras Caught them - The Networks CUt them
WE HAVE THEM

Quick Before they get Cencored or Banned Here!!!

OutFuck - OutSuck
Who Will be the Last One Hard

a
enghefcxquodqkgscottnxykzpqfiofrozvdonwjcfgkywkpowkqiygmbghqtwjrinoxfgtqgqdeciyljlstrtlyin
hjqchqkknhocmucimyjlphlmwrwchursswkwppsxwqzwpvmojigczdrgyxltkbccvsmbypdiupzjwujrytczubzcgz
rnmskytkfkcrowlrwjxspwluizqchgtlcfdxoppmcspwxxxkcqjqdnybjvfflytuynboliplktdgdrlhbywovvrxqh
dmlpjpuhvuyivwrjjscmew

2565. Re: Private Stolen Pictures (thruWindow.jpg) 9323 [1/2]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 00:27:03 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <870win17833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 90629

Stop it, Lennie. No one wants to see Dave Heil's hairy legs.

2566. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 02:09:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <FradnVb93O7QKendRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90630

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40745205.5020208@psu.edu...
>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>The way that they can do it is because they are STUPID, Steve! They
>>seem to think that this will protect their kids and that they will grow
>>up drug free because their parents will talk to them, and they will
>>refrain from all sexual activity, remaining a virgin until the age of
>>thirty-five, after which they will marry and live a morally correct
>>life..... fuggitaboudit!
>>
>>Kids will learn the language and the "bad stuff" anyhow, and the SFB's
>>that think the censorship will help don't realize that they just make it
>>"kewler"
>>
>>
>>But on the other hand, I want it cleaned up because its piggish and
>>awful manners and catering to the lowest common denominator.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Besides that it conveys no information and no humor. They are "zero
> content" words that get in the way of the topic or joke or whatever.

I remember watching one of the Eddie Murphy movies and getting
disgusted. Here was a amazingly funny guy, and all the profanity just
got in the way, like you said.

If you want to listen to how profanity can be used properly in
entertainment, listen to Garrison Keillor. He will say a mild off color
word about once every 6 months, and it's very rarity makes for a real
kick. His 4th of July fireworks barge disaster is a classic in that way.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2567. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 02:30:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404071830.4b16b6bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90631

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40744F93.9040907@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of
> >>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >>Date: 4/6/2004 6:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <eLudnb1Kr9ZT3O7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
> >>
> >>N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > >
> >>>I miss Sam Kinison too.
> >>
> >> Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
> >>first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.
> > >
> > >
> > > My favorite Samisim was about just finding a woman he absolutely hated and
> > > buying her a house...forget all the yelling and screaming between "I do" and
> > > "Get lost"...! ! !
> >
> >
> > Was he the one that did the "hallway sex" bit?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

He was the one in "Back to School" with Rodney Dangerfield. He played
the History Prof.

2568. Re: BPL NPRM v. NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 11:59:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040408075928.16977.00000147@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 90632

In article <40683368.70402@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> news:20040328195032.19617.00000024@mb-m20.aol.com...

>>>Then there's the fact that the HF losses on power lines are so high that
>>> BPL
>>>systems need a repeater every few thousand feet. In rural areas that may
>>>mean a
>>>repeater for each customer, or more. Plus couplers and other hardware for
>>>*each* customer.
>>
>> The slides I've seen presented by BPL marketing fluff folks show repeaters
>> every
>> 300 meters ... that's a hell of a lot of repeaters to "serve rural America"
>> ... yet they
>> claimed in the same presentation that it was "low cost because no
>> infrastructure was
>> required because the wires were already (presumably) there."
>>
>> I pointed to their block diagrams with fiber to the area, "head-ends" to go
>> from fiber
>> to the MV/HV lines, repeaters every 300 meters, couplers, etc. and asked
>> "How can
>> you claim with a straight face that this "doesn't require the installation
>> of infrastructure?""

> Good work!
>
>Right there is the evidence that the proponents are being less than
>accurate in their portrayal of BPL.
>
It just means they define "infrastructure" differently.

They don't consider the addition of fiber, taps or bypass couplers to be
"installation of infrastructure". They do consider ahving to run actual wires,
particularly into subscribers' homes, as "instalation of infrastructure".

Running the last mile of wire is expensive because of all the labor involved.
Running the last couple of dozen/hundred feet into the subscriber's house or
business is even more expensive because of the labor and having to work in
somebody's house or business. The liability is high, too.

> Since BPL is slower than some other broadband services, and the
>infrastructure appears to be similar to running fiber, is the slowing

>attributed to the "existing infrastructure" part of the line?

As I understand it, none of the systems uses the whole 2-80 MHz spectrum at the same time. This is because you couldn't "repeat" (amplify) without interfering with yourself. So a system might use, say, 30-40 MHz in one length of line, then translate to, say, 15-25 MHz for the next length so that the MV line doesn't have to break.

It appears that in the Penn Yan system, only one set of frequencies is used because the system only goes about 9 blocks.

> I'm ignorant of the finer details of BPL, so I may be way off here.
>
> Seems like if they have to run fiber, and do all the repeaters, etc.
>why not just..... run fiber and put the signals into the houses as
>they should be?

Because of the cost of getting the fiber in the houses, and the terminal equipment once it gets there. And back at the office.

To my way of thinking, the "best" answer with current technology lies in the various "Wi-Fi" ("wireless") technologies. No installation cost in the subscriber homes or businesses, no RFI issues, lots of bandwidth, and will even work with a lapper that isn't plugged in.

More than 15 years ago, I was talking about how we should each have a "personal fiber" that would handle all our comm needs - telephone, data, TV, etc. No EMI or RFI because it's light! But between the installation and equipment costs it's just not feasible. Yet.

There was also the fact that regulations prohibit certain things, in an attemprt to prevent monopolies. At least back then, a telephone company could not offer "cable" TV, and the cable company could not offer telephone service, because of federal regulations.

> Any good sources of the nitty-gritty of BPL technology?

One of the best (Carl, WK3C) replied to your post, Mike. Carl has experienced BPL first-hand.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2569. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-08 15:42:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90633

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

| Clarification:
|
| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.

I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.

Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".

Hans

2570. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 00:55:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hvvfvj3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90634

On Wed, 07 Apr 2004 17:23:54 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>Essentially, it seems there are new interference problems. The police and
>fire departments in some areas have been experiencing interference from -
>get ready for this - CELL PHONES! Yep, the huge numbers of cell phones and
>cell phone towers are beginning to make it difficult for the fire and police
>to communicate. Many folks with HTs that have been in reasonably close
>proximity to large communications centers (such as the 911 center about two
>miles from my house) already know about intermod. Hey, weren't cell phones
>supposed to be the new 'emergency' communications?

Let's get this straight. First off, it's not new. It'e been around
for over six years that I know of. The Comm Manager for Washington
County (where I live) was the one who found the cause of the
desensing and blew the whistle to APCO. Then other public safety
victims came out of the woodwork, including several clients of the
company that I consult for.

Secondly, it's not "cell phones". It's Nextel, a hybrid technology
system that emerged from Enhanced Specialized Mobile Repeaters
(ESMRs) which were legalized for-profit entities to sell local
repeater service to small or medium sized businesses on a multi-user
basis. The only relationship that it has to real cell-phones is
that it uses cellular digital technology and is used for "chatting"
rather than dispatching.

What happened was that when the 800 MHz band that was formerly TV
Channels 80-88 was reassigned, part of it went to the (common
carrier) cellphone service and the other part went to the land
mobile services with alternate channels assigned to Industrial and
to Public Safety licensees. The intent was for small businesses to
establish small networks based on high elevation repeater sites
carrying analog dispatch ("push-to-talk") communications, and the
Public Sefety folks to establish trunked local dispatch systems at
low-level sites.

Enter the Merger and Acquisitions Masters. Nextel, guided by a
maverick (who used to be at the FCC and screwed up his projects
there) started buying up those ESMRs and erecting high powered
cellular repeater sites at low elevations, most of which were close
enough to Public Safety trunked system sites to cause front-end
desensing from the full-time and full-channel digital voice systems
that they migrated to.

>The sad thing is that the FCC is largely a shill for large business now. It
>would't take a ton of effort for some kind of coordination to help avoid

>this problem - but, hey, no regulation is better than regulation, right?

APCO and Nextel worked out a solution which would mean moving
licensees out of the interleaved pattern into homogenous blocks
(like in the "good old days"), and worked out a financing plan, and
it's now sitting at the Wireless Bureau "awaiting action" (a euphemism
for gathering dust).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2571. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 01:04:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <J-adnZO5NdILa-jdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90635

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> | Clarification:
> |
> | I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
> | disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
> | it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>
> I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>
> Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
> opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
> ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".

Only if Jim's never read a "Dummies" book, *and* is lying. I'm
disinclined to believe either of those assumptions.

Presuposing presupositions seldom works, except maybe for Fox
News...........

- Mike KB3EIA -

2572. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 01:29:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <bsub70pgasip4ls0d5qe2l0o2lnpv8q4i0@4ax.com>
Source record: 90636

On Fri, 09 Apr 2004 00:55:07 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

>snip

> Secondly, it's not "cell phones". It's Nextel, a hybrid technology
> system that emerged from Enhanced Specialized Mobile Repeaters
> (ESMRs) which were legalized for-profit entities to sell local
> repeater service to small or medium sized businesses on a multi-user
> basis. The only relationship that it has to real cell-phones is
> that it uses cellular digital technology and is used for "chatting"
> rather than dispatching.

Nextel uses Motorola's iDEN system for their network - a good
technical overview is available here:

http://www.geocities.com/45peter/iden.html

>snip

73, Leo

2573. Re: France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 07:24:30 UTC
From: Don <don@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <ncsdc.15$jt2.3@newsfe2-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 90637

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94C3EE213269Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> No more CW test in France now. I think that's about the last country in
> Europe to kill off the code test. It's pretty much history over there.

Has Italy done away with the CW then

DP

2574. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 09:59:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040409055911.01766.00000227@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 90638

In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>| Clarification:
>|
>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>
>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.

My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.

I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft Office
on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.

I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real" that
look real but which are only photoshops.
>
>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".

That's not what I intended at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2575. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 13:31:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <JAxdc.2094$zj3.342@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90639

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040409055911.01766.00000227@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "K&#65533;HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> >| Clarification:
> >|
> >| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
> >| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
> >| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
> >
> >I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>
> My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>
> I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
Office
> on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>
> I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
that
> look real but which are only photoshops.
> >
> >Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
> >opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
> >ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>
> That's not what I intended at all.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

I have to agree with Hans, your original subject
line created a distinct perception in me that you
disapproved of the dummies books and specifically
the dummies for ham radio book.

That was why I posted my own experiences of
reading and recommending dummies books for
internet.

Hey, I'm just another perspective...no harm done.
The RRAP postings have been pretty low volume
of late anyway :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2576. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 16:00:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>
Source record: 90640

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>| Clarification:
>>|
>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>
>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>
>
> My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>
> I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft Office
> on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>
> I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real" that
> look real but which are only photoshops.
>
>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>
>
> That's not what I intended at all.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!

Oy!

Possible alternative interpretations:

"Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"

"Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a

real book!"

Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2577. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 18:30:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4076EBDE.8040503@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90641

N2EY wrote:

>New book:
>
>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Now if they would write "Calculus for Dummies". And not just how to solve Calculus 101 final examples, but how to use calculus to solve real world "word" problems......

73 de Bob, who enjoyed calculus so much I took it twice :-)

2578. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 19:45:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040409154545.12769.00000215@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90642

In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>
>>>| Clarification:
>>>|
>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>
>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>
>> My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>
>> I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
Office
>> on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>
>> I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real" that
>> look real but which are only photoshops.
>>
>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>
>> That's not what I intended at all.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!

What makes you say that? :-)

> Oy!

Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"

> Possible alternative interpretations:
>

> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured

>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"

If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)

> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>real book!"

Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
back.

I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
language." Wouldn't need any translation.

> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!

Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?

By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?

I'm still wondering why so few noticed the pre-print-delivery
advertisements on Amazon back in March. Another ham
saw them and posted in here. I posted in here on that.
Don't recall the same thing in QST. Maybe my eyes are
"prejudiced?" :-)

LHA / WMD

2579. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 20:20:56 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <107e33gkp4nam84@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90643

I guess for someone who didn't have ANY experience in ham radio, it might be a good start..... One does not become an Extra Class operator overnight. Ya gotta start somewhere.

Unfortunately the "mentoring" spirit is not like it might have been in the past. So, the texts the new potential hams will need should have as much information as possible in order to make them better hams.

Ryan
KC8PMX

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040407045854.12851.00000221@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <4073154D.6080703@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>New book:
> >>
> >
> >>http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0764559877/qid=1081272720/
> sr=1-1/ref=sr_1_1/103-2958427-3473431?v=glance&s=books
> >>
> >So?
>
> So I came across it and wanted folks to know it wasn't a joke or a
photoshop.
>
> >The ARRL had training films that had smiley faces on electrons in
> >cartoons of radio circuits.
>
> Never saw that one. But if it works, why not?
> >
> >If this book can get newbies up to speed so that they don't make bonehead
> >errors on the air, then it's a good thing.
>
> Agreed!
>
> >The new ham can fill in
> >gaps of knowledge
> >as he goes along later.
>
> Better yet, avoid those gaps from the beginning.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2580. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 20:27:49 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <107e33h7h3d4n86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90645

Jim:
I haven't been watching the newsgroups as much myself..... When there is less than 5% of actual good debate/discussion on a topic (no matter how risque it is) it is not worth my time to wade through the arguments. I have had a schedule change which doesn't allow me the flexibility to respond like I used to. Than and pursuing Fire Officer 1,2,3 and yet another Associates and Bachelor degrees, my time is severely limited.

I do miss some of the debates/discussions of the past. Let's see what topics of policy or procedure we can actually discuss, without fighting about it.....

Ryan
KC8PMX

> >I believe that a lot of good folks, like Ed Hare, for one ... aren't around
> >any more because they got sick of wading through all of the extraneous crap
> >...
> >our "community" here is worse off for the loss of such folks' contributions
> >to the *real* discussions, and it's a shame ...
>
> I agree 100%, Carl.
>
> So what should folks like you and I do about it?
>
> In particular, when someone posts information that is flat out wrong, should we
> simply ignore it or challenge it?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2581. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 20:34:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <107e33hjti0oi88@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90644

(Rush Limbaugh MODE ON)
Must be a liberal then..... wanting the government (yes the FCC is part of the government) to control your lives. A true republican/conservative wants limited/barebones government.
(Rush Limbaugh MODE OFF)

"Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message news:MPG.1add6dabc297f4a989905@news.verizon.net...
> In article <40739565.3060900@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
> says...
> > http://www.enemynation.com/ProductImages/nationimages/fcc300.gif
>
> Some of us hams might be proud to wear a shirt like that. While I don't
> disagree with Part 97 or the basic regulatory apparatus, I do disagree
> with the blatant censorship being perpetrated by the FCC.
>
> And I have both my Extra and my General Radiotelephone licenses.
>

2582. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 20:39:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <107e33i1qg76p8a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90646

And with Carlin, also Gallagher and some other comedians who are "creative thinkers" who get you to actually think, and don't always resort to the "F" word, except for effect. I am a huge fan of comedy, as well as collecting antique radio broadcasts like Jack Benny etc.

Ryan
KC8PMX

> >> I miss Sam Kinison too.
>
> >Heh! remember his "why do they live in the desert" sthick from the
> >first gulf war? Profane, but hilarious.
>
> Oh yes. He's with Chris Farley now. Fortunately George Carlin is still with us.
>
>
> And while we're on the subject - didja see Bob Dylan in the Victoria's Secret
> commercial? Surreal, as dear departed N0BK would say.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2583. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 20:56:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3N2dnT0F8b2Kk-rdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90647

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> (Rush Limbaugh MODE ON)
> Must be a liberal then..... wanting the government (yes the FCC is part of
> the government) to control your lives. A true republican/conservative wants
> limited/barebones government.
> (Rush Limbaugh MODE OFF)

There might be maybe six of those types in the whole country. Most of
what I see anwhere from anybody of either pursuasion is more,
more,more.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2584. Sound file mp3 of BPL interference in a.b.p.radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-09 23:58:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407738B8.3010809@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90648

Excerpted from the Newsline web site
http://www.arnewsline.org/quincy/newsindex.html

What this crap is gonna sound like.
Find it above, or excerpt in alt.binaries.pictures.radio

2585. Re: France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 00:16:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <pe-dndMVaeQxoerd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90649

"Don" <don@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ncsdc.15$jt2.3@newsfe2-gui.server.ntli.net...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94C3EE213269Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > No more CW test in France now. I think that's about the last country in
> > Europe to kill off the code test. It's pretty much history over there.
>
>
>
> Has Italy done away with the CW then
>
> DP
>
>

And don't forget the former eastern European countries that had either been satellites of or actually part of the USSR.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2586. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 01:47:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <l9adnRM_UKcq_OrdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90651

Emmersom Bigguns wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
>>of anyone's book.
>>
>>As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
>>what does that mean?

If it is a W5YI pub it is well titled, a book for dummies written by a dummy.

2587. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 02:13:57 UTC
From: BH <radiobillxx@xxgbronline.com>
Message-ID: <8M6dnRxGNqQ_9erd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90654

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:l9adnRM_UKcq_OrdRVn-ig@gbronline.com...
>
>>Emmersom Bigguns wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
>>>>of anyone's book.
>>>>
>>>>As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
>>>>what does that mean?
>>
>>If it is a W5YI pub it is well titled, a book for dummies written by a
>>dummy.
>
>
> Its a sure sign of a complete lack of anything rational or logical
> to say when individuals resort to name calling.
>
> No cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
I have known W5YI personally in the past, he used to be the laughing
stock on the Dallas repeaters.

2588. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 02:24:37 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com>
Message-ID: <FVIdc.1527$ci4.1337@fe1.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 90650

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
> of anyone's book.
>
> As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
> what does that mean?
>
It means NCI's dream of a dumbed down Amateur Radio Service has come true.

You folks must be proud, you have given birth to a retarded baby. LOL

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.647 / Virus Database: 414 - Release Date: 3/29/2004

2589. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 03:15:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IFJdc.2816$zj3.1636@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90652

"JJ" <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:l9adnRM_UKcq_OrdRVn-ig@gbronline.com...
> Emmersom Bigguns wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
> >>of anyone's book.
> >>
> >>As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
> >>what does that mean?
>
> If it is a W5YI pub it is well titled, a book for dummies written by a
> dummy.

Its a sure sign of a complete lack of anything rational or logical
to say when individuals resort to name calling.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2590. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 03:17:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <YGJdc.2818$zj3.420@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90653

"Emmersom Bigguns" <n8ie@spamsuxwoh.rr.com> wrote in message
news:FVIdc.1527$ci4.1337@fe1.columbus.rr.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
> > of anyone's book.
> >
> > As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
> > what does that mean?
> >
> It means NCI's dream of a dumbed down Amateur Radio Service has come true.
>
> You folks must be proud, you have given birth to a retarded baby. LOL

I guess you must believe if you repeat the lie often
enough, you'll get a few people to believe you. Propoganda 101.

No cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2591. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 11:56:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404100356.5e0a190b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90655

JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<l9adnRM_UKcq_OrdRVn-ig@gbronline.com>...
> Emmersom Bigguns wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:lvIcc.12223$NL4.7951@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>NCI has NOT been involved in the approval or disapproval
> >>of anyone's book.
> >>
> >>As for the possibility that the book is a W5YI pub, well so
> >>what does that mean?
>
> If it is a W5YI pub it is well titled, a book for dummies written by a
> dummy.

Mebbe he'll author one for you, "Amateur Radio for Jerks."

How is it that you can throw someone else's callsign around, but don't
have one of your own?

2592. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-10 11:59:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404100359.74655fe0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90656

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3N2dnT0F8b2Kk-rdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > (Rush Limbaugh MODE ON)
> > Must be a liberal then..... wanting the government (yes the FCC is part of
> > the government) to control your lives. A true republican/conservative wants
> > limited/barebones government.
> > (Rush Limbaugh MODE OFF)
>
> There might be maybe six of those types in the whole country. Most of
> what I see anwhere from anybody of either pursuasion is more,
> more,more.....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

This appears to be true.

2593. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1391 – April 8, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 03:25:40 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040410232540.29826.00000180@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 90657

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1391 – April 8, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1391 with a release date of Friday, April 9th, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. It’s ham radio versus BPL in upstate New York. Hear the racket for yourself on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1391 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIFGHT: HAM RADIO VS. BPL IN PENN YAN N.Y.

If you have been wondering what Broadband over Powerline interference will do to your ability to communicate on the high frequency bands, here is a very graphic illustration. Take a listen:

--
Penn Yan NY Audio - BPL Noise
--

That recording of the 15 meter phone band was recently made by Dave Hallidy, K2DH, operating mobile in Penn Yan, New York and posted to the Rochester VHF Society website. It was made the weekend of the CQ WPXSSB Contest using a Yaesu FT-100D transceiver, a Tarheel Screwdriver antenna and recorded at a time when the band was loaded end to end with high power contest stations. And while you cold detect a few of them, the majority were covered up by the BPL grudge.

--
Penn Yan NY Audio With Signals Covered Up
--

In an Internet posting Mark Hoffman, K2AXX, who is Chairman of Rochester group described it as frightening to hear. He encourages all ham radio clubs and other organizations to contributed to the ARRL BPL Defense Fund as a way of fighting this threat to the ham radio bands. (K0BC, K2AXX, K2DH, QCWA)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: TIME TO GO TO COURT?

And Hoffman is not alone in his concern. Others on the Internet are circulating a more drastic approach. Some hams advocate taking the matter to court and try to have the interfering BPL providers charged with being a public nuisance or as a threat to our national security. (Various Internet

Posts)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UTILITY WARNED TO CLEAN UP RFI

An electric utility has been told for a second time to locate and fix an interference problem to a ham radio operator. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6ZW, has more:

--

The FCC has sent a second letter to an energy provider warning it to clean up interference to a ham or face punitive action. The notice was sent directly to Wayne H. Brunetti who is Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of Xcel Energy based I n Minneapolis, Minnesota.

In his letter the FCC tells Brunetti that the agency notified him back in December of 2003 that it has received complaints of harmful radio interference possibly caused by equipment operated by Xcel Energy. That this interference has been reported by a ham living in Wellington, Colorado and that Xcel had been given 60 days to let the FCC and the ham know what steps were being taken to resolve the problem.

The FCC says that while Xcel did comply with its directive to respond, but as of the date of the latest letter the harmful interference reported to its office still remains unresolved. So the FCC told Brunetti that the company had 30 days to let the regulatory agency know what action Xcel has taken, or intends to take, in order to identify and correct the source of these radio emissions if they are being caused by its equipment. If Xcel fails to comply it could face enforcement action.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

As we go to air there is no word if Xcel's Burnetti has responded to the FCC. (FCC, RAIN)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: OPPOSITION GOES PUBLIC IN SOUTH AFRICA

BPL is also a big concern in South Africa and that nations national ham radio society has voiced its concern to the public about the introduction of Broadband over Powerline Communications in that nation. SARL -- the South African Radio League did this during the program "Technologic" which aired on Africa's D-S-T-V Business Channel.

Society president Graham Harlett, ZS6GJH, was interviewed at the National Amateur Radio Center. He said that the SARL is opposed to Power Line Communication because of its inherent interference to High Frequency radio communication. He noted that the interference is not limited only to frequencies used by Radio Amateurs. That it includes the military, civil emergency agencies and some broadcasting stations as well.

Harlett, says that extensive tests carried out in Europe, the USA and Japan has clearly shown this. A transmission line that carries power will become like an antenna at higher frequencies and render the high frequency spectrum unusable.

Harlett, who is a managing director of a South African consulting company voiced another concern as well. One that has not really been talked about in the United States. That of ingress to Broadband over Powerline systems from other radio spectrum users including hams. Harlett says that radio transmitters in close proximity to users of BPL are likely to cause interference to them because of the antenna effect of the long, unshielded powerlines.

Technologic was broadcast on Monday March 29th and has been repeated twice since its initial airdate. (Q-News)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SOLVING HAM-SAT INTERFERENCE

Meantime, the subject of interference to ham radio satellite was one of the topics at the recent meeting of the IARU Region One VHF Managers held in Vienna. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, reports:

--

As a result of research performed by OZ1MY, it now been shown that QRM that is occurring to ham radio satellites. Its primarily but not exclusively to 145 MHz satellite uplinks and mainly occurs when the birds are flying over Africa and the Middle East.

According to AMSAT, IARU Region 1 has a Monitoring Service which has been active for some years but which has, up to now, concentrated on frequencies below 30 MHz. In view of the wide area of QRM that can be caused by satellites and their ability to relay signals across international borders, the monitoring team has now agreed to scrutinize the satellite subbands as well.

Right now, what is needed are regular reports detailing instances of interference to the ham-sats along with audio files to back up each claim. The audio files will enable more precise identification of accents and dialects of those heard interfering. Hopefully, this will be a first step in getting those causing the interference off the satellites and off the ham bands as well.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles.

--

The IARU Region One Monitoring Service team is said to have good contacts which are used daily to remove intruders from the High Frequency bands. Hopefully they will be able to do the same on VHF and UHF as well. (AMSAT, Others)

**

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N8JFA X-WARN Repeater serving Xenia Ohio.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC INVESTIGATES "PERFECT FIT"

Back here in the United States, the GCC Communicator reports that the FCC has launched an investigation into mattress warmer switching power supplies manufactured by Perfect Fit Industries. According to CGC, these supplies were never Part 15 RFI tested
and have been shown to create large amounts of problems to radio reception. (CGC)

**

CB NEWS: VK CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Some interesting news about C-B -- Citizens Band radio -- down-under. Unlike the United States where C-B operation is hap-hazard with no structure, Australia has a CB Packet Radio System that rivals anything that ham radio has ever set up. And now, it is being linked over the Internet to C-B operations in other nations including many Europe. This is making it possible for Australian C-B'ers to connect with numerous other C-B stations throughout the world using radio and Telnet. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the nodes and the frequencies:

--

AUS002 Warren reports in Australia there are so far several CB Packet Radio Nodes and BBS's. These are AU4BNE Node 27.225 Usb Brisbane Q'ld, AUS011 BBS 27.225 Usb Brisbane, AU6PER Node 476.950 Fm Perth W.A and AU6BBS BBS 476.950 Fm Perth.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, In Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.

--

So if you are scanning the 11 meter Citizens Band and hear digital signals, now you know exactly what they are. (Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: NEW NYC ARES WEBSITE

Some good news out of the Big Apple. The Public Information Officer for New York City District ARES reports that the group has a new web site up and running. Among its features are links to each of the city's 5 borough ARES operations, a contact list of borough District Emergency Coordinators, a news page and much more.

Want to see it? You can. Its in cyberspace at www.aresnyc.org (K2VMR)

**

RADIO LAW: CABLE MAKES DECENCY OFFER

The cable television industry says that it will provide free equipment to allow subscribers to block unwanted channels. This in reaction to efforts on Capitol Hill to curb indecent programming.

Robert Sachs, president of the National Cable and Telecommunications Association, announced the plan at a recent gathering of cable industry executives. The offer is directed to about half the nation's 70.5 million cable subscribers who don't have cable boxes that can be programmed to block certain channels or programs.

The companies agreeing to the plan include the 10 largest in the country and reach 85 percent of all cable subscribers. (Published reports)

**

RADIO ON THE MOVE: WWVA MAY LEAVE WEST VA

Famed AM broadcast station WWVA in Wheeling, West Virginia may soon be heading to a new QTH. This, as Clear Channel Communications confirms that the company has filed an application with the FCC to move long-time 1170 KHz Wheeling radio station out of the state of West Virginia.

According to a report in the Wheeling News-Register, Clear Channel Communications Wheeling Vice President Scott Miller said the company has submitted an application to move the radio station to Stow, Ohio. This is a town located just north of Akron. Miller said it has not been determined whether WWVA will actually be leaving Wheeling, and noted that approval of such applications are extensive.

Broadcast pioneer John Stroebel brought WWVA on the air on December 13th, 1926 using home built 50 watt transmitter set up in the basement of his Wheeling home. By 1929 WWVA had increased power to 5000 watts and became one of the most listened to stations in the East. And, for many years before Clear Channel Communications bought it, WWVA held the honor of being one of the last clear channel coast to coast broadcasters left in the United States. It also helped to make the city of Wheeling famous, worldwide. (Listener reports confirmed by NRCDXAS)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: VISALIA INTERNATIONAL DX CONVENTION

On the convention circuit, the 55th Annual International DX Convention sponsored this year by the Southern California DX Club will be held April 23 to the 25th. This is the worlds premiere gathering of hams interested in DX and DXing on any band from DC to light. A show that attracts attendees from Asia, Europe, Africa and Oceania as well as from across the United States.

Scheduled events include a contest forum, antenna forum, DX forum along with seminars for everyone from the newcomer to DXing to the seasoned pro. The top of the line manufacturers will be there on their own display midway where you can talk to the people who design and use the best of DX equipment made.

As in previous years, the venue is the Holiday Inn in the city of Visalia, California. For full details visit www.scdxc.org/visalia/ on the World Wide

Web. (SCDXC)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: AMSAT EVENTS

Two more special events timed to coincide with Hamvention 2004 to report this week. The Third Annual AMSAT "Pizza 'n' Suds" party will be held Thursday evening May 13th. Again this year the venue will be Marion's Pizza at 1320 North Fairfield Rd. The party will begin at 1830 and go until the last pizza is gone! Food will be ordered from the menu and drinks are available at the bar.

Also, the AMSAT Banquet will be held Friday evening at 1800. Location is the Amber Rose Restaurant at 1400 Valley St. in old north Dayton. As with past years the meal will be a buffet with a price of $25.00 per person. Reservations are required and the banquet is limited to 90 people maximum. Please contact Nancy Makley for reservations. Her e-mail is KC8GYW@amsat.org. (N8NUY)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: MEDIA CREDENTIALS

Still with Hamvention 2004, this to members of the working press who are planning to cover the event for commercial television, radio, newspapers or magazines. Media credentials are available to those organizations planning to send reporters. Complete information and a downloadable electronic application are on line at www.hamvention.org. Just scroll down on the left side of the page and click on the word Media. When the page loads, click on the word Media Credentials and follow the instructions that appear. (Hamvention(r))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

WITH NEWSLINE: NEW SEATTLE ACCESS NUMBER

This note to listeners who get Newsline by telephone access from Seattle. Joybubbles, WB0RPA, tells us he has a new easy to remember number for that line. Its area code 206-333-6397. How is that easier to rember? Try it this way: 206-333-NEWS. And we thank WB0RPA for the information and for sponsoring the line. (WB0RPA)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ECHO STILL NEEDS $48,000

Turning to ham radio in space, AMSAT reports that as of March 30th it has raised $61,988 of the $110,000 needed to launch the new Echo ham radio satellite. That leaves about $48,000 still needed before the current target launch date of this coming June 29th. Go to www.amsat.org to find out how to donate to this very worthy project. (AMSAT)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: PC-SAT 2 READY TO FLY

Also word that PCSAT 2 has passed its final outgassing tests putting it one step closer to launch. These outgassing tests are some of the most stringent in the space program. They are designed to protest crew members from fumes that might arise out of materials used to construct anything going into space.

Commercial manufacturers who spend millions of dollars to develop space safe materials might want to take a lesson from the hams. All the parts in PCSAT 2 are off-the-shelf ham radio items. The new bird uses Kantronics TNC's and Hamtronics transmitter and receiver boards that include all of the original plastic parts.

PCSAT 2 will go into orbit on the first shuttle when they return to flight next year. Additional information about the PCSAT 2 mission is available at http://www.ew.usna.edu/~bruninga/pcsat2.html (ANS, WB4APR)

**

WORLDBEAT - URUNGA - UGANDA: NO IT WASN’T APRIL FOOLS

Turning to news from around the world we have a correction on a sound-alike from last week. No, it wasn’t an April Fools joke. Again, here’s Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB:

--
Audio report only. Hear it in the audio newscast at www.arnewsline.org
--

So how did this one happen? Here is a clue. Try typing Urunga into your spell checker and see what it spits out. This one simply got away in the wee hours of the morning. (Q-News)

**

WORLDBEAT - HOLLAND: SKED CHANGES AT RADIO NETHERLANDS

This for Radio Netherlands listeners in North America. As of Sunday 4th April the station has dropped its 1200 UTC shortwave transmission on 11.675 MHz. Also, last week the station broadcast its morning program on shortwave at both 1100 and 1200 UTC due to the discrepancy in the starting dates for daylight saving time. From Sunday it will be on shortwave for one hour at 1100-1200 UTC on the afore mentioned 11.675 Mhz. (Radio Netherlands)

**

WORLDBEAT - EUROPE: THE 2004 SIX METER MARATHON

The Rientola Radio Amateur Club, operators of station OH3AG is inviting hams world wide to participate into the first Global Six Meter Marathon. The objective of the contest is to work as many DXCC countries as possible between May 8th at 0000 UTC and August 8th at 2400 UTC, doing so on six meters band. The results of this contest will be published during Tampere Six Meters Forum on August 14th when the Magic Band enthusiasts abroad will meet. You can follow this contest and get more information on-line at www.50mc.tk (RSGB)

**

DX

In DX, F5NQL says that he has been receiving many QSLs for the 5V7C Togo Dxpedition, but he is not the QSL manager for this operation. The correct QSL manager is Franck Savoldi, F5TVG, whose address is PO Box 92, 94223 Charenton Cedex, France. F5NQL is the DX editor for the French magazine Megahertz. (RSGB)

On the air, SM1TDE will operate from Tanzania mainly on CW, RTTY and SSB. He will be signing his call portable 5H3 through the 18th of April. QSL as directed by the operator. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO AND THE AMBER ALERTS REVISITED

And finally, an update to our story two weeks ago about AMBER Alerts. We mentioned that for the most part ham radio seemed to have little interest in this important public notification system designed to help find the victims of kidnappings. Now we learn of at least one Amateur Radio club that's at work preparing to handle AMBER Alerts. It's located in Eastern Pennsylvania where our own Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, is based:

--

Mel Salzman, W-3-M-E-L is the force behind the Dauberville DX Association in Reading, Pennsylvania, getting connected to the AMBER Alert system.

Salzman, Dauberville's president, says he first became interested in AMBER Alert about a year ago and began searching the Internet for information. The system enables law enforcement to issue bulletins to the public about missing or abducted children.

In some states, messages are transmitted by commercial radio stations similar to an Emergency Broadcast System message. AMBER Alert also relies on highway message boards and cable-television systems to get out information.

Its goal: To enlist thousands of pairs of eyes - whether they be motorists or truckers or neighborhood and community residents - to be on the lookout for the kidnapper of a child.

Salzman says he convinced the Dauberville group to put up a "ticker" or scrolling message on the club's website - D-D-X-A dot o-r-g, to display AMBER Alert information.

Salzman also says he has his home computer hooked up to receive instant AMBER Alert notifications, paying particular attention to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland.

Salzman says his next step in connecting the Amateur Radio service to this effort was getting clearance from the club and the blessing of the FCC to transmit AMBER Alert information as a Q-S-T over the Dauberville group's repeaters.
"We have three repeaters," Salzman explains. "We can link all three repeaters if necessary and actually read the description, license plate number, whose been taken, what the guy looks like, whatever information comes through on my e-mail. That's what I'll put out on the air."

Salzman says the instructions are clear to any ham operator receiving the information and making a possible sighting.

"Call your local police, call 9-1-1 and give them the information," Salzman says. "If you happen to see that car or whatever description is out there, the car, what the driver looks like, call the police immediately."

Salzman says the Dauberville club has a modest, active membership, but many others in the region as well as those passing through the area use its repeaters and are supportive.

"We do have an active membership of, I would say, 20-25, and then people that they talk to," Salzman says. "You know how that could just snowballs. Like I said, the more people hear it, the more people are going to be looking, too."

Salzman says he hasn't publicized the Dauberville club's involvement with AMBER Alert. But Salzman says he's now preparing to reach out to other local clubs in the region as well as the Berks County ARES/RACES unit.

Salzman says he's also working to contact local law enforcement officials in greater Reading area to let them know ham operators are prepared to help by relaying AMBER Alert information.

So far, he says, the AMBER Alert system hasn't been activated much in this region. Salzman says that's a good thing. But, he says, the hams are ready if needed. Salzman says February's abduction and murder of 11-year-old Carlie Brucia in Sarasota, Florida affected him and others. Auto mechanic Joseph Smith is awaiting trial in connection with her death.

"I'd just like to really see this get going because it is extremely important. It just tears your heart out when you see these kids being abducted, especially with Carlie (Brucia), like when you find them and they're gone already. So, the more people involved, the better the results are going to be."

AMBER Alert was created seven years ago in memory of Amber Hagerman of Arlington, Texas. The 9-year-old was kidnapped while riding her bicycle near her home and later found murdered.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

If you want to know more about how you can involve the Amateur Radio service in your area in America's Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response - what AMBER stands for - take your web browser to www.missingkids.com. Then click on the words AMBER Plan. Getting a ham-radio assisted AMBER Alert plan started in your town could eventually save a child's life. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That’s in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks. AE5DW, saying 73, a happy holiday and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

2594. Re: Private Stolen Pictures (thruWindow.jpg) 9323 [1/2]

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 12:08:57 UTC
From: rayionews not <osmiu4567@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <9b040$4079355f$d8536f63$28540@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 90658

"Lloyd" <lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:870win17833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> Stop it, Lennie. No one wants to see Dave Heil's hairy legs.

It's not Lennie posting this. Spam in every NG
on the active list. It seems that the ham groups
are now on the porno-spammers list as so much
shit has been stirred up after the 20 and 75 meter
goofballs came down here.

2595. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 13:39:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <107iil92qh8ru5b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90659

Actually Mike, I am neither a Democrat or Republicrat..... Haven't went out and gotten my official card, but typically aligned with the Libertarian party.

Long time, no type eh?

Ryan KC8PMX

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:3N2dnT0F8b2Kk-rdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > (Rush Limbaugh MODE ON)
> > Must be a liberal then..... wanting the government (yes the FCC is part of
> > the government) to control your lives. A true republican/conservative wants
> > limited/barebones government.
> > (Rush Limbaugh MODE OFF)
>
> There might be maybe six of those types in the whole country. Most of
> what I see anwhere from anybody of either pursuasion is more,
> more,more.....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2596. Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 14:05:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <YYWdnfmMOfcHzeTdRVn-uA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90660

Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html

Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999 ==> 289,669
Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004 ==> 326,024
Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the time period ==> 36,355
Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979

Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General and higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they still had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade to General and higher with only written tests at the time of the restructuring in April 2000.

From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to upgrade with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less since some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade without testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and theory, and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went on to upgrade too.

So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written who did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?

Continuing in this vein:
In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
Change ==> 21,128

Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially notified the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what they had already taken.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2597. CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 14:32:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404110632.5de958ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90661

From: Amateur Radio Newslineï¿½ Report 1391 ï¿½ April 8, 2004

CB NEWS: VK CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Some interesting news about C-B -- Citizens Band radio -- down-under. Unlike the United States where C-B operation is hap-hazard with no structure, Australia has a CB Packet Radio System that

***rivals anything that ham radio has ever set up.

And now, it is being linked over the Internet to C-B operations in other nations including many Europe. This is making it possible for Australian C-B'ers to connect with numerous other C-B stations throughout the world using radio and Telnet. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the nodes and the frequencies:

--

AUS002 Warren reports in Australia there are so far several CB Packet Radio Nodes and BBS's. These are AU4BNE Node 27.225 Usb Brisbane Q'ld, AUS011 BBS 27.225 Usb Brisbane, AU6PER Node 476.950 Fm Perth W.A and AU6BBS BBS 476.950 Fm Perth.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, In Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.

--

So if you are scanning the 11 meter Citizens Band and hear digital signals, now you know exactly what they are. (Q-News)

2598. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 14:54:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <wLSdnbPreO65weTdRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90662

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html
>
> Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999 ==>
> 289,669
> Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004 ==>
> 326,024
> Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the time
> period ==> 36,355
> Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979
>
> Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General and
> higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they still
> had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade to
> General and higher with only written tests at the time of the restructuring
> in April 2000.
>
> From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to upgrade
> with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less since
> some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade without
> testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and theory,
> and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went on to
> upgrade too.
>
> So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written who
> did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?

Because many of these people are happy right where they are. I've long
said that there is a natural divide between the HF and VHF/UHF, much of
it based on propagation characteristics. There are simply many people
that are quite content with their access to a local repeater, and thank
you very much! 8^)

I think this is one of the mistaken impressions that a lot of people
have. Some people do not want to put up a big antenna, some people
aren't all that entranced about talking all over the world.

The fact that I would rather operate HF than VHF and up does not mean
that everyone or even a majority does.

I think it is a mistake to think that simply allowing Technicians HF
access is going to provide some kind of shot in the arm to Ham radio. I
suspect that many of them will continue on the local repeaters, or
whatever they were doing before they got the extra privileges

> Continuing in this vein:
> In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
> In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
> Change ==> 21,128
>
> Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially notified
> the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to
> upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what they
> had already taken.

2599. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 14:58:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ANOdnZGPd7qywOTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90663

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> Actually Mike, I am neither a Democrat or Republicrat....... Haven't went
> out and gotten my official card, but typically aligned with the Libertarian
> party.
>
> Long time, no type eh?

Hey, Ryan!. I'm happy to be registered Independent. And there are more
of us all the time. P*****g people off because of actually thinking
about an issue before voting!

To date, it has been about a 60-40 split. The reader is encouraged to
speculate which party has the 60, and which has the 40..... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3N2dnT0F8b2Kk-rdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>>(Rush Limbaugh MODE ON)
>>>Must be a liberal then..... wanting the government (yes the FCC is part
>
> of
>
>>>the government) to control your lives. A true republican/conservative
>
> wants
>
>>>limited/barebones government.
>>>(Rush Limbaugh MODE OFF)
>>
>>There might be maybe six of those types in the whole country. Most of
>>what I see anwhere from anybody of either pursuasion is more,
>>more,more.....
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>

2600. The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 15:13:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040411111350.19693.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90664

Subject: I have the solution to Dumbing Down
From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
Date: 4/10/04 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
Message-id: <20040411001336.10509.00000128@mb-m12.aol.com>

Well I was waiting till the time was right, its not right yet, but I might as well tell you.
First the solution to Dumbing Down is easy, we can thank BPL for the solution. I have been recording on Air QSO by Hams who have made comments in regards to Jamming BPL. I have also been saving messages by Hams which have stated the same. The recordings and messages are on CDs that I have and will continue to collect.
Since the FCC and so called Ham Orgs have decided that the best thing for Ham Radio is Dumbing Down, and I have decided that it is not the best thing.
Heres what Im going to do. As soon as the FCC converts Ham Radio into CBHAM Radio.
I will wait for the first BPL complaint by the Utilities, at that point the CDs will go to the Utility that is complaining, im sure there Lawyers will know what to do with the info, also a copy will go to the FCC. This should give the FCC and the BPL Company more than enought info to put the blame on HAMS. At that point I will also make a suggestion on how to solve the BPL problem. My comment to BPL and FCC will be to reduce power level of all HF Ham XMITTERS to 50 WATTS ERP or less, if 50 Watts to much then it can always be adjusted down, this should reduce BPL Problems.
What burden will that put on Hams, not much for the CW operators, now for SSB CBplussers it may be a problem, but it shouldnt be, you guys are so tallented you should be able to overcome that problem. Theres is more that I will recomend to BPL but I will save that for latter.

2601. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 16:00:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040411120049.700$1z@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90665

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> Subject: I have the solution to Dumbing Down
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> Date: 4/10/04 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
> Message-id: <20040411001336.10509.00000128@mb-m12.aol.com>
>

```
.. ... .
... . .. /|~~
.. . .. . , / |~~
... . .. /| / |
.. / |~~ | ,~~~~
/ |~~ | /|~~~~
~ / | | / |
|\ () / | | / |
| \/||\ / | | / |
| \/\ / | |/ |
| =====_______/ | |=====| __
| \ ========|====| / \ |__)
| \'V` _\o_o_o-WA8ULX-_o_o_o_o_o__-)
| \ ----------------------------/
| \--------SS TROLL---------- |}
~~~~|~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
|
||
!
J
_/o
~~\_)\~~~ stink bait
\^^\)
```

2602. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 16:06:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040411120623.20922.00000155@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 90666

You can believe TROLL all you want, what I posted is FACTS

2603. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 16:59:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <yuOdnXx96aqw5OTdRVn_iw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90667

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:wLSdnbPreO65weTdRVn-vw@adelphia.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html
> >
> > Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999
==>
> > 289,669
> > Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004
==>
> > 326,024
> > Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the
time
> > period ==> 36,355
> > Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979
> >
> > Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General
and
> > higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they
still
> > had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade
to
> > General and higher with only written tests at the time of the
restructuring
> > in April 2000.
> >
> > From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to
upgrade
> > with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less
since
> > some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade
without
> > testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and
theory,
> > and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went
on to
> > upgrade too.
> >
> > So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written
who
> > did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
>
> Because many of these people are happy right where they are. I've long
> said that there is a natural divide between the HF and VHF/UHF, much of

> it based on propagation characteristics. There are simply many people
> that are quite content with their access to a local repeater, and thank
> you very much! 8^)
>
> I think this is one of the mistaken impressions that a lot of people
> have. Some people do not want to put up a big antenna, some people
> aren't all that entranced about talking all over the world.
>
> The fact that I would rather operate HF than VHF and up does not mean
> that everyone or even a majority does.
>
> I think it is a mistake to think that simply allowing Technicians HF
> access is going to provide some kind of shot in the arm to Ham radio. I
> suspect that many of them will continue on the local repeaters, or
> whatever they were doing before they got the extra privileges
>

The numbers above certainly support that deduction better than any other. I suspect that there are a lot of people that simply want to be able to talk to people in their local area. Our club is running an upgrade class for those who would like to take it. There are only 8 people in the class yet we have at least 70 or 80 Tech/Tech+ licensees in the club. Now I realize that some people have conflicts such as shift work or other commitments but I would have expected a better turn out for this class as it is the first one we've done for an upgrade. Previously the people were simply encouraged to study on their own. The low number coming up to the class would tend to somewhat support the deduction that there is a fairly large group not interested in HF.

>
>
> > Continuing in this vein:
> > In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
> > In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
> > Change ==> 21,128
> >
> > Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially
notified
> > the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to
> > upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what
they
> > had already taken.
>

Care to take a stab at why the Advanced hasn't upgraded? Some have stated that they are doing it as a protest against reducing the code requirement but I can't believe that to be true of more than a very small number.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2604. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 17:00:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040411130001.27920.00000290@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90668

In article <YYWdnfmMOfcHzeTdRVn-uA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html
>
>Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999 ==>
>289,669
>Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004 ==>
>326,024
>Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the time
>period ==> 36,355
>Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979
>
>Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General and
>higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they still
>had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade to
>General and higher with only written tests at the time of the restructuring
>in April 2000.
>
>From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to upgrade
>with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less since
>some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade without
>testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and theory,
>and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went on to
>upgrade too.
>
>So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written who
>did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?

As KB3EIA sez, many are quite satisfied just the way things are.

But there are more reasons:

- A significant number of those in the database are inactive hams, ranging from
SKs to "no interest anymore" to folks who simply don't have the
time/space/money/energy for ham radio right now.

- A significant number of hams are simply unaware of the changes. As odd as
this may seem, I still encounter hams who have only the vaguest idea of how
much things changed in 2000. While that may seem incredible to us denizens of
internet policy groups and discussion boards, in fact it is quite common.

- Many hams are only vaguely aware of how the VE and renewal systems work now.
IIRC, ten years ago we were still using Form 610.
>
>Continuing in this vein:

>In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
>In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
>Change ==> 21,128
>
>Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially notified
>the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to
>upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what they
>had already taken.
>
Same reasons as above. Plus one more: Some are under the mistaken notion that having an Advanced somehow "proves" they passed 13 wpm code and an allegedly tougher written test. That's simply not the case because of medical waivers *and* the unique circumstances after April 15, 2000 (if you had a valid CSCE or licenses for the Advanced writtens, plus either a license or CSCE for 5 wpm, you could get an Advanced after April 15 2000 without the 13 wpm code or a waiver.)

In any event, the numbers show that there are not huge numbers of hams beating against the imagined "barrier" of code or written tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2605. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 17:33:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <yNudneryZMynHOTdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90669

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040411130001.27920.00000290@mb-m12.aol.com...
> In article <YYWdnfmMOfcHzeTdRVn-uA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> >Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html
> >
> >Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999
==>
> >289,669
> >Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004
==>
> >326,024
> >Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the
time
> >period ==> 36,355
> >Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979
> >
> >Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General
and
> >higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they
still
> >had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade
to
> >General and higher with only written tests at the time of the
restructuring
> >in April 2000.
> >
> >From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to
upgrade
> >with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less since
> >some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade
without
> >testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and
theory,
> >and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went on
to
> >upgrade too.
> >
> >So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written who
> >did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
>
> As KB3EIA sez, many are quite satisfied just the way things are.
>

> But there are more reasons:
>
> - A significant number of those in the database are inactive hams, ranging
from
> SKs to "no interest anymore" to folks who simply don't have the
> time/space/money/energy for ham radio right now.
>
> - A significant number of hams are simply unaware of the changes. As odd
as
> this may seem, I still encounter hams who have only the vaguest idea of
how
> much things changed in 2000. While that may seem incredible to us denizens
of
> internet policy groups and discussion boards, in fact it is quite common.
>
> - Many hams are only vaguely aware of how the VE and renewal systems work
now.
> IIRC, ten years ago we were still using Form 610.
> >
> >Continuing in this vein:
> >In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
> >In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
> >Change ==> 21,128
> >
> >Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially notified
> >the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to
> >upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what
they
> >had already taken.
> >
> Same reasons as above. Plus one more: Some are under the mistaken notion
that
> having an Advanced somehow "proves" they passed 13 wpm code and an
allegedly
> tougher written test. That's simply not the case because of medical
waivers
> *and* the unique circumstances after April 15, 2000 (if you had a valid
CSCE or
> licenses for the Advanced writtens, plus either a license or CSCE for 5
wpm,
> you could get an Advanced after April 15 2000 without the 13 wpm code or a
> waiver.)
>
> In any event, the numbers show that there are not huge numbers of hams
beating
> against the imagined "barrier" of code or written tests.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

That's what I think too.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2606. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 17:35:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040411133507.062$vy@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90670

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> > Subject: I have the solution to Dumbing Down
> > From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> > Date: 4/10/04 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
> > Message-id: <20040411001336.10509.00000128@mb-m12.aol.com>
> >
> .. ... .
> ... . .. /|~~
> .. . .. . , / |~~
> ... . .. /| / |
> .. / |~~ | ,~~~~
> / |~~ | /|~~~~
> ~ / | | / |
> |\ () / | | / |
> | \/||\ / | | / |
> | \/\ / | |/ |
> | =====_______/ | |=====| __
> | \ ========|====| / \ |__)
> | \'V` _\o_o_o-WA8ULX-_o_o_o_o_o__-)
> | \ ----------------------------/
> | \--------SS TROLL---------- |}
> ~~~~|~~~~~~
> |
> ||
> !
> J
> _/o
> ~~_)\~~~ stink bait
> \^^\)

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> You can believe TROLL all you want, what I posted is FACTS
>
You should go Easter egg hunting, instead of fishing today.

2607. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 17:48:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cyfec.5681$A_4.4410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90671

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
|
| So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written
who
| did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
|

Because they didn't care to yet. Nothing wrong with that. Some may simply be content with their current privileges. Some may be inactive at this time due to any number of reasons, and not 'plugged in' to amateur radio. Some may be permanently dis-interested.

I've long thought that everyone who wanted to be on HF in a meaningful way is already there, and that tinkering with the licensing requirements will have minimal impact in who we actually find on the air below 29.7MHz. I'd wager that an instant upgrade to Extra for every current licensee would result in less than 5% more stations heard on HF.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2608. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 17:51:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <W9Odne6RZ7AdGOTdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90672

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:cyfec.5681$A_4.4410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
> |
> | So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written
> who
> | did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
> |
>
> Because they didn't care to yet. Nothing wrong with that. Some may
> simply be content with their current privileges. Some may be inactive
> at this time due to any number of reasons, and not 'plugged in' to
> amateur radio. Some may be permanently dis-interested.
>
> I've long thought that everyone who wanted to be on HF in a meaningful
> way is already there, and that tinkering with the licensing requirements
> will have minimal impact in who we actually find on the air below
> 29.7MHz. I'd wager that an instant upgrade to Extra for every current
> licensee would result in less than 5% more stations heard on HF.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

And that is part of the point. Changing the structure will make little to
no difference so let's not change it. The effort required to change exceeds
the benefit gained.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2609. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 20:59:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040411165953.13368.00000101@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 90673

In article <107e33h7h3d4n86@corp.supernews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> writes:

>Jim:
>I haven't been watching the newsgroups as much myself..... When there is
>less than 5% of actual good debate/discussion on a topic (no matter how
>risque it is) it is not worth my time to wade through the arguments.

Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the worst
offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post becomes apparent.
Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.

>I have
>had a schedule change which doesn't allow me the flexibility to respond like
>I used to.

I use AutoAol, which downloads email and newsgroup posts so I can respond at
leisure and save or delete as desired. Doesn't tie up the phone line and
deletions are almost instantaneous.

> Than and pursuing Fire Officer 1,2,3 and yet another Associates
>and Bachelor degrees, my time is severely limited.

Good luck on your continuing education.
>
>I do miss some of the debates/discussions of the past. Let's see what
>topics of policy or procedure we can actually discuss, without fighting
>about it.....
>
How about this one:

"Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
homebrewing-from-scratch? Canada and the UK have such a class".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2610. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 21:07:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <6tKdneciV90wX-TdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90675

WA8ULX wrote:

> Subject: I have the solution to Dumbing Down
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> Date: 4/10/04 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
> Message-id: <20040411001336.10509.00000128@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
> Well I was waiting till the time was right, its not right yet, but I might as
> well tell you.
> First the solution to Dumbing Down is easy, we can thank BPL for the solution.
> I have been recording on Air QSO by Hams who have made comments in regards to
> Jamming BPL. I have also been saving messages by Hams which have stated the
> same. The recordings and messages are on CDs that I have and will continue to
> collect.
> Since the FCC and so called Ham Orgs have decided that the best thing for Ham
> Radio is Dumbing Down, and I have decided that it is not the best thing.
> Heres what Im going to do. As soon as the FCC converts Ham Radio into CBHAM
> Radio.
> I will wait for the first BPL complaint by the Utilities, at that point
> the CDs will go to the Utility that is complaining, im sure there Lawyers will
> know what to do with the info, also a copy will go to the
> FCC. This should give the FCC and the BPL Company more than enought info to put
> the blame on HAMS. At that point I will also make a suggestion on how to solve
> the BPL problem. My comment to BPL and FCC will be to reduce power level of all
> HF Ham XMITTERS to 50 WATTS ERP or less, if 50 Watts to much then it can always
> be adjusted down, this should reduce BPL Problems.
> What burden will that put on Hams, not much for the CW operators, now for SSB
> CBplussers it may be a problem, but it shouldnt be, you guys are so tallented
> you should be able to overcome that problem. Theres is more that I will
> recomend to BPL but I will save that for latter.
>

You must enjoy cutting off your nose in spite of your face, although
that might be an improvement.

2611. Message To America's Students: The War, The Draft, Your Future

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 21:08:40 UTC
From: allen@Vote.Nader.2004
Message-ID: <0173a651.0e6fafa1@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90676
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.politics.homosexuality.hatemongers.phelps,alt.politics.regionalism.northcentral-us,alt.politics.perot,soc.politics.marxism,alt.politics.regionalism.moravia

We have been down this road before.

U.S. troops sent to war half a world away. American foreign policy controlled by an arrogant elite, bent on projecting military power around the globe. A public misled into supporting an unconstitutional war founded on deceit and fabrications.

As the death toll mounts, we hear claims that the war is nearly won, that victory is just around the corner. But victory never arrives.

As the public loses confidence in the government, the government questions the patriotism of any who express doubt about the war.

When a presidential election arrives, both the Democrat and Republican nominees embrace the policy of continued war.

The military draft comes to dominate the lives of America's young, and vast numbers who believe the war to be a senseless blunder are faced with fighting a war they do not believe in, or facing exile or prison.

The year was 1968. Because voters had no choice that November, the Vietnam War continued for another six years. Hundreds of thousands of Americans like you died, were maimed, or suffered from diseases like malaria. A far greater number of Vietnamese died.

Today, the war is in the quicksands and alleys of Iraq. Once again, under the pressure of a determined resistance, we see an American war policy being slowly torn apart at the seams, while the candidates urge us to "stay the course" in this tragic misadventure. Today's Presidential candidates are not Nixon and Humphrey, they are now Bush and Kerry.

Once again, there is one overriding truth: If war is the only choice in this election, then war we will have.

Today enlistments in the Reserves and National Guard are declining. The Pentagon is quietly recruiting new members to fill local draft boards, as the machinery for drafting a new generation of young Americans is being quietly put into place.

Young Americans need to know that a train is coming, and it could run over their generation in the same way that the Vietnam War devastated the lives of those who came of age in the sixties.

I am running for President, and have been against this war from the beginning. We must not waste lives in order to control and waste more

oil. Stand with us and we may yet salvage your future and Americas' future from this looming disaster.

Sincerely,
Ralph Nader

HTTP://WWW.VOTENADER.ORG

--
Nepal several hundred lives and destruction of property worth millions of rupees. In 1996, the year the insurgency commenced, 82 people were killed. This figure included insurgents, security forces, personnel and civilians. During the next year, total killings came down by half - 38 people died. The following year, in 1998, after the Maoists intensified their program of violence, 408 people were killed - nearly an elevenfold increase in the number of deaths over the previous year. Ever since, the death toll has been on the rise. By late 2000 the death toll has risen to over 2,100. As of August 2002, nearly 5,000 lives have been lost to the insurgency "

Shining Path sent congratulations to RIM for its first anniversary in May of 1985. The Central Committee wrote, "...the people's war in our country continues to blaze defiantly, expanding, spreading its roots and preparing for newer and higher tasks, guided always by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, battling for the emancipation of our people for the purpose of and at the se

2612. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 21:21:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 90674

In article <cyfec.5681$A_4.4410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
>|
>| So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written who
>| did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
>
>Because they didn't care to yet. Nothing wrong with that. Some may
>simply be content with their current privileges. Some may be inactive
>at this time due to any number of reasons, and not 'plugged in' to
>amateur radio. Some may be permanently dis-interested.

I'd say that is an excellent summation of what is happening.

Problem is, in the small minority of those doing the lifestyle thing of personally boosting their favorite activity, they tend to project too much of their own activity on others. Not everyone lives ham radio like the League pushes it in publications.

>I've long thought that everyone who wanted to be on HF in a meaningful
>way is already there, and that tinkering with the licensing requirements
>will have minimal impact in who we actually find on the air below
>29.7MHz. I'd wager that an instant upgrade to Extra for every current
>licensee would result in less than 5% more stations heard on HF.

That's possible. But, to some of the "higher classes" those would be unimaginable and outrageous figures, those seeing doom, gloom, and wishing to take a broom to the heretics threatening Their favorite playground. :-)

For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948 no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally, operate on ham bands below 6 meters. That number is almost twice as big as the 146,174 or 20.1 percent who were General class licensees on that date.

Advanced class were 84,507 or 11.6 percent and Amateur Extras were 107,343 or 14.8 percent. Novice was only 38,814 or 5.3 percent and Technician Plus almost twice that at 67,359 or 9.3 percent.

There WOULD be a significant playground "threat" should the no-code-test Technicians get a piece of the HF action. Might be true doom and gloom plus the hue and cry of alarum from those who think that HF was made only for Them.

Should be clear that HF denizens need more space to play.
Nobody seems to be active on doing that. All that happened
in the relatively recent time resulted in five "channels" on 60 m.
According to NTIA Spectrum Projections, an endnote says
that ARRL "requested more bandspace" a dozen years ago.
The only thing on the current WRC-07 agenda is the 136 KHz
LF band consideration "for study."

Where are all the bandspace Activists?

LHA / WMD

2613. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 22:58:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040411185818.10411.00000281@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90677

>You must enjoy cutting off your nose in spite of your face, although
>that might be an improvement.
>

Nope its just what needs to be done.

2614. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 22:59:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040411185912.19617.00000174@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90678

In article <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948

That number includes expired licenses which are in the grace period. As of April 11 2004, the number of current (non-expired) Technicians is 262,804.

> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database.
> That's a
> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
> operate on ham bands below 6 meters.

Incorrect!

Since April 15, 2004 (4 years ago as of this coming Thursday), FCC has been renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician. In addition, any Technician who has passed Element 1 gets Novice/Technician Plus HF privileges even though the license and database still say "Technician".

So a sizable number of those with Technician licenses *do* have some access to four HF ham bands.

2615. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 23:29:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DsGdnYsxTYhxSeTdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90679

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:wLSdnbPreO65weTdRVn-vw@adelphia.com...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>Using the table at http://www.speroni.com/FCC/Licenses.html
>>>
>>>Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in July 1999
>
> ==>
>
>>>289,669
>>>Combined number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees in April 2004
>
> ==>
>
>>>326,024
>>>Increase in number of General, Advanced, and Extra licensees over the
>
> time
>
>>>period ==> 36,355
>>>Number of Tech+ licensees in July 1999 ==> 133,979
>>>
>>>Now the July 1999 Tech+ would have been eligible to upgrade to General
>
> and
>
>>>higher with only written tests. Even if they expired after July, they
>
> still
>
>>>had plenty of time to renew within their grace period and still upgrade
>
> to
>
>>>General and higher with only written tests at the time of the
>
> restructuring
>
>>>in April 2000.
>>>

>>>From the above numbers, at most only 27% of the people eligible to
>
> upgrade
>
>>>with only a written test did so. The number would actually be less
>
> since
>
>>>some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade
>
> without
>
>>>testing, some would have been Techs who upgraded by taking code and
>
> theory,
>
>>>and some would have been Techs/Tech+ licensed since July 1999 who went
>
> on to
>
>>>upgrade too.
>>>
>>>So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written
>
> who
>
>>>did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
>>
>>Because many of these people are happy right where they are. I've long
>>said that there is a natural divide between the HF and VHF/UHF, much of
>>it based on propagation characteristics. There are simply many people
>>that are quite content with their access to a local repeater, and thank
>>you very much! 8^)
>>
>>I think this is one of the mistaken impressions that a lot of people
>>have. Some people do not want to put up a big antenna, some people
>>aren't all that entranced about talking all over the world.
>>
>>The fact that I would rather operate HF than VHF and up does not mean
>>that everyone or even a majority does.
>>
>>I think it is a mistake to think that simply allowing Technicians HF
>>access is going to provide some kind of shot in the arm to Ham radio. I
>>suspect that many of them will continue on the local repeaters, or
>>whatever they were doing before they got the extra privileges
>>
>
>
> The numbers above certainly support that deduction better than any other. I
> suspect that there are a lot of people that simply want to be able to talk

> to people in their local area. Our club is running an upgrade class for
> those who would like to take it. There are only 8 people in the class yet
> we have at least 70 or 80 Tech/Tech+ licensees in the club. Now I realize
> that some people have conflicts such as shift work or other commitments but
> I would have expected a better turn out for this class as it is the first
> one we've done for an upgrade. Previously the people were simply encouraged
> to study on their own. The low number coming up to the class would tend to
> somewhat support the deduction that there is a fairly large group not
> interested in HF.
>
>
>>
>>>Continuing in this vein:
>>>In April 2000 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 101,725
>>>In April 2004 the number of Advanced licensees ==> 80,597
>>>Change ==> 21,128
>>>
>>>Thus only 21% either upgraded, died (and their family officially
>
> notified
>
>>>the FCC), or let their license expire. Why did so many choose not to
>>>upgrade? All they needed to do was take a written no harder than what
>
> they
>
>>>had already taken.
>>
>
> Care to take a stab at why the Advanced hasn't upgraded? Some have stated
> that they are doing it as a protest against reducing the code requirement
> but I can't believe that to be true of more than a very small number.

I have heard some advanced that say they want to "prove" that they took
a higher speed Morse code test and won't upgrade. Weird stuff for sure.
As much as I do support testing for Morse, I consider the tests a lot
more important. However there are a fair amount that consider the fact
that they took a faster speed test to be the more important thing

Some advanced amateurs may be inactive, although I doubt it is enought
to account for all. It's probably a combination of factors.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2616. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-11 23:37:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <yfWdnTfVH4YxS-TdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90680

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:cyfec.5681$A_4.4410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
>>|
>>| So we have OVER 97,000 people eligible to upgrade with just a written
>>who
>>| did not do so. Any one care to venture an explanation as to why?
>>|
>>
>>Because they didn't care to yet. Nothing wrong with that. Some may
>>simply be content with their current privileges. Some may be inactive
>>at this time due to any number of reasons, and not 'plugged in' to
>>amateur radio. Some may be permanently dis-interested.
>>
>>I've long thought that everyone who wanted to be on HF in a meaningful
>>way is already there, and that tinkering with the licensing requirements
>>will have minimal impact in who we actually find on the air below
>>29.7MHz. I'd wager that an instant upgrade to Extra for every current
>>licensee would result in less than 5% more stations heard on HF.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> And that is part of the point. Changing the structure will make little to
> no difference so let's not change it. The effort required to change exceeds
> the benefit gained.

And there you have it. I believe that we must address the element 1
issue, because it has been changed by the ITU. But beyond that, I
challenge people to provide the proof that the divide between Technician
and General is harming Amateur radio. Especially with Element 1 removed.

When we try to fix something that isn't broken, we usually succeed in
breaking it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2617. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 00:13:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4079DF18.9060107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90681

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> The number would actually be less since
>some were the pre-1987 Techs who only had to submit a paper upgrade without
>testing
>
This (me) pre 1987 Tech decided to do a paper upgrade to General, but while
I'm at it, might as well go for it and got the Extra. Took some
practice tests
on the web and did well enough to make going for it a no brainer. I had
dabbled
with HF years before on 10 meters novice enhancement SSB subband, and
I figured I wanted to upgrade to get more privs on HF. Upgrading also
"locks
in" credit at the FCC for the 5WPM and General written I passed back in
1976 to get
my pre 87 tech.

2618. Re: Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 03:09:53 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404120314190.3616@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90682

On Mon, 5 Apr 2004, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >Subject: =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Re=3A_Amateur_Radio_Newsline=28tm=29_Repo?=
> >From: "D. Stussy" kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org
> >Date: 4/5/2004 4:03 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404050853070.2715@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
> >
> >On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >> Radionews wrote:
> >> > Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 =AD April 2, 2004
> >> >...
> >>
> >> =09I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
> >
> >Idiot. With responders like you, Pasternak will continue to spam this grou=
> >p
> >with his drivel. Then again, this whole group is a collection of trolls.
>
> Hey Dieter. Seems to me that you're a regular, if not frequent, poster
> here too.
>
> Do you include yourself in that, or are you "above" off topic
> conversations of ANY nature?

You will find that I never start an "off-topic" thread and that most of my posts do seem to relate back to the original topic, even if the post I'm responding to is off-topic. I certainly am not a regular in that I don't post 10 times/day like some of the other characters do - I'm only here once a week at most.

2619. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 03:11:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404120228220.3616@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90683

On Mon, 5 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> D. Stussy wrote:
> > On Sat, 3 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >>Radionews wrote:
> >>
> >>>Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1390 April 2, 2004
> >>>...
> >>
> >> I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
> >
> >
> > Idiot. With responders like you, Pasternak will continue to spam this group
> > with his drivel. Then again, this whole group is a collection of trolls.
> >
> > [In case you weren't aware, the guidelines for the rec.radio hierarchy FORBID
> > his weekly posting on "rec.radio.amateur.policy". The posts are permitted on
> > "rec.radio.info" (because a specific request to do so was granted) and on
> > "rec.radio.amateur.misc" (because it is not forbidden there), yet the jerk
> > continues to post here, and it's assholes like you who respond to him (in any
> > way) that will further encourage him to post here. Why does he need to post
> > this here anyway - it's all up on his website?
>
>
> 1. If he's doing something wrong, report it to his ISP abuse.

I have been, every week for the past 18 months. His ISP is AOL and they don't
do a damn thing about spammers. I have even quoted the part of the newsgroup's
guidelines he violates.

> 2. Think you are going to convert me to your cause by calling me names?

I doubt it. It hasn't phased anyone else who dares participate here on a daily
basis. Now, the fact that you considered yourself inclusive of "the whole
group" speaks for itself.

2620. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 03:26:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040411232633.20806.00000217@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 90684

In article <20040411185912.19617.00000174@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>, Lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948
>
>That number includes expired licenses which are in the grace period. As of >April 11 2004, the number of current (non-expired) Technicians is 262,804.

Ho ho ho...you HAVE to start this all over again, don't you?

I just look at www.hamdata.com and accept that.

If you a terrible need to point fingers and cry "shame, wrong!" then go argue with the hamdata folks.

Tell you what, Rev. Jim, YOU download the ENTIRE FCC database and pass out copies on CDs. That way anyone can be very busy little bees and MASSAGE data any way that suits them.

>> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
>> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
>> operate on ham bands below 6 meters.
>
>Incorrect!
>
>Since April 15, 2004 (4 years ago as of this coming Thursday), FCC has been >renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician. In addition, any >Technician who has passed Element 1 gets Novice/Technician Plus HF privileges >even though the license and database still say "Technician".

Jimmie, Jimmie, Jimmie. Try to stay in focus without your fuse getting lit. :-)

On 6 Apr 04 the number of all US amateur licensees, less club calls, was 727,145. Divide that into 282,948 and you get 38.9%.

That's OVER one-third of all licensees...even if you insist on your VERSION of numbers.

If you can't show the EXACT numbers of ALL those T+ conversions to T or all those that "passed Element 1" then you be wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, clong. :-)

Why did I pick 6 April 2004? [funny you should ask] It's copied into several of my Comments on the 4 Petitions for 2004. If you

want to pick at flyspecks, go to the ECFS and let the FCC know.

I could pick 11 April and get those numbers. But, tomorrow, when
you finally see this, it will be 12 April and there are new numbers.
Good...then you could shout all over "He's wrong! He's wrong!"
:-)

All you are doing is poor MANUFACTURING of a dispute. As you've
done many times before. [shoddy manufacture, poor QC]

So, do you WANT all HF hams to sit forever in little tiny bandspaces?

LHA / WMD

2621. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 09:50:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040412055017.18733.00000313@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 90685

In article <20040411232633.20806.00000217@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040411185912.19617.00000174@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>, Lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948
>>
>>That number includes expired licenses which are in the grace period. As of
>>April 11 2004, the number of current (non-expired) Technicians is 262,804.
>
> Ho ho ho...you HAVE to start this all over again, don't you?

You "started" it, Len. You posted some interesting numbers. I'm simply
clarifying what they mean.
>
> I just look at www.hamdata.com and accept that.

OK, fine. Those numbers include expired licenses that are in the grace period.
The number I posted do not. No problem.

> YOU download the ENTIRE FCC database
> and pass out copies on CDs. That way anyone can be very
> busy little bees and MASSAGE data any way that suits them.

You're getting all upset over nothing, Len. Try to stay focused.
>
>>> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
>>> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
>>> operate on ham bands below 6 meters.
>>
>>Incorrect!
>>
>>Since April 15, 2004 (4 years ago as of this coming Thursday), FCC has been
>>renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician. In addition, any
>>Technician who has passed Element 1 gets Novice/Technician Plus HF
>>privileges
>>even though the license and database still say "Technician".
>
In addition, anyone whose license has expired but is still in the database due
to being in the grace period cannot, legally, operate on any ham bands at all
until their license is renewed.
>

> On 6 Apr 04 the number of all US amateur licensees, less club
> calls, was 727,145. Divide that into 282,948 and you get 38.9%.

That's true. However, a significant number of those *do* have access to some HF amateur frequencies. Your statement

"no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
operate on ham bands below 6 meters."

Is simply not correct because it ignores Technician Pluses renewed as Technician, as well as "Techs-with-HF"
>
> That's OVER one-third of all licensees...even if you insist on your
> VERSION of numbers.

Your version is still incorrect.

2622. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 10:48:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404120248.346c7a25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90686

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<bdCdnTsgPbIK9fLdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>...

>
>
> I wonder why they didn't just use their cell phone? ;^)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Maybe he wasn't in America where there is good infrastructure.

2623. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 10:50:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404120250.326c9f32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90687

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>...

>
> And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
> communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
> the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.

The only shame is the ham who refuses to give his call.

2624. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 12:52:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404120452.2eca58c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90688

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>...
> Radionews wrote:
>
>
> >
> > RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
> >
> >
> > A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
> > lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
> > Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
> > stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
> > Australia picks up the story from here:
>
>
> And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
> communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
> the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=59811

2625. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 13:43:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>
Source record: 90689

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB"
>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>
>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>|
>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>
>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>
>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>
>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>
> Office
>
>>>on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>
>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real" that
>>>look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>>
>>> That's not what I intended at all.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>

>
> What makes you say that? :-)
>
>
>> Oy!
>
>
> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"

Oy Karumba?

>
>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>
>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>
>
>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>
>
> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>
>
>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>real book!"
>
>
> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
> back.

Did it sell well?

> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>
>
>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>
>
> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?

Makes it easier, I guess.

> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?

Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.
Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.

There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
have said they want to be lawyers!

I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
other subset of males.

When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2626. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 13:54:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407A9FAC.1020701@psu.edu>
Source record: 90690

William wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>...
>
>>Radionews wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
>>>
>>>
>>>A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
>>>lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
>>>Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
>>>stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
>>>Australia picks up the story from here:
>>
>>
>>And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
>>communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
>>the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.
>
>
> http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=59811

An interesting situation. I was reading that last night.

my thoughts are:

1. The ham op did well despite his embarrassment in having participated
in a false alarm.

2. Law enforcement and emergency people would have him react the same
way if the same situation cropped up again. His job was as a
communicator. It wasn't (or shouldn't be) his decision to report the
problem or not. Someone calls for help, then it gets reported. If
someone gave a false report to him then it becomes law enforcement's job
to take care of it at that point.

I say he did a good job.

Did you read the part in the thread about the guy that *couldn't* get a
ham to turn in an emergency call? Chilling.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2627. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 13:56:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407AA00C.1040509@psu.edu>
Source record: 90691

William wrote:
> From: Amateur Radio Newslineï¿½ Report 1391 ï¿½ April 8, 2004
>
> CB NEWS: VK CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR
>
> Some interesting news about C-B -- Citizens Band radio -- down-under. Unlike
> the United States where C-B operation is hap-hazard with no structure,
> Australia has a CB Packet Radio System that
>
> ***rivals anything that ham radio has ever set up.
>
> And now, it is being linked over the Internet to C-B operations
> in other nations including many Europe. This is making it possible for
> Australian C-B'ers to connect with numerous other C-B stations throughout
> the world using radio and Telnet. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the nodes and
> the frequencies:
>
> --
>
> AUS002 Warren reports in Australia there are so far several CB Packet Radio
> Nodes and BBS's. These are AU4BNE Node 27.225 Usb Brisbane Q'ld, AUS011 BBS
> 27.225 Usb Brisbane, AU6PER Node 476.950 Fm Perth W.A and AU6BBS BBS 476.950
> Fm Perth.
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, In Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.
>
> --
>
> So if you are scanning the 11 meter Citizens Band and hear digital signals, now
> you know exactly what they are. (Q-News)

I thought Packet was dead?

- mike KB3EIA -

2628. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 15:36:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404120736.23e51d81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90692

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040412055017.18733.00000313@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <20040411232633.20806.00000217@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20040411185912.19617.00000174@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >(N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>, Lenover21@aol.com
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948
> >>
> >>That number includes expired licenses which are in the grace period. As of
> >>April 11 2004, the number of current (non-expired) Technicians is 262,804.
> >
> > Ho ho ho...you HAVE to start this all over again, don't you?
>
> You "started" it, Len. You posted some interesting numbers. I'm simply
> clarifying what they mean.
> >
> > I just look at www.hamdata.com and accept that.
>
> OK, fine. Those numbers include expired licenses that are in the grace period.
> The number I posted do not. No problem.
>
> > YOU download the ENTIRE FCC database
> > and pass out copies on CDs. That way anyone can be very
> > busy little bees and MASSAGE data any way that suits them.
>
> You're getting all upset over nothing, Len. Try to stay focused.
> >
> >>> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
> >>> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
> >>> operate on ham bands below 6 meters.
> >>
> >>Incorrect!
> >>
> >>Since April 15, 2004 (4 years ago as of this coming Thursday), FCC has been
> >>renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician. In addition, any
> >>Technician who has passed Element 1 gets Novice/Technician Plus HF
> >>privileges
> >>even though the license and database still say "Technician".
> >

> In addition, anyone whose license has expired but is still in the database due
> to being in the grace period cannot, legally, operate on any ham bands at all
> until their license is renewed.
> >
> > On 6 Apr 04 the number of all US amateur licensees, less club
> > calls, was 727,145. Divide that into 282,948 and you get 38.9%.
>
> That's true. However, a significant number of those *do* have access to some HF
> amateur frequencies. Your statement
>
> "no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
> operate on ham bands below 6 meters."
>
> Is simply not correct because it ignores Technician Pluses renewed as
> Technician, as well as "Techs-with-HF"
> >
> > That's OVER one-third of all licensees...even if you insist on your
> > VERSION of numbers.
>
> Your version is still incorrect.

If even one amateur in your omitted "2 year grace period" renews, your
numbers will be incorrect also.

I think its safe to say at this point that your numbers will be
incorrect by the end of the day, if not sooner.

Best of Luck.

Billy

2629. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 17:58:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412135849.08081.00000371@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90693

In article <407AA00C.1040509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>William wrote:
>> From: Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1391 – April 8, 2004
>>
>> CB NEWS: VK CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR
>>
>> Some interesting news about C-B -- Citizens Band radio -- down-under.
Unlike
>> the United States where C-B operation is hap-hazard with no structure,
>> Australia has a CB Packet Radio System that
>>
>> ***rivals anything that ham radio has ever set up.
>>
>> And now, it is being linked over the Internet to C-B operations
>> in other nations including many Europe. This is making it possible for
>> Australian C-B'ers to connect with numerous other C-B stations throughout
>> the world using radio and Telnet. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the nodes
and
>> the frequencies:
>>
>> --
>>
>> AUS002 Warren reports in Australia there are so far several CB Packet Radio
>> Nodes and BBS's. These are AU4BNE Node 27.225 Usb Brisbane Q'ld, AUS011
BBS
>> 27.225 Usb Brisbane, AU6PER Node 476.950 Fm Perth W.A and AU6BBS BBS
476.950
>> Fm Perth.
>>
>> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, In Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.
>>
>> --
>>
>> So if you are scanning the 11 meter Citizens Band and hear digital signals,
now
>> you know exactly what they are. (Q-News)
>
> I thought Packet was dead?

"The reports of its demise are greatly exaggerated..."
[paraphrase of Mark Twain's comment on his alleged obituary]]

Neither Packet nor BBSs [Bulletin Board Systems] are "dead." They
have simply evolved, changed slightly from their original practice.

Note that Australia is a whole other continent and somewhat far from your neighborhood. It is not a good thing to evaluate anything in terms of your own experience and what is familiar to you...and certainly not in terms of what you, yourself, particularly desire.

LHA / WMD

2630. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 17:58:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412135851.08081.00000372@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90695

In article <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>>|
>>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>>
>>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>>
>>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>>
>> Office
>>
>>>>on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>>
>>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
that
>>>>look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>>
>>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>>>
>>>> That's not what I intended at all.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>>
>> What makes you say that? :-)

>>
>>> Oy!
>>
>> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
>> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"
>
> Oy Karumba?

No, "oy gevalt!" [you haven't had enough chicken soup yet]

>>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>>
>>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>>
>>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>>
>> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>>
>>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>>real book!"
>>
>> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
>> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
>> back.
>
> Did it sell well?

Unknown. It was on the book market for over a month and actually
received literary comment in the press! Not on content, primarily on
general chutzpah of the "author" and the publishing company.

There's somewhat the same sort of chutzpah on the part of a
certain New England publishing corporation...

>> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
>> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
>> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>>
>>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>>
>> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?
>
> Makes it easier, I guess.

So, you approve of prejudice?

>> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
>> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?
>
> Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.

>Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.

Much much less of "African-American."

> There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
>technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
>always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
>ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
>have said they want to be lawyers!

You would do well - on criticism of gender content in engineering - to
look at the periodicals of the IEEE or ACM in regard to women in
engineering. Particularly in high office positions of the IEEE and ACM.

Notable example: Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard.

> I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
>other subset of males.
>
>When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)

Why do you single out engineers? I was not discussing engineers.

Engineers are human. But, engineers are forced to obey the laws
of physics first in order to stay employed as engineers. No physical
laws are changeable by human legislation.

Radio amateurs, by contrast, seem very much inclined to fantasy,
group-think, imagination, and some considerable misogyny as well
as rigid conservatism in standards and practices. Examples of that
have been in here for years.

LHA / WMD

2631. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 17:58:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412135853.08081.00000373@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 90694

In article <1e4e3692.0404120736.23e51d81@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040412055017.18733.00000313@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040411232633.20806.00000217@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20040411185912.19617.00000174@mb-m20.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> >(N2EY) writes:
>> >
>> >>In article <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>,
>Lenover21@aol.com
>> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >>
>> >>> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948
>> >>
>> >>That number includes expired licenses which are in the grace period. As of
>> >>April 11 2004, the number of current (non-expired) Technicians is 262,804.
>> >
>> > Ho ho ho...you HAVE to start this all over again, don't you?
>>
>> You "started" it, Len. You posted some interesting numbers. I'm simply
>> clarifying what they mean.
>> >
>> > I just look at www.hamdata.com and accept that.
>>
>> OK, fine. Those numbers include expired licenses that are in the grace
period.
>> The number I posted do not. No problem.
>>
>> > YOU download the ENTIRE FCC database
>> > and pass out copies on CDs. That way anyone can be very
>> > busy little bees and MASSAGE data any way that suits them.
>>
>> You're getting all upset over nothing, Len. Try to stay focused.
>> >
>> >>> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
>> >>> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
>> >>> operate on ham bands below 6 meters.
>> >>
>> >>Incorrect!

>> >>
>> >>Since April 15, 2004 (4 years ago as of this coming Thursday), FCC has
been
>> >>renewing all Technician Plus licenses as Technician. In addition, any
>> >>Technician who has passed Element 1 gets Novice/Technician Plus HF
>> >>privileges even though the license and database still say "Technician".
>> >
>> In addition, anyone whose license has expired but is still in the database
due
>> to being in the grace period cannot, legally, operate on any ham bands at
all
>> until their license is renewed.
>> >
>> > On 6 Apr 04 the number of all US amateur licensees, less club
>> > calls, was 727,145. Divide that into 282,948 and you get 38.9%.
>>
>> That's true. However, a significant number of those *do* have access to some
HF
>> amateur frequencies. Your statement
>>
>> "no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
>> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
>> operate on ham bands below 6 meters."
>>
>> Is simply not correct because it ignores Technician Pluses renewed as
>> Technician, as well as "Techs-with-HF"
>> >
>> > That's OVER one-third of all licensees...even if you insist on your
>> > VERSION of numbers.
>>
>> Your version is still incorrect.
>
>If even one amateur in your omitted "2 year grace period" renews, your
>numbers will be incorrect also.

Brian, Rev. Jim can't admit any wrongdoing if there is the slightest
negativism implied against his beloved telegrapy.

His newsgrope tactic is to bring out as much misdirection as
possible of anyone speaking in the slightest against morse code
or the highly-conservative, rigid thinking that U.S. amateur radio
is all about telegraphy skills.

Example: Each and every no-code-test Technician class licensee
that obtained their first amateur license obtained their Technician
license WITHOUT taking any telegraphy test. Those former
Technician Plus licensees whose renewal put them into the
Technician class category after 2000 seem to have disappeared
from the misdirected meanderings of Rev. Jim. He only wishes to
mention those [no numbers supplied] Technician class licenses
who SUPPOSEDLY took and passed an element 1 code test as

"destroying" my comment as "incorrect."

Note that I used a specific data compilation date. For those that bother to look, such is quoted on previous Comments to the four Petitions for Rule Making filed in 2004. Rev. Jim uses a NEW date, a later one, as if to say that His data is somehow "more correct" even though it does not present any definitive numbers on all those Technicians who supposedly passed a separate code test, nor any of those Technician Plus classes whose renewal automatically placed them in a different class category.

No data = vaporware. But, he MUST be correct because he says others with data are "incorrect." Remarkable!

Rev. Jim argues on some vaporous claims which he cannot support with real numbers. I merely quote some accessible-by-all statistics from www.hamdata.com which massages the publicly available [but huge] amateur database file from the FCC in order to provide some specific information as to license class totals and other periodic information.

>I think its safe to say at this point that your numbers will be
>incorrect by the end of the day, if not sooner.

It is safe to say that ANYTHING I say will be refuted by Rev. Jim using his common vaporware misdirection tactics displayed on this subject thread and many others in the past.

The end result is a lot of electrons wasted in discussing something not on the original subject, a common tactic by newsgroupies. Such misdirection concentrates on a communicator's alleged personal faults instead of the message subject.

And, when misdirection has been explained and refuted, Rev. Jim gets all upset and huffy about "not being respected for his accuracy" in using vaporware opinion concepts. :-)

LHA / WMD

2632. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 18:38:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <kJudnVwGgeWEbOfdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 90699

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the worst
> offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post becomes apparent.
> Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.

I find the group much more pleasent and interesting since I started
ignoring posts by lenny the lame, steveie the stupid, and wee willie winkie.

2633. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 18:54:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407AE5F2.7080300@psu.edu>
Source record: 90696

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>>>
>>>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>>>|
>>>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>>>
>>>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>>>
>>>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>>>
>>>Office
>>>
>>>
>>>>>on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>>>
>>>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
>>>>
> that
>
>>>>>look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
```

>>>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>>>>
>>>>>That's not what I intended at all.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>>>
>>> What makes you say that? :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>> Oy!
>>>
>>> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
>>> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"
>>
>> Oy Karumba?
>
>
> No, "oy gevalt!" [you haven't had enough chicken soup yet]
>
>
>>>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>>>
>>>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>>>
>>>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>>>
>>> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>>>real book!"
>>>
>>> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
>>> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
>>> back.
>>
>> Did it sell well?
>
>
> Unknown. It was on the book market for over a month and actually
> received literary comment in the press! Not on content, primarily on
> general chutzpah of the "author" and the publishing company.
>
> There's somewhat the same sort of chutzpah on the part of a
> certain New England publishing corporation...

>
>
>>> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
>>> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
>>> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>>>
>>> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?
>>
>> Makes it easier, I guess.
>
>
> So, you approve of prejudice?
>
>
>>> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
>>> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?
>>
>> Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.
>>Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.
>
>
> Much much less of "African-American."
>
>
>> There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
>>technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
>>always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
>>ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
>>have said they want to be lawyers!
>
>
> You would do well - on criticism of gender content in engineering - to
> look at the periodicals of the IEEE or ACM in regard to women in
> engineering. Particularly in high office positions of the IEEE and ACM.
>
> Notable example: Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard.
>
>
>> I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
>>other subset of males.
>>
>>When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)
>
>
> Why do you single out engineers? I was not discussing engineers.
>
> Engineers are human. But, engineers are forced to obey the laws

> of physics first in order to stay employed as engineers. No physical
> laws are changeable by human legislation.
>
> Radio amateurs, by contrast, seem very much inclined to fantasy,
> group-think, imagination, and some considerable misogyny as well
> as rigid conservatism in standards and practices. Examples of that
> have been in here for years.
>
> LHA / WMD

2634. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 19:05:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407AE85F.6010506@psu.edu>
Source record: 90698

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>>>
>>>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>>>|
>>>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>>>
>>>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>>>
>>>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>>>
>>>Office
>>>
>>>
>>>>>on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>>>
>>>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
>>>>
> that
>
>>>>>look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you

>>>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>>>>
>>>>>That's not what I intended at all.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>>>
>>> What makes you say that? :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>> Oy!
>>>
>>> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
>>> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"
>>
>> Oy Karumba?
>
>
> No, "oy gevalt!" [you haven't had enough chicken soup yet]
>
>
>>>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>>>
>>>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>>>
>>>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>>>
>>> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>>>real book!"
>>>
>>> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
>>> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
>>> back.
>>
>> Did it sell well?
>
>
> Unknown. It was on the book market for over a month and actually
> received literary comment in the press! Not on content, primarily on
> general chutzpah of the "author" and the publishing company.
>
> There's somewhat the same sort of chutzpah on the part of a
> certain New England publishing corporation...

>
>
>>> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
>>> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
>>> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>>>
>>> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?
>>
>> Makes it easier, I guess.
>
>
> So, you approve of prejudice?

Oh No! in the context of what I was saying a long time ago when this
was first posted was that Hans and Bill had *their* prejudices in
assuming Jim was posting a disparaging comment in the Subject line.

And remember, If I did approve of prejudice, I wouldn't want it easy.
Remember, I am the whack that likes things to be hard work! 8^)

>>> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
>>> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?
>>
>> Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.
>>Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.
>
>
> Much much less of "African-American."
>
>
>> There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
>>technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
>>always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
>>ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
>>have said they want to be lawyers!
>
>
> You would do well - on criticism of gender content in engineering - to
> look at the periodicals of the IEEE or ACM in regard to women in
> engineering. Particularly in high office positions of the IEEE and ACM.
>
> Notable example: Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard.
>
>
>> I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
>>other subset of males.
>>
>>When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)

>
>
> Why do you single out engineers? I was not discussing engineers.

The topic goes where it will. You were discussing Ham radio, which is a technical hobby. Engineers run to the technical by by nature. And there seems to be some problem in attracting women to the technical fields.

> Engineers are human. But, engineers are forced to obey the laws
> of physics first in order to stay employed as engineers. No physical
> laws are changeable by human legislation.
>
> Radio amateurs, by contrast, seem very much inclined to fantasy,
> group-think, imagination, and some considerable misogyny as well
> as rigid conservatism in standards and practices. Examples of that
> have been in here for years.

All of them?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2635. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 19:06:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407AE8B4.5010202@psu.edu>
Source record: 90697

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <407AA00C.1040509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>>From: Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1391 – April 8, 2004
>>>
>>>CB NEWS: VK CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR
>>>
>>>Some interesting news about C-B -- Citizens Band radio -- down-under.
>>
> Unlike
>
>>>the United States where C-B operation is hap-hazard with no structure,
>>>Australia has a CB Packet Radio System that
>>>
>>>>***rivals anything that ham radio has ever set up.
>>>
>>>And now, it is being linked over the Internet to C-B operations
>>>in other nations including many Europe. This is making it possible for
>>>Australian C-B'ers to connect with numerous other C-B stations throughout
>>>the world using radio and Telnet. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the nodes
>>
> and
>
>>>the frequencies:
>>>
>>>--
>>>
>>>AUS002 Warren reports in Australia there are so far several CB Packet Radio
>>>Nodes and BBS's. These are AU4BNE Node 27.225 Usb Brisbane Q'ld, AUS011
>>
> BBS
>
>>> 27.225 Usb Brisbane, AU6PER Node 476.950 Fm Perth W.A and AU6BBS BBS
>>
> 476.950
>
>>>Fm Perth.
>>>
>>>For the Amateur Radio Newsline, In Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.
>>>
>>>--

>>>
>>>So if you are scanning the 11 meter Citizens Band and hear digital signals,
>>
> now
>
>>>you know exactly what they are. (Q-News)
>>
>> I thought Packet was dead?
>
>
> "The reports of its demise are greatly exaggerated..."
> [paraphrase of Mark Twain's comment on his alleged obituary]]
>
> Neither Packet nor BBSs [Bulletin Board Systems] are "dead." They
> have simply evolved, changed slightly from their original practice.
>
> Note that Australia is a whole other continent and somewhat far from
> your neighborhood. It is not a good thing to evaluate anything in terms
> of your own experience and what is familiar to you...and certainly not in
> terms of what you, yourself, particularly desire.

What do I desire as far as packet operations go?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2636. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 20:47:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407B005F.9070105@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90700

Mike Coslo wrote:

>>
>
>
>
> I thought Packet was dead?
>
>

Looks like I'll be the first with the wisecrack "Now that it's on CB,
packet IS dead!"

:-)

2637. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 20:51:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407B014B.3030706@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90701

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> What do I desire as far as packet operations go?
>
One thing I used to desire was essentially usenews without the bad words
and spam. But 1200 baud just doesn't cut it anymore. Slower as there
is a lot of dead time.

>
>

2638. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Repo rt 1390 April 2, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 20:58:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404121258.4223ba8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90702

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<407A9FAC.1020701@psu.edu>...
> William wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<BOednWSl_uT7D_LdRVn-gg@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>Radionews wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>RESCUE RADIO: VK HAM BRINGS BOAT TO PORT SAFELY - BY RADIO
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>A pair of Australian and American hams are credited with being a
> >>>lifeline to a storm damaged boat with six people on board. The
> >>>Australian was at his home QTHand the American was at sea on the
> >>>stricken ship. Q-News Robert Broomhead, VK3KRB, in Waverly,
> >>>Australia picks up the story from here:
> >>
> >>
> >>And another bunch of hams showing off by using their ham radios and
> >>communication skills to help someone in distress, and someone even had
> >>the audacity to report it. Lennyboy must really be ashamed of these hams.
> >
> >
> > http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=59811
>
> An interesting situation. I was reading that last night.
>
>
> my thoughts are:
>
> 1. The ham op did well despite his embarrassment in having participated
> in a false alarm.
>
> 2. Law enforcement and emergency people would have him react the same
> way if the same situation cropped up again. His job was as a
> communicator. It wasn't (or shouldn't be) his decision to report the
> problem or not. Someone calls for help, then it gets reported. If
> someone gave a false report to him then it becomes law enforcement's job
> to take care of it at that point.
>
> I say he did a good job.
>
>

> Did you read the part in the thread about the guy that *couldn't* get a
> ham to turn in an emergency call? Chilling.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I like the several replies that went something like ~~~ "with the
proliferation of cell phones..."

2639. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 21:53:11 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040412175310.229$wz@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90703

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the
> > worst offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post
> > becomes apparent. Often it's clear from the first line that a post
> > isn;t worth my time.
>
> I find the group much more pleasent and interesting since I started
> ignoring posts by lenny the lame, steveie the stupid, and wee willie
> winkie.
>
You read every one of my posts, kid dyno-mite.

2640. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 22:42:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412184234.19617.00000178@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90705

In article <kJudnVwGgeWEbOfdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the worst
>> offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post becomes
>apparent.
>> Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.
>
>I find the group much more pleasent and interesting since I started
>ignoring posts by lenny the lame, steveie the stupid, and wee willie winkie.

No call = No ham.

No JJ = No problem.

LHA / WMD

2641. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 22:42:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412184235.19617.00000179@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90704

In article <407B014B.3030706@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> What do I desire as far as packet operations go?
>>
>One thing I used to desire was essentially usenews without the bad words
>and spam. But 1200 baud just doesn't cut it anymore. Slower as there
>is a lot of dead time.

"1200 baud" (actually 1200 bits per second) is about equivalent to
1200 words per minute as by:

1200 bps = 120 characters per second at 10 bits per character in
the ASCII 8-level character coding commonly used now.
120 characters per second = 7200 characters per minute.
If one "word" consists of 5 text characters plus a space character
(a common measure of throughput in telegraphy the century
before the last one), then 7200 char/min = 1200 words/min.

If the average "fast" radiotelegraphy rate is 20 words/minute,
then "1200 baud" is SIX HUNDRED TIMES FASTER than
average "CW."

Given the two vastly different communication rates, which one is
the "slow" one?

LHA / WMD

2642. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 22:42:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412184235.19617.00000180@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90706

In article <407AE8B4.5010202@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Note that Australia is a whole other continent and somewhat far from
>> your neighborhood. It is not a good thing to evaluate anything in terms
>> of your own experience and what is familiar to you...and certainly not in
>> terms of what you, yourself, particularly desire.
>
> What do I desire as far as packet operations go?

You said you thought packet was "dead." When I wrote (after the ellipsis) "certainly not in terms of what you, yourself, particularly desire" then that does not say you "desire" anything in regards to "packet operations," does it?

If you don't find "packet operations" in your ham neighborhood, then you are certainly free to think it is "dead" but only for that radio neighborhood you frequent. It is incorrect, reqardless of another 2-land schoolmaster-cum-moderator's "correctness" opinions to make absolute statements when there is obvious evidence that packet operations are continuing on another large continent far away from the USA...and reported on the Amateur Radio Newsline.

You are free to explore who uses packet radio methods at www.tapr.org, the website of Tucson Amateur Packet Radio.

LHA / WMD
statements

2643. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 22:42:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412184240.19617.00000181@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90707

```
In article <407AE85F.6010506@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>>
>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>>>>|
>>>>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>>>>>Office on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
>>>>>>that look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>>>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".
>>>>>>
>>>>>>That's not what I intended at all.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>>>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>>>>
>>>> What makes you say that? :-)
```

>>>>
>>>>> Oy!
>>>>
>>>> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
>>>> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"
>>>
>>> Oy Karumba?
>>
>> No, "oy gevalt!" [you haven't had enough chicken soup yet]
>>
>>>>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>>>>
>>>>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>>>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>>>>
>>>> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>>>>
>>>>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>>>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>>>>real book!"
>>>>
>>>> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
>>>> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
>>>> back.
>>>
>>> Did it sell well?
>>
>> Unknown. It was on the book market for over a month and actually
>> received literary comment in the press! Not on content, primarily on
>> general chutzpah of the "author" and the publishing company.
>>
>> There's somewhat the same sort of chutzpah on the part of a
>> certain New England publishing corporation...
>>
>>>> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse
>>>> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
>>>> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>>>>
>>>>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>>>>
>>>> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?
>>>
>>> Makes it easier, I guess.
>>
>> So, you approve of prejudice?
>
> Oh No! in the context of what I was saying a long time ago when this
>was first posted was that Hans and Bill had *their* prejudices in

>assuming Jim was posting a disparaging comment in the Subject line.

I don't see any "prejudices" other than in individual preference
for or against the telegraphy TEST for amateur radio licensing.

Hans Brakob is on public record as being a definite fan of radio
telegraphy...and as against the amateur radio telegraphy test
in the future for the purposes of amateur licensing. Bill Sohl is
on public record as having taken an amateur radio telegraphy
test to obtain a license grant and is also a Director of NCI.

The first posting of a "new book" ("Ham Radio For Dummies" as
appearing on pre-print advertisements at Amazon) was done by
someone using a pseudonym in posting. The second posting in
this newsgroup on the same book was done by me. Miccolis
was the THIRD person to post on that new book, using another
subject header.

You cannot deny that the title "Ham Radio For Dummies"
carries some emotional loading to create different impressions
to anyone reading it for the first time.

> And remember, If I did approve of prejudice, I wouldn't want it easy.
>Remember, I am the whack that likes things to be hard work! 8^)

Irrelevant in the context of the atmosphere of status-quo-ists
in this newsgroup.

>>>> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
>>>> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?
>>>
>>> Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.
>>>Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.
>>
>> Much much less of "African-American."
>>
>>> There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
>>>technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
>>>always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
>>>ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
>>>have said they want to be lawyers!
>>
>> You would do well - on criticism of gender content in engineering - to
>> look at the periodicals of the IEEE or ACM in regard to women in
>> engineering. Particularly in high office positions of the IEEE and ACM.
>>
>> Notable example: Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard.
>>
>>> I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
>>>other subset of males.
>>>
>>>When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)

>>
>> Why do you single out engineers? I was not discussing engineers.
>
> The topic goes where it will. You were discussing Ham radio, which is a

>technical hobby. Engineers run to the technical by by nature.

Electronic engineers and electronic technicians are FORCED to
work in their chosen field by the laws of physics. Human legislation
cannot change natural laws of physics.

Radio amateurs OPERATE according to legislated regulations
and the status-quo-ists in here tend towards those regulations
that were considered "best" in the 1930s, 70 years ago.

Only a minority among licensed radio amateurs can adequately
be considered "technical" about electronics-radio sufficient to
understand it.

>And there
>seems to be some problem in attracting women to the technical fields.

By all the photos, Hewlett-Packard's Carly is very much female.

A bit of searching and observation will find a surprising percentage
of females in "technical" fields such as electrical and electronic
engineering, information technology, medicine, medicines, physics,
higher mathematics, and even vehicle design and engineering.

There is little evidence that females are "into" automobile repair,
NASCAR pit crews (there are only a few drivers, none in pit
crews), or oil-field drilling. Those are "technical" fields.

>> Engineers are human. But, engineers are forced to obey the laws
>> of physics first in order to stay employed as engineers. No physical
>> laws are changeable by human legislation.
>>
>> Radio amateurs, by contrast, seem very much inclined to fantasy,
>> group-think, imagination, and some considerable misogyny as well
>> as rigid conservatism in standards and practices. Examples of that
>> have been in here for years.
>
> All of them?

Yes, all the examples. Consult Google archives to review who is who.
"Google is your friend" - or enemy - depending on what you are after.

LHA / WMD

2644. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 23:01:28 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20040412190128.209$zG@newsreader.com>
Source record: 90708

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <kJudnVwGgeWEbOfdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>, JJ
> <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the
> >> worst offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post
> >> becomes
> >apparent.
> >> Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.
> >
> >I find the group much more pleasent and interesting since I started
> >ignoring posts by lenny the lame, steveie the stupid, and wee willie
> >winkie.
>
> No call = No ham.
>
> No JJ = No problem.
>
> LHA / WMD
>
No call = No ham.

No JJ = No problem.

Reads all the posts = JJ.

2645. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 23:46:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412194612.27331.00000158@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90709

>Subject: Re: Fun with numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/11/2004 4:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040411172111.12851.00000273@mb-m06.aol.com>

> For what it's worth, as of 6 April 2004, there were 282,948
> no-code-test Technicians in the FCC ham database. That's a
> whopping 38.9 percent of all licensees who cannot, legally,
> operate on ham bands below 6 meters. That number is almost
> twice as big as the 146,174 or 20.1 percent who were General
> class licensees on that date.

For what it's worth, all 282,948 of those no-code-test Technicians were
free to take the appropriate examination and receive authorization to operate
on HF.

As of 6 April 2004, no person has ever been barred, restrained, detained,
blocked or otherwise impeded from taking ANY Amateur Radio exam by any other
person or entity, private or public, real or imagined.

> Advanced class were 84,507 or 11.6 percent and Amateur
> Extras were 107,343 or 14.8 percent. Novice was only
> 38,814 or 5.3 percent and Technician Plus almost twice that
> at 67,359 or 9.3 percent.
>
> There WOULD be a significant playground "threat" should the
> no-code-test Technicians get a piece of the HF action. Might
> be true doom and gloom plus the hue and cry of alarum from
> those who think that HF was made only for Them.

And who would "Them", be, Lennie?

> Should be clear that HF denizens need more space to play.
> Nobody seems to be active on doing that. All that happened
> in the relatively recent time resulted in five "channels" on 60 m.
> According to NTIA Spectrum Projections, an endnote says
> that ARRL "requested more bandspace" a dozen years ago.
> The only thing on the current WRC-07 agenda is the 136 KHz
> LF band consideration "for study."
>
> Where are all the bandspace Activists?

Living on Lanark and bragging about how they don't need an Amateur license
to put a Part 15 transmitter on an Amateur allocation...As if they were really
capable of doing it...

Steve, K4YZ

2646. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 23:49:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412194937.27331.00000159@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90710

>Subject: Re: Fun with numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/11/2004 10:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040411232633.20806.00000217@mb-m19.aol.com>

> Tell you what, Rev. Jim...(SNIP)

> Jimmie, Jimmie, Jimmie. Try to stay in focus without your fuse
> getting lit....(SNIP)

> All you are doing is poor MANUFACTURING of a dispute. As you've
> done many times before....(SNIP)
>
> So, do you WANT all HF hams to sit forever in little tiny bandspaces?

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

Leonard H. Anderson

From the "Lennie Anderson" anthology.

Steve, K4YZ

2647. Re: Fun with numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-12 23:56:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040412195627.27331.00000160@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90711

>Subject: Re: Fun with numbers
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/12/2004 12:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040412135853.08081.00000373@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0404120736.23e51d81@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>>If even one amateur in your omitted "2 year grace period" renews, your
>>numbers will be incorrect also.
>
> Brian, Rev. Jim can't admit any wrongdoing if there is the slightest
> negativism implied against his beloved telegrapy.

Lennie...You've been proven wrong so many times that if your lies were a
revolving door, it would have reached orbit by now...

> His newsgrope tactic is to bring out as much misdirection as
> possible of anyone speaking in the slightest against morse code
> or the highly-conservative, rigid thinking that U.S. amateur radio
> is all about telegraphy skills.

Pot/Kettle/Black.

Why do you insist on making such ludicrous statements proven false by a
simple review of Jim's posts?

>>I think its safe to say at this point that your numbers will be
>>incorrect by the end of the day, if not sooner.
>
> It is safe to say that ANYTHING I say will be refuted by Rev. Jim
> using his common vaporware misdirection tactics displayed
> on this subject thread and many others in the past.

Your posts are EASILY "refuted" by anyone who takes the time to wade
through the posts. Your "facts" are anything BUJT facts, Lennie.

> The end result is a lot of electrons wasted in discussing
> something not on the original subject, a common tactic by
> newsgroupies. Such misdirection concentrates on a
> communicator's alleged personal faults instead of the
> message subject.

In order to "communicate", there needs to be a "sender" and "receiver".
Both must be willing to truly participate in the conversation.

This leaves you out, Lennie. All Things Amateur MUST be wrong...So Sayeth You.

> And, when misdirection has been explained and refuted, Rev.
> Jim gets all upset and huffy about "not being respected for his
> accuracy" in using vaporware opinion concepts.

Jim may or may not be a lot of things, but "huffy" is not one of them.

Steve, K4YZ

2648. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 02:21:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404121821.317aede5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90712

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<kJudnVwGgeWEbOfdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the worst
> > offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post becomes apparent.
> > Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.
>
> I find the group much more pleasent and interesting since I started
> ignoring posts by lenny the lame, steveie the stupid, and wee willie winkie.

JJ, I'm sure it is much more pleasant from your perspective.

You see no evil, hear no evil, but spew as much of it as your mean
little heart desires. It is fairly cowardous of you to malign a ham
by callsign who isn't even posting here, yet you remain anonymous.
Time for you to authenticate.

2649. Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 03:58:22 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404121958.72f215c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90713

The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on the ARRL petition to the FCC.)

I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.

The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.

Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the No-Code Technician. What's now the Technician exam was two separate tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam. But in spite of this, the ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.

The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice license obsolete. In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.

Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a 4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?

My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more important than the Technician license:

1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously expect the FCC to approve it.
2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and reintroduce the Novice class.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAAATTTTTT jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/ee.html

2650. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 13:32:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IZRec.5781$I75.3794@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90714

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404121958.72f215c3@posting.google.com...
> The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
> class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
> the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>
> I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
> felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>
> The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
> is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
> just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
> License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
> island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
> important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
> Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
> NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
> Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
> downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>
> Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?

I would venture to say it is harder to get than the Novice (if we
still had novice testing) . That's the
problem as percieved by ARRL, NCVEC and other.

> During the years
> when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> No-Code Technician.

But that's probably because you were an adult and only the Tech
gave sufficient VHF capability to allow you to engage in voice
operations, especially via FM.

> What's now the Technician exam was two separate
> tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and
> Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
> exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
> additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician
> exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
> new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
> myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
> easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam.

But that was again most likly because you didn't want to
be limited to the Novice HF and limited VHF privileges.

> But in spite of this, the
> ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old
> Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
> is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
> the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.
>
> The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
> license obsolete.

I agee only to the extent that VHF operations had become a much
greater part of ham radio capabilities.

> In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
> Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
> takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.

True to a point, but that again was a result of operating
privileges, not (IMHO) the locense difficulty of 5 wpm.

> Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
> the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
> 4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?

You'll have to ask ARRL...but before you do, kook at the
privileges to be granted to new Novice class under both ARRL
and NCVECs petition. Before the Novice was almost an exclusive
HF with code operating license. That will change significantly.
The Novice was a gateway for many of us when getting on the
air really was pretty much an HF only thing. The Novice clearly
offered a great starting point for youth...far more than does
today's tech.

> My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
> important than the Technician license:
> 1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
> that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
> expect the FCC to approve it.
> 2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
> reintroduce the Novice class.

I disagree. I believe they want an easier entrance license than
tech that allows youth to get a license AND offers a full array
of operating privileges (HF, VHF, SSB, FM, CW, etc) to that
license. Today's Novice is effectively an HF non-phone lcense
and todays Tech is clearly a VHF/UHF only license. That's
the problem.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2651. Re: I Am Not Making This Up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 14:04:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407BF35C.9020105@psu.edu>
Source record: 90715

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <407AE85F.6010506@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <407A9CF4.5070206@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <4076C8A6.3070309@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>In article <3qedc.1747$A_4.342@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>| Clarification:
>>>>>>>>|
>>>>>>>>| I hope that no one considered my post about this book to be
>>>>>>>>| disparaging in any way. The subject line was chosen to indicate that
>>>>>>>>| it is a real book, not a parody or photoshop.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I'm disinclined to buy your weak disclaimer, Jim.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>My disclaimer is the truth, Hans.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I've used several of the "Dummies" books. I have the one for Microsoft
>>>>>>>Office on my desk at work. I haven't seen a bad one yet.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I have also seen many, many things on the internet passed off as "real"
>>>>>>>that look real but which are only photoshops.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Just as you intended, most everyone who saw your chosen subject line
>>>>>>>>opened the message expecting to find something on the order of "you
>>>>>>>>ain't gonna believe this crap but it's true".

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>That's not what I intended at all.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Jim, sometimes people know exactly what you will say and what you mean
>>>>>>even if you never said what they know you meant to say forever!!
>>>>>
>>>>> What makes you say that? :-)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Oy!
>>>>>
>>>>> Hold hands to cheeks when you say that. If it's really
>>>>> astonishing, say "Oy gevalt!"
>>>>
>>>> Oy Karumba?
>>>
>>> No, "oy gevalt!" [you haven't had enough chicken soup yet]
>>>
>>>
>>>>>> Possible alternative interpretations:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "Look at this folks! A dummies book about ham radio. Who'd have figured
>>>>>
>>>>>>they would write one of those? Supposedly so few people want to become
>>>>>>Hams, how will they sell any of those books?"
>>>>>
>>>>> If it isn't published by ARRL it can't be any good, can it? :-)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> "Some people in here think that Hams are dummies, and look at this
>>>>>>Dummies book that just came out! Sounds almost like a joke, but it's a
>>>>>>real book!"
>>>>>
>>>>> Could have been worse...a book printed with a title page and every
>>>>> other page blank. Real thing. Was on the book market a few years
>>>>> back.
>>>>
>>>> Did it sell well?
>>>
>>> Unknown. It was on the book market for over a month and actually
>>> received literary comment in the press! Not on content, primarily on
>>> general chutzpah of the "author" and the publishing company.
>>>
>>> There's somewhat the same sort of chutzpah on the part of a
>>> certain New England publishing corporation...
>>>
>>>
>>>>> I'm waiting for a similar book with no text content...only morse

>>>>> code dots and dashes. After all, "morse code is the universal
>>>>> language." Wouldn't need any translation.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Good luck with your prejudices, Hans and Bill!
>>>>>
>>>>> Are there codified prejudices now? Standard prejudices?
>>>>
>>>> Makes it easier, I guess.
>>>
>>> So, you approve of prejudice?
>>
>> Oh No! in the context of what I was saying a long time ago when this
>>was first posted was that Hans and Bill had *their* prejudices in
>>assuming Jim was posting a disparaging comment in the Subject line.
>
>
> I don't see any "prejudices" other than in individual preference
> for or against the telegraphy TEST for amateur radio licensing.
>
> Hans Brakob is on public record as being a definite fan of radio
> telegraphy...and as against the amateur radio telegraphy test
> in the future for the purposes of amateur licensing. Bill Sohl is
> on public record as having taken an amateur radio telegraphy
> test to obtain a license grant and is also a Director of NCI.
>
> The first posting of a "new book" ("Ham Radio For Dummies" as
> appearing on pre-print advertisements at Amazon) was done by
> someone using a pseudonym in posting. The second posting in
> this newsgroup on the same book was done by me. Miccolis
> was the THIRD person to post on that new book, using another
> subject header.
>
> You cannot deny that the title "Ham Radio For Dummies"
> carries some emotional loading to create different impressions
> to anyone reading it for the first time.
>
>
>> And remember, If I did approve of prejudice, I wouldn't want it easy.
>>Remember, I am the whack that likes things to be hard work! 8^)
>
>
> Irrelevant in the context of the atmosphere of status-quo-ists
> in this newsgroup.
>
>
>>>>> By photographic evidence in amateur radio periodicals, U.S.
>>>>> radio amateurs are invariably White Males. Prejudice?
>>>>
>>>> Mostly white males. I've seen the occasional woman show up in a pix.

>>>>Less African American men or women. Spanish heritage is fairly common.
>>>
>>> Much much less of "African-American."
>>>
>>>
>>>> There are problems getting *especially* women interested in the
>>>>technical fields. On our "Bring your sons and daughters to work day" we
>>>>always ask the kids what they want to do for a living. None of the young
>>>>ladies have indicated they want to go into engineering yet. A majority
>>>>have said they want to be lawyers!
>>>
>>> You would do well - on criticism of gender content in engineering - to
>>> look at the periodicals of the IEEE or ACM in regard to women in
>>> engineering. Particularly in high office positions of the IEEE and ACM.
>>>
>>> Notable example: Carly Fiorina, CEO of Hewlett-Packard.
>>>
>>>
>>>> I wonder why. I doubt engineers are more sexist or creepier than any
>>>>other subset of males.
>>>>
>>>>When in doubt, blame it on Liberals?? 8^)
>>>
>>> Why do you single out engineers? I was not discussing engineers.
>>
>> The topic goes where it will. You were discussing Ham radio, which is a
>
>
>>technical hobby. Engineers run to the technical by by nature.
>
>
> Electronic engineers and electronic technicians are FORCED to
> work in their chosen field by the laws of physics. Human legislation
> cannot change natural laws of physics.
>
> Radio amateurs OPERATE according to legislated regulations
> and the status-quo-ists in here tend towards those regulations
> that were considered "best" in the 1930s, 70 years ago.
>
> Only a minority among licensed radio amateurs can adequately
> be considered "technical" about electronics-radio sufficient to
> understand it.
>
>
>>And there
>>seems to be some problem in attracting women to the technical fields.
>
>
> By all the photos, Hewlett-Packard's Carly is very much female.

Fiorina holds a bachelor's degree in medieval history and philosophy
from Stanford University; a masters degree in business administration
from the Robert H. Smith School of Business at the University of
Maryland at College Park, Md.; and a master of science degree from MITï¿½s
Sloan School. She is technical only if you consider business technical.

You are right, she is unmistakably female. And my new H-P computer is a
fine machine. I think she is doing a pretty good job there.

> A bit of searching and observation will find a surprising percentage
> of females in "technical" fields such as electrical and electronic
> engineering, information technology, medicine, medicines, physics,
> higher mathematics, and even vehicle design and engineering.

A quick LexisNexis search shows 9.9 percent of engineers in 2000 were
female. And the numbers of female students pursuing engineering degrees
is dropping a bit. I don't have an overall number for that because the
numbers are broken down by ethnicity. I don't feel quite comfortable
enough with the statistics to compile an overall percentage for the
current students. But I do not find those stats all that high.

> There is little evidence that females are "into" automobile repair,
> NASCAR pit crews (there are only a few drivers, none in pit
> crews), or oil-field drilling. Those are "technical" fields.

>>> Engineers are human. But, engineers are forced to obey the laws
>>> of physics first in order to stay employed as engineers. No physical
>>> laws are changeable by human legislation.
>>>
>>> Radio amateurs, by contrast, seem very much inclined to fantasy,
>>> group-think, imagination, and some considerable misogyny as well
>>> as rigid conservatism in standards and practices. Examples of that
>>> have been in here for years.
>>
>> All of them?
>
>
> Yes, all the examples.

Do you mean "all the examples that fit your description?

> Consult Google archives to review who is who.
> "Google is your friend" - or enemy - depending on what you are after.

Google is one search appliance.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2652. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 14:15:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu>
Source record: 90716

Jason Hsu wrote:
> The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
> class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
> the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>
> I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
> felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>
> The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
> is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
> just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
> License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
> island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
> important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
> Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
> NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
> Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
> downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.

Interesting take on the issue, Jason.

My main concern is that there is a precedent in the proposed mass upgrade:

If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means that
after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come afterward.
There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements were good
enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why should I have
to take a harder test?"

And although there is really no test process needed at all to get on HF
(witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels) I believe that we should
foster technical knowledge qualifications for the ARS.

> Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
> when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> No-Code Technician.

Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.

What's now the Technician exam was two separate
> tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and
> Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
> exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
> additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician

> exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
> new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
> myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
> easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam. But in spite of this, the
> ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old
> Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
> is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
> the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.

5WPM is easy for some, and not at all easy for others.

> The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
> license obsolete. In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
> Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
> takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.
>
> Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
> the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
> 4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?

> My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
> important than the Technician license:
> 1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
> that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
> expect the FCC to approve it.
> 2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
> reintroduce the Novice class.

That is a pretty good assessment, Jason.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2653. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 18:32:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040413143242.15123.00000318@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 90717

In article <f7d9a152.0404121958.72f215c3@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)

The NCVEC suggested COMMUNICATOR class entry-level license
a bit different than the ARRL proposal.

As you surmised at the end of your post, ARRL wanted to
resurrect the old Novice out of nostalgia. All the evidence of
the ARRL's prodigious output points to such nostalgia.

NCVEC took a fresh approach to ENTRY-LEVEL class. Their
choice of "Communicator" as a name carries no emotional
baggage of "negative" ranking. Radio operating IS communicating,
and labeling anyone as a total beginner, or forcing them into some
kind of recruit training camp is not a good way to attract anyone.

>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.

You shouldn't be if you've tracked them enough.

ARRL is a membership organization which has, for most of the
past half century tried to be a "level of government" ex-officio in
the curious way that humans in fraternal organizations get when
they get a taste of power and control. :-)

ARRL is also beginning to worry about survival. Membership is
(or was in December) down to 21 percent of all licensees. It may
be on a dropping trend. This effects periodicals that depend on
advertising space sales to fully support periodical budgets; CQ is
the remaining USA ham periodical, the others dropped due to
shrinking (for printed media) ad sales. Internet is siphoning off
some of the potential ad monies, monies that are finite. ARRL
does NOT represent the majority of USA radio amateurs, only has
obligations to its membership. While demographics are informal,
ARRL has failed to get enough members from the 38% of all
licensees now making up the Technician class nor the 9% that
are Technician Plus (until the last one in 2012).

>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class.

It's Realism in looking at the near future. No new licenses in the Novice, Technician Plus, or Advanced classes have been issued since 2000. The action of not doing anything will result in those three classes (26% of all right now) being "downgraded" to "lower" classes on renewal. Any way you slice that, it is a negative-esteem action which WILL happen if nothing is changed. If some of those are disenchanted with being "downgraded," they will simply drop out. Overall numbers would shrink.

Automatic merging of those 26% into the next-higher class is a positive-esteem thing for them...and only hurts the egos of all those rank-status-privilege individuals who demand that all have to do as they did, blah, blah, blah, as if the regulations were cast in armor-plated concrete by some radio divine force.

So, for a quarter of all licensees, it's a matter of moving them "up" or "down" which really doesn't affect anything in the hobby, just the emotional mindset of a few.

>Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
>Technician license should be voted off the island.

Not quite. NCVEC differs from ARRL in dropping the historic and negative-connotation of "novice" and starting a NEW entry-level category. NCVEC can see that there IS competition from many other ways to communicate, that times have changed, and isn't afraid to pioneer.

NCVEC does NOT want to "reopen" the Novice. Novice class, despite the nostalgic attachment of some long-timers, was a failure as an entry-level category. The numbers of licensees constantly dropping in the Novice class proved that. Communicator class is a NEW concept in structure and privileges. Resurrection of Novice class from the dead isn't a religious event and shouldn't be treated as such.

>Because of the "no
>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.

Why is that a negative thing?

Sooner or later, all those who think amateur radio is all about Their rank-status-privilege in some imaginary "service" are going to have to concede that ham radio is not a quasi-military "service" with all the pomp and circumstance They think are "due" Them for existing.

Amateur radio is a voluntary avocational activity involving radio. It is a HOBBY despite the self-perceived nobility of class titles.

>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?

It shouldn't be, but it IS difficult for some that don't know anything about any radio other than operating the common front-panel controls of consumer electronics thingies. Try putting yourself

in their place, including a desire to operate their own radio station. Remember that being granted an amateur radio license of any "rank" doesn't make YOU some kind of nobility in all radio. The FCC has to, by law, be concerned with ALL citizens, not just those claiming noblesse oblige in a particular radio service, one of many civil radio services they must, by law, regulate.

That you cited your own experiences in entering amateur radio is not relevant to the discussion (despite personal protestations). The NUMBERS of no-code-test Technician class licensees entering amateur radio for the first time over the last 13 years prove several things: The overwhelming interest of newcomers is not about becoming a grande glorious radiotelegrapher; That amateur radio licensee total numbers would actually be shrinking without that Technician class license...12,000 NEW licensees in the last year came in through that class, only a fractional percentage through the other two...the overall growth for one year was only 0.14% according to www.hamdata.com.

An amateur radio license is NOT a diploma or a certificate of achieving anything other than a federal grant to transmit RF emergy according to regulations. The license - and its "rank" - is NOT the only way to actually learn anything. Several hundred questions MIGHT yield some knowledge on radio and certain regulations in a radio service, but REAL knowledge and skill acquisition is up to the individual.

>The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
>license obsolete.

I'd say it SUPPLANTED it. Novice remained an entry-level license class until 2000, 9 years after the no-code-test Tech was created. Novice class totals were beginning their drop trend before 1990.

>In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
>Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
>takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.

Not a good analogy. FCC closed THREE classes, not just one.

At 6 classes of license, the regulations had become too convoluted and complex to justify existance in a voluntary, avocational activity.

The rank-status-privilege nobility (those who had achieved top of the respect-is-due-them food chain) was generally furious at Order 99-412. An imaginary sky fell on their carefully cultivated egos.

FCC never sold licenses. ARRL sold the concepts of many ranks and associated privileges and did most of the USA advertising to Upgrade! Upgrade! Upgrade! :-)

>Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
>the expense of the Technician class?

ARRL wants nostalgia of the BoD's long-vanished youth. They
want to be the Lone Ranger with the opening line of "Come with
us now to the days of yesteryear...!" <up the stirring "charge"
music> <roll opening credits>

NCVEC is at least 8 VECs and isn't ruled by the ARRL. ARRL
may finally feel some pressure from not being as respected as
they think they should be.

>Why didn't the ARRL propose a
>4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?

Why should the Technician class be a "separate but (not) equal"
category?

Repeating a failed experiment of long ago isn't a good thing.

>My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
>important than the Technician license:
>1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
>that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
>expect the FCC to approve it.

I disagree. ARRL has found itself in the uncomfortable position
of having to compete for "leadership." That's been growing for
nearly two decades. The 2nd Petition (RM-10867) may be their
"last hurrah" effort to restore their concept of leadership. I think
they are sincere despite a lot of obvious compromise efforts.

>2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
>reintroduce the Novice class.

I agree with that. But, as the old saying goes, "Nostalgia isn't
what it used to be..."

LHA / WMD

2654. The ham spirit is well dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 18:44:48 UTC
From: Anonymous <nobody@paranoici.org>
Message-ID: <7651849f568cec5e51aa1673ebf1347f@paranoici.org>
Source record: 90718

On the site swap.qth.com, some guys try
to trade ham-radio equipments. Most of
the ads are fake either the seller is a
crook or the wares are still sold but
not removed from the site.
Sellers consider buyers like pidgeons,
some say that their equipment is "mint"
although in reality its in poor
condition (even with non-working
functions or totally dead). Once sold,
they do not take the time to remove
the ad from the site, considering that
everybody on Earth has the time to
read their lies and to mail them to get
a "SOLD" answer one week after.

The ham spirit has now totally
disapeared, there is no ham community,
all is business in a wild jungle.
Like on EBAY (far better than ham sites)
it will be essential to make an
evaluation note on the sellers and
buyers in order to get rid of crooks
and bad guys. Having a callsign is not
a proof of respectability. Take care !

2655. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 19:00:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu>
Source record: 90719

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0404121958.72f215c3@posting.google.com...
>
>>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
>>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
>>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>>
>>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
>>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>>
>>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
>>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
>>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
>>License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
>>island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
>>important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
>>Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
>>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
>>Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
>>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>>
>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?
>
>
> I would venture to say it is harder to get than the Novice (if we
> still had novice testing) . That's the
> problem as percieved by ARRL, NCVEC and other.

Probably was harder than the Novice, at least question wise. but we
aren't talking about orders of magnitude harder. I like how Jim N2EY
puts it, that the old tests tested more in depth on fewer subjects,
while the new Technician tests test more subjects to lesser depth.

>>During the years
>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
>>No-Code Technician.
>
>
> But that's probably because you were an adult and only the Tech
> gave sufficient VHF capability to allow you to engage in voice
> operations, especially via FM.

That is a *big* reason, and was why I went the Technician route. A smaller reason is the element one test. For some of us, that was a lot harder. But both were a big part of the demise of the old Novice class.

>>What's now the Technician exam was two separate
>>tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and
>>Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
>>exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
>>additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician
>>exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
>>new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
>>myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
>>easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam.
>
>
> But that was again most likly because you didn't want to
> be limited to the Novice HF and limited VHF privileges.
>
>
>>But in spite of this, the
>>ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old
>>Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
>>is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
>>the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.
>>
>>The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
>>license obsolete.
>
>
> I agee only to the extent that VHF operations had become a much
> greater part of ham radio capabilities.
>
>
>>In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
>>Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
>>takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.
>
>
> True to a point, but that again was a result of operating
> privileges, not (IMHO) the locense difficulty of 5 wpm.

I think it was a little bit of both, Bill. Mostly privileges, but there is a sizable minority that find Element 1 daunting. If I hadn't, I probably would have become a novice long before they ever had a no-code Tech.

>>Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
>>the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
>>4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?
>
>
> You'll have to ask ARRL...but before you do, kook at the

> privileges to be granted to new Novice class under both ARRL
> and NCVECs petition. Before the Novice was almost an exclusive
> HF with code operating license. That will change significantly.
> The Novice was a gateway for many of us when getting on the
> air really was pretty much an HF only thing. The Novice clearly
> offered a great starting point for youth...far more than does
> today's tech.
>
>
>>My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
>>important than the Technician license:
>>1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
>>that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
>>expect the FCC to approve it.
>>2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
>>reintroduce the Novice class.
>
>
> I disagree. I believe they want an easier entrance license than
> tech that allows youth to get a license AND offers a full array
> of operating privileges (HF, VHF, SSB, FM, CW, etc) to that
> license. Today's Novice is effectively an HF non-phone lcense
> and todays Tech is clearly a VHF/UHF only license. That's
> the problem.

But is the Technician license all that hard? I barely studied for mine,
I might be as guilty as the PCTA's that like to talk about how a person
can "get" Morse in one weekend, but I'm amazed that people would
consider the Technician test too hard.

Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
requirements? Learn as they go?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2656. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 19:11:03 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404131111.4feca5a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90720

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<IZRec.5781$l75.3794@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?
>
> I would venture to say it is harder to get than the Novice (if we
> still had novice testing) . That's the
> problem as percieved by ARRL, NCVEC and other.
>
Granted, a No-Code Novice (if it existed) would be easier to get than
a No-Code Technician license. But if the No-Code Technician license
was too hard but the Coded Novice license was easy to get, then why
didn't more new hams get the Novice license first and then upgrade to
Technician Plus later?

> > During the years
> > when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> > for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> > No-Code Technician.
>
> But that's probably because you were an adult and only the Tech
> gave sufficient VHF capability to allow you to engage in voice
> operations, especially via FM.
>
OK, but giving Tech Plus privileges to No-Code Technicians would give
this new entry-level class the same HF privileges that the Novice
licensees have. Also, removing the 5 wpm requirement for the General
class would make it easier for No-Code Technicians to upgrade. This
would resolve the issue of the lack of HF privileges for the No-Code
Technicians. If the Novice/Tech Plus HF privileges aren't enough,
then an expansion of them would be called for. A modest expansion of
Novice/Tech Plus HF privileges would be MUCH more sensible than
automatic upgrades to the General class.

Although I believe the 5 wpm exam should be eliminated for all license
classes, I oppose the free upgrades from No-Code Technician to General
because the Technician exam was never intended to prepare people to
use General class privileges and the General class license was never
intended to be an entry-level license. Most people (except for a few
of the most strident pro-code testers who want to brag about passing
the 13 wpm exam) have no objections to the free upgrades from Advanced
to Amateur Extra since most of the current Amateur Extra exam question
pool was previously in the Advanced exam question pool. But the same
argument does NOT apply in upgrading Technicians to General. If the
General exam were that unnecessary, then why wasn't it merged in the

restructuring of 2000, and why won't it be eliminated in the ARRL proposal? I highly doubt that anyone staunchly favors free upgrades from Technician to General. I think this part of the ARRL proposal is simply the result of insisting on both a 3-class system AND a new Novice class. In my opinion, either current Novices should be merged into the Technician class (with Tech Plus privileges), OR there should be 4 license classes (Novice, Technician, General, Amateur Extra).
>
> I disagree. I believe they want an easier entrance license than
> tech that allows youth to get a license AND offers a full array
> of operating privileges (HF, VHF, SSB, FM, CW, etc) to that
> license. Today's Novice is effectively an HF non-phone lcense
> and todays Tech is clearly a VHF/UHF only license. That's
> the problem.
>
I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an extended version of the old Novice exam. If a No-Code Novice license is created, it should NOT be at the expense of the Technician license. As I mentioned before, offering HF privileges to current Technicians doesn't require upgrading them to General - simply giving No-Code Technicians the Tech Plus privileges would accomplish this. Offering HF voice privileges (in addition to the slice of 10m) to current Technicians can be done by adding more voice privileges to the license. Automatic upgrades to General are not necessary and are unwarranted.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2657. Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 19:20:30 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90721

Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain privileges REDUCED. This opposes the sensible concept of avoiding automatic downgrades for any license class. The reason for stricter power limits is to avoid the need for RF safety questions in the new Novice exam.

What's wrong with testing prospective Novice licensees on RF safety? Are RF safety questions that hard? It seems like an extremely important topic to me, and learning about RF safety doesn't seem like an undue burden. Furthermore, RF safety is just one topic on the written exam and doesn't have the unilateral power that the Morse Code exams currently have. What's wrong with making the Novice question pool 10%-20% larger given how critical this topic is and given the need to avoid downgrading privileges of current licensees?

Admittedly, there are very few active Novices at any given moment, as these few active ones upgrade. But the same restructuring principles (like no downgrades) for the higher license classes should still apply.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2658. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 20:20:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407C4B99.2030708@psu.edu>
Source record: 90722

Jason Hsu wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<IZRec.5781$l75.3794@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?
>>
>>I would venture to say it is harder to get than the Novice (if we
>>still had novice testing) . That's the
>>problem as percieved by ARRL, NCVEC and other.
>>
>
> Granted, a No-Code Novice (if it existed) would be easier to get than
> a No-Code Technician license. But if the No-Code Technician license
> was too hard but the Coded Novice license was easy to get, then why
> didn't more new hams get the Novice license first and then upgrade to
> Technician Plus later?

Jason, I really think that an awful lot of hams that think we need a lot more hams on the air also don't think that people are very smart in general.

Element one was the pariah for so many years; it was keeping new hams out. And now somehow the easy test people "know" that the Technician license is too difficult!?

>
>>>During the years
>>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
>>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
>>>No-Code Technician.
>>
>>But that's probably because you were an adult and only the Tech
>>gave sufficient VHF capability to allow you to engage in voice
>>operations, especially via FM.
>>
>
> OK, but giving Tech Plus privileges to No-Code Technicians would give
> this new entry-level class the same HF privileges that the Novice
> licensees have. Also, removing the 5 wpm requirement for the General
> class would make it easier for No-Code Technicians to upgrade. This
> would resolve the issue of the lack of HF privileges for the No-Code
> Technicians. If the Novice/Tech Plus HF privileges aren't enough,
> then an expansion of them would be called for. A modest expansion of
> Novice/Tech Plus HF privileges would be MUCH more sensible than
> automatic upgrades to the General class.

>
> Although I believe the 5 wpm exam should be eliminated for all license
> classes, I oppose the free upgrades from No-Code Technician to General
> because the Technician exam was never intended to prepare people to
> use General class privileges and the General class license was never
> intended to be an entry-level license. Most people (except for a few
> of the most strident pro-code testers who want to brag about passing
> the 13 wpm exam) have no objections to the free upgrades from Advanced
> to Amateur Extra since most of the current Amateur Extra exam question
> pool was previously in the Advanced exam question pool. But the same
> argument does NOT apply in upgrading Technicians to General. If the
> General exam were that unnecessary, then why wasn't it merged in the
> restructuring of 2000, and why won't it be eliminated in the ARRL
> proposal? I highly doubt that anyone staunchly favors free upgrades
> from Technician to General. I think this part of the ARRL proposal is
> simply the result of insisting on both a 3-class system AND a new
> Novice class. In my opinion, either current Novices should be merged
> into the Technician class (with Tech Plus privileges), OR there should
> be 4 license classes (Novice, Technician, General, Amateur Extra).
>
>>I disagree. I believe they want an easier entrance license than
>>tech that allows youth to get a license AND offers a full array
>>of operating privileges (HF, VHF, SSB, FM, CW, etc) to that
>>license. Today's Novice is effectively an HF non-phone lcense
>>and todays Tech is clearly a VHF/UHF only license. That's
>>the problem.
>>
>
> I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level
> license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an
> extended version of the old Novice exam.

Agreed. I do not believe that kids are stupid and need an "easy"
license, especially if we *don't* really know that the technician
license is keeping them off the air.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2659. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 20:38:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407C4FD2.3030202@psu.edu>
Source record: 90723

Jason Hsu wrote:
> Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
> privileges REDUCED. This opposes the sensible concept of avoiding
> automatic downgrades for any license class. The reason for stricter
> power limits is to avoid the need for RF safety questions in the new
> Novice exam.
>
> What's wrong with testing prospective Novice licensees on RF safety?
> Are RF safety questions that hard? It seems like an extremely
> important topic to me, and learning about RF safety doesn't seem like
> an undue burden. Furthermore, RF safety is just one topic on the
> written exam and doesn't have the unilateral power that the Morse Code
> exams currently have. What's wrong with making the Novice question
> pool 10%-20% larger given how critical this topic is and given the
> need to avoid downgrading privileges of current licensees?
>
> Admittedly, there are very few active Novices at any given moment, as
> these few active ones upgrade. But the same restructuring principles
> (like no downgrades) for the higher license classes should still
> apply.

I would hope that the people that want rf safety diminished on the entry level tests would step up and assume responsibility for any person that injures themselves even at the lower levels they want to grant them. "Yes Virginia, it is possible to do terrible damage to yourself with 100 watts!"

We have an accepted level of safety instruction and testing established. It has been around for a few years, and appears to be working well enough. The problem as I see it is that if we reduce this in any way, then we are inviting controversy if people start harming themselves with our dangerous if misused toys.

In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know coffee was hot, or that a bike manufacturer did not tell the rider that if if becomes dark, they should turn on their headlights, people should be very careful about removing safety requirements.

This is especially important when the purported aim of the requirement reduction is to introduce more children into the radio environment. As a person that had to have multiple millions of liability insurance on myself in my dealings with children and their parents, I can say that with some authority. It's a scary path to go down.

Given the way that people come into the hobby these days, when the potential ham does not have the experience with high voltages that many

of us had in the past, and given our propensity to engage in litigation, and that some of us are trying to get children involved in the hobby, I support *more* safety related questions on the test, to include High Voltage as well as R-F issues.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2660. Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 20:45:07 UTC
From: bonita@votenader.org
Message-ID: <42b2735f.7bd50c9d@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90724
Cross-posted to: clari.usa.gov.policy,us.politics.bob-dole,rec.radio.amateur.policy,esp.charla.politica,alt.politics.liberal.bleed.bleed.bleed,poly.club.firearms-owner-advocacy

Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!
By Ralph Nader

If you work for a corporation, ask your own employer to support Taxpayer Appreciation Day. (We've included contact information at the end of the article.)

Take Action Now! April 15 is just around the corner. Please let us know what action you've taken and what type of response you receive at taxday@votenader.org

I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that April 15th of each year be designated Taxpayer Appreciation Day, a day when corporations receiving taxpayer subsidies, bailouts, and other forms of corporate welfare can express their thanks to the citizens who provide them.

Though it may not be evident, quite a few industries -- and the profits they generate -- can be traced back to taxpayer-financed programs whose fruits have been given away to (mostly) larger businesses.

Taxpayer dollars have often funded discoveries made by NASA, the Department of Defense, and the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies. In many instances the rights to those discoveries were later given away to companies that brag about them as though they were the fruits of their own investments. Taxpayer dollars have played a major role in the growth of the aviation and aerospace, biotechnology, pharmaceutical, and telecommunications industries -- to name only a few.

Though corporate America insists it must file yearly income taxes just like everyone else, it is responsible for a sharply decreasing portion of federal tax dollars -- despite record profits. Despite record profits, corporate tax contributions to the federal budget have been steadily declining for fifty years and now stand at a mere 7.4% of the federal government income because of the loopholes they driven into our tax laws. The average citizen pays more than four to five times that in federal income tax revenues (with the single exception of payroll taxes).

Clearly corporations that believe they are self-reliant are often, in fact, dependent on taxpayer funds to maintain their financial viability. The least they could do is thank us. Which is why we need something like Taxpayer Appreciation Day. Consider the following:

General Electric bought RCA (which owned NBC) in the mid-1980s with funds it was able to save by using an outrageous tax loophole passed by

Congress in 1981. That loophole allowed GE to pay no federal taxes on three years of profits, totaling more than $6 billion dollars. It also gave them a $125 million refund! That gave GE the money to buy RCA. GE should arrange a media extravaganzas on NBC to say "Thank you, taxpayers.&#65533; Pharmaceutical companies constantly ballyhoo their discoveries in advertisements. What they don't tell us is that many of the important nonredundant therapeutic drugs -- including most anticancer drugs -- were developed, in whole or in part, with taxpayer money and then given to them by the NIH and the Defense Department. Bristol-Meyers Squibb, for example, controls the rights to Taxol, an anticancer drug developed all the way through human clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health with $31 million of taxpayer moneys.

Pharmaceutical companies spend billions on advertisements each year. Perhaps they should consider a big "Thank You, Taxpayers" ad campaign every April 15, if only to remind them where their drug research and development subsidies come from.

Mining companies often receive vast sweetheart deals from taxpayers. Under the 1872 Mining Act hard rock mining companies are allowed to purchase mining rights to public land for only $5 an acre, no matter how valuable the minerals on (or in) that land might be. A Canadian company recently mined $9 billion in gold on federal land in Nevada after using the Mining Act to purchase the mining rights to it for about $30,000. Mining companies owe the taxpayers their gratitude.

Television broadcasters were given free license to use public airwaves (worth around $70 billion) by a supine Congress in 1997. They too should thank us. What about all those professional sports corporations that play and profit in taxpayer-funded stadiums and arenas? The owners and players should thank the fans/taxpayers who -- in spite of their largess -- still must pay through the nose for tickets. For years McDonalds received taxpayer subsidies to promote its products overseas as part of a foreign market access program. Now McDonalds is a ubiquitous brand name worldwide, but has it ever thanked the taxpayers who underwrote its efforts? Then there are the HMOs, hospitals, and defense contractors that have had their legal fees reimbursed by the taxpayers when our government prosecutes them for fraud or cost overruns. Those companies have great public relations firms that can help them show us their gratitude. Corporate America has taken too much from us for too long. It's time it shows us a little bit of appreciation.

Corporate Contacts:

General Electric (NBC):
David Frail
Financial Communications
1--203-373-3387
david.frail@corporate.ge.com

Bristol-Meyers Squibb:
Peter R. Dolan, CEO

345 Park Avenue
New York, New York, USA 10154-0037
1-212-546-4000
peter.dolan@bms.com

Viacom (CBS, MTV, Nickelodeon, VH1, BET, Paramount Pictures, Viacom Outdoor, Infinity, UPN, Spike TV, TV Land, CMT: Country Music Television, Comedy Central, Showtime, Blockbuster, and Simon & Schuster):
Sumner M. Redstone , Chairman and CEO
1515 Broadway
New York, NY 10036
1-212-258-6000
(refused to provide email addresses)

Walt Disney Co. (ABC):
David Eisner, CEO
500 S. Buena Vista Street
Burbank, CA 91521 ABC, Inc.
1-818-460-7477
netaudr@abc.com

McDonalds USA:
Jim Cantalupo, Chairman and CEO
McDonald&#65533;s Plaza
Oak Brook, IL 60523
1-800-244-6227
Email on-line form.

Halliburton (Kellogg Brown & Root):
David J. Lesar, Chairman, President & CEO
5 Houston Center
1401 McKinney, Suite 2400
Houston, TX 77010
1-713-759-2600
communityrelations@halliburton.com

In addition to these, pursue your favorite and let us know what they say!

--
Communist Party (RCP), through such luminaries as C. Clark
Kissinger and Mary Lou Greenberg, both of whom are Directors of NION and
members of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP). Clark Kissinger,
co-director of NION and the RCP, was quoted as saying that when the RCP took
over, "it would be necessary to shoot everyone who didn't agree with them."

The RCP is a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist group that practices Lenin's "vanguard"
philosophy, which states that a vanguard of intellectuals is needed to lead
the proletariat in establishing a worker's utopia. It fosters the worldwide
revolution through its membership in the Revolutionary International
Movement (RIM). It is through this affiliation that the RCP is related to
two organizations listed by the State Department as terrorist organizations;
the Communist Party of Peru (Shining Path/Sender Luminoso) and the Kurdish

Workers Party (PKK) are are closely associated with RIM. (The PKK is no longer a formal member of RIM; however, it was one of RIM's founders. The Shining Path is still a member.) Other groups that comprise the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement are the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist-Leninist, the Union of Iranian Communists (Sarbedaran)and the Nepal Communist Party.

The RIM via its publication A WORLD TO WIN declared its belief in the Palestinian intifada. The February 28, 2002, edition stated "the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement once again reaffirms its unwavering support .and calls on all revolutionary and progressive people to step up their actions on (the Palestinians') behalf." Another edition advised Palestinians to "link up with .the parties and organizations that make up the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement. With the weapon of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and its military strategy, people's war, the Palestinian people's fight will surely become .more integral part of the world revolution, hastening the day when imperialism, Zionism .meet their doom."

T

2661. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 21:38:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C5DCE.7040706@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90725

Jason Hsu wrote:

>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>
>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>
>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
>License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
>island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
>important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
>Extra.
>
Looks like the added 8 WPM (5+3=13) is equal to the old element 4B (the
written
test an Advanced would take to get Extra back in the olden days). Or to
put it
another way, that having passed a 13 WPM test long ago is equal to 1/2
of the Extra
written test (I'm ignoring medical waivers here). An Advanced took what
is roughly
1/2 of the current Extra written (element 4). Now that the Extra only
needs 5WPM,
I suppose this equivalence is valid....

> So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
>Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>
>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
>No-Code Technician. What's now the Technician exam was two separate
>tests back then - Novice and Technician.
>
Way back when, Tech required Novice code and general written. The old
pre 87
tech plus. I was one. Took element 4 a few years ago and now I'm an
extra.

Back in the early 1970s there was actually a rule saying that you could not
hold a tech AND a novice license at the same time. That Tech's were
restricted above 50MHz, thus no HF operations even as a novice. Even though
you had done novice code. I don't know if that was a bureaucratic
screw-up or
if the FCC had a reason. Back then I wanted to get a tech (phone privs
on VHF
I wanted) so my father and I visited a guy who was the FCC field
engineer for the
NYC area. This guy thought the tech license was an evil anti-ham dead
end that
would cause me never to attain true ham-dom on HF... Anyway, we did the
novice
code test. He set his keyer for a Farnsworth style test, but I had
trained for
slow character code. Bombed it. There's more about this guy, but it's OT.

> Both the Novice and
>Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
>exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
>additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician
>exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
>new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
>myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
>easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam. But in spite of this, the
>ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old
>Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
>is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
>the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.
>
Most of the ARRL guys are old time HF hams who did the high speed code
thing.
They say code is easy because they found it easy for themselves and got
the higher
class licenses and rose to prominence at the ARRL (not that high speed code
is a necessary skill needed for running an organization, but they used
it as a political
tool to edge out lower level licensee candidates). So nobody who found
code to
be a PITA would be there to say that code is a PITA.....

>
>The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
>license obsolete. In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
>Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
>takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.
>
>Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
>the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
>4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?
>
>My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more

>important than the Technician license:
>
>2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
>reintroduce the Novice class.
>
>
The olden days of building and operating a vacuum tube CW transmitter from
parts from junked TV sets. It worked because common consumer electronics
parts could be easily applied to transmitter work. Not so today. Tubes
are fairly forgiving
of short duration mistakes but solid state devices are not

>
>
Whatever entry level license is proposed or is established should be
achievable by teenagers who are able to do fairly well in school. You
don't have to be a genius honor roll student to get it, but you should have
more smarts than Beavis and Butthead can muster....

2662. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 21:47:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C5FF4.3090408@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90726

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level
>license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an
>extended version of the old Novice exam.
>
The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
physics
exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing
random
information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such
rules). Not
the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your
name you
graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for
a 3 credit
college class.

2663. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 21:50:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C6095.5040603@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90727

> :
>
> If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means
> that after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come
> afterward. There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements
> were good enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why
> should I have to take a harder test?"
>
> And although there is really no test process needed at all to get
> on HF (witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels)

Well, they're not *legal* and should not be there. And legal CB
operators are not supposed to
talk internationally.

2664. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 22:04:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90728

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
>
> Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
> good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
> requirements? Learn as they go?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will tell any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2665. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 22:09:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mZidnT1mobJs-eHdRVn-tw@comcast.com>
Source record: 90729

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404131111.4feca5a6@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<IZRec.5781$l75.3794@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get?
> >
> > I would venture to say it is harder to get than the Novice (if we
> > still had novice testing) . That's the
> > problem as percieved by ARRL, NCVEC and other.
> >
> Granted, a No-Code Novice (if it existed) would be easier to get than
> a No-Code Technician license. But if the No-Code Technician license
> was too hard but the Coded Novice license was easy to get, then why
> didn't more new hams get the Novice license first and then upgrade to
> Technician Plus later?
>

A very large part of the reason was that to get on 2m FM, which is your
"local watering hole" you have to be a Technician. So people took the Tech
route and then upgraded to Tech+ to get HF privileges if interested. Many
instructors actively recommended that route rather than going Novice and
then upgrading to Tech+.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2666. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 22:14:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <jN6dnfqkOYaX--HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90730

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C5DCE.7040706@ix.netcom.com...
> [snip]
> Whatever entry level license is proposed or is established should be
> achievable by teenagers who are able to do fairly well in school. You
> don't have to be a genius honor roll student to get it, but you should
have
> more smarts than Beavis and Butthead can muster....
>

This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2667. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 22:19:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <CtOdncfCxYSs-uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90731

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C5FF4.3090408@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level
> >license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an
> >extended version of the old Novice exam.
> >
> The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
> physics
> exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing
> random
> information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such
> rules). Not
> the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your
> name you
> graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for
> a 3 credit
> college class.
>

Not hardly. The Tech and General exams are no harder than the material that students are learning in junior high if they are going to even a halfway decent school. The Tech and General exams require nothing harder than adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing. I certainly hope our junior high kids of average intelligence and standard class room training can handle these basic math functions. The Extra exam couldn't hold a candle to the exams that I had to take in college for a 3 credit course. Although covering material that is not a typical school subject, it's no harder than standard high school (non-honors physics).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2668. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 22:54:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <7d_ec.6464$zj3.1227@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90732

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
> >
> > Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
> > good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
> > requirements? Learn as they go?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
tell
> any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
> General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.

Do you really believe that bringing in a new ham at the
proposed novice level isn't worth it?

My goal or objective would be to encourage
as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
and just see how it goes from there.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2669. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:04:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C7216.3020302@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90733

>
>
>
>
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
>>physics
>>exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing
>>random
>>information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such
>>rules). Not
>>the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your
>>name you
>>graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for
>>a 3 credit
>>college class.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Not hardly. The Tech and General exams are no harder than the material that
>students are learning in junior high if they are going to even a halfway
>decent school. The Tech and General exams require nothing harder than
>adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing.
>
I was thinking of the part where you have to decide when and what to
add, multiply, etc.

> I certainly hope our junior
>high kids of average intelligence and standard class room training can
>handle these basic math functions. The Extra exam couldn't hold a candle to
>the exams that I had to take in college for a 3 credit course.
>
Most 3 credit classes are harder, but I had a few that were
"give-aways". Maybe
I should say "as hard as an easier hour test taken early in a freshman
college class".

>
>

2670. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:06:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C727C.7050202@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90734

Jason Hsu wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>Granted, a No-Code Novice (if it existed)
>
Still tougher than a CB license (if they still did those).... ;-)

2671. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:08:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <np_ec.6478$zj3.4109@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90735

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
> Jason Hsu wrote:
> > The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
> > class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
> > the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
> >
> > I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
> > felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
> >
> > The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
> > is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
> > just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
> > License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
> > island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
> > important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
> > Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
> > NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
> > Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
> > downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>
> Interesting take on the issue, Jason.
>
> My main concern is that there is a precedent in the proposed mass upgrade:
>
> If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means that
> after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come afterward.

Mike, that is absolutely false as an argument of any substance.
Government has given temporary waivers in many areas and no one
has ever been able to say that after the door closed on a particular
waiver, they should be allowed a similar waiver afterwards.

> There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements were good
> enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why should I have
> to take a harder test?"

They can argue that until hell freezes over and it won't stand up in
any court. A one time "free pass" based on a legitamate FCC goal
of license and rules simplification is ample justification.

> And although there is really no test process needed at all to get on HF
> (witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels) I believe that we should
> foster technical knowledge qualifications for the ARS.

No argument there...BUT the process still needs a solution and the
hodgepodge of 6 licenses and 6 sets of rules today just isn't needed.
That is why both ARRL and NCVEC have proposed almost identical
3 license plans with the "free" upgrades.

> > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
> > when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> > for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> > No-Code Technician.
>
> Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
> can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.

Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
bright kids can take and pass.

> > What's now the Technician exam was two separate
> > tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and
> > Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
> > exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
> > additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician
> > exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
> > new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
> > myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
> > easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam. But in spite of this, the
> > ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old
> > Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
> > is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
> > the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.
>
> 5WPM is easy for some, and not at all easy for others.

Agreed.

> > The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
> > license obsolete. In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
> > Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
> > takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.
> >
> > Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
> > the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
> > 4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?
>
> > My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
> > important than the Technician license:
> > 1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
> > that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
> > expect the FCC to approve it.
> > 2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
> > reintroduce the Novice class.
>
> That is a pretty good assessment, Jason.

I have already disagreed and said so in a different email.
I would especially doubt the ARRL expects a non-approval from
the FCC. The ARRL has a long standing positive relationship
with most, if not all, those in the FCC that will be assessing the
petitions. If there's any doubt in ARRL's mind, it is (IMHO)
likly tied to doubt that any code test will remain as opposed to
even having only a 5wpm test for Extra.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2672. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:09:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C732D.4010607@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90736

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
>
>
>>Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
>>good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
>>requirements? Learn as they go?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will tell
>any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
>General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>

I would agree, *if* you mean that you will do a class where people,
partway in your
class, get the "Novice" or whatever it's called, and then continue on to
General.
How to enforce "no drop-outs" is another question....

2673. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:10:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <%r_ec.6481$zj3.3415@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90737

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C6095.5040603@ix.netcom.com...
> > :
> >
> > If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means
> > that after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come
> > afterward. There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements
> > were good enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why
> > should I have to take a harder test?"
> >
> > And although there is really no test process needed at all to get
> > on HF (witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels)
>
> Well, they're not *legal* and should not be there.

Absolutely agree.

> And legal CB operators are not supposed to
> talk internationally.

I know there's a distance limitation...but what about a
legal CBer in the USA talking to a legal Canadian CBer
over a distance of less than the specifid threshold limit?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2674. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:14:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <407C7440.5090306@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90738

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>
>This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even
>below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class
>exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.
>
>
>
Maybe all those "ordinary" kids you see passing those tests are the
smart ones. Beavis
and Butthead probably never show up at a testing session, even if they
understood
what ham radio was about, and not confuse it with CB. And no wisecracks
that ham
radio is becoming like CB, okay?.....

>
>
>

2675. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:17:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qy_ec.6486$zj3.731@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90739

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com...
> Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
> privileges REDUCED. This opposes the sensible concept of avoiding
> automatic downgrades for any license class. The reason for stricter
> power limits is to avoid the need for RF safety questions in the new
> Novice exam.

That is contrary to what I understand from having read
the ARRL proposal.

Exactly what privileges will be reduced for current Novices?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2676. Re: The ham spirit is well dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-13 23:44:28 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <vX_ec.133435$JO3.84077@attbi_s04>
Source record: 90740

> The ham spirit has now totally
> disapeared,

Sadly you are correct in some manner ......it is there but changed to something else and I wish I had the wisdom to describe what it is now. I think that the "magic" is gone with the advent of the computer and the everyday wiz-bang of modern technology. I am not lamenting this as this is progress ......it is just the way it is. It remains to be seen if ham radio as we have known it will be a recognizable in 20 to 30 years given the changes of the last 20. Again I am not tearing my rament and covering my head with ashes. It is up to us to pass on the positive traditions of our service. The question to ask yourself is how you have been a positive for the service ......not carping about things that have gone under the bridge years ago.

Having a callsign is not
> a proof of respectability. Take care !

Does the Pope serve mass on Easter Sunday ....do bears dump in the woods etc. Unfortunately some of the biggest jerks I have known in my life have had call letters .....

God Bless ....Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2677. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 00:46:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <4t0p70p1bi808fuecn57bhnr7vceq69mi8@4ax.com>
Source record: 90741

On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 23:10:51 GMT, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:407C6095.5040603@ix.netcom.com...
>> > :
>snip

>> And legal CB operators are not supposed to
>> talk internationally.
>
>I know there's a distance limitation...but what about a
>legal CBer in the USA talking to a legal Canadian CBer
>over a distance of less than the specifid threshold limit?

I'm pretty sure that cross-border communications between Canada and
the US were illegal back in the 70s when I had a CB
license.....apparently, that restriction no longer exists.

In the US, Part 95 subpart D disallows International communications,
except between US and Canadian CB stations.

http://www.noard.com/citizensband.htm

On the Canadian side, RIC-18 mentions no specific restrictions on
International communications at all. There is a limitation on
communicating beyond the 'normal range' of the station (i.e. other
than by ground wave transmission only) which pretty much rules out
International comms except with anywhere but the US, geographically
speaking.

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/ric18.pdf/$FILE/ric18.pdf

>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>

73, Leo

2678. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:17:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <t_idnTIA4b2UDOHdRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90742

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:7d_ec.6464$zj3.1227@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
> > >
> > > Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
> > > good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
> > > requirements? Learn as they go?
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
> tell
> > any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
> > General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
>
> Do you really believe that bringing in a new ham at the
> proposed novice level isn't worth it?
>
> My goal or objective would be to encourage
> as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
> and just see how it goes from there.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

It is worthwhile to encourage them to become a ham yes and I will do so. But from the discussion of what is proposed to be on the "new novice" or communicator tests, a one evening two hour session will do to cover the material in more depth than they will need. I'm not going to set up a single session one hour class. It's too much hassle to get a room, books, etc for that. I would willingly tutor individuals at my home for that license for a few hours but will not run a class for it. I'd set up the class so the first week, we discuss that study guide which they will have been asked to read in advance. We will discuss any questions that they may have on it. The remaining class weeks would cover the material to go on to General.

I want to bring new hams into the hobby but I'm simply not going to spend my time teaching material that simple. Nothing against the people or even really against the material. I simply expect a better return on my

investment of time. I will not get that teaching material aimed at the elementary school level when I am teaching adults. To me the satisfaction comes in seeing their faces light up when we've conquered a difficult chapter.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2679. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:20:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <al0fc.1055$w74.1048@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90744

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C7216.3020302@ix.netcom.com...

> I was thinking of the part where you have to decide when and what to
> add, multiply, etc.
>
> Most 3 credit classes are harder, but I had a few that were
> "give-aways". Maybe
> I should say "as hard as an easier hour test taken early in a freshman
> college class".

Robert,

All I can add here is that any Ohm's law problems I've seen have perhaps two resistors in parallel with the combination in series with a third. That hardly compares with first year college material with a modest network of resistors (perhaps 12 or so) and a couple of different emf sources thrown in - and you solve for the current and direction in one of the resistors (first year, D.C. It gets worse, of course LOL).

Ah .... 1st year physics. Hmmm ... calculus was involved here. I don't ever recall anything of that magnatude in an amateur radio exam. I also doubt a 7 year old would likely pass such physics exams.

While I have no problem with the elimination of Morse code, nor have I a problem with an easy entry level license, I am rather perplexed with the continued insistance that the tests are too hard. I am also somewhat surprised at a free ride of either codeless techs or tech plusses being moved to general. The only techs which got the free ride were the techs from years ago who took the general theory. The only difference was the 5 words per minute vs the 13 words per minute of the general class license. When the code requirement was dropped to 5 words per minute, the old techs had already passed the entire exam for new general class licensees. Hmmmm ... come to think of it, they didn't get a 'free' ride - they passed the same elements as newly issued general class licenses.

Just my thoughts ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.656 / Virus Database: 421 - Release Date: 4/9/04

2680. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:20:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <2b6dnVxw05k_DOHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90743

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C7216.3020302@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
> >>physics
> >>exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing
> >>random
> >>information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such
> >>rules). Not
> >>the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your
> >>name you
> >>graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for
> >>a 3 credit
> >>college class.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Not hardly. The Tech and General exams are no harder than the material
that
> >students are learning in junior high if they are going to even a halfway
> >decent school. The Tech and General exams require nothing harder than
> >adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing.
> >
> I was thinking of the part where you have to decide when and what to
> add, multiply, etc.

If you read the problems in the question pool, they are no more difficult
than the word problems that students are required to learn to work in 6th
grade and down. They just substitute things like amps, watts, etc for
apples and pennies.

>
> > I certainly hope our junior
> >high kids of average intelligence and standard class room training can

> >handle these basic math functions. The Extra exam couldn't hold a candle
to
> >the exams that I had to take in college for a 3 credit course.
> >
> Most 3 credit classes are harder, but I had a few that were
> "give-aways". Maybe
> I should say "as hard as an easier hour test taken early in a freshman
> college class".
>

Possibly but that will also depend on the subject they are majoring and
minoring in.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2681. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:23:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <fPSdnTWGodzqD-HdRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90745

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:np_ec.6478$zj3.4109@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
> > Jason Hsu wrote:
> > > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
> > > when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> > > for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> > > No-Code Technician.
> >
> > Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
> > can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
>
> Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
> bright kids can take and pass.

In one of my recent classes, I had an 8 year old boy of ordinary grades and ordinary intelligence take and pass the Technician. Sorry but the test does NOT need to be easier. He made it on the second try. This is no worse than many adults.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2682. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:28:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <GbmdnVAHCLETDuHdRVn-iQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90746

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C732D.4010607@ix.netcom.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
> >
> >
> >>Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
> >>good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
> >>requirements? Learn as they go?
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>
> >
> >If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
tell
> >any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
> >General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> >
> I would agree, *if* you mean that you will do a class where people,
> partway in your
> class, get the "Novice" or whatever it's called, and then continue on to
> General.
> How to enforce "no drop-outs" is another question....
>

Sure no problem with them taking the Novice as they feel like it. It might even be beneficial as they will, as did we all, struggle a bit to get on the air. What could be more convenient than going to a class you are already enrolled in? I would stress the point that they can bring questions to class as it will benefit all the other students. As to enforcing attendance, we give our classes through the Parks and Recreation Department, etc. They charge for the use of the room. Thus the students have to pay a registration fee and that must be for the whole course that goes directly to the Parks and Recreation depart. So some will stay just because they have paid for the entire thing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2683. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:29:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3JWdncKV96VHDuHdRVn-ig@comcast.com>
Source record: 90747

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C7440.5090306@ix.netcom.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even
> > >below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class
> > >exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Maybe all those "ordinary" kids you see passing those tests are the
> > smart ones. Beavis
> > and Butthead probably never show up at a testing session, even if they
> > understood
> > what ham radio was about, and not confuse it with CB. And no wisecracks
> > that ham
> > radio is becoming like CB, okay?.....

Actually we've had "Beavis & Butthead" and some even less bright. They
still passed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2684. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:30:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <5v0fc.1057$P94.102@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90748

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:407C727C.7050202@ix.netcom.com...
> Jason Hsu wrote:
>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >Granted, a No-Code Novice (if it existed)
> >
> Still tougher than a CB license (if they still did those).... ;-)
>
And cheaper than a GMRS license ;)

Just a side note - I was shopping at Sam's club yesterday and they had some small Motorola HTs. 5 watt output with a number of channels (it advertised that some of these channels were FRS channels). I read both sides of that bubble packed pair of radios (they were packaged as pairs, plus a recharger) and nowhere could I find the mention of the necessity of a license. At 5 watts and capability of a number of other channels, the user should (but, of course, won't) obtain a GMRS license. All they know is that FRS radios are often advertised as 1 or 2 miles range - and this one is advertised as a 5 mile range. More talk power. As long as some companies make money, I guess this is a very minor point.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.656 / Virus Database: 421 - Release Date: 4/9/04

2685. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:34:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <5PKdnWJ7qpBzCeHdRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90749

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:al0fc.1055$w74.1048@news02.roc.ny...
> [snip]
> While I have no problem with the elimination of Morse code, nor have I a
> problem with an easy entry level license, I am rather perplexed with the
> continued insistance that the tests are too hard. I am also somewhat
> surprised at a free ride of either codeless techs or tech plusses being
> moved to general. The only techs which got the free ride were the techs
> from years ago who took the general theory. The only difference was the 5
> words per minute vs the 13 words per minute of the general class license.
> When the code requirement was dropped to 5 words per minute, the old techs
> had already passed the entire exam for new general class licensees. Hmmmm
> ... come to think of it, they didn't get a 'free' ride - they passed the
> same elements as newly issued general class licenses.
>
> Just my thoughts ...
>
>

And keep in mind that that upgrade isn't exactly "free". They have to take
the time and energy to find or get the necessary proof of license, find a
test session, show up at said test session, and process the paperwork.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2686. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:46:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JLOdneHwnpiSBeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90750

Robert Casey wrote:

>> I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level
>> license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an
>> extended version of the old Novice exam.
>
> The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
> physics exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing
> random information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such
> rules).
I assume you are being very facetious?

> Not
> the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your
> name you graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for
> a 3 credit college class.

Possibly - though it depends on the class! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2687. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:48:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JLOdneDwnpjNBeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90751

Robert Casey wrote:

>> :
>>
>> If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means
>> that after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come
>> afterward. There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements
>> were good enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why
>> should I have to take a harder test?"
>>
>> And although there is really no test process needed at all to get
>> on HF (witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels)
>
>
> Well, they're not *legal* and should not be there. And legal CB
> operators are not supposed to talk internationally.

Sure, but if you make it legal, is there any reason to require any test
at all?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2688. Re: The ham spirit is well dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 01:56:57 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <JT0fc.1062$Qg4.498@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90752

"Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
news:7651849f568cec5e51aa1673ebf1347f@paranoici.org...
>
> On the site swap.qth.com, some guys try
> to trade ham-radio equipments. Most of
> the ads are fake either the seller is a
> crook or the wares are still sold but
> not removed from the site.
> Sellers consider buyers like pidgeons,
> some say that their equipment is "mint"
> although in reality its in poor
> condition (even with non-working
> functions or totally dead).
> Having a callsign is not
> a proof of respectability. Take care !

The secret is in the site you visit. In one Yahoo group, there have been offers which are all legitimate (and the price is invariably very kind to the buyer). This is not unlike researching products. I spent time trying to determine if one particular product would work or not - it took some searching, but I found my answer (no, it does *not* work) on the web from the New England Medical Journal. I consider the New England Medical Journal an honest source of information (if, of course, that is the type of information I happen to be looking for).

Many sites are simply a number of sellers looking for buyers. Some are legitimate; others not. This is the same for the general population. There are athletes who are quite honest; others use steroids or corked bats. It is up to the buyer to sort out the information. Buyer beware. It has nothing to do with an amateur license, despite your anonymous troll suggesting otherwise.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.656 / Virus Database: 421 - Release Date: 4/9/04

2689. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 02:05:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JIqdnYcmpIMcAeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90753

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
>>
>>>Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
>>>good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
>>>requirements? Learn as they go?
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
>
> tell
>
>>any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
>>General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
>
>
> Do you really believe that bringing in a new ham at the
> proposed novice level isn't worth it?

If the tests are going to be geared to "an average sixth grader", and
one of the requirements is to sign a paper stating that you have read
part 97, exactly what is the class going to consist of? And since ther
is a good possibility that the General test is going to end up being at
the level of the Technician license.

I know I'm mixing proposals there, but the point is, maybe the new
novice or communicator should be easy enough that people *don't* have to
take any classes for it.

> My goal or objective would be to encourage
> as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
> and just see how it goes from there.

Sure, I will work with whatever we have. That doesn't mean that I have
to like it tho'

- Mike KB3EIA -

2690. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 02:14:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <p7KdnX4uP8McA-HdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90754

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
>
>>Jason Hsu wrote:
>>
>>>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
>>>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
>>>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>>>
>>>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
>>>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>>>
>>>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
>>>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
>>>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
>>>License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
>>>island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
>>>important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
>>>Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
>>>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
>>>Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
>>>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>>
>>Interesting take on the issue, Jason.
>>
>>My main concern is that there is a precedent in the proposed mass upgrade:
>>
>>If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means that
>>after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come afterward.
>
>
> Mike, that is absolutely false as an argument of any substance.
> Government has given temporary waivers in many areas and no one
> has ever been able to say that after the door closed on a particular
> waiver, they should be allowed a similar waiver afterwards.

Is it fair to those that come afterward?

>>There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements were good
>>enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why should I have
>>to take a harder test?"
>
>

> They can argue that until hell freezes over and it won't stand up in
> any court. A one time "free pass" based on a legitamate FCC goal
> of license and rules simplification is ample justification.

Bill, just the same as we (you) are on the verge of eliminating Element
one as the great barrier to the Amateur radio service, we can change the
entrance requirements.

And who needs to argue that in any court? We simply do it the same way
that you support upgrading Techs to Generals. The same way that we make
a new "communicator license, and have people sign affidavits that they
have read part 97

>
>>And although there is really no test process needed at all to get on HF
>>(witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels) I believe that we should
>>foster technical knowledge qualifications for the ARS.
>
>
> No argument there...BUT the process still needs a solution and the
> hodgepodge of 6 licenses and 6 sets of rules today just isn't needed.
> That is why both ARRL and NCVEC have proposed almost identical
> 3 license plans with the "free" upgrades.
>
>
>>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
>>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
>>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
>>>No-Code Technician.
>>
>>Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
>>can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
>
>
> Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
> bright kids can take and pass.

I could have passed the Technician exam in 7th grade, and there are
plenty enough people that think I'm as dumb as mud. I wasn't an
exceptional student or even close.

>
>>> What's now the Technician exam was two separate
>>>tests back then - Novice and Technician. Both the Novice and
>>>Technician licenses required passing the Novice exam plus one more
>>>exam. For the Novice license, the 5 wpm Morse Code exam was the
>>>additional exam. For the No-Code Technician license, the Technician
>>>exam was the additional exam. By at least a 20:1 or 30:1 margin, the
>>>new hams chose the No-Code Technician exam. The new hams (including
>>>myself) clearly thought that preparing the Technician exam was MUCH
>>>easier than preparing for the 5 wpm exam. But in spite of this, the
>>>ARRL thinks that the current Technician exam (a merger of the old

>>>Novice and Technician exams) is too hard but says that the 5 wpm exam
>>>is quite easy and uses this view as a partial justification as keeping
>>>the 5 wpm exam requirement for the Amateur Extra license.
>>
>>5WPM is easy for some, and not at all easy for others.
>
>
> Agreed.
>
>
>>>The record is clear. The No-Code Technician license made the Novice
>>>license obsolete. In the 2000 restructuring, the FCC closed the
>>>Novice class for the same reason GM closed Oldsmobile - not enough
>>>takers to justify the administrative costs and labor required.
>>>
>>>Given all this, is it SO necessary to bring back the Novice class at
>>>the expense of the Technician class? Why didn't the ARRL propose a
>>>4-class system so that the popular Technician class could be kept?
>>
>>>My theories on why the ARRL thinks the Novice license is more
>>>important than the Technician license:
>>>1. The ARRL directors couldn't agree, so they proposed a compromise
>>>that they felt would promote good PR. I don't think they seriously
>>>expect the FCC to approve it.
>>>2. Nostalgia about their Novice days led them to want to reopen and
>>>reintroduce the Novice class.
>>
>>That is a pretty good assessment, Jason.
>
>
> I have already disagreed and said so in a different email.
> I would especially doubt the ARRL expects a non-approval from
> the FCC. The ARRL has a long standing positive relationship
> with most, if not all, those in the FCC that will be assessing the
> petitions. If there's any doubt in ARRL's mind, it is (IMHO)
> likly tied to doubt that any code test will remain as opposed to
> even having only a 5wpm test for Extra.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

- Mike KB3EIA -

2691. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 02:20:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <p6adnaKiI5VLAuHdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90755

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:7d_ec.6464$zj3.1227@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>>Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
>>>>good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
>>>>requirements? Learn as they go?
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
>>
>>tell
>>
>>>any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way to
>>>General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
>>
>>Do you really believe that bringing in a new ham at the
>>proposed novice level isn't worth it?
>>
>>My goal or objective would be to encourage
>>as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
>>and just see how it goes from there.
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>
> It is worthwhile to encourage them to become a ham yes and I will do so.
> But from the discussion of what is proposed to be on the "new novice" or
> communicator tests, a one evening two hour session will do to cover the
> material in more depth than they will need. I'm not going to set up a
> single session one hour class. It's too much hassle to get a room, books,
> etc for that. I would willingly tutor individuals at my home for that
> license for a few hours but will not run a class for it. I'd set up the
> class so the first week, we discuss that study guide which they will have
> been asked to read in advance. We will discuss any questions that they may

> have on it. The remaining class weeks would cover the material to go on to
> General.
>
> I want to bring new hams into the hobby but I'm simply not going to spend my
> time teaching material that simple. Nothing against the people or even
> really against the material. I simply expect a better return on my
> investment of time. I will not get that teaching material aimed at the
> elementary school level when I am teaching adults. To me the satisfaction
> comes in seeing their faces light up when we've conquered a difficult
> chapter.

There you go, Dee! Not every one wants to be an elementary school teacher, and not everyone wants to teach adults very simple things. How long does it take people to learn how to sign a statement that they have read part 97? I question whether a class will be needed for the new licenses anyhow.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2692. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 02:22:10 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <mf1fc.1063$O64.250@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 90756

Len,

I doubt anyone can read 120 characters per *second*. The need for more and more speed is being pushed by the desire to send more visually 'appealing' information. What once was typed into a memo and posted on a bulletin board ("come celebrate Dave's 30 years with the company") in a couple of minutes has now evolved into a 30 minute or more procedure with the word processor and all the pretty graphics. It is then passed to the employees as a 100K file (maybe 500K if Dave's picture is included) via intranet within the company. This might be nice enough, but is unnecessary information. This gets much more interesting when someone passes along a virus alert - which gets forwarded and forwarded ... you get the idea ;) Heck, we used to get warnings over the company computer about forwarding such stuff.

Mostly, the great advances in communication have resulted in more visual information being passed. At times, porn is involved. I'm not suggesting that the higher speed is bad, it certainly isn't. I am suggesting that a lot of communication going on now might well be described as "bloatware".

Come to think of it, one is safer if you've set your reader to 'text only' for receive. I wonder why ... :)
(ps - it is also a good idea to send only plain text. If only plain text were sent, 1200 baud would be a darn good clip.)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040412184235.19617.00000179@mb-m20.aol.com...
> "1200 baud" (actually 1200 bits per second) is about equivalent to
> 1200 words per minute as by:
>
> 1200 bps = 120 characters per second at 10 bits per character in
> the ASCII 8-level character coding commonly used now.
> 120 characters per second = 7200 characters per minute.
> If one "word" consists of 5 text characters plus a space character
> (a common measure of throughput in telegraphy the century
> before the last one), then 7200 char/min = 1200 words/min.
>
> If the average "fast" radiotelegraphy rate is 20 words/minute,
> then "1200 baud" is SIX HUNDRED TIMES FASTER than
> average "CW."
>
> Given the two vastly different communication rates, which one is
> the "slow" one?
>

> LHA / WMD

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.656 / Virus Database: 421 - Release Date: 4/9/04

2693. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:16:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040413231643.12769.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90759

In article <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
>privileges REDUCED.

That's not in the RM-10867 Petition for Rule Making I downloaded.

>This opposes the sensible concept of avoiding
>automatic downgrades for any license class. The reason for stricter
>power limits is to avoid the need for RF safety questions in the new
>Novice exam.

So, why weren't all those RF safety questions in the OLD Novice
exam?

>What's wrong with testing prospective Novice licensees on RF safety?
>Are RF safety questions that hard? It seems like an extremely
>important topic to me, and learning about RF safety doesn't seem like
>an undue burden.

Go back and review the two tables in 97.13.

MOST of the ham stations won't require any "performance
evaluation" now.

>Furthermore, RF safety is just one topic on the
>written exam and doesn't have the unilateral power that the Morse Code
>exams currently have. What's wrong with making the Novice question
>pool 10%-20% larger given how critical this topic is and given the
>need to avoid downgrading privileges of current licensees?

The question POOL can be as large as the NCVEC QPC cares
to make it. There's no Commission rule on maxima, only on the
minima of 10 pool questions for each examination question.

LHA / WMD

2694. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:16:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040413231644.12769.00000265@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90760

In article <407C4FD2.3030202@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Jason Hsu wrote:
>> Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
>> privileges REDUCED. This opposes the sensible concept of avoiding
>> automatic downgrades for any license class. The reason for stricter
>> power limits is to avoid the need for RF safety questions in the new
>> Novice exam.
>>
>> What's wrong with testing prospective Novice licensees on RF safety?
>> Are RF safety questions that hard? It seems like an extremely
>> important topic to me, and learning about RF safety doesn't seem like
>> an undue burden. Furthermore, RF safety is just one topic on the
>> written exam and doesn't have the unilateral power that the Morse Code
>> exams currently have. What's wrong with making the Novice question
>> pool 10%-20% larger given how critical this topic is and given the
>> need to avoid downgrading privileges of current licensees?
>>
>> Admittedly, there are very few active Novices at any given moment, as
>> these few active ones upgrade. But the same restructuring principles
>> (like no downgrades) for the higher license classes should still
>> apply.
>
> I would hope that the people that want rf safety diminished on the
>entry level tests would step up and assume responsibility for any person
>that injures themselves even at the lower levels they want to grant
>them. "Yes Virginia, it is possible to do terrible damage to yourself
>with 100 watts!"

The "RF Safety" questions came about with the political need
to show concern for OTHERS, not the licensees themselves.

That is one thing you CAN blame on cell phones...uneducated
paranoia about radiation...all the scare books about all sorts of
radiation, even from the big MHV power lines.

> We have an accepted level of safety instruction and testing
>established. It has been around for a few years, and appears to be
>working well enough. The problem as I see it is that if we reduce this
>in any way, then we are inviting controversy if people start harming
>themselves with our dangerous if misused toys.

Folkses have been playing with lots higher-power stuff than in
bitty 1 KW hamplifiers for decades before 97.13 (c) 1 and
97.13 (c) 2 were in Part 97. [also 1.1307 (b) and 1.1310]

The +100 VDC in transformerless 5-tube AM radios is lethal
but there weren't any "rules" or even "safety statements" on
those for decades. The semiconductor era with its resulting
low supply voltages was well established before anyone made
noises about tube voltages being hazardous. Where were all
the "safety" questions in ham exams then?

You're going to have to redefine what you say about "RF
Safety" as applying to OTHERS in the immediate vicinity of
ham stations.

> In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>coffee was hot, or that a bike manufacturer did not tell the rider that
>if if becomes dark, they should turn on their headlights, people should
>be very careful about removing safety requirements.

They should be more careful about their attornies...

> This is especially important when the purported aim of the requirement
>reduction is to introduce more children into the radio environment. As a
>person that had to have multiple millions of liability insurance on
>myself in my dealings with children and their parents, I can say that
>with some authority. It's a scary path to go down.

Are hockey sticks essential to ham radio? Are those radios to be
used on ice?

> Given the way that people come into the hobby these days, when the
>potential ham does not have the experience with high voltages that many
>of us had in the past, and given our propensity to engage in litigation,
>and that some of us are trying to get children involved in the hobby, I
>support *more* safety related questions on the test, to include High
>Voltage as well as R-F issues.

That's a good thought, of course, but now you are confusing
possible litigation with operating high voltage equipment.

By the way, you are reading this just a couple feet from a 24 KV
potential if you use a CRT. Do you feel "safe?" :-)

LHA / WMD

2695. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:16:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040413231645.12769.00000266@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90757

In article <jN6dnfqkOYaX--HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:407C5DCE.7040706@ix.netcom.com...
>> [snip]
>> Whatever entry level license is proposed or is established should be
>> achievable by teenagers who are able to do fairly well in school. You
>> don't have to be a genius honor roll student to get it, but you should have
>> more smarts than Beavis and Butthead can muster....
>
>This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even
>below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class
>exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.

Yes, even SEVEN YEAR OLDS to extra. :-)

Yeah, lots of "elmering." Suuure.

LHA / WMD

2696. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:16:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040413231645.12769.00000267@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90758

In article <407C5FF4.3090408@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>I still think that the Technician license is fine as an entry-level
>>license and that the Technician exam isn't terribly hard - just an
>>extended version of the old Novice exam.
>>
>The Tech exam is what, roughly equivalent to an honors level high school
physics
>exam and history exam (I mention "history' as that requires memorizing random
>information, names and dates equivalent to frequency bands and such rules).
Not
>the inner city non-honors public schools where if you can write your name you
>graduate)... The Extra exam might be roughly equivalent to an exam for a 3
credit
>college class.

Hardly.

NONE of the US amateur license examinations are any sort
of academic achievement diplomas or certifications. The FCC
was never chartered to be any academic organization.

Of course, if you want to believe in the fantasy that an extra
doing 20+ wpm morse is an "expert radio operator" in this
new millennium, that's your thing. Would have been fine in
the 1930s. Not now.

If you want to start an "electro magnet school," fine. It worked
for Gordon West.

LHA / WMD

2697. How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:31:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90761

I've been here a few years now, and listened to a lot that has been said and done.

I've come up with some ideas about how we might attract people to the ARS. What I think will work, and what won't work.

What won't work:

Bitch, Bitch, Bitch! There are a number of hams that have an amazing, big chip on their shoulders. Everything is going to be the downfall of Amateur radio. We eliminate Element one, and pretty soon we're all worshiping Satan and registered Democrats. Yeah, that's a way to attract new people! If your that unhappy, turn your license in and then you'll finally be satisfied. But it's kind of like Abe Lincon said "people are just about as happy as they make up their minds to be". Your anger is your addiction.

If we can only make it simple enough! Want to attract kids? Make the tests so simple that anyone can pass them. Well this worked well with the Citizens band didn't it? The world is full of examples of things that have been improved by making them really easy, isn't it? Want to see a kid get rid of a video game? Give him or her one that is real easy to beat. It will be traded in in no time. A game that is just difficult enough will keep 'em busy for a long time. If there is no intellectual investment in the hobby, then there is no intellectual investment in the hobby. A challenge is not a bad thing.

The Freakin' Sky is Fallin' Man! Get the wagons in a circle, and man the phasers! Mixed metaphors on purpose. If a prospective ham looks into the hobby, and they see a multitude of ARRL and others crying wolf, they just might decide they want to spend their time on an avocation that has a future. I'm glad I didn't see the "overwhelming band threats" when I was getting started. That there are threats, inadvertent and purposeful is not the issue. The stridency and panic factor is.

I am the Great TEchNoDwEEb!!!! I remember when I was a rank General, I almost gave up on ever putting together a station because I was pretty well convinced it was impossible. After all, Those dipoles suck they don't work DX and you have to have them up a hundred feet in the air the Verticals suck because they aren't efficient and you have to be crazy to put in a ground rod because radials are the only way to go and you have to dig up your whole yard to put in radials and if you don't have at least 120 of the darn things at a quarter wavelength the antenna won't work for a darn and you have to use coax because ladderline is sensitive to moisture and you'll lose all your power in the tuner and besides it's so old school but the coax sucks because you have to make an antenna for

the specific band but traps suck because they don't use all the wire in an antennas and who the heck ever thought you could put a stinkin' hf antenna on a car and ever hope to work anyone with it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Oh..... G5RV's suck and are great too!

Now what I think will work. I have to say think, because I haven't seen much of it lately.

Show a newbie that it is fun. Let them make a DX contact with you as a control op. If they are shy to talk, maybe that keyboard and PSK31 might be a catalyst!

Hmm, PSK31? Let them see that the ARS is involved with computers. Not just logging and antenna design programs, but they can work the world with 'em! Show them the multitude of modes available, but not everything. You want them to be able to discover some stuff by themselves. Give 'em a few links to good websites that have

Show them you're proud of being an amateur. Let them get a sense of the excitement of talking around the world on a few watts, or even the joy of putting out a big signal with that linear and the glowing tubes in it.

Maybe they have a competitive streak. Let them work in a contest if you can. One of the greatest things done for me as a neophyte was for the club I belong to to let me do a lot of operating in a contest or two when I was still a technician. It took me a while to realize that the control op was a lot better than me, and I was dragging the scoring down a bit, but I was hooked, and now am reasonably proficient as well as having gone for the higher level licenses. That is one reason why I am happy to spend the daytime operating at field day as the control op for the GOTA station. I want to repay the kindness.

But most importantly, they need you to let them know how much fun it is, and to not belabor them with the complaining that we so often fall into "Those darn people that want to eliminate the Morse code test will be the downfall of Amateur radio" is not something the prospective ham wants to hear, as well as " We're going to get rid of that stupid code test, and those old fuddy duddies are just going to have to live with it" isn't going to help either.

Be enthusiastic, friendly and do good work.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2698. Re: The ham spirit is well dead

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 03:44:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <X4adnS8wOJEALuHdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90762

Jim Hampton wrote:

> "Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
> news:7651849f568cec5e51aa1673ebf1347f@paranoici.org...
>
>>On the site swap.qth.com, some guys try
>>to trade ham-radio equipments. Most of
>>the ads are fake either the seller is a
>>crook or the wares are still sold but
>>not removed from the site.
>>Sellers consider buyers like pidgeons,
>>some say that their equipment is "mint"
>>although in reality its in poor
>>condition (even with non-working
>>functions or totally dead).
>>Having a callsign is not
>>a proof of respectability. Take care !
>
>
> The secret is in the site you visit. In one Yahoo group, there have been
> offers which are all legitimate (and the price is invariably very kind to
> the buyer). This is not unlike researching products. I spent time trying
> to determine if one particular product would work or not - it took some
> searching, but I found my answer (no, it does *not* work) on the web from
> the New England Medical Journal. I consider the New England Medical Journal
> an honest source of information (if, of course, that is the type of
> information I happen to be looking for).
>
> Many sites are simply a number of sellers looking for buyers. Some are
> legitimate; others not. This is the same for the general population. There
> are athletes who are quite honest; others use steroids or corked bats. It
> is up to the buyer to sort out the information. Buyer beware. It has
> nothing to do with an amateur license, despite your anonymous troll
> suggesting otherwise.

I don't know about the "amateur radio spirit being dead" because of
poor selling practices. (see my post about "How to attract people to the
ARS - especially the "bitch Bitch Bitch" part) 8^)

There is a good cure for dishonest selling practices. Don't buy the
stuff! I either buy new, or directly from a person where I can see the
equipment, hold it in my hands, and talk to the owner. And it will
either be a good price, or I'll just go buy something new with a nice
warrantee

Lets face it, anyone that is willing to pay almost new prices for equipment that they never saw, from someone that they don't know, and with no guarantee is going to find trouble.

BTW, if enough people take my approach, we'll see that used equipment prices take a nice fast tumble!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2699. Re: CB TELNET NODES ON THE AIR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 04:05:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040414000529.27920.00000321@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 90763

In article <mf1fc.1063$O64.250@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Len,
>
>I doubt anyone can read 120 characters per *second*. The need for more and
>more speed is being pushed by the desire to send more visually 'appealing'
>information.

I was referring to PACKET type of data. Internet material goes
through faster over a POTS with "attractiveness."

Generic packet transmission goes as "packets of data" along with
sync and system-housekeeping data. That slows down the data
rate in the long run. However, even at half the maximum possible,
data can go zinging through at 60 characters per second or 600
"words" per minute. If the packet stuff was interrupted badly and
required resends such that the maximum rate was dropped to ten
percent, the throughput would be 120 "words" per minute or about
equal to slow speech rate. Packet can sustain throughput as long
as the circuit holds up.

>Mostly, the great advances in communication have resulted in more visual
>information being passed. At times, porn is involved. I'm not suggesting
>that the higher speed is bad, it certainly isn't. I am suggesting that a
>lot of communication going on now might well be described as "bloatware".

In that case, newspapers with advertisements have been
"bloatware" for centuries.

One person's "bloat" is another person's gourmet delicacy.

The longest fiber-optic communications line is one that goes from
the UK, through the Med, under-around the Indian Ocean, around
Southeast Asia, and to Japan. Two 4 Gigabit per second optical
fibers, pumped at a light wavelength for amplification. No active
devices IN the cable for repeatering.

Think about it...4,000,000,000 bits per second. And that's not the
fastest comm carrier using fiber.

>Come to think of it, one is safer if you've set your reader to 'text only'
>for receive. I wonder why ... :)
>(ps - it is also a good idea to send only plain text. If only plain text
>were sent, 1200 baud would be a darn good clip.)

This dial-up POTS (Plain Old Telephone System) I connect on indicates a normal rate prompt of 49333 bps most of the time. Downloads and uploads go at about 1/10th that rate or roughly three times faster than 1200 bps data. I'm satisfied with that.

Not bad for a POTS that's only supposed to have a 3 KHz BW and some folks still saying "it can't possibly send data that fast!!!" But, it does anyway. :-)

Back a half-century ago, I was keeping SSB transmitters going that were handling two voice channels and 12 TTY circuits, all simultaneously in a 12 KHz bandwidth...and that was already two decades old in radio communications. Back then hams were bragging up a storm about how they could go "faster" than 20 words per minute. They still do, but the data rates have gone up far more. Manual "CW" maximum rate is still the same as it was a half century ago.

If you want to call anything faster than 40 wpm as "bloatware," fine. Your choice. You might also think about why a half million Teletype terminals were made and how all those tele-printer things displaced the old landline telegraphy operators long ago with all that 60 and 100 wpm "bloatware" text copy.

LHA / WMD

2700. Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 13:45:48 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404140545.1dfc06e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90764

Until the ARRL proposal came out, I had never heard anyone propose automatic upgrades of Technician licensees to the General class. Now that this proposal has come out, many people are defending this part of the proposal.

I realize this might sound radical, but I believe that the current licensing system, for the most part, is OK. The only change that I strongly believe should be made is eliminating the 5 wpm Morse Code exam for all license classes, including Amateur Extra. Until the ARRL proposal came out, the Morse Code exam was the main controversy. The proposed automatic upgrades from Tech to General have now stolen much of the spotlight.

I oppose the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General because it's too large in magnitude. The General exam material is relevant to operating as a General licensee and goes into greater depth than the material on the Technician exam. The proposed automatic upgrade from Advanced to Amateur Extra is modest in magnitude and can be justified by the fact that most of the current Amateur Extra question pool was covered by the old Advanced question pool. But the rationale for upgrading Advanced licensees to Amateur Extra does not apply to upgrading Technicians to General. (I realize that there are a few Technicians who passed the General exam, but the current system allows them to upgrade to General simply by showing that they earned their Technician license before a certain date in 1987.)

I realize that No-Code Technicians lack HF privileges, but simply eliminating the 5 wpm exam would upgrade No-Code Techs to Tech Plus and also make it easier to upgrade to General. Why not drop the 5 wpm requirement and then expand the Tech Plus privileges on HF? This would beef up Technician privileges even more without resorting to automatic upgrades to the General class. I'm not against free upgrades, but I believe they should be of modest magnitude.

I may be wrong in saying that the Technician exam is not too difficult for new licensees. I may be wrong in saying that no new Novice class is needed. If this is the case, then why not have a 4-class system instead of a 3-class system? Just split the Technician exam into separate Novice and Technician exams (which was the case before the restructuring of 2000) and offer a No-Code Novice license. Going to a 3-class system should involve eliminating the Novice class (with free upgrades to Technician), not the Technician class. The Technician class is too important to eliminate.

Believe it or not, I have not changed my views in light of the recent restructuring proposals. I strongly believe that the Morse Code exam requirement should be eliminated for all license classes, including Amateur Extra. (No, Larry, I have not joined your side of the issue.) However, I do not think that the Technician exam is too difficult. It seems to me that nobody was complaining about the difficulty of the Technician exam until the ARRL suggested this. The people who defend the proposed free upgrades from Technician to General are providing fodder for the Pro-Code-Testing people who insist that the Anti-Code-Testing people want to get rid of the written exams. I am one of the Anti-Code-Testing people, and I think the written exams are OK.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2701. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 13:52:14 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404140552.4e197c13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90765

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040413231643.12769.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
> >privileges REDUCED.
>
> That's not in the RM-10867 Petition for Rule Making I downloaded.
>
Novices are currently allowed to transmit up to 200W on 80m, 40m, 15m,
and 10m. Under the proposal, Novices would be restricted to 100W on
80m, 40m, and 15m and 50W on 10m. Also, Novices are currently allowed
to transmit on 1270-1295 MHz but would be banned from that band in the
proposal.

Don't you think it's unfair to current Novices to cut their privileges
just so that the new Novices won't have to be tested on RF safety?

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2702. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 14:06:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5Abfc.9760$A_4.8486@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90766

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404140545.1dfc06e0@posting.google.com...

| Until the ARRL proposal came out, I had never heard anyone propose
| automatic upgrades of Technician licensees to the General class. Now
| that this proposal has come out, many people are defending this part
| of the proposal.

People support the ARRL proposal because it gives about 65% of all
existing hams a coupon for a free pass to General or Extra. That
suggests that the proposal would gain 65% support right out of the box.
Even NCI has decided to support it, but then the vast majority of NCI
members are techs who would be eligible for the freebie.

2703. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:05:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vqcfc.7001$zj3.2173@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90767

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:t_idnTlA4b2UDOHdRVn-hQ@comcast.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:7d_ec.6464$zj3.1227@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:uNudnRG1vtkq_uHd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
> > >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:407C38C0.4060600@psu.edu...
> > > >
> > > > Indeed, if we support the lowered power limits, and all, is there a
> > > > good argument for simply letting Novices on the air with no
> > > > requirements? Learn as they go?
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > > If the new "Novice" or "Communicator" proposals get instituted, I will
> > tell
> > > any beginning class that I teach that we are going to go all the way
to
> > > General. It won't be worth my time to teach otherwise.
> >
> > Do you really believe that bringing in a new ham at the
> > proposed novice level isn't worth it?
> >
> > My goal or objective would be to encourage
> > as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
> > and just see how it goes from there.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> It is worthwhile to encourage them to become a ham yes and I will do so.
> But from the discussion of what is proposed to be on the "new novice" or
> communicator tests, a one evening two hour session will do to cover the
> material in more depth than they will need. I'm not going to set up a
> single session one hour class.

That's certainly your call...but I think it is shortsighted.

> It's too much hassle to get a room, books,
> etc for that. I would willingly tutor individuals at my home for that
> license for a few hours but will not run a class for it.

Personally I'd be happy to teach a one evening class. I'd
even prefer that they get the Novice and get on the air for
a period of time before continuing on for the General... especially
if they are really newcomers to radio in general.

> I'd set up the
> class so the first week, we discuss that study guide which they will have
> been asked to read in advance. We will discuss any questions that they
may
> have on it. The remaining class weeks would cover the material to go on
to
> General.

Again, that's clearly your option to do as you want.

> I want to bring new hams into the hobby but I'm simply not going to spend
my
> time teaching material that simple.

Simple for you perhaps. When I was 13 I had literally NO knowledge
before becoming a Novice. Luckily my dad had a technical
background and had been a ham himself in the 1940s. There are,
I'm sure, many possible newcomers to ham radio whowould have
literally ZERO radio knowledge as a starting point. Frankly,
that can be a great advantage...no preconceived notion that
the individual aready knows it all.

> Nothing against the people or even
> really against the material. I simply expect a better return on my
> investment of time. I will not get that teaching material aimed at the
> elementary school level when I am teaching adults.

Why do you limit your teaching to adults...or only adults with
a pre-requisite knowledge of some radio basics?

> To me the satisfaction comes in seeing their faces
> light up when we've conquered a difficult chapter.

Why wouldn't you get the same enjoyment if the first chapter
was very basic radio concepts? For most people today, they don't
have any working knowledge of radio basics at all...especially
if they never took a high school or college physics course.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2704. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:12:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <oxcfc.7007$zj3.3414@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90768

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:JIqdnYcmpIMcAeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> If the tests are going to be geared to "an average sixth grader", and
> one of the requirements is to sign a paper stating that you have read
> part 97, exactly what is the class going to consist of? And since ther
> is a good possibility that the General test is going to end up being at
> the level of the Technician license.
>
> I know I'm mixing proposals there, but the point is, maybe the new
> novice or communicator should be easy enough that people *don't* have to
> take any classes for it.

I'm sure there will be some that won't need any class and
will study or learn independent of any formal instruction. I did
exactly that myself as a teenager for Novice & General in the 50's.
On the other hand, I'd have no problem teaching a class targeted at
whatever the Novice syllabus of test material might actually end
up being.

> > My goal or objective would be to encourage
> > as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
> > and just see how it goes from there.
>
> Sure, I will work with whatever we
> have. That doesn't mean that I have to like it tho'

If you don't like teaching or working with some folks because
their initial knowledge base of radio is nonexistent then I'd
suggets you not even try as you have to be (IMHO) a
ready and willing instructor to any student group you might
encounter.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2705. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:19:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sEcfc.7010$zj3.3932@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90769

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:5PKdnWJ7qpBzCeHdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:al0fc.1055$w74.1048@news02.roc.ny...
> > [snip]
> > While I have no problem with the elimination of Morse code, nor have I a
> > problem with an easy entry level license, I am rather perplexed with the
> > continued insistance that the tests are too hard. I am also somewhat
> > surprised at a free ride of either codeless techs or tech plusses being
> > moved to general. The only techs which got the free ride were the techs
> > from years ago who took the general theory. The only difference was the
5
> > words per minute vs the 13 words per minute of the general class
license.
> > When the code requirement was dropped to 5 words per minute, the old
techs
> > had already passed the entire exam for new general class licensees.
Hmmmm
> > ... come to think of it, they didn't get a 'free' ride - they passed the
> > same elements as newly issued general class licenses.
> >
> > Just my thoughts ...
>
> And keep in mind that that upgrade isn't exactly "free". They have to
take
> the time and energy to find or get the necessary proof of license, find a
> test session, show up at said test session, and process the paperwork.

Actually there's no need at all to do that. All the FCC needs to
do is change the rules to reflect that all Techs licenses are now
General and they will be reissued as General as they individually
expire and are renewed. The same would be true for Advanced to
Extra, and, if the NCVEC petition wins out with the new entry
license being "Communicator" then existing Novice licenses
would be equivalent to Communicator and renewed as such when
the current license expired. There is NO immediate need for any
paperwork to happen at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2706. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:23:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <flcfc.7014$zj3.3721@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90770

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:fPSdnTWGodzqD-HdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:np_ec.6478$zj3.4109@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
> > > Jason Hsu wrote:
> > > > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the
years
> > > > when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> > > > for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose
the
> > > > No-Code Technician.
> > >
> > > Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
> > > can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
> >
> > Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
> > bright kids can take and pass.
>
> In one of my recent classes, I had an 8 year old boy of ordinary grades
and
> ordinary intelligence take and pass the Technician. Sorry but the test
does
> NOT need to be easier. He made it on the second try. This is no worse
than
> many adults.

If it was that easy, why two tries before passing...and what
was his passing score when he did?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2707. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:31:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <tPcfc.7019$zj3.2907@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90771

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:p7KdnX4uP8McA-HdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
> > >
> > >>Jason Hsu wrote:
> > >>
> > >>>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
> > >>>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
> > >>>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
> > >>>
> > >>>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
> > >>>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
> > >>>
> > >>>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
> > >>>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
> > >>>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
> > >>>License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
> > >>>island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
> > >>>important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
> > >>>Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
> > >>>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
> > >>>Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
> > >>>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
> > >>
> > >>Interesting take on the issue, Jason.
> > >>
> > >>My main concern is that there is a precedent in the proposed mass
upgrade:
> > >>
> > >>If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means that
> > >>after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come afterward.
> > >
> > >
> > > Mike, that is absolutely false as an argument of any substance.
> > > Government has given temporary waivers in many areas and no one
> > > has ever been able to say that after the door closed on a particular
> > > waiver, they should be allowed a similar waiver afterwards.
> >
> > Is it fair to those that come afterward?

Life's a bitch and then we die. Was it fair when new drivers no longer
had to take a drivers test on a manual gearshift auto? In any state today
you can take the driver's test on a car with automatic transmission
and then, having passed, go drive a car with a manual gearbox.

In many states, there have been waivers of penalties for people that
come forward to pay back taxes...and then, once the waiver period
is over, if someone else comes forward with a back taxes payment they
DO pay penalties.

> >>There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements were good
> >>enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why should I have
> >>to take a harder test?"
> >
> > They can argue that until hell freezes over and it won't stand up in
> > any court. A one time "free pass" based on a legitamate FCC goal
> > of license and rules simplification is ample justification.
>
> Bill, just the same as we (you) are on the verge of eliminating Element
> one as the great barrier to the Amateur radio service, we can change the
> entrance requirements.
>
> And who needs to argue that in any court? We simply do it the same way
> that you support upgrading Techs to Generals. The same way that we make
> a new "communicator license, and have people sign affidavits that they
> have read part 97

If that's what you want, then you can file an RM asking the
FCC to consider it. Jim N2EY keeps saying the same thing
but admits it is just an argument and he'd never actually do so.

> >>And although there is really no test process needed at all to get on HF
> >>(witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels) I believe that we should
> >>foster technical knowledge qualifications for the ARS.
>
> > No argument there...BUT the process still needs a solution and the
> > hodgepodge of 6 licenses and 6 sets of rules today just isn't needed.
> > That is why both ARRL and NCVEC have proposed almost identical
> > 3 license plans with the "free" upgrades.
> >
> >>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
> >>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
> >>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
> >>>No-Code Technician.
> >>
> >>Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
> >>can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
> >
> > Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
> > bright kids can take and pass.
>
> I could have passed the Technician exam in 7th grade, and there are

> plenty enough people that think I'm as dumb as mud. I wasn't an
> exceptional student or even close.

Yet there's no doubt at all that the current Tech is more
difficult than the Novice ever was.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2708. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:40:34 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c5jm1i$25g$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 90773

"Bill Sohl" (billsohl@mindspring.com) writes:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:JIqdnYcmpIMcAeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>> If the tests are going to be geared to "an average sixth grader", and
>> one of the requirements is to sign a paper stating that you have read
>> part 97, exactly what is the class going to consist of? And since ther
>> is a good possibility that the General test is going to end up being at
>> the level of the Technician license.
>>
>> I know I'm mixing proposals there, but the point is, maybe the new
>> novice or communicator should be easy enough that people *don't* have to
>> take any classes for it.
>
> I'm sure there will be some that won't need any class and
> will study or learn independent of any formal instruction. I did
> exactly that myself as a teenager for Novice & General in the 50's.
> On the other hand, I'd have no problem teaching a class targeted at
> whatever the Novice syllabus of test material might actually end
> up being.
>
One benefit of a class of some sort is that it gets the local club
into view. ONe can make a stab at "controlling" the entry into
the hobby, which might not occur if someone reads about the hobby somewhere,
memorizes the test, and then is suddenly a ham with little connection
to it's history or any of the locals. Getting a ham license is
just a first step, and when someone is teaching a class they can
influence the newcomers in operating habits, infuse them with a sense
of the history of the hobby and even show excitement about CW. Plus,
there is (or should be) a level of interaction between the class members,
which should give them a start in the hobby.

I suspect this may be far more important than the learning that occurs
at the classes. I don't like the assumption that a class is the
only way to enter the hobby, but I like these side benefits.

When I was a kid, one had to be at least fifteen here in Canada
to get a license, so when I decided to get a ham license, it was
four years in the future. They changed the rule when I was twelve,
so I had over a year reading electronic hobby magazines and QST,
where I was learning without the goal being the getting of a license.

When the rules changed in late 1971 (well, the rule went into effect
some months later), I had to use the roundabout method of contacting
the ARRL to find a local code & theory class. And I entered that class
in February, at least half way into the course. It was the code

that I needed, and even coming in late I caught up. But it put me in contact with the local club.

That seems like a long time for a code & theory class, looking back. But of course, it was once a week for an hour or two. Obviously, while the goal was to pass the test, it was not about getting the test out of the way. A simpler test does not mean one has to merely teach the questions on the test.

Michael VE2BVW

2709. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:41:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3Zcfc.7029$zj3.5151@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90772

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404140552.4e197c13@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040413231643.12769.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > In article <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>,
> > jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
> >
> > >Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
> > >privileges REDUCED.
> >
> > That's not in the RM-10867 Petition for Rule Making I downloaded.
> >
> Novices are currently allowed to transmit up to 200W on 80m, 40m, 15m,
> and 10m. Under the proposal, Novices would be restricted to 100W on
> 80m, 40m, and 15m and 50W on 10m. Also, Novices are currently allowed
> to transmit on 1270-1295 MHz but would be banned from that band in the
> proposal.
>
> Don't you think it's unfair to current Novices to cut their privileges
> just so that the new Novices won't have to be tested on RF safety?

The number of Novices thatactually are on the air with rigs that
are over 100w but under 200 is probably miniscule. The issue,
if any, is more likly the 10m 50w limitation. I think that's
all but totally unenforceable.

The number of Novices that operate 1270-1295 MHz
is probably ZERO.

I see NO downside to the newly proposed Novice privileges,
especially since there are only about 32,000 current Novice
license holders now (less than 5% of all USA hams)
...and that number is constantly going down.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2710. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 15:51:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <J5dfc.7043$zj3.3472@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90774

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
> I've been here a few years now, and listened to a lot that has been
> said and done.
>
> I've come up with some ideas about how we might attract people to the
> ARS. What I think will work, and what won't work.
>
> What won't work:
>
> Bitch, Bitch, Bitch! There are a number of hams that have an amazing,
> big chip on their shoulders. Everything is going to be the downfall of
> Amateur radio. We eliminate Element one, and pretty soon we're all
> worshiping Satan and registered Democrats. Yeah, that's a way to attract
> new people! If your that unhappy, turn your license in and then you'll
> finally be satisfied. But it's kind of like Abe Lincon said "people are
> just about as happy as they make up their minds to be". Your anger is
> your addiction.

Well said.

> If we can only make it simple enough! Want to attract kids? Make the
> tests so simple that anyone can pass them.

Not all the tests...the ARRL and NCVEC are ONLY proposing
a new entry level. No changes are proposed for testing for General
or Extra.

> Well this worked well with
> the Citizens band didn't it?

Bad analogy...there never was any license testing at all for CB.

> The world is full of examples of things
> that have been improved by making them really easy, isn't it? Want to
> see a kid get rid of a video game? Give him or her one that is real easy
> to beat. It will be traded in in no time. A game that is just difficult
> enough will keep 'em busy for a long time. If there is no intellectual
> investment in the hobby, then there is no intellectual investment in the
> hobby. A challenge is not a bad thing.

There's no reason the intellectual investment can't be for
General and Extra. Hell, that's what many of us did when we
started with the old Novice.

> The Freakin' Sky is Fallin' Man! Get the wagons in a circle, and man
> the phasers! Mixed metaphors on purpose. If a prospective ham looks into

> the hobby, and they see a multitude of ARRL and others crying wolf, they
> just might decide they want to spend their time on an avocation that has
> a future. I'm glad I didn't see the "overwhelming band threats" when I
> was getting started. That there are threats, inadvertent and purposeful
> is not the issue. The stridency and panic factor is.

I don't see ARRRL (or NCVEC) crying wolf. I don't understand
the reference?

> I am the Great TEchNoDwEEb!!!! I remember when I was a rank General, I
> almost gave up on ever putting together a station because I was pretty
> well convinced it was impossible. After all, Those dipoles suck they
> don't work DX and you have to have them up a hundred feet in the air the
> Verticals suck because they aren't efficient and you have to be crazy to
> put in a ground rod because radials are the only way to go and you have
> to dig up your whole yard to put in radials and if you don't have at
> least 120 of the darn things at a quarter wavelength the antenna won't
> work for a darn and you have to use coax because ladderline is sensitive
> to moisture and you'll lose all your power in the tuner and besides it's
> so old school but the coax sucks because you have to make an antenna for
> the specific band but traps suck because they don't use all the wire in
> an antennas and who the heck ever thought you could put a stinkin' hf
> antenna on a car and ever hope to work anyone with
it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

How did you come up with those misconceptions :-) :-)

> Now what I think will work. I have to say think, because I haven't seen
> much of it lately.
>
> Show a newbie that it is fun. Let them make a DX contact with you as a
> control op. If they are shy to talk, maybe that keyboard and PSK31 might
> be a catalyst!

OK by me. I have had the chance to be a new hams first contact
on a couple of occasions. Such situations should always be handled
by the experienced ham as a chance to foster goodwill and a
warm welcome to the newcomer.

> Hmm, PSK31? Let them see that the ARS is involved with computers. Not
> just logging and antenna design programs, but they can work the world
> with 'em! Show them the multitude of modes available, but not
> everything. You want them to be able to discover some stuff by
> themselves. Give 'em a few links to good websites that have

Agree 100%

> Show them you're proud of being an amateur. Let them get a sense of the
> excitement of talking around the world on a few watts, or even the joy
> of putting out a big signal with that linear and the glowing tubes in it.

Agree 100%

> Maybe they have a competitive streak. Let them work in a contest if you
> can. One of the greatest things done for me as a neophyte was for the
> club I belong to to let me do a lot of operating in a contest or two
> when I was still a technician. It took me a while to realize that the
> control op was a lot better than me, and I was dragging the scoring down
> a bit, but I was hooked, and now am reasonably proficient as well as
> having gone for the higher level licenses. That is one reason why I am
> happy to spend the daytime operating at field day as the control op for
> the GOTA station. I want to repay the kindness.

Agree 100%

> But most importantly, they need you to let them know how much fun it
> is, and to not belabor them with the complaining that we so often fall
> into "Those darn people that want to eliminate the Morse code test will
> be the downfall of Amateur radio" is not something the prospective ham
> wants to hear, as well as " We're going to get rid of that stupid code
> test, and those old fuddy duddies are just going to have to live with
> it" isn't going to help either.
>
> Be enthusiastic, friendly and do good work.

Agree again 100%.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2711. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 17:23:31 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404140923.4c9ba24c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90775

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<5Abfc.9760$A_4.8486@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
> People support the ARRL proposal because it gives about 65% of all
> existing hams a coupon for a free pass to General or Extra. That
> suggests that the proposal would gain 65% support right out of the box.
> Even NCI has decided to support it, but then the vast majority of NCI
> members are techs who would be eligible for the freebie.

Where did you read that No-Code International supports the ARRL
proposal? NCI already submitted a petition, and this petition only
advocated the elimination of the Morse Code test requirement. NCI's
mission is to eliminate this requirement all around the world. It
would not be appropriate for NCI to advocate automatically upgrading
Technicians to General.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2712. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 18:23:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Ckffc.40002$467.10107842@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90776

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404140923.4c9ba24c@posting.google.com...
> It
> would not be appropriate for NCI to advocate automatically upgrading
> Technicians to General.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

It could be construed as a "natural progression." After all, when you get
right down to it, it's actually about a reduction of effort...the degree of
which is subjective.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2713. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 20:17:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407D9C48.8050304@psu.edu>
Source record: 90777

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

>>I am the Great TEchNoDwEEb!!!! I remember when I was a rank General, I
>>almost gave up on ever putting together a station because I was pretty
>>well convinced it was impossible. After all, Those dipoles suck they
>>don't work DX and you have to have them up a hundred feet in the air the
>>Verticals suck because they aren't efficient and you have to be crazy to
>>put in a ground rod because radials are the only way to go and you have
>>to dig up your whole yard to put in radials and if you don't have at
>>least 120 of the darn things at a quarter wavelength the antenna won't
>>work for a darn and you have to use coax because ladderline is sensitive
>>to moisture and you'll lose all your power in the tuner and besides it's
>>so old school but the coax sucks because you have to make an antenna for
>>the specific band but traps suck because they don't use all the wire in
>>an antennas and who the heck ever thought you could put a stinkin' hf
>>antenna on a car and ever hope to work anyone with
>
> it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> How did you come up with those misconceptions :-) :-)

HOWL!!!! Perfect comeback Bill! Thanks, I needed that this afternoon! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2714. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-14 22:40:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <C5jfc.10356$A_4.1494@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90778

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote

| Where did you read that No-Code International supports the ARRL
| proposal? NCI already submitted a petition, and this petition only
| advocated the elimination of the Morse Code test requirement. NCI's
| mission is to eliminate this requirement all around the world. It
| would not be appropriate for NCI to advocate automatically upgrading
| Technicians to General.

Here is an excerpt from a message sent to NCI members:

"Almost two months ago we asked for your input on
the major aspects of the ARRL petition (RM-10867)
for amateur license restructuring. You are one of
the 800+ members who participated in the survey.
We thank you for your valued input! The response
was overwhelming as to desiring NCI to support
all the points in the ARRL petition, except, of
course, any continued code testing."

As I read it, that means that NCI is on record as supporting...

... the ARRL proposal for a new Novice license.

... the ARRL proposal to immediately upgrade all Technicians to General

... the ARRL proposal to immediately upgrade all Advanceds to Extra

... the ARRL proposal to end code testing for General

... the ARRL proposal for re-farming of the old Novice bands.

In other words, "Let the Great Giveaway Begin".

73, de Hans, K0HB

2715. Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 00:50:54 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404141650.5a942a7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90779

It seems that ever since the ARRL made its restructuring proposal, many of my fellow Anti-Code-Testers have jumped onto the ARRL restructuring bandwagon. The NCVEC submitted a new proposal that seemed to piggyback on the ARRL's proposal instead of sticking to the old proposal. What happened? I thought that eliminating the Morse Code testing requirement was the #1 most important thing in restructuring. Would there still be an alleged need to upgrade Technicians to General if the ARRL hadn't suggested this?

Is there any reason to support this idea other than the alleged needs to
1. Reduce the number of license classes to 3
2. Introduce a new entry-level license
3. Avoid downgrading privileges

I fully agree with #3, the need to avoid downgrading privileges. #1 and #2 individually sound reasonable. But insisting on meeting all three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license and upgrade the current Novices to Technician? If a new entry-level license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes instead of 3? What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?

Can anyone provide any other reason why Technicians should be upgraded to General? I realize that there are some Technicians from before a certain date in 1987 who passed the General exam, but I the restructuring of 2000 allows them to upgrade without taking a single exam. The current General exam question pool has always been much more advanced than the Technician exam question pool and is a great deal larger. Today's No-Code Technicians haven't had to study the General exam material, which goes into substantial depth on HF issues. The General exam has always been separate from the Technician exam. While most of the current Amateur Extra question pool was covered in the old Advanced question pool, you can't argue that most of the current General question pool was covered in the Technician question pool. Upgrading Advanced licensees to Amateur Extra in the interest of merging license classes sounds reasonable due to the similarity between the two classes. But upgrading Technician licensees to General is too extreme given the wide gulf in required knowledge. (I realize that there are Technicians with more know-how than some Amateur Extras, but these Technicians should have a big advantage on the General exam.)

I've heard some defenders of this upgrade argue that No-Code Technicians should have HF privileges. But eliminating the Morse Code exam requirement would give the No-Code Technicians all Novice/Tech Plus privileges and also make it easier for them to upgrade to General. I realize that Novice/Tech Plus privileges on HF are extremely limited, but that can be resolved simply by expanding these privileges. These more modest measures would address the rationale for the automatic upgrades WITHOUT resorting to such extremes.

I advocate eliminating the Morse Code testing requirement because its unilateral authority makes no sense. But the written exams do make sense because they are relevant to operating. Not every question will be relevant to everyone, but many will be. I don't believe the General exam poses an undue burden on No-Code Technicians. The questions are all multiple-choice, the question pool is public information, and no one topic or question has the unilateral authority of the Morse Code testing requirement. The more experienced and knowledgeable Technicians won't have to expend much effort in studying in order to upgrade. The current written exams aren't perfect, but I can't think of a better system that wouldn't pose an undue burden on applicants, VEs, or the FCC.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2716. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 01:07:16 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <8flfc.1722$j12.61@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 90780

I assume that you will also suggest that low band VHF television stations *also* reduce their power to 50 watts? They do not operate at the 100 or 1000 watt level, you know - and 56 to 60 MHz is channel two television in the US. 60 to 64 is channel 3 ....

Actually, this could prove hilarious. I think there is a channel 3 in Syracuse, NY, just 60 miles away or so ...
Oh, puleeeze do us that favor ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040411111350.19693.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Subject: I have the solution to Dumbing Down
> From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
> Date: 4/10/04 11:13 PM Central Daylight Time
> Message-id: <20040411001336.10509.00000128@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
> Well I was waiting till the time was right, its not right yet, but I might as
> well tell you.
> First the solution to Dumbing Down is easy, we can thank BPL for the solution.
> I have been recording on Air QSO by Hams who have made comments in regards to
> Jamming BPL. I have also been saving messages by Hams which have stated the
> same. The recordings and messages are on CDs that I have and will continue to
> collect.
> Since the FCC and so called Ham Orgs have decided that the best thing for Ham
> Radio is Dumbing Down, and I have decided that it is not the best thing.
> Heres what Im going to do. As soon as the FCC converts Ham Radio into CBHAM
> Radio.
> I will wait for the first BPL complaint by the Utilities, at that point
> the CDs will go to the Utility that is complaining, im sure there Lawyers will
> know what to do with the info, also a copy will go to the
> FCC. This should give the FCC and the BPL Company more than enought info to put
> the blame on HAMS. At that point I will also make a suggestion on how to solve

> the BPL problem. My comment to BPL and FCC will be to reduce power level
of all
> HF Ham XMITTERS to 50 WATTS ERP or less, if 50 Watts to much then it can
always
> be adjusted down, this should reduce BPL Problems.
> What burden will that put on Hams, not much for the CW operators, now for
SSB
> CBplussers it may be a problem, but it shouldnt be, you guys are so
tallented
> you should be able to overcome that problem. Theres is more that I will
> recomend to BPL but I will save that for latter.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.657 / Virus Database: 422 - Release Date: 4/13/04

2717. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 01:35:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404141735.6ee4cbbe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90781

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404140923.4c9ba24c@posting.google.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<5Abfc.9760$A_4.8486@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > People support the ARRL proposal because it gives about 65% of all
> > existing hams a coupon for a free pass to General or Extra. That
> > suggests that the proposal would gain 65% support right out of the box.
> > Even NCI has decided to support it, but then the vast majority of NCI
> > members are techs who would be eligible for the freebie.
>
> Where did you read that No-Code International supports the ARRL
> proposal? NCI already submitted a petition, and this petition only
> advocated the elimination of the Morse Code test requirement. NCI's
> mission is to eliminate this requirement all around the world. It
> would not be appropriate for NCI to advocate automatically upgrading
> Technicians to General.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

Similarly, it is not appropriate for FISTS to comment on anything
other than Morse Code. So why do they do it? Why aren't you
addressing this injustice?

2718. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 01:45:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404141745.1b8e583f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90782

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3Zcfc.7029$zj3.5151@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0404140552.4e197c13@posting.google.com...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040413231643.12769.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>,
> > > jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
> > >
> > > >Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
> > > >privileges REDUCED.
> > >
> > > That's not in the RM-10867 Petition for Rule Making I downloaded.
> > >
> > Novices are currently allowed to transmit up to 200W on 80m, 40m, 15m,
> > and 10m. Under the proposal, Novices would be restricted to 100W on
> > 80m, 40m, and 15m and 50W on 10m. Also, Novices are currently allowed
> > to transmit on 1270-1295 MHz but would be banned from that band in the
> > proposal.
> >
> > Don't you think it's unfair to current Novices to cut their privileges
> > just so that the new Novices won't have to be tested on RF safety?
>
> The number of Novices thatactually are on the air with rigs that
> are over 100w but under 200 is probably miniscule. The issue,
> if any, is more likly the 10m 50w limitation. I think that's
> all but totally unenforceable.
>
> The number of Novices that operate 1270-1295 MHz
> is probably ZERO.
>
> I see NO downside to the newly proposed Novice privileges,
> especially since there are only about 32,000 current Novice
> license holders now (less than 5% of all USA hams)
> ...and that number is constantly going down.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Great! Just Great!

We've got Hans referring to this as the "Great Giveaway." We've got
Jason referring to it as the "Great Takeaway."

I won't be able to sleep until TAFKARJ weighs in on this matter.

2719. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 02:29:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <E5WdneWfl7oHbuDdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90783

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:JIqdnYcmpIMcAeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>>If the tests are going to be geared to "an average sixth grader", and
>>one of the requirements is to sign a paper stating that you have read
>>part 97, exactly what is the class going to consist of? And since ther
>>is a good possibility that the General test is going to end up being at
>>the level of the Technician license.
>>
>>I know I'm mixing proposals there, but the point is, maybe the new
>>novice or communicator should be easy enough that people *don't* have to
>>take any classes for it.
>
>
> I'm sure there will be some that won't need any class and
> will study or learn independent of any formal instruction. I did
> exactly that myself as a teenager for Novice & General in the 50's.
> On the other hand, I'd have no problem teaching a class targeted at
> whatever the Novice syllabus of test material might actually end
> up being.
>
>
>>>My goal or objective would be to encourage
>>>as many new people, especially kids, to get a novice license
>>>and just see how it goes from there.
>>
>>Sure, I will work with whatever we
>>have. That doesn't mean that I have to like it tho'
>
>
> If you don't like teaching or working with some folks because
> their initial knowledge base of radio is nonexistent then I'd
> suggets you not even try as you have to be (IMHO) a
> ready and willing instructor to any student group you might
> encounter.

Not necessarily Bill. I'm happy to work with rank newbies. And I do, with Field Day, and at things like Kids Day at the mall, where many if not most of the kids didn't even know amateur radio existed before seeing us.

But don't connect not wanting to "teach" extremely elementary things to people that are capable of so much more with inability or lack of desire to teach. Some people want to teach college level courses, some at high

school level, and some, such as my instructor in a wheel class I'm taking, teach autistic children to work with pottery. I'm in awe of what she does, but there is no way I would do it.

As I say, I'm happy to provide a good introduction to amateur radio (fun, not too dweeby ,or overly technical, but as interesting as I can) to people that may only be awakening to technology, but I'm not interested in teaching them where to sign on the form where they say they have read part 97.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2720. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 02:49:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <q6idnfMt7PS8ZeDdRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90784

```
Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:p7KdnX4uP8McA-HdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Jason Hsu wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>The ARRL and the new NCVEC petitions call for creating a new Novice
>>>>>class and upgrading Technicians to General. (I already commented on
>>>>>the ARRL petition to the FCC.)
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm not upset with the ARRL about this. The directors did what they
>>>>>felt they had to do. But I'm still puzzled by parts of the proposal.
>>>>>
>>>>>The highly controversial proposal of upgrading Technicians to General
>>>>>is the result of insisting that all license classes be merged into
>>>>>just 3 without downgrading privileges for any class. It's a game of
>>>>>License Class Survivor, and all classes but 3 have to be voted off the
>>>>>island. General and Amateur Extra are (correctly) considered too
>>>>>important to eliminate, and Advanced licenses get upgraded to Amateur
>>>>>Extra. So only one more license class can remain, and the ARRL and
>>>>>NCVEC think that the Novice should remain and be reopened, and the
>>>>>Technician license should be voted off the island. Because of the "no
>>>>>downgrade" condition, Technician licenses are upgraded to General.
>>>>
>>>>Interesting take on the issue, Jason.
>>>>
>>>>My main concern is that there is a precedent in the proposed mass
>
> upgrade:
>
>>>>If the existing Technicians are upgraded to General, this means that
>>>>after we do this, we are discriminating against all that come afterward.
>>>
>>>
>>>Mike, that is absolutely false as an argument of any substance.
```

>>>Government has given temporary waivers in many areas and no one
>>>has ever been able to say that after the door closed on a particular
>>>waiver, they should be allowed a similar waiver afterwards.
>>
>>Is it fair to those that come afterward?
>
>
> Life's a bitch and then we die. Was it fair when new drivers no longer
> had to take a drivers test on a manual gearshift auto? In any state today
> you can take the driver's test on a car with automatic transmission
> and then, having passed, go drive a car with a manual gearbox.

The problem I see with your analogy is that it's all one license, and
the requirement never comes back.

A closer analogy would be: At one time, a special test had to be taken
to drive a motorcycle. Then everyone would be given a motorcycle
endorsement, but after that, people would *again* have to take the
motorcycle test again to get the endorsement.

>
>>>>There will be a *powerful* argument that "The Tech elements were good
>>>>enough for the majority of hams to become General, so why should I have
>>>>to take a harder test?"
>>>
>>>They can argue that until hell freezes over and it won't stand up in
>>>any court. A one time "free pass" based on a legitamate FCC goal
>>>of license and rules simplification is ample justification.
>>
>>Bill, just the same as we (you) are on the verge of eliminating Element
>>one as the great barrier to the Amateur radio service, we can change the
>>entrance requirements.
>>
>>And who needs to argue that in any court? We simply do it the same way
>>that you support upgrading Techs to Generals. The same way that we make
>>a new "communicator license, and have people sign affidavits that they
>>have read part 97
>
>
> If that's what you want, then you can file an RM asking the
> FCC to consider it. Jim N2EY keeps saying the same thing
> but admits it is just an argument and he'd never actually do so.

Of course I don't want it, nor Jim. But that doesn't mean that there
aren't some people out there that DO want it. And they will agitiate
for it.

>>>>And although there is really no test process needed at all to get on HF
>>>>(witness CB'ers that run illegal power levels) I believe that we should
>>>>foster technical knowledge qualifications for the ARS.
>>
>>>No argument there...BUT the process still needs a solution and the

>>>hodgepodge of 6 licenses and 6 sets of rules today just isn't needed.
>>>That is why both ARRL and NCVEC have proposed almost identical
>>>3 license plans with the "free" upgrades.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the years
>>>>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were available
>>>>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose the
>>>>>No-Code Technician.
>>>>
>>>>Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
>>>>can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
>>>
>>>Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
>>>bright kids can take and pass.
>>
>>I could have passed the Technician exam in 7th grade, and there are
>>plenty enough people that think I'm as dumb as mud. I wasn't an
>>exceptional student or even close.
>
>
> Yet there's no doubt at all that the current Tech is more
> difficult than the Novice ever was.

Well, I think that is the case, but I haven't seen the Novice tests, so
I'll accept that as the case from people that have been hams for a
longer time.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2721. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 02:53:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <j4qdnVcJVZvfZODdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90785

Michael Black wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" (billsohl@mindspring.com) writes:
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:JIqdnYcmpIMcAeHd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>If the tests are going to be geared to "an average sixth grader", and
>>>one of the requirements is to sign a paper stating that you have read
>>>part 97, exactly what is the class going to consist of? And since ther
>>>is a good possibility that the General test is going to end up being at
>>>the level of the Technician license.
>>>
>>>I know I'm mixing proposals there, but the point is, maybe the new
>>>novice or communicator should be easy enough that people *don't* have to
>>>take any classes for it.
>>
>>I'm sure there will be some that won't need any class and
>>will study or learn independent of any formal instruction. I did
>>exactly that myself as a teenager for Novice & General in the 50's.
>>On the other hand, I'd have no problem teaching a class targeted at
>>whatever the Novice syllabus of test material might actually end
>>up being.
>>
>
> One benefit of a class of some sort is that it gets the local club
> into view. ONe can make a stab at "controlling" the entry into
> the hobby, which might not occur if someone reads about the hobby somewhere,
> memorizes the test, and then is suddenly a ham with little connection
> to it's history or any of the locals. Getting a ham license is
> just a first step, and when someone is teaching a class they can
> influence the newcomers in operating habits, infuse them with a sense
> of the history of the hobby and even show excitement about CW. Plus,
> there is (or should be) a level of interaction between the class members,
> which should give them a start in the hobby.
>
> I suspect this may be far more important than the learning that occurs
> at the classes. I don't like the assumption that a class is the
> only way to enter the hobby, but I like these side benefits.

That is an interesting perspective, and I don't know if it was designed
that way, but it is a good thing to expose the newbies to the club study
atmosphere. As long as it is a good club, the beginner will get good
exposure. I took my Tech license without any club input, and thank
heavens I was able to get in a good club, then worked with the guys and

gals on proper procedure. Elmering is critical IMO!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2722. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 03:37:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GKydnUqv-7T0nuPdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90786

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote
>
> | Where did you read that No-Code International supports the ARRL
> | proposal? NCI already submitted a petition, and this petition only
> | advocated the elimination of the Morse Code test requirement. NCI's
> | mission is to eliminate this requirement all around the world. It
> | would not be appropriate for NCI to advocate automatically upgrading
> | Technicians to General.
>
> Here is an excerpt from a message sent to NCI members:
>
> "Almost two months ago we asked for your input on
> the major aspects of the ARRL petition (RM-10867)
> for amateur license restructuring. You are one of
> the 800+ members who participated in the survey.
> We thank you for your valued input! The response
> was overwhelming as to desiring NCI to support
> all the points in the ARRL petition, except, of
> course, any continued code testing."
>
> As I read it, that means that NCI is on record as supporting...
>
> ... the ARRL proposal for a new Novice license.
>
> ... the ARRL proposal to immediately upgrade all Technicians to General
>
> ... the ARRL proposal to immediately upgrade all Advanceds to Extra
>
> ... the ARRL proposal to end code testing for General
>
> ... the ARRL proposal for re-farming of the old Novice bands.
>
> In other words, "Let the Great Giveaway Begin".

In other words, you can take NCI's previous positions like all they want
to do is elimninate the code test, nothing else and chuck that, eh?
Who'd a thunk it?

Aren't you a member of NCI, Hans?

Hehehehehehe.

only the code test, only the code test, only the code
test.....................

2723. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 12:26:10 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1ae8496e105d3c839898e5@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 90787

If doesn't matter who gets on HF anyone and their class or lack of a license .

BPL is going to wipe it all out in a short time and HF will be useless.

Then again BPL might be an easy hack for those so inclined.

2724. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 15:02:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vuxfc.11535$k05.5299@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90788

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

| Aren't you a member of NCI, Hans?
|
| Hehehehehehe.
|

Aren't you a member of ARRL, Mike? (Which first proposed this "Grand Giveaway")

Hehehehehehe.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2725. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 15:58:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407EB126.4050305@psu.edu>
Source record: 90789

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> |
> | Aren't you a member of NCI, Hans?
> |
> | Hehehehehehe.
> |
>
> Aren't you a member of ARRL, Mike? (Which first proposed this "Grand
> Giveaway")
>
> Hehehehehehe.

Yes, I am a member of ARRL. But last time I checked, if you don't toe
the party line in NCI, you aren't allowed in NCI.

And that my friend, is no laughing matter.

ARRL appears to tolerate disagreement.

- mike KB3EIA -

2726. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 17:03:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Hfzfc.11657$k05.11252@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90790

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

|
| But last time I checked, if you don't toe
| the party line in NCI, you aren't allowed in NCI.
|
| And that my friend, is no laughing matter.
|

Sunuvagun, you seem to be wrong again. I have VIOLENTLY disagreed with NCI on the notion of free Tech-to-General upgrades, both here in public and in private email with the directors. Since they haven't excommunicated me, I guess that the laugh is on you, my friend.

Heheheheheh! (Or is it BWAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2727. Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 18:33:21 UTC
From: bert@votenader.org
Message-ID: <4e2bfd45.dbbc2737@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.politics.socialism.democratic,alt.politics.regionalism.moravia,alt.politics.regionalism.northern-italy,alt.politics.republicans,alt.politics.white-power

Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!
By Ralph Nader

If you work for a corporation, ask your own employer to support Taxpayer Appreciation Day. (We?ve included contact information at the end of the article.)

Take Action Now! April 15 is just around the corner. Please let us know what action you?ve taken and what type of response you receive at taxday@votenader.org

I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that April 15th of each year be designated Taxpayer Appreciation Day, a day when corporations receiving taxpayer subsidies, bailouts, and other forms of corporate welfare can express their thanks to the citizens who provide them.

Though it may not be evident, quite a few industries -- and the profits they generate -- can be traced back to taxpayer-financed programs whose fruits have been given away to (mostly) larger businesses.

Taxpayer dollars have often funded discoveries made by NASA, the Department of Defense, and the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies. In many instances the rights to those discoveries were later given away to companies that brag about them as though they were the fruits of their own investments. Taxpayer dollars have played a major role in the growth of the aviation and aerospace, biotechnology, pharmaceutical, and telecommunications industries -- to name only a few.

Though corporate America insists it must file yearly income taxes just like everyone else, it is responsible for a sharply decreasing portion of federal tax dollars -- despite record profits. Despite record profits, corporate tax contributions to the federal budget have been steadily declining for fifty years and now stand at a mere 7.4% of the federal government income because of the loopholes they driven into our tax laws. The average citizen pays more than four to five times that in federal income tax revenues (with the single exception of payroll taxes).

Clearly corporations that believe they are self-reliant are often, in fact, dependent on taxpayer funds to maintain their financial viability. The least they could do is thank us. Which is why we need something like Taxpayer Appreciation Day. Consider the following:

General Electric bought RCA (which owned NBC) in the mid-1980s with funds it was able to save by using an outrageous tax loophole passed by

Congress in 1981. That loophole allowed GE to pay no federal taxes on three years of profits, totaling more than $6 billion dollars. It also gave them a $125 million refund! That gave GE the money to buy RCA. GE should arrange a media extravaganzas on NBC to say "Thank you, taxpayers.? Pharmaceutical companies constantly ballyhoo their discoveries in advertisements. What they don't tell us is that many of the important nonredundant therapeutic drugs -- including most anticancer drugs -- were developed, in whole or in part, with taxpayer money and then given to them by the NIH and the Defense Department. Bristol-Meyers Squibb, for example, controls the rights to Taxol, an anticancer drug developed all the way through human clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health with $31 million of taxpayer moneys.

Pharmaceutical companies spend billions on advertisements each year. Perhaps they should consider a big "Thank You, Taxpayers" ad campaign every April 15, if only to remind them where their drug research and development subsidies come from.

Mining companies often receive vast sweetheart deals from taxpayers. Under the 1872 Mining Act hard rock mining companies are allowed to purchase mining rights to public land for only $5 an acre, no matter how valuable the minerals on (or in) that land might be. A Canadian company recently mined $9 billion in gold on federal land in Nevada after using the Mining Act to purchase the mining rights to it for about $30,000. Mining companies owe the taxpayers their gratitude.

Television broadcasters were given free license to use public airwaves (worth around $70 billion) by a supine Congress in 1997. They too should thank us. What about all those professional sports corporations that play and profit in taxpayer-funded stadiums and arenas? The owners and players should thank the fans/taxpayers who -- in spite of their largess -- still must pay through the nose for tickets. For years McDonalds received taxpayer subsidies to promote its products overseas as part of a foreign market access program. Now McDonalds is a ubiquitous brand name worldwide, but has it ever thanked the taxpayers who underwrote its efforts? Then there are the HMOs, hospitals, and defense contractors that have had their legal fees reimbursed by the taxpayers when our government prosecutes them for fraud or cost overruns. Those companies have great public relations firms that can help them show us their gratitude. Corporate America has taken too much from us for too long. It's time it shows us a little bit of appreciation.

Corporate Contacts:

General Electric (NBC):
David Frail
Financial Communications
1--203-373-3387
david.frail@corporate.ge.com

Bristol-Meyers Squibb:
Peter R. Dolan, CEO

345 Park Avenue
New York, New York, USA 10154-0037
1-212-546-4000
peter.dolan@bms.com

Viacom (CBS, MTV, Nickelodeon, VH1, BET, Paramount Pictures, Viacom Outdoor, Infinity, UPN, Spike TV, TV Land, CMT: Country Music Television, Comedy Central, Showtime, Blockbuster, and Simon & Schuster):
Sumner M. Redstone , Chairman and CEO
1515 Broadway
New York, NY 10036
1-212-258-6000
(refused to provide email addresses)

Walt Disney Co. (ABC):
David Eisner, CEO
500 S. Buena Vista Street
Burbank, CA 91521 ABC, Inc.
1-818-460-7477
netaudr@abc.com

McDonalds USA:
Jim Cantalupo, Chairman and CEO
McDonald?s Plaza
Oak Brook, IL 60523
1-800-244-6227
Email on-line form.

Halliburton (Kellogg Brown & Root):
David J. Lesar, Chairman, President & CEO
5 Houston Center
1401 McKinney, Suite 2400
Houston, TX 77010
1-713-759-2600
communityrelations@halliburton.com

In addition to these, pursue your favorite and let us know what they say!

--
for newer and higher tasks, guided always by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, battling for the emancipation of our people for the purpose of and at the service of the world revolution. Thus we are contributing and will contribute to the tasks of the RIM, more and more willing and able to aid in every possible way our glorious common cause: the emancipation of the proletariat and communism prevailing though out the earth.

"Comrades, the Communist Party of Peru is part of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement and feels honored to be so, honored to serve in such a far-reaching and historic vanguard battle, as well as to have the comrades in arms found in our Movement's ranks; and furthermore, the Party feels fortified and augmented by the repeated expressions of support, of proletarian internationalism, which it receives from the very outstanding

fraternal communist parties and organizations, and very especially from the Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement to which we extend our revolutionary gratitude for its constant encouragement and support. All this, comrades, increases our proletarian internationalist responsibility and our unshakeable commitment to the world revolution and its concrete form today, the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement."

NION: ANSWERs Needed

Is NION's financial relationship with IFCO some innocuous charitable funding arrangement? Is it a coincidence that NION donations are funneled through an organization with links to communist and pro-Palestinian groups? Is it a coincidence that NION's donations are mailed to an organization that has links with Castro? Is it a coincidence that NION is operated by an organization with links to Communist terrorists? And do

2728. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 18:41:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407ED73F.3000001@psu.edu>
Source record: 90791

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> |
> | But last time I checked, if you don't toe
> | the party line in NCI, you aren't allowed in NCI.
> |
> | And that my friend, is no laughing matter.
> |
>
> Sunuvagun, you seem to be wrong again. I have VIOLENTLY disagreed with
> NCI on the notion of free Tech-to-General upgrades, both here in public
> and in private email with the directors. Since they haven't
> excommunicated me, I guess that the laugh is on you, my friend.
>
> Hehehehehehe! (Or is it BWAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!)

So it has ALWAYS been a policy that NCI has supported reductions in the written elements? We've been told otherwise in here and elsewhere. Or is this something new, and they are broadening their horizons?

And *you* might be skirting article 4 part 2, perhaps?

Massive credibility problem here. Laugh as necessary!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2729. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:04:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hw6i6s0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 90792

On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:

>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>coffee was hot,

Here we go again.....

MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
of use but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
mouths, the intended use.

A beautiful textbook case of negligence.

--

73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2730. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:08:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415150836.09913.00000286@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 90794

In article <5Abfc.9760$A_4.8486@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
>news:f7d9a152.0404140545.1dfc06e0@posting.google.com...
>
>| Until the ARRL proposal came out, I had never heard anyone propose
>| automatic upgrades of Technician licensees to the General class. Now
>| that this proposal has come out, many people are defending this part
>| of the proposal.
>
>People support the ARRL proposal because it gives about 65% of all
>existing hams a coupon for a free pass to General or Extra. That
>suggests that the proposal would gain 65% support right out of the box.
>Even NCI has decided to support it, but then the vast majority of NCI
>members are techs who would be eligible for the freebie.

Thank you for that fair and equitable objective viewpoint,
seasoned old sea salt.

What's the percentage of the ARRL membership that are Techs
compared to other classes? Remember that the no-code-test
Tech license is over a third of ALL amateur licensees in the US.

ARRL membership was down to 21% of all US ham licensees
in December. Down from July and that down from December a
year before.

See any connections there? :-)

LHA / WMD

2731. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:08:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415150837.09913.00000287@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 90793

In article <1e4e3692.0404141745.1b8e583f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>Great! Just Great!
>
>We've got Hans referring to this as the "Great Giveaway." We've got
>Jason referring to it as the "Great Takeaway."
>
>I won't be able to sleep until TAFKARJ weighs in on this matter.

He's probably back from the Roman Curia now and is preparing
another encyclical "Sermon On The Antenna Mount."

LHA / WMD

2732. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:08:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415150839.09913.00000288@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 90795

In article <f7d9a152.0404140552.4e197c13@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040413231643.12769.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <f7d9a152.0404131120.48088479@posting.google.com>,
>> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>>
>> >Under the ARRL's proposal, current Novices will have certain
>> >privileges REDUCED.
>>
>> That's not in the RM-10867 Petition for Rule Making I downloaded.
>>
>Novices are currently allowed to transmit up to 200W on 80m, 40m, 15m,
>and 10m. Under the proposal, Novices would be restricted to 100W on
>80m, 40m, and 15m and 50W on 10m. Also, Novices are currently allowed
>to transmit on 1270-1295 MHz but would be banned from that band in the
>proposal.

What can I say? The ARRL wants to "put Novices in their place"
and be nice subservient little serfs to the mighty morsemen of the
membership...from the impression they've always shown me.

If there's nit-picking needed (I think not) then in the final Report &
Order that MAY be issued, FCC will pick up on all the fly specks
and separate it from the pepper. IF and only IF ARRL will rule as
the "final winner" after no less than 18 petitions in one year's time.

>Don't you think it's unfair to current Novices to cut their privileges
>just so that the new Novices won't have to be tested on RF safety?

Just WHICH "RF safety" thing are you thinking of?

If it's personal "RF safety" then it is a matter of whether an
individual wants to either suicide or achieve bodily harm...about
the same as whether or not they won't have accidents climbing
a tower or tree putting up that "DX-winning super antenna."

If it's about the OTHER PEOPLE'S EXPOSURE "RF safety,"
then I think it is a lot of hooey as a result of mass paranoia of
cell phones next to the head or the ugliness of MHV power
lines spoiling orderly farm land or fear of unspecified fearsome
RADIATION boogeythings. Okay, that's the LAW [97.13 in
case you haven't looked it up yet or haven't heard of Part 1].
Maybe the LAW is a good thing, maybe it's a lot of extraneous
nonsense that doesn't need Federal Regulations (!) in a form of

Witless Protection Program.

Back in Junior High basic electricity shop class in 1947 I and all classmates learned the "left-hand rule" (for right-handers) which said "keep the left hand in the pocket if you have no choice about turning the power off and working with the right hand...that keeps a circuit from going through your heart." Since we'd all had basic biology by then, that made a lot of sense. Later at Fort Monmouth Signal School in 1952 a radar basics instructor stuck a ball of steel wool on a bamboo pole in front of a live 1 MW search radar beam. The steel wool burned. Steel wool doesn't burn by itself. Class duly impressed, lesson learned in a few seconds. Wasn't any Federal Law on RF exposure then in any radio service.

Between 1953 and 1956 I worked IN an HF RF field of about 100 to 200 KW total RF energy, lived IN that field for five months, 24/7. At least 600 others did also in that time at that same station, not to mention all the civilian farmers living IN that same field. Given same conditions at different sites around the world, tens of thousands have been exposed to high levels of RF. Nobody got cooked, fried, or rare. Was no LAW on RF exposure then or in any radio service. Was so until the 1990s and the Big Radiation Paranoia time.

If there is so much "worry" over personal safety, do you think any public safety agency of any kind can arrest and prosecute a suicide? [go ahead, make my day...] Worry instead about using your mighty amateur knowledge in TEACHING others about electrical/RF safety, common sense in live circuits, etc.

If there is so much "worry" over Other People's RF safety, then I'd suggest you or anyone else get a prescription for a tranquilizer from your personal physician. That MD can't cure legislated paranoia but it will make you feel better. It also might give you and others some tranquility to look into more meaningful radio subjects and quit trying to separate legal fly specks from paranoia pepper.

LHA / WMD

2733. Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:26:01 UTC
From: ronnie@votenader.org
Message-ID: <657465f7.56e0c92c@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90805
Cross-posted to: it.politica,talk.politics.animals,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.politics.nationalism.black,alt.languages.polari

Hey, Corporate America! Show Taxpayers Some Appreciation!
By Ralph Nader

If you work for a corporation, ask your own employer to support Taxpayer Appreciation Day. (We?ve included contact information at the end of the article.)

Take Action Now! April 15 is just around the corner. Please let us know what action you?ve taken and what type of response you receive at taxday@votenader.org

I'm going to go out on a limb here and suggest that April 15th of each year be designated Taxpayer Appreciation Day, a day when corporations receiving taxpayer subsidies, bailouts, and other forms of corporate welfare can express their thanks to the citizens who provide them.

Though it may not be evident, quite a few industries -- and the profits they generate -- can be traced back to taxpayer-financed programs whose fruits have been given away to (mostly) larger businesses.

Taxpayer dollars have often funded discoveries made by NASA, the Department of Defense, and the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies. In many instances the rights to those discoveries were later given away to companies that brag about them as though they were the fruits of their own investments. Taxpayer dollars have played a major role in the growth of the aviation and aerospace, biotechnology, pharmaceutical, and telecommunications industries -- to name only a few.

Though corporate America insists it must file yearly income taxes just like everyone else, it is responsible for a sharply decreasing portion of federal tax dollars -- despite record profits. Despite record profits, corporate tax contributions to the federal budget have been steadily declining for fifty years and now stand at a mere 7.4% of the federal government income because of the loopholes they driven into our tax laws. The average citizen pays more than four to five times that in federal income tax revenues (with the single exception of payroll taxes).

Clearly corporations that believe they are self-reliant are often, in fact, dependent on taxpayer funds to maintain their financial viability. The least they could do is thank us. Which is why we need something like Taxpayer Appreciation Day. Consider the following:

General Electric bought RCA (which owned NBC) in the mid-1980s with funds it was able to save by using an outrageous tax loophole passed by Congress in 1981. That loophole allowed GE to pay no federal taxes on

three years of profits, totaling more than $6 billion dollars. It also gave them a $125 million refund! That gave GE the money to buy RCA. GE should arrange a media extravaganzas on NBC to say "Thank you, taxpayers.? Pharmaceutical companies constantly ballyhoo their discoveries in advertisements. What they don't tell us is that many of the important nonredundant therapeutic drugs -- including most anticancer drugs -- were developed, in whole or in part, with taxpayer money and then given to them by the NIH and the Defense Department. Bristol-Meyers Squibb, for example, controls the rights to Taxol, an anticancer drug developed all the way through human clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health with $31 million of taxpayer moneys.

Pharmaceutical companies spend billions on advertisements each year. Perhaps they should consider a big "Thank You, Taxpayers" ad campaign every April 15, if only to remind them where their drug research and development subsidies come from.

Mining companies often receive vast sweetheart deals from taxpayers. Under the 1872 Mining Act hard rock mining companies are allowed to purchase mining rights to public land for only $5 an acre, no matter how valuable the minerals on (or in) that land might be. A Canadian company recently mined $9 billion in gold on federal land in Nevada after using the Mining Act to purchase the mining rights to it for about $30,000. Mining companies owe the taxpayers their gratitude.

Television broadcasters were given free license to use public airwaves (worth around $70 billion) by a supine Congress in 1997. They too should thank us. What about all those professional sports corporations that play and profit in taxpayer-funded stadiums and arenas? The owners and players should thank the fans/taxpayers who -- in spite of their largess -- still must pay through the nose for tickets. For years McDonalds received taxpayer subsidies to promote its products overseas as part of a foreign market access program. Now McDonalds is a ubiquitous brand name worldwide, but has it ever thanked the taxpayers who underwrote its efforts? Then there are the HMOs, hospitals, and defense contractors that have had their legal fees reimbursed by the taxpayers when our government prosecutes them for fraud or cost overruns. Those companies have great public relations firms that can help them show us their gratitude. Corporate America has taken too much from us for too long. It's time it shows us a little bit of appreciation.

Corporate Contacts:

General Electric (NBC):
David Frail
Financial Communications
1--203-373-3387
david.frail@corporate.ge.com

Bristol-Meyers Squibb:
Peter R. Dolan, CEO
345 Park Avenue

New York, New York, USA 10154-0037
1-212-546-4000
peter.dolan@bms.com

Viacom (CBS, MTV, Nickelodeon, VH1, BET, Paramount Pictures, Viacom Outdoor, Infinity, UPN, Spike TV, TV Land, CMT: Country Music Television, Comedy Central, Showtime, Blockbuster, and Simon & Schuster):
Sumner M. Redstone , Chairman and CEO
1515 Broadway
New York, NY 10036
1-212-258-6000
(refused to provide email addresses)

Walt Disney Co. (ABC):
David Eisner, CEO
500 S. Buena Vista Street
Burbank, CA 91521 ABC, Inc.
1-818-460-7477
netaudr@abc.com

McDonalds USA:
Jim Cantalupo, Chairman and CEO
McDonald?s Plaza
Oak Brook, IL 60523
1-800-244-6227
Email on-line form.

Halliburton (Kellogg Brown & Root):
David J. Lesar, Chairman, President & CEO
5 Houston Center
1401 McKinney, Suite 2400
Houston, TX 77010
1-713-759-2600
communityrelations@halliburton.com

In addition to these, pursue your favorite and let us know what they say!

--
to address their
October 6, 2002 rally in Central Park. Stewart was indicted for passing
messages on behalf of her terrorist client Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman.

One of the members of NION's Advisory Board, Abdeen Jabara, is a member of the legal advisory board for the American Muslim Council. He is a past president of the Arab-American Ant-Discrimination Committee, a board member of William Kunstler's Center for Constitutional Rights, and a co-counsel with Lynne Stewart for Sheik Rahman, the terrorist convicted for the 1993 World Trade Center bombing.

The American Muslim Council is one of the current members of Al-Arian's NCPPF (the same group to which IFCO's Bernstein belongs). Leaders of the AMC have been quoted as praising Hamas and Hezbollah. Jabara's AMC advisory board colleagues include Fakhri Al-Barzinji. Al-Barzinji is involved in

Mar-Jac Poultry, which was raided last year by the FBI for links to Sami Al-Arian.

Bashir Ahmad is another of Jabara's AMC advisory board colleagues. Ahmad is a member of the SAMAD Group (a financial operation) and Justice Taqi Usmani works for the SAMAD Group. Taqi Usmani is a suspected major player in the Mu

2734. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:30:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415153033.15383.00000452@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90796

>Subject: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/13/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
>
> I've been here a few years now, and listened to a lot that has been
>said and done.
>
> I've come up with some ideas about how we might attract people to the
>ARS. What I think will work, and what won't work.
>
>What won't work:
>
> B****, B####, B@@@@! There are a number of hams that have an amazing,
>big chip on their shoulders. Everything is going to be the downfall of
>Amateur radio. We eliminate Element one, and pretty soon we're all
>worshiping Satan and registered Democrats. Yeah, that's a way to attract
>new people! If your that unhappy, turn your license in and then you'll
>finally be satisfied. But it's kind of like Abe Lincon said "people are
>just about as happy as they make up their minds to be". Your anger is
>your addiction.

Whew! I can put my hands on some Zoloft if ya want it, Mike! =)

(Just kidding...!)

Personally, I don't care how hard we "recruit", I think Amateur Radio has always attracted a certain few types of personalities and always will...Just like some people like hang gliding, snow skiing, Scrabble, etc etc etc.

There will be the occassional "straggler" that picks up along the way, but consider how many different "incentives" to become Amateurs there have been yet the growth rate, other than in radio's early years, has rarely reached two digits.

I honestly believe that if we put a cupon in Popular Science offering an all-privileges license for $20.00 plus the cupon, we'd STILL not see any "marked" growth. Yes...there'd be an initial spurt...Just like all the other "incentives" over the last 80 years, but that would be it.

I think the only way to get an idea of what would get more folks into Amateur Radio would be to do a "survey" in PopSci, Popular Mechanics, Popular Communications, etc, and get a feel for what the REAL "John Q" thinks.

I think the ARRL's "Novice" idea is wasted time. QST itself has numerous stories of Grade School and Junior High students who routinely pass all three

levels of licensure, so all they are doing is adding to the administrative quagmire. Furthermore, if they'd take the hint from other Administrations and just get past the code issue, there'd be no need for it (Novice).

73

Steve, K4YZ

2735. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:33:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415153315.15383.00000453@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90797

>Subject: Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 4/13/2004 10:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040413231645.12769.00000266@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>In article <jN6dnfqkOYaX--HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
><deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>>news:407C5DCE.7040706@ix.netcom.com...
>>> [snip]
>>> Whatever entry level license is proposed or is established should be
>>> achievable by teenagers who are able to do fairly well in school. You
>>> don't have to be a genius honor roll student to get it, but you should
>have
>>> more smarts than Beavis and Butthead can muster....
>>
>>This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even
>>below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class
>>exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.
>
> Yes, even SEVEN YEAR OLDS to extra. :-)
>
> Yeah, lots of "elmering." Suuure.

Lennie, how many new radio "enthusiasts" have YOU "elmered" into the
hobby? Of ANY age...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2736. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 19:54:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GLBfc.11812$k05.7935@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90798

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

|
| Massive credibility problem here. Laugh as necessary!
|

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!! SNICKER!!!!! CHORTLE!!!!!!!!
HEHEHEHEHEHEHEH!!!!!

2737. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 20:23:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9bCfc.11824$k05.2849@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90799

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
|
| Thank you for that fair and equitable objective viewpoint,
| seasoned old sea salt.
|

My viewpoint makes no effort to be "fair and equitable" whatever the phuck that is. My viewpoints are reasoned, honest, and forthright. If you can't tolerate honesty, then get out of the kitchen.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2738. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 20:51:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040415165155.15297.00000366@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90800

>Subject: Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from
>Tech to Gener
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/15/2004 3:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9bCfc.11824$k05.2849@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>|
>| Thank you for that fair and equitable objective viewpoint,
>| seasoned old sea salt.
>|
>
>My viewpoint makes no effort to be "fair and equitable" whatever the
>phuck that is. My viewpoints are reasoned, honest, and forthright. If
>you can't tolerate honesty, then get out of the kitchen.

I'd certainly call them "forthright" and since they are usually
well-stated I'd call them "honest". "Reasoned" in this forum is more
subjective than objective in this forum (my own certainly included)

What I'd like to know is why is it that many, if not most, of the
allegedly post-secondary educated persons find it necessary to use the
profanity to try and effectively express themselves...?!?! Especially those
who go out of thier way to make everyone else aware of just how well educated
they alledgedly are...And DOUBLY especially those who find it "appropriate" to
comment on the "conduct" of others in this forum...?!?!?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2739. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 21:47:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040415174744.03825.00000285@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90802

In article <0Vzbc.8814$NL4.7612@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>I also agree with Carl's concerns and would "HOPE" that enough
>of us can just ignore the obvious dumb, stupid bickering about
>individuals and personalities and just try to stay on topic.
>
>Cheers to all who use common sense, logic and a few
>ounces of forthought before posting :-)
>
>Bill K2UNK

Thanks, Bill!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2740. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 21:47:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040415174745.03825.00000286@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90801

In article <wJacnUKC5tuchfPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I hereby propose that we rename RRAP to "rec.Steve, Len, and a few others
>rag on each other endlessly.alt"
>and create a new newsgroup for those of us who really would like to discuss
>amateur radio regulatory and policy
>issues ...
>
>I'm getting REALLY tired of all of this endless, childish bickering that is
>OT and doesn't belong here ...
>most days, it's hard to find the stuff that this newsgroup is supposed to
>be for because of the volume
>of petty, personal bickering that you guys load the newsgroup up with ...

Carl:

I don't know about you, but I certainly don't waste much time reading the
Steve/Lennie sandbox fight! That's strictly between them! I search the
newsgroup using certain keywords, and usually find the postings I'm
interested in reading. I occasionally amuse myself by tossing a few
word grenades toward Lennie and a few select others, but I don't maintain
a long, drawn-out pitched battle with them.

I guess you could say that this newsgroup is what you make of it, and
lately, I don't make very much of it at all.

73 de Larry, K3LT

>
>Or, alternatively, you guys can go rag on each other in
>rec.radio.amateur.misc like it used to be (and why
>this group was created in the first place if memory serves me correctly - to
>provide a place for the serious
>regulatory/policy discussion after rec.radio.amateur.misc turned into the
>sort of argue_about_off_topic_things
>fest that you guys have going on here ...
>
>OK, there ... I've said my peace and now you can tell me to [expletive
>deleted for Jim's benefit] off ...
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

2741. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 21:47:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040415174746.03825.00000287@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 90803

In article <406F48F8.8080501@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>So what should a candidate know to get a beginner, and upper level license?
>
>As we are allowed to modify and homebrew equipment, we should have on
>the tests questions on how such equipment works, and how to identify problem
>areas like RFI, TVI, harmonic emissions and such.
>
>Also RF safety issues, as we are allowed kilowatt levels of power.
>
>electrical safety techniques, as much equipment use hazardous voltages
>(also we should know not to wear wedding rings and such near car
>batteries, a short thru a ring can burn a finger off).
>
>Rules and regs. Like no business traffic. What constitutes malicious
>interference and what is just normal life on the HF bands when conditions
>are crowded.
>
>Some knowledge of modes and bandwidth, especially why you don't
>want to set your rig on 14.349 in USB mode.
>
>Basically, we should know how not to trash the RF spectrum and
>screw up other users.
>
>What else should be here?
>

We should know how to utilize a highly practical, effective, efficient, and
universal non-voice means of communication which doesn't require any
computerized hardware to encode/decode the messages, and makes the
best possible use of the least possible power. This mode is, of course,
Morse/CW. It should be learned at progressive levels of 5, 13, and 20 WPM
for an entry level, intermediate, and full-privilege licenses, respectively.

Those who disagree are dumbed-down whiners whose opinions are invalid.

Anyone who receives a license without having passed the 3-level Morse code
proficiency learning requirement is incapable of providing a true emergency
backup communications service to the public, and therefore is not of any
value to the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2742. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 23:16:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404151516.cf712a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90806

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Hfzfc.11657$k05.11252@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> |
> | But last time I checked, if you don't toe
> | the party line in NCI, you aren't allowed in NCI.
> |
> | And that my friend, is no laughing matter.
> |
>
> Sunuvagun, you seem to be wrong again. I have VIOLENTLY disagreed with
> NCI on the notion of free Tech-to-General upgrades,

Please follow the teachings of Ghandi, non-violence.

2743. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-15 23:52:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PomdnUWn-OKwveLdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90807

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>>coffee was hot,
>
>
> Here we go again.....
>
> MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
> the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
> of use but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
> negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
> cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
> mouths, the intended use.
>
> A beautiful textbook case of negligence.

How hot is Excessively hot? Sounds almost like the law passage attempt a few years back to force homeowners to limit the hot water to a pretty low value - I don't recall, but it was like 110-120 degrees. This was to protect children IIRC. Of course the lowered temperatures make a great breeding ground for Legionellosis.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2744. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 00:05:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mdSdnQTf9l2wvuLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90808

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 4/13/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
>>
>> I've been here a few years now, and listened to a lot that has been
>>said and done.
>>
>> I've come up with some ideas about how we might attract people to the
>>ARS. What I think will work, and what won't work.
>>
>>What won't work:
>>
>> B****, B####, B@@@@! There are a number of hams that have an amazing,
>>big chip on their shoulders. Everything is going to be the downfall of
>>Amateur radio. We eliminate Element one, and pretty soon we're all
>>worshiping Satan and registered Democrats. Yeah, that's a way to attract
>>new people! If your that unhappy, turn your license in and then you'll
>>finally be satisfied. But it's kind of like Abe Lincon said "people are
>>just about as happy as they make up their minds to be". Your anger is
>>your addiction.
>
>
> Whew! I can put my hands on some Zoloft if ya want it, Mike! =)
>
> (Just kidding...!)

Wayaaayyy too much coffee that day! 8^)

But I did have fun typing it!!

> Personally, I don't care how hard we "recruit", I think Amateur Radio has
> always attracted a certain few types of personalities and always will...Just
> like some people like hang gliding, snow skiing, Scrabble, etc etc etc.
>
> There will be the occassional "straggler" that picks up along the way, but
> consider how many different "incentives" to become Amateurs there have been yet
> the growth rate, other than in radio's early years, has rarely reached two
> digits.

Another hobby of mine, Amateur Astronomy, is the same way. There are
people complaining that AA's are too old, that we need to get more
children interested in the hobby (disregarding the expense of a good
telescope that older folks have the discretionary funds for, and not too

many 8 year olds will be allowed out at night when the observing happens
to be good!)

> I honestly believe that if we put a cupon in Popular Science offering an
> all-privileges license for $20.00 plus the cupon, we'd STILL not see any
> "marked" growth. Yes...there'd be an initial spurt...Just like all the other
> "incentives" over the last 80 years, but that would be it.

Way to go Steve! you just messed up the end-game strategy for the NCTA's!

> I think the only way to get an idea of what would get more folks into
> Amateur Radio would be to do a "survey" in PopSci, Popular Mechanics, Popular
> Communications, etc, and get a feel for what the REAL "John Q" thinks.

> I think the ARRL's "Novice" idea is wasted time. QST itself has numerous
> stories of Grade School and Junior High students who routinely pass all three
> levels of licensure, so all they are doing is adding to the administrative
> quagmire. Furthermore, if they'd take the hint from other Administrations and
> just get past the code issue, there'd be no need for it (Novice).

I know. I could have passed the present test at a pretty young age, and
I'm nowhere near exceptional.

Perhaps they are trying to appeal to people that aren't interested?......

- Mike KB3EIA -

2745. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 00:12:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mdSdnQff9I1NueLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90809

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
> |
> | Massive credibility problem here. Laugh as necessary!
> |
>
> BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH!!!!! SNICKER!!!!! CHORTLE!!!!!!!!
> HEHEHEHEHEHEHEH!!!!!

See, now don't you feel better?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2746. Re: The solution to Dumbing Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 00:47:41 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <M2Gfc.46468$xn4.218368@attbi_s51>
Source record: 90810

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040411111350.19693.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> ...
> FCC will be to reduce power level of all
> HF Ham XMITTERS to 50 WATTS ERP or less, if 50 Watts to much then it can
always
> be adjusted down, this should reduce BPL Problems.

Darn, I thought it would go the other way. The FCC would require all amateur stations to run a KW minimum so that no one could complain about interference from BPL due to weak ham signals. That would seem to be the only right solution.

AK

2747. Bequeath your callsign in your will (and other stuff)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 01:38:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yOGfc.12096$k05.228@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90811

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC04-79A1.doc

2748. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 11:37:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040416073730.17648.00000390@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 90812

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/15/2004 7:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <mdSdnQTf9I2wvuLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>

> Perhaps they are trying to appeal to people that aren't
interested?......

BINGO!

Here's a bit of interesting trivia...

Have you ever taken the time to stroll through "QRZ's" bios? If you do,
I think you'll notice that certain "hobbies" and career paths keep turning up.

A very large number make reference to flying, some type of active outdoor
sports (usually camping or hiking), participatioon as volunteer FD or EMS, or
active or retired career in the Armed Forces.

THERE'S where we need to be "recruiting"...In "FLYING" , "Emergency
Medical Services", the various military papers (NAVY Times, ARMY Times, AF
Times), "Field and Stream", etc. Throw the occassional ad into "Boy's Life",
and the science related magazines I noted earlier and a few (such as your
Astronomy field) that I am sure others can come up with.

Hmmmmm???

Steve, K4YZ

2749. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 15:17:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407FF91C.7030607@psu.edu>
Source record: 90813

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> What I'd like to know is why is it that many, if not most, of the
> allegedly post-secondary educated persons find it necessary to use the
> profanity to try and effectively express themselves...?!?! Especially those
> who go out of thier way to make everyone else aware of just how well educated
> they alledgedly are...And DOUBLY especially those who find it "appropriate" to
> comment on the "conduct" of others in this forum...?!?!?

Seems to be roughly related to the strength of the argument in an
inverse fashion.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2750. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 15:43:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <407FFF0C.3020504@psu.edu>
Source record: 90814

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 4/15/2004 7:05 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <mdSdnQTf9I2wvuLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
>
>
>> Perhaps they are trying to appeal to people that aren't
>
> interested?......
>
> BINGO!
>
> Here's a bit of interesting trivia...
>
> Have you ever taken the time to stroll through "QRZ's" bios? If you do,
> I think you'll notice that certain "hobbies" and career paths keep turning up.
>
> A very large number make reference to flying, some type of active outdoor
> sports (usually camping or hiking), participatioon as volunteer FD or EMS, or
> active or retired career in the Armed Forces.
>
> THERE'S where we need to be "recruiting"...In "FLYING" , "Emergency
> Medical Services", the various military papers (NAVY Times, ARMY Times, AF
> Times), "Field and Stream", etc. Throw the occassional ad into "Boy's Life",
> and the science related magazines I noted earlier and a few (such as your
> Astronomy field) that I am sure others can come up with.

Absolutely. We need to have a target audience. Right now, it seems like
there is a scattershot approach.

Its nice that there are some pretty ladies that are hams, and it's nice
that there are a few celebrities that are hams, but by and large, we are
the techie's.

I doubt L'il Kim or Brittany Spears or Justin Timberlake will ever be
hams, or (name your popular type person) will ever even think about it.

Well, that's just fine. Ham radio wasn't, isn't, and never will be
Kewl. And that's kewl by me. If those type people were involved in it, I
probably wouldn't be.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2751. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 15:57:44 UTC
From: dougmc@frenzy.com
Message-ID: <YnTfc.12435$Wf5.3898@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 90815

In article <Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>,
Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

| The world is full of examples of things that have been improved by
| making them really easy, isn't it? Want to see a kid get rid of a
| video game? Give him or her one that is real easy to beat. It will
| be traded in in no time. A game that is just difficult enough will
| keep 'em busy for a long time. If there is no intellectual
| investment in the hobby, then there is no intellectual investment in
| the hobby. A challenge is not a bad thing.

Bad analogy, a game vs. ham radio.

The FCC tests are a tiny fraction of what there is to learn out there.
The FCC could replace all the tests with a `check here to get your
license' form, and ham radio wouldn't be any easier, harder or less or
more interesting.

You make it sound like ham radio is all about the FCC test, and if
that's easy, ham radio is suddenly easy. Well, I disagree. The tests
are already easy -- it's all the other stuff to learn, the *useful*
stuff, that's interesting and challenging.

Really, all the tests do is keep the riff-raff out. (Which seems
very important to many people.) And I guess as far as <30 mHz goes,
I'm riff-raff. For now. :)

| Show a newbie that it is fun. Let them make a DX contact with you as a
| control op. If they are shy to talk, maybe that keyboard and PSK31 might
| be a catalyst!

I actually was able to decode several PSK31 discussions last night on
14.073. I was very pleased. I was beginning to think that the dipole
I set up in my garage was somehow wrong. :)

I've passed elements 2, 3 and 4 and am working on 1, but I'm still a
rank amateur and I know it. Still, I'm really bummed that I can't
transmit on anything under 50 mhz until I pass the CW test, even
though I'm not really that interested in doing CW.

(And passing element 1 isn't going to magically make me stop being a
rank amateur. But at least then I'll be able to transmit `down
there'.)

--
Doug McLaren, dougmc@frenzy.com, KD5YRD
01234567 <- The amazing* indent-o-meter!

```
^ (*: Indent-o-meter may not actually amaze.)
```

2752. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 16:29:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0404160829.4828aeb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90816

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mdSdnQTf9I2wvuLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> > I honestly believe that if we put a cupon in Popular Science offering an
> > all-privileges license for $20.00 plus the cupon, we'd STILL not see any
> > "marked" growth. Yes...there'd be an initial spurt...Just like all the other
> > "incentives" over the last 80 years, but that would be it.
>
> Way to go Steve! you just messed up the end-game strategy for the NCTA's!

Actually, I am willing to bet they'd either whine about the
$20.00, demanding that it be halved, or they'd complain about how
cutting out the cupon aggrivated thier carpal tunnel, and they'd
subsequently sue under the American's with Disabilities Act to have
the cupon requirement waived.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2753. New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 16:33:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2VTfc.8603$l75.4289@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90817

Amateur Radio NPRM issued by FCC

Word document version....see:

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-79A1.doc

100 pages.

Note: This is not related to any of the more recent (i.e.
post WRC-2003, July 03) RMs.

The document is also available in Text (.txt) and Adobe (.pdf)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2754. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 16:49:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <n8Ufc.8611$l75.3130@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90818

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hw6i6s0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
> >coffee was hot,
>
> Here we go again.....

Right you are, see below:

> MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
> the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
> of use

That is based on opinion ONLY. True it apparently found
support in a jury of 12, but that doesn't make it right. Many
people want "steaming hot" food...including coffee. The fact
that the old lady was so stupid as to put the cup in her croch
tells me a lot about how dumb she was.

Let's change the brew from coffee to tea. Anyone with an
ounce of brains or experience knows tea is made with boiling
water poured into a cup with a teabag. NOTE - boiling water
is the norm. Had Miss Idiot had tea in the cup instead of
coffee would she not have sued? I suspect we know the
answer to that since personal responsibility seems to be
abondoned today.

> ...but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
> negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
> cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
> mouths, the intended use.

So I ask...is it OK for a cup of tea to be served to a customer
at 212 degrees...boiling water? If you were at a friend's home and that
friend made you a cup of tea which you then spilled on yourself,
would you sue your friend because the water was poured
from a pot that had just been boiling?

> A beautiful textbook case of negligence.

In your opinion anyway. More a case of screw the corporation
and make a few bucks when the case should have been dismissed.
If the logic is that it was too hot, then what should the temperature
threshold be for any food (i.e. tea, coffee, french fries, etc.)?
Correct me if I'm wrong, but I notice there's no temperature
threshold so designated by any governmental entity I know of.

Sorry Phil, the public opinion is not a slam dunk in support of
your legal viewpoint on this.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2755. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 16:56:03 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404160856.3eafe3d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90819

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0404141735.6ee4cbbe@posting.google.com>...
>
> Similarly, it is not appropriate for FISTS to comment on anything
> other than Morse Code. So why do they do it? Why aren't you
> addressing this injustice?

I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code testing.
The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse Code,
not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should have
either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse Code
requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of themselves instead
of on behalf of FISTS.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2756. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 16:57:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IfUfc.8612$I75.2923@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90820

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:PomdnUWn-OKwveLdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com...
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
> > On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
> >>coffee was hot,
> >
> > Here we go again.....
> > MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
> > the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
> > of use but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
> > negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
> > cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
> > mouths, the intended use.
> >
> > A beautiful textbook case of negligence.
>
> How hot is Excessively hot? Sounds almost like the law passage attempt
> a few years back to force homeowners to limit the hot water to a pretty
> low value - I don't recall, but it was like 110-120 degrees. This was to
> protect children IIRC. Of course the lowered temperatures make a great
> breeding ground for Legionellosis.
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Good point Mike. In many houses (mine for example) there is NO
way to separately regulate the domestic hot water temperature from
the heating system's temperature because the heater is a dual funtion
unit whereby the domestic hot water is a coil inside the heating system
hot water unit... and in today's hot water heating units (mine is only
three years old), the water temp setting cuts off at the high end at
around 180 degrees F.

Frankly it really gets my goat about how everyone else has to have
their lives dictated by the blatent stupidity of a few.

Soapbox off :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2757. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:01:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404160901.4bde45fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90821

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040416073730.17648.00000390@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
> >From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >Date: 4/15/2004 7:05 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <mdSdnQTf9I2wvuLdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
>
> > Perhaps they are trying to appeal to people that aren't
> interested?......
>
> BINGO!
>
> Here's a bit of interesting trivia...
>
> Have you ever taken the time to stroll through "QRZ's" bios? If you do,
> I think you'll notice that certain "hobbies" and career paths keep turning up.
>
> A very large number make reference to flying, some type of active outdoor
> sports (usually camping or hiking), participatioon as volunteer FD or EMS, or
> active or retired career in the Armed Forces.
>
> THERE'S where we need to be "recruiting"...In "FLYING" , "Emergency
> Medical Services", the various military papers (NAVY Times, ARMY Times, AF
> Times), "Field and Stream", etc. Throw the occassional ad into "Boy's Life",
> and the science related magazines I noted earlier and a few (such as your
> Astronomy field) that I am sure others can come up with.
>
> Hmmmmm???
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, good point. Flying, RC model airplane, model rocketry, GPS,
any type of military or public service (LE, fire, EMS), but also
electronics hobbyists and careerists.

Not your usual skateboarders and glue sniffers.

bb

2758. Re: What should a license test for ham radio demand knowledge of anyway?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:08:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404160908.4baebc79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90822

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20040415174746.03825.00000287@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> We should know how to utilize a highly practical, effective, efficient, and
> universal non-voice means of communication which doesn't require any
> computerized hardware to encode/decode the messages, and makes the
> best possible use of the least possible power. This mode is, of course,
> Morse/CW. It should be learned at progressive levels of 5, 13, and 20 WPM
> for an entry level, intermediate, and full-privilege licenses, respectively.

You can plug a keyboard directly into a Patcomm HF transceiver. Cool

And Kenwood makes a vhf/uhf dual bander that lets you send text w/o a
'puter.

> Those who disagree are dumbed-down whiners whose opinions are invalid.

Not necessarily. No more dumb than some code elitists.

> Anyone who receives a license without having passed the 3-level Morse code
> proficiency learning requirement is incapable of providing a true emergency
> backup communications service to the public, and therefore is not of any
> value to the ARS.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

If that's true, then it's time to fire 99.999% of the 911 operators.
But yet, they manage to provide emergency communications daily w/o any
knowledge of Morse or Farnsworth code whatsoever.

So its probably not true.

Nice troll, Larry tRoll.

bb

2759. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:10:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8sUfc.12945$k05.6691@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90823

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

|
| I doubt L'il Kim or Brittany Spears or Justin Timberlake will ever be
| hams, or (name your popular type person) will ever even think about
it.
|
| Well, that's just fine. Ham radio wasn't, isn't, and never will be
| Kewl. And that's kewl by me. If those type people were involved in it,
I
| probably wouldn't be.
|

Why wouldn't you be? I don't personally know the three young people you mention and I'll concede that I haven't paid a great deal of attention to them, but my impression is that they are bright, intelligent, successful, "with it" sorts who have influence among a wide segment of the population, particularly young people. Seems that the involvement of "those type people" could be one way (obviously not the only way) to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service.

Personally I find myself in direct disagreement with "wasn't, isn't, and never will be Kewl". (Thanks to WB8IMY for some of his thoughts) In case you didn't know, belief in magic is a necessary requirement for all Amateur Radio operators. Of course, you won't see a question concerning magic or metaphysics on the test you take to obtain your license, but in your heart you will come to believe in that powerful, intangible force.

All of us in the hobby have felt its influence at one time or another. Some night when the band is dead as a doornail you'll be tuning aimlessly, not expecting to hear a single signal because NOTHING could be coming through at that hour. But then, rising out of the noise like a ghost, there will be a faint call from another stalwart explorer thousands of miles distant. You pounce, establish contact and both of you marvel at the fact that the conversation is taking place at all. A few minutes later, however, the signal vanishes as quickly as it came. Your rational mind will shrug it off as a quirk of propagation, but that little tingle in your gut will tell you otherwise.

Hey, that's Kewl!

If you could travel back in time 1000 years to 1004 AD, you'd probably be burned at the nearest stake for even suggesting that two human beings could communicate with each other over great distances without a physical connection. No doubt they would accuse you of dabbling in magic -- and they'd be right!

As Amateur Radio operators, we work feats of magic every day. Many of us have become jaded about our powers and we tend to dismiss them as commonplace. We hardly think twice when we use our equipment to sommon the elemental forces of the universe. But every so often we need to pause and remind ourselves of what we are really doing. We need to remember the essence of what drew us to our unusual avocation in the first place: the wonderful magic of wireless communications.

Hey, that's Kewl!

Those of us who play at RadioSport contesting regularly employ our station engineering and operating skills in weekend-long games of world-wide electronic splatball with tens of thousands of other participants aged from pre-teen to near 100.

Hey, that's Kewl!

I could go on and on.....

3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333,

de Hans, K0HB

2760. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:21:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40801600.1030202@psu.edu>
Source record: 90824

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hw6i6s0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>
>>On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>>>coffee was hot,
>>
>> Here we go again.....
>
>
> Right you are, see below:
>
>
>> MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
>> the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
>> of use
>
>
> That is based on opinion ONLY. True it apparently found
> support in a jury of 12, but that doesn't make it right. Many
> people want "steaming hot" food...including coffee. The fact
> that the old lady was so stupid as to put the cup in her croch
> tells me a lot about how dumb she was.

I kind of wish that McD's would have taken the tack of printing "do not try to hold the coffee in your crotch" on the coffee cups. simply printing "caution, contents may be hot will not absolve them of negligence for the people that do not know that they should not *sit on* the cup, or try to pour it on their children.

> Let's change the brew from coffee to tea. Anyone with an
> ounce of brains or experience knows tea is made with boiling
> water poured into a cup with a teabag. NOTE - boiling water
> is the norm. Had Miss Idiot had tea in the cup instead of
> coffee would she not have sued? I suspect we know the
> answer to that since personal responsibility seems to be
> abondoned today.

Stupidicus adoramicus

>>...but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
>> negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
>> cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'

>> mouths, the intended use.
>
>
> So I ask...is it OK for a cup of tea to be served to a customer
> at 212 degrees...boiling water? If you were at a friend's home and that
> friend made you a cup of tea which you then spilled on yourself,
> would you sue your friend because the water was poured
> from a pot that had just been boiling?

And don't forget that the taste of the coffee changes with the
temperature it is brewed at. Boiled coffee is a from that some people enjoy.

I wonder if McD's is negligent re the obesity lawsuits that a
group of lawyers are working on as we speak.

http://www.banzhaf.net/obesitylinks

- mike KB3EIA -

2761. Re: New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:24:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HFUfc.8625$l75.6458@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90825

April 15, 2004: The FCC released a 100 page combined Amateur
Radio Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which
included, among other things, the ARRL's proposed
2002 "refarming" of the so-called Novice/Tech
Plus frequencies (See Paragraph 11.) and the NCVEC proposed
additional voice privileges over that proposed by the League.

Twelve petitions are ruled on by the FCC in one of 4 ways:
(1) "Proposed" ...amateurs must comment on them by June 15.
(2) Granted the Petition,
(3) Granted in part and
(4) Denied.

None of the eighteen petitions generated as a
result of WRC-2003 (i.e. after July 2003) are included.

Word document version....see:

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-79A1.doc

100 pages.

The document is also available in Text (.txt) and Adobe (.pdf)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2762. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:27:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4080176B.8040606@psu.edu>
Source record: 90826

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:PomdnUWn-OKwveLdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>>On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>>>>coffee was hot,
>>>
>>> Here we go again.....
>>> MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
>>> the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
>>> of use but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
>>> negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
>>> cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
>>> mouths, the intended use.
>>>
>>> A beautiful textbook case of negligence.
>>
>>How hot is Excessively hot? Sounds almost like the law passage attempt
>>a few years back to force homeowners to limit the hot water to a pretty
>>low value - I don't recall, but it was like 110-120 degrees. This was to
>>protect children IIRC. Of course the lowered temperatures make a great
>>breeding ground for Legionellosis.
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Good point Mike. In many houses (mine for example) there is NO
> way to separately regulate the domestic hot water temperature from
> the heating system's temperature because the heater is a dual funtion
> unit whereby the domestic hot water is a coil inside the heating system
> hot water unit... and in today's hot water heating units (mine is only
> three years old), the water temp setting cuts off at the high end at
> around 180 degrees F.

My parents hot water heater is the same way. You do need to be careful,
but we should always be careful

> Frankly it really gets my goat about how everyone else has to have
> their lives dictated by the blatent stupidity of a few.

The bright spot in all this is that the pathetic losers do not know the satisfaction of accepting responsibility for their own actions. They remain lifelong victims. When I'm wrong, I'm wrong, and If I put a flexible cup of hot coffee in my lap and it spills, I'm the stupid person.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2763. Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 17:57:30 UTC
From: demas@TheWorld.com
Message-ID: <03cf665d.4c49f8d1@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90836
Cross-posted to: fido7.mo.pool,alt.support.relationships,rec.radio.amateur.policy,fido7.far.support,se.politik.droger

Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney,
Get Congress to Take Action

Sign our online Petition and read below for more information:

http://www.votenader.org/get_involved/impeach.php

HEY DUDE WHERE'S MY BUDDY!!!???
COME BACK HOME MICHAEL!!!

Ok Michael, you've had your realpolitik fling with ex-General Wesley Clark. Your endorsed Presidential candidate in the Democratic Primaries has withdrawn. It is time for you to come home, to join your buddies and resume your only genuine role which is that of defiance and resistance. Compliance and assistance with the Democrats does not accord with your past, your character, your bold writings and, most memorably, your long corrosive assaults on the Party that betrayed the working classes and plunged our country into corporate globalization. Remember, Michael, you're the flinty man from Flint, Michigan. You've never forgotten your roots. The heady Hollywood, Manhattan scene with the celebrities and Academy Awards have never gotten to your head but rather have gotten into your deserving pockets. How we all recall your standing before one billion people in Los Angeles at the televised Academy Awards in 2003 and, breaking the customary cant of the awardees, throwing the gauntlet down to George W. Bush and his "fictitious" war mongering.

Now the War has become a quagmire, with both Republicans and Democrats complicit (check the votes in Congress). The Draft may be on the way. So what are you doing going on the Al Franken Show very nearly breaking down when Al Gore (he of the pro NAFTA/GATT, anti-worker, regime-change, Iraq-bombing, lethal sanctions on half a million children Administration) called and thought you were apologizing. You have nothing to apologize for, Michael. Gore has a lot to apologize for-blowing the election he won in Florida and the country as a whole and for blowing, with Bill Clinton, the many opportunities the rich-booming Nineties and the collapse of the Soviet Union gave this country to turn a peace dividend into a pro-worker, pro-environment, pro-consumer and anti-poverty resurgence.

Come back and join our Presidential campaign, Michael. Talk to those "Reagan Democrats"-those 35% of union members who still vote Republican and against their own interests-as only you can. Michael, if you go pumping for the Democratic Party this year, just what are you going to say to the unemployed steelworkers near Sparrows Point in Maryland? To the megathousands of laid off textile and furniture workers in North and

South Carolina? To the abandoned auto workers waiting and waiting near their empty factories that went to repressive countries? To the millions of blue-collar workers, who fought our wars, only to learn that the two parties won't fight for their company pensions and health insurance? Are you going to tell them how the Democratic Party pushed through the WTO, let their pensions erode or disappear, were too busy collecting checks from the corporate bosses to pay attention to the corporate crime wave that looted and drained trillions of dollars from millions of workers, their retirement and small investments? Will you tell them that the cowardly Democrats, who couldn't win the fewer elections they are now not losing without the labor vote, won't even mount a determined drive to repeal the notorious, union-blocking Taft Hartley Act?

How can you be free to be what you are, or to depress Bush's vote, to jolt into consciousness the moribund Democratic Party?

Hey Dude, join your real buddies! The ones you may be thinking about just don't fit either your message, your vision, or our website VoteNader.org.

Come back home Michael. The workers and the youth of America are looking for you.

Best regards,
Ralph Nader

P.S. Will you put this invitation on your website and see how your fans react to Michael Moore returning to the Nader 2004 presidential campaign? Patti Smith will reserve a big singing spot, for you, on the stage for the customary finale, PEOPLE HAVE THE POWER.

Wednesday April 14, 2004

Join the Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney
Help us Get Congress to Take Action

You can help the call for an impeachment inquiry of President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney. Sign our online Petition.

http://www.votenader.org/get_involved/impeach.php

George W. Bush and Dick Cheney should be impeached for two reasons:

They led the United States into an illegal, unconstitutional war in Iraq.
They misled the Congress and the American people with five falsehoods that led to war.

All it takes is one Member of the House of Representatives to call for an Impeachment Inquiry to start the process to investigate the two grounds. If the House then votes by a simple majority for Articles of Impeachment, the Senate would then undertake a trial of the President and Vice President. They would only be convicted, and impeached, if two-thirds of the Senate agrees.

--
project. The
WILPF also issued a condemnation of Clinton's Cuba policy in 1998. Bernstein was also quoted as saying she believes Cuba is the paradigm of democracy.

IFCO does not limit its activity to pro-Castro factions, though. Its management maintains relationships with extremist Islamist groups as well. Walker travels frequently to Iraq, usually alongside Ramsey Clark. IFCO is a member of ANSWER Steering Committee.) Bernstein is a member of the American Muslim Council's campaign against the use of secret evidence. Clement met with Palestinians during a WILPF "solidarity" conference in May 2002. IFCO is also a fiscal sponsor of the National Coalition to Protect Political Freedom (NCPPF). The co-founder of NCPPF was the recently indicted terrorist financier Sami Al-Arian.

However, NION's links with Muslim terrorists are not just indirect, through IFCO. NION invited both Sami Al-Arian and Lynne Stewart to address their October 6, 2002 rally in Central Park. Stewart was indicted for passing messages on behalf of her terrorist client Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman.

One of the members of NION's Advisory Board, Abdeen Jabara, is a member of the legal advisory board for the American Muslim Council. He is a past president of the Arab-American Ant-Discrimination Committee, a board member of William Kunstler's Center for Constitutional Rights, and a co-counsel with Lynne Stewart for Sheik Rahman, the terrorist convicted for the 1993 World Trade Center bombing.

The American Muslim Council is one of the current members of Al-Arian's NCPPF (the same group to which IFCO's Bernstein belongs). Leaders of the AMC have been quoted as praising Hamas and Hezbollah. Jabara's AMC advisory board colleagues include Fakhri Al-Barzinji. Al-Barzinji is involved in Mar-Jac Poultry, which was raided last year by the FBI

2764. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 18:57:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40802C97.4020505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90827

>
>
>
> Have you ever taken the time to stroll through "QRZ's" bios? If you do,
>I think you'll notice that certain "hobbies" and career paths keep turning up.
>
> A very large number make reference to flying, some type of active outdoor
>sports (usually camping or hiking), participatioon as volunteer FD or EMS, or
>active or retired career in the Armed Forces.
>
>
>
Al the above people make use of 2 way radios. So ham radio is a natural
path of progression for
them.

2765. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 19:04:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40802E34.1070805@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90828

>
>
>
>Not your usual skateboarders and glue sniffers.
>
>
>
Well, maybe skateboarders might like to use hands free radios to
talk to each other while rolling down the street. Though they'd
probably use GMRS sets for that.

I really don't understand glue sniffing. Whenever I worked with such
glue, I'd get a headache if I got too much of the fumes. Can't
imagine wanting that.

>
>

2766. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 19:17:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4080313C.2030107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90829

Doug McLaren wrote:

>In article <Eq-dnVBestgBLeHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>,
>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>| The world is full of examples of things that have been improved by
>| making them really easy, isn't it? Want to see a kid get rid of a
>| video game? Give him or her one that is real easy to beat. It will
>| be traded in in no time. A game that is just difficult enough will
>| keep 'em busy for a long time. If there is no intellectual
>| investment in the hobby, then there is no intellectual investment in
>| the hobby. A challenge is not a bad thing.
>
>Bad analogy, a game vs. ham radio.
>
>The FCC tests are a tiny fraction of what there is to learn out there.
>The FCC could replace all the tests with a `check here to get your
>license' form, and ham radio wouldn't be any easier, harder or less or
>more interesting.
>
>You make it sound like ham radio is all about the FCC test, and if
>that's easy, ham radio is suddenly easy. Well, I disagree. The tests
>are already easy -- it's all the other stuff to learn, the *useful*
>stuff, that's interesting and challenging.
>
>Really, all the tests do is keep the riff-raff out. (Which seems
>*very* important to many people.) And I guess as far as <30 mHz goes,
>I'm riff-raff. For now. :)
>
Well, something is working to leep ham radio from being like the CB band
(yes, there are some instances like 14.313 and that repeater out in LA
but those
are fairly rare). May not be the tests, it could just be the existing hams
giving guidance and elmering the newbies as they first get on the air.
There's
more than enough of a "critical mass" out there on the ham bands to keep
this
happening. All of us new general and extra-lites have not trashed HF since
restructuring.

>
>| Show a newbie that it is fun. Let them make a DX contact with you as a
>| control op. If they are shy to talk, maybe that keyboard and PSK31 might
>| be a catalyst!
>

A rank newbie might think that you're on the 'net. Though you might
point out that
there's no ISP or other infrastructure than your radios and anttennas
required.

>
>I actually was able to decode several PSK31 discussions last night on
>14.073. I was very pleased. I was beginning to think that the dipole
>I set up in my garage was somehow wrong. :)
>
Indoor antennas can be troublesome, but if you have CCRs you got little
choice....

>
>I've passed elements 2, 3 and 4 and am working on 1, but I'm still a
>rank amateur and I know it. Still, I'm really bummed that I can't
>transmit on anything under 50 mhz until I pass the CW test, even
>though I'm not really that interested in doing CW.
>
>(And passing element 1 isn't going to magically make me stop being a
>rank amateur. But at least then I'll be able to transmit `down
>there'.)
>
I did it, and I'm no good at "motor" skills like that. Be sure to be
ready for high
speed characters spaced at 5WPM (Farnsworth method). This is designed to
get you used to the "sound" of each character and not get you in the mode of
counting dits and dahs. Makes getting up to higher speeds easier if you so
choose.

>
>
>

2767. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 19:22:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40803276.2000405@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90830

>
>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Good point Mike. In many houses (mine for example) there is NO
>> way to separately regulate the domestic hot water temperature from
>> the heating system's temperature because the heater is a dual funtion
>> unit whereby the domestic hot water is a coil inside the heating system
>> hot water unit... and in today's hot water heating units (mine is only
>> three years old), the water temp setting cuts off at the high end at
>> around 180 degrees F.
>
>
> My parents hot water heater is the same way. You do need to be
> careful, but we should always be careful
>
>
We have that too, and every so often you get a cold shower because the
heating system
decided that the house was cold, and sucked all the heat out of the
unit. GRRRR!!!

2768. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 19:24:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40803303.7050602@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90831

Phil Kane wrote:

>On Tue, 13 Apr 2004 16:38:42 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>
>>In a world where people can successfully sue because they did not know
>>coffee was hot,
>>
>>
>
> Here we go again.....
>
> MacDonalds was sued successfully because they were on notice that
> the coffee was excessively hot for its intended purpose and manner
> of use but did nothing to prevent such injuries, and they were found
> negligent in not reducing the temperature to where it would not
> cause second-degree burns on exposed skin, let alone in customers'
> mouths, the intended use.
>
>
>
I always chill my coffee a bit with some ice or water from the soda
machine. Otherwise
it's too damm hot. Maybe my mouth lacks insulation or something, but my
mouth
will scald before my skin would.

2769. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 19:51:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40803943.3070309@psu.edu>
Source record: 90832

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> |
> | I doubt L'il Kim or Brittany Spears or Justin Timberlake will ever be
> | hams, or (name your popular type person) will ever even think about
> it.
> |
> | Well, that's just fine. Ham radio wasn't, isn't, and never will be
> | Kewl. And that's kewl by me. If those type people were involved in it,
> I
> | probably wouldn't be.
> |
>
> Why wouldn't you be? I don't personally know the three young people you
> mention and I'll concede that I haven't paid a great deal of attention
> to them, but my impression is that they are bright, intelligent,
> successful, "with it" sorts who have influence among a wide segment of
> the population, particularly young people. Seems that the involvement
> of "those type people" could be one way (obviously not the only way) to
> attract people to the Amateur Radio Service.

Agreed that they are all a part of popular culture, and are widely
respected and emulated by a lot of youth.

L'il Kim was just indicted for lying to the FBI about her involvement
in a shootout outside a studio when a security cam showed her very much
involved in it. Ms Spears has a lot to do with many prepubescent girls
"sluttin it up" the past few years. They adore her and emulate her as
much as possible. And Justin was the other half of the Janet Jackson
"wardrobe malfunction during the Super bowl.

> Personally I find myself in direct disagreement with "wasn't, isn't, and
> never will be Kewl". (Thanks to WB8IMY for some of his thoughts) In
> case you didn't know, belief in magic is a necessary requirement for all
> Amateur Radio operators. Of course, you won't see a question concerning
> magic or metaphysics on the test you take to obtain your license, but in
> your heart you will come to believe in that powerful, intangible force.

Sorry, I don't believe in either.

> All of us in the hobby have felt its influence at one time or another.
> Some night when the band is dead as a doornail you'll be tuning
> aimlessly, not expecting to hear a single signal because NOTHING could
> be coming through at that hour. But then, rising out of the noise like a
> ghost, there will be a faint call from another stalwart explorer

> thousands of miles distant. You pounce, establish contact and both of
> you marvel at the fact that the conversation is taking place at all. A
> few minutes later, however, the signal vanishes as quickly as it came.
> Your rational mind will shrug it off as a quirk of propagation, but that
> little tingle in your gut will tell you otherwise.
>
> Hey, that's Kewl!

Certainly a coincidence.

> If you could travel back in time 1000 years to 1004 AD, you'd probably
> be burned at the nearest stake for even suggesting that two human beings
> could communicate with each other over great distances without a
> physical connection. No doubt they would accuse you of dabbling in
> magic -- and they'd be right!
>
> As Amateur Radio operators, we work feats of magic every day. Many of
> us have become jaded about our powers and we tend to dismiss them as
> commonplace. We hardly think twice when we use our equipment to sommon
> the elemental forces of the universe. But every so often we need to
> pause and remind ourselves of what we are really doing. We need to
> remember the essence of what drew us to our unusual avocation in the
> first place: the wonderful magic of wireless communications.
>
> Hey, that's Kewl!
>
> Those of us who play at RadioSport contesting regularly employ our
> station engineering and operating skills in weekend-long games of
> world-wide electronic splatball with tens of thousands of other
> participants aged from pre-teen to near 100.
>
> Hey, that's Kewl!
>
> I could go on and on.....

What you are talking about is what I find fascinating about Amateur
radio also. Electronics in general for that matter.

Just imagine, all this starts with rocks. Rocks contain things that do
things when they are hit with electricity. Might be conduct electricity,
conduct it in one direction only, or block it. Maybe the rock will make
electricity when you hit it or when the sun shines on it. Maybe it will
make electricity when you get it near a magnet. Maybe the rock is a
magnet. All kind of stuff that enables us to do great things. And it's
all in rocks.

But it isn't too likely that the Popsters are going to be too
interested in that. It isn't the way they think.

Popular culture is what it is, and if the purveyors of pop thought that
Amateur radio was something to be popular, they would say so. Then the
popsters will come running to the ARS in droves.

And you or me thinking it is cool doesn't make it kewl for them.

> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333,

hey, that's good!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2770. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 21:13:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <U%Xfc.13169$A_4.5001@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90833

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

| Just imagine, all this starts with rocks. Rocks contain things that do
| things when they are hit with electricity. Might be conduct
electricity,
| conduct it in one direction only, or block it. Maybe the rock will
make
| electricity when you hit it or when the sun shines on it. Maybe it
will
| make electricity when you get it near a magnet. Maybe the rock is a
| magnet. All kind of stuff that enables us to do great things. And it's
| all in rocks.

Hey, Kewl, Magic Rocks!!! Rock on, Dude! (Pass me that doobie you're
puffin'!)

|
| But it isn't too likely that the Popsters are going to be too
| interested in that. It isn't the way they think.
|

I don't know what the hell a "Popster" is, but I've got 14 grandkids and
I know how they think. Several of them think it's way Kewl that grandpa
plays in "weekend-long games of world-wide electronic splatball with
tens of thousands of others". "Kewl" enough that 3 of them are licensed
and 2 are studying. They don't care crap about rocks in the sunlight,
and frankly neither does grandpa.

3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333,

de Hans, K0HB

2771. Re: New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 21:26:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fcYfc.13175$A_4.917@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90834

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

| http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-79A1.doc

Lot's of stuff in there. Some of it pretty goofy, like a petition for color-coded paper for different license classes (Denied), lot's of administrivia, etc.

The piece which will probably have the widest day-to-day impact on how we operate is related to changes in band segments on HF. If adopted, here's what you'll see.

On 80M Novices and Tech+ will have CW privileges expanded 4-fold. Will have 200KHz at 3535 to 3725.

75M phone band will be extended downward to 3725. Extra, Advanced, and General lower phone boundary will shift to 3725, 3750, and 3775 respectively.

On 40M Novice and Tech+ will have CW privileges doubled. Will have 100KHz at 7025 to 7125.

40M phone band will extended downward to 7125. Generals will gain 50KHz of phone. Extra and Advanced will gain 25KHz.

On 15M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 75KHz. Will have 175KHz 21025 to 21200.

On 10M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 100KHz, giving them 28000 to 28300 for CW and 28300 to 28500 for Phone.

3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333,

de Hans, K0HB

2772. Re: New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 21:28:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GdYfc.13177$A_4.1006@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90835

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

```
|
| On 80M Novices and Tech+ will have CW privileges expanded 4-fold.
Will
| have 200KHz at 3535 to 3725.
|

Ooopppssss! Make that 3525 to 3725.

3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333
3333333333,

de Hans, K0HB
```

2773. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-16 23:21:53 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0404161521.13656135@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90837

I think weather weenies are a potential market for ham radio.
Admittedly, I'm biased by the fact that storm spotting is what led me
to become a ham.

I guess that we can write off anyone on a diet, anyone concerned about
his/her blood cholesterol, and health/fitness gurus. :)

Jason Hsu, AG4DG

2774. Re: New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 00:56:04 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408080A3.30602@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90838

>
>
>
>The piece which will probably have the widest day-to-day impact on how
>we operate is related to changes in band segments on HF. If adopted,
>here's what you'll see.
>
>On 80M Novices and Tech+ will have CW privileges expanded 4-fold. Will
>have 200KHz at 3535 to 3725.
>
>75M phone band will be extended downward to 3725. Extra, Advanced, and
>General lower phone boundary will shift to 3725, 3750, and 3775
>respectively.
>
>On 40M Novice and Tech+ will have CW privileges doubled. Will have
>100KHz at 7025 to 7125.
>
>40M phone band will extended downward to 7125. Generals will gain 50KHz
>of phone. Extra and Advanced will gain 25KHz.
>
>On 15M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 75KHz. Will have 175KHz
>21025 to 21200.
>
>On 10M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 100KHz, giving them 28000
>to 28300 for CW and 28300 to 28500 for Phone.
>
>
>
If I understand it right, these take effect June 1, 2004. Or is it 90
days after that?

>
>

2775. Re: New NPRM 04-79A1 from FCC on amateur radio -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 01:28:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0404161728.7d5fd95c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90839

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<fcYfc.13175$A_4.917@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> | http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-79A1.doc
>
> Lot's of stuff in there. Some of it pretty goofy, like a petition for
> color-coded paper for different license classes (Denied), lot's of
> administrivia, etc.
>
> The piece which will probably have the widest day-to-day impact on how
> we operate is related to changes in band segments on HF. If adopted,
> here's what you'll see.
>
> On 80M Novices and Tech+ will have CW privileges expanded 4-fold. Will
> have 200KHz at 3535 to 3725.
>
> 75M phone band will be extended downward to 3725. Extra, Advanced, and
> General lower phone boundary will shift to 3725, 3750, and 3775
> respectively.
>
> On 40M Novice and Tech+ will have CW privileges doubled. Will have
> 100KHz at 7025 to 7125.
>
> 40M phone band will extended downward to 7125. Generals will gain 50KHz
> of phone. Extra and Advanced will gain 25KHz.
>
> On 15M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 75KHz. Will have 175KHz
> 21025 to 21200.
>
> On 10M Novice and Tech+ CW privileges expanded 100KHz, giving them 28000
> to 28300 for CW and 28300 to 28500 for Phone.

Odd NPRM to say the least. This is hardly an "overhaul" or a "major
"restructuring". Whatta yawner. It'll get nit-picked into oblivion
around here of course, snore, snore. The CB mob oughta eat it up
though, ham leanyers will start showing up on the truck stop shelves
ready to roll on 27 Mhz . .

How long doya 'spose they'll keep ducking the code test issue? Or . .
is their silence on the matter all we're going to hear from the FCC
about the code tests for some very long time to come?

> 3333333333
> 3333333333

> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333
> 3333333333,

> de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

2776. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 01:31:55 UTC
From: Daveed <kink8btbt@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <5ac7c$4080a66b$d1cc7b07$3723@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 90840

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0404140545.1dfc06e0@posting.google.com...
> Until the ARRL proposal came out, I had never heard anyone propose
> automatic upgrades of Technician licensees to the General class. Now
> that this proposal has come out, many people are defending this part
> of the proposal.

Sure is bunkie!

Ain't it just grand?

> I realize this might sound radical, but I believe that the current
> licensing system, for the most part, is OK. The only change that I
> strongly believe should be made is eliminating the 5 wpm Morse Code
> exam for all license classes, including Amateur Extra. Until the ARRL
> proposal came out, the Morse Code exam was the main controversy. The
> proposed automatic upgrades from Tech to General have now stolen much
> of the spotlight.

That is because that is how the ARRL wants it to be!!
The yankee-blueblood-old-boys-club in Newington
has finally admitted that the stats for HF operators has
been on a steady decline since the mid-80's. All the new
op's have been getting on 2 Meters and 440 FM so they
can talk to their friends during morning and evening
drive time. They have no interest whatsoever, for the majority
of them, to "upgrade" to TRADITIONAL HF mode of
operation because the *mistique* and *unique* ability to
have in your private home a radio that you can talk to
the other side of the USA or into Europe. Not any longer!
Today a teenager with a Dell computer and a DSL connection
can conduct live chat and/or video with their friends across
town or across the country or across the world. And they
don't need any unsightly antennas, limited propagation or
other things to hinder them...plus it's also much cheaper
than ham radio. (besides...from a generational perspective,
what kid or teenager wants to converse with a bunch of
60+ something year-olds on HF radio?) Face it boys.
The REAL REASON this is being done is the ARRL
knows that within 10-15 years, most of the current
hams who use HF will be DEAD OF OLD AGE AND
OR IT'S COMPLICATIONS THEROF. Along with that
the subscription rate for QST (..and CQ Magazine also)
is steadly declining each year. Ham radio is on it's death

bed boys, the sooner you admit it, the better you'll feel. We have *nothing* to offer the current youthfull generation but a pile of obsolete technology which they not only have no interest whatsoever in, but look upon the same and it's current users as being both eccentric and wierd. As one 13 year old said to me at a ham radio demo last year: "What do I want with just a microphone and a speaker? I can video conference with my friends online at once and swap music from home". The next generation has spoken boys!

Ham Radio is OBSOLETE. That is the root cause of the problem issue. Ham radio will be DEAD in 20 years just like the automobile replaced the horsebuggy.

2777. Re: France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 04:31:28 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94CE540A2909elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90841

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:pe-dndMVaeQxoerd4p2dnA@comcast.com:

>
> "Don" <don@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:ncsdc.15$jt2.3@newsfe2-gui.server.ntli.net...
>> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns94C3EE213269Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > No more CW test in France now. I think that's about the last country
>> > in Europe to kill off the code test. It's pretty much history over
>> > there.
>>
>>
>>
>> Has Italy done away with the CW then
>>
>> DP
>>
>>
>
> And don't forget the former eastern European countries that had either
> been satellites of or actually part of the USSR.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Italy hasn't yet. Nor has Spain or Sweden, but we know they will, it's just
a question of when. Most other Western European countries have axed the CW
test. As for the Eastern bloc, since when have they been a shining example
for anything?

2778. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 12:56:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404170456.30c6b9ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90842

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 15, 2004:

Novice - 32,092 (decrease of 17,237)
Technician - 262,886 (increase of 57,492)
Technician Plus - 60,597 (decrease of 68,263)
General - 140,586 (increase of 27,909)
Advanced - 80,717 (decrease of 19,065)
Extra - 105,246 (increase of 26,496)
Total - 682,124 (increase of 7,332)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2779. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 13:45:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404170545.2ee4bdbb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90843

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404160856.3eafe3d1@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0404141735.6ee4cbbe@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > Similarly, it is not appropriate for FISTS to comment on anything
> > other than Morse Code. So why do they do it? Why aren't you
> > addressing this injustice?
>
> I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code testing.
> The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse Code,
> not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should have
> either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse Code
> requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of themselves instead
> of on behalf of FISTS.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

Jason, I've finally met an RRAPer who can look at both sides of an
issue. Thanks for an honest answer.

bb

2780. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 13:52:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404170552.6873d3c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90844

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404161521.13656135@posting.google.com>...
> I think weather weenies are a potential market for ham radio.

Hey, I resemble that remark.

> Admittedly, I'm biased by the fact that storm spotting is what led me
> to become a ham.
>
> I guess that we can write off anyone on a diet, anyone concerned about
> his/her blood cholesterol, and health/fitness gurus. :)

I should be.

> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

Jason, looks like you're going to be a regular around here. Welcome.

bb/n-0-eye-m-d

2781. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 13:57:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404170557.6ebdff61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90845

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<407FF91C.7030607@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > What I'd like to know is why is it that many, if not most, of the
> > allegedly post-secondary educated persons find it necessary to use the
> > profanity to try and effectively express themselves...?!?! Especially those
> > who go out of thier way to make everyone else aware of just how well educated
> > they alledgedly are...And DOUBLY especially those who find it "appropriate" to
> > comment on the "conduct" of others in this forum...?!?!?
>
>
> Seems to be roughly related to the strength of the argument in an
> inverse fashion.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Wonder if Hans was a professional Sailor?

Wonder if he ever heard the skipper swear an order?

2782. Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 14:04:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404170604.76b448fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90846

We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.

So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.

I'd like to ask them why their organization, a non-political organization of Morse Code -Use- advocates, has filed with the FCC?

Thank you, bb

2783. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 14:28:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Y9bgc.14650$k05.13405@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90847

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

| Wonder if he ever heard the skipper swear an order?

Awww, the girls are all a-twitter because a sailor used a bad word!
Isn't that special! Maybe they'll tell their mommies there's a sailor
talking naughty on rrap! I hope so, because I've heard that their
mommies like sailors very much.

The hypothalamus is one of the most important parts of the brain,
involved in many kinds of motivation. Among other functions, the
hypothalamus controls the "Four F's":

1. fighting;
2. fleeing;
3. feeding; and
4. mating.

Mate you very much.

As Always,
Hans, K0HB

2784. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 14:36:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90848

William wrote:
> We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
> proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.

My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse code test.

In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.

If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have disagreed, but I can respect the position.

But if the story keeps getting changed, both on a personal and group level, I am a little disappointed, and future assertions from them will have credibility in proportion.

I doubt that they care what I think.

> So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.
>
> I'd like to ask them why their organization, a non-political
> organization of Morse Code -Use- advocates, has filed with the FCC?

2785. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 15:08:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BLbgc.14681$k05.9598@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90849

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

|
| So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.
|

FISTS member #7419 present and accounted for, SIR!

|
| I'd like to ask them why their organization, a non-political
| organization of Morse Code -Use- advocates, has filed with the FCC?
|

I have no idea. I'm just a lowly foul-mouthed seaman and I don't get to
steer the ship. Perhaps you could get an answer from the skipper:
Nancy A. Kott WZ8C emailto:nancy@tir.com

Self Appointed Executive Director, North American Chapter

FISTS CW Club

P.O. Box 47

Hadley, MI 48440-0047

As always,

Hans, K0HB &#65533;&#65533;&#65533;
--
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

2786. Amateur Radio Newsline☐ Report 1392 April 16, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 15:53:17 UTC
From: netmanager2@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <78f1f2d5.0404170753.5946476@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Amateur Radio Newslineï¿½ Report 1392 ï¿½ April 16, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1392 with a release date of
Friday, April 16th, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Iraqi hams put out a plea to keep ham radio
alive in that war torn nation and the ARRL asks the FCC to extend the
filing deadline on B-P-L. Find out the details on Amateur Radio
Newsline report number 1392 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

A PLEA FROM A WAR ZONE: PLEASE HELP HAM RADIO SURVIVE IN IRAQ

Even as the bloodshed continues, hams in Iraq are asking their
counterparts world-wide to keep Amateur Radio alive in the war torn
nation. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW has more:

--

A widely publicized e-mail from Laith Adhary, YI1SRA, in Baghdad asks
the worlds radio amateurs for support in keeping ham radio a part of
a new Iraq. This, as the June 30th date for handover of the
government to local authorities approaches.

Adhary is a member of the Iraqi Association for Radio Amateurs and
works at the University in Baghdad. He says that it is urgent that
Iraq establish a viable ham radio program in the country before the
shift of governing takes place. To accomplish this, Laith and Iraqi
Association for Radio Amateurs president Diya Sayah, YI1DZ are asking
hams around the globe to and their national societies to a letter of
support for the future of the hobby in Iraq.

Both men indicate that this is a time sensitive issue and request
support right away.

With thanks to Ian Abel, G3ZHI, for passing the information along,
I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting for the Amateur Radio
Newsline.

--

The best way to make sure your letter of support arrives is to send
it by E-mail We have two addresses. Sayah can be reached at
yi1dz@hotmail.com and Adhary is at laithtariq@yahoo.com. (G3ZHI)

**

THE BPL WAR: ARRL ASKS FOR FILING DEADLINE EXTENSION IN BPL NPRM

Back here in the United States, the ARRL has asked the FCC to extend the deadline for comments and reply comments by 45 days in the Broadband over Power Line Notice of Proposed Rule Making. Thats E-T Docket 04-37.

The ARRL filing says that it anticipates the National Telecommunications and Information Administration report on B-P-L to go public on or around April 16th. Also, that the current deadline would allow only a couple of weeks at best to evaluate the study's results and incorporate its findings into comments in the proceeding.

Although the FCC does not routinely grant such extensions, the ARRL says that it is important to allow time for the N-T-I-A to conclude its study at B-P-L field trial locations. Unless the extension is granted, the last day to file comments is May 3rd and reply comments is June 1st. (ARRL Bulletin)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: SWL'S VS. BROADBAND OVER POWERLINES

Short-wave listeners can complain to the FCC if a Broadband Over Powerline installation interferes with their reception, but there are some caveats. Amateur Radio Newsline's Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, has the
rest of the story:

--

Progress Energy has made a concerted effort to move BPL signals out of the ham bands in their trial areas near Raleigh, North Carolina. But the systems, which are governed by FCC Part 15 and are prohibited from interfering with licensed services, are still radiating signals across much of the rest of the short-wave spectrum. That's leading
short-wave listeners to ask if they have "standing" to complain to
the FCC, since they don't have licenses themselves.

The - General Council Chris Imlay W3KD says they do, if the BPL signals are interfering with international shortwave broadcasts from other countries, but not if they are trying to listen to domestic shortwave broadcasters. Replying to an e-mail inquiry, Imlay adds that "One does not have to be a licensee of a transmitter in order to
receive harmful interference."

ARRL Chief Executive Officer David Sumner K1ZZ noted that the US is a member of the International Telecommunications Union, whose Radio Regulations require member nations to protect HF communications from harmful interference.

RR 15.12 reads, "Administrations shall take all practicable and necessary steps to ensure that the operation of electrical apparatus or installations of any kind, including power and telecommunication distribution networks, do not cause harmful interference to a radiocommunication service operating in accordance with the provisions of these Regulations."

Reporting for Newsline, this is Gary Pearce KN4AQ, in Raleigh, North Carolina.

--

The bottom line: If you are trying to listen to Radio Netherlands and a Broadband Over Powerline installation covers the station up -- complain to the FCC. (KN4AQ, ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: EXPEDITION 9 HEADED TO THE ISS

The International Space Station's next set of ham radio residents will arrive this month. Expedition 9 Commander Gennady Padalka and Flight Engineer Mike Fincke are slated to launch to orbit from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan on April 18. They will arrive at the I-S-S on April 21 to replace Expedition 8 explorers Mike Foale, KB5UAC, and Sasha Kaleri, U8MIR.

Padalka is a space flight veteran having spent 198 days aboard the Russian Mir space station in 1999. On the other hand, Expedition 9 is Fincke's first trip to space. Both are hams. Fincke holds the call sign KE5AIT and Padalka is RN3DT.

European Space Agency Astronaut Andrï¿½ Kuipers will also travel to the
Station with Fincke and Padalka and return to Earth with Expedition 8 about nine days later. Padalka and Fincke will then spend about six months on-orbit. Their tasks include maintaining ISS operations, continuing science operations, conducting two spacewalks and operating the ham radio station as time permits. Their tour of duty is scheduled to end in late October when the Expedition 10 crew rockets up to replace them. (ANS, ARISS, MAREX)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the A-I-R Repeaters serving Flint Michigan.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: PHONE TUNNEL FIRE BRINGS HAM RADIO CALLOUT

Raynet -- the United Kingdom's version of RACES -- was called on
as
March drew to a close. This, as fire rips through a tunnel carrying
telephone lines across a wide area. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, is in
Nottingham, with more:

--

Raynet groups in Cheshire, Greater Manchester and Derbyshire were put on standby following a fire in a BT underground tunnel in central Manchester in the early hours of Monday the 29th of March. The fire disrupted more than 130,000 telephone lines in Lancashire, Merseyside, Derbyshire and further afield. Cheshire Police were concerned about the effects on communications, and via the Cheshire Emergency Planning Department requested the availability of Raynet operators to cover the affected area.

The Greater Manchester ambulance service lost landline and radio communications with their vehicles, but were able to use mobile phones as a means of contact. Other difficulties included a loss of 999 calls and disruption to the broadband data network. Large areas of the High Peak area of Derbyshire were without landlines or mobile phones.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

The majority of Raynet members were dismissed by the evening of March 29th, but the Cheshire Group and County Controllers were on call through Wednesday afternoon the 31st. Thats when the emergency call in 999 service was finally restored to the worst-affected area of Cheshire. (GB2RS)

**

RESCUE RADIO: TV CHANNEL 16 GOES TO PUBLIC SAFETY AGENCIES IN NYC

On this side of the Atlantic pond the FCC has permanently reallocated 482 to 488 MHz in the New York City metropolitan area to the land-mobile service. This, for public safety communications.

482 to 488 MHz which is also known as UHF television Channel 16 has been used in New York for that purpose since 1995 when the FCC issued a Conditional Waiver of its rules to permit the initial operation.

The entire story is on-line at
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-80A1.doc
(CGC)

**

RADIO RULES: BY-BY FORMS

And a change of forms at the FCC. Effective with Monday, May 3, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau will dismiss any applications

filed on an FCC Form 605 issued earlier than December 2003.

Form 605, the Quick-Form Application for Authorization in the Ship, Aircraft, Amateur, Restricted and Commercial Operator, and General Mobile Radio Service, is the hard-copy version of the Amateur Service application. The FCC has been accepting both older and current Form 605 applications that included room for a Taxpayer Identification Number or a Social Security number. The FCC would then issue the applicant an FCC Registration Number or F-R-N without additional paperwork.

All amateur service applicants must have and use an F-R-N when filing an application such as Form 605 with the FCC. The change does not affect applicants filing on-line with the Universal Licensing System. (ARRL Bulletin)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NEVER UNDERESTIMATE THE VALUE OF CB RADIO

Turning to the enforcement arena, never underestimate the value of an 11 meter Class D C-B radio set in catching a bad guy. Even when the alleged perpetrator happens to be the C-B operator at the controls. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the details:

--

According to the CGC Communicator, complaints about interference from a citizens band radio led police to the home of one Vernando Malone of South Bend, Indiana. When they searched the premises they found more than $20,000 worth of Nextel cellular telephones and another $20,000 in Motorola phones. Also located was a computer that Malone allegedly used to activate the phones

Malone has now been charged with forgery and theft. This, in connection with what police claim was scheme to fraudulently order large numbers of cell phones, activate them with a home computer, and then sell them on the street at discounted prices.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in
Los
Angeles.

--

Stamp this one 10-4 good buddy. And if you want to read more, its on-line at http://tinyurl.com/ytb3z (CGC)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: W4RWG ELECTED PRES OF SERA

On a more positive note, Repeater Journal reports that Roger Gregory, W4WRG, has been elected as the new President of the giant South Eastern Repeater Association for 2004 through 2005. Gregory replaces

Don Williams, W4VT, who has served in the post for the past six years.

The South Eastern Repeater Association -- better known as SERA Incorporated -- is one of the nations largest repeater coordination umbrella organizations providing service to Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, the Carolina's, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia.
It also publishes the Repeater Journal magazine four times a year. (SERA)

**

CONFERENCE: THE DCC IN IOWA IN SEPTEMBER

The 2004 joint Tucson Amateur Packet Radio and ARRL Digital Communications Conference will be held September 10th to the 12th. The venue this year is the Airport Holiday Inn in Des Moines, Iowa. More on the conference is on-line at www.tapr.org/dcc/. (TAPR)

**

CELEBRATIONS: OARC AS K4H IN MAY

The Owensboro Amateur Radio Club in Western Kentucky will celebrate its 50th anniversary as an ARRL affiliated club. This, by using the special event call sign K4H. K4H will be valid for all club members to use both mobile and from their home station location from May 15th through the 31st.

By the way. Only two members of the Owensboro Amateur Radio Club are still is here from its formation. They are Max Douglas, W4VJV and Jim Rush, W4EWL. Both are were instructors at early Amateur Radio classes run by the club. Also, W4EWL has three "QST Cover Plaque" Awards over the years. (Via e-mail)

**
BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United
States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

TECHNOLOGY: KNRC AM IN COLORADO TURNS OFF IBOC

A broadcaster has shut down its A-M stereo system to avoid interfering with listeners of another near-by station. KNRC A-M on 1150 kHz in Littleton, Colorado, turned off the I-B-O-C or High

Definition Radio encoding equipment in response to listener complaints of interference to the signal of KJJD, on 1170 kHz in the town of Windsor.

Rodger Tighe writing in the CGC Communicator calls this is a second adjacent channel situation. He reports that part of the decision to silence I-B-O-C was based on the thinking that interference to a small mom & pop station like KJJD was totally unwarranted since consumers have so few H-D radios in their hands at this time.

Tighe is the Chief Engineer of KNRC. He says that the I-B-O-C encoding equipment is still in the racks and the whole issue could be revisited at a later date. (CGC)

**

CONVENTIONS: THE NAB HAM RADIO RECEPTION IN LAS VEGAS NV. APRIL 21

A reminder that this week, on April 21st is the National Association of Broadcasters `Amateur Radio Reception'. This years `Ham Radio
Reception' will be hosted by Heil Sound, Limited and its well known
owners Bob, K9EID, and Sarah Heil. They would like to invite any and all amateur radio operators who will be in attendance at the NAB show to join them for this annual fun event.

Audio Only: Hear it at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

This years NAB Ham Radio Reception takes place Wednesday April 21st, from 6 to 9 P.M. local time. The venue is the Las Vegas Hilton Hotel, Ballrom B. Of coarse, thats in Las Vegas, Nevada. For more information please feel to contact Bob or Sarah at 618-257-3000 or by e-mail to bob@heilsound.com. The Heil's say that they hope to see
you there. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

WORLDBEAT - ALBANIA: FIRST DX COM JUNE 19-20

Turning to news from around the world. Datline Albania where that nations hams will hold their first DX convention this spring. The dates are June 19th and 20th in the city of Tirana.

The actual DX convention will begin Saturday afternoon, concluding with a gala dinner and Sunday morning program. Sightseeing tours of the region will be available on Sunday afternoon. More information will be posted on line at www.za1a.com in the near future. (OH2BH)

**

WORLDBEAT - JORDAN: UK HAMS PLAN VISIT

Robin Bellerby, GM3ZYE, is in the early stages of planning an amateur radio trip to Jordan. The excursion will take place either in May or September of 2005 and will be mainly - but not exclusively - for members of the United Kingdom's Royal Signals, Royal Naval, and Royal
Air Force Amateur Radio Societies. Between 20 and 60 people are expected to make the trip. (GB2RS)

**

RADIO RECORDS: 2413 KM on 70 CM

Congratulations to ZL1AOX and VK3EK for extending the Trans Tasman 70cm distance record. On the 3rd January the two made a path of 2,413 Kilometers using SSB. The previous record was set on January 13, 1998 when ZL2TPY and VK4ZSH conversed across 2402 kilometers on the 432 MHz band. (NZART)

**

DX

In D-X, JE3MAS is in Tanzania for one year and will operate as 5H3HK. QSL as directed on the air.

And the multi-operator T33C DXpedition to Banaba island started on schedule on the 4th of April. The island counts as OC-018 for the Islands on the Air awards program. (Various DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: WORLD CLASS T-HUNTING - PART 1

And finally, a question. Have you tried ham radio's version of fox hunting? It's not hard and you might win yourself some medals. Newsline's Joe Moell K0OV has the story of the next Amateur Radio direction finding championships:

--

Most hams know that in Amateur Radio, the term "foxhunt" doesn't have anything to do with horses or hound dogs. Our foxes are radio transmitters and the object of the hunt is to find them with radio direction finding equipment. But what many hams don't know is that the equipment for hunting radio foxes can be very simple and inexpensive. For a two-meter foxhunt in the park on foot, you can do very well by augmenting your handi-talkie with a simple yagi antenna made out of a steel measuring tape and some PVC pipe from the hardware store. For closing in, build an offset-type RF attenuator for about 15 dollars worth of small parts. Plans are on the Web, so warm up your soldering iron. Then maybe you could be like Newsline's Young Ham of the Year Jay Thompson W6JAY, who has won a place on our country's team to the World ARDF Championships. You don't have to be

a super-athlete, just reasonably fit.

To see the USA's best on-foot foxhunters in action, to learn from them, and to try it for yourself, make plans to come to southern California this June. The Fourth USA ARDF Championships get under way on June 16th, with practice sessions, a big two-meter hunt, and another hunt on 80 meters. Come out the weekend before, and you can take part in an optional intensive training camp. It's all being put on by the Santa Barbara Amateur Radio Club and it's open to anyone at any foxhunting skill level, with or without a ham license. If you're a senior, don't worry about trying to compete with W6JAY. Equal medals will be awarded in five separate age category for OM's from under 18 to over 60. There are four similar age categories for the YLs.

For everything you need to know about the Championships, including schedules, registration forms and equipment ideas, point your Web browser to www.homingin.com. That's HomingIn, as one word, homingin.com. I hope to see you there. Next week, I'll tell you about a way to get the foxhunting fun going in your own home town. From southern California, this is Joe Moell Kay-Zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

More with Joe in Next Weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report.

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff
for
nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm
Jim
Damron, N8TMW, and I'm Randy Damron, N8XEA, saying 73 and we
thank
you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004.
All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

2787. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:23:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417132330.03003.00000012@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90851

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/16/2004 4:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <U%Xfc.13169$A_4.5001@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>I don't know what the hell a "Popster" is, but I've got 14 grandkids...(SNIP)

Congratulations. Why the profanity?

>...and I know how they think. Several of them think it's way Kewl that
grandpa
>plays in "weekend-long games of world-wide electronic splatball with
>tens of thousands of others". "Kewl" enough that 3 of them are licensed
>and 2 are studying.

Great. Now you can call the K-ZERO-HB net on Sunday evenings. Will you
take non-DNA related check-ins? What mode?

>They don't care crap about rocks in the sunlight,
>and frankly neither does grandpa.

I doubt there is a great deal grandpa DOES care about. Mostly things
ABOUT grandpa, I bet.

>3333333333
>3333333333
>3333333333
>3333333333
>3333333333
>3333333333
>3333333333,

I guess I make a point of this since YOU care to make issue with MY posts,
Hans, but that was cute the first dozen or so times you used it....Time to
exercise your imagination.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2788. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:27:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417132700.03003.00000013@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90852

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 4/16/2004 1:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40802C97.4020505@ix.netcom.com>
>
>> Have you ever taken the time to stroll through "QRZ's" bios? If you
>do,
>>I think you'll notice that certain "hobbies" and career paths keep turning
>up.
>>
>> A very large number make reference to flying, some type of active
>outdoor
>>sports (usually camping or hiking), participatioon as volunteer FD or EMS,
>or
>>active or retired career in the Armed Forces.
>>
>Al the above people make use of 2 way radios. So ham radio is a natural
>path of progression for
>them.

EXACTLY the point I was making, Robert!

So if we KNOW that people involved in these activitites are more likely to
be the ones to be interested or get involved, why not cocentrate our efforts
there?

Certain, by no means do I suggest that we NOT "recruit" in other media,
nor should we exclude anyone by omission, however if we KNOW that we are more
likely to draw from those groups aren't our efforts more wisely spent in those
venues?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2789. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:33:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417133324.03003.00000014@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90853

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/17/2004 10:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <BLbgc.14681$k05.9598@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
>
>|
>| So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.
>|
>
>FISTS member #7419 present and accounted for, SIR!

FISTS 3505

What took ya so long, Master Chief.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2790. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:36:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417133651.03003.00000015@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90854

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/16/2004 12:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404160901.4bde45fc@posting.google.com>

>> THERE'S where we need to be "recruiting"...In "FLYING" , "Emergency
>> Medical Services", the various military papers (NAVY Times, ARMY Times, AF
>> Times), "Field and Stream", etc. Throw the occassional ad into "Boy's
>Life",
>> and the science related magazines I noted earlier and a few (such as your
>> Astronomy field) that I am sure others can come up with.
>>
>> Hmmmmm???
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, good point. Flying, RC model airplane, model rocketry, GPS,
>any type of military or public service (LE, fire, EMS), but also
>electronics hobbyists and careerists.
>
>Not your usual skateboarders and glue sniffers.

Speaking of glue sniffers, we just had a full arrest on a 15 year old who
waas huffing glue and paint...What's up with these kids...?!?!

Anyway...Thanks Brian...Maybe a letter to the ARRL suggesting this...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2791. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:41:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <P_dgc.14803$k05.5010@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90855

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

|
| I doubt there is a great deal grandpa DOES care about.
|

Here's a pointer to some of what I care about ---
http://tinyurl.com/uksv

Here's another --- http://tinyurl.com/22v9k

And another --- http://tinyurl.com/2uq8n

And now that I've tired of your shallow insulting posts, the following
is not the sound of a tennis racket..... >>>PLONK<<<

As always,

K0HB

2792. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:41:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417134112.03003.00000016@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90856

>Subject: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/17/2004 9:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404170604.76b448fe@posting.google.com>
>
>We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
>proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.

Farnsworth Exam...?!?!

Ive done a Google Search and can't find any reference to this...Can you
provide a URL...?!?!

>So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.

3505 here.

>I'd like to ask them why their organization, a non-political
>organization of Morse Code -Use- advocates, has filed with the FCC?

Why not?

The FCC allows persons with no vested interest in various radio services
to post thier opinons relative to that service and to receive the same weight
as any other persons (or entities) comments as any other.

Certainly FISTS >>DOES<< have a vested interest in Amateur Radio issues as
(I believe...I do not know for sure...) all of FISTS members ARE licensed
Amateur Radio operators.

No?

>Thank you, bb

73

Steve, K4YZ

2793. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 17:49:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040417134922.10465.00000052@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 90857

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/17/2004 12:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <P_dgc.14803$k05.5010@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>|
>| I doubt there is a great deal grandpa DOES care about.
>|
>
>Here's a pointer to some of what I care about ---

Pardon me if I skip the URL'.s...Hard to tell what might get imported.

>And now that I've tired of your shallow insulting posts, the following
>is not the sound of a tennis racket..... >>>PLONK<<<
>
>As always,

And, as always you have demonstrated a strong "Do As I say, Not Do As I Do"
practice, Hans.

It's perfectly OK for you to be insinuating, snide, assinine or
distruptive, but you certainly don't like it tossed back at you.

Why am I not surprised?

Steve, K4YZ

2794. Problems with vanityhq.com, N4MC & AE7Q - loons!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 19:56:33 UTC
From: will_210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b5d0bdbb.0404171156.364b312e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90858
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I've had a problem with vanityhq and AE7Q's fcc call sign lookup pages. And I'm not talking about the fact that they're both run by a couple of really odd sociopaths, which they are. I'm talking about the fact that they disagree on certain callsign predictions. Namely, if you file for a 1x3 whose suffix starts with an 'X', vanityhq will give you the all-clear and AE7Q's will tell you it's "reserved." Same with all 2x3s starting with 'WC', which used to be reserved for RACES but which aren't anymore.

So here's the scenario: you see these discrepancies and start reading the message boards on vanityhq to find an answer. You see how bizarre most of the people who post on it are, completely obsessed with call signs; it's like that's all they think about all day. So you post anonymously, hoping that these freaks will answer your question but not particularly wanting them to know who you are. Instead of helping they start digging into your files and fcc info to find out who you are. So you get a bit nervous and try to make them stop by posing as someone else and telling them they're being strange and just to answer the question. Then they write a program to figure out your IP and ban you from the message boards altogether, even though you'd just like to bring up a few problems with their database filtering routines.

So enjoy! But look out for the "vanity loons".. these guys should double up on their OCD meds!

B

2795. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 20:52:07 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <XNggc.159965$K91.413098@attbi_s02>
Source record: 90859

```
>
> The hypothalamus is one of the most important parts of the brain,
> involved in many kinds of motivation. Among other functions, the
> hypothalamus controls the "Four F's":
>
> 1. fighting;
> 2. fleeing;
> 3. feeding; and
> 4. mating.
>
> Mate you very much.
>
> As Always,
> Hans, K0HB
```

Fornication ....na .... 73 Tom KI3R

2796. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 20:55:23 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <%Qggc.159983$K91.412790@attbi_s02>
Source record: 90860

> > Similarly, it is not appropriate for FISTS to comment on anything
> > other than Morse Code. So why do they do it? Why aren't you
> > addressing this injustice?
>
> I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code testing.
> The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse Code,
> not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should have
> either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse Code
> requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of themselves instead
> of on behalf of FISTS.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in there as I have read repeatedly that the group is only against testing ...... Oh well Back on 40 CW ....

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2797. Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 21:04:38 UTC
From: "John N. Kessler" <jnkessler@kc.rr.com>
Message-ID: <b74dd0b4.12a4f3f6@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 90864
Cross-posted to:
rec.travel.usa-canada,rec.arts.tv.mst3k.misc,rec.games.miniatures.historical,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.travel.africa

Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney,
Get Congress to Take Action

Sign our online Petition and read below for more information:

http://www.votenader.org/get_involved/impeach.php

HEY DUDE WHERE'S MY BUDDY!!!???
COME BACK HOME MICHAEL!!!

Ok Michael, you've had your realpolitik fling with ex-General Wesley Clark. Your endorsed Presidential candidate in the Democratic Primaries has withdrawn. It is time for you to come home, to join your buddies and resume your only genuine role which is that of defiance and resistance. Compliance and assistance with the Democrats does not accord with your past, your character, your bold writings and, most memorably, your long corrosive assaults on the Party that betrayed the working classes and plunged our country into corporate globalization. Remember, Michael, you're the flinty man from Flint, Michigan. You've never forgotten your roots. The heady Hollywood, Manhattan scene with the celebrities and Academy Awards have never gotten to your head but rather have gotten into your deserving pockets. How we all recall your standing before one billion people in Los Angeles at the televised Academy Awards in 2003 and, breaking the customary cant of the awardees, throwing the gauntlet down to George W. Bush and his "fictitious" war mongering.

Now the War has become a quagmire, with both Republicans and Democrats complicit (check the votes in Congress). The Draft may be on the way. So what are you doing going on the Al Franken Show very nearly breaking down when Al Gore (he of the pro NAFTA/GATT, anti-worker, regime-change, Iraq-bombing, lethal sanctions on half a million children Administration) called and thought you were apologizing. You have nothing to apologize for, Michael. Gore has a lot to apologize for-blowing the election he won in Florida and the country as a whole and for blowing, with Bill Clinton, the many opportunities the rich-booming Nineties and the collapse of the Soviet Union gave this country to turn a peace dividend into a pro-worker, pro-environment, pro-consumer and anti-poverty resurgence.

Come back and join our Presidential campaign, Michael. Talk to those "Reagan Democrats"-those 35% of union members who still vote Republican and against their own interests-as only you can. Michael, if you go pumping for the Democratic Party this year, just what are you going to say to the unemployed steelworkers near Sparrows Point in Maryland? To

the megathousands of laid off textile and furniture workers in North and South Carolina? To the abandoned auto workers waiting and waiting near their empty factories that went to repressive countries? To the millions of blue-collar workers, who fought our wars, only to learn that the two parties won't fight for their company pensions and health insurance? Are you going to tell them how the Democratic Party pushed through the WTO, let their pensions erode or disappear, were too busy collecting checks from the corporate bosses to pay attention to the corporate crime wave that looted and drained trillions of dollars from millions of workers, their retirement and small investments? Will you tell them that the cowardly Democrats, who couldn't win the fewer elections they are now not losing without the labor vote, won't even mount a determined drive to repeal the notorious, union-blocking Taft Hartley Act?

How can you be free to be what you are, or to depress Bush's vote, to jolt into consciousness the moribund Democratic Party?

Hey Dude, join your real buddies! The ones you may be thinking about just don't fit either your message, your vision, or our website VoteNader.org.

Come back home Michael. The workers and the youth of America are looking for you.

Best regards,
Ralph Nader

P.S. Will you put this invitation on your website and see how your fans react to Michael Moore returning to the Nader 2004 presidential campaign? Patti Smith will reserve a big singing spot, for you, on the stage for the customary finale, PEOPLE HAVE THE POWER.

Wednesday April 14, 2004

Join the Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney
Help us Get Congress to Take Action

You can help the call for an impeachment inquiry of President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney. Sign our online Petition.

http://www.votenader.org/get_involved/impeach.php

George W. Bush and Dick Cheney should be impeached for two reasons:

They led the United States into an illegal, unconstitutional war in Iraq.
They misled the Congress and the American people with five falsehoods that led to war.

All it takes is one Member of the House of Representatives to call for an Impeachment Inquiry to start the process to investigate the two grounds. If the House then votes by a simple majority for Articles of Impeachment, the Senate would then undertake a trial of the President and Vice President. They would only be convicted, and impeached, if two-thirds of the Senate agrees.

--

like the
Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and the Revolutionary Communist Party.

Not In Our Name: What is IFCO?

Not In Our Name (NION) requests donations on its website, yet on this site donors are asked to make checks payable to NION/IFCO. IFCO is the acronym for the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization. NION states that the " Interreligous Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO). is our fiscal sponsor." Fiscal sponsorship by IFCO means Not In Our Name receives donations that are tax deductible because of IFCO's 501c(3) (charitable, federal tax-exempt) status. IFCO charges a fee for this service.

Why is NION not a 501c(3)?

Donations to NION/IFCO are then mailed to the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), which is located at 339 Lafayette Street in New York City. The address is the same as NION's. The intimate nature of a financial partnership shows how closely aligned these two organizations are. And that's scary, because the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has been associated with Communist causes since its inception. Molly Klopot of the WILPF is a NION organizer. The WILPF is related to I

2798. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 21:27:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qjhgc.15012$k05.2560@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90861

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote

|
| Fornication ....na .... 73 Tom KI3R
|

Careful Tom.... no "f" words around here or the sanctimonious USMC
Profanity Police will incarcerate in the RRAP brig.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2799. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 21:36:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4081A34F.1050403@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90862

>
>
>Towards that point, if we add grace
>period expirations to the 684K total it would probably
>be over 800K hams.
>
>
>
Well, some are SK's. But unless someone in the family specifically
tells the FCC,
they would still show up in the database.

>
>

2800. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 21:50:34 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <4081A6AA.976EA9C2@firstinter.net>
Source record: 90863

Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.

Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
classes of license, immediately. On the other hand, we
could keep the Tech, give them all Communicator HF
privileges, and truck on with four classes for the long
term. Or, we could set a 10 year upgrade deadline for
Techs, and then all would expire. (In the next 10 years,
Tech renewals would be for a less than 10 year term) It
remains to be seen how the FCC will propose new license
classes in the NPRM still to come that will deal with the
entire license class structure, and code requirements.

Rick Tannehill - W7RT
Member; NCI Board

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> William wrote:
> > We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
> > proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.
>
> My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we
> have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse
> code test.
>
> In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never
> support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.
>
> If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element
> one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have
> disagreed, but I can respect the position.
>
> But if the story keeps getting changed, both on a personal and group
> level, I am a little disappointed, and future assertions from them will
> have credibility in proportion.
>
> I doubt that they care what I think.

>
> > So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.
> >
> > I'd like to ask them why their organization, a non-political
> > organization of Morse Code -Use- advocates, has filed with the FCC?

2801. Re: Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-17 23:35:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8bjgc.15136$k05.9470@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90865
Cross-posted to: rec.travel.usa-canada,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.travel.africa

"John N. Kessler" <jnkessler@kc.rr.com> wrote

| Call for an Impeachment Inquiry of Bush and Cheney,
| Get Congress to Take Action

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.

Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never!

The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!

They demand a recount!

--

"Reality does not care what you believe." --K0HB

2802. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 01:18:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <THkgc.34515$_g4.3440891@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90866

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040417133324.03003.00000014@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: "K&#65533;HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/17/2004 10:08 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <BLbgc.14681$k05.9598@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote
> >
> >|
> >| So I'd like to know who the FISTS members are on RRAP.
> >|
> >
> >FISTS member #7419 present and accounted for, SIR!
>
> FISTS 3505
>
> What took ya so long, Master Chief.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I think FISTS has a right to make proposals or comment on proposals to the
FCC re. the preservation of Morse code within AR. I happen to believe the
retention of Element 1 relates to said "preservation."

73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384

2803. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 01:19:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90867

Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
> Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
> NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
> in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
> know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
> all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
> bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
>
> Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
> over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
> only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
> classes of license, immediately.

Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.

I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes immediately.

I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains Morse for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that make it very scary.

Here is a test question:

Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC proposal is preferable to what we have now?

The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to retain the test for the Extra class exam".

Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level privileges.

You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2804. Re: Proposal to rename RRAP ... (was - Re: New Candidate for 'Youngest Extra')

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 02:07:22 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <1085bqiqc5kk65e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90876

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040411165953.13368.00000101@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <107e33h7h3d4n86@corp.supernews.com>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> writes:
>
> >Jim:
> >I haven't been watching the newsgroups as much myself..... When there
is
> >less than 5% of actual good debate/discussion on a topic (no matter how
> >risque it is) it is not worth my time to wade through the arguments.
>
> Agreed, Ryan. I have found it very effective to either killfile the worst
> offenders, or simply skim until the general tone of the post becomes
apparent.
> Often it's clear from the first line that a post isn;t worth my time.
>
> >I have
> >had a schedule change which doesn't allow me the flexibility to respond
like
> >I used to.
>
> I use AutoAol, which downloads email and newsgroup posts so I can respond
at
> leisure and save or delete as desired. Doesn't tie up the phone line and
> deletions are almost instantaneous.
>

I currently use Outlook Express, which seems to work fine for me..... it's
merely scheduling the time to respond I guess.

> > Than and pursuing Fire Officer 1,2,3 and yet another Associates
> >and Bachelor degrees, my time is severely limited.
>
> Good luck on your continuing education.

Thank you! I am a big believer in education and training, and hope to see
that rub off onto others.

> >
> >I do miss some of the debates/discussions of the past. Let's see what
> >topics of policy or procedure we can actually discuss, without fighting
> >about it.....
> >
> How about this one:

>
> "Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
> homebrewing-from-scratch? Canada and the UK have such a class".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
That would be a good one or there are many other topics I think may be
good.....

Ryan KC8PMX

2805. Re: T shirt for some of you non hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 02:11:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <1085bqp3h7cqn65@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90878

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ANOdnZGPd7qywOTd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > Actually Mike, I am neither a Democrat or Republicrat..... Haven't
went
> > out and gotten my official card, but typically aligned with the
Libertarian
> > party.
> >
> > Long time, no type eh?
>
> Hey, Ryan!. I'm happy to be registered Independent. And there are more
> of us all the time. P*****g people off because of actually thinking
> about an issue before voting!
>
> To date, it has been about a 60-40 split. The reader is encouraged to
> speculate which party has the 60, and which has the 40..... 8^)
>

I am actually encouraging others to vote Independant as often as I can, just
to give the "Olde Guarde" Republicrat and Democrats a run for their money
this time..... Not saying which one they should choose as I believe that
is something they should educate themselves on, but not to vote the "big
two" regardless....

Ryan KC8PMX

2806. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 02:17:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <1085bqptjkvec66@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90879

All these proposals need to stop for a while and what we as a ham community NEED to work on is:

1. Improving P.R. of the hobby.

2. Strengthening from within (continued training etc.)

3. Keeping existing hams active.

Ham Radio, although it has gone through many changes in the past 50+ years, it does not need to change any further than it is now, except the written testing needs to be a little more tougher, but that can be changed at the VE/VEC level and does not necessarily require alot on the FCC part.

Keep the requirements where they are now, and don't lessen it further. Work on making Ham Radio stronger from within.

Ryan KC8PMX

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5Abfc.9760$A_4.8486@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:f7d9a152.0404140545.1dfc06e0@posting.google.com...
>
> | Until the ARRL proposal came out, I had never heard anyone propose
> | automatic upgrades of Technician licensees to the General class. Now
> | that this proposal has come out, many people are defending this part
> | of the proposal.
>
> People support the ARRL proposal because it gives about 65% of all
> existing hams a coupon for a free pass to General or Extra. That
> suggests that the proposal would gain 65% support right out of the box.
> Even NCI has decided to support it, but then the vast majority of NCI
> members are techs who would be eligible for the freebie.
>
>
>

2807. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to Gener

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 02:27:14 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <1085bqs1sajjc67@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90877

The biggest thing that the ARRL needs to do right now, and would have positive "rippling effects" not only through ham radio but within the organization itself, is to work on getting that roughly 75% of hams as subscribers!

Not only would they have a ton more of money to "defend" (still remains to be proven as to exactly how they do that.....) amateur radio, but would allow for "benefits" as well, and of course allowing a slightly cheaper subscription cost. One thing that needs to be done, and might get more to sign up is to do something like this:

1st year membership= Free (but some limitation on benefits) (kinda like an assocaite membership as opposed to FULL membership

2nd year membership=Reduced cost

3rd year membership=Normal price

Another thing that could be done is to have some type of incentive program. If you "sponsor" or "sell" the idea of membership to new applicants, you get some type of kickback on your membership for each person like $1 or so per person that gets a new membership or re-joins after a certain minimum length of absence.

Ryan KC8PMX

> What's the percentage of the ARRL membership that are Techs
> compared to other classes? Remember that the no-code-test
> Tech license is over a third of ALL amateur licensees in the US.
>
> ARRL membership was down to 21% of all US ham licensees
> in December. Down from July and that down from December a
> year before.
>
> See any connections there? :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

2808. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 03:20:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eumgc.43$e4.27@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90868

"Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net> wrote

| We agree that it is the
| only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
| classes of license, immediately.

The FCC has not publicly expressed any "hellbent" intention. That notion is a construction of ARRL, which the NCI directors have unwisely chosen to support.

The immediate result will be free upgrade coupons for almost 2/3-rds of all current licensees.

The not-so-immediate result (read "unintended but entirely predictable consequence") will be the permanent loss of credibility in the qualification process for General and Extra ("If those 300,000 guys got General licenses based on passing the fall-off-a-log-easy entry-level Technician exam, then why do I have to take a harder test like all the 'real' Generals previously had to take? Oh, my dear, the unfairness of it all!") And please don't insult us by trotting out the anecdotal selective-memory jeremiad from W1RFI about how the Tech exam is every bit as hard as the General exam.

73,
de Hans, K0HB &#65533;&#65533;&#65533;
--
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

2809. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 04:21:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <C4SdnS_nxqnYnx_dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90869

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net> wrote
>
> | We agree that it is the
> | only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
> | classes of license, immediately.
>
> The FCC has not publicly expressed any "hellbent" intention. That
> notion is a construction of ARRL, which the NCI directors have unwisely
> chosen to support.
>
> The immediate result will be free upgrade coupons for almost 2/3-rds of
> all current licensees.
>
> The not-so-immediate result (read "unintended but entirely predictable
> consequence") will be the permanent loss of credibility in the
> qualification process for General and Extra ("If those 300,000 guys got
> General licenses based on passing the fall-off-a-log-easy entry-level
> Technician exam, then why do I have to take a harder test like all the
> 'real' Generals previously had to take? Oh, my dear, the unfairness of
> it all!") And please don't insult us by trotting out the anecdotal
> selective-memory jeremiad from W1RFI about how the Tech exam is every
> bit as hard as the General exam.

Agreed 100 percent Hans!

....remember, just because I agree with you doesn't mean you're wrong!.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2810. Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 08:06:31 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0404180006.6318782d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Anyone have what they think is the best antenna for a 2m, 70cm, 6m?
Price isn't an object in this case. I just want a choice of some
great antennas. I have a mag mount right now, but it's got a
Bayonet-style antenna, and not the screw-on.

(Pardon the lack of expertise, I'm a comparative new ham)

WW6DJM

Dan

2811. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 14:06:08 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <kc8ldo@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ptKdneRF45zOFh_dRVn-sQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 90871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a7dee37b.0404180006.6318782d@posting.google.com...
> Anyone have what they think is the best antenna for a 2m, 70cm, 6m?
> Price isn't an object in this case. I just want a choice of some
> great antennas. I have a mag mount right now, but it's got a
> Bayonet-style antenna, and not the screw-on.

You can try asking in the alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf news group. Also does it have to be one antenna? A 6m quarter wave is going to be at least 5 feet tall. That puts a lower limit on the size of any multiband antenna that inclues the 6m band. Some people have had good luck using two antennas. One for 70cm, and a 5/8 wave for 2m. The 5/8 wave 2m antenna will work on 6m, its close to a quarter wave lenght, if you don't mind the some what poor match you get.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

Wireless Network
Mobile computing
on the go brought
to you by Micro$oft

2812. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 14:12:42 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <db8ffc8f75f629409bca16f00361c9f6@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 90872

In article <20040415153315.15383.00000453@mb-m02.aol.com>
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>
> >Subject: Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 4/13/2004 10:16 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040413231645.12769.00000266@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <jN6dnfqkOYaX--HdRVn-uQ@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> ><deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
> >
> >>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >>news:407C5DCE.7040706@ix.netcom.com...
> >>> [snip]
> >>> Whatever entry level license is proposed or is established should be
> >>> achievable by teenagers who are able to do fairly well in school. You
> >>> don't have to be a genius honor roll student to get it, but you should
> have
> >>> more smarts than Beavis and Butthead can muster....
> >>
> >>This means that all the tests need to be harder as ordinary youths even
> >>below the teen age level regularly pass the Technician and General class
> >>exams. With a little extra elmering, some pass the Extra exam.
> >
> > Yes, even SEVEN YEAR OLDS to extra. :-)
> >
> > Yeah, lots of "elmering." Suuure.
>
> Lennie, how many new radio "enthusiasts" have YOU "elmered" into the
> hobby? Of ANY age...?!?!

Aww, come on, Steve, Lennie's too busy "elmering" the kids into his
NAMBLA lifestyle.

2813. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 14:19:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <yu-dnQnJ-cfJEx_dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> Anyone have what they think is the best antenna for a 2m, 70cm, 6m?
> Price isn't an object in this case. I just want a choice of some
> great antennas. I have a mag mount right now, but it's got a
> Bayonet-style antenna, and not the screw-on.
>
> (Pardon the lack of expertise, I'm a comparative new ham)
>
> WW6DJM
>
> Dan

Hi Dan.

I took the liberty of forwarding the message to
rec.radio.amateur.antenna. It is a better group for this subject.

Your question is a little broad. I'm not sure of the application, base
or mobile, or if you would like a multiband or what.

If you want a good general purpose antenna, there are multiband 2m/70cm
ones out there. Single band antennas work well also. I've made a ground
plane for the house, and the mobile antennas use the car body for the
ground plane, although I've heard some discussion to the contrary. A
number of people like J-pole antennas, I've just built one for 2 meters,
and am evaluating it now.

If you want more "gain", you might look into one of the multi-element
antennas. These are a good deal more expensive, and need a rotator, as
the gain in one direction is offset by a null in the opposite direction.

But so much depends on what you want to do. If repeater operations are
your main interest on the higher frequencies, then the ground
plane/jpole approach is better IMO, unless you are on a fringe area and
need the gain just to hit the repeater.

On six meters, there are a number of options, from dipole to the
multiple element antennas also. The same ideas apply.

Hope this helps, but if you like, you can give us a few more details.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2814. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 14:57:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <LHwgc.987$e4.584@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90874

"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote

|
| Aww, come on, Steve, Lennie's too busy "elmering" the kids into his
| NAMBLA lifestyle.
|

I've found a lot of reasons to discount Len's contributions to this newsgroup, but to suggest that he's involved in corrupting children is the lowest form of insult imaginable. That you are so cowardly that you lack the balls to identify yourself speaks volumes. In plain simple English, you're a gutless asshole.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2815. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 15:48:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040418114807.20369.00000148@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 90875

>Subject: Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/18/2004 9:57 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <LHwgc.987$e4.584@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote
>
>|
>| Aww, come on, Steve, Lennie's too busy "elmering" the kids into his
>| NAMBLA lifestyle.
>|
>
>I've found a lot of reasons to discount Len's contributions to this
>newsgroup, but to suggest that he's involved in corrupting children is
>the lowest form of insult imaginable. That you are so cowardly that you
>lack the balls to identify yourself speaks volumes. In plain simple
>English, you're a gutless a**hole.

Although his delivery is a bit barbaric and poorly worded, I'd have to
agree with Hans' assessment. Lennie's a lot of things, but I doubt that he's a
THAT low.

Steve, K4YZ

2816. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 16:43:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <vf-dnXx0vJxnMh_dRVn-jg@comcast.com>
Source record: 90880

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:sEcfc.7010$zj3.3932@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:5PKdnWJ7qpBzCeHdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:al0fc.1055$w74.1048@news02.roc.ny...
> > > [snip]
> > > While I have no problem with the elimination of Morse code, nor have I
a
> > > problem with an easy entry level license, I am rather perplexed with
the
> > > continued insistance that the tests are too hard. I am also somewhat
> > > surprised at a free ride of either codeless techs or tech plusses
being
> > > moved to general. The only techs which got the free ride were the
techs
> > > from years ago who took the general theory. The only difference was
the
> 5
> > > words per minute vs the 13 words per minute of the general class
> license.
> > > When the code requirement was dropped to 5 words per minute, the old
> techs
> > > had already passed the entire exam for new general class licensees.
> Hmmmm
> > > ... come to think of it, they didn't get a 'free' ride - they passed
the
> > > same elements as newly issued general class licenses.
> > >
> > > Just my thoughts ...
> >
> > And keep in mind that that upgrade isn't exactly "free". They have to
> take
> > the time and energy to find or get the necessary proof of license, find
a
> > test session, show up at said test session, and process the paperwork.
>
> Actually there's no need at all to do that. All the FCC needs to
> do is change the rules to reflect that all Techs licenses are now
> General and they will be reissued as General as they individually
> expire and are renewed. The same would be true for Advanced to
> Extra, and, if the NCVEC petition wins out with the new entry

> license being "Communicator" then existing Novice licenses
> would be equivalent to Communicator and renewed as such when
> the current license expired. There is NO immediate need for any
> paperwork to happen at all.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

If the goal is simplification of number of classes, then there would indeed be a need to do the upgrades enmass. Otherwise the closed classes could hang on for up to 10 years, which nearly negates the simplification process.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2817. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 16:45:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <KOqdnX1UnP4OLR_dRVn-uA@comcast.com>
Source record: 90881

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:fIcfc.7014$zj3.3721@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:fPSdnTWGodzqD-HdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:np_ec.6478$zj3.4109@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
> > > > Jason Hsu wrote:
> > > > > Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the
> years
> > > > > when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were
available
> > > > > for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose
> the
> > > > > No-Code Technician.
> > > >
> > > > Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
> > > > can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
> > >
> > > Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
> > > bright kids can take and pass.
> >
> > In one of my recent classes, I had an 8 year old boy of ordinary grades
> and
> > ordinary intelligence take and pass the Technician. Sorry but the test
> does
> > NOT need to be easier. He made it on the second try. This is no worse
> than
> > many adults.
>
> If it was that easy, why two tries before passing...and what
> was his passing score when he did?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Because he didn't get serious about studying until after he failed it once.
It is not possible to make a test simple enough to always pass on the first
try without seriously compromising the test.

I did not note was his score was as the important point was that he passed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2818. Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 17:12:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YFygc.1101$e4.504@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90882

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote

| How about this one:
|
| "Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
| homebrewing-from-scratch?"

Here comes Jim with another of his "Appliance Operator Class License" strawmen. Excuse me while I piss some flaming napalm on it. (ooopppsss, uh, I musta meant to say "void my bladder for the nursie")

While I can't remember the last "fully homebrew" shack I saw (probably KG6AIG back in the 60's, and even Luis had *some* commercial test equipment items lying about), it is extremely uncommon to find a shack where every item is commercial (or in it's original commercial state.) Homebrewing and modification to commercial designs is especially alive and well in the QRP, contesting, satelite, and microwave communities.

The QCAO (Quarter Century Appliance Operators club) and ASSOOBA (Amalgamated Simple Shacks On Our Belt Association) would love it, but this idea would put our service on an immediate slide into nothing more than another consumer orientated Family Radio Service, and the consequent abolishment of Amateur
Radio.

The *single* unique element which differentiates our service from all the other radio services is our authority to experiment, build, modify, and generally tinker around and operate equipment which is not type accepted. The "technical" aspect of our hobby comprises 3 of the 5 reasons (paragraph 97.1) for the existence of the ARS, and removal of this requirement for licensing would tear the heart and soul out of the hobby.

If even a single class of amateurs were to be licensed without any requirement for electronics knowledge, then it follows that type acceptance of amateur equipment would be a requirement for sale to those induhviduals. Used equipment, if sold to "no-Tech" amateurs would need to be recertified and "mod-free", and repairs could only be accomplished by FCC-approved service facilities. The cost of new equipment would rise to commercial-service price levels, because of type-acceptance issues, and most vendors would probably leave the market.

Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free?

73,
de Hans, K0HB &#65533;&#65533;&#65533;
--

SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

2819. Re: Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 21:22:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040418172214.22215.00000027@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 90883

>Subject: Proposal for a no-Tech license class
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/18/2004 12:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <YFygc.1101$e4.504@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote
>
>| How about this one:
>|
>| "Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
>| homebrewing-from-scratch?"
>
>Here comes Jim with another of his "Appliance Operator Class License"
>strawmen. Excuse me while I piss some flaming napalm on it. (ooopppsss,
>uh, I musta meant to say "void my bladder for the nursie")

No problem, Hans.

You're the one with the two-face complex, not me. Cuss all you want. It only sets the stage for "What Can We Believe From Hans"...You express your angst about MY posting habits, yet you make liberal use of insults, profanity and snide insults to "express" yourself.

>Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free?

Hey...YOU joined "NCI"...You helped to get us here. Now you're complaining...?!?!

> NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

Uh huh...that's what I thought.

Steve, K4YZ

2820. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 22:16:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404181416.35427859@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90884

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<KOqdnX1UnP4OLR_dRVn-uA@comcast.com>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:fIcfc.7014$zj3.3721@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > If it was that easy, why two tries before passing...and what
> > was his passing score when he did?
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Because he didn't get serious about studying until after he failed it once.
> It is not possible to make a test simple enough to always pass on the first
> try without seriously compromising the test.
>
> I did not note was his score was as the important point was that he passed.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Wonder when he'll put up a 60' tower and tribander?

2821. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 22:18:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404181418.700ad7c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90885

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<%Qggc.159983$K91.412790@attbi_s02>...
> > > Similarly, it is not appropriate for FISTS to comment on anything
> > > other than Morse Code. So why do they do it? Why aren't you
> > > addressing this injustice?
> >
> > I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code testing.
> > The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse Code,
> > not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should have
> > either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse Code
> > requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of themselves instead
> > of on behalf of FISTS.
> >
> > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>
> Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in there as I have
> read repeatedly that the group is only against testing ...... Oh well
> Back on 40 CW ....
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
violence for their name?

2822. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 22:50:30 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0404181450.133aaa52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90886
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Ah! Thanks a lot! Actually 2 Meters is really the ONLY one I'm wanting to be using. I have a new Icom T90A, and just want a nice car antenna for talking on 2 meters. It's an HT. I have an actual Icom V8000 rig, but that's for indoors. (Got a beautiful Diamond X-50 for that, and I get repeaters all over the place here in the sierra foothills. Though I have to get to work on my coax, which is damaged, but ... Got the new coax and connectors, and will be dealing with that after I move to Indianapolis.)

For now, I want to operate with a reasonable degree of effectiveness from inside my vehicle with my HT. It's a fine, fine HT. My biggest concern is 2 meters, and whether or not it comes with the coax I'll need to put on my car. Again, I am VERY new to this hobby, having only gone on the air a dozen times (since moving has taken all of my energies) and I want something to use in the car. I have a mag mount, but it has the bayonet style connector. I'll need an adapter, but I ALSO want to get a good antenna. My radio only puts out 5 watts max.

I wouldn't mind being able to test out some 6M, but 2M is most important for me. Thanks so much for your help and interest in helping.

73, WW6DJM

Dan

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<yu-dnQnJ-cfJEx_dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
> Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> > > Anyone have what they think is the best antenna for a 2m, 70cm, 6m?
> > > Price isn't an object in this case. I just want a choice of some
> > > great antennas. I have a mag mount right now, but it's got a
> > > Bayonet-style antenna, and not the screw-on.
> > >
> > > (Pardon the lack of expertise, I'm a comparative new ham)
> > >
> > > WW6DJM
> > >
> > > Dan
> >
> > Hi Dan.
> >
> > I took the liberty of forwarding the message to
> > rec.radio.amateur.antenna. It is a better group for this subject.
> >

> Your question is a little broad. I'm not sure of the application, base
> or mobile, or if you would like a multiband or what.
>
> If you want a good general purpose antenna, there are multiband 2m/70cm
> ones out there. Single band antennas work well also. I've made a ground
> plane for the house, and the mobile antennas use the car body for the
> ground plane, although I've heard some discussion to the contrary. A
> number of people like J-pole antennas, I've just built one for 2 meters,
> and am evaluating it now.
>
> If you want more "gain", you might look into one of the multi-element
> antennas. These are a good deal more expensive, and need a rotator, as
> the gain in one direction is offset by a null in the opposite direction.
>
> But so much depends on what you want to do. If repeater operations are
> your main interest on the higher frequencies, then the ground
> plane/jpole approach is better IMO, unless you are on a fringe area and
> need the gain just to hit the repeater.
>
> On six meters, there are a number of options, from dipole to the
> multiple element antennas also. The same ideas apply.
>
> Hope this helps, but if you like, you can give us a few more details.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

2823. Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 22:54:26 UTC
From: radio-operator@telus.net
Message-ID: <d318809e.0404181454.6d883e6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90887
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
you come across one feel free to let me know.

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/Canada Frequency Database.txt

Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/Canada Radio Spectrum.pdf
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/US Radio Spectrum.pdf

*** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***

Homac
radio-operator@telus.net

2824. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 23:15:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <w_udnZl9sJCQkR7dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90888

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:fIcfc.7014$zj3.3721@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:fPSdnTWGodzqD-HdRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>news:np_ec.6478$zj3.4109@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>>news:407BF5FA.8090509@psu.edu...
>>>>
>>>>>Jason Hsu wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Is the No-Code Technician license THAT hard to get? During the
>>
>>years
>>
>>>>>>when both the Novice and No-Code Technician licenses were
>
> available
>
>>>>>>for new hams, the new hams (including myself) overwhelmingly chose
>>
>>the
>>
>>>>>>No-Code Technician.
>>>>>
>>>>>Not difficult at all. Many people have taken and passed the test. I
>>>>>can't think of any good arguments for reducing it.
>>>>
>>>>Think of a very basic entry level that more than just extraordinary
>>>>bright kids can take and pass.
>>>
>>>In one of my recent classes, I had an 8 year old boy of ordinary grades
>>
>>and
>>
>>>ordinary intelligence take and pass the Technician. Sorry but the test
>>
>>does
>>
>>>NOT need to be easier. He made it on the second try. This is no worse

>>
>>than
>>
>>>many adults.
>>
>>If it was that easy, why two tries before passing...and what
>>was his passing score when he did?
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>
> Because he didn't get serious about studying until after he failed it once.
> It is not possible to make a test simple enough to always pass on the first
> try without seriously compromising the test.
>
> I did not note was his score was as the important point was that he passed.

I really don't think we want to go down the path of ensuring universal
passage in one test, do we?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2825. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 23:17:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040418191730.25772.00000081@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 90889

>Subject: Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from
>Tech to General?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/18/2004 5:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404181418.700ad7c8@posting.google.com>

>Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
>violence for their name?

On the other hand...

The fist has also represented skilled trade unions, unity and solidarity.

That it represents a "symbol of violence" is more or less true if you are presdisposed to looking for violence. Once sees what one wants, I suppose.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2826. Re: Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 23:23:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <C_KdnaVJJs6ekx7dRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90890

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote
>
> | How about this one:
> |
> | "Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
> | homebrewing-from-scratch?"
>
> Here comes Jim with another of his "Appliance Operator Class License"
> strawmen. Excuse me while I piss some flaming napalm on it.

Aww man, that makes me cringe just thinking about it! But penicillin
will take care of it in a week or so...

(ooopppsss,
> uh, I musta meant to say "void my bladder for the nursie")
>
> While I can't remember the last "fully homebrew" shack I saw (probably
> KG6AIG back in the 60's, and even Luis had *some* commercial test
> equipment items lying about), it is extremely uncommon to find a shack
> where every item is commercial (or in it's original commercial state.)
> Homebrewing and modification to commercial designs is especially alive
> and well in the QRP, contesting, satelite, and microwave communities.
>
> The QCAO (Quarter Century Appliance Operators club) and ASSOOBA
> (Amalgamated Simple Shacks On Our Belt Association) would love it, but
> this idea would put our service on an immediate slide into nothing more
> than another consumer orientated Family Radio Service, and the
> consequent abolishment of Amateur
> Radio.
>
> The *single* unique element which differentiates our service from all
> the other radio services is our authority to experiment, build, modify,
> and generally tinker around and operate equipment which is not type
> accepted. The "technical" aspect of our hobby comprises 3 of the 5
> reasons (paragraph 97.1) for the existence of the ARS, and removal of
> this requirement for licensing would tear the heart and soul out of the
> hobby.
>
> If even a single class of amateurs were to be licensed without any
> requirement for electronics knowledge, then it follows that type
> acceptance of amateur equipment would be a requirement for sale to those
> induhviduals. Used equipment, if sold to "no-Tech" amateurs would need
> to be recertified and "mod-free", and repairs could only be accomplished

> by FCC-approved service facilities. The cost of new equipment would
> rise to commercial-service price levels, because of type-acceptance
> issues, and most vendors would probably leave the market.
>
> Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free?

Aren't you *agreeing* with Jim here? I mean I agree with what you wrote here, and I agree with Jim that it isn't a good idea to have a "no homebrew class".

Help a dumb guy out here!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2827. Re: Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-18 23:59:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QNidnTE9-4j1ix7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90891

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Proposal for a no-Tech license class
>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>Date: 4/18/2004 12:12 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <YFygc.1101$e4.504@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote
>>
>>| How about this one:
>>|
>>| "Is it a good idea to have an class of license that does not allow
>>| homebrewing-from-scratch?"
>>
>>Here comes Jim with another of his "Appliance Operator Class License"
>>strawmen. Excuse me while I piss some flaming napalm on it. (ooopppsss,
>>uh, I musta meant to say "void my bladder for the nursie")
>
>
> No problem, Hans.
>
> You're the one with the two-face complex, not me. Cuss all you want. It
> only sets the stage for "What Can We Believe From Hans"...You express your
> angst about MY posting habits, yet you make liberal use of insults, profanity
> and snide insults to "express" yourself.
>
>
>>Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free?
>
>
> Hey...YOU joined "NCI"...You helped to get us here. Now you're
> complaining...?!?!

Its a continuum. All things are related, and all actions have more
consequences than expected. More's the pity, since something good could
be salvaged from the present situation without the Element 1 test. Now
it is mutating into something that can really damage the Amateur Radio
Service.

- Mike, KB3EIA -

sometimes the worst thing to do to people is to give them what they ask
for.

2828. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 00:05:41 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <pJEgc.164828$K91.421193@attbi_s02>
Source record: 90892

> > >
> > > I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code testing.
> > > The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse Code,
> > > not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should have
> > > either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse Code
> > > requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of themselves instead
> > > of on behalf of FISTS.
> > >
> > > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> >
> > Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in there as I
have
> > read repeatedly that the group is only against testing ...... Oh well
> > Back on 40 CW ....
> >
> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
> violence for their name?

Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the years ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that fellow can really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index finger and his forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess it has degenerated into the pressing of a mike button to complain about one's health problems or making bizarre noises either on purpose or by some wildly compressed splattering signal to make up for poor operating skill Oh BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But I guess that pounding brass is more violent than flapping one's jaw

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2829. Re: Just how necessary is a new Novice class?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 00:10:01 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <195635801f2895bc38b8145d22cdbb88@dizum.com>
Source record: 90893

In article <LHwgc.987$e4.584@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
>
> "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote
>
> |
> | Aww, come on, Steve, Lennie's too busy "elmering" the kids into his
> | NAMBLA lifestyle.
> |
>
> I've found a lot of reasons to discount Len's contributions to this
> newsgroup, but to suggest that he's involved in corrupting children is
> the lowest form of insult imaginable. That you are so cowardly that you
> lack the balls to identify yourself speaks volumes. In plain simple
> English, you're a gutless asshole.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

```
Fuck you. You must be into it as well.
```

2830. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 00:29:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DemdnehNkK7ngB7dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Daniel J. Morlan wrote:

> Ah! Thanks a lot! Actually 2 Meters is really the ONLY one I'm
> wanting to be using. I have a new Icom T90A, and just want a nice car
> antenna for talking on 2 meters. It's an HT.

Okay, now we have something to work with. I'm using a 5/8th wave antenna on my car. It works pretty well. I'd suggest one of those. The brand is MFJ. Some don't like them, but it has performed well for over 3 years now. It has a small bottom loading coil. If you can spare the height, a full length version should perform a bit better.

Most come with coax.

Then you have to deal with mounting. I use a mag mount, and can run the cable between the doors of my Cherokee and it looks good. If that doesn't work for you, you can possibly run the cable down the back and into the trunk, then back up.

You can also use a trunk lip mount and do the same.

If you are really brave, you can body mount the antenna, but that is quite a project.

I don't recommend glass mount antennas for 2 meters.

After mounting the antenna, get a bnc or sma adapter, according to your needs, give the swr a check, and there you go. The big thing to look out for on installations is to avoid crimping the coax between doors, trunk lid, etc. That can create a swore problem.

I used a HT in the car for quite a while. (FT-50) Worked just fine. You should be happy with it. With a decent antenna and 5 watts, it is impressive how well it works.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2831. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 00:46:34 UTC
From: Stephen Cowell <scowell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <KjFgc.18468$VE3.12533@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 90895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a7dee37b.0404181450.133aaa52@posting.google.com...
> Ah! Thanks a lot! Actually 2 Meters is really the ONLY one I'm
> wanting to be using. I have a new Icom T90A, and just want a nice car
> antenna for talking on 2 meters.

You want a mag-mount 5/8wave Larsen... it's a
nice 1/4wave on 6m, too. Get the Larsen mag
mount, too... your present mag-mount (probably
BNC, with a duck on it) is insufficient... BNC
connectors are not rated for outdoor exposure.
Just run the coax in the passenger side, via the
rear door's front edge, down the center post, and
under the rocker panel to the dash.

--
Steve
KI5YG
.

2832. Re: Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 00:55:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SrFgc.1681$e4.1449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90896

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

|
| Help a dumb guy out here!
|

About once every 2 or 3 fortnights, Jim drags out this old bedraggled strawman.

It is always a question which in one form or another asks "I don't want to be involved in this techie crap... I just wanna talk on ra-did-eo, so why don't they have an amateur license for me?"

And just as regularly as Jim drags out this nontribution (no, I didn't misspell 'contribution') to the future of amateur radio, I am compelled to try to convince him the idea is a non-starter. But if Jim is nothing else, he is a persistent cuss, so lurk along with me and before long you'll see his strawman skulking again here on rrap asking......

"If I don't wanna be an amateur radio techie, why do I
gotta take these stupid tests. It just ain't fair! I'm gonna
go join the QCAO!"

73, de Hans, K0HB

2833. Need Help with ADI AT-200/AT-201 HT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 02:07:57 UTC
From: Maxwell <maxheadspace@cox.net>
Message-ID: <1wGgc.21883$fq4.5987@lakeread05>
Source record: 90897

Greetings!

I have an ADI AT-200 and an AT-201 HT, but lost the instructions. Can anyone tell me how to program the PL tones?

Thanks much!
Max.
maxheadspace@cox.net

2834. Re: Proposal for a no-Tech license class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 02:18:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xNGdnSH1nfKYqh7dRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90898

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> |
> | Help a dumb guy out here!
> |
>
> About once every 2 or 3 fortnights, Jim drags out this old bedraggled
> strawman.
>
> It is always a question which in one form or another asks "I don't want
> to be involved in this techie crap... I just wanna talk on ra-did-eo, so
> why don't they have an amateur license for me?"
>
> And just as regularly as Jim drags out this nontribution (no, I didn't
> misspell 'contribution') to the future of amateur radio, I am compelled
> to try to convince him the idea is a non-starter. But if Jim is nothing
> else, he is a persistent cuss, so lurk along with me and before long
> you'll see his strawman skulking again here on rrap asking......
>
> "If I don't wanna be an amateur radio techie, why do I
> gotta take these stupid tests. It just ain't fair! I'm gonna
> go join the QCAO!"

Okay, I see what you are talking about.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2835. Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 03:10:06 UTC
From: radio-operator@telus.net
Message-ID: <d318809e.0404181910.2d9b365@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
you come across one feel free to let me know.

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaFrequencyDatabase.txt

Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaRadioSpectrum.pdf
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/USRadioSpectrum.pdf

*** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***

Homac
radio-operator@telus.net

2836. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 03:52:28 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94CFF2C45F1F6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90900

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
news:pJEgc.164828$K91.421193@attbi_s02:

>
>> > >
>> > > I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code
>> > > testing.
>> > > The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse
>> > > Code, not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should
>> > > have
>> > > either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse
>> > > Code requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of
>> > > themselves instead of on behalf of FISTS.
>> > >
>> > > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>> >
>> > Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in there
>> > as I have read repeatedly that the group is only against testing
>> > ...... Oh well Back on 40 CW ....
>> >
>> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>>
>> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
>> violence for their name?
>
>
> Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
> has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the years
> ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that fellow can
> really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index finger and his
> forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess it has degenerated
> into the pressing of a mike button to complain about one's health
> problems or making bizarre noises either on purpose or by some wildly
> compressed splattering signal to make up for poor operating skill Oh
> BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But I guess that pounding brass is
> more violent than flapping one's jaw
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
>
>

You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to the phone end of the band!

2837. Re: Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 03:53:15 UTC
From: Brian Denley <b.denley@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <L2Igc.165215$K91.423207@attbi_s02>
Source record: 90901
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Private wrote:
> For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
> LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
> you come across one feel free to let me know.
>

> Homac
> radio-operator@telus.net

Homac:

Omission #1:
I am decoding FM FAX and RTTY right now from 4271 KHz which is the Canadian
Metroc Centre in Halifax NS but I don't see it on your list.
--
Brian Denley
http://home.comcast.net/~b.denley/index.html

2838. Re: Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 04:58:06 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <y%Igc.11797$Z4.3752@clgrps12>
Source record: 90902
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Homac,

You are a God! :-)

--
Gregg
It's probably useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

2839. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 07:38:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404151040520.91@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90903

On Thu, 14 Apr 2004, Jason Hsu wrote:
> It seems that ever since the ARRL made its restructuring proposal, ...
>
> Is there any reason to support this idea other than the alleged needs
> to
> 1. Reduce the number of license classes to 3

Why do we even need 3? Why not simply TWO: Below 30Mhz and above 30Mhz, and people can hold both.

> 2. Introduce a new entry-level license

A new "entry-level" license: Why? The TECHNICIAN class, as it is now, IS the entry-level license. It doesn't matter that it was not originally meant to be; it has evolved into such. If the ARRL can't see that, then their leadership are truly idiots.

> 3. Avoid downgrading privileges
>
> I fully agree with #3, the need to avoid downgrading privileges. #1
> and #2 individually sound reasonable. But insisting on meeting all
> three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be
> automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there
> only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license
> and upgrade the current Novices to Technician? If a new entry-level
> license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes
> instead of 3? What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?

I disagree. However, if a license privilege is going to change, there should be a transitional period of two years where a person can do whatever is needed to upgrade to the appropriate class where the privilege will be retained (or expanded, if that class has more privilege), and for all those who do not upgrade, they get what they deserve by their inaction.

> Can anyone provide any other reason why Technicians should be upgraded ...

2840. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 07:48:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404151053330.91@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 90904

On Tue, 13 Apr 2004, Mike Coslo wrote:
> I've been here a few years now, and listened to a lot that has been
> said and done.

Two big problems:

1) Stop calling it "ham radio" as that is actually a derrogatory term. One origin of it is from 19th century telegraphy where POOR telegraph operators were called "hams." Only the truly ignorant really believe the story that it was from the initials of the operators of one of the more popular (east coast) stations.

2) Impose a requirement where one's weight (in pounds) may not exceed one's IQ. There are just too many fat people in the hobby, and one may think that it's called "ham radio" because all the people in it are PIGS (literally).

;-)

2841. Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 11:25:08 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90905
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for various solid state and tube conversions.

Thanks in advance for any help.

WA3MOJ

2842. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 12:14:37 UTC
From: Ready Kilowatt <Ready@none.org>
Message-ID: <bc36ecb32b465ea62ae20499db1aa0a0@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Wouldn't that be illegal?

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ
>

2843. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 12:16:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419081650.28714.00000053@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 90906

>If the ARRL can't see that, then their leadership are
>truly idiots.

You just figured that out.

2844. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 12:25:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404190425.c85a594@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90908

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94CFF2C45F1F6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
> news:pJEgc.164828$K91.421193@attbi_s02:
>
> >
> > >> > >
> > >> > > I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code
> > >> > > testing.
> > >> > > The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING Morse
> > >> > > Code, not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The leaders should
> > >> > > have
> > >> > > either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse
> > >> > > Code requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of
> > >> > > themselves instead of on behalf of FISTS.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> > >> >
> > >> > Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in there
> > >> > as I have read repeatedly that the group is only against testing
> > >> > ...... Oh well Back on 40 CW ....
> > >> >
> > >> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
> > >>
> > >> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
> > >> violence for their name?
> > >
> > >
> > > Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
> > > has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the years
> > > ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that fellow can
> > > really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index finger and his
> > > forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess it has degenerated
> > > into the pressing of a mike button to complain about one's health
> > > problems or making bizarre noises either on purpose or by some wildly
> > > compressed splattering signal to make up for poor operating skill Oh
> > > BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But I guess that pounding brass is
> > > more violent than flapping one's jaw
> > >
> > > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
> >
> > You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to the
> > phone end of the band!

Definitely a phonaphobe!

If I recall my Morse Code instruction, you don't use your fist on the key. You gently hold the knob between your between your thumb and index (and middle) finger.

Ah well, it's all going away soon anyhow.

2845. Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 12:45:27 UTC
From: prjames@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <65a4e370.0404190445.2bdcaa99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Greetings all,

I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and would like to know if there are any communities that I should specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio antennas or other issues.

Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of what I am willing to consider.

Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.

73,

Cathy (N5WVR)

2846. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 12:48:59 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <%UPgc.61129$_g4.9385579@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 90910

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0404151040520.91@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> It doesn't matter that it was not originally meant to be;
> it has evolved into such. If the ARRL can't see that, then their
leadership are
> truly idiots.

I like this statement. The recognition of evolution wrt radio services is
somewhat dear to my heart. <ggg>

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2847. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 13:03:13 UTC
From: exray <dontspamme-exray@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <1087jeasabg29f4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90911
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

WA3MOJ wrote:

> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ
>

George,
Are you wanting to convert them to AM or SSB?

-BM

2848. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 13:03:51 UTC
From: Stephen Cowell <scowell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <X6Qgc.18544$JE7.16765@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 90912
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
for
> various solid state and tube conversions.

Kinda late for April 1, isn't it?

--
Steve
KI5YG
.

2849. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 13:35:14 UTC
From: mi-oldradios <wa8x@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4083d5f1_5@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 90913
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

I guess an Extra should be able to figure it out. I would say it would be a lot of work to put UHF FM gear on 11 meters AM/SSB. Too much work in fact. Now if he was going to use them on GMRS FM I would say go for it BUT it would still be illegal as they won't be FCC type accepted. Get caught selling these things, lose your Ham ticket.

--

Please reply to:
mi_oldradios at yahoo dot com

" Stephen Cowell" <scowell@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:X6Qgc.18544$JE7.16765@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
> that
> > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
> finding
> > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
references
> for
> > various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Kinda late for April 1, isn't it?
> __
> Steve
> KI5YG
> .
>
>

2850. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 13:47:18 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D06378F470elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90914

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0404190425.c85a594@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94CFF2C45F1F6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
>> news:pJEgc.164828$K91.421193@attbi_s02:
>>
>> >
>> >> > >
>> >> > > I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code
>> >> > > testing.
>> >> > > The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING
>> >> > > Morse Code, not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The
>> >> > > leaders should have
>> >> > > either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse
>> >> > > Code requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of
>> >> > > themselves instead of on behalf of FISTS.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>> >> >
>> >> > Why isn't NCI ....NCTI .... Should have testing in
>> >> > there as I have read repeatedly that the group is only against
>> >> > testing ...... Oh well Back on 40 CW ....
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>> >>
>> >> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
>> >> violence for their name?
>> >
>> >
>> > Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
>> > has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the
>> > years ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that
>> > fellow can really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index
>> > finger and his forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess
>> > it has degenerated into the pressing of a mike button to complain
>> > about one's health problems or making bizarre noises either on
>> > purpose or by some wildly compressed splattering signal to make up
>> > for poor operating skill Oh BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But
>> > I guess that pounding brass is more violent than flapping one's jaw
>> >
>> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

>>
>> You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to
>> the phone end of the band!
>
> Definitely a phonaphobe!
>
> If I recall my Morse Code instruction, you don't use your fist on the
> key. You gently hold the knob between your between your thumb and
> index (and middle) finger.
>
> Ah well, it's all going away soon anyhow.

Already gone in Switzerland, the UK, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Papua Niugini, etc. Soon to go in France (awaiting a signature). It will go here too when the FCC eventually gets it's act together.

And you're right, you aren't supposed to use your fist, but I suppose their name does come from the 'good fist' expression.

We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain wrong to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I had to learn 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and don't tell me I 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.

2851. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 13:49:36 UTC
From: Chuck Harris <cfharris@erols.com>
Message-ID: <4083d8f1$0$16477$61fed72c@news.rcn.com>
Source record: 90915
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

That doesn't make any sense. UHF gear is suited to the 400-600MHz
region. 11 meters is 27MHz. You would have to completely gut the
unit and replace all of the tuned circuits.

Besides, it is very ILLEGAL to run any non type accepted gear on the
11m CB band (unless the power is in the milliwatt region.. Even in
today's relaxed enforcement environment, running funny gear on 11m can
get your ham ticket pulled.

-Chuck Harris

OBTW, you are 18 days late for an april fools joke.

WA3MOJ wrote:
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ
>

2852. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 14:12:19 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c60mo308em@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90916
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <1087jeasabg29f4@corp.supernews.com>, exray says...
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>
>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
>>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
>> various solid state and tube conversions.
>>
>> Thanks in advance for any help.
>>
>> WA3MOJ
>>
>
>George,
>Are you wanting to convert them to AM or SSB?
>
>-BM
>
SSB. Also, I should of posted HF gear in my OP.

2853. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:01:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4083E9D0.8000208@psu.edu>
Source record: 90918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Cathy James wrote:
> Greetings all,
>
> I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
> would like to know if there are any communities that I should
> specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
> antennas or other issues.
>
> Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute
> time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing
> me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of
> what I am willing to consider.
>
> Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My
> realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her
> and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.

She should understand covenants. Have her look into that. Other than that, there can be township restrictions on antenna towers. Those usually don't prohibit them, but put limits on height. And you can often get allowances or exceptions.

Your requests are reasonable and to be expected. Other people make requests to find out if dogs are allowed in the neighborhood, etc, so the realtor needs to do their job. You are paying them a lot of money when you buy your house, so if they can't seem to find covenant and zoning laws, you might want to mention about finding a realtor that can.

Remember - Mr or Ms Realtor is NOT your friend.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2854. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:02:51 UTC
From: "Alun L. Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c60pmr$j4t$0@216.221.129.222>
Source record: 90917

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in news:20040415150839.09913.00000288
@mb-m26.aol.com:

<snip>

>
> Back in Junior High basic electricity shop class in 1947 I and
> all classmates learned the "left-hand rule" (for right-handers)
> which said "keep the left hand in the pocket if you have no
> choice about turning the power off and working with the right
> hand...that keeps a circuit from going through your heart."
> Since we'd all had basic biology by then, that made a lot of
> sense.

<snip>

> LHA / WMD

Actually, it's a left hand rule regardless of which is your preferred hand,
because your heart is on your left side. (Some people's hearts are on the
right, but it's very rare).

I was taught to keep one hand in my pocket over 200V, and both hands in my
pockets over 1kV !!

2855. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:06:15 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c60pt7$mp9$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 90919
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com>, WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
>there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
>various solid state and tube conversions.

No, you need plutonium to do this right, and that's becoming more and more
difficult to get these days.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

2856. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:22:16 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <I8Sgc.2334$e4.1466@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90920
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Cathy James" <prjames@mindspring.com> wrote

| Greetings all,
|
| I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
| would like to know if there are any communities that I should
| specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
| antennas or other issues.

The city of Plymouth should be on your list of candidates. We have a very ham-friendly antenna ordinance which I wrote. You can put up a 70-foot antenna support structure without any variance needed.

Regardless of which city you select, be aware that a particular developer or homeowners association may have restrictive covenants in the property deed. Your realtor should be able to uncover those on properties which interest you.

73, and welcome to Minnesota,

de Hans, K0HB

2857. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:30:59 UTC
From: Lou <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM>
Message-ID: <TgSgc.2852$WC3.24831@ord-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 90922
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back when.
Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the new stuff
such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing the two bands?
IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others have stated,
legality will be out the window. Lou

"Chuck Harris" <cfharris@erols.com> wrote in message
news:4083d8f1$0$16477$61fed72c@news.rcn.com...
> That doesn't make any sense. UHF gear is suited to the 400-600MHz
> region. 11 meters is 27MHz. You would have to completely gut the
> unit and replace all of the tuned circuits.
>
> Besides, it is very ILLEGAL to run any non type accepted gear on the
> 11m CB band (unless the power is in the milliwatt region.. Even in
> today's relaxed enforcement environment, running funny gear on 11m can
> get your ham ticket pulled.
>
> -Chuck Harris
>
> OBTW, you are 18 days late for an april fools joke.
>
> WA3MOJ wrote:
> > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
references for
> > various solid state and tube conversions.
> >
> > Thanks in advance for any help.
> >
> > WA3MOJ
> >

2858. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:37:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4083F242.1040908@psu.edu>
Source record: 90923

```
Alun wrote:
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0404190425.c85a594@posting.google.com:
>
>
>>Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:<Xns94CFF2C45F1F6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>>>"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
>>>news:pJEgc.164828$K91.421193@attbi_s02:
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>I agree. FISTS has a hard-line stance in favor of Morse Code
>>>>>>>>testing.
>>>>>>> The organization is supposed to be dedicated to OPERATING
>>>>>>> Morse Code, not keeping the Morse Code requirement. The
>>>>>>> leaders should have
>>>>>>>>either started a new organization dedicated to defending Morse
>>>>>>>>Code requirements or simply filed petitions on behalf of
>>>>>>>>themselves instead of on behalf of FISTS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Why isn't NCI .......NCTI ....... Should have testing in
>>>>>>there as I have read repeatedly that the group is only against
>>>>>>testing ...... Oh well Back on 40 CW ....
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>>>>>
>>>>>Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
>>>>>violence for their name?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
>>>>has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the
>>>>years ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that
>>>>fellow can really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index
>>>>finger and his forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess
>>>>it has degenerated into the pressing of a mike button to complain
>>>>about one's health problems or making bizarre noises either on
>>>>purpose or by some wildly compressed splattering signal to make up
>>>>for poor operating skill Oh BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But
>>>>I guess that pounding brass is more violent than flapping one's jaw
```

>>>>
>>>>73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>>>
>>>You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to
>>>the phone end of the band!
>>
>>Definitely a phonaphobe!
>>
>>If I recall my Morse Code instruction, you don't use your fist on the
>>key. You gently hold the knob between your between your thumb and
>>index (and middle) finger.
>>
>>Ah well, it's all going away soon anyhow.
>
>
> Already gone in Switzerland, the UK, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands,
> Norway, Papua Niugini, etc. Soon to go in France (awaiting a signature). It
> will go here too when the FCC eventually gets it's act together.
>
> And you're right, you aren't supposed to use your fist, but I suppose their
> name does come from the 'good fist' expression.
>
> We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain wrong
> to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I had to learn
> 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and don't tell me I
> 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.

Don't worry, Alun. they are making up for the injustices forced upon
you and me by making sure that we are not forcing much of anything on
anybody soon.

People that only wanted to talk on their radios were being forced to
learn some stupid theory and other likewise irrelevant (to them)
material just to get the license.

The No-code people are getting what they asked for, although not
necessarily what they wanted.

We embark on an interesting social experiment in the Amateur radio service.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2859. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:42:38 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c60s1e$813$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 90924
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Lou <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM> wrote:
>I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back when.
>Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the new stuff
>such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing the two bands?

There used to be something called Class A citizens band, which was AM modulation... I think on 460 MHz. There were a bunch of tube transmitters built for that band, most notably the Vocaline, and some of those can be sort of tweaked to kind of run on 440 MHz if you don't really care much about stability. A lot of them used bend-until-it-works capacitor and inductor technology.

I do not think this is a currently usable band. Although if it WERE currently usable, Fair Radio has a bunch of UHF AM aircraft transceivers for the military air band, which they are practically giving away right now. Not type-accepted of course...

>IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others have stated,
>legality will be out the window. Lou

The 11M crowd has never been one for worrying about legality. Which is kind of a shame since there's clearly a need being met there.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

2860. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 15:43:04 UTC
From: tnom@mucks.net
Message-ID: <qps780dq12h069hml0t6g1is4as8gdhu2a@4ax.com>
Source record: 90925
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

On 19 Apr 2004 04:25:08 -0700, WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:

>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
>there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
>various solid state and tube conversions.
>
>Thanks in advance for any help.
>
>WA3MOJ

I think the below link will accommodate your needs quite well.

http://www.opengroup.com/hubooks/089/0898048044.shtml

2861. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 16:29:35 UTC
From: Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net>
Message-ID: <4083FE6F.8010804@myob.net>
Source record: 90921
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

I don't know anything about Minneapolis in particular (except for MSP, with which I am too well acquainted), but I recommend that you *insist* on getting information about any CC&Rs and/or Home Owners' Associations that pertain to the particular subdivision or lot in which you are interested.

We bought a house in W. Michigan last year in a 30-yr old subdivision with minimal CC&Rs (with no mention of antennas or transmitters), no HOA, and underground utilities. Although most municipalities around here exempt amateur radio towers/antennas up to 70ft from any zoning ordinances (and the township in which we bought does not even require a building permit for a tower to ensure that it is safe), all the newer properties we looked at had draconian CC&Rs specifically outlawing anything more than a small satellite dish mounted no more than a few feet above the roof. You *must* check out the CC&Rs before signing anything, as they typically "run with the land," are recorded at the local "Registry of Deeds" (or whatever), and are enforceable even if you have never seen them -- the CC&Rs for the property we bought were not even made available at the closing (and even if they had been, that would have been a little late to back out of the deal).

Alan AB2OS

On 04/19/04 08:45 am Cathy James put fingers to keyboard and launched the following message into cyberspace:

> I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
> would like to know if there are any communities that I should
> specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
> antennas or other issues.
>
> Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute
> time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing
> me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of
> what I am willing to consider.
>
> Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My
> realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her
> and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.

2862. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 17:51:23 UTC
From: Richard Clark <kb7qhc@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <d44880t7ivq3b8pprvc50e7521rite4a8k@4ax.com>
Source record: 90926
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 12:14:37 GMT, "Ready Kilowatt" <Ready@none.org>
wrote:
>Wouldn't that be illegal?

Hi OM,

Yes it would. It is against the law to sell Transmitters that are not
type-accepted for the band they are intended.

On the other hand, the Amateur radio service is the ONLY exception to
the rule. We CAN design, build, and operate non type-accepted gear.

On the third hand, the 11 Meter band is not Amateur radio service.
Even tho' we can work there, we must abide by all rules and
regulations for that service (all restrictions apply in spite of our
"privileges").

73's
Richard Clark, KB7QHC

2863. 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 18:06:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90927
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz

ZCZC AG13
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 13 ARLB013
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT April 16, 2004
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB013
ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz

The FCC has adopted a somewhat limited proposal to permit deployment of RF Identification (RFID) tags on the 70-cm band at much greater duty cycles than current Part 15 rules permit for such devices.

Among other applications, RFID tags are used to track shipments and packing containers. A Third Report and Order (R & O) in ET Docket 01-278--approved April 15 but not yet released--follows a 2000 petition by SAVI Technology to revise FCC Part 15 rules to accommodate such devices in the vicinity of 433 MHz. The ARRL has consistently opposed the proposal, but the FCC just as unfailingly has gone along with it. FCC Office of Engineering and Technology (OET) Chief Ed Thomas said RFIDs provide important public benefits.

"This device is designed to increase homeland security at ports, rail yards and warehouses," Thomas told the FCC open meeting. "It will foster the development of more powerful and advanced RFID systems that can identify the contents of shipping containers and determine whether tampering has occurred during shipment." Thomas said the devices also would increase efficiency in shipping operations and inventory control.

In requesting Commission adoption, OET's Hugh van Tuyl provided the broad strokes of the Part 15 rule changes, which, he said, would apply specifically to shipping containers "in commercial and industrial areas." In certain cases, he asserted, current Part 15 requirements aimed at preventing interference to licensed services "may unnecessarily constrain the operational range of RFID systems as well as the speed and quantity of data that can be transmitted."

The Third R & O would increase the maximum radiated field strength permitted for such devices as well as the maximum permissible duty cycle--from one second to one minute. The longer duty cycle would

allow an RFID to transmit the contents of an entire shipping container, van Tuyl said. "We therefore believe there will be no significant increase in the potential for interference to authorized services," he concluded.

The Third R & O reflects certain accommodations to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), which expressed "grave concerns" about the proposal in 2002. The R & O limits the operating band for such RFID tags to 433.5 to 434.5 MHz, instead of the 425 to 435 MHz SAVI originally asked for. It further prohibits operation of RFID tag systems within 40 km (about 25 miles) of five government radar sites. Manufacturers of 433 MHz RFID systems would have to register the locations of their system base stations to aid in interference resolution.

Since SAVI first approached the FCC in 2000, ARRL has maintained that the RFID tags the company proposed would represent a significant source of potential interference to sensitive receivers and be incompatible with ongoing requirements of incumbent services.

More than 130 amateurs filed comments in opposition to SAVI Technology's RFID tags proposal, and most supported the ARRL's position that the proposed rules were flawed and should not be adopted.
NNNN
/EX

SB QST @ ARL $ARLB012
ARLB012 FCC proposes wide-ranging changes to Amateur Service rules

ZCZC AG12
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 12 ARLB012
From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT April 16, 2004
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB012
ARLB012 FCC proposes wide-ranging changes to Amateur Service rules

The FCC has released an "omnibus" Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) that seeks comments on a wide range of proposed Amateur Service (Part 97) rule changes. The FCC also denied several petitions for rule making aimed at altering portions of the Amateur Radio regulatory landscape and ordered minor changes in Part 97. The NPRM is a result of a dozen petitions for rule making, all filed more than a year ago and some as long ago as 2001.

Comments on the proposals put forth in WT Docket 04-140 are due by Tuesday, June 15, with reply comments by Wednesday, June 30. Among other changes, the FCC has recommended adopting the ARRL's "Novice refarming" plan, which can be seen on the web at, http://www.arrl.org/announce/regulatory/refarm/.

"Because the ARRL petition addresses the operating privileges of all classes of licensees on these Amateur Service bands, we believe that the ARRL petition provides a basis for a comprehensive restructuring of operating privileges," the FCC said.

The ARRL referenced its Novice refarming proposal in its recent Petition for Rule Making, RM-10867, which, along with three other petitions remains open for comment until April 23.

The FCC also has proposed essentially eliminating its rules prohibiting manufacture or marketing of Amateur Radio Service power amplifiers capable of operating between 24 and 35 MHz. The current rules "impose unnecessary restrictions on manufacturers of Amateur Radio equipment and are inconsistent with the experimental nature of the Amateur Service," the FCC said.

The FCC proposed amending Section 97.201(b) of the rules to permit auxiliary operation on 2 meters above 144.5 MHz, with the exception of the satellite subband 145.8 to 146.0 MHz, in addition to frequency segments already authorized.

The FCC proposed extending the bands available for spread spectrum experimentation and use to include 222-225 MHz as well as 6 and 2 meters. Current rules limit SS emissions to frequencies above 420 MHz.

Among other things, the FCC also proposed to prohibit acceptance of more than one application per applicant per vanity call sign; permit retransmission of communications between a manned spacecraft and its associated Earth stations, including the International Space Station; allow current amateurs to designate a specific Amateur Radio club to acquire their call sign in memoriam; eliminate Section 97.509(a) of the rules, which requires a public announcement of volunteer examiner test locations and times; and add to Section 97.505(a) to provide Element 1 (5 WPM Morse) credit to any applicant holding a Technician license granted after February 14, 1991, and who can document having passed a telegraphy examination element.

The Commission ordered some changes in Part 97 without requesting comment. It ordered, among others, the revision of the definition of an "amateur operator" in Section 97.3(a)(1) to reflect that entry in the FCC Universal Licensing System (ULS), not a license document, determines whether a person is an Amateur Radio operator.

The FCC adopted a technical change to specify that the mean power of any spurious emission from a new amateur station transmitter or amplifier operating below 30 MHz be at least 43 dB below the mean power of the fundamental emission.

Among other petitions, the FCC turned down a proposal to establish distinct CW and phone segments in the 160-meter band. Also denied were petitions that would have imposed restrictions on the time, length or transmission frequencies of bulletins or informational transmissions directed at the amateur community and a request to add

to the special event call sign system certain call sign blocks designating territories and possessions that lack mailing addresses.

The FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making, on the web at, http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-79A1.doc, in WT Docket 04-140, is available on the FCC Web site.

As soon as the document has been posted, comments on the NPRM may be filed via the FCC Electronic Comment Filing System at, http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/. Click on "Submit a filing." To view filed comments, click on "Search for filed comments." In either case enter the NPRM number in the "Proceeding" field as "04-140" (without the quotation marks).
NNNN
/EX

2864. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 18:11:52 UTC
From: dplatt@radagast.org
Message-ID: <10885j8k6d2kn8a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <d44880t7ivq3b8pprvc50e7521rite4a8k@4ax.com>,
Richard Clark <kb7qhc@comcast.net> wrote:
>>Wouldn't that be illegal?
>
>Hi OM,
>
>Yes it would. It is against the law to sell Transmitters that are not
>type-accepted for the band they are intended.

Quite right. Converting existing equipment to 11-meter use would
probably require individual certification of every unique piece or
type. Sure sounds expensive.

Issue 2: external power amplifiers are not allowed in the 11-meter
band... conversion of higher-powered UHF amps would not be legal.

Issue 3: equipment originally designed for UHF operation (1 meter and
shorter wavelengths) seems to me to be a less-than-wonderful choice
for conversion to 11-meter operation.

Issue 4: there's plenty of cheap 11-meter gear already on the market
(both legal-type-certificated, and outside-the-pale). Doesn't seem
like there'd be much of a [legal] market for converted UHF gear.

All in all, this idea sounds like a great way to lose lots of money,
and risk big fines and the loss of an amateur-radio license. As folks
may have noted, the FCC has recently raised their level of enforcement
against companies and individuals who have been playing loose-and-easy
with the rules about 11-meter operation and equipment sales.

--
Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> AE6EO
Hosting the Jade Warrior home page: http://www.radagast.org/jade-warrior
I do _not_ wish to receive unsolicited commercial email, and I will
boycott any company which has the gall to send me such ads!

2865. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 18:32:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1XUgc.2518$e4.320@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90929
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote

| Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
site's that
| will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
I'm finding
| there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
references for
| various solid state and tube conversions.

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.

Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never!

The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!

They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2866. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:15:59 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aedef724d19d55998993a@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 90930
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
w4nti@get says...
> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
> ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz

It's use it or loose it. I've turned on the rig several time during commute and during the day when I get a chance. The 70cm band in RI/SE MA is dead. Throw a call out, hear nothing back.

2M is pretty much the same. It's just too bad.

2867. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:33:01 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c619hd024bp@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90937
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <1XUgc.2518$e4.320@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, K&#65533;HB says...
>
>
>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote
>
>| Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
>site's that
>| will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
>I'm finding
>| there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
>references for
>| various solid state and tube conversions.
>
>The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
>they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
>1.4.
>
>The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
>It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was
>poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack
>the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.
>
>Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a
>9.8? Never!
>
>The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in
>dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!
>
>They demand a recount!
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
Hans, sind Sie absolut keine Hilfe gewesen. Zuk&#65533;nftig entfernen Sie bitte Ihren
Kopf von Ihrem Esel, bevor Sie zu mir sprechen.

Danke.

2868. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:39:27 UTC
From: Robert Spooner <rls19@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <c619ti$s1q$1@f04n12.cac.psu.edu>
Source record: 90931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Cathy,

From experience, I would advise you not to depend on realtors, or anyone else who has an interest in the sale, to inform you concerning restrictive covenants. It's really not in their interest. The best thing to do when you find a property in which you are interested is to go to the courthouse and look up the information yourself.

73,
Bob AD3K

Kï¿œHB wrote:

> ... Your realtor should be able to uncover those on
> properties which interest you.
>
> 73, and welcome to Minnesota,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

--
Robert L. Spooner
Registered Professional Engineer
Associate Research Engineer
Intelligent Control Systems Department

Applied Research Laboratory Phone: (814) 863-4120
The Pennsylvania State University FAX: (814) 863-7841
P. O. Box 30
State College, PA 16804-0030 rls19@psu.edu

2869. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:42:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419154251.15763.00000007@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90932

>Subject: Re: Radio Conversion
>From: Chuck Harris cfharris@erols.com
>Date: 4/19/2004 8:49 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4083d8f1$0$16477$61fed72c@news.rcn.com>

>Besides, it is very ILLEGAL to run any non type accepted gear on the
>11m CB band (unless the power is in the milliwatt region....SNIP

No problem...CBers will just tell the inspectors they are running in the
"milliwatt" region...Of course it's like 100,000,000 milliwatts!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2870. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:44:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419154445.15763.00000008@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90933

>Subject: Re: Radio Conversion
>From: "Lou" FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM
>Date: 4/19/2004 10:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <TgSgc.2852$WC3.24831@ord-read.news.verio.net>
>
>I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back when.
>Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the new stuff
>such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing the two bands?
>IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others have stated,
>legality will be out the window. Lou

Big difference.

"UHF CB" is known as GMRS, or General Mobile Radio Service. It's in the
462-467MHz range.

MURS is five discreet channels in the 151-156MHz range, or "VHF".

73

Steve, K4YZ

2871. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:45:56 UTC
From: mcalhoun@ksu.edu
Message-ID: <c61a9k$blo@unix2.cc.ksu.edu>
Source record: 90939
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

>>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
>>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
>>finding there is a substantial market for such gear ....

Am I mis-understanding or mis-interpreting something, or
doesn't 11-meter stuff have to be "type accepted"?

I can't imagine homebrew conversions being "type acceptable"!

--Myron.
--
Five boxes preserve our freedoms: soap, ballot, witness, jury, and cartridge
PhD EE (retired). "Barbershop" tenor. CDL(PTXS). W0PBV. (785) 539-4448
NRA Life Member and Certified Instructor (Home Firearm Safety, Rifle, Pistol)

2872. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:46:23 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c61aaf$f6m$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 90934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Richard Clark <kb7qhc@comcast.net> wrote:
>
>Yes it would. It is against the law to sell Transmitters that are not
>type-accepted for the band they are intended.
>
>On the other hand, the Amateur radio service is the ONLY exception to
>the rule. We CAN design, build, and operate non type-accepted gear.

No, the experimental service is also available for people who want to
run non-type-accepted equipment.

I _think_ there might still be a provision under Part 73 to allow broadcast
stations to operate non-type accepted transmitters under certain circumstances
if they can provide measurements that the equipment meets the standards of
the type requirement, and they affix a label to the equipment. I seem to
recall that it only applies to equipment built by the station itself. This
may have been removed from the rule book since I took my First Phone test.

>On the third hand, the 11 Meter band is not Amateur radio service.
>Even tho' we can work there, we must abide by all rules and
>regulations for that service (all restrictions apply in spite of our
>"privileges").

11M is a funny thing. It's not really one thing and it's not really another.
--scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

2873. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:47:40 UTC
From: Lou <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM>
Message-ID: <w1Wgc.2857$WC3.25326@ord-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 90935

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040419154445.15763.00000008@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Radio Conversion
> >From: "Lou" FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM
> >Date: 4/19/2004 10:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <TgSgc.2852$WC3.24831@ord-read.news.verio.net>
> >
> >I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back
when.
> >Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the new stuff
> >such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing the two
bands?
> >IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others have stated,
> >legality will be out the window. Lou
>
> Big difference.
>
> "UHF CB" is known as GMRS, or General Mobile Radio Service. It's in
the
> 462-467MHz range.
>
> MURS is five discreet channels in the 151-156MHz range, or "VHF".
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

That's what you get when one replies before the coffee has kicked in! Lou

2874. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:47:51 UTC
From: Jon <wa3mtc@qsl.com>
Message-ID: <cbd5106f00b97b101158d0dea9bdff53@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.cb

"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0A03E427FC1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "Lou" <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM> wrote in
> news:TgSgc.2852$WC3.24831@ord-read.news.verio.net:
>
> > I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back
> > when. Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the
> > new stuff such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing
> > the two bands? IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others
> > have stated, legality will be out the window. Lou
>
> Lou that is a troll post that is not WA3MOJ

i called him and ask him, he said it was him

2875. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:48:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419154848.15763.00000009@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90936

>ubject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice
>exam?
>From: "Alun L. Palmer" elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 4/19/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c60pmr$j4t$0@216.221.129.222>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in news:20040415150839.09913.00000288
>@mb-m26.aol.com:
>
><snip>
>
>>
>> Back in Junior High basic electricity shop class in 1947 I and
>> all classmates learned the "left-hand rule" (for right-handers)
>> which said "keep the left hand in the pocket if you have no
>> choice about turning the power off and working with the right
>> hand...that keeps a circuit from going through your heart."
>> Since we'd all had basic biology by then, that made a lot of
>> sense.
>
><snip>
>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Actually, it's a left hand rule regardless of which is your preferred hand,
>because your heart is on your left side. (Some people's hearts are on the
>right, but it's very rare).
>
>I was taught to keep one hand in my pocket over 200V, and both hands in my
>pockets over 1kV !!

Acutally, at potentially fatal amperages, it doesn't matter which hand you grab the juice from. I've had to deal with electrocutions in which the victim had no upper extremity contact with the source at all...they're dead none-the-less.

Steve, K4YZ

2876. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:52:09 UTC
From: Lou <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM>
Message-ID: <J5Wgc.2858$WC3.25476@ord-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 90938
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0A03E427FC1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "Lou" <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM> wrote in
> news:TgSgc.2852$WC3.24831@ord-read.news.verio.net:
>
> > I seem to recall a "CB" class of operation IN the UHF region way back
> > when. Long before MURS and such came into play. Actually I think the
> > new stuff such as MURS replaced the UHF CB band. Maybe he is confusing
> > the two bands? IF NOT, WOW..... that is a task and a half. As others
> > have stated, legality will be out the window. Lou
>
> Lou that is a troll post that is not WA3MOJ

I see this..... not that it would matter.. I wouldn't know a true post from WA3MOJ even if I did see one. "I" am not one to decipher headers. Well, thanks for the heads up just the same.

Lou

2877. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 19:59:13 UTC
From: Ready Kilowatt <Ready@none.org>
Message-ID: <4d18f9fcdc729ac74ecd7dc12cebcda5@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D09FC92FF651234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "mi-oldradios" <wa8x@yahoo.com> wrote in
> news:4083d5f1_5@newsfeed.slurp.net:
>
> > I guess an Extra should be able to figure it out. I would say it would
> > be a lot of work to put UHF FM gear on 11 meters AM/SSB. Too much work
> > in fact. Now if he was going to use them on GMRS FM I would say go for
> > it BUT it would still be illegal as they won't be FCC type accepted.
> > Get caught selling these things, lose your Ham ticket.
> >
> > --
> >
> > Please reply to:
> > mi_oldradios at yahoo dot com
> >
> >
> > " Stephen Cowell" <scowell@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> > news:X6Qgc.18544$JE7.16765@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com...
> >>
> >> "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> >> news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> >> > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >> > site's
> >> that
> >> > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> >> > I'm
> >> finding
> >> > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> > references
> >> for
> >> > various solid state and tube conversions.
> >>
> >> Kinda late for April 1, isn't it?
> >> __
> >> Steve
> >> KI5YG
>
> that is a forge he is not wa3moj just a troll.... looking to >get his
> kicks.
>
Um, I just spoke to George Busch on the phone and he assured me he is in the
radio resale business. You better check your info.

2878. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 20:06:33 UTC
From: Ready Kilowatt <Ready@none.org>
Message-ID: <d5e311954f62d0ade18589f60cf559b3@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90942
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.swap

George told me it is him, just this morning. Are you trying to steal food
from his plate?
>
"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D09F9A576C01234567890@216.196.97.136...
> exray <dontspamme-exray@coqui.net> wrote in
> news:1087jeasabg29f4@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > WA3MOJ wrote:
> >
> >> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >> site's that will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on
> >> 11 meters. I'm finding there is a substantial market for such gear
> >> and I'll need some references for various solid state and tube
> >> conversions.
> >>
> >> Thanks in advance for any help.
> >>
> >> WA3MOJ
> >>
> >
> > George,
> > Are you wanting to convert them to AM or SSB?
> >
> > -BM
>
> That is not george that is a forge of him and a bad one at that.
>

2879. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 20:19:53 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <593c44cb380a2e625b7ff6e9a906f44b@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90943
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:1XUgc.2518$e4.320@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote
>
> | Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> site's that
> | will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> I'm finding
> | there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> references for
> | various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
> they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
> 1.4.
>
> The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
> It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was
> poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack
> the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.
>
> Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a
> 9.8? Never!
>
> The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in
> dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!
>
> They demand a recount!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
I don't know, Hans, I just did a quick google search on WA3MOJ and he seems
to be quite the character. I'm not sure I would put anything past him.

`http://groups.google.com/groups?q=wa3moj`

2880. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 20:31:05 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <ad16f0fe822cf8e9a2bd4877608d64e4@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90944
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.swap

"Concerned Citizen" <concerned@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0A109225111234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:1XUgc.2518$e4.320
> @newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote
> >
> >| Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> > site's that
> >| will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> > I'm finding
> >| there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> > references for
> >| various solid state and tube conversions.
> >
> > The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
> > they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
> > 1.4.
> >
> > The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
> >
> > It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was
> > poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack
> > the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.
> >
> > Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a
> > 9.8? Never!
> >
> > The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in
> > dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!
> >
> > They demand a recount!
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
> Good Call Hans, yes indeed it is a troll from rec.radio.cb, they have
> even gone as far as driving to 2- Ham operators homes and threatened them
> physically, harrased them, and have taken pictures of thier homes etc and
> posted them on rec.radio.cb as a form of intimidation and harrasment.

> This is because these hams are against illegal radio operation and have
> spoken out about it. Becareful or they will forge you next and accuse you
> of being someone you are not. They are 100% certain that I am wa3moj, I
> have told them for 3 years that I am not and they continue the harrasment
> of his good name.
>
Here is a list of what WA3MOJ has in stock. He emailed it to me yesterday.

```
----------------------------------
Amplifiers
----------------------------------
Texas Star

Dave Made

Ameritron

X-Force
---------------------------------

Radios
---------------------------------
Cobra Electronics

Galaxy Radios

Kenwood Communications Corp.

Yaesu

Alinco
------------------------------

Tubes
-----------------------------
Eimac Tubes

Svetlana (Russian) Tubes
```

2881. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 20:49:28 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <da358619d09585b312270193464e0a06@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 90945
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ
>
Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear from the
likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be desired according to
google, George.

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=wa3moj

2882. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:03:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404191303.4d24bb3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90946
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

prjames@mindspring.com (Cathy James) wrote in message
news:<65a4e370.0404190445.2bdcaa99@posting.google.com>...
> Greetings all,
>
> I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
> would like to know if there are any communities that I should
> specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
> antennas or other issues.
>
> Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute
> time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing
> me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of
> what I am willing to consider.
>
> Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My
> realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her
> and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.
>
Cathy:

First off, you need the services of a good *real estate* attorney. Not just any lawyer will do; you need someone who does RE as a specialty and who deals with CC&Rs (codes, covenants and restrictions) on a daily basis. Make sure the attorney understands that his/her job is to dig up any and all restrictions on any property you might be interested in *before* you sign anything.

Second, require that you and your attorney be provided with a complete and up-to-date set of the deed, title and all covenants and deed restrictions *before* you make an offer, and read them thoroughly. Sometimes they are part of the deed/title itself but often they are not. States differ widely and you may need to be a bit insistent on what you want to see. Almost all properties built in the past 40-50 years have some sort of restrictions, and those built in the last 30 years often have lots and lots of restrictions of various types. Note that most restrictions are intentionally designed to be *impossible* to change, and that by signing on the dotted line you agree to abide by *all* of them.

Third, try to educate the realtor. Show her some typical amateur antenna installations so she has a better idea of what it is you want to put up. Terms like "antenna tower" mean different things to different people.

Fourth, realize that most but not all of the people involved in a real estate transaction only get paid if you actually buy a house. No sale = no comission/fees/taxes.

In my case the realtor and attorney were able to get me a complete copy of the restrictions fairly easily. They were *not* part of the deed/title documents - instead, those documents referred to the restrictions, which had to be retrieved from the county courthouse records. I had to ask specifically to see them early on in the transaction - if I hadn't insisted, I would never have seen them at all. Until somebody complained.

Even though my house is over 50 years old and there has never been any sort of home owner's association, there were a page and a half of restrictions. Most of them seem a bit comical today (no raising livestock on a property that is 60 x 120 feet) or have been superseded by more-restrictive township ordinances (setbacks, advertising signage, noise). No mention of antennas but I can't have a freestanding tower (or a shed) with a concrete base because that would constitute a "structure" and only the house and garage structures are permitted.
Doesn't matter to me because there's no room for a tower anyway but that's the sort of thing to look for.

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2883. Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:16:33 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61fjh02nos@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90950
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.

INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.

I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)

2884. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:22:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40844303.2070505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90947
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tony P. wrote:

>In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>w4nti@get says...
>
>
>>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
>>ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
>>
>>
>
>It's use it or loose it. I've turned on the rig several time during
>commute and during the day when I get a chance. The 70cm band in RI/SE
>MA is dead. Throw a call out, hear nothing back.
>
>2M is pretty much the same. It's just too bad.
>
>
>

IIRC, 434 MHz is in the middle of an ATV channel, not the repeater sub band. Part of
me would be willing to concede (on a 2nd or 3rd basis) 434 for a horse trade deal to
avoid BPL. But there is also the aspect of the camel's nose getting inside the tent....
(I also realize that the RFID people are not the same as the BPL people).

There are airport radars at around 445MHz that look for wind shear. The government
IIRC did go out of their way to avoid interference to the ham repeaters in the area at each
such equipped airport.

2885. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:31:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4084452D.7050107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90948
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Richard Clark wrote:

>On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 12:14:37 GMT, "Ready Kilowatt" <Ready@none.org>
>wrote:
>
>
>>Wouldn't that be illegal?
>>
It would violate various laws of physics (really major mods are
required) as well
as FCC rules.....

>>
>>
>
>Hi OM,
>
>Yes it would. It is against the law to sell Transmitters that are not
>type-accepted for the band they are intended.
>
>On the other hand, the Amateur radio service is the ONLY exception to
>the rule. We CAN design, build, and operate non type-accepted gear.
>
I think the rules say "no more than 5 (or is it 10) copies of the same
design per year.
Manufacturers who want to make more than that *do* have to get
certificated. That's
what the FCC calls "type acceptance" nowadays.....

>
>On the third hand, the 11 Meter band is not Amateur radio service.
>Even tho' we can work there, we must abide by all rules and
>regulations for that service (all restrictions apply in spite of our
>"privileges").
>
On CB, hams are just like other civilians.

>
>
>

2886. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:34:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408445C7.50807@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90949
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

>
>
>>
>>
>
>11M is a funny thing. It's not really one thing and it's not really another.
>--scott
>
>
Well, there are several different allocations there. There's the
infamous CB band, and various
forest ranger, mil and other such where the "freebanders" operate
illegally.

2887. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:35:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4084463D.7040505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 90951
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>
>>
>
>That is not george that is a forge of him and a bad one at that.
>
>
>
The OP was an obvious troll, but I threw in my $0.02 for the hell of it
anyway.... :-)

2888. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:41:00 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c61h1c$t7k$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 90952
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
Scott writes:
>>
>>11M is a funny thing. It's not really one thing and it's not really another.
>>
>Well, there are several different allocations there. There's the
>infamous CB band, and various
>forest ranger, mil and other such where the "freebanders" operate
>illegally.

Sad to say, the legitimate users of those latter bands are being driven
out by the FCC's refusal to do anything about the freebanders. God knows
that the auxiliary broadcast channels at 26 MHz are constantly being trashed.
I've had to move some government comms to 33 MHz where things are a bit
quieter.
--scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

2889. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:46:49 UTC
From: kashe@sonic.net
Message-ID: <n1h880hlt1g96536iee5rlqd015i4i5kgm@4ax.com>
Source record: 90953
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

On 19 Apr 2004 14:03:51 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Cathy:
>
>
>Third, try to educate the realtor. Show her some typical amateur
>antenna installations so she has a better idea of what it is you want
>to put up. Terms like "antenna tower" mean different things to
>different people.

Just as an aside, it might be worthwhile to drive around a prospective purchase area and just look for antennas. A couple of polite questions might tell you a lot about what is possible.

It might also be worthwhile to Google for amateur radio clubs in the area to see if they have a feel for local conditions. While neither of these will necessarily be binding on your particular property, they might give you a general clue to the area.

For what it's worth, I live in Daly City, a suburb of San Francisco. This area was built across the 60s. I'm not aware of any local restrictions, but I have two ham friends within a few blocks, one of whom has a few slopers and verticals on his roof and the other of which has about a 60 foot crank-up tower in his back yard with a yagi that barely fits within his own property lines (maybe a 25' x 150' lot).

Westlake, an area closer to San Francisco, maybe even part of Daly City for all I know, has extensive CC&Rs, including requirements to keep your house painted in an acceptable color and to keep a living palm tree on your living green (grass only) lawn (even those whose houses are sliding into the Pacific Ocean, aided by pumping all that water into the ground. Some of the earlier restrictions, like those restricting sales to certain ethnic groups have been overturned by courts and some sections of that subdivision are now easing or abandoning some of the restrictions as the opportunity for the residents to re-vote on them comes up.

All of which is to say that conditions may vary greatly within short distances, whether in urban or rural areas. So I have to agree with the earlier posts which note that the Realtor (tm) -- yes it is a restricted term than just anyone may not use -- is working for the seller and that involving a knowledgeabla local real estate attorney is your only guarantee.

2890. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 21:56:44 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <vWXgc.532$GR.73467@attbi_s01>
Source record: 90954

> >> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
> >> violence for their name?
> >
> >
> > Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
> > has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the years
> > ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that fellow can
> > really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index finger and his
> > forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess it has degenerated
> > into the pressing of a mike button to complain about one's health
> > problems or making bizarre noises either on purpose or by some wildly
> > compressed splattering signal to make up for poor operating skill Oh
> > BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But I guess that pounding brass is
> > more violent than flapping one's jaw
> >
> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
> >
> >
> >
>
> You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to the
> phone end of the band!

No Alun I like phone .....I get on 2 meters with the local hams ...if you are ever on I-70 give a call on the 147.27 machine. I do, admittedly on occasion, get on HF phone and have had good conversations with others. I will say how ever that most of the poorest operating practices occur there. I derive more hassle free operation via CW and data. The above was in response to a mildly thought out troll.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2891. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:07:04 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <c4Ygc.173363$JO3.99349@attbi_s04>
Source record: 90955

> Definitely a phonaphobe!

I am not afraid of phone on a personal level ....but I forsee the destruction of the CW portions of the band if subbands are not maintained ...ditto I may say regarding the displacement of data.

> If I recall my Morse Code instruction, you don't use your fist on the
> key. You gently hold the knob between your between your thumb and
> index (and middle) finger.
>
> Ah well, it's all going away soon anyhow.

William ...we are all going away sooner or later ..... I am not going to rent my cloak or sit in the neighborhood ash pit pouring the same over my brow when and if CW leaves. There are a myriad of things that interest me and when CW goes ....it goes.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2892. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:13:50 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <yaYgc.162026$gA5.1910559@attbi_s03>
Source record: 90956

> We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain wrong
> to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I had to learn
> 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and don't tell me I
> 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.

Ya ya did ....lest you would not be operating with a "ham" ticket. Just like I had to learn obscure musculature functions that I have not needed since my state boards 32 years ago. It is all a part of the process defined by others and bemoaned by the underlings but that is the way it was and is ...don't want to do it fine ....then take another tack.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2893. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:15:39 UTC
From: JOE <joe77557@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <f2b71a840adb9289841a726217e6129d@news.meganetnews.com>
Source record: 90958
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> >> WA3MOJ
> >>
> > Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear from
> > the likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be desired
> > according to google, George.
>
> Hmm pretty funny considering all the post from wa3moj and you come from
> the same Isp.... Enjoy yourself while you can, soon the fun will be over.
> :-)

No shit!!! What a fucking FARCE! The TROLL and his 'argumental
replies' are all the SAME SOURCE!!!

Come on Sibyl - you need to go back on your meds already!

JOE

2894. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:17:59 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <reYgc.173397$JO3.100813@attbi_s04>
Source record: 90957

>
> Don't worry, Alun. they are making up for the injustices forced upon
> you and me by making sure that we are not forcing much of anything on
> anybody soon.
>
> People that only wanted to talk on their radios were being forced to
> learn some stupid theory and other likewise irrelevant (to them)
> material just to get the license.
>
> The No-code people are getting what they asked for, although not
> necessarily what they wanted.
>
> We embark on an interesting social experiment in the Amateur radio
service.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Yepper Mike just like that little fellow in QST who viewed a safety error
....hold on to your hats ...say what you will but we are all in for an
interesting ride.

73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2895. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:21:16 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61jcs041d@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <Xns94D0B5A8DE3251234567890@216.196.97.136>, Duke Of Windsor says...
>
>WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61fjh02nos@drn.newsguy.com:
>
>> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
>> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>>
>> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
>> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>>
>> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)
>
>What is your phone number?
>
I opened a toll-free line since sales are booming now. Thanks for your interest
in my service.

1-888-293-4688

2896. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:50:28 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.04.19.22.50.26.828000@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 90960
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 14:16:33 -0700, WA3MOJ wrote:

> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>
> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>
> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)
well,
2 problems with that price:
1. its a USED amp
2. you can BUY a new one for less than that
<ok, more problems>
3. its a "Dirty" amp (most class C devices are)
4. it ain't legal under part 95 or part 97 (for the ham types).

basically, you got a lemmon there.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

2897. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 22:54:46 UTC
From: "G.Beat" <now9spamgb@no.comcast.spam.net>
Message-ID: <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>
Source record: 90961
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
> that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
> finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
> for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ

Troll

2898. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:19:19 UTC
From: WhosUrDadi <unohu@aol.com>
Message-ID: <X7Zgc.1142$gH6.195@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Funny your MOM answered and said call back when she wasnt on hers!

WA3MOJ wrote:
> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>
> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>
> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)
>

2899. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:34:54 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <DdZgc.51848$UC4.19151@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90963
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

WA3MOJ wrote:
> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie
> came calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment
> neighbors.
>
> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving
> 4/2sc2879's Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000
> Watts.
>
> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)

How much to ship to Canada?

2900. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:38:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TpZgc.1159$gH6.663@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90964
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1aedef724d19d55998993a@news.verizon.net...
> In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> w4nti@get says...
> > SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
> > ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
>
> It's use it or loose it. I've turned on the rig several time during
> commute and during the day when I get a chance. The 70cm band in RI/SE
> MA is dead. Throw a call out, hear nothing back.
>
> 2M is pretty much the same. It's just too bad.
>
Well the freqs being used for the RFID tags are not in the FM segement. But
I do agree with your point.

We have three strong and high repeaters in my immediate area. Hardly any
activity at all.

Dan/W4NTI

2901. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:44:24 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61o8o0nk3@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <X7Zgc.1142$gH6.195@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, WhosUrDadi says...
>
>Funny your MOM answered and said call back when she wasnt on hers!
>
Your mom should have taught you the golden rule.
>
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
>> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>>
>> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
>> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>>
>> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)
>>
>

2902. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:46:38 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90968
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
>
>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
>> that
>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
>> finding
>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
>> for
>> various solid state and tube conversions.
>>
>> Thanks in advance for any help.
>>
>> WA3MOJ
>
>Troll
>
>
Why is it a troll? It is on topic.

2903. Simple answer to your problem!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:46:51 UTC
From: Steve <metalworks@ev1.net>
Message-ID: <408464EB.49079A47@ev1.net>
Source record: 90965
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Very simple, go out a throw away the piece of crap of
amp you have and buy a nice Alpha and your problems will be
over! remember crap signal going in, even a worse
signal coming out!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Over the last 8 years i've own this alpha i never a had flaw
or problem with this amp.
If your serious about amateur radio like i am, please go
out and buy yourself and nice equipment that you will be
proud to own!

gud luck, metal guy.

2904. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-19 23:48:18 UTC
From: "J. McLaughlin" <JCM@Power-Net.Net>
Message-ID: <1088pabi6i833@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90966
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Dear Ms. Cathy:
I ran a township zoning board for 18 years. My experience is that real estate agents (by whatever name) will tell a buyer anything! to make a sale. Most of the serious problems dealt with by the board came from buyers believing "their" agents. The agent is not your friend.
[The only honest agents that I encountered were involved with million dollar sales with several lawyers (on each side) keeping them honest, and one other agent who became so appalled at the lack of ethics that she quit.]
A lawyer with experience in real estate is your best defense. Even so, check and double check. You have been provided with some good advice.
Consider the long term benefits of a slightly longer commute time.
In Michigan, 10+ A. is a farm and is treated better than a lot. Raising antennas is best done on a farm.
Good luck. Remember that the agent, as friendly as she or he may seem, is not working in your interest. Verify.
73 Mac N8TT

--
J. Mc Laughlin - Michigan USA
Home: JCM@Power-Net.Net

"Robert Spooner" <rls19@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:c619ti$s1q$1@f04n12.cac.psu.edu...
> Cathy,
>
> From experience, I would advise you not to depend on realtors, or
> anyone else who has an interest in the sale, to inform you concerning
> restrictive covenants. It's really not in their interest. The best
thing
> to do when you find a property in which you are interested is to go to
> the courthouse and look up the information yourself.
>
> 73,
> Bob AD3K
>
> Kï¿œHB wrote:
>

2905. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:12:15 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D0CD6DFE3C4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90969

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
news:vWXgc.532$GR.73467@attbi_s01:

>
>
>> >> Why does a Morse/Farnsworth Code advocacy group use a symbol of
>> >> violence for their name?
>> >
>> >
>> > Nope .....a symbol of anatomy used to describe a good CW op as in he
>> > has a good fist .....which I have heard used repeatedly over the
>> > years ...I guess it is a lot simpler to say that than ..... that
>> > fellow can really coordinate the use of his thumb-middle and index
>> > finger and his forearm to send good signals ......na .....I guess
>> > it has degenerated into the pressing of a mike button to complain
>> > about one's health problems or making bizarre noises either on
>> > purpose or by some wildly compressed splattering signal to make up
>> > for poor operating skill Oh BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But
>> > I guess that pounding brass is more violent than flapping one's jaw
>> >
>> > 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to
>> the phone end of the band!
>
> No Alun I like phone .....I get on 2 meters with the local hams ...if
> you are ever on I-70 give a call on the 147.27 machine. I do,
> admittedly on occasion, get on HF phone and have had good conversations
> with others. I will say how ever that most of the poorest operating
> practices occur there. I derive more hassle free operation via CW and
> data. The above was in response to a mildly thought out troll.
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
>
>

I passed that way a few days ago. I use the turnpike to visit my cousin in
Michigan (I am in Maryland). I might just try calling you next time,
although I'm not sure when that will be.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2906. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:21:31 UTC
From: Steve <LafayetteRadio@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <40846D32.D36BBDE5@optonline.net>
Source record: 90970
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

I thought Charlie took for themselves?

WA3MOJ wrote:

> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>
> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>
> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)

2907. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:24:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D0CF89ACE51elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90971

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
news:yaYgc.162026$gA5.1910559@attbi_s03:

>
>
>
>> We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain
>> wrong to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I had
>> to learn 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and don't
>> tell me I 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.
>
> Ya ya did ....lest you would not be operating with a "ham" ticket.
> Just like I had to learn obscure musculature functions that I have not
> needed since my state boards 32 years ago. It is all a part of the
> process defined by others and bemoaned by the underlings but that is
> the way it was and is ...don't want to do it fine ....then take another
> tack.
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>
>
>

Well, I didn't choose to learn code, it was imposed on me. I chose to get the licence, but that isn't the same thing. If you don't see it that way, I don't suppose I can convince you.

I think we already know what the FCC will do re the phone subbands. Although the FCC haven't responded to the WRC petitions, they just released a new NPRM on some other assorted issues and it offers an additional 25 kHz of phone on each of 80 and 40. That ain't much, certainly less than I would like, and scarcely enough to upset the CW guys (although there's bound to be someone!). I think we can take it that will be finalised in the near future.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2908. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:28:28 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61qrc0vub@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

They did take some but not all of his gear.
In article <40846D32.D36BBDE5@optonline.net>, Steve says...
>
>I thought Charlie took for themselves?
>
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>
>> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
>> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>>
>> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
>> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>>
>> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)
>

2909. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:29:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <C-KdnRBEjIlm8xndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90972
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

N2EY wrote:
> prjames@mindspring.com (Cathy James) wrote in message
news:<65a4e370.0404190445.2bdcaa99@posting.google.com>...
>
>>Greetings all,
>>
>>I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
>>would like to know if there are any communities that I should
>>specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
>>antennas or other issues.
>>
>>Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute
>>time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing
>>me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of
>>what I am willing to consider.
>>
>>Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My
>>realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her
>>and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.
>>
>
> Cathy:
>
> First off, you need the services of a good *real estate* attorney. Not
> just any lawyer will do; you need someone who does RE as a specialty
> and who deals with CC&Rs (codes, covenants and restrictions) on a
> daily basis. Make sure the attorney understands that his/her job is to
> dig up any and all restrictions on any property you might be
> interested in *before* you sign anything.

I don't know about hiring an attorney first off, Jim. Over the course
of buying a hous, I looked at maybe 30 or more. Sorry, I just don't have
the money to pay an attorney to investigate every house I looked at.

When the field got really, really narrow, then perhaps

> Second, require that you and your attorney be provided with a complete
> and up-to-date set of the deed, title and all covenants and deed
> restrictions *before* you make an offer, and read them thoroughly.
> Sometimes they are part of the deed/title itself but often they are
> not. States differ widely and you may need to be a bit insistent on
> what you want to see. Almost all properties built in the past 40-50
> years have some sort of restrictions, and those built in the last 30
> years often have lots and lots of restrictions of various types. Note

> that most restrictions are intentionally designed to be *impossible*
> to change, and that by signing on the dotted line you agree to abide
> by *all* of them.
>
> Third, try to educate the realtor. Show her some typical amateur
> antenna installations so she has a better idea of what it is you want
> to put up. Terms like "antenna tower" mean different things to
> different people.

Maybe for a little kickback? Seriously, that is the job they are
supposed to do, and considering th eamount of commission they get, they
are supposed to find out things you need to know.

Mind you, I don't think very highly of most of them. I could tell you
about the time that we took a tour of a house that was already sold. Or
the time we put a down payment on a house that the agent "neglected" to
tell us was in a flood plain until the day after the check was cashed. I
told him he had exactly 30 minutes to repay us the money. Took 15.

> Fourth, realize that most but not all of the people involved in a real
> estate transaction only get paid if you actually buy a house. No sale
> = no comission/fees/taxes.

Sure enough. That isn't an excuse for incompetence tho'.

> In my case the realtor and attorney were able to get me a complete
> copy of the restrictions fairly easily. They were *not* part of the
> deed/title documents - instead, those documents referred to the
> restrictions, which had to be retrieved from the county courthouse
> records. I had to ask specifically to see them early on in the
> transaction - if I hadn't insisted, I would never have seen them at
> all. Until somebody complained.

Part of their job, like asking to see only green houses. Or not green
houses.

> Even though my house is over 50 years old and there has never been any
> sort of home owner's association, there were a page and a half of
> restrictions. Most of them seem a bit comical today (no raising
> livestock on a property that is 60 x 120 feet) or have been superseded
> by more-restrictive township ordinances (setbacks, advertising
> signage, noise). No mention of antennas but I can't have a
> freestanding tower (or a shed) with a concrete base because that would
> constitute a "structure" and only the house and garage structures are
> permitted.
> Doesn't matter to me because there's no room for a tower anyway but
> that's the sort of thing to look for.

I got lucky when I bought my house. I could put up a 40 foot tower
without a problem, and no restrictions on wire antennas. I say lucky,
because I didn't become interested in the ARS until after we were in the
place for 5 years or so.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2910. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:34:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <C-KdnRNEjImN7RndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90973

garigue wrote:

> No Alun I like phone .....I get on 2 meters with the local hams ...if you
> are ever on I-70 give a call on the 147.27 machine. I do, admittedly on
> occasion, get on HF phone and have had good conversations with others. I
> will say how ever that most of the poorest operating practices occur there.
> I derive more hassle free operation via CW and data. The above was in
> response to a mildly thought out troll.
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

Tom, do you do psk31? Forgive if I've asked you this before! But If you can do 80 psk, we should have a decent path. I don't know about 20 meters, but would even like to light up on 40 - maybe get more interest going on that band for PSK.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2911. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:35:39 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D0D165B402Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 90974

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040419154848.15763.00000009@mb-m16.aol.com:

>>ubject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new
>>Novice exam? From: "Alun L. Palmer" elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 4/19/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c60pmr$j4t$0@216.221.129.222>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>>news:20040415150839.09913.00000288 @mb-m26.aol.com:
>>
>><snip>
>>
>>>
>>> Back in Junior High basic electricity shop class in 1947 I and
>>> all classmates learned the "left-hand rule" (for right-handers)
>>> which said "keep the left hand in the pocket if you have no
>>> choice about turning the power off and working with the right
>>> hand...that keeps a circuit from going through your heart."
>>> Since we'd all had basic biology by then, that made a lot of
>>> sense.
>>
>><snip>
>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>Actually, it's a left hand rule regardless of which is your preferred
>>hand, because your heart is on your left side. (Some people's hearts
>>are on the right, but it's very rare).
>>
>>I was taught to keep one hand in my pocket over 200V, and both hands in
>>my pockets over 1kV !!
>
> Acutally, at potentially fatal amperages, it doesn't matter which
> hand you
> grab the juice from. I've had to deal with electrocutions in which the
> victim had no upper extremity contact with the source at all...they're
> dead none-the-less.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>

The current kills you, but it takes volts to jump the gap, thousands of them. I have a little L-shaped scar on my right index finger from 10kV that I didn't touch. I'm an EE amongst other things, and I assume you are a physician?? If you say it doesn't matter which hand it is, then I beleive you, as it sounds like you know. I've never worked with power transmission or distribution, only with electronics, so that limits the current quite a bit (but not necessarily the volts)!

2912. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:39:22 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <kc_gc.61987$Lh2.50419@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 90975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

WA3MOJ wrote:
> WhosUrDadi says...
>> Funny your MOM answered and said call back when she wasnt on hers!
>>
> Your mom should have taught you the golden rule.

Whoever has the gold makes the rules?

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

2913. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:43:36 UTC
From: Ron H <123456@attbi.com>
Message-ID: <Ym_gc.29718$0b4.40867@attbi_s51>
Source record: 90976
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

The FCC recently rescinded the ban on power amps that work in the 11 meter band. See the arrl web site for details...

Ron H.

"Dave Platt" <dplatt@radagast.org> wrote in message news:10885j8k6d2kn8a@corp.supernews.com...
> In article <d44880t7ivq3b8pprvc50e7521rite4a8k@4ax.com>,
> Richard Clark <kb7qhc@comcast.net> wrote:
> >>Wouldn't that be illegal?
> >
> >Hi OM,
> >
> >Yes it would. It is against the law to sell Transmitters that are not
> >type-accepted for the band they are intended.
>
> Quite right. Converting existing equipment to 11-meter use would
> probably require individual certification of every unique piece or
> type. Sure sounds expensive.
>
> Issue 2: external power amplifiers are not allowed in the 11-meter
> band... conversion of higher-powered UHF amps would not be legal.
>
> Issue 3: equipment originally designed for UHF operation (1 meter and
> shorter wavelengths) seems to me to be a less-than-wonderful choice
> for conversion to 11-meter operation.
>
> Issue 4: there's plenty of cheap 11-meter gear already on the market
> (both legal-type-certificated, and outside-the-pale). Doesn't seem
> like there'd be much of a [legal] market for converted UHF gear.
>
> All in all, this idea sounds like a great way to lose lots of money,
> and risk big fines and the loss of an amateur-radio license. As folks
> may have noted, the FCC has recently raised their level of enforcement
> against companies and individuals who have been playing loose-and-easy
> with the rules about 11-meter operation and equipment sales.
>
> --
> Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> AE6EO
> Hosting the Jade Warrior home page: http://www.radagast.org/jade-warrior
> I do _not_ wish to receive unsolicited commercial email, and I will
> boycott any company which has the gall to send me such ads!

2914. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:44:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90977

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> William wrote:
> > We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
> > proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.
>
> My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we
> have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse
> code test.

THE agenda of NCI is elimination of code testing.
NCI has recently received member input asking
NCI to take a role in the ARRL petition and as a
result, NCI conducted a member survey. Subsequent to
that initial survey, NCVEC petition became known and
NCI conducted another survey on the ARRL vs NCVEC
differences.

> In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never
> support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.

Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written
qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.

> If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element
> one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have
> disagreed, but I can respect the position.

I don't understand the "reduction in qualifications" argument
you claim.

> But if the story keeps getting changed, both on a personal and group
> level, I am a little disappointed, and future assertions from them will
> have credibility in proportion.
> I doubt that they care what I think.

It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
our (NCI) membership wants.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2915. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:53:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <iw_gc.14002$l75.8150@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90979

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
> > Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
> > NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
> > in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
> > know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
> > all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
> > bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
> >
> > Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
> > over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
> > only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
> > classes of license, immediately.
>
> Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
>
> I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
> immediately.
>
> I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
> either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
> difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains Morse
> for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that make
> it very scary.
>
> Here is a test question:
>
> Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
> proposal is preferable to what we have now?

Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are
identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.

> The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
> code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to
> retain the test for the Extra class exam".
>
> Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
> think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
> privileges.

Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
General.

> You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
> almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?

Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
we end up doing is and will be member based.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2916. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 00:54:45 UTC
From: dplatt@radagast.org
Message-ID: <1088t6lodu2tna7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 90980
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <Ym_gc.29718$0b4.40867@attbi_s51>, Ron H <123456@attbi.com> wrote:

>The FCC recently rescinded the ban on power amps that work in the 11 meter
>band. See the arrl web site for details...

Not entirely accurate... at least, not yet.

They have proposed rescinding the Part 97 rule which places a whole bunch of restrictions on the manufacture and sale of amplifiers which can be used between 24 MHz and 35 MHz (the 10- and 12-meter amateur bands, and the 11-meter CB band). This change has not actually been enacted - they're inviting comments on whether it's a Good Idea or a Bad Idea.

They have _not_ proposed making any change to the Part 95 rules, which currently make it illegal to actually _use_ any such amplifier with an 11-meter (CB) transmitter.

So - if their proposed rule change is adopted, it'll be easier for amateurs to buy amps that can be used on 10 and 12 meters. General-purpose HF-band amplifier designs will probably be revised, to "open them up" to the higher frequencies.

It will still remain illegal to use any such amplifier on the 11-meter CB band.

Whether this illegality will stop anyone... well, that's another question entirely!

--
Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> AE6EO
Hosting the Jade Warrior home page: http://www.radagast.org/jade-warrior
I do _not_ wish to receive unsolicited commercial email, and I will boycott any company which has the gall to send me such ads!

2917. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:00:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sZednespkty06xndRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90981

Alun wrote:

<snippage>

> The current kills you, but it takes volts to jump the gap, thousands of
> them. I have a little L-shaped scar on my right index finger from 10kV that
> I didn't touch. I'm an EE amongst other things, and I assume you are a
> physician?? If you say it doesn't matter which hand it is, then I beleive
> you, as it sounds like you know. I've never worked with power transmission
> or distribution, only with electronics, so that limits the current quite a
> bit (but not necessarily the volts)!

IIRC, the accepted lower limit for electrocution is 24 volts. That is under some extraordinary conditions to be sure, but hey, don't misunderestimate (hehe) the ability of idiots! 8^) mebbe we better lower that 48 volt finals limit to 24 volts.

And of course, even lesser voltages van do lots of damage, like 5 volt power supplies for large computers. Come into contact with one of them with your wedding ring on, and you'll have to find a new finger to wear it on. Oh... the new ring that is.

These are the reasons that I really want to stress safety, as we remake the ARS. I'm capable of and willing to handle high voltages safely. If the tests are simplified badly, as it looks like will happen, there will be a new cadre of hams that may have little to no experience in these matters.

Maybe the ARS is going to do their own version of Fear Factor.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2918. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:11:48 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c61tck0179u@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 90986
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <kc_gc.61987$Lh2.50419@bignews1.bellsouth.net>, Road Warrior says...
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>> WhosUrDadi says...
>>> Funny your MOM answered and said call back when she wasnt on hers!
>>>
>> Your mom should have taught you the golden rule.
>
>Whoever has the gold makes the rules?
>
I have a Golden Eagle Mark III and an Ameritron AL-800H that makes the rules.

2919. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:15:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EtOdnUl-3NQA5BndRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90982

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
>
>>William wrote:
>>
>>>We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
>>>proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.
>>
>>My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we
>>have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse
>>code test.
>
>
> THE agenda of NCI is elimination of code testing.
> NCI has recently received member input asking
> NCI to take a role in the ARRL petition and as a
> result, NCI conducted a member survey. Subsequent to
> that initial survey, NCVEC petition became known and
> NCI conducted another survey on the ARRL vs NCVEC
> differences.

I don't doubt that, Bill. But it is a change from what we've been told here.

Of course, you could argue that the petitions are related to the elimination of the code test, because it is one of the things being eliminated. But all the rest is tretching the purpose IMO.

Another thing is that So Many Times, we have been told about the difference between NCI policy and private opinion.

>>In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never
>>support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.
>
>
> Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written
> qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.

Explain in a manner that I won't bust a gut laughing how the upgrade of most amateurs from Technician to General is not a lowering of the written requirements.

You can certainly argue that the General test is not in itself reduced. But that won't matter, because at that time MOST General level hams will

not have taken the General test.

You can call it an adjustement. The adjustment is a lowering of the
level required to become a General.

A significant suspension of disbelief is required here.

>>If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element
>>one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have
>>disagreed, but I can respect the position.
>
>
> I don't understand the "reduction in qualifications" argument
> you claim.

Bill, I know you are a smart guy. Obtuseness doesn't suit you.

>>But if the story keeps getting changed, both on a personal and group
>>level, I am a little disappointed, and future assertions from them will
>>have credibility in proportion.
>>I doubt that they care what I think.
>
>
> It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> our (NCI) membership wants.

So NOW we have another story! What if suddenly most of the membership
had a change of heat and supported extensive code testing. Would you
support that? Would you support the NCVEC proposal?

I noted that NCI was going to morph a while back.

- Your humble Cassandra...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2920. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:17:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EtOdnUh-3NS75xndRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90983

Alun wrote:

> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
> news:yaYgc.162026$gA5.1910559@attbi_s03:
>
>
>>
>>
>>>We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain
>>>wrong to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I had
>>>to learn 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and don't
>>>tell me I 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.
>>
>>Ya ya did ....lest you would not be operating with a "ham" ticket.
>>Just like I had to learn obscure musculature functions that I have not
>>needed since my state boards 32 years ago. It is all a part of the
>>process defined by others and bemoaned by the underlings but that is
>>the way it was and is ...don't want to do it fine ....then take another
>>tack.
>>
>>73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> Well, I didn't choose to learn code, it was imposed on me. I chose to get
> the licence, but that isn't the same thing. If you don't see it that way, I
> don't suppose I can convince you.

Under your definition, was I forced to learn questions regarding
satellite operations? They are something I don't think I'll ever try, or
even want to. Is any question on the test that you find irrelevant or
that you dislike being forced on you?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2921. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:25:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8__gc.3056$e4.2600@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90984

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

| Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written
| qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.

ARRL has proposed that current Techs/Tech+ be upgraded to General.
Since the current General qualification protocol calls for both the
current Technician written test and an additional more strenuous General
written examination, granting a Technician license to someone who has
not passed that additional examination ipso facto results in a lowering
of written qualifications for the one-third of a million licensees
affected.

Now you can dance around that fact all you want, but you can't change
the reality that the "written qualifications for General" will have been
lowered for roughly 323,055 individuals. We can
pick-flyshit-out-of-the-pepper-pot forever wrestling with the niceties
of semantics, but the cold hard fact is that out of the new 'combined'
General class, only 30% would have met todays written qualifications for
that license. The remaining 70% would have met a significantly lower
qualification. That walks like "lowered qualifications", it talks like
"lowered qualifications", it smells like "lowered qualifications", and
in fact IS "lowered qualifications".

| It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
| our (NCI) membership wants.

Are you sure? Here is a direct quote from an email from another of the
NCI directors.

".....our members by an overwhelming percentage
like most parts of the ARRL proposal. That
doesn't translate into what our comments will
end up being; it's like sausage made by a Board
of people. We'll see what happens ...."

I can easily interpret that to mean that the "sausage" may NOT
necessarily include all the ingredients desired by "an overwhelming
percentage" of NCI members.

Cheers,

de Hans, K0HB

2922. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:33:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90985

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

| Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
| General.

The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055 of them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing be eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.

Cheers,

de Hans, K0HB

2923. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:39:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ML2dnTWMmNjR4hndRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90987

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>
>>Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
>>
>>>Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
>>>NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
>>>in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
>>>know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
>>>all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
>>>bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
>>>
>>>Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
>>>over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
>>>only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
>>>classes of license, immediately.
>>
>>Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
>>
>>I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
>>immediately.
>>
>>I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
>>either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
>>difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains Morse
>>for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that make
>>it very scary.
>>
>>Here is a test question:
>>
>>Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
>>proposal is preferable to what we have now?
>
>
> Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are
> identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.
>
>
>>The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
>>code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to
>>retain the test for the Extra class exam".
>>

>>Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
>>think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
>>privileges.
>
>
> Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> General.

Wow, quite the spin. If a person wants to have General privileges right now, do you suggest that they take the Technician test and wait for the "adjustment"?

Even if the tests are "reinstated", which I doubt will happen, it will take a long time before the majority of "Generals" are those that have taken a General test.

>>You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
>>almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?
>
>
> Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
> we end up doing is and will be member based.

Can I join your organization to influence your member base opinion?

And be that such as it may, it is now evident that an apparent majority of NCI members support the majority of hams to be at least at the General level without being tested for it. That cannot be denied.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2924. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:40:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5c%gc.14033$l75.9658@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90988

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:EtOdnUl-3NQA5BndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>William wrote:
> >>
> >>>We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
> >>>proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.
> >>
> >>My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we
> >>have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse
> >>code test.
> >
> >
> > THE agenda of NCI is elimination of code testing.
> > NCI has recently received member input asking
> > NCI to take a role in the ARRL petition and as a
> > result, NCI conducted a member survey. Subsequent to
> > that initial survey, NCVEC petition became known and
> > NCI conducted another survey on the ARRL vs NCVEC
> > differences.
>
> I don't doubt that, Bill. But it is a change from what we've been told
> here.

Nevertheless, it is a change driven by membership, not Board
of Director fiat.

> Of course, you could argue that the petitions are related to the
> elimination of the code test, because it is one of the things being
> eliminated. But all the rest is tretching the purpose IMO.
>
> Another thing is that So Many Times, we have been told about the
> difference between NCI policy and private opinion.

Whatever the "official" NCI position will be,
it will not be "private" opinion.

> >>In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never
> >>support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.
> >
> > Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written

> > qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.
>
> Explain in a manner that I won't bust a gut laughing how the upgrade of
> most amateurs from Technician to General is not a lowering of the
> written requirements.

You are free to bust a gut or whatever...but the reality still is
that a "one-time' upgrade is NOT an overall or permant
licensing requirement change.

> You can certainly argue that the General test is not in itself reduced.
> But that won't matter, because at that time MOST General level hams will
> not have taken the General test.

And just what will that end up meaning to the future?

> You can call it an adjustement. The adjustment is a lowering of the
> level required to become a General.
>
> A significant suspension of disbelief is required here.

Such is life.

> >>If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element
> >>one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have
> >>disagreed, but I can respect the position.
> >
> > I don't understand the "reduction in qualifications" argument
> > you claim.
>
> Bill, I know you are a smart guy. Obtuseness doesn't suit you.

Your inability to understand the difference between a "one-time"
upgrade and a permanent change can also be considered obtuse.

> >>But if the story keeps getting changed, both on a personal and group
> >>level, I am a little disappointed, and future assertions from them will
> >>have credibility in proportion.
> >>I doubt that they care what I think.
> >
> > It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> > our (NCI) membership wants.
>
> So NOW we have another story!

Another story? Listening to the membership?

> What if suddenly most of the membership
> had a change of heat and supported extensive code testing.

Illogical construct. To be an NCI member requires opposition
to code testing. That's a basic NCI 101 item.

> Would you support that?

Ditto my last comment.

Would you support the NCVEC proposal?

I have personally filed my own comments supporting ARRL
with the exception of the code test. I support the NCVEC
petition only to the extent it equals ARRL except I supported,
of course NCVEC's dropping code.

> I noted that NCI was going to morph a while back.

Life goes on, you are free to think whatever you wish
of us. Bottom line, our core agenda goes forward and,
for the moment, we have been asked by our memebrship
take a position on more than just the code issue. In
the end, the FCC is the only place all this matters.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2925. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:40:55 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Hc%gc.3205$hR1.929@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 90989
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0D5AAD9BE51234567890@216.196.97.136...
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com:
>
> > In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
> >>
> >>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> >>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> >>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >>> site's that
> >>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> >>> I'm finding
> >>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> >>> references for
> >>> various solid state and tube conversions.
> >>>
> >>> Thanks in advance for any help.
> >>>
> >>> WA3MOJ
> >>
> >>Troll
> >>
> >>
> > Why is it a troll? It is on topic.
>
> On topic for what? You are not wa3moj, and are posting in amatuer NG's
> with a federal issued call sign. Seems you may have more problems then
> you care to admit. You want peopl to think you are the amatuer radio
> operator wa3moj, that could lead you into serious problems. take it for
> what it is worth. That is only if george want's to pursue the matter.

Troll extraordinaire Geo attempts to give advice! All too funny!

2926. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:52:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90990

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> | General.
>
> The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055 of
> them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing be
> eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.

That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
your mind.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2927. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:56:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iJCdnQeB1O6pHhndRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90991

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written
> | qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.
>
>
> ARRL has proposed that current Techs/Tech+ be upgraded to General.
> Since the current General qualification protocol calls for both the
> current Technician written test and an additional more strenuous General
> written examination, granting a Technician license to someone who has
> not passed that additional examination ipso facto results in a lowering
> of written qualifications for the one-third of a million licensees
> affected.

Correct. And then there is the "day after" problem. Anyone that thinks
that there won't be tremndous pressure exerted to KEEP the testing at
the Tech level is less than clever.

By contrast, your plan is wonderful, and you know I have some problems
with your plan. But if it were a choice between the three, You'd have
it. At least yours won't reduce qualifications overall.

> Now you can dance around that fact all you want, but you can't change
> the reality that the "written qualifications for General" will have been
> lowered for roughly 323,055 individuals. We can
> pick-flyshit-out-of-the-pepper-pot forever wrestling with the niceties
> of semantics, but the cold hard fact is that out of the new 'combined'
> General class, only 30% would have met todays written qualifications for
> that license. The remaining 70% would have met a significantly lower
> qualification. That walks like "lowered qualifications", it talks like
> "lowered qualifications", it smells like "lowered qualifications", and
> in fact IS "lowered qualifications".
>
>
> | It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> | our (NCI) membership wants.
>
> Are you sure? Here is a direct quote from an email from another of the
> NCI directors.
>
> ".....our members by an overwhelming percentage
> like most parts of the ARRL proposal. That
> doesn't translate into what our comments will

> end up being; it's like sausage made by a Board
> of people. We'll see what happens ...."
>
> I can easily interpret that to mean that the "sausage" may NOT
> necessarily include all the ingredients desired by "an overwhelming
> percentage" of NCI members.

From what I've seen, a "semi official" position of NCI is "we don't
care what anyone thinks".

- Mike KB3EIA -

2928. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 01:58:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Ws%gc.3098$e4.197@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90992

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
|
| "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
| news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
| >
| > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
| >
| > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
| > | General.
| >
| > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
of
| > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
be
| > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
| > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
|
| That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
| requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
| can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
| your mind.
|
| Cheers,
| Bill K2UNK

Bill,

With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.

It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).

Cheers,

Hans, K0HB
NCI # 4304

2929. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:02:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <lx%gc.14051$l75.10804@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90993

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ML2dnTWMmNjR4hndRVn-uw@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
> >>
> >>>Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
> >>>NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
> >>>in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
> >>>know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
> >>>all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
> >>>bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
> >>>
> >>>Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
> >>>over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
> >>>only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
> >>>classes of license, immediately.
> >>
> >>Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
> >>
> >>I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
> >>immediately.
> >>
> >>I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
> >>either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
> >>difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains Morse
> >>for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that make
> >>it very scary.
> >>
> >>Here is a test question:
> >>
> >>Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
> >>proposal is preferable to what we have now?
> >
> >
> > Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are
> > identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.
> >
> >
> >>The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
> >>code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to

> >>retain the test for the Extra class exam".
> >>
> >>Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
> >>think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
> >>privileges.
> >
> > Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> > General.
>
> Wow, quite the spin. If a person wants to have General privileges right
> now, do you suggest that they take the Technician test and wait for the
> "adjustment"?

A one time adjustment.

> Even if the tests are "reinstated", which I doubt will happen,

On what do you make that wild statemnent. Exactly where is
there any proposal to end all General testing?

> it will
> take a long time before the majority of "Generals" are those that have
> taken a General test.

And that leads to what problems?
>
> >>You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
> >>almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?
> >
> > Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
> > we end up doing is and will be member based.
>
> Can I join your organization to influence your member base opinion?

Anyone can join as long as you agree to the basics of being
an NCI member.

> And be that such as it may, it is now evident that an apparent majority
> of NCI members support the majority of hams to be at least at the
> General level without being tested for it. That cannot be denied.

Imprecise statement. The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
upgrade.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2930. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:05:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404191805.6ce19c39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90994

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<reYgc.173397$JO3.100813@attbi_s04>...
> >
> > Don't worry, Alun. they are making up for the injustices forced upon
> > you and me by making sure that we are not forcing much of anything on
> > anybody soon.
> >
> > People that only wanted to talk on their radios were being forced to
> > learn some stupid theory and other likewise irrelevant (to them)
> > material just to get the license.
> >
> > The No-code people are getting what they asked for, although not
> > necessarily what they wanted.
> >
> > We embark on an interesting social experiment in the Amateur radio
> service.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Yepper Mike just like that little fellow in QST who viewed a safety error
> ....hold on to your hats ...say what you will but we are all in for an
> interesting ride.
>
> 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

What little feller in QST? What safety error? What ride?

Tom, you gotta be more specific.

2931. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:06:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <DA%gc.14055$l75.6936@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 90995

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Ws%gc.3098$e4.197@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> |
> | "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> | news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> | >
> | > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> | >
> | > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> | > | General.
> | >
> | > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
> of
> | > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
> be
> | > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> | > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
> |
> | That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> | requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> | can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> | your mind.
> |
> | Cheers,
> | Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill,
>
> With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
>
> It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
> director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).

You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2932. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:07:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404191807.39d22d72@posting.google.com>
Source record: 90996

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<c4Ygc.173363$JO3.99349@attbi_s04>...
> > Definitely a phonaphobe!
>
> I am not afraid of phone on a personal level ....but I forsee the
> destruction of the CW portions of the band if subbands are not maintained
> ...ditto I may say regarding the displacement of data.
>
> > If I recall my Morse Code instruction, you don't use your fist on the
> > key. You gently hold the knob between your between your thumb and
> > index (and middle) finger.
> >
> > Ah well, it's all going away soon anyhow.
>
> William ...we are all going away sooner or later ..... I am not going to
> rent my cloak or sit in the neighborhood ash pit pouring the same over my
> brow when and if CW leaves. There are a myriad of things that interest me
> and when CW goes ....it goes.
>
> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

Yep. I went fishing with my Grandpap at Virgin Run before he passed.
You ever fished there?

2933. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:13:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419221351.15763.00000040@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 90997

>Subject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice
>exam?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 4/19/2004 7:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94D0D165B402Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>The current kills you, but it takes volts to jump the gap, thousands of
>them. I have a little L-shaped scar on my right index finger from 10kV that
>I didn't touch. I'm an EE amongst other things, and I assume you are a
>physician?? If you say it doesn't matter which hand it is, then I beleive
>you, as it sounds like you know. I've never worked with power transmission
>or distribution, only with electronics, so that limits the current quite a
>bit (but not necessarily the volts)!

Nope...Not an M.D....An ER/Trauma Nurse with 15 years of EMS behind that.
But it only took one electrocution to make me a believer. The one victim in
particular was in a trench along a runway installing new lights...Somehow his
feet came into contact with buried power lines that the work crew was unaware
were there.

Typical paddle application for defibrillation is to the left chest wall
and upper midline sternum. The placement of the paddles in combination with
the delivered current attempts to repolarize the the irratically firing SA node
causing ventricular fibrillation. (That's the "HE'S IN VEE-FIB" you hear on
countless episodes of "E.R." and "Third Watch".)

Congrats on being an EE. Does it make you immune to electrocution? Does
my NOT being an M.D. in any way diminish the fact that sufficient current
sustained by adequate voltage can be fatal regardless of how or where it's
applied to human tissue?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2934. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:15:20 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419221520.12587.00000146@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 90998

>1) Stop calling it "ham radio" as that is actually a derrogatory term.

Good to see that someone else realizes that the term "ham" radio is
derrogatory.

>2)
...
>There are just too many fat people in the hobby...

I've noticed that also.

2935. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:16:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ebadnfTq-eF2GhndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 90999

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:EtOdnUl-3NQA5BndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>William wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>We've recently seen NCI criticized for commenting on restructuring
>>>>>proposals not directly related to the Morse and Farnsworth Exam issue.
>>>>
>>>>My concerns are not the NCI has an official position. It is that we
>>>>have been told that their *only* agenda was the elimination of the Morse
>>>>code test.
>>>
>>>
>>>THE agenda of NCI is elimination of code testing.
>>>NCI has recently received member input asking
>>>NCI to take a role in the ARRL petition and as a
>>>result, NCI conducted a member survey. Subsequent to
>>>that initial survey, NCVEC petition became known and
>>>NCI conducted another survey on the ARRL vs NCVEC
>>>differences.
>>
>>I don't doubt that, Bill. But it is a change from what we've been told
>>here.
>
>
> Nevertheless, it is a change driven by membership, not Board
> of Director fiat.

Better get on that constitution, pronto!

>
>>Of course, you could argue that the petitions are related to the
>>elimination of the code test, because it is one of the things being
>>eliminated. But all the rest is tretching the purpose IMO.
>>

>>Another thing is that So Many Times, we have been told about the
>>difference between NCI policy and private opinion.
>
> Whatever the "official" NCI position will be,
> it will not be "private" opinion.

+ 50 cents and I'll have a down paymenty on a cup of coffee.

>
>>>>In addition, some prominent members are on record that they would never
>>>>support reduction in the written qualifications, and now they do.
>>>
>>>Neither ARRL nor NCVEC proposes any lowering of written
>>>qualifications for General or Extra from what I have seen.
>>
>>Explain in a manner that I won't bust a gut laughing how the upgrade of
>>most amateurs from Technician to General is not a lowering of the
>>written requirements.
>
>
> You are free to bust a gut or whatever...but the reality still is
> that a "one-time' upgrade is NOT an overall or permant
> licensing requirement change.

Your reality is much different than mine.

>>You can certainly argue that the General test is not in itself reduced.
>>But that won't matter, because at that time MOST General level hams will
>>not have taken the General test.
>
>
> And just what will that end up meaning to the future?

Nothing stands still, Bill. The idea of the technically adroit Amateur
radio crowd has been taking a beating lately, and the winners are pretty
full of themselves at the moment. We've gone from "simply" eliminating
the Morse code test to giving the majority of hams an untested-for
upgrade. This is plenty uncomfortable for people like me, that happen to
like the lost idea of technically savvy hams.

>
>>You can call it an adjustement. The adjustment is a lowering of the
>>level required to become a General.
>>
>>A significant suspension of disbelief is required here.
>
>
> Such is life.

Not for me it isn't. Is this an admission that you have reconciled the
non-tested upgrade via the suspension of disbelief route?
>

>>>>If they were to have said "We are in favor of elimination of Element
>>>>one and a reduction of qualifications for the licenses", I would have
>>>>disagreed, but I can respect the position.
>>>
>>>I don't understand the "reduction in qualifications" argument
>>>you claim.
>>
>>Bill, I know you are a smart guy. Obtuseness doesn't suit you.
>
>
> Your inability to understand the difference between a "one-time"
> upgrade and a permanent change can also be considered obtuse.

Perhaps. I can respect the idea that an adjustment might be warranted
by circumstances. I can respect the idea that the General test is too
hard. (note that I would disagree) But the idea that it is not a free
upgrade for most hams and that since it is a supposed "one time" thing,
it *isn't* a lowering of standards is doublethink.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2936. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:17:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mL%gc.3135$e4.1815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91000

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

| The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
| upgrade.

That's probably not a remarkable revelation, given that the overwhelming
majority of the NCI members are Technicians who would naturally benefit
from such action.

The REAL question isn't what the NCI membership supports, but rather....

Q: Will the NCI Board of Directors recommend
upgrading all Tech/Tech+ licensees to General
without further testing?

A: (please select one and only one answer)
___ Yes
___ No
___ The Board will take no position on this matter

Cheers,

de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

2937. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:17:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ebadnffq-eHOFRndRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91001

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>
>>| Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
>>| General.
>>
>>The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055 of
>>them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing be
>>eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
>>sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
>
>
> That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> your mind.

Bill, I'll be waiting in a couple years when you explain why the
permanent changing of the testing requirements is not a permanent
changing of the test requirements.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2938. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:20:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419222041.15763.00000042@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 91002

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/19/2004 8:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <8__gc.3056$e4.2600@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

> We can
>pick-flyshit-out-of-the-pepper-pot forever wrestling with the niceties
>of semantics, but the cold hard fact is that out of the new 'combined'
>General class, only 30% would have met todays written qualifications for
>that license. The remaining 70% would have met a significantly lower
>qualification. That walks like "lowered qualifications", it talks like
>"lowered qualifications", it smells like "lowered qualifications", and
>in fact IS "lowered qualifications".

Two questions, Hans...

Can YOU pass the current written examination without using one of the Q&A
pubs to prep for it?

The "problem" is not with the content of the tests. It's with the fact
that we find it necessary to humiliate ourselves by allowing emotional cowards
and mental weaklings to have brought the tests down by demanding that we "open"
the polls.

My other question is what did you do with the education provided you?
Judging by your almost automatic use of profanity anymore, the money got spent
elsewhere.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2939. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:21:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BO%gc.3144$e4.1788@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91003

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

|
| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
|

Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!

Cheers,
de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

2940. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:24:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040419222420.15763.00000043@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 91004

>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 4/19/2004 9:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040419221520.12587.00000146@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>>1) Stop calling it "ham radio" as that is actually a derrogatory term.
>
>Good to see that someone else realizes that the term "ham" radio is
>derrogatory.
>
>>2)
>...
>>There are just too many fat people in the hobby...
>
>I've noticed that also.

Welcome back, Vipul.

Steve, K4YZ

2941. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:29:00 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aee54f7b43c9e6098993d@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91005
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <40844303.2070505@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> Tony P. wrote:
>
> >In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >w4nti@get says...
> >
> >
> >>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
> >>ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
> >>
> >>
> >
> >It's use it or loose it. I've turned on the rig several time during
> >commute and during the day when I get a chance. The 70cm band in RI/SE
> >MA is dead. Throw a call out, hear nothing back.
> >
> >2M is pretty much the same. It's just too bad.
> >
> >
> >
> IIRC, 434 MHz is in the middle of an ATV channel, not the repeater sub
> band. Part of
> me would be willing to concede (on a 2nd or 3rd basis) 434 for a horse
> trade deal to
> avoid BPL. But there is also the aspect of the camel's nose getting
> inside the tent....
> (I also realize that the RFID people are not the same as the BPL people).
>
> There are airport radars at around 445MHz that look for wind shear. The
> government
> IIRC did go out of their way to avoid interference to the ham repeaters
> in the area at each
> such equipped airport.

Oh - those are the Doppler radar units, particularly the one in Chatham
in my area, although I'm on the southwestern fringe of it.

And all they did was create quiet zones around many of them, for a
radius of 30mi. in some cases.

2942. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:31:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <7fWdnawAna4KFhndRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91006

```
Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> |
> | "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> | news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> | >
> | > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> | >
> | > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> | > | General.
> | >
> | > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
> of
> | > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
> be
> | > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> | > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
> |
> | That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> | requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> | can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> | your mind.
> |
> | Cheers,
> | Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill,
>
> With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
>
> It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
> director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).

You have it correct, Hans. But I'm afraid that isn't what they are all
about.

- Mike KB3EIA -
```

2943. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:37:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <9NadnUler69wERndRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91007

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ML2dnTWMmNjR4hndRVn-uw@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
>>>>>NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
>>>>>in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
>>>>>know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
>>>>>all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
>>>>>bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
>>>>>
>>>>>Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
>>>>>over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
>>>>>only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
>>>>>classes of license, immediately.
>>>>
>>>>Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
>>>>
>>>>I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
>>>>immediately.
>>>>
>>>>I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
>>>>either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
>>>>difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains Morse
>>>>for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that make
>>>>it very scary.
>>>>
>>>>Here is a test question:
>>>>
>>>>Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
>>>>proposal is preferable to what we have now?
>>>
>>>

>>>Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are
>>>identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
>>>>code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to
>>>>retain the test for the Extra class exam".
>>>>
>>>>Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
>>>>think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
>>>>privileges.
>>>
>>>Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
>>>General.
>>
>>Wow, quite the spin. If a person wants to have General privileges right
>>now, do you suggest that they take the Technician test and wait for the
>>"adjustment"?
>
>
> A one time adjustment.

Doesn't matter how many times you repeat that Bill.

>>Even if the tests are "reinstated", which I doubt will happen,
>
>
> On what do you make that wild statemnent. Exactly where is
> there any proposal to end all General testing?

Where was the proposal to give all technicians the presumed one time
upgrade? Doesn't take long for things to happen.

>>it will
>>take a long time before the majority of "Generals" are those that have
>>taken a General test.
>
>
> And that leads to what problems?

It most certainly leads to problems the day after the presumed one-time
upgrade.

>>>>You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
>>>>almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?
>>>
>>>Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
>>>we end up doing is and will be member based.
>>
>>Can I join your organization to influence your member base opinion?
>

>
> Anyone can join as long as you agree to the basics of being
> an NCI member.

What If I want elimination of Morse code, but am adamantly opposed to
the ARRL or NCVEC proposals?

>>And be that such as it may, it is now evident that an apparent majority
>>of NCI members support the majority of hams to be at least at the
>>General level without being tested for it. That cannot be denied.
>
>
> Imprecise statement. The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
> upgrade.

And once upon a time, they were simply for the elimination of the code
test.

And you, kind sir, know exactly what an imprecise statement is. Dontchya?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2944. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:51:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91008

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> |
> | You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> |
>
> Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
> wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
>

Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.

And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy

But whatever you do, don't quit.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2945. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:54:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qh0hc.3180$e4.9@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91009

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

|
| What If I want elimination of Morse code, but am adamantly opposed to
| the ARRL or NCVEC proposals?
|

I don't think that's a problem. I've been openly critical of both the ARRL and NCVEC proposals, both in public forums like this one, and in email and telephone exchanges. I think a couple of the Directors are sick of my lobbying, but they're not retiring my membership number.

73, Hans, K0HB

2946. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 02:56:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D0E948F7BD4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91010

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:EtOdnUh-3NS75xndRVn-ug@adelphia.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
>> news:yaYgc.162026$gA5.1910559@attbi_s03:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>We all have an agenda, I suppose. I happen to think it's just plain
>>>>wrong to force phone ops to learn code. And yes, we were forced. I
>>>>had to learn 20wpm to get on the DX end of the phone subbands, and
>>>>don't tell me I 'chose' to do that, 'cos I didn't.
>>>
>>>Ya ya did ....lest you would not be operating with a "ham" ticket.
>>>Just like I had to learn obscure musculature functions that I have not
>>>needed since my state boards 32 years ago. It is all a part of the
>>>process defined by others and bemoaned by the underlings but that is
>>>the way it was and is ...don't want to do it fine ....then take
>>>another tack.
>>>
>>>73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Well, I didn't choose to learn code, it was imposed on me. I chose to
>> get the licence, but that isn't the same thing. If you don't see it
>> that way, I don't suppose I can convince you.
>
> Under your definition, was I forced to learn questions regarding
> satellite operations? They are something I don't think I'll ever try,
> or even want to. Is any question on the test that you find irrelevant
> or that you dislike being forced on you?
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

This has been rehashed so many times, but as you know the difference is that you did not have to prove in a practical test that you could have a satellite QSO, only answer questions on it. If you weren't allowed to bash away at the key because you couldn't find the passing satellite in the test I would say that would be unfair. There is only one practical test, and it only relates to one mode. If you can't see how lop-sided that is, then it can only be because you don't _want_ to see it.

2947. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:01:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Un0hc.3195$e4.1257@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91011

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

|
| Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
|

I don't identify with "majority" or "minority" --- those are
popularity polls. I identify with what I believe in, and my beliefs are
not modified by whether they are widely popular or not.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2948. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:02:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D0EA4D4D918elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91012

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040419221351.15763.00000040@mb-m16.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new
>>Novice exam? From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 4/19/2004 7:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94D0D165B402Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>The current kills you, but it takes volts to jump the gap, thousands of
>>them. I have a little L-shaped scar on my right index finger from 10kV
>>that I didn't touch. I'm an EE amongst other things, and I assume you
>>are a physician?? If you say it doesn't matter which hand it is, then I
>>beleive you, as it sounds like you know. I've never worked with power
>>transmission or distribution, only with electronics, so that limits the
>>current quite a bit (but not necessarily the volts)!
>
> Nope...Not an M.D....An ER/Trauma Nurse with 15 years of EMS behind
> that.
> But it only took one electrocution to make me a believer. The one
> victim in particular was in a trench along a runway installing new
> lights...Somehow his feet came into contact with buried power lines
> that the work crew was unaware were there.
>
> Typical paddle application for defibrillation is to the left chest
> wall
> and upper midline sternum. The placement of the paddles in combination
> with the delivered current attempts to repolarize the the irratically
> firing SA node causing ventricular fibrillation. (That's the "HE'S IN
> VEE-FIB" you hear on countless episodes of "E.R." and "Third Watch".)
>

I know the basic theory. It was explained to me by a scientist from the UK
Dept of Health. We tested automatic defibrillators for him to try to
trigger them with various types of electrical interference. We discharged
them into electric fire elements, though, not into people!

> Congrats on being an EE. Does it make you immune to
> electrocution?

No

> Does
> my NOT being an M.D. in any way diminish the fact that sufficient
> current sustained by adequate voltage can be fatal regardless of how or
> where it's applied to human tissue?

No

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2949. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:15:01 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <VA0hc.30571$yD1.89600@attbi_s54>
Source record: 91013

>
> I think we already know what the FCC will do re the phone subbands.
> Although the FCC haven't responded to the WRC petitions, they just
released
> a new NPRM on some other assorted issues and it offers an additional 25
kHz
> of phone on each of 80 and 40. That ain't much, certainly less than I
would
> like, and scarcely enough to upset the CW guys (although there's bound to
> be someone!). I think we can take it that will be finalised in the near
> future.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Hello Alun .... ain't upset with 25 kcs .....hopefully that will bring more DX to the phone guys but I would probably bet the kid's shoe money that the foreign phone ops will be more upset than the domestic CW ops.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

2950. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:21:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hwg07zf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 21:46:49 GMT, kashe@sonic.net wrote:

> For what it's worth, I live in Daly City, a suburb of San
>Francisco. This area was built across the 60s. I'm not aware of any
>local restrictions, but I have two ham friends within a few blocks,
>one of whom has a few slopers and verticals on his roof and the other
>of which has about a 60 foot crank-up tower in his back yard with a
>yagi that barely fits within his own property lines (maybe a 25' x
>150' lot).

I lived in Daly City (St, Francis Heights area) from 1977 to 1985
and there were no restrictions on the 1960-era house and lot.

>Westlake, an area closer to San Francisco, maybe even part of
>Daly City for all I know,

Yes, the Westlake District is an integral part of Daly City that was
the first tract development by Henry Doelger post WW-II (in fact
when one says "Daly City" one thinks of Westlake first).

>has extensive CC&Rs, including requirements
>to keep your house painted in an acceptable color and to keep a living
>palm tree on your living green (grass only) lawn

That requirement was overturned as unreasonable by a court case in
the early 1970s.

My kids, OTOH, live in one of the condos up near the water tanks in
the foothills of San Bruno Mountain (still in Daly City) and there
are CC&Rs up the wazoo. For obvious reasons they did not seek my
legal advice or assistance before they bought the (obscenely-priced)
property - no big deal, neither of them are hams.

> All of which is to say that conditions may vary greatly within
>short distances, whether in urban or rural areas. So I have to agree
>with the earlier posts which note that the Realtor (tm) -- yes it is a
>restricted term than just anyone may not use -- is working for the
>seller and that involving a knowledgeabla local real estate attorney
>is your only guarantee.

Now for Cathy -

Make your receiving, examination, and acceptance of all the
restrictions (CC&Rs and any Homeowners' Association Regulations)
a contingency of any offer, and get some advice from a local
ARRL Volunteer Counsel who can give you local information of the

sort that Hans gave you about Plymouth. VCs are listed on the ARRL web site - you should touch base with one first.

Also it would not be a bad idea to touch base with Jay Bellows, K0QB, the ARRL Dakota Division Director who lives in St. Paul. Jay is one of a handful of us attorneys who deal in zoning, permit, and legal issues involving amateur stations on a regular basis, and was the attorney who was successful in getting the key U S Court of Appeals ruling in _Pentel v Mendota Heights_ upholding the FCC's requirement that a municipality must give "reasonable accomodation" to amateur antenna structure applicants.

I can only wish you good fortune in finding a place that suits your needs.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2951. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:21:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hwg0e9g.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91014

On 19 Apr 2004 03:52:28 GMT, Alun wrote:

>> BTW don't forget my 10-10 number. But I guess that pounding brass is
>> more violent than flapping one's jaw
>>
>> 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

>You really don't like phone do you? Nobody's forcing you to tune up to the
>phone end of the band!

I suspect that Tom, like myself, likes phone well enough but does not
like what some people do on "phone"......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2952. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:21:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hwg0olh.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91015

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 22:07:04 GMT, garigue wrote:

>William ...we are all going away sooner or later ..... I am not going to
>rent my cloak or sit in the neighborhood ash pit pouring the same over my
>brow when and if CW leaves. There are a myriad of things that interest me
>and when CW goes ....it goes.

Where is CW going? I've not heard of any rational proposals by
regulators to ban CW from amateur radio. In fact, CW is not banned
from the Maritime Services either - it just isn't required as it
once was for distress and safety purposes.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2953. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:21:23 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <TG0hc.163578$gA5.1929140@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91017

>
> Yep. I went fishing with my Grandpap at Virgin Run before he passed.
> You ever fished there?

Sure did ...my dad. brothers and I would go there a lot and also on the Youghiogheny down at Whitsett. That is something I need to do more of. I am about a mile and a half from the Mon here and really need to break out the equipment.

73 Tom KI3R

2954. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:26:20 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wL0hc.174901$JO3.102197@attbi_s04>
Source record: 91018

> I passed that way a few days ago. I use the turnpike to visit my cousin in
> Michigan (I am in Maryland). I might just try calling you next time,
> although I'm not sure when that will be.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

No problem Alun ...I am off of exit 42 on I-70 ....pass the BP and left at
Stop sign then quick right at the light ....follow Fayette to Delmont
....you'll see my windom on the right ....about a mile off 70

73 Tom KI3R

2955. Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:42:51 UTC
From: radio-operator@telus.net
Message-ID: <d318809e.0404191942.4e89c4b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,alt.radio.international,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
you come across one feel free to let me know.

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaFrequencyDatabase.txt

Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaRadioSpectrum.pdf
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/USRadioSpectrum.pdf

*** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***

Homac
radio-operator@telus.net

2956. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:52:07 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <H71hc.2278$GR.313682@attbi_s01>
Source record: 91020

> >William ...we are all going away sooner or later ..... I am not going to
> >rent my cloak or sit in the neighborhood ash pit pouring the same over my
> >brow when and if CW leaves. There are a myriad of things that interest
me
> >and when CW goes ....it goes.
>
> Where is CW going? I've not heard of any rational proposals by
> regulators to ban CW from amateur radio. In fact, CW is not banned
> from the Maritime Services either - it just isn't required as it
> once was for distress and safety purposes.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Phil ......I will have long become an integral part of the ash pit when that
happens ...

73 Tom KI3R

2957. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 03:53:28 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <X81hc.163732$gA5.1932526@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91021

>
> I suspect that Tom, like myself, likes phone well enough but does not
> like what some people do on "phone"......
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Zactly Phil zactly ....

73 Tom KI3R

2958. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 04:02:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hwg22ek.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91022

On 20 Apr 2004 02:13:51 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>But it only took one electrocution to make me a believer. The one
>victim in particular was in a trench along a runway installing new
>lights...Somehow his feet came into contact with buried power lines
>that the work crew was unaware were there.

<Shudder....>

My wife's present specialty is runway utility and lighting design
for upgrades of major airports and conversions of military airfields
to civilian use. Although she doesn't go onto the jobsite - that's
done by electrical contractors on bid - she has mentioned many times
that the "as-installed" drawings were missing or they were inaccurate.
I'm thinking of two particular SAC bases (one is still active, the
other is a conversion) that she's working on now which I had
"intimate familiarity with" when I worked for SAC 40 years ago.
Like "old home week"..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2959. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 04:17:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040420001747.18662.00000043@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 91023

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/19/2004 9:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <BO%gc.3144$e4.1788@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>|
>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
>|
>
>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!

And sometimes being "the squeakyky wheel" just means you get replaced.

And Democracy is a fine thing...even for the functionally illiterate or
profane.

Steve, K4YZ

2960. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 04:21:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040420002148.18662.00000044@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 91024

>Subject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice
>exam?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 4/19/2004 10:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94D0EA4D4D918elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>> Congrats on being an EE. Does it make you immune to
>> electrocution?
>
>No
>
>> Does
>> my NOT being an M.D. in any way diminish the fact that sufficient
>> current sustained by adequate voltage can be fatal regardless of how or
>> where it's applied to human tissue?
>
>No
>

Then why did you deem it important to raise either in the exchange?

73

Steve, K4YZ

2961. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 04:56:35 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1aee7786cc15c3b798993e@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91025
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <0q19805i0544f2e4v1tbfnvcka7i7rmmfu@4ax.com>,
god_freee_jones@hotmail.com says...
> On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 19:15:59 GMT, Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
wrote:
>
> >In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >w4nti@get says...
> >> SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
> >> ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
> >
> >It's use it or loose it.
>
> I thought it was use it or lose it.

Ooops.

2962. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 07:40:58 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.04.20.07.40.58.319670@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 91026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 20:01:03 -0500, Concerned Citizen wrote:

> "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in
> news:pan.2004.04.19.22.50.26.828000@127.0.0.1:
>
>> [quoted text muted]
>
> eric 2 problems with your post if you would have read the others, it is a
> troll post so save your breath.
didn't sound like a troll to me.
but then, it appears to be a fairly good one to get by me anyway. :)

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

2963. Re: Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 09:53:58 UTC
From: Doz <dcreber@camfordpressdotco.uk>
Message-ID: <4084f339$0$31685$fa0fcedb@lovejoy.zen.co.uk>
Source record: 91027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

corrected URL:
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/Canada%20Frequency%20Database.txt

"Private" <radio-operator@telus.net> wrote in message
news:d318809e.0404181454.6d883e6c@posting.google.com...
> For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
> LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
> you come across one feel free to let me know.
>
> http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/Canada Frequency Database.txt
>
>
> Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:
>
> http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/Canada Radio Spectrum.pdf
> http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/US Radio Spectrum.pdf
>
> *** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***
>
> Homac
> radio-operator@telus.net

2964. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 12:25:20 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <QE8hc.71400$_g4.13366348@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91028

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> > I doubt that they care what I think.
>
> It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> our (NCI) membership wants.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all 680K+ USA licenced ARO's? If not, you should at least be aware that what you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use wrt NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.

The only thing you REALLY have working to your benefit is the current apathetic stance of the FCC. A "reduction of effort" appears to be a shared goal. As a member of the 680K+ club who is not an NCI member, I am saddened at what NCI's influence is doing to my chosen hobby/service.

73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384

BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just had the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist who explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved" re. an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest. Believe it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer. Usually a casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few minutes to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.

Remember the vanity call system.

2965. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 12:32:41 UTC
From: Speedy <memorex@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <554bf0816f93bfb145560796e8650b4a@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0B61BCC7661234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in
> news:da358619d09585b312270193464e0a06@news.teranews.com:
>
> >
> > "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> > news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> >> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >> site's
> > that
> >> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> >> I'm
> > finding
> >> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> >> references
> > for
> >> various solid state and tube conversions.
> >>
> >> Thanks in advance for any help.
> >>
> >> WA3MOJ
> >>
> > Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear from
> > the likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be desired
> > according to google, George.
>
> Hmm pretty funny considering all the post from wa3moj and you come from
> the same Isp.... Enjoy yourself while you can, soon the fun will be over.
> :-)

they did? WA3MOJ's post were from newsguy.com, Bada Bing's are from
Teranews. How is that the same ISP?

2966. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 12:36:33 UTC
From: Speedy <memorex@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <65460924c7e17725e5219e8cf91593ce@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91030
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JOE" <joe77557@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:f2b71a840adb9289841a726217e6129d@news.meganetnews.com...
> > >> WA3MOJ
> > >>
> > > Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear from
> > > the likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be desired
> > > according to google, George.
> >
> > Hmm pretty funny considering all the post from wa3moj and you come from
> > the same Isp.... Enjoy yourself while you can, soon the fun will be
over.
> > :-)
>
> No shit!!! What a fucking FARCE! The TROLL and his 'argumental
> replies' are all the SAME SOURCE!!!
>
> Come on Sibyl - you need to go back on your meds already!
>
> JOE
>
>

no shit joe, take your meds.
WA3MOJ posts with newsguy.com
Bada Bing posts with Teranews
same source?
your just a stupid ham that doesn't
know anything about a computer

2967. Good deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 12:44:41 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c635vp01kuv@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.swap

I have the chance to pick up a Henry 8k amp for $6000, it's in good working order.

Do you think that is a fair price?

http://www.radiodan.com/Henry/Amp_specs/ultra_info.htm

2968. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 13:30:06 UTC
From: Tam/WB2TT <t-tammaru@c0mca$t.net>
Message-ID: <KIGdnZgSzNZAuBjdRVn-sA@comcast.com>
Source record: 91032
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@spam.82d59834> wrote in message
news:108a80cb2eelsee@corp.supernews.com...
> On 19 Apr 2004 04:25:08 -0700,
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
> > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
references for
> > various solid state and tube conversions.
> >
> > Thanks in advance for any help.
> >
> > WA3MOJ
> >
>
>
> Yes, The conversion of a UHF FM transceiver is
> a simple four step process.
>
> 1. Remove the top cover of the UHF FM transceiver.
> 2. Inspect the board for any coils
> 3. Inspecting the board for any capacitors
> 4. Stand up and click your heels together three times
> and chant
> "There is no place like a CB with AM and SSB."
>
> Thanks for trolling.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.
> Replace spam.82d59834 with wvi dot com & del

There may actually be a market for converted UHF gear for CB. The key here
is CB, NOT 11 METERS. Some countries in Europe have FM CB. I don't know what
the frequencies are, but quite likely VHF or UHF.

Other than that, for anybody still reading this thread - ever hear of a non
amateur UHF SSB radio?

In general, this thread is in the same line as converting old black/white TVs to color.

Tam/WB2TT

2969. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 13:41:42 UTC
From: Speedy <memorex@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <30ebac4466cedc590ab09a501be86d7a@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91033
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D0D5AAD9BE51234567890@216.196.97.136...
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com:
>
> > In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
> >>
> >>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> >>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> >>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >>> site's that
> >>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> >>> I'm finding
> >>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> >>> references for
> >>> various solid state and tube conversions.
> >>>
> >>> Thanks in advance for any help.
> >>>
> >>> WA3MOJ
> >>
> >>Troll
> >>
> >>
> > Why is it a troll? It is on topic.
>
> On topic for what? You are not wa3moj, and are posting in amatuer NG's
> with a federal issued call sign. Seems you may have more problems then
> you care to admit. You want peopl to think you are the amatuer radio
> operator wa3moj, that could lead you into serious problems. take it for
> what it is worth. That is only if george want's to pursue the matter.

since no one claiming to be wa3moj has disputed
the post,it stands to reason that it is a valid post.

I have sent a couple of e-mails to the F.C.C. pointing out that
he is selling illegal equipment. everyone else should send
e-mails to the F.C.C.
maybe we can get his ham ticket pulled.

2970. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 13:56:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <tc-dnUdpEaRCthjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 91034

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hwg0olh.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 22:07:04 GMT, garigue wrote:
>
> >William ...we are all going away sooner or later ..... I am not going to
> >rent my cloak or sit in the neighborhood ash pit pouring the same over my
> >brow when and if CW leaves. There are a myriad of things that interest
me
> >and when CW goes ....it goes.
>
> Where is CW going? I've not heard of any rational proposals by
> regulators to ban CW from amateur radio. In fact, CW is not banned
> from the Maritime Services either - it just isn't required as it
> once was for distress and safety purposes.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

These days I see more and more of the "rare" DX hiding down in the CW bands,
especially in the Extra portion.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2971. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 13:58:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D16560954F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91035

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040420002148.18662.00000044@mb-m01.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice
>>exam? From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 4/19/2004 10:02 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94D0EA4D4D918elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>> Congrats on being an EE. Does it make you immune to
>>> electrocution?
>>
>>No
>>
>>> Does
>>> my NOT being an M.D. in any way diminish the fact that sufficient
>>> current sustained by adequate voltage can be fatal regardless of how or
>>> where it's applied to human tissue?
>>
>>No
>>
>
> Then why did you deem it important to raise either in the exchange?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>

To explain my background and find out if you had some kind of medical
training, which you do

2972. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 14:05:03 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c63amfijb1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 91036
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Dave Platt <dplatt@radagast.org> wrote:
>
>They have proposed rescinding the Part 97 rule which places a whole
>bunch of restrictions on the manufacture and sale of amplifiers which
>can be used between 24 MHz and 35 MHz (the 10- and 12-meter amateur
>bands, and the 11-meter CB band). This change has not actually been
>enacted - they're inviting comments on whether it's a Good Idea or a
>Bad Idea.

I'm feeling it's a good idea. It's a good idea first of all because it
will now make it legal to sell a lot of those military surplus wideband
DC-to-daylight amplifier systems.

And it's a good idea secondly, because the CB crowd already has bootleg
linears and there is already a substantial underground selling the things.
If it's legal, maybe at least more of those guys will be using clean
linear amps that aren't bandsplatter machines. If the FCC can't stop
the sale, they can at least try to reduce the sale of the worst amps out
there.

>They have _not_ proposed making any change to the Part 95 rules, which
>currently make it illegal to actually _use_ any such amplifier with an
>11-meter (CB) transmitter.
>
>So - if their proposed rule change is adopted, it'll be easier for
>amateurs to buy amps that can be used on 10 and 12 meters.
>General-purpose HF-band amplifier designs will probably be revised, to
>"open them up" to the higher frequencies.

This is a good idea.

>It will still remain illegal to use any such amplifier on the 11-meter
>CB band.

This is also a good idea. It might be nice if it were enforced, but we
can't have everything.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

2973. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 15:01:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404200701.c31ef2d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91037
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<C-KdnRBEjIlm8xndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > First off, you need the services of a good *real estate* attorney. Not
> > just any lawyer will do; you need someone who does RE as a specialty
> > and who deals with CC&Rs (codes, covenants and restrictions) on a
> > daily basis. Make sure the attorney understands that his/her job is to
> > dig up any and all restrictions on any property you might be
> > interested in *before* you sign anything.
>
> I don't know about hiring an attorney first off, Jim. Over the course
> of buying a hous, I looked at maybe 30 or more. Sorry, I just don't have
> the money to pay an attorney to investigate every house I looked at.

Mike & Cathy,

Sorry if I wasn't clear about the attorney's role. My point was that
the thing to do is to line up a good RE attorney right away, with the
understanding that when you are seriously considering a particular
house you'll have the attorney research it.

In my local RE market, things move so fast that you need to have all
your people ready to go beforehand. MN may be different, though.
>
> When the field got really, really narrow, then perhaps
>
> > Second, require that you and your attorney be provided with a complete
> > and up-to-date set of the deed, title and all covenants and deed
> > restrictions *before* you make an offer, and read them thoroughly.
> > Sometimes they are part of the deed/title itself but often they are
> > not. States differ widely and you may need to be a bit insistent on
> > what you want to see. Almost all properties built in the past 40-50
> > years have some sort of restrictions, and those built in the last 30
> > years often have lots and lots of restrictions of various types. Note
> > that most restrictions are intentionally designed to be *impossible*
> > to change, and that by signing on the dotted line you agree to abide
> > by *all* of them.
> >
> > Third, try to educate the realtor. Show her some typical amateur
> > antenna installations so she has a better idea of what it is you want
> > to put up. Terms like "antenna tower" mean different things to
> > different people.
>

> Maybe for a little kickback? Seriously, that is the job they are
> supposed to do, and considering th eamount of commission they get, they
> are supposed to find out things you need to know.

In a perfect world, yes. But fewer than 1 in 100 Americans is a ham,
and many hams are in the same family, so the chances are good that a
given RE agent will have little or no experience with antenna
restriction covenants and such.
>
> Mind you, I don't think very highly of most of them. I could tell you
> about the time that we took a tour of a house that was already sold. Or
> the time we put a down payment on a house that the agent "neglected" to
> tell us was in a flood plain until the day after the check was cashed. I
> told him he had exactly 30 minutes to repay us the money. Took 15.

Was this *your* agent or *their* agent?
>
> > Fourth, realize that most but not all of the people involved in a real
> > estate transaction only get paid if you actually buy a house. No sale
> > = no comission/fees/taxes.
>
> Sure enough. That isn't an excuse for incompetence tho'.

'Course not. But it happens nonetheless. Laws differ by state - I only
know PA and I'm not an attorney.
>
> > In my case the realtor and attorney were able to get me a complete
> > copy of the restrictions fairly easily. They were *not* part of the
> > deed/title documents - instead, those documents referred to the
> > restrictions, which had to be retrieved from the county courthouse
> > records. I had to ask specifically to see them early on in the
> > transaction - if I hadn't insisted, I would never have seen them at
> > all. Until somebody complained.
>
> Part of their job, like asking to see only green houses. Or not green
> houses.

Point is you have to tell them about the green and how you define
"green".
>
> > Even though my house is over 50 years old and there has never been any
> > sort of home owner's association, there were a page and a half of
> > restrictions. Most of them seem a bit comical today (no raising
> > livestock on a property that is 60 x 120 feet) or have been superseded
> > by more-restrictive township ordinances (setbacks, advertising
> > signage, noise). No mention of antennas but I can't have a
> > freestanding tower (or a shed) with a concrete base because that would
> > constitute a "structure" and only the house and garage structures are
> > permitted.
> > Doesn't matter to me because there's no room for a tower anyway but
> > that's the sort of thing to look for.

>
> I got lucky when I bought my house. I could put up a 40 foot tower
> without a problem, and no restrictions on wire antennas. I say lucky,
> because I didn't become interested in the ARS until after we were in the
> place for 5 years or so.
>
Someday I will have the proverbial couple of unrestricted acres in the
country with the antenna farm. Right now other considerations govern.
That's the spot most hams are in when house hunting.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2974. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 15:10:48 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Y3bhc.24551$mB4.19249@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91038
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@spam.911384f8> wrote in message
news:108ad9dfo8irhe0@corp.supernews.com...

>
> It is a troll posted by some guy trying to embarrassing Geroge. ;-)
>
> >
> > Tam/WB2TT
> >
> >
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.
> Replace spam.911384f8 with wvi dot com & del _

Yes it's a troll post, but George by no
means needs any help on embarrassing himself.
He's been a troll in Rec.Radio.CB for years now,
using thousands of different screen nics and an AOL
account, so he really doesn't need any help to
embarrass himself.

Watch by his reply, you'll see either from
his Comcast account or AOL account.

Landshark

--
Courage is what it takes to stand up
and speak; courage is also what it
takes to sit down and listen.

2975. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 16:26:39 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <a0654e2e9932e68a36561783c60cae12@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 91039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Speedy" <memorex@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:554bf0816f93bfb145560796e8650b4a@news.bubbanews.com...
>
> "Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D0B61BCC7661234567890@216.196.97.136...
> > "Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in
> > news:da358619d09585b312270193464e0a06@news.teranews.com:
> >
> > >
> > > "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> > > news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> > >> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> > >> site's
> > > that
> > >> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> > >> I'm
> > > finding
> > >> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> > >> references
> > > for
> > >> various solid state and tube conversions.
> > >>
> > >> Thanks in advance for any help.
> > >>
> > >> WA3MOJ
> > >>
> > > Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear from
> > > the likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be desired
> > > according to google, George.
> >
> > Hmm pretty funny considering all the post from wa3moj and you come from
> > the same Isp.... Enjoy yourself while you can, soon the fun will be
over.
> > :-)
>
> they did? WA3MOJ's post were from newsguy.com, Bada Bing's are from
> Teranews. How is that the same ISP?
>
>
Don't confuse geo with the facts please.
```

2976. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 17:02:45 UTC
From: Browning Mark FourA <tommyboys_news@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <5tla80lf07c91ke7qi2d6e1hqi9j7kiq6e@4ax.com>
Source record: 91040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

+4db +2db 0db +2db +4db

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

noise...Signal

On 19 Apr 2004 14:16:33 -0700, WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:

>I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
>calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>
>INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
>Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>
>I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)

remove <SPAMSUCKS> to reply

2977. PLEASE READ Re: Radio Conversion: THIS THREAD STARTED AS A FORGERY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 17:42:59 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0404200942.1ff6fe8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91041
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Speedy" <memorex@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<30ebac4466cedc590ab09a501be86d7a@news.bubbanews.com>...
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D0D5AAD9BE51234567890@216.196.97.136...
> > WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com:
> >
> > > In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
> > >>
> > >>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> > >>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> > >>> site's that
> > >>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
> > >>> I'm finding
> > >>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> > >>> references for
> > >>> various solid state and tube conversions.
> > >>>
> > >>> Thanks in advance for any help.
> > >>>
> > >>> WA3MOJ
> > >>
> > >>Troll
> > >>
> > >>
> > > Why is it a troll? It is on topic.
> >
> > On topic for what? You are not wa3moj, and are posting in amatuer NG's
> > with a federal issued call sign. Seems you may have more problems then
> > you care to admit. You want peopl to think you are the amatuer radio
> > operator wa3moj, that could lead you into serious problems. take it for
> > what it is worth. That is only if george want's to pursue the matter.
>
> since no one claiming to be wa3moj has disputed
> the post,it stands to reason that it is a valid post.
>
> I have sent a couple of e-mails to the F.C.C. pointing out that
> he is selling illegal equipment. everyone else should send
> e-mails to the F.C.C.
> maybe we can get his ham ticket pulled.

FYI as any one reading this can guess WA3MOJ, is being forged.. It is being done by a group of anonymous out law CBers from rec.radio.cb. Thier goal is to punish licensed hams who have spoken out against freeband, mod'ed radios, and, illegal power in that newsgroup. Operating outside the rules means a lot to these CBers. Anyone that disaproves of it is seen as a threat. A licensed ham who does not 'go along with the program" and is foolish enough to use his callsign in that group gets harrased. Recently, one, of the out law CBers rang door bells, left notes, and took photos at the residences of hams N8WWM and KC8LDO for the purpose of stalking them. This is now a court matter. Also these same CB out laws are so ignorant they get mixed up and latch on to call signs of hams who do not even post there which is the case with WA3MOJ, N7VCF, and, others. It may be best to let them forge away so that the ISPs involved can shut them down.

2978. Re: Good deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 18:02:59 UTC
From: Win <win@winlyn.us>
Message-ID: <icpa80hutelausjueslnluiaubh8o534cm@4ax.com>
Source record: 91042

On 20 Apr 2004 05:44:41 -0700, WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:

>I have the chance to pick up a Henry 8k amp for $6000, it's in good
>working order.
>
>Do you think that is a fair price?
>
>http://www.radiodan.com/Henry/Amp_specs/ultra_info.htm

Cross-posted! Troll??

Win

2979. Re: PLEASE READ Re: Radio Conversion: THIS THREAD STARTED AS A FORGERY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 18:45:50 UTC
From: Speedy <memorex@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <533c0439c3ae8ff946ffd3a0ca9be052@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91043
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"I Am Not George" <iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c034bd2.0404200942.1ff6fe8c@posting.google.com...
> "Speedy" <memorex@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<30ebac4466cedc590ab09a501be86d7a@news.bubbanews.com>...
> > "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94D0D5AAD9BE51234567890@216.196.97.136...
> > > WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com:
> > >
> > > > In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
> > > >>
> > > >>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> > > >>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> > > >>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> > > >>> site's that
> > > >>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11
meters.
> > > >>> I'm finding
> > > >>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> > > >>> references for
> > > >>> various solid state and tube conversions.
> > > >>>
> > > >>> Thanks in advance for any help.
> > > >>>
> > > >>> WA3MOJ
> > > >>
> > > >>Troll
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > > Why is it a troll? It is on topic.
> > >
> > > On topic for what? You are not wa3moj, and are posting in amatuer NG's
> > > with a federal issued call sign. Seems you may have more problems then
> > > you care to admit. You want peopl to think you are the amatuer radio
> > > operator wa3moj, that could lead you into serious problems. take it
for
> > > what it is worth. That is only if george want's to pursue the matter.
> >
> > since no one claiming to be wa3moj has disputed
> > the post,it stands to reason that it is a valid post.
> >
> > I have sent a couple of e-mails to the F.C.C. pointing out that
> > he is selling illegal equipment. everyone else should send

> > e-mails to the F.C.C.
> > maybe we can get his ham ticket pulled.
>
>
> FYI as any one reading this can guess WA3MOJ, is being forged.. It is
> being done by a group of anonymous out law CBers from rec.radio.cb.
> Thier goal is to punish licensed hams who have spoken out against
> freeband, mod'ed radios, and, illegal power in that newsgroup.
> Operating outside the rules means a lot to these CBers. Anyone that
> disaproves of it is seen as a threat. A licensed ham who does not 'go
> along with the program" and is foolish enough to use his callsign in
> that group gets harrased. Recently, one, of the out law CBers rang
> door bells, left notes, and took photos at the residences of hams
> N8WWM and KC8LDO for the purpose of stalking them. This is now a
> court matter. Also these same CB out laws are so ignorant they get
> mixed up and latch on to call signs of hams who do not even post there
> which is the case with WA3MOJ, N7VCF, and, others. It may be best to
> let them forge away so that the ISPs involved can shut them down.

maybe if the F.C.C gets enough complaints,they will investigate and
see if its really WA3MOJ or not.
if you care so much, get in contact
with him and ask him to quit selling illegal stuff.

2980. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 19:14:10 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <6Eehc.34977$yD1.100569@attbi_s54>
Source record: 91044

Have they considered renaming the "Extra" license to the "Nothing-Special"
ticket?
Or just make it a "General"; that's what my 1st Class Radiotelephone is now.

Seriously, what's needed is to "re-invent" a truly entry-level Novice
license (give it a snappier name) that encourages young people to tryout
amateur radio before the more serious regulations and theory knowledge is
required for the advanced license(es) .

ak

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0404170456.30c6b9ad@posting.google.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of April 15, 2004:
>
> Novice - 32,092 (decrease of 17,237)
> Technician - 262,886 (increase of 57,492)
> Technician Plus - 60,597 (decrease of 68,263)
> General - 140,586 (increase of 27,909)
> Advanced - 80,717 (decrease of 19,065)
> Extra - 105,246 (increase of 26,496)
> Total - 682,124 (increase of 7,332)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2981. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 20:09:52 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <108b0sp524n953c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91045

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
news:6Eehc.34977$yD1.100569@attbi_s54...
> Have they considered renaming the "Extra" license to the "Nothing-Special"
> ticket?
> Or just make it a "General"; that's what my 1st Class Radiotelephone is
now.
>
> Seriously, what's needed is to "re-invent" a truly entry-level Novice
> license (give it a snappier name) that encourages young people to tryout
> amateur radio before the more serious regulations and theory knowledge is
> required for the advanced license(es) .
>
> ak
>

You're right about the name. People, young and old have been big on titles for several years like for instance, Sanitary Engineer for janitor or Executive Assistant for an entry level secretary.

Maybe call the new class Certified Electronic Experimenter or Electronic Experimenter In Training or some other snazzy name. The young kids are looking for something like that. Novice is an immediate turnoff nowadays. The new class wouldn't have to have lots of privileges, just a classy name to attract most young people.

David

2982. Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice exam?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 22:03:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040420180333.18372.00000257@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 91046

>Subject: Re: Are RF safety questions too hard for the proposed new Novice
>exam?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 4/20/2004 8:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94D16560954F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>news:20040420002148.18662.00000044@mb-m01.aol.com:

>> Then why did you deem it important to raise either in the exchange?
>
>To explain my background and find out if you had some kind of medical
>training, which you do

OK. Thanks.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2983. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 22:34:45 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <9Ahhc.26167$hw5.41450@attbi_s53>
Source record: 91047

"David 01" <ifiwantspam@illask.org> wrote in message
news:108b0sp524n953c@corp.supernews.com...
> You're right about the name. People, young and old have been big on titles
> for several years like for instance, Sanitary Engineer for janitor or
> Executive Assistant for an entry level secretary.
>
> Maybe call the new class Certified Electronic Experimenter or Electronic
> Experimenter In Training or some other snazzy name. The young kids are
> looking for something like that. Novice is an immediate turnoff nowadays.
> The new class wouldn't have to have lots of privileges, just a classy name
> to attract most young people.
>
> David

I agree. And when the Novice ticket became renewable, the test materiel got harder; that made it more difficult to attract middle school and early high school candidates. In my day, it was knowing just enough of the rules to get by and a very little theory to operate at 75-watts input with a crystal to keep us in our band. From that, I gained enough interest in radio to get the Extra before the disastrous "incentive licensing" debacle took place. Today's beginners need to be connected with computers, so I think that the simple entry ticket (CEE ?) should allow all digital modes within restricted sub-bands, including the HF bands. The code capability should be an endorsement thing, with a small bottom-of-the band CW incentive, much like the Extras has today. However, the no-coders should be able to use cw within their sub-bands, without the endorsement. But when BPL gets going full force, maybe all such concerns will just be academic as the bands won't be much good for anyone except the power companies.

AK

2984. N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 23:10:12 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous>
Source record: 91048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
700 ADAMS STREET
TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
DATE: 4/20/2004

CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL

MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:

Party Counsel Prosecutor
Defendant 1:
ADAIR DOUGLAS W
5319 SECOR RD.
TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
4199365120
411 N MICHIGAN
TOLEDO , OH 436241606

COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4

DATE SEQ EVENT
6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
PARTY : -
5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
CAPIAS C-174-842
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
CAPIAS C-174-843

PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
SERVED ON 11/13/00
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
SERVED ON 11/12/00
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
SWANSON appointed as counsel.
Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
Sue Swanson
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
ADAIR present in court.
Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
of probation.
Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section

2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1) Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding agreement.
Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees associated with being granted probation. Payment of financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution, supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel fees.
JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
SENTENCE C-184-502
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
terminated unsuccesfully
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

2985. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 23:52:52 UTC
From: chuckles <chuck@att.net>
Message-ID: <74f927e823e32149f4c29ce71276b4b1@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91049
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen wrote:

> "Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in
> news:a0654e2e9932e68a36561783c60cae12@news.teranews.com:
>
>
>>"Speedy" <memorex@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:554bf0816f93bfb145560796e8650b4a@news.bubbanews.com...
>>
>>>"Duke Of Windsor" <duke@hen.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns94D0B61BCC7661234567890@216.196.97.136...
>>>
>>>>"Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in
>>>>news:da358619d09585b312270193464e0a06@news.teranews.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or
>>>>>>web site's
>>>>>
>>>>>that
>>>>>
>>>>>>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11
>>>>>>meters. I'm
>>>>>
>>>>>finding
>>>>>
>>>>>>there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
>>>>>>references
>>>>>
>>>>>for
>>>>>
>>>>>>various solid state and tube conversions.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Thanks in advance for any help.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>WA3MOJ
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Do you really think people are stupid enough to buy illegal gear
>>>>>from the likes of you? Your online character leaves much to be

>>>>>desired according to google, George.
>>>>
>>>>Hmm pretty funny considering all the post from wa3moj and you come
>>>>from the same Isp.... Enjoy yourself while you can, soon the fun
>>>>will be
>>
>>over.
>>
your response to bada bing,who is the you with the same isp?

>>>>:-)
>>>
>>>they did? WA3MOJ's post were from newsguy.com, Bada Bing's are from
>>>Teranews. How is that the same ISP?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Don't confuse geo with the facts please.
>
>
> who said anything about bada bing , but bada bing is twisty in drag

you did chucklehead, your response was to him

2986. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-20 23:59:23 UTC
From: chuckles <chuck@att.net>
Message-ID: <b6983f10dcfd7e5060b8110044054d1c@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Duke Of Windsor wrote:

> exray <dontspamme-exray@coqui.net> wrote in
> news:1087jeasabg29f4@corp.supernews.com:
>
>
>>WA3MOJ wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
>>>site's that will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on
>>>11 meters. I'm finding there is a substantial market for such gear
>>>and I'll need some references for various solid state and tube
>>>conversions.
>>>
>>>Thanks in advance for any help.
>>>
>>>WA3MOJ
>>>
>>
>>George,
>>Are you wanting to convert them to AM or SSB?
>>
>>-BM
>
>
> That is not george that is a forge of him and a bad one at that.
>

if he would have sounded drunk or on drugs, like WA3MOJ normally is,
would that have been a good forge?

2987. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 01:41:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Tikhc.2071$fW.1841@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91051
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:TpZgc.1159$gH6.663@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Well the freqs being used for the RFID tags are not in the FM segement.
But
> I do agree with your point.
>
> We have three strong and high repeaters in my immediate area. Hardly any
> activity at all.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Hello, Dan

It really depends upon your area whether you'll find a lot of use or very little. Someone in North Dakota might not even have a repeater available, yet if he fires up on 75 meters in the evening - wow! It's busy! Likely no one is near him, he simply hears a ton of stations via F layer reflection.

Rochester, NY, is hardly Chicago or NYC, but I've filled my limited memories on my HTX-404 (10 memory channels plus 3 priority channels) - every one of them usable. I've chatted at 3:00 am with a trucker in Toronto via the Toronto repeater (linked to the Rice Lake repeater in Canada which I can use very well). I've chatted locally at 2:00 am with a professor from the University of Rochester. Usually, there is some activity on 440 almost every time of day (with the exception that it does get quiet between midnight and 5:00 am LOL).

We have a *ton* of repeaters (I can use more than the 13, but that is the limit of memory on the old Rat Shack HT) around here. One of the repeater systems has ports on every band from 10 meters to 1.2 GHz (including 900 MHz). I've chatted with Australia and England via the 10 meter port (whilst I was on one of the 440 ports). It really all depends .... ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.659 / Virus Database: 423 - Release Date: 4/15/04

2988. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 01:50:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%rkhc.2073$rX.777@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91052
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c619hd024bp@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <1XUgc.2518$e4.320@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, K&#65533;HB
says...
> >The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
> >they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
> >1.4.
> >
> >The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
> >
> >It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was
> >poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack
> >the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.
> >
> >Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a
> >9.8? Never!
> >
> >The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in
> >dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!
> >
> >They demand a recount!
> >
> >73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> Hans, sind Sie absolut keine Hilfe gewesen. Zuk&#65533;nftig entfernen Sie bitte
Ihren
> Kopf von Ihrem Esel, bevor Sie zu mir sprechen.
>
> Danke.

I beg to differ. Hans has been most helpful. He has given a little comic
relief to what was an obvious troll.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.659 / Virus Database: 423 - Release Date: 4/15/04

2989. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 02:17:36 UTC
From: tnom@mucks.net
Message-ID: <j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>
Source record: 91053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

snip
>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>agreement.

The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.

2990. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 03:45:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <G6SdnW1ORvDocxjdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91054

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>I doubt that they care what I think.
>>
>>It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
>>our (NCI) membership wants.
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>
> An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all
> 680K+ USA licenced ARO's? If not, you should at least be aware that what
> you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use wrt
> NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.
>
> The only thing you REALLY have working to your benefit is the current
> apathetic stance of the FCC. A "reduction of effort" appears to be a shared
> goal. As a member of the 680K+ club who is not an NCI member, I am saddened
> at what NCI's influence is doing to my chosen hobby/service.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
> FISTS #9384
>
> BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or
> e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just had
> the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist who
> explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved" re.
> an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest. Believe
> it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will
> likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer. Usually a
> casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few minutes
> to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.

Good advice, Bert.

Let's not forget that unless Bill is a master Sophist - and I highly
doubt that - he would not be espousing the mass upgrade of Technicians
unless he personally supported it.

All the fluff about membership wishes is just that - fluff.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2991. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 03:49:25 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040420234925.801$tV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

chuckles <chuck@att.net> wrote:
> Duke Of Windsor wrote:
>
> > exray <dontspamme-exray@coqui.net> wrote in
> > news:1087jeasabg29f4@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> >
> >>WA3MOJ wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
> >>>site's that will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on
> >>>11 meters. I'm finding there is a substantial market for such gear
> >>>and I'll need some references for various solid state and tube
> >>>conversions.
> >>>
> >>>Thanks in advance for any help.
> >>>
> >>>WA3MOJ
> >>>
> >>
> >>George,
> >>Are you wanting to convert them to AM or SSB?
> >>
> >>-BM
> >
> >
> > That is not george that is a forge of him and a bad one at that.
> >
>
> if he would have sounded drunk or on drugs, like WA3MOJ normally is,
> would that have been a good forge?
>
Dead ringer.

2992. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 03:53:56 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <ofmhc.2576$Dn1.798@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...

>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.

For Christ's sake George, can't you see Doug is a useless compilation of
semi-human DNA? What a loser. Ordered to seek mental health? He must have
really flipped out for the court to order that in such a case.

2993. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 03:57:23 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040420235723.415$Pu@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91057
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote:
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
>
> >
> > This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them.
> > Yet the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
> For Christ's sake George, can't you see Doug is a useless compilation of
> semi-human DNA? What a loser. Ordered to seek mental health? He must have
> really flipped out for the court to order that in such a case.
>
Geo likes short, fat, greasy, balding men. That's why he likes Frank.

2994. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 10:31:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404210231.42fdad11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91058

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<QE8hc.71400$_g4.13366348@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> > > I doubt that they care what I think.
> >
> > It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> > our (NCI) membership wants.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all
> 680K+ USA licenced ARO's? If not, you should at least be aware that what
> you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use wrt
> NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.

What's wrong with taking a page out of the ARRL playbook?

2995. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 10:50:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404210250.a8e5a6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91059

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<tc-dnUdpEaRCthjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
>
> These days I see more and more of the "rare" DX hiding down in the CW bands,
> especially in the Extra portion.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Did you work them or just see them on the cluster?

2996. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 13:10:45 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c65rsl0u0n@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136>, Concerned Citizen says...
>
>Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
>news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>> J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>> 700 ADAMS STREET
>> TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>> DATE: 4/20/2004
>>
>> CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>> TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>> JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>> FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>
>> --
>> --------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>> ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>> PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>
>> --
>> ---------
>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>> Defendant 1:
>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 5319 SECOR RD.
>> TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>> 4199365120
>> 411 N MICHIGAN
>> TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>
>> --
>> --------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>> 1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>
>> --
>> --------- DATE SEQ EVENT
>> 6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>> PARTY : -
>> 5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>> 803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)

>> Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>> issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>> CAPIAS C-174-842
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>> CAPIAS C-174-843
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>> C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>> November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>> SERVED ON 11/13/00
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>> SERVED ON 11/12/00
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>> 772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>> Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>> ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>> SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>> Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>> the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>> Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>> Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
>> Sue Swanson
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
>> RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>> 671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE

>> Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>> present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>> ADAIR present in court.
>> Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>> having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>> of probation.
>> Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>> of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>> 2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>> Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>> ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>> Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>> mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>> agreement.
>> Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>> any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>> further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>> associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>> financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>> supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>> fees.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>> SENTENCE C-184-502
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>> terminated unsuccesfully
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>
>>
>> -=-
>> This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
I really hate when people dont use their real name.

2997. Re: Good deal?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 13:12:29 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c65rvt0ufk@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91061

In article <icpa80hutelausjueslnluiaubh8o534cm@4ax.com>, Win says...
>
>On 20 Apr 2004 05:44:41 -0700, WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
>
>>I have the chance to pick up a Henry 8k amp for $6000, it's in good
>>working order.
>>
>>Do you think that is a fair price?
>>
>>http://www.radiodan.com/Henry/Amp_specs/ultra_info.htm
>
>Cross-posted! Troll??
>
>Win
>
>
It must be a troll it's on topic.

2998. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 13:25:30 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <feebf80acf4ff0eb582de52271c23a00@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 91060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
> > LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> > J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> > 700 ADAMS STREET
> > TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> > DATE: 4/20/2004
> >
> > CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> > TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> > JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> > FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
> >
> > ---------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> > ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> > PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
> >
> > ---------
> > Party Counsel Prosecutor
> > Defendant 1:
> > ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 5319 SECOR RD.
> > TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> > 4199365120
> > 411 N MICHIGAN
> > TOLEDO , OH 436241606
> >
> > --------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
> > 1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
> >
> > --------- DATE SEQ EVENT
> > 6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
> > PARTY : -
> > 5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
> > 803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
> > Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered

> > issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
> > JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
> > CAPIAS C-174-842
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
> > CAPIAS C-174-843
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> > C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
> > November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> > SERVED ON 11/13/00
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> > SERVED ON 11/12/00
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
> > 772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
> > Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
> > ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
> > ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
> > SWANSON appointed as counsel.
> > Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
> > the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
> > Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> > Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
> > JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
> > Sue Swanson
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
> > RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
> > 671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
> > Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE

> > ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
> > present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
> > ADAIR present in court.
> > Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
> > having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
> > of probation.
> > Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> > of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> > 2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> > Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> > ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> > Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
> > mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
> > agreement.
> > Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
> > any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
> > further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
> > associated with being granted probation. Payment of
> > financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
> > supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
> > fees.
> > JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
> > SENTENCE C-184-502
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
> > terminated unsuccesfully
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
> >
> >
> > -=-
> > This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
Devon circle?

2999. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 13:29:08 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <e887963f5d11f4a24f64742c4ebfb6a9@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 91063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>
>
> > WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> > GEORGE BUSCH
> > 1385 DEVON CIR
> > ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> > USA
>
>
>
> wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
more
> like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post it
> again...
>
Momma

http://www.lehighvalleyelderlaw.com/about.html

3000. "Harry's Hams" a policy violation

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 18:24:52 UTC
From: Scott n7rvn <n7rvn@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <ohxhc.33063$pk5.18061@fe03.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 91064

I am looking for an article about "Harry's Hams". The article was published in May (I believe) of 1983. I am pretty sure of the year. Can anyone either scan, copy, or heaven forbid type the text of the article so I can get accurate information?

The article addresses a weather net that a local forecaster used to report the information he overheard on the nets. He called the guys on the nets "Harry's Hams" and the FCC squashed that quickly. Seems the FCC felt sharing this as his hams doing the work for the television station, violates the regulations. Imagine that. Today the fines would be huge for that little faux paw.

Any help would be appreciated.

Thanks

3001. Re: hardly any lower clouds are bitter and other new wrinkles are outer, but will Steve grasp that

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 19:10:34 UTC
From: Graham Drabble <graham.drabble@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <4c96414f.c8395427@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 91068
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,fr.rec.plongee,es.rec.juegos.pinball,fr.rec.arts.spectacles,rec.sport.football.misc,microsoft.public.ru.russian.hardware

Nader: Iraq an Unconstitutional, Illegal War

Based on Five Falsehoods:
CONGRESS SHOULD BEGIN IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY OF BUSH AND CHENEY

"All public policy should revolve around the principle that individuals are responsible for what they say and do." -- George W. Bush, 1994.

Washington, DC:
Building on his call for the impeachment of President Bush and Vice President Cheney, Independent Presidential candidate Ralph Nader today is calling on Members of the House of Representatives to begin an impeachment inquiry to investigate two distinct impeachable offenses.

An Impeachment Inquiry is the first step toward considering Articles of Impeachment. During an Impeachment Inquiry the House would investigate whether there are potential impeachable offenses.

Impeachment Inquiry and the Process of Impeachment

While the Constitution is clear in granting the impeachment power to the House, it leaves the development of mechanisms for exercising the power to the House. As noted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York in "The Law of Presidential Impeachment By the Committee on Federal Legislation" (see: http://www.abcny.org/presimpt.htm):

"A variety of methods have been employed to institute impeachment proceedings: Charges may be made orally on the floor by a Member of the House; a Member may submit a written statement of charges; one or more Members of the House may offer a resolution and place it in the legislative hopper; a presidential message to the House may initiate proceedings. The House has also received charges from a state legislature, from a territory, and from a grand jury. Finally, there may be a report of a committee of the House which may submit facts or charges that will lead to impeachment. Under the rules governing the order of business in the House a direct proposition to impeach is a matter of highest privilege and supersedes other business. Similar privileged treatment is given to propositions relating to a pending impeachment."

The purpose of the Impeachment Inquiry is to have a Committee develop a report for the House which then can be considered for the purpose of determining whether to proceed with impeachment proceedings. The House

determines whether to impeach based on a majority vote. It is important to remember that impeachment does not mean conviction - that is left to the Senate. Impeachment is the equivalent of an indictment, making formal charges, which the Senate then considers. Conviction requires two-thirds of the Members present in the Senate to vote for conviction.

Two Potential Articles of Impeachment that Should be Part of an Impeachment Inquiry

The Impeachment Inquiry should focus on two areas involving President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney.

The unconstitutional war in Iraq.

"The Inquiry should examine whether President Bush and Vice President Cheney have gone beyond the bounds of the Constitution, defied the rule of law, and if so, whether impeachment is the appropriate constitutional punishment," said Nader. The United States Congress never voted for the Iraq war. Congress voted for a resolution in October 2002 which unlawfully transferred to the President the decision-making power of whether to launch a first-strike invasion of Iraq. The United States Constitution's War Powers Clause (Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11) vests the power of deciding whether to send the nation into war solely in the United States Congress. This can only be changed by a constitutional amendment.

"Our founders had seen what could occur when the power to declare war was vested in one person, a King or a Queen, so they took clear steps to ensure no one person could declare war for the United States. As James Madison wrote: "In no part of the constitution is more wisdom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war and peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department," noted Nader.

Five Falsehoods that Led to the Iraq Quagmire:

Making matters worse in this situation, the illegal first-strike invasion and occupation of Iraq was justified by five falsehoods. Nader calls for a second area for Impeachment Inquiry to examine: the "five falsehoods that led to war." In 1994 George W. Bush said: "All public policy should revolve around the principle that individuals are responsible for what they say and do." In 2000, he ran as the "responsibility " candidate. Manipulation or deliberate misuse of national security intelligence data, if proven, would be "a high crime" under the Constitution's impeachment clause. Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution provides: "The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

The weapons have still not been found. Nader emphasized, "Until the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam Hussein was our government's anti-communist ally in the Middle East. We also used him to keep Iran at bay. In so doing, in the

1980s under Reagan and the first Bush, corporations were licensed by the Department of Commerce to export the materials for chemical and biological weapons that President George W. Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney later accused him of having." Those weapons were destroyed after the Gulf War. President Bush's favorite chief weapons inspector, David Kay, after returning from Iraq and leading a large team of inspectors and spending nearly half a billion dollars told the president :We were wrong."

See: David Kay testimony before Senate Armed Services Committee, January 28, 2004.

IRAQ TIES TO AL QAEDA:

The White House made this claim even though the CIA and FBI repeatedly told the Administration that there was no tie between Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda. They were mortal enemies - one secular, the other fundamentalist.

SADDAM HUSSEIN WAS A THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES:

In fact, Saddam was a tottering dictator, with an antiquated, fractured army of low morale and with Kurdish enemies in Northern Iraq and Shiite adversaries in the South of Iraq. He did not even control the air space over most of Iraq.

SADDAM HUSSEIN WAS A THREAT TO HIS NEIGHBORS:

In fact, Iraq was surrounded by countries with far superior military forces. Turkey, Iran and Israel were all capable of obliterating any aggressive move by the Iraqi dictator.

THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE:

There are brutal dictators throughout the world, many supported over the years by Washington, whose people need "liberation " from their leaders. This is not a persuasive argument since for Iraq, it's about oil. In fact, the occupation of Iraq by the United States is a magnet for increasing violence, anarchy and insurrection.

Nader urges the Congress to investigate the illegal nature of the war, and how the five falsehoods became part of the Bush Administration's drum beat for war, in a formal Inquiry of Impeachment.

--

For further information, contact:

Kevin Zeese
1-202-265-4000

Matt Ahearn
ahearn@votenader.org
1-201-314-9747

--
| March 19, 2003

In the run-up to this war, Not In Our Name became one of the major "peace" organizers and coalitions in the United States. Not In Our Name has spared no cost purchasing ads in newspapers around the world to publish its anti-American Statement of Conscience. Its signatories include scores of Hate America bigwigs, like Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, Michael Parenti, Gloria Steinem and Barbara Kingsolver. Hollywood icons (and many more has-beens) like Danny Glover, Jessica Lange, Tyne Daly, Martin Sheen and Ed Harris have also signed or endorsed the statement. NION organizes marches and other protest activities in its support.

However, Not In Our Name is deeper than the latest academic babblers and limosuine liberals. NION professes peace, yet it is involved - directly as well as indirectly - with terrorist organizations and anti-American propaganda campaigns headed by fanatical Communist and Muslim groups. NION has cemented alliances with bona fide radical organizations like the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and the Revolutionary Communist P

3002. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 21:03:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Zsydnczt3oMcfBvdRVn_iw@comcast.com>
Source record: 91065

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404210250.a8e5a6a@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<tc-dnUdpEaRCthjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
> >
> > These days I see more and more of the "rare" DX hiding down in the CW
bands,
> > especially in the Extra portion.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Did you work them or just see them on the cluster?

Worked some, missed others.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3003. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 21:06:45 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <EnBhc.172527$gA5.1998676@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91066

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404210250.a8e5a6a@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<tc-dnUdpEaRCthjdRVn-vg@comcast.com>...
> >
> > These days I see more and more of the "rare" DX hiding down in the CW
bands,
> > especially in the Extra portion.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Did you work them or just see them on the cluster?

Cluster ....CLUSTER !!!!!!..... That's cheating ..... Like fishing with
those newfangled finders ....one step below using a handgrenade ......

73 Tom KI3R

3004. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 21:59:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <19Chc.4066$eZ5.1246@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91067

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote

|
| Cluster ....CLUSTER !!!!!!..... That's cheating ..... Like fishing
with
| those newfangled finders ....one step below using a handgrenade ......
|

From the French:

Un chasseur sachant chasser chasse sans son chien.
(A hunter who knows how to hunt hunts without his dog)

73, de Hans, K0HB

3005. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 22:26:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040421182642.07050.00000201@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 91069

>Subject: Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from
>Tech to General?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/21/2004 4:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <19Chc.4066$eZ5.1246@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>From the French:

>Un chasseur sachant chasser chasse sans son chien.
> (A hunter who knows how to hunt hunts without his dog)

From an American:

A Hunter With Better Things To Do Let's The Dog Do What It's Trained To
Do.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3006. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 22:36:36 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <UHChc.8652$NR5.3722@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91070
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D25F0491B211234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040420234925.801
> $tV@newsreader.com:
>
>
> > Dead ringer.
>
>
> That's what you will be called you ever show up to my front door.
>

Does your tenement even have a front door?

3007. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-21 22:38:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2KChc.17878$l75.5951@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91071
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:Tikhc.2071$fW.1841@news02.roc.ny...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:TpZgc.1159$gH6.663@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Well the freqs being used for the RFID tags are not in the FM segement.
> But
> > I do agree with your point.
> >
> > We have three strong and high repeaters in my immediate area. Hardly
any
> > activity at all.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Hello, Dan
>
> It really depends upon your area whether you'll find a lot of use or very
> little. Someone in North Dakota might not even have a repeater available,
> yet if he fires up on 75 meters in the evening - wow! It's busy! Likely
no
> one is near him, he simply hears a ton of stations via F layer reflection.
>
> Rochester, NY, is hardly Chicago or NYC, but I've filled my limited
memories
> on my HTX-404 (10 memory channels plus 3 priority channels) - every one of
> them usable. I've chatted at 3:00 am with a trucker in Toronto via the
> Toronto repeater (linked to the Rice Lake repeater in Canada which I can
use
> very well). I've chatted locally at 2:00 am with a professor from the
> University of Rochester. Usually, there is some activity on 440 almost
> every time of day (with the exception that it does get quiet between
> midnight and 5:00 am LOL).
>
> We have a *ton* of repeaters (I can use more than the 13, but that is the
> limit of memory on the old Rat Shack HT) around here. One of the repeater
> systems has ports on every band from 10 meters to 1.2 GHz (including 900
> MHz). I've chatted with Australia and England via the 10 meter port
(whilst
> I was on one of the 440 ports). It really all depends .... ;)
>

>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.659 / Virus Database: 423 - Release Date: 4/15/04
>
>
I am fully aware of that. There 'used to be' a LOT of 2 meter activity
around here. It all died away. There are 300 licensed hams in Calhoun
county. Maybe 30 are active.

Dan/W4NTI

3008. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 00:22:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <ev6dncYlqOzrjRrdRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 91072

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040421182642.07050.00000201@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade
from
> >Tech to General?
> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/21/2004 4:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <19Chc.4066$eZ5.1246@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
> >From the French:
>
> >Un chasseur sachant chasser chasse sans son chien.
> > (A hunter who knows how to hunt hunts without his dog)
>
> From an American:
>
> A Hunter With Better Things To Do Let's The Dog Do What It's Trained
To
> Do.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

When it comes to DX, I use all the tools at my disposal. This means I do not limit my efforts to the clusters. When I dial up and down and search, sometimes I'm lucky enough to find that DX before others do. Then it's really easy to work them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3009. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 00:42:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CxEhc.4258$eZ5.1203@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91073

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote

| When it comes to DX, I use all the tools at my disposal. This means I
do
| not limit my efforts to the clusters.

To each his/her own, and the clusters seem to survive after all other uses of packet except APRS are withering, but I consider the cluster not a tool but a crutch.

YMMV.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3010. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:18:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <q3Fhc.18058$l75.9197@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91074

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:CxEhc.4258$eZ5.1203@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
>
> | When it comes to DX, I use all the tools at my disposal. This means I
> do
> | not limit my efforts to the clusters.
>
> To each his/her own, and the clusters seem to survive after all other
> uses of packet except APRS are withering, but I consider the cluster not
> a tool but a crutch.
>
> YMMV.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

Clusters are a pain in the rump. Dee has it right...tune and pounce...hi.

Basically the situation is .... if you catch the DX on the first or maybe 3rd call...you have a chance to work them.. Otherwise the clusters are active and you have a million callers. Some of them can actually hear the guy.

Dan/W4NTI

3011. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:23:22 UTC
From: Joe Sixpack <Joe@Joe.com>
Message-ID: <c676ot$f3q$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:

> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> 700 ADAMS STREET
> TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> DATE: 4/20/2004
>
> CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>
> --
> --------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>
> --
> ---------
> Party Counsel Prosecutor
> Defendant 1:
> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 5319 SECOR RD.
> TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> 4199365120
> 411 N MICHIGAN
> TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>
<DELETE>
> terminated unsuccesfully
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>
>
> -=-
> This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.

This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of maliciousness.

3012. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:32:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <RgFhc.6140$gH6.2126@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91076

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:mL%gc.3135$e4.1815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> | The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
> | upgrade.
>
> That's probably not a remarkable revelation, given that the overwhelming
> majority of the NCI members are Technicians who would naturally benefit
> from such action.
>
> The REAL question isn't what the NCI membership supports, but rather....
>
> Q: Will the NCI Board of Directors recommend
> upgrading all Tech/Tech+ licensees to General
> without further testing?
>
> A: (please select one and only one answer)
> ___ Yes
> ___ No
> ___ The Board will take no position on this matter
>
> Cheers,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

```
The NCI board decision has been made yet.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
```

3013. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:32:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <TgFhc.6141$gH6.5859@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91077

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:9NadnUler69wERndRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:ML2dnTWMmNjR4hndRVn-uw@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> >>>
> >>>>Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
> >>>>Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
> >>>>NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
> >>>>in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
> >>>>know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
> >>>>all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
> >>>>bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
> >>>>
> >>>>Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
> >>>>over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
> >>>>only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
> >>>>classes of license, immediately.
> >>>>
> >>>>Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
> >>>>
> >>>>I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
> >>>>immediately.
> >>>>
> >>>>I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
> >>>>either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
> >>>>difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains
Morse
> >>>>for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that
make
> >>>>it very scary.
> >>>>
> >>>>Here is a test question:
> >>>>
> >>>>Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
> >>>>proposal is preferable to what we have now?
> >>>
> >>>Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are

> >>>identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.
> >>>
> >>>>The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
> >>>>code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to
> >>>>retain the test for the Extra class exam".
> >>>>
> >>>>Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
> >>>>think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
> >>>>privileges.
> >>>
> >>>Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> >>>General.
> >>
> >>Wow, quite the spin. If a person wants to have General privileges right
> >>now, do you suggest that they take the Technician test and wait for the
> >>"adjustment"?
> >
> > A one time adjustment.
>
> Doesn't matter how many times you repeat that Bill.

The truth is the truth.

> >>Even if the tests are "reinstated", which I doubt will happen,
> >
> > On what do you make that wild statemnent. Exactly where is
> > there any proposal to end all General testing?
>
> Where was the proposal to give all technicians the presumed one time
> upgrade? Doesn't take long for things to happen.

Yet you can point to nothing that has been filed that supports
your claim.

> >>it will
> >>take a long time before the majority of "Generals" are those that have
> >>taken a General test.
> >
> > And that leads to what problems?
>
> It most certainly leads to problems the day after the presumed one-time
> upgrade.

Yet you still fail to articulate even ONE problem that you
can think of.

> >>>>You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
> >>>>almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?
> >>>
> >>>Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
> >>>we end up doing is and will be member based.
> >>

> >>Can I join your organization to influence your member base opinion?
> >
> > Anyone can join as long as you agree to the basics of being
> > an NCI member.
>
> What If I want elimination of Morse code, but am adamantly opposed to
> the ARRL or NCVEC proposals?

NCI isn't in favor of elinating morse code...morse code
testing, yes.
Assuming you meant that you want morse testing ended, but
don't faorv support of the ARRL or NCVEC petitions...
well I see nothing in that stance that would serve to disallow
you from joining NCI. As an example, I think it is safe to
say that is exactly Hans's position.

> >>And be that such as it may, it is now evident that an apparent majority
> >>of NCI members support the majority of hams to be at least at the
> >>General level without being tested for it. That cannot be denied.
> >
> > Imprecise statement. The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
> > upgrade.
>
> And once upon a time, they were simply for the elimination of the code
> test.

That can't be stated with any accuracy as we never had
any indication of how members felt about anything beyond
the code test.

> And you, kind sir, know exactly what an imprecise statement is. Dontchya?

I know accuracy when I see and when I don't.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3014. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:37:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DIFhc.4360$eZ5.2657@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91078

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

|
| The NCI board decision has been made yet.
|

Good! Then, regardless of the overwhelming support of NCI members for the ARRL "Great Giveaway", I can continue to lobby you and the other directors to have the courage to do the right thing and make a strong case against instant upgrades for 60+% of all licensed amateurs.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3015. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:40:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <0oFhc.6149$gH6.1712@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91079

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:QE8hc.71400$_g4.13366348@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> > > I doubt that they care what I think.
> >
> > It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> > our (NCI) membership wants.
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all
> 680K+ USA licenced ARO's?

I don't believe any organization can claim they represent all
680K licensed USA hams.

> If not, you should at least be aware that what
> you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use
wrt
> NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.

Actually, it won't. Many hams will be unafected by the changes
in licensing put forth by ARRL, NCVEC as well as others.
Those 100K hams that are already Extra won't be affected by
any license changes.

> The only thing you REALLY have working to your benefit is the current
> apathetic stance of the FCC. A "reduction of effort" appears to be a
shared
> goal. As a member of the 680K+ club who is not an NCI member, I am
saddened
> at what NCI's influence is doing to my chosen hobby/service.

You are free to hold whatever opinion you wish.

> BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or
> e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just
had
> the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist who
> explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved" re.
> an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest. Believe
> it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will
> likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer. Usually

a
> casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few
minutes
> to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.

Somehow I doubt the elected officals give a hoot about morse code
testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3016. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:40:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <EoFhc.4361$eZ5.2170@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91080

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

|
| The NCI board decision has been made yet.
|

I just read that statement again. It is gobbledygook. Would you wish to
clarify it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3017. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:48:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <NvFhc.6162$gH6.4200@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91081

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:G6SdnW1ORvDocxjdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> >>
> >>>I doubt that they care what I think.
> >>
> >>It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
> >>our (NCI) membership wants.
> >>
> >>Cheers,
> >>Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> > An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all
> > 680K+ USA licenced ARO's? If not, you should at least be aware that what
> > you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use
wrt
> > NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.
> >
> > The only thing you REALLY have working to your benefit is the current
> > apathetic stance of the FCC. A "reduction of effort" appears to be a
shared
> > goal. As a member of the 680K+ club who is not an NCI member, I am
saddened
> > at what NCI's influence is doing to my chosen hobby/service.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> > FISTS #9384
> >
> > BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or
> > e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just
had
> > the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist
who
> > explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved"
re.
> > an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest.
Believe

> > it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will
> > likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer.
Usually a
> > casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few
minutes
> > to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.
>
> Good advice, Bert.
>
>
> Let's not forget that unless Bill is a master Sophist - and I highly
> doubt that - he would not be espousing the mass upgrade of Technicians
> unless he personally supported it.
>
> All the fluff about membership wishes is just that - fluff.
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I never denied my personal support for the upgrades. My comments are on
public display via the FCC ECFS on RM-10867 and 10870.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3018. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 01:48:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OvFhc.6163$gH6.3641@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91082

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:EoFhc.4361$eZ5.2170@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> |
> | The NCI board decision has been made yet.
> |
>
> I just read that statement again. It is gobbledygook. Would you wish to
> clarify it.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

```
Should read:
...has NOT been made yet

Bill
```

3019. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 02:23:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hrednZnX98VcsRrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91083

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:9NadnUler69wERndRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:ML2dnTWMmNjR4hndRVn-uw@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:eM2dnYhmqrcRShzdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Richard L. Tannehill wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Please read Article II, Paragraph 2 of the NCI Bylaws at the
>>>>>>>NCI website. This article, as currently written, has been
>>>>>>>in the bylaws since they were originally drafted. (I should
>>>>>>>know; I was the original drafter) It would appear to give
>>>>>>>all the leeway necessary to comment on licenses and
>>>>>>>bandplans proposed for licenses not requiring code testing.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Some of us on the NCI Board do have serious reservations
>>>>>>>over the Tech to General upgrades. We agree that it is the
>>>>>>>only logical choice if the FCC is hellbent on having only 3
>>>>>>>classes of license, immediately.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Thanks for taking the time to answer, Richard.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I did not realize that FCC was adamant about only having three classes
>>>>>>immediately.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I don't doubt that many in NCI have reservations about the proposals
>>>>>>either. FWIW, support of the new proposals at this point is probably a
>>>>>>difficult thing for NCI, because the ARRL proposal still contains
>
> Morse
>
>>>>>>for Extra, and the NCVEC proposal has some severe deficiencies that

>
> make
>
>>>>>>it very scary.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Here is a test question:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Is elimination of Element 1 testing important enough that the NCVEC
>>>>>>proposal is preferable to what we have now?
>>>>>
>>>>>Yet on the point of Tech and Advanced upgrades, ARRL and NCVEC are
>>>>>identical. It is the incidentals that differentiate the two.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>The prudent course would be "We support the elimination of the Morse
>>>>>>code test in the ARRL plan, but are disappointed that they choose to
>>>>>>retain the test for the Extra class exam".
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Otherwise, people like me are going to (mistakenly in your view) just
>>>>>>think that NCI supports Technician level testing for General level
>>>>>>privileges.
>>>>>
>>>>>Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
>>>>>General.
>>>>
>>>>Wow, quite the spin. If a person wants to have General privileges right
>>>>now, do you suggest that they take the Technician test and wait for the
>>>>"adjustment"?
>>>
>>>A one time adjustment.
>>
>>Doesn't matter how many times you repeat that Bill.
>
> The truth is the truth.

>
>>>>Even if the tests are "reinstated", which I doubt will happen,
>>>
>>>On what do you make that wild statemnent. Exactly where is
>>>there any proposal to end all General testing?
>>
>>Where was the proposal to give all technicians the presumed one time
>>upgrade? Doesn't take long for things to happen.
>
>
> Yet you can point to nothing that has been filed that supports
> your claim.

And here we have it. You make the statement that nothing has been
filed. Lets look at this. We have two proposals that have been filed.
They have not been accepted. Of course nothing has been filed on this!

>>>>it will
>>>>take a long time before the majority of "Generals" are those that have
>>>>taken a General test.
>>>
>>>And that leads to what problems?
>>
>>It most certainly leads to problems the day after the presumed one-time
>>upgrade.
>
> Yet you still fail to articulate even ONE problem that you
> can think of.

Google me, Bill (not too hard tho' I'm ticklish! ;^))

I've articulated problems, plenty times, here and to the ARRL.

>>>>>>You are so close to achieving your goal here in the US. Element one
>>>>>>almost certainly goes away soon. Why taint your victory?
>>>>>
>>>>>Like ARRL, we are, however, a member organization and what
>>>>>we end up doing is and will be member based.
>>>>
>>>>Can I join your organization to influence your member base opinion?
>>>
>>>Anyone can join as long as you agree to the basics of being
>>>an NCI member.
>>
>>What If I want elimination of Morse code, but am adamantly opposed to
>>the ARRL or NCVEC proposals?
>
>
> NCI isn't in favor of elinating morse code...morse code
> testing, yes.

Sorry, I didn't put the "test" in the sentence. I know that as of this
moment, they claim no interest in eliminating Morse code.

That could change tho'. I'm not arguing that point, although it would
be interested if your membership expressed interest in that.

> Assuming you meant that you want morse testing ended, but
> don't faorv support of the ARRL or NCVEC petitions...

Yeah, like that...

> well I see nothing in that stance that would serve to disallow
> you from joining NCI. As an example, I think it is safe to
> say that is exactly Hans's position.
>
>
>>>>And be that such as it may, it is now evident that an apparent majority
>>>>of NCI members support the majority of hams to be at least at the
>>>>General level without being tested for it. That cannot be denied.
>>>

>>>Imprecise statement. The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
>>>upgrade.
>>
>>And once upon a time, they were simply for the elimination of the code
>>test.
>
>
> That can't be stated with any accuracy as we never had
> any indication of how members felt about anything beyond
> the code test.
>
>
>>And you, kind sir, know exactly what an imprecise statement is. Dontchya?
>
>
> I know accuracy when I see and when I don't.

Everyone needs a coach at times.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3020. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 02:25:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hrednZjX98WSsBrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91084

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> |
> | The NCI board decision has been made yet.
> |
>
> I just read that statement again. It is gobbledygook. Would you wish to
> clarify it.

I though it was a Freudian slip! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3021. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 02:28:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hrednZvX98UpsBrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91085

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:G6SdnW1ORvDocxjdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>Bert Craig wrote:
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Ln_gc.13996$l75.1897@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:PIqdnSPQt9lG3RzdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I doubt that they care what I think.
>>>>
>>>>It is not about caring what you may think, but rather what
>>>>our (NCI) membership wants.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>>Bill K2UNK
>>>
>>>
>>>An interesting statement, to say the least, Bill. Does NCI speak for all
>>>680K+ USA licenced ARO's? If not, you should at least be aware that what
>>>you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use
>
> wrt
>
>>>NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.
>>>
>>>The only thing you REALLY have working to your benefit is the current
>>>apathetic stance of the FCC. A "reduction of effort" appears to be a
>
> shared
>
>>>goal. As a member of the 680K+ club who is not an NCI member, I am
>
> saddened
>
>>>at what NCI's influence is doing to my chosen hobby/service.
>>>
>>>73 de Bert

>>>WA2SI
>>>FISTS #9384
>>>
>>>BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or
>>>e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just
>
> had
>
>>>the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist
>
> who
>
>>>explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved"
>
> re.
>
>>>an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest.
>
> Believe
>
>>>it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will
>>>likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer.
>
> Usually a
>
>>>casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few
>
> minutes
>
>>>to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.
>>
>>Good advice, Bert.
>>
>>
>>Let's not forget that unless Bill is a master Sophist - and I highly
>>doubt that - he would not be espousing the mass upgrade of Technicians
>>unless he personally supported it.
>>
>>All the fluff about membership wishes is just that - fluff.
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> I never denied my personal support for the upgrades. My comments are on
> public display via the FCC ECFS on RM-10867 and 10870.

That wasn't my point, Bill. Or perhaps in a way, it was. Would you come
in here and tout NCI's likely support of the ARRL proposal if you say,
felt about the subject as Hans does?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3022. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 02:29:05 UTC
From: tnom@mucks.net
Message-ID: <9hae809ub23jin4in6n1kadf62sfdvtaa9@4ax.com>
Source record: 91086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
>____
>
>This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
>this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
>remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
>maliciousness.
>
Your argument holds no water. Doug has brought ALL of this
upon himself. When and if Dougs mental health becomes
stable he may realize why his life is so miserable. He'll realize
that it is foolish to harass people and justify it with the argument
that he is just doing his civic duty. Until he wises up nothing will
change.

Have a miserable day/life Doug.

3023. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 05:55:14 UTC
From: KC7DVF@webtv.net
Message-ID: <21700-40875E42-156@storefull-3151.bay.webtv.net>
Source record: 91087

Too bad that amp is ILLEGAL in the US...

Adam--kc7dvf

3024. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 08:55:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <jMLhc.92729$_g4.20547929@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91088

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:0oFhc.6149$gH6.1712@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:QE8hc.71400$_g4.13366348@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > If not, you should at least be aware that what
> > you're attempting to accomplish (Not really the appropriate word to use
> wrt
> > NCI, but...) will ultimately affect all 680K+.
>
> Actually, it won't. Many hams will be unafected by the changes
> in licensing put forth by ARRL, NCVEC as well as others.
> Those 100K hams that are already Extra won't be affected by
> any license changes.

The degradation of quality wrt the ARS is, for many, an effect...ostensibly
brought on by NCI's lobbying. It's not just about one's individual license
change.

> > BTW, to all those who feel similarly, please take the time to write (or
> > e-mail) your elected representatives...and I DON'T mean the ARRL. I just
> had
> > the pleasure of attending a presentation given by an upstate lobbyist
who
> > explained how easily our elected representatives can become "involved"
re.
> > an issue as long as they receive an indication of public interest.
Believe
> > it or not, 15 to 20 e-mails, letters, calls, etc. on a given issue will
> > likely get it some attention and it will be assigned to a staffer.
Usually
> a
> > casual inquiry will follow. In this case...to the FCC. Take the few
> minutes
> > to fire off an e-mail...it really could make a difference.
>
> Somehow I doubt the elected officals give a hoot about morse code
> testing.

Hence the necessity of making them "give a hoot."

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3025. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 11:48:35 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <676ce33.0404220348.3b02cdb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
> snip
> >Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> >of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> >2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> >Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> >ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> >Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
> >mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
> >agreement.
>
> The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.

Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
Both?

Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...

-Chuck

3026. Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 14:48:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4087DB2C.1080400@psu.edu>
Source record: 91090

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: How to attract people to the Amateur Radio Service
>>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>>Date: 4/19/2004 9:15 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040419221520.12587.00000146@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>>1) Stop calling it "ham radio" as that is actually a derrogatory term.
>>
>>Good to see that someone else realizes that the term "ham" radio is
>>derrogatory.
>>
>>
>>>2)
>>
>>...
>>
>>>There are just too many fat people in the hobby...
>>
>>I've noticed that also.
>
>
> Welcome back, Vipul.

Oh my gawsh! Looks like time for a new round of fat smelly, go on a dxpedition and have the nerve to operate radios and club members not doing what we want stuff, eh Steve?

Anyhow, welcome back Vipul, I hope you're doing well.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3027. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 15:34:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0404220734.1a672855@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91091
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<2KChc.17878$l75.5951@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:Tikhc.2071$fW.1841@news02.roc.ny...
> > We have a *ton* of repeaters (I can use more than the 13, but that is the
> > limit of memory on the old Rat Shack HT) around here. One of the repeater
> > systems has ports on every band from 10 meters to 1.2 GHz (including 900
> > MHz). I've chatted with Australia and England via the 10 meter port
> (whilst
> > I was on one of the 440 ports). It really all depends .... ;)
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> >
> I am fully aware of that. There 'used to be' a LOT of 2 meter activity
> around here. It all died away. There are 300 licensed hams in Calhoun
> county. Maybe 30 are active.
>
That's ten percent, that's not bad at all. But it depends on the
regional population density which varies enormously across the
country. We have individual suburban townships which have as many as
200 ham residents here in the Delaware Valley region of the NE
corridor. This county alone has 43 municipalities, etc. We still have
the old 2M packet spots system up and running from Virginia well into
New England.

I have no idea what the actual numbers are but it's probably safe to
assume that most of the repeaters in this region have hundreds if not
thousands of potential users each. If even ten percent of 'em got on
the machines there would be complete chaos never mind what would
happen if the whole pack fired up and "got active". My point being
that activity levels in terms of perceptions of activity levels varies
all over the map. Literally. e.g., this patch ain't Calhoun County!

A couple trends I think I'm seeing here at least on 2M are movements
back to FM simplex ops and a noticeable growth in the use of SSB which
is being fueled by the availability of affordable multimode rigs like
the 706 and the 817. Might be that after 35 years or so of repeaters
dominating VHF/UHF ham comms they've run their course for a number of
reasons, the costs of acquisition, installation, maintenance and
operation being what they are.

Another piece of this discussion I think involves what I call the "Nocode Bubble". We all know that in some huge number of instances these folk have come into the hobby, jacked up the total head counts by very large percentages and have left never to be heard from again. But they're still taking up space on the FCC license servers and skewing the real-world data by inordinate amounts. Pull the nocode data out of the mix when talking about activity levels vs. raw head counts and you get a whole different and much more realistic picture of ham radio as it really exists in this country.

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

3028. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 17:54:19 UTC
From: tnom@mucks.net
Message-ID: <4g1g80p7bah6j41ho3okce6kp95q5dj01u@4ax.com>
Source record: 91092
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 22 Apr 2004 04:48:35 -0700, k8cpa@arrl.net (Me) wrote:

>tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
>> snip
>> >Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>> >of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>> >2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>> >Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>> >ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>> >Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>> >mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>> >agreement.
>>
>> The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.
>
>Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
>might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
>and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
>trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
>Both?
>
>Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...
>
>-Chuck

You are correct. The most important thing to remember is what we
all knew already. He has mental problems. The court would never
order mental health counseling unless he has been diagnosed with
the disorder.

3029. Re: Amp for sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 17:57:03 UTC
From: ARRL Member <no.code@ham.org>
Message-ID: <408806dd$0$9236$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 91093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61fjh02nos@drn.newsguy.com:

> I have a used mobile amp that my son can't use anymore since charlie came
> calling. I tried to warn him about the tvi to his apartment neighbors.
>
> INTRUDER DRV-400 CB radio amplifier has 2/2sc2290's Driving 4/2sc2879's
> Transistors * 14V Output 700 Watts * 18V Output 1000 Watts.
>
> I'll take $425 for it, shipped to your door. (cont. US)

WA3MOJ,

Where can I buy a new AMP? I need one for my CB but I don't want a used
one. I know I could do a search google for one, but I'm a democrat and
need to be spoon-fed everything. Thanks.

arrl_member@simple.sideband.org

3030. March your way into the weekend!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 20:09:49 UTC
From: Morely Dotes <MorelyDotes@spamblocked.com>
Message-ID: <75a064fa.7c04fdc8@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 91096
Cross-posted to:
de.org.politik.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,li.politics,alt.emircpih.politics.taxation,alt.outer-polk.salad.annie,alt.hipcrime.politics

March your way into the weekend!

Join Nader supporters in DC, April 24-25,
as they rally for justice and equal rights

Washington, DC:

Saturday, April 24th, IMF/World Bank Protest - meet at 11am, 15th & H St, NW.

Sunday, April 25th, March for Women's Lives - meet at 9:30am, Smithsonian Metro Stop.

If you arrive late, ask a volunteer to point you towards the Ralph Nader group.

See you there!

Nader: Oil the Source of Two of Earth's Major Problems:
Wars for Oil and Climate Change

Protect the Environment and the People of Our Planet by Ending Our Addiction to Oil

Washington, DC: On Earth Day 2004, Independent presidential candidate
Ralph Nader highlighted as two priorities: ending the Iraqi occupation
and facing up to the immediate crisis of global climate change. "Future
geopolitical crises involving oil resources and environmental problems
will be diminished by finding alternatives to fossil fuels," said Nader.

Nader linked the two issues on Earth Day because he sees them as
symptomatic of the corporate oil-based, planet destructive behavior of
the Bush Administration. Nader has called for the United States to
withdraw from Iraq - including military, private military contractors,
oil industry and other corporations. Nader noted: "The war in Iraq is
unleashing widening cycles of violence. The potential for escalation of
violence increases every day the US military remains in Iraq. The way to
reverse the spiral of violence is for the United States to go back home.
The US presence serves as a magnet for the insurrection, kidnapping,
terrorism and destruction." Nader released a three-step strategy for
withdrawal earlier this week. See www.votenader.org for details.

--

For further information, contact:

Kevin Zeese
1-202-265-4000

Matt Ahearn
ahearn@votenader.org

1-201-314-9747

--
to be found there instead.

8 large cabbage leaves
1 lb. lean ground newborn human filets, or ground chuck
Onions
peppers
celery
garlic
soy sauce
salt pepper, etc
Olive oil
breadcrumbs
Tomato Gravy (see index)

Boil the cabbage leaves for 2 minutes to soften.
In skillet, brown the meat in a little olive oil,
then add onions, peppers, and celery (all chopped finely)
and season well.
Place in a large bowl and cool.
Add seasoned breadcrumbs and a little of the tomato gravy,
enough to make the mixture pliable.
Divide the stuffing among the cabbage leaves then roll.
Place seam down in a baking pan.
Ladle tomato gravy on top,
and bake at 325 for 30 - 45 minutes.

Umbilical Cordon Bleu

Nothing is so beautiful as the bond between mother and child,
so why not consume it?
Children or chicken breasts will work wonderfully also.

4 whole umbilical chords (or baby breasts, or chicken breasts)
4 thin slices of smoked ham, and Gruyere cheese
Flour
eggwash (milk and eggs)
seasoned bread crumbs
1 onion
minced
salt
pepper
butter
olive oil

Pound the breasts flat (parboil first if using umbilical
cords so they won?t be tough).
Place a slice of ham and cheese on each, along with some minced onion
then fold in half, trimming neatly.
Dredge in flour, eggwash, then seasoned breadcrumbs;

allow to sit for a few minutes.
Saut&#65533; in butter and olive oil until golden brown,
about 6 minutes on each side.

Shish Kababes

As old as the hills, this technique has employed seafood, beef, pork, lamb, poultry, and vegetables; just about anything can be grilled, and young humans are no exception!

High quality mari

3031. March your way into the weekend!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 21:02:51 UTC
From: Vincenzo Ciccone <vinz77@libero.it>
Message-ID: <ae9b678a.8e7822eb@host-69-48-73-244.roc.choiceone.net>
Source record: 91095
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.personals.poly,alt.police.canada,comp.admin.policy,alt.politics.fans.izquierdaunida

March your way into the weekend!

Join Nader supporters in DC, April 24-25,
as they rally for justice and equal rights

Washington, DC:

Saturday, April 24th, IMF/World Bank Protest - meet at 11am, 15th & H St, NW.

Sunday, April 25th, March for Women's Lives - meet at 9:30am, Smithsonian Metro Stop.

If you arrive late, ask a volunteer to point you towards the Ralph Nader group.

See you there!

Nader: Oil the Source of Two of Earth's Major Problems:
Wars for Oil and Climate Change

Protect the Environment and the People of Our Planet by Ending Our Addiction to Oil

Washington, DC: On Earth Day 2004, Independent presidential candidate
Ralph Nader highlighted as two priorities: ending the Iraqi occupation
and facing up to the immediate crisis of global climate change. "Future
geopolitical crises involving oil resources and environmental problems
will be diminished by finding alternatives to fossil fuels," said Nader.

Nader linked the two issues on Earth Day because he sees them as
symptomatic of the corporate oil-based, planet destructive behavior of
the Bush Administration. Nader has called for the United States to
withdraw from Iraq - including military, private military contractors,
oil industry and other corporations. Nader noted: "The war in Iraq is
unleashing widening cycles of violence. The potential for escalation of
violence increases every day the US military remains in Iraq. The way to
reverse the spiral of violence is for the United States to go back home.
The US presence serves as a magnet for the insurrection, kidnapping,
terrorism and destruction." Nader released a three-step strategy for
withdrawal earlier this week. See www.votenader.org for details.

--

For further information, contact:

Kevin Zeese
1-202-265-4000

Matt Ahearn
ahearn@votenader.org
1-201-314-9747

--
If it becomes necessary to hide the fact that you are eating
human babies, this is the perfect solution.
But if you are still paranoid, you can substitute pork butt.

5 lb. lean chuck roast
3 lb. prime baby butt
2 tablespoons each:
salt
black, white and cayenne peppers
celery salt
garlic powder
parsley flakes
brown sugar
1 teaspoon sage
2 onions
6 cloves garlic
bunch green onions, chopped

Cut the children?s butts and the beef roast into pieces
that will fit in the grinder.
Run the meat through using a 3/16 grinding plate.
Add garlic, onions and seasoning then mix well.
Add just enough water for a smooth consistency, then mix again.
Form the sausage mixture into patties or stuff into natural casings.

Stillborn Stew

By definition, this meat cannot be had altogether fresh,
but have the lifeless unfortunate available immediately after delivery,
or use high quality beef or pork roasts (it is cheaper and better to
cut up a whole roast than to buy stew meat).

1 stillbirth, de-boned and cubed
&#65533; cup vegetable oil
2 large onions
bell pepper
celery
garlic
&#65533; cup red wine
3 Irish potatoes
2 large carrots

Thi

3032. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 21:55:46 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <CbXhc.16131$Dn1.15889@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91094
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<tnom@mucks.net> wrote in message
news:4g1g80p7bah6j41ho3okce6kp95q5dj01u@4ax.com...
> On 22 Apr 2004 04:48:35 -0700, k8cpa@arrl.net (Me) wrote:
>
> >tnom@mucks.net wrote in message
news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
> >> snip
> >> >Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> >> >of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> >> >2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> >> >Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> >> >ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> >> >Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
> >> >mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
> >> >agreement.
> >>
> >> The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.
> >
> >Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
> >might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
> >and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
> >trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
> >Both?
> >
> >Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...
> >
> >-Chuck
>
> You are correct. The most important thing to remember is what we
> all knew already. He has mental problems. The court would never
> order mental health counseling unless he has been diagnosed with
> the disorder.

Bingo!

3033. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-22 23:30:38 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <676ce33.0404221530.37241d94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91097
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<4g1g80p7bah6j41ho3okce6kp95q5dj01u@4ax.com>...
> On 22 Apr 2004 04:48:35 -0700, k8cpa@arrl.net (Me) wrote:
>
> >tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
> >> snip
> >> >Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> >> >of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> >> >2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> >> >Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> >> >ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> >> >Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
> >> >mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
> >> >agreement.
> >>
> >> The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.
> >
> >Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
> >might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
> >and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
> >trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
> >Both?
> >
> >Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...
> >
> >-Chuck
>
> You are correct. The most important thing to remember is what we
> all knew already. He has mental problems. The court would never
> order mental health counseling unless he has been diagnosed with
> the disorder.

I see, Hmph, I knew something was kinda weird with the ol' boy,
singling me out for attack and all... maybe he won't be so quick to
attack people now. Hey Dougie how's it feel to get a taste of your own
medicine?

-Chuck

3034. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 00:26:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <soZhc.18915$l75.15122@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91098

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:hrednZvX98UpsBrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:G6SdnW1ORvDocxjdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com...

SNIP

> >>Let's not forget that unless Bill is a master Sophist - and I highly
> >>doubt that - he would not be espousing the mass upgrade of Technicians
> >>unless he personally supported it.
> >>
> >>All the fluff about membership wishes is just that - fluff.
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > I never denied my personal support for the upgrades. My comments are on
> > public display via the FCC ECFS on RM-10867 and 10870.
>
> That wasn't my point, Bill. Or perhaps in a way, it was. Would you come
> in here and tout NCI's likely support of the ARRL proposal if you say,
> felt about the subject as Hans does?

There's no way I can assess what my answer would be since
I don't hold the views that Hans does. Hypothetical
constructs as to what a person might do if they had a
different opinion are really not answerable.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3035. Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 00:32:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GLWdnS9xVuSy-RXdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91099

In case we didn't have enpough of cell phone stories. 8^)

http://consumeraffairs.com/news03/isabel_cells.html

- Mike KB3EIA -

3036. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 00:42:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oKWdnczVCsD--xXdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91100

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:hrednZvX98UpsBrdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:G6SdnW1ORvDocxjdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com...
>
>
> SNIP
>
>
>>>>Let's not forget that unless Bill is a master Sophist - and I highly
>>>>doubt that - he would not be espousing the mass upgrade of Technicians
>>>>unless he personally supported it.
>>>>
>>>>All the fluff about membership wishes is just that - fluff.
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>I never denied my personal support for the upgrades. My comments are on
>>>public display via the FCC ECFS on RM-10867 and 10870.
>>
>>That wasn't my point, Bill. Or perhaps in a way, it was. Would you come
>>in here and tout NCI's likely support of the ARRL proposal if you say,
>>felt about the subject as Hans does?
>
>
> There's no way I can assess what my answer would be since
> I don't hold the views that Hans does. Hypothetical
> constructs as to what a person might do if they had a
> different opinion are really not answerable.

And now I know.

- mike KB3EIA -

3037. Re: IMPORTANT ANTI VIRUS INFORMATION

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 01:16:36 UTC
From: the.night@hunter.com
Message-ID: <1erg80dmqbr8i726nes5c75k6cjqhejisc@4ax.com>
Source record: 91101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Don't forget to report this virus/spammer to abuse@shaw.ca
On Thu, 22 Apr 2004 22:52:30 GMT, SysAdmin@ed.shawcable.net wrote:

>Protect yourself from new viruses that you may not know you have. We have designed a set of anti virus tools to keep your system secure. Visit here for more information on these free and easy to use tools
>
>http://www.gigdot.net/

3038. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 01:55:30 UTC
From: Tom Ring <tarnews@taring.org>
Message-ID: <4088779c$0$439$5cbedd26@news.real-time.com>
Source record: 91102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Cathy

Thanks to a couple hams in this city, Golden Valley MN has very nice antenna "restrictions". I don't know all the rules, but as I understand things, the city essentially matches most of the FCC regs. The only thing I would check on is maximum tower height. A large number of antenna installations are allowed with no permissions at all.

Feel free to email me at throwaway27 at taring.org

tom
K0TAR

Cathy James wrote:

> Greetings all,
>
> I am planning to move to the western suburbs of Minneapolis soon, and
> would like to know if there are any communities that I should
> specifically "look at" or "avoid" due to restrictions on ham radio
> antennas or other issues.
>
> Even apart from ham radio issues, I prefer rural to urban, but commute
> time to the areas on the west side of downtown is an issue preventing
> me from being too far out. Mound is probably the western limit of
> what I am willing to consider.
>
> Right now I am looking at Mound, Champlin, and Maple Grove. My
> realtor is generally helpful, but amateur radio is a mystery to her
> and I do not think she is used to getting such requests.
>
>
> 73,
>
> Cathy (N5WVR)

3039. Re: Need info on antenna issues in Minneapolis area

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 02:04:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fR_hc.5749$eZ5.4590@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91103
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Tom Ring" <tarnews@taring.org> wrote

| Thanks to a couple hams in this city, Golden Valley MN has very nice
| antenna "restrictions".

Golden Valley is very ham friendly. The city donates space in the Public Safety building for our W0EF club station. See http://www.tcfmc.org We have a full 2-position contest station on MF/HF, antenna towers atop the building, etc. They also provide a free meeting room for our club meetings, and break-room facilities for coffee/snacks during contest weekends and club meetings. The only "cost" to our club is that we provide a 2-person Skywarn team at their EOC during severe-wx.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3040. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 02:09:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ZZadnUUtwfRFFBXdRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91105

Mike Coslo wrote:
> In case we didn't have enpough of cell phone stories. 8^)
>
>
> http://consumeraffairs.com/news03/isabel_cells.html
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
"Cell phones performed as expected -- i.e., not very well -- ".

And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include amateur radio.

3041. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 02:37:56 UTC
From: The Masked Marvel <s_crook_remove_underbars_@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <8k%hc.16866$GR.2460124@attbi_s01>
Source record: 91104
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Wouldn't conversion of UHF gear (300MHz-3GHz) to 11m (27MHz) be tricky?
Commercial UHF gear to 70 cm OTOH...

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ
>

3042. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 03:37:01 UTC
From: kashe@sonic.net
Message-ID: <ip3h8090odvef60uvfrouhpi2le00qaj9k@4ax.com>
Source record: 91106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 19:59:58 -0500, Concerned Citizen
<phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote:

>WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c61ocu0o49@drn.newsguy.com:
>
>> In article <WMYgc.173537$JO3.101093@attbi_s04>, G.Beat says...
>>>
>>>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
>>>news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
>>>> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
>>>> site's that
>>>> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
>>>> I'm finding
>>>> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
>>>> references for
>>>> various solid state and tube conversions.
>>>>
>>>> Thanks in advance for any help.
>>>>
>>>> WA3MOJ
>>>
>>>Troll
>>>
>>>
>> Why is it a troll? It is on topic.
>
>On topic for what? You are not wa3moj, and are posting in amatuer NG's
>with a federal issued call sign. Seems you may have more problems then
>you care to admit. You want peopl to think you are the amatuer radio
>operator wa3moj, that could lead you into serious problems. take it for
>what it is worth. That is only if george want's to pursue the matter.

In any case, to be an effective troll, the message _should_ be
on-topic.

3043. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 04:04:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <iB0ic.5842$eZ5.440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91107

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
|
| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
| amateur radio.
|

I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included amateur radio as a component of that planning.

Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in emergency situations.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3044. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 04:36:19 UTC
From: "David G. Nagel" <nagel@core.com>
Message-ID: <108h7a0d51bv047@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91108
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

The Masked Marvel wrote:
> Wouldn't conversion of UHF gear (300MHz-3GHz) to 11m (27MHz) be tricky?
> Commercial UHF gear to 70 cm OTOH...
>
> "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> news:c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com...
>
>>Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
>
> that
>
>>will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
>
> finding
>
>>there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references
>
> for
>
>>various solid state and tube conversions.
>>
>>Thanks in advance for any help.
>>
>>WA3MOJ
>>
>
>
>
If you want to keep your ham license my advise to you is not to make any
conversions to 11 meters. CB radios still need FCC acceptance. If you
want to undertake the task of getting the acceptance then disregard my
previous advice. BTW the tests to obtain acceptance should only cost you
1 or 2 hundred thousand dollars if you are lucky.

Dave WD9BDZ

3045. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 05:49:42 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404171526400.167@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 91109

On Mon, 19 Apr 2004, WA8ULX wrote:
> >If the ARRL can't see that, then their leadership are
> >truly idiots.
>
> You just figured that out.

No. I've known that for years. However, the person I replied to never seemed to have figured that out for himself.

3046. Re: Why are so many defending the proposed automatic upgrade from Tech to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 05:58:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0404171531401.167@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 91110

There is a technical reason for DENYING such an automatic upgrade:

The general class test has "many" questions involving HF operation.
The technician class test has few to no questions involving HF operation.

The reason is simple: They should not get a privilege that their test did not ask (or potentially ask) about.

[For those of the "dumbed down" school: They should not get a privilege related to a topic for which the question pool lacks a "token question."] :-)

3047. Re: Best antenna for an Icom T90A (rig and car)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 06:48:57 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0404222248.6aae4daf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Okay, what I ended up getting was a Larsen... A 5.8 wave... I'm using
a diamond mag mount (pinched my fingers on that sucker... Good
magnet!) Had to get a SMA adapter... I told the guy to include it,
and he didn't... Good guys at HRO though... No shipping at least.
Fast delivery. Can't ask for more than that, really...

I look forward to giving it a test flight tomorrow. Thanks for the
information folks! It really helped.

73, WW6DJM

" Stephen Cowell" <scowell@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<KjFgc.18468$VE3.12533@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:a7dee37b.0404181450.133aaa52@posting.google.com...
> > Ah! Thanks a lot! Actually 2 Meters is really the ONLY one I'm
> > wanting to be using. I have a new Icom T90A, and just want a nice car
> > antenna for talking on 2 meters.
>
> You want a mag-mount 5/8wave Larsen... it's a
> nice 1/4wave on 6m, too. Get the Larsen mag
> mount, too... your present mag-mount (probably
> BNC, with a duck on it) is insufficient... BNC
> connectors are not rated for outdoor exposure.
> Just run the coax in the passenger side, via the
> rear door's front edge, down the center post, and
> under the rocker panel to the dash.
> --
> Steve
> KI5YG
> .

3048. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 10:17:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404230217.e9249dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91112

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<GLWdnS9xVuSy-RXdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>...
> In case we didn't have enpough of cell phone stories. 8^)
>
>
> http://consumeraffairs.com/news03/isabel_cells.html
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Go to QRZ.com for some FRS points of view.

3049. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 11:30:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423073002.08524.00000171@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 91113

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/22/2004 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <iB0ic.5842$eZ5.440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>|
>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
>| amateur radio.
>|
>
>I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
>planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included
>amateur radio as a component of that planning.

You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS station or
used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???

I know of four military facilities, one of them Naval, that incorporate
MARS teams for emergency purposes, and two of them that utilize RACES teams for
civil coordination in appropriate scenarios.

>Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in
>emergency situations.

"Civil Defense guys" include military planners. I just finished
"Heartland Response 04" and I can tell you that there were at least two
uniformed representitives from Penatgon offices there.

Guess they forgot to consult you first, Hans.

Go figure, eh...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3050. CodeTesting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 14:15:44 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D468370E666elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91114

The following countries have dropped the code test: the UK, Switzerland, Belgium, Germany, Norway, the Netherlands, Ireland, Singapore, Luxembourg, Papua New Guinea, Denmark and Hong Kong. In addition, Sweden, France, Austria and New Zealand have anoounced that they will drop the code test shortly.

3051. Re: CodeTesting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 14:36:43 UTC
From: Thor Kottelin <thor@anta.net>
Message-ID: <408929FB.925AA47C@anta.net>
Source record: 91115

Alun wrote:
>
> The following countries have dropped the code test: the UK, Switzerland,
> Belgium, Germany, Norway, the Netherlands, Ireland, Singapore, Luxembourg,
> Papua New Guinea, Denmark and Hong Kong.

As has Finland.

Thor

--
http://thorweb.anta.net/ IRCnet #areena

3052. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 16:03:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <pMydnWtbMpv10RTdRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91116

```
Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
> |
> | And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
> | include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
> | amateur radio.
> |
>
> I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
> planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included
> amateur radio as a component of that planning.
>
> Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in
> emergency situations.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
plans, so does the Office of Homeland Defense.
```

3053. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 16:06:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <PKidnU1UUPPY0BTdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91117

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>Date: 4/22/2004 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <iB0ic.5842$eZ5.440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>>|
>>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
>>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
>>| amateur radio.
>>|
>>
>>I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
>>planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included
>>amateur radio as a component of that planning.
>
>
> You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS station or
> used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???
>
> I know of four military facilities, one of them Naval, that incorporate
> MARS teams for emergency purposes, and two of them that utilize RACES teams for
> civil coordination in appropriate scenarios.
>
>
>>Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in
>>emergency situations.
>
>
> "Civil Defense guys" include military planners. I just finished
> "Heartland Response 04" and I can tell you that there were at least two
> uniformed representitives from Penatgon offices there.
>
> Guess they forgot to consult you first, Hans.
>
> Go figure, eh...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

In the past I certainly ran lots of phone patches for U.S Naval personel
aboard U.S Naval ships to family here in the states. Still even have the
logs I kept of each patch.

3054. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 17:33:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <rrcic.6388$eZ5.2285@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91118

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote

| NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
| plans,

bs

3055. Re: CodeTesting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 18:05:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0404231005.10c4d33a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91119

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94D468370E666elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> The following countries have dropped the code test: the UK, Switzerland,
> Belgium, Germany, Norway, the Netherlands, Ireland, Singapore, Luxembourg,
> Papua New Guinea, Denmark and Hong Kong. In addition, Sweden, France,
> Austria and New Zealand have anoounced that they will drop the code test
> shortly.

I guess that really cooks it . . the rest obviously being no-counters
and all that. The little folk. Like Russia, China, Brazil, the
Africans, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, and ummm . . let's see here . .
who else? Oh, yeah, the US of A.

w3rv

3056. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 18:11:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91120

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
| >>|
| >>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
| >>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do
include
| >>| amateur radio.
| >>|
| >>
| >>I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
| >>planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once
included
| >>amateur radio as a component of that planning.
| >
| >
| > You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS
station or
| > used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???
| >
|
| In the past I certainly ran lots of phone patches for U.S Naval
personel
| aboard U.S Naval ships to family here in the states. Still even have
the
| logs I kept of each patch.

Sorry JJ,

MARS is not amateur radio.

Even if it were, phone patches home to Mom are great morale boosters,
but they not "emergency planning".

73, de Hans, K0HB
ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
Islands)

3057. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 18:48:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ueCdnT6BgZiy6RTdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91121

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>
> | NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
> | plans,
>
> bs

BS all you want, but just a few weeks ago I sat in a seminar with USN
Rear Admiral Daniel Stone, Director of Logistics and Engineering for
NORAD/USNORTHCOM and he says differently.

3058. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 18:50:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ueCdnTmBgZhL6RTdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91122

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
> | >>|
> | >>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
> | >>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do
> include
> | >>| amateur radio.
> | >>|
> | >>
> | >>I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
> | >>planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once
> included
> | >>amateur radio as a component of that planning.
> | >
> | >
> | > You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS
> station or
> | > used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???
> | >
> |
> | In the past I certainly ran lots of phone patches for U.S Naval
> personel
> | aboard U.S Naval ships to family here in the states. Still even have
> the
> | logs I kept of each patch.
>
> Sorry JJ,
>
> MARS is not amateur radio.
>
> Even if it were, phone patches home to Mom are great morale boosters,
> but they not "emergency planning".

Where did I say MARS was amateur radio? I did not even mention MARS.
These were phone patches made on the amateur bands by Naval personnel
who held amateur radio licenses.

3059. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 19:56:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423155639.202$kb@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91123

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> K�HB wrote:
> > "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
> >
> > | NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
> > | plans,
> >
> > bs
>
> BS all you want, but just a few weeks ago I sat in a seminar with USN
> Rear Admiral Daniel Stone, Director of Logistics and Engineering for
> NORAD/USNORTHCOM and he says differently.
>
Was he laughing when you wouldn't tell him your call sign?

3060. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 20:33:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <04fic.6616$eZ5.3079@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91124

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote

| > | >>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do
not
| > | >>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do

|
| Where did I say MARS was amateur radio? I did not even mention MARS.
| These were phone patches made on the amateur bands by Naval personnel
| who held amateur radio licenses.
|

Been there, done that. It's just amateurs passing third party morale
traffic to other amateurs and has nothing whatever to do with "emergency
planning".

73, de Hans, K0HB

3061. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 21:58:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404231358.4fad3e53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91125

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040423073002.08524.00000171@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/22/2004 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <iB0ic.5842$eZ5.440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
> >|
> >| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
> >| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
> >| amateur radio.
> >|
> >
> >I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
> >planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included
> >amateur radio as a component of that planning.
>
> You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS station or
> used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???

Steve, you're confusing MARS with Amateur Radio. They are not the
same thing.

> I know of four military facilities, one of them Naval, that incorporate
> MARS teams for emergency purposes,

That's like saying, "I know of military installations that are guarded
by military police,"

MARS is military. Check out what the acronym means sometime.

and two of them that utilize RACES teams for
> civil coordination in appropriate scenarios.

"and two of them use contract security services."

> >Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in
> >emergency situations.
>
> "Civil Defense guys" include military planners.

Except when one is Master Chief Brakob or MSgt. Burke.

I just finished
> "Heartland Response 04" and I can tell you that there were at least two

> uniformed representitives from Penatgon offices there.

OK.

> Guess they forgot to consult you first, Hans.

Since you've concluded "Heartland Response 04," would you mind giving
us an after action report? Lessons learned?

> Go figure, eh...?!?!

So does MARS still = ARS?

> Steve, K4YZ

bb

3062. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 22:11:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423181139.22124.00000059@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 91126

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 12:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <rrcic.6388$eZ5.2285@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>
>| NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
>| plans,
>
>bs

OK, Hans...Prove him wrong. I say you're running off at the mouth.

Steve, K4YZ

3063. Re: "Harry's Hams" a policy violation in QST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 22:18:05 UTC
From: Scott n7rvn <n7rvn@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <yDgic.407$3m2.54@fe03.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 91128

Sorry, the article was written in QST.

Thanks, 73

Scott

"Keith" <kilo_watt_radio@spam.80e3213d> wrote in message
news:108hoqcnlmsq3e4@corp.supernews.com...
> On Wed, 21 Apr 2004 11:24:52 -0700,
> Scott n7rvn <n7rvn@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > I am looking for an article about "Harry's Hams". The article was
published
> > in May (I believe) of 1983. I am pretty sure of the year. Can anyone
> > either scan, copy, or heaven forbid type the text of the article so I
can
> > get accurate information?
>
> What publication?
>
> >
> > The article addresses a weather net that a local forecaster used to
report
> > the information he overheard on the nets. He called the guys on the
nets
> > "Harry's Hams" and the FCC squashed that quickly. Seems the FCC felt
> > sharing this as his hams doing the work for the television station,
violates
> > the regulations. Imagine that. Today the fines would be huge for that
> > little faux paw.
> >
> > Any help would be appreciated.
> >
> > Thanks
> >
> >
> >
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> Pax melior est quam iustissimum bellum.
> Replace spam.80e3213d with wvi dot com & del _

3064. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 22:18:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423181830.22124.00000061@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 91127

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote

>| In the past I certainly ran lots of phone patches for U.S Naval
>personel
>| aboard U.S Naval ships to family here in the states. Still even have
>the
>| logs I kept of each patch.
>
>Sorry JJ,
>
>MARS is not amateur radio.
>
>Even if it were, phone patches home to Mom are great morale boosters,
>but they not "emergency planning".
>

Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to oversee the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are licensed Amateur Radio Operators.

Prerequisite #1 for ALL branches is licensure in the Amatuer Radio Service.

>ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
>Islands)

Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.

Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide Coordinator for Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.

So there....Nyah.....

Steve, K4YZ

3065. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 22:21:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423182120.22124.00000062@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 91129

>ubject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 3:33 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <04fic.6616$eZ5.3079@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>
>| > | >>| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do
>not
>| > | >>| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do
>
>|
>| Where did I say MARS was amateur radio? I did not even mention MARS.
>| These were phone patches made on the amateur bands by Naval personnel
>| who held amateur radio licenses.
>|
>
>Been there, done that. It's just amateurs passing third party morale
>traffic to other amateurs and has nothing whatever to do with "emergency
>planning".

I see you're ate up with "stupid" today, Hans. Air too rare in MN these
days?

Not all MARS activities are involved in "emergency planning", however MANY
installations INCLUDE the MARS program >>IN<< thier plans.

Sorry you are too caught up in your own self-righteousness to acknowledge
it. Seeems you ahve a really bad problem with that lately.

It still doesn't change facts, however.

Sorry. It really IS >>THAT<< simple.

Steve, K4YZ

3066. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 22:57:58 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108j7rmtnvcf058@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:

> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>
>
>> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>> GEORGE BUSCH
>> 1385 DEVON CIR
>> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>> USA
>
>
>
> wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
> more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
> it again...

Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!

http://tinyurl.com/3dpws

3067. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 23:02:46 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91131
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> > >
> > >
> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >> GEORGE BUSCH
> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >> USA
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
> > more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
> > it again...
>
> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>
> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>
Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.

> Geo using another nym wrote:
> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine, everyone knows
> my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see the need I have a pair
> of balls to back up what I say, the only balls I see you have are the 2 on
> your chin.

Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?

3068. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 23:16:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Ushic.2566$EE3.1253@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91132

Hello, Hans

Does "sparkplug", "sparkplug1", and "KG6AAY" ring a bell ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (formerly WB2OSP whilst on Guam Island)
ps - your point, however, is well taken. If something happens, everyone
pitches in to make thing happen the way they should.

"K<unk>HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> Sorry JJ,
>
> MARS is not amateur radio.
>
> Even if it were, phone patches home to Mom are great morale boosters,
> but they not "emergency planning".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
> Islands)
>
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.665 / Virus Database: 428 - Release Date: 4/21/04

3069. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-23 23:30:37 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <xGhic.2569$rR3.641@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91133

Steve,

Hans was involved in emergencies. He can tell you the story about getting comms back up to Guam from Saipan (did I get the right island that time, Hans? ;)

What everyone seems to forget here is that a considerable amount of military traffic just might be classified. Also, do you want anyone knowing what the ratio of classified to unclassified traffic is? If only some traffic were encrypted, if that ratio changed to much more encrypted, people might be able to draw some guesses as to "something is either happening or about to happen".

The military has their way of doing things, and, quite frankly, I think they do it very well indeed. No slam on amateur radio, but this is a very different situation. Even military radios have mil-spec components and can operate in conditions that our radios could not stand up to. You might be in the Middle East in a desert in summer with sandstorms or in Korea in the wintertime. You might be in a jungle with extensive rain and 100% humidity. You might be in mountains.

Why would they try to include an unsecure (as opposed to encrypted - which, by our laws, cannot be encrypted) service with gear that may perform well - so long as the temperature is between 40 and 90 degrees farenheit with a relative humidity between 30 and 90 percent and at an altitude not to exceed 10,000 feet?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040423182120.22124.00000062@mb-m01.aol.com...

> I see you're ate up with "stupid" today, Hans. Air too rare in MN
these
> days?
>
> Not all MARS activities are involved in "emergency planning", however
MANY
> installations INCLUDE the MARS program >>IN<< thier plans.
>
> Sorry you are too caught up in your own self-righteousness to
acknowledge
> it. Seeems you ahve a really bad problem with that lately.
>
> It still doesn't change facts, however.

>
> Sorry. It really IS >>THAT<< simple.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.665 / Virus Database: 428 - Release Date: 4/21/04

3070. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 00:03:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <69iic.6894$eZ5.2679@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91134

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

| Hello, Hans
|
| Does "sparkplug", "sparkplug1", and "KG6AAY" ring a bell ;)

Indeed it does, Jim. Still exchange holiday correstpondence with both
Norm Spidell and Tom Belvin.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3071. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 00:29:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4089B4D7.9040007@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91135

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>
>| NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
>| plans,
>
>bs
>
>
Maybe not for "secret" traffic, but routine stuff would be handled by
hams to
offload the more important communications channels. Or maybe some
"secret" stuff, encrypted and disguised to look like boring routine
traffic, is
handled by hams, but they wouldn't be aware of it.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3072. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 00:37:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423203704.11461.00000179@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 91136

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 6:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <xGhic.2569$rR3.641@news01.roc.ny>
>
>Steve,
>
>Hans was involved in emergencies. He can tell you the story about getting
>comms back up to Guam from Saipan (did I get the right island that time,
>Hans? ;)

I know he was, Jim. It still doesn't negate the fact that there are
numerous MARS BST's (Base Support Teams) that are part-and-parcel of base
disaster relief programs. Hans would have us believe that this is not true at
ALL. He is in error.

>What everyone seems to forget here is that a considerable amount of military
>traffic just might be classified. Also, do you want anyone knowing what the
>ratio of classified to unclassified traffic is? If only some traffic were
>encrypted, if that ratio changed to much more encrypted, people might be
>able to draw some guesses as to "something is either happening or about to
>happen".

Of course. And base commanders know what's "classified" and what's not.
A MARS BST would nhever even hear about "classified" traffic being passed, let
alone be handed something to pass.

>The military has their way of doing things, and, quite frankly, I think they
>do it very well indeed. No slam on amateur radio, but this is a very
>different situation. Even military radios have mil-spec components and can
>operate in conditions that our radios could not stand up to. You might be
>in the Middle East in a desert in summer with sandstorms or in Korea in the
>wintertime. You might be in a jungle with extensive rain and 100% humidity.
>You might be in mountains.

Absolutely. And no one here (except those who keep trying to justify
thier rants by insinuating it's an "only-Amateur" scenario) is suggesting that
such is the case.

This is a forum relative to Amateur Radio. Most of the participants are
in the contiguous 48 United States, and I am going to "assume" that we are
discussing disaster situations involving the civilian populous in general.

In these specific exchanges we have included MARS as a resource for
"disaster communications" at those DoD facilities that have opted to implement
those programs, and certainly thos are facilities located within the United

States' jurisdiction.

Not all (certainly a few rather than a lot) have done so.

I know it's really rhetorical to do so, but since Hans has made a point of misrepresenting the nature and composition of the MARS programs, I have taken the stance of disagreeing with him. >>A L L<< of the MARS programs are made of of licensed Amateurs. No Amateur Radio operators, no MARS.

>Why would they try to include an unsecure (as opposed to encrypted - which,
>by our laws, cannot be encrypted) service with gear that may perform well -
>so long as the temperature is between 40 and 90 degrees farenheit with a
>relative humidity between 30 and 90 percent and at an altitude not to exceed
>10,000 feet?

I don't think JJ was making ANY suggestion of MILOPS in enviromental extremes, nor was he suggesting any interoperabilty where COMSEC was of concern.

MARS >>IS<< used in many instances for "disaster communications".

MARS is populated by civilian Amateur Radio operators. No...MARS is not "Amateur Radio", nor is Amateur Radio MARS...However, No Amateur Radio, No MARS.

My point here has been that Hans is belching out "absolutes" that are anything BUT absolute, and he has been, in some significant margin, in error in his representations of the MARS programs as they pertain to "disaster communications".

73

Steve, K4YZ

3073. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 00:38:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423203814.11461.00000180@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 91137

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 7:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <69iic.6894$eZ5.2679@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
>
>| Hello, Hans
>|
>| Does "sparkplug", "sparkplug1", and "KG6AAY" ring a bell ;)
>
>
>Indeed it does, Jim. Still exchange holiday correstpondence with both
>Norm Spidell and Tom Belvin.

Do they correstpondence back?

Steve, K4YZ

3074. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 00:53:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423205352.11461.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 91138

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/23/2004 4:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404231358.4fad3e53@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040423073002.08524.00000171@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>> >Date: 4/22/2004 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <iB0ic.5842$eZ5.440@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>> >
>> >
>> >"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>> >|
>> >| And that is why the military and other emergency officials do not
>> >| include cell phones in their emergency planning , but they do include
>> >| amateur radio.
>> >|
>> >
>> >I spent a whole career involved in military (Naval) communications
>> >planning, from single units to entire fleets, and never once included
>> >amateur radio as a component of that planning.
>>
>> You never seerved at a Naval facility that didn't have a MARS station
>or
>> used MARS for passing ANY kind of traffic, Hans...???
>
>Steve, you're confusing MARS with Amateur Radio. They are not the
>same thing.

No, I am not.

>> I know of four military facilities, one of them Naval, that
>incorporate
>> MARS teams for emergency purposes,
>
>That's like saying, "I know of military installations that are guarded
>by military police,"

No, it's not.

>MARS is military. Check out what the acronym means sometime.

I know it quite well.

Military AFFILIATE Radio System.

That means licensed AMATEURS "affiliated" with that particular
MARS/military program.

No Amateur Radio Operators = No MARS.

> and two of them that utilize RACES teams for
>> civil coordination in appropriate scenarios.
>
>"and two of them use contract security services."

Very true.

>> >Civil Defense guys like FEMA in fact do count on amateur radio in
>> >emergency situations.
>>
>> "Civil Defense guys" include military planners.
>
>Except when one is Master Chief Brakob or MSgt. Burke.

Unless you were assigned the responsibility of incorportating those assets
to your plan by higher headquarters, Brian. Are you stating for the record
that if you are tasked with such a requirement that you'd disobey lawful
orders?

> I just finished
>> "Heartland Response 04" and I can tell you that there were at least two
>> uniformed representitives from Penatgon offices there.
>
>OK.
>
>> Guess they forgot to consult you first, Hans.
>
>Since you've concluded "Heartland Response 04," would you mind giving
>us an after action report? Lessons learned?

No, I would not care to give you an "after action report", other than to
say I had a good time and a lot WAS learned/accomplished.

>> Go figure, eh...?!?!
>
>So does MARS still = ARS?

Only as it pertains to providing the people and resources to HAVE a MARS
program, Brian.

No Amateur Radio Operators = No MARS program. Such is NOT true with
REACT, Civil Air Patrol, the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and other
programs/agencies, although they MAY have some Amateurs participating. An
Amateur ticket is NOT required for them.

Unless, of course, you know of some secret DoD document that would deploy
Active Duty service persons to flesh out the MARS ranks if they all decided to
quit...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3075. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:04:53 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108jf9ldtk98l40@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
news:20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>>
>> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>> >
>> >
>> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>> >> GEORGE BUSCH
>> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
>> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>> >> USA
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
>> > look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
>> > ... post it again...
>>
>> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>>
>> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>>
> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>
>> Geo using another nym wrote:
>> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
>> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
>> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only balls
>> I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
>
> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?

Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey paw
chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>

3076. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:05:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <53jic.6952$eZ5.4407@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91140

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:xGhic.2569$rR3.641@news01.roc.ny...

| Hans was involved in emergencies. He can tell you the story about
getting
| comms back up to Guam from Saipan (did I get the right island that
time,
| Hans? ;)

Yup, that's the right island <grin>.

The Crockstar is trying to somehow make MARS into an amateur radio program, and therefore make his case that military planners include amateur radio in their plans.

Of course MARS >>isn't<< amateur radio, it is the Military Affiliate Radio Service, which uses MARS frequencies, issues MARS licenses, and trains it's operators in MARS procedures. The only resemblance it has to amateur radio is the fact that most (not all) volunteers are recruited from amateur ranks. Not all amateurs are eligible to be licensed as MARS operators.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3077. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:09:58 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423210958.989$S1@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com:
>
> > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> >> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
> >>
> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >> >> GEORGE BUSCH
> >> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
> >> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >> >> USA
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
> >> > look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
> >> > ... post it again...
> >>
> >> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
> >>
> >> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
> >>
> > Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
> >
> >> Geo using another nym wrote:
> >> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
> >> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
> >> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only balls
> >> I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
> >
> > Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>
> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey paw
> chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>
Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?

3078. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:24:40 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <sljic.309$ya6.240@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91142
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BP" <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in message
news:108jf9ldtk98l40@corp.supernews.com...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com:
>
> > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> >> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
> >>
> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >> >> GEORGE BUSCH
> >> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
> >> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >> >> USA
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
> >> > look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
> >> > ... post it again...
> >>
> >> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
> >>
> >> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
> >>
> > Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
> >
> >> Geo using another nym wrote:
> >> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
> >> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
> >> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only balls
> >> I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
> >
> > Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>
>
> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey paw
> chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>

There's a Greyhound bus station with in
driving distance? How else would he get there?

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

3079. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:24:40 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <sljic.308$ya6.198@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BP" <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in message
news:108j7rmtnvcf058@corp.supernews.com...
> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> >
> >
> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >> GEORGE BUSCH
> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >> USA
> >
> >
> >
> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
> > more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
> > it again...
>
>
> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>
> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws

LOLL!!!, now you know why he's AX/No archiving
cover the snail tracks.....

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

3080. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 01:24:40 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <sljic.310$ya6.162@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:20040423210958.989$S1@newsreader.com...
> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> > news:20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com:
> >
> > > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> > >> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> > >> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
> > >>
> > >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> > >> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> > >> >> GEORGE BUSCH
> > >> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
> > >> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> > >> >> USA
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
> > >> > look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
> > >> > ... post it again...
> > >>
> > >> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
> > >>
> > >> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
> > >>
> > > Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
> > >
> > >> Geo using another nym wrote:
> > >> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
> > >> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
> > >> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only balls
> > >> I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
> > >
> > > Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
> >
> > Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey paw
> > chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
> >

> Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?

Mermaid Man..... LMAO!!! or is he Barnacle Boy?

Landshark

--
Real heroes are men who fall and fail
and are flawed, but win out in the end
because they've stayed true to their
ideals and beliefs and commitments.

3081. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:03:55 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108jiobgmq7qg68@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040423210958.989
$S1@newsreader.com:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>> news:20040423190246.095$ep@newsreader.com:
>>
>> > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>> >> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>> >> news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>> >>
>> >> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>> >> > news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>> >> >> GEORGE BUSCH
>> >> >> 1385 DEVON CIR
>> >> >> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>> >> >> USA
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
>> >> > look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
>> >> > ... post it again...
>> >>
>> >> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>> >>
>> >> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>> >>
>> > Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>> >
>> >> Geo using another nym wrote:
>> >> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
>> >> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
>> >> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only
balls
>> >> I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
>> >
>> > Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>>
>> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey paw
```

>> chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>>
> Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?

Thats a funny visual, especially when George wears his cape
getup at the hamfests. hehehe..

3082. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:07:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040423220754.11380.00000268@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 91146

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/23/2004 8:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <53jic.6952$eZ5.4407@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:xGhic.2569$rR3.641@news01.roc.ny...
>
>| Hans was involved in emergencies. He can tell you the story about
>getting
>| comms back up to Guam from Saipan (did I get the right island that
>time,
>| Hans? ;)
>
>Yup, that's the right island <grin>.
>
>The Crockstar is trying to somehow make MARS into an amateur radio
>program, and therefore make his case that military planners include
>amateur radio in their plans.

No one's "...trying to somehow make MARS into an amateur radio program".

I guess all that stuff in the various branches of MARS about disaster planning was just to use up the surplus ink. And those BST's...?!?! Just another opportunity to have lunch in the O-Club, Hans?

>Of course MARS >>isn't<< amateur radio, it is the Military Affiliate
>Radio Service, which uses MARS frequencies, issues MARS licenses, and
>trains it's operators in MARS procedures.

Duhhhh....Ya think...?!?! I believe I said (in not so many words) the very same thing.

>The only resemblance it has
>to amateur radio is the fact that most (not all) volunteers are
>recruited from amateur ranks. Not all amateurs are eligible to be
>licensed as MARS operators.

Just the majority of them.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS program.

It really is just that simple.

Steve, K4YZ

3083. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:36:03 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <1mkic.1504$7a5.786@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>>>> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>>>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>>>>> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>>>>>> GEORGE BUSCH
>>>>>> 1385 DEVON CIR
>>>>>> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>>>>>> USA
>>>>>
>>>>> wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
>>>>> look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
>>>>> ... post it again...
>>>>
>>>> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>>>>
>>>> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>>>>
>>> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>>>
>>>> Geo using another nym wrote:
>>>> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
>>>> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
>>>> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only
>>>> balls I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
>>>
>>> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>>
>> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey
>> paw chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>>
> Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?

I am gonna kick him so hard that he flies out of his Captain Insano uniform
and out of his alcohol stupor.

3084. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:36:48 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <Kmkic.1505$7a5.781@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91148
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Landshark wrote:
>> Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?
> Mermaid Man.................. LMAO!!! or is he Barnacle Boy?

He thinks he is Captain Insano - and is going to use his double secret
turbo sleeper hold on me. BWHAHAHA

3085. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:50:25 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423225025.534$q3@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91149
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> >> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> >>>> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >>>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >>>>>> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >>>>>> GEORGE BUSCH
> >>>>>> 1385 DEVON CIR
> >>>>>> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >>>>>> USA
> >>>>>
> >>>>> wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you
> >>>>> look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again
> >>>>> ... post it again...
> >>>>
> >>>> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
> >>>>
> >>>> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
> >>>>
> >>> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
> >>>
> >>>> Geo using another nym wrote:
> >>>> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
> >>>> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see
> >>>> the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the only
> >>>> balls I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
> >>>
> >>> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
> >>
> >> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey
> >> paw chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
> >>
> > Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?
>
> I am gonna kick him so hard that he flies out of his Captain Insano
> uniform and out of his alcohol stupor.
>
Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant material
as opposed to bad plant material.

It's all legal and stuff. :)

3086. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:50:32 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <Bzkic.1510$7a5.50@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>> What did i say assclown, that everyone knows my callsign, ok lets
>> try a game what is my call sign?
>>
> WA3MOJ...was this a trick question geo-sock? Everyone knows that.

He says everyone knows his callsign, but is afraid to post what it is.
What's up with that?

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> he burns the Star of David in the front yard

Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> Whoever has the gold makes the rules?
> Spoken like a stereotypical Jew.

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> Or do you need it
> described to you in Yiddish?

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> I just won't call you by any name at all. Just a
> nameless, racist Jew.

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> I have admitted lying in this ng, and on
> more than one occasion

3087. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:52:37 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423225237.567$p0@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> >> What did i say assclown, that everyone knows my callsign, ok lets
> >> try a game what is my call sign?
> >>
> > WA3MOJ...was this a trick question geo-sock? Everyone knows that.
>
He drinks too much and forgets what he posted. His dad is really
gonna be pissed this time.

3088. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:55:53 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <DEkic.1512$7a5.557@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
> expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant material
> as opposed to bad plant material.

I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No matter, I
will bring one of mine.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3089. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 02:58:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423225839.692$5p@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91153
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
> > expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant material
> > as opposed to bad plant material.
>
> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No matter, I
> will bring one of mine.
>
Cool..maybe you've seen my work? <g> I'll pay my own way, as long as you
give me a receipt for my Agriculture consultation.

3090. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:00:16 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <KIkic.1514$7a5.876@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91154
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
>> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No
>> matter, I will bring one of mine.
>>
> Cool..maybe you've seen my work? <g> I'll pay my own way, as long as
> you give me a receipt for my Agriculture consultation.

Consider it done, buddy.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3091. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:05:56 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423230556.542$UB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> >> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No
> >> matter, I will bring one of mine.
> >>
> > Cool..maybe you've seen my work? <g> I'll pay my own way, as long as
> > you give me a receipt for my Agriculture consultation.
>
> Consider it done, buddy.
>
Now I need a date, so I can look for that super-saver rate. Can
I stay at your place Geo?

3092. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:25:24 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <V%kic.77798$Lh2.7998@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91156
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in
> news:1mkic.1504$7a5.786@bignews6.bellsouth.net:
>
>> Steveo wrote:
>>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>>>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>>>>>> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>>>>>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>>>>>>> WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>>>>>>>> GEORGE BUSCH
>>>>>>>> 1385 DEVON CIR
>>>>>>>> ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>>>>>>>> USA
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and
>>>>>>> you look more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it
>>>>>>> again ... post it again...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>>>>>>
>>>>> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Geo using another nym wrote:
>>>>>> I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine,
>>>>>> everyone knows my name. I have never been anonymous and don't
>>>>>> see the need I have a pair of balls to back up what I say, the
>>>>>> only balls I see you have are the 2 on your chin.
>>>>>
>>>>> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>>>>
>>>> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey
>>>> paw chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>>>>
>>> Think he has a cape and jumps around in front of the mirror?
>>
>> I am gonna kick him so hard that he flies out of his Captain Insano
>> uniform and out of his alcohol stupor.
>
> you aren't kicking shit little man, is there any money involved? You

> will find out the hard way you don't know who is behind a keyboard.

Fuck you I will, bitch. And I don't need your co-signed welfare checks.
Just bring your own ass to wherever we meet. That's all you need to bring,
bitch.

--

____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3093. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:26:03 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <f7lic.40508$m_4.24384@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91157
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in message
news:DEkic.1512$7a5.557@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> Steveo wrote:
> > Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
> > expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant material
> > as opposed to bad plant material.
>
> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No matter, I
> will bring one of mine.

I have a digital video camera I'll donate
to the cause.....

Landshark

--
That does suck..sometimes you're the
windshield..sometimes you're the bug.

3094. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:31:30 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0404231931.25e10527@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" s3buell@sbcglobal.net wrote
>"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in message
>news:DEkic.1512$7a5.557@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>> Steveo wrote:
>> > Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
>> > expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant
material
>> > as opposed to bad plant material.
>>
>> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No
matter,
> I
>> will bring one of mine.
>
>
> I have a digital video camera I'll donate
>to the cause.....
>
> Landshark

If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL

3095. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:41:22 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423234122.628$mu@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <s3buell@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in message
> news:DEkic.1512$7a5.557@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> > Steveo wrote:
> > > Can you hire me for your trainer and write it off as a business
> > > expense while you're at it? I'll advise you on good plant material
> > > as opposed to bad plant material.
> >
> > I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No matter,
> > I will bring one of mine.
>
> I have a digital video camera I'll donate
> to the cause.....
>
> Landshark
>
>
Mpegs would be nice.

3096. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:41:59 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <bilic.5326$Uz1.2398@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I Am Not George wrote:
> If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
> never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL

You are too obsessed with Landshark's love life. Folks are going to begin
to wonder if you are projecting.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3097. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:44:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040423234420.447$o3@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91161
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> I Am Not George wrote:
> > If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
> > never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL
>
> You are too obsessed with Landshark's love life. Folks are going to
> begin to wonder if you are projecting.
>
Is projecting a fancy word for leg humping?

3098. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:46:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <deqdnWZJTImNbBTdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91166

Jim Hampton wrote:

>
> The military has their way of doing things, and, quite frankly, I think they
> do it very well indeed. No slam on amateur radio, but this is a very
> different situation. Even military radios have mil-spec components and can
> operate in conditions that our radios could not stand up to. You might be
> in the Middle East in a desert in summer with sandstorms or in Korea in the
> wintertime. You might be in a jungle with extensive rain and 100% humidity.
> You might be in mountains.

That's why Collins built the S-Line series of equipment, which was also
very widely used by amateurs. I still run an S-Line.

3099. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 03:48:12 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <1olic.5420$Uz1.2748@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
>> I Am Not George wrote:
>>> If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
>>> never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL
>>
>> You are too obsessed with Landshark's love life. Folks are going to
>> begin to wonder if you are projecting.
>>
> Is projecting a fancy word for leg humping?

Projecting is where he accuses everyone else of transsexualism to draw
attention away from his issues with it.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3100. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 04:03:06 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108jpnqass6okb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94D4E64F450551234567890@216.196.97.136:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in news:108jf9ldtk98l40
> @corp.supernews.com:
>
>> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey
>> paw chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>
> No there would be 2 reasons why, first you are a anonymous troll who
> will never come for so there is your first strike. 2 you would have to
> have some balls to show up and confront someone strike 2. ....the wind
> up the pitch ....

Yep, you're Georgre alright.. 90 proof courage and 100% hypocracy.

3101. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 04:13:20 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <APlic.55565$s%5.34575@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in message
news:1olic.5420$Uz1.2748@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> Steveo wrote:
> > "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> >> I Am Not George wrote:
> >>> If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
> >>> never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL
> >>
> >> You are too obsessed with Landshark's love life. Folks are going to
> >> begin to wonder if you are projecting.
> >>
> > Is projecting a fancy word for leg humping?
>
> Projecting is where he accuses everyone else of transsexualism to draw
> attention away from his issues with it.

LOL!!!! He just has issues.

Landshark

--
Any day riding, is better than
being a newsgroupie

73 Baja Stroppe Bronco
98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt
99 Ford F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

3102. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 04:15:22 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <7Plic.1603$7a5.1140@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Landshark wrote:
> LOL!!!! He just has issues.

And none of them good! LOL

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3103. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 06:26:23 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040424022623.617$c9@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91167
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> > Steveo wrote:
> > >> I do think we need a photographer. Do you have a digital? No
> > >> matter, I will bring one of mine.
> > >>
> > > Cool..maybe you've seen my work? <g> I'll pay my own way, as long as
> > > you give me a receipt for my Agriculture consultation.
> >
> > Consider it done, buddy.
> >
> Now I need a date, so I can look for that super-saver rate. Can
> I stay at your place Geo?
>
Huh?

3104. Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 13:58:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <uP2dnfk5S_gP7xfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91168

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Ws%gc.3098$e4.197@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> |
> | "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> | news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> | >
> | > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> | >
> | > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> | > | General.
> | >
> | > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
> of
> | > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
> be
> | > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> | > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
> |
> | That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> | requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> | can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> | your mind.
> |
> | Cheers,
> | Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill,
>
> With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
>
> It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
> director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).
>
> Cheers,
>
> Hans, K0HB
> NCI # 4304

Hans,

With all due respect, your e-mails to NCI Directors have been answered, the
issues have been discussed with you, and your views have been taken into

account.
(As you have pointed out, you have not "been excommunicated" ... presumably you still support the "prime directive" (as opposed to the "sole directive") of eliminating Morse testing requirements ... it has been well-explained that that is a core principle that is considered a pre-requisite for membership in NCI.)

HOWEVER, with respect to the other aspects of the ARRL and NCVEC petitions, you must realize, in all reasonableness, that you are only ONE of thousands of NCI members - and your views were in the stark minority when we surveyed US members to ask them 1) "Do you want us to comment on the other aspects of the ARRL/NCVEC petitions?" and 2) "If your answer to (1) is affirmative, what do you want us to say?"

To imply something is wrong because your individual (significantly minority) views are not the determining factor in whatever the final NCI policy decision might be is unrealistic and as a representative Board of Directors, we would be remiss in our duties to the membership if we were to ignore an overwhelming majority.

Regardless of the personal views of the NCI Directors, as the representatives of a membership-supported organization, I believe we have an obligation to convey the views of the membership to the FCC. (Which is not to say that NCI Directors will not/have not filed their own *individual, personal* comments with the FCC that may express somewhat different *personal* views on some or all of the issues raised by the ARRL and NCVEC petitions.)

73,
Carl - wk3c

3105. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 14:23:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3Muic.7416$eZ5.5157@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91169

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

| ....and as a representative Board of Directors,
| we would be remiss in our duties to the membership
| if we were to ignore an overwhelming majority.

...and...

| Which is not to say that NCI Directors will not/have
| not filed their own *individual, personal* comments
| with the FCC that may express somewhat different
| *personal* views on some or all of the issues raised
| by the ARRL and NCVEC petitions.

That's an interesting dilemma, Carl, and I think how you handle it is a measure of how well you're suited to a leadership role.

"As an elected official shall I officially support a wildly popular opinion which I disagree with, then privately file a position with my *personal* views in opposition to the organization which I represent?"

73, de Hans, K0HB

3106. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 14:32:01 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108kuj137nosoa6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94D55EDE2231E1234567890@216.196.97.136:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in news:108jpnqass6okb0
> @corp.supernews.com:
>
>> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>> news:Xns94D4E64F450551234567890@216.196.97.136:
>>
>>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in news:108jf9ldtk98l40
>>> @corp.supernews.com:
>>>
>>>> Gee, I hope Geo don't get pissed at me and put his triangle monkey
>>>> paw chicken-choke thingy move on me?? ::trembles:: <BFG!>
>>>
>>> No there would be 2 reasons why, first you are a anonymous troll who
>>> will never come for so there is your first strike. 2 you would have
to
>>> have some balls to show up and confront someone strike 2. ....the
wind
>>> up the pitch ....
>>
>>
>> Yep, you're Georgre alright.. 90 proof courage and 100% hypocracy.
>
> great answer, plus your spelling suxs

Are the rest of your sock-puppets hungover this morning too, Geo??
lmao!

3107. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 14:43:08 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <V%uic.42494$Yw5.7299@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen wrote:
> hey are you and Landshark butt buddies now, perhaps Load Warrior you
> are a bear type and that is exactly why you Like landshark.

Stop your spewing and start getting in shape for June, Geo.

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> he burns the Star of David in the front yard

Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> Whoever has the gold makes the rules?
> Spoken like a stereotypical Jew.

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> Or do you need it
> described to you in Yiddish?

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> I just won't call you by any name at all. Just a
> nameless, racist Jew.

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> I have admitted lying in this ng, and on
> more than one occasion

3108. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 14:44:43 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108kvarng4b3uc1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94D55E6A25D101234567890@216.196.97.136:

> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in
> news:bilic.5326$Uz1.2398@bignews3.bellsouth.net:
>
>> I Am Not George wrote:
>>> If you get a camera from transshark you better steam clean it you
>>> never know what transsexuals ass its been up LOL
>>
>> You are too obsessed with Landshark's love life. Folks are going to
>> begin to wonder if you are projecting.
>
> and you are obsessed with a fictional person named george, folks are
> going to wonder if your projecting your homosexuality?
>

If you're not George, then you must be an ano[nym]ous troll after all..
Well, thanks for clearing that up for us, shitbird. :P

3109. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 14:54:41 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <Kavic.42549$Yw5.17892@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91173
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BP wrote:
> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>> and you are obsessed with a fictional person named george, folks are
>> going to wonder if your projecting your homosexuality?
>>
>
> If you're not George, then you must be an ano[nym]ous troll after
> all.. Well, thanks for clearing that up for us, shitbird. :P

You mean he aspires to be a shitbird. He has no idea what he is. But I sure hope someone will tend his wounds when he gets back to his dad's basement.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3110. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:08:23 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040424110823.198$gt@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> BP wrote:
> > Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >> and you are obsessed with a fictional person named george, folks are
> >> going to wonder if your projecting your homosexuality?
> >>
> >
> > If you're not George, then you must be an ano[nym]ous troll after
> > all.. Well, thanks for clearing that up for us, shitbird. :P
>
> You mean he aspires to be a shitbird. He has no idea what he is. But I
> sure hope someone will tend his wounds when he gets back to his dad's
> basement.
>
So the graduations hang on the wall
But they never really helped us at all
No they never taught us what was real
Iron and coke
And chromium steel
And we're waiting here in Allentown

3111. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:21:22 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <408A8608.8050703@optonline.net>
Source record: 91175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
>
>>BP wrote:
>>
>>>Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>>>
>>>>and you are obsessed with a fictional person named george, folks are
>>>>going to wonder if your projecting your homosexuality?
>>>>
>>>
>>>If you're not George, then you must be an ano[nym]ous troll after
>>>all.. Well, thanks for clearing that up for us, shitbird. :P
>>
>>You mean he aspires to be a shitbird. He has no idea what he is. But I
>>sure hope someone will tend his wounds when he gets back to his dad's
>>basement.
>>
>
> So the graduations hang on the wall
> But they never really helped us at all
> No they never taught us what was real
> Iron and coke
> And chromium steel
> And we're waiting here in Allentown

captain jack will get you high tonight :o

3112. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:30:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <l_CdnTZuC-eAFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91176

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:DA%gc.14055$l75.6936@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:Ws%gc.3098$e4.197@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > |
> > | "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > | news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > | >
> > | > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > | >
> > | > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> > | > | General.
> > | >
> > | > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
> > of
> > | > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
> > be
> > | > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> > | > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
> > |
> > | That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> > | requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> > | can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> > | your mind.
> > |
> > | Cheers,
> > | Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Bill,
> >
> > With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
> >
> > It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
> > director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).
>
> You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
```

To his credit, Hans did take the survey and I'm sure that his views were consistent with what he expresses here.

However, as Bill points out above, and I have pointed out in a separate message, Hans is but one of thousands of NCI members, and the views he has expressed are in an extreme minority.

Once again, it would be irresponsible for the NCI Board of Directors to ignore the wishes of the vast majority of our membership in favor of honoring Hans' wishes - though we certainly did listen to and consider his views, and some of the NCI Directors even had lengthily e-mail discussions with him.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3113. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:32:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91177

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:BO%gc.3144$e4.1788@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> |
> | You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> |
>
> Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
> wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
>
> Cheers,
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
> FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
> NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

Hans,

Squeak away ... your are entitled to your opinion, even if it is in an extreme minority amongst the membership - and I'm sure I speak for all of NCI's Directors when I say that our in-boxes are always open to comment from you - and all of the other members of NCI.

Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!

73,
Carl - wk3c

3114. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:33:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wfCdnVWAzcB6FRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91178

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > |
> > | You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> > |
> >
> > Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
> > wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
> >
>
> Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
>
> And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy

Mike,

I respectfully disagree with your assertion ... the whole reason NCI
surveyed US members on the issues involved in the ARRL and NCVEC petitions
was so that we would know their wishes and act in a representative manner.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3115. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:35:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BvCdneFJ8JPXFBfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91179

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:7fWdnawAna4KFhndRVn-gQ@adelphia.com...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > |
> > | "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > | news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > | >
> > | > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > | >
> > | > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
> > | > | General.
> > | >
> > | > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
> > of
> > | > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
> > be
> > | > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
> > | > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
> > |
> > | That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
> > | requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
> > | can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
> > | your mind.
> > |
> > | Cheers,
> > | Bill K2UNK
> >
> > Bill,
> >
> > With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
> >
> > It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
> > director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).
>
> You have it correct, Hans. But I'm afraid that isn't what they are all
> about.

Mike ... are you suggesting that the NCI Board of Directors should have
ignored the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the membership and
listened only to Hans???

I don't think so ...
```

73,
Carl - wk3c

3116. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:39:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <nfOdnaQIQ52uFxfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91180

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:mL%gc.3135$e4.1815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> | The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
> | upgrade.
>
> That's probably not a remarkable revelation, given that the overwhelming
> majority of the NCI members are Technicians who would naturally benefit
> from such action.
>
> The REAL question isn't what the NCI membership supports, but rather....
>
>
> Q: Will the NCI Board of Directors recommend
> upgrading all Tech/Tech+ licensees to General
> without further testing?
>
> A: (please select one and only one answer)
> ___ Yes
> ___ No
> ___ The Board will take no position on this matter
>
> Cheers,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
> FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
> NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

Hans,

WADR ... As a Board of Directors, the NCI BoD has an obligation to the membership to represent its views.

Your "question" is so patently biased against the BoD acting in a manner that is responsive to (and responsible to) the membership that I refuse to play that game.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3117. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:41:46 UTC
From: Landshark <s3buell@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <_Uvic.40606$N81.6530@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 91181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote in message
news:V%uic.42494$Yw5.7299@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> Concerned Citizen wrote:
> > hey are you and Landshark butt buddies now, perhaps Load Warrior you
> > are a bear type and that is exactly why you Like landshark.
>
> Stop your spewing and start getting in shape for June, Geo.

LMAO!!! George's Homo fantasy again.....

Landshark

--
Courage is what it takes to stand up
and speak; courage is also what it
takes to sit down and listen.

3118. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:53:10 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LOidnSGNFdY_EBfdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91182
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tony P. wrote:
> In article <0q19805i0544f2e4v1tbfnvcka7i7rmmfu@4ax.com>,
> god_freee_jones@hotmail.com says...
>
>>On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 19:15:59 GMT, Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>w4nti@get says...
>>>
>>>>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
>>>>ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
>>>
>>>It's use it or loose it.
>>
>>I thought it was use it or lose it.
>
>
> Ooops.

I thought it was oops.

3119. Re: IMPORTANT ANTI VIRUS INFORMATION

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 15:59:08 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LOidnSCNFdaUEhfdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.packet,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.swap

the.night@hunter.com wrote:

> Don't forget to report this virus/spammer to abuse@shaw.ca
> On Thu, 22 Apr 2004 22:52:30 GMT, SysAdmin@ed.shawcable.net wrote:
>
>
>>Protect yourself from new viruses that you may not know you have. We have designed a set of anti virus tools to keep your system secure. Visit here for more information on these free and easy to use tools
>>
>>http://www.gigdot.net/
>
>

Another good site that you can trust is http://www.gullible.com

3120. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 16:05:52 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Afwic.22878$NR5.16125@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91184
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D577B1FDE801234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote in news:ofmhc.2576
> $Dn1.798@fe2.texas.rr.com:
>
> > For Christ's sake George, can't you see Doug is a useless compilation
> of
> > semi-human DNA? What a loser. Ordered to seek mental health? He must
> have
> > really flipped out for the court to order that in such a case.
>
>
> Kinda like you Randy...
>
Not at all, geo. Please don't get mad at me simply because the AKC has been
proven to be run by a mentally deranged deadbeat dad. BTW, is Doug your dad?
Is that why you get so incensed when someone attacks him?

P.S. If any of the above words are too big for you to understand, let me
know and I'll type more slowly for you.

3121. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 16:21:08 UTC
From: AKC KennelMaster <KennelMaster@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Utwic.22958$NR5.11681@fe1.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94D57C41C486D1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> "AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote in
> news:Afwic.22878$NR5.16125@fe1.texas.rr.com:
>
> >
> > "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94D577B1FDE801234567890@216.196.97.136...
> >> "AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote in
> >> news:ofmhc.2576 $Dn1.798@fe2.texas.rr.com:
> >>
> >> > For Christ's sake George, can't you see Doug is a useless
> >> > compilation
> >> of
> >> > semi-human DNA? What a loser. Ordered to seek mental health? He
> >> > must
> >> have
> >> > really flipped out for the court to order that in such a case.
> >>
> >>
> >> Kinda like you Randy...
> >>
> > Not at all, geo. Please don't get mad at me simply because the AKC has
> > been proven to be run by a mentally deranged deadbeat dad. BTW, is
> > Doug your dad? Is that why you get so incensed when someone attacks
> > him?
> >
> > P.S. If any of the above words are too big for you to understand, let
> > me know and I'll type more slowly for you.
>
> Wow pretty fast reply Randy that post wasn't out there 20 minutes and
> bang you are all over it. I understand what you said pefectly Randy, you
> have no room to talk.

Sure I do. I support my kids. Doug doesn't, and can't. He's mentally ill.

3122. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 16:25:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404240825.2bc961d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91186

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040423181830.22124.00000061@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/23/2004 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
>
> >| In the past I certainly ran lots of phone patches for U.S Naval
> personel
> >| aboard U.S Naval ships to family here in the states. Still even have
> the
> >| logs I kept of each patch.
> >
> >Sorry JJ,
> >
> >MARS is not amateur radio.
> >
> >Even if it were, phone patches home to Mom are great morale boosters,
> >but they not "emergency planning".
> >
>
> Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Sorry Steve, but MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

> With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to oversee
> the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are licensed
> Amateur Radio Operators.

I don't believe that Ray Collins is an amateur.

> Prerequisite #1 for ALL branches is licensure in the Amatuer Radio
> Service.

There's never been an exception?

> >ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
> >Islands)
>
> Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.

Correct. And you have your >>>FACTS<<< wrong.

MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

> Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide Coordinator for
> Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.
>
> So there....Nyah.....
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Looks like the military wasted a lot of training on you if you cannot
get even the most basic >>>FACT<<< right.

Now just accept it so that Carl doesn't have to come on here spank you
again.

3123. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 16:42:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404240842.6e08a93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91187

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040423205352.11461.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>...

> >MARS is military. Check out what the acronym means sometime.
>
> I know it quite well.
>
> Military AFFILIATE Radio System.
>
> That means licensed AMATEURS "affiliated" with that particular
> MARS/military program.

I am a leader in the BSA.

When I am on my paying job, am I representing the BSA?

When a volunteer is signing AFA3xx, is he or she representing the BSA,
CSA, FFa or the PTA?

Nope. And neither are they representing the ARS or the ARRL.

> No Amateur Radio Operators = No MARS.

Not true. Regulations change every day. The regulations will be
changed to suit new conditions.

MARS would have an easier training load by training people off the
street rather than having to retrain a bunch of amateurs.

> Unless you were assigned the responsibility of incorportating those assets
> to your plan by higher headquarters, Brian. Are you stating for the record
> that if you are tasked with such a requirement that you'd disobey lawful
> orders?

Comms was not my functional area, but weather comms were. But I will
state for the record that I'd write anything into the plan or opord
that hhq told me to - as long as it was a legal order.

> No, I would not care to give you an "after action report", other than to
> say I had a good time and a lot WAS learned/accomplished.

Great! You accomplished WAS. Glad you had fun.

> Unless, of course, you know of some secret DoD document that would deploy
> Active Duty service persons to flesh out the MARS ranks if they all decided to
> quit...?!?!

I suspect that MARS, if need be, could find volunteers who didn't have
amateur licenses. Isn't that what CAP does? Doesn't CAP use radios

on military frequencies?

MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

Best of Luck, and last this subject.

3124. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 16:45:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404240845.30512e4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91188

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<ueCdnT6BgZiy6RTdRVn-jg@gbronline.com>...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
> > "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote
> >
> > | NORAD, which is definitely military, does include ham radio in their
> > | plans,
> >
> > bs
>
> BS all you want, but just a few weeks ago I sat in a seminar with USN
> Rear Admiral Daniel Stone, Director of Logistics and Engineering for
> NORAD/USNORTHCOM and he says differently.

There you go again throwing around other peoples names and titles, but
you don't appear to have one.

No credibility whatsoever.

3125. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 17:31:27 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0404240931.73f983df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91189
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
news:20040424112202.315$W5
@newsreader.com:

> Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>> Opp hear we go again with this assload talking shit and not doing a
god
>> damn thing, sounds more like steve every day
>>
> If he's anything like me you're doomed.

doomed to have a picture taken of ones house? doomed to have a note
left in ones mail box? thats not doomed thats hilarious

3126. Canadian LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts (Canada/US)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 17:48:25 UTC
From: radio-operator@telus.net
Message-ID: <d318809e.0404240948.6551dac5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
you come across one feel free to let me know.

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaFrequencyDatabase.txt

Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaRadioSpectrum.pdf
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/USRadioSpectrum.pdf

*** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***

Homac
radio-operator@telus.net

3127. Re: 70cm being trashed/Novice band history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 17:53:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UQxic.8636$gH6.7516@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91191
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave Bushong" <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:LOidnSGNFdY_EBfdRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
> Tony P. wrote:
> > In article <0q19805i0544f2e4v1tbfnvcka7i7rmmfu@4ax.com>,
> > god_freee_jones@hotmail.com says...
> >
> >>On Mon, 19 Apr 2004 19:15:59 GMT, Tony P.
<kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>In article <_yUgc.620$gH6.553@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >>>w4nti@get says...
> >>>
> >>>>SB QST @ ARL $ARLB013
> >>>>ARLB013 FCC okays RF identification tags at 433.5 to 434.5 MHz
> >>>
> >>>It's use it or loose it.
> >>
> >>I thought it was use it or lose it.
> >
> >
> > Ooops.
>
> I thought it was oops.

3128. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 18:40:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <QBidnU7ST8Q4KRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91192

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3Muic.7416$eZ5.5157@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> | ....and as a representative Board of Directors,
> | we would be remiss in our duties to the membership
> | if we were to ignore an overwhelming majority.
>
> ...and...
>
> | Which is not to say that NCI Directors will not/have
> | not filed their own *individual, personal* comments
> | with the FCC that may express somewhat different
> | *personal* views on some or all of the issues raised
> | by the ARRL and NCVEC petitions.
>
> That's an interesting dilemma, Carl, and I think how you handle it is a
> measure of how well you're suited to a leadership role.
>
> "As an elected official shall I officially support a wildly popular
> opinion which I disagree with, then privately file a position with my
> *personal* views in opposition to the organization which I represent?"
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I think there are two sides to every coin .... and there are subtle, yet important, differences between "leadership" and "representation."

1) On one side of the coin, elected representatives have an obligation to represent and advocate for the views of their constituents - they should not, in my opinion allow their personal views to prevent them from fulfilling their duties to the constituents that they are supposed to represent - it's a sort of fiduciary duty.

2) On the other side of the coin, being an elected representative does not strip one of one's rights to one's own views - or the right to express them AS AN INDIVIDUAL as long as it is CLEAR that one is voicing one's individual views (and not misrepresenting them as the views of the constituency in the case where they might differ).

NCI's comments on the ARRL and NCVEC petitions accurately reflect the views of the majority of the membership - as well as the LEVEL of support on each of the major non-Morse-related points.

For the most part, having considered all of the pros and cons, I found that my personal views were *generally* in line with the views of a majority of NCI's membership - 100% agreement with the overwhelming majority views on the ARRL proposals and partial agreement/partial disagreement on some of the "deltas" in the NCVEC petition. (The member's views were much more mixed - less overwhelmingly one way or the other - on some of the NCVEC differences from the ARRL proposals.)

In my *personal* comments, I stated what *my* views were ... and I don't feel at all that I did anything at all inappropriate.

It sounds to me like you view "leadership" as "Listen to Hans' point of view and 'have the courage' to ignore the majority." Sorry, I won't abrogate my responsibility to the membership like that.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3129. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 19:18:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <84zic.7802$eZ5.1705@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91193

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

| It sounds to me like you view "leadership" as "Listen to Hans' point
of view
| and 'have the courage' to ignore the majority."

Not at all. I am but a single data point, and I could be wrong (but so far I've only been wrong once and that was the time I thought I was wrong but I wasn't <grin>).

"A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be."
---R. S. Carter

Put differently, leadership is not conducting a popularity poll and representing that as the best for Amateur Radio, but rather representing the best for Amateur Radio on the conviction that your constituents elected you to make good choices.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3130. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 20:04:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <r7idnfYVu-v_VRfdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91194

William wrote:

> MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/

Mars certainly consists of Radio amateurs, and according to

http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/join.htm

you need to be an amateur.

And since you can ba an amateur without being in MARS, yet cannot be in MARS without being an Amateur.....

Her is something from from

http://www.ieway.com/~billw/wamars.htm

which seems to contradict that the MARS people aren't involved in emergency work.

Quote start:

In times of emergencies, whether local, regional, or national, you will find MARS radio operators handling logistics and emergency communications. A part of our membership is equipped to "go portable" with radio and computer equipment to help with health and welfare radio traffic handling. During the recent flooding, members assisted local authorities relaying messages from families to their relatives and friends in regards to their situations. After the earthquakes in California, members also handled messages from the earthquake victims to others outside the area. All phone systems were disabled or overloaded and the only efficient means of communication was by radio. Members of the MARS program were there to lend a hand.

NNN0ZSJ / NNN0GCC Five

Quote end.

So what is it guys. Is this person "innacurate?

While MARS "isn't involved in emergency work", we might read

http://www.marsgateway.net/docs/AR25-6.pdf

and sneak a peek at Chapter 1 paragraph 6, sentence a.

Let me know what it says. ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3131. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 20:11:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <56ednSEnPoiYRRfdRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91198

Mike Coslo wrote:
> William wrote:
>
>> MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>
>
> http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/
>
>
> Mars certainly consists of Radio amateurs, and according to
>
> http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/join.htm
>
> you need to be an amateur.
>
> And since you can ba an amateur without being in MARS, yet cannot be in
> MARS without being an Amateur.....
>
> Her is something from from
>
> http://www.ieway.com/~billw/wamars.htm
>
> which seems to contradict that the MARS people aren't involved in
> emergency work.
>
> Quote start:
>
>
> In times of emergencies, whether local, regional, or national, you will
> find MARS radio operators handling logistics and emergency
> communications. A part of our membership is equipped to "go portable"
> with radio and computer equipment to help with health and welfare radio
> traffic handling. During the recent flooding, members assisted local
> authorities relaying messages from families to their relatives and
> friends in regards to their situations. After the earthquakes in
> California, members also handled messages from the earthquake victims to
> others outside the area. All phone systems were disabled or overloaded
> and the only efficient means of communication was by radio. Members of
> the MARS program were there to lend a hand.
>
> NNN0ZSJ / NNN0GCC Five
>
> Quote end.
>

>
> So what is it guys. Is this person "innacurate?
>
>
> While MARS "isn't involved in emergency work", we might read
>
> http://www.marsgateway.net/docs/AR25-6.pdf
>
> and sneak a peek at Chapter 1 paragraph 6, sentence a.
>
> Let me know what it says. ;^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

There you go again Mike, upsetting the apple cart with facts. It seems
that some just can't except the fact that amateur radio and the military
have a close relationship and the military does accept amateur radio as
a valuable service when needed, but not cell phones.

3132. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 21:00:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RZmdnS3WTJfkSBfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91195

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> | It sounds to me like you view "leadership" as "Listen to Hans' point
> of view
> | and 'have the courage' to ignore the majority."
>
> Not at all. I am but a single data point, and I could be wrong (but so
> far I've only been wrong once and that was the time I thought I was
> wrong but I wasn't <grin>).
>
> "A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes
> people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be."
> ---R. S. Carter
>
> Put differently, leadership is not conducting a popularity poll and
> representing that as the best for Amateur Radio, but rather representing
> the best for Amateur Radio on the conviction that your constituents
> elected you to make good choices.

Well put, Hans.

It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.

But that is just how it is. NCI has new fields to plow now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3133. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 21:05:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <afGdnTkpLZg4Sxfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91196

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:BO%gc.3144$e4.1788@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
>>|
>>
>>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
>>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
>>
>>Cheers,
>>de Hans, K0HB
>>--
>> SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
>> FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
>> NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/
>
>
> Hans,
>
> Squeak away ... your are entitled to your opinion, even if it is in an
> extreme minority amongst the membership -

And Hans is no longer of any use to you and your agenda, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3134. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 21:08:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <o-ednXhb9Y_2ShfdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91197

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>>
>>>|
>>>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
>>>|
>>>
>>>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
>>>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
>>>
>>
>>Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
>>
>>And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy
>
>
> Mike,
>
> I respectfully disagree with your assertion ... the whole reason NCI
> surveyed US members on the issues involved in the ARRL and NCVEC petitions
> was so that we would know their wishes and act in a representative manner.

And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the Element 1
test. But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams priveleges
that they haven't been tested for.

And there is still that nasty "day after" thing, when th eetsting
regimin goes up again..... or does it?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3135. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 21:19:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TaidnYhGTZZVRBfdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91199

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:7fWdnawAna4KFhndRVn-gQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>>news:pn%gc.14041$l75.12104@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>|
>>>| "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>| news:C5%gc.3068$e4.298@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>>| >
>>>| > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>>| >
>>>| > | Neither ARRL nor NCVEC propose Tech level testing gor
>>>| > | General.
>>>| >
>>>| > The ARRL and NCVEC both propose that every individual (some 323,055
>>>of
>>>| > them by todays numbers) who has currently passed Tech level testing
>>>be
>>>| > eligible for advancement to General without further testing. That
>>>| > sounds to me like Tech level testing will get you a General ticket.
>>>|
>>>| That is a one-time adjustment/upgrade. It does not alter the testing
>>>| requirements for General on a permanent basis. But enough, we
>>>| can at best agree to disagree as I hold no prospect of changing
>>>| your mind.
>>>|
>>>| Cheers,
>>>| Bill K2UNK
>>>
>>>Bill,
>>>
>>>With all due respect, you have it bass-ackwards.
>>>
>>>It's not your job to change my mind. It is my job to persuade you (a
>>>director) to follow the wishes of me (the member).
>>
>>You have it correct, Hans. But I'm afraid that isn't what they are all
>>about.
>
>

>
> Mike ... are you suggesting that the NCI Board of Directors should have
> ignored the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the membership and
> listened only to Hans???
>
> I don't think so ...

No, I think that NCI members have opinions about everything from antenna covenants to BPL threats to abortion to pledge of allegiance and on and on.

I just don't see where they have relevance to what was *once* NCI's purpose - abolishment of Morse code testing as a requirement of licensing.

The instant upgrade of most amateurs to General is not related to code testing as far as I can see. And the unfairness to the people the "day after" that suddenly have to take a harder test.

Perhaps NCI should poll it's members about gay marriage? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3136. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 22:41:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424184155.29909.00000352@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91200

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/24/2004 9:23 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3Muic.7416$eZ5.5157@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>"As an elected official shall I officially support a wildly popular
>opinion which I disagree with, then privately file a position with my
>*personal* views in opposition to the organization which I represent?"

Frankly, I'd buy a whole lot of stock from a man who did it, Hans.

It takes a lot of cajones for an "elected representitive", be it for an organization like NCI or a public official, to proactively represent the "majority" when it's known that his/her "personal" views are part of that minority.

Steve, K4YZ

3137. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 22:48:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424184839.29909.00000353@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91201

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/24/2004 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <84zic.7802$eZ5.1705@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>"A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes
>people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be."
> ---R. S. Carter

A different Carter (Jimmy, to be specific...) tried this. He wound up gutting the intelligence community, tied our hands in covert operations, ran the inflation rate into double digits, left us humilated in world opinion for 444 days and got several of my friends killed.

When I vote for someone, I expect he will represent the majority...Not use his election as a license to do what HE wants to do despite guidance from hbis constituents to the contrary.

Steve, K4YZ

3138. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 22:54:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424185419.29909.00000354@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91202

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/24/2004 11:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404240825.2bc961d0@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040423181830.22124.00000061@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>> >Date: 4/23/2004 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>> Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
>Sorry Steve, but MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>
>> With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to
>oversee
>> the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are licensed
>> Amateur Radio Operators.
>
>I don't believe that Ray Collins is an amateur.

Who cares?

>> Prerequisite #1 for ALL branches is licensure in the Amatuer Radio
>> Service.
>
>There's never been an exception?

Enough to completely ignore the fact that 99% of all MARS personnel are
licensed Amateurs? I hardly thionk so.

>> >ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
>> >Islands)
>>
>> Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.
>
>Correct. And you have your >>>FACTS<<< wrong.

Which ones, Brian?

YOUR experience in AMRS, please?

>MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>
>> Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide Coordinator

>for
>> Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.
>>
>> So there....Nyah.....
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Looks like the military wasted a lot of training on you if you cannot
>get even the most basic >>>FACT<<< right.
>
>Now just accept it so that Carl doesn't have to come on here spank you
>again.

Hardly, Brian.

So...You going to Dayton?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3139. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 23:04:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424190402.29909.00000355@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91203

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/24/2004 11:42 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404240842.6e08a93@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040423205352.11461.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
>> >MARS is military. Check out what the acronym means sometime.
>>
>> I know it quite well.
>>
>> Military AFFILIATE Radio System.
>>
>> That means licensed AMATEURS "affiliated" with that particular
>> MARS/military program.
>
>I am a leader in the BSA.

That's scary.

>When I am on my paying job, am I representing the BSA?

Who cares? You may. When I am on my paying job I occassionally get to
discuss CAP, Amateur Radio, EMS and several other "programs" I participate in.

Ergo, you MAY be "representing" BSA when you're on your "paying job"...

>When a volunteer is signing AFA3xx, is he or she representing the BSA,
>CSA, FFa or the PTA?

Could be.

>Nope. And neither are they representing the ARS or the ARRL.

Says you?

>> No Amateur Radio Operators = No MARS.
>
>Not true. Regulations change every day. The regulations will be
>changed to suit new conditions.

Perhaps.

But right now...today...what I stated is true.

TOMORROW they may require that I be wearing Avon when I operate and that I
hang from the shower curtain by my ankles.

But not today.

>MARS would have an easier training load by training people off the
>street rather than having to retrain a bunch of amateurs.
>
>> Unless you were assigned the responsibility of incorportating those
>assets
>> to your plan by higher headquarters, Brian. Are you stating for the record
>> that if you are tasked with such a requirement that you'd disobey lawful
>> orders?
>
>Comms was not my functional area, but weather comms were. But I will
>state for the record that I'd write anything into the plan or opord
>that hhq told me to - as long as it was a legal order.

Then you were not being honest with yourself or faithful to your sworn
oath. Yes, 99.999% of the time I am sure no one would ask you to write dumb
stuff.

>> No, I would not care to give you an "after action report", other than
>to
>> say I had a good time and a lot WAS learned/accomplished.
>
>Great! You accomplished WAS. Glad you had fun.

Huh...???

>> Unless, of course, you know of some secret DoD document that would
>deploy
>> Active Duty service persons to flesh out the MARS ranks if they all decided
>to
>> quit...?!?!
>
>I suspect that MARS, if need be, could find volunteers who didn't have
>amateur licenses. Isn't that what CAP does? Doesn't CAP use radios
>on military frequencies?

What CAP does today is irrelevent to the topic being discussed.

And I have proposed changes to the AFMARS system that would allow CAP
members who have completed "ACUT" (Advanced Communicator User Training) and who
have demonstrated competency to be allowed to enroll in AFMARS.

But that is NOT what the rules allow now, and what MIGHT happen in the
future is irrelevent NOW.

>MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>
>Best of Luck, and last this subject.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

And best of luck to you.

Steve, K4YZ

3140. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 23:06:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424190639.29909.00000356@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91204

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 4/24/2004 5:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040424185419.29909.00000354@mb-m07.aol.com>

> YOUR experience in AMRS, please?

My bust.

MARS. But I could ALSO ask what experience you have IN AMRS since it was
an Air Force program related to Amateur Radio.

Steve, K4YZ

3141. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 23:28:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040424192848.24684.00000265@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91205

>And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the Element 1
>test. But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams priveleges
>that they haven't been tested for.

Did anyone really think thats what they were for, next step give away licenses.
face it your dealing with KARL

3142. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-24 23:37:24 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <108luhkqrgbpra4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94D5732CBEA401234567890@216.196.97.136:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in news:108kvarng4b3uc1
> @corp.supernews.com:
>
>
>> If you're not George, then you must be an ano[nym]ous troll after all..
>> Well, thanks for clearing that up for us, shitbird. :P
>
> just like you ass monger
>

Ok, poopie-puppet geo. whatever you say.. lol

3143. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 01:32:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91207

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.

I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a free country. (In fact, I was confident that Carl (and a few other Leaders in several organizations including NCI) were forward looking enough to vigorously OPPOSE actions which tended to dilute the technical base of our hobby.)

But I have a real problem when the Leaders run a beauty-contest poll instead of making responsible decisions based on what's best for the Amateur Radio Service.

Asking the NCI membership, overwhelmingly Technicians, whether upgrading Technicians to General without testing is a good idea is pretty much akin to asking the cannibals of ZL whether the Christians should send more well-fattened missionaries. The answer is a foregone conclusion! Now they hide behind that "mandate" rather than taking a responsible stand against the "Great ARRL Giveaway".

In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class" license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven help us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3144. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 02:11:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <97Fic.8321$eZ5.7388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91208

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

|
| I think there are two sides to every coin .... and there are subtle,
yet
| important, differences between "leadership" and "representation."
|

There are important differences between "leadership" and
"representation" but they are NOT subtle!

"Representation" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is the most
popular based on the last poll, regardless if it's in our best
interest."

"Leadership" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is our best interest,
regardless how unpopular."

73, de Hans, K0HB

3145. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 02:21:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iJOcneVX4uBLvRbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91209

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040424184839.29909.00000353@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions ...
> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/24/2004 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <84zic.7802$eZ5.1705@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
> >"A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes
> >people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be."
> > ---R. S. Carter
>
> A different Carter (Jimmy, to be specific...) tried this. He wound
up
> gutting the intelligence community, tied our hands in covert operations,
ran
> the inflation rate into double digits, left us humilated in world opinion
for
> 444 days and got several of my friends killed.
>
> When I vote for someone, I expect he will represent the
majority...Not use
> his election as a license to do what HE wants to do despite guidance from
hbis
> constituents to the contrary.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve,

Thanks for speaking up for the responsibilities of elected representatives
to BE representative of their constituents rather than using their position
as a platform for their personal views.

I particularly appreciate you comment in light of the fact that I know you
don't agree with me (or NCI) on some of the issues.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3146. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 02:24:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <FpOcnX5jCtbovBbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91210

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:97Fic.8321$eZ5.7388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> |
> | I think there are two sides to every coin .... and there are subtle,
> yet
> | important, differences between "leadership" and "representation."
> |
>
> There are important differences between "leadership" and
> "representation" but they are NOT subtle!
>
> "Representation" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is the most
> popular based on the last poll, regardless if it's in our best
> interest."
>
> "Leadership" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is our best interest,
> regardless how unpopular."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I disagree. The differences are more subtle - and much less cynical - that
you state.

Carl - wk3c

3147. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 02:26:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <s5KcnV1mfJNjvBbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91211

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:afGdnTkpLZg4Sxfd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:BO%gc.3144$e4.1788@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >>
> >>|
> >>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> >>|
> >>
> >>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the squeaky
> >>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
> >>
> >>Cheers,
> >>de Hans, K0HB
> >>--
> >> SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
> >> FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
> >> NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/
> >
> >
> > Hans,
> >
> > Squeak away ... your are entitled to your opinion, even if it is in an
> > extreme minority amongst the membership -
>
> And Hans is no longer of any use to you and your agenda, eh?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

No, Mike, I never said that ...

AFAIK, Hans still supports the goal of NCI to eliminate Morse test
requirements.

And, as Hans himself has said, he has not been "excommunicated" from NCI for
having differing views on the other restructuring proposals than the
majority of the members ...

Carl - wk3c

3148. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 02:59:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MQFic.8398$eZ5.4355@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91212

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

```
|
| In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
| looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
| license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven
help
| us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!
|

On reflection, Mike, it seems there's some hope on this one. I found
this encouraging item:

> I agree with you that we should vigorously resist classes
> that legitimize "know-nothing appliance operator" status
> .. and any form of "type acceptance" as well ...
>
> 73,
> Carl - wa6vse
```

3149. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 03:25:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404241925.2e53193c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91213

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040424185419.29909.00000354@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/24/2004 11:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404240825.2bc961d0@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040423181830.22124.00000061@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >> >From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >> >Date: 4/23/2004 1:11 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <f%cic.6437$eZ5.5314@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
> >> Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >
> >Sorry Steve, but MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
> >
> >> With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to
> oversee
> >> the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are licensed
> >> Amateur Radio Operators.
> >
> >I don't believe that Ray Collins is an amateur.
>
> Who cares?

You do. You just said that, "With the exception of a very few Active
Duty personnel assigned to oversee the program, every single person in
all three branches of MARS are licensed Amateur Radio Operators."

Ray is neither Active Duty nor an Amateur Radio Operator. He is
merely the Chief of Air Force MARS.

> >> Prerequisite #1 for ALL branches is licensure in the Amatuer Radio
> >> Service.
> >
> >There's never been an exception?
>
> Enough to completely ignore the fact that 99% of all MARS personnel are
> licensed Amateurs? I hardly thionk so.

Now you're saying that 1% of all MARS personnel are not amateurs?

> >> >ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
> >> >Islands)

> >>
> >> Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.
> >
> >Correct. And you have your >>>FACTS<<< wrong.
>
> Which ones, Brian?

For starters, this one: "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio"."

> YOUR experience in AMRS, please?

I've never been in AMRS, or even in AMWAY.

I have been in AF MARS at two assignements; base support team at
Andersen AB in 1990-91, and Scott AFB 1993 - 1999. I did sign up for
Army Mars when I arrived in Korea in 1988, but didn't become active
with it.

> >MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
> >
> >> Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide Coordinator
> for
> >> Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.
> >>
> >> So there....Nyah.....
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Looks like the military wasted a lot of training on you if you cannot
> >get even the most basic >>>FACT<<< right.
> >
> >Now just accept it so that Carl doesn't have to come on here spank you
> >again.
>
> Hardly, Brian.
>
> So...You going to Dayton?

I have a scouting campout the weekend of the Hamvention.

3150. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 03:46:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404241946.1effa328@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91214

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<TaidnYhGTZZVRBfdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>...
>
> No, I think that NCI members have opinions about everything from
> antenna covenants to BPL threats to abortion to pledge of allegiance and
> on and on.
>
> I just don't see where they have relevance to what was *once* NCI's
> purpose - abolishment of Morse code testing as a requirement of licensing.

Again, I don't hear you complaining about FISTS stepping out of bounds.

> The instant upgrade of most amateurs to General is not related to code
> testing as far as I can see. And the unfairness to the people the "day
> after" that suddenly have to take a harder test.
>
> Perhaps NCI should poll it's members about gay marriage? ;^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Perhaps FISTS should.

3151. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 03:51:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WNednZEFCewjqBbdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91215

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
> | It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
> | premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
> | there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
>
> I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
> that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
> free country. (In fact, I was confident that Carl (and a few other
> Leaders in several organizations including NCI) were forward looking
> enough to vigorously OPPOSE actions which tended to dilute the technical
> base of our hobby.)

And once upon I time, we were told that they *did* oppose downgrading a test.

> But I have a real problem when the Leaders run a beauty-contest poll
> instead of making responsible decisions based on what's best for the
> Amateur Radio Service.

There is a widespread and horrible misconception that it is ALL about "the majority". I see it all the time. On many issues, a majority will suffice. But there are some things that speak to something higher.

Can a majority in a democracy vote to dissolve the democracy?

Many times the majority would vote to enact laws that are illegal or unconstitutional.

A leader that simply does what the majority of members or votes want is not a leader. He is an employee.

> Asking the NCI membership, overwhelmingly Technicians, whether upgrading
> Technicians to General without testing is a good idea is pretty much
> akin to asking the cannibals of ZL whether the Christians should send
> more well-fattened missionaries. The answer is a foregone conclusion!
> Now they hide behind that "mandate" rather than taking a responsible
> stand against the "Great ARRL Giveaway".
>
> In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
> looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
> license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven help

> us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!

Right, the employee thing again. When I have been in a leadership position, I have often polled the membership about their wishes. But it was always with letting them know that their opinion was taken under advisement.

Often we made our decisions with the desires of the majority as a guide. However, there were a few occasions that we did not, and for good reasons. There were even a couple times that I defied the board of directors on a voted issue. Each time I offered my resignation as the price of that defiance. Not once was it accepted, nor was my act of defiance overruled.

Of course it helped that in each case I was proven right in the end. But sometimes you just HAVE to do what is right if you are going to be a real leader. It is one hell of a lot harder than just "well this is what the majority wanted". But oh man, it feels a lot better.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3152. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:00:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VdOdncWXQ5lnqhbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91216

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040424184839.29909.00000353@mb-m07.aol.com...
>
>>>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>>>petitions ...
>>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>>Date: 4/24/2004 2:18 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <84zic.7802$eZ5.1705@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>
>>>"A leader takes people where they want to go. A great leader takes
>>>people where they don't necessarily want to go but ought to be."
>>> ---R. S. Carter
>>
>> A different Carter (Jimmy, to be specific...) tried this. He wound
>
> up
>
>>gutting the intelligence community, tied our hands in covert operations,
>
> ran
>
>>the inflation rate into double digits, left us humilated in world opinion
>
> for
>
>>444 days and got several of my friends killed.
>>
>> When I vote for someone, I expect he will represent the
>
> majority...Not use
>
>>his election as a license to do what HE wants to do despite guidance from
>
> hbis
>
>>constituents to the contrary.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Steve,

>
> Thanks for speaking up for the responsibilities of elected representatives
> to BE representative of their constituents rather than using their position
> as a platform for their personal views.
>
> I particularly appreciate you comment in light of the fact that I know you
> don't agree with me (or NCI) on some of the issues.

If that is how it is, The officials should be hired as employees, and
vetted for compliance and obedience. Why elect anyone. Simply poll the
constituants, and do exactly what the majority asks.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3153. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:02:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VdOdncSXQ5nTpRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91217

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:97Fic.8321$eZ5.7388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>|
>>| I think there are two sides to every coin .... and there are subtle,
>>yet
>>| important, differences between "leadership" and "representation."
>>|
>>
>>There are important differences between "leadership" and
>>"representation" but they are NOT subtle!
>>
>>"Representation" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is the most
>>popular based on the last poll, regardless if it's in our best
>>interest."
>>
>>"Leadership" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is our best interest,
>>regardless how unpopular."
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
> Hans,
>
> I disagree. The differences are more subtle - and much less cynical - that
> you state.

Would you do whatever your constituants asked, as long as it was a
majority opinion?

Even if you knew it was wrong?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3154. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:14:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <PLGcnUNF9ZX5phbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91218

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:o-ednXhb9Y_2ShfdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>Kï¿½HB wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > >>>
> > >>>|
> > >>>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> > >>>|
> > >>>
> > >>>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the
squeaky
> > >>>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
> > >>
> > >>And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy
> > >
> > >
> > > Mike,
> > >
> > > I respectfully disagree with your assertion ... the whole reason NCI
> > > surveyed US members on the issues involved in the ARRL and NCVEC
petitions
> > > was so that we would know their wishes and act in a representative
manner.
>
> And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the Element 1
> test.

NCI's *primary* goal is the elimination of Morse testing.

However, the NCI Bylaws, as Rick, W7RT, pointed out, contemplate and allow
for NCI to comment from time to time on issues that would have an effect on
at least a significant part of the membership.

Since the ARRL petition would have an effect on the structure of amateur classes and privileges (both code-related and not) that will likely last for at least a decade (we don't envision the FCC considering major changes for about that long after a major restructuring), the Board felt it necessary to ask the membership for their views.

First we asked, "Should NCI comment on the issues in the ARRL petition other than the code test issue?"
Then, we asked for comment on the other issues point by point.

> But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams priveleges
> that they haven't been tested for.

As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only practical way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had evolved over the years.

And, as a number of experienced, yet realistic, hams have pointed out, the amount and level of material in the 200-ish page "Now you're talking!" study guide (and on the Tech test) is not all that different from the old General that I took at the FCC's old Long Beach, CA office over 25 years ago.

The fact is that many people mis-remember the tests they took many years ago as being harder than they really were ... I guess that's human nature ... after you get used to something it seems easier (and correspondingly the beginning stages are remembered as harder).

> And there is still that nasty "day after" thing, when th eetsting
> regimin goes up again..... or does it?

The testing regieme doesn't *have* to "go up again" ... NOBODY has proposed that the testing regieme be changed ... only that, in the interest of "nobody loses privileges" (which was a DISASTER in the past), that there be a one-time "adjustment" to make everyone fit the new structure without losing ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

3155. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:35:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <l6ycnaNW_fDZ3RbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91219

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:VdOdncSXQ5nTpRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:97Fic.8321$eZ5.7388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> >>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> >>
> >>|
> >>| I think there are two sides to every coin .... and there are subtle,
> >>yet
> >>| important, differences between "leadership" and "representation."
> >>|
> >>
> >>There are important differences between "leadership" and
> >>"representation" but they are NOT subtle!
> >>
> >>"Representation" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is the most
> >>popular based on the last poll, regardless if it's in our best
> >>interest."
> >>
> >>"Leadership" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is our best interest,
> >>regardless how unpopular."
> >>
> >>73, de Hans, K0HB
> >>
> >
> >
> > Hans,
> >
> > I disagree. The differences are more subtle - and much less cynical -
that
> > you state.
>
>
> Would you do whatever your constituants asked, as long as it was a
> majority opinion?
>
> Even if you knew it was wrong?
```

Mike,

If it was morally wrong (like killing, etc.) or illegal, no ... of course not.

But the ARRL proposals don't fall into either category, nor do the NCVEC proposals.

NCI's comments state *what our members said they think about the ARRL and NCVEC proposals* ... with the percentages from the surveys.

I believe the surveys were scientifically and statistically sound (and secure):
the response rate was just over 50% - exceptionally good for surveys by virtually any standard
each respondent had an individually assigned unique password, that was sent to them by e-mail (by a "merge" from the member database)
then they were sent an "invitation" from the survey site (same mailing list used) with a unique URL corresponding to their invitation/password
the survey site only allows one response per respondent (and tracks IP addresses to make it easy to do a quick check to see if someone is trying to hack it to "stack the deck"), etc.

So, what is "wrong" with NCI telling the FCC what its members said they think about the ARRL and NCVEC petitions?

Carl - wk3c

3156. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:51:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AtHic.8550$eZ5.1595@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91220

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

|
| As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only
practical
| way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had
evolved
| over the years.
|

It's instructive to note that ARRL and NCI, (not FCC) are characterizing the license structure as "overly complicated". With only modest changes, this structure has been extant since 1951, before the age of computerized record keeping and modern database. How come it's suddenly "overly complicated"?

But >>suppose<< for the moment that it IS overly complicated and needs reform... to use a term from another NCI Director, do we need to be "hellbent" to do it in one swell foop? I recall a proposal by one WA6VSE a few years back that would have transformed the structure from it's present state into a 2-class structure in as little as 5 years, with no free passes and with nobody being stripped of privileges. The details escape me, but I'm sure we could Google it up and have a look.

Or if the administrative burden isn't really at FCC but at the VEC's like ARRL and W5YI, well there's another proposal floating about which would overnight limit their testing burden to just two classes. No Morse test to give, and only two written tests. Again, not a soul would get a free pass and not a soul would be stripped of any privilege they now enjoy. You can view that proposal at http://tinyurl.com/wce9

| And, as a number of experienced, yet realistic, hams have pointed out,
the
| amount and level of material in the 200-ish page "Now you're talking!"
study
| guide (and on the Tech test) is not all that different from the old
General
| that I took at the FCC's old Long Beach, CA office over 25 years ago.

We're not talking about 25-years ago. We're talking about today.

>Today< an applicant needs to pass a single 35 question exam to acquire a Technician license.
>Today< an applicant needs to pass a second 35 question exam (which contains material not tested in the Technician exam) to acquire a General license.

The ARRL proposal to waive the second examination for all todays Technicains (about a third of a million) effectively states that todays Technican exam is perfectly adequate for General class privileges. If that is true, then ipso facto we can make the case that forevermore the exam for General need be no more technically demanding than todays fall-off-a-log-easy entry level Technician exam.

Now you and Ed Hare at ARRL can spin-doctor all you wish, but reality doesn't care what you believe.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3157. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 04:58:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iaicnXiuA4sy2BbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91221

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MQFic.8398$eZ5.4355@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> |
> | In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
> | looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
> | license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven
> help
> | us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!
> |
>
> On reflection, Mike, it seems there's some hope on this one. I found
> this encouraging item:
>
> > I agree with you that we should vigorously resist classes
> > that legitimize "know-nothing appliance operator" status
> > .. and any form of "type acceptance" as well ...
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wa6vse

And, Hans, I don't believe that the ARRL proposals do anything of the sort ... what they propose is a novice test that is more like the novice test of old than today's (more difficult) Tech test as the "entry point" - and to give the holders of that license enough privileges (access to HF) to allow them to be "mainstreamed" and "get a taste of what 'real ham radio' is like," so they'll remain interested and have an incentive to learn and upgrade, rather than becoming bored and dropping out. (I would find it boring if I lived in a place where there were few hams, fewer repeaters, etc. - basically nobody to talk to - and I was restricted to VHF/UHF.)

There is no proposal to reduce the level of difficulty or comprehensiveness of the General or Extra tests.

A majority of NCI's members opposed the NCVEC proposals for "commercial gear only" and "low (<=30V) finals only" for beginners, so it appears that they want (or, more accurately, want beginners to have) the freedom to experiment and tinker - as well as the opportunity to be able to pick up that "first HF rig" as a hamfest special (maybe even a "fixer-upper") that's older, cheaper, and has tube finals ... (and I would have concerns that a "commercial only" limitation could eventually lead to "type acceptance" requirements - which would drive up the cost of gear considerably)

While my personal comments supported the ARRL proposals (except, of course, for the "keep the code test for Extra" part), I also in my *personal* comments opposed those NCVEC proposals ... but if NCI's membership had "voted" the other way in the survey, NCI's comments would have reported the numbers accurately even though *I* would have disagreed.

There is a misperception that NCI members are all "newcomers who want something for nothing" ... in actuallity, I think many, if not most, readers here will be surprised to know the breakdown of how long the NCI members who responded to the survey have been licensed:

Not licensed yet 1.3%
0-1 years 4.7%
1-2 years 7.6%
2-5 years 22.3%
5-10 years 23.6%
10-20 years 30.3%
> 20 years 10.3%

So, over 40% have been licensed for over 10 years, and just barely shy of 2/3 have been licensed for more than 5 years ... with another 22% between 2 and 5 years.

So you can see that we're not exactly "over-run with newbies wanting a freebie ..."

73,
Carl - wk3c

3158. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 05:15:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <SaqcnR2Lcokj1BbdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91222

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WNednZEFCewjqBbdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>
> There is a widespread and horrible misconception that it is ALL about
> "the majority". I see it all the time. On many issues, a majority will
> suffice. But there are some things that speak to something higher.
>
> Can a majority in a democracy vote to dissolve the democracy?

Perhaps ... in the US system it would require a Constitutional amendment and would probably end up being reviewed by the Supreme Court.

> Many times the majority would vote to enact laws that are illegal or
> unconstitutional.

And many times elected officials that "do their own thing" with little regard for their constituent's views vote to enact laws that would trod on the rights and/or sensibilities of their constitutents ... that's another reason we have "checks and balances" like the Supreme Court.

NCI's Board of Directors are like the legislature in a way - elected representatives - NOT the Supreme Court.

> [snip] When I have been in a leadership
> position, I have often polled the membership about their wishes. But it
> was always with letting them know that their opinion was taken under
> advisement.
>
> Often we made our decisions with the desires of the majority as a
> guide. However, there were a few occasions that we did not, and for good
> reasons.

If it were morally wrong, or illegal, that's one thing ... but NCI's Board of Directors debated the issues and, while there was not 100% agreeement on our personal views we agreed that we should represent our members' views to the FCC and that we could each file our personal comments to voice our personal views.

> There were even a couple times that I defied the board of
> directors on a voted issue. Each time I offered my resignation as the
> price of that defiance. Not once was it accepted, nor was my act of
> defiance overruled.

So your colleagues on that board "gave you a pass" ... how cute.

If I violated my obligations/authority I would expect to be removed from office ... and I would move to remove from office any of my colleagues on the NCI Board of Directors if they violated their obligations/authority.

> Of course it helped that in each case I was proven right in the end.
> But sometimes you just HAVE to do what is right if you are going to be a
> real leader. It is one hell of a lot harder than just "well this is what
> the majority wanted". But oh man, it feels a lot better.

Again ... please note that NCI's comments report what the membership said in the survey (and that these are just initial comments on 4 of 18 outstanding post-WRC-03 petitions - the "main event" will be when the FCC digests those 18 petitions and all of the comments on them and comes out with a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. I fully expect that NCI will use the services of the survey service again to gather member input on the NPRM ...

Also ... I know that at least some of the ARRL Directors want to know what the majority of their constituents feel on the issues ... and try to vote in a way that represents their constituents.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3159. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 09:10:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425051006.10326.00000222@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 91223

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/24/2004 9:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <97Fic.8321$eZ5.7388@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>"Leadership" says "Elect me and I will do whatever is our best interest,
>regardless how unpopular."

Hmmmmmm.....Sound's like a former eleceted official's "Silent Majority"
ploy, Hans...

Your suggestion of what "leadership" is is an open invitation to do what
"he" wants as opposed to what THEY want!

Steve, K4YZ

3160. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 09:14:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425051424.10326.00000223@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 91224

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 4/24/2004 11:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <VdOdncWXQ5lnqhbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>> I particularly appreciate you comment in light of the fact that I know you
>> don't agree with me (or NCI) on some of the issues.
>
> If that is how it is, The officials should be hired as employees, and
>vetted for compliance and obedience. Why elect anyone. Simply poll the
>constituants, and do exactly what the majority asks.

I see your point, Mike, however in 85% of the cases the elected
representitives are supposed to be doing JUST that..."representing".

Yes, I know there are those times when they must act without taking the
time to get the "pulse" of what thier constituents want...Like responding to an
attack. In those cases I EXPECT them to not wait around. Otherwise, there's
very little reason for them to NOT be able to take SOME time to work with the
constituency.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3161. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 12:49:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040425084936.11088.00000312@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 91225

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
>| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
>| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
>
>I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
>that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
>free country.

But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element 1 gets involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses the "membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception. Particularly when the number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.

>(In fact, I was confident that Carl (and a few other
>Leaders in several organizations including NCI) were forward looking
>enough to vigorously OPPOSE actions which tended to dilute the technical
>base of our hobby.)
>
You mean like when they opposed setting aside 300 kHz of 2 meters for modes with bandwidth of less than 3 kHz?

>But I have a real problem when the Leaders run a beauty-contest poll
>instead of making responsible decisions based on what's best for the
>Amateur Radio Service.

Considering how ARRL has been criticized for doing just that....
>
>Asking the NCI membership, overwhelmingly Technicians, whether upgrading
>Technicians to General without testing is a good idea is pretty much
>akin to asking the cannibals of ZL whether the Christians should send
>more well-fattened missionaries. The answer is a foregone conclusion!
>Now they hide behind that "mandate" rather than taking a responsible
>stand against the "Great ARRL Giveaway".
>

Of course.

Now imagine that someone polled all US hams about whether or not Element 1 would remain for an HF amateur license. And imagine that the answer was a resounding "YES!".

Would that result be used by NCI?

>In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
>looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
>license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven help
>us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!

Exactly.

And recall that I was admonished here for discussing certain subjects. Now a variation on those subjects/discussions has become an RM - and NCI *supports* it!

Surreal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3162. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:01:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <6xPic.1690$g31.1128@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91226

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:SaqcnR2Lcokj1BbdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WNednZEFCewjqBbdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
> >
> > There is a widespread and horrible misconception that it is ALL about
> > "the majority". I see it all the time. On many issues, a majority will
> > suffice. But there are some things that speak to something higher.
> >
> > Can a majority in a democracy vote to dissolve the democracy?
>
> Perhaps ... in the US system it would require a Constitutional amendment
and
> would probably end up being reviewed by the Supreme Court.

Note, however, that a
properly passed constitutional amendment is, by its own existence,
constitutional.

> > Many times the majority would vote to enact laws that are illegal or
> > unconstitutional.

> And many times elected officials that "do their own thing" with little
> regard for their constituent's views vote to enact laws that would trod on
> the rights and/or sensibilities of their constitutents ... that's another
> reason we have "checks and balances" like the Supreme Court.
>
> NCI's Board of Directors are like the legislature in a way - elected
> representatives - NOT the Supreme Court.
>
> > [snip] When I have been in a leadership
> > position, I have often polled the membership about their wishes. But it
> > was always with letting them know that their opinion was taken under
> > advisement.
> >
> > Often we made our decisions with the desires of the majority as a
> > guide. However, there were a few occasions that we did not, and for good
> > reasons.
>
> If it were morally wrong, or illegal, that's one thing ... but NCI's Board
> of Directors debated the issues and, while there was not 100% agreeement
on
> our personal views we agreed that we should represent our members' views

to
> the FCC and that we could each file our personal comments to voice our
> personal views.

And, like Carl, I 'personally' filed comments supporting the ARRL
petition except for code testing. I supported NCVEC where it
is the same as ARRL, where it ends all code testing...but I
opposed NCVEC on the other points. Cleraly I differ with the
NCI membership on several points as does Carl...and have made
my own comment filing on both petitions.

> > There were even a couple times that I defied the board of
> > directors on a voted issue. Each time I offered my resignation as the
> > price of that defiance. Not once was it accepted, nor was my act of
> > defiance overruled.
>
> So your colleagues on that board "gave you a pass" ... how cute.

No pass at all. Just agreement to disagree on a point. That
goes on everywhere in government, organizations, clubs, etc.

> If I violated my obligations/authority I would expect to be removed from
> office ... and I would move to remove from office any of my colleagues on
> the NCI Board of Directors if they violated their obligations/authority.

And we have never encountered such a need in NCI.

> > Of course it helped that in each case I was proven right in the end.
> > But sometimes you just HAVE to do what is right if you are going to be a
> > real leader. It is one hell of a lot harder than just "well this is what
> > the majority wanted". But oh man, it feels a lot better.
>
> Again ... please note that NCI's comments report what the membership said
in
> the survey (and that these are just initial comments on 4 of 18
outstanding
> post-WRC-03 petitions - the "main event" will be when the FCC digests
those
> 18 petitions and all of the comments on them and comes out with a Notice
of
> Proposed Rulemaking. I fully expect that NCI will use the services of the
> survey service again to gather member input on the NPRM ...
>
> Also ... I know that at least some of the ARRL Directors want to know what
> the majority of their constituents feel on the issues ... and try to vote
in
> a way that represents their constituents.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3163. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:06:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2fGdnWm_Dt5pWBbdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91227

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WNednZEFCewjqBbdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>There is a widespread and horrible misconception that it is ALL about
>>"the majority". I see it all the time. On many issues, a majority will
>>suffice. But there are some things that speak to something higher.
>>
>>Can a majority in a democracy vote to dissolve the democracy?
>
>
> Perhaps ... in the US system it would require a Constitutional amendment and
> would probably end up being reviewed by the Supreme Court.

(shudder)

>
>>Many times the majority would vote to enact laws that are illegal or
>>unconstitutional.
>
>
> And many times elected officials that "do their own thing" with little
> regard for their constituent's views vote to enact laws that would trod on
> the rights and/or sensibilities of their constitutents ... that's another
> reason we have "checks and balances" like the Supreme Court.
>
> NCI's Board of Directors are like the legislature in a way - elected
> representatives - NOT the Supreme Court.
>
>
>>[snip] When I have been in a leadership
>>position, I have often polled the membership about their wishes. But it
>>was always with letting them know that their opinion was taken under
>>advisement.
>>
>>Often we made our decisions with the desires of the majority as a
>>guide. However, there were a few occasions that we did not, and for good
>>reasons.
>
>
> If it were morally wrong, or illegal, that's one thing ... but NCI's Board
> of Directors debated the issues and, while there was not 100% agreeement on
> our personal views we agreed that we should represent our members' views to

> the FCC and that we could each file our personal comments to voice our
> personal views.
>
>
>>There were even a couple times that I defied the board of
>>directors on a voted issue. Each time I offered my resignation as the
>>price of that defiance. Not once was it accepted, nor was my act of
>>defiance overruled.
>
>
> So your colleagues on that board "gave you a pass" ... how cute.

If you want to know the details, I was darn near lynched by 4 entire teams parents after a controversial decision by the Board of Directors. This was just about half the entire league and 100 percent of the affected teams. They were going to walk, and that would have wrecked the league. And it was no idle threat. The BOD decision had eliminated half the games they would play, and no reduction of fees.

Quick! What would you do? Do you wreck your league by sticking to the BOD decision, or do you defy it and not lose almost half your teams, which in this case was effectively all the teams, due to league play regulations. My decision was to reverse the BOD's decision, get the parents back in the fold, and quite possibly sacrifice myself in the process.

I can assure you that the situation was neither cute, nor charming. At the time, I was thankful for my formidable physical presence!

It could even be argued that I was listening to my constituents. Even though it was less than half the league, it was 100 percent of the people affected by the decision. But now, who's the majority in that case?

> If I violated my obligations/authority I would expect to be removed from
> office ...

I did. I was willing to accept that.

> and I would move to remove from office any of my colleagues on
> the NCI Board of Directors if they violated their obligations/authority.

A soon as the rest of the BOD saw what happened, they realized their mistake. Most were in fact grateful that I saved their collective kiesters.

So while people can pontificate on constituents and majorities and "What You Have To Do", my experience shows that it *isn't that simple*. Hopefully you won't find yourself in a similar situation. You might find it easier to hide behind the "decision". At least that way you can say "It wasn't my fault".

But we still digress here. My main point in all this is that it seems to me that NCI is growing out if it's previous self defined interest.

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

3164. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:18:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <cdGdnV41TaMnVRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91228

N2EY wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>>petitions ...
>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>>Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
>>| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
>>| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
>>
>>I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
>>that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
>>free country.
>
>
> But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element 1 gets
> involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses the
> "membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception. Particularly when the
> number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.

And that has really been my bone with the whole process here, Jim.
We're told that they are only here to eliminate Code testing. Now it has
branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.

All this makes for a marked lack of credibility.

>>(In fact, I was confident that Carl (and a few other
>>Leaders in several organizations including NCI) were forward looking
>>enough to vigorously OPPOSE actions which tended to dilute the technical
>>base of our hobby.)
>>
>
> You mean like when they opposed setting aside 300 kHz of 2 meters for modes
> with bandwidth of less than 3 kHz?
>

>
>>But I have a real problem when the Leaders run a beauty-contest poll
>>instead of making responsible decisions based on what's best for the
>>Amateur Radio Service.
>
>
> Considering how ARRL has been criticized for doing just that....
>
>>Asking the NCI membership, overwhelmingly Technicians, whether upgrading
>>Technicians to General without testing is a good idea is pretty much
>>akin to asking the cannibals of ZL whether the Christians should send
>>more well-fattened missionaries. The answer is a foregone conclusion!
>>Now they hide behind that "mandate" rather than taking a responsible
>>stand against the "Great ARRL Giveaway".
>>
>
> Of course.
>
> Now imagine that someone polled all US hams about whether or not Element 1
> would remain for an HF amateur license. And imagine that the answer was a
> resounding "YES!".
>
> Would that result be used by NCI?

>
>>In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
>>looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
>>license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven help
>>us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!
>
>
> Exactly.
>
> And recall that I was admonished here for discussing certain subjects. Now a
> variation on those subjects/discussions has become an RM - and NCI *supports*
> it!

That is because you were tipping their hand Jim!

> Surreal.

How about this:

Certain people want to get rid of code testing so badly that they are
willing to do whatever necessary to do this.

Their constituency is largely in the group that will be positively
affected in the free upgrade, or "one time adjustment" if you prefer the
spun version.

Say anything do anything in support of your goal. Truth is so
subjective anyhow.

And now it isn't so surreal, is it?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3165. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:25:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425102532.19729.00000321@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91229

>But we still digress here. My main point in all this is that it seems
>to me that NCI is growing out if it's previous self defined interest.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

And you think this is sometthing NEW for NCI? Whats even funnier is that some NCI Members are starting to cry about things that are happening. NCI MEMBERS stop your BITCHING AND WHINNING, you got what you wanted, more DUMBING DOWN.

3166. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:38:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425103800.15096.00000297@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91230

>We're told that they are only here to eliminate Code testing.

And you actually Believed KARL and the other Knuckle Draggers?

>We are toled that on a
>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
>exams"

I cant believe you guys bought that line of BS.

>All this makes for a marked lack of credibility.
>

There was never any credibility

>Their constituency is largely in the group that will be positively
>affected in the free upgrade, or "one time adjustment" if you prefer the
>spun version.

This has been there main goal all along. Hell most of them cant PASS the
written, let alone CW.
The next move is the good one, if they get there FREE HANDOUTS. Then there is
no reason for a GROUP not to pettion the FCC on behalf of the General
population, and DEMAND that all TESTS be reduced to the LEVEL of the NO-CODE.
If the No-Code Testing is good enough for the present then there is no reason
it shouldnt be good enough for the future. And I will bet you the FCC will go
along with it.

3167. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:41:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <etWdnZnaYpm-UxbdRVn-ig@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91231

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:o-ednXhb9Y_2ShfdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>|
>>>>>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
>>>>>|
>>>>>
>>>>>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the
>
> squeaky
>
>>>>>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
>>>>
>>>>And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy
>>>
>>>
>>>Mike,
>>>
>>>I respectfully disagree with your assertion ... the whole reason NCI
>>>surveyed US members on the issues involved in the ARRL and NCVEC
>
> petitions
>
>>>was so that we would know their wishes and act in a representative
>

> manner.
>
>>And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the Element 1
>>test.
>
>
> NCI's *primary* goal is the elimination of Morse testing.
>
> However, the NCI Bylaws, as Rick, W7RT, pointed out, contemplate and allow
> for NCI to comment from time to time on issues that would have an effect on
> at least a significant part of the membership.

> Since the ARRL petition would have an effect on the structure of amateur
> classes and privileges (both code-related and not) that will likely last for
> at least a decade (we don't envision the FCC considering major changes for
> about that long after a major restructuring), the Board felt it necessary to
> ask the membership for their views.
>
> First we asked, "Should NCI comment on the issues in the ARRL petition other
> than the code test issue?"
> Then, we asked for comment on the other issues point by point.
>
>
>>But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams priveleges
>>that they haven't been tested for.
>
>
> As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only practical
> way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had evolved
> over the years.
>
> And, as a number of experienced, yet realistic, hams have pointed out, the
> amount and level of material in the 200-ish page "Now you're talking!" study
> guide (and on the Tech test) is not all that different from the old General
> that I took at the FCC's old Long Beach, CA office over 25 years ago.
>
> The fact is that many people mis-remember the tests they took many years ago
> as being harder than they really were ... I guess that's human nature ...
> after you get used to something it seems easier (and correspondingly the
> beginning stages are remembered as harder).

I took the modern tests, from Technician to Extra.

Technician October 1999
General June 2001
Extra Feb 2002

All were at just about the correct level for the privileges conferred,
IMO. I don't think the Technician test is proper preparation for the
General class license.

>
>>And there is still that nasty "day after" thing, when th eetsting
>>regimin goes up again..... or does it?
>
>
> The testing regieme doesn't *have* to "go up again" ... NOBODY has proposed
> that the testing regieme be changed ... only that, in the interest of
> "nobody loses privileges" (which was a DISASTER in the past), that there be
> a one-time "adjustment" to make everyone fit the new structure without
> losing ...

But there is the problem. You either choose to believe (or simply don't care) that the person that takes and passes a Technician test one day before "the adjustment" is not treated differently by the testing process than the person that takes the general test the day after "the adjustment".

While people are grousing about how HARD those tests are, I look at it as giving a royal shaft to the technicians upgraded in this proposal.

It makes for a little awkwardness at the Extra level afterwards, as they will not have taken a General element test.

I know that it's all about getting maximum benefits for minimum input these days, but if a prospective ham asked me, I would suggest that they wait until after "the one time adjustment" to get their license, unless they wanted to go through the ranks quickly and get at least General before the "one time adjustment. Learning and testing is not a bad thing, IMO.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3168. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:41:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <H6Qic.1733$g31.796@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91232

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040425084936.11088.00000312@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions ...
> >From: "K&#65533;HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >
> >
> >| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
> >| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
> >| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
> >
> >I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
> >that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
> >free country.
>
> But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element 1
gets
> involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses the
> "membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception.

You are free to take whatever exception you want.

> Particularly when the
> number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.

There is NO obligation for NCI to publish that data...as you well know.

> >(In fact, I was confident that Carl (and a few other
> >Leaders in several organizations including NCI) were forward looking
> >enough to vigorously OPPOSE actions which tended to dilute the technical
> >base of our hobby.)
> >
> You mean like when they opposed setting aside 300 kHz of 2 meters for
modes
> with bandwidth of less than 3 kHz?
>
> >But I have a real problem when the Leaders run a beauty-contest poll
> >instead of making responsible decisions based on what's best for the
> >Amateur Radio Service.

>
> Considering how ARRL has been criticized for doing just that....

Politics 101: You can't please all the people (or members) all
the time.

> >Asking the NCI membership, overwhelmingly Technicians, whether upgrading
> >Technicians to General without testing is a good idea is pretty much
> >akin to asking the cannibals of ZL whether the Christians should send
> >more well-fattened missionaries. The answer is a foregone conclusion!
> >Now they hide behind that "mandate" rather than taking a responsible
> >stand against the "Great ARRL Giveaway".
> >
> Of course.
>
> Now imagine that someone polled all US hams about whether or not Element 1
> would remain for an HF amateur license. And imagine that the answer was a
> resounding "YES!".
>
> Would that result be used by NCI?

Hypothetical silliness again. I have no time to
discuss that which will never happen.

> >In addition to this ill-conceived notion of free upgrades, we have
> >looming another proposal for what amounts to an "Applicance Class"
> >license. NCI has polled it's members on that gem also, and heaven help
> >us if I'm again a "stark minority" in opposition!
>
> Exactly.
>
> And recall that I was admonished here for discussing certain subjects. Now
a
> variation on those subjects/discussions has become an RM - and NCI
supports
> it!

What aspect/variation are you talking about?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3169. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 14:50:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2rqdndQMKY3ZTRbdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91233

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message

>>
>>So your colleagues on that board "gave you a pass" ... how cute.
>
>
> No pass at all. Just agreement to disagree on a point. That
> goes on everywhere in government, organizations, clubs, etc.

Quick comment, Bill. In the context of what Carl and I were discussing, they pretty much did give me a pass. I deliberately defied a board decision (the background is in another post I just made) for the good of the league, and our groups very existence. I fully expected to be removed from my position.
But as I noted in the post, in the end, most were very grateful I did what I did, as they concluded that thier ruling that I defied was likely a fatal mistake.

- Mike KB3EIA

3170. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 15:02:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425110243.17474.00000334@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 91234

>There is NO obligation for NCI to publish that data...as you well know.
>

Of course not, your group doesnt want anyone to know hnow small your org is.

>Politics 101: You can't please all the people (or members) all
>the time.

And everyone knows how Lies are part of politics.

>Hypothetical silliness again. I have no time to
>discuss that which will never happen.

Just like, we will never support Dumbing Down of the Written

3171. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 15:17:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404250717.1f389b71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91235

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040424190402.29909.00000355@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/24/2004 11:42 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404240842.6e08a93@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040423205352.11461.00000181@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >
> >> >MARS is military. Check out what the acronym means sometime.
> >>
> >> I know it quite well.
> >>
> >> Military AFFILIATE Radio System.
> >>
> >> That means licensed AMATEURS "affiliated" with that particular
> >> MARS/military program.
> >
> >I am a leader in the BSA.
>
> That's scary.
>
> >When I am on my paying job, am I representing the BSA?
>
> Who cares? You may. When I am on my paying job I occassionally get to
> discuss CAP, Amateur Radio, EMS and several other "programs" I participate in.
>
> Ergo, you MAY be "representing" BSA when you're on your "paying job"...
>
> >When a volunteer is signing AFA3xx, is he or she representing the BSA,
> >CSA, FFa or the PTA?
>
> Could be.
>
> >Nope. And neither are they representing the ARS or the ARRL.
>
> Says you?

You need to learn to compartmentalize your activities.

> >> No Amateur Radio Operators = No MARS.
> >
> >Not true. Regulations change every day. The regulations will be
> >changed to suit new conditions.

>
> Perhaps.
>
> But right now...today...what I stated is true.

Nope, you're "FACTS" are moving targets. You've already backtracked
on your original statement and now say that 1% of MARS personnel are
not Amateurs.

> TOMORROW they may require that I be wearing Avon when I operate and that I
> hang from the shower curtain by my ankles.
>
> But not today.

They won't. Trust me.

Try to stay away from extremes.

> >MARS would have an easier training load by training people off the
> >street rather than having to retrain a bunch of amateurs.
> >
> >> Unless you were assigned the responsibility of incorportating those
> assets
> >> to your plan by higher headquarters, Brian. Are you stating for the record
> >> that if you are tasked with such a requirement that you'd disobey lawful
> >> orders?
> >
> >Comms was not my functional area, but weather comms were. But I will
> >state for the record that I'd write anything into the plan or opord
> >that hhq told me to - as long as it was a legal order.
>
> Then you were not being honest with yourself or faithful to your sworn
> oath.

How am I not being honest?

> Yes, 99.999% of the time I am sure no one would ask you to write dumb
> stuff.

Lots of dumb stuff is written here. Arguing minutia over and over and
over is what Carl commented on.

> >> No, I would not care to give you an "after action report", other than
> to
> >> say I had a good time and a lot WAS learned/accomplished.
> >
> >Great! You accomplished WAS. Glad you had fun.
>
> Huh...???
>
> >> Unless, of course, you know of some secret DoD document that would
> deploy
> >> Active Duty service persons to flesh out the MARS ranks if they all decided

> to
> >> quit...?!?!
> >
> >I suspect that MARS, if need be, could find volunteers who didn't have
> >amateur licenses. Isn't that what CAP does? Doesn't CAP use radios
> >on military frequencies?
>
> What CAP does today is irrelevent to the topic being discussed.

Yes, it is. The USAF has set a precedent that they don't require
amateur volunteers to operate radios on military frequencies. Do you
disagree?

> And I have proposed changes to the AFMARS system that would allow CAP
> members who have completed "ACUT" (Advanced Communicator User Training) and who
> have demonstrated competency to be allowed to enroll in AFMARS.

Hopefully you didn't include Avon products and hanging upside down
from the shower rod in your proposal.

Now please allow me to have an opinion.

You have a CAP volunteer who now wants to add AFMARS volunteer to
his/her credentials. Then the big disaster occurs and CAP calls him
up for duty. Then AFMARS calls him up for duty. Then RACES calls him
up for duty. Then the ARC calls him up for duty. Then the ER calls
him up for duty. Then home calls and say they need him there.

Choose one (1) emergency service to volunteer for and do it well.
When work calls and says they need you there, you go to work. When
home calls and says they need you there, you go home.

I think some people collect volunteer credentials like some people
collect 10-10 numbers.

> But that is NOT what the rules allow now, and what MIGHT happen in the
> future is irrelevent NOW.

If future rules are irrelevant, why do you propose changes?

> >MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
> >
> >Best of Luck, and last this subject.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

> And best of luck to you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

3172. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 15:24:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <oKQic.21619$t26.5688978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91236

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
> Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

We'd find out if we could have a very fine vote...all 680K U.S. licensed
ARO's AND those who are interested in becoming a licensed U.S. AR.

Vy 73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384
*Proudly applied for first award, KMPW (1000 Miles Per Watt) for LI, NY to
Kilauea. HI or 5053 miles with 5 Watts. :-)

3173. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 15:36:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <VVQic.10698$gH6.10328@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91237

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:etWdnZnaYpm-UxbdRVn-ig@adelphia.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:o-ednXhb9Y_2ShfdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:WcCdnQjV8OfdDRndRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>K&#65533;HB wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >>>>>
> >>>>>|
> >>>>>| You are ONE member. You did take the survey I presume?
> >>>>>|
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Indeed I did. And now I'm exercising my perogative to being the
> >
> > squeaky
> >
> >>>>>wheel. Ain't democracy a damned fine thing!
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Just so that you don't mind being a very small minority.
> >>>>
> >>>>And remember, NCI isn't anywhere close to a Democracy
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Mike,
> >>>
> >>>I respectfully disagree with your assertion ... the whole reason NCI
> >>>surveyed US members on the issues involved in the ARRL and NCVEC
> >
> > petitions

> >
> >>>was so that we would know their wishes and act in a representative
> >
> > manner.
> >
> >>And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the Element 1
> >>test.
> >
> >
> > NCI's *primary* goal is the elimination of Morse testing.
> >
> > However, the NCI Bylaws, as Rick, W7RT, pointed out, contemplate and
allow
> > for NCI to comment from time to time on issues that would have an effect
on
> > at least a significant part of the membership.
>
> > Since the ARRL petition would have an effect on the structure of amateur
> > classes and privileges (both code-related and not) that will likely last
for
> > at least a decade (we don't envision the FCC considering major changes
for
> > about that long after a major restructuring), the Board felt it
necessary to
> > ask the membership for their views.
> >
> > First we asked, "Should NCI comment on the issues in the ARRL petition
other
> > than the code test issue?"
> > Then, we asked for comment on the other issues point by point.
> >
> >
> >>But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams priveleges
> >>that they haven't been tested for.
> >
> >
> > As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only
practical
> > way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had
evolved
> > over the years.
> >
> > And, as a number of experienced, yet realistic, hams have pointed out,
the
> > amount and level of material in the 200-ish page "Now you're talking!"
study
> > guide (and on the Tech test) is not all that different from the old
General
> > that I took at the FCC's old Long Beach, CA office over 25 years ago.

> >
> > The fact is that many people mis-remember the tests they took many years
ago
> > as being harder than they really were ... I guess that's human nature
...
> > after you get used to something it seems easier (and correspondingly the
> > beginning stages are remembered as harder).
>
> I took the modern tests, from Technician to Extra.
>
> Technician October 1999
> General June 2001
> Extra Feb 2002
>
> All were at just about the correct level for the privileges conferred,
> IMO. I don't think the Technician test is proper preparation for the
> General class license.
>
>
> >
> >>And there is still that nasty "day after" thing, when th eetsting
> >>regimin goes up again..... or does it?
> >
> >
> > The testing regieme doesn't *have* to "go up again" ... NOBODY has
proposed
> > that the testing regieme be changed ... only that, in the interest of
> > "nobody loses privileges" (which was a DISASTER in the past), that there
be
> > a one-time "adjustment" to make everyone fit the new structure without
> > losing ...
>
> But there is the problem. You either choose to believe (or simply don't
> care) that the person that takes and passes a Technician test one day
> before "the adjustment" is not treated differently by the testing
> process than the person that takes the general test the day after "the
> adjustment".
>
> While people are grousing about how HARD those tests are, I look at it
> as giving a royal shaft to the technicians upgraded in this proposal.
>
> It makes for a little awkwardness at the Extra level afterwards, as
> they will not have taken a General element test.
>
> I know that it's all about getting maximum benefits for minimum input
> these days, but if a prospective ham asked me, I would suggest that they
> wait until after "the one time adjustment" to get their license, unless
> they wanted to go through the ranks quickly and get at least General
> before the "one time adjustment. Learning and testing is not a bad

> thing, IMO.

I suspect then you'd be unhappy with the General/Tech test given in the latter 50's throught the gos which until 1968 conferred full operating privileges to Generals. The ARRL study guide for General was only 16 pages of material.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3174. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 15:40:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <lZQic.10702$gH6.745@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91238

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:oKQic.21619$t26.5688978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> >
> > Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> We'd find out if we could have a very fine vote...all 680K U.S. licensed
> ARO's AND those who are interested in becoming a licensed U.S. AR.
>
> Vy 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
> FISTS #9384

Sorry Bert, whereas NCI can look only to its membership
for guidance as to NCI's organizational stance, the FCC can
not simply look ONLY towards the already licensed
amateur community for its input and guidance. In fact,
I know of NO entity that claims total representation
of ONLY the existing licensed body of hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3175. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 16:19:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <YxRic.22088$t26.5858652@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91239

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lZQic.10702$gH6.745@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:oKQic.21619$t26.5688978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> > >
> > > Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Carl - wk3c
> >
> > We'd find out if we could have a very fine vote...all 680K U.S. licensed
> > ARO's AND those who are interested in becoming a licensed U.S. AR.
> >
> > Vy 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> > FISTS #9384
>
> Sorry Bert, whereas NCI can look only to its membership
> for guidance as to NCI's organizational stance, the FCC can
> not simply look ONLY towards the already licensed
> amateur community for its input and guidance. In fact,
> I know of NO entity that claims total representation
> of ONLY the existing licensed body of hams.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Guess you missed it, again..."AND those who are interested in becoming a
licensed U.S. AR."

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3176. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 19:20:26 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <408C0F7B.5020906@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 91240

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
>
>>Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!
>>
>>73,
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>
> We'd find out if we could have a very fine vote...all 680K U.S. licensed
> ARO's AND those who are interested in becoming a licensed U.S. AR.
>
> Vy 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
> FISTS #9384
> *Proudly applied for first award, KMPW (1000 Miles Per Watt) for LI, NY to
> Kilauea. HI or 5053 miles with 5 Watts. :-)
>
>
Once again there is only one vote that ends up counting - the FCC's. I
would suggest they
may have tipped their hand on this proposal based on the recent NPRM.
In the section on the petition for granting upgrades based on service
they say this.

"Rather, we believe that passing an examination concerning the
operational and technical privileges of a higher class operator license
shows that a licensee qualifies for that license. In this regard, we
note that because current examination questions reflect current
technological advances and operating practices that did not exist twenty
years ago the examinations an examinee must pass today may be more
difficult than the examinations required of licensees in the past. For
these reasons, we deny the petition."

What was said about another petition regarding expanding privileges may
also be pertinent.

" We believe that a Novice or Technician Plus Class licensee can easily
upgrade to the General or Amateur Extra Class, thereby obtaining access
to significantly more spectrum and greatly increasing the chance of
establishing contacts with other amateur radio stations. Additionally,
because the number of Novice and Technician Plus Class licensees has
declined significantly, we believe that we should address operating
privileges for these license classes only in a comprehensive

restructuring of operating privileges for all license classes. "

John

3177. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 19:56:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <96CdnQ0Fi-eWhRHdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91241

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:etWdnZnaYpm-UxbdRVn-ig@adelphia.com...

<some snippage>

>>I know that it's all about getting maximum benefits for minimum input
>>these days, but if a prospective ham asked me, I would suggest that they
>>wait until after "the one time adjustment" to get their license, unless
>>they wanted to go through the ranks quickly and get at least General
>>before the "one time adjustment. Learning and testing is not a bad
>>thing, IMO.
>
>
> I suspect then you'd be unhappy with the General/Tech test given in the
> latter 50's throught the gos which until 1968 conferred full operating
> privileges to Generals. The ARRL study guide for General was
> only 16 pages of material.

I don't know. Comparing the relative difficulties is pretty hard. I've tried, and so much has changed between then and now.

I definitely *don't* think the earlier tests were harder. But how much difference is about impossible to quantify.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3178. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 20:27:35 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <XaVic.2742$ku3.2388@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91242

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:deqdnWZJTImNbBTdRVn-uQ@gbronline.com...
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >
> > The military has their way of doing things, and, quite frankly, I think
they
> > do it very well indeed. No slam on amateur radio, but this is a very
> > different situation. Even military radios have mil-spec components and
can
> > operate in conditions that our radios could not stand up to. You might
be
> > in the Middle East in a desert in summer with sandstorms or in Korea in
the
> > wintertime. You might be in a jungle with extensive rain and 100%
humidity.
> > You might be in mountains.
>
> That's why Collins built the S-Line series of equipment, which was also
> very widely used by amateurs. I still run an S-Line.
>

Yep, and the S-line was top notch gear and is still good equipment. KG6AAY
had considerable Collins equipment in it when I was there in the mid to late
60s.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.668 / Virus Database: 430 - Release Date: 4/24/04

3179. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 20:43:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xpVic.12162$e4.2259@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91243

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

|
| I definitely *don't* think the earlier tests were harder. But how much
| difference is about impossible to quantify.
|

The degree of difficulty of tests written back in the 50's is immaterial
to todays situation.

Today the General exam requires passing two 35-question written
examinations, and the Technician requires passing only the simpler of
those two exams.

The ARRL proposal, which NCI directors seem hellbent to support, would
waive the second (harder) of the examinations, in effect giving away
"half-price" General licenses to a third of a million licensees. They
attempt, with a straight face, to rationalize this away by how few pages
were in Ed Hare's study material for General 40 or more years ago!
This support, from people like Carl, who previously stood four-square
against any dillution of the technical requirements for amateur
licenses, is unfathomable even when masked by platitudes of his
"fiduciary duty", as though he were appointed to some "guardianship"
responsibility to the amateur service???

73, de Hans, K0HB

3180. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 21:14:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91244

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<AtHic.8550$eZ5.1595@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> |
> | As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only
> practical
> | way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had
> evolved
> | over the years.
> |
>
> It's instructive to note that ARRL and NCI, (not FCC) are characterizing
> the license structure as "overly complicated". With only modest
> changes, this structure has been extant since 1951, before the age of
> computerized record keeping and modern database. How come it's suddenly
> "overly complicated"?

Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
amateur radio service, one license.

bb

3181. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 22:31:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404251431.757c6a30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91245

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<l_CdnTZuC-eAFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> Once again, it would be irresponsible for the NCI Board of Directors to
> ignore the wishes of the vast majority of our membership in favor of
> honoring Hans' wishes - though we certainly did listen to and consider his
> views, and some of the NCI Directors even had lengthily e-mail discussions
> with him.

Thought-experiment:

Suppose the vast majority of your membership said they'd reconsidered.

Suppose they said that 5 wpm for Extra was OK, as proposed by ARRL.

Would NCI support that, or simply expel the heretics?

73 de de Jim, N2EY

3182. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 22:43:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404251443.a1bf369@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91246

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<AtHic.8550$eZ5.1595@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> |
> | As outlined by the ARRL, a "one time adjustment" seems the only
> practical
> | way to clean up the overly complicated license structure that had
> evolved
> | over the years.
> |
>
> It's instructive to note that ARRL and NCI, (not FCC) are characterizing
> the license structure as "overly complicated".

Also NCVEC.

The ARRL proposal says it is "absolutely necessary" to eliminate
license classes that are not available to new issues (such as the
Advanced) anymore.
Why it is so "absolutely necessary" is not explained.

> With only modest
> changes, this structure has been extant since 1951, before the age of
> computerized record keeping and modern database. How come it's suddenly
> "overly complicated"?

Bingo!

The Advanced class was closed to new issues from the beginning of 1953
to some time in 1967. The FCC kept those folks on the paper database
for all those years, even though an Advanced carried no different
privileges than a General back then.

> But >>suppose<< for the moment that it IS overly complicated and needs
> reform... to use a term from another NCI Director, do we need to be
> "hellbent" to do it in one swell foop? I recall a proposal by one
> WA6VSE a few years back that would have transformed the structure from
> it's present state into a 2-class structure in as little as 5 years,
> with no free passes and with nobody being stripped of privileges. The
> details escape me, but I'm sure we could Google it up and have a look.
>
> Or if the administrative burden isn't really at FCC but at the VEC's
> like ARRL and W5YI, well there's another proposal floating about which
> would overnight limit their testing burden to just two classes. No
> Morse test to give, and only two written tests. Again, not a soul would

> get a free pass and not a soul would be stripped of any privilege they
> now enjoy. You can view that proposal at http://tinyurl.com/wce9

What's it's RM-number? It looks better and better...
>
> | And, as a number of experienced, yet realistic, hams have pointed out,
> the
> | amount and level of material in the 200-ish page "Now you're talking!"
> study
> | guide (and on the Tech test) is not all that different from the old
> General
> | that I took at the FCC's old Long Beach, CA office over 25 years ago.
>
> We're not talking about 25-years ago. We're talking about today.

Yup.

And remember this fun fact: *anyone* who passed the old Technician
(before March 21, 1987) and can dicument it and now holds a Technician
(or passes the 35 question test for it) can get a no-additional-tests
upgrade to General. Just go to a VE session, present the
documentation, pay the fee and get the upgrade. Even a Tech license
that expired in 1956 is good for Element 1 and Element 3 credit.
>
> >Today< an applicant needs to pass a single 35 question exam to acquire
> a Technician license.
> >Today< an applicant needs to pass a second 35 question exam (which
> contains material not tested in the Technician exam) to acquire a
> General license.
>
> The ARRL proposal to waive the second examination for all todays
> Technicains (about a third of a million) effectively states that todays
> Technican exam is perfectly adequate for General class privileges. If
> that is true, then ipso facto we can make the case that forevermore the
> exam for General need be no more technically demanding than todays
> fall-off-a-log-easy entry level Technician exam.

That's the discussion that I was admonished not to have some months
back.
>
> Now you and Ed Hare at ARRL can spin-doctor all you wish, but reality
> doesn't care what you believe.

Same argument goes for the Advanced.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3183. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 22:47:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425184705.22633.00000270@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91247

>This support, from people like Carl, who previously stood four-square
>against any dillution of the technical requirements for amateur
>licenses, is unfathomable even when masked by platitudes of his
>"fiduciary duty", as though he were appointed to some "guardianship"
>responsibility to the amateur

Karl cant be trusted, and his WORD has never been truthfull. I think Karl is on some EGO TRIP. I think he really believes hes the SAVIOR of Ham Radio, when In truth hes 1 of the many forces destroying it.

3184. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 22:49:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425184908.22633.00000271@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91248

>Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
>amateur radio service, one license.
>
>bb
>

Of course, that is the Real Motive, 1 License, 1 Test, maybe not even a TEST, remember were all EQUAL, arent we?

3185. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 23:43:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408C4D13.9070604@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91249

>
>
> Even a Tech license
>that expired in 1956 is good for Element 1 and Element 3 credit.
>
>
Thought you would get lifetime credit for Element 1 only. At 5WPM. If
you took and passed 13 or 20 and didn't do 5 I heard that you would not
get credit for Element 1.

3186. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-25 23:51:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408C4EFB.30508@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91250

>
>
>>
>
> I took the modern tests, from Technician to Extra.
>
> Technician October 1999
> General June 2001
> Extra Feb 2002
>
> All were at just about the correct level for the privileges
> conferred, IMO. I don't think the Technician test is proper
> preparation for the General class license.

Does it really require more skill and knowledge to operate on 14.155 vs.
14.326? ;-)

Of course the real reason for the frequency based priv's is that it is
easily identified
what frequency you are operating on at a remote FCC receiving site.

Your point is more valid when comparing techs against general/extras
(VHF vs HF).

>
>
>>
>>> And there is still that nasty "day after" thing, when th eetsting
>>> regimin goes up again..... or does it?
>>
>>
>>
>> The testing regieme doesn't *have* to "go up again" ... NOBODY has
>> proposed
>> that the testing regieme be changed ... only that, in the interest of
>> "nobody loses privileges" (which was a DISASTER in the past), that
>> there be
>> a one-time "adjustment" to make everyone fit the new structure without
>> losing ...
>
>
> But there is the problem. You either choose to believe (or simply
> don't care) that the person that takes and passes a Technician test
> one day before "the adjustment" is not treated differently by the
> testing process than the person that takes the general test the day

> after "the adjustment".
>
> While people are grousing about how HARD those tests are, I look
> at it as giving a royal shaft to the technicians upgraded in this
> proposal.
>
> It makes for a little awkwardness at the Extra level afterwards,
> as they will not have taken a General element test.
>
> I know that it's all about getting maximum benefits for minimum
> input these days, but if a prospective ham asked me, I would suggest
> that they wait until after "the one time adjustment" to get their
> license, unless they wanted to go through the ranks quickly and get at
> least General before the "one time adjustment. Learning and testing is
> not a bad thing, IMO.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3187. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 00:51:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <cZidnUBDSeSQwBHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91301

N2EY wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<l_CdnTZuC-eAFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
>
>>Once again, it would be irresponsible for the NCI Board of Directors to
>>ignore the wishes of the vast majority of our membership in favor of
>>honoring Hans' wishes - though we certainly did listen to and consider his
>>views, and some of the NCI Directors even had lengthily e-mail discussions
>>with him.
>
>
> Thought-experiment:
>
> Suppose the vast majority of your membership said they'd reconsidered.
>
> Suppose they said that 5 wpm for Extra was OK, as proposed by ARRL.
>
> Would NCI support that, or simply expel the heretics?

I've tried that already, Jim. They don't like thought experiments very
much!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3188. The Generals of RM-10867

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 01:21:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yuZic.12779$e4.1619@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91302

As has been cussed and discussed here, ARRL has petitioned FCC to reduce the number of license classes from six down to three, namely Novice, General, and Extra.

If you haven't read the entire petition (it runs somewhere around 35 pages, each page laden with microscopic-print footnotes) you may have missed the fact that there will actually be 5 sub-classes of General.

One-Star General - Post 1987 Technician given a complimentary field promotion to General

Two-Star General - Previous Conditional given humanitarian promotion to General

Three-Star General - Pre 1987 Technician given posthumous promotion to General

Four-Star General - General who took an actual General examination in modern times at a VE session

Five-Star General - General who took an actual General examination in front of a steely eyed FCC official in a noisy drafty government office in downtown Fargo and had to walk uphill (both ways) through 10-foot snowdrifts on Good Friday 1954.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3189. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 01:49:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404251749.7d954803@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91303

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040425184908.22633.00000271@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
> >amateur radio service, one license.
> >
> >bb
>
> Of course, that is the Real Motive, 1 License, 1 Test,

So far, so good. I'm amazed that you grasp the concept of, "one amateur radio service, one amateur radio license," so quickly. Way to go, Bruce!

> maybe not even a TEST,

Oops. You've strayed.

> remember were all EQUAL, arent we?

Only before Riley.

3190. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 02:06:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404251806.779ae141@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91304

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<56ednSEnPoiYRRfdRVn-uA@gbronline.com>...
>
> There you go again Mike, upsetting the apple cart with facts. It seems
> that some just can't except the fact that amateur radio and the military
> have a close relationship and the military does accept amateur radio as
> a valuable service when needed, but not cell phones.

What Mike posted is generally correct.

And nearly anyone who'se anybody in the service has a cell phone on
their hip paid for by you and me. I'd say that the military does
accept cellular telephones as a valuable service daily.

Meanwhile you can call me by name and Mike by name, but we don't know
what to call you.

3191. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 02:13:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404251813.297124ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91305

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040425110243.17474.00000334@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >There is NO obligation for NCI to publish that data...as you well know.
>
> Of course not, your group doesnt want anyone to know hnow small your org is.

What's it to you?

> >Politics 101: You can't please all the people (or members) all
> >the time.
>
> And everyone knows how Lies are part of politics.

They're certainly a part of your upgrade stories.

> >Hypothetical silliness again. I have no time to
> >discuss that which will never happen.
>
> Just like, we will never support Dumbing Down of the Written

Someone must have. You got in.

3192. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 02:38:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425223821.15149.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91306

>Oops. You've strayed.

Why, why even have a TEST? The test doesnt prove anything anymore.

3193. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:02:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425230249.25970.00000333@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91307

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/24/2004 10:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404241925.2e53193c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040424185419.29909.00000354@mb-m07.aol.com>...

>> >> With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to
>> oversee
>> >> the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are
>licensed
>> >> Amateur Radio Operators.
>> >
>> >I don't believe that Ray Collins is an amateur.
>>
>> Who cares?
>
>You do. You just said that, "With the exception of a very few Active
>Duty personnel assigned to oversee the program, every single person in
>all three branches of MARS are licensed Amateur Radio Operators."
>
>Ray is neither Active Duty nor an Amateur Radio Operator. He is
>merely the Chief of Air Force MARS.

Then you're one up, after...what...three years of getting your tail caught
under the rockers?

>> Enough to completely ignore the fact that 99% of all MARS personnel
>are
>> licensed Amateurs? I hardly think so.
>
>Now you're saying that 1% of all MARS personnel are not amateurs?

Do you NEED a specific number, Brian? I am sure we can come up with one,
and I am sure that no matter what, it will STILL be under 10% regardless...

>> >> >ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
>> >> >Islands)
>> >>
>> >> Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.
>> >
>> >Correct. And you have your >>>FACTS<<< wrong.
>>
>> Which ones, Brian?
>

>For starters, this one: "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio"."

And without Amateur Radio MARS is...what...?!?!

>> YOUR experience in AMRS, please?
>
>I've never been in AMRS, or even in AMWAY.

Too bad. It was a lot of fun.

>I have been in AF MARS at two assignements; base support team at
>Andersen AB in 1990-91, and Scott AFB 1993 - 1999. I did sign up for
>Army Mars when I arrived in Korea in 1988, but didn't become active
>with it.

OK...that takes you up to five years ago. Thanks.

>> >MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>> >
>> >> Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide
>Coordinator
>> for
>> >> Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.
>> >>
>> >> So there....Nyah.....
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Looks like the military wasted a lot of training on you if you cannot
>> >get even the most basic >>>FACT<<< right.
>> >
>> >Now just accept it so that Carl doesn't have to come on here spank you
>> >again.
>>
>> Hardly, Brian.
>>
>> So...You going to Dayton?
>
>I have a scouting campout the weekend of the Hamvention.

I am sure you do.

Steve, K4YZ

3194. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:31:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425233134.25970.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91308

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/25/2004 10:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404250717.1f389b71@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040424190402.29909.00000355@mb-m07.aol.com>...

>> But right now...today...what I stated is true.
>
>Nope, you're "FACTS" are moving targets. You've already backtracked
>on your original statement and now say that 1% of MARS personnel are
>not Amateurs.

OK...here we go again.

Brian, I have ALWAYS stated that there are SOME "non-Amateur" personnel involved in MARS. Most of those are Active Duty Armed Forces. You provided the name of ONE person who is neither Amateur nor ADAF. I will accept that there are probably folks who fall into that same category for N/MC and Army MARS. I still contend that the numbers will be around 1%, certainly no more than 10%.

That means 90% of the load is carried by licensed Amateur Radio operators.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS, that 1-10% notwithstanding.

>> TOMORROW they may require that I be wearing Avon when I operate and
>that I
>> hang from the shower curtain by my ankles.
>>
>> But not today.
>
>They won't. Trust me.
>
>Try to stay away from extremes.

Hey...You're the one who can't/won't accept that MARS existence is directly predicated on the participation of licensed Amateur Radio operators.

You're also the one who has made suggestions about what MARS may or may not be based upon arbitrary rules changes that COULD be enacted SOME time in the future.

Not what >>IS<< in writing...but what MIGHT happen.

That's "extreme".

>> >Comms was not my functional area, but weather comms were. But I will
>> >state for the record that I'd write anything into the plan or opord
>> >that hhq told me to - as long as it was a legal order.
>>
>> Then you were not being honest with yourself or faithful to your sworn
>> oath.
>
>How am I not being honest?

You said you'd write "anything" if it were a "legal order".

Your commanding officer could tell you to write "I am gay" on a blackboard
100 times. That would be a legal order. Would you do it, knowing it wasn't
true? (Or is it?)

>> Yes, 99.999% of the time I am sure no one would ask you to write dumb
>> stuff.
>
>Lots of dumb stuff is written here. Arguing minutia over and over and
>over is what Carl commented on.

I am impressed that several people express angst over "arguing minutia",
but usually what THEY consider "minutia" is inversely proportional to whether
they find it important to themselves...Not what others consider important.

I, for one, do not consider your assertion of "significant role" in the
use of unlicensed radio services in emergency communications, to be valid, well
founded, nor even wise. You, however, considered it "minutia", no doubt due to
the fact taht it was an indefensible idea.

>> >I suspect that MARS, if need be, could find volunteers who didn't have
>> >amateur licenses. Isn't that what CAP does? Doesn't CAP use radios
>> >on military frequencies?
>>
>> What CAP does today is irrelevent to the topic being discussed.
>
>Yes, it is. The USAF has set a precedent that they don't require
>amateur volunteers to operate radios on military frequencies. Do you
>disagree?

Yes, I do. (Disagree)

CAP is NOT MARS. It never was. It NEVER required Amateur licensure in
order to participate. CAP has encouraged Amateurs to participate, and
encourages it's members to consider being licensed. However they are also very
adamant that CAP operators not use Amateur frequencies for CAP business, and
"Amateur-like" communications not be conducted on CAP frequencies.

Apples and oranges, Brian.

>> And I have proposed changes to the AFMARS system that would allow CAP
>> members who have completed "ACUT" (Advanced Communicator User Training) and
>who
>> have demonstrated competency to be allowed to enroll in AFMARS.

>
>Hopefully you didn't include Avon products and hanging upside down
>from the shower rod in your proposal.
>
>Now please allow me to have an opinion.
>
>You have a CAP volunteer who now wants to add AFMARS volunteer to
>his/her credentials. Then the big disaster occurs and CAP calls him
>up for duty. Then AFMARS calls him up for duty. Then RACES calls him
>up for duty. Then the ARC calls him up for duty. Then the ER calls
>him up for duty. Then home calls and say they need him there.
>
>Choose one (1) emergency service to volunteer for and do it well.
>When work calls and says they need you there, you go to work. When
>home calls and says they need you there, you go home.

I am sure you have a point to make, Brian, but I think the point is that
you're jealous that others are capable of being/doing more than one thing.

If you're a one-thing-at-a-time kinda guy, that's fine. There's nothing
to be ashamed of. Lot's of people can't handle more than one thing at a
time...Or one thing at all...

>I think some people collect volunteer credentials like some people
>collect 10-10 numbers.

Like I said...If you're a OTAAT kinda guy, that's fine.

Some of us realize that there's only one pass at life and a lot of things
to do and experience.

I like to do a lot of things. I may never "master" any of them, but I
will have done them and been made better for it. And in some cases my having
DONE them has made things better for others.

That's the icing on the cake.

>> But that is NOT what the rules allow now, and what MIGHT happen in the
>> future is irrelevent NOW.
>
>If future rules are irrelevant, why do you propose changes?

They are irrelevent at this moment. They may not be tomorrow. Can I hold
you accountable TODAY for a yet-to-be enacted law...?!?!

>> >MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
>> >
>> >Best of Luck, and last this subject.
>>
>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
>MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

3195. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:33:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91309

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>

>Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
>amateur radio service, one license.

So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?

Steve, K4YZ

3196. Re: The Generals of RM-10867

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:37:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408C83D7.8080908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91310

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>
>Three-Star General - Pre 1987 Technician given posthumous
>promotion to General
>
That'd be me had I not taken the extra written(s) (When I did it was 4a
and 4b).

>
>
>Five-Star General - General who took an actual General
>examination in front of a steely eyed FCC official in a noisy
>drafty government office in downtown Fargo and had to walk uphill
>(both ways) through 10-foot snowdrifts on Good Friday 1954.
>
I took my tech at the FCC field office in NYC back in 1976. The FCC
official
was a woman who likely did all the various tests other than just the ham
tests
(done only on Wednesdays). She did know the code as I had to do a sending
test as well as copying. I didn't do 13wpm, so maybe I'd only be a 4
star? :-)

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3197. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:43:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408C8556.4080207@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91311

>
>
>
>
>And nearly anyone who'se anybody in the service has a cell phone on
>their hip paid for by you and me. I'd say that the military does
>accept cellular telephones as a valuable service daily.
>
>
>
I doubt the military expects cell phone service in battle zones. But
cell phones
are useful for routine stuff back on the various bases and such inside
the USA.
Or at the pentagon. But not up in the mountians of Afghanastan or
Iraqastan....

3198. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:46:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <hC%ic.11378$gH6.3668@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91312

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:YxRic.22088$t26.5858652@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lZQic.10702$gH6.745@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:oKQic.21619$t26.5688978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > news:tfCdnUYfBKwTFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net...
> > > >
> > > > Yes, democracy IS a damned fine thing!
> > > >
> > > > 73,
> > > > Carl - wk3c
> > >
> > > We'd find out if we could have a very fine vote...all 680K U.S.
licensed
> > > ARO's AND those who are interested in becoming a licensed U.S. AR.
> > >
> > > Vy 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > > FISTS #9384
> >
> > Sorry Bert, whereas NCI can look only to its membership
> > for guidance as to NCI's organizational stance, the FCC can
> > not simply look ONLY towards the already licensed
> > amateur community for its input and guidance. In fact,
> > I know of NO entity that claims total representation
> > of ONLY the existing licensed body of hams.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Guess you missed it, again..."AND those who are interested in becoming a
> licensed U.S. AR."

It would not even be limited to existing and interested. FCC rules
can be and should be subject to review and comment by anyone,
interested or not.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3199. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 03:53:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <iJ%ic.11387$gH6.6257@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91313

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:cZidnUBDSeSQwBHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<l_CdnTZuC-eAFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> >
> >>Once again, it would be irresponsible for the NCI Board of Directors to
> >>ignore the wishes of the vast majority of our membership in favor of
> >>honoring Hans' wishes - though we certainly did listen to and consider
his
> >>views, and some of the NCI Directors even had lengthily e-mail
discussions
> >>with him.
> >
> >
> > Thought-experiment:
> >
> > Suppose the vast majority of your membership said they'd reconsidered.
> >
> > Suppose they said that 5 wpm for Extra was OK, as proposed by ARRL.
> >
> > Would NCI support that, or simply expel the heretics?
>
> I've tried that already, Jim. They don't like thought experiments very
> much!

Especially one as silly as that just suggested by Jim.
Me thinks Jim has too much idle time on his hands :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3200. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 10:47:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404260247.2bcce7d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91314

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>
> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
> >amateur radio service, one license.
>
> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

There you go with your extremism again.

3201. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 10:47:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404260247.3694982e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91315

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>
> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
> >amateur radio service, one license.
>
> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

There you go with your extremism again.

3202. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 10:55:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426065529.23386.00000427@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91316

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/26/2004 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404260247.2bcce7d3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
>> >amateur radio service, one license.
>>
>> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>There you go with your extremism again.

What extremism...?!?!

Your suggestion of "one license fits all" is the very epitome of
socialism, Brian.

Again I ask you, Socialist or Marxist?

The withering of the soul due to the numbinginly cold and apathetic "one
size fits all" socialist state was at the very heart of the fall of the Soviet
Union, Brian...or weren't you paying attention to social issues in the
80's...?!?!

Sheeesh...

Steve, K4YZ

3203. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 10:56:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426065637.23386.00000428@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91318

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/26/2004 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404260247.3694982e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
>> >amateur radio service, one license.
>>
>> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>There you go with your extremism again.
>

And the question remains...Socialist or Marxist? You must be one or the
other in order to hold such concepts.

Steve, K4YZ

3204. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 10:56:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404260256.64d6a85e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91317

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<408C8556.4080207@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >And nearly anyone who'se anybody in the service has a cell phone on
> >their hip paid for by you and me. I'd say that the military does
> >accept cellular telephones as a valuable service daily.
> >
> I doubt the military expects cell phone service in battle zones.

I don't think they do either, but the intent was not war fighting, but
disaster comms in the USA. I suggest that the cell phone is the best
thing that non-amateurs have going for them. See the long line of
jabs from JJ and cronies.

But
> cell phones
> are useful for routine stuff back on the various bases and such inside
> the USA.

Yup. And probably some not so routine stuff.

> Or at the pentagon. But not up in the mountians of Afghanastan or
> Iraqastan....

Deliberate and Contingency planning is done in the USA.

Alert notification is done using unsecure comms, including cellular
telephones.

Nobody was talking Afghanastan.

3205. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 12:22:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404260422.25db7f01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91319

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<iJ%ic.11387$gH6.6257@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:cZidnUBDSeSQwBHdRVn-vg@adelphia.com...
> >
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<l_CdnTZuC-eAFRfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> > >
> > >>Once again, it would be irresponsible for the NCI Board of Directors to
> > >>ignore the wishes of the vast majority of our membership in favor of
> > >>honoring Hans' wishes - though we certainly did listen to and consider
> his
> > >>views, and some of the NCI Directors even had lengthily e-mail
> discussions
> > >>with him.
> > >
> > >
> > > Thought-experiment:
> > >
> > > Suppose the vast majority of your membership said they'd reconsidered.
> > >
> > > Suppose they said that 5 wpm for Extra was OK, as proposed by ARRL.
> > >
> > > Would NCI support that, or simply expel the heretics?
> >
> > I've tried that already, Jim. They don't like thought experiments very
> > much!
>
> Especially one as silly as that just suggested by Jim.

It is interesting that NCI folks avoid such a simple, direct question.

> Me thinks Jim has too much idle time on his hands :-)

It took only a few seconds to write that post. Far more has been spent
by NCI folks trying to justify their support of free upgrades for
Techs after at least one said they would *never* support reductions in
the written requirements.

Hans, K0HB has described the situation plainly and clearly.

As for my thought-experiment being "silly" - that's exactly what many
of us were told about possible reductions in written test standards.

Here's another thought-experiment:

Suppose that, in order to break the logjam, someone proposes that the lower 15-20% of each MF/HF ham band be made manual-CW-only. And a 5 wpm code test would be required to use those segments.

And suppose the majority of NCI members said "Fine! The code folks will have their protected spots and the rest of us won't have to deal with code unless we want to, and we can disband NCI and move on."

What would NCI's leadership do?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

3206. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 12:39:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <m8ucnXGA5tFnnxDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91320

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:cdGdnV41TaMnVRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >>petitions ...
> >>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >>Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >>Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> >>
> >>
> >>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
> >>| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
> >>| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
> >>
> >>I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
> >>that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
> >>free country.
> >
> >
> > But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element
1 gets
> > involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses
the
> > "membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception. Particularly
when the
> > number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.
>
> And that has really been my bone with the whole process here, Jim.
> We're told that they are only here to eliminate Code testing.

Please note that the "only to eliminate code TESTING" was to clarify that
NCI had no goal of eliminating code USE on a voluntary basis.

We never said we would "never" comment on other issues of interest to our
membership and our bylaws specifically provide for doing so.

> Now it has
> branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
> personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
> exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written

> exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.

Sorry ... but that's BS ... there is NO proposal to change the written exams for General/Extra ... the proposal is to create a new entry level class with testing similar to the old Novice tests that all of us "old-timers" started out with ...

I don't see what's "bad" or "inappropriate" about that ... I agree with ARRL that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that we need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that will be interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them interested in learning and progressing.

NCI's membership also agrees with that by an overwhelming majority.

We have filed our comments - if you have filed yours, YMMV ... that's why the FCC seeks comments - to see what people think.

I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be allowed to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.

Carl - wk3c

3207. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 13:58:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408D156F.5080501@psu.edu>
Source record: 91321

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> |
> | I definitely *don't* think the earlier tests were harder. But how much
> | difference is about impossible to quantify.
> |
>
> The degree of difficulty of tests written back in the 50's is immaterial
> to todays situation.
>
> Today the General exam requires passing two 35-question written
> examinations, and the Technician requires passing only the simpler of
> those two exams.
>
> The ARRL proposal, which NCI directors seem hellbent to support, would
> waive the second (harder) of the examinations, in effect giving away
> "half-price" General licenses to a third of a million licensees.

I would suggest that "relevant" might be substituted for "harder",
Hans. While the giveaway goons whine about how hard the test is or
isn't, The fact is that the general test tests for knowledge that is
relevant to hf operation.

So in the great giveaway, people will be given access to HF without
some of the necessary knowledge.

Is that fair to them?

Fact: None of the tests are that hard. All it takes is some study.

Fact: the tests aren't necessarily supposed to be hard. They are to
show that a person is prepared to exercise the privileges gained by
passing the test.

Fact: the "one time adjustment" hams, now a majority of hams, will not
have been prepared properly for their HF access.

Opinion: It is one heck of a disservice we are doing for them.

> They
> attempt, with a straight face, to rationalize this away by how few pages
> were in Ed Hare's study material for General 40 or more years ago!

I don't care about Ed's test.

> This support, from people like Carl, who previously stood four-square
> against any dillution of the technical requirements for amateur
> licenses, is unfathomable even when masked by platitudes of his
> "fiduciary duty", as though he were appointed to some "guardianship"
> responsibility to the amateur service???

It's a heavy weight to bear.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3208. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 14:03:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408D16A8.6000106@psu.edu>
Source record: 91322

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

>>Now it has
>>branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
>>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
>>exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
>>exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.
>
>
> Sorry ... but that's BS ... there is NO proposal to change the written exams
> for General/Extra ... the proposal is to create a new entry level class with
> testing similar to the old Novice tests that all of us "old-timers" started
> out with ...

Hey Carl. I don't call any of your ideas what you just called mine.
Fine gentleman!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3209. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 14:21:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8W8jc.10117$eZ5.4921@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91323

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404260247.2bcce7d3@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> > >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of
thinking. One
> > >amateur radio service, one license.
> >
> > So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is
it?
> >

Brian,

Just as a matter of interest, the USSR (Socialist) had 4 classes
of license. Hmmmmm, maybe they weren't Socialist after all?

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: Please quit quoting the Crockstar so profusely. It allows
him to evade my Bozo Bin when someone else quotes him.

3210. Re: The Generals of RM-10867

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 17:27:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <EDbjc.2803$Jh6.351@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91324

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:yuZic.12779$e4.1619@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> As has been cussed and discussed here, ARRL has petitioned FCC to
> reduce the number of license classes from six down to three,
> namely Novice, General, and Extra.
<<snip>>
> If you haven't read the entire petition (it runs somewhere around
> 35 pages, each page laden with microscopic-print footnotes) you
> may have missed the fact that there will actually be 5
> sub-classes of General.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

This appears to reflect what is going on in society in general. The company I worked for had various apprenticeships - one was for automation. It was a four year apprenticeship. Today, the same apprenticeship is three years in duration - plus you end up with an *associate's degree*! I would tend to question whether an individual actually learned more in three years to deserve that degree or not, but the fact remains that the 3 year graduate is now qualified to go into many other fields as a technician whilst the 4 year graduate is not.

If an 8 year old can pass the extra exam (itself pretty much a cakewalk today), why the necessity of a field promotion for someone that didn't take all of the theory elements for a general?

Meanwhile, back in Rochester, NY, I went to one of those fast food outlets about a month ago. The cash register operator took my $20.00 (the bill was something like $11.83), hit a button, and - the look on her face told me she punched a button which told the machine I gave her $11.83. She took a five out of the register .... slowly took a single .... then after frowning for several seconds, another single .... then she had to get the manager to make change. Heck, if she learns to add and subtract, maybe they'll grandfather her to a bachelor's degree ;)

All in all, it is frightening to see newly minted extras asking such questions as "I have an SWR of 2 to 1. What can I do to lower it?".

We'll see more replays of such things as happened on Guam "sparkplug1 this is sparkplug. You are loud, but garbbled." - hey guys, take out the antenna and stick a coat hanger in the antenna jack. Either that, or lower the rf gain :)) But they were the experts, right?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.668 / Virus Database: 430 - Release Date: 4/24/04

3211. Re: The Generals of RM-10867

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 17:42:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408D4A10.5040808@psu.edu>
Source record: 91325

Jim Hampton wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:yuZic.12779$e4.1619@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>As has been cussed and discussed here, ARRL has petitioned FCC to
>>reduce the number of license classes from six down to three,
>>namely Novice, General, and Extra.
>
> <<snip>>
>
>>If you haven't read the entire petition (it runs somewhere around
>>35 pages, each page laden with microscopic-print footnotes) you
>>may have missed the fact that there will actually be 5
>>sub-classes of General.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> Hans,
>
> This appears to reflect what is going on in society in general. The company
> I worked for had various apprenticeships - one was for automation. It was a
> four year apprenticeship. Today, the same apprenticeship is three years in
> duration - plus you end up with an *associate's degree*! I would tend to
> question whether an individual actually learned more in three years to
> deserve that degree or not, but the fact remains that the 3 year graduate is
> now qualified to go into many other fields as a technician whilst the 4 year
> graduate is not.
>
> If an 8 year old can pass the extra exam (itself pretty much a cakewalk
> today), why the necessity of a field promotion for someone that didn't take
> all of the theory elements for a general?
>
> Meanwhile, back in Rochester, NY, I went to one of those fast food outlets
> about a month ago. The cash register operator took my $20.00 (the bill was
> something like $11.83), hit a button, and - the look on her face told me she
> punched a button which told the machine I gave her $11.83. She took a five
> out of the register .... slowly took a single .... then after frowning for
> several seconds, another single .... then she had to get the manager to make
> change. Heck, if she learns to add and subtract, maybe they'll grandfather
> her to a bachelor's degree ;)

I think Rochester had a one time upgrade of second graders to HS
diplomas a while back, didn't they?

> All in all, it is frightening to see newly minted extras asking such
> questions as "I have an SWR of 2 to 1. What can I do to lower it?".

I know what you mean. All they have to do is take the face off of the
meter, and manually push the needle down. If their meter uses LED's,
they can put tape over the offending lights.

> We'll see more replays of such things as happened on Guam "sparkplug1 this
> is sparkplug. You are loud, but garbbled." - hey guys, take out the antenna
> and stick a coat hanger in the antenna jack. Either that, or lower the rf
> gain :)) But they were the experts, right?

Were they actually Extra's? The SWR thing I can almost see, if a person
is inexperienced, and considering the religious like pursuit of 1:1 SWR.

But what you describe after that is pretty dum for shure!

- mike KB3EIA -

3212. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 17:51:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404260951.6ff370b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91326

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<m8ucnXGA5tFnnxDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:cdGdnV41TaMnVRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> > >>petitions ...
> > >>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> > >>Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> > >>Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
> > >>| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
> > >>| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
> > >>
> > >>I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
> > >>that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
> > >>free country.
> > >
> > >
> > > But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element
> 1 gets
> > > involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses
> the
> > > "membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception. Particularly
> when the
> > > number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.
> >
> > And that has really been my bone with the whole process here, Jim.
> > We're told that they are only here to eliminate Code testing.
>
> Please note that the "only to eliminate code TESTING" was to clarify that
> NCI had no goal of eliminating code USE on a voluntary basis.

Uh-huh.
>
> We never said we would "never" comment on other issues of interest to our
> membership and our bylaws specifically provide for doing so.
```

You mean like commenting *against* the proposed subbands on VHF for
modes narrower than 3 kHz some years back?

And despite having high confidence in how WRC-03 would affect S25,
NCI's proposal consisted of just one action item: drop Element 1.

> > Now it has
> > branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
> > personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
> > exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
> > exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.
>
> Sorry ... but that's BS ...

Which part?

> there is NO proposal to change the written exams
> for General/Extra ...

Not directly.

However, if the proposal goes through, we will have a situation where
the majority of Generals have never passed the *written* test for
General. Plus about 40% of Extras never passing the written test for
that class.

You can say that the standards have not been lowered, but in effect
they have. If the proposal goes through, those who paid "list price"
for their General licenses (in terms of written tests) will be in the
minority.

It's like saying that the standard marathon distance of 26.22 miles is
"too long", so we're going to allow anyone who has run a 13.11 mile
half-marathon before a certain date to claim they are a "marathoner".
Then we will abolish the half-marathon and any new runner who wants to
be called a marathoner will have to run 26.22 miles to earn the title.

How do you think that would go over? As a runner with 23 years'
experience and 2 marathons I can tell you it wouldn't be very popular
among those who had actually run marathons.

Or better yet - how about this:

Enact a new 2 class license system.

Two license classes: Basic and Full.

Basic has a simple written test and Full has a much more comprehensive
written test.

Privileges coincide with the tests in many ways. Basic is a limited
"learner's permit" license, Full is all amateur privileges.

Everyone who has a US ham license before Date X get Full licenses.
After Date X, the new system takes over and newbies have to pass the
new Basic and Full tests.

Would that be a good system? Why or why not?

> the proposal is to create a new entry level class with
> testing similar to the old Novice tests that all of us "old-timers" started
> out with ...

Yup. Simple written test, 5 wpm sending and receiving code tests, even
the same name as in the old days. Got me started.

> I don't see what's "bad" or "inappropriate" about that ...

Yet it was not proposed by NCI.

> I agree with ARRL
> that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that we
> need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that will be
> interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them
> interested in learning and progressing.

Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.

Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....

> NCI's membership also agrees with that by an overwhelming majority.

Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
>
> We have filed our comments - if you have filed yours, YMMV ... that's why
> the FCC seeks comments - to see what people think.

Some of us think the free upgrades are a very bad idea.
>
> I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be allowed
> to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.

Nobody I know says anyone should not be allowed to comment. The
frowning is about the support for lowering of *written* test
standards, which some folks claimed they would *never* support.

ARRL sez in their proposal that it is "absolutely necessary" to get
rid of license classes that are no longer issued to new applicants.
IOW, we *must* get down to three license classes no matter what it
takes.

The big question: Why is it "absolutely necessary"? FCC maintained the
Advanced for almost 14 years, in the days of paper records. They have
maintained the Novice, Tech Plus and Advanced for over 4 years now.
What's the problem? Who is being burdened or hurt?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3213. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 18:00:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404261000.f299309@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91327

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<408C4D13.9070604@ix.netcom.com>...

(I previously wrote):

> > Even a Tech license
> >that expired in 1956 is good for Element 1 and Element 3 credit.
> >
> >
> Thought you would get lifetime credit for Element 1 only.

See below.

> At 5WPM. If
> you took and passed 13 or 20 and didn't do 5 I heard that you would not
> get credit for Element 1.

That part is true - you have to have passed 5 wpm to get Element 1
credit.

Quoting Part 97:

ï¿½97.505 Element credit.

(a) The administering VEs must give credit as specified below to an
examinee
holding any of the following license grants or license documents:

(1) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted Advanced Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and
3.

(2) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted General Class operator license grant: Elements 1, 2, and
3.

(3) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted Technician Plus Class operator (including a Technician
Class
operator license granted before February 14, 1991) license grant:
Elements 1
and 2.

(4) An unexpired (or expired but within the grace period for renewal)
FCC-granted Technician Class operator license grant: Element 2.

(5) An unexpired (or expired) FCC-granted Novice Class operator
license grant:

Element 1.

(6) A CSCE: Each element the CSCE indicates the examinee passed within the
previous 365 days.

(7) An unexpired (or expired less than 5 years) FCC-issued commercial
radiotelegraph operator license or permit: Element 1.

(8) An expired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license document granted
before March 21, 1987: Element 3.

(9) An expired or unexpired FCC-issued Technician Class operator license
document granted before February 14, 1991: Element 1.

(b) No examination credit, except as herein provided, shall be allowed on the
basis of holding or having held any other license grant or document.

(End of Part 97 quote)

Note that an old expired Tech can be good for Element and 3,
(97.505/8) and an old expired Novice or Tech can be good for Element
1. (97.505/9). So anyone who ever held a Tech before March 21, 1987
and can document it need only pass Element 2 to get a General.

Consider these scenarios:

Expired Novice or Tech-with-code licenses are good for Element 1, but other
expired-beyond-the-grace-period licenses are not. So someone who held a Novice
53 years ago and let it expire gets Element 1 credit, but someone who held an
Extra and let it expire 732 days ago gets no credit. Similar for Technician.

In similar fashion, an expired Tech from before March 21, 1987 is worth Element
3, but not Element 2! Also, no other expired-beyond-the-grace-period license is
worth written element credit.

But them's the rules.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3214. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 18:49:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408D59D5.2050406@psu.edu>
Source record: 91328

N2EY wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<m8ucnXGA5tFnnxDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:cdGdnV41TaMnVRbd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>>>>>petitions ...
>>>>>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>>>>>Date: 4/24/04 9:32 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>>>>>Message-id: <6zEic.8252$eZ5.1870@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>| It seems to me that NCI could easily have stuck to their initial
>>>>>| premise of only wanting to get rid of Element one and go from
>>>>>| there. But they are not. Must be disappointing for you.
>>>>>
>>>>>I don't have a problem with the NCI leadership (actually, let me make
>>>>>that Leadership) taking a stand on any issue they wish. Hey, it's a
>>>>>free country.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>But when an organization that says it exists *only* to eliminate Element
>>>
>>> 1 gets
>>>
>>>>involved in areas that have nothing to do with code testing, and uses
>>>
>>> the
>>>
>>>>"membership wants it" claim, some of us take exception. Particularly
>>>
>>> when the
>>>
>>>>number of US hams who are current NCI members is not public knowledge.
>>>

>>>And that has really been my bone with the whole process here, Jim.
>>>We're told that they are only here to eliminate Code testing.
>>
>>Please note that the "only to eliminate code TESTING" was to clarify that
>>NCI had no goal of eliminating code USE on a voluntary basis.
>
>
> Uh-huh.

I always thought it was a good idea to arrange things so that you
didn't have to ever say "what I really meant was...."

>>We never said we would "never" comment on other issues of interest to our
>>membership and our bylaws specifically provide for doing so.
>
>
> You mean like commenting *against* the proposed subbands on VHF for
> modes narrower than 3 kHz some years back?
>
> And despite having high confidence in how WRC-03 would affect S25,
> NCI's proposal consisted of just one action item: drop Element 1.
>
>
>>>Now it has
>>>branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
>>>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
>>>exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
>>>exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.
>>
>>Sorry ... but that's BS ...
>
> Which part?
>

I can't find anything that is that particular term in my whole
statement. Perhaps he is trying to say that anyone that disagrees with
him is a slinger of such?

And I wonder what 100 non-Hams would say about the situation. Not
people that stand to get the free "one time adjustment" or their leaders.

>>there is NO proposal to change the written exams
>>for General/Extra ...
>
>
> Not directly.

Not yet.

> However, if the proposal goes through, we will have a situation where
> the majority of Generals have never passed the *written* test for
> General. Plus about 40% of Extras never passing the written test for

> that class.

I still say we are ripping them off.

> You can say that the standards have not been lowered, but in effect
> they have. If the proposal goes through, those who paid "list price"
> for their General licenses (in terms of written tests) will be in the
> minority.

On average, most Generals will have been tested at the Technician
level. I'll entertain anyone's attempt to say that the average testing
level has not gone down.

> It's like saying that the standard marathon distance of 26.22 miles is
> "too long", so we're going to allow anyone who has run a 13.11 mile
> half-marathon before a certain date to claim they are a "marathoner".
> Then we will abolish the half-marathon and any new runner who wants to
> be called a marathoner will have to run 26.22 miles to earn the title.
>
> How do you think that would go over? As a runner with 23 years'
> experience and 2 marathons I can tell you it wouldn't be very popular
> among those who had actually run marathons.
>
> Or better yet - how about this:
>
> Enact a new 2 class license system.
>
> Two license classes: Basic and Full.
>
> Basic has a simple written test and Full has a much more comprehensive
> written test.
>
> Privileges coincide with the tests in many ways. Basic is a limited
> "learner's permit" license, Full is all amateur privileges.
>
> Everyone who has a US ham license before Date X get Full licenses.
> After Date X, the new system takes over and newbies have to pass the
> new Basic and Full tests.
>
> Would that be a good system? Why or why not?
>
>
>>the proposal is to create a new entry level class with
>>testing similar to the old Novice tests that all of us "old-timers" started
>>out with ...
>
>
> Yup. Simple written test, 5 wpm sending and receiving code tests, even
> the same name as in the old days. Got me started.

snicker...

>>I don't see what's "bad" or "inappropriate" about that ...
>
>
> Yet it was not proposed by NCI.
>
>
>>I agree with ARRL
>>that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that we
>>need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that will be
>>interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them
>>interested in learning and progressing.
>
>
> Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.
>
> Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
> experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....

Testing = knowledge = bad

Unfortunately, we seem headed that way

>>NCI's membership also agrees with that by an overwhelming majority.
>
>
> Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
> majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
> and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?

>>We have filed our comments - if you have filed yours, YMMV ... that's why
>>the FCC seeks comments - to see what people think.
>
>
> Some of us think the free upgrades are a very bad idea.
>
>>I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be allowed
>>to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.
>
>
> Nobody I know says anyone should not be allowed to comment. The
> frowning is about the support for lowering of *written* test
> standards, which some folks claimed they would *never* support.

I don't see why this is such a hard message to get through! I don't
care if NCI supports giving dogs ham licenses, I don't agree, but I
don't care.

I do care about integrity.

I don't even care if people change their mind. I've done it in the
past, and if I was wrong, I said so, and if I just got more data, I said
that too.

But I don't care for spinning a story to make it seem as if a
contradiction was indeed, not a contradiction.

And they can say whatever disparaging comments about my argument that
they like. It only convinces me that I have hit a nerve.

> ARRL sez in their proposal that it is "absolutely necessary" to get
> rid of license classes that are no longer issued to new applicants.
> IOW, we *must* get down to three license classes no matter what it
> takes.
>
> The big question: Why is it "absolutely necessary"? FCC maintained the
> Advanced for almost 14 years, in the days of paper records. They have
> maintained the Novice, Tech Plus and Advanced for over 4 years now.
> What's the problem? Who is being burdened or hurt?

Occam's razor says that ARRL sees that few Technicians belong to the
organization, so they rationalize that if we change that so that most
hams have HF access, more will join. Simplest answer, likeliest answer.

But we so seldom approach things directly.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3215. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 20:04:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <s7Odnd1uZLzj9hDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91329

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:408D59D5.2050406@psu.edu...

[snipped part - not going to play that game any more]

and I may have some of Jim's comments in here, too ...

> >>>Now it has
> >>>branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
> >>>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
> >>>exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
> >>>exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.
> >>
> >>Sorry ... but that's BS ...
> >
> > Which part?
> >
>
> I can't find anything that is that particular term in my whole
> statement. Perhaps he is trying to say that anyone that disagrees with
> him is a slinger of such?

No, I was referring to your assertion that we were supporting a reduction in
the written exams and the "spin-us maximus" stuff. I don't believe that's
an accurate characterization of the ARRL's proposal or NCI's comments to the
FCC or my comments here.

['nuther snip]

> >>I agree with ARRL
> >>that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that
we
> >>need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that will
be
> >>interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them
> >>interested in learning and progressing.
> >
> >
> > Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.

Many people's mileage varys on that ...

> > Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
> > experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....

You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse. However, geting on HF and talking around the world, experimenting with (and maybe developing) some new sound card digital modes (ever notice how many kids are computer wizzes?) would appeal to them and keep them interested.

> Testing = knowledge = bad

No ...

Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad

[snip]

> > Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
> > majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
> > and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?

Read the numbers ... the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the "commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as did the Novices of our beginning days ...

As far as the NCVEC proposal that applicants be required to certify that they have read and understand the Part 97 rules, most felt that was reasonable, and so do I. However, the way the question was worded (mea culpa), it doesn't indicate that that would be a substitute for at least some rules and regs questions on the written test - just "should folks certify that they understand the rules."

If you read my *personal* comments, I state what *I* believe (and what I *honestly* believe in my own heart that most of NCI's members meant and thought they were answering on that survey question) - that the certification is OK, but that "... however, it should NOT be viewed as a replacement for reasonable testing on the basic rules and regulations as a part of the examination requirement for licensure."

> >>I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be
allowed
> >>to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.
> >
> >
> > Nobody I know says anyone should not be allowed to comment. The
> > frowning is about the support for lowering of *written* test
> > standards, which some folks claimed they would *never* support.

Again, it is not "support for lowering of *written* test standards" ... other than introducing an appropriate test like the Novice test of old for beginners, I see no "lowering of written test standards" - the General and Extra tests would remain the same. And I would oppose weakening them.

However, for a "one shot adjustment" to align the current licensees with the new structure proposed, I personally don't have a problem with the ARRL proposal.

I think it's the only way to avoid the fiasco that occured 50-some years ago when folks lost privileges ... you know about that, and I'm sure you're aware that there are still some folks around who are very bitter about it.

> I don't see why this is such a hard message to get through! I don't
> care if NCI supports giving dogs ham licenses, I don't agree, but I
> don't care.

I understand ... we disagree (just don't start claiming that NCI supports giving dogs ham licenses :-)

> I do care about integrity.

Me, too ... that's why I felt compelled to represent the views of NCI's membership.

If you read NCI's comments, you will see that we essentially "report" the membership's views to the FCC ... views that were overwhelmingly in favor of the ARRL proposal (except for the "code for Extra" part, of course, which wasn't even on the table - that view is a given, due to the nature and basic purpose of NCI.

If you look at the treatment of the NCVEC proposals, you will find that, since the numbers were more mixed, our comments do even more "reporting" of the numbers and take less of a firm position, since we did not have such an overwhelming mandate from the membership.

3216. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 20:41:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408D73F5.2000101@psu.edu>
Source record: 91330

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:408D59D5.2050406@psu.edu...
>
> [snipped part - not going to play that game any more]
>
> and I may have some of Jim's comments in here, too ...
>
>
>>>>>Now it has
>>>>>branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
>>>>>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
>>>>>exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
>>>>>exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us maximus.
>>>>
>>>>Sorry ... but that's BS ...
>>>
>>>Which part?
>>>
>>
>>I can't find anything that is that particular term in my whole
>>statement. Perhaps he is trying to say that anyone that disagrees with
>>him is a slinger of such?
>
>
> No, I was referring to your assertion that we were supporting a reduction in
> the written exams and the "spin-us maximus" stuff. I don't believe that's
> an accurate characterization of the ARRL's proposal or NCI's comments to the
> FCC or my comments here.
>
> ['nuther snip]
>
>
>>>>I agree with ARRL
>>>>that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that
>>>
> we
>
>>>>need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that will
>>>
> be
>
>>>>interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them

>>>>interested in learning and progressing.
>>>
>>>
>>>Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.
>>
>
> Many people's mileage varys on that ...
>
>
>>>Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
>>>experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....
>>
>
> You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I
> know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse. However,
> geting on HF and talking around the world, experimenting with (and maybe
> developing) some new sound card digital modes (ever notice how many kids are
> computer wizzes?) would appeal to them and keep them interested.
>
>
>>Testing = knowledge = bad
>
>
> No ...
>
> Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad

Hold on Carl. You are putting Jim's and my posts together here. (at
least I think) I support Morse code testing. But if it goes away, I
doubt I'll miss a minute of sleep.

But I don't think that the tested requirements for General are
irrelevant or unnecessary, etc. I think you were talking about element
one instead of the writtens?

> [snip]
>
>
>>>Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
>>>majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
>>>and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
>>
>
> Read the numbers ... the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the
> "commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
> newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they
> want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as
> did the Novices of our beginning days ...

You're still replying to Jim here. I gave up on the hypothetical
questions a little while ago.

> As far as the NCVEC proposal that applicants be required to certify that
> they have read and understand the Part 97 rules, most felt that was
> reasonable, and so do I. However, the way the question was worded (mea
> culpa), it doesn't indicate that that would be a substitute for at least
> some rules and regs questions on the written test - just "should folks
> certify that they understand the rules."
>
> If you read my *personal* comments, I state what *I* believe (and what I
> *honestly* believe in my own heart that most of NCI's members meant and
> thought they were answering on that survey question) - that the
> certification is OK, but that "... however, it should NOT be viewed as a
> replacement for reasonable testing on the basic rules and regulations as a
> part of the examination requirement for licensure."
>
>
>>>>I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be
>>>
> allowed
>
>>>>to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.
>>>
>>>
>>>Nobody I know says anyone should not be allowed to comment. The
>>>frowning is about the support for lowering of *written* test
>>>standards, which some folks claimed they would *never* support.
>>
>
> Again, it is not "support for lowering of *written* test standards" ...
> other than introducing an appropriate test like the Novice test of old for
> beginners, I see no "lowering of written test standards" - the General and
> Extra tests would remain the same. And I would oppose weakening them.
>
> However, for a "one shot adjustment" to align the current licensees with the
> new structure proposed, I personally don't have a problem with the ARRL
> proposal.
> I think it's the only way to avoid the fiasco that occured 50-some years ago
> when folks lost privileges ... you know about that, and I'm sure you're
> aware that there are still some folks around who are very bitter about it.

I support a system that is basically like what we have now. Only
difference is that Morse code is not tested for AT ALL. I would think
NCI would prefer a system like that instead of one in which there is
still a test for Extra. No one loses *anything at all*. No one gains.
And if the Technicians want to upgrade to General, they will now have
the ability to take the General test without Element one.

Now this does not address the problem of the different classes. I could
be convinced that that there is the need to change the classes. I would
ask for some solid evidence of the difficulties that people are going
through with the present system. But I really don't think that people
are having such difficulties.

I keep a database that has numbers assigned to parts that are 50 years
old. Those numbers aren't used any more, and in fact are assigned new
names. But the old names are still there. It isn't a problem at all, and
in fact would be more trouble to change than it is to just let it alone.

>>I don't see why this is such a hard message to get through! I don't
>>care if NCI supports giving dogs ham licenses, I don't agree, but I
>>don't care.
>
>
> I understand ... we disagree (just don't start claiming that NCI supports
> giving dogs ham licenses :-)

Of course not!

>>I do care about integrity.
>
>
> Me, too ... that's why I felt compelled to represent the views of NCI's
> membership.
>
> If you read NCI's comments, you will see that we essentially "report" the
> membership's views to the FCC ... views that were overwhelmingly in favor of
> the ARRL proposal (except for the "code for Extra" part, of course, which
> wasn't even on the table - that view is a given, due to the nature and basic
> purpose of NCI.
>
> If you look at the treatment of the NCVEC proposals, you will find that,
> since the numbers were more mixed, our comments do even more "reporting" of
> the numbers and take less of a firm position, since we did not have such an
> overwhelming mandate from the membership.
>
>

3217. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 21:39:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404261339.5fa4f73e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91331

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040425223821.15149.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >Oops. You've strayed.
>
> Why, why even have a TEST? The test doesnt prove anything anymore.

I could say that it hasn't since you passed your Advanced exam, but I won't.

3218. Re: The Generals of RM-10867

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 21:44:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Eofjc.2701$DY6.379@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91332

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:408D4A10.5040808@psu.edu...
> Jim Hampton wrote:

> > Hans,
> >
> > This appears to reflect what is going on in society in general.
<<snip>>
> > If an 8 year old can pass the extra exam (itself pretty much a cakewalk
> > today), why the necessity of a field promotion for someone that didn't
take
> > all of the theory elements for a general?
> >
> > Meanwhile, back in Rochester, NY, I went to one of those fast food
outlets
> > about a month ago. The cash register operator took my $20.00 (the bill
was
> > something like $11.83), hit a button, and - the look on her face told me
she
> > punched a button which told the machine I gave her $11.83. She took a
five
> > out of the register .... slowly took a single .... then after frowning
for
> > several seconds, another single .... then she had to get the manager to
make
> > change. Heck, if she learns to add and subtract, maybe they'll
grandfather
> > her to a bachelor's degree ;)
>
>
> I think Rochester had a one time upgrade of second graders to HS
> diplomas a while back, didn't they?
>
>
> > All in all, it is frightening to see newly minted extras asking such
> > questions as "I have an SWR of 2 to 1. What can I do to lower it?".
>
> I know what you mean. All they have to do is take the face off of the
> meter, and manually push the needle down. If their meter uses LED's,
> they can put tape over the offending lights.
>
> > We'll see more replays of such things as happened on Guam "sparkplug1
this
> > is sparkplug. You are loud, but garbbled." - hey guys, take out the

antenna
> > and stick a coat hanger in the antenna jack. Either that, or lower the
rf
> > gain :)) But they were the experts, right?
>
> Were they actually Extra's? The SWR thing I can almost see, if a person
> is inexperienced, and considering the religious like pursuit of 1:1 SWR.
>
> But what you describe after that is pretty dum for shure!
>
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>
No, Mike ..

I hate to tell you this, but those were USN radiomen who had "all knobs to the right". This is usually caused by such things as when I was in RM "a" school and we were given a printed page stating that a class A amplifier was 50% efficient. One did not question the chief.

Such stuff has propogated into industry where might makes right. The manager may often be wrong, but never in doubt. It is such stuff that leads to companies being cleaned out by upper management. Number two in command must tread carefully against number one (or the CEO) or he/she may be out. Oh well ... it probably doesn't matter as we've got plenty of cellphones anyways ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.669 / Virus Database: 431 - Release Date: 4/26/04

3219. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 21:48:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404261348.1acb00da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91333

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040426065529.23386.00000427@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/26/2004 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404260247.2bcce7d3@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
> >> >amateur radio service, one license.
> >>
> >> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >There you go with your extremism again.
>
> What extremism...?!?!

Above and below.

> Your suggestion of "one license fits all" is the very epitome of
> socialism, Brian.

OK, you've pigeon-holed it as Socialism.

> Again I ask you, Socialist or Marxist?

Since you've already pigeon-holed my idea as Socialist, why do you ask
such a stupid question?

Because you're not happy enough to call me a Socialist, you've got to
call me a Marxist, too!

Did I say that you tend toward extremes?

> The withering of the soul due to the numbinginly cold and apathetic "one
> size fits all" socialist state was at the very heart of the fall of the Soviet
> Union, Brian...or weren't you paying attention to social issues in the
> 80's...?!?!
>

> Sheeesh...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Let me 'splain it to you Steve.

In Socialism, there are two license classes. A class for the masses,
and a class for the governmental elitists.

In Marxism, there is one license class. A class for the governmental
elitists.

3220. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 21:52:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404261352.2e593c77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91334

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040426065637.23386.00000428@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/26/2004 5:47 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404260247.3694982e@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040425233300.25970.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 4/25/2004 4:14 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404251314.199e2c0d@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Given enough time, they'll come around to my way of thinking. One
> >> >amateur radio service, one license.
> >>
> >> So...you're either a Socialist or a Marxist. Which is it?
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >There you go with your extremism again.
> >
>
> And the question remains...Socialist or Marxist? You must be one or the
> other in order to hold such concepts.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You might be a Jihadist to hold such views.

3221. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 22:04:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404261404.2cbf532d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91335

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040425230249.25970.00000333@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/24/2004 10:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404241925.2e53193c@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040424185419.29909.00000354@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> With the exception of a very few Active Duty personnel assigned to
> oversee
> >> >> the program, every single person in all three branches of MARS are
> licensed
> >> >> Amateur Radio Operators.
> >> >
> >> >I don't believe that Ray Collins is an amateur.
> >>
> >> Who cares?
> >
> >You do. You just said that, "With the exception of a very few Active
> >Duty personnel assigned to oversee the program, every single person in
> >all three branches of MARS are licensed Amateur Radio Operators."
> >
> >Ray is neither Active Duty nor an Amateur Radio Operator. He is
> >merely the Chief of Air Force MARS.
>
> Then you're one up, after...what...three years of getting your tail caught
> under the rockers?

There you go viewing my posts with a jaundiced eye. You've been wrong
more than you've been right. But in either case, you're almost always
extreme.

> >> Enough to completely ignore the fact that 99% of all MARS personnel
> are
> >> licensed Amateurs? I hardly think so.
> >
> >Now you're saying that 1% of all MARS personnel are not amateurs?
>
> Do you NEED a specific number, Brian? I am sure we can come up with one,
> and I am sure that no matter what, it will STILL be under 10% regardless...

Great!

First you've gone from none to 1%. Now you're saying that between 1%
and 10% of all MARS personnel are not amateurs?

Do I hear between 10% and 25%?

Going once, going twice...

Can you say, "moving target?"

> >> >> >ex NNN0GCM (Area Coordinator, Navy/Marine Corps MARS, Guam/Mariana
> >> >> >Islands)
> >> >>
> >> >> Congratulations. None of it changes the facts about MARS, however.
> >> >
> >> >Correct. And you have your >>>FACTS<<< wrong.
> >>
> >> Which ones, Brian?
> >
> >For starters, this one: "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio"."
>
> And without Amateur Radio MARS is...what...?!?!

Aha! Another slippery fella who needs to have "IS" defined.

> >> YOUR experience in AMRS, please?
> >
> >I've never been in AMRS, or even in AMWAY.
>
> Too bad. It was a lot of fun.
>
> >I have been in AF MARS at two assignements; base support team at
> >Andersen AB in 1990-91, and Scott AFB 1993 - 1999. I did sign up for
> >Army Mars when I arrived in Korea in 1988, but didn't become active
> >with it.
>
> OK...that takes you up to five years ago. Thanks.
>
> >> >MARS is >>>NOT<<< "Amateur Radio."
> >> >
> >> >> Formerly NNN0VVU (CHOP, NNN0MOC/MOF, Assistant Islandwide
> Coordinator
> for
> >> >> Okinawa, 1981), AFA1OQ, AAT4SA.
> >> >>
> >> >> So there....Nyah.....
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >Looks like the military wasted a lot of training on you if you cannot
> >> >get even the most basic >>>FACT<<< right.
> >> >
> >> >Now just accept it so that Carl doesn't have to come on here spank you
> >> >again.

> >>
> >> Hardly, Brian.
> >>
> >> So...You going to Dayton?
> >
> >I have a scouting campout the weekend of the Hamvention.
>
> I am sure you do.

Just stay away from me wherever I happen to be.

3222. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 22:24:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404261424.609b4b53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91336

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040425233134.25970.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/25/2004 10:17 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404250717.1f389b71@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040424190402.29909.00000355@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
> >> But right now...today...what I stated is true.
> >
> >Nope, you're "FACTS" are moving targets. You've already backtracked
> >on your original statement and now say that 1% of MARS personnel are
> >not Amateurs.
>
> OK...here we go again.

No, Steve. There >>>YOU<<< go again.

> Brian, I have ALWAYS stated that there are SOME "non-Amateur" personnel
> involved in MARS.

You absolutely have >>>NOT<<<.

This is what you stated: " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
"

Must I define " >>>IS<<< " for you?

Not only aren't all MARS personnel not amateur radio operators, but
MARS is >>>NOT<<< Amateur Radio.

> Most of those are Active Duty Armed Forces.

And so you start modifying your position.

At first, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

Then, you allowed for active duty personnel.

You provided
> the name of ONE person who is neither Amateur nor ADAF.

It only takes >>>ONE<<< to make your equation false.

I will accept that
> there are probably folks who fall into that same category for N/MC and Army

> MARS.

It matters not that you accept it. As a matter of fact, the more you
modify your nonsense statement that " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<<
"Amateur Radio". ," the closer you come to the truth.

> I still contend that the numbers will be around 1%, certainly no more
> than 10%.

Yet another modification. Congrats.

> That means 90% of the load is carried by licensed Amateur Radio operators.

If you say so. I'm losing interest.

Let me know when you accept that your statement was false.

3223. The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-26 22:30:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404261430.3b7a3208@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91337

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own prediction, are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
K0HB: January 1, 3000

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3224. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 00:17:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <1sadnQojtNRGOxDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91338

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:408D73F5.2000101@psu.edu...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:408D59D5.2050406@psu.edu...
> >
> > [snipped part - not going to play that game any more]
> >
> > and I may have some of Jim's comments in here, too ...
> >
> >
> >>>>>Now it has
> >>>>>branched out to a free upgrade to most hams. We are toled that on a
> >>>>>personal level, that "I'll" never support a reduction in the written
> >>>>>exams" and now they are here supporting a reduction in the written
> >>>>>exams. And sorry folks, that "one time adjustment" is spin-us
maximus.
> >>>>
> >>>>Sorry ... but that's BS ...
> >>>
> >>>Which part?
> >>>
> >>
> >>I can't find anything that is that particular term in my whole
> >>statement. Perhaps he is trying to say that anyone that disagrees with
> >>him is a slinger of such?
> >
> >
> > No, I was referring to your assertion that we were supporting a
reduction in
> > the written exams and the "spin-us maximus" stuff. I don't believe
that's
> > an accurate characterization of the ARRL's proposal or NCI's comments to
the
> > FCC or my comments here.
> >
> > ['nuther snip]
> >
> >
> >>>>I agree with ARRL
> >>>>that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs)
that
> >>>

> > we
> >
> >>>>need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that
will
> >>>
> > be
> >
> >>>>interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them
> >>>>interested in learning and progressing.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.
> >>
> >
> > Many people's mileage varys on that ...
> >
> >
> >>>Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
> >>>experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....
> >>
> >
> > You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones
I
> > know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse.
However,
> > geting on HF and talking around the world, experimenting with (and maybe
> > developing) some new sound card digital modes (ever notice how many kids
are
> > computer wizzes?) would appeal to them and keep them interested.
> >
> >
> >>Testing = knowledge = bad
> >
> >
> > No ...
> >
> > Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest =
bad
>
>
> Hold on Carl. You are putting Jim's and my posts together here. (at
> least I think) I support Morse code testing. But if it goes away, I
> doubt I'll miss a minute of sleep.

You will note at the top that I said I thought I had inadvertently mixed
in/didn't trim some of Jim's comments.

> But I don't think that the tested requirements for General are
> irrelevant or unnecessary, etc. I think you were talking about element
> one instead of the writtens?

You are correct ...

> > [snip]
> >
> >
> >>>Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
> >>>majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
> >>>and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
> >>
> >
> > Read the numbers ... the majority of NCI members did NOT support either
the
> > "commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
> > newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that
they
> > want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just
as
> > did the Novices of our beginning days ...
>
>
> You're still replying to Jim here. I gave up on the hypothetical
> questions a little while ago.
>
> > As far as the NCVEC proposal that applicants be required to certify that
> > they have read and understand the Part 97 rules, most felt that was
> > reasonable, and so do I. However, the way the question was worded (mea
> > culpa), it doesn't indicate that that would be a substitute for at least
> > some rules and regs questions on the written test - just "should folks
> > certify that they understand the rules."
> >
> > If you read my *personal* comments, I state what *I* believe (and what I
> > *honestly* believe in my own heart that most of NCI's members meant and
> > thought they were answering on that survey question) - that the
> > certification is OK, but that "... however, it should NOT be viewed as a
> > replacement for reasonable testing on the basic rules and regulations as
a
> > part of the examination requirement for licensure."
> >
> >
> >>>>I don't understand the implication that NCI should somehow "not be
> >>>
> > allowed
> >
> >>>>to" file comments - or why doing so is so frowned on.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Nobody I know says anyone should not be allowed to comment. The
> >>>frowning is about the support for lowering of *written* test
> >>>standards, which some folks claimed they would *never* support.
> >>
> >

> > Again, it is not "support for lowering of *written* test standards" ...
> > other than introducing an appropriate test like the Novice test of old
for
> > beginners, I see no "lowering of written test standards" - the General
and
> > Extra tests would remain the same. And I would oppose weakening them.
> >
> > However, for a "one shot adjustment" to align the current licensees with
the
> > new structure proposed, I personally don't have a problem with the ARRL
> > proposal.
> > I think it's the only way to avoid the fiasco that occured 50-some years
ago
> > when folks lost privileges ... you know about that, and I'm sure you're
> > aware that there are still some folks around who are very bitter about
it.
>
> I support a system that is basically like what we have now. Only
> difference is that Morse code is not tested for AT ALL. I would think
> NCI would prefer a system like that instead of one in which there is
> still a test for Extra.

The one part of the ARRL proposal that NCI opposes is the "keep the Morse
test for Extra" part.

73,
Carl - wk3c

3225. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 00:22:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <PMadnb2-xtRDOhDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91339

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0404261430.3b7a3208@posting.google.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own
> prediction, are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004

At the rate the FCC is moving, I'm wishing I'd picked N8UZE's date of July 1, 2005 ... while I prefer my date, I'm beginning to think it's going to take them that long ... can I add 6 months to mine and make it June 1, 2005???

Carl - wk3c

> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3226. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 00:33:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DdmdnUKNhpCjNxDdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91340

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

>>I support a system that is basically like what we have now. Only
>>difference is that Morse code is not tested for AT ALL. I would think
>>NCI would prefer a system like that instead of one in which there is
>>still a test for Extra.
>
>
> The one part of the ARRL proposal that NCI opposes is the "keep the Morse
> test for Extra" part.

Do you think my proposal is BS?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3227. Morse meeting in Minnesota

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 00:41:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <x_hjc.10789$eZ5.5164@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91341

http://www.startribune.com/stories/389/4743033.html

3228. Re: Morse meeting in Minnesota (2nd Try)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 01:02:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_iijc.10802$eZ5.10467@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91342

This article from the Star Tribune has been sent to you by K0HB.

BYLINE: Peg Meier

CREDITLINE: Star Tribune

HEADLINE: Minnesotans dot, dash down memory lane

Morse code is a dying language, but it's not click-clacking its way to the grave unnoticed.

Some of the last of the Minnesota men who can communicate in dots and dashes gathered Saturday to celebrate the birthday of Samuel F.B. Morse, the man who invented the telegraph and developed the code. He was born in Massachusetts on April 27, 1791 -- 213 years ago today.

Since 1944, Morse Telegraph Club chapters nationwide have met on the last Saturday in April to honor Morse. The Twin Cities group even had a birthday cake for him, with a "Happy birthday Sam" inscription in English and Morse code.

The other reason for members getting together was sharing stories about their former careers as telegraph operators.

Such as this one from Bert Miner of Cottage Grove. (You have to understand that experienced telegraphers could tell which colleague was sending a telegraph, just by the rhythm of the clicks.) One frigid winter day, Miner sent a message to a telegrapher in Fargo: "It doesn't sound like you." The response: "That's because I'm telegraphing with my mittens on."

A few decades ago, the Twin Cities chapter alone pulled in more than 100 people for the Morse birthday party, and so did other chapters around the state. This year, the state's only gathering was at the Pavek Museum of Broadcasting in St. Louis Park and attracted just 14 men, most of whom had been telegraphers for railroads, and a few wives and significant others. So few people today are proficient in Morse code that they relish being together.

"This stuff is dead, I mean dead, except for us kids who play with it," said Bob Branchaud, 79, also from Cottage Grove. He's been the club's president since 1968.

Any regrets that their code is on its way out?

"Oh, my," Branchaud said. "The technology is interesting, but, no, it's gone. Now we think e-mail is super fast and wonderful. That's what people thought about the telegraph and Morse code more than 100 years ago. Things change. That's progress."

Branchaud learned the code at age 16, and it provided him the groundwork for a fabulous job -- "never a bad day." He went to work for Western Union in Aberdeen, S.D., in 1946. By 1951, he was with the Great Northern Railway, working first with telegraphy and then with data processing.

Now he's retired, and his home office is filled with a collection of old technology, including telegraph equipment. But even his grandkids show no particular interest.

Memories live on

Stories flew Saturday. Gary Braasch, 64, of Brooklyn Center, told about the telegrapher so entranced with his job that he installed a telegraph key next to his bed. What was music to his ears drove his wife nuts. She moved into another bedroom.

Boyd Ferrell, 67, of Black Duck, Minn., remembered that new telegraphers were rotated to various stations to relieve employees on vacation. In his first two years, he moved 64 times and never got his suitcase unpacked. He remembers sitting under the bridge in Burlington, Iowa, "bawling night after night because I was so lonely."

Yet Lee Mills, 81, of Brooklyn Center, the club's vice president, brought along the cover of an old Railroad Magazine that pictured an adoring woman gazing at a handsome telegraph operator. "Ours was a pretty good-paying job in a small town, and the girls wouldn't mind looking up a new agent," Mills said. He spent 42 years with the Great Northern railroad and reports that the living standard shrank with time: "Eisenhower got in, and the working man didn't do too good after that."

Some telegraph operators were almost lyrical in their transmissions, and others "you'd swear were sending with their left feet," Branchaud said. The men all had stories about how hard it sometimes was for a receiving operator to tell the difference among an "h" (four dots), a p (five dots) and the number 6 (6 dots) as wired by a sloppy sender.

Mistakes survive in memories. There's one about the florist who sent a telegram ordering flowers for a funeral with a card reading, "Lord, she is thine." It came through as "Lord, she is thin."

With practice, telegraphers stopped hearing individual dots and dashes; their brains processed them as words. And once they knew Morse code, it was with them forever, the men said. For fun, Branchaud brought a tape recording of Morse code transmissions.

The table where it was clicking away became the center of the party.

It was in the 1830s that Morse invented the telegraph, which means "far writing." He was already one of America's leading portrait painters. If he had be able to build an electric telegraph sooner, he might have gotten home in time for his wife's funeral. She died at home in Connecticut in 1825 when he was in Washington, D.C., seeking lucrative commissions. The two cities were four travel days away, and word of her illness didn't reach him in time.

Seven years later, he was returning from Europe, where he studied painting for years, and he took part in a shipboard discussion of the new electro-magnet. If electric current could pass almost instantaneously over a wire, as one of the speakers maintained, Morse reasoned that it could be interrupted to produce signals. This was the beginning of the idea for his code. He built his first telegraph instruments at New York University, where he taught art.

After years of struggle, Morse and a partner got congressional funding to finance the first telegraph line, from Washington to Baltimore. On May 24, 1844, a small group gathered in a Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol to watch him send a message to a railroad station in Baltimore, 40 miles away. The message was the biblical phrase, "What hath God wrought?" Those four words were said to change the world.

After that success, Morse and associates were able to raise money to extend the line to Philadelphia and New York City. Eventually, telegraph wires went to every little hamlet in the nation.

Telegraph agents were the first to record news of war, birth, death, marriages, everyday business, million-dollar deals and plaintive appeals for bus fare home. To the outside world, it seemed miraculous that messages could be sent at the speed of 20 or 30 words a minute. With time, telegraph operators used more abbreviations and could get even more than 50 words a minute.

Branchaud said the Morse code was at its peak after World War I, when press associations were still sending stories by telegraph. Baseball games were telegraphed play-by-play (Branchaud himself relayed some games) until radio broadcast games after World War II. In the late 1950s, more than 800 telegraph stations were in place along rail lines in Minnesota, with twice that many operators.

The electronics industry has changed rapidly, Branchaud said, but he and his buddies sure had fun while the code was king. As Ernie Olson of Brooklyn Center said in his prayer before their lunch Saturday, "Heavenly Father, thank you for the privilege of being

telegraphers."

Peg Meier is at pmeier@startribune.com.

3229. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 02:18:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426221821.29049.00000005@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91343

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/26/2004 9:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <8W8jc.10117$eZ5.4921@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>PS: Please quit quoting the Crockstar so profusely. It allows
>him to evade my Bozo Bin when someone else quotes him.

If it's a "Bozo Bin", how do you see your OWN posts, Pops?

Steve, K4YZ

3230. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 03:01:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426230103.29049.00000006@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91344

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/26/2004 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261404.2cbf532d@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040425230249.25970.00000333@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> Then you're one up, after...what...three years of getting your tail
>caught
>> under the rockers?
>
>There you go viewing my posts with a jaundiced eye. You've been wrong
>more than you've been right. But in either case, you're almost always
>extreme.

It doesn't take a jaundiced eye to see that you have a poor grasp on a
great many things, Brian.

>> Do you NEED a specific number, Brian? I am sure we can come up with
>one,
>> and I am sure that no matter what, it will STILL be under 10% regardless...
>
>Great!
>
>First you've gone from none to 1%. Now you're saying that between 1%
>and 10% of all MARS personnel are not amateurs?
>
>Do I hear between 10% and 25%?
>
>Going once, going twice...
>
>Can you say, "moving target?"

I can say that even if it WAS 25%, it would still mean that AMATEUR RADIO
was responsible for the other 75%, and that if they decided to stop being in
MARS all at once, there'd be no MARS.

Besides, Brian, you forget where I received my Marksmanship Training. A
"moving target" is a no brainer. Sorry that you are having such difficulty.

>> And without Amateur Radio MARS is...what...?!?!
>
>Aha! Another slippery fella who needs to have "IS" defined.

That "slippery fella" would be you, Brian. It seems you have very little real awareness of what the program is about.

>> >I have a scouting campout the weekend of the Hamvention.
>>
>> I am sure you do.
>
>Just stay away from me wherever I happen to be.

No problem, Brian.

You have said that people should do one thing well.

It appears yours is shrinking from the truth and hiding behind middle school boys.

Steve, K4YZ

3231. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 03:22:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426232253.29049.00000007@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91345

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/26/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261424.609b4b53@posting.google.com>

>No, Steve. There >>>YOU<<< go again.

Brian, why do you want to start lying again?

It's been a nice couple of weeks, and here you are again, trying to hide behind middle school boys and re-write what others have said despite the inviobility of Google.

>> Brian, I have ALWAYS stated that there are SOME "non-Amateur"
>personnel
>> involved in MARS.
>
>You absolutely have >>>NOT<<<.

"Absolutely", Brian?

I have REPEATEDLY said there are non-Amateur Active Duty personnel assigned to the MARS program.

>This is what you stated: " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>"
>
>Must I define " >>>IS<<< " for you?
>
>Not only aren't all MARS personnel not amateur radio operators, but
>MARS is >>>NOT<<< Amateur Radio.
>
>> Most of those are Active Duty Armed Forces.
>
>And so you start modifying your position.

I see...Once someone says "something", it is absolute and non-amendable.

You ARE an idiot, Burke.

>At first, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
>Then, you allowed for active duty personnel.

I have said that long before this, Brian. Please get your stories straight.

> You provided
>> the name of ONE person who is neither Amateur nor ADAF.
>
>It only takes >>>ONE<<< to make your equation false.

What equation?

That over 90% of the membership of MARS are licensed Amateurs?

That at any given moment the program is WHOLLY depenedent on those
AMATEURS...?

You can beleive that if you want to, but it will make you look pretty
idiotic, Brian

> I will accept that
>> there are probably folks who fall into that same category for N/MC and Army
>> MARS.
>
>It matters not that you accept it. As a matter of fact, the more you
>modify your nonsense statement that " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<<
>"Amateur Radio". ," the closer you come to the truth.
>
>> I still contend that the numbers will be around 1%, certainly no more
>> than 10%.
>
>Yet another modification. Congrats.
>
>> That means 90% of the load is carried by licensed Amateur Radio
>operators.
>
>If you say so. I'm losing interest.

No doubt you are. You are woefully unprepared and wholly incapable of
carrying on an adequate debate here, Brian. You border on incompetent.

>Let me know when you accept that your statement was false.

MARS - Amateur Radio = Ancient History.

MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio. Sorry you don't agree. Sorry you don't
UNDERSTAND.

Now scurry off with the Scouts, Brian. I am sure your "knowledge" and
"experiences" impress them.

Steve, K4YZ

3232. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 03:31:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040426233140.29049.00000008@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91346

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/26/2004 4:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261348.1acb00da@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040426065529.23386.00000427@mb-m04.aol.com>...

>> Your suggestion of "one license fits all" is the very epitome of
>> socialism, Brian.
>
>OK, you've pigeon-holed it as Socialism.
>
>> Again I ask you, Socialist or Marxist?
>
>Since you've already pigeon-holed my idea as Socialist, why do you ask
>such a stupid question?

I haven't pigeon-holed anything.

I asked you a question about your views which I said are the "epitome" of
socialism. You then decried it as "extremist" and got very defensive rather
than explain why you think this "one licnese fits all" idea would work.

I can tell you in ONE sentence why it WOULDN'T...It wouldn't fulfil the
requirements of Part 97.1, Basis and Purpose.

>Because you're not happy enough to call me a Socialist, you've got to
>call me a Marxist, too!
>
>Did I say that you tend toward extremes?

I asked you a question which you've chose to become argumentive about
rather than discuss like a man.

Your problem, Brian, not mine.

You COULD have just explained your position...Instead you resorted to
Sandlot 101.

Teach that in the Scouts, do you? I am sure you are the milestone against
which leaders are hallmarked.

>Let me 'splain it to you Steve.
>
>In Socialism, there are two license classes. A class for the masses,
>and a class for the governmental elitists.

>
>In Marxism, there is one license class. A class for the governmental
>elitists.

And you are which...?!?! (Do I need to ask a FOURTH time...????)

Steve, K4YZ

3233. Re: Morse meeting in Minnesota (2nd Try)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 09:43:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0404270143.1394ebeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91347

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_iijc.10802$eZ5.10467@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> This article from the Star Tribune has been sent to you by K0HB.
>
>
> BYLINE: Peg Meier
>
> CREDITLINE: Star Tribune
>
> HEADLINE: Minnesotans dot, dash down memory lane
>
>
>
> Morse code is a dying language, but it's not click-clacking its
> way to the grave unnoticed . . .

> . . . As Ernie
> Olson of Brooklyn Center said in his prayer before their lunch
> Saturday, "Heavenly Father, thank you for the privilege of being
> telegraphers."
>

Well done - Tnx Hans!

w3rv

3234. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 12:10:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <AlydnU7hJKg40BPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91348

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:DdmdnUKNhpCjNxDdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>
> >>I support a system that is basically like what we have now. Only
> >>difference is that Morse code is not tested for AT ALL. I would think
> >>NCI would prefer a system like that instead of one in which there is
> >>still a test for Extra.
> >
> >
> > The one part of the ARRL proposal that NCI opposes is the "keep the
Morse
> > test for Extra" part.
>
> Do you think my proposal is BS?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

You are free to have your own views/proposals. I didn't say they were BS
... I was ONLY talking about the assertion that NCI was "supporting a
reduction in written test requirements" and your "spin" comments.

Carl - wk3c

3235. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 12:24:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404270424.14fb31b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91349

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040426233140.29049.00000008@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/26/2004 4:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261348.1acb00da@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040426065529.23386.00000427@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
> >> Your suggestion of "one license fits all" is the very epitome of
> >> socialism, Brian.
> >
> >OK, you've pigeon-holed it as Socialism.
> >
> >> Again I ask you, Socialist or Marxist?
> >
> >Since you've already pigeon-holed my idea as Socialist, why do you ask
> >such a stupid question?
>
> I haven't pigeon-holed anything.
>
> I asked you a question about your views which I said are the "epitome" of
> socialism. You then decried it as "extremist" and got very defensive rather
> than explain why you think this "one licnese fits all" idea would work.
>
> I can tell you in ONE sentence why it WOULDN'T...It wouldn't fulfil the
> requirements of Part 97.1, Basis and Purpose.
>
> >Because you're not happy enough to call me a Socialist, you've got to
> >call me a Marxist, too!
> >
> >Did I say that you tend toward extremes?
>
> I asked you a question which you've chose to become argumentive about
> rather than discuss like a man.
>
> Your problem, Brian, not mine.
>
> You COULD have just explained your position...Instead you resorted to
> Sandlot 101.
>
> Teach that in the Scouts, do you? I am sure you are the milestone against
> which leaders are hallmarked.

>
> >Let me 'splain it to you Steve.
> >
> >In Socialism, there are two license classes. A class for the masses,
> >and a class for the governmental elitists.
> >
> >In Marxism, there is one license class. A class for the governmental
> >elitists.
>
> And you are which...?!?! (Do I need to ask a FOURTH time...????)
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Inflamatory questions won't be answered.

3236. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 12:33:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404270433.1396682f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91350

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040426232253.29049.00000007@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/26/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261424.609b4b53@posting.google.com>
>

> I see...Once someone says "something", it is absolute and non-amendable.

Amendable? Why not just say, "Geez, bb, I was dead wrong!"

> You ARE an idiot, Burke.

You said, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". ."

Last this subject.

3237. Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 12:34:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
Source record: 91251

Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing question, but is related by being a CW operating question.

With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?

While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?

Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than operating Phone.

I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more than half that number.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3238. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 13:11:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408E5C17.5030103@psu.edu>
Source record: 91252

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:DdmdnUKNhpCjNxDdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>
>>>>I support a system that is basically like what we have now. Only
>>>>difference is that Morse code is not tested for AT ALL. I would think
>>>>NCI would prefer a system like that instead of one in which there is
>>>>still a test for Extra.
>>>
>>>
>>>The one part of the ARRL proposal that NCI opposes is the "keep the
>>
> Morse
>
>>>test for Extra" part.
>>
>>Do you think my proposal is BS?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> You are free to have your own views/proposals. I didn't say they were BS
> ... I was ONLY talking about the assertion that NCI was "supporting a
> reduction in written test requirements" and your "spin" comments.

But do you think my proposal will work? We have a number of years of operation under such a system, and I have not heard of any problems with the database administration of the orphan licensees.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3239. Re: FCC to make CB Amps Legal again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 13:59:09 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6lovd01amg@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <ItKdnY47WLra_RPdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>, Dave VanHorn says...
>
>
>"PowerHouse CB & Scanner" <PowerHouse_CB_&_Scanner@PrivateBox.com> wrote in
>message news:108slgaf52ije4d@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> news:OZidnWE0p6oFshDdRVn-jw@gbronline.com...
>> >
>> > The subject line of this thread is incorrect, amps were never legal on
>> > cb and still aren't. This FCC ruling applies only to amateur radio,
>> > nothing changes for cb.
>> >
>>
>> That's not totally true... It would make it even easier for a CB operator
>> to acquire one... Doesn't change the legality, just makes it easier...
>
>Then again, if they were running quality amps with real output filters,
>maybe there would be less problems.. Still illegal as all hell, but cleaner
>anyway.
>
>
Screw the FCC they are powerless anyway.

3240. BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 14:07:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xOtjc.14640$e4.10294@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

From: JBellows K0QB

To:
N0OEL@aol.com;k0ad@arrl.net;wc0v@comcast.net;wa1gwe@mn.rr.com;n0b
m@arrl.net;n0bgo@arrl.net;k0to@arrl.org;w0su@arrl.net;hartgc@ix.n
etcom.com

Cc: mn-wireless-assn@yahoogroups.com; tcdxa-list@tcdxa.org

Sent: 4/27/2004 2:32:10 PM

Subject: [TCDXA-list] BPL Comments of President Bush im
Minneapolis on April 26th

The following is from the President's speech in Minneapolis on
April 26, 2004. Note the last line of paragraph four.
Particularly note the comment "(s)o technical standards need to
be changed to encourage that."

"Now, the use of broadband has tripled since 2000 from 7 million
subscriber lines to 24 million. That's good. But that's way short
of the goal for 2007. And so -- by the way, we rank 10th amongst
the industrialized world in broadband technology and its
availability. That's not good enough for America. Tenth is 10
spots too low as far as I'm concerned. (Applause.)

Broadband technology must be affordable. In order to make sure it
gets spread to all corners of the country, it must be affordable.
We must not tax broadband access. If you want broadband access
throughout the society, Congress must ban taxes on access.
(Applause.)

Secondly, a proper role for the government is to clear regulatory
hurdles so those who are going to make investments do so.
Broadband is going to spread because it's going to make sense for
private sector companies to spread it so long as the regulatory
burden is reduced -- in other words, so long as policy at the
government level encourages people to invest, not discourages
investment.

And so here are some smart things to do: One, increase access to
federal land for fiberoptic cables and transmission towers. That
makes sense. As you're trying to get broadband spread throughout
the company, make sure it's easy to build across federal lands.
One sure way to hold things up is that the federal lands say, you
can't build on us. So how is some guy in remote Wyoming going to

get any broadband technology? Regulatory policy has got to be wise and smart as we encourage the spread of this important technology. There needs to be technical standards to make possible new broadband technologies, such as the use of high-speed communication directly over power lines. Power lines were for electricity; power lines can be used for broadband technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to encourage that.

And we need to open up more federally controlled wireless spectrum to auction in free public use, to make wireless broadband more accessible, reliable, and affordable. Listen, one of the technologies that's coming is wireless. And if you're living out in -- I should -- I was going to say Crawford, Texas, but it's not -- maybe not nearly as remote. (Laughter.) How about Terlingua, Texas? There's not a lot of wires out there. But wireless technology is going to change all that so long as government policy makes sense.

And we're going to continue to support the Federal Communications Commission. Michael Powell -- Chairman Michael Powell, under his leadership, his decision to eliminate burdensome regulations on new broadband networks availability to homes. In other words, clearing out the underbrush of regulation, and we'll get the spread of broadband technology, and America will be better for it. (Applause.) "

I thought you would be interested. Perhaps you might think about expressing your views on the BPL issue to President Bush. You may want to check the ARRL Website on this. I expect Jim Haynie will be sending a letter to President Bush on behalf of ARRL. The mail and email address for the President should be available on the Web page.

73,

Jay Bellows, KQB

3241. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 15:00:09 UTC
From: Bob Schreibmaier <k3ph@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <50KdnQxWXKXk6BPdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In article <xOtjc.14640$e4.10294@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net says...
>

>The following is from the President's speech in Minneapolis on
>April 26, 2004.
>
>"Now, the use of broadband has tripled since 2000 from 7 million
>subscriber lines to 24 million. That's good. But that's way short
>of the goal for 2007. And so -- by the way, we rank 10th amongst
>the industrialized world in broadband technology and its
>availability. That's not good enough for America. Tenth is 10
>spots too low as far as I'm concerned. (Applause.)

Looks like his arithmetic is almost as good as his
grammar. He wants us to be 0th? 8^)

--
+---+
| Bob Schreibmaier K3PH | E-mail: k3ph@ptd.net |
| Kresgeville, PA 18333 | http://www.dxis.org |
+---+

3242. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 16:37:23 UTC
From: Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net>
Message-ID: <108t3238orns363@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Yes, the technical standards need to be changed to allow BPL: require all power lines to be shielded.

Alan AB2OS

On 04/27/04 10:07 am Kï¿½HB put fingers to keyboard and launched the following message into cyberspace:

> The following is from the President's speech in Minneapolis on
> April 26, 2004. Note the last line of paragraph four.
> Particularly note the comment "(s)o technical standards need to
> be changed to encourage that."

3243. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 16:47:54 UTC
From: Doug Smith W9WI <w9wi@invalid.invalid>
Message-ID: <408E8EBA.7030908@invalid.invalid>
Source record: 91257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Bob Schreibmaier wrote:
>>availability. That's not good enough for America. Tenth is 10
>>spots too low as far as I'm concerned. (Applause.)
>
> Looks like his arithmetic is almost as good as his
> grammar. He wants us to be 0th? 8^)

Well, that could just mean he's been spending his spare time learning
how to program<grin>...
--
Doug Smith W9WI
Pleasant View (Nashville), TN EM66
http://www.w9wi.com

3244. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 17:11:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cvwjc.11882$eZ5.720@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Doug Smith W9WI" <w9wi@invalid.invalid> wrote in message
news:408E8EBA.7030908@invalid.invalid...
> Bob Schreibmaier wrote:
> >>availability. That's not good enough for America. Tenth is 10
> >>spots too low as far as I'm concerned. (Applause.)
> >
> > Looks like his arithmetic is almost as good as his
> > grammar. He wants us to be 0th? 8^)
>
> Well, that could just mean he's been spending his spare time
learning
> how to program<grin>...
> --

A friend of mine, K0TO, said If this wasn't the same Man who declared that he was going to start a program to go to Mars, the he was going to build an anti-missile system, that he was going to..... he would be more worried. It is an election year(has been for more than 36 months) and the objective is to promise everything and anything in a way the makes some other group of people responsible for its failure, not you. [This is political party independent by the way -- all of them utilize the same methodology].

73, de Hans, K0HB

3245. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 17:45:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91259

>Subject: Morse and Contests
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
>
> Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing

>question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
>
> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
>have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?

Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this regard, as in any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.

> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
>make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?

Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.

As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to be compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest that required using honed skills, too...?!?!

> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
>points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
>points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
>points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
>operating Phone.

And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?

> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
>logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
>than half that number.

Shudda been on the paddles!

Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...

Steve, K4YZ

3246. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 17:49:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040427134940.21319.00000354@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91260

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/27/2004 7:24 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404270424.14fb31b9@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040426233140.29049.00000008@mb-m07.aol.com>...

>> And you are which...?!?! (Do I need to ask a FOURTH time...????)
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Inflamatory questions won't be answered.

So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.

I guess your brief slip into lucidity has waned and it's back to being
"Brain" again.

Steve, K4YZ

3247. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 17:52:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040427135216.21319.00000355@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91261

>Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/27/2004 7:33 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404270433.1396682f@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040426232253.29049.00000007@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Cell phone woes
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/26/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404261424.609b4b53@posting.google.com>
>>
>
>> I see...Once someone says "something", it is absolute and
>non-amendable.
>
>Amendable? Why not just say, "Geez, bb, I was dead wrong!"
>
>> You ARE an idiot, Burke.
>
>You said, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". ."

MARS is made almost wholly of Amateur Radio operators.

>Last this subject.

Run away, Brain. Sure would hate for you to embarass yourself for your
Scouts. As if one more time would make any difference.

Steve, K4YZ

3248. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 18:22:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408EA4CF.20508@psu.edu>
Source record: 91262

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Morse and Contests
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
>>
>> Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
>
>
>>question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
>>
>> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
>>have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
>
>
> Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this regard, as in
> any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
>

True it does take some skill. But if we use Field day as an example,
there is so much else going on that I find it hard to make special
compensations for certain modes.

I would make an exception for "demonstration modes" such as the lesser
used modes such as sat ops, feld-hell, etc. I'd use these as multipliers
though.

>> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
>>make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
>
>
> Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
>
> As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to be
> compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest that
> required using honed skills, too...?!?!
>
>
>> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
>>points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
>>points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
>>points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
>>operating Phone.
>
>

> And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?

We had a kid come on and operate psk31 almost immediately. It was amazing. I had picked it up quickly, but I did some reading beforehand. This young fellow was operating like a pro in no time. In fact, I'm modifying the setup for next year to allow more of the PSK frequencies for the GOTA. The kid was transfixed, and sat patiently working 14.070 until he had worked the band clean.

>
>> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
>>logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
>>than half that number.
>
>
> Shudda been on the paddles!

hehe

> Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...

Just seems like the ones I participate in give double for the CW. I'll need to look some more.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3249. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 18:34:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040427143422.23386.00000539@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91263

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/27/2004 1:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <408EA4CF.20508@psu.edu>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?

> We had a kid come on and operate psk31 almost immediately...(SNIP)

That's my point! Almsot anyone can do it. So why give it par-level
scoring with Morse Code?

> Just seems like the ones I participate in give double for the CW. I'll
>need to look some more.

I am contemplating a trip to VO1 for Sweepstakes this year. I had hoped
to go last year but a family emergency canx'd that idea. Not sure if I will go
for CW or SSB weekend, tho...Can't swing both!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3250. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 19:31:36 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ad0xw73b.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91264

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
Mike> contacts?

How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to the
point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're orthogonal, as far
as I can tell.

Mike> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does
Mike> it make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than
Mike> others?

Yes, in my humble opinion. It's harder (at least for me and many of
my ham friends) to make contacts via CW, so those should be worth more
points.

Mike> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth
Mike> double points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the
Mike> same double points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked
Mike> up a fair number of points operating PSK31, and it was certainly
Mike> no more difficult than operating Phone.

I don't operate PSK31, and I'm not that interested in trying at the
moment, so I can't say.

Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
Mike> with little more than half that number.

And how hard did that CW op work?

Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjrUeGPFSfAB/ezgRAhxOAKCfflw5xPgEzJIa7PPN9vpLi7/83wCfSi5S
3EeSAY8uleph+tUYvVWcFNk=

```
=sI7M
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3251. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 19:56:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408EBB03.8010609@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

>
>And so here are some smart things to do: One, increase access to
>federal land for fiberoptic cables and transmission towers. That
>makes sense. As you're trying to get broadband spread throughout
>the company, make sure it's easy to build across federal lands.
>One sure way to hold things up is that the federal lands say, you
>can't build on us.
>
Most fibre optic cables use railroad right of ways. The railroad
already exists and
has direct paths from one city or town to another, and is one entity for
the firbre
company to lease from. And the railroads like having the extra income.
They bury
the cable off to one or both sides of the tracks and railroads are used
to heavy
equipment work being done. Railroads need communications for their signals
and keeping track of where the trains are and such anyway. So they throw in
extra fibre for that when installing the other fibre. And from those
towns fibre
is strung along telephone poles to reach that place out in the sticks.
Imagine
a high speed 'net link to Ted Clampet's shack he had before he got his
oil money....
"Wee Doggies, look at this porn"..... :-)

> So how is some guy in remote Wyoming going to
>get any broadband technology? Regulatory policy has got to be
>wise and smart as we encourage the spread of this important
>technology. There needs to be technical standards to make
>possible new broadband technologies, such as the use of
>high-speed communication directly over power lines. Power lines
>were for electricity; power lines can be used for broadband
>technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to
>encourage that.
>
Yeah, BPL serving an entire remote town will give individual users
service that will
make 300 baud modems seem fast. How much stuff can you multiplex on one
set of
power cables feeding that town? Else you'd be talking about microwave
freqs to
get enough bandwidth.

>
>And we need to open up more federally controlled wireless
>spectrum to auction in free public use, to make wireless
>broadband more accessible, reliable, and affordable. Listen, one
>of the technologies that's coming is wireless.
>
Then we won't need powerline *wires*.....

> And if you're
>living out in -- I should -- I was going to say Crawford, Texas,
>but it's not -- maybe not nearly as remote. (Laughter.) How about
>Terlingua, Texas? There's not a lot of wires out there. But
>wireless technology is going to change all that so long as
>government policy makes sense.
>
>And we're going to continue to support the Federal Communications
>Commission. Michael Powell -- Chairman Michael Powell, under his
>leadership, his decision to eliminate burdensome regulations on
>new broadband networks availability to homes. In other words,
>clearing out the underbrush of regulation, and we'll get the
>spread of broadband technology, and America will be better for
>it. (Applause.) "
>
>
>
And make sure we never see another bare breast again at halftime.

3252. Re: Cell phone woes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:03:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408EBC9F.6020305@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91266

William wrote:

>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<408C8556.4080207@ix.netcom.com>...
>
>
>>>
>>>
>>>And nearly anyone who'se anybody in the service has a cell phone on
>>>their hip paid for by you and me. I'd say that the military does
>>>accept cellular telephones as a valuable service daily.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>I doubt the military expects cell phone service in battle zones.
>>
>>
>
>I don't think they do either, but the intent was not war fighting, but
>disaster comms in the USA. I suggest that the cell phone is the best
>thing that non-amateurs have going for them. See the long line of
>jabs from JJ and cronies.
>
>
>
Cell phones will be fine for small emergencies (car accidents and such)
but are likely to
be down for earthquakes (not guarenteed to be dead, some cell sites will
survive and
still have connections to the rest of the world. Some people in LA
still had 'net access
after their last big earthquake years ago. But you can't plan on any
one system so you should
have a selection avaliable to improve your odds of having something
usable when the shjt
hits the fan....

3253. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:06:38 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408EBD50.1000702@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91267

Mike Coslo wrote:

>

Many if not most contests are mode specific. Like the "whatever CW
sprint" or
"North European SSB contest"..... Or RTTY events.

3254. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:08:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <408EBDD6.6080008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91268

>
>
>
>And how hard did that CW op work?
>
>
>
Well some of us here could do it while driving a bus. I wouldn't recomment
it, as if something happened that driver would be in deep do-do.....

3255. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:14:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dazjc.12099$eZ5.8779@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91269

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> Many if not most contests are mode specific. Like the
"whatever CW
> sprint" or "North European SSB contest"..... Or RTTY events.

We allow 2 points for CW, 2 points for RTTY, and 1 point for
phone. See http://www.w0aa.org/mnqp/2004/mnqprule.html

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/

3256. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:14:05 UTC
From: mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Message-ID: <c6meuc$a3o$2@puck.litech.org>
Source record: 91270
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In <408EBB03.8010609@ix.netcom.com> (rec.radio.amateur.misc), Robert Casey wrote:

> Most fibre optic cables use railroad right of ways. The railroad
> already exists and has direct paths from one city or town to
> another, and is one entity for the firbre company to lease from. And
> the railroads like having the extra income. They bury the cable off
> to one or both sides of the tracks and railroads are used to heavy
> equipment work being done. Railroads need communications for their
> signals and keeping track of where the trains are and such anyway.
> So they throw in extra fibre for that when installing the other
> fibre. And from those towns fibre is strung along telephone poles to
> reach that place out in the sticks. Imagine a high speed 'net link
> to Ted Clampet's shack he had before he got his oil money.... "Wee
> Doggies, look at this porn"..... :-)

An increasing amount of fiber is being buried on (or under) highway
right-of-way. I know; I work for a state department of transportation,
and we worked deals to get some very nice free bandwidth out of the
fibers along some Interstates. I expect we'll be able to do the same
for fibers buried along federal and state highways, once the carriers
recover from the dot-bomb and start building bandwidth out again.

--
Mike Andrews
mikea@mikea.ath.cx
Tired old sysadmin

3257. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:33:08 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <8665blw48r.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91271
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Andrews <mikea@mikea.ath.cx> writes:

[... Robert Casey talks about fiber and railroad right-of-ways ...]

Mike> An increasing amount of fiber is being buried on (or under)
Mike> highway right-of-way. I know; I work for a state department of
Mike> transportation, and we worked deals to get some very nice free
Mike> bandwidth out of the fibers along some Interstates. I expect
Mike> we'll be able to do the same for fibers buried along federal and
Mike> state highways, once the carriers recover from the dot-bomb and
Mike> start building bandwidth out again.

This was done five or ten years ago in New York -- I worked at
the place that managed the fiber for the state. The fiber was laid
along the NYS Thruway, which passes through the nine largest cities in
NY and within some short number of miles of a large percentage of the
state population. Much of that fiber was dark last I heard.

The idea of buried fiber along every two-lane road in the country may
be a fantasy, but laying cable along every Interstate is certainly
doable with the resources available. Of course, who will run this
true "information superhighway" is the next debate...

Mike> -- Mike Andrews mikea@mikea.ath.cx Tired old sysadmin

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjsOPGPFSfAB/ezgRAoLNAKDQ1ba8/I5uGGZCpqs0U5D2R7HKrwCeMmyq
SpbRzv99q4xLcYnhNN6mF2U=
=JVbz
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3258. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 20:34:45 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <861xm9w462.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91272

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Robert" == Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?

Robert> Well some of us here could do it while driving a bus. I
Robert> wouldn't recomment it, as if something happened that driver
Robert> would be in deep do-do.....

True, just like some of those phone ops could do it while driving an
SUV filled with brats in soccer cleats. What's your point?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjsPrGPFSfAB/ezgRAgybAJ92dlOK9JlVY5s9OEVuO14NtIPm4ACfbKOk
REl/krIR11Wnwuji8DPpLkg=
=skfO
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3259. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:03:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wUzjc.12164$eZ5.7276@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote

>
> The idea of buried fiber along every two-lane road in the
country may
> be a fantasy, but laying cable along every Interstate is
certainly
> doable with the resources available. Of course, who will run
this
> true "information superhighway" is the next debate...
>

Ten-twelve years ago I was up in northern Minnesota deer hunting. Got up to my stand way back down a township road, 5 miles from the nearest dwelling, at zero-dark-thirty and waited for Bambi's dad to show up with the sunrise. Just in time for morning colors (0800) I start hearing this awful racket off in the distance, like a farmer might be buring drainage tiles or something, except this part of Minnesota hasn't seen an agricultural plow since the depression. Finally got curious (and cold) enough to go investigate. Here, out in the middle of absolute nowhere, is a contract crew burying a 144-fiber cable big as your wrist, and another spare alonside of it. Every half-mile they put in an above-ground service loop, and the next day another crew came behind and plonked down a splice-and-access pedestal at each loop waiting for the subscribers to show up. The pedestals are still there, some kinda shot up, but no customers on the horizon. I bet the local Podunk Power Cooperative is getting ready to roll out BPL in the same manner!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3260. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:32:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <OjAjc.2838$Ur7.331@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:wUzjc.12164$eZ5.7276@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
>
> >
> > The idea of buried fiber along every two-lane road in the
> country may
> > be a fantasy, but laying cable along every Interstate is
> certainly
> > doable with the resources available. Of course, who will run
> this
> > true "information superhighway" is the next debate...
> >
>
> Ten-twelve years ago I was up in northern Minnesota deer hunting.
> Got up to my stand way back down a township road, 5 miles from
> the nearest dwelling, at zero-dark-thirty and waited for Bambi's
> dad to show up with the sunrise. Just in time for morning colors
> (0800) I start hearing this awful racket off in the distance,
> like a farmer might be buring drainage tiles or something, except
> this part of Minnesota hasn't seen an agricultural plow since the
> depression. Finally got curious (and cold) enough to go
> investigate. Here, out in the middle of absolute nowhere, is a
> contract crew burying a 144-fiber cable big as your wrist, and
> another spare alonside of it. Every half-mile they put in an
> above-ground service loop, and the next day another crew came
> behind and plonked down a splice-and-access pedestal at each loop
> waiting for the subscribers to show up. The pedestals are still
> there, some kinda shot up, but no customers on the horizon. I
> bet the local Podunk Power Cooperative is getting ready to roll
> out BPL in the same manner!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hello, Hans

My gut feeling is that if someone is out in the boonies and they *really*
want high speed internet, they could go for satellite and have a decent
system. Yes, $50.00 per month is not as cheap as you can get cable or DSL
(at least in some areas), but it is doable and I doubt too many ISPs are
going to try high speed service where, even if they could subscribe
everyone, the average population density is 10 per square mile or less ;)

I suspect that BPL will go the same route; they'll try, perhaps, but it will be in the cities and suburbs where they can make money (and they will have competition *and* cause a lot of qrm). The low population density areas will *still* not be served (except by satellite or, perhaps, dial-up).

As for president, I *still* like Ike!!!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.669 / Virus Database: 431 - Release Date: 4/26/04

3261. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:32:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404271332.6af38517@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91275

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<PMadnb2-xtRDOhDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0404261430.3b7a3208@posting.google.com...
> > Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> > eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own
> > prediction, are in the past.
> >
> > WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> > KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> > KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> > K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> > K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> > AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> > N2EY: April 15, 2004
> > N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> > KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> > WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> > K3LT: September 15, 2004
> > WK3C: December 30, 2004
>
> At the rate the FCC is moving, I'm wishing I'd picked N8UZE's date of July
> 1, 2005 ... while I prefer my date, I'm beginning to think it's going to
> take them that long ... can I add 6 months to mine and make it June 1,
> 2005???
>
> Carl - wk3c

Sorry, Carl, if I do it for you then I gotta do it for everybody and
the whole point of the pool is lost.

The original ARRL blurb on WRC-03 said it would take two years. That's
almost exactly Dee's date.

Frankly I am surprised it's taken this long - and with the new NPRM
out there, it may be even further down the pike.
>
> > N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> > KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> > K0HB: January 1, 3000
> >
> > Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
> >

email or write your senator, congressman and the president about BPL.
See arrl website for details. Do it today!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3262. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:43:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404271343.737542f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91276

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>...
> Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
> question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
>
> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?

Yep. In fact it should be triple for CW and double for data modes.
>
> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?

Sure - if that mode uses less spectrum space and is more efficient.
>
> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
> points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
> points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> operating Phone.

It's more than fair. If anything the slant is towards 'phone because
you can put almost anybody in front of the mike after a few minutes
instruction and they can make FD QSOs (particularly if there's a
'logger' sitting right there).

Working CW takes special skills, working PSK-31 takes more equipment
and some skill (not as much as CW, of course, but more than 'phone).
Both modes use much less spectrum space and are more efficient. So
their use should be encouraged on Field Day (which is about the only
large mixed-mode HF contest in existence).
>
> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
> logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> than half that number.
>
Said CW op also worked hard, did he not? And is "hard work" the
criteria, or effectiveness? You can fit at least 10 CW or PSK QSOs in
the space of one SSB QSO. Shouldn't that sort of efficiency be
encouraged?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3263. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:54:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404271354.357af597@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91277

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20040425103800.15096.00000297@mb-m10.aol.com>...

>
> I cant believe you guys bought that line of BS.
>

Especially when there are more believable things to buy into.

Like "passing the Extra Exam on a lark, in under 8 minutes, without
error, without studying, and collecting $250."

I'll stick with NCI.

3264. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:54:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_DAjc.4990$g31.3489@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91278

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >Subject: Morse and Contests
> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
> >
> > Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
>
> >question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
> >
> > With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> >have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
>
> Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this regard,
as in
> any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
>
> > While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> >make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
>
> Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
>
> As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to be
> compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest that
> required using honed skills, too...?!?!
>
> > Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
> >points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> >points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
> >points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> >operating Phone.
>
> And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?
>
> > I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
> >logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> >than half that number.
>
> Shudda been on the paddles!
>
> Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

>
>
>
>
>
Simply stated....CW Contesting requires real skills. Digital requires the
ability to type.
Phone is way down there from the above requirements.

If you want to do so....Give phone 1 point, digital 2 points, and CW 5
points per qso.

That's my opinion, and I'm sticking to it.

Dan/W4NTI

3265. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 21:59:39 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <fJAjc.31966$cF6.1437625@attbi_s04>
Source record: 91279

> > Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do.

5nn QRZ ....

> >> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> >>make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?

5nn vs you're five by nine

honed skills, too...?!?!
and it was certainly no more difficult than
> >>operating Phone.

5nn 5nn

> >> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard

Yep with one of those new fangled voice machines.

The above is in response to what one hears in contesting in addition to a
lot of bad manners and yes that happens on CW also ergo KI3R does his
"needle point" that weekend.

73 and 5nn de Tom KI3R QRZ .....

3266. Re: Morse meeting in Minnesota (2nd Try)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 22:02:18 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <KLAjc.43352$GR.6076884@attbi_s01>
Source record: 91280

> > . . . As Ernie
> > Olson of Brooklyn Center said in his prayer before their lunch
> > Saturday, "Heavenly Father, thank you for the privilege of being
> > telegraphers."

YIKES ....I hope Lennie didn't see this ...if so ....

73 Tom KI3R

3267. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 22:14:04 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86r7u9ul03.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91281

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Tom" == garigue <garigue@comcast.net> writes:

[...]

Tom> Yep with one of those new fangled voice machines.

Ugh! You've hit my primary pet peeve with contesting.

Tom> The above is in response to what one hears in contesting in
Tom> addition to a lot of bad manners and yes that happens on CW also
Tom> ergo KI3R does his "needle point" that weekend.

Those "voice keyers" annoy me more than anything, even "CW keyers". I
felt like jumping into a QSO Party a few weeks ago but *five*
different stations had voice keyers calling CQ every thirty seconds
and didn't acknowledge my response. Honestly, if you can't talk into
the radio for the length of the contest, then maybe you should take a
break.

Voice keyers in my opinion are just plain wrong.

Tom> 73 and 5nn de Tom KI3R QRZ .....

Jack.
(thanks for pushing the button)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjtsxGPFSfAB/ezgRAgdLAKCqxaW4mWGaE/2JZkb6p/bkdArVJACg6LbK
tiQMYzT8fHn12xJ9GSeAO/g=
=d0ry
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3268. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 22:57:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1qKdna7JAtbfeBPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91282

Jack Twilley wrote:
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>>>>>>"Mike" == Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
> Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
> Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
> Mike> contacts?
>
> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to the
> point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're orthogonal, as far
> as I can tell.

I was always told that the increased points offered was an
encouragement to work CW.

> Mike> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does
> Mike> it make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than
> Mike> others?
>
> Yes, in my humble opinion. It's harder (at least for me and many of
> my ham friends) to make contacts via CW, so those should be worth more
> points.
>
> Mike> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth
> Mike> double points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the
> Mike> same double points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked
> Mike> up a fair number of points operating PSK31, and it was certainly
> Mike> no more difficult than operating Phone.
>
> I don't operate PSK31, and I'm not that interested in trying at the
> moment, so I can't say.
>
> Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
> Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
> Mike> with little more than half that number.
>
> And how hard did that CW op work?

I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3269. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 23:34:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1vSdnd-mYJptcBPdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91283

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>...
>
>>Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
>>question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
>>
>> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
>>have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
>
>
> Yep. In fact it should be triple for CW and double for data modes.
>
>> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
>>make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
>
>
> Sure - if that mode uses less spectrum space and is more efficient.

Wow, talk about an arbitrary point, Jim! I never heard of any contest
rules based on bandwidth. ALthough if they did, it could make fro some
interesting scoring.

>> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
>>points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
>>points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
>>points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
>>operating Phone.
>
>
> It's more than fair. If anything the slant is towards 'phone because
> you can put almost anybody in front of the mike after a few minutes
> instruction and they can make FD QSOs (particularly if there's a
> 'logger' sitting right there).
>
> Working CW takes special skills, working PSK-31 takes more equipment
> and some skill (not as much as CW, of course, but more than 'phone).
> Both modes use much less spectrum space and are more efficient. So
> their use should be encouraged on Field Day (which is about the only
> large mixed-mode HF contest in existence).
>
>> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
>>logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
>>than half that number.
>>

>
> Said CW op also worked hard, did he not? And is "hard work" the
> criteria, or effectiveness? You can fit at least 10 CW or PSK QSOs in
> the space of one SSB QSO. Shouldn't that sort of efficiency be
> encouraged?

If it were the arbitrary reasoning behind the contest.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3270. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 23:34:39 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91284

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
Mike> contacts?

Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.

Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
Mike> encouragement to work CW.

That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present. A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore, whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.

Now, if you're going to assert that the potential end to Morse code testing will eventually cause hams to stop learning and/or using Morse code, and that therefore the multiplier is akin to the "marriage penalty" [1], well, I'm not sure that's true. If it is, NCI should be raising holy hell about the pro-code conspiracy behind all these contests, right?

[...]

Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
Mike> with little more than half that number.

Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?

Mike> I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.

You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar contests (say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely in phone for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of your experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for the second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking. Report back to the group with your personal experience.

When I know the code, I'll do the same thing, if only to satisfy my
own curiosity.

Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -

Jack.

[1] For those who are unfamiliar with this concept, for some time the
tax structure in the US was such that married couples with two similar
incomes paid more tax than married couples with one income, or with
two very dissimilar incomes, even when the total number of dollars
earned is the same. The common theory behind this is that it is
designed to encourage married couples to have one working spouse and
one non-working spouse. Whether or not this is moral, ethical, or
even a good idea is a different question.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAju4UGPFSfAB/ezgRAvc8AKDsuo+Lf/ts2eXFq6wc6f9fJET1dwCg7/4Q
W7TwjbDIGGxQdW3cYMrHczE=
=cyRV
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3271. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 23:39:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <UMudnU4jMaTbchPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91285

Jack Twilley wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>>>>>>"Tom" == garigue <garigue@comcast.net> writes:
>
>
> [...]
>
> Tom> Yep with one of those new fangled voice machines.
>
> Ugh! You've hit my primary pet peeve with contesting.
>
> Tom> The above is in response to what one hears in contesting in
> Tom> addition to a lot of bad manners and yes that happens on CW also
> Tom> ergo KI3R does his "needle point" that weekend.
>
> Those "voice keyers" annoy me more than anything, even "CW keyers". I
> felt like jumping into a QSO Party a few weeks ago but *five*
> different stations had voice keyers calling CQ every thirty seconds
> and didn't acknowledge my response. Honestly, if you can't talk into
> the radio for the length of the contest, then maybe you should take a
> break.
>
> Voice keyers in my opinion are just plain wrong.

Agreed, I don't like keyers at all. If I made contest rules, they would
be outlawed. Get caught using a keyer, and yer out!

I've been in contests where the timeing is set so close between CQ's
that there isn't time to get in a reply. I suppose the idiot wonders why
he's getting no one coming back.

hmmm, maybe an op could get mults for turning in keyers! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3272. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 23:39:54 UTC
From: aa6lk <aa6lk@cwnet.NOSPAM.com>
Message-ID: <408EEF4A.7760@cwnet.NOSPAM.com>
Source record: 91286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Jim Hampton wrote:
>... <stuff deleted> ...
> I suspect that BPL will go the same route; they'll try, perhaps, but it will
> be in the cities and suburbs where they can make money (and they will have
> competition *and* cause a lot of qrm). The low population density areas
> will *still* not be served (except by satellite or, perhaps, dial-up).

I agree with this, except that a satellite link has too much latency to
support
VPN, so some of us rural folk are still stuck with only dialup (and
I$DN). There
is an outfit in town that's putting up terrestrial microwave links in
the area,
but they claim the County is stalling on the approval for the tower they
need
to service my area. Grrrr!

I give BPL little chance of success in my neighborhood - the PG&E lines
around here
generate so much hash that it would never fly. Had PG&E come out once
to look at
it aan it went away for awhile, but now that the hot weather's back so's
the noise.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

73,
L

3273. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-27 23:48:35 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ekq9ugmk.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91287

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

[... me ranting about voice keyers ...]

Mike> Agreed, I don't like keyers at all. If I made contest rules,
Mike> they would be outlawed. Get caught using a keyer, and yer out!

Sounds like a good deal to me. Make every contest night a straight
key night. Or paddles, or whatever, as long as it's by hand and
without assistance -- that means no keyboards either.

Mike> I've been in contests where the timeing is set so close between
Mike> CQ's that there isn't time to get in a reply. I suppose the
Mike> idiot wonders why he's getting no one coming back.

I'm waiting for the day I hear "CQ contest, CQ contest, this is K1XY,
please QSY five kilohertz up..." repeated over and over. That'll
really tweak me.

Mike> hmmm, maybe an op could get mults for turning in keyers! 8^)

Nah, imagine a Turing-like contest where you get points for
identifying different methods of Morse transmission, such as straight
keys, paddles, bugs, keyboard or keyers.

Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -

Jack.
(talk about your obscure skills test)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjvFZGPFSfAB/ezgRAoh1AJwMzT28t4r7roGY/50tCYqFGTEg+QCgzpz8
u0x+657boJBkYLhwc85fv+I=
=5XD3
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3274. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 00:00:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <WuCjc.12421$eZ5.4710@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91288

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote

> If it is, NCI should be raising holy hell about the
> pro-code conspiracy behind all these
> contests, right?

One NCI Director calls contests "electronic splat ball".
Actually, I kinda like that description. One of my grandsons
asked about contesting, and I used that metaphor. Now he wants
to multi-op with me in this years SS.

> You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar
contests
> (say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely
in phone
> for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of
your
> experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for
the
> second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking.
Report
> back to the group with your personal experience.

I regularly work both weekends of SS (CW one weekend, Phone two
weeks later). Both are scored the same way, each two-way contact
counts for 2 points (a message sent and a message received).
Personally I enjoy the CW weekend more, but invariably score
higher on Phone weekend, simply because I can copy CW at only
about 45 WPM, and voice at about 300WPM.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: If you don't like keyers, you ain't gonna make it
contesting.

3275. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 00:36:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <CPOdnZwRd-XoYRPdRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 91289

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:408E533C.6010002@psu.edu...
> Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
> question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
>
>
> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
>
> While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
>
> Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
> points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
> points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> operating Phone.
>
> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
> logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> than half that number.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yes it is worth giving the CW contacts double points. It will serve as an aid in preserving a valuable communications tool. Some people will learn it for the very purpose of getting more points in the contest.

This last Field Day, conditions were so poor that our two CW stations netted more contacts than our three voice stations and GOTA station combined. Not just points mind you but actual number of contacts.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3276. Bush Backs BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 00:38:03 UTC
From: Kim_Jong_Il@volcanomail.com
Message-ID: <26a0f230.0404271638.14c97838@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91290
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

A month ago, I pointed out that Bush backed broadband access.

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&safe=off&threadm=26a0f230.0403261754.1561309d%40posting.google.com&rnum=10&prev=/groups%3Fq%3Dkim_jong_il%2Bgroup:rec.radio.shortwave%26hl%3Den%26lr%3D%26ie%3DUTF-8%26oe%3DUTF-8%26group%3Drec.radio.shortwave%26safe%3Doff%26scoring%3Dd%26selm%3D26a0f230.0403261754.1561309d%2540posting.google.com%26rnum%3D10

or

http://tinyurl.com/3gvsn

His speech at the time lacked details, and he made no mention of BPL.
Yesterday, he backed BPL.

http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/04/20040426-6.html

>>
....
And so here are some smart things to do: One, increase access to
federal land for fiberoptic cables and transmission towers. That makes
sense. As you're trying to get broadband spread throughout the
company, make sure it's easy to build across federal lands. One sure
way to hold things up is that the federal lands say, you can't build
on us. So how is some guy in remote Wyoming going to get any broadband
technology? Regulatory policy has got to be wise and smart as we
encourage the spread of this important technology. There needs to be
technical standards to make possible new broadband technologies, such
as the use of high-speed communication directly over power lines.
Power lines were for electricity; power lines can be used for
broadband technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to
encourage that.

And we need to open up more federally controlled wireless spectrum to
auction in free public use, to make wireless broadband more
accessible, reliable, and affordable. Listen, one of the technologies
that's coming is wireless. And if you're living out in -- I should --
I was going to say Crawford, Texas, but it's not -- maybe not nearly
as remote. (Laughter.) How about Terlingua, Texas? There's not a lot
of wires out there. But wireless technology is going to change all
that so long as government policy makes sense.

And we're going to continue to support the Federal Communications
Commission. Michael Powell -- Chairman Michael Powell, under his
leadership, his decision to eliminate burdensome regulations on new
broadband networks availability to homes. In other words, clearing out

the underbrush of regulation, and we'll get the spread of broadband technology, and America will be better for it. (Applause.)
....
<<

Sell your radios now. America will be better for it.

3277. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 00:53:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <DIqdnYxOTZ7hnRLdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 91291

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
> Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
> Mike> contacts?
>
> Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
> Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
> Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.
>
> Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
> Mike> encouragement to work CW.
>
> That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on
> certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present.
> A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore,
> whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to
> do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the
> multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still
> doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.
>
> Now, if you're going to assert that the potential end to Morse code
> testing will eventually cause hams to stop learning and/or using Morse
> code, and that therefore the multiplier is akin to the "marriage
> penalty" [1], well, I'm not sure that's true. If it is, NCI should be
> raising holy hell about the pro-code conspiracy behind all these
> contests, right?
>
> [...]
>
> Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
> Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
> Mike> with little more than half that number.
>
> Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?
>
> Mike> I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.
>
> You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar contests

> (say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely in phone
> for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of your
> experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for the
> second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking. Report
> back to the group with your personal experience.
>
> When I know the code, I'll do the same thing, if only to satisfy my
> own curiosity.
>
> Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Jack.

Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The CW op has put in many hours of practicing and participating in contests to get his/her speed up to a really useful contest level. Although the phone op has also put in hours participating in contests to get his/her abilities honed to contest level, it is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels of ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges the longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.

In the contests in which I've participated, I have noticed that the best CW ops can usually run more stations in less time because of the need for fewer repeats than the best phone ops. On the other hand, less experienced people can run phone contacts faster than CW contacts.

In my own contesting experience, my all time high was 310 contacts and it was a CW contest. My second best was down around 150 contacts and it was a voice contest. I'm running only 100 watts and wire antennas. I found it much easier to break through pileups and bad conditions on CW. But it took time to learn CW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3278. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 00:56:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <cu6dnf5aGYKBnBLdRVn-jw@comcast.com>
Source record: 91292

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:WuCjc.12421$eZ5.4710@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
>
> > If it is, NCI should be raising holy hell about the
> > pro-code conspiracy behind all these
> > contests, right?
>
> One NCI Director calls contests "electronic splat ball".
> Actually, I kinda like that description. One of my grandsons
> asked about contesting, and I used that metaphor. Now he wants
> to multi-op with me in this years SS.
>
> > You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar
> contests
> > (say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely
> in phone
> > for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of
> your
> > experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for
> the
> > second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking.
> Report
> > back to the group with your personal experience.
>
> I regularly work both weekends of SS (CW one weekend, Phone two
> weeks later). Both are scored the same way, each two-way contact
> counts for 2 points (a message sent and a message received).
> Personally I enjoy the CW weekend more, but invariably score
> higher on Phone weekend, simply because I can copy CW at only
> about 45 WPM, and voice at about 300WPM.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> PS: If you don't like keyers, you ain't gonna make it
> contesting.
>

Actually I find that CW is more productive and I'm not nearly as fast at CW
(20wpm for contest, 15wpm for ragchew) as you are but then I'm just running
100watts into basic wire antennas.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3279. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 01:12:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uyDjc.12487$eZ5.6040@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91293

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote

>
> Actually I find that CW is more productive and I'm not nearly
as fast at CW
> (20wpm for contest, 15wpm for ragchew) as you are but then I'm
just running
> 100watts into basic wire antennas.
>

Do you run a frequency, or do you "search and pounce"?

If you have a modest station and you S&P, then CW will likely be more productive because the gating factor is **getting the attention of the target station**. CW can be better at that because you can 'un-zero-beat' to stand out from the pile up and use other tricks and skills.

However, if you're running a frequency, then the **speed with which you can exchange messages** is the gating factor, and voice is faster than Morse by quite a margin.

The November SS is a particularly good event to compare CW vs. Phone, since the two weekends are close together (share the same general propagation conditions) and the list of participants is nearly identical between the two weekends so differing skill levels and station configurations are factored out.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3280. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 01:55:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <QOWdnd0AwrtgkxLd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 91294

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:uyDjc.12487$eZ5.6040@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Actually I find that CW is more productive and I'm not nearly
> as fast at CW
> > (20wpm for contest, 15wpm for ragchew) as you are but then I'm
> just running
> > 100watts into basic wire antennas.
> >
>
> Do you run a frequency, or do you "search and pounce"?
>
> If you have a modest station and you S&P, then CW will likely be
> more productive because the gating factor is **getting the
> attention of the target station**. CW can be better at that
> because you can 'un-zero-beat' to stand out from the pile up and
> use other tricks and skills.
>
> However, if you're running a frequency, then the **speed with
> which you can exchange messages** is the gating factor, and voice
> is faster than Morse by quite a margin.
>
> The November SS is a particularly good event to compare CW vs.
> Phone, since the two weekends are close together (share the same
> general propagation conditions) and the list of participants is
> nearly identical between the two weekends so differing skill
> levels and station configurations are factored out.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

I've tried running a frequency on SSB contests but just don't get enough takers to make it worthwhile so I finally end up doing the "search and pounce". I'm not good enough yet to run a frequency on CW so by necessity do "search and pounce" when operating in this mode.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3281. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 02:05:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040427220556.13628.00000467@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 91295

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>Date: 4/27/2004 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <QOWdnd0AwrtgkxLd4p2dnA@comcast.com>

>I've tried running a frequency on SSB contests but just don't get enough
>takers to make it worthwhile so I finally end up doing the "search and
>pounce". I'm not good enough yet to run a frequency on CW so by necessity
>do "search and pounce" when operating in this mode.

I had a lot more fun just setting a "personal goal" and working towards
that when I get into a contest. I set out to get a "Clean Sweep" a few yeas
ago and did it...with less than 150 Q's on each mode!

I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile signal
if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3282. Re: FCC to make CB Amps Legal again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 02:37:08 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <bLEjc.15031$7a5.7136@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: cool.gif

"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
news:c6lovd01amg@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <ItKdnY47WLra_RPdRVn-

> Screw the FCC they are powerless anyway.
\

Like this? They're hittin' those guys more and more. LOL!
J

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Gambler's C.B. & Ham Radio Sales & Service) File No.
EB-04-DT-225
)
Pinconning, Michigan) Citation No.
C20043236004)

CITATION
Released: April 13,
2004

By the Enforcement Bureau, Detroit Office:

1. This is an official Citation issued pursuant to Section
503((5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended
(``Act''),1 to Gambler's C.B. & Ham Radio Sales & Service
(``Gambler's'') for violation of Section 302(of the Act,2
and Sections 2.803(a)(1) and 2.815(of the Commission's
Rules (``Rules'').3

2. On April 9, 2004, Gambler's offered for sale at their
store located at 4671 North Huron Road, Pinconning,
Michigan, the following non-certified Citizens Band (``CB'')
transceivers:

NAME MODEL COST
Ranger RCI 2970 DX
$449.95
Ranger RCI 2980 WX
$449.95

Ranger RCI 2985 DX
$479.95
Ranger RCI 6300 F
$329.95
Galaxy DX33HML $198.95
Galaxy DX48T
$419.95
Galaxy DX66V
$279.95

According to the Commission's records, these devices have not received an FCC equipment authorization which is required for Citizens Band transmitters marketed in the United States.

3. Section 302(of the Act provides ``No person shall manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship devices or home electronic equipment and systems, or use devices, which fail to comply with regulations promulgated pursuant to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules provides that ``... no person shall sell or lease, or offer for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease), or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to certification, such device has been authorized by the Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and is properly identified and labeled....'' Gambler's offer for sale of these devices violates both sections.

4. Gambler's marketed these devices as amateur transceivers. The Commission has evaluated radiofrequency devices similar to those listed in paragraph 2 and concluded that the devices at issue are not only amateur radios but can easily be altered for use as CB devices as well. A CB transmitter is a transmitter that operates or is intended to operate at a station authorized for the CB service, and it must be certificated by the FCC prior to marketing or importation.4 The Commission has further concluded that these devices fall within the definition of a CB transmitter and therefore cannot legally be imported or marketed in the United States. See Response from the Commission's General Counsel to U.S. Customs Service dated May 17, 1999, 14 FCC Rcd 7797 (1999).

5. Additionally, dual use CB and amateur radios of the kind at issue here may not be certificated under the Commission's rules. Section 95.655(a) of the Rules5 states ``....([CB] Transmitters with frequency capability for the Amateur Radio Services....will not be certificated.'' See also FCC 88-256, 1988 WL488084 (August 17, 1988). This clarification was added to explicitly foreclose the

possibility of certification of dual use CB and amateur radios, see id., and thereby deter use by CB operators of frequencies allocated for amateur radio use.

6. Furthermore, the Commission has revised Section 2.1204(a)(5) of its Rules6 to prohibit all marketing and/or offering for sale in the United States of such devices even when the purchaser(s) had provided assurances that the transceivers are being bought solely for export. ALL DOMESTIC MARKETING OF SUCH DEVICES VIOLATES THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, AND THE COMMISSION'S RULES.

7. In addition to the marketing of the non-certified transceivers addressed above, Gambler's also offered for sale on April 9, 2004, the following CB external radio frequency power amplifiers (``linears''):

NAME MODEL COST
Palomar Skipper
$349.95
Palomar 225 $119.95
Palomar 250 $159.95
Palomar Skipper 350
$179.95
Palomar 650 Magnum
$348.95

8. The linear amplifiers indicated above are not only illegal to sell but also illegal to advertise for sale. Section 302(of the Act provides ``No person shall manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship devices or home electronic equipment and systems, or use devices, which fail to comply with regulations promulgated pursuant to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules provides that ``... no person shall sell or lease, or offer for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease), or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to certification, such device has been authorized by the Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and is properly identified and labeled...'' Section 2.815(of the Rules states: ``... no person shall manufacture, sell ... any external radio frequency power amplifier or amplifier kit capable of operation on any frequencies between 24 and 35 MHz.'' Gambler's offer for sale of these devices violates these sections.

9. Subsequent violations of the Communications Act and/or the Commission's Rules may subject the violator to substantial monetary forfeitures not to exceed $11,000 for

each such violation or each day of a continuing violation,7 seizure of equipment through in rem forfeiture action, and criminal sanctions including imprisonment.8

10. Gambler's may request a personal interview at the Commission's Field Office nearest your place of business. The nearest office is the Detroit Office, 24897 Hathaway Street, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48335-1552, which you may contact by telephone at (248) 471-5661. You must schedule this interview to take place within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Citation. Alternatively, you may submit a written statement to the above address within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Citation. Any written statement should specify what actions have been taken to correct the violations outlined above. Please reference case number EB-04-DT-225 when corresponding with the Detroit Office.

11. This Citation shall be sent First Class U.S. Mail and, Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to Gambler's C.B. & Ham Radio Sales & Service, 4671 North Huron Road, Pinconning, Michigan 48650.

12. The Privacy Act of 19749 requires that we advise you that the Commission will use all relevant material information before it, including any information disclosed in your reply, to determine what, if any, enforcement action is required to ensure compliance. Any false statement made knowingly and willfully in reply to this Citation is punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the U.S. Code.10 Please be advised that if you choose not to respond to this Citation and a forfeiture is issued, your unresponsiveness will be considered in our assessment of a forfeiture amount.

FEDERAL
COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

James A.
Bridgewater
District
Director
Detroit
Office

---

1 47 U.S.C. § 503((5)
2
47 U.S.C. § 302(
3
47 C.F.R. §§ 2.803(a)(1), 2.815(
4 See 47 C.F.R, §§ 95.603§, 2.803

5
47 C.F.R. &#65533; 95.655(a)

6 47 C.F.R. &#65533; 2.1204(a)(5) revised effective February 28, 2000

7
See 47 C.F.R. &#65533; 1.80((3)
8
See 47 U.S.C. &#65533;&#65533; 401, 501, 503, 510
9
P.L. 93-579, 5 U.S.C. &#65533; 552a(e)(3)
10
18 U.S.C. &#65533; 1001 et seq.

>

[Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: cool.gif]

3283. LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing + Spectrum Charts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 02:37:38 UTC
From: radio-operator@telus.net
Message-ID: <d318809e.0404271837.7faf5681@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

For those of you which requested it, below is a link to the Canadian
LF/MF/HF Utility Frequency Listing. There are some omissions so if
you come across one feel free to let me know.

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaFrequencyDatabase.txt

Below are links to the Canadian and US Radio Spectrum Charts:

http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/CanadaRadioSpectrum.pdf
http://www.telusplanet.net/~homac/USRadioSpectrum.pdf

*** These links will be removed April 30, 2004 ***

Homac
radio-operator@telus.net

3284. Re: FCC to make CB Amps Legal again!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 03:07:18 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94D8EB0AE22F9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in news:bLEjc.15031$7a5.7136
@bignews6.bellsouth.net:

> "WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> news:c6lovd01amg@drn.newsguy.com...
>> In article <ltKdnY47WLra_RPdRVn-
>
>> Screw the FCC they are powerless anyway.
> \
>
> Like this? They're hittin' those guys more and more. LOL!
> J
>
>
> Before the
> Federal Communications Commission
> Washington, D.C. 20554
>
>
>
> In the Matter of)
>)
> Gambler's C.B. & Ham Radio Sales & Service) File No.
> EB-04-DT-225
>)
> Pinconning, Michigan) Citation No.
> C20043236004)
>
> CITATION
> Released: April 13,
> 2004
>
>
> By the Enforcement Bureau, Detroit Office:
>
> 1. This is an official Citation issued pursuant to Section
> 503((5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended
> (``Act''),1 to Gambler's C.B. & Ham Radio Sales & Service
> (``Gambler's'') for violation of Section 302(of the Act,2
> and Sections 2.803(a)(1) and 2.815(of the Commission's
> Rules (``Rules'').3
>
> 2. On April 9, 2004, Gambler's offered for sale at their

> store located at 4671 North Huron Road, Pinconning,
> Michigan, the following non-certified Citizens Band (``CB'')
> transceivers:
>
> NAME MODEL COST
> Ranger RCI 2970 DX
> $449.95
> Ranger RCI 2980 WX
> $449.95
> Ranger RCI 2985 DX
> $479.95
> Ranger RCI 6300 F
> $329.95
> Galaxy DX33HML $198.95
> Galaxy DX48T
> $419.95
> Galaxy DX66V
> $279.95
>
> According to the Commission's records, these devices have not
> received an FCC equipment authorization which is required for
> Citizens Band transmitters marketed in the United States.
>
> 3. Section 302(of the Act provides ``No person shall
> manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship devices
> or home electronic equipment and systems, or use devices,
> which fail to comply with regulations promulgated pursuant
> to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules
> provides that ``... no person shall sell or lease, or offer
> for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease),
> or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or
> leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency
> device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to
> certification, such device has been authorized by the
> Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and
> is properly identified and labeled....'' Gambler's offer
> for sale of these devices violates both sections.
>
> 4. Gambler's marketed these devices as amateur
> transceivers. The Commission has evaluated radiofrequency
> devices similar to those listed in paragraph 2 and concluded
> that the devices at issue are not only amateur radios but
> can easily be altered for use as CB devices as well. A CB
> transmitter is a transmitter that operates or is intended to
> operate at a station authorized for the CB service, and it
> must be certificated by the FCC prior to marketing or
> importation.4 The Commission has further concluded that
> these devices fall within the definition of a CB transmitter
> and therefore cannot legally be imported or marketed in the

> United States. See Response from the Commission's General
> Counsel to U.S. Customs Service dated May 17, 1999, 14 FCC
> Rcd 7797 (1999).
>
> 5. Additionally, dual use CB and amateur radios of the
> kind at issue here may not be certificated under the
> Commission's rules. Section 95.655(a) of the Rules5 states
> ``....([CB] Transmitters with frequency capability for the
> Amateur Radio Services....will not be certificated.'' See
> also FCC 88-256, 1988 WL488084 (August 17, 1988). This
> clarification was added to explicitly foreclose the
> possibility of certification of dual use CB and amateur
> radios, see id., and thereby deter use by CB operators of
> frequencies allocated for amateur radio use.
>
> 6. Furthermore, the Commission has revised Section
> 2.1204(a)(5) of its Rules6 to prohibit all marketing and/or
> offering for sale in the United States of such devices even
> when the purchaser(s) had provided assurances that the
> transceivers are being bought solely for export. ALL
> DOMESTIC MARKETING OF SUCH DEVICES VIOLATES THE
> COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, AND THE COMMISSION'S
> RULES.
>
> 7. In addition to the marketing of the non-certified
> transceivers addressed above, Gambler's also offered for
> sale on April 9, 2004, the following CB external radio
> frequency power amplifiers (``linears''):
>
> NAME MODEL COST
> Palomar Skipper
> $349.95
> Palomar 225 $119.95
> Palomar 250 $159.95
> Palomar Skipper 350
> $179.95
> Palomar 650 Magnum
> $348.95
>
> 8. The linear amplifiers indicated above are not only
> illegal to sell but also illegal to advertise for sale.
> Section 302(of the Act provides ``No person shall
> manufacture, import, sell, offer for sale, or ship devices
> or home electronic equipment and systems, or use devices,
> which fail to comply with regulations promulgated pursuant
> to this section.'' Section 2.803(a)(1) of the Rules
> provides that ``... no person shall sell or lease, or offer
> for sale or lease (including advertising for sale or lease),
> or import, ship or distribute for the purpose of selling or

> leasing or offering for sale or lease, any radio frequency
> device unless: (1) In the case of a device subject to
> certification, such device has been authorized by the
> Commission in accordance with the rules in this chapter and
> is properly identified and labeled..." Section 2.815(of
> the Rules states: ``... no person shall manufacture, sell
> ... any external radio frequency power amplifier or
> amplifier kit capable of operation on any frequencies
> between 24 and 35 MHz." Gambler's offer for sale of these
> devices violates these sections.
>
> 9. Subsequent violations of the Communications Act and/or
> the Commission's Rules may subject the violator to
> substantial monetary forfeitures not to exceed $11,000 for
> each such violation or each day of a continuing violation,7
> seizure of equipment through in rem forfeiture action, and
> criminal sanctions including imprisonment.8
>
> 10. Gambler's may request a personal interview at the
> Commission's Field Office nearest your place of business.
> The nearest office is the Detroit Office, 24897 Hathaway
> Street, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48335-1552, which you may
> contact by telephone at (248) 471-5661. You must schedule
> this interview to take place within fourteen (14) days of
> the date of this Citation. Alternatively, you may submit a
> written statement to the above address within fourteen (14)
> days of the date of this Citation. Any written statement
> should specify what actions have been taken to correct the
> violations outlined above. Please reference case number EB-
> 04-DT-225 when corresponding with the Detroit Office.
>
> 11. This Citation shall be sent First Class U.S. Mail and,
> Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to Gambler's C.B.
> & Ham Radio Sales & Service, 4671 North Huron Road,
> Pinconning, Michigan 48650.
>
> 12. The Privacy Act of 19749 requires that we advise you
> that the Commission will use all relevant material
> information before it, including any information disclosed
> in your reply, to determine what, if any, enforcement action
> is required to ensure compliance. Any false statement made
> knowingly and willfully in reply to this Citation is
> punishable by fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the
> U.S. Code.10 Please be advised that if you choose not to
> respond to this Citation and a forfeiture is issued, your
> unresponsiveness will be considered in our assessment of a
> forfeiture amount.
>
>

> FEDERAL
> COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
>
>
>
> James A.
> Bridgewater
> District
> Director
> Detroit
> Office
>
> _____
>
> 1 47 U.S.C. ? 503((5)
> 2
> 47 U.S.C. ? 302(
> 3
> 47 C.F.R. ?? 2.803(a)(1), 2.815(
> 4 See 47 C.F.R, ?? 95.603?, 2.803
> 5
> 47 C.F.R. ? 95.655(a)
>
> 6 47 C.F.R. ? 2.1204(a)(5) revised effective February 28, 2000
>
> 7
> See 47 C.F.R. ? 1.80((3)
> 8
> See 47 U.S.C. ?? 401, 501, 503, 510
> 9
> P.L. 93-579, 5 U.S.C. ? 552a(e)(3)
> 10
> 18 U.S.C. ? 1001 et seq.
>
>>
>
>
> begin 666 cool.gif
> Attachment saved: C:\PROGRAM FILES\XNEWS\attachments\cool.gif
> `
> end
>
>

The latest NPRM would allow low-drive linears and linears that cover 10m without mods to be certified. About time, as the rules only hurt hams and didn't make much difference to those who want to run illegal power on CB.

3285. Re: Bush Backs BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 03:26:43 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <TvFjc.32494$0u6.5811893@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes..he is clueless, but the political agenda here is to promise people what they want to hear. Given that the FCC has increased restrictions on BPL deployment in its recent NPRM regarding Part 15 requirements means that the market will sort it out. Investors in BPL will see new limitations on BPL and have to consider its reliability against alternative systems that really work, like DSL, cable, and the various flavors of wireless continuously emerging. The shrub and his current administration won't have to kill it, the market will. It just sounds good in this election year. However, it just shows how stupid and gutless the management of this BPL issue has been!!!

3286. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 03:30:04 UTC
From: Wes Stewart <n7ws@_arrl.net>
Message-ID: <pi7u80ph2rqo4ee82sle3ut22t4lsk7u59@4ax.com>
Source record: 91300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

On Tue, 27 Apr 2004 12:37:23 -0400, Minnie Bannister
<GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net> wrote:

|Yes, the technical standards need to be changed to allow BPL: require
|all power lines to be shielded.

The ones under ground and under water already are.

The problem will be when every house in your neighborhood is a big
#&%*(*& radiator. Or even worse when your KW wipes out the entire
Internet service in a few square miles.

I'm a rural customer of an electric cooperative. (I happen to use
them for my dialup ISP also)

A couple of years ago when I was having a bout of power line
interference I happened to talk to their VP for new technology,
engineer to engineer.

Among other things he told me that reading meters was a big expense
since their service area is huge, covering good parts of three
counties, one of which is the size of Connecticut. They (we, I'm a
part owner) have 29,000 customers and 2,400 miles of lines.

So they (we) tried a system of reading the meters remotely, using
(very) slow-speed data on the power lines. They couldn't even solve
the technical challenges of doing this and wound up changing out most
of the meters to ones with built in transmitters that can be
interrogated by a guy driving around in a pickup truck.

If they can't read my meter remotely how in the hell are they going to
supply me with high-speed data transmission? BTW, I've strongly
suggested that they don't try.

3287. Re: Bush Backs BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 03:30:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mzFjc.12619$eZ5.1927@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Beloved Leader" <Kim_Jong_Il@volcanomail.com> wrote

> Sell your radios now. America will be better for it.

My friend, K0TO, said "If this wasn't the same Man who declared that he was going to start a program to go to Mars, that he was going to build and anti-missile system, that he was going to..... I would be more worried.

"It is an election year(has been for more than 36 months) and the objective is to promise everything and anything in a way the makes some other group of people responsible for its failure, not you. [This is political party independent by the way -- all of them utilize the same methodology]."

73, de Hans, K0HB

3288. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 04:05:40 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ad0wvjaj.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91352

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Hans" == groupk0hb <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

Hans> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote

Jack> If it is, NCI should be raising holy hell about the pro-code
Jack> conspiracy behind all these contests, right?

Hans> One NCI Director calls contests "electronic splat ball".
Hans> Actually, I kinda like that description. One of my grandsons
Hans> asked about contesting, and I used that metaphor. Now he wants
Hans> to multi-op with me in this years SS.

Contests mean different things to different people, as you make clear
with your postscript.

Hans> I regularly work both weekends of SS (CW one weekend, Phone two
Hans> weeks later). Both are scored the same way, each two-way
Hans> contact counts for 2 points (a message sent and a message
Hans> received). Personally I enjoy the CW weekend more, but
Hans> invariably score higher on Phone weekend, simply because I can
Hans> copy CW at only about 45 WPM, and voice at about 300WPM.

If you were the average ham, Hans, and the purpose of the point
multiplier was to balance out the speeds, then the multiplier would
have to be 6 to be "fair". Personally, my multiplier right now would
have to be 20, but it's a goal of mine to get it down to 2 someday.

Hans> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans> PS: If you don't like keyers, you ain't gonna make it
Hans> contesting.

We definitely have different goals in contesting. I don't care about
beating anyone else. When I enter a contest, my goal is to collect as
many points as possible without losing sight of why I'm there -- to
have fun, and to become a better operator.

What's your goal?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

```
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjy2ZGPFSfAB/ezgRAm/8AKD8MobgiCprF9UtmCUq+UrWBxowkwCfZ324
Slso84mESWnOw0+r5SVjEyc=
=QbCa
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3289. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 04:16:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ueGjc.12663$eZ5.2473@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91353

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote

>
> What's your goal?
>

Depends on the event....

In the MNQP it's to give everyone (especially county hunters) a chance to work a new Minnesota county.

In CQWWDX it's to do better than I've ever done before (setting a new personal best) knowing I'll never win because I live in the infamous "black hole" of propagation and can't break throught the right- and left-coast RF curtains.

In either of the 160 contests it's to pick up new countries to fill out my 6-band DXCC.

In Nov SS it's take-no-prisoners-bring-home-the-walnut-plaque and get in the top-10 box for my class.

In CQ-M it's to fill in the blanks on my oblast map.

In all of them, to have fun, tweak the engineering of my station and antenna farm for best communications efficiency, and to pick up some kind of bragging rights for the next MWA meeting (see http://www.w0aa.org)

73, de Hans, K0HB

3290. Re: Bush Backs BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 04:23:37 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <clGjc.32764$0u6.5865056@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes..he is clueless, but the political agenda here is to promise people what they want to hear. Given that the FCC has increased restrictions on BPL deployment in its recent NPRM regarding Part 15 requirements means that the market will sort it out. Investors in BPL will see new limitations on BPL and have to consider its reliability against alternative systems that really work, like DSL, cable, and the various flavors of wireless continuously emerging. The shrub and his current administration won't have to kill it, the market will. It just sounds good in this election year. However, it just shows how stupid and gutless the management of this BPL issue has been!!!

3291. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 04:29:25 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <864qr4vi6y.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91355

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

[... I suggested an experiment ...]

Dee> Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The
Dee> CW op has put in many hours of practicing and participating in
Dee> contests to get his/her speed up to a really useful contest
Dee> level. Although the phone op has also put in hours participating
Dee> in contests to get his/her abilities honed to contest level, it
Dee> is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels of
Dee> ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges
Dee> the longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.

Not all CW ops put in as many hours of practice, and some phone ops put in serious hours. My first contest -- as an Extra, no less -- was a Field Day. I was terrified of the microphone, and spent more than six hours practicing calling into a dead mike. It may sound stupid to some of you, but I was really really really shy. We had a written script to follow: "CQ Field Day, CQ Field Day, this is Whiskey Six Charlie X-Ray" was the first line, then the next line included the response with blanks to fill in, and even a line to thank the other amateur and wish them luck in the contest. I don't think of this as being the same as a voice keyer, by the way. We were actually pushing the mike button and speaking, which was very exciting. The one thing that was more fun than calling CQ was being the control op for Technicians and non-amateurs who wanted to give it a try. One Tech got the Cooke Islands as his first QSO, and he's now a General.

Dee> In the contests in which I've participated, I have noticed that
Dee> the best CW ops can usually run more stations in less time
Dee> because of the need for fewer repeats than the best phone ops.
Dee> On the other hand, less experienced people can run phone contacts
Dee> faster than CW contacts.

Oh, I agree. By far, the most common phrase at my station was "Say again?". At my current stage of CW "literacy", I effectively need an interpreter -- that cuts down on speed drastically.

Dee> In my own contesting experience, my all time high was 310
Dee> contacts and it was a CW contest. My second best was down around
Dee> 150 contacts and it was a voice contest. I'm running only 100
Dee> watts and wire antennas. I found it much easier to break through
Dee> pileups and bad conditions on CW. But it took time to learn CW.

I'm also in the 100W and wire antenna group. I don't have enough
experience with pile-ups and bad conditions, but one reason I want to
learn CW is because people think about what they send and don't waste
words on stupid stuff (at least in my fantasy-land) unlike other parts
of the band. I've only heard five minutes of 14.313, but that plus
some VHF repeater abuse has been enough to convince me that I want to
be where the better operators are, and I really hope they're on CW.

Dee> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAjzMqGPFSfAB/ezgRAtWXAJoDHF4ElNcrEYtVxgNlSlmMZ4fb3wCgkzVR
tePSMfm+cxCUMDijrVN+tpg=
=e859
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3292. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 05:17:24 UTC
From: Doug Smith W9WI <w9wi@invalid.invalid>
Message-ID: <408F3E5D.4040904@invalid.invalid>
Source record: 91356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Wes Stewart wrote:
> If they can't read my meter remotely how in the hell are they going to
> supply me with high-speed data transmission? BTW, I've strongly
> suggested that they don't try.

I've done the same with our cooperative here.

Personally, I think attempts to fight BPL through the political system are a waste of time. The amateur radio community doesn't have the financial resources to outbid the utilities for legislation.

What *will* stop BPL is economics.

Many of the expenses of offering broadband communications are independent of transmission technology. Obtaining a backbone connection, providing mail & web servers, customer support & billing are all expenses that are the same whether you're providing BPL, DSL, or cable modem service.

BPL has the additional disadvantage of requiring well-trained personnel with expensive safety gear to maintain the infrastructure. Most cable and DSL maintenance can be done on the ground.

BPL is at an advantage ONLY in very rural places, too small for cable and too far from the CO for DSL. Such places don't have enough customers to pay for the fixed infrastructure.

IMHO a few utilities will try full-scale rollouts of BPL - and will find it doesn't sell enough to pay the expenses. It'll go the way of the picturephone.

==========

If that doesn't work, we can tell the freeband community what's wiping out 26-29MHz, and post a few photos of the BPL access equipment, and then be sure to not get anywhere near a power pole without a bulletproof vest<grin>...

--
Doug Smith W9WI
Pleasant View (Nashville), TN EM66
http://www.w9wi.com

3293. Something more important than BPL...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 12:37:12 UTC
From: Beeper <nocoder@aol.com>
Message-ID: <569v809d8relmtqls17c9gsj1ho53a3gno@4ax.com>
Source record: 91358

Know code, Know ham.
No code, no ham.

The eternal truth, proven every day.

3294. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 13:02:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408FAB4C.9070905@psu.edu>
Source record: 91357

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
> news:86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
>
>>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>>Hash: SHA1
>>
>>
>>>>>>>"Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>>>>
>>Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
>>Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
>>Mike> contacts?
>>
>>Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
>>Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
>>Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.
>>
>>Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
>>Mike> encouragement to work CW.
>>
>>That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on
>>certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present.
>>A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore,
>>whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to
>>do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the
>>multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still
>>doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.
>>
>>Now, if you're going to assert that the potential end to Morse code
>>testing will eventually cause hams to stop learning and/or using Morse
>>code, and that therefore the multiplier is akin to the "marriage
>>penalty" [1], well, I'm not sure that's true. If it is, NCI should be
>>raising holy hell about the pro-code conspiracy behind all these
>>contests, right?
>>
>>[...]
>>
>>Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
>>Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
>>Mike> with little more than half that number.
>>
>>Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?
>>

>>Mike> I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.
>>
>>You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar contests
>>(say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely in phone
>>for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of your
>>experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for the
>>second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking. Report
>>back to the group with your personal experience.
>>
>>When I know the code, I'll do the same thing, if only to satisfy my
>>own curiosity.
>>
>>Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>Jack.
>
>
> Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The CW op has
> put in many hours of practicing and participating in contests to get his/her
> speed up to a really useful contest level. Although the phone op has also
> put in hours participating in contests to get his/her abilities honed to
> contest level, it is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels
> of ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges the
> longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.

hmmmm, I have to disagree somewhat.

This is kind of putting CW on a pedestal. Let's take FD as an example.

I spend a lot of time planning, putting up antennas and tents and hours
and hours of operating. Some of our CW ops help in this effort also,
including the hardest working one out of the bunch. But some others
simply show up and work a few hours, then go home.

The point is, if you give extra points because of effort involved, then
you have to decide what constitutes "effort".

> In the contests in which I've participated, I have noticed that the best CW
> ops can usually run more stations in less time because of the need for fewer
> repeats than the best phone ops.

I have been amazed how quickly they can run. Humbled in fact. Adn I
think that kind of flies in the face of those that say that CW is slower
to work in a contest than SSB.

> On the other hand, less experienced people
> can run phone contacts faster than CW contacts.

If you compare the person to them self, that is true.

> In my own contesting experience, my all time high was 310 contacts and it
> was a CW contest. My second best was down around 150 contacts and it was a
> voice contest. I'm running only 100 watts and wire antennas. I found it

> much easier to break through pileups and bad conditions on CW. But it took
> time to learn CW.

But it took some time to learn just how to put a station together too.

I'll defend testing CW, and I've been willing to put in a lot of effort
to take my CW abilities to the "he stinks" level. But it sure seems like
an unnatural advantage to have double points.

- mike KB3EIA -

3295. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 13:37:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9sOjc.16052$e4.3377@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91359

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the
Element 1
> test. But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams
priveleges
> that they haven't been tested for.
>

We can quit fussing about the NCI "support" of the "Great ARRL Giveaway". I've read the NCI comments on RM-10867, and they contain no persuasive arguments whatsoever. Basically NCI just ticks off the points of the ARRL/NCVEC petitions, and "supports" them with remarks like "81% agree with this", "92% agree with this", etc.

Reading the FCC ECFS comments uncovered one very heartening bit of information. W3BE, who is generally a very staunch supporter of ARRL, and who notably is a member of NCVEC (with their clone giveaway proposal) rips into them (ARRL and by extension NCVEC) on several points. John is also a long time FCC'er and his views will have influence with the Commission. In stark contrast to the say-nothing NCI comments, here are some excerpts from his submittal.

"This commenter also takes issue with the petition.s plan for the Commission to upgrade our 282,500 Technician and our 67,532 Tech Plus operators, without examination, to General Class.19 In effect, our present 146,164 General Class operators -- all of whom have qualified by examination for the privileges of that operator license class -- would suddenly find their stations sharing their privileges with some 350,032 operators, none of whom have similarly qualified. Today, for a Technician or Tech Plus Class operator to upgrade to our General Class, the person has to answer correctly 26 out of a unique set of 35 questions concerning the privileges of our General Class operators.20 Each examination utilizes questions taken from our Element 3 question pool. Our pool is also maintained through a cooperative effort among our VECs and is in the public domain. An Amateur Extra or Advanced Class VE has prepared each question in this pool. It is, therefore, the definitive statement by our knowledgeable operators as to what a successful examinee for our General Class operator license needs to know. Our VEs stand ready to administer this examination to any and all of our Technician and Tech Plus

Class operators. There are training manuals and courses available to those who need assistance.

"Moreover, for the Commission to order an exemption to our Element 3 General Class examination for our 350,032 Technician and Tech Plus operators would sully our reputation for excellence. After all, the Commission would have excused from our examination over 70% of our General Class licensees. More than two operators out of three, therefore, would be unqualified for their privileges. Such an indefensible situation would be detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the Commission to also dismiss this aspect of the proposal.

"This commenter takes issue with the petition's plan that would have the Commission upgrade our 84,563 Advanced Class operators to Amateur Extra Class without proving to our amateur service community that they are qualified to hold this -- our most prestigious class of operator license. To adopt this proposal would be highly unfair to our most dedicated and most highly qualified 107,313 Amateur Extra Class operators who have expended the time and effort to master the necessary qualifications. By climbing to the top, step-by-step, they have demonstrated their unqualified support for the objectives of our amateur service in our United States. Our Advanced Class operators -- for whatever reasons. have stopped short of the top rung of our ladder. To implement any such plan would diminish the reputation for excellence associated with our expert class. It would incur the disapproval of the very amateur operators who have so faithfully passed all of our examinations. It would, therefore, be detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the Commission to dismiss this aspect of the proposal."

---Then he takes aim on the disincentive licensing practice of slicing the bands up into it's current host of ghettos-by-license-class.

"Finally, this commenter takes issue with the petition.s request to once again tinker with our frequency sub-bands. Our frequency sub-bands are the classic example of well intentioned, but ineffective, rules taking on a life of their own. All operator frequency authorizations should be as complete bands. Only in this manner would the notion of spectrum rewards as an upgrading motivator have a chance of working effectively. Too many hams seem to have the attitude, 'I like my call sign. There's no need to upgrade just for a few more kHz.. That should tell us something. It is the Commission's class-distinctive sequential call sign system that is the upgrading motivational tool that

works. Slicing up a frequency band by license classes seems to provide little, if any, significant motivation for upgrading to those who need motivation beyond the personal satisfaction of having attained our expert level of excellence. A segregated frequency sub-band scheme clearly increases the monitoring and enforcement workloads and isolates those whose self-training progress would benefit most from over-the-air communication with those having the expertise of the higher operator classes. It would, therefore, be detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the Commission to also dismiss this aspect of the proposal."

Finally, it was humorous to note one commenter who has submitted a total of 89 pages of comments, almost totally unresponsive to the ARRL petition, but merely tangential meanderings uncomplimentary to amateur radio in general. Unfortunately he gave no call sign, so I was unable to identify his license class.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3296. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 13:55:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428095505.26900.00000225@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 91360

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 4/28/2004 8:37 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <9sOjc.16052$e4.3377@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>Reading the FCC ECFS comments uncovered one very heartening bit
>of information. W3BE, who is generally a very staunch supporter
>of ARRL, and who notably is a member of NCVEC (with their clone
>giveaway proposal) rips into them (ARRL and by extension NCVEC)
>on several points. John is also a long time FCC'er and his views
>will have influence with the Commission. In stark contrast to
>the say-nothing NCI comments, here are some excerpts from his
>submittal.

(Quoting from W3BE's comments:)

>"Moreover, for the Commission to order an exemption to our
>Element 3 General Class examination for our 350,032 Technician
>and Tech Plus operators would sully our reputation for
>excellence....(SNIP)

Lord knows the FCC doesn't need to "sully" it's reputation any more than
it already has. I don't think it could stand any more "sully(ing)" than they
ahve already inflicted upon themselves and us as an end result...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3297. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 14:33:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428103322.15763.00000626@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 91361

>"supports"
>them with remarks like "81% agree with this", "92% agree with
>this", etc.

This is the best part of NCIs BS. 81%, whats that come out to 20 people, 92%, whats that 24 people. It might have some REAL meaning, but, since NCIs Membership is TOP SECRET, its value is useless.

3298. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 14:50:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ixPjc.16117$e4.15640@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

While GWB calls for relaxing Part 15.....

> There needs to be technical standards to make
> possible new broadband technologies, such as the use of
> high-speed communication directly over power lines. Power lines
> were for electricity; power lines can be used for broadband
> technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to
> encourage that.

....the NTIAyesterday (4/27/2004) released a paper which argues
AGAINST relaxing Part 15 (see below). Full NTIA report at
http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fccfilings/2004/bpl/index.html

"Critical review of the assumptions underlying these analyses
revealed that application of existing Part 15 compliance
measurement procedures for BPL systems results in a significant
underestimation of peak field strength. Underestimation of the
actual peak field strength is the leading contributor to high
interference risks. As applied in current practice to BPL
systems, Part 15 measurement guidelines do not address unique
physical and electromagnetic characteristics of BPL radiated
emissions. Refining compliance measurement procedures for BPL
systems will not impede implementation of BPL technology because
BPL networks reportedly can be successfully implemented under
existing field strength limits.

"Accordingly, NTIA does NOT recommend that the FCC relax Part 15
field strength limits for BPL systems. Further based on studies
to date, NTIA recommends several "access" BPL compliance
measurement provisions that derive from existing Part 15
measurement guidelines. Among these are requirements to: use
measurement antenna heights near the height of power lines;
measure at a uniform distance of ten (10) meters from the BPL
device and power lines; and measure using a calibrated rod
antenna or a loop antenna in connection with appropriate factors
relating magnetic and electric field strength levels at
frequencies below 30 MHz."

Sunuvagun,

de Hans, K0HB

3299. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 14:57:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GDPjc.16122$e4.10810@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91363
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

>
> ....the NTIAyesterday (4/27/2004) released a paper which argues
> AGAINST relaxing Part 15 (see below). Full NTIA report at
> http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fccfilings/2004/bpl/index.html
>
>
Another excerpt.....

"Assuming that co-frequency BPL devices are deployed at a density
of one per km^2 within a circular area of 10 km radius,
interference to aircraft reception of moderate-to-strong radio
signals is likely to occur below 6 km altitude within 12 km of
the center of the BPL deployment. Interference likely would
occur to aircraft reception of weak-to-moderate radio signals
within 40 km of the center of the BPL deployment area."

Gee, do ya think we oughta deploy this in Terlingua, Texas, Mr.
President?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3300. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 15:06:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SLPjc.16129$e4.4332@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91364
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

GWB said:

> And if you're living out in -- I should -- I was going to
> say Crawford, Texas, but it's not -- maybe not nearly as
> remote. (Laughter.) How about Terlingua, Texas?

Hey, I've been through Terlingua. It's a ghost town outside the
west gate of Big Bend National Park near the XE border. They're
welcome to BPL!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3301. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 15:25:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <o1Qjc.16150$e4.9182@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91365

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote

> If you were the average ham, Hans......

"Average" and "contesting" are incompatible concepts.

"Nothing average ever stood as a monument to progress. When
progress is looking for a partner it doesn't turn to those who
believe that they are only average. It turns instead to those who
are forever searching and striving to become the best they
possibly can. If we seek the average level, we cannot hope to
achieve a higher level of success. Our only hope is to avoid
being a failure."
-- Lou Vickery

3302. Tribune in MN To Correct Article About Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 15:43:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428114307.24592.00000548@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 91366

Many of you have written to say that the Morse code we ran on the
Variety cover of April 27 was incorrect. It was not wrong, but it was
not the version many of you know.
What we should have made clear was that there was several versions of
the Morse code. The one we ran was the original Morse code, the one used
by generations of railroad telegraphers, including the retired men who
gathered Saturday to celebrate Samuel Morse's birthday. You may notice
in the article that they refer to confusion among the 5 dots for a
''p'' and 4 dots for an ''h.''
The other version, the International Morse Code, was used by the Navy,
ham radio operators and some Boy Scouts. (Some Scouts used the original
code.) Many people still use it.
We regret the confusion and should have made the difference clear.

Peg Meier, Star Tribune

>>> <K4YZ@aol.com> 04/26/04 09:43PM >>>
Dear Ms. Meier,

If Morse Code as a methodology of radio communication is "dead",
then
there are several MILLION licensed Radio Amateurs around the world who
have yet
to get the word!

Perhaps you should listen to the radio frequencies between 7.0 to

7.1MHz, 14.0 to 14.1 MHz, 18.068 to 18.090Mhz, and 21.0 to 21.1MHz on
any good
weekend and listen for yourself. These are not the only frequencies
that Amateurs
use to communicate in Morse Code...Just the most popular ones.

With best regards,

Steven J Robeson, LPN
151 12th Avenue Northwest
Winchester, TN 37398

3303. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 16:35:26 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@lloydswlbest.net>
Message-ID: <c6omdv$94v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:xOtjc.14640$e4.10294@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
//drivelsnipped//

Hey Hans,

give us a break and quit x-posting!!?? We're not interested in
your crap. Doesn't Phil have some errands for you to run?

73,

Lloyd

3304. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 16:57:57 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <I-2dnRCHhrcqfxLdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91368

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:408E5C17.5030103@psu.edu...
>
> But do you think my proposal will work? We have a number of years of
> operation under such a system, and I have not heard of any problems with
> the database administration of the orphan licensees.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

It's not *just* the database administration. Another aspect of the problem is that the *rules* have to be maintained for those orphaned classes. How do you deal with the sub-band by class privs without consolidation.

By consolidating into just three classes (including the new beginner class with meaningful HF privs), the rules can be simplified greatly. That will ease the administrative burden on the FCC (and the VECs) in ways that go beyond just the database issue.

Carl - wk3c

3305. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 17:16:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <408FE6FB.2060208@psu.edu>
Source record: 91369

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>And I respectfully thought that NCI was solely against the
>
> Element 1
>
>>test. But now NCI is coming out in favor of giving most hams
>
> priveleges
>
>>that they haven't been tested for.
>>
>
>
> We can quit fussing about the NCI "support" of the "Great ARRL
> Giveaway". I've read the NCI comments on RM-10867, and they
> contain no persuasive arguments whatsoever. Basically NCI just
> ticks off the points of the ARRL/NCVEC petitions, and "supports"
> them with remarks like "81% agree with this", "92% agree with
> this", etc.

Yeah, you're right. Those numbers don't mean a whole lot since it is
those that chose to respond to the poll, etc, etc...

> Reading the FCC ECFS comments uncovered one very heartening bit
> of information. W3BE, who is generally a very staunch supporter
> of ARRL, and who notably is a member of NCVEC (with their clone
> giveaway proposal) rips into them (ARRL and by extension NCVEC)
> on several points. John is also a long time FCC'er and his views
> will have influence with the Commission. In stark contrast to
> the say-nothing NCI comments, here are some excerpts from his
> submittal.
>
> "This commenter also takes issue with the petition.s plan for the
> Commission to upgrade our 282,500 Technician and our 67,532 Tech
> Plus operators, without examination, to General Class.19 In
> effect, our present 146,164 General Class operators -- all of
> whom have qualified by examination for the privileges of that
> operator license class -- would suddenly find their stations
> sharing their privileges with some 350,032 operators, none of
> whom have similarly qualified. Today, for a Technician or Tech
> Plus Class operator to upgrade to our General Class, the person
> has to answer correctly 26 out of a unique set of 35 questions

> concerning the privileges of our General Class operators.20 Each
> examination utilizes questions taken from our Element 3 question
> pool. Our pool is also maintained through a cooperative effort
> among our VECs and is in the public domain. An Amateur Extra or
> Advanced Class VE has prepared each question in this pool. It
> is, therefore, the definitive statement by our knowledgeable
> operators as to what a successful examinee for our General Class
> operator license needs to know. Our VEs stand ready to administer
> this examination to any and all of our Technician and Tech Plus
> Class operators. There are training manuals and courses available
> to those who need assistance.

Freakin' Elegant!

> "Moreover, for the Commission to order an exemption to our
> Element 3 General Class examination for our 350,032 Technician
> and Tech Plus operators would sully our reputation for
> excellence. After all, the Commission would have excused from our
> examination over 70% of our General Class licensees. More than
> two operators out of three, therefore, would be unqualified for
> their privileges. Such an indefensible situation would be
> detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and
> for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service
> community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the
> Commission to also dismiss this aspect of the proposal.

Wordy but spot-on!

> "This commenter takes issue with the petition's plan that would
> have the Commission upgrade our 84,563 Advanced Class operators
> to Amateur Extra Class without proving to our amateur service
> community that they are qualified to hold this -- our most
> prestigious class of operator license. To adopt this proposal
> would be highly unfair to our most dedicated and most highly
> qualified 107,313 Amateur Extra Class operators who have expended
> the time and effort to master the necessary qualifications. By
> climbing to the top, step-by-step, they have demonstrated their
> unqualified support for the objectives of our amateur service in
> our United States. Our Advanced Class operators -- for whatever
> reasons. have stopped short of the top rung of our ladder. To
> implement any such plan would diminish the reputation for
> excellence associated with our expert class. It would incur the
> disapproval of the very amateur operators who have so faithfully
> passed all of our examinations. It would, therefore, be
> detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and
> for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service
> community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the
> Commission to dismiss this aspect of the proposal."

I want to shake this dude's hand! It's almost like something MEANS
something! Like our licenses.

That is one of the saddest things about the Giveaway...oops,
the one time adjustment. In the end, all it does is dilute the service.
More General glass ops? sure. But if most of them are Technicians, that
will dilute the average amateur to the Technician level.

If some people here think that's BS, let 'em. Life's a b***h, and then
ya have to listen to my opinion.

> ---Then he takes aim on the disincentive licensing practice of
> slicing the bands up into it's current host of
> ghettos-by-license-class.
>
> "Finally, this commenter takes issue with the petition.s request
> to once again tinker with our frequency sub-bands. Our frequency
> sub-bands are the classic example of well intentioned, but
> ineffective, rules taking on a life of their own.

Process before progress.

> All operator
> frequency authorizations should be as complete bands. Only in
> this manner would the notion of spectrum rewards as an upgrading
> motivator have a chance of working effectively. Too many hams
> seem to have the attitude, 'I like my call sign. There's no need
> to upgrade just for a few more kHz.. That should tell us
> something. It is the Commission's class-distinctive sequential
> call sign system that is the upgrading motivational tool that
> works. Slicing up a frequency band by license classes seems to
> provide little, if any, significant motivation for upgrading to
> those who need motivation beyond the personal satisfaction of
> having attained our expert level of excellence. A segregated
> frequency sub-band scheme clearly increases the monitoring and
> enforcement workloads and isolates those whose self-training
> progress would benefit most from over-the-air communication with
> those having the expertise of the higher operator classes. It
> would, therefore, be detrimental to the future well being of our
> amateur service and for maintaining harmony and goodwill within
> our amateur service community. This commenter, therefore, asks
> respectfully for the Commission to also dismiss this aspect of
> the proposal."
>
>
>
> Finally, it was humorous to note one commenter who has submitted
> a total of 89 pages of comments, almost totally unresponsive to
> the ARRL petition, but merely tangential meanderings
> uncomplimentary to amateur radio in general. Unfortunately he
> gave no call sign, so I was unable to identify his license class.

could it be???????

- Mike KB3EIA -

3306. Re: BPL Comments of President Bush in Minneapolis on April 26th

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 17:59:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MhSjc.5991$g31.5528@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91370
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Wes Stewart" <n7ws@_arrl.net> wrote in message
news:pi7u80ph2rqo4ee82sle3ut22t4lsk7u59@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 27 Apr 2004 12:37:23 -0400, Minnie Bannister
> <GoonButNotForgotten@myob.net> wrote:
>
> |Yes, the technical standards need to be changed to allow BPL: require
> |all power lines to be shielded.
>
> The ones under ground and under water already are.
>
> The problem will be when every house in your neighborhood is a big
> #&%*(*& radiator. Or even worse when your KW wipes out the entire
> Internet service in a few square miles.
>
> I'm a rural customer of an electric cooperative. (I happen to use
> them for my dialup ISP also)
>
> A couple of years ago when I was having a bout of power line
> interference I happened to talk to their VP for new technology,
> engineer to engineer.
>
> Among other things he told me that reading meters was a big expense
> since their service area is huge, covering good parts of three
> counties, one of which is the size of Connecticut. They (we, I'm a
> part owner) have 29,000 customers and 2,400 miles of lines.
>
> So they (we) tried a system of reading the meters remotely, using
> (very) slow-speed data on the power lines. They couldn't even solve
> the technical challenges of doing this and wound up changing out most
> of the meters to ones with built in transmitters that can be
> interrogated by a guy driving around in a pickup truck.
>
> If they can't read my meter remotely how in the hell are they going to
> supply me with high-speed data transmission? BTW, I've strongly
> suggested that they don't try.
>

Tell me about it. Another thing that hasn't been considered is the
condition of these lines. I have been fighting for 5 years here in Alabama
to get the 20/9 noise level (at times past) fixed. Two years of that was
educating the fools what to do about it.

Can you imagine how much trouble its going to be getting BPL through that
noise?

Dan/W4NTI

3307. Re: Bush Backs BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 18:08:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9qSjc.5994$g31.2849@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:TvFjc.32494$0u6.5811893@attbi_s03...
> Yes..he is clueless, but the political agenda here is to promise people
what
> they want to hear. Given that the FCC has increased restrictions on BPL
> deployment in its recent NPRM regarding Part 15 requirements means that
the
> market will sort it out. Investors in BPL will see new limitations on BPL
> and have to consider its reliability against alternative systems that
really
> work, like DSL, cable, and the various flavors of wireless continuously
> emerging. The shrub and his current administration won't have to kill it,
> the market will. It just sounds good in this election year. However, it
> just shows how stupid and gutless the management of this BPL issue has
> been!!!
>

Hi Chuck, ya sounding good on 20AM.

Oh do you think Mr. Powell will have to reconsider quitting the FCC and get
a different job, instead of BPL guru?

Dan/W4NTI

3308. Re: Something more important than BPL...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 18:38:32 UTC
From: - XC - <nobody@home.net>
Message-ID: <2aWdnRCC_p62ZxLdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 91372

Aw common Beeps, you should at least admit stealing this from:
Know guns, know safety
No guns, no safety.

And I think you are severely underestimating the BPL threat to HF reception;
it's a real hobby killer.
Even though I love and use CW if I HAD to choose between no code or no BPL
I'd choose no BPL.
First things first, if you can't hear 'em you can't work 'em.

That's the eternal truth, proven every day.

XC

"Beeper" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:569v809d8relmtqls17c9gsj1ho53a3gno@4ax.com...
> Know code, Know ham.
> No code, no ham.
>
> The eternal truth, proven every day.

3309. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 19:26:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4090054D.1030203@psu.edu>
Source record: 91373

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 4/27/2004 1:22 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <408EA4CF.20508@psu.edu>
>>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
>
>>> And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?
>>
>
>> We had a kid come on and operate psk31 almost immediately...(SNIP)
>
>
> That's my point! Almsot anyone can do it. So why give it par-level
> scoring with Morse Code?
>
>
>> Just seems like the ones I participate in give double for the CW. I'll
>>need to look some more.
>
>
> I am contemplating a trip to VO1 for Sweepstakes this year. I had hoped
> to go last year but a family emergency canx'd that idea. Not sure if I will go
> for CW or SSB weekend, tho...Can't swing both!

Now that should be a cool trip. One of these years I want to make it to
Newfoundland.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3310. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 20:19:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nlUjc.16423$e4.3253@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91374

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
.
>
> NCI's Board of Directors debated the issues and,
> while there was not 100% agreeement on our personal
> views we agreed that we should represent our members'
> views to the FCC and that we could each file our personal
> comments to voice our personal views.
>

In the military that is commonly called "go along to get along"
leadership or "let's have a beauty contest and even if the winner
is ugly we can swallow hard and put a bag over her head".

73, de Hans, K0HB

3311. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 20:55:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40901A5C.6010802@psu.edu>
Source record: 91375

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> .
>
>>NCI's Board of Directors debated the issues and,
>>while there was not 100% agreeement on our personal
>>views we agreed that we should represent our members'
>>views to the FCC and that we could each file our personal
>>comments to voice our personal views.
>>
>
>
> In the military that is commonly called "go along to get along"
> leadership or "let's have a beauty contest and even if the winner
> is ugly we can swallow hard and put a bag over her head".

NCI representing it's views is one thing, but I think that when a membership supports an idea that is actually harmful to the ARS, it is time to kinda step back from it.

The day after the "one time upgrade" the testing level of the average General class licensee has gone up or down?

When is *lowering* the average tested levels of Hams a good thing?

Hans, I liked your "average" quote in the "Morse and contests" thread. Maybe it fits here too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3312. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 21:09:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40901D85.1040408@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91376

>
>
>
>> "Moreover, for the Commission to order an exemption to our
>> Element 3 General Class examination for our 350,032 Technician
>> and Tech Plus operators would sully our reputation for
>> excellence. After all, the Commission would have excused from our
>> examination over 70% of our General Class licensees. More than
>> two operators out of three, therefore, would be unqualified for
>> their privileges.
>
This would be a serious issue at the FAA for pilot licenses or even at your
local DMV for truck or bus driver licenses, but, really, from a safety and
regulatory standpoint, there isn't a whole lotta difference between HF
and VHF.
Sure it's good to know what HF band will have decent propagation at what
times, but if you did make a poor selection the worst that happens is that
you get no answer to a CQ. The regulatory rules (no pecunary business
comms, don't maliciously interfere, nobody owns any one frequency, and such)
are pretty much the same regardless of the band.

>
>
>
>
>
>> "This commenter takes issue with the petition's plan that would
>> have the Commission upgrade our 84,563 Advanced Class operators
>> to Amateur Extra Class without proving to our amateur service
>> community that they are qualified to hold this -- our most
>> prestigious class of operator license. To adopt this proposal
>> would be highly unfair to our most dedicated and most highly
>> qualified 107,313 Amateur Extra Class operators who have expended
>> the time and effort to master the necessary qualifications. By
>> climbing to the top, step-by-step, they have demonstrated their
>> unqualified support for the objectives of our amateur service in
>> our United States. Our Advanced Class operators -- for whatever
>> reasons. have stopped short of the top rung of our ladder. To
>> implement any such plan would diminish the reputation for
>> excellence associated with our expert class. It would incur the
>> disapproval of the very amateur operators who have so faithfully
>> passed all of our examinations. It would, therefore, be
>> detrimental to the future well being of our amateur service and
>> for maintaining harmony and goodwill within our amateur service

>> community. This commenter, therefore, asks respectfully for the
>> Commission to dismiss this aspect of the proposal."
>
Except for a few medical waviers, every Advanced had to pass a 13 WPM
code test.
I'd be willing to equate that to passing the old Extra element 4b written.
Advanceds' and Extras' passed element 4a. But newer Extras (I'm an
"Extra Lite" didn't have to pass 20 or even 13 WPM. So:
element 4a + 4b (nowadays just element 4) + 5 WPM = element 4a + 13 WPM

Oh, there'd be two varities of new extras (written extra and code extra)
but I don't
see a need to keep track of which one any one extra is. This would get
us to
one less license class for the FCC to deal with.

By extension, they could also be done to make old novices to become no-code
techs. But that might mean making them give up the HF novice subbands in
trade for VHF and above. Not sure if that's such a hot idea..... Are
there
any truely active novices who haven't upgraded to general or extra by now?

>>
>
>
> I want to shake this dude's hand! It's almost like something MEANS
> something! Like our licenses.

Getting a "gold star" is nice, but there really isn't anything a general
can't do that an extra
can do, except operate on certian subbands. Otherwise it's all the same
modes and power
levels. So what does the government (FCC) get out of it? The subbands
are a "carrot"
to get people to upgrade, but I'm not sure what the FCC gets out of it.

>
>
> That is one of the saddest things about the Giveaway...oops,
> the one time adjustment. In the end, all it does is dilute the service.
> More General glass ops? sure. But if most of them are Technicians,
> that will dilute the average amateur to the Technician level.

How many other hobbies require licenses to do the hobby? Model railroading
doesn't have novices, techs, generals and extras. Or amateur astronomy.

>
>
>

3313. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 23:02:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zKWjc.16586$e4.2371@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91377

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

>
> How many other hobbies require licenses to do the hobby? Model
railroading
> doesn't have novices, techs, generals and extras. Or amateur
astronomy.
>

OK folks, you saw it first here! The founder of NLI.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3314. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 23:51:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428195144.24684.00000560@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91378

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/28/2004 2:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4090054D.1030203@psu.edu>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests

>> I am contemplating a trip to VO1 for Sweepstakes this year. I had
>hoped
>> to go last year but a family emergency canx'd that idea. Not sure if I
>will go
>> for CW or SSB weekend, tho...Can't swing both!
>
> Now that should be a cool trip. One of these years I want to make it to

>Newfoundland.

Yeah...but in November...?!?!

I can hack wet, and I can hack cold...wet and cold doesn't seem to be a
very comforting combination...! I have put out a solicitation on my
"ER-Nurses" list server and have already received some responses from my
colleagues in Canada with info on lodging opportunities. I hope to find a nice
cabin somewhere.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3315. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-28 23:59:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4090456E.6010306@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91379

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote
>
>
>
>>How many other hobbies require licenses to do the hobby? Model
>>
>>
>railroading
>
>
>>doesn't have novices, techs, generals and extras. Or amateur
>>
>>
>astronomy.
>
>
>
>OK folks, you saw it first here! The founder of NLI.
>
>
>
Nah, that's 11 meters. Nobody wants that mess on the ham bands. My point was to mention competing hobbies that do not require a license to do. Also an additional point I wanted to make was that we need to avoid excessive grades or levels of ham license.

3316. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 00:42:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428204211.24684.00000564@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91380

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 4/28/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <4090456E.6010306@ix.netcom.com>
>
>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

>>>How many other hobbies require licenses to do the hobby? Model
>>railroading doesn't have novices, techs, generals and extras. Or amateur
>>>astronomy.

>>OK folks, you saw it first here! The founder of NLI.

>Nah, that's 11 meters. Nobody wants that mess on the ham bands. My point
>was to mention competing hobbies that do not require a license to do. Also
>an additional point I wanted to make was that we need to avoid excessive
>grades or levels of ham license.

Most other "competing hobbies" don't have the potential to create havoc
like an untrained, unlicensed person let loose with a radio transmitter that
s/he doesn't know how to use properly.

Most other "competing hobbies" with the potential to create a hazard to
the public are either licensed or regulated by the government in some fashion
(ie: hang gliding, SCUBA diving, motorcycle racing, etc.)

And, unfortunately Robert, there ARE some people who would love to hear
"that mess" on the Ham bands. They are few and for the most part, functionally
illiterate, but they are there. (ie: WA8ULX)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3317. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 00:54:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404281654.11054804@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91381

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040427134940.21319.00000354@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/27/2004 7:24 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404270424.14fb31b9@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040426233140.29049.00000008@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
> >> And you are which...?!?! (Do I need to ask a FOURTH time...????)
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Inflamatory questions won't be answered.
>
> So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.

Hey! Whatta you know? I agree with that.

3318. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:06:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404281706.2d092c1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91382

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nlUjc.16423$e4.3253@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> .
> >
> > NCI's Board of Directors debated the issues and,
> > while there was not 100% agreeement on our personal
> > views we agreed that we should represent our members'
> > views to the FCC and that we could each file our personal
> > comments to voice our personal views.
> >
>
> In the military that is commonly called "go along to get along"
> leadership or "let's have a beauty contest and even if the winner
> is ugly we can swallow hard and put a bag over her head".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

That's why I thanked my lucky stars that I met the Air Force
standards. What few females we got were the Calendar Girls.

3319. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:10:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428211055.26462.00000594@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91383

>They are few and for the most part, functionally
>illiterate, but they are there. (ie: WA8ULX)
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ
>

Screw you BED PAN BOY

3320. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:19:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404281719.2d62cab3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91384

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<_DAjc.4990$g31.3489@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Morse and Contests
> > >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > >Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
> > >
> > > Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW testing
>
> > >question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
> > >
> > > With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> > >have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
> >
> > Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this regard,
> as in
> > any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
> >
> > > While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> > >make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
> >
> > Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
> >
> > As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to be
> > compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest that
> > required using honed skills, too...?!?!
> >
> > > Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth double
> > >points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> > >points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number of
> > >points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> > >operating Phone.
> >
> > And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a keyboard?
> >
> > > I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard and
> > >logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> > >than half that number.
> >
> > Shudda been on the paddles!
> >
> > Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...

> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> Simply stated....CW Contesting requires real skills. Digital requires the
> ability to type.
> Phone is way down there from the above requirements.
>
> If you want to do so....Give phone 1 point, digital 2 points, and CW 5
> points per qso.
>
> That's my opinion, and I'm sticking to it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Your opinion looks wrong to me.

My opinion is that the point schedule should be inverted from what you propose. I mean, when Aaron Jones was keeping the Morse Myths list, it would appear that a CW QSO just couldn't fail. It always got through, no matter the propogation, the power level, the QRN, or the QRM. Each and every Op would QRS for the new guy and everything was just so wonderful.

Meanwhile phone Ops practice dog-eat-dog, QRM each other, use bad phonetics, and propogation is always iffy. Furthermore, they marry their Technician sisters and don't even QSL.

Bass turds!

Give the phone ops 5 pts per completed QSO, the CW Ops get 1.

3321. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:35:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428213519.25458.00000528@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91385

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/28/2004 7:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281654.11054804@posting.google.com>

>> >Inflamatory questions won't be answered.
>>
>> So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.
>
>Hey! Whatta you know? I agree with that.

Which pretty much makes you a coward, especially in as all of the
questions were the result of stupid statements YOU made...Like how "unlicensed
radio services play a "major role" in disaster communicaitons".

Still waiting for you to pull THAT rabbit out of your....hat.

Steve, K4YZ

3322. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:36:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <vyOdnRP_9PjJwQ3dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 91387

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40901A5C.6010802@psu.edu...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> > .
> >
> >>NCI's Board of Directors debated the issues and,
> >>while there was not 100% agreeement on our personal
> >>views we agreed that we should represent our members'
> >>views to the FCC and that we could each file our personal
> >>comments to voice our personal views.
> >>
> >
> >
> > In the military that is commonly called "go along to get along"
> > leadership or "let's have a beauty contest and even if the winner
> > is ugly we can swallow hard and put a bag over her head".
>
>
> NCI representing it's views is one thing, but I think that when a
> membership supports an idea that is actually harmful to the ARS, it is
> time to kinda step back from it.

We didn't think it was "actually harmful to the ARS" - there was just not
unanimous agreement amongst the directors on a couple of points ...

Carl - wk3c

3323. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 01:36:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040428213646.25458.00000529@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91386

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/28/2004 8:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281706.2d092c1b@posting.google.com>

>That's why I thanked my lucky stars that I met the Air Force
>standards. What few females we got were the Calendar Girls.

Uh huh...

From "The Far Side", perhaps!

Steve, K4YZ

3324. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 02:06:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91388

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>>Date: 4/27/2004 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <QOWdnd0AwrtgkxLd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
>
>
>>I've tried running a frequency on SSB contests but just don't get enough
>>takers to make it worthwhile so I finally end up doing the "search and
>>pounce". I'm not good enough yet to run a frequency on CW so by necessity
>>do "search and pounce" when operating in this mode.
>
>
> I had a lot more fun just setting a "personal goal" and working towards
> that when I get into a contest. I set out to get a "Clean Sweep" a few yeas
> ago and did it...with less than 150 Q's on each mode!

My goal is to try to up my personal best each time I revisit the same
contest. Two years in a row now, I have missed getting all 67 counties
in the PAQSO by *one* county. That is my biggest goal this year. Second
goal is to be first from PA in the New England QSO party. I've been
stuck at third for the last two years. I did a lot better last year than
the year before, but so have the people I'm competing with.

> I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile signal
> if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!

You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3325. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 02:19:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <a6OdnZNKdsu_-w3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91389

Jack Twilley wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>>>>>>"Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
>
> [... I suggested an experiment ...]
>
> Dee> Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The
> Dee> CW op has put in many hours of practicing and participating in
> Dee> contests to get his/her speed up to a really useful contest
> Dee> level. Although the phone op has also put in hours participating
> Dee> in contests to get his/her abilities honed to contest level, it
> Dee> is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels of
> Dee> ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges
> Dee> the longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.
>
> Not all CW ops put in as many hours of practice, and some phone ops
> put in serious hours. My first contest -- as an Extra, no less -- was
> a Field Day. I was terrified of the microphone, and spent more than
> six hours practicing calling into a dead mike. It may sound stupid to
> some of you, but I was really really really shy. We had a written
> script to follow: "CQ Field Day, CQ Field Day, this is Whiskey Six
> Charlie X-Ray" was the first line, then the next line included the
> response with blanks to fill in, and even a line to thank the other
> amateur and wish them luck in the contest. I don't think of this as
> being the same as a voice keyer, by the way.

Definitely not! I am a firm believer that Contesting can be a great way to get people involved in ham radio. Many of them don't quite know what to say the first times, and a set call/reply/response gives a structure to the QSO. After that, they can develop their own personal manner of speaking during the QSO. I think what you did is the only way to go for new folk.

> We were actually pushing
> the mike button and speaking, which was very exciting. The one thing
> that was more fun than calling CQ was being the control op for
> Technicians and non-amateurs who wanted to give it a try. One Tech
> got the Cooke Islands as his first QSO, and he's now a General.

Oh yeah, lightning strikes! Not to sound gushy, but imagine what was going through his mind at the moment.

Contesting was what started me on the upgrade path. At one time I was happy to just use the repeater and was going to do things on VHF and up.
- Mike KB3EIA -

3326. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 02:29:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jlSdnZmlYbc49Q3dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91390

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 4/28/2004 2:26 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <4090054D.1030203@psu.edu>
>>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>
>
>>> I am contemplating a trip to VO1 for Sweepstakes this year. I had
>>
>>hoped
>>
>>>>to go last year but a family emergency canx'd that idea. Not sure if I
>>
>>will go
>>
>>>>for CW or SSB weekend, tho...Can't swing both!
>>
>> Now that should be a cool trip. One of these years I want to make it to
>
>
>>Newfoundland.
>
>
> Yeah...but in November...?!?!
>
> I can hack wet, and I can hack cold...wet and cold doesn't seem to be a
> very comforting combination...! I have put out a solicitation on my
> "ER-Nurses" list server and have already received some responses from my
> colleagues in Canada with info on lodging opportunities. I hope to find a nice
> cabin somewhere.

Well, I went to the "Winterlude" in Ottawa this past February. Did you know that Ottawa is the second coldest countries capital in the world - the coldest is in one of the 'Stans! Anyhow, the people in Ottawa, after being socked in during November, December and January, finally go bonkers when the days get longer and the cold loses a little of it's grip. They then pretend it is warmer than it really is, and have three weekends of partying outside. Very cool, if crazy. I had a blast. My son and I took a many mile skate on the Rideau canal, which freezes over entirely during the winter. They even have concessions on the canal,

and flood it to resurface the ice for a good skate.

They really know how to do winter in Canada, so you'll be taken care of well, youbet.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3327. Re: Something more important than BPL...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 02:56:52 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <nmr090h8mv06tckrie14nlp1mgptubnmp8@4ax.com>
Source record: 91508

On Wed, 28 Apr 2004 08:37:12 -0400, Beeper <nocoder@aol.com> wrote:

>Know code, Know ham.
>No code, no ham.

Not true. I have full legal access to ham bands with no morse code.

>
>The eternal truth, proven every day.

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3328. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 11:44:12 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0404290344.abef633@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91391

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<nfOdnaQIQ52uFxfdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:mL%gc.3135$e4.1815@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > | The NCI membership supports a "one-time"
> > | upgrade.
> >
> > That's probably not a remarkable revelation, given that the overwhelming
> > majority of the NCI members are Technicians who would naturally benefit
> > from such action.
> >
> > The REAL question isn't what the NCI membership supports, but rather....
> >
> >
> > Q: Will the NCI Board of Directors recommend
> > upgrading all Tech/Tech+ licensees to General
> > without further testing?
> >
> > A: (please select one and only one answer)
> > ___ Yes
> > ___ No
> > ___ The Board will take no position on this matter
> >
> > Cheers,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > SOC # 291 http://www.qsl.net/soc/
> > FISTS # 7419 http://www.fists.org
> > NCI # 4304 http://www.nocode.org/
>
> Hans,
>
> WADR ... As a Board of Directors, the NCI BoD has an obligation to the
> membership to represent its views.
>
> Your "question" is so patently biased against the BoD acting in a manner
> that is responsive to (and responsible to) the membership that I refuse to
> play that game.
>
> 73,

> Carl - wk3c

Wow, Hans' "question" looks like a simple matter of yes or no to me. I think he even gave you a gracious "out" with the inclusion of "The Board will take no position on this matter." Where's the "bias?"

73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384

3329. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 12:23:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404290423.4b3d903@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91392

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040428213646.25458.00000529@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions ...
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/28/2004 8:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281706.2d092c1b@posting.google.com>
>
> >That's why I thanked my lucky stars that I met the Air Force
> >standards. What few females we got were the Calendar Girls.
>
> Uh huh...
>
> From "The Far Side", perhaps!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

They looked good from the far side and the near side, front side and
back side. So I married one of 'em.

3330. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 12:32:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404290432.39a800d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91393

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040428213519.25458.00000528@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/28/2004 7:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281654.11054804@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Inflamatory questions won't be answered.
> >>
> >> So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.
> >
> >Hey! Whatta you know? I agree with that.
>
> Which pretty much makes you a coward, especially in as all of the
> questions were the result of stupid statements YOU made...Like how "unlicensed
> radio services play a "major role" in disaster communicaitons".
>
> Still waiting for you to pull THAT rabbit out of your....hat.
>
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Try stuffing this stupid statement back into your....hat.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

3331. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 12:39:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4090F783.5050903@psu.edu>
Source record: 91394

Robert Casey wrote:
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>
>>> How many other hobbies require licenses to do the hobby? Model
>>>
>>
>> railroading
>>
>>
>>> doesn't have novices, techs, generals and extras. Or amateur
>>>
>>
>> astronomy.
>>
>>
>>
>> OK folks, you saw it first here! The founder of NLI.
>>
>>
>>
> Nah, that's 11 meters. Nobody wants that mess on the ham bands. My point
> was to mention competing hobbies that do not require a license to do. Also
> an additional point I wanted to make was that we need to avoid excessive
> grades or levels of ham license.

perhaps they compete for participation, but they certainly not the
same. I also do amateur astronomy, and can't do much harm if I have a
poor telescope or don't know how to use it properly.

If I don't know anything about RF safety or if I can't adjust my radio
or if I put up a station that puts out RFI I can certainly have an
impact on myself and others.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3332. cancel <c676ot$f3q$0@pita.alt.net>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:28:40 UTC
From: joe@joe.com
Message-ID: <si8kc.96845$Lh2.94238@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
This message was cancelled from within Mozilla.
```

3333. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:30:38 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <xd8kc.96841$Lh2.81601@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91395
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I guess if the raving drunks N9PGE or K9BSD had any dependants we would
see papers on them too. They stay too drunk to keep a wife though.

Anonymous wrote:
> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> 700 ADAMS STREET
> TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> DATE: 4/20/2004
>
> CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>
> ---
> MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>
> ---
> Party Counsel Prosecutor
> Defendant 1:
> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 5319 SECOR RD.
> TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> 4199365120
> 411 N MICHIGAN
> TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>
> ---
> COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
> 1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>
> ---
> DATE SEQ EVENT
> 6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
> PARTY : -
> 5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
> 803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
> Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
> issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN

> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
> CAPIAS C-174-842
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
> CAPIAS C-174-843
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
> November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> SERVED ON 11/13/00
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> SERVED ON 11/12/00
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
> 772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
> Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
> ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
> SWANSON appointed as counsel.
> Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
> the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
> Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
> Sue Swanson
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
> RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
> 671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
> Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
> present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS

> ADAIR present in court.
> Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
> having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
> of probation.
> Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> 2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
> mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
> agreement.
> Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
> any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
> further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
> associated with being granted probation. Payment of
> financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
> supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
> fees.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
> SENTENCE C-184-502
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
> terminated unsuccesfully
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>
>
> -=-
> This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
>
>

3334. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:31:56 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <Me8kc.96842$Lh2.51762@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

It was either N9PGE or K9BSD, two drunks with way too much time on their hands.

Concerned Citizen wrote:
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
>
>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>>J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>>700 ADAMS STREET
>>TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>>DATE: 4/20/2004
>>
>>CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>>TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>>JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>>FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>
>>---------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>>ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>>PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>
>>---------
>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>>Defendant 1:
>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>5319 SECOR RD.
>>TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>>4199365120
>>411 N MICHIGAN
>>TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>
>>---------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>>1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>
>>---------- DATE SEQ EVENT
>>6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>>PARTY : -

>>5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>>803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
>>Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>>issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>CAPIAS C-174-842
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>CAPIAS C-174-843
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>>November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>SERVED ON 11/13/00
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>SERVED ON 11/12/00
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>>772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>>Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>>SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>>Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>>the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>>Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
>>Sue Swanson
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
>>RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W

>>12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>>671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
>>Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>>present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>ADAIR present in court.
>>Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>>having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>>of probation.
>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>agreement.
>>Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>>any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>>further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>>associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>>financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>>supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>>fees.
>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>>SENTENCE C-184-502
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>>terminated unsuccesfully
>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>
>>
>>-=-
>>This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.

3335. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:34:31 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <ah8kc.96844$Lh2.42758@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91397
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N9PGE and K9BSD have been doing it for years. They are cowardly drunk chicken-shits.

WA3MOJ wrote:
> In article <Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136>, Concerned Citizen
> says...
>
>>Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
>>news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>>
>>
>>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>>>J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>>>700 ADAMS STREET
>>>TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>>>DATE: 4/20/2004
>>>
>>>CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>>>TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>>>JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>>
>>>---
>>>--------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>>>ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>>>PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>>
>>>---
>>>---------
>>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>>>Defendant 1:
>>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>5319 SECOR RD.
>>>TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>>>4199365120
>>>411 N MICHIGAN
>>>TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>>
>>>---
>>>--------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>>>1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>>
>>>---

>>>--------- DATE SEQ EVENT
>>>6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>>>PARTY : -
>>>5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>>>803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
>>>Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>>>issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>CAPIAS C-174-842
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>CAPIAS C-174-843
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>>>November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>SERVED ON 11/13/00
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>SERVED ON 11/12/00
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>>>772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>>>Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>>>SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>>>Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>>>the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>>>Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
>>>Sue Swanson
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
>>>RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483

>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>>>671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
>>>Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>>>present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>ADAIR present in court.
>>>Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>>>having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>>>of probation.
>>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>>agreement.
>>>Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>>>any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>>>further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>>>associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>>>financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>>>supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>>>fees.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>>>SENTENCE C-184-502
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>>>terminated unsuccesfully
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>>
>>>
>>>-=-
>>>This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>>
>>
>>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>>
>
> I really hate when people dont use their real name.
>

3336. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and faggot lover K9BSD at it again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:38:14 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <Dl8kc.38844$oN1.31462@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

N9PGE and K9BSD are the gutless wonders behind this shit. They are
either harassing others or licking each others balls. They are pathetic,
single, alcoholic faggots.

tnom@mucks.net wrote:
>>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>>
>>____
>>
>>This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
>>this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
>>remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
>>maliciousness.
>>
>
> Your argument holds no water. Doug has brought ALL of this
> upon himself. When and if Dougs mental health becomes
> stable he may realize why his life is so miserable. He'll realize
> that it is foolish to harass people and justify it with the argument
> that he is just doing his civic duty. Until he wises up nothing will
> change.
>
> Have a miserable day/life Doug.

3337. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and K9BSD wish they had their own children

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:40:19 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <An8kc.38852$oN1.1393@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91399
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

At least he was able to conceive children. K9BSD and N9PGE cannot even
get a date, the faggot alcoholics.

tnom@mucks.net wrote:
> On 22 Apr 2004 04:48:35 -0700, k8cpa@arrl.net (Me) wrote:
>
>
>>tnom@mucks.net wrote in message news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
>>
>>>snip
>>>
>>>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>>>agreement.
>>>
>>>The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.
>>
>>Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
>>might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
>>and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
>>trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
>>Both?
>>
>>Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...
>>
>>-Chuck
>
>
> You are correct. The most important thing to remember is what we
> all knew already. He has mental problems. The court would never
> order mental health counseling unless he has been diagnosed with
> the disorder.

3338. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue to cornhole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:43:26 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <vq8kc.38865$oN1.35545@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91400
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

N9PGE and K9BSD stay drunk! Why do you think they cannot keep a woman?
Hell they cannot even get a date.

Steveo wrote:
> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>
>>Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>>news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>>
>>
>>>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>>news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>>>>GEORGE BUSCH
>>>>1385 DEVON CIR
>>>>ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>>>>USA
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
>>>more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
>>>it again...
>>
>>Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>>
>>http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>>
>
> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>
>
>>Geo using another nym wrote:
>>I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine, everyone knows
>>my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see the need I have a pair
>>of balls to back up what I say, the only balls I see you have are the 2 on
>>your chin.
>
>

> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?

3339. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, gutless anon bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:47:29 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <iu8kc.38882$oN1.5247@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So what kind of puppies do you have dumbass?

AKC KennelMaster wrote:
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D57C41C486D1234567890@216.196.97.136...
>
>>"AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote in
>>news:Afwic.22878$NR5.16125@fe1.texas.rr.com:
>>
>>
>>>"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns94D577B1FDE801234567890@216.196.97.136...
>>>
>>>>"AKC KennelMaster" <KennelMaster@not-here.com> wrote in
>>>>news:ofmhc.2576 $Dn1.798@fe2.texas.rr.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>For Christ's sake George, can't you see Doug is a useless
>>>>>compilation
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>>semi-human DNA? What a loser. Ordered to seek mental health? He
>>>>>must
>>>>
>>>>have
>>>>
>>>>>really flipped out for the court to order that in such a case.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Kinda like you Randy...
>>>>
>>>
>>>Not at all, geo. Please don't get mad at me simply because the AKC has
>>>been proven to be run by a mentally deranged deadbeat dad. BTW, is
>>>Doug your dad? Is that why you get so incensed when someone attacks
>>>him?
>>>
>>>P.S. If any of the above words are too big for you to understand, let
>>>me know and I'll type more slowly for you.
>>
>>Wow pretty fast reply Randy that post wasn't out there 20 minutes and
>>bang you are all over it. I understand what you said pefectly Randy, you

>>have no room to talk.
>
>
> Sure I do. I support my kids. Doug doesn't, and can't. He's mentally ill.
>
>

3340. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 14:59:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91402

>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040428213519.25458.00000528@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/28/2004 7:54 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281654.11054804@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >Inflamatory questions won't be answered.
>> >>
>> >> So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.
>> >
>> >Hey! Whatta you know? I agree with that.
>>
>> Which pretty much makes you a coward, especially in as all of the
>> questions were the result of stupid statements YOU made...Like how
>"unlicensed
>> radio services play a "major role" in disaster communicaitons".
>>
>> Still waiting for you to pull THAT rabbit out of your....hat.
>>
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Try stuffing this stupid statement back into your....hat.
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio.

There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and plans,
would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.

Sorry you don't agree.

Sorry you're not man enough to understand.

Steve, K4YZ

3341. Re: PRIVATE Voyeur Survivor Shots (real4.jpg) 2874

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:30:10 UTC
From: NC Tim <tbrooks7_nospam_@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <6c9kc.7237$g31.592@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91404
Cross-posted to: rec.music.reggae,rec.org.mensa,rec.org.sca,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

what gets me is that the spam must be somewhat effective or people wouldn't continue to do it. i guess if .0001 percent respond, it is worthwhile. which sucks for the rest of us.

"Ras Claat" <bumboclaat_3@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:c6r5q3$fb19t$1@ID-231387.news.uni-berlin.de...
> I F***IN' HATE SPAMMERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
>
> <niznqp@cnet.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:c6megp$4u4$290@news.loxinfo.co.th...
> > Ever Wondered What Happens When the Cameras
> > are not On During Survivor or Temptations Island ?
> >
> > Curious About What Happens Behind Closeed Doors
> > On Big Brother or American Idol?
> >
> > You Know Crazy, Wild and even Obscene things Happen!
> >
> > The Networks Dont Want you to See This!!!!
> > BUT WE SHOW IT TO YOU!!!
> >
> > http://nxwkingsitz.nom.vg/
> >
> > BECAUSE THE CAMERA WERE ROLLING the Shots just got
> > BANNED or CENCORED but we Have the SECRETS from REALITY TV
> >
> > This is for real You Know You Want to See It!
> >
> > More Erotic Than Temptation Island
> > Beyong BigBrother
> > Sexior than Survivor
> > Better than the Bachelor
> > Raunchier than The Amazing Race
> >
> > EXHIBITION VOYEUR
> > Nasty Obscene, erotic, dirty, insestuous, gross, indecent,
> > sleezy, impure, wild, erotic, pornographic, smutty,
> > risque, sensual, sexy.........
> > YOU NAME IT - THEY DID IT
> > ADD WE HAVE THE PROOF
> >
> > http://tinyurl.com/2jysv

> >
> > The Contestants Did it all and the NetWorks Couldnt
> > Show it, it was Banned, Cencored there Secret
> > Now we show you what they were doing!!!!
> >
> > Fetishes, Lingere, Lesbianism, Bi Sexual Experiments,
> > Foot Fetishes, FORCED SEX, Cross Dressing, Swinging,
> > jacuzzi group sex, threesomes, hi heels, rubber,
> > Whatever turns you on - they did it while they
> > thought no one was watching.
> >
> >
> > The Real Private Secrets from, Survivor, Bachelor,
> > Bachelorette, Temptation Island, Mole, Joe Millionare
> >
> > Contestants caught naked, stripping, playing, sucking,
> > fucking
> >
> > Did you know some contestants were lesbians some were
> > sluts, On one show a chick gave everyone a blowjob
> > including the camera MEN!!!!
> >
> > Behind Closed doors, in changing rooms, dressing rooms,
> > in the bushes, private sets, closets, showers, lakes,
> > all sorts of places they thought the cameras were not
> > around, BUT THEY WERE and WE GOT THE SHOTS!!!!!
> >
> >
> > All the things that got Cut out, the
> > camera men saved them after the Network
> > cut them and banned them.
> >
> >
> > You Wont See this ON Jerry Springer!!!!!!!!
> >
> >
> > You Think Girls Gone Wild was HOT This is like
> > The Sexual Olympics, but only for Real
> >
> > The Cameras Caught them - The Networks CUt them
> > WE HAVE THEM
> >
> > Quick Before they get Cencored or Banned Here!!!
> >
> > OutFuck - OutSuck
> > Who Will be the Last One Hard
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > a
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > LOVE
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > asdfasdf
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> > b
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > a
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > b
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > adsfasdf
> > \
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >

> >
> > asdf
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > a
> >
>
ljftbrufwuduxiojvgbolwyooqsjbrmxfwzeigyknhizsvegfdklyxgmoflgkrepvdwpulluudtw
>
rgiqghhzsknnnchylvreyesirtrejjgtwcmipqpmxtildkeujsimfxmqbvciwztxnvzdyjhesqyz
>
yezchtpgiobucdbzydeptcjuykfjimvzsjrbjpvgvzhcydzzisjetjwdgugjtvlgdcdyusninjeu
>
umiepuguqfzwmpkkigcmsigerqyfzpoguplfmluvodewiumtcggnfdxwfxqswujqddswnqvpspsv
>
kmmufjhchnblnbypvymivmqbmmihghdolqgsweqbnopdtphqpevoghnlyydfhptwbjrufdrcqfk
> >
> >
>
>

3342. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:51:33 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8a501ei3@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

They helped me pass my novice test.

In article <vq8kc.38865$oN1.35545@bignews5.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>N9PGE and K9BSD stay drunk! Why do you think they cannot keep a woman?
>Hell they cannot even get a date.
>
>Steveo wrote:
>> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
>>
>>>Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>>>news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>>>news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
>>>>>GEORGE BUSCH
>>>>>1385 DEVON CIR
>>>>>ALLENTOWN PA 18104
>>>>>USA
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
>>>>more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
>>>>it again...
>>>
>>>Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
>>>
>>>http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
>>>
>>
>> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.
>>
>>
>>>Geo using another nym wrote:
>>>I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine, everyone knows
>>>my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see the need I have a pair

>>>of balls to back up what I say, the only balls I see you have are the 2 on
>>>your chin.
>>
>>
>> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
>

3343. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and K9BSD wish they had their own

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:52:50 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8ci01epa@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Ive been out with them there nice guys.....

In article <An8kc.38852$oN1.1393@bignews5.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>At least he was able to conceive children. K9BSD and N9PGE cannot even
>get a date, the faggot alcoholics.
>
>tnom@mucks.net wrote:
>> On 22 Apr 2004 04:48:35 -0700, k8cpa@arrl.net (Me) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>tnom@mucks.net wrote in message
>>>news:<j9mb80dah4q72dq4re8h9k1gv2h9k0166j@4ax.com>...
>>>
>>>>snip
>>>>
>>>>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>>>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>>>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>>>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>>>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>>>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>>>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>>>>agreement.
>>>>
>>>>The state should get a new mental health counselor. It's not working.
>>>
>>>Okay... Help me understand something here.... and I know some of you
>>>might think I'm stupid, because I'm trying to deciper lawyer talk...
>>>and legal talk, But from what I can deciper from this... Doug got into
>>>trouble for not paying child support? and for voliating his parol? or
>>>Both?
>>>
>>>Anyhow, I'm just trying to sense of the Legal mumbo-jumbo...
>>>
>>>-Chuck
>>
>>
>> You are correct. The most important thing to remember is what we
>> all knew already. He has mental problems. The court would never
>> order mental health counseling unless he has been diagnosed with
>> the disorder.

>

3344. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and faggot lover K9BSD at it again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:53:34 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8du01etu@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91405
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

whats wrong with a little tea bag fun?

In article <Dl8kc.38844$oN1.31462@bignews5.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>N9PGE and K9BSD are the gutless wonders behind this shit. They are
>either harassing others or licking each others balls. They are pathetic,
>single, alcoholic faggots.
>
>tnom@mucks.net wrote:
>>>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>>>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>>>
>>>____
>>>
>>>This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
>>>this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
>>>remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
>>>maliciousness.
>>>
>>
>> Your argument holds no water. Doug has brought ALL of this
>> upon himself. When and if Dougs mental health becomes
>> stable he may realize why his life is so miserable. He'll realize
>> that it is foolish to harass people and justify it with the argument
>> that he is just doing his civic duty. Until he wises up nothing will
>> change.
>>
>> Have a miserable day/life Doug.
>

3345. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:54:56 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8gg01f4h@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Im brave when Im drunk!

In article <ah8kc.96844$Lh2.42758@bignews1.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>N9PGE and K9BSD have been doing it for years. They are cowardly drunk
>chicken-shits.
>
>WA3MOJ wrote:
>> In article <Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136>, Concerned Citizen
>> says...
>>
>>>Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
>>>news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>>>
>>>
>>>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>>>>J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>>>>700 ADAMS STREET
>>>>TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>>>>DATE: 4/20/2004
>>>>
>>>>CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>>>>TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>>>>JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>>FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>>>
>>>>--
>>>>--------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>>>>ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>>>>PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>>>
>>>>--
>>>>---------
>>>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>>>>Defendant 1:
>>>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>5319 SECOR RD.
>>>>TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>>>>4199365120
>>>>411 N MICHIGAN
>>>>TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>>>
>>>>--

>>>>--------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>>>>1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>>>
>>>>----------
>>>>--------- DATE SEQ EVENT
>>>>6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>>>>PARTY : -
>>>>5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>>>>803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
>>>>Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>>>>issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>>CAPIAS C-174-842
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>>CAPIAS C-174-843
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>>C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>>>>November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>>SERVED ON 11/13/00
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>>SERVED ON 11/12/00
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>>>>772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>>>>Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>>ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>>>>SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>>>>Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>>>>the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>>>>Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>>Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED

>>>>Sue Swanson
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
>>>>RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>>>>671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
>>>>Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>>>>present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>>ADAIR present in court.
>>>>Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>>>>having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>>>>of probation.
>>>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>>>agreement.
>>>>Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>>>>any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>>>>further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>>>>associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>>>>financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>>>>supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>>>>fees.
>>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>>>>SENTENCE C-184-502
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>>3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>>>>terminated unsuccesfully
>>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>-=-
>>>>This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>>>
>>>
>>>This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>>>the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>>>
>>
>> I really hate when people dont use their real name.

>>
>

3346. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:56:07 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8in01fbj@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91410
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I love having too much time since I got fired from burger king.

In article <Me8kc.96842$Lh2.51762@bignews1.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>It was either N9PGE or K9BSD, two drunks with way too much time on their
>hands.
>
>Concerned Citizen wrote:
>> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
>> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>>
>>
>>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>>>J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>>>700 ADAMS STREET
>>>TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>>>DATE: 4/20/2004
>>>
>>>CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>>>TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>>>JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>>
>>>--
>>>--------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>>>ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>>>PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>>
>>>--
>>>---------
>>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>>>Defendant 1:
>>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>5319 SECOR RD.
>>>TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>>>4199365120
>>>411 N MICHIGAN
>>>TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>>
>>>--
>>>--------- COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>>>1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>>

>>>--
>>>--------- DATE SEQ EVENT
>>>6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>>>PARTY : -
>>>5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>>>803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
>>>Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>>>issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>CAPIAS C-174-842
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>>>CAPIAS C-174-843
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>>>November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>SERVED ON 11/13/00
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>>>SERVED ON 11/12/00
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>>>772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>>>Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>>>SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>>>Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>>>the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>>>Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>>>Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
>>>Sue Swanson
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03

>>>RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>>>671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
>>>Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>>>ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>>>present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>>>ADAIR present in court.
>>>Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>>>having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>>>of probation.
>>>Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>>>of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>>>2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>>>Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>>>ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>>>Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>>>mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>>>agreement.
>>>Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>>>any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>>>further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>>>associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>>>financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>>>supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>>>fees.
>>>JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>>>SENTENCE C-184-502
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>>>3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>>>terminated unsuccesfully
>>>PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>>
>>>
>>>-=-
>>>This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>>
>>
>>
>> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
>> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>

3347. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 15:56:52 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c6r8k401ffr@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Whats wrong with being drunk?
In article <xd8kc.96841$Lh2.81601@bignews1.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
>
>I guess if the raving drunks N9PGE or K9BSD had any dependants we would
>see papers on them too. They stay too drunk to keep a wife though.
>
>Anonymous wrote:
>> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
>> J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
>> 700 ADAMS STREET
>> TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
>> DATE: 4/20/2004
>>
>> CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
>> TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
>> JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
>> FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>>
>>--
>> MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
>> ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
>> PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>>
>>--
>> Party Counsel Prosecutor
>> Defendant 1:
>> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 5319 SECOR RD.
>> TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
>> 4199365120
>> 411 N MICHIGAN
>> TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>>
>>--
>> COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
>> 1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>>
>>--
>> DATE SEQ EVENT
>> 6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
>> PARTY : -
>> 5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
>> 803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)

>> Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
>> issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>> CAPIAS C-174-842
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED JOURNALIZED
>> CAPIAS C-174-843
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>> C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFDT ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
>> November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>> SERVED ON 11/13/00
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
>> SERVED ON 11/12/00
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
>> 772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
>> Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>> ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
>> SWANSON appointed as counsel.
>> Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
>> the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
>> Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
>> Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
>> Sue Swanson
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
>> RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:RECD PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
>> 671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE

>> Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
>> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
>> present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
>> ADAIR present in court.
>> Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
>> having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
>> of probation.
>> Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
>> of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
>> 2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
>> Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
>> ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
>> Seek and maintain gainful employment 2) Defendant to seek
>> mental health counseling 3) Execute wage withholding
>> agreement.
>> Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
>> any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
>> further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
>> associated with being granted probation. Payment of
>> financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
>> supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
>> fees.
>> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
>> SENTENCE C-184-502
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
>> 3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
>> terminated unsuccesfully
>> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
>>
>>
>> -=-
>> This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>

3348. Re: PRIVATE Voyeur Survivor Shots (real4.jpg) 2874

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 16:07:38 UTC
From: Ras Claat <bumboclaat_3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <c6r5q3$fb19t$1@ID-231387.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 91403
Cross-posted to: rec.music.reggae,rec.org.mensa,rec.org.sca,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I F***IN' HATE SPAMMERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

<niznqp@cnet.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:c6megp$4u4$290@news.loxinfo.co.th...
> Ever Wondered What Happens When the Cameras
> are not On During Survivor or Temptations Island ?
>
> Curious About What Happens Behind Closeed Doors
> On Big Brother or American Idol?
>
> You Know Crazy, Wild and even Obscene things Happen!
>
> The Networks Dont Want you to See This!!!!
> BUT WE SHOW IT TO YOU!!!
>
> http://nxwkingsitz.nom.vg/
>
> BECAUSE THE CAMERA WERE ROLLING the Shots just got
> BANNED or CENCORED but we Have the SECRETS from REALITY TV
>
> This is for real You Know You Want to See It!
>
> More Erotic Than Temptation Island
> Beyong BigBrother
> Sexior than Survivor
> Better than the Bachelor
> Raunchier than The Amazing Race
>
> EXHIBITION VOYEUR
> Nasty Obscene, erotic, dirty, insestuous, gross, indecent,
> sleezy, impure, wild, erotic, pornographic, smutty,
> risque, sensual, sexy.........
> YOU NAME IT - THEY DID IT
> ADD WE HAVE THE PROOF
>
> http://tinyurl.com/2jysv
>
> The Contestants Did it all and the NetWorks Couldnt
> Show it, it was Banned, Cencored there Secret
> Now we show you what they were doing!!!!
>
> Fetishes, Lingere, Lesbianism, Bi Sexual Experiments,
> Foot Fetishes, FORCED SEX, Cross Dressing, Swinging,

> jacuzzi group sex, threesomes, hi heels, rubber,
> Whatever turns you on - they did it while they
> thought no one was watching.
>
>
> The Real Private Secrets from, Survivor, Bachelor,
> Bachelorette, Temptation Island, Mole, Joe Millionare
>
> Contestants caught naked, stripping, playing, sucking,
> fucking
>
> Did you know some contestants were lesbians some were
> sluts, On one show a chick gave everyone a blowjob
> including the camera MEN!!!!
>
> Behind Closed doors, in changing rooms, dressing rooms,
> in the bushes, private sets, closets, showers, lakes,
> all sorts of places they thought the cameras were not
> around, BUT THEY WERE and WE GOT THE SHOTS!!!!!
>
>
> All the things that got Cut out, the
> camera men saved them after the Network
> cut them and banned them.
>
>
> You Wont See this ON Jerry Springer!!!!!!!!
>
>
> You Think Girls Gone Wild was HOT This is like
> The Sexual Olympics, but only for Real
>
> The Cameras Caught them - The Networks CUt them
> WE HAVE THEM
>
> Quick Before they get Cencored or Banned Here!!!
>
> OutFuck - OutSuck
> Who Will be the Last One Hard
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> a
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> LOVE
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> asdfasdf
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> b
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> a
>
>
>
>
>
>
> b
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> adsfasdf
> \
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> asdf
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> a
>
ljftbrufwuduxiojvgbolwyooqsjbrmxfwzeigyknhizsvegfdklyxgmoflgkrepvdwpulluudtw
rgiqghhzsknnnchylvreyesirtrejjgtwcmipqpmxtildkeujsimfxmqbvciwztxnvzdyjhesqyz
yezchtpgiobucdbzydeptcjuykfjimvzsjrbjpvgvzhcydzzisjetjwdgugjtvlgdcdyusninjeu
umiepuguqfzwmpkkigcmsigerqyfzpoguplfmluvodewiumtcggnfdxwfxqswujqddswnqvpspsv
kmmufjhchnblnbypvymivmqbmmihghdolqgsweqbnopdtphqpevoghnlyydfhptwbjrufdrcqfk
>
>

3349. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 16:58:17 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404290858.5da46594@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91411

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<s7Odnd1uZLzj9hDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...

> > >>I agree with ARRL
> > >>that to stimulate growth (or even to keep up with dropouts and SKs) that
> > >>we need a new entry class with meaningful, mainstream privileges that
> > >>will be
> > >>interesting enough to bring in newbies (especially kids) and KEEP them
> > >>interested in learning and progressing.

> > > Morse Code is mainstream in amateur radio.
>
> Many people's mileage varys on that ...

Whose mileage, Carl? Yours?

Is Morse Code "mainstream" in amateur radio or not?

> > > Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
> > > experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....
>
> You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I
> know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse.

How many kids do you really know, Carl? How many of them would be
interested in *any* sort of radio avocation?

> However,
> geting on HF and talking around the world, experimenting with (and maybe
> developing) some new sound card digital modes (ever notice how many kids are
> computer wizzes?) would appeal to them and keep them interested.

With all due respect, Carl, I don't think you're the most objective
observer of people's interest in Morse Code. Nor do I think you'd be
quite the best salesperson for the mode...

Here's testimony from someone (not me!) who actually works with *lots*
of kids on a long-term basis. This guy is right here in EPA, closer to
your QTH than to mine. His program goes after the exact kinds of kids
we say we want to attract. These are *his* words and experiences, not
mine:

BEGIN QUOTE:

"I have had the privilege of teaching an after school activity,
at the local middle school, for five years. I named it Tune in

the World, and it covers many aspects of radio and television, and of course, pushes ham radio. Each year I have had several students, both boys and girls, obtain their license and try to help them continue on the hobby."

"With this as my basis, I can tell you that 95% of the students were a pleasure to work with and each year the district offers me a nice salary to teach the class and each year I decline it. Yes, it is a lot of work, but the students enjoy it and come away with a very positive idea of ham radio."

"The attention span varies, but I have found that I have to work at making sure I have an interesting program and that no part of it goes on and on and on. I set the rules at the first meeting and have not had any serious problems. (My son and his friends have been my biggest problem.) If one expects the students to sit in their chairs and listen to a presentation for an hour, after being in school all day, they good luck. I combine power point presentations, live demonstrations, part of ARRL videos, short movies, simple building projects and computers. Interestingly, the students are always VERY interested in the Morse code and seem less so in modes connected with the computer."

"I am not a STRONG disciplinarian, but we have rules and the kids obey them and something must be going right, a few kids who were in the previous class always take the next year's class and we always have 35 to 40 students. In fact, my biggest problem is that other students want to join the class after it has been on a few weeks."

"Last year at the last minute, I offer the Radio Merit Badge at Boy Scout Camp. I was given a terrible time and hoped for six kids. I had over 1/4 of the camp at the classes and more wanted to attend. We got a dozen hams out of that one."

"So, if we want to get new, young hams, then think about reaching out to the Middle Schools, and Scout Camps. Just the camp alone, with eight weeks of camp, would produce between 80 and 100 new hams....with about 400 Scout Camps in the USA, (Cub and Boy Scout) that would mean a very nice increase in our membership."

"I do agree, that like every previous generation, the new hams need help in
getting into the hobby and if nothing else, get their email address and send
them info as well as forwarding the address to the ARRL, and local clubs.
We can sit here and complain about the lack of young people in our hobby, or
we can do something, or expect someone else to do it. Ahhh, it is

easier to
complain...right?"

END QUOTE

Note that sentence at the end of the third paragraph. The emphasis is
his:

"Interestingly, the students are always VERY
interested in the Morse code and seem less so in
modes connected with the computer."

Just one teacher's experience in one middle school and one Boy Scout
camp. But he's there, with the kids, doing the teaching and recruiting
on his own time.

Who are any of us - including you, Carl - to say he's wrong?

What evidence do you have to counter what he says, Carl?

> > Testing = knowledge = bad
>
> No ...
>
> Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad

OK, fine. Now imagine FCC enacts free upgrades. How are you going to
argue that the General written test is "relevant" or "necessary" when
about 2/3 of the then-licensed Generals never passed the test for the
license they hold? How are you going to sell the idea that the General
written is "necessary"?

> > > Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
> > > majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
> > > and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
>
> Read the numbers ...

Where? You won't even tell us how many members NCI has, or how many of
them are US hams. How many NCI members actually answered the survey?

> the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the
> "commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
> newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they
> want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as
> did the Novices of our beginning days ...

Yep, I built my first station and many more since then. And a key part
of being able to do it was being able to start with simple projects
that gave good results. Like a simple Morse Code transmitter and
receiver.

Suppose a 'kid' with a brand-new license told you she wanted to build,
not buy, her ham radio station. Tools, skills, time and $$ are limited

- we're talking about a middle-schooler, not an adult.

What would you suggest to her as a first project, Carl?

> As far as the NCVEC proposal that applicants be required to certify that
> they have read and understand the Part 97 rules, most felt that was
> reasonable, and so do I. However, the way the question was worded (mea
> culpa), it doesn't indicate that that would be a substitute for at least
> some rules and regs questions on the written test - just "should folks
> certify that they understand the rules."

All hams should certify that they have read and understand the rules.
That's not a substitute for testing. But NCVEC's proposal wants to do
just that. Read the "21st Century" paper - it's a blueprint for the
NCVEC proposal. The proposers don't think new hams will learn the
rules well enough to pass a test on them!
>
> Again, it is not "support for lowering of *written* test standards" ...
> other than introducing an appropriate test like the Novice test of old for
> beginners, I see no "lowering of written test standards" - the General and
> Extra tests would remain the same. And I would oppose weakening them.

If 2/3 of the extant holders of a license haven't passed the written
test for that license, the standards have been weakened.
>
> However, for a "one shot adjustment" to align the current licensees with the
> new structure proposed, I personally don't have a problem with the ARRL
> proposal.

Why is such an adjustment needed at all? We've had 3 classes of
"legacy license" for over 4 years now. What's the problem?

> I think it's the only way to avoid the fiasco that occured 50-some years ago
> when folks lost privileges ... you know about that, and I'm sure you're
> aware that there are still some folks around who are very bitter about it.

What "fiasco" of 50 some years ago?

In 1951, FCC replaced the old ABC incentive licensing system with the
Novice/Technician/Conditional/General/Advanced/Extra incentive
licensing system that still forms the basis for our system today.

In 1953, FCC reversed its 1951 program and gave all operating
privileges to all US hams except Novices and Technicians, effective
mid-Feb., 1953. (51 years ago - was that the fiasco you meant?)

I wasn't around for those two. Some folks were bitter about the 1953
changes (no kids no lids no space cadets). The "legacy" Advanced class
was kept separate by FCC for more than 14 years.

In 1968, FCC reinstituted differences in operating privileges between
the Extra, Advanced, and General/Conditional licenses. These were
expanded in 1969. I was there, I lost privileges, and I had to wait
two years before I was even allowed to take the tests to get them

back. I wasn't bitter then, nor now. Other folks feel differently. But most hams today weren't hams when those changes took place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3350. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 17:37:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <T3bkc.7313$g31.4691@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91412

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0404281719.2d62cab3@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<_DAjc.4990$g31.3489@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Morse and Contests
> > > >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > >Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
> > > >
> > > > Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW
testing
> >
> > > >question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
> > > >
> > > > With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> > > >have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
> > >
> > > Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this
regard,
> > as in
> > > any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
> > >
> > > > While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> > > >make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
> > >
> > > Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
> > >
> > > As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to
be
> > > compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest
that
> > > required using honed skills, too...?!?!
> > >
> > > > Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth
double
> > > >points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> > > >points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number
of
> > > >points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> > > >operating Phone.
> > >
> > > And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a

keyboard?
> > >
> > > > I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard
and
> > > >logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> > > >than half that number.
> > >
> > > Shudda been on the paddles!
> > >
> > > Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Simply stated....CW Contesting requires real skills. Digital requires
the
> > ability to type.
> > Phone is way down there from the above requirements.
> >
> > If you want to do so....Give phone 1 point, digital 2 points, and CW 5
> > points per qso.
> >
> > That's my opinion, and I'm sticking to it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Your opinion looks wrong to me.
>
> My opinion is that the point schedule should be inverted from what you
> propose. I mean, when Aaron Jones was keeping the Morse Myths list,
> it would appear that a CW QSO just couldn't fail. It always got
> through, no matter the propogation, the power level, the QRN, or the
> QRM. Each and every Op would QRS for the new guy and everything was
> just so wonderful.
>
> Meanwhile phone Ops practice dog-eat-dog, QRM each other, use bad
> phonetics, and propogation is always iffy. Furthermore, they marry
> their Technician sisters and don't even QSL.
>
> Bass turds!
>
> Give the phone ops 5 pts per completed QSO, the CW Ops get 1.

And what was your score in the last major DX contest? Or lets make it
easier. How many DX QSO's have you had in a major contest....????

If under 300, you are disqualified from inputing on this discussioon.

Dan/W4NTI

3351. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 17:39:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <o5bkc.7316$g31.1642@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91413

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
> >>Date: 4/27/2004 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <QOWdnd0AwrtgkxLd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
> > >
> > >
> >>I've tried running a frequency on SSB contests but just don't get enough
> >>takers to make it worthwhile so I finally end up doing the "search and
> >>pounce". I'm not good enough yet to run a frequency on CW so by
necessity
> >>do "search and pounce" when operating in this mode.
> > >
> > >
> > > I had a lot more fun just setting a "personal goal" and working
towards
> > > that when I get into a contest. I set out to get a "Clean Sweep" a few
yeas
> > > ago and did it...with less than 150 Q's on each mode!
>
> My goal is to try to up my personal best each time I revisit the same
> contest. Two years in a row now, I have missed getting all 67 counties
> in the PAQSO by *one* county. That is my biggest goal this year. Second
> goal is to be first from PA in the New England QSO party. I've been
> stuck at third for the last two years. I did a lot better last year than
> the year before, but so have the people I'm competing with.
>
>
> > I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile
signal
> > if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!
>
> You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much rarer.

Dan/W4NTI

3352. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 17:45:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40913F4B.4090401@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91414

>
>
> NCI representing it's views is one thing, but I think that when a
> membership supports an idea that is actually harmful to the ARS, it is
> time to kinda step back from it.
>
>

Who determines what is "harmful"?

3353. Re: Something more important than BPL...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 17:58:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4091423C.4010709@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91415

>Aw common Beeps, you should at least admit stealing this from:
>Know guns, know safety
>No guns, no safety.
>
"Gun control" is using both hands.

>
>And I think you are severely underestimating the BPL threat to HF reception;
>it's a real hobby killer.
>Even though I love and use CW if I HAD to choose between no code or no BPL
>I'd choose no BPL.
>First things first, if you can't hear 'em you can't work 'em.
>
>That's the eternal truth, proven every day.
>
Maybe code will be the only thing that gets thru BPL. If it's true what
they claim that
code gets thru when SSB fails. Though I doubt that FISTS will endorsee BPL.

>
>
>
>
>>no code, Know ham.
>>kNow code, no ham.
>>
>>
>>
>
>

3354. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 18:01:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429140147.21784.00000633@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91416

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/29/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0404290858.5da46594@posting.google.com>
>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<s7Odnd1uZLzj9hDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...

>> Many people's mileage varys on that ...
>
>Whose mileage, Carl? Yours?
>
>Is Morse Code "mainstream" in amateur radio or not?

Judging by the amount of RF I hear on HF and the presnece of a key jack on
even the most prestigeous of HF transceivers, I'd have to say "yes, it's
mainstream".

>> > > Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
>> > > experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....
>>
>> You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I
>> know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse.
>
>How many kids do you really know, Carl? How many of them would be
>interested in *any* sort of radio avocation?

In CAP we have dozens of kids chomping at the bit to "get on the air". Of
the current "crop" of Cadets at th local unit, seven out of 12 are licensed
Amateurs, six of them have already one on to General.

>> > Testing = knowledge = bad
>>
>> No ...
>>
>> Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad
>
>OK, fine. Now imagine FCC enacts free upgrades. How are you going to
>argue that the General written test is "relevant" or "necessary" when
>about 2/3 of the then-licensed Generals never passed the test for the
>license they hold? How are you going to sell the idea that the General
>written is "necessary"?

And who's making the call on what's irrelevant and what's
unnecessary...?!?!

Isn't that the "call" of the person seeking Amateur licensure...?!?!

>> > > Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
>> > > majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
>> > > and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
>>
>> Read the numbers ...
>
>Where? You won't even tell us how many members NCI has, or how many of
>them are US hams. How many NCI members actually answered the survey?

The League and CQ Magazine always provide the numbers of those responding
to surveys.

>> the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the
>> "commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
>> newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they
>> want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as
>> did the Novices of our beginning days ...
>
>Yep, I built my first station and many more since then. And a key part
>of being able to do it was being able to start with simple projects
>that gave good results. Like a simple Morse Code transmitter and
>receiver.
>
>Suppose a 'kid' with a brand-new license told you she wanted to build,
>not buy, her ham radio station. Tools, skills, time and $$ are limited
>- we're talking about a middle-schooler, not an adult.
>
>What would you suggest to her as a first project, Carl?

I'm a bit curious too...........

>> As far as the NCVEC proposal that applicants be required to certify that
>> they have read and understand the Part 97 rules, most felt that was
>> reasonable, and so do I. However, the way the question was worded (mea
>> culpa), it doesn't indicate that that would be a substitute for at least
>> some rules and regs questions on the written test - just "should folks
>> certify that they understand the rules."
>
>All hams should certify that they have read and understand the rules.
>That's not a substitute for testing. But NCVEC's proposal wants to do
>just that. Read the "21st Century" paper - it's a blueprint for the
>NCVEC proposal. The proposers don't think new hams will learn the
>rules well enough to pass a test on them!

This was exactly the response I got from one of the guys who wrote that
paper. I e-mailed him a lengthy resposne and got a very pleasant reply. I
believe them to have the right "motivations", but thier executions will be
wrong, wrong, wrong...

>> However, for a "one shot adjustment" to align the current licensees with
>the
>> new structure proposed, I personally don't have a problem with the ARRL
>> proposal.
>
>Why is such an adjustment needed at all? We've had 3 classes of
>"legacy license" for over 4 years now. What's the problem?

Agreed.

The "numbers" continue to demonstrate that plenty of people are able to
pass the requisite examinations. If there's ANY "upgrade", it should include a
written exam on the added privileges and pretinent HF propagation and
practices, even if the "upgrade" does NOT include Morse Code.

>> I think it's the only way to avoid the fiasco that occured 50-some years
>ago
>> when folks lost privileges ... you know about that, and I'm sure you're
>> aware that there are still some folks around who are very bitter about it.
>
>What "fiasco" of 50 some years ago?
>
>In 1951, FCC replaced the old ABC incentive licensing system with the
>Novice/Technician/Conditional/General/Advanced/Extra incentive
>licensing system that still forms the basis for our system today.
>
>In 1953, FCC reversed its 1951 program and gave all operating
>privileges to all US hams except Novices and Technicians, effective
>mid-Feb., 1953. (51 years ago - was that the fiasco you meant?)
>
>I wasn't around for those two. Some folks were bitter about the 1953
>changes (no kids no lids no space cadets). The "legacy" Advanced class
>was kept separate by FCC for more than 14 years.
>
>In 1968, FCC reinstituted differences in operating privileges between
>the Extra, Advanced, and General/Conditional licenses. These were
>expanded in 1969. I was there, I lost privileges, and I had to wait
>two years before I was even allowed to take the tests to get them
>back. I wasn't bitter then, nor now. Other folks feel differently. But
>most hams today weren't hams when those changes took place.

The FCC won't do that twice...I hope.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3355. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 18:03:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429140348.21784.00000634@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91417

>bject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 4/29/2004 12:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <T3bkc.7313$g31.4691@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0404281719.2d62cab3@posting.google.com...
>> Meanwhile phone Ops practice dog-eat-dog, QRM each other, use bad
>> phonetics, and propogation is always iffy. Furthermore, they marry
>> their Technician sisters and don't even QSL.
>>
>> Bass turds!
>>
>> Give the phone ops 5 pts per completed QSO, the CW Ops get 1.
>
>And what was your score in the last major DX contest? Or lets make it
>easier. How many DX QSO's have you had in a major contest....????
>
>If under 300, you are disqualified from inputing on this discussioon.

Better yet, how many DX contacts has he made as a duly-authorized control operator from a DX location...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3356. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 18:09:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429140912.21784.00000635@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91418

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 4/29/2004 12:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <o5bkc.7316$g31.1642@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>>
>>
>> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> > I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile
>signal
>> > if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!
>>
>> You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)
>
>I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much rarer.

You pay for the addded travel and winter clothing and you're on, Dan! ! !
=)

Heck, if we're gonna go for "rare", how about from the Iniuit
Territories...?!?! Add in the cost of the bush plane and dog sled too,
OK...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ
(already shivvering just thinking about it!)

3357. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 18:23:28 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AKbkc.14297$eZ5.5644@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91419

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> But NCVEC's proposal wants to do just that. Read
> the "21st Century" paper - it's a blueprint for the
> NCVEC proposal.

I'm having some doubts about the "21st Century" paper authorship.
KL7-whatever-his-call-is claims W3BE as a co-author, yet W3BE in
his comments to FCC comes down in opposition to most of those
ideas like free upgrades as looney-tune-stupid (which they are).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3358. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 18:56:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40914FD1.8020801@psu.edu>
Source record: 91420

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>>>>Date: 4/27/2004 8:55 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <QOWdnd0AwrtgkxLd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
>>>
>>>
>>>>I've tried running a frequency on SSB contests but just don't get enough
>>>>takers to make it worthwhile so I finally end up doing the "search and
>>>>pounce". I'm not good enough yet to run a frequency on CW so by
>>>
> necessity
>
>>>>do "search and pounce" when operating in this mode.
>>>
>>>
>>> I had a lot more fun just setting a "personal goal" and working
>>
> towards
>
>>>that when I get into a contest. I set out to get a "Clean Sweep" a few
>>
> yeas
>
>>>ago and did it...with less than 150 Q's on each mode!
>>
>>My goal is to try to up my personal best each time I revisit the same
>>contest. Two years in a row now, I have missed getting all 67 counties
>>in the PAQSO by *one* county. That is my biggest goal this year. Second
>>goal is to be first from PA in the New England QSO party. I've been
>>stuck at third for the last two years. I did a lot better last year than
>>the year before, but so have the people I'm competing with.
>>
>>
>>
>>> I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile
>>
> signal

>
>>>if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!
>>
>>You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much rarer.
>

That would be a real adventure during that time of the year. I never had a VE8 (why does that remind me of a commercial??) ever, much less in a contest.

- mike KB3EIA -

3359. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 19:12:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <409153B0.5070807@psu.edu>
Source record: 91422

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>>Date: 4/29/2004 12:39 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <o5bkc.7316$g31.1642@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>
>>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>
>>>> I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt mobile
>>>
>>signal
>>
>>>>if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!
>>>
>>>You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)
>>
>>I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much rarer.
>
>
> You pay for the addded travel and winter clothing and you're on, Dan! ! !
> =)
>
> Heck, if we're gonna go for "rare", how about from the Iniuit
> Territories...?!?! Add in the cost of the bush plane and dog sled too,
> OK...?!?!

Apparently there are 4 hams resident in VY0-land.

- mike KB3EIA -

3360. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 19:12:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Vsckc.14360$eZ5.3987@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91421

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> > I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much
rarer.
> >
>
> That would be a real adventure during that time of the year. I
never
> had a VE8 (why does that remind me of a commercial??) ever,
much less in
> a contest.

Yukon is VY1, and pretty well represented in most contests. Jay,
VY1JA, is always in the chair on contest weekends, along with
assorted KL7xx/VY1 players.

The tough VE from here is VE4. Several stations are active in
RadioSport (VE4GV, VE4GV, VE4YU, etc) but they're all in Winnipeg
which is roughly 600KM away, deep in my skip zone.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3361. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 19:41:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>
Source record: 91423

Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>> NCI representing it's views is one thing, but I think that when a
>> membership supports an idea that is actually harmful to the ARS, it is
>> time to kinda step back from it.
>>
>>
>
>
> Who determines what is "harmful"?
>

I wrote a couple sentences/questions to that effect, that you snipped out.

Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler. Despite what marketing wonks may tell us, nothing is. Give me what you think is an example, and I can quickly tell you why it isn't.

Nothing is improved by lowering the bar. If most General hams have only taken the Technician test, then the average tested level is brought down to somewhere between Technician and General.

None of this is subject to spin, it is just how it is. Simple mathematics is all it is.

If it isn't improving things, or at least neutral, then it is harming things.

Database administration isn't a good excuse at all. just imagine how much database administration would be eased if there were only one class. So why don't we simply "one time adjust" every ham in the country to Extra? Everyone will have all the same privileges, so no wondering what ham is supposed to be at what frequency. That would make administration EASY.

Would one time adjusting *everyone* to the Extra level be harmful to the ARS?

Adjusting the Technicians to the next level is an incremental adjustment of the same. At what level is incrementalism not harmful?

Quick note here. I do not oppose one license class. But it would be at the Extra level at least.

- mike KB3EIA -

3362. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 19:58:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429155848.07672.00000501@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91424

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/29/2004 2:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <409153B0.5070807@psu.edu>

> Apparently there are 4 hams resident in VY0-land.

Does that include the one's curing on the pole outside the igloo...?!?!

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3363. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 20:00:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040429160028.07672.00000502@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91425

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 4/29/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>

>Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler.

I dunno about that, Mike...I kinda liked the velcro-closed bikini bra my
former g/f used to wear!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3364. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 20:38:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <409167B6.3070006@psu.edu>
Source record: 91426

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>>petitions ...
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 4/29/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0404290858.5da46594@posting.google.com>
>>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>>news:<s7Odnd1uZLzj9hDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
>
>
>>>Many people's mileage varys on that ...
>>
>>Whose mileage, Carl? Yours?
>>
>>Is Morse Code "mainstream" in amateur radio or not?
>
>
> Judging by the amount of RF I hear on HF and the presnece of a key jack on
> even the most prestigeous of HF transceivers, I'd have to say "yes, it's
> mainstream".
>
>
>>>>>Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
>>>>>experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....
>>>>
>>>You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I
>>>know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse.
>>
>>How many kids do you really know, Carl? How many of them would be
>>interested in *any* sort of radio avocation?
>
>
> In CAP we have dozens of kids chomping at the bit to "get on the air". Of
> the current "crop" of Cadets at th local unit, seven out of 12 are licensed
> Amateurs, six of them have already one on to General.
>
>
>>>>Testing = knowledge = bad
>>>
>>>No ...
>>>
>>>Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad

>>
>>OK, fine. Now imagine FCC enacts free upgrades. How are you going to
>>argue that the General written test is "relevant" or "necessary" when
>>about 2/3 of the then-licensed Generals never passed the test for the
>>license they hold? How are you going to sell the idea that the General
>>written is "necessary"?
>
>
> And who's making the call on what's irrelevant and what's
> unnecessary...?!?!
>
> Isn't that the "call" of the person seeking Amateur licensure...?!?!
>
>
>>>>>Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
>>>>>majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
>>>>>and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?
>>>>
>>>Read the numbers ...
>>
>>Where? You won't even tell us how many members NCI has, or how many of
>>them are US hams. How many NCI members actually answered the survey?
>
>
> The League and CQ Magazine always provide the numbers of those responding
> to surveys.
>
>
>>>the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the
>>>"commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
>>>newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they
>>>want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as
>>>did the Novices of our beginning days ...
>>
>>Yep, I built my first station and many more since then. And a key part
>>of being able to do it was being able to start with simple projects
>>that gave good results. Like a simple Morse Code transmitter and
>>receiver.
>>
>>Suppose a 'kid' with a brand-new license told you she wanted to build,
>>not buy, her ham radio station. Tools, skills, time and $$ are limited
>>- we're talking about a middle-schooler, not an adult.
>>
>>What would you suggest to her as a first project, Carl?
>
>
> I'm a bit curious too.....
>

If I were to butt in here, I would say that aside from the obvious CW transceiver, simple and easy to build, There are plenty of other possibilities.

AM transmitters. - Yeah, groan.

Simple SSB transmitters. There appear to be a few out there that can be homebrewed. If not, Jim should design one!

All these would be somewhat more complex than the classic CW transmitter, but that brings me back to the point I like to make about what hams "should know". Now that we are probably moving beyond the time when a super simple transmitter is the rig of choice for the budding homebrewer, it is more important than ever that the same should have a well grounded knowledge of basic electronics.

Aside from homebrewing entire radios, the youngster can do things like building interfaces to their computers from their radios. Note that there is a PSK31 Transceiver that can be built from Rocky mountain Labs IIRC that while it isn't quite a homebrew design, it isn't a bad start - it's like building a modern da version of a Heathkit.

Antennas are another matter. There is a lot of quackery on the matter of antennas these days, and some serious guidance is needed to keep the kids from getting discouraged. And yaknow, a homebrew tuner might just be a good project too!

Someone oughta write a book. hmmmmmmm.

Discouraging homebrew is possibly the most damaging part of at least one of the proposals out there as far as attracting young people.

I just don't think that there are that many youngsters that want to simply mash the PTT button on their Yeacommwood transceiver and yak as their primary activity in the ARS. We won't attract too many people that way.

I'm firmly convinced that kids that might want to join the ARS want to BUILD!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3365. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 20:55:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <EYdkc.14435$eZ5.7782@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91427

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> And ya know, a homebrew tuner might just
> be a good project too!

Antenna tuners (more properly called feed line tuners) are a crutch for people who can't manage to build a proper antenna to fool their transmitter into thinking it has a proper antenna.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3366. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-29 23:29:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404291529.33ad8693@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91428

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040428213519.25458.00000528@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 4/28/2004 7:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404281654.11054804@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >Inflamatory questions won't be answered.
> >> >>
> >> >> So far that's been just about ANY question put to you.
> >> >
> >> >Hey! Whatta you know? I agree with that.
> >>
> >> Which pretty much makes you a coward, especially in as all of the
> >> questions were the result of stupid statements YOU made...Like how
> "unlicensed
> >> radio services play a "major role" in disaster communicaitons".
> >>
> >> Still waiting for you to pull THAT rabbit out of your....hat.
> >>
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Try stuffing this stupid statement back into your....hat.
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio.
>
> There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and plans,
> would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.
>
> Sorry you don't agree.
>
> Sorry you're not man enough to understand.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Maniliness? That has nothing to do with it.

No wonder you're the Pariah of RRAP.

3367. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, gutless anon bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 00:14:02 UTC
From: Joe Sixpack <Joe@Joe.com>
Message-ID: <c6s5mo$lf9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

A little hung over this morning, are we? Hmmmmmm????

"Joe Smith" <joe@joe.com> wrote in message
news:iu8kc.38882$oN1.5247@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
So what kind of puppies do you have dumbass?

AKC KennelMaster wrote:
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message

3368. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 01:11:42 UTC
From: Max Mustermann <anonymous@remail.amessage.info>
Message-ID: <a09979ca30b66043895b9471d84baab2@remail.amessage.info>
Source record: 91430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <c676ot$f3q$0@pita.alt.net>
"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined:
>
>
>
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
> > LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> > J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> > 700 ADAMS STREET
> > TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> > DATE: 4/20/2004
> >
> > CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> > TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> > JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> > FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
> >
> > ------------------------------------------------------------------------
> > --------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> > ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> > PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
> >
> > ------------------------------------------------------------------------
> > ---------
> > Party Counsel Prosecutor
> > Defendant 1:
> > ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 5319 SECOR RD.
> > TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> > 4199365120
> > 411 N MICHIGAN
> > TOLEDO , OH 436241606
> >
> <DELETE>
> > terminated unsuccesfully
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
> >
> >
> > -=-
```

> > This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
> ____
>
> This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
> this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
> remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
> maliciousness.

You're a rather whiny cunt, aren't you?

3369. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 01:51:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XoSdnWhtQ6uiLAzdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91431

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>> And ya know, a homebrew tuner might just
>>be a good project too!
>
>
>
> Antenna tuners (more properly called feed line tuners) are a crutch for
> people who can't manage to build a proper antenna to fool their
> transmitter into thinking it has a proper antenna.

I thought a crutch was on a car!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3370. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 01:53:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XoSdnWttQ6sFLAzdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91432

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 4/29/2004 2:12 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <409153B0.5070807@psu.edu>
>
>
>>Apparently there are 4 hams resident in VY0-land.
>
>
> Does that include the one's curing on the pole outside the igloo...?!?!

hehe, well that one isn't going to be operating in sweeps. Perhaps
keeping the operator going?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3371. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 02:02:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <i4SdnfP1O7hZLgzdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91433

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>>I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much
>
> rarer.
>
>>That would be a real adventure during that time of the year. I
>
> never
>
>>had a VE8 (why does that remind me of a commercial??) ever,
>
> much less in
>
>>a contest.
>
>
> Yukon is VY1, and pretty well represented in most contests. Jay,
> VY1JA, is always in the chair on contest weekends, along with
> assorted KL7xx/VY1 players.

Oops, somehow or another something got messed up. I might have replied to the wrong message. Steve noted that even rarer would have been a VY0 Nunavit, which at one time was part of VE8. A bad case of shifting territories going on here! And Yup, I do get into the Yukon fairly often.

> The tough VE from here is VE4. Several stations are active in
> RadioSport (VE4GV, VE4GV, VE4YU, etc) but they're all in Winnipeg
> which is roughly 600KM away, deep in my skip zone.

Ve4 isn't too bad from here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3372. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 02:02:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <itikc.17931$e4.14585@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91434

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> I thought a crutch was on a car!
>

My Cororra has no crutch. It has an automagic tlansmission, powel
blakes, powel steeling, and white warr tiles.

Sebentee tlee to you and the XYR,

de Hans, K0HB/4ID

3373. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 02:26:18 UTC
From: Leonard Martin <lmarti49NOSPAM@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <lmarti49NOSPAM-8E9B97.21261829042004@bignews.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91435
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <1XUgc.2518$e4.320@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:

>"WA3MOJ" <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote
>
>| Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web
>site's that
>| will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters.
>I'm finding
>| there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
>references for
>| various solid state and tube conversions.
>
>The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
>they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
>1.4.
>
>The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!
>
>It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was
>poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack
>the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.
>
>Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a
>9.8? Never!
>
>The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in
>dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!
>
>They demand a recount!
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

BRAVO!

Leonard

--
"Everything that rises must converge"
--Flannery O'Connor

3374. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 02:28:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404291828.42c0a2ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91436

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040429160028.07672.00000502@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions
> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >Date: 4/29/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>
>
> >Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler.
>
> I dunno about that, Mike...I kinda liked the velcro-closed bikini bra my
> former g/f used to wear!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Former?

You sure got a lot of "former's" in your life.

Why am I not suprised?

3375. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 03:49:46 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DAF276CF9B71234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8gg01f4h@drn.newsguy.com:

> Im brave when Im drunk!

That would be nice but why are you impersonating a ham operator?

3376. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and faggot lover K9BSD at it again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 03:51:03 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DAF2AEB88401234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8du01etu@drn.newsguy.com:

> whats wrong with a little tea bag fun?

That was posted by Steve park medina, Ohio he has a thing for Ham
operators, he has went as far as going to thier homes as a sort of threat
or intimidation, but he forgot to pull his skirt up.

3377. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 03:51:54 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DAF2D3EAC4E1234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8in01fbj@drn.newsguy.com:

> I love having too much time since I got fired from burger king.

posted by Steve parks Medina Ohio, Bootleg CB Operator

3378. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 08:12:55 UTC
From: KD6MSI <See_my@Signature.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <See_my-CAADBB.01130530042004@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
"koolones" <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com> wrote:

> Let's face it boys, BPL is comming at us like a fast
> freight train rolling thru the Utah Badlands on the
> Southern Pacific. (..or is that the Burlington Northern?)
>
> It will turn up in your neighborhood if you're in the suburbs.

It may, it may not. It remains to be seen just which way this is going
to go. Stay tuned.

> Consider THIS however...can you imagine the SUPRISE
> and SHOCK (..hint) when all those folks who signed up
> for BPL are all online when the first Spring or Summer
> thunderstorm rolls thru...????
>
> Think of it 4 a moment.............
>
> It sure is going to be as *amusing* as a Baby Ruth bar in a punchbowl
> at a Bar Mitzva, when all your dumbsh-t neighbors get their PC's
> other "BPL ready" hardware fried-to-a-crisp when a lightning bolt from
> above hits the power pole 1/2 a mile away and blows the crapola
> out of every PC that's plugged into the outlet for **miles** around !!
>
> BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
> ....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"

Unlikely. It is more likely a transformer would explode before you would
see any home damage. How many times has lightning hit close to home with
the worst effect being a blackout and no fried home electronics? In
addition, most homes that have surge suppressed power strips serving
entertainment centers probably already have enough protection to prevent
this scenario. These power strips are cheap and common. Specialized
computer surge suppressed, noise filtered strips, like the kind commonly
used for computers, provide even more protection than their wimpier
cousins serving power to the family VCR. Finally, any BPL modem that
gets deployed will most certainly have lightning protection built into
it in one form or another for the simple sake of the companies
investment.

> (..and I will bet you dimes to doughnuts that the local utility
> will bury a tough *non-liability clause* into the 2mm tall fine print when
> they sign up for BPL internet service, absolving themselves for all surge
> related damage because the average person will think they are "safe".

> when that happens, watch everyone dump BPL like it's a used ford car)

I agree that a standard and general non liability clause will appear in the paperwork somewhere, as a matter of routine. However, I think the rest is a bit of wishful thinking. Besides, Ford makes a hell of a truck :-)

73,

Mathew

--
ROT 13 this address to mail me:

bar jbeq abg guerr; uvtu qrfreg zna, gura nqq - ng lnubb qbg pbz.

3379. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 08:24:56 UTC
From: KD6MSI <See_my@Signature.com.invalid>
Message-ID: <See_my-BC8242.01250630042004@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <dLKdncbV2Otowf7dRVn-hQ@crocker.com>,
"Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote:

<snip>

> it won't be any worse than the hits that modems already take from phone
> lines, or that cable modems get from their systems, or that computers
> without surge protectors get hit with now... it may even be better as they
> are likely designed with that in mind anyway. the one that will be more fun
> will be to watch the bpl tech try to diagnose a problem in the neighborhood
> when a m/m contest station fires up at 0000z on friday night and shuts down
> the whole area.
>
>

I think simple economics will be the death of BPL. Cable Broadband, and
DSL are getting cheaper and cheaper, and for the first time DSL is
actually cheaper in some markets than Cable broadband. Broadband can now
be had for what a dialup line cost just a few years ago. The newest
contender, and the one I think is going to kill BPL in the long run, is
satellite internet. The price is a bit high right now, but no more so
than DSL was a short time ago. I predict that it will be coming down
fast, and satellite internet will be *the* provider of the future
because it can be had as a package with digital satellite television,
and provides service to *anywhere* in north America with a clear view of
the southern sky. No miles to source limits, no load balancing, no
landlines, no muss, no fuss. I just don't believe BPL can catch up with
the economics of its competitors who have been at it alot longer.

73,

Mathew

--
ROT 13 this address to mail me:

bar jbeq abg guerr; uvtu qrfreg zna, gura nqq - ng lnubb qbg pbz.

3380. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 11:14:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430071420.23031.00000241@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 91509

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/29/2004 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291529.33ad8693@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>...

>> There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and
>plans,
>> would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.
>>
>> Sorry you don't agree.
>>
>> Sorry you're not man enough to understand.
>
>Maniliness? That has nothing to do with it.
>
>No wonder you're the Pariah of RRAP.

I can be the "pariah" of anything, Briam, but it doesn't negate this
simple truth:

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

That you seem to want to make an argument out of it when no argumant can
exist is silly. That you have a hard time telling the truth (or at least being
able to accept it) is evident. This is directly related to your inability to
suck-it-up as a man and admit that there are greater truths in the world than
your own made up ones.

Sucks to be you.

Steve, K4YZ

3381. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 11:17:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430071725.23031.00000242@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 91510

```
>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/29/2004 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291828.42c0a2ba@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040429160028.07672.00000502@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>> >petitions
>> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>> >Date: 4/29/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>
>>
>> >Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler.
>>
>> I dunno about that, Mike...I kinda liked the velcro-closed bikini bra
>my
>> former g/f used to wear!
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Former?
>
>You sure got a lot of "former's" in your life.
>
>Why am I not suprised?

You've only had one woman in your entire life, Brain?

You met and dated one and only one woman your ENTIRE life?

Yes, there a lot of "former" girlfriends. A bit jealous, are you?
Perhaps it's that residual fecal material behind your ears from plugging and
unplugging your head in the wrong orifice all the time...

You might try toothpaste, too....

Steve, K4YZ
```

3382. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 11:17:54 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <Ud2dnRqphLN5qA_dRVn-tA@crocker.com>
Source record: 91502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KD6MSI" <See_my@Signature.com.invalid> wrote in message
news:See_my-BC8242.01250630042004@news.verizon.net...
> In article <dLKdncbV2Otowf7dRVn-hQ@crocker.com>,
> "Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
> > it won't be any worse than the hits that modems already take from phone
> > lines, or that cable modems get from their systems, or that computers
> > without surge protectors get hit with now... it may even be better as
they
> > are likely designed with that in mind anyway. the one that will be more
fun
> > will be to watch the bpl tech try to diagnose a problem in the
neighborhood
> > when a m/m contest station fires up at 0000z on friday night and shuts
down
> > the whole area.
> >
> >
>
> I think simple economics will be the death of BPL. Cable Broadband, and
> DSL are getting cheaper and cheaper, and for the first time DSL is
> actually cheaper in some markets than Cable broadband. Broadband can now
> be had for what a dialup line cost just a few years ago. The newest
> contender, and the one I think is going to kill BPL in the long run, is
> satellite internet. The price is a bit high right now, but no more so
> than DSL was a short time ago. I predict that it will be coming down
> fast, and satellite internet will be *the* provider of the future
> because it can be had as a package with digital satellite television,
> and provides service to *anywhere* in north America with a clear view of
> the southern sky. No miles to source limits, no load balancing, no
> landlines, no muss, no fuss. I just don't believe BPL can catch up with
> the economics of its competitors who have been at it alot longer.
>
satellite may be ok for the REALLY remote place that wants to surf the web
and download email, but it has serious drawbacks for anything more than
that. the delays up and down are so long that real time games are
worthless. the split ip system messes up some business vpn uses. the
uplink bandwidth from the user is SLOW (read 56k or less in most cases).
the downlink bandwidth is limited and in the one i looked at they reserved
the right to throttle you back if you were using too much... remember, the
downlink is shared just like cable broadband, so one hog slows it down for

everyone else. they also did not like streaming video and prohibit servers. and it is not a do-it-yourself installation, it must be installed by trained techs. fiber to the curb, cable broadband, and improved dsl with extended range is more likely to be the common mechanism... some of the terrestrial wireless systems are also making inroads in medium density areas.

3383. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 11:22:28 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040430072228.486$v5@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8in01fbj@drn.newsguy.com:
>
> > I love having too much time since I got fired from burger king.
>
> posted by Steve parks Medina Ohio, Bootleg CB Operator
>
Guess again, geo.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3384. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and faggot lover K9BSD at it again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 11:23:29 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040430072329.659$gh@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8du01etu@drn.newsguy.com:
>
> > whats wrong with a little tea bag fun?
>
> That was posted by Steve park medina, Ohio he has a thing for Ham
> operators, he has went as far as going to thier homes as a sort of threat
> or intimidation, but he forgot to pull his skirt up.
>
Hey columbo, that ain't me posting that, but it is funny.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3385. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 12:07:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404300407.2833b703@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91511

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<409167B6.3070006@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >>petitions ...
> >>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >>Date: 4/29/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <c2356669.0404290858.5da46594@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >>news:<s7Odnd1uZLzj9hDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>...

> >>>Many people's mileage varys on that ...
> >>
> >>Whose mileage, Carl? Yours?
> >>
> >>Is Morse Code "mainstream" in amateur radio or not?

> > Judging by the amount of RF I hear on HF and the presnece of a key jack on
> > even the most prestigeous of HF transceivers, I'd have to say "yes, it's
> > mainstream".

In amateur radio, anyway.

> >>>>Kids aren't put off by code tests *or* written tests, in my
> >>>>experience. And I do have a bit of experience in that area....

> >>>You must know different kids than I do ... the vast majority of the ones I
> >>>know couldn't give a rat's backside about learning or using Morse.
> >>
> >>How many kids do you really know, Carl? How many of them would be
> >>interested in *any* sort of radio avocation?

The quote I posted here demonstrates that the realities of getting
"kids" into amateur radio are quite different from what Carl has
presented.

> > In CAP we have dozens of kids chomping at the bit to "get on the air". Of
> > the current "crop" of Cadets at th local unit, seven out of 12 are licensed
> > Amateurs, six of them have already one on to General.

What ages are we talking about?

> >>>>Testing = knowledge = bad

> >>>No ...
> >>>

> >>>Irrelevant/unnecessary requirements = waste of time/lack of interest = bad
> >>
> >>OK, fine. Now imagine FCC enacts free upgrades. How are you going to
> >>argue that the General written test is "relevant" or "necessary" when
> >>about 2/3 of the then-licensed Generals never passed the test for the
> >>license they hold? How are you going to sell the idea that the General
> >>written is "necessary"?

> > And who's making the call on what's irrelevant and what's
> > unnecessary...?!?!

FCC makes that call. And note this: One of the arguments for dumping
Element 1 is the claim that when it was dumped for Tech, the whole ARS
didn't fall apart.
So if we get over 323,000 free upgrades to General with no testing and
the ARS
doesn't fall apart.....

> > Isn't that the "call" of the person seeking Amateur licensure...?!?!

Nope. A person might think that 20 wpm code tests given by FCC
examiners are relevant and necessary to an Extra license, but they
will have a hard time finding them today..

> >>>>>Sure. But that part of the ARRL proposal isn't the problem. And if the
> >>>>>majority of NCI members support NCVEC's "appliance operator" class,
> >>>>>and their "copy of Part 97" idea, will NCI support that, too?

> >>>Read the numbers ...
> >>
> >>Where? You won't even tell us how many members NCI has, or how many of
> >>them are US hams. How many NCI members actually answered the survey?

> > The League and CQ Magazine always provide the numbers of those responding
> > to surveys.

> >>>the majority of NCI members did NOT support either the
> >>>"commercial gear only for newbies" or the "low voltage finals only for
> >>>newbies" proposals from NCVEC - that implies pretty clearly to me that they
> >>>want newbies to be able to tinker, build, modify, and experiment, just as
> >>>did the Novices of our beginning days ...
> >>
> >>Yep, I built my first station and many more since then. And a key part
> >>of being able to do it was being able to start with simple projects
> >>that gave good results. Like a simple Morse Code transmitter and
> >>receiver.
> >>
> >>Suppose a 'kid' with a brand-new license told you she wanted to build,
> >>not buy, her ham radio station. Tools, skills, time and $$ are limited
> >>- we're talking about a middle-schooler, not an adult.
> >>
> >>What would you suggest to her as a first project, Carl?
> >

> >
> > I'm a bit curious too..........
>
> If I were to butt in here, I would say that aside from the obvious CW
> transceiver, simple and easy to build, There are plenty of other
> possibilities.
>
> AM transmitters. - Yeah, groan.
>
> Simple SSB transmitters. There appear to be a few out there that can be
> homebrewed. If not, Jim should design one!

The reality of modern amateur HF SSB operation is transceivers, not
separate transmitters and receivers with the difficulties of
zero-beating - although it *can* be done...

> All these would be somewhat more complex than the classic CW
> transmitter, but that brings me back to the point I like to make about
> what hams "should know". Now that we are probably moving beyond the time
> when a super simple transmitter is the rig of choice for the budding
> homebrewer, it is more important than ever that the same should have a
> well grounded knowledge of basic electronics.

It's still very practical to build a simple CW *transceiver* from
scratch. Plenty of designs out there, as well as kits. A rig doesn't
have to be SOTA to be useful.

> Aside from homebrewing entire radios, the youngster can do things like
> building interfaces to their computers from their radios.

Sure, but that misses the point.

> Note that
> there is a PSK31 Transceiver that can be built from Rocky mountain Labs
> IIRC that while it isn't quite a homebrew design, it isn't a bad start -
> it's like building a modern da version of a Heathkit.

Sort of. While the little PSK rigs are fascinating, they are QRP
monobanders that cover a tiny slice of one band each. And you have to
have a computer to use them. They're certainly an option, though.

> Antennas are another matter. There is a lot of quackery on the matter
> of antennas these days, and some serious guidance is needed to keep the
> kids from getting discouraged. And yaknow, a homebrew tuner might just
> be a good project too!
>
Knowledgeable guidance is needed. That's in short supply sometimes.

> Someone oughta write a book. hmmmmmmm.

ARRL used to put out a book called "Understanding Amateur Radio".
Great stuff. Lots of practical projects.

> Discouraging homebrew is possibly the most damaging part of at least
> one of the proposals out there as far as attracting young people.
>

Exactly.

> I just don't think that there are that many youngsters that want to
> simply mash the PTT button on their Yeacommwood transceiver and yak as
> their primary activity in the ARS. We won't attract too many people that
> way.

I agree 100%.

>
> I'm firmly convinced that kids that might want to join the ARS want to
> BUILD!
>
And since the most practical first projects are related to a certain
mode...

Boils down to this: Both the ARRL and NCVEC proposals are trying to
recapture the success of the old Novice license, although their
approaches are somewhat different. Yet they fail to see that said
success wasn't impeded in the least by a basic code skill test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3386. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 12:25:36 UTC
From: Paul_Morphy <nopaul_morphy2@coolgoose.com>
Message-ID: <4Brkc.3918$Ut1.116429@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 91503
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KD6MSI" <See_my@Signature.com.invalid> wrote in message
news:See_my-CAADBB.01130530042004@news.verizon.net...
> In article <1fab6$40634e2a$d1cc5a37$6131@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>,
> "koolones" <rsanders111@freemail.nospams.com> wrote:
> > BZZZZZZAPPP!!!!!!! POW-POP!!!
> > ....."WHAT HAPPENED ?!?!?"
>
> Unlikely. It is more likely a transformer would explode before you would
> see any home damage. How many times has lightning hit close to home with
> the worst effect being a blackout and no fried home electronics? In
> addition, most homes that have surge suppressed power strips serving
> entertainment centers probably already have enough protection to prevent
> this scenario. These power strips are cheap and common. Specialized
> computer surge suppressed, noise filtered strips, like the kind commonly
> used for computers, provide even more protection than their wimpier
> cousins serving power to the family VCR. Finally, any BPL modem that
> gets deployed will most certainly have lightning protection built into
> it in one form or another for the simple sake of the companies
> investment.

In most of the U.S., perhaps. People living in Florida should not count on
even the best surge suppressors to protect their computers or other
sensitive electronic devices from lightning-induced damage. Trust me on
this, I've tried it at home. :> Of course, that doesn't mean BPL equipment
is any more or less susceptible to damage. In Florida though, it is a good
idea to unplug equipment when it isn't in use, especially during peak
thunderstorm season, which is approaching. If you hear the sound of distant
thunder, disconnect in a hurry. If you must leave the computer plugged in,
use an APC UPS. They offer a substantial guarantee that will pay for the new
motherboard and power supply.

73,

"PM"

3387. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 12:38:34 UTC
From: Paul_Morphy <nopaul_morphy2@coolgoose.com>
Message-ID: <eNrkc.3946$Ut1.117032@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 91504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"KD6MSI" <See_my@Signature.com.invalid> wrote in message
news:See_my-BC8242.01250630042004@news.verizon.net...

> I think simple economics will be the death of BPL. Cable Broadband, and
> DSL are getting cheaper and cheaper, and for the first time DSL is
> actually cheaper in some markets than Cable broadband. Broadband can now
> be had for what a dialup line cost just a few years ago. The newest
> contender, and the one I think is going to kill BPL in the long run, is
> satellite internet. The price is a bit high right now, but no more so
> than DSL was a short time ago. I predict that it will be coming down
> fast, and satellite internet will be *the* provider of the future
> because it can be had as a package with digital satellite television,
> and provides service to *anywhere* in north America with a clear view of
> the southern sky. No miles to source limits, no load balancing, no
> landlines, no muss, no fuss. I just don't believe BPL can catch up with
> the economics of its competitors who have been at it alot longer.

As the population ages and moves into condos, satellite access is going to have less appeal. Wireless, OTOH, could be used anywhere. The countryside is already littered with cellphone towers.

There's another problem with DSL in particular: Aged, inadequate telephone delivery conductors. This may not be a problem in 6-land, but it is in other parts of the country. The phone companies have been getting by with antiquated wiring for decades. Or you have the 'distance from switching center' problem. WRT keeping up with the times, the cable companies have done a better job, because they had to, to compete with the satellites for television service. Cable comes with its own set of problems, though. IMO, instead of inflicting another system on consumers, FCC would have better served its role by working to improve what we already have. I would say that BPL is sort of like reverse psychology: Use BPL to threaten DSL and cable providers, so they improve their service; but I don't think Powell is that smart.

73,

"PM"

3388. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 12:39:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0Orkc.73$Hs1.67@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91512

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> It's still very practical to build a simple CW *transceiver* from
> scratch. Plenty of designs out there, as well as kits.
>

Which you might postulate as an argument to retain the Morse
examination, except that knowledge of Morse is not a requirement to heat
a soldering iron.

>
>A rig doesn't have to be SOTA to be useful.
>

"Any sufficicently advanced technology is indistinguishable from
agic." -- A. C. Clarke

"Any technology distinguishable from magic is insufficiently
dvanced." -- K0HB

3389. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, N9PGE and faggot lover K9BSD at it again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 13:02:16 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DB5BFF946A1234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
news:20040430072329.659$gh@newsreader.com:

> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in news:c6r8du01etu@drn.newsguy.com:
>>
>> > whats wrong with a little tea bag fun?
>>
>> That was posted by Steve park medina, Ohio he has a thing for Ham
>> operators, he has went as far as going to thier homes as a sort of
>> threat or intimidation, but he forgot to pull his skirt up.
>>
> Hey columbo, that ain't me posting that, but it is funny.

Yes watching you squirm from denial is sure funny thanks for the laughs.

3390. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, gutless anon bastards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 13:44:44 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <sEskc.97733$Lh2.16267@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91505
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N9PGE and K9BSD strike again!!

Joe Sixpack wrote:

> A little hung over this morning, are we? Hmmmmmm????
>
>
> "Joe Smith" <joe@joe.com> wrote in message
> news:iu8kc.38882$oN1.5247@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> So what kind of puppies do you have dumbass?
>
> AKC KennelMaster wrote:
>
>>"Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
>
>
>

3391. CW vs SSB vs Data --- An interesting study

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 14:41:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XAtkc.186$Hs1.122@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91513

http://tinyurl.com/2kfsk

3392. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 15:34:25 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <7CMVHLK238107.4822337963@anonymous>
Source record: 91652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <c6r8a501ei3@drn.newsguy.com>
WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
>
>
> They helped me pass my novice test.

Translation: They helped you CHEAT.

> In article <vq8kc.38865$oN1.35545@bignews5.bellsouth.net>, Joe Smith says...
> >
> >N9PGE and K9BSD stay drunk! Why do you think they cannot keep a woman?
> >Hell they cannot even get a date.
> >
> >Steveo wrote:
> >> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote:
> >>
> >>>Concerned Citizen <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >>>news:Xns94D2610C48BE31234567890@216.196.97.136:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >>>>news:20040421015924.610$h0@newsreader.com:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>WA3MOJ Lookups: 524
> >>>>>GEORGE BUSCH
> >>>>>1385 DEVON CIR
> >>>>>ALLENTOWN PA 18104
> >>>>>USA
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>wow and this means what to me . roflmao, I am not george, and you look
> >>>>more like an ass every day... roflmao !!!!.... post it again ... post
> >>>>it again...
> >>>
> >>>Whatever you say George.. LMAO!!
> >>>
> >>>http://tinyurl.com/3dpws
> >>>
> >>
> >> Oh, that geo quote is priceless, BP.

> >>
> >>
> >>>Geo using another nym wrote:
> >>>I sure am Dick Head whats your call sign everyone knows mine, everyone knows
> >>>my name. I have never been anonymous and don't see the need I have a pair
> >>>of balls to back up what I say, the only balls I see you have are the 2 on
> >>>your chin.
> >>
> >>
> >> Can he really get so drunk as to forget what he has posted!?
> >

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

3393. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 15:58:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <OIukc.236$a47.216@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91514

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:0Orkc.73$Hs1.67@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > It's still very practical to build a simple CW *transceiver* from
> > scratch. Plenty of designs out there, as well as kits.
>
> Which you might postulate as an argument to retain the Morse
> examination, except that knowledge of Morse is not a requirement to heat
> a soldering iron.

Exactly. When I was in college we buit a 10w CW transmitter
and tested the results into a dummy load. No knowledge
of code was needed or expected.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3394. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 16:21:36 UTC
From: Anonymous <nobody@paranoici.org>
Message-ID: <a09979ca30b66043895b9471d84baab2@paranoici.org>
Source record: 91653
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c676ot$f3q$0@pita.alt.net>
"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined:
>
>
>
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
> > LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> > J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> > 700 ADAMS STREET
> > TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> > DATE: 4/20/2004
> >
> > CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> > TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> > JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> > FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
> >
> > --
> > --------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> > ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> > PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
> >
> > --
> > ---------
> > Party Counsel Prosecutor
> > Defendant 1:
> > ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 5319 SECOR RD.
> > TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> > 4199365120
> > 411 N MICHIGAN
> > TOLEDO , OH 436241606
> >
> <DELETE>
> > terminated unsuccesfully
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
> >
> >
> > -=-

> > This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
> ____
>
> This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
> this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
> remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
> maliciousness.

You're a rather whiny cunt, aren't you?

3395. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 16:24:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404300824.36a866c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91515
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in message news:...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote in message
> news:408E5C17.5030103@psu.edu...
> >
> > But do you think my proposal will work? We have a number of years of
> > operation under such a system, and I have not heard of any problems with
> > the database administration of the orphan licensees.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> It's not *just* the database administration. Another aspect of the problem
> is that the *rules* have to be maintained for those orphaned classes. How
> do you deal with the sub-band by class privs without consolidation.

Easy! See below.
>
> By consolidating into just three classes (including the new beginner class
> with meaningful HF privs), the rules can be simplified greatly.

Not really. See below.

> That will
> ease the administrative burden on the FCC (and the VECs) in ways that go
> beyond just the database issue.

Let's get down to the *real* differences in operating privileges
between license classes.

Above 30 MHz, we have the following:

Novices: Limited privileges on a few bands

All other classes: All privileges.

The proposed "NewNovice" won;t change that situation at all, so the
regs don't get any simpler for VHF/UHF.

Below 30 MHz:

Technicians: Nil

Novices & Technician Pluses: Small bits of 80/40/15/10

Generals: All privileges *except* some parts of 80/40/20/15

Advanceds: All privileges *except* some parts of 80/40/20/15

Extras: All privileges.

On HF, we now have 4 sets of privileges:

Novice/Tech
General
Advanced
Extra

and the differences between the last three are only on four popular bands.

Now suppose we do the free upgrades. Here's the result:

"NewNovices": Small but different bits of 80/40/15/10

Generals: All privileges *except* some parts of 80/40/20/15

Extras: All privileges.

Three sets of operating privileges remain. All we've really lost is the Advanced set, which was simply some 'phone/image space on 80/40/20/15.

Now suppose instead of the free upgrades we do the following:

"New Novices" - Revised set of privileges. Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses get NewNovice HF privileges. Existing Techs and Tech Pluses keep full VHF/UHF privs.

Everybody else stays the same.

Here's the result:

Above 30 MHz, we have the following:

"NewNovices": Limited privileges on a few bands

All other classes: All privileges.

Below 30 MHz:

"NewNovices", Techs & Technician Pluses: Bits of 80/40/15/10

Generals: All privileges *except* some parts of 80/40/20/15

Advanceds: All privileges *except* some parts of 80/40/20/15

Extras: All privileges.

On HF, we still have 4 sets of privileges:

NewNovice/Tech
General
Advanced
Extra

and the differences between the last three are only on four popular bands.

Let me make it even simpler for ya:

Giving free Generals to existing Techs and Pluses, rather than just giving them "NewNovice" HF privileges, doesn't simplify the regs at all. We still need a section to describe the NewNovice privs.

Giving Advanceds a free upgrade to Extra *does* simplify the regs slightly, by eliminating the Advanced subbands on 4 HF bands. Big deal - they amount to a few lines of text and a few blocks in the band tables.

As for VEs, the rules on testing and element credit are straightforward. clear and in the regs already. Works like this for the "legacy" licenses:

If you have or had a Novice, you get Element 1 credit only.
If you have a Tech plus, you get credit for Elements 1 and 2, and possibly 3 depending on the date.
If you have an Advanced, you get the same credits as a General - Elements 1, 2 and 3.

Simple as that.

And note this:

The NCVEC proposal includes a whole bunch of unnecessary junk such as restrictions on the type of equipment that can be used, special callsigns for "Communicators", and the "signed Part 97 statement" nonsense. (Note that since those special callsigns are only for Communicators, upgrading means a new callsign and more admin work for FCC. Since the new-callsign-with-upgrade thing would be an FCC requirement if NCVEC has its way, it wouldn't be part of the vanity rules and they couldn't charge for it.

I ask again: Show us why the "legacy" license classes *must* be immediately eliminated.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3396. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 16:36:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404300836.7a595f61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91516

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<AKbkc.14297$eZ5.5644@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > But NCVEC's proposal wants to do just that. Read
> > the "21st Century" paper - it's a blueprint for the
> > NCVEC proposal.
>
> I'm having some doubts about the "21st Century" paper authorship.

I can certainly understand that.

> KL7-whatever-his-call-is

KL7CC

> claims W3BE as a co-author, yet W3BE in
> his comments to FCC comes down in opposition to most of those
> ideas like free upgrades as looney-tune-stupid (which they are).
>
All it takes to claim somebody as coauthor is for them to contribute a
few things. They don't have to agree with the entire paper. But I do
think that someone who is as much at odds with that paper as the
comments reveal would have demanded their name be removed from the
author list.

What really tells the tale is who signed the NCVEC submittal to FCC.
It wasn't either of the hams you mentioned above.

For the record, I find the following NCVEC proposal ideas to be
"looney-tune-stupid" (great phrase):

- Limitations on homebrewing
- Free upgrade to General for post-March-21-1987 Techs and Tech Pluses
- Free upgrade to Extra for Advanceds
- 30 volt rule
- Special callsign block reserved only for newbies
- Any replacement of relevant regs questions by "signed statement"
nonsense. (If it takes a few more questions to test regs knowledge,
add 'em)

Your proposal looks better and better, Hans.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3397. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1394 - April 30, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 16:48:25 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430124825.01933.00000611@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91517

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1394 - April 30, 2004

A Very Important Note: We urge all readers of this report to also download the audio version of this report at http://www.arnewsline.org/quincy and listen to it. Please pat special attention to the words of ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, and the urgency in his voice as he discusses the latest developments in the fight to keep Broadband Over Powerline technology from encroaching into the Amateur Service bands. There is no way to express in print the very grave nature of this situation. Only by listening for yourself can you truly understand the extreme gravity of the circumstances that our service faces if BPL is introduced nationwide.

The ARNewsline Production Team

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1394 with a release date of Friday, April 30th, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

The ARRL takes on the White House over BPL, a power provider says BPL interference to mobile operations has to be tolerated and a ham radio name change. Its called the Dayton Hamvention once again. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1394 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: PRES BUSH VS. PRES HAYNIE AND THE ARRL

The ARRL and its president has expressed what they call deep concerns about a speach by United States President George Bush. One where where the leader of the free world says that standards need to be changed to encourage the delivery of Internet access using Broadband Over Poweline technology. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, is here with more:

--

In the boldest and most dramatic move yet in the BPL debate, the ARRL's president Jim Haynie W5JBP, directly appealed to President Bush to abandon his support for BPL technology.

Haynie says Bush's speech last week during the American Association of Community Colleges convention in Minneapolis prompted him to action. In

that speech, President Bush stated directly:

"...power lines can be used for broadband technology. So the technical standards need to be changed to encourage that."

"I faxed a letter to the White House cause I wanted to make sure they got it and we followed it up again with the regular U.S. Mail," Haynie says. "And, it'll be curious to see what kind of reaction that we get. I think, like I said, it's ill-advised.

"It's so much hype that the broadband industry has been putting out and I'm sorry to say it looks like the president has been suckered into it a little bit."

Haynie says amateur radio has reached a defining moment in its history and he is issuing a call to arms.

"This is the time that amateur radio is going to have to pull together and speak with one big voice," Haynie says. "And, on our website, we put the contact information and I want everybody to go there and look at it (www.arrl.org) and you can write the president, you can write your congressman, you can write your senators you can call 'em.

"Anything like that is helpful because amateur radio has been around for a lot of years and I'd hate to see it end based on a technology like this that any engineer worth their salt would be able to say, 'Well, this sounds fun but it's just not going to work.' "

Haynie says he wasn't blind-sided by President Bush's remarks, but has questions about his fellow Texan's true understanding of the issue.

"If you go back and read his speech he made in New Mexico, I think it was Albuquerque, he alluded to broadband then just as a general term," Haynie says. "Since that time, the actual term broadband over power line has come into his speech and I know he doesn't write his own speeches, other people do."

Haynie says its likely Bush administration advisers believe BPL is an issue that may have some mileage.

"This is an election year and anything that would seemingly stimulate the economy and create jobs is going to be a real political football and this has just got caught up in it," Haynie says.

Haynie says he is now working with the ARRL's Washington staff to arrange a personal meeting with President Bush to lay out the issue for him. And Haynie says he's hopeful that if Bush sees the damaging effect BPL has on radio spectrum - occupied not by just amateur radio - but police, fire, and government services - he may reconsider.

Haynie says he'll also go in with the findings of the National Telecommunications and Information Agency - the president's own advisory arm on radio frequency spectrum management - to make his case.

"When you get into the actual and engineering report, there's some good stuff there," Haynie says. "And I'm glad to see it. I'm also glad to see that they corroborated a lot of stuff that we said in our data.

"And, it gives us more credibility because NTIA has quoted ARRL in there a number of times in this report. But some of their measurements were even more - for lack of a better word - devastating to the industry than ours. They're talking as much as 200 meters. That's a long way!"
Haynie says BPL threatens the future of amateur radio as we know it and it's time to step up and be counted:

"I've been a ham for 32 years, 33 years or something like that and this is the worst, most difficult situation I've ever seen amateur radio in," Haynie says. "And I think whether you're interested in licensing restructuring or you're interested in somebody not identifying every 10 minutes on 75 meters or whatever the case, that all pales. It is insignificant to this particular issue.

"So we need to set all these differences aside in the amateur radio community and come together. This is the time."

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

Since before the first test installations went into operation, the ARRL has been warning the public about the potential for massive radio disruption to vital radio communications that BPL has the potential to cause. More information is on line daily at the ARRL website at http://www.arrl.org (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: NTIA RELEASES ITS BPL IMPACT REPORT

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration has issued its long-awaited report on the interference potential of Broadband over Power Lines. Despite a generally-glowing news release, the report itself identifies significant interference risks from BPL and concludes that the methods currently used for measuring BPL noise levels are inadequate and that more study is needed on such areas as ionospheric propagation of BPL signals.

The full report may be downloaded, either in full or chapter by chapter,from the NTIA website at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/new.html (CQ)

**

POWER PROBLEMS: INVESTIGATION INTO BLACKOUT FAULTS ENERGY COMPANIES

Power companies may be interested in reeping huge profits by selling high speed Internet access using BPL technology, but a report says that they disregarded voluntary rules that were intended to ensure the flow of electricity. This is what opened the way for last summer's blackout in

eight states and Canada, the report says.

The investigators who prepared the report say that there was a clear understanding long before the blackout last August that the Ohio region was highly vulnerable to power distribution grid instability. Ohio is where the problem began.

The report continues that had the situation been properly addressed, the cascading blackout that sped across states from Michigan to New York and into Canada probably would have been averted. In fact, investigators said that something as simple as shutting off 200 megawatts of power an hour prior to the blackout might have kept the problem from spreading.

This is the final report by investigators who looked into the cause of last summers electrical breakdown. They are urging Congress to impliment strict government standards to ward off future outages. (Published reports)

**

Break 1

From beneath the Southern Cross in Auckland, New Zealand and the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WD6HFR repeater serving Palomar, California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: NC POWER COMPANY MAKE INTERFERENCE CLAIMS

Meantime, a North Carolina power company says that the interference coming from its BPL system is not harmful to ham radio operations. As reported last week, Progress Energy claims it has solved almost all of the problems to the Amateur bands created by its test installation near the city of Raleigh. But local hams have a different view. Newsline's Gary Pearce, KN4AQ, takes an in-depth look at the claims being made by Progress Energy and what the ham radio community has to say:

--

The FCC has received its first reply from a BPL system operator to a complaint about BPL interference. Progress Energy, which operates three BPL trials near Raleigh, North Carolina, says that they are in full compliance with Part 15. Their letter attempts to set a mark for "harmful interference" to home stations, and makes a claim that BPL doesn't cause harmful interference to mobiles because they drive by so quickly.

When the Progress Energy trial began in January, Amperion, the equipment vendor, set the hardware up with signals on the overhead lines that covered the 10 and 12 meter ham bands, and most of the spectrum in between. The signals appear as a series of carriers, 1.1 kHz apart, covering 6 MHz of

spectrum for each 2000 feet of power line.

Hams complained to the FCC, and Amperion moved the spectrum used. They attempted to operate in spectrum between the 20 and 15-meter bands, with a notch blocking BPL signals across the 17-meter band. They missed the mark a little, with BPL signals starting at 14.3 MHz, 50 kHz inside the 20-meter band. And while the notch at 17 meters did reduce the signal strength, the BPL carriers were still audible, and might be heard by home stations for a block or two, if there were any hams living in the trial area_ but there are no hams living there.

In addition, the BPL signals don't end with a "brick wall" filter at the edge of their spectrum block. They trail off slowly. And those "fringe" signals were still falling inside several ham bands, again expected to be audible to a ham within a block or two of the power line.

After giving Amperion time to correct the apparent errors, hams complained again to the FCC. The result was a meeting between Raleigh hams and a Progress Energy engineer in the trial area on April 6th to review the complaint and the spectrum used. Bill Godwin, the Progress Energy engineer, had arranged to be able to talk to an Amperion technician to make adjustments to the spectrum used in real time - but, the technician was a no-show on the telephone.

On April 13th, hams checked the spectrum used again, and still no changes had been made.

On April 20th, Len Anthony, Regulatory Affairs attorney for Progress Energy, sent e-mail to the James Burtle, Chief of the FCC's Experimental Licensing Division, claiming that after moving the BPL signals off the ham bands, their system "is not causing any harmful interference and is in full compliance with the FCC's Part 15 rules."

Referring to the April 6th observation with Bill Godwin, Anthony says, "These tests revealed a small level of interference at the fringes of certain frequencies. Since that time, further modifications have been made to address this fringe interference. It is Progress Energy's position and interpretation of the FCC's rules with regard to `harmful interference' that any interference that may still exist is not `harmful' as that term is defined by the FCC's rules. This level of interference does not seriously degrade ham radio operation or transmissions or cause repeated interruptions. Importantly" he continues, "since Progress Energy can make modifications to completely eliminate any interference with fixed ham operators, the only impact of any kind upon ham operations is upon mobile operators."

As for mobiles, Anthony continues, "Given that any interference experienced by a mobile operator only occurs within close proximity to the BPL facilities, such interference would be very short lived. Thus, Progress Energy is not causing any harmful interference and is in full compliance with the FCC's Part 15 rules."

An observation of the trial area on April 21st, the day after the e-mail was sent to the FCC, revealed that there had been no changes to the spectrum used. The overhead line was still emitting a full-strength signal on the top 50 kHz of the 20 meter band; signals were still audible in the notch at 17 meters, and the "fringe" carriers were still encroaching on the bottom 50 kHz or so of the 15 meter band.

This is the first claim by a BPL operator that weak BPL signals do not create "harmful" interference by the FCC's definition, interference that "seriously degrades, obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radiocommunication service." Ham operators, of course, routinely tune through quiet spectrum looking for weak signals, and a series of carriers one kHz apart covering the band might be considered to seriously degrade, obstruct or repeatedly interrupt that activity.

And a mobile driving 35 miles per hour along a BPL-carrying power line can be in the interference zone for a minute or more - and much longer in stop-and-go traffic, waiting at signal lights, or stopping in a driveway or parking lot.

Frank Lynch W4FAL, an ARRL Technical Specialist for North Carolina who has been concentrating on the Progress Energy BPL trial, says that he will be filing another complaint with the FCC, responding to the Progress Energy e-mail. He also says that hams are not opposed to BPL per se, just the interference it causes. And he notes that it should be easy to clear up interference in a small trial area. It's BPL signals buzzing around every power line in town that have him worried.

Reporting for Newsline, this is Gary Pearce KN4AQ in Raleigh, North Carolina.

--

Once the new interference complaint is filed it will be up to the FCC to investigate it and to take whatever action it deems necessary. (ARNewsline(tm), KN4AQ)

**

RADIO LAW: PETITION TO PROHIBIT BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS ON FRS FAILS

A Petition for Rulemaking to prohibit daily business communications in the Family Radio Service has been dismissed by the Commission. Amateur RadioNewsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--

On August 22, 2002, the Industrial Telecommunciatons Association, Inc. -- or ITA -- filed a petition for rulemaking requesting that the Commission amend Section 95.401(b) of the Commission's Rules. This, to prohibit daily business communications on the Family Radio Service frequencies.

In making its case for the prohibition the ITA said that it was concerned about the unlicensed mix of business and personal users. The ITA said that

traditional businesses were using FRS units for daily business needs and thereby limiting the ability of others to engage in the personal communications that the Commission envisioned for FRS.

One of those challenging the ITA petition was the Personal Radio Steering Group. This is an advocacy group for General Mobile Radio Service users who share part of the spectrum with the Family Radio Service. According to the PRSG filing, the FCC specifically indicated in the Regulatory Flexibility Analysis for creating the Family Radio Service that small businesses may use the FRS to conduct their affairs. Also, while FRS congestion does exist in and near sports and recreational facilities, theme parks and shopping malls, little of this congestion is attributable to recurrent business or commercial communications.

Based on this and other information provided by the public, the FCC has concluded that day to day business communications is a valid use of the Family Radio Service. That this was intended in the Report and Order creating the service and that there is little merit to the Industrial Telecommunications Association rules change request.

Reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

In other words, it is okay to continue to use FRS channels for routine business as well as personal communications needs. The full story is on-line at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-04-1035A1.doc (CGC, FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: OFFERING NON CERTIFIED CB'S FOR SALE BRINGS CITATION

The FCC has gone after yet another purveyor of non certified CB radio gear capable of operating in the ham radio bands. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: "The FCC's Altanta Office has issued a citation to Jim Norton, the owner of CB Sales and Service in Anniston, Alabama for the sale of non certified CB equipment. Noted in the citation were six different models of non certified exquoipent, five of which had been modified to transmit on Amateur frequencies."

--

The FCC alleges that an investigation by its Atlanta Office revealed that on March 11, 2004, Norton offered for sale at his retail store up to eight models of non-certified Citizens Band transceivers all bearing the Galaxy trade name. According to Commission's records, none of these devices have received an FCC equipment authorization which is required for Citizens Band transmitters marketed in the United States. CB Sales was charged with

violation of Section 302(b) of the Communications Act, and Section 2.803(a)(1) of the F-C-C's Rules. (FCC, RAIN)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From Auckland, New Zealand and the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: CA HAMS SUPPOERT MS WALK

Members of the Huntington Beach California Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service supported the early morning 2004 MS Walk event on Sunday April 18th. The Huntington Beach volunteer radio operators were on hand at each rest stop along the five and 10 kilometer courses, to provide communications and assist state beach rangers and event management in case an emergency occurred.

There were over 1200 walkers on the beach path taking part in the fund raisuing event. Peter Shores, AD6TN, brought his communications van that is fully equipped with communications gear and emergency supplies. It served as a mobile command post. Another volunteer patrolled the entire course on bicycle.

The communications effort continued until about noon. There were no incidents or injuries reported during the event. (KH6WZ)

**

HAMVENTION NEWS : DARA RETURNS TO THE DAYTON HAMVENTION NAME

When thousands of hams return to Dayton, Ohio for Hamvention 2004, they will find that the "Dayton" has returned to the Hamvention. This, with word that the Dayton Amateur Radio Association which sponsors the yearly event has again remamed the gathering the Dayton Hamvention.

According to General Chairman Gary Des Combes, N8EMO, the change is in keeping with the Hamvention's 'going back to the future' theme. It also goes along with the pledge made to return Hamvention to its roots as the biggest and friendliest hometown hamfest, found anyplace in the world.

Des Combes says that for more than half a century the event has been known to the world, and to the world of Amateur Radio as the Dayton Hamvention. He says that Hamvention's ties are to the entire Dayton metropolitan area, to its economy and to the ham radio community of the region.

The 33rd annual Dayton Hamvention opens on Friday, May 14th and runs until Sunday 16th. During those three days the event is expected to draw about 25,000 people from around the world and bring millions of dollars of sales and business to the Dayton area. (Dayton Hamvention)

**

HAMVENTION NEWS: THE HAM RADIO TOWN MEETING

And since we are talking the Dayton Hamvention, let me take a moment to invite you to join our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, and an all-star group of guests as we take a trip through time to look at the "traditions" that have made Amateur Radio the great hobby and service that it is today. This, as we at Amateur Rasdio Newsline present the 6th annual Dayton Hamvention "Ham Radio Town Meeting."

This years topic is "IT'S MORE THAN RADIOS -- Keeping The Traditions of Amateur Radio Alive." Bill will be your host and moderator. Joining him will be a whose who group including our leynote speaker Bob Heil, K9EID, of Heil Sound Ltd. Other presenters include Radio School's Gordon West WB6NOA, Worldradio Magazine Editor Nancy Kott WZ8C, Producer/Director Dave Bell W6AQ, Philadelphia newsman Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, to name only a few. Also, if time permits, we will present a screening of the 1990 Icom produced motion picture titled "More Than Radios." This is the story of an "old time ham" who rather reluctantly becomes the Amateur Radio "Elmer" for a teenager thrust into his life on summer.

The festivities begin at 1 P.M. EDT on Saturday, May 15th in Hara Arena Meeting Room 3 and as usual we will have lots of door prizes. If you have the time, we promise you a most entertaining and illuminating two hours reliving the traditions of the hobby and learning that being a ham truly is a lot more than radios. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: CREW CHANGE ON THE ISS

For a time last week there were five astro-hams on board the International Space Station. This as Expedition 9 crew members Mike Fincke, KE5AIT, and Gennady Padalka, RN3DT, arrived at the space outpost on April 21st The trip was made to the Iss using a Russian built Soyuz launcher.

Making the voyage with them was European Space Agency explorer Andr, Kuipers, PI9ISS. The three joined Expedition 8 crew members Mike Foale, KB5UAC, and Sasha Kaleri, U8MIR, who along with Kuipers are on their way back to Earth as this newscast goes to air.

Kuipers may have only spent a bit more than a week on-orbit, but he wasted little time in getting on-the-air. PE1SCW in Deventer in the Netherlands reported hearing PI9ISS in QSO with PI9ESA at 7:50 hours UTC on Saturday May 24th. Bas says that Kuipers signal was very strong signal that was reading 40 db over S-9. A few minutes later Kuipers was in range of Francisco Costa, CT1EAT, in Beja, Portugal. He said that he heard PI9ISS in a scheduled ARISS QSO also at well over S-9.

During their six-month stay on the ISS, Russian Cosmonaut Padalka will serve as the ISS Commander while Fincke will be the science officer and flight engineer. Both are expected on the air before they return home in late October. (ARISS, VHF Reflector, published news reports)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: K6DUE ISS OPERATING EVENT CERTIFICATES

Certificates for those who took part in the K6DUE International Space Station Commemorative Operating Event held earlier this year have been distributed to the international delegates at the ARISS Meeting in the Netherlands on March 26th and 27th. Those picking them up were to forward the certificates to their national Q-S-L distributors who would then distribute them locally.

ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, says that approximately 130 hams will be receiving certificates. The event was held to honor the memory of the late Roy Neal, K6DUE who founded both the SAREX and ARISS programs. Neal, who also served as the Vice President of Amateur Radio Newsline and as a frequent news anchor passed away last August due to complications following heart valve replacement surgery. (ARISS, AMSAT BB)

**

WORLDBEAT: NEW ZEALAND TO ARGENTINA COMMEMORATIVE

ZL1AWW is working on plans for a commemorative station to celebrate the 80 th anniversary of the first New Zealand to South America two way contact. This, by Ivan O'Meara Z2AC and Carlos Braggio, RCB8.

The proposed date is May 22nd or 23rd. This original 10,300 kilometer Morse code conversation took place in 1924 and established a world distance record for two-way radio for that era. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that the Rodrigues Island 3B9C operation finally went QRT on Monday, April 12th. In their time on the air, the operators racked up a very impressive 153,000 QSO's. QSL this one as you were directed on the air. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE NAB 2004 HAM RADIO RECEPTION

And finally, as most of you know, it was Heil Sound Limited hosted the National Association of Broadcasters ham radio reception on Wednesday night April 21st. It was literally a star studded event. Newsline's Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, and his tape recorder were there:

--

When Bob Heil, K9EID, and his wife Sarah throw a party, everyone with a ham radio license shows up. And thats exactly the way it was on Wednesday, April 21st when Heil Sound Limited hosted the annual National Association of Broadcasters Ham Radio Reception at the Hilton Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada. There was food music and lots of prizes. Some were even personalized:

--

Bob Heil Audio: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

That was Bob Heil presenting only one of over a hundred prizes given out over the three hours of the gathering. We finally were able to corner Bob Heil and we asked him how this all came about:

--

Bob Heil Audio: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

Somewhere between 800 to 900 radio amateurs attending the National Association of Broadcasters Convention literally had a hamfest of their own thanks to Bob and Sarah Heil. Thats up by an estimated 40% over past years. Sarah Heil says that for her husband, putting this reception together was a labor of love:

--

Sarah Heil Audio: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

The 2004 NAB Ham Radio Reception sems to have set several records. More important -- a good time was had by all.

Reporting from near the Convention Center in Las Vegas, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

For those not aware, the annual Natrional Association of Broadcasters Convention in Las Vegas is the largest gathering of broadcasting and teleproduction professionals in the world. (ARNewsline (tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support

us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, in Auckland, New Zealand saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

3398. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 17:07:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0404300907.400ca2c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91518

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>...
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler. Despite what marketing
> wonks may tell us, nothing is. Give me what you think is an example,
> and I can quickly tell you why it isn't.

OK, here goes:

Way back in the 1930s, hams began to replace their "blooper" (regenerative) receivers with "super-hets" (superheterodynes). The added complexity of the "super" was justified by the invention of the single signal crystal filter, which gave improved adjacent-channel selectivity.

Those early ham supers almost all used an IF around 455 kHz, because the available crystal filter systems worked best around that frequency. The better ones had one or preferably two RF stages before the mixer, to reduce image response and override the mixer noise. A top receiver of those days might have two RF stages and three IF stages, plus a couple of audio stages and the mixer and detector. And even so, image response was a problem.

After WW2, the trend moved towards "double conversion". The first IF was typically in the low HF region, to reduce images, and the second IF much lower, to get selectivity. Some designs like Collins kept the 455 kHz second IF, while many others (National, Hallicrafters) used a first IF around 1700 or 2215 kHz and a second IF of 50-60 kHz. Such a low second IF meant that LC circuits could be used for the selectivity.

Such receivers were arguably "better" - and unarguably more complex. Compare the prewar National NC-101X with the mid-50s NC-300, or a typical homebrew super of the '30s with an HBR. And while better in some ways, they were worse in others.

Then packaged high-frequency crystal filters were developed (about 1957), followed by improved mixer designs such as the Pullen mixer. It became possible to design receivers with a high IF for image rejection, no RF stages and a much reduced parts count. The Squires Sanders SS-1R is an example of such a design. It is simpler than, say, an NC-300, as well as smaller, lighter and less power-hungry.

There are lots of other examples. Compare an Elecraft K2 with almost any other current amateur HF transceiver - then compare the specs and

features. In many ways its high performance is a direct result of the relative simplicity.

Simplification can be an improvement. But simplicity isn't always simple, or easy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3399. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 18:01:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6wwkc.328$a47.290@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91519

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040429140912.21784.00000635@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> >Date: 4/29/2004 12:39 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <o5bkc.7316$g31.1642@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:c9GdneEld6iQ_g3dRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> >>
> >>
> >> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >> > I'm wondering how many S-units will be added to my 100 watt
mobile
> >signal
> >> > if it's "/VO1" in the next Sweepstakes...?!?!
> >>
> >> You gonna be pop-u-lar! 8^)
> >
> >I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much rarer.
>
> You pay for the addded travel and winter clothing and you're on, Dan!
! !
> =)
>
> Heck, if we're gonna go for "rare", how about from the Iniuit
> Territories...?!?! Add in the cost of the bush plane and dog sled too,
> OK...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
> (already shivvering just thinking about it!)
>
You wan't me to PAY??? Next you will charge 5 bux for the computer grade
QSL card.

Dan/W4NTI

3400. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 18:06:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lAwkc.332$a47.283@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91520

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:i4SdnfP1O7hZLgzdRVn-jg@adelphia.com...
>
>
> K�HB wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
> >
> >
> > >>>I would rather see him sign from the Yukon myself. Much
> >
> > rarer.
> >
> > >>That would be a real adventure during that time of the year. I
> >
> > never
> >
> > >>had a VE8 (why does that remind me of a commercial??) ever,
> >
> > much less in
> >
> > >>a contest.
> >
> >
> > Yukon is VY1, and pretty well represented in most contests. Jay,
> > VY1JA, is always in the chair on contest weekends, along with
> > assorted KL7xx/VY1 players.
>
> Oops, somehow or another something got messed up. I might have replied
> to the wrong message. Steve noted that even rarer would have been a VY0
> Nunavit, which at one time was part of VE8. A bad case of shifting
> territories going on here! And Yup, I do get into the Yukon fairly often.
>
>
> > The tough VE from here is VE4. Several stations are active in
> > RadioSport (VE4GV, VE4GV, VE4YU, etc) but they're all in Winnipeg
> > which is roughly 600KM away, deep in my skip zone.
>
>
> Ve4 isn't too bad from here.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I don't have any problem from East Central Alabama on any of the Canadians. If they are active. I have 4 clean sweeps out of 5 years on both phone and cw modes in the Sweeps.

Missed it this last time tho.

Dan/W4NTI

3401. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 20:02:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4092B0D2.2040400@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91521

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>>
>>
>
>
>Antenna tuners (more properly called feed line tuners) are a crutch for
>people who can't manage to build a proper antenna to fool their
>transmitter into thinking it has a proper antenna.
>
>
>
>
If you use low loss feedline and a tuner, it doesn't much matter how bad
the antenna's
SWR is. Low loss feedline means that you don't lose much RF energy as
it bounced
back off the bad antenna to the tuner, and then back to the antenna.
Actually, lossy
feedline can make your SWR look better. The propagation delays of
these bounces
are of little importance for the narrowband modes we use on HF (SSB, CW,
RTTY
and such). I use some old Ethernet cable (essentially foam RG8U) to run
the feed
from the shack upstairs down to the basement, and there I switch over to
coax
more weather resistant thru a small hole in the wall (caulked to keep
bugs out) to the
vertical in the back yard. It's a pre WARC multiband HF vertical.

A major reason for bad antennas is a lack of space or place to install a
good
antenna.

>
>
>
>

3402. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 20:45:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0404301245.75fe93f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91522

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040430071420.23031.00000241@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/29/2004 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291529.33ad8693@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>
> >> There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and
> plans,
> >> would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.
> >>
> >> Sorry you don't agree.
> >>
> >> Sorry you're not man enough to understand.
> >
> >Maniliness? That has nothing to do with it.
> >
> >No wonder you're the Pariah of RRAP.
>
> I can be the "pariah" of anything, Briam, but it doesn't negate this
> simple truth:
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

This is your simple truth, and it's simply wrong:

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

3403. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 22:17:07 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <3W4HNLY738107.7618865741@anonymous>
Source record: 91654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <c676ot$f3q$0@pita.alt.net>
"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined:
>
>
>
> "Concerned Citizen" <phuqqoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94D1F1C1C2D971234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:KPJ0GACH38097.79875@anonymous:
>
> > LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> > J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> > 700 ADAMS STREET
> > TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 7:01:16 PM
> > DATE: 4/20/2004
> >
> > CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> > TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> > JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> > FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
> >
> > --
> > --------- MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> > ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> > PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
> >
> > --
> > ---------
> > Party Counsel Prosecutor
> > Defendant 1:
> > ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> > 5319 SECOR RD.
> > TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> > 4199365120
> > 411 N MICHIGAN
> > TOLEDO , OH 436241606
> >
> <DELETE>
> > terminated unsuccesfully
> > PARTY : D1 - ADAIR
> >
> >
> > -=-

> > This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
> This is why you guys want peoples anmes and addreses to harass them. Yet
> the poster did not have enough balls to use thier own name.
>
> ____
>
> This is the sort of thing Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ likes to pull. He has done
> this to others and he DOES like to hide behind "two or more anonymous
> remailing services" because he has lost previous ISP's for this sort of
> maliciousness.

You're a rather whiny cunt, aren't you?

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

3404. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 22:57:42 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DBC0F3D14761234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
news:7CMVHLK238107.4822337963@anonymous:

> In article <c6r8a501ei3@drn.newsguy.com>
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> They helped me pass my novice test.
>
> Translation: They helped you CHEAT.

That is not the real wa3moj that is a bad forge of him... I hear george is
letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation then
Kaboom end of the jig

3405. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-04-30 23:56:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DOmdndCPGfA6eg_dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91523

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:0Orkc.73$Hs1.67@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>
>>>It's still very practical to build a simple CW *transceiver* from
>>>scratch. Plenty of designs out there, as well as kits.
>>
>>Which you might postulate as an argument to retain the Morse
>>examination, except that knowledge of Morse is not a requirement to heat
>>a soldering iron.
>
>
> Exactly. When I was in college we buit a 10w CW transmitter
> and tested the results into a dummy load. No knowledge
> of code was needed or expected.

hehe, now that sounds like fun! 8^0

- Mike KB3EIA -

3406. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 01:18:15 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040430211815.326$e9@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:7CMVHLK238107.4822337963@anonymous:
>
> > In article <c6r8a501ei3@drn.newsguy.com>
> > WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> They helped me pass my novice test.
> >
> > Translation: They helped you CHEAT.
>
> That is not the real wa3moj that is a bad forge of him... I hear george
> is letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation
> then Kaboom end of the jig
>
You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.
```

3407. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 01:23:20 UTC
From: Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
@newsreader.com:

> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.

then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts, except
you and your leg humping activity

3408. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 01:42:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430214205.05832.00000412@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 91524

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions ...
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 4/30/2004 7:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0404300407.2833b703@posting.google.com>
>
>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<409167B6.3070006@psu.edu>...
>> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> > In CAP we have dozens of kids chomping at the bit to "get on the air".
>Of
>> > the current "crop" of Cadets at th local unit, seven out of 12 are
>licensed
>> > Amateurs, six of them have already one on to General.
>
>What ages are we talking about?

CAP cadets can be 12 to 21 if they join before age 18, however the one's I
am addressing specifically are all between 15 to 17. (Ironically the 17 year
old is the one who has yet to upgrade!)

>> > And who's making the call on what's irrelevant and what's
>> > unnecessary...?!?!
>
>FCC makes that call. And note this: One of the arguments for dumping
>Element 1 is the claim that when it was dumped for Tech, the whole ARS
>didn't fall apart.
>So if we get over 323,000 free upgrades to General with no testing and
>the ARS
>doesn't fall apart.....
>
>> > Isn't that the "call" of the person seeking Amateur licensure...?!?!
>
>Nope. A person might think that 20 wpm code tests given by FCC
>examiners are relevant and necessary to an Extra license, but they
>will have a hard time finding them today..

Point taken, Jim, but what I was trying (unsuccessfully) to say was that
it's partly the applicant's decision to decide if acquiring the knowledge or
skill was appropriate to gaining the license...In other words, are the benefits
of licensure worth the time and effort expended to get it...?!?!

Any better?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3409. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 01:50:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430215011.25300.00000364@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 91525

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 4/30/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <6wwkc.328$a47.290@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040429140912.21784.00000635@mb-m07.aol.com...

>> Heck, if we're gonna go for "rare", how about from the Iniuit
>> Territories...?!?! Add in the cost of the bush plane and dog sled too,
>> OK...?!?!
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>> (already shivvering just thinking about it!)
>>
>You wan't me to PAY??? Next you will charge 5 bux for the computer grade
>QSL card.

Oh No!...All my QSL cards are "real" QSL cards...

And if you pay to get me to VY1 or VY0, I P-R-O-M-I-S-E you will get
>FREE< QSL service, Dan! Heck, I'll even drive down and HAND DELIVER your
card with a six pack of your favorite brew, even if it's Crown Royal!

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3410. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 01:54:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 91526

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 4/30/2004 3:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404301245.75fe93f6@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040430071420.23031.00000241@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/29/2004 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291529.33ad8693@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and
>> plans,
>> >> would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.
>> >>
>> >> Sorry you don't agree.
>> >>
>> >> Sorry you're not man enough to understand.
>> >
>> >Maniliness? That has nothing to do with it.
>> >
>> >No wonder you're the Pariah of RRAP.
>>
>> I can be the "pariah" of anything, Briam, but it doesn't negate this
>> simple truth:
>>
>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
>This is your simple truth, and it's simply wrong:

No, I am not...Not unless recent MARS policy has provided for a major
shift in MARS membership demographics and prerequisites.

>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do to get
around it.

Steve, K4YZ

3411. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:16:28 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <109623slg8vsobf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in
news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136:

> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040430211815.326$e9 @newsreader.com:
>
>> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>
> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
> except you and your leg humping activity

WAAAAA!! WAAAAAA!!! Have mommy warm a baby bottle for you... lol!

Citizen Rod Lover = rrcb punchclown.

3412. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:18:09 UTC
From: FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DBE2F022F961234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in
news:109623slg8vsobf@corp.supernews.com:

> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136:
>
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>> news:20040430211815.326$e9 @newsreader.com:
>>
>>> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>>
>> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
>> except you and your leg humping activity
>
>
> WAAAAA!! WAAAAAA!!! Have mommy warm a baby bottle for you... lol!
>
> Citizen Rod Lover = rrcb punchclown.

Punchclown, lol you assholes have nothing for me I tear you to shred
every reply to me, roflmao, now go change Nym's again socko
...roflmaooooooooo

3413. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:26:01 UTC
From: "Reuben N. Fries" <sourcrout@nopickle.kom>
Message-ID: <10962lpjik6cfce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in news:Xns94DBE2F022F961234567890@
216.196.97.136:

> BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in
> news:109623slg8vsobf@corp.supernews.com:
>
>> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in
>> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136:
>>
>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
>>> news:20040430211815.326$e9 @newsreader.com:
>>>
>>>> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>>>
>>> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
>>> except you and your leg humping activity
>>
>>
>> WAAAAA!! WAAAAAA!!! Have mommy warm a baby bottle for you... lol!
>>
>> Citizen Rod Lover = rrcb punchclown.
>
>
> Punchclown, lol you assholes have nothing for me I tear you to shred
> every reply to me, roflmao, now go change Nym's again socko
> ...roflmaooooooooo
>

You're so special, Geo. Did you know that?? LMAO!!!

3414. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:37:44 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040430223744.966$4y@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Reuben N. Fries" <sourcrout@nopickle.kom> wrote:
> FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in news:Xns94DBE2F022F961234567890@
> 216.196.97.136:
>
> > BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm> wrote in
> > news:109623slg8vsobf@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> >> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in
> >> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136:
> >>
> >>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> >>> news:20040430211815.326$e9 @newsreader.com:
> >>>
> >>>> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
> >>>
> >>> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
> >>> except you and your leg humping activity
> >>
> >>
> >> WAAAAA!! WAAAAAA!!! Have mommy warm a baby bottle for you... lol!
> >>
> >> Citizen Rod Lover = rrcb punchclown.
> >
> >
> > Punchclown, lol you assholes have nothing for me I tear you to shred
> > every reply to me, roflmao, now go change Nym's again socko
> > ...roflmaooooooooo
> >
>
> You're so special, Geo. Did you know that?? LMAO!!!
>
He gets his own parking space, right by the door.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3415. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:40:13 UTC
From: FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DBE6AE13B081234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430223744.966
$4y@newsreader.com:

> He gets his own parking space, right by the door.

And your old lady

3416. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 02:44:42 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040430224442.337$Pq@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430223744.966
> $4y@newsreader.com:
>
> > He gets his own parking space, right by the door.
>
> And your old lady
>
No Fava beans for you.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3417. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 05:04:11 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040501010411.075$2c@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
> I hear george
> is letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation
> then Kaboom end of the jig.
>
Did dad tell you that today?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3418. cancel <c6v9mq$7c1$0@pita.alt.net>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 09:19:52 UTC
From: joe@joe.com
Message-ID: <YYJkc.61613$Uz1.40088@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91438
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

This message was cancelled from within Mozilla.

3419. cancel <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 09:19:59 UTC
From: joe@joe.com
Message-ID: <3ZJkc.61615$Uz1.52347@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
This message was cancelled from within Mozilla.
```

3420. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 09:21:56 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <XWJkc.61594$Uz1.49216@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jerome is quite the queer.

Rod Laver wrote:
> Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in
> news:7CMVHLK238107.4822337963@anonymous:
>
>
>>In article <c6r8a501ei3@drn.newsguy.com>
>>WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>They helped me pass my novice test.
>>
>>Translation: They helped you CHEAT.
>
>
>
> That is not the real wa3moj that is a bad forge of him... I hear george is
> letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation then
> Kaboom end of the jig

3421. cancel <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 09:22:39 UTC
From: joe@joe.com
Message-ID: <z%Jkc.61641$Uz1.16167@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
This message was cancelled from within Mozilla.
```

3422. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 09:24:58 UTC
From: Joe Smith <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <OZJkc.61626$Uz1.38268@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Please don't feed the faggot trolls.

Steveo wrote:

> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>
>>I hear george
>>is letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation
>>then Kaboom end of the jig.
>>
>
> Did dad tell you that today?
>

3423. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 12:26:35 UTC
From: BP <bakedpotato@nospam.comm>
Message-ID: <10975rrfr3fj776@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Joe Sixpack" <Joe@Joe.com> wrote in news:c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net:

>
> "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in
> news:20040430211815.326$e9 @newsreader.com:
>
>> You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>
> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
> except you and your leg humping activity
>
> Sounds like Wiseman again...
>
>

Not quite, but just about as demented..

3424. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 15:02:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405010702.540c2ef2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91527

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/30/2004 3:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404301245.75fe93f6@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040430071420.23031.00000241@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 4/29/2004 6:29 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291529.33ad8693@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040429105922.10667.00000454@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> There's nothing to "stuff". MARS, under current regulations and
> plans,
> >> >> would cease to exist without Amateur Radio Operators to flesh it out.
> >> >>
> >> >> Sorry you don't agree.
> >> >>
> >> >> Sorry you're not man enough to understand.
> >> >
> >> >Maniliness? That has nothing to do with it.
> >> >
> >> >No wonder you're the Pariah of RRAP.
> >>
> >> I can be the "pariah" of anything, Briam, but it doesn't negate this
> >> simple truth:
> >>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> >This is your simple truth, and it's simply wrong:
>
> No, I am not...Not unless recent MARS policy has provided for a major
> shift in MARS membership demographics and prerequisites.
>
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do to get
> around it.
>

> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, why can't you just admit that you were wrong? Huh?

Do you recall TAFKARJ commenting on those great >>>AMATEUR<<< CW Operators saving the day during WWII? When >>>AMATEUR<<< Radio was off the air?

Welp, there's another one who cannot admit that he was wrong. Ever.

Two peas in a pod.

3425. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 15:11:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405010711.14583830@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91528

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<T3bkc.7313$g31.4691@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0404281719.2d62cab3@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<_DAjc.4990$g31.3489@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > > >Subject: Morse and Contests
> > > > >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > > >Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > >Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
> > > > >
> > > > > Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW
> testing
>
> > > > >question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
> > > > >
> > > > > With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any reason to
> > > > >have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
> > > > >
> > > > Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this
> regard,
> as in
> > > > any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
> > > > >
> > > > > While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does it
> > > > >make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than others?
> > > > >
> > > > Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
> > > > >
> > > > As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I expect to
> be
> > > > compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a contest
> that
> > > > required using honed skills, too...?!?!
> > > > >
> > > > > Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth
> double
> > > > >points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same double
> > > > >points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair number
> of
> > > > >points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult than
> > > > >operating Phone.

> > > >
> > > > And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a
> keyboard?
> > > >
> > > > > I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked hard
> and
> > > > > >logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little more
> > > > > >than half that number.
> > > >
> > > > Shudda been on the paddles!
> > > >
> > > > Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in awards...
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Simply stated....CW Contesting requires real skills. Digital requires
> the
> > > > ability to type.
> > > > Phone is way down there from the above requirements.
> > >
> > > If you want to do so....Give phone 1 point, digital 2 points, and CW 5
> > > points per qso.
> > >
> > > That's my opinion, and I'm sticking to it.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Your opinion looks wrong to me.
> >
> > My opinion is that the point schedule should be inverted from what you
> > propose. I mean, when Aaron Jones was keeping the Morse Myths list,
> > it would appear that a CW QSO just couldn't fail. It always got
> > through, no matter the propogation, the power level, the QRN, or the
> > QRM. Each and every Op would QRS for the new guy and everything was
> > just so wonderful.
> >
> > Meanwhile phone Ops practice dog-eat-dog, QRM each other, use bad
> > phonetics, and propogation is always iffy. Furthermore, they marry
> > their Technician sisters and don't even QSL.
> >
> > Bass turds!
> >
> > Give the phone ops 5 pts per completed QSO, the CW Ops get 1.
>
> And what was your score in the last major DX contest?

Name the last Major DX contest.

Or lets make it
> easier. How many DX QSO's have you had in a major contest....????

Don't recall. Go look it up in CQ. 1990 - 1991 time frame.

> If under 300, you are disqualified from inputing on this discussioon.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, you're wrong again. You don't speak for CQ Magazine nor the
ARRL, though it appears that you would like to.

3426. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 15:18:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405010718.71bf8f0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91529

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040430071725.23031.00000242@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 4/29/2004 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291828.42c0a2ba@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040429160028.07672.00000502@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >> >petitions
> >> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >> >Date: 4/29/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>
>
> >> >Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler.
> >>
> >> I dunno about that, Mike...I kinda liked the velcro-closed bikini bra
> my
> >> former g/f used to wear!
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Former?
> >
> >You sure got a lot of "former's" in your life.
> >
> >Why am I not suprised?
>
> You've only had one woman in your entire life, Brain?
>
> You met and dated one and only one woman your ENTIRE life?
>
> Yes, there a lot of "former" girlfriends. A bit jealous, are you?
> Perhaps it's that residual fecal material behind your ears from plugging and
> unplugging your head in the wrong orifice all the time...
>
> You might try toothpaste, too....
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I happen to be married. Out of respect for my wife I don't
dredge up the velcroed past. But you do.

bb

3427. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 15:43:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <4093C5AB.4020503@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91530

>
>
>>>
>>>
>>Which you might postulate as an argument to retain the Morse
>>examination, except that knowledge of Morse is not a requirement to heat
>>a soldering iron.
>>
>>
>
>Exactly. When I was in college we buit a 10w CW transmitter
>and tested the results into a dummy load. No knowledge
>of code was needed or expected.
>
>
>
Now, if you used the soldering iron *as* the dummy load, ... :-)

>
>

3428. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 16:15:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91531

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<408FAB4C.9070905@psu.edu>...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
> > news:86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> >
> >>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >>Hash: SHA1
> >>
> >>
> >>>>>>>"Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >>>>>>
> >>Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
> >>Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
> >>Mike> contacts?
> >>
> >>Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
> >>Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
> >>Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.
> >>
> >>Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
> >>Mike> encouragement to work CW.
> >>
> >>That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on
> >>certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present.
> >>A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore,
> >>whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to
> >>do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the
> >>multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still
> >>doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.

That's certainly true. But how many non-code-tested hams do you think
are actually making CW contacts of Field Day?

> >>Now, if you're going to assert that the potential end to Morse code
> >>testing will eventually cause hams to stop learning and/or using Morse
> >>code, and that therefore the multiplier is akin to the "marriage
> >>penalty" [1], well, I'm not sure that's true. If it is, NCI should be
> >>raising holy hell about the pro-code conspiracy behind all these
> >>contests, right?
> >>
> >>[...]
> >>
> >>Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
> >>Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
> >>Mike> with little more than half that number.

> >>
> >>Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?
> >>
> >>Mike> I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.

It's not just about how "hard" something is.
> >>
> >>You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar contests
> >>(say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely in phone
> >>for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of your
> >>experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for the
> >>second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking. Report
> >>back to the group with your personal experience.

Not necessarily a good comparison. Conditions during one weekend may
be better, for example.
> >>
> >>When I know the code, I'll do the same thing, if only to satisfy my
> >>own curiosity.
> >>
> >>Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>Jack.
> >
> >
> > Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The CW op has
> > put in many hours of practicing and participating in contests to get his/her
> > speed up to a really useful contest level. Although the phone op has also
> > put in hours participating in contests to get his/her abilities honed to
> > contest level, it is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels
> > of ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges the
> > longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.

That all depends on the person. Some folks pick up contest operating
(in any mode) pretty quickly, while for others it's a real strain.

It's not called "radiosport" for nothing!
>
> hmmmm, I have to disagree somewhat.
>
> This is kind of putting CW on a pedestal.

Data modes get the same scoring on FD, and count as a separate "band".

Let's take FD as an example.
>
> I spend a lot of time planning, putting up antennas and tents and hours
> and hours of operating. Some of our CW ops help in this effort also,
> including the hardest working one out of the bunch. But some others
> simply show up and work a few hours, then go home.

Been there, done that - the hard work, that is.
>
> The point is, if you give extra points because of effort involved, then
> you have to decide what constitutes "effort".

It's not about "effort" so much as it's about "rewarding a desired
activity". That's why there are power level multipliers, all sorts of
bonus point thingies, and different classes of operation.

The spectrum efficiency of CW and data modes makes them worthy of the
moide multipliers.
>
> > In the contests in which I've participated, I have noticed that the best CW
> > ops can usually run more stations in less time because of the need for fewer
> > repeats than the best phone ops.

So much for Morse being "slow" and "error prone"...
>
> I have been amazed how quickly they can run. Humbled in fact. Adn I
> think that kind of flies in the face of those that say that CW is slower
> to work in a contest than SSB.
>
The point is not how many words are transmitted but how fast the
message gets across. The need for phonetics and repeats on 'phone
slows things, but the big slower-downer is the fact that if the other
op is using paper logs (still very common on FD) you can't go faster
than he/she can write. Which is normally less than 30 wpm.

> > On the other hand, less experienced people
> > can run phone contacts faster than CW contacts.
>
>If you compare the person to them self, that is true.
>
I'm not sure what that is intended to mean.

> > In my own contesting experience, my all time high was 310 contacts and it
> > was a CW contest. My second best was down around 150 contacts and it was a
> > voice contest. I'm running only 100 watts and wire antennas. I found it
> > much easier to break through pileups and bad conditions on CW. But it took
> > time to learn CW.

My best on Field Day was 629 contacts - all CW. Almost all S&P, too.
Plus 11 on 2 meter FM simplex during breaks. That was in 1B-1
category, which meant I had to do everyhting myself - setup, takedown,
etc. Also copied the W1AW message and sent a message report to the SM
(via CW, of course) for the bonus points. The W1AW message was copied
Saturday morning but the SM message was sent during FD.

All of this was with 100 W and wire antennas. It is by no means top
performance - really good ops with somewhat better setups (no beams or
high power, though) have done much better.
>
> But it took some time to learn just how to put a station together too.

>
> I'll defend testing CW, and I've been willing to put in a lot of effort
> to take my CW abilities to the "he stinks" level. But it sure seems like
> an unnatural advantage to have double points.

I think the mode bonus is more than justified by the spectrum
efficiency.
>
I remember when there was no mode bonus on FD. The result was that FD
was 'phone heavy and CW/data light.

--

Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
Day - but only one 'phone:

I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
you'll hear:

"November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
alfa ...."

Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!

On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
"roger" and "73" both.

--

One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
have to send but which are part of the required logging.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3429. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 16:21:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405010821.5542fa9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91532

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of April 30, 2004:
Novice - 32,009 (decrease of 17,320)
Technician - 263,923 (increase of 58,529)
Technician Plus - 60,241 (decrease of 68,619)
General - 140,628 (increase of 27,951)
Advanced - 80,650 (decrease of 19,132)
Extra - 105,360 (increase of 26,610)
Total - 682,811 (increase of 8,019)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3430. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 16:30:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xgQkc.1791$Hs1.351@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91533

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Not necessarily a good comparison. Conditions during one weekend may
> be better, for example.

While one mode or the other may have an advantage due to better
conditions (or whatever) in any single given year, the Nov SS contest
has been run with CW and Phone weekends 14 days apart for many decades
(1st and 3rd weekends of November respectively). Without a SINGLE
exception, the average scores on phone weekends are significantly higher
than on the CW weekends, no exceptions. The reason is that the exchange
is faster on phone than on CW.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3431. How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 17:43:27 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <3lRkc.8817$lk.732054@attbi_s53>
Source record: 91534

How to prove prior ham license ??

Herbert Fischer would like to show that he held a valid ham license (WN1UYH) in 1954 that required the 5 wpm code proficiency. Without the actual license, is there a way to prove he held the license? (Maybe a copy of the old CallBook page with his call would work?)

All suggestions welcomed.

AK

3432. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 17:46:45 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <864qr0rqey.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91535

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "N2EY" == N2EY <N2EY@aol.com> writes:

[...]

N2EY> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on
N2EY> Field Day - but only one 'phone:

N2EY> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received*
N2EY> exchange. That is, you'll hear:

N2EY> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger
N2EY> your One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please
N2EY> copy my three alfa ...."

N2EY> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told
N2EY> them? Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!

Actually, we were told to do it at our site. The purpose of the
repeat is to ensure that information was transferred correctly. This
is relevant in real emergency communications as well as contesting, in
my eyes, and I think it's good practice.

N2EY> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't
N2EY> even bother with the R - they send their exchange as an
N2EY> indication that they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you)
N2EY> which does the job of "roger" and "73" both.

Hopefully my code will be fast enough that I can observe the CW
station during FD this year.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAk+KMGPFSfAB/ezgRApkLAJ4seayv7lnDFtcNZ+YMl8CR1HpdcQCePWV6
TYJetaGTT1OAJuAdV57phSQ=
=Ugj+
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3433. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 18:29:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <G0Skc.1905$Hs1.1542@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91536

> Herbert Fischer would like to show that he held a valid ham license
(WN1UYH)
> in 1954 that required the 5 wpm code proficiency. Without the actual
> license, is there a way to prove he held the license?

Contact QCWA -----> http://www.qcwa.org

73, de Hans, K0HB

3434. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 18:42:14 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <acSkc.8732$0H1.963476@attbi_s54>
Source record: 91537

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:G0Skc.1905$Hs1.1542@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> > Herbert Fischer would like to show that he held a valid ham license
> (WN1UYH)
> > in 1954 that required the 5 wpm code proficiency. Without the actual
> > license, is there a way to prove he held the license?
>
> Contact QCWA -----> http://www.qcwa.org
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

And then ? AK

3435. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 19:13:55 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <TFSkc.1955$Hs1.1848@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91538
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote

>
> And then ? AK
>

QCWA has a library of old-timey callbooks. Ask them to look up the call
in that time frame. Or not, if you don't want to --- suit yourself.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3436. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 19:34:51 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <vZSkc.9061$0H1.993083@attbi_s54>
Source record: 91539
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:TFSkc.1955$Hs1.1848@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote
>
> >
> > And then ? AK
> >
>
> QCWA has a library of old-timey callbooks. Ask them to look up the call
> in that time frame. Or not, if you don't want to --- suit yourself.

Be glad to, Hans. It just wasn't clear where to go next next once at the
QCWA website.
Thanks, AK -- helping out a neighbor who was a ham a long time ago.

3437. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 21:10:42 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1afddc5fb8e7896398997c@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91540
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <TFSkc.1955$Hs1.1848@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net says...
>
> "King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote
>
> >
> > And then ? AK
> >
>
> QCWA has a library of old-timey callbooks. Ask them to look up the call
> in that time frame. Or not, if you don't want to --- suit yourself.
>
> With all kind wishes,

Lots of public libraries also keep old copies of callbooks.

3438. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 21:25:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RAUkc.1850$8S1.1053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91541

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040430215011.25300.00000364@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> >Date: 4/30/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <6wwkc.328$a47.290@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> >
> >
> >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20040429140912.21784.00000635@mb-m07.aol.com...
>
> >> Heck, if we're gonna go for "rare", how about from the Iniuit
> >> Territories...?!?! Add in the cost of the bush plane and dog sled too,
> >> OK...?!?!
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> (already shivvering just thinking about it!)
> >>
> >You wan't me to PAY??? Next you will charge 5 bux for the computer grade
> >QSL card.
>
> Oh No!...All my QSL cards are "real" QSL cards...
>
> And if you pay to get me to VY1 or VY0, I P-R-O-M-I-S-E you will get
> >FREE< QSL service, Dan! Heck, I'll even drive down and HAND DELIVER
your
> card with a six pack of your favorite brew, even if it's Crown Royal!
>
> =)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
Your in luck Steve....while having a hole dug for my tower I found a box
full of money.

Its confederate, Alabama state issue. How much you need?

Dan/W4NTI

3439. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 21:28:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BDUkc.1851$8S1.671@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91542

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405010711.14583830@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<T3bkc.7313$g31.4691@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0404281719.2d62cab3@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<_DAjc.4990$g31.3489@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20040427134548.21319.00000353@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > > > >Subject: Morse and Contests
> > > > > >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> > > > > >Date: 4/27/2004 7:34 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > > >Message-id: <408E533C.6010002@psu.edu>
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Idly musing, I thought of this a few moments ago. It isn't a CW
> > testing
> > >
> > > > > >question, but is related by being a CW operating question.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
reason to
> > > > > >have contests give double the points for Morse code contacts?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sure...why not? It requires some REAL skill to do. In this
> > regard,
> > as in
> > > > > > any other pursuit in life, greater skill should be rewarded.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > While of course all contest rules are inherently arbitrary, does
it
> > > > > >make sense to have one mode of contact be "more equal" than
others?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not "more equal"...Just better compensation.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > As a Nurse with my experience, credentials and skills, I
expect to
> > be
> > > > > > compensated accordiningly. So why not be "compensated" in a
contest
> > that
> > > > > > required using honed skills, too...?!?!
> > > > > >

> > > > > > Put another way, if you think that CW contacts should be worth
> > double
> > > > > > >points, is it fair to have say, PSK31 contacts worth the same
double
> > > > > > >points such as in Field day? Our GOTA station racked up a fair
number
> > of
> > > > > > >points operating PSK31, and it was certainly no more difficult
than
> > > > > > >operating Phone.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And how long would it take a "new" Ham to master using a
> > keyboard?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
hard
> > and
> > > > > > >logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op with little
more
> > > > > > >than half that number.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Shudda been on the paddles!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Seriously, though...Most contests differentiatemodes in
awards...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > Simply stated....CW Contesting requires real skills. Digital
requires
> > the
> > > > > ability to type.
> > > > > Phone is way down there from the above requirements.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you want to do so....Give phone 1 point, digital 2 points, and
CW 5
> > > > > points per qso.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's my opinion, and I'm sticking to it.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > Your opinion looks wrong to me.
> > > >
> > > > My opinion is that the point schedule should be inverted from what you
> > > > propose. I mean, when Aaron Jones was keeping the Morse Myths list,

> > > it would appear that a CW QSO just couldn't fail. It always got
> > > through, no matter the propogation, the power level, the QRN, or the
> > > QRM. Each and every Op would QRS for the new guy and everything was
> > > just so wonderful.
> > >
> > > Meanwhile phone Ops practice dog-eat-dog, QRM each other, use bad
> > > phonetics, and propogation is always iffy. Furthermore, they marry
> > > their Technician sisters and don't even QSL.
> > >
> > > Bass turds!
> > >
> > > Give the phone ops 5 pts per completed QSO, the CW Ops get 1.
> >
> > And what was your score in the last major DX contest?
>
> Name the last Major DX contest.
>
> Or lets make it
> > easier. How many DX QSO's have you had in a major contest....????
>
> Don't recall. Go look it up in CQ. 1990 - 1991 time frame.
>
> > If under 300, you are disqualified from inputing on this discussioon.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan, you're wrong again. You don't speak for CQ Magazine nor the
> ARRL, though it appears that you would like to.

The last major DX contest was the CQWWPXPhone. But what does that have to
do with what your saying?

I don't claim to represent anyone, other than myself. Again what does that
have to do with things?

I simply want to assertain your credibility.

Give me a callsign and I'll look you up. I don't think 'William' is valid
for a ham call.

Dan/W4NTI

3440. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 21:32:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91543

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>
>
> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
> Day - but only one 'phone:
>
> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
> you'll hear:
>
> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
> alfa ...."
>
> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>
> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> "roger" and "73" both.
>
> --
>
> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do it with
continous wave.

Dan/W4NTI

3441. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-01 21:41:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405011341.7f7b83b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91544

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040430214205.05832.00000412@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions ...
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 4/30/2004 7:07 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0404300407.2833b703@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<409167B6.3070006@psu.edu>...
> >> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> >> > In CAP we have dozens of kids chomping at the bit to "get on the air".
> Of
> >> > the current "crop" of Cadets at th local unit, seven out of 12 are
> licensed
> >> > Amateurs, six of them have already one on to General.
> >
> >What ages are we talking about?
>
> CAP cadets can be 12 to 21 if they join before age 18, however the one's I
> am addressing specifically are all between 15 to 17. (Ironically the 17 year
> old is the one who has yet to upgrade!)

Not ironic at all; the 17 year old probably has more competing
activities. This is why it makes sense to market ham radio to middle
school and even the older elementary school kids. Most of the ones I
know are certainly smart enough and responsible enough to be hams.
>
> >> > And who's making the call on what's irrelevant and what's
> >> > unnecessary...?!?!
> >
> >FCC makes that call. And note this: One of the arguments for dumping
> >Element 1 is the claim that when it was dumped for Tech, the whole ARS
> >didn't fall apart.
> >So if we get over 323,000 free upgrades to General with no testing and
> >the ARS
> >doesn't fall apart.....
> >
> >> > Isn't that the "call" of the person seeking Amateur licensure...?!?!
> >
> >Nope. A person might think that 20 wpm code tests given by FCC
> >examiners are relevant and necessary to an Extra license, but they
> >will have a hard time finding them today..

>
> Point taken, Jim, but what I was trying (unsuccessfully) to say was that
> it's partly the applicant's decision to decide if acquiring the knowledge or
> skill was appropriate to gaining the license...In other words, are the benefits
> of licensure worth the time and effort expended to get it...?!?!
>
> Any better?

I think what you're trying to say is that it's up to the prospective
ham whether the license earned is worth the "price" paid - where that
"price" is in the form of learning required to pass the tests.

One basic rule of marketing is that lowering the "price" of something
usually results in more "sales" - but not always. Lowering the price
of something is ineffective if potential buyers don't know about it,
or if they are not interested in buying the thing in the first place.
For example, I recall when VCRs were well over $1000 - there was lots
of demand but very few sales. As the prices came down, sales went up.
For me, the critical price was $300 - when I found a good VCR for
under $300, I bought it. Had a few since then - Beta gave way to VHS,
and the first VHS one I had wore out, etc. Now they are under $100.
But I'm not going to run out and buy another unless the present one
wears out. So VCR sales/prices have no effect on me right now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3442. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 00:15:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <trydncul7bIMoAndRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91545

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<408FAB4C.9070905@psu.edu>...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
>>>news:86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
>>>
>>>
>>>>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>>>>Hash: SHA1
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
>>>>Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
>>>>Mike> contacts?
>>>>
>>>>Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
>>>>Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
>>>>Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.
>>>>
>>>>Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
>>>>Mike> encouragement to work CW.
>>>>
>>>>That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on
>>>>certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present.
>>>>A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore,
>>>>whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to
>>>>do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the
>>>>multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still
>>>>doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.
>>>
>>>
>>> That's certainly true. But how many non-code-tested hams do you think
>>> are actually making CW contacts of Field Day?

hmmm, not my quote.
>
>>>>Now, if you're going to assert that the potential end to Morse code
>>>>testing will eventually cause hams to stop learning and/or using Morse
>>>>code, and that therefore the multiplier is akin to the "marriage

>>>>penalty" [1], well, I'm not sure that's true. If it is, NCI should be
>>>>raising holy hell about the pro-code conspiracy behind all these
>>>>contests, right?
>>>>
>>>>[...]
>>>>
>>>>Mike> I've seen a number of cases where a phone operator has worked
>>>>Mike> hard and logged a lot of QSO's, only to be beaten by a CW op
>>>>Mike> with little more than half that number.
>>>>
>>>>Jack> And how hard did that CW op work?
>>>>
>>>>Mike> I doubt twice as hard as the Phone person.
>
>
> It's not just about how "hard" something is.

NO doubt about that. My CW QSO's would be worth about 50 points if
learning effort was included!

>>>>You could measure it yourself, you know. Work two similar contests
>>>>(say, two of the QSO parties coming up soon). Operate solely in phone
>>>>for the first contest. Score your points and keep track of your
>>>>experience with notes or something. Operate solely in CW for the
>>>>second contest. Do the same sort of scoring and note-taking. Report
>>>>back to the group with your personal experience.
>
>
> Not necessarily a good comparison. Conditions during one weekend may
> be better, for example.
>
>>>>When I know the code, I'll do the same thing, if only to satisfy my
>>>>own curiosity.
>>>>
>>>>Mike> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>Jack.
>>>
>>>
>>>Actually Jack, that would not be quite a fair measurement. The CW op has
>>>put in many hours of practicing and participating in contests to get his/her
>>>speed up to a really useful contest level. Although the phone op has also
>>>put in hours participating in contests to get his/her abilities honed to
>>>contest level, it is far fewer hours than the CW op to get to the top levels
>>>of ability. So the double points, at least to me, also acknowledges the
>>>longer preparatory stage that it takes to get good at it.
>
>
> That all depends on the person. Some folks pick up contest operating
> (in any mode) pretty quickly, while for others it's a real strain.
>

> It's not called "radiosport" for nothing!
>
>> hmmmm, I have to disagree somewhat.
>>
>> This is kind of putting CW on a pedestal.
>
>
> Data modes get the same scoring on FD, and count as a separate "band".
>
> Let's take FD as an example.
>
>>I spend a lot of time planning, putting up antennas and tents and hours
>>and hours of operating. Some of our CW ops help in this effort also,
>>including the hardest working one out of the bunch. But some others
>>simply show up and work a few hours, then go home.
>
>
> Been there, done that - the hard work, that is.
>
>> The point is, if you give extra points because of effort involved, then
>>you have to decide what constitutes "effort".
>
>
> It's not about "effort" so much as it's about "rewarding a desired
> activity". That's why there are power level multipliers, all sorts of
> bonus point thingies, and different classes of operation.
>
> The spectrum efficiency of CW and data modes makes them worthy of the
> moide multipliers.
>
>>>In the contests in which I've participated, I have noticed that the best CW
>>>ops can usually run more stations in less time because of the need for fewer
>>>repeats than the best phone ops.
>
>
> So much for Morse being "slow" and "error prone"...
>
>> I have been amazed how quickly they can run. Humbled in fact. Adn I
>>think that kind of flies in the face of those that say that CW is slower
>>to work in a contest than SSB.
>>
>
> The point is not how many words are transmitted but how fast the
> message gets across. The need for phonetics and repeats on 'phone
> slows things, but the big slower-downer is the fact that if the other
> op is using paper logs (still very common on FD) you can't go faster
> than he/she can write. Which is normally less than 30 wpm.
>
>
>>> On the other hand, less experienced people

>>>can run phone contacts faster than CW contacts.
>>
>>If you compare the person to them self, that is true.
>>
>
> I'm not sure what that is intended to mean.
>
>
>>>In my own contesting experience, my all time high was 310 contacts and it
>>>was a CW contest. My second best was down around 150 contacts and it was a
>>>voice contest. I'm running only 100 watts and wire antennas. I found it
>>>much easier to break through pileups and bad conditions on CW. But it took
>>>time to learn CW.
>
>
> My best on Field Day was 629 contacts - all CW. Almost all S&P, too.
> Plus 11 on 2 meter FM simplex during breaks. That was in 1B-1
> category, which meant I had to do everyhting myself - setup, takedown,
> etc. Also copied the W1AW message and sent a message report to the SM
> (via CW, of course) for the bonus points. The W1AW message was copied
> Saturday morning but the SM message was sent during FD.
>
> All of this was with 100 W and wire antennas. It is by no means top
> performance - really good ops with somewhat better setups (no beams or
> high power, though) have done much better.
>
>> But it took some time to learn just how to put a station together too.
>>
>> I'll defend testing CW, and I've been willing to put in a lot of effort
>>to take my CW abilities to the "he stinks" level. But it sure seems like
>>an unnatural advantage to have double points.
>
>
> I think the mode bonus is more than justified by the spectrum
> efficiency.

You are the only person I've heard of using BW as a justification. Not
that it isn't some kind of justification, but it is unusual.

> I remember when there was no mode bonus on FD. The result was that FD
> was 'phone heavy and CW/data light.
>
> --
>
> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
> Day - but only one 'phone:
>
> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
> you'll hear:
>
> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One

> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
> alfa ...."
>
> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!

Here is my take on why that happens. Most contacts I make ask QSL? So I simply repeat it back. Then I give them my exchange. I also say "please" copy (exchange) If I'm the person initiating the QSO, I generally don't. I actually heard a ham chewing another one out for saying Please copy (exchange)in the VAQSO party. Told him saying "please" made him sound like an idiot. I was next to QSO with him, and gave him the prettiest, drawn out pulleeeezze he ever heard.

> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> "roger" and "73" both.

That brings up a mini-beef I've had with CW ops. At one time, I was trying to copy on the air operations. It wasn't until I found that almost everything was abbreviated that I realized I was often copying correctly. It was like a code within a code.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3443. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 00:54:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040501205440.01933.00000703@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91546

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 5/1/2004 4:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <RAUkc.1850$8S1.1053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>

>Your in luck Steve....while having a hole dug for my tower I found a box
>full of money.
>
>Its confederate, Alabama state issue. How much you need?

HEY! Take it to a collector! It's proably worth 100 times whatever the
face value was!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3444. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 00:56:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040501205650.01933.00000709@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91547

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 5/1/2004 4:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <BDUkc.1851$8S1.671@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>

>> Dan, you're wrong again. You don't speak for CQ Magazine nor the
>> ARRL, though it appears that you would like to.
>
>The last major DX contest was the CQWWPXPhone. But what does that have to
>do with what your saying?
>
>I don't claim to represent anyone, other than myself. Again what does that
>have to do with things?
>
>I simply want to assertain your credibility.
>
>Give me a callsign and I'll look you up. I don't think 'William' is valid
>for a ham call.

Dan, that's Lennie's padawan learner and devoted fan, Brian Burke,
N-ZERO-IMD. I emphasize the ZERO since I feel it's particularly applicable to
him!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3445. Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:02:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers, 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and constantly yammering raffles.

So here's a poll ----

Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components, connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of non-Amateur Radio items.

___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come back to go to one like this.

___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you describe too.

___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you describe.

Vote for one (and only one) choice.

3446. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:02:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040501210258.01933.00000712@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91549

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/1/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010702.540c2ef2@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>...

>> OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do to
>get
>> around it.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, why can't you just admit that you were wrong? Huh?

Because I am not.

Sorry you have a problem with it. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

>Do you recall TAFKARJ commenting on those great >>>AMATEUR<<< CW
>Operators saving the day during WWII? When >>>AMATEUR<<< Radio was
>off the air?

Wake up knuckle head and crack some history books OTHER than the tained and
antagonistic crap that Lennie spews.

>Welp, there's another one who cannot admit that he was wrong. Ever.

So far neither you or Lennie has "proven" Jim to be wrong. So far you
have not proven yourself to be right...About ANYthing...

>Two peas in a pod.

If that was supposed to be an insult, you missed...By a mile.

Steve, K4YZ

3447. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:11:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040501211112.01933.00000713@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91550

```
>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/1/2004 10:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010718.71bf8f0a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040430071725.23031.00000242@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>> >petitions
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 4/29/2004 9:28 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0404291828.42c0a2ba@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040429160028.07672.00000502@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>> >> >petitions
>> >> >From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>> >> >Date: 4/29/2004 2:41 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <40915A60.3000305@psu.edu>
>> >>
>> >> >Nothing is ever improved by making it simpler.
>> >>
>> >> I dunno about that, Mike...I kinda liked the velcro-closed bikini
>bra
>> my
>> >> former g/f used to wear!
>> >>
>> >> 73
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Former?
>> >
>> >You sure got a lot of "former's" in your life.
>> >
>> >Why am I not suprised?
>>
>> You've only had one woman in your entire life, Brain?
>>
>> You met and dated one and only one woman your ENTIRE life?
>>
>> Yes, there a lot of "former" girlfriends. A bit jealous, are you?
```

>> Perhaps it's that residual fecal material behind your ears from plugging
>and
>> unplugging your head in the wrong orifice all the time...
>>
>> You might try toothpaste, too....
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, I happen to be married. Out of respect for my wife I don't
>dredge up the velcroed past. But you do.

Ahhhhhhhhhhh....I see.

You can make such aspurgences against others, however vague or
insinuating, but it's not OK for others...Uh huh...

BTW...You were the one who opened THAT can of worms, so sit down and get
you a plate full, Puppet Boy.

YOU are the one making insinuating comments about how many "former"
girlfriends I may or may not have had...That it's more than one probably makes
you jealous. Too bad for you, eh...???

Sucks to be you, Brian.

Steve, K4YZ

3448. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:12:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040501211241.01933.00000714@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91451

>Subject: Hamfests?
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/1/2004 8:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
>Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
>7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
>constantly yammering raffles.
>
>So here's a poll ----
>
>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
>non-Amateur Radio items.
>
>___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
>back to go to one like this.
>
>_YES__ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
>describe too.
>
>___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
>DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you
>describe.

3449. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:15:36 UTC
From: FlavaFlav <qoff@xzz.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DCD854A3E9E1234567890@216.196.97.136>
Source record: 91668
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040501010411.075
$2c@newsreader.com:

> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>> I hear george
>> is letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation
>> then Kaboom end of the jig.
>>
> Did dad tell you that today?

No nancy did

3450. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:17:01 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@themanlloyds.net>
Message-ID: <c71i3t$j6i$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91452
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
//childish drivelsnipped//

Hans,

Really, we would like to see you stop this incessant childish
x-posting. Do you think you can control yourself and limit
your nonesense to one ng at a time? No, I guess not.

Phil has many errands for you to run, have you done any?

Lloyd

3451. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:18:20 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <w%Xkc.8452$TD4.887023@attbi_s01>
Source record: 91453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> ___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> describe too.

Good question Hans .... I go really for the opportunity to meet with the fellows one on one ....It is good to see fellow ops in person and the fests provide that ....however most of the fests are on Sundays and I am tied up with teaching Sunday School ....you know the job you get asked to take only for one year in 1974. I find that if I do go later most of the guys leave early as they snag the "needs" of the day.

73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

3452. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:30:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZaYkc.2334$Hs1.1582@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Lloyd" <lloyd@themanlloyds.net> wrote

> Do you think you can control yourself and limit
> your nonesense to one ng at a time?

Not a chance.. Deal with it.

With all kind wishes,

K0HB

PS: WTF is "nonesense"? I am patient with stupidity but not with those
who are proud of it as you are. Please QSY to
http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy and enjoy yourself.

3453. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 01:33:31 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <LdYkc.7632$Ia6.876988@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91455

The CW op has
> > > put in many hours of practicing and participating in contests to get
his/her
> > > speed up to a really useful contest level.
Well I think most CW ops are in there at a minimum of several nights a week
....I try to get on ever night time permitting ....Speed ... 25 WPM I think
generally speaking ..... The CW op really doesn't practice as such but
just gets on the air and enjoys an efficient non-verbal mode.

Some of our CW ops help in this effort also,
> > including the hardest working one out of the bunch. But some others
> > simply show up and work a few hours, then go home.

Or really don't show up at all ..... I remember one fellow from our club who
had an antenna raising party on FD.

> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> "roger" and "73" both.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I always ask the WPA section guys or even the PA guys or others where they
are at and how things are going ....a slight off topic tends top break up
the flow from time to time. I am not in there for blood or a free pass for
everlasting life due to a FD score. FD does present itself in many ways to
get the message out and get the public to see first hand an aspect of our
service. Heck ...we even give the cops free food ..I think the word gets
out on the police radio ...

73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa .... W3CSL Monessen ARC on FD

3454. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 02:01:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GcGdnSOfpbvtywndRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
> Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
> 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
> constantly yammering raffles.
>
> So here's a poll ----
>
> Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
> itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
> connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
> retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
> non-Amateur Radio items.
>
> ___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
> back to go to one like this.
>
> ___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> describe too.
>
> ___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
> DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you
> describe.
>
> Vote for one (and only one) choice.

I guess I'd have to say B if I had to just answer from your list.

But I don't have a problem with *some* decent computers showing up at
hamfests. My shack has three of them in it, and they are an integral
part of it.

Problem is that too many hamfests appear to have the computers I put
out on the sidewalk for riffraff day.

So I'm really a lot closer to your A answer. I'de really like a lot
more ham related stuff, and less computer junk and Ginsu knives.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3455. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 02:10:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GcGdnSKfpbs-xQndRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91457
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>> Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
>> Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
>> 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
>> constantly yammering raffles.
>>
>> So here's a poll ----
>> Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>> itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>> connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>> retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
>> non-Amateur Radio items.

And what do the Armenian judges have to say about all this?? ;^)

hehe..... Mike KB3EIA -

3456. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 03:12:05 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <k7o890tucp3vd1kcjjlm0mskjnkpv3t3v2@4ax.com>
Source record: 91458

On Sat, 01 May 2004 17:43:27 GMT, "King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote:

>How to prove prior ham license ??
>
>Herbert Fischer would like to show that he held a valid ham license (WN1UYH)
>in 1954 that required the 5 wpm code proficiency. Without the actual
>license, is there a way to prove he held the license? (Maybe a copy of the
>old CallBook page with his call would work?)

Would the FCC have a record of such?

>All suggestions welcomed.
>
>AK
>

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3457. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 03:21:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <iPZkc.2401$Hs1.1375@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91459

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote

>
> Would the FCC have a record of such?
>

Yes, buried in some dusty paper archive in a low humidity cave in Resume
Speed, Alabama. They won't go look.

But there's a commercial firm licensed to go into the catacomb and
search, which they'll be happy to do for a modest fee of about $122.85
per half-hour, results not guaranteed.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3458. Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 04:12:12 UTC
From: n1sni@comcast.net
Message-ID: <a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello,
I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer. I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.

Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>

Thank you! Thank you!

Bill B. - N1SNI

3459. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 04:26:22 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <4cb069787c05c88e75252229630b3171@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 91669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
In article <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>
"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined out of his fatass:
>
>
>
> "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
> @newsreader.com:
>
> > You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>
> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts, except
> you and your leg humping activity
>
> Sounds like Wiseman again...

Looks like Joe Shitpack has his malformed head somehow wedged up his
fatass again.......
```

3460. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 04:30:21 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <Doggiedaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <c71tf8$90f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
in message news:4cb069787c05c88e75252229630b3171@cypherpunks.to...
In article <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>
"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined out of his fatass:
>
>
>
> "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
> @newsreader.com:
>
> > You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>
> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
except
> you and your leg humping activity
>
> Sounds like Wiseman again...

Looks like Joe Shitpack has his malformed head somehow wedged up his
fatass again.......

..
Yup. It is Wiseman again...

3461. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 05:26:42 UTC
From: Paul_Morphy <nopaul_morphy2@coolgoose.com>
Message-ID: <mE%kc.9895$Ut1.301135@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 91460
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...

> Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
> itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
> connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
> retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
> non-Amateur Radio items.

X B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
describe too.

Trouble is, you'd be driving two hours each way to spend one minute at the
hamfest. I think eBay has been the kiss of death for hamfests.

73,

"PM"

3462. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 12:14:45 UTC
From: Hamfest Guy <fruits@hamfestfruits.org>
Message-ID: <c72ol5aao0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hans,

I took the liberty of adding a fourth category (D).

Hamfest Guy

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
> Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
> 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
> constantly yammering raffles.
>
> So here's a poll ----
>
> Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
> itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
> connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
> retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
> non-Amateur Radio items.
>
> ___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
> back to go to one like this.
>
> ___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> describe too.
>
> ___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
> DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you
> describe.
>

____ D. I would attend hamfests if there was a contest to select the
guy with the greatest body odor, most obese, & stupidest looking
clothing & largest call sign badge.

> Vote for one (and only one) choice.
>
>
>

3463. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 12:37:45 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <BomdnfuCodQCdgndRVn-hQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 91462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

D has my vote!

"Hamfest Guy" <fruits@hamfestfruits.org> wrote in message
news:c72ol5aao0@pita.alt.net...
> Hans,
>
> I took the liberty of adding a fourth category (D).
>
>
> Hamfest Guy
>
>
>
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
> > Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
> > 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
> > constantly yammering raffles.
> >
> > So here's a poll ----
> >
> > Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
> > itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
> > connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
> > retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
> > non-Amateur Radio items.
> >
> > ___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
> > back to go to one like this.
> >
> > ___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> > describe too.
> >
> > ___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
> > DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you
> > describe.
> >
>
>
> ____ D. I would attend hamfests if there was a contest to select the
> guy with the greatest body odor, most obese, & stupidest looking
> clothing & largest call sign badge.

> > > > > Vote for one (and only one) choice.
> > > > > > > > >

3464. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:24:32 UTC
From: tad danley <nospam@atsbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <4094F692.3070007@atsbcglobal.net>
Source record: 91463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> So here's a poll ----

B

73,

--
* Do NOT use Reply *

Reply to K3TD via arrl dot net

Tad, K3TD

3465. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:37:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405020537.2d8e5d82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91464

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<BDUkc.1851$8S1.671@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0405010711.14583830@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<T3bkc.7313$g31.4691@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > > And what was your score in the last major DX contest?
> >
> > Name the last Major DX contest.
> >
> > Or lets make it
> > > easier. How many DX QSO's have you had in a major contest....????
> >
> > Don't recall. Go look it up in CQ. 1990 - 1991 time frame.
> >
> > > If under 300, you are disqualified from inputing on this discussioon.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Dan, you're wrong again. You don't speak for CQ Magazine nor the
> > ARRL, though it appears that you would like to.
>
> The last major DX contest was the CQWWPXPhone. But what does that have to
> do with what your saying?

You wanted to know my score in the last "major" DX contest. I just
wanted to make sure you didn't think Field Day was a major DX contest.

> I don't claim to represent anyone, other than myself. Again what does that
> have to do with things?

I think CQ magazine can get along just fine without you running
interference for them.

> I simply want to assertain your credibility.

Oh, is that what you were doing?

Who put you in charge? John Dorr?

> Give me a callsign and I'll look you up. I don't think 'William' is valid
> for a ham call.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, get with the program. Everyone else knows my callsign.

Best of Luck, bb

3466. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:38:54 UTC
From: Roy Lewallen <w7el@eznec.com>
Message-ID: <1099uffhdrg4g3d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's not clear to me what noise you're trying to measure. If you're trying to measure the thermal noise of a good resistor, you're SOL -- anything you try to measure it with will add its own noise, which you'll end up measuring instead. You can easily calculate the thermal noise, though. If you're trying to measure the internal noise of the spectrum analyzer, the answer is on the screen and, as you've found, it's a function of the filter bandwidth. If you're trying to measure the noise coming from a receiver, it has to be considerably greater than the SA's internal noise, or you'll never see it. That means you'll have to amplify it until you can see it, with an amplifier that's quiet enough that the noise it adds isn't significant. The noise figure of the SA itself is typically much worse than a decent receiver -- it's been traded for dynamic range.

Once you get whatever noise you're trying to measure up to the level you can see it on the SA, you'll find that its magnitude also varies with the SA filter bandwidth, if the noise is broadband. You can get any S/N ratio you want, if you can tolerate an arbitrarily narrow bandwidth. A real receiver has some particular bandwidth to accommodate the incoming signal. It's usually this bandwidth at which the S/N ratio is measured.

Roy Lewallen, W7EL

Bill B. wrote:
> Hello,
> I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
> I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
> an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the
> puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
> noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
> same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I
> ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
> reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
> size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
> the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
> would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
> more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
> 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
> further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that
> requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
> to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
>
> Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
>

> Thank you! Thank you!
>
> Bill B. - N1SNI

3467. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:41:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405020541.4ce5d815@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91465

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040501205650.01933.00000709@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> >Date: 5/1/2004 4:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <BDUkc.1851$8S1.671@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
> >> Dan, you're wrong again. You don't speak for CQ Magazine nor the
> >> ARRL, though it appears that you would like to.
> >
> >The last major DX contest was the CQWWPXPhone. But what does that have to
> >do with what your saying?
> >
> >I don't claim to represent anyone, other than myself. Again what does that
> >have to do with things?
> >
> >I simply want to assertain your credibility.
> >
> >Give me a callsign and I'll look you up. I don't think 'William' is valid
> >for a ham call.
>
> Dan, that's Lennie's padawan learner and devoted fan, Brian Burke,
> N-ZERO-IMD. I emphasize the ZERO since I feel it's particularly applicable to
> him!

Yes, Steve, the zero in my call is particularly applicable since it
represents the 10th Call District. I was licensed while stationed in
Nebraska. So I am a 10.

You are the Master of the Obvious.

3468. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:44:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405020544.2f13bfed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91466

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040501211112.01933.00000713@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/1/2004 10:18 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010718.71bf8f0a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Steve, I happen to be married. Out of respect for my wife I don't
> >dredge up the velcroed past. But you do.
>
> Ahhhhhhhhhhhh....I see.
>
> You can make such aspurgences against others, however vague or
> insinuating, but it's not OK for others...Uh huh...
>
> BTW...You were the one who opened THAT can of worms, so sit down and get
> you a plate full, Puppet Boy.

No, I made no mention of bikini clad formers. You did. Are you still
married this time?

3469. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:53:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405020553.780b5ef4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91467

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040501210258.01933.00000712@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/1/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010702.540c2ef2@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
> >> OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do to
> get
> >> around it.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, why can't you just admit that you were wrong? Huh?
>
> Because I am not.

But you are. Here is what you said again:

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> Sorry you have a problem with it. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

That was your backpedalling recovery from making such a stupid
statement.

It is equally wrong as I have shown.

> >Do you recall TAFKARJ commenting on those great >>>AMATEUR<<< CW
> >Operators saving the day during WWII? When >>>AMATEUR<<< Radio was
> >off the air?
>
> Wake up knuckle head and crack some history books OTHER than the tained and
> antagonistic crap that Lennie spews.

TAFKARJ is our self-appointed historian. Even he will spout the dates
that the ARS was denied priveleges during WWII, but not in the same
post where Amateur Radio Operators saved the day in WWII.

It's one of those PCTA double standard things.

And don't forget that he also said that code testing was a barrier to
CW use.

> >Welp, there's another one who cannot admit that he was wrong. Ever.
>
> So far neither you or Lennie has "proven" Jim to be wrong. So far you
> have not proven yourself to be right...About ANYthing...

Of course we have. Time and again. But his most obnoxious
cheerleader won't hear of it.

> >Two peas in a pod.
>
> If that was supposed to be an insult, you missed...By a mile.

Then you haven't seen his reaction.

3470. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 13:57:16 UTC
From: me@me.com
Message-ID: <cgv9905pcg5548h4o1agqfb2g06aqnnogr@4ax.com>
Source record: 91671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 1 May 2004 23:30:21 -0500, "Arf! Arf!"
<Doggiedaze@Liberalz.com> wrote:

>
>"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
>in message news:4cb069787c05c88e75252229630b3171@cypherpunks.to...
>In article <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>
>"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined out of his fatass:
>>
>>
>>
>> "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
>> @newsreader.com:
>>
>> > You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>>
>> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
>except
>> you and your leg humping activity
>>
>> Sounds like Wiseman again...
>
>Looks like Joe Shitpack has his malformed head somehow wedged up his
>fatass again.......
>
>..
>Yup. It is Wiseman again...
>
>
>
>
>
>

I really wish you dumb anuses would keep your B.S. in the ham groups
and stay outta rec.radio.cb

-Me

3471. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 14:34:41 UTC
From: futureworlds <nobody@mail.futureworlds.it>
Message-ID: <5fab998b8457b559b747af9032420e13@mail.futureworlds.it>
Source record: 91672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
In article <c71tf8$90f$0@pita.alt.net>
"LARDASS = Arf! Arf!" <Doggiedaze@Liberalz.com> whined:
>
>
>
>>: "Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer"
<nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
>>: in message news:4cb069787c05c88e75252229630b3171@cypherpunks.to...
> In article <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>
> "Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined out of his fatass:
> >
> >
> >
> > "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
> > @newsreader.com:
> >
> > > You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
> >
> > then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
> except
> > you and your leg humping activity
> >
> > Sounds like Wiseman again...
>
>>: Looks like Joe Shitpack has his malformed head somehow wedged up his
>>: fatass again.......
>
> Yup. It is ...

Nice of you to admit it, Joe Shitpack aka arfarf the lardass!
```

3472. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 15:41:50 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c734ru0vhr@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
In article <cgv9905pcg5548h4o1agqfb2g06aqnnogr@4ax.com>, me@me.com says...
>
>On Sat, 1 May 2004 23:30:21 -0500, "Arf! Arf!"
><Doggiedaze@Liberalz.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
>>in message news:4cb069787c05c88e75252229630b3171@cypherpunks.to...
>>In article <c6v9t3$8oq$0@pita.alt.net>
>>"Joe Shitpack" <Joe@Joe.com> whined out of his fatass:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> "Rod Laver" <qoff@xzz.com> wrote in message
>>> news:Xns94DBD9A46E4ED1234567890@216.196.97.136...
>>> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040430211815.326$e9
>>> @newsreader.com:
>>>
>>> > You are the only one who cares, geo. Give up your charade already.
>>>
>>> then don't read it assclown, no one is forcing you to read my posts,
>>except
>>> you and your leg humping activity
>>>
>>> Sounds like Wiseman again...
>>
>>Looks like Joe Shitpack has his malformed head somehow wedged up his
>>fatass again.......
>>
>>..
>>Yup. It is Wiseman again...
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>I really wish you dumb anuses would keep your B.S. in the ham groups
>and stay outta rec.radio.cb
>
```

>-Me
>
>
Im not a dumb anus Im a smart anus.

3473. Re: N8WWM COURT DOCUMENTS, or gay lovers K9BSD and N9PGE continue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 15:42:42 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c734ti0voe@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 91674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
In article <Xns94DCD854A3E9E1234567890@216.196.97.136>, FlavaFlav says...
>
>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in news:20040501010411.075
>$2c@newsreader.com:
>
>> Rod Laver <qoff@xzz.com> wrote:
>>> I hear george
>>> is letting him hang himself with his posts and forgery, impersonation
>>> then Kaboom end of the jig.
>>>
>> Did dad tell you that today?
>
>No nancy did
>
Nancy gives great head.
```

3474. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 16:35:55 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DD7FFE19A2Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91468

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:iPZkc.2401$Hs1.1375 @newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote
>
>>
>> Would the FCC have a record of such?
>>
>
> Yes, buried in some dusty paper archive in a low humidity cave in Resume
> Speed, Alabama. They won't go look.
>
> But there's a commercial firm licensed to go into the catacomb and
> search, which they'll be happy to do for a modest fee of about $122.85
> per half-hour, results not guaranteed.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
```

There used to be a set of callbooks for multiple years in the back room at the now defunct Maryland Radio. This room was used for VE tests and the store was in Laurel, so it is possible they may be in the posession of the Laurel VEC.

3475. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 16:37:37 UTC
From: k7itm@aol.com
Message-ID: <3200347.0405020837.750d015c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi Bill,

Welcome to the wonderful world of posting.

I'd expect noise levels to be specified in (nano)volts per sqrt(Hz), or (femto)watts per Hertz. This can be experessed in dBm, too, of course. If you know the noise bandwidth of the filter the SA is putting the signal through, then you just take the measured noise floor and adjust it by the ratio of that bandwidth to 1 Hz. So if it were a 10Hz noise bandwidth, the noise per Hz would be 10dB below what you see. If the filter is 100Hz, it would be 20dB below. Now, is the noise bandwidth of the filter the same as the resolution bandwidth? Not necessarily, but it should be fairly close, generally within a few percent. We build FFT-based spectral analysis equipment, and have to document the noise bandwidth of the effective filters, but we also generally have a way to directly display "noise density" which is already in v/rt(Hz) or w/Hz or dBm -- so it's worth looking to see if the analyzer MIGHT have such a function. -- It's worthwhile because of the variation from measurement to measurement to use as much averaging as is convenient. This might be called "video filtering", but is done after the signal filtering and detection. Lessee...what else. Normally, the base level noise of the analyzer would be measured with the input terminated in its input resistance, usually 50 ohms.

Footnoote about the bandwidths: the noise bandwidth (or noise power bandwidth) says if you have an input signal of, say, 1.000 picowatts per Hz, and it's uniform power density per unit bandwidth (a flat, broadband noise), and you measure 12.345 picowatts coming through your filter, then the noise bandwidth is 12.345Hz. That may differ from the -3dB bandwidth of the filter, though generally not by a huge amount. With analog filters, it's probably expecting a lot for it to be really the same from analyzer to analyzer of the same model, but with digital filters (not necessarily even FFT-based), it should be spot-on the same from one to the next.

Cheers,
Tom

n1sni@comcast.net (Bill B.) wrote in message
news:<a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com>...
> Hello,
> I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
> I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
> an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the

> puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
> noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
> same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I
> ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
> reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
> size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
> the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
> would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
> more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
> 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
> further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that
> requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
> to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
>
> Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
>
> Thank you! Thank you!
>
> Bill B. - N1SNI

3476. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 16:42:25 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91469

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>>
>>
>> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
>> Day - but only one 'phone:
>>
>> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
>> you'll hear:
>>
>> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
>> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
>> alfa ...."
>>
>> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
>> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>>
>> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
>> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
>> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
>> "roger" and "73" both.
>>
>> --
>>
>> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
>> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
>> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
>> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do it
> with continous wave.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised. You
want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops to be

lids.

Alun, N3KIP

3477. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 16:47:56 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1afec6178f34d7e79896f3@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 91470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net says...

> Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
> Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
> 7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
> constantly yammering raffles.

<snippety>

I disagree. I've been (and continue to go) to several hamfests a
year. Although I have noticed some of the degradation you describe, each
hamfest/swap seems to differ depending on the area it happens in.

Examples: The two major Bay Area (California) swap meets, those
put on monthly by LARK and ASVARO, generally have a high content of
computer hardware and associated items. Granted, much of it is "trashed
out," but there are still Good Things to be found if one is sharp-eyed,
observant, and a good haggler.

Going further north and west: Once you get into Oregon and
Washington, the character of the ham swaps changes drastically, becoming
much more radio and test equipment oriented. I bought both of my service
monitors from vendors at local (to me -- Puget Sound region) swaps, and
I continue, every year, to see lots of assorted radios, both commercial
and made-for-amateur, and some good deals in test gear IN ADDITION TO
the assortments of computer and other goodies.

Anyway... With that said, let's move on to your poll.

> So here's a poll ----
>
> Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
> itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
> connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
> retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
> non-Amateur Radio items.

<snippety>

> ___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> describe too.

This one is my response. I've also seen cases where a couple of
the ham swaps have been "contaminated" by people selling utterly
unrelated-to-any-electronics-field items, such as stuffed animals and

(God help us) Mary Kay cosmetics. The best possible way to handle such intrusions is to, simply, vote with your wallet and IGNORE THEM. If such sellers fail to make money from a given venue, they will no longer set up at it.

I would add that, at least once a year, I make a scrounge run back to the Bay Area (I grew up there). I never fail to come back with less than 100 or so pounds of useful goodies as a result.

SHAMELESS PLUG ALERT! I have listings on my web site for some hamfests, and many of the electronic surplus places, on my web site. Start with the page:

http://www.bluefeathertech.com/technoid/swapindex.html

...And work forward from there.

Keep the peace(es).

--
Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped with surreal ports?"

3478. Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 16:55:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cK9lc.2825$Hs1.2276@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91471

The FCC has given all citizens a great tool, in the form of the ECFS, for commenting on matters under its purview, including matters related to the Amateur Radio Service.

I thank the Commission for providing that forum for commentary by all citizens.

Unfortunately, at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the judge of what is appropriate and inappropriate for other citizens to say to the Commission.

This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,

Here is a small sample of his attempts to choose for the FCC which citizen comments are not appropriate.

"I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected"

"I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."

"Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."

"Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."

Sorry, Mr. Citizen, but the FCC doesn't need you to determine which comments are appropriate. ALL CITIZENS may comment.

Sunuvagun, where have I heard that before?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3479. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 17:14:18 UTC
From: John Smith <pani@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c73a8e$hfbqp$1@ID-225206.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 91445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What is the "Bandwidth" of the "stuff" you are trying to measure?
You could set the analyzer to that or a little less, and then use relative measurements.
You may need more gear if you are trying to measure a very low noise wideband preamp.
Depends on what you are trying to measure.
Bigger bandwidth=higher noise floor, simply kTB. and it is a ratio if you change kTB1/kTB2= B1/B2 (10 log it of course)

If you have the analyzer on, then connect the gizmo without signal and the noise floor rises up 10 dB or more, you could probably ignore calculating what the SA contributes. just add signal and it should be 6 dB or more above noise floor established by your gizmo.

If not, then It is possible to calculate almost exactly the noise floor on the analyzer to verify what is displayed is good, but you need a number or two from the MFGR of the analyzer, which takes into account the filter shape of the analyzer. (0.8 ot 1.6 something like that)

SAs are cool! What type do you have, makes a big difference, (depending on what you are trying to measure) Some will not do it.

"Bill B." <n1sni@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com...
> Hello,
> I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
> I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
> an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the
> puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
> noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
> same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I
> ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
> reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
> size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
> the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
> would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
> more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
> 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
> further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that
> requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
> to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
>
> Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
>

> Thank you! Thank you!
>
> Bill B. - N1SNI

3480. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 17:59:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5Galc.2883$Hs1.1976@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote

> I've also seen cases where a couple of the ham
> swaps have been "contaminated" by people selling
> utterly unrelated-to-any-electronics-field items,
> such as stuffed animals and (God help us) Mary
> Kay cosmetics.

There was a story many years ago. A buyer for a major cigarette distributor was in North Carolina buying several box car loads of Raleighs. The fellow representing Raleighs shook the buyer's hand and said, "You won't be sorry. Our formula now calls for 5% tobacco mixed with 95% horseshit."

The buyer looked surprised.

"Heck, give me six more box car loads. I never knew there was any tobacco in the damn things."

That is just about where the hamfests around here are. We're at 5% and barely holding. Ham radio related stuff has been diluted to the point that it is no longer visible without the use of long range optics.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3481. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 19:30:07 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3%blc.11395$Ia6.1459038@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Unlikely. It is more likely a transformer would explode before you would see any home damage."

I disagree with this statement for the following reason. The flavor of BPL that allows the outlets in your home to be the internet connection, through the BPL modem, requires that the step down transformer from the 4 KV to 13.8KV lines be BYPASSED, primary to secondary, with capacitors to let the HF BPL signal around it. Guess what this will do. This implementation of BPL will let HF noise along with the BPL signal on the lines into your home, including all that lightening energy. This may actually help protect the transformer while the energy is directed into your home! Not all BPL equipment companies are going this way though.

Chuck...K1KW

3482. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 19:35:31 UTC
From: Hammer-tyme <hammer@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <109aj2cgotde5f6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

K&#65533;HB, I have to agree with you that most "hamfests" in my area (upper Midwest) are more like "junkfests" or "fleamarkets" these days and I don't attend as often as I used to. It would be nice if they were to advertise these as such so at least you would know what to expect. I have not seen any major equipment dealers at any of the local fests, however, if you need parts or batteries or the like they are good for that. So, I would have to say my answer to your poll is A.

Hammertyme

3483. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 20:29:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <QSclc.3346$af7.1006@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91474

Hello, Hans

Well, I still have my novice license (issued in 1962). I got out of amateur radio (licensed then as N2JH) around 1981. Fortunately, when I decided to get back into amateur radio, I didn't wait for all of the giveaways (5 word per minute code or codeless tech license). Of course, some will still wait for the code to go away (and codeless techs be promoted to 1 star general). At my age, I couldn't afford to wait; besides, 20 words per minute isn't all the difficult - even after not hearing Morse since 1969 (with the sole exception of the movie "Fantastic Voyage"). ;)

BTW, the written exams aren't exactly "difficult", given that an 8 year old can pass 'em :))

Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses in boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:iPZkc.2401$Hs1.1375@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Would the FCC have a record of such?
> >
>
> Yes, buried in some dusty paper archive in a low humidity cave in Resume
> Speed, Alabama. They won't go look.
>
> But there's a commercial firm licensed to go into the catacomb and
> search, which they'll be happy to do for a modest fee of about $122.85
> per half-hour, results not guaranteed.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.675 / Virus Database: 437 - Release Date: 5/2/04

3484. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 20:35:10 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <2Yclc.3347$Oi7.9@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91475

Hans,

They used to do something like that some decades ago. Free elections. You elect whomever you want. Of course, there was only one person to vote for. They also decided what was appropriate to say.

The U.S.S.R. fell apart a few decades ago, but that was one place that tried that - and failed. ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:cK9lc.2825$Hs1.2276@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> The FCC has given all citizens a great tool, in the form of the ECFS,
> for commenting on matters under its purview, including matters related
> to the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> I thank the Commission for providing that forum for commentary by all
> citizens.
>
> Unfortunately, at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
> judge of what is appropriate and inappropriate for other citizens to say
> to the Commission.
>
> This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other
> citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,
>
> Here is a small sample of his attempts to choose for the FCC which
> citizen comments are not appropriate.
>
> "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected"
>
> "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
>
> "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
>
> "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."
>
> Sorry, Mr. Citizen, but the FCC doesn't need you to determine which
> comments are appropriate. ALL CITIZENS may comment.
>
> Sunuvagun, where have I heard that before?
>
> With all kind wishes,

>
> de Hans, K0HB

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.675 / Virus Database: 437 - Release Date: 5/2/04

3485. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 20:40:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91476

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >>
> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
> >> Day - but only one 'phone:
> >>
> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
> >> you'll hear:
> >>
> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
> >> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
> >> alfa ...."
> >>
> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
> >>
> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> >> "roger" and "73" both.
> >>
> >> --
> >>
> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
> >> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
> >> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
> >> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do it
> > with continous wave.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >

>
> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised. You
> want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops to be
> lids.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is better
than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?

Dan/W4NTI

3486. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 20:43:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PP6dnR7Xno7CwAjdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91477
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

At Hamfests I have gone to, the most obese and smelly people have been
those selling the computer junk.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Dave wrote:
> D has my vote!
>
> "Hamfest Guy" <fruits@hamfestfruits.org> wrote in message
> news:c72ol5aao0@pita.alt.net...
>
>>Hans,
>>
>>I took the liberty of adding a fourth category (D).
>>
>>
>>Hamfest Guy
>>
>>
>>
>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
>>>Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
>>>7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
>>>constantly yammering raffles.
>>>
>>>So here's a poll ----
>>>
>>>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>>>itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>>>connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>>>retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
>>>non-Amateur Radio items.
>>>
>>>___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
>>>back to go to one like this.
>>>
>>>___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
>>>describe too.
>>>
>>>___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
>>>DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you

>>>describe.
>>>
>>
>>
>> ____ D. I would attend hamfests if there was a contest to select the
>>guy with the greatest body odor, most obese, & stupidest looking
>>clothing & largest call sign badge.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>Vote for one (and only one) choice.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

3487. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 20:49:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ntednZPJB8lAwwjdRVn-jg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Paul_Morphy wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:PMXkc.2307$Hs1.1975@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
>>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>>itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>>connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>>retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
>>non-Amateur Radio items.
>
>
> X B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
> describe too.
>
> Trouble is, you'd be driving two hours each way to spend one minute at the
> hamfest. I think eBay has been the kiss of death for hamfests.

Ebay has hurt hamfests recently for sure. Presumably this will be eased when the buyers come to their senses, as the sellers are happy to sell items for more than what they cost new. The bubble will eventually burst, or we will have proven that inbreeding is more widespread than we thought.

In the meantime, buy new! It's often cheaper than ebay, and you get a warrantee!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3488. Re: PRIVATE Voyeur Survivor Shots (real4.jpg) 2874

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 21:31:23 UTC
From: abuse@localhost.net
Message-ID: <hfScnckhK7I29Qjd38DK-g@speakeasy.net>
Source record: 91686
Cross-posted to: rec.music.reggae,rec.org.mensa,rec.org.sca,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In a large list of newsgroups, Ras Claat <bumboclaat_3@hotmail.com>
whined:

RC> I F***IN' HATE SPAMMERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

and then proceeded to inflict upon the rest of us a COMPLETE REPEAT of
the very same spam. Those of us who had filtered out the original spam
were treated to it by his kind, generous, thoughtful, and oh-so-relevant
reply.

Rassie-baby, you need to go get two things. First is a grip, and
second but much more important is a clue.

3489. Re: PRIVATE Voyeur Survivor Shots (real4.jpg) 2874

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 21:34:39 UTC
From: abuse@localhost.net
Message-ID: <hfScncghK7Ly9Ajd38DK-g@speakeasy.net>
Source record: 91687
Cross-posted to: rec.music.reggae,rec.org.mensa,rec.org.sca,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In a huge list of newsgroups, NC Tim <tbrooks7_nospam_@mindspring.com>
pintificated (that's like pontificating after a few too many pints):

NT> what gets me is that the spam must be somewhat effective or people
NT> wouldn't continue to do it. i guess if .0001 percent respond, it is
NT> worthwhile. which sucks for the rest of us.

Note that they only have to do about a third as much spamming as they
might have to, to get a given level of response, so long as idiots like
you and Ras are willing to repeat their spam for them.

Your homework is to go find the RFCs on how to post to Usenet, read
them, sleep with them under your pillow, and OBEY THEM.

NT> "Ras Claat" <bumboclaat_3@hotmail.com> wrote in message
NT> news:c6r5q3$fb19t$1@ID-231387.news.uni-berlin.de...
>> I F***IN' HATE SPAMMERS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>>
>>
>> <niznqp@cnet.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
>> news:c6megp$4u4$290@news.loxinfo.co.th...
[spam FINALLY snipped]

3490. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 21:57:57 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405021357.2cb417ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91479
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<ZaYkc.2334$Hs1.1582@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Lloyd" <lloyd@themanlloyds.net> wrote
>
> > Do you think you can control yourself and limit
> > your nonesense to one ng at a time?
>
> Not a chance.. Deal with it.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> K0HB
>
> PS: WTF is "nonesense"? I am patient with stupidity but not with those
> who are proud of it as you are. Please QSY to
> http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy and enjoy yourself.

Hans, you really have been stirring it up lately. All I can do is get
the usual reactions from the usual suspects. Not at all rewarding.

bb

3491. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 22:42:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040502184207.21796.00000663@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91480

K0HB writes:

>Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less
>Amateur Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled
>trashed out computers, 7-generation-old software, lockbuster-reject >video
tapes, and constantly yammering raffles.

I haven't been to a hamfest in more than 5 years, Hans, so I'll have to take your word for it.

From the late 1970s until the mid-1990s I was pretty much a regular at the 'fests within about 2 hours of my QTH. Would go as far as 3 hours for a biggie like Gaithersburg or Timonium.

I intend to go to a few local ones this summer, mostly to sell.

My main reason for nonattendance was that it became increasingly difficult to get that much free time in one block.

Another major reason was the want ad section of Electric Radio, and then the internet. Not just eBay, but the newsgroups and particularly the specialized email reflectors. Rather than haul lots of stuff to a fest and be at the mercy of the weather and attendance, I can trade, buy and sell online whenever time permits. Including answering other hams' "WTB" postings.

But it lacks the personal touch.

From my recollections, the trends you mention were already in motion more than 5 years ago. Some 'fests went so far as to explicitly forbid the sale or display of "adult" merchandise.

>So here's a poll ----
>
>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited >sales of
non-Amateur Radio items.
>
>___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd >come back
to go to one like this.
>
>_X_ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
>describe too.
>
>___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
>DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you

>describe.
>
>Vote for one (and only one) choice.

Definitely B.

And now a question for you, Hans:

Local hams with more tenure than me say that 40-50+ years ago hamfests were more of a social event and much less of a flea market. Hams would congregate by activity (traffic men, DXers, VHF/UHF, mobileers, etc.) and the tailgating was small and informal. The main draws were the socializing and the forums on various topics. They say that only since about the 1970s has the flea market aspect become dominant.

Any comments?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3492. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 23:11:47 UTC
From: Keith KC8TCQ <callsign@qrz>
Message-ID: <ihva90dokjq1smifugrukpv9sel0gjvdu7@4ax.com>
Source record: 91481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sun, 02 May 2004 01:02:39 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>Hamfests in recent years seem to have become less and less Amateur
>Radio, and more and more showcases for crippled trashed out computers,
>7-generation-old software, Blockbuster-reject video tapes, and
>constantly yammering raffles.
>
>So here's a poll ----
>
>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>itself to Amateur Radio material (new/used rigs, raw components,
>connectors, antennas, Amateur Radio software, radio clubs, radio
>retailers, VE sessions, ham radio forums, etc.) and prohibited sales of
>non-Amateur Radio items.

B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you describe
too.

I have friends who have gotten interested in amateur radio from going
with me to hamfests because they were into computers.

One of the more amusing stories I have heard regarding hamfests. it is
rumored to have happened at the Fulton County Hamfest in Wauseon Ohio.
It seems a lady saw the sign, pulledin and payed the entrance fee,
then asked, "whats with all the junk I see people selling, I'm hungry
where is the ham".

73 de Keith

3493. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 23:30:45 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <109b15abaimtc2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91482

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:QSclc.3346$af7.1006@news02.roc.ny...
> Hello, Hans
>
> Well, I still have my novice license (issued in 1962). I got out of
amateur
> radio (licensed then as N2JH) around 1981. Fortunately, when I decided to
> get back into amateur radio, I didn't wait for all of the giveaways (5
word
> per minute code or codeless tech license). Of course, some will still
wait
> for the code to go away (and codeless techs be promoted to 1 star
general).
> At my age, I couldn't afford to wait; besides, 20 words per minute isn't
all
> the difficult - even after not hearing Morse since 1969 (with the sole
> exception of the movie "Fantastic Voyage"). ;)
>
> BTW, the written exams aren't exactly "difficult", given that an 8 year
old
> can pass 'em :))
>
> Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses
in
> boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
>
>

The ACLU and other groups known by acronyms would never go for that. People would be out something, they'd have to pay money to get them then. Maybe just mail them out to everybody unsolicited.

3494. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-02 23:35:47 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <109b1ej7t6q18f8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91441

[No readable article body recovered]

3495. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 00:13:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405021613.6f33deb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91483

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >>
> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
> >> Day - but only one 'phone:
> >>
> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
> >> you'll hear:
> >>
> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
> >> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
> >> alfa ...."
> >>
> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
> >>
> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> >> "roger" and "73" both.
> >>
> >> --
> >>
> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
> >> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
> >> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
> >> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do it
> > with continous wave.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
```

>
> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised. You
> want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops to be
> lids.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

Alun, that come out with this bozo's 1st post about 2 years ago.
About the same time he buddy'd up with Bruce.

3496. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 00:15:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405021615.4c5f1175@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91484

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<408FAB4C.9070905@psu.edu>...
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
> > > news:86n04xuh9s.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> > >
> > >>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > >>Hash: SHA1
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>>>>>"Mike" == Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> > >>>>>>
> > >>Mike> With the likely demise of Morse code testing, is there any
> > >>Mike> reason to have contests give double the points for Morse code
> > >>Mike> contacts?
> > >>
> > >>Jack> How is the presence or absence of Morse code testing related to
> > >>Jack> the point multiplier for Morse code contacts? They're
> > >>Jack> orthogonal, as far as I can tell.
> > >>
> > >>Mike> I was always told that the increased points offered was an
> > >>Mike> encouragement to work CW.
> > >>
> > >>That doesn't really answer the question. A Technician can send CW on
> > >>certain HF bands, even without a higher-class license-holder present.
> > >>A ham with any other license can work phone contacts. Therefore,
> > >>whether or not an amateur has passed a Morse code test has nothing to
> > >>do with woether or not they can use Morse code. Even if the
> > >>multiplier is to provide encouragement to use Morse code, it still
> > >>doesn't have anything to do with whether or not hams are tested.
> >
> That's certainly true. But how many non-code-tested hams do you think
> are actually making CW contacts of Field Day?

TAFKARJ: "CW exams are a barrier to CW use."

3497. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:22:08 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040502212208.17474.00000684@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 91485

From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Ebay has hurt hamfests recently for sure.

Someone already mentioned that he likes to converse with fellow hams. Ebay cannot replace the Hamfest experience.

3498. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:25:12 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040502212512.17474.00000685@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 91486

>At Hamfests I have gone to, the most obese and smelly people have been
>those selling the computer junk.
> - Mike KB3EIA -

No, they must be hams.

I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003). All hams, a high percentage which were overweight.

3499. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:30:44 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040502213044.17474.00000686@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 91487

>From: Dr. Anton T. Squeegee
>This one is my response. I've also seen cases where a couple of
>the ham swaps have been "contaminated" by people selling utterly
>unrelated-to-any-electronics-field items

I disagree.

Sometimes non-electronics items are offered at a significant discount. I have purchase mostly electronics items. I also purchased some non-electronics items. If I can get a good deal on these other items, why not?

As long as most of the items are radio and electronics related, whats the harm? Also, the non-electronics items contribute to the whole "flea-market" environment.

3500. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:34:06 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040502213406.17474.00000687@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 91488

From: "Kï¿½HB"

>Would you travel 2-hours to support a hamfest which strictly limited
>itself to Amateur Radio material

No, 2 hours is too far.

>___ A. I quit going to hamfests for the reasons you state, but I'd come
>back to go to one like this.

The current hamfest are fine.

>___ B. I like the current hamfests, but I'd support one like you
>describe too.

Agree.

>___ C. I go to hamfests for all the clapped out computers and X-rated
>DVD;s and I ignore the radio stuff, so I wouldn't support what you
>describe.

Disagree. I go mainly for radio stuff. My many radio related purchases at
hamfests support this claim.

3501. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:38:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DYGdnYX0DMcsPwjdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91489

Lumushahs wrote:
>>At Hamfests I have gone to, the most obese and smelly people have been
>>those selling the computer junk.
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> No, they must be hams.
>
> I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003). All hams, a high percentage
> which were overweight.

Hi Vipul. So you extrapolate that to hams as a whole?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3502. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 01:40:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DYGdnYT0DMeNPgjdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91490

Lumushahs wrote:

> From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>
>>Ebay has hurt hamfests recently for sure.
>
>
> Someone already mentioned that he likes to converse with fellow hams. Ebay
> cannot replace the Hamfest experience.

I certainly agree there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3503. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 02:04:31 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040502220431.13276.00000771@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 91491

>> I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003). All hams, a high
>percentage
>> which were overweight.
>
> Hi Vipul. So you extrapolate that to hams as a whole?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I am not "extrpolating" from just one experience. I have been to <many>
hamfests, ham radio meetings, field day setups, etc. I have noticed that about
most hams.

3504. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 03:44:53 UTC
From: "Bill B." <n1sniNOSPAM@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mPKdnbkxMsJclgjdRVn-sQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 91446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank you so much for all your help (Crazy George, Roy, Tom, John)!! Per Crazy George's suggestion, I am picking up some books tomorrow at Borders <grin>. However, the posts that I received were very helpful. Let me explain a little more what I am trying to do, just to see if I am even close to the right track. We have a Microwave link that operates at 5 GHz... specifically one sides transmits between 5.25-5.25GHz and receives at 5.725-5.825 GHz. The product we are using for this link is a Stratum 100 (http://www.commputercations.com/products/wsstratum.htm - The only datasheet I could find). This link went down hard a few days ago, so we switched polarization (From Horizontal to Vertical). Things got much better, but we still were taking corrupt packets. So, we went out there with an Advantest R3465 SA (http://www.ntecusa.com/graphics/pdf/WE106.pdf), an Omni antenna, and 10 degree directional dish, with the hopes to (1) look at the "same" noise floor that the Stratum sees and (2), try to track down any single direction (And hopefully antenna) that is causing interference. Now, I thought I knew this stuff <grin>, at least enough to retrieve somewhat accurate results. Boy was I wrong! I scanned the receiving frequencies using the following settings:

Start Freq: 5.725GHz
End Freq: 5.825GHz
Span: 100MHz
RBW: 5 MHz
VBW: 1 MHz
Sweep Time: 50ms
ATT: 10dB
REF: 0.0dBm (10dB/)

Knowing what I know now, I would have kept the RBW value MUCH lower (Like 10kHz). But what I saw was a "noise floor" - Which I was assuming to be (I believe) the Thermal noise floor which I now know to be the Filter Noise Floor, peaking out at about -64dBm. Now our receive strength when the radio is on is -65dB... So I figured "Hey, there is our problem... the receiver in the Stratum unit is seeing the noise floor so loud that it can hardly see the actual signal". What makes this even more believable is that these readings were taken in the middle of Boston on the 26th floor roof. So I packed up and went home... Then I tried the same test at my fairly isolated house... and got the same results!

Now I know there is at least one answer to how to avoid this embarrassing situation in the future... read a book (Which I will start tomorrow)... however, I really would like to get this link up in short order and need to know these numbers. Am I correct in saying that I need to (1) contact the manufacture of the Stratum unit, and find out what their Bandwidth filter

looks like and then (2), Set my RBW to the same or lower setting as their radio and do the test again?

If the above two steps are correct than great... I can do that... but I really would like to make use of the measurements I already took if possible.

Again, I really appreciate the comments from before. While I don't yet understand all of it, these really point me in the right direction, and I will keep reading/researching until it all comes together.

Thank you,
Bill B. - N1SNI

"John Smith" <pani@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c73a8e$hfbqp$1@ID-225206.news.uni-berlin.de...
> What is the "Bandwidth" of the "stuff" you are trying to measure?
> You could set the analyzer to that or a little less, and then use relative
> measurements.
> You may need more gear if you are trying to measure a very low noise
> wideband preamp.
> Depends on what you are trying to measure.
> Bigger bandwidth=higher noise floor, simply kTB. and it is a ratio if you
> change kTB1/kTB2= B1/B2 (10 log it of course)
>
> If you have the analyzer on, then connect the gizmo without signal and the
> noise floor rises up 10 dB or more, you could probably ignore calculating
> what the SA contributes. just add signal and it should be 6 dB or more
above
> noise floor established by your gizmo.
>
> If not, then It is possible to calculate almost exactly the noise floor
on
> the analyzer to verify what is displayed is good, but you need a number or
> two from the MFGR of the analyzer, which takes into account the filter
shape
> of the analyzer. (0.8 ot 1.6 something like that)
>
> SAs are cool! What type do you have, makes a big difference, (depending on
> what you are trying to measure) Some will not do it.
>
>
> "Bill B." <n1sni@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com...
> > Hello,
> > I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
> > I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
> > an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the
> > puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
> > noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
> > same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I

> > ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
> > reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
> > size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
> > the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
> > would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
> > more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
> > 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
> > further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that
> > requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
> > to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
> >
> > Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
> >
> > Thank you! Thank you!
> >
> > Bill B. - N1SNI
>
>

3505. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 04:00:48 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91492

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on
>> >> Field Day - but only one 'phone:
>> >>
>> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That
>> >> is, you'll hear:
>> >>
>> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your
>> >> One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my
>> >> three alfa ...."
>> >>
>> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
>> >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>> >>
>> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
>> >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
>> >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job
>> >> of "roger" and "73" both.
>> >>
>> >> --
>> >>
>> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part
>> >> of the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial
>> >> number, class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time
>> >> which you don't have to send but which are part of the required
>> >> logging.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do
>> > it with continous wave.

>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised.
>> You want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops
>> to be lids.
>>
>> Alun, N3KIP
>
> No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is
> better than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
You are unbeleivable.

1) That ain't what you said; and

2) Even if it were it would be an indefensible position.

If we define a lid as being a bad operator, you are saying that anyone who thinks that one mode is better than another is a bad operator (unless they say that your preferred mode is better). I have never heard such idiotic cr*p in my entire life.

My only reason for preferring phone is that I like to use radio to talk. If you prefer to make bleeping noises instead I could't care less. If you were into SSTV, or PSK31 or what-have-you I would say that was fine too. On the whole, I would say that comparisons of bandwidth, throughput, signal-to-noise etc were only valid within one type of information, whether it is phone, or data or video, or whatever.

You said, and I quote "phone ops are lids" and then, partially recanting "not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is better than CW". Well, I am a phone op and I think that phone is not surprisingly better at carrying voice information than CW is.

You know what, though, you are the lid.

Alun, N3KIP

3506. early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 09:39:34 UTC
From: griffph@aol.com
Message-ID: <d698d3e7.0405030139.4cdbd0ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91493

hi there everyone

I'm currently reading a book called "Code" by Charles Petzold which is essentially a history and overview of computer technology, quite entertainingly told. I've just read the section on telegraphs and relays and am confused by something he has written.

He explains the basic principle of the telegraph, and goes on to show with some simple Ohm's Law calculations that you can't extend the length of telegraph wires indefinitely due to the loop resistance etc., hence the need for the invention of the relay.

However, I am a bit puzzled by his summing-up quote for this chapter: "Regardless of the thickness of the wires and the high levels of voltage, telegraph wires simply couldn't be continued indefinitely". Now I would have thought the restriction was *exactly* due to the limitations on wire thickness and voltage (ie the practical problems with manufacturing telegraph cables and voltaic cells at that time). Or am I doing Mr.Petzold an injustice, when perhaps there was some other limiting factor ?
I have read somewhere that there were problems with insulation for very long cables, is this perhaps something to do with it ?

Any thoughts you may have are welcomed,

best rgds

griffph

3507. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 10:05:42 UTC
From: Scott <acepilot@bloomer.net>
Message-ID: <hIplc.1376$KG2.2391@reggie.win.bright.net>
Source record: 91447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I assume these unit are the unlicensed variety and use spread spectrum technology (frequency hopping)? If interference is the cause, it may be hard to find since you probably don't know the discreet frequencies used in the hops. If I am understanding you correctly, you are looking for the ambient level of noise coming down your coax to the radio? I know just enough to be dangerous as far as spectrum analyzers go. We just plug the coax into the analyzer and see where the "fuzz" is located at the bottom of the display, i.e. -108 dbm.

I am not familiar with the radio you are using, but if it like the ones we use, can you swap frequency bands such as Band A or Band B? We have some Lynx and Tsunami 2.4 GHz T1 radios where the back filter unit comes off and we invert it to select another band of frequencies. Might be worth a shot if you can do it (to both ends of course!)...

Good luck! Let us all know what you find!!

Scott
N0EDV

Bill B. wrote:
> Thank you so much for all your help (Crazy George, Roy, Tom, John)!! Per
> Crazy George's suggestion, I am picking up some books tomorrow at Borders
> <grin>. However, the posts that I received were very helpful. Let me explain
> a little more what I am trying to do, just to see if I am even close to the
> right track. We have a Microwave link that operates at 5 GHz... specifically
> one sides transmits between 5.25-5.25GHz and receives at 5.725-5.825 GHz.
> The product we are using for this link is a Stratum 100 (
> http://www.commputercations.com/products/wsstratum.htm - The only datasheet
> I could find). This link went down hard a few days ago, so we switched
> polarization (From Horizontal to Vertical). Things got much better, but we
> still were taking corrupt packets. So, we went out there with an Advantest
> R3465 SA (http://www.ntecusa.com/graphics/pdf/WE106.pdf), an Omni antenna,
> and 10 degree directional dish, with the hopes to (1) look at the "same"
> noise floor that the Stratum sees and (2), try to track down any single
> direction (And hopefully antenna) that is causing interference. Now, I
> thought I knew this stuff <grin>, at least enough to retrieve somewhat
> accurate results. Boy was I wrong! I scanned the receiving frequencies using
> the following settings:
>
> Start Freq: 5.725GHz
> End Freq: 5.825GHz
> Span: 100MHz
> RBW: 5 MHz

> VBW: 1 MHz
> Sweep Time: 50ms
> ATT: 10dB
> REF: 0.0dBm (10dB/)
>
> Knowing what I know now, I would have kept the RBW value MUCH lower (Like
> 10kHz). But what I saw was a "noise floor" - Which I was assuming to be (I
> believe) the Thermal noise floor which I now know to be the Filter Noise
> Floor, peaking out at about -64dBm. Now our receive strength when the radio
> is on is -65dB... So I figured "Hey, there is our problem... the receiver in
> the Stratum unit is seeing the noise floor so loud that it can hardly see
> the actual signal". What makes this even more believable is that these
> readings were taken in the middle of Boston on the 26th floor roof. So I
> packed up and went home... Then I tried the same test at my fairly isolated
> house... and got the same results!
>
> Now I know there is at least one answer to how to avoid this embarrassing
> situation in the future... read a book (Which I will start tomorrow)...
> however, I really would like to get this link up in short order and need to
> know these numbers. Am I correct in saying that I need to (1) contact the
> manufacture of the Stratum unit, and find out what their Bandwidth filter
> looks like and then (2), Set my RBW to the same or lower setting as their
> radio and do the test again?
>
> If the above two steps are correct than great... I can do that... but I
> really would like to make use of the measurements I already took if
> possible.
>
> Again, I really appreciate the comments from before. While I don't yet
> understand all of it, these really point me in the right direction, and I
> will keep reading/researching until it all comes together.
>
> Thank you,
> Bill B. - N1SNI
>
> "John Smith" <pani@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c73a8e$hfbqp$1@ID-225206.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>>What is the "Bandwidth" of the "stuff" you are trying to measure?
>>You could set the analyzer to that or a little less, and then use relative
>>measurements.
>>You may need more gear if you are trying to measure a very low noise
>>wideband preamp.
>>Depends on what you are trying to measure.
>>Bigger bandwidth=higher noise floor, simply kTB. and it is a ratio if you
>>change kTB1/kTB2= B1/B2 (10 log it of course)
>>
>>If you have the analyzer on, then connect the gizmo without signal and the
>>noise floor rises up 10 dB or more, you could probably ignore calculating
>>what the SA contributes. just add signal and it should be 6 dB or more

>
> above
>
>>noise floor established by your gizmo.
>>
>>If not, then It is possible to calculate almost exactly the noise floor
>
> on
>
>>the analyzer to verify what is displayed is good, but you need a number or
>>two from the MFGR of the analyzer, which takes into account the filter
>
> shape
>
>>of the analyzer. (0.8 ot 1.6 something like that)
>>
>>SAs are cool! What type do you have, makes a big difference, (depending on
>>what you are trying to measure) Some will not do it.
>>
>>
>>"Bill B." <n1sni@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>news:a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>Hello,
>>>I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
>>>I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
>>>an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the
>>>puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
>>>noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
>>>same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I
>>>ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
>>>reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
>>>size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
>>>the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
>>>would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
>>>more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
>>>1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
>>>further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that
>>>requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
>>>to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
>>>
>>>Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
>>>
>>>Thank you! Thank you!
>>>
>>>Bill B. - N1SNI
>>
>>
>
>

3508. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 12:02:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405030402.1368beb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91494

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<cK9lc.2825$Hs1.2276@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> The FCC has given all citizens a great tool, in the form of the ECFS,
> for commenting on matters under its purview, including matters related
> to the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> I thank the Commission for providing that forum for commentary by all
> citizens.
>
> Unfortunately, at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
> judge of what is appropriate and inappropriate for other citizens to say
> to the Commission.

Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
callsign?
>
> This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other
> citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,
>
> Here is a small sample of his attempts to choose for the FCC which
> citizen comments are not appropriate.
>
> "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected"
>
> "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."

That's just his opinion.
>
> "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
>
> "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."

Found by whom?
>
> Sorry, Mr. Citizen, but the FCC doesn't need you to determine which
> comments are appropriate. ALL CITIZENS may comment.

Of course. In fact, noncitizens may comment, I think. Not only that,
but organizations and business concerns may comment as well as
individuals.

The problem is that any system which is as free and open as ECFS is
bound to attract at least a few folks who are not serious about the
subjects being discussed. And it will also attract all sorts of folks
who have an "agenda" that isn't immediately apparent.

Hopefully those at FCC who read the comments will recognize the nature
and spirit of such remarks.
>
> Sunuvagun, where have I heard that before?

But who is it that you refer to, Hans?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3509. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 12:49:33 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <xdrlc.103246$Gd3.25278182@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91495

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405030402.1368beb6@posting.google.com...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<cK9lc.2825$Hs1.2276@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > The FCC has given all citizens a great tool, in the form of the ECFS,
> > for commenting on matters under its purview, including matters related
> > to the Amateur Radio Service.
> >
> > I thank the Commission for providing that forum for commentary by all
> > citizens.
> >
> > Unfortunately, at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
> > judge of what is appropriate and inappropriate for other citizens to say
> > to the Commission.
>
> Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
> callsign?
> >
> > This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other
> > citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,
> >
> > Here is a small sample of his attempts to choose for the FCC which
> > citizen comments are not appropriate.
> >
> > "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected"
> >
> > "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
>
> That's just his opinion.
> >
> > "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
> >
> > "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."
>
> Found by whom?
> >
> > Sorry, Mr. Citizen, but the FCC doesn't need you to determine which
> > comments are appropriate. ALL CITIZENS may comment.
>
> Of course. In fact, noncitizens may comment, I think. Not only that,
> but organizations and business concerns may comment as well as
> individuals.
>

> The problem is that any system which is as free and open as ECFS is
> bound to attract at least a few folks who are not serious about the
> subjects being discussed. And it will also attract all sorts of folks
> who have an "agenda" that isn't immediately apparent.
>
> Hopefully those at FCC who read the comments will recognize the nature
> and spirit of such remarks.
> >
> > Sunuvagun, where have I heard that before?
>
>
>
> But who is it that you refer to, Hans?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I noticed the same practice on some of the other petitiions. The FCC marks them as duplicates, not sure if they're given equal (or any) consideration.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3510. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 13:21:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QHrlc.3775$Hs1.2148@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91496

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
> callsign?
>

The name of the citizen is not important (and I didn't say it was a
"he"). No amateur radio callsign was evident in any of the persons
comments (dozens of different submissions on several recent RM's)
although the person did claim learning Morse code to the speed of 8WPM.

> "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as
misdirected"
>
> "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
>
> "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
>
> "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."

I just thought it presumptous for that to tell the FCC that other
citizens comments were innapropriate.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3511. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 13:30:22 UTC
From: Dave <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <LJCdnVxarqzr1AvdRVn-uQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 91497

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:QHrlc.3775$Hs1.2148@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> >
> > Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
> > callsign?
> >
>
> The name of the citizen is not important (and I didn't say it was a
> "he"). No amateur radio callsign was evident in any of the persons
> comments (dozens of different submissions on several recent RM's)
> although the person did claim learning Morse code to the speed of 8WPM.
>
> > "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as
> misdirected"
> >
> > "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
> >
> > "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
> >
> > "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."
>
> I just thought it presumptous for that to tell the FCC that other
> citizens comments were innapropriate.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
isn't it just as bad that you come in here and throw dirt at an unnamed
citizen for the wording of their comments? and not even knowing if they
read here to defend themselves?? or do you know that they read this forum?

3512. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 13:49:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <U5slc.3821$Hs1.419@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91498

"Dave" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote

> isn't it just as bad that you come in here and throw dirt at
> an unnamed citizen for the wording of their comments?

I specifically avoided naming the individual so as not to disparge
anyones good name in a public forum.

And unlike you, I have the balls to identify myself, not take anonymous
potshots from behind noone@nowhere.

(Or perhaps you really ARE noone worth paying attention to.) >>PLONK<<

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3513. Re: early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 14:12:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Tqslc.3830$Hs1.3291@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91499

"Griff" <griffph@aol.com> wrote

>
> However, I am a bit puzzled by his summing-up quote for this chapter:
> "Regardless of the thickness of the wires and the high levels of
> voltage, telegraph wires simply couldn't be continued indefinitely".
> Now I would have thought the restriction was *exactly* due to the
> limitations on wire thickness and voltage (ie the practical problems
> with manufacturing telegraph cables and voltaic cells at that time).
> Or am I doing Mr.Petzold an injustice, when perhaps there was some
> other limiting factor ?

Probably due to the cumulative C and L of a long wire eventually shaping
the waveform so that rise and fall profiles are smeared.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3514. Re: early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 15:20:16 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DE732811A25elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91500

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:Tqslc.3830$Hs1.3291 @newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Griff" <griffph@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> However, I am a bit puzzled by his summing-up quote for this chapter:
>> "Regardless of the thickness of the wires and the high levels of
>> voltage, telegraph wires simply couldn't be continued indefinitely".
>> Now I would have thought the restriction was *exactly* due to the
>> limitations on wire thickness and voltage (ie the practical problems
>> with manufacturing telegraph cables and voltaic cells at that time).
>> Or am I doing Mr.Petzold an injustice, when perhaps there was some
>> other limiting factor ?
>
> Probably due to the cumulative C and L of a long wire eventually shaping
> the waveform so that rise and fall profiles are smeared.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

I beleive they used to add inductors to telegraph wires at intervals before
they had repeaters. This seems counter-intuitive to me, as I would have
thought the L was more of a problem than the C. Does anyone know the
correct explanation?

Alun, N3KIP
```

3515. Re: early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 15:23:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Cttlc.4018$Hs1.682@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91551

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> I beleive they used to add inductors to telegraph wires at intervals
before
> they had repeaters. This seems counter-intuitive to me, as I would
have
> thought the L was more of a problem than the C. Does anyone know the
> correct explanation?

Makes perfect sense to me. A parallel L would cancel the distributed C.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3516. Re: early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 16:17:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405030817.321398bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91552

griffph@aol.com (Griff) wrote in message
news:<d698d3e7.0405030139.4cdbd0ed@posting.google.com>...
> hi there everyone
>
> I'm currently reading a book called "Code" by Charles Petzold which is
> essentially a history and overview of computer technology, quite
> entertainingly told. I've just read the section on telegraphs and
> relays and am confused by something he has written.
>
> He explains the basic principle of the telegraph, and goes on to show
> with some simple Ohm's Law calculations that you can't extend the
> length of telegraph wires indefinitely due to the loop resistance
> etc., hence the need for the invention of the relay.
>
> However, I am a bit puzzled by his summing-up quote for this chapter:
> "Regardless of the thickness of the wires and the high levels of
> voltage, telegraph wires simply couldn't be continued indefinitely".
> Now I would have thought the restriction was *exactly* due to the
> limitations on wire thickness and voltage (ie the practical problems
> with manufacturing telegraph cables and voltaic cells at that time).
> Or am I doing Mr.Petzold an injustice, when perhaps there was some
> other limiting factor ?
> I have read somewhere that there were problems with insulation for
> very long cables, is this perhaps something to do with it ?

It's simply a matter of a poorly-written sentence. It should read
something like 'could not be economically or practically continued
indefinitely'.

In theory, a basic telegraph circuit could be any conceivable length
if there is no limit placed on the size of the wire used nor the
battery voltage. But in the real world, there were very definite
practical limits to how thick a wire could be used, and how high a
battery voltage could be used. And the economics of the hardware used
were a major consideration.

The early transatlantic telegraph cables were thousands of miles long
and used *no* repeaters or relays along their route.

For a more detailed historical account of the telegraph and its
development, I suggest the book "The Victorian Internet"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3517. Re: Spectrum Analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 16:44:41 UTC
From: John Smith <pani@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c75t6e$2vr4$1@ID-225206.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 91448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Your Software Must be robust enough to accept, reject and process corrupt packets as you will Always get them with wireless, always. --You will ALWAYS have bad/corrupted packets with any wireless system.-- The 5 band antennas have very splintered patterns, and ducting from point to point. and you will have +20dB one second and -20 the next second, your firmware, and software must handle this stuff, RF cannot do it alone. Mother nature set the rules on this one.

The MFGR will tell you the max range, and the dishes to use, rain degrades the signal, as well as heat (ducting) The big boys use 4 dishes for a link ATT @ 11 Gigs two on each side spaced vertically some so when ducting occures, the other dish picks it up. If the cost is low enough, you could put in another entire link as backup. Also % of packets getting though is an indicator of SNR, but that can depend on how you have the link hooked up, as a LAN extention, you have timing constraints, and so on. 90% or better is great. Less than 20% you may have a link or LAN timing problem (path too long, pointing is off, ducting, SW lame).

On a roof in Boston, your 5 gig unit may be susceptible to radio and TV interference, the scan may be detected on a junction in the unit. Signal blasts through the case and so on. Urban RF is a dirty world, and we can't see it either!

"Bill B." <n1sniNOSPAM@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:mPKdnbkxMsJcIgjdRVn-sQ@comcast.com...
> Thank you so much for all your help (Crazy George, Roy, Tom, John)!! Per
> Crazy George's suggestion, I am picking up some books tomorrow at Borders
> <grin>. However, the posts that I received were very helpful. Let me
explain
> a little more what I am trying to do, just to see if I am even close to
the
> right track. We have a Microwave link that operates at 5 GHz...
specifically
> one sides transmits between 5.25-5.25GHz and receives at 5.725-5.825 GHz.
> The product we are using for this link is a Stratum 100 (
> http://www.commputercations.com/products/wsstratum.htm - The only
datasheet
> I could find). This link went down hard a few days ago, so we switched
> polarization (From Horizontal to Vertical). Things got much better, but we
> still were taking corrupt packets. So, we went out there with an Advantest
> R3465 SA (http://www.ntecusa.com/graphics/pdf/WE106.pdf), an Omni
antenna,
> and 10 degree directional dish, with the hopes to (1) look at the "same"
> noise floor that the Stratum sees and (2), try to track down any single

> direction (And hopefully antenna) that is causing interference. Now, I
> thought I knew this stuff <grin>, at least enough to retrieve somewhat
> accurate results. Boy was I wrong! I scanned the receiving frequencies
using
> the following settings:
>
> Start Freq: 5.725GHz
> End Freq: 5.825GHz
> Span: 100MHz
> RBW: 5 MHz
> VBW: 1 MHz
> Sweep Time: 50ms
> ATT: 10dB
> REF: 0.0dBm (10dB/)
>
> Knowing what I know now, I would have kept the RBW value MUCH lower (Like
> 10kHz). But what I saw was a "noise floor" - Which I was assuming to be (I
> believe) the Thermal noise floor which I now know to be the Filter Noise
> Floor, peaking out at about -64dBm. Now our receive strength when the
radio
> is on is -65dB... So I figured "Hey, there is our problem... the receiver
in
> the Stratum unit is seeing the noise floor so loud that it can hardly see
> the actual signal". What makes this even more believable is that these
> readings were taken in the middle of Boston on the 26th floor roof. So I
> packed up and went home... Then I tried the same test at my fairly
isolated
> house... and got the same results!
>
> Now I know there is at least one answer to how to avoid this embarrassing
> situation in the future... read a book (Which I will start tomorrow)...
> however, I really would like to get this link up in short order and need
to
> know these numbers. Am I correct in saying that I need to (1) contact the
> manufacture of the Stratum unit, and find out what their Bandwidth filter
> looks like and then (2), Set my RBW to the same or lower setting as their
> radio and do the test again?
>
> If the above two steps are correct than great... I can do that... but I
> really would like to make use of the measurements I already took if
> possible.
>
> Again, I really appreciate the comments from before. While I don't yet
> understand all of it, these really point me in the right direction, and I
> will keep reading/researching until it all comes together.
>
> Thank you,
> Bill B. - N1SNI
>
> "John Smith" <pani@yahoo.com> wrote in message

> news:c73a8e$hfbqp$1@ID-225206.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > What is the "Bandwidth" of the "stuff" you are trying to measure?
> > You could set the analyzer to that or a little less, and then use
relative
> > measurements.
> > You may need more gear if you are trying to measure a very low noise
> > wideband preamp.
> > Depends on what you are trying to measure.
> > Bigger bandwidth=higher noise floor, simply kTB. and it is a ratio if
you
> > change kTB1/kTB2= B1/B2 (10 log it of course)
> >
> > If you have the analyzer on, then connect the gizmo without signal and
the
> > noise floor rises up 10 dB or more, you could probably ignore
calculating
> > what the SA contributes. just add signal and it should be 6 dB or more
> above
> > noise floor established by your gizmo.
> >
> > If not, then It is possible to calculate almost exactly the noise floor
> on
> > the analyzer to verify what is displayed is good, but you need a number
or
> > two from the MFGR of the analyzer, which takes into account the filter
> shape
> > of the analyzer. (0.8 ot 1.6 something like that)
> >
> > SAs are cool! What type do you have, makes a big difference, (depending
on
> > what you are trying to measure) Some will not do it.
> >
> >
> > "Bill B." <n1sni@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:a461033a.0405012012.4d6965b1@posting.google.com...
> > > Hello,
> > > I need some help in figuring out how to properly use a Spec. Analyzer.
> > > I have done several hours of research online now, and have somewhat of
> > > an idea of what I am doing, but I just can't get down one piece of the
> > > puzzle. In my line of work, we use simple devices that give us the
> > > noise floor level in dB. I (stupidly) expected to be able to get this
> > > same information easily out of a SA. As you may have guessed by now, I
> > > ran into a problem when switching the RBW value. After much... much
> > > reading, I fully understand *WHY* it changes (Filters increasing in
> > > size cause a greater internal noise level, etc.) but I can't figure
> > > the best way to get a "base" noise level reading. And as much as I
> > > would like to fully understand the theory, what I really need is a few
> > > more examples... IE: If you are looking a 100 MHz span and your RBW is
> > > 1MHz simply ___Fill in the Blank____ to find the base noise floor. To
> > > further explain what I am trying to do, we are setting up a link that

> > > requires a SNR of at least 6dB... I need to get the noise floor level
> > > to compare with my projected signal strength for this link.
> > >
> > > Please be nice... This is my first post <grin>
> > >
> > > Thank you! Thank you!
> > >
> > > Bill B. - N1SNI
> >
> >
>
>

3518. Re: Spectrum Analyzer & "noise" measurements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 16:52:19 UTC
From: Steve Nosko <suteuve.nosukowicuz@moutouroula.com>
Message-ID: <c75tg1$ht7$1@newshost.mot.com>
Source record: 91449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Roy Lewallen" <w7el@eznec.com> wrote in message
news:1099uffhdrg4g3d@corp.supernews.com...
> [...snip...]
> If you're trying to measure the noise
> coming from a receiver, it has to be considerably greater than the SA's
> internal noise, or you'll never see it.

Assuming classical "noise" as we are all probably thinking...
First, a minor correction to the above "considerably greater", Roy. If the EXternal noise is just 6dB above the SA's INternal noise (I guess 4 times can be considered 'considerable'), then the resulting displayed value will be only 1 dB higher than the incomming noise actually is. Noise power (when combining in one receiver) simply adds. To see the math, think this way. A 1 dB increase amounts to 1.25 times the power. That extra 25 percent is one fourth the original power. 25% of the power is 6dB down from the original. SO adding some power which is -6 dB (or 25% the original) will raise the total 1 dB.

However, The poster used the term "noise", but doesn't know the source of his problem. His data hits can be caused by other than what we are thinking is noise. It can be (sounds like since it recently started) spurious signals in his channel OR it could be IM being caused from strong signals getting into his receiver. The spurious in-band stuff could be narrow signals or wideband. Typical CDMA signals behave much like simple wide-band noise as we think of noise. A narrow band signal/spur is different.

From a later post I see that he is trying to measure some junk that has appeared on the link frequency causing interference. In any case, the front-end noise floor (noise figure) of the SA will determine how far down you will be able to see and if it is not low enough, then you won't see the interference. I can not comment on the Advantest sensitivity. If you have access to a low noise amplifier of the type used in your system, it can be used in front of the SA and *MAY* raise the sensitivity (lower the noise figure/floor) enough to see yout interference.

Good luck. We've had a strange low level (around -123 dBm)spur on our repeater input since last fall and can't locate it...wish I had lotsa time.
--
Steve N, K,9;d, c. i My email has no u's.

3519. Re: BPL - a curious twist to consider !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 19:30:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hx5bf4a.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 30 Apr 2004 12:38:34 GMT, Paul_Morphy wrote:

>As the population ages and moves into condos, satellite access is going to
>have less appeal. Wireless, OTOH, could be used anywhere. The countryside is
>already littered with cellphone towers.

As we aged we moved OUT of a condo. Too small for our needs and too
many restrictions, although I was able to put up 4 vhf/uhf verticals
and a 200-foot long wire.

Young thirty-something family members, though, moved into a rental
condo and one of their conditions was an internet connection "in the
wall" - no problem finding it in any place that they looked.

Finally, installation of small-dish satellite antennas for delivery
of broadcast and video services (including internet) has better legal
pre-emption than we hams have with PRB-1.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3520. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 19:30:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hx5c1ob.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91553

On Sun, 02 May 2004 03:21:50 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:

```
>> Would the FCC have a record of such?
>>
>
>Yes, buried in some dusty paper archive in a low humidity cave in Resume
>Speed, Alabama. They won't go look.
>
>But there's a commercial firm licensed to go into the catacomb and
>search, which they'll be happy to do for a modest fee of about $122.85
>per half-hour, results not guaranteed.

That's what happens when the gov'mint is forced to privatize what we
should be getting in return for our taxes.

Federal Archive searches are not all that bad (I had to do it once)
provided that you know the box number in which the desired material
is stored. The agency has those lists, but finding the right person
in the agency to give you the magic number is an exercise in itself.

The Leo Ryan National Archives Repository in suburban San Francisco
is in a delightful park adjacent to the vast open green space known
as the Golden Gate National Cemetery. I've been in "big box" retail
stores that had less aisle room. I understand that now you give
them the box number and they bring it to you in a library-type
reading room.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
```

3521. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 19:30:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91554

On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses in
>boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL

Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3522. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 20:29:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405031229.3a7ef21e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91555

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<QHrlc.3775$Hs1.2148@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> >
> > Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
> > callsign?
> >
>
> The name of the citizen is not important (and I didn't say it was a
> "he").

I think you indicated that the citizen is a male, Hans. From your post
that originated this thread:

"at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
judge"

and

"sample of his attempts to choose"

That's why I thought the citizen was a he.

> No amateur radio callsign was evident in any of the persons
> comments (dozens of different submissions on several recent RM's)
> although the person did claim learning Morse code to the speed of 8WPM.

It should be a simple matter to correlate the citizen's name with the
FCC callsign database. Have you done so?
>
> > "I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as
> misdirected"
> >
> > "I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
> >
> > "Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
> >
> > "Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."

I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
to as "Mr."....
>
> I just thought it presumptous for that to tell the FCC that other
> citizens comments were innapropriate.

Of course - but that won't stop some people.

In fact, a large volume of such commentary says more about the commenter than about those commented on.

In any event, I say let the comments speak for themselves.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3523. R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 20:44:54 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <abylc.110282$Gd3.26584768@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91556

Anybody wanna hop on 7045 kHz tonite...say about 9 PM? :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

Er, ah...AK & RI stations especially welcome. <hihi>

3524. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 20:50:34 UTC
From: Joe Smith <n9pge@queer.com>
Message-ID: <leylc.83718$Yw5.22921@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91557

It is the little green man in his head.

N2EY wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<cK9lc.2825$Hs1.2276@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>The FCC has given all citizens a great tool, in the form of the ECFS,
>>for commenting on matters under its purview, including matters related
>>to the Amateur Radio Service.
>>
>>I thank the Commission for providing that forum for commentary by all
>>citizens.
>>
>>Unfortunately, at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
>>judge of what is appropriate and inappropriate for other citizens to say
>>to the Commission.
>
>
> Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
> callsign?
>
>>This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other
>>citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,
>>
>>Here is a small sample of his attempts to choose for the FCC which
>>citizen comments are not appropriate.
>>
>>"I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected"
>>
>>"I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
>
>
> That's just his opinion.
>
>>"Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
>>
>>"Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."
>
>
> Found by whom?
>
>>Sorry, Mr. Citizen, but the FCC doesn't need you to determine which
>>comments are appropriate. ALL CITIZENS may comment.
>

>
> Of course. In fact, noncitizens may comment, I think. Not only that,
> but organizations and business concerns may comment as well as
> individuals.
>
> The problem is that any system which is as free and open as ECFS is
> bound to attract at least a few folks who are not serious about the
> subjects being discussed. And it will also attract all sorts of folks
> who have an "agenda" that isn't immediately apparent.
>
> Hopefully those at FCC who read the comments will recognize the nature
> and spirit of such remarks.
>
>>Sunuvagun, where have I heard that before?
>
>
>
>
> But who is it that you refer to, Hans?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3525. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 20:51:18 UTC
From: Joe Smith <n9pge@queer.com>
Message-ID: <nfylc.83723$Yw5.68917@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91558

Their name is paranoia.

Dave wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:QHrlc.3775$Hs1.2148@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
>>>callsign?
>>>
>>
>>The name of the citizen is not important (and I didn't say it was a
>>"he"). No amateur radio callsign was evident in any of the persons
>>comments (dozens of different submissions on several recent RM's)
>>although the person did claim learning Morse code to the speed of 8WPM.
>>
>>
>>>"I consider Mr. Sanford's Comment inappropriate as well as
>>
>>misdirected"
>>
>>>"I consider Mr.Brakob's Comment inappropriate as well as misdirected."
>>>
>>>"Mr. Desany's Comments were found inappropriate..."
>>>
>>>"Mr. Oring's Comments are once again found inappropriate..."
>>
>>I just thought it presumptous for that to tell the FCC that other
>>citizens comments were innapropriate.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>
> isn't it just as bad that you come in here and throw dirt at an unnamed
> citizen for the wording of their comments? and not even knowing if they
> read here to defend themselves?? or do you know that they read this forum?
>
>

3526. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 21:10:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Xyylc.5296$Hs1.559@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91559

9PM as in 040200Z? I will be QRV.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3527. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 21:38:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3Zylc.3660$8S1.2956@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91560

```
"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405021613.6f33deb@posting.google.com...
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
> > >> Day - but only one 'phone:
> > >>
> > >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
> > >> you'll hear:
> > >>
> > >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your
One
> > >> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
> > >> alfa ...."
> > >>
> > >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> > >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
> > >>
> > >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> > >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> > >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
> > >> "roger" and "73" both.
> > >>
> > >> --
> > >>
> > >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
> > >> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
> > >> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you
don't
> > >> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do
it
> > > with continous wave.
```

> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised. You
> > want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops to be
> > lids.
> >
> > Alun, N3KIP
>
> Alun, that come out with this bozo's 1st post about 2 years ago.
> About the same time he buddy'd up with Bruce.

Not so William. I have had that opinion for 40 years now.

Dan/W4NTI

3528. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 21:40:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <r%ylc.3661$8S1.1339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91561

```
"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on
> >> >> Field Day - but only one 'phone:
> >> >>
> >> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That
> >> >> is, you'll hear:
> >> >>
> >> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your
> >> >> One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my
> >> >> three alfa ...."
> >> >>
> >> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> >> >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
> >> >>
> >> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> >> >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> >> >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job
> >> >> of "roger" and "73" both.
> >> >>
> >> >> --
> >> >>
> >> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part
> >> >> of the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial
> >> >> number, class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time
> >> >> which you don't have to send but which are part of the required
> >> >> logging.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
```

> >> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do
> >> > it with continous wave.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised.
> >> You want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops
> >> to be lids.
> >>
> >> Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is
> > better than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> You are unbeleivable.
>
> 1) That ain't what you said; and
>
> 2) Even if it were it would be an indefensible position.
>
> If we define a lid as being a bad operator, you are saying that anyone who
> thinks that one mode is better than another is a bad operator (unless they
> say that your preferred mode is better). I have never heard such idiotic
> cr*p in my entire life.
>
> My only reason for preferring phone is that I like to use radio to talk.
If
> you prefer to make bleeping noises instead I could't care less. If you
were
> into SSTV, or PSK31 or what-have-you I would say that was fine too. On the
> whole, I would say that comparisons of bandwidth, throughput, signal-to-
> noise etc were only valid within one type of information, whether it is
> phone, or data or video, or whatever.
>
> You said, and I quote "phone ops are lids" and then, partially recanting
> "not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is better than
> CW". Well, I am a phone op and I think that phone is not surprisingly
> better at carrying voice information than CW is.
>
> You know what, though, you are the lid.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

And I think your a lid. Now what?

Dan/W4NTI

3529. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 21:49:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <98zlc.5411$Hs1.3248@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91562

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
> to as "Mr."....

Yes, your comments were commented on.

You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that Appalachian?) "Mr."

The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis' remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside amateurism."

And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.

Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as practicable?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3530. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-03 22:36:29 UTC
From: ghldbrd@ccp.com
Message-ID: <598dc4be.0405031436.6f51ff7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91675
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message news:<c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com>...
> Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
> will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
> there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
> various solid state and tube conversions.
>
> Thanks in advance for any help.
>
> WA3MOJ

First, the circuit techniques for UHF receiver front ends and
transmitter PA's are totally different than those on 11 meters.
Conversion becomes wholesale replacement of about half of the radio.

Second, <<`ALL'>> CB radios must be type-accepted by the FCC for use
on the air. Unless you have the thousands of dollars for R&D, and
legal assistance to complete this, forget the whole thing.

What you are trying to do is tantamount to modifing a VCR into a
satellite uplink to jam television satellites. Can't get there from
here, No how, now way. Zip. Nada. The BIG goose egg.

Now you could use UHF commercial radios on the GMRS (former Class A CB
channels) with very little problem. Just change crystals or reprogram
the synthesizer in the radio, tweak, and you're in business. Any
competent two-way radio shop can do that.

I'd suggest you study a LOT more on basic electronic theory, and
circuit design before you post such an asinine question.

Gary Hildebrand WA7KKP

3531. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 00:40:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3EBlc.3873$8S1.151@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91563

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:r%ylc.3661$8S1.1339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > news:51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >
> > >
> > > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > >> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> > >>
> > >> >
> > >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > >> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
> > >> >>
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on
> > >> >> Field Day - but only one 'phone:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That
> > >> >> is, you'll hear:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your
> > >> >> One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my
> > >> >> three alfa ...."
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
> > >> >> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
> > >> >>
> > >> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
> > >> >> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
> > >> >> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job
> > >> >> of "roger" and "73" both.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> --
> > >> >>
> > >> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part
> > >> >> of the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial
> > >> >> number, class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time
> > >> >> which you don't have to send but which are part of the required
> > >> >> logging.

> > >> >>
> > >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >> >
> > >> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams
do
> > >> > it with continous wave.
> > >> >
> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised.
> > >> You want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops
> > >> to be lids.
> > >>
> > >> Alun, N3KIP
> > >
> > > No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is
> > > better than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > You are unbeleivable.
> >
> > 1) That ain't what you said; and
> >
> > 2) Even if it were it would be an indefensible position.
> >
> > If we define a lid as being a bad operator, you are saying that anyone
who
> > thinks that one mode is better than another is a bad operator (unless
they
> > say that your preferred mode is better). I have never heard such idiotic
> > cr*p in my entire life.
> >
> > My only reason for preferring phone is that I like to use radio to talk.
> If
> > you prefer to make bleeping noises instead I could't care less. If you
> were
> > into SSTV, or PSK31 or what-have-you I would say that was fine too. On
the
> > whole, I would say that comparisons of bandwidth, throughput, signal-to-
> > noise etc were only valid within one type of information, whether it is
> > phone, or data or video, or whatever.
> >
> > You said, and I quote "phone ops are lids" and then, partially recanting
> > "not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is better

than
> > CW". Well, I am a phone op and I think that phone is not surprisingly
> > better at carrying voice information than CW is.
> >
> > You know what, though, you are the lid.
> >
> > Alun, N3KIP
>
> And I think your a lid. Now what?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Oh, and one more thing Alun. Why is it you don't think CW (Morse Code) is talking ? Do you think we just sit in front of the radio and send random characters? Or even random words?

Comunications is the 'exchange of information'. Are you actually that ignorant Alun?

Dan/W4NTI

3532. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 00:45:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ZsednaWVeoNcegvdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91564

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> This citizen has singled out to the FCC the comments of several other
> citizens as innapropriate and/or misdirected,
>

Hey Hans.

I went through and read the comments from the good poster, and I am amazed that the perp would treat the public comments as he would the newsgroup - that is to attack those he disagrees with.

In the comments even more than in the newsgroup, it is imperitive that the attacking comments be given the respect they deserve, and utterly no reply from those attacked.

To do otherwise is to invite the inclusion of your comments with his, and having what may be a reasoned assessment look like one of the strange little brawls that is the embarrassment of the ARS.

The public comment forums are just that. He is welcome to make all the personal attacks he sees fit, and the F.C.C. will just eventually consider the source.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3533. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 00:52:46 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DED4390E9C8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91565

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:r%ylc.3661$8S1.1339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> >> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on
>> >> >> Field Day - but only one 'phone:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange.
>> >> >> That is, you'll hear:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger
>> >> >> your One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please
>> >> >> copy my three alfa ...."
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told
>> >> >> them? Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>> >> >>
>> >> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't
>> >> >> even bother with the R - they send their exchange as an
>> >> >> indication that they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you)
>> >> >> which does the job of "roger" and "73" both.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> --
>> >> >>
>> >> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as
>> >> >> part of the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is
>> >> >> serial number, class, callsign, check and section, plus date and
>> >> >> time which you don't have to send but which are part of the
```

>> >> >> required logging.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >> >
>> >> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams
>> >> > do it with continous wave.
>> >> >
>> >> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not
>> >> surprised. You want the code test kept because you consider all of
>> >> us phone ops to be lids.
>> >>
>> >> Alun, N3KIP
>> >
>> > No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone is
>> > better than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> You are unbeleivable.
>>
>> 1) That ain't what you said; and
>>
>> 2) Even if it were it would be an indefensible position.
>>
>> If we define a lid as being a bad operator, you are saying that anyone
>> who thinks that one mode is better than another is a bad operator
>> (unless they say that your preferred mode is better). I have never
>> heard such idiotic cr*p in my entire life.
>>
>> My only reason for preferring phone is that I like to use radio to
>> talk. If you prefer to make bleeping noises instead I could't care
>> less. If you were into SSTV, or PSK31 or what-have-you I would say
>> that was fine too. On the whole, I would say that comparisons of
>> bandwidth, throughput, signal-to- noise etc were only valid within one
>> type of information, whether it is phone, or data or video, or
>> whatever.
>>
>> You said, and I quote "phone ops are lids" and then, partially
>> recanting "not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone
>> is better than CW". Well, I am a phone op and I think that phone is
>> not surprisingly better at carrying voice information than CW is.
>>
>> You know what, though, you are the lid.

>>
>> Alun, N3KIP
>
> And I think your a lid. Now what?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

At least we know where we stand

3534. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 00:55:35 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94DED4B2ED299elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91566

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:3EBlc.3873$8S1.151@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:r%ylc.3661$8S1.1339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > news:51dlc.2052$a47.1563@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>> >
>> > >
>> > > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> > >> news:xHUkc.1855$8S1.832@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>> > >>
>> > >> >
>> > >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > >> > news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear
>> > >> >> on Field Day - but only one 'phone:
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange.
>> > >> >> That is, you'll hear:
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger
>> > >> >> your One Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please
>> > >> >> copy my three alfa ...."
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told
>> > >> >> them? Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't
>> > >> >> even bother with the R - they send their exchange as an
>> > >> >> indication that they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank
>> > >> >> you) which does the job of "roger" and "73" both.
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> --
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as
```

>> > >> >> part of the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is
>> > >> >> serial number, class, callsign, check and section, plus date
>> > >> >> and time which you don't have to send but which are part of
>> > >> >> the required logging.
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> > >> >
>> > >> > Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real
>> > >> > hams do it with continous wave.
>> > >> >
>> > >> > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >> >
>> > >> >
>> > >> >
>> > >>
>> > >> At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not
>> > >> surprised. You want the code test kept because you consider all
>> > >> of us phone ops to be lids.
>> > >>
>> > >> Alun, N3KIP
>> > >
>> > > No, not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think phone
>> > > is better than CW. Does that shoe fit Alun?
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> > >
>> > >
>> > You are unbeleivable.
>> >
>> > 1) That ain't what you said; and
>> >
>> > 2) Even if it were it would be an indefensible position.
>> >
>> > If we define a lid as being a bad operator, you are saying that
>> > anyone who thinks that one mode is better than another is a bad
>> > operator (unless they say that your preferred mode is better). I
>> > have never heard such idiotic cr*p in my entire life.
>> >
>> > My only reason for preferring phone is that I like to use radio to
>> > talk. If you prefer to make bleeping noises instead I could't care
>> > less. If you were into SSTV, or PSK31 or what-have-you I would say
>> > that was fine too. On the whole, I would say that comparisons of
>> > bandwidth, throughput, signal-to- noise etc were only valid within
>> > one type of information, whether it is phone, or data or video, or
>> > whatever.
>> >
>> > You said, and I quote "phone ops are lids" and then, partially
>> > recanting "not all phone ops are lids. Just the ones that think
>> > phone is better than CW". Well, I am a phone op and I think that

>> > phone is not surprisingly better at carrying voice information than
>> > CW is.
>> >
>> > You know what, though, you are the lid.
>> >
>> > Alun, N3KIP
>>
>> And I think your a lid. Now what?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
> Oh, and one more thing Alun. Why is it you don't think CW (Morse
> Code) is talking ?

I'm not talking to you now either, just typing on a keyboard

> Do you think we just sit in front of the radio and
> send random characters? Or even random words?
>

I've never listened to you in QSO - you might for all I know

> Comunications is the 'exchange of information'. Are you actually that
> ignorant Alun?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Talking is communications, but not necessarily vicea versa

3535. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 01:11:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lv-dne22uNZMcAvdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91567

N2EY wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<QHrlc.3775$Hs1.2148@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Who is this individual? Does he have a name? An amateur radio
>>>callsign?
>>>
>>
>>The name of the citizen is not important (and I didn't say it was a
>>"he").
>
>
> I think you indicated that the citizen is a male, Hans. From your post
> that originated this thread:
>
> "at least one citizen seems to have set himself up as the
> judge"
>
> and
>
> "sample of his attempts to choose"
>
> That's why I thought the citizen was a he.

It only takes about 3-4 minutes to find out who the citizen *is*!

<Snip>

> In any event, I say let the comments speak for themselves.

Which they do indeed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3536. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 01:23:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2gClc.6031$Hs1.2670@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91568

Bert,

Nice to work you on 40M this evening. How is that new Argonaut working?

Let's plan on same time next Monday eve, and maybe some of the others
will join in.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3537. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 01:56:27 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <fLClc.112816$Gd3.27692999@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91569

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:2gClc.6031$Hs1.2670@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Bert,
>
> Nice to work you on 40M this evening. How is that new Argonaut working?
>
> Let's plan on same time next Monday eve, and maybe some of the others
> will join in.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Thanks Hans, I had a ball. Pride refused to let me ask you to QRS. (Although I probably should've, hihi.) It forced me to put down my pencil and just listen. Same time next Monday sounds fine to me. Thanks again. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3538. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 02:01:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <VPCIc.6060$Hs1.5424@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91570

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> Pride refused to let me ask you to QRS.

My apologies..... I always try to be more deliberate, then I get in the middle of a thought and the damned paddles just speed up of their own accord. I'll put a big fat choke on the keyline next Monday to slow it down.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3539. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 02:12:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <j_Clc.112824$Gd3.27743603@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91571

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:VPClc.6060$Hs1.5424@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > Pride refused to let me ask you to QRS.
>
> My apologies..... I always try to be more deliberate, then I get in
> the middle of a thought and the damned paddles just speed up of their
> own accord. I'll put a big fat choke on the keyline next Monday to slow
> it down.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

It's all good. "No pain, no gain." Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard you, didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3540. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 02:18:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4096FD68.47835B7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 91572

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
> > to as "Mr."....
>
> Yes, your comments were commented on.
>
> You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that
> Appalachian?) "Mr."
>
> The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of
> other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis'
> remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside
> amateurism."
>
> And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which
> require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.
>
> Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting
> industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services
> which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you
> please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as
> practicable?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

I didn't need to go play along this far to find the answer. I went to
the comments page, typed in one name in the search field and had the
answer in four or five minutes. The comments were what I expected.

Dave K8MN

3541. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 02:34:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZiDlc.6088$Hs1.1886@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91573

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard you,
> didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.

Sorry I missed Jim. I had a lot of DSP working to isolate you from that buzzy signal from W5TVW. He was actually about 625 Hz off our QRG, but that rough buzz on his signal was washing over you. Likely would have heard N2EY without the DSP laundering I was doing.

CU next week.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3542. Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 03:26:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hx5subd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91574

On Mon, 03 May 2004 13:21:52 GMT, K&#65533;HB wrote:

>I just thought it presumptous for that to tell the FCC that other
>citizens comments were innapropriate.

"Other citizens comments were innapropriate and unfounded and etc.
etc." is a typical attack by litigators who don't have any ammunition
in their gun or any skill in gently demolishing the opposition. I've
been the "honoree" of such attacks in several proceedings, but I
refuse to reply in kind. I know better.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3543. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 04:01:03 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504000103.23696.00000489@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 91575

I wrote:

>I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003).

By the way, I was re-invited to go this year, but couldn't make it because of family obligations.

3544. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 04:04:12 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504000412.23696.00000491@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 91576

From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM

>Anybody wanna hop on 7045 kHz >tonite...say about 9 PM? :-)

Why don't you call CQ and wait and see who answers?

3545. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 04:17:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mPElc.6199$Hs1.5915@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91577

"Lumushahs" <lumushahs@aol.com> wrote

> Why don't you call CQ and wait and see who answers?

That's precisely what I did. I transmitted "CQ RRAP CQ RRAP DE K0HB K0HB" 7045.221 KC and WA2SI answered me.

Sunuvagun!

de Hans, K0HB

3546. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 10:20:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405040220.53827470@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91578

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3Zylc.3660$8S1.2956@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0405021613.6f33deb@posting.google.com...
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94DD811872FB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > >
> > > At last your real agenda comes out, Dan. Somehow. I'm not surprised. You
> > > want the code test kept because you consider all of us phone ops to be
> > > lids.
> > >
> > > Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Alun, that come out with this bozo's 1st post about 2 years ago.
> > About the same time he buddy'd up with Bruce.
>
> Not so William. I have had that opinion for 40 years now.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I didn't say that you formed your opinion about 2 years ago, I just
stated that it come out here about 2 years ago. It's your problem
that you've been tormented by such ideas for so long. God bless you.

3547. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 10:25:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405040225.52a49265@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91579

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<r%ylc.3661$8S1.1339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94DDF41AED88Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

big snip

> > You know what, though, you are the lid.
> >
> > Alun, N3KIP
>
> And I think your a lid. Now what?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

An impasse?

Doesn't have to be. I'll go with Alun on this one.

3548. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 10:30:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405040230.77c45ff7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91580

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses in
> >boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
>
> Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
> place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>

When did the Navy get airplanes?

3549. Re: early telegraphs and relays

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 10:36:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405040236.253de55b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91581

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405030817.321398bc@posting.google.com>...
> griffph@aol.com (Griff) wrote in message
news:<d698d3e7.0405030139.4cdbd0ed@posting.google.com>...
> > hi there everyone
> >
> > I'm currently reading a book called "Code" by Charles Petzold which is
> > essentially a history and overview of computer technology, quite
> > entertainingly told. I've just read the section on telegraphs and
> > relays and am confused by something he has written.
> >
> > He explains the basic principle of the telegraph, and goes on to show
> > with some simple Ohm's Law calculations that you can't extend the
> > length of telegraph wires indefinitely due to the loop resistance
> > etc., hence the need for the invention of the relay.
> >
> > However, I am a bit puzzled by his summing-up quote for this chapter:
> > "Regardless of the thickness of the wires and the high levels of
> > voltage, telegraph wires simply couldn't be continued indefinitely".
> > Now I would have thought the restriction was *exactly* due to the
> > limitations on wire thickness and voltage (ie the practical problems
> > with manufacturing telegraph cables and voltaic cells at that time).
> > Or am I doing Mr.Petzold an injustice, when perhaps there was some
> > other limiting factor ?
> > I have read somewhere that there were problems with insulation for
> > very long cables, is this perhaps something to do with it ?
>
> It's simply a matter of a poorly-written sentence. It should read
> something like 'could not be economically or practically continued
> indefinitely'.
>
> *In theory*, a basic telegraph circuit could be any conceivable length
> *if* there is no limit placed on the size of the wire used nor the
> battery voltage. But in the real world, there were very definite
> practical limits to how thick a wire could be used, and how high a
> battery voltage could be used. And the economics of the hardware used
> were a major consideration.
>
> The early transatlantic telegraph cables were thousands of miles long
> and used *no* repeaters or relays along their route.
>
> For a more detailed historical account of the telegraph and its
> development, I suggest the book "The Victorian Internet"
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Another bit of history, I recall seing in a historical drama, Chief Hiakowa sending his braves out to cut the lines to Ft Bliss. If the wires had been thick enough and the voltage high enough....

3550. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 11:33:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <gfve90d7f6g6phd5l6flcu4qgl2g6sc537@4ax.com>
Source record: 91582

On Tue, 04 May 2004 02:12:31 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:

>snip
>
>It's all good. "No pain, no gain." Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard you,
>didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.

Hopefully, this will end the oft-quoted myth that CW "always gets
through"!

>
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI
>
73, Leo

3551. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:03:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4097869F.6040301@psu.edu>
Source record: 91583

Lumushahs wrote:
> I wrote:
>
>
>>I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003).
>
>
> By the way, I was re-invited to go this year, but couldn't make it because of
> family obligations.

Do they know how you talk about them?

- Mike -

3552. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:28:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504082838.27047.00000690@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91584

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/2/2004 8:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040502212208.17474.00000684@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Ebay has hurt hamfests recently for sure.
>
>Someone already mentioned that he likes to converse with fellow hams. Ebay
>cannot replace the Hamfest experience.

But I thouhgt you said that Hamfests were just places for fat, older white guys with ugly women, Vipul...Why the change?

Steve, K4YZ

3553. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:29:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504082945.27047.00000691@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91585

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/2/2004 8:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040502212512.17474.00000685@mb-m13.aol.com>
>
>>At Hamfests I have gone to, the most obese and smelly people have been
>>those selling the computer junk.
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>No, they must be hams.
>
>I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003). All hams, a high
>percentage
>which were overweight.

Lost the other job, huih?

Too bad. Back to being an "EE"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3554. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:31:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504083144.27047.00000693@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91586

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/3/2004 11:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040504000103.23696.00000489@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>I wrote:
>
>>I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003).
>
>By the way, I was re-invited to go this year, but couldn't make it because of
>family obligations.
>

This would be the same family who told you it was dishonorable to be an
Electrical Engineer, Vippy?

Steve, K4YZ

3555. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:39:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504083903.27047.00000694@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91587

>Subject: Re: R.R.A.P Net?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/3/2004 11:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040504000412.23696.00000491@mb-m20.aol.com>
>
>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM
>
>>Anybody wanna hop on 7045 kHz >tonite...say about 9 PM? :-)
>
>Why don't you call CQ and wait and see who answers?

It's a pretty sure bet there won't be any KB1's in THAT "pile-up"...!!!

Come on, Vippy...You're outted again...Might as well sign your posts.

(Aren't ya wondering by now how I knew with only ONE post who you
were...?!?!)

Steve, K4YZ

3556. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:41:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504084147.27047.00000695@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91588

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/2/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020541.4ce5d815@posting.google.com>

>You are the Master of the Obvious.

It's obvious that you're a ZERO, Brian. And that has nothing to do with
the ZERO in your callsign, byt the way...

Steve, K4YZ

3557. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:42:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <fdMlc.120380$Gd3.29486867@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91589

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:gfve90d7f6g6phd5l6flcu4qgl2g6sc537@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 04 May 2004 02:12:31 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
> >snip
> >
> >It's all good. "No pain, no gain." Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard
you,
> >didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.
>
> Hopefully, this will end the oft-quoted myth that CW "always gets
> through"!
>
> >
> >73 de Bert
> >WA2SI
> >
> 73, Leo

Not "always," Leo...but more often than phone. (& that's what QSP's fer.)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3558. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:45:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504084534.27047.00000696@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91590

>Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
>petitions
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/2/2004 8:44 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020544.2f13bfed@posting.google.com>

>> BTW...You were the one who opened THAT can of worms, so sit down and
>get
>> you a plate full, Puppet Boy.
>
>No, I made no mention of bikini clad formers. You did. Are you still
>married this time?

Which "time", Brain?

And you haven't answered MY question..."Did you ONLY date and marry ONE woman, having never dated any OTHER woman...???"

You seem to insinuate that having had a "former" girlfriend was a flaw of some kind. I'd like to know the answer to THIS question...And please don't gimme that "out of respoect for my wife" mularkey again. If you TRULY respected her you wouldn't make such a fool out of yourself in public.

Just "yes" or "no"...Did you ever have a girlfriend before the present Mrs B took office?

Steve, K4YZ

3559. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:53:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91591

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/2/2004 8:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020553.780b5ef4@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040501210258.01933.00000712@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/1/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010702.540c2ef2@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do
>to
>> get
>> >> around it.
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Steve, why can't you just admit that you were wrong? Huh?
>>
>> Because I am not.
>
>But you are. Here is what you said again:
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

And I stand by it..

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

>> Sorry you have a problem with it. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> It really is THAT simple.
>
>That was your backpedalling recovery from making such a stupid
>statement.

What backpeddling, Brain?

I am STANDING BY it.

No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

>It is equally wrong as I have shown.

You've "shown" nothing.

>> >Do you recall TAFKARJ commenting on those great >>>AMATEUR<<< CW
>> >Operators saving the day during WWII? When >>>AMATEUR<<< Radio was
>> >off the air?
>>
>> Wake up knuckle head and crack some history books OTHER than the tained
>and
>> antagonistic crap that Lennie spews.
>
>TAFKARJ is our self-appointed historian. Even he will spout the dates
>that the ARS was denied priveleges during WWII, but not in the same
>post where Amateur Radio Operators saved the day in WWII.

You'll have to show me the post wherein Jim "appo9inted" himself.

And as far as "self appointed historians" go, you had better survey some
of the posts your scumbuddy has put up here...More than a few way off Amateur
Radio topic and in the thousands of bytes of bandwidth.

>It's one of those PCTA double standard things.

I think YOU need to read what you write before YOU assert any "double
standard" allegations, Your Creepiness.

>And don't forget that he also said that code testing was a barrier to
>CW use.
>
>> >Welp, there's another one who cannot admit that he was wrong. Ever.
>>
>> So far neither you or Lennie has "proven" Jim to be wrong. So far you
>> have not proven yourself to be right...About ANYthing...
>
>Of course we have. Time and again. But his most obnoxious
>cheerleader won't hear of it.
>
>> >Two peas in a pod.
>>
>> If that was supposed to be an insult, you missed...By a mile.
>
>Then you haven't seen his reaction.

It's not about what >>JIM<< may percieve as an insult, Brain.

But you never do seem to keep your perspectives in order, do you?

Steve, K4YZ

3560. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 12:55:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504085530.27047.00000698@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 91592

>Subject: Re: How to prove prior ham license ??
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/4/2004 5:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405040230.77c45ff7@posting.google.com>
>
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>> >Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses
>in
>> >boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
>>
>> Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
>> place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>
>
>When did the Navy get airplanes?

You ARE kidding...right...???

Steve, K4YZ

3561. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 13:07:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <ur4f90hmhd30b0b3223taooi6bqfco67nd@4ax.com>
Source record: 91593

On Tue, 04 May 2004 12:42:51 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>news:gfve90d7f6g6phd5l6flcu4qgl2g6sc537@4ax.com...
>> On Tue, 04 May 2004 02:12:31 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >snip
>> >
>> >It's all good. "No pain, no gain." Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard
>you,
>> >didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.
>>
>> Hopefully, this will end the oft-quoted myth that CW "always gets
>> through"!
>>
>> >
>> >73 de Bert
>> >WA2SI
>> >
>> 73, Leo
>
>Not "always," Leo...but more often than phone. (& that's what QSP's fer.)

True enough - although in the example above, the medium of choice for
QSP was email. The laws of propagation obviously do not favour one
mode over another - contrary to the belief of a few....

>
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI
>

73, Leo

3562. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 15:22:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <4097B521.3090806@psu.edu>
Source record: 91594

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>>Date: 5/2/2004 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040502220431.13276.00000771@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>>>I lived with hams on a DXpedition, last May (2003). All hams, a high
>>>
>>>percentage
>>>
>>>>which were overweight.
>>>
>>> Hi Vipul. So you extrapolate that to hams as a whole?
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>I am not "extrpolating" from just one experience. I have been to <many>
>>hamfests, ham radio meetings, field day setups, etc. I have noticed that
>>about
>>most hams.
>
>
> See Mike...WatdidItellya...?!?!

Yeah.... same old same old.

FWIW, in my club, there are no obese members. I'm probably one of the heaviest members, but most of my mass is other than fat.

So my experience at least defies Vipul's.

- Mike KB3EIA

3563. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 17:57:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hx72uvl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91595

On 4 May 2004 03:30:30 -0700, William wrote:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>> >Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses in
>> >boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
>>
>> Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
>> place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>
>
>When did the Navy get airplanes?

Somewhere around 1925.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3564. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 22:03:31 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <TqUlc.22305$la6.3248261@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91596

>
> > > You know what, though, you are the lid.
> > >
> > > Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > And I think your a lid. Now what?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

Gentlemen ....gentlemen ......I think this can be solved in a civilized manner ......What we need is a Texas Death Match. I would add a cage of barbed wire (non-resonate) of course with the key to the locked door suspended by 20 feet of ladder line above the center of the mat. There would of course be allowed one foreign object per contestant. Dan my choice for you would be a vintage Vibroplex bug attached to a 4 foot length of quarter inch cable. Alun you of course would have to use the same cable set up but with a D-104 at the end. We would let Alun fill the 104 with lead shot to even things up. The winner would be presented with the World No Lid Belt. Ya know this would probably be a lot more interesting than most contests I have been involved with over the years.

Take care guys .....remember peace in the valley ..... Tom KI3R

3565. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 22:22:03 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <flUlc.3548$Y24.1338@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91597

Heck, Phil, I couldn't spell then and I can't spell now either nohow LOL ;)

Probably helped me copy cypher groups in the Navy, though.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses
in
> >boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
>
> Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
> place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.677 / Virus Database: 439 - Release Date: 5/4/04

3566. Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-04 23:02:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405041502.66e3f95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91598

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<4096FD68.47835B7B@earthlink.net>...
> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> > > I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
> > > to as "Mr."....
> >
> > Yes, your comments were commented on.

That's hardly surprising.
> >
> > You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that
> > Appalachian?) "Mr."

Indeed.
> >
> > The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of
> > other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis'
> > remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside
> > amateurism."
> >
> > And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which
> > require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.

How can I, if the "errors and disconnections" are not explained?
> >
> > Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting
> > industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services
> > which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you
> > please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as
> > practicable?

Dear me, I managed to do all that in a few paragraphs of comments? All
I did was say that I'm against some parts of the various proposals and
in favor of other parts.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> I didn't need to go play along this far to find the answer. I went to
> the comments page, typed in one name in the search field and had the
> answer in four or five minutes. The comments were what I expected.
>
Well, it was never my intention to insult anyone or any industry with
my comments on the requirements for an amateur radio license.

So let me ask those who have read my comments to the FCC on the various restructuring proposals (most recently RM-10867, -10868 and 10870):

Are *you* insulted by anything in my comments? I'm not asking that you agree with them, just if you find yourself insulted by my comments to FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3567. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 01:48:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_JXlc.7407$Hs1.3607@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91599

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

>
> When did the Navy get airplanes?
>

On May 8, 1911 Captain Washington I. Chambers prepared requisitions for two Curtiss biplanes. One, the Triad, was to be equipped for arising from or alighting on land or water; with a metal tipped propeller designed for a speed of at least 45 miles per hour; with provisions for carrying a passenger alongside the pilot; and with controls that could be operated by either the pilot or the passenger. The machine thus described later became the Navy's first airplane, the A-1. On July 1, 1911 the A-1 was delivered to the Navy.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3568. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 02:37:16 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40985311.9020609@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91676
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

bbb

Gary hildebrand wrote:

3569. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 02:43:22 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504224322.21846.00000778@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91600

From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Ebay cannot replace the Hamfest experience.

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>But I thouhgt you said that Hamfests were just places for fat, older >white guys with ugly women, Vipul...Why the change?

Wouldn't such people like to be among other such people?

3570. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 02:59:51 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504225951.21846.00000779@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91601

From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu

>So my experience at least defies Vipul's.

Perhaps, they follow me?

Currently have other priorities than to attend clubs meetings, Hamfests (although I may be able to fit some of those in my schedule), etc. So, I don't know right now.

I will have to try to check out Field Day and see what the demographics are.

3571. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:02:45 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504230245.21846.00000780@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91602

>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Do they know how you talk about them?

Perhaps, not the people at the "DXpedition", but (a long while ago) I have mentioned some of my observations to hams at hamfests, and club meetings.

3572. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:14:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504231443.08439.00000659@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91603

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/4/2004 9:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040504224322.21846.00000778@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>>Ebay cannot replace the Hamfest experience.
>
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>But I thouhgt you said that Hamfests were just places for fat, older >white
>guys with ugly women, Vipul...Why the change?
>
>Wouldn't such people like to be among other such people?

Sorry Vipul, I forgot just how big a bigot you were.

Steve, K4YZ

3573. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:15:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504231548.08439.00000660@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91604

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/4/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040504225951.21846.00000779@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>>So my experience at least defies Vipul's.
>
>Perhaps, they follow me?
>
>Currently have other priorities than to attend clubs meetings, Hamfests
>(although I may be able to fit some of those in my schedule), etc. So, I
>don't
>know right now.
>
>I will have to try to check out Field Day and see what the demographics are.

I seriously doubt that Amateur Radio has "enrolled" the "preety fems" you
are stalking, Vippy.

Steve, K4YZ

3574. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:17:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040504231724.08439.00000661@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91605

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/4/2004 10:02 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040504230245.21846.00000780@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Do they know how you talk about them?
>
>Perhaps, not the people at the "DXpedition", but (a long while ago) I have
>mentioned some of my observations to hams at hamfests, and club meetings.

"Observations"...?!?!

More like "condemnations", I 'd say.

Still a bigot.

Steve, K4YZ

3575. Re: Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:45:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40986355.A72C2926@earthlink.net>
Source record: 91606

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4096FD68.47835B7B@earthlink.net>...
> > "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > >
> > > > I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
> > > > to as "Mr."....
> > >
> > > Yes, your comments were commented on.
>
> That's hardly surprising.
> > >
> > > You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that
> > > Appalachian?) "Mr."
>
> Indeed.
> > >
> > > The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of
> > > other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis'
> > > remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside
> > > amateurism."
> > >
> > > And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which
> > > require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.
>
> How can I, if the "errors and disconnections" are not explained?
> > >
> > > Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting
> > > industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services
> > > which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you
> > > please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as
> > > practicable?
>
> Dear me, I managed to do all that in a few paragraphs of comments? All
> I did was say that I'm against some parts of the various proposals and
> in favor of other parts.
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > I didn't need to go play along this far to find the answer. I went to
> > the comments page, typed in one name in the search field and had the

> > answer in four or five minutes. The comments were what I expected.
> >
> Well, it was never my intention to insult anyone or any industry with
> my comments on the requirements for an amateur radio license.
>
> So let me ask those who have read my comments to the FCC on the
> various restructuring proposals (most recently RM-10867, -10868 and
> 10870):
>
> Are *you* insulted by anything in my comments? I'm not asking that you
> agree with them, just if you find yourself insulted by my comments to
> FCC.

I wasn't insulted by anything in your comments but I'm a radio amateur.
If I was a total outsider, the type who might be miffed because mere
radio amateurs didn't show me the deference I thought I was owed, given
my PROFESSIONAL standing, I might have taken umbrage to your comments.

Dave K8MN

3576. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 03:49:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405041949.2026c527@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91607

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405040230.77c45ff7@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hx5c6xc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > On Sun, 02 May 2004 20:29:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
> >
> > >Of course, some will still wait for the day they package amateur licenses in
> > >boxes of "Cracker Jax" LOL
> >
> > Are "Cracker Jax" the type that are sold at the Naval Air Station in
> > place of "Cracker Jack" ?? <ggg>
>
> When did the Navy get airplanes?

1911.

http://www.history.navy.mil/branches/nhcorg4.htm

The Naval Aircraft Factory opened in 1917 on the Philadelphia Naval
Base property and eventually morphed into the Naval Air Engineering
Center where I landed coming out of school in 1963. I stayed aboard
for six years and had a blast. I got stories . . !

http://www.aerofiles.com/_naf.html

w3rv

3577. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 04:25:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pKqdnV4hrvwl8QXdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91608

Lumushahs wrote:
> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>
>
>>So my experience at least defies Vipul's.
>
>
> Perhaps, they follow me?

HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3578. Re: How to prove prior ham license ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 04:26:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405042026.55fe8134@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91609

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message news:<3lRkc.8817$Ik.732054@attbi_s53>...
> How to prove prior ham license ??
>
> Herbert Fischer would like to show that he held a valid ham license (WN1UYH)
> in 1954 that required the 5 wpm code proficiency. Without the actual
> license, is there a way to prove he held the license? (Maybe a copy of the
> old CallBook page with his call would work?)
>
> All suggestions welcomed.

His QSL card collection from those days would at least be in the right direction.

> AK

w3rv

3579. ARRL BOOK ON INTERNET LINKING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 06:58:31 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <409e905d.3172435@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 91610

ARRL BOOK ON INTERNET LINKING

VoIP: Internet Linking for Radio Amateurs
-- by Jonathan Taylor, K1RFD
Growing numbers of hams are using VoIP, or Voice Over Internet Protocol, in combination with their radios for long-distance communication spanning hundreds or thousands of miles. They're using the Internet as the relay between their base stations, handhelds and mobile transceivers.

This is a guide to the four primary VoIP systems used by hams: EchoLink, IRLP, eQSO and WIRES-II. The book is designed for beginners who need information on how to set up and use these systems, but it also provides plenty of technical "meat" for those who want to dig deeper and explore how the systems actually work.

Contents:

Connecting The World
Using A VoIP Link
Conference Servers, Reflectors and Nets
Other Linking Systems
Setting Up Your Own Node
Digital Audio and the Internet
Under The Hood: Echolink
Under The Hood: IRLP
Legal Issues In Linking
Web Resources & Glossary
This may be the first book ever written about ham radio applications of VoIP! Author Jonathan Taylor, K1RFD, is the creator of EchoLink and one of the top experts in Amateur Radio Voice Over Internet Protocol. He is a member of the American Radio Relay League.

First edition, ï¿½ 2004, The American Radio Relay League, Inc.

(ISBN: 0-87259-926-4) #9264 -- $17.95

73 Ian G3ZHI

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - many ham radio links
http://www.ukirlp.co.uk

G4NJI IRLP 5200 Echolink 135909
Rotherham simplex 145.2875mhz

GB3XN IRLP 5708 Echolink 153126
Langold 430.925 Mhz

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0783 338 0578

3580. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 11:41:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040505074127.09060.00000860@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91611

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/4/2004 11:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <pKqdnV4hrvwl8QXdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
>
>Lumushahs wrote:
>> From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>
>>
>>>So my experience at least defies Vipul's.
>>
>>
>> Perhaps, they follow me?
>
> HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing

>you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!

Actually I had visions reminiscent of the angry villagers hunting down the Frankenstein monster in the 1930's movie...Sickles, sythes, torches...you get the picture!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3581. Re: R.R.A.P Net?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 16:13:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405050813.49c24718@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91612

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<gfve90d7f6g6phd5l6flcu4qgl2g6sc537@4ax.com>...
> On Tue, 04 May 2004 02:12:31 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
> >snip
> >
> >It's all good. "No pain, no gain." Got an e-mail from Jim, N2EY...heard you,
> >didn't hear me and you couldn't hear him...ah, the comedy of it.
>
> Hopefully, this will end the oft-quoted myth that CW "always gets
> through"!
>
Quoted by whom?

No mode "always gets through". But Morse/CW often gets through when
none of the other available modes can.

--

IIRC, 7037 was the QRG of choice last time, and it worked well. We
only need a few Hz anyway...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3582. Re: Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 16:15:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405050815.4d2b9e45@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91613

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40986355.A72C2926@earthlink.net>...

> I wasn't insulted by anything in your comments but I'm a radio amateur.
> If I was a total outsider, the type who might be miffed because mere
> radio amateurs didn't show me the deference I thought I was owed, given
> my PROFESSIONAL standing, I might have taken umbrage to your comments.
>

Aren't/weren't you also a "professional in radio", Dave?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3583. Re: Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 17:02:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40991E17.A8F042F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 91614

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40986355.A72C2926@earthlink.net>...
>
> > I wasn't insulted by anything in your comments but I'm a radio amateur.
> > If I was a total outsider, the type who might be miffed because mere
> > radio amateurs didn't show me the deference I thought I was owed, given
> > my PROFESSIONAL standing, I might have taken umbrage to your comments.
> >
> Aren't/weren't you also a "professional in radio", Dave?

I certainly was but I left all the *PROFESSIONAL* baggage behind several
years ago. Now I'm simply a radio amateur. I do feel quite qualified
to comment on matters relating to amateur radio regulation. Like you,
I'm an active participant in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3584. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 17:44:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <HJ9mc.5721$8S1.1344@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91615

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:TqUlc.22305$Ia6.3248261@attbi_s03...
>
>
> >
> > > > You know what, though, you are the lid.
> > > >
> > > > Alun, N3KIP
> > >
> > > And I think your a lid. Now what?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Gentlemen ....gentlemen ......I think this can be solved in a civilized
> manner ......What we need is a Texas Death Match. I would add a cage of
> barbed wire (non-resonate) of course with the key to the locked door
> suspended by 20 feet of ladder line above the center of the mat. There
> would of course be allowed one foreign object per contestant. Dan my
choice
> for you would be a vintage Vibroplex bug attached to a 4 foot length of
> quarter inch cable. Alun you of course would have to use the same cable
set
> up but with a D-104 at the end. We would let Alun fill the 104 with lead
> shot to even things up. The winner would be presented with the World No
Lid
> Belt. Ya know this would probably be a lot more interesting than most
> contests I have been involved with over the years.
>
> Take care guys .....remember peace in the valley ..... Tom KI3R
>
>
I like that Tom.....I have both the key and the Mic. I'll let the lid
provide the cage.

Dan/W4NTI

3585. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 19:56:55 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E0A20EBF2C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91616

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in news:HJ9mc.5721
$8S1.1344@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:TqUlc.22305$Ia6.3248261@attbi_s03...
>>
>>
>> >
>> > > > You know what, though, you are the lid.
>> > > >
>> > > > Alun, N3KIP
>> > >
>> > > And I think your a lid. Now what?
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> Gentlemen ....gentlemen ......I think this can be solved in a civilized
>> manner ......What we need is a Texas Death Match. I would add a cage of
>> barbed wire (non-resonate) of course with the key to the locked door
>> suspended by 20 feet of ladder line above the center of the mat. There
>> would of course be allowed one foreign object per contestant. Dan my
>> choice for you would be a vintage Vibroplex bug attached to a 4 foot
>> length of quarter inch cable. Alun you of course would have to use the
>> same cable set up but with a D-104 at the end. We would let Alun fill
>> the 104 with lead shot to even things up. The winner would be presented
>> with the World No Lid Belt. Ya know this would probably be a lot more
>> interesting than most contests I have been involved with over the years.
>>
>> Take care guys .....remember peace in the valley ..... Tom KI3R
>>
>>
> I like that Tom.....I have both the key and the Mic. I'll let the lid
> provide the cage.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

I already hold the moral high ground. Dan is on record as saying phone ops
are lids, and I have not expressed any similar opinion re CW ops, only re
him. By my reckoning I have already won.

Alun, N3KIP

3586. Re: Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 20:24:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40994D81.5060006@psu.edu>
Source record: 91617

N2EY wrote:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4096FD68.47835B7B@earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
>>>>to as "Mr."....
>>>
>>>Yes, your comments were commented on.
>>
>
> That's hardly surprising.
>
>>>You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that
>>>Appalachian?) "Mr."
>>
>
> Indeed.
>
>>>The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of
>>>other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis'
>>>remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside
>>>amateurism."
>>>
>>>And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which
>>>require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.
>>
>
> How can I, if the "errors and disconnections" are not explained?
>
>>>Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting
>>>industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services
>>>which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you
>>>please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as
>>>practicable?
>>
>
> Dear me, I managed to do all that in a few paragraphs of comments? All
> I did was say that I'm against some parts of the various proposals and
> in favor of other parts.

>
>>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>I didn't need to go play along this far to find the answer. I went to
>>the comments page, typed in one name in the search field and had the
>>answer in four or five minutes. The comments were what I expected.
>>
>
> Well, it was never my intention to insult anyone or any industry with
> my comments on the requirements for an amateur radio license.
>
> So let me ask those who have read my comments to the FCC on the
> various restructuring proposals (most recently RM-10867, -10868 and
> 10870):
>
> Are *you* insulted by anything in my comments? I'm not asking that you
> agree with them, just if you find yourself insulted by my comments to
> FCC.

For cryin' out loud, Jim!
The short answer is no.

The liddle bit longer answer is - to my knowledge, you have never
stooped to insulting anyone here.

The longer answer is that we are talking about a person that calls you
"The Reverend Jim", calls me a hockey puck, calls Dave various
disparaging names dealing with German heritage, suggests that people
that disagree with him get mental counseling or that they appear to have
a drinking problem - and those are the ones I can think of offhand.

My point is that he knows full well what insulting is, and insulting is
what you isn't.

Shame on ya for even asking the question, and giving the accusation
even a bit of credence! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3587. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 20:27:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40994E23.6050809@psu.edu>
Source record: 91618

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/4/2004 11:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <pKqdnV4hrvwl8QXdRVn-jA@adelphia.com>
>>
>>Lumushahs wrote:
>>
>>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>So my experience at least defies Vipul's.
>>>
>>>
>>>Perhaps, they follow me?
>>
>> HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing
>
>
>>you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!
>
>
> Actually I had visions reminiscent of the angry villagers hunting down the
> Frankenstein monster in the 1930's movie...Sickles, sythes, torches...you get
> the picture!

Hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
Frankenstein"?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3588. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 21:05:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040505170509.15096.00000868@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91619

>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 5/5/2004 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40994E23.6050809@psu.edu>

>>> HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing
>>
>>
>>>you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!
>>
>>
>> Actually I had visions reminiscent of the angry villagers hunting down
>the
>> Frankenstein monster in the 1930's movie...Sickles, sythes, torches...you
>get
>> the picture!
>
>
> Hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
>Frankenstein"?

Believe it or not I've never watched it! I was never a Mel Brooks fan, and
I believe that was one of his, wasn't it...???

SR

3589. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 21:50:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Pkdmc.5926$8S1.1035@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91620

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E0A20EBF2C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:HJ9mc.5721
> $8S1.1344@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:TqUlc.22305$Ia6.3248261@attbi_s03...
> >>
> >>
> >> >
> >> > > > You know what, though, you are the lid.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Alun, N3KIP
> >> > > >
> >> > > And I think your a lid. Now what?
> >> > >
> >> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> Gentlemen ....gentlemen ......I think this can be solved in a civilized
> >> manner ......What we need is a Texas Death Match. I would add a cage of
> >> barbed wire (non-resonate) of course with the key to the locked door
> >> suspended by 20 feet of ladder line above the center of the mat. There
> >> would of course be allowed one foreign object per contestant. Dan my
> >> choice for you would be a vintage Vibroplex bug attached to a 4 foot
> >> length of quarter inch cable. Alun you of course would have to use the
> >> same cable set up but with a D-104 at the end. We would let Alun fill
> >> the 104 with lead shot to even things up. The winner would be
presented
> >> with the World No Lid Belt. Ya know this would probably be a lot more
> >> interesting than most contests I have been involved with over the
years.
> >>
> >> Take care guys .....remember peace in the valley ..... Tom KI3R
> >>
> >>
> > I like that Tom.....I have both the key and the Mic. I'll let the lid
> > provide the cage.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >

>
> I already hold the moral high ground. Dan is on record as saying phone ops
> are lids, and I have not expressed any similar opinion re CW ops, only re
> him. By my reckoning I have already won.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

A good CW operator could out operate a phone operator with less power, less equipment, and worse propagation.

Dan/W4NTI

3590. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 22:08:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405051408.25fbb239@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91621

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/2/2004 8:53 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020553.780b5ef4@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040501210258.01933.00000712@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/1/2004 10:02 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405010702.540c2ef2@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040430215401.25300.00000365@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> OK, Brain...You're back in "Idiot Mode" and there's nothing I can do
> to
> get
> >> >> around it.
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >Steve, why can't you just admit that you were wrong? Huh?
> >>
> >> Because I am not.
> >
> >But you are. Here is what you said again:
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> And I stand by it..
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

You really are that simple, and foolish to keep repeating such a false
statement as:

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >> Sorry you have a problem with it. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>

> >> It really is THAT simple.
> >
> >That was your backpedalling recovery from making such a stupid
> >statement.
>
> What backpeddling, Brain?
>
> I am STANDING BY it.
>
> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >It is equally wrong as I have shown.
>
> You've "shown" nothing.

I've shown that a person neither has to be an amateur radio operator,
nor a military personnel to be in MARS. That was another one of your
stupid assertions.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >> >Do you recall TAFKARJ commenting on those great >>>AMATEUR<<< CW
> >> >Operators saving the day during WWII? When >>>AMATEUR<<< Radio was
> >> >off the air?
> >>
> >> Wake up knuckle head and crack some history books OTHER than the tained
> and
> >> antagonistic crap that Lennie spews.
> >
> >TAFKARJ is our self-appointed historian. Even he will spout the dates
> >that the ARS was denied priveleges during WWII, but not in the same
> >post where Amateur Radio Operators saved the day in WWII.
>
> You'll have to show me the post wherein Jim "appo9inted" himself.

No, I won't have to.

> And as far as "self appointed historians" go, you had better survey some
> of the posts your scumbuddy has put up here...More than a few way off Amateur
> Radio topic and in the thousands of bytes of bandwidth.

Carl spanked you for wasting bandwidth, and here you are... again.

> >It's one of those PCTA double standard things.
>
> I think YOU need to read what you write before YOU assert any "double
> standard" allegations, Your Creepiness.

It was well thought out. That is precisely why I used the phrase,
"PCTA double standard."

> >And don't forget that he also said that code testing was a barrier to
> >CW use.
> >
> >> >Welp, there's another one who cannot admit that he was wrong. Ever.
> >>
> >> So far neither you or Lennie has "proven" Jim to be wrong. So far you
> >> have not proven yourself to be right...About ANYthing...
> >
> >Of course we have. Time and again. But his most obnoxious
> >cheerleader won't hear of it.
> >
> >> >Two peas in a pod.
> >>
> >> If that was supposed to be an insult, you missed...By a mile.
> >
> >Then you haven't seen his reaction.
>
> It's not about what >>JIM<< may percieve as an insult, Brain.

There you go assuming again.

> But you never do seem to keep your perspectives in order, do you?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yep. You're nuts and I'm not.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

Pffft.

3591. Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 22:12:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405051412.3f2b3ad1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91622

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040504084534.27047.00000696@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Hans' views/complaints about NCI and the ARRL and NCVEC
> >petitions
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/2/2004 8:44 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020544.2f13bfed@posting.google.com>
>
> >> BTW...You were the one who opened THAT can of worms, so sit down and
> get
> >> you a plate full, Puppet Boy.
> >
> >No, I made no mention of bikini clad formers. You did. Are you still
> >married this time?
>
> Which "time", Brain?

"this time?"

3592. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 22:34:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040505183433.19729.00000946@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91623

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/5/2004 5:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405051408.25fbb239@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>...

>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> It really is THAT simple.
>
>You really are that simple, and foolish to keep repeating such a false
>statement as:
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

I don't keep repeating that statement, Your Sliminess...YOU do.

>> >> Sorry you have a problem with it. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>> >>
>> >> It really is THAT simple.
>> >
>> >That was your backpedalling recovery from making such a stupid
>> >statement.
>>
>> What backpeddling, Brain?
>>
>> I am STANDING BY it.
>>
>> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
>> >It is equally wrong as I have shown.

You've only shown that you don't understand the relationship between the
Military Affiliate Radio System and the Amateur Radio Service.

Your problem, Your Putziness...Not mine;

>> You've "shown" nothing.
>
>I've shown that a person neither has to be an amateur radio operator,
>nor a military personnel to be in MARS. That was another one of your
>stupid assertions.

And I did acknowledge that there ARE a FEW people in MARS who are neither.

I had stated that almost from the outset. You DID point out ONE person
who was neither a licensed Amateur nor military person assigned as official
duty.

It still does not make my statement any less true.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

YOU repeated it again, Brain. It's the only way you can slide out from
under the truth.

>> >TAFKARJ is our self-appointed historian. Even he will spout the dates
>> >that the ARS was denied priveleges during WWII, but not in the same
>> >post where Amateur Radio Operators saved the day in WWII.
>>
>> You'll have to show me the post wherein Jim "appointed" himself.
>
>No, I won't have to.

I know you won't.

You can't.

You've stated that Jim Miccolis has somehow "appointed" himself to some
imaginary post.

Of course you ignored the fact that your "mentor" is far more guilty of
ravaging this NG with "historical" ramblings 100-to-1.

And if you DID try to "show" where Jim alledgedly appointed himspelf to
ANY post, you would, of course, be lying.

>> And as far as "self appointed historians" go, you had better survey
>some
>> of the posts your scumbuddy has put up here...More than a few way off
>Amateur
>> Radio topic and in the thousands of bytes of bandwidth.
>
>Carl spanked you for wasting bandwidth, and here you are... again.

He didn't spank anything, Brain.

And it seems to me that you're just as equally cupable.

>> >It's one of those PCTA double standard things.
>>
>> I think YOU need to read what you write before YOU assert any "double
>> standard" allegations, Your Creepiness.
>
>It was well thought out. That is precisely why I used the phrase,
>"PCTA double standard."

As for "double standards" your admonishment about what Carl alledgedly did and then wasting reams of bandwidth to (unsuccessfully) engage me over the relationship between the MARS program and Amateur Radio is one of them.

Got your britches around your ankles, Brain, and the picture ain't pretty....

>> >Then you haven't seen his reaction.
>>
>> It's not about what >>JIM<< may percieve as an insult, Brain.
>
>There you go assuming again.

I am not "assuming" anything, Your Wimpiness.

I said this is not about what Jim perceives, and that's true.

>> But you never do seem to keep your perspectives in order, do you?

>Yep. You're nuts and I'm not.

>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
>Pffft.

You're the one who keeps repeating that, Brain, not me.

>>I<< keep saying No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

That is true. MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio for it's own existence. If you can't accept that, then you're everybit the idiot I have reason to believe you are. You welcome to try and disprove it, however you've littered the NG with so much evidence to the contrary that you'll be at it for a verrrrrrrrrry long time.

Why don't you just admit that, once again, you tried to make an issue from a non-issue and got your private parts caught in the zipper. I have a pair of tweezers and a steri-strip to bandage it with, if you need it.

Now...About those T5 logs.....?!?!?

Steve, K4YZ

3593. RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 23:00:48 UTC
From: channel391@juno.com
Message-ID: <c7brn0sib1@xuxa.iecc.com>
Source record: 91624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

April 14, 2004

Mr. Glenn A. Baxter
RR 1 Box 776
Belgrade Lakes, ME 04918

RE: Amateur Radio license K1MAN

Dear Mr. Baxter:

This letter explains in what ways your Amateur station has come into compliance with Commission rules since our letter to you of January 29, 2002; and notifies you of two areas of operation that, if not corrected, will lead to enforcement action against your license and/or designation of your renewal application for a hearing.

By letter dated January 29, 2002, the Commission notified you that your understanding of various Amateur Radio Service rules was incorrect. We outlined your apparent misconceptions regarding station control, publishing a transmitting schedule and how that related to interference, threats made to licensee complainants, including threats made with so-called "felony complaint affidavits", broadcasting and broadcasting of tape recordings and telephone conversations.

The January 29 letter detailed complaints received by the Commission, and explained that your method of station control, i.e., "a timer from Radio Shack", did not achieve compliance with the Commission's Rules when you were not present at the control point for your station and, therefore, did not satisfy the Commission's Rules regarding automatic control of a station. We explained to you that to comply with the Commission's Rules you must be at the transmitter, or at the transmitter control point, every moment your station is transmitting when your station is locally or remotely controlled; and that if the station is controlled by telecommand from the control point using a radio link, the frequencies used for telecommand must comply with the Section 97.201 requirements for an auxiliary station (may transmit only on the 1.25 m and shorter wavelength bands, except 219-220, 222-222.150, 431-433 and 435-438 MHz segments).

By letter dated March 4, 2003, the Commission's Boston Office notified you that Commission monitoring and numerous complaints filed with the Commission indicated that the problems outlined in January 2002 had not been corrected. The letter stated that your Amateur station was apparently being used for broadcasting various programs having nothing to do with Amateur Radio; and that transmissions from your station

were being used for deliberate interference and for communications in which you apparently had a pecuniary interest. The Boston Office letter stated that transmissions started and ended erratically, were sometimes repetitive and abruptly ended with no identification as required by Commission rules, and that such operation indicated that the transmissions were not under proper control of a licensed operator. The letter noted also that you continually broadcast notices of so-called "felony complaint affidavits " that you claimed to have filed with the United States Justice Department against other Amateur Radio licensees whom you perceived to have interfered with your broadcasts, or refused to relinquish their operating frequency to you.

The Boston Office's letter stated that transmissions from your Amateur station included references to a degree program and directed listeners to your website that advertised an "American Radio School Technician Degree in Electronics" for "$299.95". On that web site you solicited donations for radio equipment, advertised a credit card, and solicited donations and advertised for "IARN" and "AARA". The letter from the Boston office pointed out that such use of your station was in apparent violation of Section 97.113(a)(3) of the Commission's rules, which prohibits "Communications for hire or for material compensation, direct or indirect...." and "Communications in which the station licensee or control operator has a pecuniary interest..."

The letter from the Boston Office requested that you provide substantial additional information about the operation of your station, including submission of a log detailing the information on a weekly basis until further notice. In January 2004, the Boston office notified you that you could discontinue the log submissions, and referred the case to this office.

We have reviewed the information you submitted, as well as numerous complaints filed against your station. Additionally we have reviewed tape recordings made by Commission personnel of your transmissions at various times during 2003 and 2004 subsequent to the Boston Office letter of March 3, 2003.

It is the finding of this office that you are, with some exceptions, generally in compliance with the Commission's rules in the Amateur Service related to broadcasting and information bulletins, and we explain as follows. Broadcasting is prohibited in the Amateur Radio Service, with some exceptions. Section 97.3(a)(10) defines broadcasting as "transmissions intended for reception by the general public, either direct or relayed." One-way transmissions are limited in the Amateur service, but an exception is allowed in Section 97.111(b)(6) for "Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins."

Information bulletins are defined by Section 97.3(a)(26) as messages "directed only to Amateur operators consisting solely of subject matter of direct interest to the Amateur service." There are no specific time limits placed upon information bulletins by Commission

rules. A review of your programs at random times since March 3, 2003 indicates that your transmissions were directed to Amateur Radio operators, not to the general public, and that the individual bulletins were related to the Amateur Radio Service. The only notable exception was the offering of a reward for information leading to the identity of parties making threatening telephone calls to you.

The station control problems outlined to you in warnings from the Commission appear, with minor exceptions, to have been corrected. During the monitoring period your station abruptly ended transmission with no identification in one instance, and started transmissions in mid-sentence in another instance.

There are, however, two areas in the operation of your Amateur station that must be corrected in order to avoid enforcement action and/or a designation of your renewal application for hearing to determine if you are qualified to remain a licensee. These are: 1) deliberate interference resulting from your commencing operation on top of ongoing communications, in violation of Section 97.101(a) and (d); and 2) use of your Amateur station for pecuniary interests, in violation of Sections 97.113(a)(2)and (3).

Regarding deliberate interference, we receive continuing complaints, and our monitoring verifies, that your transmissions start up on top of existing communications of individual licensees as well as nets such as the Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio Network. Such operation constitutes deliberate interference. Stations engaging in ongoing communications are not obligated to stop transmitting when K1MAN wants to start transmitting on a frequency, and complainants are so advised by the Commission. You appear to believe that the publication of a transmission schedule gives you the right to begin transmitting on a certain frequency at a certain time, even if the frequency is occupied. It does not.

All frequencies in the Amateur Radio Service are shared--no frequency is assigned for the exclusive use of any station, and your Amateur station has no greater rights to a frequency at any particular time than any other Amateur station. Section 97.101(d) of the rules prohibits an Amateur station from willfully or maliciously interfering with any radio communication or signal. Moreover, publishing a schedule is merely one of the several conditions necessary for the control operator of a club station to accept compensation for transmitting information bulletins, pursuant to Section 97.113(d) of the Commission's rules. Your station K1MAN, however, is not a club station.

Regarding use of an Amateur station for pecuniary interest, we note that your Amateur Radio program transmissions regularly advertise your web page at www.K1man.com, and on those pages you advertise items for sale by the American Amateur Radio Association (AARA), including T shirts, hats and a "Technician Degree Diploma". You advertise the sales commissions and "overrides" that your State Directors and

Section Managers can receive, and detail ways in which your Section Managers can earn money by recruiting members, selling hats, name badges or T shirts.

Section 97.113(a)(2) prohibits communications for hire or for material compensation, direct or indirect, paid or promised. Section 97.113(a)(3) prohibits communications in which the station licensee or control operator has a pecuniary interest.

We remind you that any attempts to threaten or intimidate Amateur radio licensees operating on the Amateur bands will reflect adversely upon your qualifications to remain a Commission licensee, and would be the subject of a license revocation or renewal hearing. By letter dated December 11, 2001, you were warned against the sending of your so-called "felony complaint affidavits" to various Amateur Radio licenses that you perceive to either cause interference to your station or which do not relinquish to you the frequency on which they are operating.

Complainants were advised by the Commission to forward any such "affidavits" they received to the Commission, and that they could otherwise be ignored. The United States Attorney for your jurisdiction also warned you that the mailing of such "affidavits" is contrary to law. Apparently you have discontinued those threats. We also remind you that, in regard to the taping and broadcasting of telephone calls, you must comply with applicable state laws.

In conclusion, failure to correct the deliberate interference caused by K1MAN, and the continued use of K1MAN for pecuniary interests, will lead to enforcement action against your license. Either would be sufficient to designate your renewal application for an evidentiary hearing to determine if you are qualified to remain a Commission licensee.

An adverse finding in regard to threats to complainant licensees, or violation of state law regarding recording and broadcasting telephone conversations, would lead to enforcement action against your license and would be sufficient to designate your renewal application for an evidentiary hearing to determine if you are qualified to remain a Commission licensee. You would have the burden of proof in such a proceeding.

You should be aware that in 1990, the Commission revised its character qualifications policy, expanding the types of non-FCC-related misconduct that it would consider as bearing on licensee or applicant character qualifications (Policy Regarding Character Qualifications in Broadcast Licensing, Policy Statement and Order, 5 FCC RCD 3252 (1990) (Character Policy Statement), recon. granted in part, denied in part, 6 FCC Rcd 3448 (1991), further recon. granted, 7 FCC Rcd 6564 (1992). The Commission concluded that "a propensity to comply with the law generally is relevant to the Commission's public interest analysis, and that an applicant's or licensee's willingness to violate other

laws, and, in particular, to commit felonies, also bears on our confidence that an applicant or licensee will conform to FCC rules and policies. The 1990 Character Policy Statement applies to Amateur Radio licensees just as it does to all other FCC licensees (See, e.g., Herbert L. Schoenbohm, Decision, 13 FCC Rcd 15028 (1998), recon. denied, 13 FCC Rcd 23774 (1998), aff'd in part, dismissed in part sub nom. Schoenbohm v. FCC, 204 F.3d 243 (2000), cert. denied, 121 S. Ct. 405 (2000); Leslie D. Brewer, Order to Show Cause, Notice of Order of Suspension, Notice of Opportunity for Hearing, and Notice of Apparent Liability for a Forfeiture, 16 FCC Rcd 5671, licenses revoked, 16 FCC Rcd 12878 (2001).

Accordingly, we will continue to review the operation of K1MAN in light of the issues outlined above.

CC: FCC Northeastern Regional Director
FCC Boston Office District Director
Honorable Paula D. Silsby, United States Attorney, US Department of Justice, District of Maine
Timothy D. Wing, Assistant U.S. Attorney, U. S. Department of Justice, District of Maine

---

NOTE: Issuance by the FCC of a Warning Notice indicates that the FCC has what it believes to be reliable evidence of possible rules infractions and not necessarily that the recipient has violated FCC rules. The FCC has the authority, pursuant to §97.519(d)(2) of the rules to readminister any examination element previously administered by a volunteer examiner. These enforcement letters are representative of recent Advisory Notices, Warning Notices, Notices of Violation and other FCC communications to licensees and others involving possible serious rules violations. Unless otherwise indicated, all letters were signed by FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth. This listing is not a comprehensive record of FCC Amateur enforcement actions. Follow-up correspondence will be published as provided. Address all inquiries regarding this correspondence to FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth, rholling@fcc.gov.

3594. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-05 23:12:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gpSdnQA_eZRF6QTdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91625

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 5/5/2004 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40994E23.6050809@psu.edu>
>
>
>>>> HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing
>>>
>>>
>>>>you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!
>>>
>>>
>>> Actually I had visions reminiscent of the angry villagers hunting down
>>
>>the
>>
>>>Frankenstein monster in the 1930's movie...Sickles, sythes, torches...you
>>
>>get
>>
>>>the picture!
>>
>>
>> Hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
>>Frankenstein"?
>
>
> Believe it or not I've never watched it! I was never a Mel Brooks fan, and
> I believe that was one of his, wasn't it...???

Oh yes. It's worth a look, even if just to see the young Terri Garr. I
like it best out of all his movies.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3595. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 01:39:53 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E0DC33A2324elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91626

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:Pkdmc.5926$8S1.1035@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E0A20EBF2C3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:HJ9mc.5721 $8S1.1344@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> > news:TqUlc.22305$Ia6.3248261@attbi_s03...
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > > > You know what, though, you are the lid.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Alun, N3KIP
>> >> > >
>> >> > > And I think your a lid. Now what?
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> >>
>> >> Gentlemen ....gentlemen ......I think this can be solved in a
>> >> civilized manner ......What we need is a Texas Death Match. I would
>> >> add a cage of barbed wire (non-resonate) of course with the key to
>> >> the locked door suspended by 20 feet of ladder line above the
>> >> center of the mat. There would of course be allowed one foreign
>> >> object per contestant. Dan my choice for you would be a vintage
>> >> Vibroplex bug attached to a 4 foot length of quarter inch cable.
>> >> Alun you of course would have to use the same cable set up but with
>> >> a D-104 at the end. We would let Alun fill the 104 with lead shot
>> >> to even things up. The winner would be presented with the World No
>> >> Lid Belt. Ya know this would probably be a lot more interesting
>> >> than most contests I have been involved with over the years.
>> >>
>> >> Take care guys .....remember peace in the valley ..... Tom KI3R
>> >>
>> >>
>> > I like that Tom.....I have both the key and the Mic. I'll let the
>> > lid provide the cage.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >

>> >
>> >
>>
>> I already hold the moral high ground. Dan is on record as saying phone
>> ops are lids, and I have not expressed any similar opinion re CW ops,
>> only re him. By my reckoning I have already won.
>>
>> Alun, N3KIP
>
> A good CW operator could out operate a phone operator with less power,
> less equipment, and worse propagation.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

A good operator (CW or any other kind) wouldn't say "(insert mode here)
operators are lids".

3596. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 02:07:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Well not quite all legal. Seems he must clean up his act in regards to
the following items.
>
>
> Section 97.113(a)(2) prohibits communications for hire or for material
> compensation, direct or indirect, paid or promised. Section
> 97.113(a)(3) prohibits communications in which the station licensee or
> control operator has a pecuniary interest.
>
>
> We remind you that any attempts to threaten or intimidate Amateur
> radio licensees operating on the Amateur bands will reflect adversely
> upon your qualifications to remain a Commission licensee, and would be
> the subject of a license revocation or renewal hearing. By letter
> dated December 11, 2001, you were warned against the sending of your
> so-called "felony complaint affidavits" to various Amateur Radio
> licenses that you perceive to either cause interference to your
> station or which do not relinquish to you the frequency on which they
> are operating.
>
>
> Complainants were advised by the Commission to forward any such
> "affidavits" they received to the Commission, and that they could
> otherwise be ignored. The United States Attorney for your jurisdiction
> also warned you that the mailing of such "affidavits" is contrary to
> law. Apparently you have discontinued those threats. We also remind
> you that, in regard to the taping and broadcasting of telephone calls,
> you must comply with applicable state laws.
>
>
> In conclusion, failure to correct the deliberate interference caused
> by K1MAN, and the continued use of K1MAN for pecuniary interests, will
> lead to enforcement action against your license. Either would be
> sufficient to designate your renewal application for an evidentiary
> hearing to determine if you are qualified to remain a Commission
> licensee.
>
>
> An adverse finding in regard to threats to complainant licensees, or
> violation of state law regarding recording and broadcasting telephone
> conversations, would lead to enforcement action against your license
> and would be sufficient to designate your renewal application for an
> evidentiary hearing to determine if you are qualified to remain a

> Commission licensee. You would have the burden of proof in such a
> proceeding.
>

The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
be taken off the air.

3597. Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 04:03:56 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 91628

I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.

Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one either.

I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3598. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 05:09:56 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91629

daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in
news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com:

> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
> feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF
> bands.
>
> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not.
> There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one
> either.
>
> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll
> be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
>

The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so evidently a majority around the world agree with you. I think the FCC will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace. I didn't think it would survive for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only nine months so far, so I could still be right.

3599. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 08:49:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <z_mmc.149870$Gd3.37099821@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91630

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I didn't think it would survive
> for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only nine
> months so far, so I could still be right.

I don't know, Alun. I'd wager that more than a few PCTA's have made their feelings felt to the FCC and, more importantly, to their local elected representatives. (Some of whom have a say re. the FCC's bugdet.) Perhaps it might be more than a year...much more.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3600. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 10:50:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405060250.124cae81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91631

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040504084147.27047.00000695@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/2/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020541.4ce5d815@posting.google.com>
>
> >You are the Master of the Obvious.
>
> It's obvious that you're a ZERO, Brian. And that has nothing to do with
> the ZERO in your callsign, byt the way...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, its obvious that you're nuts and I'm not.

3601. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 10:52:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405060252.33a9bcc6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91632

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<gpSdnQA_eZRF6QTdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
> >>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
> >>Date: 5/5/2004 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <40994E23.6050809@psu.edu>
> >
> >
> >>>> HOWL! I'm getting these images of fat ugly people stalking you, chasing
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>you around, Vipul! Not a pretty image mind you, but a very funny one!
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Actually I had visions reminiscent of the angry villagers hunting down
> >>
> >>the
> >>
> >>>Frankenstein monster in the 1930's movie...Sickles, sythes, torches...you
> >>
> >>get
> >>
> >>>the picture!
> >>
> >>
> >> Hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
> >>Frankenstein"?
> >
> >
> > Believe it or not I've never watched it! I was never a Mel Brooks fan, and
> > I believe that was one of his, wasn't it...???
>
> Oh yes. It's worth a look, even if just to see the young Terri Garr. I
> like it best out of all his movies.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Steve's jar says "Abby Normal" on it.

3602. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 11:04:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91633

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040505183433.19729.00000946@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/5/2004 5:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405051408.25fbb239@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>
> >> It really is THAT simple.
> >
> >You really are that simple, and foolish to keep repeating such a false
> >statement as:
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> I don't keep repeating that statement, Your Sliminess...YOU do.

Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
attaching it to your name.

So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
is substantially true.

No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
"Amateur Radio."

That is all. And since you're probably a radio volunteer for all
three services, and an amateur radio operator, you should be able to
vindicate yourself in short time.

Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.

bb

3603. Re: Are You Insulted? (was: Re: Citizens make inappropriate comments?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 11:27:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405060327.52bd13b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91634

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40994D81.5060006@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<4096FD68.47835B7B@earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> >>
> >>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> >>>>I wonder if my comments were commented on. I wonder if I was referred
> >>>>to as "Mr."....

> >>>Yes, your comments were commented on.

> > That's hardly surprising.
> >
> >>>You were simply called "Miccolis", without the appellation (or is that
> >>>Appalachian?) "Mr."

> > Indeed.
> >
> >>>The citizen commented that "There is a decided ignorance of the tasks of
> >>>other radio service operators displayed by Miccolis." and "Miccolis'
> >>>remarks must be taken as due to his ignorance of the radio world outside
> >>>amateurism."
> >>>
> >>>And your FCC submittal "has a number of errors and disconnections which
> >>>require correction." Please see to that at your earliest convenience.
> >
> > How can I, if the "errors and disconnections" are not explained?
> >
> >>>Further, your comments were "a decided insult to the broadcasting
> >>>industry, civil aviation, maritime world, and all of those services
> >>>which enable constant communications by means of radio." Would you
> >>>please make it a point to apologize to those good folks as soon as
> >>>practicable?
> >
> > Dear me, I managed to do all that in a few paragraphs of comments? All
> > I did was say that I'm against some parts of the various proposals and
> > in favor of other parts.
> >
> >>>73, de Hans, K0HB
> >>
> >>I didn't need to go play along this far to find the answer. I went to
> >>the comments page, typed in one name in the search field and had the

> >>answer in four or five minutes. The comments were what I expected.
> >
> > Well, it was never my intention to insult anyone or any industry with
> > my comments on the requirements for an amateur radio license.
> >
> > So let me ask those who have read my comments to the FCC on the
> > various restructuring proposals (most recently RM-10867, -10868 and
> > 10870):
> >
> > Are *you* insulted by anything in my comments? I'm not asking that you
> > agree with them, just if you find yourself insulted by my comments to
> > FCC.
>
> For cryin' out loud, Jim!
> The short answer is no.

That's reassuring, Mike.
>
> The liddle bit longer answer is - to my knowledge, you have never
> stooped to insulting anyone here.

Thank you.
>
> The longer answer is that we are talking about a person that calls you
> "The Reverend Jim", calls me a hockey puck, calls Dave various
> disparaging names dealing with German heritage, suggests that people
> that disagree with him get mental counseling or that they appear to have
> a drinking problem - and those are the ones I can think of offhand.

I've lost track of how many different unflattering nicknames and
descriptions have been applied to me here. I think that sort of
behavior says a lot about the person writing the stuff.
>
> My point is that he knows full well what insulting is, and insulting is
> what you isn't.

I know what *my* idea of insulting is. I'm just checking what others
think, including those who disagree with me on license issues (such as
Hans, K0HB). Did you read my comments?

> Shame on ya for even asking the question, and giving the accusation
> even a bit of credence! 8^)

I hope I did not insult you by my question...

I don't know whether such reply comments make any difference to FCC. I
do know that I will take K2ASP's excellent advice and example and not
reply in kind.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3604. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 12:34:54 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com>
Source record: 91635

On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote:

>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it
>should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.

It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of morse.

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3605. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 15:42:19 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7dm9u$98g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
> The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
> be taken off the air.
>

Why?

73,

Lloyd

3606. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 16:53:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405060853.60895f75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91637

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<gpSdnQA_eZRF6QTdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> >>Subject: Re: Hamfests?

> >>hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
> >>Frankenstein"?

Or the townsfolk in "Blazing Saddles".
> >
> > Believe it or not I've never watched it!

Rent it. You won't be dissapointed. Gene Wilder, Marty Feldman, Teri
Garr, Madeline Kahn, Cloris Leachman, Peter Boyle and even Gene
Hackman.

> > I was never a Mel Brooks fan, and
> > I believe that was one of his, wasn't it...???

One of his best, although it's tough to pick from among classics such
as "Blazing Saddles" ("Mongo is but pawn in game of life" and "The
Producers" ("Boids. Doity, stinking, disgusting boids.")

(moment of silence as we remember N0BK, now in a better place)

> Oh yes. It's worth a look, even if just to see the young Terri Garr. I
> like it best out of all his movies.

So many great moments in "YF":

"Elevate me!"

"What knockers!"

"Oh you men. Six or seven quick ones and you're off with the boys..."

"What hump?"

"Frau Blucher!"

"You gave the monster part of your wonderful brain. But what did the
monster give you?"

(sung):"Oh sweet mystery of life, at last I've found you!"

and the one I've used many many times:

"Could be worse. Could be raining."

73 de Jim, N2EY

3607. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 17:15:01 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1b043ca46d72748e98999a@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 91638

In article <20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com>, daviesl2003
@aol.com says...
> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it
> should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>
> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not. There
> should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one either.
>
> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll be lucky
> to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.

I didn't find the series of tests difficult at all. The 5WPM and 13WPM
were fairly easy too, as I had time to practice the 5WPM while on a
rainy camping trip. Good thing I brought plenty of batteries and a code
practice tapes.

13WPM was gotten by actually working HF with what privileges I had as a
Tech+. From there, up to 20WPM and all done.

I think the biggest detriment to testing now is the publication of the
question pools. People can get into the hobby via rote memorization,
which by the way is what schools teach kids, not how to think but how to
memorize.

So over time the hobby is just going to be awash in nitwits, and then
fade away. There are too many other options to communicate.

3608. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 17:17:29 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506131729.355$tx@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>
We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3609. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 17:34:07 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <SDumc.76718$7a5.5104@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91678
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>>
> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.

I'll kick in for the cost of the domain.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3610. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 17:38:52 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506133852.545$Ka@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >>
> > We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
>
> I'll kick in for the cost of the domain.
>
I'll kick in on the bandwidth.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3611. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 18:07:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxaskb0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91639

On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:34:54 +1000, Barry OGrady wrote:

>>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it
>>should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>
>It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of morse.

You, sir, have that only by virtue of being licensed by some
Administration other than the U.S. Federal Communications
Commission.

It is the latter's licensing policy that is under discussion here.

But you knew that all along, didn't you?

Don't tease the bears..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3612. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 18:32:07 UTC
From: AKC Master Control <akcmc@akcmc.org>
Message-ID: <b9b668ef946ffa7b2aaa5e530c7927ed@news.bubbanews.com>
Source record: 91680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:20040506131729.355$tx@newsreader.com...
> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >
> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
>
directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting

3613. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 19:02:10 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506150210.843$Cp@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20040506131729.355$tx@newsreader.com...
> > "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> > >
> > We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
> >
> directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting
>
Cool, I'm in. Where do I send the money?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3614. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 19:07:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <m--dnbPVYtXJBgfd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
>>The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
>>be taken off the air.
>>
>
>
>
> Why?
>

If you don't know why, then you are a part of the problem like he is.
Tell me why someone who has no respect for other amateurs, who interfers
with other amateur communications, issues phoney "felony complaint
affidavits" to harass other amateurs, threatens other amateurs because
they refuse to give up the frequency to him, willfully violates the FCC
rules, uses amateur radio for monitary gain (against the rules), engages
in broadcasting (against the FCC rules), should be on the air?

3615. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 19:31:59 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <mmwmc.77338$7a5.73018@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91682
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Steveo wrote:
> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
>> news:20040506131729.355$tx@newsreader.com...
>>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>>>>
>>> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
>>>
>> directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting
>>
> Cool, I'm in. Where do I send the money?

I think you just buy the site. I use Internet Connection; but DirectNIC is
dirt cheap.

--
_____________________________________
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?
```

3616. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 19:41:50 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506154150.455$m3@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20040506131729.355$tx@newsreader.com...
> >>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
> >>>
> >> directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting
> >>
> > Cool, I'm in. Where do I send the money?
>
> I think you just buy the site. I use Internet Connection; but DirectNIC
> is dirt cheap.
>
We need someone to run the site. I'm certainly no website builder
but I'm happy to pay, if'n I can put up some pics on the site.

Let's do it.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3617. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 19:49:37 UTC
From: Road Warrior <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us>
Message-ID: <fywmc.9139$cb.131@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
>> Steveo wrote:
>>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>>>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
>>>>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
>>>>>
>>>> directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting
>>>>
>>> Cool, I'm in. Where do I send the money?
>>
>> I think you just buy the site. I use Internet Connection; but
>> DirectNIC is dirt cheap.
>>
> We need someone to run the site. I'm certainly no website builder
> but I'm happy to pay, if'n I can put up some pics on the site.
>
> Let's do it.

Once you have the site, send me an Id/password and I will put together
something decent (but simple) for you. I won't spend as much time on it as
my employees did on my corporate sites, but I will make it at least as nice
as my home site.

--

_____
Hotel sheets, rental cars, late flights, fast food.
What's not to love about consulting?!?!?

3618. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 20:22:36 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E1A66458320elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91641

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxaskb0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:34:54 +1000, Barry OGrady wrote:
>
>>>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>>>feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
>>>HF bands.
>>
>>It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
>>morse.
>
> You, sir, have that only by virtue of being licensed by some
> Administration other than the U.S. Federal Communications
> Commission.
>
> It is the latter's licensing policy that is under discussion here.
>
> But you knew that all along, didn't you?
>
> Don't tease the bears..... <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>
>

I'd say it's still relevant. Lots of countries have now abolished the code
test, since the international requirement went away last July. What
problems have been reported as a result? None, of course. So that is proof
that it isn't necessary.

3619. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 20:30:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E1A7B59F6BFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91642

Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in
news:MPG.1b043ca46d72748e98999a@news.verizon.net:

> In article <20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com>, daviesl2003
> @aol.com says...
>> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>> feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
>> HF bands.
>>
>> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should
>> not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a
>> easy one either.
>>
>> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll
>> be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>
> I didn't find the series of tests difficult at all. The 5WPM and 13WPM
> were fairly easy too, as I had time to practice the 5WPM while on a
> rainy camping trip. Good thing I brought plenty of batteries and a code
> practice tapes.
>

I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work

> 13WPM was gotten by actually working HF with what privileges I had as a
> Tech+. From there, up to 20WPM and all done.
>

I'd say it's a bit harder for those with no interest in using CW

> I think the biggest detriment to testing now is the publication of the
> question pools. People can get into the hobby via rote memorization,

True in some instances, but most people don't have photographic memory

> which by the way is what schools teach kids, not how to think but how
> to memorize.
>
> So over time the hobby is just going to be awash in nitwits,

I don't think so. Not any more than it already is, anyway!

> and then
> fade away. There are too many other options to communicate.
>
>

...which is another issue altogether. The Internet has hit the hobby pretty hard.

3620. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 20:41:42 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506164142.699$wb@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> >> Steveo wrote:
> >>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >>>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> >>>>> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
> >>>>>
> >>>> directnic.com, $15.00/year, free hosting
> >>>>
> >>> Cool, I'm in. Where do I send the money?
> >>
> >> I think you just buy the site. I use Internet Connection; but
> >> DirectNIC is dirt cheap.
> >>
> > We need someone to run the site. I'm certainly no website builder
> > but I'm happy to pay, if'n I can put up some pics on the site.
> >
> > Let's do it.
>
> Once you have the site, send me an Id/password and I will put together
> something decent (but simple) for you. I won't spend as much time on it
> as my employees did on my corporate sites, but I will make it at least
> as nice as my home site.
>
Is it registered yet?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.
```

3621. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 20:47:47 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7e86n$o55$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:m--dnbPVYtXJBgfd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
> If you don't know why, then you are a part of the problem like he is.
> Tell me why someone who has no respect for other amateurs, who interfers
> with other amateur communications, issues phoney "felony complaint
> affidavits" to harass other amateurs, threatens other amateurs because
> they refuse to give up the frequency to him, willfully violates the FCC
> rules, uses amateur radio for monitary gain (against the rules), engages
> in broadcasting (against the FCC rules), should be on the air?
>

How does me not understanding the problem make me *part* of the
problem?

73,

Lloyd

3622. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 20:49:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506164949.666$mI@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:m--dnbPVYtXJBgfd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> >
> > If you don't know why, then you are a part of the problem like he is.
> > Tell me why someone who has no respect for other amateurs, who
> > interfers with other amateur communications, issues phoney "felony
> > complaint affidavits" to harass other amateurs, threatens other
> > amateurs because they refuse to give up the frequency to him, willfully
> > violates the FCC rules, uses amateur radio for monitary gain (against
> > the rules), engages in broadcasting (against the FCC rules), should be
> > on the air?
> >
>
> How does me not understanding the problem make me *part* of the
> problem?
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd
>
Heh, it's just more of JJ's double-speak. Ask him what his
call is.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3623. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 21:18:15 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <rYxmc.43864$I%1.2842221@attbi_s51>
Source record: 91645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
> be taken off the air.

For sure! Baxter has not mellowed a bit. I remember when he got his kicks knocking the fine, friendly gentlemen who ran the Sunday morning Bermuda Net off their traditional frequency with his one-way high-powered blather. Then Baxter went and declared a national emergency for the country of Bermuda! What a nut. How long must we endure Baxter's abuse of amateur radio? AK

--------- Tony's letter to the Bermuda Government Telecom Officer --------

Antony Sxxxx, VP9--
Hamilton, Bermuda
August 21st. 1989

Mr. E. Pitman,

Governement Telecommunications Officer,
Department of Telecommunications,
Hamilton.

Dear Ted,

I am faxing a transcript of the broadcast put out by K1MAN last week.

When you have read this I would like to have a meeting with you, maybe we could have lunch and discuss it then, to fill you in on what actually happened.

Your support with this would be appreciated. I have been to the American Consulate and will be writing a formal letter of complaint this week, requesting a public apology from K1MAN. He is advocating that I should lose my license for NOT passing third party traffic when the "world needed to know" and he had declared an emergency. He was doing this under the authority of the "FCC" according to him. I reminded him that we were not a State of the United States of America and that we were governed by the Department of Telecommunications and also the British arrangements for third party traffic. He could declare whatever he wanted to but until we had clearance, we would not pass it

No emergency had been declared and as far as we were concerned it was an unofficial net standing by in case we were needed should an emergency be declared. He did not like being informed that we were handling the situation ourselves very efficiently, without his help.

Please telephone me when it is convenient and I will explain more, or as I said, maybe we could have lunch.

Yours sincerely,
Antony Sxxxx VP9--

This is a response to the editorial broadcast by K1MAN after Hurricane Dean.

STATEMENT -
KlMAN stated "IARN activated for Hurricane Dean as it neared Bermuda, Sunday August 6th. 1989 at 11.30 UTC. IARN Headquarters in Belgrade Lakes etc. received a call from Tony Sxxxxx, VP9--, requesting assistance from IARN on 14.275mHz. Tony wants to activate 14 . 275mHz. . .etc. "

FACT - At 11.15 UTC, VP9-- & VP9__ activated the Bermuda net.

A broadcast was in progress and VP9-- decided to telephone KlMAN.

The conversation was "Glen Baxter" and the response was "Tony Sxxxx VP9-- in Bermuda. We want 14.275mHz cleared due to the impending Hurricane"

Response from Glen Baxter, "No problem" and the telephone conversation finished.

FACT - At no time was a request made for IARN to assist or to activate.

FACT - KlMAN checked in to the Bermuda net at 11.45 UTC and he was informed, (as were many others who had checked in) of the current situation in Bermuda.

STATEMENT -
"Associated Press and therefore the entire world, was, de facto, cut off from the world of public information dissemination..... up to the minute detail report, now assured that ham radio and IARN had a well established and well maintained link to Bermuda"

FACT - Glen Baxter was not on a well maintained link to Bermuda. He checked in and was given information the same as many other hams. The so called emergency was K1MAN generated and not an emergency in Bermuda. The reports of lack of readiness at 20.00 UTC were absolute poppycock. All of this information had been issued by the Bermuda Hams between the hours of 11.15 UTC and 13.00 UTC that Bermuda had been well prepared.

STATEMENT
by Glen Baxter ".....festival the previous Thursday which included a soccer match between teams on either end of the Island."

FACT - Again, poppycock. K1MAN had been informed that the Cup Match was a cricket game between St. Georges and Somerset, had been played, the result was a draw and everyone had a good time. The match was on Thursday and Friday when the storm was hundreds of miles away. This Information had been given hours earlier.

FACT - IARU had generated an emergency, no one else. Totally uncalled for "here is the important news we gathered for Associated Press." IARN were more interested in promoting themselves and Glen Baxter in particular and when he found that he was not wanted on the net and did not have control of it he resorted to terminological inexactitudes to achieve his ends.

FACT - Glen Baxter relayed conversations he had with VP9-- to Associated Press without the consent or knowledge of VP9-- at the time. This is in contravention of International Law.

As an American citizen he has no right to assume Governmental authority and issue edicts to hams in other countries. At no time can he advocate publicly that licenses should be revoked and should he have any complaints then these should be directed through the Department of Telecommunications in Bermuda. His pontificating on people's attitudes and his declarations of emergencies allows him to promote himself and his organization in such a way that his approach does sound plausible. As they say you can fool some of the people some of the time but not all of the people all of the time and K1MAN does not fool any Bermuda Ham. His trip to Moscow paid for by the Young Communist League leaves one to suspect his motives and his reporting.

3624. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 21:59:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405061359.574d0fb3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message news:<c7dm9u$98g$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> >
> > The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
> > be taken off the air.
> >
>
>
> Why?
>
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd
```

Because AnonJJ says so. And he speaks for NORAD and FEMA.

3625. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:00:06 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7ece9$ps7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
news:rYxmc.43864$I%1.2842221@attbi_s51...
>
> For sure! Baxter has not mellowed a bit. I remember when he got his kicks
> knocking the fine, friendly gentlemen who ran the Sunday morning Bermuda
Net
> off their traditional frequency with his one-way high-powered blather.
Then
> Baxter went and declared a national emergency for the country of Bermuda!
> What a nut. How long must we endure Baxter's abuse of amateur radio? AK
>

An interesting story and yet another *opinion* of why Baxter should lose
his license. As yet, no one has said *why* Baxter should lose his
license.

73,

Lloyd

3626. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:04:58 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <eEymc.31654$Ia6.5199030@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
news:c7ece9$ps7$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
> news:rYxmc.43864$I%1.2842221@attbi_s51...
> >
> > For sure! Baxter has not mellowed a bit. I remember when he got his
kicks
> > knocking the fine, friendly gentlemen who ran the Sunday morning Bermuda
> Net
> > off their traditional frequency with his one-way high-powered blather.
> Then
> > Baxter went and declared a national emergency for the country of
Bermuda!
> > What a nut. How long must we endure Baxter's abuse of amateur radio? AK
> >
>
>
>
> An interesting story and yet another *opinion* of why Baxter should lose
> his license. As yet, no one has said *why* Baxter should lose his
> license.

Repeated willful interference.
One-way broadcasting violating FCC regulations.

AK

3627. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:05:24 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <EEymc.3764$0V1.725@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd,

Personally, I think K1MAN should be removed. Why? Because of the attitude "I am always right." and might makes right. It is such attitudes that brought us Tailgate, the Marine Corps mess (where medals were jammed into bare flesh, amongst other things) and the current situation where the mighty (who served, maybe, perhaps, uh .... well, he *did* receive at least one paycheck - I think) and their well monied supporters have caused us irreperable damage in the sight of the world with abominable treatment of prisoners.

Argue all you want; I won't. The world *will* pass judgement. The best thing is the removal of the current administration of this country and removal of K1MAN would do the amateur service a good boost in the right - uh, make that *proper* - direction.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
news:c7dm9u$98g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> >
> > The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
> > be taken off the air.
> >
>
>
> Why?
>
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04

3628. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:09:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XIymc.7143$8S1.6859@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91692

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com...
> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel
it
> should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>
> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not.
There
> should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one either.
>
> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll be
lucky
> to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

This subject has been discussed, cussed, chopped up, thrown about for the
last 20 years. Enough is enough.

Anyway Lllllllooooooyyyyyyyyddddddd no one gives a crap what you think.

Dan/W4NTI

3629. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:11:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oKymc.7144$8S1.2696@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91693

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:z_mmc.149870$Gd3.37099821@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > I didn't think it would survive
> > for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only nine
> > months so far, so I could still be right.
>
> I don't know, Alun. I'd wager that more than a few PCTA's have made their
> feelings felt to the FCC and, more importantly, to their local elected
> representatives. (Some of whom have a say re. the FCC's bugdet.) Perhaps
it
> might be more than a year...much more.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

If the FCC goes along with the ARRL proposal, which it looks like they will.
Then CW will be here for the Extra class for the next generation or so.
After that everyone will be dead and the grandkids will be liked to the
internet at birth with bio implants.

Dan/W4NTI

>

3630. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:12:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LLymc.7146$8S1.1400@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91694

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
> On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time
Lord) wrote:
>
> >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel
it
> >should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>
> It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
morse.
>
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.

All a bunch of whinning losers.

Dan/W4NTI

3631. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:14:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NMymc.7148$8S1.1958@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91695

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E1A66458320elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hxaskb0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> > On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:34:54 +1000, Barry OGrady wrote:
> >
> >>>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
> >>>feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
> >>>HF bands.
> >>
> >>It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
> >>morse.
> >
> > You, sir, have that only by virtue of being licensed by some
> > Administration other than the U.S. Federal Communications
> > Commission.
> >
> > It is the latter's licensing policy that is under discussion here.
> >
> > But you knew that all along, didn't you?
> >
> > Don't tease the bears..... <ggg>
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
> >
> >
> >
>
> I'd say it's still relevant. Lots of countries have now abolished the code
> test, since the international requirement went away last July. What
> problems have been reported as a result? None, of course. So that is proof
> that it isn't necessary.

The only problem is to those that don't learn Morse Code. They can now
officially say they are half a ham.

Dan/W4NTI

3632. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:18:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3Rymc.7154$8S1.4510@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91696

> >
> > A good CW operator could out operate a phone operator with less power,
> > less equipment, and worse propagation.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> A good operator (CW or any other kind) wouldn't say "(insert mode here)
> operators are lids".

Again Alun you are not qualified to judge. Since you are only half a ham. You have no experience to enable you able to judge anything about CW. You need to just admit that before you have the whole USENET laughing at your ignorance on the subject.

Dan/W4NTI

3633. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:24:11 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7edrd$5sa$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Yet another nicely worded personal *opinion* but no one has yet
to say *why* Baxter should lose his license. What has the current
administration have to do with Baxter?

73,

Lloyd

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:EEymc.3764$0V1.725@news02.roc.ny...
> Lloyd,
>
> Personally, I think K1MAN should be removed. Why? Because of the
attitude
> "I am always right." and might makes right. It is such attitudes that
> brought us Tailgate, the Marine Corps mess (where medals were jammed into
> bare flesh, amongst other things) and the current situation where the
mighty
> (who served, maybe, perhaps, uh .... well, he *did* receive at least one
> paycheck - I think) and their well monied supporters have caused us
> irreperable damage in the sight of the world with abominable treatment of
> prisoners.
>
> Argue all you want; I won't. The world *will* pass judgement. The best
> thing is the removal of the current administration of this country and
> removal of K1MAN would do the amateur service a good boost in the right -
> uh, make that *proper* - direction.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

3634. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:24:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <409ABB0C.C1D993E8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 91698

Alun wrote:

> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work

There's a gaping contradiction buried in there some place.

Dave K8MN

3635. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:26:49 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7ee0c$77h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
news:eEymc.31654$Ia6.5199030@attbi_s03...
>
>
> Repeated willful interference.
> One-way broadcasting violating FCC regulations.
>
> AK

Perhaps in the past, but the FCC says Baxter is "generally"
in compliance now. So why should he lose his license *now* ?

73,

Lloyd

3636. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:33:03 UTC
From: iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c034bd2.0405061433.64d5f39a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91729
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:<20040506133852.545$Ka@newsreader.com>...
> "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> > Steveo wrote:
> > > "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> > >>
> > > We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
> > >
> > I'll kick in for the cost of the domain.
> >
> I'll kick in on the bandwidth.

Oh yes please register it so the identity of the person registering it
can be verified. register it right now dont wait rotflmao

3637. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:33:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_2zmc.7169$8S1.301@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91700
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
news:c7e86n$o55$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:m--dnbPVYtXJBgfd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> >
> > If you don't know why, then you are a part of the problem like he is.
> > Tell me why someone who has no respect for other amateurs, who interfers
> > with other amateur communications, issues phoney "felony complaint
> > affidavits" to harass other amateurs, threatens other amateurs because
> > they refuse to give up the frequency to him, willfully violates the FCC
> > rules, uses amateur radio for monitary gain (against the rules), engages
> > in broadcasting (against the FCC rules), should be on the air?
> >
>
>
>
> How does me not understanding the problem make me *part* of the
> problem?
>
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd
>
>
>

JJ.....you can't rationalize with Lllllllooooooyyyyyddddd........

Ya just cain't fix stupid.

Dan/W4NTI

3638. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:34:48 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506183448.680$ta@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> JJ.....you can't rationalize with Lllllllooooooyyyyyddddd........
>
> Ya just cain't fix stupid.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
You know all about being stupid, Dan.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3639. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:34:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <f4zmc.7171$8S1.6101@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405061359.574d0fb3@posting.google.com...
> "Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
news:<c7dm9u$98g$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> > >
> > > The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN
to
> > > be taken off the air.
> > >
> >
> >
> > Why?
> >
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Lloyd
>
> Because AnonJJ says so. And he speaks for NORAD and FEMA.

Actually JJ just repeated what the FCC said to Baxter. And just what does
NORAD and FEMA have to do with it?

Dan/W4NTI

3640. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:35:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506183520.513$wl@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
iamnotgeorge2004@yahoo.com (I Am Not George) wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:<20040506133852.545$Ka@newsreader.com>...
> > "Road Warrior" <RoadWarrior@Consulting.nospam.us> wrote:
> > > Steveo wrote:
> > > > "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> > > >>
> > > > We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
> > > >
> > > I'll kick in for the cost of the domain.
> > >
> > I'll kick in on the bandwidth.
>
> Oh yes please register it so the identity of the person registering it
> can be verified. register it right now dont wait rotflmao
>
What's your hurry, geo?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.
```

3641. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:37:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <M6zmc.7176$8S1.5605@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91703
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Damn that was good Jim Hampton. I really liked the way you wound MAN in with alleged prisoner mis treatment in Iraq, and got it all, including MAN to be blamed on Bush.

You should go write for CNN. I hear they are sinking fast and need another writer from their political commentary (see political comedy) section.

Dan/W4NTI
Vote GW

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:EEymc.3764$0V1.725@news02.roc.ny...
> Lloyd,
>
> Personally, I think K1MAN should be removed. Why? Because of the attitude
> "I am always right." and might makes right. It is such attitudes that
> brought us Tailgate, the Marine Corps mess (where medals were jammed into
> bare flesh, amongst other things) and the current situation where the mighty
> (who served, maybe, perhaps, uh .... well, he *did* receive at least one
> paycheck - I think) and their well monied supporters have caused us
> irreperable damage in the sight of the world with abominable treatment of
> prisoners.
>
> Argue all you want; I won't. The world *will* pass judgement. The best
> thing is the removal of the current administration of this country and
> removal of K1MAN would do the amateur service a good boost in the right -
> uh, make that *proper* - direction.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
> news:c7dm9u$98g$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> > >
> > > The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
> > > be taken off the air.
> > >
> >

> >
> > Why?
> >
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Lloyd
> >
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04
>
>

3642. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:43:37 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tczmc.3768$0V1.3656@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd,

Regardless, he has *not* totally cleaned up his act. My best thought would be to eliminate any kind of "broadcasting". The ARRL wouldn't care for that, obviously, but there are going to be more folks that feel if one person (or organization) can, then they can. They *can* indeed, if they follow the rules. But those with the attitudes that bother me are always 'pushing' the envelope. Either they are given carte blanc, or others start the same thing. In any event, the willful interference bothers me a *lot*. This has been getting worse over time and if not nipped in the bud, amateur radio might just as well be called amateur cb. Sorry, just my opinion.

73,
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
news:c7edrd$5sa$0@pita.alt.net...
> Yet another nicely worded personal *opinion* but no one has yet
> to say *why* Baxter should lose his license. What has the current
> administration have to do with Baxter?
>
> 73,
>
> Lloyd
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04

3643. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:44:14 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0405061444.41e36e2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91705

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404141650.5a942a7e@posting.google.com>...
>... But insisting on meeting all
> three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be
> automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there
> only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license
> and upgrade the current Novices to Technician?

Because we need to bring back the eliminated entry-level license!

> If a new entry-level
> license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes
> instead of 3?

Because it is UNNECESSARY... the General, Technician, and TechPlus
tests are/were virtually identical - ergo, MERGE 'EM ALL!

> What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?

Forget it... NO MORE COMPROMISING! It has been attempted over the
years, and all these foot-draggers want to do is pull us back to
December 6, 1941... 'aint gonna happen McGee... It is 2004, and we
have Cell Phones, the Internet, 125 Channels on TV, etc., etc., etc...
time for US Ham Radio to join the 21st century.

Morse Code will now officially be IRRELEVANT (at least as far as
Novice and General Classes are concerned). LIVE WITH IT.

The ARRL proposal is PERFECT... time to MOVE ON!

- Stewart (N0MHS)

3644. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:45:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Gezmc.7185$8S1.4717@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91706
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:20040506183448.680$ta@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > JJ.....you can't rationalize with Lllllllooooooyyyyyddddd........
> >
> > Ya just cain't fix stupid.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> You know all about being stupid, Dan.
>
> --
> I won't retire, but I might retread.

Sure do, larned it all right here on USENET.

Dan/W4NTI

3645. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:54:36 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <889987017833.2458F8789@taranews.net>
Source record: 91707

On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@gotridofmymind> wrote:
>
> "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
> > On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time
> Lord) wrote:
> >
> > >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel
> it
> > >should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
> >
> > It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
> morse.
> >
> >
> > -Barry
> > ========
> > Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> > Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
> Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.

Nope. It's an Australian. You know: one of the countries sharing
the burden of Iraq. One of our few remaining friends.

> All a bunch of whinning losers.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I reserve that description ("loser") for old irrelevant farts like you
who are unable to learn about Usenet headers, no matter how long you
use the Internet. Truly, you are obsolete.

3646. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 22:57:02 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <2pzmc.3770$yq.3615@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91708

Lloyd,

It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?

As far as a test, methinks that when an 8 year old can pass the extra, it is time to rethink exactly what we want. Certainly, it isn't, nor should it be, a test that might well be appropriate for a college student. That said, it appears headed towards a bonus question (worth 50 points). Spell your name and address properly, and they add 50 points. Starting with 50 points (assuming most folks can spell their name and address properly), most folks could randomly select answers and have a fair chance of passing. Of course, someone will complain that if they can't read and write, they should simply mark their 'X' and get the 50 points. Someone else can read the questions and they can guess - and still have a good chance of passing.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com...
> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it
> should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>
> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not. There
> should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one either.
>
> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll be lucky
> to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04

3647. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 23:00:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <9ngl909m356btvj1s6v3c9gkg9r1aq1k0b@4ax.com>
Source record: 91709

On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>snip

>>
>> -Barry
>> ========
>> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
>Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.

The '.au' in Barry's Internet address kinda localizes him to
Australia......not Austria.....

>
>All a bunch of whinning losers.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
73, Leo

3648. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-06 23:17:36 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506191736.348$aB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20040506183448.680$ta@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > JJ.....you can't rationalize with Lllllllooooooyyyyyddddd........
> > >
> > > Ya just cain't fix stupid.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > You know all about being stupid, Dan.
> >
> > --
> > I won't retire, but I might retread.
>
> Sure do, larned it all right here on USENET.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
leland is a jackass on Usenet.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.
```

3649. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 00:04:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <LoAmc.3791$xz2.1352@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

C'mon, Dan, I wasn't blaming MAN for the prisoner mistreatment. I was blaming "attitude", of which I believe MAN has a mindset not unlike some other folks - all of whom I do *not* trust at all.

Most of the folks in Washington (Democrats as well as Republicans) did *not* serve. I believe there are only two congresspersons who have sons or daughters serving - and those few serving are officers.

I find it interesting that it is fine to export our jobs to other countries, but *OMG* to allow seniors to buy prescription medicine from Canada is positivly unamerican and illegal. Money and power talks. Kind of a double standard, don't you think?

I don't like double standards, and I believe that K1MAN is setting himself up as a standard above everyone else. Note how the FCC mentions that *no* amateur has any more right to a given frequency than any other. Perhaps that escaped you. Go read the note from the FCC again.

This might bring up another interesting topic. The license classes. I'd like to see extra with full access; general with about half of that, and novice with about 1/4 of extra. Then, I'd limit novice to 200 watts, general to 1.5 KW and extra to 200 watts. Yep, and no more even in the other areas (i.e. extras would *still* be limited to 200 watts in the general or novice portions). Generals would have to reduce to 200 watts in the novice portions. At least half of the bands would be cleaner. Anyone could request a downgrade so they could run that "gallon", along with the reduced frequency access. Anyone caught using excess power would have their license revoked. No second chance and no reapplies for 10 years. Maybe things would clean up a bit. Wishful thinking LOL.

BTW, perhaps you should take a job writing for the Republican party. Maybe you could put a good spin on what has happened. Then again, I think the Catholic Church might need a good spin writer. Go check with them. I'm not into putting spins on anything; the world is going to judge us regardless of the spin-masters and your wishful thinking..

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:M6zmc.7176$8S1.5605@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Damn that was good Jim Hampton. I really liked the way you wound MAN in
> with alleged prisoner mis treatment in Iraq, and got it all, including MAN
> to be blamed on Bush.

>
> You should go write for CNN. I hear they are sinking fast and need
another
> writer from their political commentary (see political comedy) section.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
> Vote GW
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04

3650. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 00:10:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <vMSdnYqX7ZHxfwfdRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91715
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Steveo wrote:

>>
>
> Heh, it's just more of JJ's double-speak. Ask him what his
> call is.
>

And your call is?

3651. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 00:24:57 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <roll905204cntv9lmeohfg0fivrnemkgmr@4ax.com>
Source record: 91712

On Thu, 06 May 2004 18:07:21 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

>On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:34:54 +1000, Barry OGrady wrote:
>
>>>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel it
>>>should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>>
>>It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of morse.
>
> You, sir, have that only by virtue of being licensed by some
> Administration other than the U.S. Federal Communications
> Commission.

True.

> It is the latter's licensing policy that is under discussion here.

I understand.

> But you knew that all along, didn't you?
>
> Don't tease the bears...... <ggg>

Thank you for your good humo[u]r.

>--
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3652. Re: Last Chance to register WA3MOJ.COM, hurry before its gone.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 00:39:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506203905.602$Fs@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote:
> "AKC Master Control" <akcmc@akcmc.org> wrote:
> >
> We should all pitch in on it and put up some pics.
>
Anyone in rec.radio.amateur.policy want in on this radio website? It's
all in fun, and family pics are welcome, along with shack pics and fest
pics..so long as it's not asscrack pics of certain hams who will remain
nameless. :)

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3653. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 00:59:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409ADF82.2020100@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd wrote:

>"JJ" <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:bLydnZS9JrXjMQTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
>
>>The best thing that could happen to Amateur Radio would be for K1MAN to
>>be taken off the air.
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>Why?
>
>
>
Rules violations. Seems he has fixed all but 2 such problems. One that
needs to
be corrected is starting his transmissions on top of existing QSOs.
Even W1AW
has to QSY up or down several KHz to find an unused frequency. Hams who
wish to listen to K1MAN know how to tune a receiver to find him.

A more serious issue would be pecuniary interests he might be having in
his transmissions.

Wacky opinions are still protected by the 1st Amendment.

>
>

3654. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 01:06:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409AE127.6030402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91714

>
>
>>
>>
>
>The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
>evidently a majority around the world agree with you. I think the FCC will
>drop it, but they move at a snail's pace. I didn't think it would survive
>for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only nine
>months so far, so I could still be right.
>
>
Likely the FCC brearucracy just hasn't gotten around to it yet. They
have bigger fish to
fry, and will likely get to it when there's nothing better to do.

3655. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 01:14:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409AE2E4.7050705@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91716

>
>
>>
>>
>
>The only problem is to those that don't learn Morse Code. They can now
>officially say they are half a ham.
>
>
>
Has there been any trouble attribatable to a "non-code" ham fumbling
with code on the
bands? As long as he's not QRMing anyone, other hams will likely
"elmer" him so he
will become more proficinent. This would be a good use of the old
Novice subbands.
By gentlemens' agreements, designate s few frequencies as training
grounds for code
beginners. Not everyone can make it to a code class.

>
>
>

3656. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 01:19:51 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506211951.952$RL@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91717
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> >>
> > >
> > > Heh, it's just more of JJ's double-speak. Ask him what his
> > > call is.
> > >
>
> And your call is?
>
When is the last time you heard a CBer use a call, JJ? Oh never
mind, you're the dood who claims to have never used a CB, right?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3657. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 01:51:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040506215105.22537.00000009@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91718

>Subject: Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to
>General?
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 5/6/2004 5:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0405061444.41e36e2e@posting.google.com>
>
>jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
>news:<f7d9a152.0404141650.5a942a7e@posting.google.com>...
>>... But insisting on meeting all
>> three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be
>> automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there
>> only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license
>> and upgrade the current Novices to Technician?
>
>Because we need to bring back the eliminated entry-level license!

No, we don't.

All of the Amatuer Radio periodicals are ripe with stories of K I D S
passing ALL classes of Amatuer Radio licensure.

>> If a new entry-level
>> license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes
>> instead of 3?
>
>Because it is UNNECESSARY... the General, Technician, and TechPlus
>tests are/were virtually identical - ergo, MERGE 'EM ALL!

"Virtually identical"...?!?!

You really ARE an idiot. Not to mention that you've not been keeping
abreast of the question pools.

>> What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?
>
>Forget it... NO MORE COMPROMISING! It has been attempted over the
>years, and all these foot-draggers want to do is pull us back to
>December 6, 1941... 'aint gonna happen McGee... It is 2004, and we
>have Cell Phones, the Internet, 125 Channels on TV, etc., etc., etc...
>time for US Ham Radio to join the 21st century.

It's already there.

Too bad you keep trying to take us back to 1951.

>Morse Code will now officially be IRRELEVANT (at least as far as
>Novice and General Classes are concerned). LIVE WITH IT.

Hardly irrelevant.

>The ARRL proposal is PERFECT... time to MOVE ON!

No, it's not.

>- Stewart (N0MHS)

Another "zero" worthy of the number.

Steve, K4YZ

3658. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 01:55:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040506215522.22537.00000010@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91719

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/6/2004 5:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060250.124cae81@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040504084147.27047.00000695@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/2/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020541.4ce5d815@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >You are the Master of the Obvious.
>>
>> It's obvious that you're a ZERO, Brian. And that has nothing to do
>with
>> the ZERO in your callsign, by the way...
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, its obvious that you're nuts and I'm not.

To WHO...?!?!

YOU...?!?!

A documented liar? A "man" who won't stand behind his own word?

Am I supposed to be impressed by this?

Sheeeeeeesh. You really ARE an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

3659. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:04:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040506220402.22537.00000011@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 91720

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/6/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040505183433.19729.00000946@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/5/2004 5:08 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405051408.25fbb239@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>> >>
>> >> It really is THAT simple.
>> >
>> >You really are that simple, and foolish to keep repeating such a false
>> >statement as:
>> >
>> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>>
>> I don't keep repeating that statement, Your Sliminess...YOU do.
>
>Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
>attaching it to your name.

But YOU keep stating that I am allegedly repeating it.

I am not. You are. That act alone once again underscores my assertion
that you are a liar. And you have, in this statement, acknowledged that you
are indeed doing it.

Which makes you an idiot.

>So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
>statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
>as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
>where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
>is substantially true.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

That is sufficient.

>No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
>what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
>"Amateur Radio."

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>That is all. And since you're probably a radio volunteer for all
>three services, and an amateur radio operator, you should be able to
>vindicate yourself in short time.

NNN0VVU (1977-1982)

CHOP NNN0MOC/MOF 1981.

AFA1OQ 1983 thru 1988

AAT4SA/T....Didn't stay long...Decided it wasn't feasable to

>Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.

>>>I<<< don't have to "make" you do anything, Brain. >>>YOU<<<
continually make assertions you can't/won't substantiate, make assertions of
derring-do that are not documented ANYwhere, and you generally keep walking all
over your own tail over and over while claiming others to be "nuts".

I ahve no crow to eat here or anywhere, Brain.

Stop lying in public. Stop making assertions you can't/won't substantiate.
Be a man.

Steve, K4YZ

3660. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:08:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <dIidnfrVGsM3cgfdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91721
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Lloyd wrote:
> "King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
> news:eEymc.31654$Ia6.5199030@attbi_s03...
>
>>
>>Repeated willful interference.
>>One-way broadcasting violating FCC regulations.
>>
>>AK
>
>
>
>
> Perhaps in the past, but the FCC says Baxter is "generally"
> in compliance now. So why should he lose his license *now* ?

Ummm, they are maneuvering here. That "general compliance" means that they are doing an end run around the broadcasting issue and prepping to go after him on the other issues.

He ought to be a tad worried now. The broadcast issue was a sticking point, as there is a thin line between what he is doing and the ARRL reports. That sticking point has been negated.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3661. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:13:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ms-dnaYCicdGbQfdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Damn that was good Jim Hampton. I really liked the way you wound MAN in
> with alleged prisoner mis treatment in Iraq, and got it all, including MAN
> to be blamed on Bush.
>
> You should go write for CNN. I hear they are sinking fast and need another
> writer from their political commentary (see political comedy) section.

Yeah, that was quite a jump there, Dan! I think Jim learned that tactic from the neocons. I hear Rush and Anne do it all the time. And remember they are still blaming everything on Billary! Might as well get used to it. The libs have learned.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3662. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:19:51 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506221951.260$Ws@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
> That sticking point has been negated.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
And BPL has been introduced. Every station for themselves. :)

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3663. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:35:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <P_2dnYA1GbVJaAfdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:

> C'mon, Dan, I wasn't blaming MAN for the prisoner mistreatment. I was
> blaming "attitude", of which I believe MAN has a mindset not unlike some
> other folks - all of whom I do *not* trust at all.
>
> Most of the folks in Washington (Democrats as well as Republicans) did *not*
> serve. I believe there are only two congresspersons who have sons or
> daughters serving - and those few serving are officers.

> I find it interesting that it is fine to export our jobs to other countries,
> but *OMG* to allow seniors to buy prescription medicine from Canada is
> positivly unamerican and illegal. Money and power talks. Kind of a double
> standard, don't you think?

Here is an interesting thing I found out last night:

My wife's boss is paying $5.65 an hour to provide health insurance for
one employee and his family. He's paying the total cost. The cost has
gone up three times since January.

> I don't like double standards, and I believe that K1MAN is setting himself
> up as a standard above everyone else. Note how the FCC mentions that *no*
> amateur has any more right to a given frequency than any other. Perhaps
> that escaped you. Go read the note from the FCC again.

'Em are setting him up, I tell ya!

> This might bring up another interesting topic. The license classes. I'd
> like to see extra with full access; general with about half of that, and
> novice with about 1/4 of extra. Then, I'd limit novice to 200 watts,
> general to 1.5 KW and extra to 200 watts. Yep, and no more even in the
> other areas (i.e. extras would *still* be limited to 200 watts in the
> general or novice portions). Generals would have to reduce to 200 watts in
> the novice portions. At least half of the bands would be cleaner. Anyone
> could request a downgrade so they could run that "gallon", along with the
> reduced frequency access. Anyone caught using excess power would have their
> license revoked. No second chance and no reapplies for 10 years. Maybe
> things would clean up a bit. Wishful thinking LOL.
>
> BTW, perhaps you should take a job writing for the Republican party. Maybe
> you could put a good spin on what has happened.

Never had, are not, and never will ever make a mistake!

Then again, I think the
> Catholic Church might need a good spin writer. Go check with them.

I was at a funeral in a Catholic church today. I think they found a way
to keep the young boys out of trouble. The altar boys were girls! 8^)

> I'm not
> into putting spins on anything; the world is going to judge us regardless of
> the spin-masters and your wishful thinking..

Spin is only convincing to those that do not need convincing. AKA
preaching to the Choir.

>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:M6zmc.7176$8S1.5605@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>Damn that was good Jim Hampton. I really liked the way you wound MAN in
>>with alleged prisoner mis treatment in Iraq, and got it all, including
>
> MAN
>
>>to be blamed on Bush.
>>
>>You should go write for CNN. I hear they are sinking fast and need
>
> another
>
>>writer from their political commentary (see political comedy) section.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>Vote GW
>>
>
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04
>
>

3664. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:38:19 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <rACmc.83529$Uz1.3543@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91725

Also in Blazing Saddles..Slim Pickens. Harvey Korman, Dom DeLuise, Count Basie and his Orchestra...

"Tell the Governor that I said 'Owww'".

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message news:c2356669.0405060853.60895f75@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<gpSdnQA_eZRF6QTdRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
> > Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
> > >>Subject: Re: Hamfests?
>
> > >>hehe. Remember we're amateurs, so maybe the villagers in "young
> > >>Frankenstein"?
>
> Or the townsfolk in "Blazing Saddles".
> > >
> > > Believe it or not I've never watched it!
>
> Rent it. You won't be dissapointed. Gene Wilder, Marty Feldman, Teri
> Garr, Madeline Kahn, Cloris Leachman, Peter Boyle and even Gene
> Hackman.
>
> > > I was never a Mel Brooks fan, and
> > > I believe that was one of his, wasn't it...???
>
> One of his best, although it's tough to pick from among classics such
> as "Blazing Saddles" ("Mongo is but pawn in game of life" and "The
> Producers" ("Boids. Doity, stinking, disgusting boids.")
>
> (moment of silence as we remember N0BK, now in a better place)
>
> > Oh yes. It's worth a look, even if just to see the young Terri Garr. I
> > like it best out of all his movies.
>
> So many great moments in "YF":
>
> "Elevate me!"
>
> "What knockers!"
>
> "Oh you men. Six or seven quick ones and you're off with the boys..."
>
> "What hump?"
>

> "Frau Blucher!"
>
> "You gave the monster part of your wonderful brain. But what did the
> monster give you?"
>
> (sung):"Oh sweet mystery of life, at last I've found you!"
>
> and the one I've used many many times:
>
> "Could be worse. Could be raining."
>
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3665. Re: Are You Insulted?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:39:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TcqdnX6qmv5CawfdRVn-vg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91726

N2EY wrote:

> I hope I did not insult you by my question...

Oh, I'm just mortified! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3666. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:41:52 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@herblloydcb.net>
Message-ID: <c7esuh$t4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

More fun than a barrel of monkeys. Throw out a few pieces of
bait to the Baxter-Haters and watch them work themselves up into
a hissy fit, complete with drooling & foamiing at the mouth.
Too easy! Hook, Line, & Sinker!

ROTFLMAO!

73,

"Lloyd" a.k.a. Anon

3667. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 02:48:36 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040506224836.537$4A@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91728
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote:
> More fun than a barrel of monkeys. Throw out a few pieces of
> bait to the Baxter-Haters and watch them work themselves up into
> a hissy fit, complete with drooling & foamiing at the mouth.
> Too easy! Hook, Line, & Sinker!
>
> ROTFLMAO!
>
> 73,
>
> "Lloyd" a.k.a. Anon
>
Leland has Riley's autograph. <g>

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3668. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 06:49:22 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E21C8834B01elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91732

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in news:409ABB0C.C1D993E8
@earthlink.net:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
>
> There's a gaping contradiction buried in there some place.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Not atall. Something doesn't have to be hard to take a long time to do.

3669. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 06:51:21 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E21CDF08DA6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91733

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:409AE127.6030402@ix.netcom.com:

>>
>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
>>evidently a majority around the world agree with you. I think the FCC
>>will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace. I didn't think it would
>>survive for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's
>>only nine months so far, so I could still be right.
>>
>>
> Likely the FCC brearucracy just hasn't gotten around to it yet. They
> have bigger fish to
> fry, and will likely get to it when there's nothing better to do.
>
>

Sad but true. You only have to look at their home page to see where we are
in their priorities, i.e. not even on their radar atall.

3670. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 07:07:16 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E21F9215FB0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91734

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:3Rymc.7154$8S1.4510@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
>> >
>> > A good CW operator could out operate a phone operator with less
>> > power, less equipment, and worse propagation.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> A good operator (CW or any other kind) wouldn't say "(insert mode
>> here) operators are lids".
>
> Again Alun you are not qualified to judge. Since you are only half a
> ham. You have no experience to enable you able to judge anything about
> CW. You need to just admit that before you have the whole USENET
> laughing at your ignorance on the subject.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Dan, you are not only a lid, you lack even the rudiments of logical reasoning. I was _not_ judging anything about CW. I don't even care to do so. What I was saying, since you evidently fail to understand, is that anyone who says that users of a particular mode are lids just because they use or prefer that mode is not a considerate person, i.e. you aren't.

There is a valid place for each mode that we use in the amateur service, and if anyone wants to do all of their operating using one mode, whether it be CW, or slow-scan, or PSK, or SSB, they should be left in peace and not maligned by the likes of you. IMO none of them should be labelled as 'half a ham'. What should we count you as? One quarter of a ham? One eighth?

3671. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 09:45:12 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.comunspam
Message-ID: <20040507054512.09069.00000007@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91735

```
test only
```

3672. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 10:07:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 91736

Alun wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in news:409ABB0C.C1D993E8
> @earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun wrote:
> >
> >> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
> >
> > There's a gaping contradiction buried in there some place.

> Not atall. Something doesn't have to be hard to take a long time to do.

Now you've added an additional element. We've gone from "easy" to "a lot of work" to "long time to do". Something "easy" wouldn't seem to require either a lot of work or a long time to do.

I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it requires a long time to learn.

Dave K8MN

3673. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 10:53:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405070253.4e171c36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91737

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040506220402.22537.00000011@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/6/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040505183433.19729.00000946@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/5/2004 5:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405051408.25fbb239@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040504085354.27047.00000697@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >> >>
> >> >> It really is THAT simple.
> >> >
> >> >You really are that simple, and foolish to keep repeating such a false
> >> >statement as:
> >> >
> >> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
> >>
> >> I don't keep repeating that statement, Your Sliminess...YOU do.
> >
> >Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
> >attaching it to your name.
>
> But YOU keep stating that I am allegedly repeating it.
>
> I am not.

But you should; it's so wonderfully stupid. And it is the statement
(of fact) that got this ball rolling. You back-pedalled and are now
soft pedalling a different statement, which was also shown to be
wrong.

> >So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
> >statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
> >as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
> >where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
> >is substantially true.

>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> That is sufficient.

No, it is not sufficient. Quote A Military Regulation or Title 47
document.

> >No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
> >what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
> >"Amateur Radio."
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Nope, not sufficient.

Why do you keep running away from your statement,

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >That is all. And since you're probably a radio volunteer for all
> >three services, and an amateur radio operator, you should be able to
> >vindicate yourself in short time.
>
> NNN0VVU (1977-1982)
>
> CHOP NNN0MOC/MOF 1981.
>
> AFA1OQ 1983 thru 1988
>
> AAT4SA/T....Didn't stay long...Decided it wasn't feasable to

I knew you were qualified to research the DoD and Title 47 regs to
back up your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
"

The only question now is when you'll post the applicable citation.

> >Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.
>
> >>>I<<< don't have to "make" you do anything, Brain. >>>YOU<<<
> continually make assertions you can't/won't substantiate, make assertions of
> derring-do that are not documented ANYwhere, and you generally keep walking all
> over your own tail over and over while claiming others to be "nuts".

Document this:

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> I ahve no crow to eat here or anywhere, Brain.
>
> Stop lying in public. Stop making assertions you can't/won't substantiate.
> Be a man.
>

> Steve, K4YZ

I am a man.

Now you be a man and post any DoD or Title 47 citation whatsoever that substantially says,

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "

without the "Sorry Hans" part, of course.

"Caw, caw!"

Steve, I hear your crow calling. You might want to locate some Tobasco sauce.

3674. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 10:57:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405070257.78d83560@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91738

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040506215522.22537.00000010@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/6/2004 5:50 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060250.124cae81@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040504084147.27047.00000695@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/2/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405020541.4ce5d815@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >You are the Master of the Obvious.
> >>
> >> It's obvious that you're a ZERO, Brian. And that has nothing to do
> with
> >> the ZERO in your callsign, by the way...
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, its obvious that you're nuts and I'm not.
>
> To WHO...?!?!
>
> YOU...?!?!
>
> A documented liar? A "man" who won't stand behind his own word?
>
> Am I supposed to be impressed by this?
>
> Sheeeeeeesh. You really ARE an idiot.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Poor demented Steve.

I told you that the zero in my callsign stood for the tenth district,
not the zeroeth district.

And so you call me a liar and an idiot, and insinuate that I'm not a
man.

Get help.

3675. Re: Hamfests?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 11:51:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405070351.70e36ff7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91739

"Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<rACmc.83529$Uz1.3543@bignews3.bellsouth.net>...
> Also in Blazing Saddles..Slim Pickens

"We almost lost a three-hundred-dollar hand cart!!"

> Harvey Korman,

"That's *Hedley*...."

> Dom DeLuise,

doing the French Mistake

> Count Basie and his Orchestra...
>
> "Tell the Governor that I said 'Owww'".
>
"ohhh...it's twue! It's twue!!!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3676. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 13:40:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405070540.37b0704@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91740

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E1A7B59F6BFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in
> news:MPG.1b043ca46d72748e98999a@news.verizon.net:
>
> > In article <20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com>, daviesl2003
> > @aol.com says...
> >> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
> >> feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
> >> HF bands.
> >>
> >> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should
> >> not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a
> >> easy one either.
> >>
> >> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll
> >> be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
> >
> > I didn't find the series of tests difficult at all. The 5WPM and 13WPM
> > were fairly easy too, as I had time to practice the 5WPM while on a
> > rainy camping trip. Good thing I brought plenty of batteries and a code
> > practice tapes.
> >
>
> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
>
> > 13WPM was gotten by actually working HF with what privileges I had as a
> > Tech+. From there, up to 20WPM and all done.
> >
>
> I'd say it's a bit harder for those with no interest in using CW

I had no particular interest in the topics covered by probably half
the courses I had to pass to get a degree. But I did pass 'em
(grousing all the way) and the priveleges flowed. The philosophy
behind volume of work invested in learning = volume of privs goes back
at least to the guilds of the early Renaissance.

> > I think the biggest detriment to testing now is the publication of the
> > question pools. People can get into the hobby via rote memorization,
>
> True in some instances, but most people don't have photographic memory
>
> > which by the way is what schools teach kids, not how to think but how
> > to memorize.

> >
> > So over time the hobby is just going to be awash in nitwits,
>
> I don't think so. Not any more than it already is, anyway!
>
> > and then
> > fade away. There are too many other options to communicate.
> >
> >
>
> ...which is another issue altogether. The Internet has hit the hobby pretty
> hard.

What's your point? Ham radio license tests should be reduced to passing a test on mouse operations in order for ham radio to compete with the Internet? Passing a one-button mouse test garners a Tech ticket, two gets a General and two plus a scroller wheel gets the examinee an Extra?

w3rv

3677. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 13:48:13 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <ms4n90duj0ghdvci8vm0p4iousmcq36ug1@4ax.com>
Source record: 91741

On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
>> On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time
>Lord) wrote:
>>
>> >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I feel
>it
>> >should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
>>
>> It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
>morse.
>>
>>
>> -Barry
>> ========
>> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
>Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.

No. I'm a whining aussie.

>All a bunch of whinning losers.

We are losers of the morse requirement.

>Dan/W4NTI

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3678. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1395 May 7, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 16:39:08 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040507123908.17812.00000963@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 91742

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1395 May 7, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1395 with a release date of Friday, May 7, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The FCC denies a request for more time to respond on BPL, the NTIA report on BPL explained and ham radio will honor the military. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1395 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: FCC REFUSES TO EXTEND COMMENT CUTOFF ON BPL

The FCC has issued a ruling denying a request from the ARRL to extend the Commentary cutoff date on the introduction of BPL as outlined in ET Docket 04-37.

The ARRL had asked the Commission to extend the deadline for Comments and Reply Comments by 45 days in the Broadband over Power Line Notice of Proposed Rule Making. The League had argued that this would give it and others the time required for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to conclude its study at BPL, issue an initial report and give commenters time to evaluate it.

In its April 30th release denying the request the FCC gave no overriding reason for turning it down. Instead the agency said that the now past May 3rd commentary cutoff date stands. It added that those wanting to address the issues raised in the NTIA report can do so during the Reply Comment period. That's open now and ends on June 1st. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: NTIA RELEASES LONG AWAITED REPORT ON BPL

Meantime, as reported last week, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration has issued its long-awaited report on the interference potential of BPL. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramwicz, NT3V, is here with an in-depth look at the report and the affect it might of on the introduction of BPL technology:

--

The very title: "NTIA Report Lays Groundwork for Responsible Deployment of Broadband Over Power Lines" doesn't sound encouraging.

But like any package - or the glowing press release that accompanied it - the more than 100-page document contains so much more once you open it.

And, you don't have to go beyond the executive summary that accompanies the report to find the glowing praise by Acting NTIA Administrator Michael Gallagher in the press release is quickly muted. Muted by the facts and some disturbing interference problems the agency's own technical review identified.

CQ Magazine Editor Rich Moseson, W2VU, digested and analyzed the NTIA report and agreed to share his findings with the Amateur Radio Newsline audience.

"It is one of the first really objective looks at the real danger of interference caused by BPL," Moseson says. "As of objective as studies by the ARRL might be, they would be perceived as someone with a certain interest here.

"The NTIA is a federal agency and their engineering study should carry a lot of weight with the FCC."

Moseson says he identified five major conclusions. First, among them, that the methods currently used to measure noise levels and interference potential are not adequate, according to the NTIA. Essentially, he says, there's an underestimation of peak-field strength. And, peak field strength is the leading contributor to high-interference risks.

"As applied in current practice to BPL systems, Part 15 measurement guidelines do not address unique physical and electromagnetic characteristics of BPL-radiated emissions," Moseson says. "That's a quote. That's pretty significant that the Part 15 guidelines do not address the unique physical and electromagnetic characteristics of BPL emissions. So the measurement system being used is not right."

Second, he says the NTIA engineers said noise levels must be measured from power lines carrying BPL as well as the device that couples the signal to the power lines.

"What the NTIA is saying here is that you can be 100 feet down the street from the actual coupling device or up to 300 feet down the street and if the signal bumps into one of these corroded connecters or something, then, it's going to start radiating there," Moseson says. "And you have to measure all along the line as well as at the coupling device."

Third, Moseson says NTIA found interference to weak- or medium-strength signals is likely to affect aircraft operation and the navigational frequencies used by aircraft.

"Interference to aircraft reception of moderate to strong radio signals is likely to occur below 6 kilometers altitude - that's 20,000 feet - within 12 kilometer center of the BPL deployment," says

Moseson, quoting from the report. "Interference would likely occur to aircraft reception of weak to moderate signals within 40 miles of the center of the BPL deployment area."

NTIA's fourth major conclusion, according to Moseson, is that results of BPL tests and implementation in other countries has met with mixed results. And, in some cases, it has been shut down entirely. He cites an example:

"During an emergency exercise of the Austrian Red Cross in May 2003, communication was massively disturbed - that's their words - by BPL with interference levels exceeding the limits by a factor of 10,000," Moseson says.

The fifth NTIA conclusion identified by Moseson is the agency's desire to conduct more testing.

"They proposed some more stringent measurement standards and procedures along with some of the interference mitigation techniques that were mentioned in the FCC's Proposed Rulemaking and others that weren't," Moseson says. "But they're saying here that they're not even sure that those are going to work. They want to do more testing on them and report on it later in the year."

The bottom line: Will the FCC's commissioner take seriously the findings and red flags raised by the NTIA report?

"In this case, I'm not really sure because they seem to have made up their minds going into this as to what they were planning to do," Moseson says. "So, I am not as optimistic as I might be in other rulemaking proceedings."

So, how soon could the FCC act? Moseson says he wouldn't even begin to speculate.

"At this point the comment period is closed. Comments closed on May 3," Moseson says. "There's a two-week reply comment period. And, then it's up to the commission of what they're going to do and when they're going to do it.

"There is no requirement that the FCC issue a ruling in a given amount of time after the close of comments on a proceeding. So, they very well could wait until the NTIA issues its second report. And, I'm sure that it would be accepted into the record as coming from another federal agency."

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

The full report may be downloaded, either in full or chapter by chapter, from the NTIA website. Its in cyberspace at www.ntia.doc.gov/new.html (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO LAW: LEGALIZING AMBER ALERTS ON THE HAM BANDS

Hams worried that they might get into trouble if they relay lost child or AMBER alerts on the air may soon have regulatory relief. This as wording in an omnibus 71-page, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on a variety of ham radio issues issued in mid-April tackles the problem had on.

One of the proposals in the April 15th NPRM proposes to and we quote: "clarify that amateur stations may at all times and on all channels … make transmissions … which may be instrumental in saving human life and property." In other words, if enacted as proposed, retransmitting AMBER Alerts and just about any other type of live saving communications would become legal under Federal law.

The proposal is part of FCC WT Docket 04-140. The Comment deadline is June 15th. (CQ)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W0EF repeater sereving Minneapolis Minnesota.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: YOUNG HAM TRIES TO GET AID FOR DROWNING VICTIM

A tragic story from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park near Townsend, Tennessee. That's where a youngster on a field trip drowned at Cades Cove while a classmate with a hand held 2 meter transceiver tried to get help to save him. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, reports:

--

It started about an hour after the group arrived at the campsite on Friday, April 30th. According to news reports, a group of people including the ill fated teen took to the water. In a short time, the victum, identified only as Chris found himself in trouble. Others tried to save him while teachers using cell phones tried to call for help.

When it was found that there was no cell phone coverage, another student, Jordan Webb, KI4AVG, said he would try ham radio. Jordan had brought along his two meter hand held radio. He found a near-by high location and called for help over the Knoxville area WB4GBI repeater. He was answered by Jim Bond, K6SPY, who notified Park Rangers. Unfortunately they didn't arrive in time to save the victum, but because KI4AVG had the foresight to bring along his 2

meter talkie, his classmate's body was recovered within hours, instead of days.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, reporting.

--

Jordan Webb, KI4AVG is only thirteen year old and attends the Vine Middle School in Knoxville. He has been a ham for just about a year and serves as net control for the weekly Young Amateur Radio Net on the Radio Amateur Club of Knoxville W4BBB repeater. (K4PZT, KG4UJC, KG4YTT, WBIR.com)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NET INTERFERENCE FOUND

Authorities in the United Kingdom were quick to act when a propagation net became the target of a jammer. We have more in this report:

--

Listeners to the DK0WCY Solar Geomagnetic Information broadcast on 75 meters recently experienced interference from an unmodulated carrier on the channel. The interference, which appeared to be deliberate jamming, was reported by the DK0WCY team to the authorities in Germany who founf that the interference was coming from from the United Kingdom.

With support from the Radio Society of Great Britain's Amateur Radio Observation Service and other U-K hams, authorities traced the interference to an amateur station in the Chepstow area. The interference ceased abruptly at 0608UTC on the 25th of March. No explanation was given but it is assumed that government regulators took the station off the air.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

No word on who the jammer was or what punitive action will be taken by U-K telecommunications authorities. (GB2RS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU BETTER STAY OFF THE RADIO

Back here in the U-S-A, the FCC says that a former ham who has been to jail for operating without a license is back on the air and still has no FCC authorization to be there. Again, the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

Duckworth: "Richard A. Burton of Harbor City, California, has been sent a Warning Notice of unlicensed radio operation on 2 meters in the Los Angeles area. Mr. Burton has been convicted in 1984, 1990, 1993 and 2000 of unlicensed radio operation under Section 301 of the Communications Act of 1934, as ammernded, and has served time."

--

According to Duckworth, the Notice sent to Burton states that additional instances will lead to -- and we quote -- to the same result. The FCC has also designated for hearing a second General Mobile Radio Service application that Burton had filed with the agency. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: CRANK CALL TO CUBA'S CASTRO LEADS TO $4000 FINE

The FCC says that a Florida radio station should be fined $4000. This, for permitting the hosts of the Morning High Jinks show placed a crank-called to Cuban President Fidel Castro and broadcast the recording.

As previously reported, Joe Ferrero and Enrique Santos of WXJD FM used snippets of an earlier prank call involving Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez get past a Castro receptionist and up the chain of command in a five-minute broadcast June 17th of last year. They then fed pleasantries to Castro before breaking in and calling him an assassin.

On April 28th the FCC concluded that the station should be forced to pay a fine for the broadcast. The agency rejected claims that a rule requiring people to be notified before their voices are used on the air does not apply to people in Cuba.

WXJD was given the usual 30 days to pay the fine or to file a further appeal. (Published reports)

**

RADIO RECORDS: XL TO UA ON 137 KHZ

Hams in New Zealand and Asiatic Russia have claimed a new world low-frequency distance record. ZM2E at Quartz Hill near Wellington and UA0LE near Vladivostok say that they completed a two-way contact the night of the 20th of March on 137.70kHz. The path length is estimated to be 10,311 kilometers or 6392 miles. (Q-News, GB2RS)

**

AWARDS: YCCC OFFERS SUBSIDY AWARD PROGRAM

The 400 member Yankee Clipper Contest Club has announced that it's First Annual DXpedition Award Program has been funded for the 2004 through 2005 contesting season. The purpose of the program is to encourage new as well as young amateurs to participate in

contesting.

As part of the award program, the Yankee Clipper group will award the winning applicant up to $1,500 to accompany a YCCC authorized Dxpedition and / or Contesting operation any where in the world for up to one week, to operate in one of the four major contests.

This a first time program for the club. The winner will be chosen and announced at the Boxboro Hamfest in August and there are some restrictions on who can apply. More information is on line at www.yccc.org or by e-mail to W1LLU@verizon.net (W1LLU)

**

THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT: MARC HAMFEST AND COMPUTER FAIR

Turning to the ham radio social scene, the Mid-Atlantic Amateur Radio Club will be presenting their annual Valley Forge Hamfest and Computer Fair, Sunday, July 11th. The venue is the Kimberton Pennsylvania Fire Company Fairgrounds on Route 113. Admission is $6.00 for hams. Unlicensed spouse and children of licensed amateur radio operator will be admitted free of charge. For additional hamfest information, please e-mail MARC at Hamfest-info@marc-radio.org. Information is also available on the club website at www.marc-radio.org. (Via e-mail)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: THE ARRL PUBLIC RELATIONS FORUM

The ARRL sponsored Public Relations Forum at the 2004 Dayton Hamvention will be held at 8:30 A-M on Sunday morning, May 16th. The venue is Meeting Room 1 at the Hara Arena and those planning it say that this will be a do not miss event for anyone interested in promoting the hobby.

What will be discussed you ask? Well the major items include public service, spectrum protection and of coarse Broadbnd Over Powerline internet access. The session will also explain how to tell the world outside the hobby about Amateur Radio and how to address our concerns to public officials and local media.

Again, that's Sunday, May 16th at 8:30 in the morning for the ARRL Public Relations Fourm at Hamvention 2004. We will see you there. (Dayton Hamvention(r))

**

HAMVENTION 2004: A NICE PLACE TO LAND

And if you are a private pilot planning to fly your own plane to next weeks Dayton Hamvention, the events planners have a tip for you. Consider landing and tie-down at Greene County Airport in the near-by town of Xenia.

That field is located just south of Route 35 approximately 7 miles east of Dayton and is the closest airport to downtown. Its also among the easiest to get in and out of using small aircraft. Fuel prices are reportedly some of the lowest in the area, and the facility is well kept and capable of handling quite a bit of traffic.

Green County is just one of many airports catering to pilots of small aircraft in the Dayton area. More information about it is on-line at www.gwaohio.co. (Dayton Hamvention(r))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

WITH NEWSLINE: MORE THANK-YOU'S FROM N6TCQ

Ladies and gentlemen, here is Amateur Radio Newsline's Support Fund Administrator, Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Still playing "catch-up" for our supporters, in the month of July last year
we heard from:

The Raleigh, NC Amateur Radio Society, The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Amateur Radio Society, The Garland, TX ARC, Monthly contributor William Walters, WA2IBM, of San Jose, CA; Monthly contributor Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, also in San Jose and Brad Berryhill, WA6JJB of Anaheim Hills

Thank you to everyone, and we promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at
www.arnewsline.org. That address will be repeated at the end of the newscast. I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thank you Andy. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SPAM LOWERING LEGIT E-MAIL

Meantime, a recent survey finds that Americans are e-mailing less and trusting e-mail less because of the growing flood of junk messages. According to the Pew Internet and American Life Project, 29% of e-mail users have reduced their overall use of the medium while 63% of e-mail users say they are less trusting of e-mail overall because of spam. That's up from 52 percent in June of 2002. (Technology OnLibe)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SCIENTIST TO BE NEXT SPACE TOURIST

The next space tourist plans to spend his time on-orbit studying environmental issues. Gregory Olsen, the founder of Sensors Unlimited Inc. in Princeton, New Jersey says that he plans to bring along infrared sensors, which detect varying levels of heat, to analyze pollution in the Earth's atmosphere and the health of agricultural systems on the ground.

Olsen told a recent news conference that he hopes to inspire young people with his mission, and want to arrange a video teleconference with Trenton High School in New Jersey and a school at the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana.

The 58-year-old Olsen has hired Space Adventures to get him to the I-S-S. This is the same company that brokered the first space tourist trip of millionaire Dennis Tito's flight aboard a Russian spacecraft in 2001. Olson's eight-day voyage to Earth orbit is currently scheduled for April of 2005. As with all past space station visitors, Olson is expected to be trained in Amateur Radio and operation of the ham gear aboard the I-S-S as well. (Published reports)

**

WORLDBEAT: NEW RADIO RULES IN KENYA

Visiting hams now have a way to get on the air from Kenya. Ted Alleyne, 5Z4NU, the Chairman and Secretary of the Amateur Radio Society of Kenya sdays that that the Communications Commission of Kenya announced on April a new and more relaxed policy towards amateur radio licensing.

Until now it was "practically impossible" for most visitors to obtain an amateur radio license in Kenya. The previous stumbling blocks for reciprocal agreements, Security and Police vetting, have been dropped entirely. However, applicants' countries must have diplomatic relations with Kenya and 5Z4NU says that the ARSK will be happy to supply the new license application forms. (GB2RS)

**

WORLDBEAT - GERMANY: PROPAGATION STUDIES WEBSITE UPDATED

Volker Grassmann, DF5AI, says over the VHF Reflector that he recently updated his "Amateur Radio Propagation Studies" web site. Features now include a countdown for the 2004 sporadic E season, a discussion

of thunderstorm effects on the ionosphere, notes on the people behind VHF dxing and much, much more. The page is in cyberspace at www.df5ai.net. Volker says come over and spend some time at the site. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In D-X, word that GB5JCT is on the air from the fishing trawler Jacinta moored in Fleetwood dock in the UK. The trawler is now a museum dedicated to the fishing fleet that used to be based at Fleetwood. Over the Easter weekend the station was heard on 40 metros SSB and locally on 2 meter FM. (GB2RS)

Also, G3TMA, G3KHZ and IZ1CRR will activate a couple of Borneo's Islands on the Air during the next couple of weeks. If you work them QSL via G3KHZ. (GB2RS)

Lastly, GW3UOF will be active portable SV8 from Kavos, Corfu, in the Greek Isles through May 17th. Look for him on CW, SSB and various digital modes. QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HONORING THE MILITARY

And finally this week, ham radio will be honoring those serving in the military. Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, is here with the details:

--

Amateur Radio Military Appreciation Day will be held world-wide on Saturday, May 29th from approximately 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. Central U-S time. According to Emery McClendon, KB9IBW, this will be a day-long operation to talk to troops, and associated groups around the globe in appreciation of their service and personal sacrifice.

The main operating location will be from Johnny Appleseed Park and Wizards Memorial Stadium in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, using Emery's KB9IBW call sign. That station will be on from about 4 p.m. Central Daylight Time through the end of the Wizards game.

Planners say that they know of at least 25 military bases and club stations that will be operating the event. This includes stations in Iraq, Kuwait, and bases around the globe. More information on this event is in cyberspace at www.fortwaneradioclub.org

--

Again, the website for more information on Military Appreciation Day is www.fortwaneradioclub.org. (KB9IBW)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

Before we go, this word for listeners who use our 661-296-2407 phone line to get the newscast. That line will be down for about a week or so starting on Friday, May 14th as the phone machine that feeds the newscast undergoes repairs. We should have it back on-line by May 21st if not before. In the meantime, please use any of the other lines you find listed on our website.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73, see you all at the 2004 Dayton Hamvention and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

3679. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 16:56:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405070856.6eeb7b3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91743

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<xgQkc.1791$Hs1.351@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > Not necessarily a good comparison. Conditions during one weekend may
> > be better, for example.
>
> While one mode or the other may have an advantage due to better
> conditions (or whatever) in any single given year, the Nov SS contest
> has been run with CW and Phone weekends 14 days apart for many decades
> (1st and 3rd weekends of November respectively).

Yep.

> Without a SINGLE
> exception, the average scores on phone weekends are significantly higher
> than on the CW weekends, no exceptions.

Did you mean winning scores, Hans? Or did you actually add up all the
scores submitted each year and work out the average? "Average scores"
can mean a lot of different things.

> The reason is that the exchange
> is faster on phone than on CW.

For a sizable percentage of the participants, that's certainly a
factor. And I'm sure most of them don't repeat back the entire SS
exchange - unlike what I hear so often on Field Day.

There is also the factor that there may be more participants during
the 'phone weekend. Also fewer QRP entries on phone?

A really fun contest regardless of mode. Someday I'll do a sweep...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3680. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:07:19 UTC
From: netmanager2@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <78f1f2d5.0405070907.152a414e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:<20040506224836.537$4A@newsreader.com>...
> "Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote:
> > More fun than a barrel of monkeys. Throw out a few pieces of
> > bait to the Baxter-Haters and watch them work themselves up into
> > a hissy fit, complete with drooling & foamiing at the mouth.
> > Too easy! Hook, Line, & Sinker!
> >
> > ROTFLMAO!
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > "Lloyd" a.k.a. Anon
> >
> Leland has Riley's autograph. <g>

Glenn Baxter truly is K-1-MANkind as his associate Mr. Murdock has
often said. K1MAN is a kind person who only has the best interest of
the hams of the entire world in his heart. His love of ham radio and
those in it is truly god like. My admiration for him grows with each
passing hour.

My one wish would be for him to bring his leadership to where all the
"good buddies" are, because he is so much like them. And that's a big
10-4!

3681. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:23:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405070923.5e69f1ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91745

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in
> news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com:
>
> > I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
> > feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF
> > bands.
> >
> > Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should not.
> > There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a easy one
> > either.
> >
> > I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 - I'll
> > be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
> >
> >
> > Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> > "On the Domestic Front"
> > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
> >
>
> The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
> evidently a majority around the world agree with you.

A majority of the world's governments that bothered to attend and vote
on the issue.

And all they did was change the rules so each country can decide for
itself what is required - just like the written test.

Although a suggested standard for written tests was added at the same
WRC, it's really more of a suggestion than anything else. Countries
can have wide-ranging interpretations of what's "needed". For example,
do you think ol' JY1 and his family had to sit for written and code
exams that were equivalent to what US or UK hams had to pass for the
same privileges? Or do you think the US writtens compare with, say,
those in the UK?

If I'm not mistaken, getting a license in some countries *requires*
successful completion of an approved training course. (I know the
"Foundation" license has this requirement). Doesn't matter if someone
is a Ph.D. in EE, they have to attend and pass the ham radio classes
to get the license - even though such courses are not part of any
treaty and not required in many other countries.

Imagine the reaction here in the USA if the code test were dropped *and* getting a license required attendance at an approved ham radio training course. Not a "one day wonder" course such as was recently the subject of an article on the ARRL website ("Is Your License Class Efficient" or some such title), but rather a multisession course with quizzes and a final test that were not from a published pool.

Point is, just because it's not in the treaty anymore doesn't mean all countries will or should drop it.

> I think the FCC will
> drop it, but they move at a snail's pace.

They're busy with other things. And perhaps they don't see what all the fuss is about. After all, we're talking about a 5 wpm code test that can be passed in a number of ways, with all sorts of adaptations and accomodations (tone, volume, headphones, typewriter, flashing light, Farnsworth, etc.) Add to this the fact that today there are training aids undreamed of in the past - most of them free or quite inexpensive.

> I didn't think it would survive
> for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only nine
> months so far, so I could still be right.

I think you meant 'no longer required by treaty'. Whether something is needed as a license requirement is purely a matter of opinion.

It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months before we even get to the NPRM stage.

Most of all, note that the 2000 restructuring did not result in lots of new hams, even though the requirements for all classes of license were lowered and the whole structure simplified.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3682. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:49:36 UTC
From: Barry Baxter <hoh@baxsunham.com>
Message-ID: <c7gi4f$4q4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Baxter is truly a giant among giants, a gentleman and a scholar!
The finest ham radio operator ever to key a microphone.
A humanitarian, both in word and deed!

"Steve Baxter" <netmanager2@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:78f1f2d5.0405070907.152a414e@posting.google.com...
>
> Glenn Baxter truly is K-1-MANkind as his associate Mr. Murdock has
> often said. K1MAN is a kind person who only has the best interest of
> the hams of the entire world in his heart. His love of ham radio and
> those in it is truly god like. My admiration for him grows with each
> passing hour.
>
> My one wish would be for him to bring his leadership to where all the
> "good buddies" are, because he is so much like them. And that's a big
> 10-4!

3683. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:51:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%0Qmc.822$KE6.32@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91747

"Lloyd" <lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:889987017833.2458F8789@taranews.net...
> On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@gotridofmymind> wrote:
> >
> > "Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
> > > On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The
Time
> > Lord) wrote:
> > >
> > > >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
feel
> > it
> > > >should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF
bands.
> > >
> > > It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
> > morse.
> > >
> > >
> > > -Barry
> > > ========
> > > Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> > > Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
> >
> > Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.
>
> Nope. It's an Australian. You know: one of the countries sharing
> the burden of Iraq. One of our few remaining friends.
>
> > All a bunch of whinning losers.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I reserve that description ("loser") for old irrelevant farts like you
> who are unable to learn about Usenet headers, no matter how long you
> use the Internet. Truly, you are obsolete.

The USENET is a place for incompetents like yourself LLLLLooooooyyyyyyddddd.
This is the perfect medium for goofs like you.

I could care less about your opinions of me. We ALL KNOW what you are.

Dan/W4NTI

3684. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:53:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <42Qmc.823$KE6.427@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91748

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:9ngl909m356btvj1s6v3c9gkg9r1aq1k0b@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >snip
>
> >>
> >> -Barry
> >> ========
> >> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> >> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
> >
> >Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.
>
> The '.au' in Barry's Internet address kinda localizes him to
> Australia......not Austria.....
>
> >
> >All a bunch of whinning losers.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> 73, Leo

Your right Leo. I didn't check it out. You see I am more interested in
putting down LLLlllllloooooyyyyyyddddddd whenever I can.

Dan/W4NTI

3685. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:54:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <P3Qmc.825$KE6.12@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91749

"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ms4n90duj0ghdvci8vm0p4iousmcq36ug1@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
> >> On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The
Time
> >Lord) wrote:
> >>
> >> >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
feel
> >it
> >> >should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the HF bands.
> >>
> >> It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick of
> >morse.
> >>
> >>
> >> -Barry
> >> ========
> >> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> >> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
> >
> >Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.
>
> No. I'm a whining aussie.
>
> >All a bunch of whinning losers.
>
> We are losers of the morse requirement.
>
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

I should have know so Barry. My problem is when I knew the Aussies they
were real men. You know....had a set of them. Good ole boys, could

outdrink the Queen anyday. Were men of there word. Took the ears and passed them around at mess for all to see.

What ever happened to the real Aussies?

Dan/W4NTI

3686. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 17:57:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <B6Qmc.826$KE6.94@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91750

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:409AE2E4.7050705@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >The only problem is to those that don't learn Morse Code. They can now
> >officially say they are half a ham.
> >
> >
> >
> Has there been any trouble attribatable to a "non-code" ham fumbling
> with code on the
> bands? As long as he's not QRMing anyone, other hams will likely
> "elmer" him so he
> will become more proficinent. This would be a good use of the old
> Novice subbands.
> By gentlemens' agreements, designate s few frequencies as training
> grounds for code
> beginners. Not everyone can make it to a code class.
>
I don't know where its from but I am hearing a lot more phone activity in
the CW bands of late. And not speaking Spanish. English. But who knows.

As for the use of the Novice sub bands. You really should keep more up to
date. The FCC has a proposal out right now to delete them and extend the
phone bands. And guess what? I agree with it.

Dan/W4NTI

Real hams do it with continous wave.

3687. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 18:16:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ooQmc.869$KE6.365@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91751

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E21F9215FB0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:3Rymc.7154$8S1.4510@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> >> >
> >> > A good CW operator could out operate a phone operator with less
> >> > power, less equipment, and worse propagation.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> A good operator (CW or any other kind) wouldn't say "(insert mode
> >> here) operators are lids".
> >
> > Again Alun you are not qualified to judge. Since you are only half a
> > ham. You have no experience to enable you able to judge anything about
> > CW. You need to just admit that before you have the whole USENET
> > laughing at your ignorance on the subject.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> Dan, you are not only a lid, you lack even the rudiments of logical
> reasoning. I was _not_ judging anything about CW. I don't even care to do
> so. What I was saying, since you evidently fail to understand, is that
> anyone who says that users of a particular mode are lids just because they
> use or prefer that mode is not a considerate person, i.e. you aren't.
>

I never made the claim of being considerate. That is your choice of words.

> There is a valid place for each mode that we use in the amateur service,
> and if anyone wants to do all of their operating using one mode, whether
it
> be CW, or slow-scan, or PSK, or SSB, they should be left in peace and not
> maligned by the likes of you. IMO none of them should be labelled as 'half
> a ham'. What should we count you as? One quarter of a ham? One eighth?

A real ham is the proper answer.

You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the FCC. Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND CW in front of the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience since then. You know....a real ham.

Make of that what you must.

Dan/W4NTI

3688. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 18:22:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3uQmc.889$KE6.157@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

If anything was going to be done about the willfull interference, it would have been done by now. With the exception of three individuals, all licensed hams, the same clown are still on and doing the same things.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:tczmc.3768$0V1.3656@news02.roc.ny...
> Lloyd,
>
> Regardless, he has *not* totally cleaned up his act. My best thought would
> be to eliminate any kind of "broadcasting". The ARRL wouldn't care for
> that, obviously, but there are going to be more folks that feel if one
> person (or organization) can, then they can. They *can* indeed, if they
> follow the rules. But those with the attitudes that bother me are always
> 'pushing' the envelope. Either they are given carte blanc, or others start
> the same thing. In any event, the willful interference bothers me a *lot*.
> This has been getting worse over time and if not nipped in the bud, amateur
> radio might just as well be called amateur cb. Sorry, just my opinion.
>
>
> 73,
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Lloyd" <lloyd@herblloydcb.net> wrote in message
> news:c7edrd$5sa$0@pita.alt.net...
> > Yet another nicely worded personal *opinion* but no one has yet
> > to say *why* Baxter should lose his license. What has the current
> > administration have to do with Baxter?
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Lloyd
> >
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).

> Version: 6.0.678 / Virus Database: 440 - Release Date: 5/6/04
>
>

3689. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 19:34:46 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86u0ysni95.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91754

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <Dan> writes:

[...]

Dan> A real ham is the proper answer.

Dan> You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the
Dan> FCC. Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND
Dan> CW in front of the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience
Dan> since then. You know....a real ham.

Dan> Make of that what you must.

Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
run the risk of being a real ham.

Dan> Dan/W4NTI

Jack.
(I'm happier being me, thanks.)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAm+TbGPFSfAB/ezgRAsjOAKDNQUy5b62MY53oGofMP3/azLWoDwCfcEXM
dvXTKkm8BLVTxuI/keHV3PA=
=vNwr
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3690. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 19:41:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <409BE662.1050203@psu.edu>
Source record: 91755

stewart wrote:
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404141650.5a942a7e@posting.google.com>...
>
>>... But insisting on meeting all
>>three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be
>>automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there
>>only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license
>>and upgrade the current Novices to Technician?
>
>
> Because we need to bring back the eliminated entry-level license!

We have a perfectly good entry level license, the Technician level.

>>If a new entry-level
>>license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes
>>instead of 3?
>
>
> Because it is UNNECESSARY... the General, Technician, and TechPlus
> tests are/were virtually identical - ergo, MERGE 'EM ALL!

I took all of my tests during the last restructuring, and the tests are
not even close to identical.

>>What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?
>
>
> Forget it... NO MORE COMPROMISING! It has been attempted over the
> years, and all these foot-draggers want to do is pull us back to
> December 6, 1941...

Wow, some spin there, Stewart! and just whose "no more compromising" are
you talking about? And are you suggesting that Code tested hams are
responsible for Pearl Harbor? ;^)

> 'aint gonna happen McGee... It is 2004, and we
> have Cell Phones, the Internet, 125 Channels on TV, etc., etc., etc...
> time for US Ham Radio to join the 21st century.

> Morse Code will now officially be IRRELEVANT (at least as far as
> Novice and General Classes are concerned). LIVE WITH IT.
>
> The ARRL proposal is PERFECT... time to MOVE ON!

I wouldn't know why morse shouldn't be eliminated for Extra also, it it is eliminated for the General class.

And no, the ARRL proposal isn't anywhere near perfect.

The Morse code requirement for Extra is just a bone thrown to the people that still want Element 1 testing. If we are going to get rid of element one, get rid of it for cryin' out loud. Why subject it to a lingering decline?

Over half of the Generals will then have been tested at the Technician level. Despite what you say, the tests are quite different. I've taken them all, and in my experience and opinion, they are appropriate for the privileges granted.

The administrative quagmire of Novice and Advanced class licensees that is stated as the reason for further untested upgrading simply doesn't exist.

Not a terribly perfect plan at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3691. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 21:07:49 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <b33b7f9a912fd20fc7467f51ef547a39@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 91756

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:

>Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>run the risk of being a real ham.

Age has nothing to do with Dan's personality problems. I've been
licensed for 50 years, took all my exams except for the first one
(Novice) in front of FCC examiners, but I've moved on since then.

Some people sit back and try to live in the past (military days,
ham radio license -- whatever) while others continue to anticipate
the future. Dan's "real ham" mantra is a plea for respect which
arises out of his own insecurity.

I've been there, done that, got the ARRL 35 wpm certificate, and
then proceeded to persue other things. It is my belief that ham
radio has become quite "uncool" to newbies in these days of
the internet, personal computers, Wi-Fi, and the rest of the
technology that attracts today's bright kids. I put ham radio on
the back burner way back in 1980 when my interests also turned to
computers and the Arpanet. I've built my own machines, written
operating systems for them, and developed software in persuit of
my technical interests. I think that the "real hams" of the 80's
did very similar things and enlarged their own worlds beyond the
narrow view that the SPST switch throwers (CW dudes) seem to espouse
as "real" ham radio.

As the other "real hams" left the Dan types behind, they became
insecure and increasingly strident. Ignore them. They not only
don't matter any more, they are not "real hams" themselves. They
are now merely old timers who couldn't keep up.

3692. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 21:15:32 UTC
From: nobody@See.Comments.Header
Message-ID: <70ZN5FSN38114.9691203704@anonymous.poster>
Source record: 91757

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:

>Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>run the risk of being a real ham.

Age has nothing to do with Dan's personality problems. I've been licensed for 50 years, took all my exams except for the first one (Novice) in front of FCC examiners, but I've moved on since then. Some people sit back and try to live in the past (military days, ham radio license -- whatever) while others continue to anticipate the future. Dan's "real ham" mantra is a plea for respect which arises out of his own insecurity.

I've been there, done that, got the ARRL 35 wpm certificate, and then proceeded to persue other things. It is my belief that ham radio has become quite "uncool" to newbies in these days of the internet, personal computers, Wi-Fi, and the rest of the technology that attracts today's bright kids. I put ham radio on the back burner way back in 1980 when my interests also turned to computers and the Arpanet. I've built my own machines, written operating systems for them, and developed software in persuit of my technical interests. I think that the "real hams" of the 80's did very similar things and enlarged their own worlds beyond the narrow view that the SPST switch throwers (CW dudes) seem to espouse as "real" ham radio.

As the other "real hams" left the Dan types behind, they became insecure and increasingly strident. Ignore them. They not only don't matter any more, they are not "real hams" themselves. They are now merely old timers who couldn't keep up.

3693. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 21:32:28 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040507173228.817$Gi@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

netmanager2@yahoo.com (Steve Baxter) wrote:
> My one wish would be for him to bring his leadership to where all the
> "good buddies" are, because he is so much like them. And that's a big
> 10-4!
>
10 Code rocks!

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3694. Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 22:00:36 UTC
From: Dan Jacobson <jidanni@jidanni.org>
Message-ID: <87k6znganv.fsf@jidanni.org>
Source record: 91759

There is much information available about licencing for hams who take temporary trips aboard. But what about people who are Permanent Residents and want to become a ham? Do most countries allow Permanent Residents to obtain an operator's licence? a station licence? all without needing to return or have any paperwork from one's country of origin?

I'm not talking about Reciprocal Licensing, I believe. I'm taking about citizens of country A who have long ago moved to country B where they are now Permanent Residents, when one day the ham bug bites and they want to get into ham radio for the first time. They may live very far from country A and don't want to go there anymore.

How far does the average country B allow them to get as far as licencing as compared to citizens of country B?

3695. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 23:27:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405071527.6f048287@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91760

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ooQmc.869$KE6.365@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> A real ham is the proper answer.
>
> You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the FCC.
> Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND CW in front of
> the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience since then. You
> know....a real ham.
>
> Make of that what you must.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

That would be an anachronism. It can't be done for real anymore, but
you're welcome to petition the SCA to start a chapter where you can
play at it.

One day QST will run that article in their April issue.

3696. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 23:34:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405071534.31bb80d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91761

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<B6Qmc.826$KE6.94@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:409AE2E4.7050705@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >The only problem is to those that don't learn Morse Code. They can now
> > >officially say they are half a ham.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Has there been any trouble attribatable to a "non-code" ham fumbling
> > with code on the
> > bands? As long as he's not QRMing anyone, other hams will likely
> > "elmer" him so he
> > will become more proficinent. This would be a good use of the old
> > Novice subbands.
> > By gentlemens' agreements, designate s few frequencies as training
> > grounds for code
> > beginners. Not everyone can make it to a code class.
> >
> I don't know where its from but I am hearing a lot more phone activity in
> the CW bands of late. And not speaking Spanish. English. But who knows.

Do you know what the prefix for Canada is?

> As for the use of the Novice sub bands. You really should keep more up to
> date. The FCC has a proposal out right now to delete them and extend the
> phone bands. And guess what? I agree with it.

And put the Novices in the General CW authorizations. I agreed with
that idea in 1987.

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> Real hams do it with continous wave.

Yep, I hear them on top of the DX. They might want to interrupt their
continuous waves and add some intelligence to their transmissions.

3697. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-07 23:38:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91762

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...

> I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse at
> a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it requires a
> long time to learn.
>
> Dave K8MN

Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.

3698. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 00:19:37 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86oeozojmu.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 91763

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Anon" == nobody <starwars> writes:

Jack> Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I
Jack> might run the risk of being a real ham.

Anon> Age has nothing to do with Dan's personality problems. I've
Anon> been licensed for 50 years, took all my exams except for the
Anon> first one (Novice) in front of FCC examiners, but I've moved on
Anon> since then.

Age is not merely a chronological concept, this is so true.

Anon> Some people sit back and try to live in the past (military days,
Anon> ham radio license -- whatever) while others continue to
Anon> anticipate the future. Dan's "real ham" mantra is a plea for
Anon> respect which arises out of his own insecurity.

You're thinking harder about it than I did.

Anon> I've been there, done that, got the ARRL 35 wpm certificate, and
Anon> then proceeded to persue other things. It is my belief that ham
Anon> radio has become quite "uncool" to newbies in these days of the
Anon> internet, personal computers, Wi-Fi, and the rest of the
Anon> technology that attracts today's bright kids. I put ham radio
Anon> on the back burner way back in 1980 when my interests also
Anon> turned to computers and the Arpanet. I've built my own
Anon> machines, written operating systems for them, and developed
Anon> software in persuit of my technical interests. I think that the
Anon> "real hams" of the 80's did very similar things and enlarged
Anon> their own worlds beyond the narrow view that the SPST switch
Anon> throwers (CW dudes) seem to espouse as "real" ham radio.

Amateur radio is no longer the cutting edge. I am very happy about
that, because most of the time I don't have to worry about poseur
ham-wannabe people. The vast majority of the amateurs with whom I
interact are grownup, mature, and interested in playing with and
learning about radio and other related technologies. I am very happy
about that, too.

Anon> As the other "real hams" left the Dan types behind, they became
Anon> insecure and increasingly strident. Ignore them. They not only
Anon> don't matter any more, they are not "real hams" themselves.
Anon> They are now merely old timers who couldn't keep up.

It is a shame that the wealth of experience and knowledge bottled up
inside is going to waste. Ah well. Such is life.

Jack.
(time marches on.)
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAnCedGPFSfAB/ezgRAt3ZAKC/uVAfJdlqnJ/6K2QZ7kDfzozOegCg4+GJ
teFRfmlbFrvxHDp9jww8wc8=
=7+mK
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3699. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 00:44:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <r3Wmc.11682$Hs1.2207@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91764

"Dan Jacobson" <jidanni@jidanni.org> wrote in message
news:87k6znganv.fsf@jidanni.org...

> Do most countries allow Permanent
> Residents to obtain an operator's licence?
> a station licence? all without needing to return
> or have any paperwork from one's country of origin?

I don't know about other countries, but the US has no citizenship requirement to obtain a US amateur radio operator or station license. All you need is to pass the examination and to have a US mailing address. You need never have ever stepped foot on US soil, if you can somehow gain access to a US mailing address. As only ONE EXAMPLE there was (is?) a flourishing VE group in Japan which was giving tests in Japan, and the applicants would use mailing addresses in the US (or US territories) to obtain their trophy US license, and in the process grabbing up choice US call signs, which then become unavailable to US citizens.

As an exercise for a rainy Saturday afternoon, peruse the FCC data for AH0/KH0/NH0/WH0xx and AH2/KH2/NH2/WH2xx calls and note the clusters of calls which share a common address and a penchant for Japanese names (the citizens of the Marianas have predominately hispanic surnames).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3700. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 03:19:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91765

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/7/2004 5:53 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405070253.4e171c36@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040506220402.22537.00000011@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/6/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>

>> >Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
>> >attaching it to your name.
>>
>> But YOU keep stating that I am allegedly repeating it.
>>
>> I am not.
>
>But you should; it's so wonderfully stupid. And it is the statement
>(of fact) that got this ball rolling. You back-pedalled and are now
>soft pedalling a different statement, which was also shown to be
>wrong.

When it comes to "so wonderfully stupid" you DO seem to have a propensity
to get in knee deep.

You've done it again.

I am not "back-peddling" on anything. No Amateur Radio = No MARS. You
have yet to disprove this.

Otherwise, you just keep trying to dazzle us with your brilliance only to
realize it the glare off the baldness of your ignorance.

Your problem, not mine.

>> >So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
>> >statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
>> >as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
>> >where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
>> >is substantially true.
>>
>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> That is sufficient.

>
>No, it is not sufficient. Quote A Military Regulation or Title 47
>document.

Yes, it IS sufficient. Each MARS program is wholly dependent on the
Amateur Radio Service to exist. It seems that everyone except you is aware of
this.

Again, ANOTHER one of your problems.

Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper. Perhaps
she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have a
history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into corners
with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...

>> >No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
>> >what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
>> >"Amateur Radio."
>>
>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
>Nope, not sufficient.
>
>Why do you keep running away from your statement,
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

It's still correct.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>I knew you were qualified to research the DoD and Title 47 regs to
>back up your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>"
>The only question now is when you'll post the applicable citation.

No need, Brain. Again, it seems everyone knows about teh relationship
between the MARS programs and Amateur Radio EXCEPT you.

Must be kinda lonely on the outside looking in, huh...?!?!

>> >Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.
>>
>> >>>I<<< don't have to "make" you do anything, Brain. >>>YOU<<<
>> continually make assertions you can't/won't substantiate, make assertions
>of
>> derring-do that are not documented ANYwhere, and you generally keep walking
>all
>> over your own tail over and over while claiming others to be "nuts".
>
>Document this:
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> I have no crow to eat here or anywhere, Brain.
>>
>> Stop lying in public. Stop making assertions you can't/won't
>substantiate.
>> Be a man.

>I am a man.

No, you're not.

>Now you be a man and post any DoD or Title 47 citation whatsoever that
>substantially says,
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
>
>without the "Sorry Hans" part, of course.
>
>"Caw, caw!"

Now who's nuts?

>Steve, I hear your crow calling. You might want to locate some
>Tobasco sauce.

Sorry Brain...That's only your over-active imagination and wishful
thinking.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

You can prove differently, of course?

Steve, K4YZ

3701. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 03:32:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91766

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/7/2004 5:57 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405070257.78d83560@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040506215522.22537.00000010@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> >Steve, its obvious that you're nuts and I'm not.
>>
>> To WHO...?!?!
>>
>> YOU...?!?!
>>
>> A documented liar? A "man" who won't stand behind his own word?
>>
>> Am I supposed to be impressed by this?
>>
>> Sheeeeeeesh. You really ARE an idiot.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Poor demented Steve.
>
>I told you that the zero in my callsign stood for the tenth district,
>not the zeroeth district.

I understand that for Amateur Radio applications the ZERO in the callsign is for the tenth call district. Unlike you, I can think in the abstract.

I also understand there is only one numeral in your callsign. It >>IS<< a ZERO.

So are you.

It really is THAT simple.

>And so you call me a liar and an idiot, and insinuate that I'm not a
>man.

You are a liar. You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with ANY form of proof.

You're an idiot because you keep exposing yourself to such ridicule even though you've been caught doing it over and over.

I doubt you're much of a man because of your foolish regard for your own reputation and reckless behaviour in a public forum

>Get help.

For what? Making a fool out of you? That's what I HAVE you for, PuppetBoy! Now...Tell us all about your hero Lennie...How proud you are to be associated with him...How you worked "portable" from Somalia without proper authorization to do so. Then you can ALSO provide us with SOME sort of proof to substantiate YOUR claim that "unlicensed radio services play a major role in disaster communications....

We'll wait right here while you pony up an excuse for all of that....And THEN tell us who's "nuts"...

Steve, K4YZ

3702. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 03:45:49 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91767

From: Jack Twilley jmt+usenet@twilley.org

>I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>run the risk of being a real ham.
>

There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not all hams are old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.I don't think hams are frustrated either. (They seem to be comfortable with who they are).

I don't know any "real" hams that are old, bitter, or frustrated. Okay. I know some that are old. But, your'e saying all real hams are old.

3703. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 03:50:39 UTC
From: lumushahs@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040507235039.08632.00000883@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91768

From: starwars nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net

> It is my belief that ham
>radio has become quite "uncool" to newbies in these days of
>the internet, personal computers, Wi-Fi, and the rest of the
>technology that attracts today's bright kids.

I don't think its the new gadgets.People that like building things may be interested in amateur radio. This will be true, despite the internet, personal computers, etc.

3704. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 04:46:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508004601.15149.00000990@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91769

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: lumushahs@aol.com (Lumushahs)
>Date: 5/7/2004 10:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com>

>There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not all hams
>are
>old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.

I know a couple, unfortunately....KB1HMW and N0IMD come to mind right off
the bat...

>I don't think hams are frustrated
>either.

Haven't found any "preety fems" yet, Vippy?

> (They seem to be comfortable with who they are).

We are.

You seem to have a problem, however. Most of your "posts" lament your
exposure to most of us at one level or another...

Steve, K4YZ

3705. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 04:46:52 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508004652.16549.00000916@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91770

>Anyway Lllllllooooooyyyyyyyyddddddd no one gives a crap what you think.
>

Hey Dan, nice to see we are still freinds. LOL.

Seriously, I have left you alone. Why can't you just let me post my opinions? I made no personal attack on you with this post. Just for that, expect to see more and more of me in this newsgroup.

Bye bye -

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3706. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 04:47:52 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91771

>It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?
>

Yes man I know that, but does'nt that blow a hole for those folks who code to stay as a filter?

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3707. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 11:32:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405080332.8c79e6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91772

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<r3Wmc.11682$Hs1.2207@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Dan Jacobson" <jidanni@jidanni.org> wrote in message
> news:87k6znganv.fsf@jidanni.org...
>
> > Do most countries allow Permanent
> > Residents to obtain an operator's licence?
> > a station licence? all without needing to return
> > or have any paperwork from one's country of origin?
>
> I don't know about other countries, but the US has no citizenship
> requirement to obtain a US amateur radio operator or station license.
> All you need is to pass the examination and to have a US mailing
> address. You need never have ever stepped foot on US soil, if you can
> somehow gain access to a US mailing address. As only ONE EXAMPLE there
> was (is?) a flourishing VE group in Japan which was giving tests in
> Japan, and the applicants would use mailing addresses in the US (or US
> territories) to obtain their trophy US license, and in the process
> grabbing up choice US call signs, which then become unavailable to US
> citizens.
>
> As an exercise for a rainy Saturday afternoon, peruse the FCC data for
> AH0/KH0/NH0/WH0xx and AH2/KH2/NH2/WH2xx calls and note the clusters of
> calls which share a common address and a penchant for Japanese names
> (the citizens of the Marianas have predominately hispanic surnames).
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

The second Japanese invasion of the Marianas Islands was economic.

3708. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 12:28:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508082859.21784.00001165@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 91773

>Subject: Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/8/2004 6:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405080332.8c79e6f@posting.google.com>
>
>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<r3Wmc.11682$Hs1.2207@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> "Dan Jacobson" <jidanni@jidanni.org> wrote in message
>> news:87k6znganv.fsf@jidanni.org...
>>
>> > Do most countries allow Permanent
>> > Residents to obtain an operator's licence?
>> > a station licence? all without needing to return
>> > or have any paperwork from one's country of origin?
>>
>> I don't know about other countries, but the US has no citizenship
>> requirement to obtain a US amateur radio operator or station license.
>> All you need is to pass the examination and to have a US mailing
>> address. You need never have ever stepped foot on US soil, if you can
>> somehow gain access to a US mailing address. As only ONE EXAMPLE there
>> was (is?) a flourishing VE group in Japan which was giving tests in
>> Japan, and the applicants would use mailing addresses in the US (or US
>> territories) to obtain their trophy US license, and in the process
>> grabbing up choice US call signs, which then become unavailable to US
>> citizens.
>>
>> As an exercise for a rainy Saturday afternoon, peruse the FCC data for
>> AH0/KH0/NH0/WH0xx and AH2/KH2/NH2/WH2xx calls and note the clusters of
>> calls which share a common address and a penchant for Japanese names
>> (the citizens of the Marianas have predominately hispanic surnames).
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>The second Japanese invasion of the Marianas Islands was economic.

There's a "PT2" that's been living in Atlanta for at least 20 years who continues to use his Brazilian call "portable 4". One wonder's who is getting paid off on this one.

Steve, K4YZ

3709. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:25:07 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E369CB2B4FFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91774

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net:

> Alun wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in news:409ABB0C.C1D993E8
>> @earthlink.net:
>>
>> > Alun wrote:
>> >
>> >> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
>> >
>> > There's a gaping contradiction buried in there some place.
>>
>> Not atall. Something doesn't have to be hard to take a long time to do.
>
> Now you've added an additional element. We've gone from "easy" to "a
> lot of work" to "long time to do". Something "easy" wouldn't seem to
> require either a lot of work or a long time to do.

Why not? I don't see any contradiction. For example, bricklaying is easy,
but how long would it take you to build the Great Wall of China? In any
case, I only said relatively easy, by which I meant it is below the speed
at which you can no longer copy individual dits and dahs, which was a
barrier to a lot of people..

>
> I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse at
> a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it requires a
> long time to learn.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

That's the trouble with this whole debate. It isn't uniformly difficult for
different people.

3710. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:30:49 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91775

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
>
>> I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
>> at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
>> requires a long time to learn.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
> Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
> change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
> takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
> Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
>

That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a good
method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
point of me learning 20wpm?

3711. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:38:26 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E36C0D3D054elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91776

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0405070540.37b0704@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94E1A7B59F6BFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> Tony P. <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net> wrote in
>> news:MPG.1b043ca46d72748e98999a@news.verizon.net:
>>
>> > In article <20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>> > daviesl2003 @aol.com says...
>> >> I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>> >> feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to
>> >> the HF bands.
>> >>
>> >> Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should
>> >> not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a
>> >> easy one either.
>> >>
>> >> I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 -
>> >> I'll be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>> >
>> > I didn't find the series of tests difficult at all. The 5WPM and
>> > 13WPM were fairly easy too, as I had time to practice the 5WPM while
>> > on a rainy camping trip. Good thing I brought plenty of batteries
>> > and a code practice tapes.
>> >
>>
>> I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
>>
>> > 13WPM was gotten by actually working HF with what privileges I had
>> > as a Tech+. From there, up to 20WPM and all done.
>> >
>>
>> I'd say it's a bit harder for those with no interest in using CW
>
> I had no particular interest in the topics covered by probably half
> the courses I had to pass to get a degree. But I did pass 'em
> (grousing all the way) and the priveleges flowed. The philosophy
> behind volume of work invested in learning = volume of privs goes back
> at least to the guilds of the early Renaissance.
>

You would have thought we would have learnt since then, rather than aping
the practices of hundreds of years ago.

>> > I think the biggest detriment to testing now is the publication of
>> > the question pools. People can get into the hobby via rote
>> > memorization,
>>
>> True in some instances, but most people don't have photographic memory
>>
>> > which by the way is what schools teach kids, not how to think but
>> > how to memorize.
>> >
>> > So over time the hobby is just going to be awash in nitwits,
>>
>> I don't think so. Not any more than it already is, anyway!
>>
>> > and then
>> > fade away. There are too many other options to communicate.
>> >
>> >
>>
>> ...which is another issue altogether. The Internet has hit the hobby
>> pretty hard.
>
> What's your point?

My point is that we need to recruit people into the hobby.

> Ham radio license tests should be reduced to
> passing a test on mouse operations in order for ham radio to compete
> with the Internet? Passing a one-button mouse test garners a Tech
> ticket, two gets a General and two plus a scroller wheel gets the
> examinee an Extra?
>
> w3rv
>

Where do you get that from? I don't think we should reduce theory standards
atall. I just think we need to abolish the code test.

3712. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:39:20 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E36C34255E4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91777

Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in
news:ms4n90duj0ghdvci8vm0p4iousmcq36ug1@4ax.com:

> On Thu, 06 May 2004 22:12:59 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Barry OGrady" <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:f4ck901c11robp4fn2l6a451j36ihd53ka@4ax.com...
>>> On 06 May 2004 04:03:56 GMT, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The
>>> Time Lord) wrote:
>>>
>>> >I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>>> >feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
>>> >HF bands.
>>>
>>> It's not! I have full access to all HF amateur bands without a lick
>>> of morse.
>>>
>>>
>>> -Barry
>>> ========
>>> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
>>> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>>
>>Must be a Frenchman, Belgium, or a Kraut.
>
> No. I'm a whining aussie.
>
>>All a bunch of whinning losers.
>
> We are losers of the morse requirement.

That's the best sort of loser to be

>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>

3713. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:49:23 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E36DE865F2Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91778

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0405070923.5e69f1ae@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in
>> news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com:
>>
>> > I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>> > feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
>> > HF bands.
>> >
>> > Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should
>> > not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a
>> > easy one either.
>> >
>> > I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 -
>> > I'll be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>> >
>> >
>> > Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
>> > "On the Domestic Front"
>> > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
>> >
>>
>> The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
>> evidently a majority around the world agree with you.
>
> A majority of the world's governments that bothered to attend and vote
> on the issue.
>
> And all they did was change the rules so each country can decide for
> itself what is required - just like the written test.
>
> Although a suggested standard for written tests was added at the same
> WRC, it's really more of a suggestion than anything else. Countries
> can have wide-ranging interpretations of what's "needed". For example,
> do you think ol' JY1 and his family had to sit for written and code
> exams that were equivalent to what US or UK hams had to pass for the
> same privileges? Or do you think the US writtens compare with, say,
> those in the UK?
>
> If I'm not mistaken, getting a license in some countries *requires*
> successful completion of an approved training course. (I know the

> "Foundation" license has this requirement). Doesn't matter if someone
> is a Ph.D. in EE, they have to attend and pass the ham radio classes
> to get the license - even though such courses are not part of any
> treaty and not required in many other countries.

Actually, they only have to do the practical assesments, it's not necessary
to attend the course.

>
> Imagine the reaction here in the USA if the code test were dropped
> *and* getting a license required attendance at an approved ham radio
> training course. Not a "one day wonder" course such as was recently
> the subject of an article on the ARRL website ("Is Your License Class
> Efficient" or some such title), but rather a multisession course with
> quizzes and a final test that were not from a published pool.
>
> Point is, just because it's not in the treaty anymore doesn't mean all
> countries will or should drop it.
>
>> I think the FCC will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace.
>
> They're busy with other things. And perhaps they don't see what all
> the fuss is about. After all, we're talking about a 5 wpm code test
> that can be passed in a number of ways, with all sorts of adaptations
> and accomodations (tone, volume, headphones, typewriter, flashing
> light, Farnsworth, etc.) Add to this the fact that today there are
> training aids undreamed of in the past - most of them free or quite
> inexpensive.
>

I doubt if they even think about any of that

>> I didn't think it would survive
>> for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only
>> nine months so far, so I could still be right.
>
> I think you meant 'no longer required by treaty'. Whether something is
> needed as a license requirement is purely a matter of opinion.
>

I meant both, since I agree with the FCC that it was only needed because of
the treaty

> It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
> FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
> before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>

That may be, although I still think it will be earlier than that. How do we
stand with the pool, BTW?

> Most of all, note that the 2000 restructuring did not result in lots
> of new hams, even though the requirements for all classes of license

> were lowered and the whole structure simplified.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I think abolishing the code test will remove a block in the system, but
won't have much effect unless we actively do something to recruit new hams.
I don't really see much of that happening right now.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3714. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:50:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508105038.27780.00001219@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91779

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/8/2004 9:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a good
>method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
>point of me learning 20wpm?

Uhhhhhhhhhh....passing Element 1C...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

3715. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 14:52:05 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E36E5DFC741elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91780

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:B6Qmc.826$KE6.94@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:409AE2E4.7050705@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >The only problem is to those that don't learn Morse Code. They can
>> >now officially say they are half a ham.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> Has there been any trouble attribatable to a "non-code" ham fumbling
>> with code on the
>> bands? As long as he's not QRMing anyone, other hams will likely
>> "elmer" him so he
>> will become more proficinent. This would be a good use of the old
>> Novice subbands.
>> By gentlemens' agreements, designate s few frequencies as training
>> grounds for code
>> beginners. Not everyone can make it to a code class.
>>
> I don't know where its from but I am hearing a lot more phone activity
> in the CW bands of late. And not speaking Spanish. English. But who
> knows.
>
> As for the use of the Novice sub bands. You really should keep more
> up to date. The FCC has a proposal out right now to delete them and
> extend the phone bands. And guess what? I agree with it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> Real hams do it with continous wave.
>
>
>
>

Don't forget that the CW subbands extend much further in the US than
anywhere else. Those you are hearing are almost certainly in their phone
subbands.

3716. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:17:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508111708.27780.00001221@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91781

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/8/2004 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E36C0D3D054elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>news:d22b54c3.0405070540.37b0704@posting.google.com:

>> I had no particular interest in the topics covered by probably half
>> the courses I had to pass to get a degree. But I did pass 'em
>> (grousing all the way) and the priveleges flowed. The philosophy
>> behind volume of work invested in learning = volume of privs goes back
>> at least to the guilds of the early Renaissance.
>>
>
>You would have thought we would have learnt since then, rather than aping
>the practices of hundreds of years ago.

Nope.

You can refer to almost any current career college degree program and
still find curricula loaded with irrelevant and inconsequential "fluff"
courses, no doubt "mandated" for the purpose of keeping the paying student
paying.

>> What's your point?
>
>My point is that we need to recruit people into the hobby.

If one reflects back on the history and demograpics of the Amateur Radio
Service, there have been those who obtained licensure for a myriad of reasons,
but those who really get in it and stick with it have recurring central
interests...Two types come to mind. First are those who are facinated by radio
for radio's sake...Gadgets.

The other are those who see Amateur Radio as a further means to an
end...public service, emergency services, etc.

Then there are always those "others", ie: husband-wife licensee's who just
want a cheap honey-do connection and nothing else.

Most of the "active" folks are the gadget operators and ES types, so let's
go to where they are rather than wait for them to find us..."Popular Science"
and "Popular Mechanics" magazine..."Journal of Emergency Medical Services",
"Emergency Medical Services", etc etc etc.

I never understood why we put the number of "basic" licensing course ads we do in Amateur Radio magazines...Most folks who read them are ALREADY licensed!

>> Ham radio license tests should be reduced to
>> passing a test on mouse operations in order for ham radio to compete
>> with the Internet? Passing a one-button mouse test garners a Tech
>> ticket, two gets a General and two plus a scroller wheel gets the
>> examinee an Extra?
>
>Where do you get that from? I don't think we should reduce theory standards
>atall. I just think we need to abolish the code test.

Code test-schmode test...If you want to re-establish some validity of the Amateur Radio Service's credibility as a breeding ground for technically competent licensees, close the written test pools.

That will never happen, however, for one very prominent reason if no other...Truth be known that MOST people would never get an Amateur license because of the WRITTEN test...In it's raw form, it requires that the applicant actually KNOW something. That requires REAL learning, not just rote memorization, which is exactly what learning Morse Code is, and is exactly what the written tests are now.

Element 1 only adds access to about 2.5% of all Amateur allocations. Those that really wanted HF priviledges only saw the Code test as a hurdle...Not a brick wall.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3717. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:18:04 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E372C539FDBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91782

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040508082859.21784.00001165@mb-m07.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/8/2004 6:32 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405080332.8c79e6f@posting.google.com>
>>
>>"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<r3Wmc.11682$Hs1.2207@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>> "Dan Jacobson" <jidanni@jidanni.org> wrote in message
>>> news:87k6znganv.fsf@jidanni.org...
>>>
>>> > Do most countries allow Permanent
>>> > Residents to obtain an operator's licence?
>>> > a station licence? all without needing to return or have any
>>> > paperwork from one's country of origin?
>>>
>>> I don't know about other countries, but the US has no citizenship
>>> requirement to obtain a US amateur radio operator or station license.
>>> All you need is to pass the examination and to have a US mailing
>>> address. You need never have ever stepped foot on US soil, if you
>>> can somehow gain access to a US mailing address. As only ONE EXAMPLE
>>> there was (is?) a flourishing VE group in Japan which was giving
>>> tests in Japan, and the applicants would use mailing addresses in the
>>> US (or US territories) to obtain their trophy US license, and in the
>>> process grabbing up choice US call signs, which then become
>>> unavailable to US citizens.
>>>
>>> As an exercise for a rainy Saturday afternoon, peruse the FCC data
>>> for AH0/KH0/NH0/WH0xx and AH2/KH2/NH2/WH2xx calls and note the
>>> clusters of calls which share a common address and a penchant for
>>> Japanese names (the citizens of the Marianas have predominately
>>> hispanic surnames).
>>>
>>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>The second Japanese invasion of the Marianas Islands was economic.
>
> There's a "PT2" that's been living in Atlanta for at least 20 years
> who
> continues to use his Brazilian call "portable 4". One wonder's who is
> getting paid off on this one.

>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>

So long as he doesn't become a US citizen or get a US licence, and so long as he keeps his Brazilian licence renewed, he can operate in the US indefinitely. However, he should be signing "W4 portable PT2___". Only Canadians are now supposed to add the US prefix on the end. "PT2___ portable W4" would have been right 20 years ago, but things change.

20 years ago he would have needed to apply to the FCC for a new 610A every year, but now he doesn't need anything from the FCC to do it. Also, if he really doesn't use a W in front of the 4 he would be saying he was in the 4th distrct of Brasil, so that would always have been totally incorrect, 20 years ago and now.

It used to be common to require citizenship as a condition of getting a licence other than a reciprocal licence, but most countries dropped that many years ago. There may still be some places left on the planet where it is still the case, so it's always a good idea to check.

3718. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:21:24 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E3735639965elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91783

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040508105038.27780.00001219@mb-m11.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/8/2004 9:30 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
>>good method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What
>>was the point of me learning 20wpm?
>
> Uhhhhhhhhhh....passing Element 1C...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

So let me rephrase that. Why should I have had to pass 1C to get the bottom ends of the phone subbands? Actually, that's where the DX used to be, but it seems to have moved up to avoid the 'hernia nets' that now seem to occupy that spectrum.

3719. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:29:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E374B73D6D0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91784

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040508111708.27780.00001221@mb-m11.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/8/2004 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E36C0D3D054elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>>
>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>>news:d22b54c3.0405070540.37b0704@posting.google.com:
>
>>> I had no particular interest in the topics covered by probably half
>>> the courses I had to pass to get a degree. But I did pass 'em
>>> (grousing all the way) and the priveleges flowed. The philosophy
>>> behind volume of work invested in learning = volume of privs goes
>>> back at least to the guilds of the early Renaissance.
>>>
>>
>>You would have thought we would have learnt since then, rather than
>>aping the practices of hundreds of years ago.
>
> Nope.
>
> You can refer to almost any current career college degree program
> and
> still find curricula loaded with irrelevant and inconsequential "fluff"
> courses, no doubt "mandated" for the purpose of keeping the paying
> student paying.
>
>>> What's your point?
>>
>>My point is that we need to recruit people into the hobby.
>
> If one reflects back on the history and demograpics of the Amateur
> Radio
> Service, there have been those who obtained licensure for a myriad of
> reasons, but those who really get in it and stick with it have
> recurring central interests...Two types come to mind. First are those
> who are facinated by radio for radio's sake...Gadgets.
>

I don't think I've ever got over my facination with how radio waves bridge
huge distances. It still seems like magic even though I have studied how it
works.

> The other are those who see Amateur Radio as a further means to an
> end...public service, emergency services, etc.
>
> Then there are always those "others", ie: husband-wife licensee's
> who just
> want a cheap honey-do connection and nothing else.
>
> Most of the "active" folks are the gadget operators and ES types,
> so let's
> go to where they are rather than wait for them to find us..."Popular
> Science" and "Popular Mechanics" magazine..."Journal of Emergency
> Medical Services", "Emergency Medical Services", etc etc etc.
>

Agreed. Mind you, ads in Popular Mecanics are incredibly expensive

> I never understood why we put the number of "basic" licensing
> course ads
> we do in Amateur Radio magazines...Most folks who read them are ALREADY
> licensed!
>
>>> Ham radio license tests should be reduced to
>>> passing a test on mouse operations in order for ham radio to compete
>>> with the Internet? Passing a one-button mouse test garners a Tech
>>> ticket, two gets a General and two plus a scroller wheel gets the
>>> examinee an Extra?
>>
>>Where do you get that from? I don't think we should reduce theory
>>standards atall. I just think we need to abolish the code test.
>
> Code test-schmode test...If you want to re-establish some validity
> of the
> Amateur Radio Service's credibility as a breeding ground for
> technically competent licensees, close the written test pools.
>
> That will never happen, however, for one very prominent reason if
> no
> other...Truth be known that MOST people would never get an Amateur
> license because of the WRITTEN test...In it's raw form, it requires
> that the applicant actually KNOW something. That requires REAL
> learning, not just rote memorization, which is exactly what learning
> Morse Code is, and is exactly what the written tests are now.
>
> Element 1 only adds access to about 2.5% of all Amateur
> allocations.
> Those that really wanted HF priviledges only saw the Code test as a
> hurdle...Not a brick wall.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

>
>
>
>
>

My recollection of hurdles in school sports is mostly of falling over the bl**dy things, HI!

Alun, N3KIP

3720. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:29:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508112943.08632.00000898@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91785

>Subject: Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/8/2004 10:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E372C539FDBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>news:20040508082859.21784.00001165@mb-m07.aol.com:

>> There's a "PT2" that's been living in Atlanta for at least 20 years
>> who
>> continues to use his Brazilian call "portable 4". One wonder's who is
>> getting paid off on this one.
>
>So long as he doesn't become a US citizen or get a US licence, and so long
>as he keeps his Brazilian licence renewed, he can operate in the US
>indefinitely. However, he should be signing "W4 portable PT2___". Only
>Canadians are now supposed to add the US prefix on the end. "PT2___
>portable W4" would have been right 20 years ago, but things change.
>
>20 years ago he would have needed to apply to the FCC for a new 610A every
>year, but now he doesn't need anything from the FCC to do it. Also, if he
>really doesn't use a W in front of the 4 he would be saying he was in the
>4th distrct of Brasil, so that would always have been totally incorrect, 20
>years ago and now.
>
>It used to be common to require citizenship as a condition of getting a
>licence other than a reciprocal licence, but most countries dropped that
>many years ago. There may still be some places left on the planet where it
>is still the case, so it's always a good idea to check.

It appears as though he's been clipped.

He now has a US call...And with privileges that are less than his
Brazilian license. If he were not required to change, why would he?

73

Steve, K4YZ

3721. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:40:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508114023.08632.00000899@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91786

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/8/2004 10:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E3735639965elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>news:20040508105038.27780.00001219@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>>Date: 5/8/2004 9:30 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>>
>>>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
>>>good method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What
>>>was the point of me learning 20wpm?
>>
>> Uhhhhhhhhhh....passing Element 1C...?!?!
>
>So let me rephrase that. Why should I have had to pass 1C to get the bottom
>ends of the phone subbands? Actually, that's where the DX used to be, but
>it seems to have moved up to avoid the 'hernia nets' that now seem to
>occupy that spectrum.

Because at the time that was what was required to pass the level of
licensure you sought.

Obviously you WANTED that level of licensure because you did what you had
to do and got over it. The benefits outweighed the effort to obtain them.

How many people "want" to be doctors, airline pilots, bankers, etc, but
never get there because of the amount of education or training it takes to get
there?

Yes, some are hindered by financial or other "real world" hurdles, but
then too there are hundreds of stories of people who worked two-three
jobs...weathered divorces...single parenthood...etc and overcame those hurdles
to get what they wanted.

It's all a matter of what you want as opposed to what you're willing to do
to get it.

As for the "hernia nets", they aren't a factor for me...I don't find folks
who are predisposed to discussing thier gastrointestinal dysfunctions below the
phone subbands.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3722. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 15:54:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508115449.08632.00000900@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91787

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/8/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E374B73D6D0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>news:20040508111708.27780.00001221@mb-m11.aol.com:

>> If one reflects back on the history and demograpics of the Amateur
>> Radio
>> Service, there have been those who obtained licensure for a myriad of
>> reasons, but those who really get in it and stick with it have
>> recurring central interests...Two types come to mind. First are those
>> who are facinated by radio for radio's sake...Gadgets.
>>
>
>I don't think I've ever got over my facination with how radio waves bridge
>huge distances. It still seems like magic even though I have studied how it
>works.

Ditto! And altho I can "work" somone in Australia on the pooter, I liken
it to fishing with hand grenades!...

It takes skill to drop that line in and coax "the big one" onto the hook!

I am the same way with aircraft. I used to live at the junction of two
low-level military training routes in Sequatchie County, Tennessee, and was
routinely treated to impromptu "airshows" courtesy of the United States Air
Force, Navy and Marine Corps. I could hear the "whistling" of the engines
coming up the valley and would run out to catch a glimpse.

When the U.S. was gearing up for Kosovo, B-1B Lancers and F15 Eagles were
regulars along the route.

>> Most of the "active" folks are the gadget operators and ES types,
>> so let's
>> go to where they are rather than wait for them to find us..."Popular
>> Science" and "Popular Mechanics" magazine..."Journal of Emergency
>> Medical Services", "Emergency Medical Services", etc etc etc.
>>
>
>Agreed. Mind you, ads in Popular Mecanics are incredibly expensive

I agree, but what price would we pay if we lost Amateur Radio altogether
due to low census? With the dollar-figures the ARRL posts every year they can
afford to put at least one full page ad in those mags per quarter, at least!

>> Element 1 only adds access to about 2.5% of all Amateur
>> allocations.
>> Those that really wanted HF priviledges only saw the Code test as a
>> hurdle...Not a brick wall.
>
>My recollection of hurdles in school sports is mostly of falling over the
>bl**dy things, HI!

Jump higher, Alun! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3723. News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 16:19:21 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E37D290EF5Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91788

The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal, probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.

3724. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 16:21:00 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E37D706DFE9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91789

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040508115449.08632.00000900@mb-m11.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/8/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E374B73D6D0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>>news:20040508111708.27780.00001221@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
>>> If one reflects back on the history and demograpics of the
>>> Amateur Radio
>>> Service, there have been those who obtained licensure for a myriad of
>>> reasons, but those who really get in it and stick with it have
>>> recurring central interests...Two types come to mind. First are
>>> those who are facinated by radio for radio's sake...Gadgets.
>>>
>>
>>I don't think I've ever got over my facination with how radio waves
>>bridge huge distances. It still seems like magic even though I have
>>studied how it works.
>
> Ditto! And altho I can "work" somone in Australia on the pooter,
> I liken
> it to fishing with hand grenades!...
>
> It takes skill to drop that line in and coax "the big one" onto
> the hook!
>
> I am the same way with aircraft. I used to live at the junction
> of two
> low-level military training routes in Sequatchie County, Tennessee, and
> was routinely treated to impromptu "airshows" courtesy of the United
> States Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. I could hear the "whistling"
> of the engines coming up the valley and would run out to catch a
> glimpse.
>
> When the U.S. was gearing up for Kosovo, B-1B Lancers and F15
> Eagles were
> regulars along the route.
>
>>> Most of the "active" folks are the gadget operators and ES
>>> types, so let's

>>> go to where they are rather than wait for them to find us..."Popular
>>> Science" and "Popular Mechanics" magazine..."Journal of Emergency
>>> Medical Services", "Emergency Medical Services", etc etc etc.
>>>
>>
>>Agreed. Mind you, ads in Popular Mecanics are incredibly expensive
>
> I agree, but what price would we pay if we lost Amateur Radio
> altogether
> due to low census? With the dollar-figures the ARRL posts every year
> they can afford to put at least one full page ad in those mags per
> quarter, at least!
>
>>> Element 1 only adds access to about 2.5% of all Amateur
>>> allocations.
>>> Those that really wanted HF priviledges only saw the Code test as a
>>> hurdle...Not a brick wall.
>>
>>My recollection of hurdles in school sports is mostly of falling over
>>the bl**dy things, HI!
>
> Jump higher, Alun! =)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>

I have short legs

3725. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 16:23:26 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E37DDA65EFDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91790

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040508112943.08632.00000898@mb-m11.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/8/2004 10:18 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E372C539FDBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>>news:20040508082859.21784.00001165@mb-m07.aol.com:
>
>>> There's a "PT2" that's been living in Atlanta for at least 20
>>> years who
>>> continues to use his Brazilian call "portable 4". One wonder's who
>>> is getting paid off on this one.
>>
>>So long as he doesn't become a US citizen or get a US licence, and so
>>long as he keeps his Brazilian licence renewed, he can operate in the
>>US indefinitely. However, he should be signing "W4 portable PT2___".
>>Only Canadians are now supposed to add the US prefix on the end.
>>"PT2___ portable W4" would have been right 20 years ago, but things
>>change.
>>
>>20 years ago he would have needed to apply to the FCC for a new 610A
>>every year, but now he doesn't need anything from the FCC to do it.
>>Also, if he really doesn't use a W in front of the 4 he would be saying
>>he was in the 4th distrct of Brasil, so that would always have been
>>totally incorrect, 20 years ago and now.
>>
>>It used to be common to require citizenship as a condition of getting a
>>licence other than a reciprocal licence, but most countries dropped
>>that many years ago. There may still be some places left on the planet
>>where it is still the case, so it's always a good idea to check.
>
> It appears as though he's been clipped.
>
> He now has a US call...And with privileges that are less than his
> Brazilian license. If he were not required to change, why would he?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

>
>
>
>

Probably for the same reason I did. W3/G8VUK was too long, and N3KIP is shorter.

3726. FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 16:50:05 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <c86aed7e1f299a7635bcf423efb28816@dizum.com>
Source record: 91791

Signed on May 4th by P. DEVEDJIAN the
Minister of Industry. Mr DEVEDJIAN has
informed the REF-UNION (IARU) that he
allows class 2 operators (technicians)
on HF bands without requiring a CW exam.
Publication of the text to the Journal
Officiel is expected in the next few
days.

Fuck CW !

3727. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 17:25:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508132553.07718.00000385@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 91792

>Fuck CW !

Wellcome to CBHAM RADIO

3728. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 17:26:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <vL8nc.5793$iF6.647058@attbi_s02>
Source record: 91793

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:c86aed7e1f299a7635bcf423efb28816@dizum.com...
>
> Signed on May 4th by P. DEVEDJIAN the
> Minister of Industry. Mr DEVEDJIAN has
> informed the REF-UNION (IARU) that he
> allows class 2 operators (technicians)
> on HF bands without requiring a CW exam.
> Publication of the text to the Journal
> Officiel is expected in the next few
> days.
>
> Fuck CW !

There ya go ...a real intellectual comment really reflects the amount of
intelligence at work here .....

You are absolutely no part of the amateur community that I would want to be
involved in .....

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

3729. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 17:51:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508135139.12081.00000850@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91794

>Subject: Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government
>From: "garigue" garigue@comcast.net
>Date: 5/8/2004 12:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <vL8nc.5793$iF6.647058@attbi_s02>
>
>
>"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
>news:c86aed7e1f299a7635bcf423efb28816@dizum.com...
>>
>> Signed on May 4th by P. DEVEDJIAN the
>> Minister of Industry. Mr DEVEDJIAN has
>> informed the REF-UNION (IARU) that he
>> allows class 2 operators (technicians)
>> on HF bands without requiring a CW exam.
>> Publication of the text to the Journal
>> Officiel is expected in the next few
>> days.
>>
>> F### CW !
>
>
>There ya go ...a real intellectual comment really reflects the amount of
>intelligence at work here .....
>
>You are absolutely no part of the amateur community that I would want to be
>involved in .....

Ditto.

Steve, K4YZ

3730. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 18:19:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LN6dnaI9KNpSuQDdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91795

```
Alun wrote:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net:
>
>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in news:409ABB0C.C1D993E8
>>>@earthlink.net:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Alun wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I'll grant that 5wpm is relatively easy, but still a lot of work
>>>>
>>>>There's a gaping contradiction buried in there some place.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Not atall. Something doesn't have to be hard to take a long time to do.
>>
>>Now you've added an additional element. We've gone from "easy" to "a
>>lot of work" to "long time to do". Something "easy" wouldn't seem to
>>require either a lot of work or a long time to do.
>
>
> Why not? I don't see any contradiction. For example, bricklaying is easy,
> but how long would it take you to build the Great Wall of China? In any
> case, I only said relatively easy, by which I meant it is below the speed
> at which you can no longer copy individual dits and dahs, which was a
> barrier to a lot of people..
>
>
>>I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse at
>>a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it requires a
>>long time to learn.
>>
>>Dave K8MN
>>
>
>
> That's the trouble with this whole debate. It isn't uniformly difficult for
> different people.
```

Excellent point, Alun. Every once in a while, I have to remind the folks that *do* find it easy that their experience is not everyone's. It took me 6 months of every day practice to get to 5 wpm. And I flunked the first element 1 test I took.

I am now getting close to 13 wpm, but it depends on how my ears are behaving on any particular day. On good days I can do it, but if I'm tired or stressed, I'm back to 5 wpm in a heartbeat.

This second effort has been another roughly three month effort - this hasn't quite been every day though.

I'm neither lazy, stupid or unmotivated.

Interesting to think that under the old system, I would only just possibly be a General, and yet under the new, I am an Extra.

Considering that my main interests are the digital modes for my everyday hamming, I would probably not be anything at all, since I would have been years learning.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3731. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 19:30:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QYqdnSWks7b4qADdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91796

Alun wrote:

> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:
>
>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
>>
>>
>>>I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
>>>at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
>>>requires a long time to learn.
>>>
>>>Dave K8MN
>>
>>Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
>>change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
>>takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
>>Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
>>
>
>
> That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a good
> method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
> point of me learning 20wpm?

What is the point of learning anything that you don't want to learn?.
Why should people learn to spell now that we have spell checking?

Since 90 percent of my time on the air is PSK31 why did I have to learn
about anything else?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3732. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 19:34:55 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508153455.01933.00001051@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91797

AMEN!!!!!

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3733. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 19:35:40 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508153540.01933.00001052@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91798

What's wrong?

Don't like the tables being turned?

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3734. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 19:53:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NLSdnWnYFJhXpwDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91799

Alun wrote:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0405070923.5e69f1ae@posting.google.com:
>
>
>>Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:<Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>>>daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in
>>>news:20040506000356.28807.00000977@mb-m28.aol.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I think that since Morse Code is old, but not completely useless, I
>>>>feel it should no longer be made to be learned to gain access to the
>>>>HF bands.
>>>>
>>>>Do I feel that Amateur Radio be made a free for all? No, it should
>>>>not. There should be a test, but not a really hard test, but not a
>>>>easy one either.
>>>>
>>>>I'll even admit, I'll never get a new Icom 7800, at $10,000.00 -
>>>>I'll be lucky to maybe get a used 706 at about 400 or 500 or so.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
>>>>"On the Domestic Front"
>>>>http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
>>>>
>>>
>>>The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
>>>evidently a majority around the world agree with you.
>>
>>A majority of the world's governments that bothered to attend and vote
>>on the issue.
>>
>>And all they did was change the rules so each country can decide for
>>itself what is required - just like the written test.
>>
>>Although a suggested standard for written tests was added at the same
>>WRC, it's really more of a suggestion than anything else. Countries
>>can have wide-ranging interpretations of what's "needed". For example,
>>do you think ol' JY1 and his family had to sit for written and code
>>exams that were equivalent to what US or UK hams had to pass for the

>>same privileges? Or do you think the US writtens compare with, say,
>>those in the UK?
>>
>>If I'm not mistaken, getting a license in some countries *requires*
>>successful completion of an approved training course. (I know the
>>"Foundation" license has this requirement). Doesn't matter if someone
>>is a Ph.D. in EE, they have to attend and pass the ham radio classes
>>to get the license - even though such courses are not part of any
>>treaty and not required in many other countries.
>
>
> Actually, they only have to do the practical assesments, it's not necessary
> to attend the course.
>
>
>>Imagine the reaction here in the USA if the code test were dropped
>>*and* getting a license required attendance at an approved ham radio
>>training course. Not a "one day wonder" course such as was recently
>>the subject of an article on the ARRL website ("Is Your License Class
>>Efficient" or some such title), but rather a multisession course with
>>quizzes and a final test that were not from a published pool.
>>
>>Point is, just because it's not in the treaty anymore doesn't mean all
>>countries will or should drop it.
>>
>>
>>>I think the FCC will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace.
>>
>>They're busy with other things. And perhaps they don't see what all
>>the fuss is about. After all, we're talking about a 5 wpm code test
>>that can be passed in a number of ways, with all sorts of adaptations
>>and accomodations (tone, volume, headphones, typewriter, flashing
>>light, Farnsworth, etc.) Add to this the fact that today there are
>>training aids undreamed of in the past - most of them free or quite
>>inexpensive.
>>
>
>
> I doubt if they even think about any of that
>
>
>>>I didn't think it would survive
>>>for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only
>>>nine months so far, so I could still be right.
>>
>>I think you meant 'no longer required by treaty'. Whether something is
>>needed as a license requirement is purely a matter of opinion.
>>
>
>

> I meant both, since I agree with the FCC that it was only needed because of
> the treaty
>
>
>>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>>before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>>
>
>
> That may be, although I still think it will be earlier than that. How do we
> stand with the pool, BTW?
>
>
>>Most of all, note that the 2000 restructuring did not result in lots
>>of new hams, even though the requirements for all classes of license
>>were lowered and the whole structure simplified.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> I think abolishing the code test will remove a block in the system, but
> won't have much effect unless we actively do something to recruit new hams.
> I don't really see much of that happening right now.

I guess the question is "What are YOU doing to recruit more hams",
Alun? The torch is being passed, and it is being passed to those that
"won" the code/no code debate.

I'm pretty new as a Ham, I try to recruit whenever possible, and will
welcome new hams regardless of their education. Some people might feel
otherwise at this point, having the wind knocked out of their sails, so
to speak.

You guys won. You have the ball now. Using the NCI's polled membership
as an example, you now want to make all Technicians Generals, and
advanced, Extra's. A drastic reduction in entrance requirements seems to
be the rationale du jour for the brave new Amateur Radio Service.

Really it's your ball and your game now. Godspeed!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3735. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 19:58:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NLSdnWjYFJifoQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91800

Alun wrote:

> I have short legs

I'm getting this image of Hank Hill's father.......

- Mike KB3EIA -

3736. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:00:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91851

Alun wrote:

> The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister to sign
> the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on the 4th, and
> will take effect when published in the official journal, probably either on
> the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.

Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
the change one way or the other.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3737. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:38:06 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <109qh9i7abg972b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91852

Why don't you quote some of the message you're replying to so that we won't think you're just talking to yourself?

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040508153540.01933.00001052@mb-m05.aol.com...
> What's wrong?
>
> Don't like the tables being turned?
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3738. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:38:18 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <109qh9uptlk2b3b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91853

Why don't you quote some of the message you're replying to so that we won't think you're just talking to yourself?

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040508153455.01933.00001051@mb-m05.aol.com...
> AMEN!!!!!
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3739. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:42:53 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <hDbnc.6540$536.1324579@attbi_s03>
Source record: 91854

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040508153540.01933.00001052@mb-m05.aol.com...
> What's wrong?
>
> Don't like the tables being turned?

No Lloyd ..... my comments had nothing to do with CW or Phone or RTTY etc. etc. My comment was based on the fact that there are what ...about 400,000 words in the English language and the consistent use of this universal "sentence enhancer" only shows the ignorance of the user. It takes a beautiful act that is a gift of God for two people to share and debases it. I think that we ALL are above that here and in our daily lives.

Take care 73 .....KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

3740. Re: Can anyone explain why Technicians should be upgraded to General?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:49:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405081249.6245af34@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91855

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0405061444.41e36e2e@posting.google.com>...
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0404141650.5a942a7e@posting.google.com>...
> >... But insisting on meeting all
> > three of these goals requires that Technician licensees be
> > automatically upgraded to General. If it's that essential that there
> > only be 3 license classes, then why not keep the Technician license
> > and upgrade the current Novices to Technician?
>
> Because we need to bring back the eliminated entry-level license!

The entry-level license now is the Technician. It has been obtained by
preschoolers, so it cannot be "too hard".

The old Novice license class required a simple written test and 5 wpm
code. Started many thousands of hams on their way.
>
> > If a new entry-level
> > license is necessary, then what's wrong with having 4 license classes
> > instead of 3?
>
> Because it is UNNECESSARY... the General, Technician, and TechPlus
> tests are/were virtually identical - ergo, MERGE 'EM ALL!

The Tech Plus and Tech writtens are indeed identical, but the General
(after March 21, 1987) is quite different.

And what is proposed by ARRL and NCVEC is to allow hundreds of
thousands of Techs and Tech Pluses to upgrade without any test at all.
>
> > What's wrong with compromising on #1 or #2?
>
> Forget it... NO MORE COMPROMISING!

OK, fine.

No more compromising on code tests - all license classes to require at
least 5 wpm.

No more compromising on written tests - no free upgrades.

> It has been attempted over the
> years, and all these foot-draggers want to do is pull us back to
> December 6, 1941... 'aint gonna happen McGee... It is 2004, and we
> have Cell Phones, the Internet, 125 Channels on TV, etc., etc., etc...
> time for US Ham Radio to join the 21st century.

What, exactly, are you talking about?

> Morse Code will now officially be IRRELEVANT (at least as far as
> Novice and General Classes are concerned). LIVE WITH IT.

Most of what's in the theory exams is also "irrelevant" if all someone
wants to do is use manufactured ham gear.
>
> The ARRL proposal is PERFECT... time to MOVE ON!
>
Please explain why Techs should get a free upgrade to General, and
Advanceds a free upgrade to Extra, without taking the tests for those
licenses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3741. MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 20:54:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405081254.2afaa365@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91856

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/7/2004 5:53 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405070253.4e171c36@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040506220402.22537.00000011@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/6/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >> >Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
> >> >attaching it to your name.
> >>
> >> But YOU keep stating that I am allegedly repeating it.
> >>
> >> I am not.
> >
> >But you should; it's so wonderfully stupid. And it is the statement
> >(of fact) that got this ball rolling. You back-pedalled and are now
> >soft pedalling a different statement, which was also shown to be
> >wrong.
>
> When it comes to "so wonderfully stupid" you DO seem to have a propensity
> to get in knee deep.

This statement is eyeball deep: " MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> You've done it again.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> I am not "back-peddling" on anything. No Amateur Radio = No MARS. You
> have yet to disprove this.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

hi hi. What silliness!

> Otherwise, you just keep trying to dazzle us with your brilliance only to
> realize it the glare off the baldness of your ignorance.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> Your problem, not mine.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

hi hi. What silliness!

> >> >So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
> >> >statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
> >> >as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
> >> >where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
> >> >is substantially true.
> >>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>
> >> That is sufficient.
> >
> >No, it is not sufficient. Quote A Military Regulation or Title 47
> >document.
>
> Yes, it IS sufficient. Each MARS program is wholly dependent on the
> Amateur Radio Service to exist. It seems that everyone except you is aware of
> this.

Not sufficient. And while you're at it, find a citation for, "Each
MARS program is wholly dependent on the Amateur Radio Service to
exist."

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> Again, ANOTHER one of your problems.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper. Perhaps
> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have a
> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into corners
> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...

I told you to stay away from my family.

> >> >No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
> >> >what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
> >> >"Amateur Radio."
> >>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> >Nope, not sufficient.
> >
> >Why do you keep running away from your statement,
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
> It's still correct.

It is still False.

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >I knew you were qualified to research the DoD and Title 47 regs to
> >back up your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >"
> >The only question now is when you'll post the applicable citation.
>
> No need, Brain. Again, it seems everyone knows about teh relationship
> between the MARS programs and Amateur Radio EXCEPT you.
>
> Must be kinda lonely on the outside looking in, huh...?!?!

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >> >Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.
> >>
> >> >>>I<<< don't have to "make" you do anything, Brain. >>>YOU<<<
> >> continually make assertions you can't/won't substantiate, make assertions
> of
> >> derring-do that are not documented ANYwhere, and you generally keep walking
> all
> >> over your own tail over and over while claiming others to be "nuts".
> >>
> >Document this:
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

> >> I have no crow to eat here or anywhere, Brain.
> >>
> >> Stop lying in public. Stop making assertions you can't/won't
> substantiate.
> >> Be a man.
>
> >I am a man.
>
> No, you're not.

I am a man. You are a creep.

> >Now you be a man and post any DoD or Title 47 citation whatsoever that
> >substantially says,
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
> >
> >without the "Sorry Hans" part, of course.
> >

> >"Caw, caw!"
>
> Now who's nuts?

Steve is.

> >Steve, I hear your crow calling. You might want to locate some
> >Tobasco sauce.
>
> Sorry Brain...That's only your over-active imagination and wishful
> thinking.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> You can prove differently, of course?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

3742. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:33:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Cmcnc.2454$KE6.1640@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91857

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:c86aed7e1f299a7635bcf423efb28816@dizum.com...
>
> Signed on May 4th by P. DEVEDJIAN the
> Minister of Industry. Mr DEVEDJIAN has
> informed the REF-UNION (IARU) that he
> allows class 2 operators (technicians)
> on HF bands without requiring a CW exam.
> Publication of the text to the Journal
> Officiel is expected in the next few
> days.
>
> Fuck CW !
>
Imagine that ! Same opinion I have of the French.

Dan/W4NTI

3743. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:35:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%ocnc.2461$KE6.1928@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91858

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Turd" <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040508153540.01933.00001052@mb-m05.aol.com...
> What's wrong?
>
> Don't like the tables being turned?
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Turd and Whiney show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/]

Can't wait to hear you on 75 phone Turd face.

Dan/W4NTI

3744. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:36:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Fpcnc.2465$KE6.809@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91859

You have to understand LLoyd the Toid. He ain't too bright.

Dan/W4NTI

"David 01" <ifiwantspam@illask.org> wrote in message
news:109qh9i7abg972b@corp.supernews.com...
> Why don't you quote some of the message you're replying to so that we
won't
> think you're just talking to yourself?
>
> "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040508153540.01933.00001052@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > What's wrong?
> >
> > Don't like the tables being turned?
> >
> >
> > Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> > "On the Domestic Front"
> > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
>
>

3745. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:38:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Lrcnc.2473$KE6.1822@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91860

One more time David. Lllllloooooyyyydddd is a complete idiot. He hasn't the sense to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We have all learned to 'deal' with him. Usually with a laugh and hit the delete button.

Dan/W4NTI

"David 01" <ifiwantspam@illask.org> wrote in message news:109qh9uptlk2b3b@corp.supernews.com...
> Why don't you quote some of the message you're replying to so that we won't
> think you're just talking to yourself?
>
> "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040508153455.01933.00001051@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > AMEN!!!!!
> >
> >
> > Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> > "On the Domestic Front"
> > http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/
>
>

3746. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:41:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Hucnc.2483$KE6.69@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91861

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405071534.31bb80d4@posting.google.com...

> Do you know what the prefix for Canada is?

Gee, Duhhhhhhhhhh, let the think.......Uh......maybe it's a VE or a VA
or some other strange letters depending what part of a seal arse you are
celebrating that month. Sound right?

And yes I do know that Canada is allowed to operate in what the US calls the
'CW Segements'. And that has what to do with what I said?

Dan/W4NTI

3747. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:43:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vwcnc.2488$KE6.2346@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91862

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
> >
> >> I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
> >> at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
> >> requires a long time to learn.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> > Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
> > change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
> > takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
> > Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
> >
>
> That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a good
> method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
> point of me learning 20wpm?

Uh,,,,,,,maybe.....lets see now......to use it on the air to
communicate?......Duhhhhhh.

Dan/W4NTI

3748. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:44:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508174411.21319.00001030@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91863

>Subject: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/8/2004 3:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405081254.2afaa365@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>This statement is eyeball deep: " MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
>hi hi. What silliness!

>Not sufficient. And while you're at it, find a citation for, "Each
>MARS program is wholly dependent on the Amateur Radio Service to
>exist."

Very simple, Brain.

Review the roster of active stations in each service.

Disenroll all those who are participants based upon licensure in the
Amateur Radio Service.

Please tell us how many "stations" would be left in each service after
doing that.

I repeat...No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper.
>Perhaps
>> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have
>a
>> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into
>corners
>> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...
>
>I told you to stay away from my family.

I just wanted to see what kind of reaction I'd get.

It's very predictable. Cowards never do want thier families to know about thier "alternative lifestyle".

I wouldn't want MY wife to see me acting like that and developing a reputation as not being truthful either. You DO have that reputation, Brain. Stupid assertions...tales of radio bravado...public assertions of admiration for a documented pathological liar...

Is THAT message getting through to you yet, Brain?

I wouldn't want YOU "near" my family if I knew the net result would be some revelation of alternate-reality behaviour to them.

If her reaction was anywhere NEAR "normal", she'd probably jack-slap you, tell you to stay off of the Internet, and not embarras the family name any further.

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

>> >I am a man.
>>
>> No, you're not.
>
>I am a man. You are a creep.

Backwards as always, Brain.

>" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

How much longer are you going to humilate yourself, Brain?

Checked your mail box lately, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

3749. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:50:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1Dcnc.2508$KE6.742@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91864

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E3735639965elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040508105038.27780.00001219@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >>Date: 5/8/2004 9:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
> > >
> > >>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
> > >>good method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What
> > >>was the point of me learning 20wpm?
> > >
> > > Uhhhhhhhhhh....passing Element 1C...?!?!
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> So let me rephrase that. Why should I have had to pass 1C to get the
bottom
> ends of the phone subbands? Actually, that's where the DX used to be, but
> it seems to have moved up to avoid the 'hernia nets' that now seem to
> occupy that spectrum.

Among other things getting the Extra will allow you to work the DX where you
hear it. Assuming of course they are in the US phone bands. CW don't have
that problem. Because the DX hangs low, and everyone in the world can work
it.

Dan/W4NTI

3750. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 21:53:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <sFcnc.2538$KE6.70@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91865

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:QYqdnSWks7b4qADdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> Alun wrote:
>
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> > news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:
> >
> >
> > >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >>news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
> > >>>at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
> > >>>requires a long time to learn.
> > >>>
> > >>>Dave K8MN
> > >>
> > >>Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
> > >>change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
> > >>takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
> > >>Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
> good
> > > method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
> > > point of me learning 20wpm?
> >
> > What is the point of learning anything that you don't want to learn?.
> > Why should people learn to spell now that we have spell checking?
> >
> > Since 90 percent of my time on the air is PSK31 why did I have to learn
> > about anything else?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

How about the good feeling of knowing something that the vast majority of
humanity doesn't?

Dan/W4NTI

3751. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 22:06:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VRcnc.2740$KE6.2693@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91866

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?
> >
>
> Yes man I know that, but does'nt that blow a hole for those folks who code
to
> stay as a filter?
>
Hows that? Most of the people doing that stupitidy are multiple guess
receive only cw test takers. In other words, they can't do it either.

Dan/W4NTI

3752. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 22:07:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VScnc.2782$KE6.1351@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91867

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040508004652.16549.00000916@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >Anyway Lllllllooooooyyyyyyyyddddddd no one gives a crap what you think.
> >
>
> Hey Dan, nice to see we are still freinds. LOL.
>
> Seriously, I have left you alone. Why can't you just let me post my
opinions?
> I made no personal attack on you with this post. Just for that, expect
to see
> more and more of me in this newsgroup.
>
> Bye bye -

I guess its just that I think your a puke. Nice hearing from you again.

Bye Bye

Dan/W4NTI

3753. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 22:09:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zUcnc.2851$KE6.1668@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91868

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86u0ysni95.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <Dan> writes:
>
> [...]
>
> Dan> A real ham is the proper answer.
>
> Dan> You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the
> Dan> FCC. Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND
> Dan> CW in front of the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience
> Dan> since then. You know....a real ham.
>
> Dan> Make of that what you must.
>
> Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
> run the risk of being a real ham.
>
> Dan> Dan/W4NTI
>
> Jack.
> (I'm happier being me, thanks.)
> - --
> Jack Twilley
> jmt at twilley dot org

And I'm so happy that I'm not a know it all, but learned nothing newguy that thinks he is the cats meow.

Dan/W4NTI

3754. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 22:12:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CXcnc.2940$KE6.1626@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91869

"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
news:b33b7f9a912fd20fc7467f51ef547a39@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:
>
> >Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
> >run the risk of being a real ham.
>
> Age has nothing to do with Dan's personality problems. I've been
> licensed for 50 years, took all my exams except for the first one
> (Novice) in front of FCC examiners, but I've moved on since then.
>
> Some people sit back and try to live in the past (military days,
> ham radio license -- whatever) while others continue to anticipate
> the future. Dan's "real ham" mantra is a plea for respect which
> arises out of his own insecurity.
>
> I've been there, done that, got the ARRL 35 wpm certificate, and
> then proceeded to persue other things. It is my belief that ham
> radio has become quite "uncool" to newbies in these days of
> the internet, personal computers, Wi-Fi, and the rest of the
> technology that attracts today's bright kids. I put ham radio on
> the back burner way back in 1980 when my interests also turned to
> computers and the Arpanet. I've built my own machines, written
> operating systems for them, and developed software in persuit of
> my technical interests. I think that the "real hams" of the 80's
> did very similar things and enlarged their own worlds beyond the
> narrow view that the SPST switch throwers (CW dudes) seem to espouse
> as "real" ham radio.
>
> As the other "real hams" left the Dan types behind, they became
> insecure and increasingly strident. Ignore them. They not only
> don't matter any more, they are not "real hams" themselves. They
> are now merely old timers who couldn't keep up.
>
>

You make some valid points there. And I probably fit most to all of that. Unfortunatly this has NOT happened to me since the 80s or before. It happened as soon as I came up to these newsgroups. And when the CB type of operations came to HF. And when CBers turned ham radio VHF/UHF into a pizza ordering service.

Real Ham Radio is Morse Code, and decent Voice operations. All history. And I hate that. Your right.

Dan/W4NTI

3755. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 22:19:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <o1dnc.2956$KE6.1607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91870

"Lumushahs" <lumushahs@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com...
> From: Jack Twilley jmt+usenet@twilley.org
>
> >I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
> >run the risk of being a real ham.
> >
>
> There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not all hams
are
> old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.I don't think hams are
frustrated
> either. (They seem to be comfortable with who they are).
>
> I don't know any "real" hams that are old, bitter, or frustrated. Okay. I
know
> some that are old. But, your'e saying all real hams are old.
>
>
Nor do I thing my age of 57 is 'OLD'. I'm no spring chicken but I sure hear
a LOT of older folks on the air than I am.

Dan/W4NTI

3756. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 23:26:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <X0enc.4201$Tc4.1440@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91871
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ms-dnaYCicdGbQfdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> Yeah, that was quite a jump there, Dan! I think Jim learned that tactic
> from the neocons. I hear Rush and Anne do it all the time. And remember
> they are still blaming everything on Billary! Might as well get used to
> it. The libs have learned.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Hello, Mike

Actually, that jump took since 1967 to form. My parents were Republicans. I was *going* to be (couldn't vote until you were 21 back then).

I've seen what that kind of thinking can do. When I was in boot camp, someone got on the wrong side of someone. He was taken into the shower and when he came out (do *not* attempt to tell me otherwise - I was there and saw this kid when he came out of the shower), his lip was split and he had a nasty bruise on his forehead. This was company 43, Great Lakes, in 1967. I mentioned this to someone else and the guy laughed - "that was nothing. The next company over, some guy's shirt was dirty. They stripped him naked and scrubbed him over *every inch of his body* with a scrub brush!". The discription was actually more graphic than that, but I'm sure you get the idea. That second story I cannot confirm; but it finally got me to thinking. If we treat our own that way, how would we treat prisoners (from whom we wish to obtain information). Over 3 decades later, I have my answer. And a lot of non-thinkers screaming that it is nobody's fault. LOL

The city mayor (a democrat) ran agains the county treasurer (a republican) last year. The republican said "no more taxes, no reduction in service". The democrat stated "anyone who thinks we can continue services and not raise taxes is either not telling the truth or they are kidding themselves."

Of course, the republican won and became county manager. Aid was cut to the city (natch), but OMG - a *huge* deficit. They are going to borrow more funds. Their credit rating has been cut again (I think this is 5 reductions in credit rating in 6 years). Now the courts have ruled that in New York State, there is underfunding of poor school districts (surprise, surprise - all 8th graders in Mendon - a *high* income area nearby - got free laptop computers!). None of this has caught me by surprise. It isn't a matter of if; rather, when.

So, go ahead and giggle in your self-rightousness. It isn't going to change what is happening and what will happen. Perhaps we *should* give away

amateur licenses. Get some of those 20 KW class C amps up on 75 and 20 meters and out of 11 meters. Heck, if someone can afford to run a 20 KW rig, they should be entitled to do so, right? :))

You guys are a scream. Pardon me for not laughing.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.679 / Virus Database: 441 - Release Date: 5/7/04

3757. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 23:38:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DYudnTJaBOLp8gDdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91872

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:QYqdnSWks7b4qADdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>
>>>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
>>>news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
>>>>>at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
>>>>>requires a long time to learn.
>>>>>
>>>>>Dave K8MN
>>>>
>>>>Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
>>>>change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
>>>>takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
>>>>Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
>
> good
>
>>>method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
>>>point of me learning 20wpm?
>>
>>What is the point of learning anything that you don't want to learn?.
>>Why should people learn to spell now that we have spell checking?
>>
>>Since 90 percent of my time on the air is PSK31 why did I have to learn
>>about anything else?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -

>>
>
>
> How about the good feeling of knowing something that the vast majority of
> humanity doesn't?

Never though of that, but yeah, that works for me!

- Mike KB3EIA

3758. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-08 23:52:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GOWdnSOcFtA27wDdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ms-dnaYCicdGbQfdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
>
>>Yeah, that was quite a jump there, Dan! I think Jim learned that tactic
>>from the neocons. I hear Rush and Anne do it all the time. And remember
>>they are still blaming everything on Billary! Might as well get used to
>>it. The libs have learned.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Hello, Mike
>
> Actually, that jump took since 1967 to form. My parents were Republicans.
> I was *going* to be (couldn't vote until you were 21 back then).
>
> I've seen what that kind of thinking can do. When I was in boot camp,
> someone got on the wrong side of someone. He was taken into the shower and
> when he came out (do *not* attempt to tell me otherwise - I was there and
> saw this kid when he came out of the shower), his lip was split and he had a
> nasty bruise on his forehead. This was company 43, Great Lakes, in 1967. I
> mentioned this to someone else and the guy laughed - "that was nothing. The
> next company over, some guy's shirt was dirty. They stripped him naked and
> scrubbed him over *every inch of his body* with a scrub brush!". The
> discription was actually more graphic than that, but I'm sure you get the
> idea. That second story I cannot confirm; but it finally got me to
> thinking. If we treat our own that way, how would we treat prisoners (from
> whom we wish to obtain information). Over 3 decades later, I have my
> answer. And a lot of non-thinkers screaming that it is nobody's fault. LOL

Funny you should mention that. I was watching Hannity and Colmes the
other night, and Hannity was coming up with a rationale for why the
perps wre justified in treating those prisoners that way. Thought I'd puke.

Then last night I go to the local Barnes and Noble, and I see he has a
book out "Deliver us Fron Evil". That was amusing enough, but then I
read a review (plug actually) on Thebookservice.com. One of his
"Insights" as they called it was:

"Why it's so difficult for liberals to see clearly on moral questions --
including the moral dimensions of the war on terror."

> The city mayor (a democrat) ran agains the county treasurer (a republican)
> last year. The republican said "no more taxes, no reduction in service".
> The democrat stated "anyone who thinks we can continue services and not
> raise taxes is either not telling the truth or they are kidding themselves."
>
> Of course, the republican won and became county manager. Aid was cut to the
> city (natch), but OMG - a *huge* deficit. They are going to borrow more
> funds. Their credit rating has been cut again (I think this is 5 reductions
> in credit rating in 6 years). Now the courts have ruled that in New York
> State, there is underfunding of poor school districts (surprise, surprise -
> all 8th graders in Mendon - a *high* income area nearby - got free laptop
> computers!). None of this has caught me by surprise. It isn't a matter of
> if; rather, when.
>
> So, go ahead and giggle in your self-rightousness.

Hey, I'm not giggling.

It isn't going to change
> what is happening and what will happen. Perhaps we *should* give away
> amateur licenses. Get some of those 20 KW class C amps up on 75 and 20
> meters and out of 11 meters. Heck, if someone can afford to run a 20 KW
> rig, they should be entitled to do so, right? :))
>
> You guys are a scream. Pardon me for not laughing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3759. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 00:02:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxex7j4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91874

On 7 May 2004 06:51:21 GMT, Alun wrote:

>> Likely the FCC brearucracy just hasn't gotten around to it yet. They
>> have bigger fish to
>> fry, and will likely get to it when there's nothing better to do.

>Sad but true. You only have to look at their home page to see where we are
>in their priorities, i.e. not even on their radar atall.

Yes but....

The reality is that the "first hoop" at the Commission is the amateur radio specialist - currently an individual named Bill Cross, a licensed amateur, BTW. He's the successor to Johnny Johnston, W3BE.

His specialty is formulation of amateur radio rules and policy. Light his fire, and see how fast the matter moves through the pipeline.

Sometimes it's better if the issue is "under the radar" so the politicians who inhabit the Eighth Floor don't get involved with photo ops and sound bites as they have been with BPL, for instance.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3760. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 00:02:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxexor5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91875

On 7 May 2004 10:23:31 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>before we even get to the NPRM stage.

The NCI Petition for Rulemaking gave the FCC a quick out to drop
Element 1 immediately, with sufficient legal foundation to do so
without an NPRM (I read that part thoroughly, and it's right on the
mark).

The fact that it hasn't been done means that "someone's" fire hasn't
been lighted. This is a phenominon that I am all too familiar with
when dealing with The Monkey House whether from within or from
without.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3761. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 00:36:50 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxezwu7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91876

On Sat, 08 May 2004 06:00:36 +0800, Dan Jacobson wrote:

>There is much information available about licencing for hams who take
>temporary trips aboard. But what about people who are Permanent
>Residents and want to become a ham? Do most countries allow Permanent
>Residents to obtain an operator's licence? a station licence? all
>without needing to return or have any paperwork from one's country of origin?
>
>I'm not talking about Reciprocal Licensing, I believe. I'm taking
>about citizens of country A who have long ago moved to country B where
>they are now Permanent Residents, when one day the ham bug bites and
>they want to get into ham radio for the first time. They may live
>very far from country A and don't want to go there anymore.
>
>How far does the average country B allow them to get as far as
>licencing as compared to citizens of country B?

The US allows anyone - citizen, resident, or tourist - to obtain a
US license by examination.

The only exception is a representative of a foreign country. I have
a relative who is a diplomat of another country ("Country B") and
held a US license by examination before moving to "Country B" and
becoming a diplomat of that country. AFAIK s/he is able to retain
the US license as long as s/he is not accredited as a diplomat to
the United States (which is not likely to happen for quite a while
if ever).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3762. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:03:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Erfnc.4208$Mx2.135@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91877
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:GOWdnSOcFtA27wDdRVn-jw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:ms-dnaYCicdGbQfdRVn-hw@adelphia.com...
> >

> >
> >
> > Hello, Mike
> >
> > Actually, that jump took since 1967 to form. My parents were
Republicans.
> > I was *going* to be (couldn't vote until you were 21 back then).
> >
> > I've seen what that kind of thinking can do. When I was in boot camp,
> > someone got on the wrong side of someone. He was taken into the shower
and
> > when he came out (do *not* attempt to tell me otherwise - I was there
and
> > saw this kid when he came out of the shower), his lip was split and he
had a
> > nasty bruise on his forehead. This was company 43, Great Lakes, in
1967. I
> > mentioned this to someone else and the guy laughed - "that was nothing.
The
> > next company over, some guy's shirt was dirty. They stripped him naked
and
> > scrubbed him over *every inch of his body* with a scrub brush!". The
> > discription was actually more graphic than that, but I'm sure you get
the
> > idea. That second story I cannot confirm; but it finally got me to
> > thinking. If we treat our own that way, how would we treat prisoners
(from
> > whom we wish to obtain information). Over 3 decades later, I have my
> > answer. And a lot of non-thinkers screaming that it is nobody's fault.
LOL
>
> Funny you should mention that. I was watching Hannity and Colmes the
> other night, and Hannity was coming up with a rationale for why the

> perps wre justified in treating those prisoners that way. Thought I'd
puke.
>
> Then last night I go to the local Barnes and Noble, and I see he has a
> book out "Deliver us Fron Evil". That was amusing enough, but then I
> read a review (plug actually) on Thebookservice.com. One of his
> "Insights" as they called it was:
>
> "Why it's so difficult for liberals to see clearly on moral questions --
> including the moral dimensions of the war on terror."
>
> > The city mayor (a democrat) ran agains the county treasurer (a
republican)
> > last year. The republican said "no more taxes, no reduction in
service".
> > The democrat stated "anyone who thinks we can continue services and not
> > raise taxes is either not telling the truth or they are kidding
themselves."
> >
> > Of course, the republican won and became county manager. Aid was cut to
the
> > city (natch), but OMG - a *huge* deficit. They are going to borrow more
> > funds. Their credit rating has been cut again (I think this is 5
reductions
> > in credit rating in 6 years). Now the courts have ruled that in New
York
> > State, there is underfunding of poor school districts (surprise,
surprise -
> > all 8th graders in Mendon - a *high* income area nearby - got free
laptop
> > computers!). None of this has caught me by surprise. It isn't a matter
of
> > if; rather, when.
> >
> > So, go ahead and giggle in your self-rightousness.
>
> Hey, I'm not giggling.
>
> It isn't going to change
> > what is happening and what will happen. Perhaps we *should* give away
> > amateur licenses. Get some of those 20 KW class C amps up on 75 and 20
> > meters and out of 11 meters. Heck, if someone can afford to run a 20 KW
> > rig, they should be entitled to do so, right? :))
> >
> > You guys are a scream. Pardon me for not laughing.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Sorry, Mike

Guess this thing got my dander up just a tad. The most frustrating thing is that I can see something wrong, but I'm at a loss for an answer. Should a unit come under fire (and I've been combat stations aboard ship), everyone *has* to follow orders. Period. Lives depend upon it. So, the military wants to weed out folks that aren't suited for military life, and some problems occur. What the proper answer is beats the heck out of me.

Certainly, in civilian life, we should at least be civil - even if we don't agree ;)

I guess that the actions of a few amateurs I would not consider at all "considerate" and I'm not too certain about "civil" either.

Off my soap box (finally - LOL)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.679 / Virus Database: 441 - Release Date: 5/7/04

3763. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:10:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405081710.4e669df4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91878

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E37D706DFE9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040508115449.08632.00000900@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >>Date: 5/8/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <Xns94E374B73D6D0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
> >>
> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> >>news:20040508111708.27780.00001221@mb-m11.aol.com:
> >
> >>> If one reflects back on the history and demograpics of the
> >>> Amateur Radio
> >>> Service, there have been those who obtained licensure for a myriad of
> >>> reasons, but those who really get in it and stick with it have
> >>> recurring central interests...Two types come to mind. First are
> >>> those who are facinated by radio for radio's sake...Gadgets.
> >>>
> >>
> >>I don't think I've ever got over my facination with how radio waves
> >>bridge huge distances. It still seems like magic even though I have
> >>studied how it works.
> >
> > Ditto! And altho I can "work" somone in Australia on the pooter,
> > I liken
> > it to fishing with hand grenades!...
> >
> > It takes skill to drop that line in and coax "the big one" onto
> > the hook!
> >
> > I am the same way with aircraft. I used to live at the junction
> > of two
> > low-level military training routes in Sequatchie County, Tennessee, and
> > was routinely treated to impromptu "airshows" courtesy of the United
> > States Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. I could hear the "whistling"
> > of the engines coming up the valley and would run out to catch a
> > glimpse.
> >
> > When the U.S. was gearing up for Kosovo, B-1B Lancers and F15
> > Eagles were
> > regulars along the route.
> >

> >>> Most of the "active" folks are the gadget operators and ES
> >>> types, so let's
> >>> go to where they are rather than wait for them to find us..."Popular
> >>> Science" and "Popular Mechanics" magazine..."Journal of Emergency
> >>> Medical Services", "Emergency Medical Services", etc etc etc.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Agreed. Mind you, ads in Popular Mecanics are incredibly expensive
> >
> > I agree, but what price would we pay if we lost Amateur Radio
> > altogether
> > due to low census? With the dollar-figures the ARRL posts every year
> > they can afford to put at least one full page ad in those mags per
> > quarter, at least!
> >
> >>> Element 1 only adds access to about 2.5% of all Amateur
> >>> allocations.
> >>> Those that really wanted HF priviledges only saw the Code test as a
> >>> hurdle...Not a brick wall.
> >>
> >>My recollection of hurdles in school sports is mostly of falling over
> >>the bl**dy things, HI!
> >
> > Jump higher, Alun! =)
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> I have short legs

You're a tad short in some other respects to . .

3764. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:16:29 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <NDfnc.173510$Gd3.47897941@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 91879

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
> news:1e4e3692.0405071538.412478d3@posting.google.com:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:<409B5FAE.12A2CAAE@earthlink.net>...
> >
> >> I have little sympathy for anyone who would claim that learning morse
> >> at a speed of five words per minute is a lot of work or that it
> >> requires a long time to learn.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> > Your sympathy was not solicited, and it or the lack of it doesn't
> > change the fact that for many, learning code at 5wpm is difficult and
> > takes a long time to learn. The real pity are all of the 20WPM
> > Code-Tape Extras that have never used code.
> >
>
> That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a good
> method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What was the
> point of me learning 20wpm?

Discipline, knowledge, achievement...shall I go on? I know these are bad
words in today's "I just want what I want" world.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3765. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:42:25 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E3DC9A9FE92elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91880

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister to
>> sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on the
>> 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>> probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>
>
> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
> earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
> the change one way or the other.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

What sort of numbers? All their no-coders are licenced for HF, and we could
probably find out how many there are, but is that what you meant?
Violations of rules by no-coders? We have that number - it's zero.

3766. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:45:09 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E3DD1138CFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91881

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:zUcnc.2851$KE6.1668@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
> news:86u0ysni95.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
>> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>> Hash: SHA1
>>
>> >>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <Dan> writes:
>>
>> [...]
>>
>> Dan> A real ham is the proper answer.
>>
>> Dan> You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the
>> Dan> FCC. Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND
>> Dan> CW in front of the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience
>> Dan> since then. You know....a real ham.
>>
>> Dan> Make of that what you must.
>>
>> Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>> run the risk of being a real ham.
>>
>> Dan> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> Jack.
>> (I'm happier being me, thanks.)
>> - --
>> Jack Twilley
>> jmt at twilley dot org
>
> And I'm so happy that I'm not a know it all, but learned nothing newguy
> that thinks he is the cats meow.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Jack may be relatively new, but I've been a ham for 24 years, 'real' or
otherwise, and I'm also glad that I'm me and not you.

3767. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 01:46:29 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E3DD4BBB37Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91882

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:o1dnc.2956$KE6.1607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Lumushahs" <lumushahs@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> From: Jack Twilley jmt+usenet@twilley.org
>>
>> >I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>> >run the risk of being a real ham.
>> >
>>
>> There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not all
>> hams are old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.I don't think hams
>> are frustrated either. (They seem to be comfortable with who they
>> are).
>>
>> I don't know any "real" hams that are old, bitter, or frustrated.
>> Okay. I know some that are old. But, your'e saying all real hams are
>> old.
>>
>>
> Nor do I thing my age of 57 is 'OLD'. I'm no spring chicken but I sure
> hear a LOT of older folks on the air than I am.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

And some of those much older are more resonable

3768. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 02:10:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kKydnaTByOWWDgDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91883

Alun wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com:
>
>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>
>>>The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister to
>>>sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on the
>>>4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>>>probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>>
>>
>> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
>>earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
>>the change one way or the other.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> What sort of numbers? All their no-coders are licenced for HF, and we could
> probably find out how many there are, but is that what you meant?
> Violations of rules by no-coders? We have that number - it's zero.

Hmm, I though it would be obvious. How many new hams are licensed in
the countries that have eliminated the Morse code requirement

NOw that they are rid of the evil of Morse testing, one would think
that many new hams are coming into the fold, so to speak.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3769. Is there really a toll on the Glendale tunnel?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 03:06:10 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <49856097d7538a5fbe148a996d76b182@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 91884

My freind dan says that there is no toll and that the storie
is all a crock made up by wiseman so poeple wont come thru
the tunnel and drive by his shitty house.

Oris

3770. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 03:52:10 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508235210.27600.00000936@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91885

>I guess its just that I think your a puke.

(Dr Phil mode on)

Why do you think Lloyd is a puke?
(Dr Phil mode off)

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3771. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 03:53:45 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508235345.27600.00000937@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91886

>Hows that? Most of the people doing that stupitidy are multiple guess
>receive only cw test takers

Do you have some proof?

Learning code does not make the quality of the operator! Look at David Castle, look at ex-WB2OTK, Roger Wiseman, etc.

Need I say more??

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3772. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 03:57:01 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040508235701.27600.00000939@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91887

>You see I am more interested in
>putting down LLLlllllloooooyyyyyyddddddd whenever I can.

Why?

What have I done to you?

I thought we buried the hatchet?

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3773. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 05:35:17 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E4FDD62547elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91888

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:kKydnaTByOWWDgDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com:

>
>
> Alun wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>> news:NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com:
>>
>>
>>>Alun wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister
>>>>to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on
>>>>the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>>>>probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>>>
>>>
>>> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
>>>earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
>>>the change one way or the other.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> What sort of numbers? All their no-coders are licenced for HF, and we
>> could probably find out how many there are, but is that what you
>> meant? Violations of rules by no-coders? We have that number - it's
>> zero.
>
> Hmm, I though it would be obvious. How many new hams are licensed
> in
> the countries that have eliminated the Morse code requirement
>
> NOw that they are rid of the evil of Morse testing, one would
> think
> that many new hams are coming into the fold, so to speak.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

>
>

All these countries had no-code licences. So now they can use modes other than CW on HF without having to learn CW, which is finally as it should be. Most of the true radio enthusiasts will get whatever licence they can, even if it doesn't allow them to do what they really want.

I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.

3774. Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 06:28:47 UTC
From: Timmy <DumbassVic@LibNutz>
Message-ID: <c7kj2v$799$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dumbass Vic, W1WCR, was spouting his lies on the Lib Net again tonight.
Dumbass said the United States provided Iraq and Saddam Hussein with the poiseness gas Hussein used on the Kurds. Vic said the gas was used to kill "a few" Kurds and Sheites.
Duh! Apparently Vic views the 5,000 gassing deaths of the Kurds as being "a few".
Where the heck does Vic manufacture these "facts" from?
Oh, wait. For guys like Vic and his malingerers it is not necessary to have facts OR proof. Any lie will do and Vic is surely full of them.
Aside of Al Jazeera, Vic is the best propaganda machine that Saddam could hope for.

These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and a conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.

3775. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 11:48:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405090348.7f680a38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91892

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hxexor5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 7 May 2004 10:23:31 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
> >FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
> >before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>
> The NCI Petition for Rulemaking gave the FCC a quick out to drop
> Element 1 immediately, with sufficient legal foundation to do so
> without an NPRM (I read that part thoroughly, and it's right on the
> mark).

I recall that even before any petitions were filed, both of us agreed
that if FCC "wanted to", Element 1 could be simply dropped once the
treaty changed. I believe the procedure is called "Memorandum Report
and Order" (could be some other name) but in any event a lot quicker
and simpler than a complete NPRM cycle.
>
> The fact that it hasn't been done means that "someone's" fire hasn't
> been lighted.

Right. Could also be that "someone" doesn't want to get in the middle
of the catfight and get scratched by both sides. In which case the
thing to do is to entertain all sorts of petitions, (we're up to what
- 17-18 of them so far?!) collect comments and reply comments and even
ex partes on each of them, and allow the whole thing to percolate
through the great bureaucratic machine. Then, when the flood of
petitions has been reduced to a trickle, issue an NPRM with long
comment time (like 98-143). Resolution of the issue could take years -
and every new petition just resets the clock.

IOW, don't hold yer breath. Lookit how long it took for the "incentive
licensing" proposals of the '60s to take place. First proposals in
1963, final plan in 1966, major changes in 1968 and 1969. And they had
far fewer proposals back then.

> This is a phenominon that I am all too familiar with
> when dealing with The Monkey House whether from within or from
> without.

"Welcome To The Monkey House" ...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3776. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 12:06:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405090406.1f31f03e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91893

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<NLSdnWnYFJhXpwDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
> Alun wrote:
>
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> > news:c2356669.0405070923.5e69f1ae@posting.google.com:
> >
> >
> > >>Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:<Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > >>
> > >>>
> > >>>The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003, so
> > >>>evidently a majority around the world agree with you.
> > >>
> > >>A majority of the world's governments that bothered to attend and vote
> > >>on the issue.
> > >>
> > >>And all they did was change the rules so each country can decide for
> > >>itself what is required - just like the written test.
> > >>
> > >>Although a suggested standard for written tests was added at the same
> > >>WRC, it's really more of a suggestion than anything else. Countries
> > >>can have wide-ranging interpretations of what's "needed". For example,
> > >>do you think ol' JY1 and his family had to sit for written and code
> > >>exams that were equivalent to what US or UK hams had to pass for the
> > >>same privileges? Or do you think the US writtens compare with, say,
> > >>those in the UK?
> > >>
> > >>If I'm not mistaken, getting a license in some countries *requires*
> > >>successful completion of an approved training course. (I know the
> > >>"Foundation" license has this requirement). Doesn't matter if someone
> > >>is a Ph.D. in EE, they have to attend and pass the ham radio classes
> > >>to get the license - even though such courses are not part of any
> > >>treaty and not required in many other countries.
> >
> > > Actually, they only have to do the practical assesments, it's not necessary
> > > to attend the course.
>
> "Practical Assesmants" - as in tests? What, exactly, is required?
> >
> > >>Imagine the reaction here in the USA if the code test were dropped
> > >>*and* getting a license required attendance at an approved ham radio
> > >>training course. Not a "one day wonder" course such as was recently

> >>the subject of an article on the ARRL website ("Is Your License Class
> >>Efficient" or some such title), but rather a multisession course with
> >>quizzes and a final test that were not from a published pool.
> >>
> >>Point is, just because it's not in the treaty anymore doesn't mean all
> >>countries will or should drop it.

Another point is that requirements vary from country to country, even
with CEPT and S25.5

> >>>I think the FCC will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace.
> >>
> >>They're busy with other things. And perhaps they don't see what all
> >>the fuss is about. After all, we're talking about a 5 wpm code test
> >>that can be passed in a number of ways, with all sorts of adaptations
> >>and accomodations (tone, volume, headphones, typewriter, flashing
> >>light, Farnsworth, etc.) Add to this the fact that today there are
> >>training aids undreamed of in the past - most of them free or quite
> >>inexpensive.

> > I doubt if they even think about any of that

Why? Those accomodations and adaptations are all part of the rules. In
fact, a lot is left to the VE's judgement. For example, a *sending*
test can be substituted for the receiving test if the VEs think it is
justified.

> >>>I didn't think it would survive
> >>>for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only
> >>>nine months so far, so I could still be right.
> >>
> >>I think you meant 'no longer required by treaty'. Whether something is
> >>needed as a license requirement is purely a matter of opinion.
> >
> > I meant both, since I agree with the FCC that it was only needed because of
> > the treaty
> >
> >>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
> >>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
> >>before we even get to the NPRM stage.
> >
> > That may be, although I still think it will be earlier than that. How do we
> > stand with the pool, BTW?

I just did an update. Google up the thread - WK3C wanted to change his
date!
>
> >>Most of all, note that the 2000 restructuring did not result in lots
> >>of new hams, even though the requirements for all classes of license
> >>were lowered and the whole structure simplified.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY

> >
> > I think abolishing the code test will remove a block in the system, but
> > won't have much effect unless we actively do something to recruit new hams.
> > I don't really see much of that happening right now.

What would you suggest?

Here's what one ham is doing - and has been doing for years. I don't know this ham personally, but he is right here in EPA. Note the results and the reactions he gets. The following is a direct quote:

BEGIN QUOTE

I have had the privilege of teaching an after school activity, at the local middle school, for five years. I named it Tune in the World, and it covers many aspects of radio and television, and of course, pushes ham radio. Each year I have had several students, both boys and girls, obtain their license and try to help them continue on the hobby.

With this as my basis, I can tell you that 95% of the students were a pleasure to work with and each year the district offers me a nice salary to teach the class and each year I decline it. Yes, it is a lot of work, but the students enjoy it and come away with a very positive idea of ham radio. The attention span varies, but I have found that I have to work at making sure I have an interesting program and that no part of it goes on and on and on. I set the rules at the first meeting and have not had any serious problems. (My son and his friends have been my biggest problem.)

If one expects the students to sit in their chairs and listen to a presentation for an hour, after being in school all day, they good luck. I combine power point presentations, live demonstrations, parts of ARRL videos short movies, simple building projects and computers. Interestingly, the students are always VERY interested in the Morse code and seem less so in modes connected with the computer.

I am not a STRONG disciplinarian, but we have rules and the kids obey them and something must be going right, a few kids who were in the previous class

always take the next year's class and we always have 35 to 40
students. In
fact, my biggest problem is that other students want to join the class
after
it has been on a few weeks.

Last year at the last minute, I offer the Radio Merit Badge at Boy
Scout
Camp. I was given a terrible time and hoped for six kids. I had over
1/4
of the camp at the classes and more wanted to attend. We got a dozen
hams
out of that one.

So, if we want to get new, young hams, then think about reaching out
to the
Middle Schools, and Scout Camps. Just the camp alone, with eight
weeks of
camp, would produce between 80 and 100 new hams....with about 400
Scout
Camps in the USA, (Cub and Boy Scout) that would mean a very nice
increase
in our membership.

I do agree, that like every previous generation, the new hams need
help in
getting into the hobby and if nothing else, get their email address
and send
them info as well as forwarding the address to the ARRL, and local
clubs.
We can sit here and complain about the lack of young people in our
hobby, or
we can do something, or expect someone else to do it. Ahhh, it is
easier to
complain...right?

END QUOTE

Note particularly when he writes:

"the students are always VERY interested in the Morse code and seem
less so in
modes connected with the computer."

A block to the license process?

> I guess the question is "What are YOU doing to recruit more hams",
> Alun? The torch is being passed, and it is being passed to those that
> "won" the code/no code debate.

Exactly.
>
> I'm pretty new as a Ham, I try to recruit whenever possible, and will

> welcome new hams regardless of their education. Some people might feel
> otherwise at this point, having the wind knocked out of their sails, so
> to speak.

My policy has always been that if they have the license, they're a
ham.

> You guys won. You have the ball now. Using the NCI's polled membership
> as an example, you now want to make all Technicians Generals, and
> advanced, Extra's. A drastic reduction in entrance requirements seems to
> be the rationale du jour for the brave new Amateur Radio Service.

Exactly!

And who can really argue against it? Remember the question "why does
someone have to learn code to operate voice"? Well, if you accept that
argument, then what do you say when someone says "Why does it take a
Technician license to operate legal limit SSB on 2 meters but a
General to do the same thing on most of 20 meters?" and "Since the
Technician written allows maximum authorized power on all authorized
modes allocated to hams above 30 MHz,why is more theory testing needed
to do the same thing below 30 MHz?"

Etc.

>Really it's your ball and your game now. Godspeed!

Don't hold yer breath, Mike.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3777. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 12:35:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qaGdnfm17JobuAPdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91894

N2EY wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hxexor5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>
>>On 7 May 2004 10:23:31 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>>>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>>>before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>>
>> The NCI Petition for Rulemaking gave the FCC a quick out to drop
>> Element 1 immediately, with sufficient legal foundation to do so
>> without an NPRM (I read that part thoroughly, and it's right on the
>> mark).
>
>
> I recall that even before any petitions were filed, both of us agreed
> that if FCC "wanted to", Element 1 could be simply dropped once the
> treaty changed. I believe the procedure is called "Memorandum Report
> and Order" (could be some other name) but in any event a lot quicker
> and simpler than a complete NPRM cycle.

Yup! And do me that is the most damning indictement of the NCI crowd.
Simply petitioning to simply dropo Element 1 would have been consistent
with what we had heard their aims were all along.

But that wasn't quite enough was it?

>> The fact that it hasn't been done means that "someone's" fire hasn't
>> been lighted.
>
>
> Right. Could also be that "someone" doesn't want to get in the middle
> of the catfight and get scratched by both sides. In which case the
> thing to do is to entertain all sorts of petitions, (we're up to what
> - 17-18 of them so far?!) collect comments and reply comments and even
> ex partes on each of them, and allow the whole thing to percolate
> through the great bureaucratic machine. Then, when the flood of
> petitions has been reduced to a trickle, issue an NPRM with long
> comment time (like 98-143). Resolution of the issue could take years -
> and every new petition just resets the clock.

With all the complicated petitinos out there, I think it is time to add
mine. Maybe in a year or so, when the initial furor dies down....

> IOW, don't hold yer breath. Lookit how long it took for the "incentive
> licensing" proposals of the '60s to take place. First proposals in
> 1963, final plan in 1966, major changes in 1968 and 1969. And they had
> far fewer proposals back then.

I *really* like my prediction in the poll. 8^)

>
>> This is a phenominon that I am all too familiar with
>> when dealing with The Monkey House whether from within or from
>> without.
>
>
> "Welcome To The Monkey House" ...

- Mike KB3EIA -

3778. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:03:29 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E45BF3DD773elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91895

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0405090348.7f680a38@posting.google.com:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:<xnfcneeyarg.hxexor5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On 7 May 2004 10:23:31 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>> >FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>> >before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>>
>> The NCI Petition for Rulemaking gave the FCC a quick out to drop
>> Element 1 immediately, with sufficient legal foundation to do so
>> without an NPRM (I read that part thoroughly, and it's right on the
>> mark).
>
> I recall that even before any petitions were filed, both of us agreed
> that if FCC "wanted to", Element 1 could be simply dropped once the
> treaty changed. I believe the procedure is called "Memorandum Report
> and Order" (could be some other name) but in any event a lot quicker
> and simpler than a complete NPRM cycle.
>>
>> The fact that it hasn't been done means that "someone's" fire hasn't
>> been lighted.
>
> Right. Could also be that "someone" doesn't want to get in the middle
> of the catfight and get scratched by both sides. In which case the
> thing to do is to entertain all sorts of petitions, (we're up to what
> - 17-18 of them so far?!) collect comments and reply comments and even
> ex partes on each of them, and allow the whole thing to percolate
> through the great bureaucratic machine. Then, when the flood of
> petitions has been reduced to a trickle, issue an NPRM with long
> comment time (like 98-143). Resolution of the issue could take years -
> and every new petition just resets the clock.
>
> IOW, don't hold yer breath. Lookit how long it took for the "incentive
> licensing" proposals of the '60s to take place. First proposals in
> 1963, final plan in 1966, major changes in 1968 and 1969. And they had
> far fewer proposals back then.
>
>> This is a phenominon that I am all too familiar with
>> when dealing with The Monkey House whether from within or from
>> without.
>

> "Welcome To The Monkey House" ...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

If you are right, then the US will be the last country with a code test, decades after it no longer exists anywhere else. I don't think it will take that long, though.

Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they don't care about amateur radio, period.

Secondly, I don't think they will wait for any more petitions.

Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.

In the recent NPRM I submitted comments that many of the proposed changes, although good, were mooted by the fact they referred to the former ITU code test requirement as if it still existed. If they don't issue an NPRM on this matter they will get comments on it submitted in every other one. I know this because I will personally see to it.

As for any further restructuring, there are two separate issues:-

1) Re-farming the Novice frequencies an increasing the phone allocations. Here there is already an NPRM, and I think they will carry it out. It just gives the same amount of additional spectrum to phone as is now Novice CW. This is what they are going to do. It's less than I wanted, and even less than the ARRL or the NCVEC asked for, but I'm betting it's all done;

2) Eliminating supefluous licence classes. They will ultimately just do the obvious, i.e. give Novices and Advanceds a free upgrade. They won't revive the Novice and kill off the Tech. They will view that as a waste of time. The FCC is all for simplification, and they will point to the petitions as providing the consensus they were looking for, even thought they are slightly different.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3779. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:12:45 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91896

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0405090406.1f31f03e@posting.google.com:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<NLSdnWnYFJhXpwDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>...
>> Alun wrote:
>>
>> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> > news:c2356669.0405070923.5e69f1ae@posting.google.com:
>> >
>> >
>> >>Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >>news:<Xns94E1BABB95FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >>
>> >>>
>> >>>The ITU requirement for a code test was dropped on July 5th, 2003,
>> >>>so evidently a majority around the world agree with you.
>> >>
>> >>A majority of the world's governments that bothered to attend and
>> >>vote on the issue.
>> >>
>> >>And all they did was change the rules so each country can decide for
>> >>itself what is required - just like the written test.
>> >>
>> >>Although a suggested standard for written tests was added at the
>> >>same WRC, it's really more of a suggestion than anything else.
>> >>Countries can have wide-ranging interpretations of what's "needed".
>> >>For example, do you think ol' JY1 and his family had to sit for
>> >>written and code exams that were equivalent to what US or UK hams
>> >>had to pass for the same privileges? Or do you think the US writtens
>> >>compare with, say, those in the UK?
>> >>
>> >>If I'm not mistaken, getting a license in some countries *requires*
>> >>successful completion of an approved training course. (I know the
>> >>"Foundation" license has this requirement). Doesn't matter if
>> >>someone is a Ph.D. in EE, they have to attend and pass the ham radio
>> >>classes to get the license - even though such courses are not part
>> >>of any treaty and not required in many other countries.
> >
>> > Actually, they only have to do the practical assesments, it's not
>> > necessary to attend the course.
>
> "Practical Assesmants" - as in tests? What, exactly, is required?
>> >

>> >>Imagine the reaction here in the USA if the code test were dropped
>> >>*and* getting a license required attendance at an approved ham radio
>> >>training course. Not a "one day wonder" course such as was recently
>> >>the subject of an article on the ARRL website ("Is Your License
>> >>Class Efficient" or some such title), but rather a multisession
>> >>course with quizzes and a final test that were not from a published
>> >>pool.
>> >>
>> >>Point is, just because it's not in the treaty anymore doesn't mean
>> >>all countries will or should drop it.
>
> Another point is that requirements vary from country to country, even
> with CEPT and S25.5
>
>> >>>I think the FCC will drop it, but they move at a snail's pace.
>> >>
>> >>They're busy with other things. And perhaps they don't see what all
>> >>the fuss is about. After all, we're talking about a 5 wpm code test
>> >>that can be passed in a number of ways, with all sorts of
>> >>adaptations and accomodations (tone, volume, headphones, typewriter,
>> >>flashing light, Farnsworth, etc.) Add to this the fact that today
>> >>there are training aids undreamed of in the past - most of them free
>> >>or quite inexpensive.
>
>> > I doubt if they even think about any of that
>
> Why? Those accomodations and adaptations are all part of the rules. In
> fact, a lot is left to the VE's judgement. For example, a *sending*
> test can be substituted for the receiving test if the VEs think it is
> justified.
>
>> >>>I didn't think it would survive
>> >>>for as long as a year after it was no longer needed, but it's only
>> >>>nine months so far, so I could still be right.
>> >>
>> >>I think you meant 'no longer required by treaty'. Whether something
>> >>is needed as a license requirement is purely a matter of opinion.
> >
>> > I meant both, since I agree with the FCC that it was only needed
>> > because of the treaty
>> >
>> >>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>> >>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>> >>before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>> >
>> > That may be, although I still think it will be earlier than that.
>> > How do we stand with the pool, BTW?
>
> I just did an update. Google up the thread - WK3C wanted to change his
> date!

>>
>> >>Most of all, note that the 2000 restructuring did not result in lots
>> >>of new hams, even though the requirements for all classes of license
>> >>were lowered and the whole structure simplified.
>> >>
>> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > I think abolishing the code test will remove a block in the system,
>> > but won't have much effect unless we actively do something to
>> > recruit new hams. I don't really see much of that happening right
>> > now.
>
> What would you suggest?
>
> Here's what one ham is doing - and has been doing for years. I don't
> know this ham personally, but he is right here in EPA. Note the
> results and the reactions he gets. The following is a direct quote:
>
> BEGIN QUOTE
>
> I have had the privilege of teaching an after school activity, at the
> local
> middle school, for five years. I named it Tune in the World, and it
> covers
> many aspects of radio and television, and of course, pushes ham radio.
> Each
> year I have had several students, both boys and girls, obtain their
> license
> and try to help them continue on the hobby.
>
> With this as my basis, I can tell you that 95% of the students were a
> pleasure to work with and each year the district offers me a nice
> salary to
> teach the class and each year I decline it. Yes, it is a lot of work,
> but
> the students enjoy it and come away with a very positive idea of ham
> radio.
> The attention span varies, but I have found that I have to work at
> making
> sure I have an interesting program and that no part of it goes on and
> on and
> on. I set the rules at the first meeting and have not had any serious
> problems. (My son and his friends have been my biggest problem.)
>
> If one expects the students to sit in their chairs and listen to a
> presentation for an hour, after being in school all day, they good
> luck. I
> combine power point presentations, live demonstrations, parts of ARRL
> videos
> short movies, simple building projects and computers. Interestingly,

> the
> students are always VERY interested in the Morse code and seem less so
> in
> modes connected with the computer.
>
> I am not a STRONG disciplinarian, but we have rules and the kids obey
> them
> and something must be going right, a few kids who were in the previous
> class
> always take the next year's class and we always have 35 to 40
> students. In
> fact, my biggest problem is that other students want to join the class
> after
> it has been on a few weeks.
>
> Last year at the last minute, I offer the Radio Merit Badge at Boy
> Scout
> Camp. I was given a terrible time and hoped for six kids. I had over
> 1/4
> of the camp at the classes and more wanted to attend. We got a dozen
> hams
> out of that one.
>
> So, if we want to get new, young hams, then think about reaching out
> to the
> Middle Schools, and Scout Camps. Just the camp alone, with eight
> weeks of
> camp, would produce between 80 and 100 new hams....with about 400
> Scout
> Camps in the USA, (Cub and Boy Scout) that would mean a very nice
> increase
> in our membership.
>
> I do agree, that like every previous generation, the new hams need
> help in
> getting into the hobby and if nothing else, get their email address
> and send
> them info as well as forwarding the address to the ARRL, and local
> clubs.
> We can sit here and complain about the lack of young people in our
> hobby, or
> we can do something, or expect someone else to do it. Ahhh, it is
> easier to
> complain...right?
>
> END QUOTE
>
> Note particularly when he writes:
>
> "the students are always VERY interested in the Morse code and seem

> less so in
> modes connected with the computer."
>
> A block to the license process?
>
>> I guess the question is "What are YOU doing to recruit more hams",
>> Alun? The torch is being passed, and it is being passed to those that
>> "won" the code/no code debate.
>
> Exactly.
>>
>> I'm pretty new as a Ham, I try to recruit whenever possible, and will
>> welcome new hams regardless of their education. Some people might feel
>> otherwise at this point, having the wind knocked out of their sails,
>> so to speak.
>
> My policy has always been that if they have the license, they're a
> ham.
>
>> You guys won. You have the ball now. Using the NCI's polled
>> membership
>> as an example, you now want to make all Technicians Generals, and
>> advanced, Extra's. A drastic reduction in entrance requirements seems
>> to be the rationale du jour for the brave new Amateur Radio Service.
>
> Exactly!
>
> And who can really argue against it? Remember the question "why does
> someone have to learn code to operate voice"? Well, if you accept that
> argument, then what do you say when someone says "Why does it take a
> Technician license to operate legal limit SSB on 2 meters but a
> General to do the same thing on most of 20 meters?" and "Since the
> Technician written allows maximum authorized power on all authorized
> modes allocated to hams above 30 MHz,why is more theory testing needed
> to do the same thing below 30 MHz?"
>
> Etc.
>
>>Really it's your ball and your game now. Godspeed!
>
> Don't hold yer breath, Mike.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts a
couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The troop leader
is more interested in finding someone for the computer badge.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

PS: The requirement for a CW QSO has been dropped from the badge, which makes it more practical for me to do it!

3780. Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:13:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509091318.23382.00001100@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91897

Hello Everyone,

I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish they'd actually said something to the effect of "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......

73

Steve, K4YZ

QUOTE

Cingular Wireless Recommends an Emergency Communications Plan

SAN ANTONIO, May 5 /PRNewswire/ -- The 2004 hurricane season is about to begin and Cingular Wireless wants consumers to be armed with the knowledge they need before a hurricane or severe weather hits. Consumers need to understand what to expect when they use their cell phones or other wireless devices during an emergency and what they can do to prepare. Cingular is offering consumers some simple tips to help maximize their wireless service during an emergency situation.

"Taking the time to plan now can make a considerable difference in how much a hurricane or any severe weather affects your family or business," says Andy Shibley, vice president and general manager for Cingular Wireless in South Texas. "Any emergency plan should include a communications component, too, so that every member of the family knows who to contact if they get separated."

There are many weather-related events that can put you in a dangerous situation if you are not ready. According to the National Hurricane Center, hurricane hazards take many forms: storm surges, tornadoes, high winds, and flooding. By understanding the potential dangers, you can ensure your family is ready.

What can you do to prepare yourself before severe weather hits?

* Program in all of your emergency contact numbers. Program in 9-1-1, the police department, fire station and hospital contact numbers as well as your family members into your cell phone so you don't have to think about it during and after an emergency.

* Have a family communications plan in place. Designate someone out of the area as a central contact, and make certain all family members know who to contact if they become separated.

* Keep your wireless phone batteries charged at all times. Have an alternate plan to recharge your battery in case of power outages.

* Keep your wireless phone dry. The biggest threat from hurricanes is water versus wind damage so keep your equipment safe from the elements.

* Forward your home number to your wireless number in the event of an evacuation. Since call forwarding is based out of the telephone central office, you will get incoming calls from your landline phone, even if your local telephone service is disrupted at your home. In the unlikely event the central office is isolated, call forwarding may not work.

* Consider additional cell phones for your family's use. If you want to add additional cell phones to your wireless service, remember to do so prior to the emergency.

What can you expect from your wireless service during severe weather?

* Remember, wireless phones are complex radios. Your wireless call travels over airwaves to another phone, and just like radios, wireless calls can be obstructed by bad weather.

* It is important for consumers to keep in mind that during an emergency, many more people are trying to use their cell phones at the same time when compared to normal calling activity. When more people try to call at the same time, the increased calling volume may create network congestion. Network congestion can cause "fast busy" signals from wireless phones during times of heavy wireless phone usage, such as during an emergency. Customers may even receive a message that says, "Your call cannot be completed at this time." If you hear this message, simply hang up, wait a few seconds and retry.

What can you do to get through to loved ones during an emergency?

* Try short/text messaging service (SMS). More than 70 percent of Cingular phones are SMS capable. Also, if you have a wireless data device such as a BlackBerry, you can use its messaging capabilities to communicate. Depending on your call plan, additional charges may apply.

* Use a landline phone if it is available. In many instances, landline service may still be available in your area so this still may be an option.

* Keep non-emergency calls to a minimum; limit your calls to the most important ones. Chances are that if there is severe weather, many people will be attempting to place wireless calls to loved ones, friends and business associates. If the landline phones are not working, this probability increases.

* Wait 10 seconds before redialing: If you do hang up before your call has gone through, pause before you redial. This allows your original call data to clear the network before you try again.

UNQUOTE

3781. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:35:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91898

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/9/2004 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E45BF3DD773elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>If you are right, then the US will be the last country with a code test,
>decades after it no longer exists anywhere else. I don't think it will take
>that long, though.

I was afraid of this.

Despite supporting Code testing, I am also of the mind that once the
majority has spoken, it's time to move on.

They could have pre-empted all this by stating something to the effect of
"based upon recent previous commnets on the subject, we are suspending the
requirement for Element 1 for access to HF licensure"....But nooooooooooo...

>Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and
>order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they
>don't care about amateur radio, period.

They really don't care about ANY radio, if you pay close attention to
thier "thought processes" in other actions, Alun. I really don't think there
are too many people up there who have a clear picture of what's going on in ANY
radio service.

>Secondly, I don't think they will wait for any more petitions.

Sure they will! They are BUREAUCRATS! They are >>all about"<< petitions,
applications, hearings, and the PROCESS of administering...They are poorly
prepared to deal with the EFFECTS of thier actions!

>Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
>were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.

Months and months later.....

>1) Re-farming the Novice frequencies an increasing the phone allocations.
>Here there is already an NPRM, and I think they will carry it out. It just
>gives the same amount of additional spectrum to phone as is now Novice CW.
>This is what they are going to do. It's less than I wanted, and even less
>than the ARRL or the NCVEC asked for, but I'm betting it's all done;

I dunno.....

There's been what...a half dozen petitions in the last five or six years
asking for the same thing and the FCC keeps thumbing thier noses at it...I

don't understand why since the Novice license hasn't generated much interest since 1987

>2) Eliminating supefluous licence classes. They will ultimately just do the >obvious, i.e. give Novices and Advanceds a free upgrade. They won't revive >the Novice and kill off the Tech. They will view that as a waste of time. >The FCC is all for simplification, and they will point to the petitions as >providing the consensus they were looking for, even thought they are >slightly different.

I really doubt they will "upgrade" the Novice since it's rapidly withering to nothingness...The Advanced...?!?! Maybe, but a lot of the Advanced guys see >THIER< license as being the last readily evident class as having been 13WPM/Old School tested and want nothing to do with "upgrades".

73

Steve, K4YZ

3782. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:38:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91899

Alun wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:kKydnaTByOWWDgDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com:
>
>
>>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>>>news:NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Alun wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister
>>>>>to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on
>>>>>the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>>>>>probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
>>>>earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
>>>>the change one way or the other.
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>What sort of numbers? All their no-coders are licenced for HF, and we
>>>could probably find out how many there are, but is that what you
>>>meant? Violations of rules by no-coders? We have that number - it's
>>>zero.
>>
>> Hmm, I though it would be obvious. How many new hams are licensed
>> in
>>the countries that have eliminated the Morse code requirement
>>
>> NOw that they are rid of the evil of Morse testing, one would
>> think

>>that many new hams are coming into the fold, so to speak.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> All these countries had no-code licences. So now they can use modes other
> than CW on HF without having to learn CW, which is finally as it should be.
> Most of the true radio enthusiasts will get whatever licence they can, even
> if it doesn't allow them to do what they really want.
>
> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but for
> the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we had
> abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late and we have
> blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.

My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation, there is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What they are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing interest in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".

Whether it is the Morse code requirement, or the cost of a rig or effort of putting up an antenna, or the cost of a telescope or the need to travel to remote areas that are dark enough or the fact that you have to stay up all night to observe, etc, etc.

People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the hobby, and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can actually be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of money. And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to be staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....

In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have to be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on a rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the other things we have to do to get on the air.

Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types? For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so happily upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna. All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field day.

Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two. Beyond the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?

My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like saying that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is deaf.

It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3783. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:41:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91900

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

> Hello Everyone,
>
> I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish they'd
> actually said something to the effect of
> "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......

I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
supposed to buy more cell phones!!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3784. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:43:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <r7OdndzeG-gdqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91801

Alun wrote:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0405090348.7f680a38@posting.google.com:
>
>
>>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>>news:<xnfcneeyarg.hxexor5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>>
>>>On 7 May 2004 10:23:31 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>It's been ten months and two days since WRC-2003 ended, and given
>>>>FCC's method of handling the issue it may well be another ten months
>>>>before we even get to the NPRM stage.
>>>
>>> The NCI Petition for Rulemaking gave the FCC a quick out to drop
>>> Element 1 immediately, with sufficient legal foundation to do so
>>> without an NPRM (I read that part thoroughly, and it's right on the
>>> mark).
>>
>>I recall that even before any petitions were filed, both of us agreed
>>that if FCC "wanted to", Element 1 could be simply dropped once the
>>treaty changed. I believe the procedure is called "Memorandum Report
>>and Order" (could be some other name) but in any event a lot quicker
>>and simpler than a complete NPRM cycle.
>>
>>> The fact that it hasn't been done means that "someone's" fire hasn't
>>> been lighted.
>>
>>Right. Could also be that "someone" doesn't want to get in the middle
>>of the catfight and get scratched by both sides. In which case the
>>thing to do is to entertain all sorts of petitions, (we're up to what
>>- 17-18 of them so far?!) collect comments and reply comments and even
>>ex partes on each of them, and allow the whole thing to percolate
>>through the great bureaucratic machine. Then, when the flood of
>>petitions has been reduced to a trickle, issue an NPRM with long
>>comment time (like 98-143). Resolution of the issue could take years -
>>and every new petition just resets the clock.
>>
>>IOW, don't hold yer breath. Lookit how long it took for the "incentive
>>licensing" proposals of the '60s to take place. First proposals in
>>1963, final plan in 1966, major changes in 1968 and 1969. And they had
>>far fewer proposals back then.

>>
>>
>>> This is a phenominon that I am all too familiar with
>>> when dealing with The Monkey House whether from within or from
>>> without.
>>
>>"Welcome To The Monkey House" ...
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> If you are right, then the US will be the last country with a code test,
> decades after it no longer exists anywhere else. I don't think it will take
> that long, though.
>
> Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and
> order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they
> don't care about amateur radio, period.
>
> Secondly, I don't think they will wait for any more petitions.
>
> Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
> were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.

Let's hope it ends that way, Alun!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3785. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:45:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509094535.23382.00001103@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91802

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/9/2004 8:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts a
>couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The troop leader
>is more interested in finding someone for the computer badge.

From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder for the
Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....

>PS: The requirement for a CW QSO has been dropped from the badge, which
>makes it more practical for me to do it!

Examiners have always had it at thier discretion to send random letters
and check for character count. In the long run, I bet more folks have passed
the test because it WAS a "QSO" since they could go back and fill in missing
letters....ITS N T T AT ARD TO FI L IN THE BL NKS ON E YOU BACK U
AN LOOK AT W T YOU WR TE DO N.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3786. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 13:46:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509094651.23382.00001104@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91803

>Subject: Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine
>Areas
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/9/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>

> I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
>supposed to buy more cell phones!!!

Good ole capitalism at work!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3787. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:06:54 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E466B48F57Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91804

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040509094535.23382.00001103@mb-m14.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:12 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts a
>>couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The troop
>>leader is more interested in finding someone for the computer badge.
>
> From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder
> for the
> Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....
>
>>PS: The requirement for a CW QSO has been dropped from the badge, which
>>makes it more practical for me to do it!
>
> Examiners have always had it at thier discretion to send random
> letters
> and check for character count. In the long run, I bet more folks have
> passed the test because it WAS a "QSO" since they could go back and
> fill in missing letters....ITS N T T AT ARD TO FI L IN THE BL
> NKS ON E YOU BACK U AN LOOK AT W T YOU WR TE DO N.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

I think maybe you are a bit confused, so I guess I need to explain a little more. The radio merit badge used to require the boys to participate in 2 CW QSOs and 1 phone QSO. Now that requirement is just for 1 QSO in any mode. Some phone ops used to teach the badge and do CW QSOs by computer, which had the added advantage that the boys could see what was being said, whilst others used to get a CW op to participate (the counselor tests the boys, but anyone can provide the instruction/demos).

The QSO requirement is only one from a long list, and can be satisfied by boys with a ham licence if they submit 5 QSL cards from 3 call districts. The boys who are not hams (obviously the vast majority) just have to sit in on a QSO instead.

One of the other requirements is to draw a frequency chart, and there are very specific rules about what it has to show. The funny thing is, the example in the book doesn't comply. It was done by the ARRL, but I don't think it was created specially for the purpose. I think it was just something that already existed that they let the boy scouts use. One of the questions I am contemplating is whether I should give credit for copying it, or whether they should have to do it properly?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3788. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:08:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91805

>Subject: Re: News from France
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>
>Alun wrote:

>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but for
>> the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we had
>> abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late and we have
>> blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.

WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to get a
code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!

If it weren't the Code test, it would be the written....If it's not the
tests themselves, it's the perception that you have to have to have enough
equipment to rival VOA

> My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation, there
>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What they
>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing interest
>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".

In hang gliding we call them "wuffos"...

As in "Wuffo you wanna do that..???" You oughtta see the faces at
speedgliding events!

> People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the hobby,

>and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can actually
>be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>money. And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to be
>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....

Sure...and why go to all that effort when you can see Jupiter a lot easier
with a bit of creative websurfing!

> In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have to
>be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on a
>rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the other
>things we have to do to get on the air.

I guess "fair amount" is realtive. You can put up an effective HF/VHF/UHF
station for under $350/400 if you do a bit of shopping and don't want all the

latest bells and whistles. Then there are they guys with TOO MUCH "discretionary income" and have stations who look like the aforementioned VOA outlets!

> Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so happily
>upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field day.

This is where "Elmering" could come in and these youngsters get introduced to where/how to look for those used rigs.

> Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two. Beyond
>the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time keeping
>other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical acumen
>level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?

I dunno, Mike...How much >>IS<< needed...?!?! =O =)

> My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like saying
>that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is deaf.
>
> It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.

Yep...like I said...Amateur Radio (for those who participate regularly) has almost always appealed to a very narrow segment of society and always will. All we need to do is keep it out there in front of those "potentials" and wait for them to decide for themselves.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3789. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:12:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509101229.23382.00001108@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91806

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/9/2004 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E466B48F57Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>I think maybe you are a bit confused, so I guess I need to explain a little
>more. The radio merit badge used to require the boys to participate in 2 CW
>QSOs and 1 phone QSO. Now that requirement is just for 1 QSO in any mode.
>Some phone ops used to teach the badge and do CW QSOs by computer, which
>had the added advantage that the boys could see what was being said, whilst
>others used to get a CW op to participate (the counselor tests the boys,
>but anyone can provide the instruction/demos).

Ahhhhhhh....I see...You were speaking of the REAL "Merit Badges"....!

Yes, you were correct, of course...I stand corrected.

>The QSO requirement is only one from a long list, and can be satisfied by
>boys with a ham licence if they submit 5 QSL cards from 3 call districts.
>The boys who are not hams (obviously the vast majority) just have to sit in
>on a QSO instead.
>
>One of the other requirements is to draw a frequency chart, and there are
>very specific rules about what it has to show. The funny thing is, the
>example in the book doesn't comply. It was done by the ARRL, but I don't
>think it was created specially for the purpose. I think it was just
>something that already existed that they let the boy scouts use. One of the
>questions I am contemplating is whether I should give credit for copying
>it, or whether they should have to do it properly?

The FCC has a real nice chart available from GPO and is all inclusive from
a few KHz up to, I beleive, 300GHz. It might go higher.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3790. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:13:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91807

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: News from France
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>>
>>Alun wrote:
>
>>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but
>>> for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we
>>> had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late
>>> and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.
>
> WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to
> get a
> code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>

Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.

> If it weren't the Code test, it would be the written....If it's
> not the
> tests themselves, it's the perception that you have to have to have
> enough equipment to rival VOA
>
>> My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation,
>> there
>>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What they
>>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing interest
>>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".
>
> In hang gliding we call them "wuffos"...
>
> As in "Wuffo you wanna do that..???" You oughtta see the faces
> at
> speedgliding events!
>
>> People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the
>> hobby,
>
>>and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can actually
>>be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>>money. And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids

>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
>>be staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>
> Sure...and why go to all that effort when you can see Jupiter a lot
> easier
> with a bit of creative websurfing!
>
>> In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they
>> have to
>>be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on a
>>rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the other
>>things we have to do to get on the air.
>
> I guess "fair amount" is realtive. You can put up an effective
> HF/VHF/UHF
> station for under $350/400 if you do a bit of shopping and don't want
> all the latest bells and whistles. Then there are they guys with TOO
> MUCH "discretionary income" and have stations who look like the
> aforementioned VOA outlets!
>
>> Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt
>> types?
>>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so happily
>>upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field day.
>
> This is where "Elmering" could come in and these youngsters get
> introduced
> to where/how to look for those used rigs.

Absolutely

>
>> Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two. Beyond
>>the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time
>>keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical
>>acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf
>>porn?
>
> I dunno, Mike...How much >>IS<< needed...?!?! =O =)
>
>> My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an
>> arguable
>>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like saying
>>that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is
>>deaf.
>>
>> It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.

>
> Yep...like I said...Amateur Radio (for those who participate
> regularly) has
> almost always appealed to a very narrow segment of society and always
> will. All we need to do is keep it out there in front of those
> "potentials" and wait for them to decide for themselves.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>

3791. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:15:42 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E46832915FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91808

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040509101229.23382.00001108@mb-m14.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/9/2004 9:06 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E466B48F57Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>>I think maybe you are a bit confused, so I guess I need to explain a
>>little more. The radio merit badge used to require the boys to
>>participate in 2 CW QSOs and 1 phone QSO. Now that requirement is just
>>for 1 QSO in any mode. Some phone ops used to teach the badge and do CW
>>QSOs by computer, which had the added advantage that the boys could see
>>what was being said, whilst others used to get a CW op to participate
>>(the counselor tests the boys, but anyone can provide the
>>instruction/demos).
>
> Ahhhhhhh....I see...You were speaking of the REAL "Merit
> Badges"....!
>
> Yes, you were correct, of course...I stand corrected.
>
>>The QSO requirement is only one from a long list, and can be satisfied
>>by boys with a ham licence if they submit 5 QSL cards from 3 call
>>districts. The boys who are not hams (obviously the vast majority) just
>>have to sit in on a QSO instead.
>>
>>One of the other requirements is to draw a frequency chart, and there
>>are very specific rules about what it has to show. The funny thing is,
>>the example in the book doesn't comply. It was done by the ARRL, but I
>>don't think it was created specially for the purpose. I think it was
>>just something that already existed that they let the boy scouts use.
>>One of the questions I am contemplating is whether I should give credit
>>for copying it, or whether they should have to do it properly?
>
> The FCC has a real nice chart available from GPO and is all
> inclusive from
> a few KHz up to, I beleive, 300GHz. It might go higher.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

>
>
>
>

That's a good point. I understand that Icom has one you can download, although I don't know if it meets the requirements. I'm sure the FCC chart meets all possible requirements, though.

3792. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 14:18:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509101821.23382.00001109@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 91809

>Subject: Re: News from France
>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 5/9/2004 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:

>> WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to
>> get a
>> code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>>
>
>Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.

And once we "gave" it to them, Alun, what do you think they would have
done with it?

>> This is where "Elmering" could come in and these youngsters get
>> introduced
>> to where/how to look for those used rigs.
>
>Absolutely

I forgot to add "what" to look for. No use letting them look if they
don't knw what to get! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3793. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 15:07:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2Prnc.13392$Hs1.2624@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91810

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> > I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> > YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> > actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations.
> > I wish they'd actually said something to the effect of
> > "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......
>
>
> I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
> supposed to buy more cell phones!!!

This isn't something new nor is it specifically related to wireless phones. The 'wired' phone system has also been saying exactly the same thing since Moby Dick was a minnow. "During emergencies (bad weather or whatever) our systems may be overloaded by the surge of callers." Obviously (as Cingular correctly points out) the wireless infrastructure has an increased level of vulnerability over a strictly 'hardwired' phone system of yore. No surprise there! The Cingular instructions seem to me honest, useful, and corporately responsible.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3794. 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 16:00:36 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <EAsnc.13520$Hs1.7177@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91811

In 2004, following exhaustive input from persons concerned about the future of Amateur Radio, a revised version of the FISTS proposal became the basis for new USA Part 97 regulations became effective. It was decided only high-quality, technically competent individuals should be licensed; and quality is more important than quantity. Telegraphy testing speeds are 13 wpm for Technician, 20 for General and 35 for Extra, requiring one minute of perfect handwritten copy and demonstration of sending proficiency. Written examinations correspond with BS, MS, and PhD EE curriculum respectively per license class. The prestigious accounting firm Price Waterhouse agreed to monitor and validate testing sessions on the stipulation that examinees agree to a 30 minute presentation on portfolio management.

The FCC license database was finally purged of bad data when Amateur Radio was renamed the Professional Radio Volunteer Service to more accurately reflect the prevailing high standards in the US. It was discovered the database included deceased licensees beyond all estimates. The total number of licensees was found to be 28% fewer than previously indicated.

By the end of the first ten-year cycle under new regulations (2004-2013), 61% of existing licensees failed their mandatory retests while 11% chose to return their licenses for cancellation rather than re-sit the test. New licensees entered the ranks at the rate of 13 in the first year, leveling off to a smoothed average of 9 over each of the following years. The median age of licensees reached 76.

Fourteen days each year, major contests continue to bring activity to some HF and VHF bands in the US. All other times are declared off-peak. Beacon stations transmitting high speed Morse code advise interested parties when on-air activity will resume in accordance with the next scheduled contest.

A milestone was reached in early 2017 when internet penetration into US Households reached 100%. This allowed for low-cost surveys of all licensees. The Professional Radio Volunteer League (PRVL) headquartered in Oldham, SD posed the question "Do you presently own and operate radio equipment?" A yes response was submitted by 23%. Later it was learned many of the respondents were referring to their Wi-Fi networks. A rephrased question yielded a yes answer from 15%. Analysts determined 11,987 licensees were using their radio privileges for the purpose of communications with others. Some operators expressed dismay over the relatively low numbers and mostly vacant radio spectrum. Persons concerned about the future of the Professional Radio Volunteer Service reminded everyone it's still all about quality and not quantity.

That brings us to the prevailing conditions today in 2029. Medical technology continues to extend life expectancy, but the advances however magnificent, cannot keep pace with the demographic profile of Professional

Radio Volunteer Operators, now numbering 3,632 with a median age of 83. The latest survey indicates 4% are active on the air during one or more contest days.

On the international DX scene, the United States is a rare one, prompting great interest in DXpeditions to the US. Until recently, the issue of reciprocal operating permits had not been resolved, as the US is the only country in the world still requiring telegraphy for HF access. The two persons concerned about the future of the Professional Radio Volunteer Service reluctantly agreed to allow operators from other countries access to the HF voice band consisting of 15 kHz on 29 MHz. Visitor access to all other HF spectrum, 99 percent CW and 1 percent Data, remains strictly prohibited.

A DXpedition team member asked, "Didn't the Yanks used to have a lot of operators back when they had Amateur Radio?" No one knew.

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be construed."

(Note from BGO: This actually came from the USA, attributed to W8MW, unknown to me but with no doubt a wise man.)

Sincerely 73,

Barnabus Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch Overbyte

3795. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 16:29:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <LbednbgVUecfwQPdRVn-hw@comcast.com>
Source record: 91812

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E466B48F57Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040509094535.23382.00001103@mb-m14.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:12 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
> >
> >>I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts a
> >>couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The troop
> >>leader is more interested in finding someone for the computer badge.
> >
> > From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder
> > for the
> > Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....
> >
> >>PS: The requirement for a CW QSO has been dropped from the badge, which
> >>makes it more practical for me to do it!
> >
> > Examiners have always had it at thier discretion to send random
> > letters
> > and check for character count. In the long run, I bet more folks have
> > passed the test because it WAS a "QSO" since they could go back and
> > fill in missing letters....ITS N T T AT ARD TO FI L IN THE BL
> > NKS ON E YOU BACK U AN LOOK AT W T YOU WR TE DO N.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> I think maybe you are a bit confused, so I guess I need to explain a
little
> more. The radio merit badge used to require the boys to participate in 2
CW
> QSOs and 1 phone QSO. Now that requirement is just for 1 QSO in any mode.

> Some phone ops used to teach the badge and do CW QSOs by computer, which
> had the added advantage that the boys could see what was being said,
whilst
> others used to get a CW op to participate (the counselor tests the boys,
> but anyone can provide the instruction/demos).
>
> The QSO requirement is only one from a long list, and can be satisfied by
> boys with a ham licence if they submit 5 QSL cards from 3 call districts.
> The boys who are not hams (obviously the vast majority) just have to sit
in
> on a QSO instead.
>
> One of the other requirements is to draw a frequency chart, and there are
> very specific rules about what it has to show. The funny thing is, the
> example in the book doesn't comply. It was done by the ARRL, but I don't
> think it was created specially for the purpose. I think it was just
> something that already existed that they let the boy scouts use. One of
the
> questions I am contemplating is whether I should give credit for copying
> it, or whether they should have to do it properly?
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

I'd say make them do the chart by the rules of the merit badge. There's very little to be learned just by copying a pre-existing chart. Of course they should be allowed to use the ARRL one (and others) as an information resource.

In the real world of work, one frequently has to reformat information to meet customer formatting requirements.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3796. Re: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 16:39:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509123948.28263.00000143@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 91813

>Subject: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here
>From: "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de
>
>Date: 5/9/2004 11:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <EAsnc.13520$Hs1.7177@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>
>In 2004, following exhaustive input from persons concerned about the future
>of Amateur Radio, a revised version of the FISTS proposal became the basis
>for new USA Part 97 regulations became effective. It was decided only
>high-quality, technically competent individuals should be licensed; and
>quality is more important than quantity. Telegraphy testing speeds are 13
>wpm for Technician, 20 for General and 35 for Extra, requiring one
minute.....(SNIP)

0 2 4 6 8 S9 10 20 30 40

IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
IIIIIIIIIIIIIIII

The digital troll-o-meter burst through the stops. Yet another Lennistic
ranting made at the expense of thousands of good, dedicated people.

What a waste of bandwidth.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3797. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 16:50:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405090850.7622a2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91814

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E4FDD62547elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:kKydnaTByOWWDgDdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com:

> > Alun wrote:
>
> >> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> >> news:NLSdnWvYFJj2oQDdRVn-hA@adelphia.com:
>>
> >>>Alun wrote:
>>
> >>>>The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister
> >>>>to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on
> >>>>the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
> >>>>probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>>>
> >>> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
> >>>earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
> >>>the change one way or the other.
> >>>
> >>> - Mike KB3EIA -

> >> What sort of numbers?

1) Numbers of new hams who got licenses since the code test was
removed, compared to the number who got licenses for a similar time
period before it was removed.

2) Numbers of new hams who got HF licenses since the code test was
removed, compared to the number who got HF licenses for a similar time
period before it was removed.

3) Numbers of existing hams who upgraded to HF licenses since the code
test was removed, compared to the number who upgraded for a similar
time period before it was removed.

4) Numbers of new hams who actually get on the air, by band and mode,
since the code test was removed, compared to the number who did so for
a similar time period before it was removed.

> >> All their no-coders are licenced for HF, and we
> >> could probably find out how many there are, but is that what you
> >> meant?

See above.

> >> Violations of rules by no-coders? We have that number - it's
> >> zero.

Do we really have that number, or is it just "we haven't heard of
any"? Sounds a lot like the BPL folks who say "we haven't gotten any
interference complaints".
> >
> > Hmm, I though it would be obvious. How many new hams are licensed
> > in the countries that have eliminated the Morse code requirement
> >
> > NOw that they are rid of the evil of Morse testing, one would
> > think
> > that many new hams are coming into the fold, so to speak.
> >
See above.
>
> All these countries had no-code licences. So now they can use modes other
> than CW on HF without having to learn CW, which is finally as it should be.
> Most of the true radio enthusiasts will get whatever licence they can, even
> if it doesn't allow them to do what they really want.

I'm not sure at all what you mean.

> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but for
> the code test.

Me too.

I've also met people who told me they would get a license but for the
written test. Or the high cost (to them) of equipment. Or the size
of the antennas. Or the time/money/space/work required to set up an
antenna.

I've also met people who told me they would get a license but for
their job, spouse, kids, extended family, living situation, school
situation, other commitments, etc., etc., etc.

> I think we could have had them in the hobby if we had
> abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late and we have
> blown it.

The Technician lost its code test more than 13 years ago. It's been
possible to get full HF privileges in the USA since 1990 with just a 5
wpm code test (medical waivers, then restructuring).

Most of all, code testing could not have been fully eliminated 20
years ago because of S25.5. Nor even 20 months ago.

>Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.

Sure they are - otherwise the number of hams would be dropping like a
stone.

Let's do some math:

There are about 682,000 US hams right now. That's currently licensed individuals, not clubs or folks in the grace period.

Suppose the *average* ham career lasts 40years. Yes we all know plenty of folks who have been licensed longer, but there are also folks who will have to reach their 100th birthday to do that.

If the average ham career lasts 40years, it works out that 2.5% of the ham population drops out per year. 2.5% of 682,000 is 17,050, so we must get 17,050 new hams per year just to keep up with the losses.

You can work out the numbers for any given "ham career" time.

Now of course it's not enough just to stay even. But still more important is the number of *active* hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3798. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:02:54 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <Kltnc.42522$UG2.15932@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 91889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Timmy" <DumbassVic@LibNutz> wrote in message
news:c7kj2v$799$0@pita.alt.net...
> Dumbass Vic, W1WCR, was spouting his lies on the Lib Net again tonight.
> Dumbass said the United States provided Iraq and Saddam Hussein with the
> poiseness gas Hussein used on the Kurds. Vic said the gas was used to kill
> "a few" Kurds and Sheites.
> Duh! Apparently Vic views the 5,000 gassing deaths of the Kurds as being
"a
> few".
> Where the heck does Vic manufacture these "facts" from?
> Oh, wait. For guys like Vic and his malingerers it is not necessary to
have
> facts OR proof. Any lie will do and Vic is surely full of them.
> Aside of Al Jazeera, Vic is the best propaganda machine that Saddam could
> hope for.
>
> These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and a
> conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.
>
>
>

Please don't slander the Liberty Net anymore. I am not complete without it.

Lloyd Davies, N0VFP - soon to be no-code General!
TimeLord and Talk show host.
"On the Domestic Front"
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

3799. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:13:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405090913.71f0a4e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91815

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040509101821.23382.00001109@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: News from France
> >From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >Date: 5/9/2004 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> >news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
>
> >> WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to
> >> get a
> >> code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
> >>
> >
> >Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.
>
> And once we "gave" it to them, Alun, what do you think they would have
> done with it?

Likely the same thing that you've done with it.

3800. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:16:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405090916.485c320d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91816

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E46832915FBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040509101229.23382.00001108@mb-m14.aol.com:
> >
> > The FCC has a real nice chart available from GPO and is all
> > inclusive from
> > a few KHz up to, I beleive, 300GHz. It might go higher.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> That's a good point. I understand that Icom has one you can download,
> although I don't know if it meets the requirements. I'm sure the FCC chart
> meets all possible requirements, though.

I wonder if it shows the MARS frequencies separate from the Amateur frequencies?

After all, " "MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

3801. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:19:08 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E4874B361B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91817

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:LbednbgVUecfwQPdRVn-hw@comcast.com:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E466B48F57Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>> news:20040509094535.23382.00001103@mb-m14.aol.com:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for
>> >>all? From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:12 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>> >
>> >>I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts
>> >>a couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The
>> >>troop leader is more interested in finding someone for the computer
>> >>badge.
>> >
>> > From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder
>> > for the
>> > Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....
>> >
>> >>PS: The requirement for a CW QSO has been dropped from the badge,
>> >>which makes it more practical for me to do it!
>> >
>> > Examiners have always had it at thier discretion to send
>> > random letters
>> > and check for character count. In the long run, I bet more folks
>> > have passed the test because it WAS a "QSO" since they could go back
>> > and fill in missing letters....ITS N T T AT ARD TO FI L IN
>> > THE BL NKS ON E YOU BACK U AN LOOK AT W T YOU WR TE DO N.
>> >
>> > 73
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>

>> I think maybe you are a bit confused, so I guess I need to explain a
>> little more. The radio merit badge used to require the boys to
>> participate in 2 CW QSOs and 1 phone QSO. Now that requirement is just
>> for 1 QSO in any mode. Some phone ops used to teach the badge and do
>> CW QSOs by computer, which had the added advantage that the boys could
>> see what was being said, whilst others used to get a CW op to
>> participate (the counselor tests the boys, but anyone can provide the
>> instruction/demos).
>>
>> The QSO requirement is only one from a long list, and can be satisfied
>> by boys with a ham licence if they submit 5 QSL cards from 3 call
>> districts. The boys who are not hams (obviously the vast majority)
>> just have to sit in on a QSO instead.
>>
>> One of the other requirements is to draw a frequency chart, and there
>> are very specific rules about what it has to show. The funny thing is,
>> the example in the book doesn't comply. It was done by the ARRL, but I
>> don't think it was created specially for the purpose. I think it was
>> just something that already existed that they let the boy scouts use.
>> One of the questions I am contemplating is whether I should give
>> credit for copying it, or whether they should have to do it properly?
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> I'd say make them do the chart by the rules of the merit badge.
> There's very little to be learned just by copying a pre-existing chart.
> Of course they should be allowed to use the ARRL one (and others) as
> an information resource.
>
> In the real world of work, one frequently has to reformat information
> to meet customer formatting requirements.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

That's pretty much what I was thinking. I just wanted to see if others would agree. The league's chart in the scout merit badge book covers a slightly wrong frequency range, and it doesn't really show the required 8 services. At least, it sort of does, but it mixes some services together while separating some users that are part of the same service.

I was wondering if I was being too pedantic, but I tend to think that maybe it is best to ignore that chart and show them one that is more correct. I imagine the FCC chart is super correct There again, were the scouts really meaning to imply the proper definition of a 'service' in their requirements? Maybe they had something vaguer in mind?

3802. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:22:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405090922.58fbbcc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91818

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E3735639965elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040508105038.27780.00001219@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >>Date: 5/8/2004 9:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <Xns94E36AC29A1C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
> >>That would be me. Not just tapes, in fact I didn't find tapes to be a
> >>good method of learning, but I've never attached a key to a rig. What
> >>was the point of me learning 20wpm?
> >
> > Uhhhhhhhhhh....passing Element 1C...?!?!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> So let me rephrase that. Why should I have had to pass 1C to get the bottom
> ends of the phone subbands?

Because that's what Steve and Jim had to do.

3803. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:36:08 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c_tnc.4080$WN2.1124@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91819

Hello, Mike

Yep, I *love* that suggestion about programming in 911. Now, instead of having to hit three buttons (9-1-1), you simply hit "memory-0-1".

Wow! I *am* impressed :))

I also like the idea about buying more cell phones. If the lines are all busy due to overloading, you have your whole family try dialing on 10 cell phones. You increase your chances *ten* times! Reminder to self: go buy 100 lottery tickets; instead of 1 chance in 12 million, I'd have one chance in 120 thousand. Golly gee. Who'd have thunk?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Hello Everyone,
> >
> > I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> > YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> > actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish they'd
> > actually said something to the effect of
> > "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......
>
>
> I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
> supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.679 / Virus Database: 441 - Release Date: 5/7/04

3804. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 17:39:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405090939.8d07c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91820

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Hucnc.2483$KE6.69@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0405071534.31bb80d4@posting.google.com...

Dansan said: " I don't know where its from but I am hearing a lot
more phone activity in the CW bands of late. And not speaking
Spanish. English. But who knows. "

> > Do you know what the prefix for Canada is?
>
> Gee, Duhhhhhhhhhh, let the think.......Uh......maybe it's a VE or a VA
> or some other strange letters depending what part of a seal arse you are
> celebrating that month. Sound right?

Wow. You're a quick study.

> And yes I do know that Canada is allowed to operate in what the US calls the
> 'CW Segements'. And that has what to do with what I said?

Some citizens of Canada speak English, and some even operate phone in
our CW subband while speaking English.

I don't know how much more related it can get to what you said. Any
ideas?

3805. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 18:07:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405091007.48246a26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91821

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040508174411.21319.00001030@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/8/2004 3:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405081254.2afaa365@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >This statement is eyeball deep: " MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >
> >hi hi. What silliness!
>
> >Not sufficient. And while you're at it, find a citation for, "Each
> >MARS program is wholly dependent on the Amateur Radio Service to
> >exist."
>
> Very simple, Brain.

Nope, wrong again. Finding such a citation is not only very
difficult, but it is impossible because it doesn't exist except in one
nutter's mind.

> Review the roster of active stations in each service.

They have MARS calls.

> Disenroll all those who are participants based upon licensure in the
> Amateur Radio Service.

I have no such authority.

But you might want to see if JJ can do it. He speaks for both NORAD
and FEMA.

> Please tell us how many "stations" would be left in each service after
> doing that.

I have no way of knowing.

> I repeat...No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

That's nice, but what about this statement?

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

Exactly how is MARS amateur radio?

Do you know the transitive property of your false little equation?
Doubt it.

> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper.
> Perhaps
> >> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have
> a
> >> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into
> corners
> >> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...
> >
> >I told you to stay away from my family.
>
> I just wanted to see what kind of reaction I'd get.

Right.

> It's very predictable. Cowards never do want thier families to know about
> thier "alternative lifestyle".

Did some lunatic send your wife a photo of you cross-dressing?

> I wouldn't want MY wife to see me acting like that and developing a
> reputation as not being truthful either. You DO have that reputation, Brain.
> Stupid assertions...tales of radio bravado...public assertions of admiration
> for a documented pathological liar...

Not with anyone I know. But there is this nutter on R.R.A.P.....

> Is THAT message getting through to you yet, Brain?
>
> I wouldn't want YOU "near" my family if I knew the net result would be
> some revelation of alternate-reality behaviour to them.
>
> If her reaction was anywhere NEAR "normal", she'd probably jack-slap you,
> tell you to stay off of the Internet, and not embarras the family name any
> further.

You do have trouble staying on topic, don't you?

So when are you going to fire up your MARS net on amateur radio
frequencies?

Hey, when are you going to fire up amateur radio on MARS frequencies?

Be sure to invite Reilly to both.

After all, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio" ," according
to one nutter on this planet.

3806. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 18:34:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509143413.08524.00001199@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 91822

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/9/2004 1:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405091007.48246a26@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040508174411.21319.00001030@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/8/2004 3:54 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405081254.2afaa365@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>>
>> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>>
>> >This statement is eyeball deep: " MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>>
>> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>>
>> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>>
>> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >
>> >hi hi. What silliness!
>>
>> >Not sufficient. And while you're at it, find a citation for, "Each
>> >MARS program is wholly dependent on the Amateur Radio Service to
>> >exist."
>>
>> Very simple, Brain.
>
>Nope, wrong again. Finding such a citation is not only very
>difficult, but it is impossible because it doesn't exist except in one
>nutter's mind.
>
>> Review the roster of active stations in each service.
>
>They have MARS calls.

Uh huh...And...?!?!

>> Disenroll all those who are participants based upon licensure in the
>> Amateur Radio Service.

>
>I have no such authority.

I doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your non-dominant hand
without written permission.

>That's nice, but what about this statement?
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
>Exactly how is MARS amateur radio?

Subtract the participation of licensed Radio Amateurs and what do you
have...???

>Do you know the transitive property of your false little equation?
>Doubt it.

My statement is not false.

No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

>> It's very predictable. Cowards never do want thier families to know
>about
>> thier "alternative lifestyle".
>
>Did some lunatic send your wife a photo of you cross-dressing?

Had it occured I am sure she would have.

>> I wouldn't want MY wife to see me acting like that and developing a
>> reputation as not being truthful either. You DO have that reputation,
>Brain.
>> Stupid assertions...tales of radio bravado...public assertions of
>admiration
>> for a documented pathological liar...
>
>Not with anyone I know. But there is this nutter on R.R.A.P.....

Yep..Named Brian Burke. Well known for not being able to stand up to his
rhetoric.

>> Is THAT message getting through to you yet, Brain?
>>
>> I wouldn't want YOU "near" my family if I knew the net result would be
>> some revelation of alternate-reality behaviour to them.
>>
>> If her reaction was anywhere NEAR "normal", she'd probably jack-slap
>you,
>> tell you to stay off of the Internet, and not embarras the family name any
>> further.
>
>You do have trouble staying on topic, don't you?

None at all.

YOU mentioned family, Brain. I only asked if your wife knew how foolish you act in a public forum.

And I repeat my previous question...Is THAT message getting through to you yet?

>So when are you going to fire up your MARS net on amateur radio
>frequencies?

It's perfectly legal for most MARS personnel to conduct a net on Amateur frequencies, Brain...just as it is for gardners, NASCAR fans and other hobbyists

>Hey, when are you going to fire up amateur radio on MARS frequencies?

You're not, if you value your license, Brain.

>Be sure to invite Reilly to both.

Sure. And while he's listening, I think we'll ask HIM what major role non-licensed radio services play in emergency communication.

>After all, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio" ," according
>to one nutter on this planet.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

You've still not been able to tell me how I am wrong, Brain.

Yet another assertion you've made that remains unsubstantiated.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3807. The impact of the abolishment of CW in France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 18:59:46 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <a985062c4dda401fc13873ca0afd1c1e@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 91823

About 16000 hams in France (mean age
75 years old). Half are no-coders. In
the other half, about 1000 passed a real
CW exam (the majority have fake military
certificates or are invalid or got their
their HF ticket by corruption).
No-coders are the youngest hams and the
best technicians (except the CBers like F4DBD).
Statistics on the last licenses show
that new hams choose to pass the
NOVICE license (F0) authorized to use
only the 2m band with 10 W. Very few class 2 (technicians) and no new coders
(class 1) join the hobby.
About 10 per cent of hams are active, so
the abolishment of CW will bring about
800 new hams on HF bands with F1 and
F4 prefixs (mean age 45 years old).
It remains about 100 coders in France
on the bands, most of them are
military or navy retired people.

So if you plan to sink with your boat
on the french coasts and want to be
rescued, use your microphone rather
than a CW key to have a chance to
be heard.

3808. Re: The impact of the abolishment of CW in France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 19:10:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <emvnc.57775$0H1.5736630@attbi_s54>
Source record: 91824

> So if you plan to sink with your boat
> on the french coasts and want to be
> rescued, use your microphone rather
> than a CW key to have a chance to
> be heard.

I don't know about the French coast but I sure do like French toast ......

73 all .... KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

3809. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 19:57:37 UTC
From: beefourzees <thwaccck2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <aff89$409e8d95$d1cc7b6b$20417@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 91890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Timmy" <DumbassVic@LibNutz> wrote in message
news:c7kj2v$799$0@pita.alt.net...
> Dumbass Vic, W1WCR, was spouting his lies on the Lib Net again tonight.
> Dumbass said the United States provided Iraq and Saddam Hussein with the
> poiseness gas Hussein used on the Kurds. Vic said the gas was used to kill
> "a few" Kurds and Sheites.

Jeebus on a rocket powered sled in the Utah desert!
Do you mean to say that those imbred freaks on the
Saturday night Liberty Net are still around....??
I would have thought by now that 80% of those bitchin
and moanin fatasses would be six feet under by now.
I can recall listening to them outgass back in the 80's
and I can only imagine how pathetic they must ound now
20+ years later...!

> Duh! Apparently Vic views the 5,000 gassing deaths
> of the Kurds as being "a few".
> Where the heck does Vic manufacture these "facts" from?

Does Vic still have that ANNOYING habit of eating while
he is talking? I can recall years ago this bozo saying he was
stuffing his face full of apples (like a demented chipmunk)
and talking and slobbering all over his mic. I'll bet you dimes
to a dozen Krispy-Kreme doughnutz that ole Victor has
balooned up to near 300 pounds. Probably looks just like
ole fat Junkyard Sid in Estenchia N.Mex. Poetic justice?

Does ole KJI still get on there and drive them up the
wall or has he keeled over into cemetary mulch by now also..?

> Oh, wait. For guys like Vic and his malingerers it is not necessary to
have
> facts OR proof. Any lie will do and Vic is surely full of them.
> Aside of Al Jazeera, Vic is the best propaganda machine that Saddam could
> hope for.

Vic & Baghdad Bob (r they one and the same??) rotflmao!

> These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and a
> conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.

Does Harrisson from Florida still get on there and
monologue and play his stupid tapes? How about
that other guy DKJ? He used to get on from W. Va
was a former KKK and every other word was "nig--r".

Does the 14313 dentist from NNJ and the nutcase
from Central Pa still qrm them for hours at a time?

Jeeze, I gots to listen there next week. I bet half of the
guys who used to get on there from the 80's are either
dead or so hen-pecked their wives won't let em on
anymore. Probably all new lineup of kooks and goofballs.
The Lib Net was always one of ham radio's biggest "kook
magnets"...

3810. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 19:59:02 UTC
From: beefourzees <thwaccck2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <d1f28$409e8d97$d1cc7b6b$20417@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 91891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:Kltnc.42522$UG2.15932@bignews2.bellsouth.net...

> Please don't slander the Liberty Net anymore. I am not complete without
it.
>
> Lloyd Davies, N0VFP - soon to be no-code General!

Try taping a kiebassa to your leg and take
a walk down Castro street. Then in no time
you'll be so 'complete' that you'll be able
to catch a softball with your arse..

3811. Re: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 20:18:43 UTC
From: Ida Takencash <carolsj@google.com>
Message-ID: <df4t90hr1fpdpgq2mlne1rprhn0e4o3ekn@4ax.com>
Source record: 91827

```
On 09 May 2004 16:39:48 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>0 2 4 6 8 S9 10 20 30 40
>
>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
>
> The digital troll-o-meter burst through the stops. Yet another Lennistic
>ranting made at the expense of thousands of good, dedicated people.
>
> What a waste of bandwidth.
>
> Putz.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Maybe you just need to get the stick out of your arse.
```

3812. NEWS: N2DUP announces for ARRL section manager in Minnesota

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 20:19:50 UTC
From: n2dup@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20040509161950.19107.00000691@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 91825

VOTE FOR A LEADER
Chuck Gysi, N2DUP for ARRL section manager in Minnesota

NEWS RELEASE

For immediate release
May 9, 2004
Contact: Chuck Gysi, N2DUP / N2DUP@RadioHams.net

NOTE TO EDITORS: A digital mug shot of Chuck Gysi, N2DUP, is available via e-mail request. Please specify the file format you prefer.

N2DUP announces run for ARRL Minnesota section manager

Chuck Gysi, N2DUP, has announced his candidacy for Minnesota section manager in this summer's election in the American Radio Relay League.

Gysi is a long-time ARRL volunteer and has been an active amateur radio operator for a solid 22 years. He chose to run for the section manager's position because of his leadership experience.

"I have a lot to bring to the section manager's position," Gysi said. "I am the best candidate running because of my leadership skills and long-time involvement as an amateur."

The section manager oversees the more than 2,500 ARRL members in Minnesota and appoints hams to serve in capacities ranging from official observers to public information officers.

"I can bring the ARRL Minnesota section back on track and fill unfilled key appointments," Gysi said. "I have served in a number of key ARRL positions in the past and know how to find the best people to get the job done."

ARRL members will receive ballots from league headquarters in Newington, Conn., about July 1.

Gysi currently serves as an ARRL public information officer and also has served as emergency coordinator, district emergency coordinator and official emergency station. He is a member of the Rochester Amateur Radio Club and the Minnesota Wireless Association. He also has served as a volunteer in amateur radio communications during his entire 22 years as a ham operator.

"I am the only qualified and experienced candidate running for section manager," Gysi said. "The Minnesota section has a lot of work ahead that needs to be done and only an experienced candidate can handle the task. That's why I ask you to vote for a leader. I look forward to serving my fellow ARRL members in our great state."

Gysi is available to make presentations at club meetings or other gatherings of hams anywhere in Minnesota. Call him toll-free at (888) 463-5355 or send an e-mail to N2DUP@RadioHams.net. In addition, he has set up an extensive web site about his candidacy at www.RadioHams.net.

- 30 -

3813. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricane Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 20:32:38 UTC
From: Jim D <james@no.spam>
Message-ID: <888887833.2458F8789@flaffel.tub>
Source record: 91826

On 09 May 2004 13:13:18 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:
> Hello Everyone,
>
> I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish they'd
> actually said something to the effect of
> "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......

I live in hurricane country along the Gulf Coast, and I can tell you
that the advice given by Cingular is moot. The fact is that there is
almost no cellular service available from the time that a hurricane
is within 24 hours of possible landfall in any nearby area.

If you try to make a call, you'll get no response from the overloaded
cell system. A land line telephone will be the only operational phone
in your area, and even with it, you may have to wait for several
minutes to get a dial tone.

I have evacuated my residence on several occasions (the last one
happening when a cat 4 hurricane was bearing down on our area), and in
no case was a cell phone useful for making calls to do something like
reserve an inland hotel room. In every case, I was thankful that I
had a regular, land line telephone for that purpose, because that was
the *only* telephone that worked.

Again, let me repeat that there was no severe WX around yet; there was
only the prediction of severe weather in effect.

Cell phones are a joke in emergency situations, because cell systems
have little reserve capacity built in and are quickly overloaded.
They are totally useless and you shouldn't even assume that they are
going to work during an emergency situation.

I still take my cell phone along when I evacuate, but I always assume
that it will only be useful AFTER the storm has passed.

3814. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:25:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zlxnc.301$zO3.115@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91828

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Hello Everyone,
> >
> > I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> > YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> > actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish
they'd
> > actually said something to the effect of
> > "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......
>
>
> I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
> supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
I am ready. I got rid of my cell phones 3 years ago. And now have two
pieces of wire connected to tacks on a plywood base. These are all hooked
to a ham CW transmitter.

Oh no...that won't work either. No one knows the code anymore.

Technology....ain't it wonderful?

Dan/W4NTI

3815. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:27:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Jmxnc.302$zO3.115@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91829

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:2Prnc.13392$Hs1.2624@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> > > I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
> > > YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
> > > actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations.
> > > I wish they'd actually said something to the effect of
> > > "if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone".....
> >
> >
> > I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
> > supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>
> This isn't something new nor is it specifically related to wireless
> phones. The 'wired' phone system has also been saying exactly the same
> thing since Moby Dick was a minnow. "During emergencies (bad weather or
> whatever) our systems may be overloaded by the surge of callers."
> Obviously (as Cingular correctly points out) the wireless infrastructure
> has an increased level of vulnerability over a strictly 'hardwired'
> phone system of yore. No surprise there! The Cingular instructions seem
> to me honest, useful, and corporately responsible.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
In other words....a world class CYA situation.

Dan/W4NTI

3816. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:38:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <0xxnc.309$zO3.277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91830

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord " <daviesl2003@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040508235345.27600.00000937@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Hows that? Most of the people doing that stupitidy are multiple guess
> >receive only cw test takers
>
> Do you have some proof?
>
> Learning code does not make the quality of the operator! Look at David
Castle,
> look at ex-WB2OTK, Roger Wiseman, etc.
>
> Need I say more??
>
>
> Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
> "On the Domestic Front"
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/domesticfront/

Gotta admit you got me on that one.

Dan/W4NTI

3817. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:46:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_Exnc.313$zO3.1@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91831

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E3DD4BBB37Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:o1dnc.2956$KE6.1607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Lumushahs" <lumushahs@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >> From: Jack Twilley jmt+usenet@twilley.org
> >>
> >> >I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
> >> >run the risk of being a real ham.
> >> >
> >>
> >> There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not all
> >> hams are old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.I don't think hams
> >> are frustrated either. (They seem to be comfortable with who they
> >> are).
> >>
> >> I don't know any "real" hams that are old, bitter, or frustrated.
> >> Okay. I know some that are old. But, your'e saying all real hams are
> >> old.
> >>
> >>
> > Nor do I thing my age of 57 is 'OLD'. I'm no spring chicken but I sure
> > hear a LOT of older folks on the air than I am.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> And some of those much older are more resonable

I guess they just got tired of fighting with you know-it-alls, and just
laugh at you when they unkey.

Dan/W4NTI

3818. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:47:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9Gxnc.315$zO3.313@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91832

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E3DD1138CFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:zUcnc.2851$KE6.1668@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
> > news:86u0ysni95.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> >> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> >> Hash: SHA1
> >>
> >> >>>>> "Dan" == w4nti <Dan> writes:
> >>
> >> [...]
> >>
> >> Dan> A real ham is the proper answer.
> >>
> >> Dan> You know one that paid his dues, passed his tests in front of the
> >> Dan> FCC. Demonstrated his abilty to not only receive....but to SEND
> >> Dan> CW in front of the FCC examiners. And has 43 years of experience
> >> Dan> since then. You know....a real ham.
> >>
> >> Dan> Make of that what you must.
> >>
> >> Huh. I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
> >> run the risk of being a real ham.
> >>
> >> Dan> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> Jack.
> >> (I'm happier being me, thanks.)
> >> - --
> >> Jack Twilley
> >> jmt at twilley dot org
> >
> > And I'm so happy that I'm not a know it all, but learned nothing newguy
> > that thinks he is the cats meow.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> Jack may be relatively new, but I've been a ham for 24 years, 'real' or

> otherwise, and I'm also glad that I'm me and not you.

Dang Alun....one more thing we agree on.

Dan/W4NTI

3819. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 21:54:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JMxnc.317$zO3.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91833

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com...

> It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Absolutely correct Mike, another arguement for quality and not quanity.

Dan/W4NTI

3820. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 22:00:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <HRxnc.318$zO3.81@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91834

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
>
> >>Subject: Re: News from France
> >>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
> >>
> >>Alun wrote:
> > >
> > >>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but
> > >>> for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we
> > >>> had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late
> > >>> and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.
> > >
> > > WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to
> > > get a
> > > code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
> > >
> >
> > Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.

Why is that Alun? Do you think that getting out a decent signal on HF is a
piece of cake?

Daily I hear the newguys trying to contact someone. Getting sorry pathetic
signal reports and going away in frustration.

Wonder how many new HFers we lose like that? You know the ones that believe
its soooooo easy to get up on HF? Probably hundreds per week.

I do the best I can when I hear someone like that. But it gets really old
when you trying to have a conversation with a bud, to talk to all the S2
signals.

Perhaps 'giving' out HF is NOT the answer as you think.

Dan/W4NTI

3821. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-09 22:04:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405091404.464d1e39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91835

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040509143413.08524.00001199@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/9/2004 1:07 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405091007.48246a26@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040508174411.21319.00001030@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/8/2004 3:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405081254.2afaa365@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
> >> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >> >This statement is eyeball deep: " MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> >> >" MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >
> >> >hi hi. What silliness!
>
> >> >Not sufficient. And while you're at it, find a citation for, "Each
> >> >MARS program is wholly dependent on the Amateur Radio Service to
> >> >exist."
> >>
> >> Very simple, Brain.
> >
> >Nope, wrong again. Finding such a citation is not only very
> >difficult, but it is impossible because it doesn't exist except in one
> >nutter's mind.
> >
> >> Review the roster of active stations in each service.
> >
> >They have MARS calls.
>
> Uh huh...And...?!?!

and they have MARS calls.

> >> Disenroll all those who are participants based upon licensure in the
> >> Amateur Radio Service.
> >
> >I have no such authority.
>
> I doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your non-dominant hand
> without written permission.

Please stay on subject and quit resorting to personal attacks.

> >That's nice, but what about this statement?
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
> >
> >Exactly how is MARS amateur radio?
>
> Subtract the participation of licensed Radio Amateurs and what do you
> have...???

Answer the question, if you can.

> >Do you know the transitive property of your false little equation?
> >Doubt it.
>
> My statement is not false.

Your statement is false.

> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

Steve, if, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio" " is true,
then

"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS" is also true.

But it isn't.

> >> It's very predictable. Cowards never do want thier families to know
> about
> >> thier "alternative lifestyle".
> >
> >Did some lunatic send your wife a photo of you cross-dressing?
>
> Had it occured I am sure she would have.
>
> >> I wouldn't want MY wife to see me acting like that and developing a
> >> reputation as not being truthful either. You DO have that reputation,
> Brain.
> >> Stupid assertions...tales of radio bravado...public assertions of
> admiration
> >> for a documented pathological liar...
> >
> >Not with anyone I know. But there is this nutter on R.R.A.P.....

>
> Yep..Named Brian Burke.

You guessed wrong.

> Well known for not being able to stand up to his
> rhetoric.

But here I am standing up to the little marine.

> >> Is THAT message getting through to you yet, Brain?
> >>
> >> I wouldn't want YOU "near" my family if I knew the net result would be
> >> some revelation of alternate-reality behaviour to them.
> >>
> >> If her reaction was anywhere NEAR "normal", she'd probably jack-slap
> you,
> >> tell you to stay off of the Internet, and not embarras the family name any
> >> further.
> >
> >You do have trouble staying on topic, don't you?
>
> None at all.

You continually veer toward my family. Stay away.

> YOU mentioned family, Brain.

You mentioned my family, Steve. I asked you not to.

> I only asked if your wife knew how foolish
> you act in a public forum.

That is none of your business.

> And I repeat my previous question...Is THAT message getting through to you
> yet?

How is " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio" " true?

> >So when are you going to fire up your MARS net on amateur radio
> >frequencies?
>
> It's perfectly legal for most MARS personnel to conduct a net on Amateur
> frequencies, Brain...just as it is for gardners, NASCAR fans and other
> hobbyists

That was not the question that I asked you.

Are you going to conduct a MARS net on amateur frequencies?

> >Hey, when are you going to fire up amateur radio on MARS frequencies?
>
> You're not, if you value your license, Brain.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

so,

" Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>IS<< "MARS". "

Both are false statements.

> >Be sure to invite Reilly to both.
>
> Sure. And while he's listening, I think we'll ask HIM what major role
> non-licensed radio services play in emergency communication.

You won't be asking Reilly anything because you won't be conducting a
MARS net on amateur frequencies, or an amateur net on MARS
frequencies. The reason I say that is because MARS IS NOT AMATEUR
RADIO!

> >After all, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio" ," according
> >to one nutter on this planet.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> You've still not been able to tell me how I am wrong, Brain.
>
> Yet another assertion you've made that remains unsubstantiated.
>
> Putz.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Nutter

bb

3822. 73 or 73's or Best 73's --- which is it?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 00:55:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <VpAnc.14234$Hs1.13318@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91836

The question extends back B4 HPM!

http://www.qsl.net/aa0mz/73s.htm

73's, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

3823. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:05:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409ED544.4090707@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91837

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> The only exception is a representative of a foreign country. I have
> a relative who is a diplomat of another country ("Country B") and
> held a US license by examination before moving to "Country B" and
> becoming a diplomat of that country. AFAIK s/he is able to retain
> the US license as long as s/he is not accredited as a diplomat to
> the United States (which is not likely to happen for quite a while
> if ever).
>
>
>
If he did get that diplomat accreditation, the FCC then couldn't do
anything to him. Hell,
you can shoplift and go drunk driving and they can't touch you if you're
a diplomat. The
only way New York City gets diplomats to pay up on parking tickets is to
tow his car
away, and he has to pay the tickets to get it back.

>
>

3824. Re: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:17:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409ED835.2020502@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91838

>
>
>
>
>That brings us to the prevailing conditions today in 2029. Medical
>technology continues to extend life expectancy, but the advances however
>magnificent, cannot keep pace with the demographic profile of Professional
>Radio Volunteer Operators, now numbering 3,632 with a median age of 83. The
>latest survey indicates 4% are active on the air during one or more contest
>days.
>
The last possible "Worked All States" award was given out last fall, as
there are no longer any
operators living in North Dakota or in Vermont. :-)

>
>
>On the international DX scene, the United States is a rare one, prompting
>great interest in DXpeditions to the US. Until recently, the issue of
>reciprocal operating permits had not been resolved, as the US is the only
>country in the world still requiring telegraphy for HF access. The two
>persons concerned about the future of the Professional Radio Volunteer
>Service reluctantly agreed to allow operators from other countries access to
>the HF voice band consisting of 15 kHz on 29 MHz.
>
DXpeditions are scheduled only at sunspot peaks, making the USA a very
rare one. :-)

However there have been many improper cross-service contacts between
foreign hams
and American CB operators running split frequency/band/service. Even
CBers with type certificated legal CB
rigs running SSB and AM when conditions are exceptional. (They use ham
receivers to hear the
foriegn hams).

;-)

3825. Re: 73 or 73's or Best 73's --- which is it?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:19:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <q8OdnTPAmZcyRQPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91839

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> The question extends back B4 HPM!
>
> http://www.qsl.net/aa0mz/73s.htm
>
> 73's, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

I have gotten in the habit of simply saying or writing 73.

Beyond that, I find the argument of "what is correct" kind of amusing.

Too many hams seem to want to control what others say. Just like the fellow that was lecturing another on saying "please copy" in a contest exchange instead of what he wanted to hear.

Especially with all the different shorthand abbreviations that CW ops use, I can't get very excited about 73 vs 73's.

The only thing that bothers me is the habit of some hams to say HI HI on vocal QSO's. It is either funny enough to continue laughing or it isn't. Seems like a person saying HI HI is saying "well, that was funny, but not all that funny. Obviously HIHI has a place in Morse ops.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3826. Re: FRANCE : End of CW signed by the government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:20:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409ED8CD.9010102@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91840

Nomen Nescio wrote:

>
>F*ck CW !
>

Guess I won't find you on the code subbands......

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3827. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:22:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <q8OdnTLAmZegRAPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91841

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine
>>Areas
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>
>
>> I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
>>supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>
>
> Good ole capitalism at work!

I would hope that they would keep to logical facts for emergency prep plans.

Maybe they could put in a plug like "Be sure to keep plenty of Pepsi on
hand for emergencies!"

- Mike KB3EIA -

3828. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:24:43 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409ED9DB.6070503@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91842

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Alun wrote:
>
>> The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister
>> to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on
>> the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>> probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>
>
>
> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
> earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
> the change one way or the other.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

More likely you will see a lot of existing hams upgrading, like what happened
after Restructuring in the USA. Do all French no-coders get access to all of
HF? Or just some small subbands? Likely they will still need to take and pass some written tests to get access to all of HF.

3829. Re: 73 or 73's or Best 73's --- which is it?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:29:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <TVAnc.14305$Hs1.5826@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91843

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Obviously HIHI has a place in Morse ops.

Well, it's certainly a lot easier to send "didididit didit" than
"dahdahdahdididit dahdidididididah dahdidahdahdidah"

Best 73's, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

3830. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:31:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <G6ydnVq4kpAURgPdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91844

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>> I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
>>>YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
>>>actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations.
>>>I wish they'd actually said something to the effect of
>>>"if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......
>>
>>
>>I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
>>supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>
>
> This isn't something new nor is it specifically related to wireless
> phones. The 'wired' phone system has also been saying exactly the same
> thing since Moby Dick was a minnow. "During emergencies (bad weather or
> whatever) our systems may be overloaded by the surge of callers."
> Obviously (as Cingular correctly points out) the wireless infrastructure
> has an increased level of vulnerability over a strictly 'hardwired'
> phone system of yore. No surprise there! The Cingular instructions seem
> to me honest, useful, and corporately responsible.

I dunno, "Buy more cell phones but don't use them because lot's of
people are using them". just doesn't sit well with me.

If a person has limited funds for emergency preparedness, would it be
better to spend that money on extra cell phones that they "should not" -
or more likely can't use, or maybe things like flashlights, food, water,
batteries.

We have 2 cell phones. They are there, but aren't a part of my
emergency plans.

Other than that, their piece is okay.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3831. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:46:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EPudndKJ2a6XQgPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91845

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Hello, Mike
>
> Yep, I *love* that suggestion about programming in 911. Now, instead of
> having to hit three buttons (9-1-1), you simply hit "memory-0-1".
>
> Wow! I *am* impressed :))

hehe. Just like I have said on other subjects, you can't make things easy enough for some people. Even if the convenience insn't any more convenient.

> I also like the idea about buying more cell phones. If the lines are all
> busy due to overloading, you have your whole family try dialing on 10 cell
> phones. You increase your chances *ten* times! Reminder to self: go buy
> 100 lottery tickets; instead of 1 chance in 12 million, I'd have one chance
> in 120 thousand. Golly gee. Who'd have thunk?

That is an important consideration. When there is an emergency, such as ice storm or hurricane or the like, it is incredibly compelling. Parents want to call their parents, big sis wants to call her best friend to see if she is alright, and little brother want's to compare freaky disaster notes with his bud's.

If you've ever been in one, it is almost impossible to resist. You know that loved ones are worried sick about your predicament, and if you have a family of 3, and 3 cell phones, I'll wager that all three will be tried.

>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

And from your QTH, I know you've been involved in some wethear disasters lately! 8^) We've hade them here in State College over the last 10 years, and cell service has gone out almost immediately. More cell phones will simply put it out of commission a few seconds quicker.

- mike KB3EIA -

3832. Re: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 01:50:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509215024.21491.00001131@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91846

```
>Subject: Re: 25 years later in the US --- A view from over here
>From: Ida Takencash carolsj@google.com
>Date: 5/9/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <df4t90hr1fpdpgq2mlne1rprhn0e4o3ekn@4ax.com>
>
>On 09 May 2004 16:39:48 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>
>>0 2 4 6 8 S9 10 20 30 40
>>
>>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
>>IIIIIIIIIIIIIIII
>>
>> The digital troll-o-meter burst through the stops. Yet another
>Lennistic
>>ranting made at the expense of thousands of good, dedicated people.
>>
>> What a waste of bandwidth.
>>
>> Putz.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>Maybe you just need to get the stick out of your arse.

So you can use it? Perhaps to pick your teeth with?

Troll X2

Steve, K4YZ
```

3833. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:12:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JeWdnVG_s52CeAPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91847

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:r7Odnd3eG-iTqAPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hello Everyone,
>>>
>>> I picked this up off of my listserver group "CitizenSoldiers" on
>>>YahooGroups. I find it interesting that Cingular
>>>actually went to the effort of acknowledging thier limitations. I wish
>
> they'd
>
>>>actually said something to the effect of
>>>"if ya ain't bleeding or drowning, stay off the phone"......
>>
>>
>>I had to chuckle that you are supposed to stay off the phone, but are
>>supposed to buy more cell phones!!!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> I am ready. I got rid of my cell phones 3 years ago. And now have two
> pieces of wire connected to tacks on a plywood base. These are all hooked
> to a ham CW transmitter.
>
> Oh no...that won't work either. No one knows the code anymore.

The way I look at it is that there are levels of disasters. Small scale stuff will work with cell phones.

Big disasters need hf comms. If a really big one comes along, that CW is going to start looking pretty good. For all the ops that might think that phone is the way to go - and if the conditions support it, then that's great.

But if you are the station trying to get communications going from a devastated area, you might be trying to nurse a station along on a weak battery, or working with a jury rigged antenna of questionable performance, that CW operation may just be critical.

I am marginal at Morse CW, (by comparison with most) but I can do it acceptably when I need to.

And that is why I support the continued testing for it. We *don't* know who is going to end up being the point man in a big disaster, but whoever it is should know how to communicate with whatever they can communicate with.

And that is what I think a lot of people DON'T UNDERSTAND. It isn't about the person sitting in comfort taking info from the disaster area. It is about the random ham that is at ground zero. Is he or she going to be able to do the job?

Of course I am one of those nerds that takes all the Red Cross courses in first aid and CPR and defib etc. Hopefully I'll never need to use this training beyond the first aid part, but I suspect the person that I am called upon to help in extremis might find that training of interest!

> Technology....ain't it wonderful?

Sometimes!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3834. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:14:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91848

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/9/2004 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405091404.464d1e39@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040509143413.08524.00001199@mb-m02.aol.com>...

>> >They have MARS calls.
>>
>> Uh huh...And...?!?!
>
>and they have MARS calls.

Uh huh...Guys in MARS do. You dodged again. Coward.

>> I doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your non-dominant
>hand
>> without written permission.
>
>Please stay on subject and quit resorting to personal attacks.

It's not "personal attacks" if it's true.

And I STILL doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your
non-dominant hand without written permission.

>> Subtract the participation of licensed Radio Amateurs and what do you
>> have...???
>
>Answer the question, if you can.

I have.

I continue to ask YOU what would be the result if all those licensed
Amateurs quit the MARS programs tomorrow. You refuse to answer.

>> >Do you know the transitive property of your false little equation?
>> >Doubt it.
>>
>> My statement is not false.
>
>Your statement is false.

No. It is not. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> Sure. And while he's listening, I think we'll ask HIM what major role
>> non-licensed radio services play in emergency communication.

>
>You won't be asking Reilly anything because you won't be conducting a
>MARS net on amateur frequencies, or an amateur net on MARS
>frequencies. The reason I say that is because MARS IS NOT AMATEUR
>RADIO!

Well, PuppetBoy, too bad you didn't pay closer attention to what I said.

MARS members CAN conduct nets on Amatuer frequencies and can even discuss
thier activities thereon...

Again...GET YOUR HEAD OUT OF YOUR RECTUM, BURKE! Or at least wipe the
brown stuff off your nose before you make a public appearance.

I further suggest that before you further humiliate yourself about what
MARS is or isn't that you take some time to actually LISTEN to MARS frequencies
and then tell me exactly how much difference there is between the two.

Now, you can keep running off at the mouth if you care to, Mr. Burke, but
the ONLY person you are making a fool of here is yourself. And I might add
you're doing a spectacular job of it.

Idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

3835. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:16:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509221615.21491.00001134@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 91849

>Subject: Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine
>Areas
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/9/2004 9:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <JeWdnVG_s52CeAPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>

> Of course I am one of those nerds that takes all the Red Cross courses
>in first aid and CPR and defib etc. Hopefully I'll never need to use
>this training beyond the first aid part, but I suspect the person that I
>am called upon to help in extremis might find that training of interest!

Me too, but I get to use mine numerous times a WEEK...!

Glad I'm getting paid (well!) for it!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3836. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:21:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <q-qdnZeTWY6oegPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91850

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>>From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:12 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Xns94E45D85A58A0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
>
>>I applied to be a counselor for the radio merit badge in boy scouts a
>>couple of months ago, but haven't heard anything back yet. The troop leader
>>is more interested in finding someone for the computer badge.
>
>
> From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder for the
> Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....

It's an unfortunate situation. I've worked with kids before, and have gone through the pertinent background checks. In most respects, it's no big deal.

It is getting harder to find people that will voluntarily go through such things anymore though.

Think of it. You could be a perfectly normal person, but one dumb clerical error could not only keep you from coaching your kid or being a merit badge counselor, but ruin your entire life! Its not likely to happen, but.....

It's harder to get people to help period!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3837. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:35:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <yoqdnYxPg5f5dwPd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91901

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com...
>
>
>>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> Absolutely correct Mike, another arguement for quality and not quanity.

And yet that is lost on so many people! Let's say we get a huge influx of new hams. Where the heck are they all going to go? What will they do? Here it is 10:30 p.m. heading toward the bottom of the present sunspot cycle, and I'm looking at 20 signals on my PSK31 setup in a 3 kHz segment. I can tune the bands on ssb and cw and by Gaw, they are busy! As much as I like contesting, I don't want the bands to sound like contest weekends all the time.

I want new hams, I want more to come along to balance out the SK's and those that lose interest. But I want good hams, not simply people that are here to provide a statistic. Anything else will be BAD for Ham radio.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3838. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:41:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mpudnSniiKNFdgPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91902

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>>news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: News from France
>>>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>>>>
>>>>Alun wrote:
>>>
>>>>>I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but
>>>>>for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we
>>>>>had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late
>>>>>and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.
>>>
>>> WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to
>>> get a
>>>code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>>>
>>
>>Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.
>
>
> Why is that Alun? Do you think that getting out a decent signal on HF is a
> piece of cake?
>
> Daily I hear the newguys trying to contact someone. Getting sorry pathetic
> signal reports and going away in frustration.
>
> Wonder how many new HFers we lose like that? You know the ones that believe
> its soooooo easy to get up on HF? Probably hundreds per week.

Darn near lost me! Thank goodness I found a good Elmer. I was pulling
me hair out trying to put a station together.

No, Putting an adequate station together is not easy.

> I do the best I can when I hear someone like that. But it gets really old
> when you trying to have a conversation with a bud, to talk to all the S2

> signals.
>
> Perhaps 'giving' out HF is NOT the answer as you think.

Nope. Just imagine all the "why should I have to learn anything people trying to do this. Perhaps they will sue the older hams for the information to get a decent station going? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3839. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 02:49:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040509224918.27780.00001307@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 91903

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 5/9/2004 9:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <q-qdnZeTWY6oegPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> From what I read in the papaers, it's getting harder and harder for
>the
>> Scouts to find leaders who want to be leaders and not molesters....
>
> It's an unfortunate situation. I've worked with kids before, and have
>gone through the pertinent background checks. In most respects, it's no
>big deal.

Yep.

CAP instituted it's background check program over 15 years ago and it's
worked well.

> It is getting harder to find people that will voluntarily go through
>such things anymore though.

All they have to do for us is go to the local SO or PD and get the prints
done. Here in Franklin County, TN, the local SO will do it for free.

> Think of it. You could be a perfectly normal person, but one dumb
>clerical error could not only keep you from coaching your kid or being a
>merit badge counselor, but ruin your entire life! Its not likely to
>happen, but.....

My concern is what people today call "child abuse"...

We see "abuse" in the ER all the time that is nothing of the sort...It's
estranged parents arguing over who's the better parent or trying to use Junior
as a pawn in thier on-going domestic disputes...Most of the time the "charges"
are on the person who thought to bring charges second...

The BIG problem is getting that crap cleared off...Even if no actual
charges are substantiated, there's always a record of "allegations" that are
out there...The "innocent until proven guilty" thing sounds good as the
disclaimer on an episode of "COPS", but unfortunately is not necessarrily a
fact of life.

> It's harder to get people to help period!

Yep. "Everybody" wants "Somebody" to "do it", but "Nobody" has the time to
do it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3840. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:08:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Qt2dnY5qxbWrbwPdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91904

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: News from France
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>>
>>Alun wrote:
>
>
>>>I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence but for
>>>the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby if we had
>>>abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is too late and we have
>>>blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham anymore.
>
>
> WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity to get a
> code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>
> If it weren't the Code test, it would be the written....If it's not the
> tests themselves, it's the perception that you have to have to have enough
> equipment to rival VOA
>
>
>> My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation, there
>>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What they
>>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing interest
>>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".
>
>
> In hang gliding we call them "wuffos"...
>
> As in "Wuffo you wanna do that..???" You oughtta see the faces at
> speedgliding events!
>
>
>> People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the hobby,
>
>
>>and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can actually
>>be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>>money. And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to be

>>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>
>
> Sure...and why go to all that effort when you can see Jupiter a lot easier
> with a bit of creative websurfing!
>
>
>> In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have to
>>be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on a
>>rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the other
>>things we have to do to get on the air.
>
>
> I guess "fair amount" is realtive. You can put up an effective HF/VHF/UHF
> station for under $350/400 if you do a bit of shopping and don't want all the
> latest bells and whistles. Then there are they guys with TOO MUCH
> "discretionary income" and have stations who look like the aforementioned VOA
> outlets!

True. I put together my station for $250.00 for the rig (got real lucky
there) 14 dollars for antenna wire, 20 dollars for twinlead, 140 dollars
for antenna tuner. Already had a computer so I don't count that. So I
was right around that 350 dollar mark. If a young'un could spend the
time and effort (remembering that the parents have to spend that time
and effort too) they could get something pretty inexpensive. I suspect
most wouldn't though.

>> Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
>>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so happily
>>upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field day.
>
>
> This is where "Elmering" could come in and these youngsters get introduced
> to where/how to look for those used rigs.

Yaknow, I think clubs might think about getting a member that works
with the kids. This would be a person willing to go through the
background checks for working with young'uns and is good with kids.

>
>> Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two. Beyond
>>the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time keeping
>>other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical acumen
>>level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?
>
>
> I dunno, Mike...How much >>IS<< needed...?!?! =O =)
>

I remember years ago one of the guy's on Fidonet had a tagline that
stated he was looking for a good one handed GIF viewer!! 8^P

>
>> My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
>>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like saying
>>that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is deaf.
>>
>> It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
>
>
> Yep...like I said...Amateur Radio (for those who participate regularly) has
> almost always appealed to a very narrow segment of society and always will.
> All we need to do is keep it out there in front of those "potentials" and wait
> for them to decide for themselves.

Yup, viva le geeky kids! (as a former geeky kid, I can say that)

Steve, were you going to Dayton this year?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3841. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:15:59 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E4EC7B22200elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91905

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:HRxnc.318$zO3.81@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>> news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: News from France
>> >>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>> >>
>> >>Alun wrote:
>> >>
>> >>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence
>> >>> but for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby
>> >>> if we had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is
>> >>> too late and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham
>> >>> anymore.
>> >>
>> > WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity
>> > to get a
>> > code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>> >
>>
>> Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.
>
> Why is that Alun? Do you think that getting out a decent signal on HF
> is a piece of cake?
>
> Daily I hear the newguys trying to contact someone. Getting sorry
> pathetic signal reports and going away in frustration.
>
> Wonder how many new HFers we lose like that? You know the ones that
> believe its soooooo easy to get up on HF? Probably hundreds per week.
>
> I do the best I can when I hear someone like that. But it gets really
> old when you trying to have a conversation with a bud, to talk to all
> the S2 signals.
>
> Perhaps 'giving' out HF is NOT the answer as you think.
>

> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
>

And knowing CW is going to enhance their knowledge of how to set up and HF station? I think not.

3842. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:17:18 UTC
From: kk4tl@aol.com
Message-ID: <2b98299d.0405091917.574ba41e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote >...

>
> Please don't slander the Liberty Net anymore. I am not complete without it.
>

That's The Great Liberty Net to you, sir.

Give Kevin a call.

See if he'll meet you at profit Stair's place and check out the young "sisters".

3843. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:18:39 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E4ECEF6543Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91907

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in
news:409ED9DB.6070503@ix.netcom.com:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Alun wrote:
>>
>>> The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister
>>> to sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on
>>> the 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
>>> probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>>
>>
>>
>> Have any numbers on the impact of this Morse code abolition? The
>> earliest countries to dump Morse should have some numbers that reflect
>> the change one way or the other.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
> More likely you will see a lot of existing hams upgrading, like what
> happened
> after Restructuring in the USA. Do all French no-coders get access to
> all of
> HF? Or just some small subbands? Likely they will still need to take
> and pass some written tests to get access to all of HF.
>

They will all get the whole thing. Unlike here, they took the same theory.
This is the most common scenario in Europe. Most of the hams in Europe are
now licenced for all the HF bands.

3844. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:21:14 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E4ED5F52304elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91908

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:_Exnc.313$zO3.1@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E3DD4BBB37Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:o1dnc.2956$KE6.1607@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Lumushahs" <lumushahs@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20040507234549.08632.00000882@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> >> From: Jack Twilley jmt+usenet@twilley.org
>> >>
>> >> >I'm so glad I'm not an old, bitter, frustrated person. I might
>> >> >run the risk of being a real ham.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> There are young hams, and old hams (and all ages in between). Not
>> >> all hams are old. I don't know any hams that are bitter.I don't
>> >> think hams are frustrated either. (They seem to be comfortable with
>> >> who they are).
>> >>
>> >> I don't know any "real" hams that are old, bitter, or frustrated.
>> >> Okay. I know some that are old. But, your'e saying all real hams
>> >> are old.
>> >>
>> >>
>> > Nor do I thing my age of 57 is 'OLD'. I'm no spring chicken but I
>> > sure hear a LOT of older folks on the air than I am.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> And some of those much older are more resonable
>
> I guess they just got tired of fighting with you know-it-alls, and just
> laugh at you when they unkey.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
```

>

No, some of them are more mature than you

3845. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricane Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:30:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <MdadneRW8e_bmwLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 91914

Jim D wrote:
>
> Cell phones are a joke in emergency situations, because cell systems
> have little reserve capacity built in and are quickly overloaded.
> They are totally useless and you shouldn't even assume that they are
> going to work during an emergency situation.

Oh my, now you are going to upset those who think the cell network is
vital to communications in an emergency.

3846. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:40:57 UTC
From: kk4tl@aol.com
Message-ID: <2b98299d.0405091940.28e1865e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Timmy" wrote >...

> These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and a
> conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.

Dag Nabbit Timmy you been knowing what these guys are for years. Too
bad Riley came along and made everyone behave.

I bet if Riley would leave us alone, Sir Sidney and Kind Jewish Indian
would show The Great Liberty Net a thing or two.

3847. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:45:36 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040509234536.005$KO@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91910
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

kk4tl@aol.com (LW) wrote:
> "Timmy" wrote >...
>
> > These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and
> > a conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.
>
> Dag Nabbit Timmy you been knowing what these guys are for years. Too
> bad Riley came along and made everyone behave.
>
> I bet if Riley would leave us alone, Sir Sidney and Kind Jewish Indian
> would show The Great Liberty Net a thing or two.
>
Donut matter..the bpl makes your ears fubar'd eventually, so it's
every station for themselves.

I'm gonna have to dust off an amp I swore I'd never use again.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3848. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 03:55:02 UTC
From: Minnie Bannister <GoonButNotForgotten@NottheBBC.org>
Message-ID: <109tv8kplj7q63@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 91911

It used to be the case in UK many decades ago (it may have changed now) that one could simply go to an auto accessories store and buy "CD" ("Corps Diplomatique") stickers (just like the "GB" stickers for UK vehicles being driven in France). (Not as strange as it may sound: even license plates were not *issued* officially: one was allocated a registration number and could go and get the embossed plate made anywhere -- or stick plastic letters and numbers on a blank plate). The chances of a vehicle so adorned being ticketed were very slim (at least, so it was said), because the police didn't want to risk a "diplomatic incident."

AB2OS

Robert Casey wrote:

>> The only exception is a representative of a foreign country. I have
>> a relative who is a diplomat of another country ("Country B") and
>> held a US license by examination before moving to "Country B" and
>> becoming a diplomat of that country. AFAIK s/he is able to retain
>> the US license as long as s/he is not accredited as a diplomat to
>> the United States (which is not likely to happen for quite a while
>> if ever).

> If he did get that diplomat accreditation, the FCC then couldn't do
> anything to him. Hell,
> you can shoplift and go drunk driving and they can't touch you if you're
> a diplomat. The
> only way New York City gets diplomats to pay up on parking tickets is to
> tow his car
> away, and he has to pay the tickets to get it back.

3849. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 04:16:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxh4834.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91912

On 9 May 2004 13:03:29 GMT, Alun wrote:

>Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and
>order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they
>don't care about amateur radio, period.

The "they" is really one individual, the specialist who has to
start the ball rolling by drafting the new rules and the discussion
and justification therefor, and AFAIK the current incumbent in that
slot is an active amateur. After that, his job is to sell it up the
ladder, where ham radio is on the bottom of the totem pole, and he
may see that there is a barrier upstream of him and may be doing
nothing because of that. Were it me, I'd have the rules and the
text all ready to go in my wordprocessor files by now.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3850. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 04:20:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <409F031B.90209@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91913

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>
>"Welcome To The Monkey House" ...
>
>
>
>
So how many bananas will this require? :-)

3851. Re: 73 or 73's or Best 73's --- which is it?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 05:30:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <fsEnc.4266$9X7.2277@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 91915

Hans,

Don't sweat it. Now, if one of the guys wishes you 88's - then sweat it LOL

:))

73 from Rocheter, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - and I ain't wishin' ya 88's either LOL

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:VpAnc.14234$Hs1.13318@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> The question extends back B4 HPM!
>
> http://www.qsl.net/aa0mz/73s.htm
>
> 73's, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.680 / Virus Database: 442 - Release Date: 5/9/04

3852. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 07:16:07 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E5210DA234Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91916

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxh4834.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On 9 May 2004 13:03:29 GMT, Alun wrote:
>
>>Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and
>>order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they
>>don't care about amateur radio, period.
>
> The "they" is really one individual, the specialist who has to
> start the ball rolling by drafting the new rules and the discussion
> and justification therefor, and AFAIK the current incumbent in that
> slot is an active amateur. After that, his job is to sell it up the
> ladder, where ham radio is on the bottom of the totem pole, and he
> may see that there is a barrier upstream of him and may be doing
> nothing because of that. Were it me, I'd have the rules and the
> text all ready to go in my wordprocessor files by now.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

I knew it was one person, but didn't know he was a ham. I still don't think
the FCC as a whole gives a fig for ham radio.

3853. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 09:27:53 UTC
From: Scott M <spamkiller@elp.rr.com>
Message-ID: <tWHnc.77583$Dn1.67771@fe2.texas.rr.com>
Source record: 91917
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.

"Gary hildebrand" <ghldbrd@ccp.com> wrote in message news:598dc4be.0405031436.6f51ff7f@posting.google.com...
> WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message news:<c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com>...
> > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's that
> > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm finding
> > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some references for
> > various solid state and tube conversions.
> >
> > Thanks in advance for any help.
> >
> > WA3MOJ
>
> First, the circuit techniques for UHF receiver front ends and
> transmitter PA's are totally different than those on 11 meters.
> Conversion becomes wholesale replacement of about half of the radio.
>
> Second, <<`ALL'>> CB radios must be type-accepted by the FCC for use
> on the air. Unless you have the thousands of dollars for R&D, and
> legal assistance to complete this, forget the whole thing.
>
> What you are trying to do is tantamount to modifing a VCR into a
> satellite uplink to jam television satellites. Can't get there from
> here, No how, now way. Zip. Nada. The BIG goose egg.
>
> Now you could use UHF commercial radios on the GMRS (former Class A CB
> channels) with very little problem. Just change crystals or reprogram
> the synthesizer in the radio, tweak, and you're in business. Any
> competent two-way radio shop can do that.
>
> I'd suggest you study a LOT more on basic electronic theory, and
> circuit design before you post such an asinine question.
>
> Gary Hildebrand WA7KKP

3854. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 09:37:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405100137.78ebb476@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91918

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
>My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation,
there
>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What
they
>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing
interest
>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".

BANG! Drove that nail with a single blow, Mike!
>
>Whether it is the Morse code requirement, or the cost of a rig or
>effort of putting up an antenna, or the cost of a telescope or the
need
>to travel to remote areas that are dark enough or the fact that you
have
>to stay up all night to observe, etc, etc.
>
This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...

>People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the
hobby,
>and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can
actually
>be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>money.

Is it really so much money, Mike? I've heard that there are some folks
who make their own 'scopes, down to the grinding of lenses and mirrors
and such. And of course there are used telescopes. But the telescope
itself is probably the least of the issues.

>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
be
>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>
Here's another issue:

If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the

pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret what is seen, either.

Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.

>In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have to
>be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on a
>rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the other
>things we have to do to get on the air.
>
The biggest investments aren't monetary. It's the time and effort.

>Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so happily
>upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field day.

37 years ago I was one of those young hams, and got no help from the parental units. Today's kids are no different. The big difference today is that for too many folks the antenna is a really big deal. Heck, look how many *adult* hams can't figure out how to put up an effective HF antenna these days...
>
>Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two. Beyond
>the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time keeping
>other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical acumen
>level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?

Since the advent of GUIs the whole point of personal computing has been to make it easier for *everyone* to use them. That's what has driven the industry for 20+ years.
>
>My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like saying
>that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is deaf.
>

I wish I knew where that one came from!

>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.

Here's a datapoint for ya:

In 1972 I graduated from a suburban Catholic boys' high school. This was in a solidly middle-class area, at a school that stressed math and science (AP courses available in those days were calculus, physics, chemistry, and history). My graduating class was over 600. IIRC exactly three of us graduates were hams. Of those three, only I am still licensed.

The girls' high school next door (literally) was slightly larger - and had no hams at all. Out of maybe 5000 kids in grades 9 through 12 there were perhaps 9 or 10 licensed hams.

The reasons for the scarcity were many. For example, many extracurricular activities competed for our time and energy. (Like this blonde 11th grader who - no, wait, wrong newsgroup...). There was no organized school activity until we kids started a radio club of our own, which rose and fell on the efforts of us kids. More than a few kids back then though amateur radio was "square" - its conservative political nature (K7UGA) and military ties made more than a few look askance.

Most of all, those were the boom times for cb. For less than the cost of a half-decent used receiver like a Drake 2B, one could head over to Lafayette Radio or one of its competitors and bring home a complete setup - 23 channel transceiver, groundplane antenna, coax, mounting hardware, etc. All brand new, ready to go. And if you had a car, a few more dollars bought a mobile mount and 102" whip antenna. License? Just fill out a form - but in fact many did not bother to do even that much. No tuneup, no fancy adjustments - just pick a channel, push the button and talk.

I don't know how many kids in my school had cbs or access to them, but they outnumbered us hams back then. Some of them became hams, most lost interest when the cb boom ended.

Things haven't changed all that much, except now it's the 'net that's a prime competitor.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3855. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 10:34:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405100234.102930ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91919

daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in message news:<20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>...
In article <20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>, daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) writes:

>>It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?

What mode are those folks using for their alleged violations? It isn't Morse Code!
>>
>
>Yes man I know that, but does'nt that blow a hole for those folks who code to
>stay as a filter?
>
Not really.

No test can be a perfect filter that somehow guarantees perfect behavior by everyone who passes it. That doesn't mean we don't need testing.

Consider this plain, simple fact: All of those violators mentioned above allegedly passed *written* tests which covered the rules, regulations and operating practices. In fact most of them passed several written tests. Yet those tests have not prevented them from running afoul of the regulations. Thus, the written exams are not a "filter" either, even though they deal directly with the rules and regs.

So, should we just dump the written tests because they're not a perfect filter?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3856. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricane Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 10:48:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040510064801.09260.00000236@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 91920

>Subject: Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricane Areas
>From: JJ radiobuff99@mailcity.moc
>Date: 5/9/2004 10:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <MdadneRW8e_bmwLd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
>
>Jim D wrote:
>>
>> Cell phones are a joke in emergency situations, because cell systems
>> have little reserve capacity built in and are quickly overloaded.
>> They are totally useless and you shouldn't even assume that they are
>> going to work during an emergency situation.
>
>Oh my, now you are going to upset those who think the cell network is
>vital to communications in an emergency.

Or worse...those who inisist that unlicensed devices play a "major role"
in emergency communications...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3857. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 11:08:04 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1b092ca162e0dc149898ee@news.frontiernet.net>
Source record: 91921

I think the most popular 2 meter repeater frequencies and simplex calling freqs should be added to new FRS/GMRS blister pack radios in WalMart with a little scrunched up application for an FCC license placed in the package just where you would put a knife thru it to open the blister pack.

N2UBP

3858. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 12:01:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510080105.200$yv@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91922
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com> wrote:
> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the
> radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply
> convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
>
That's what everyone has told wa3moj, but he insists it's possible.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3859. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 12:16:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405100416.218548bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91923

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >From: Alun elektros@yahoo.com
> >Date: 5/9/2004 8:03 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Xns94E45BF3DD773elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
>
> >If you are right, then the US will be the last country with a code test,
> >decades after it no longer exists anywhere else. I don't think it will take
> >that long, though.
>
> I was afraid of this.
>
> Despite supporting Code testing, I am also of the mind that once the
> majority has spoken, it's time to move on.

Which majority?

What happened at WRC-2003 was *not* the abolition of code testing.
Instead, the treaty was modified so that each country decides for
itself what its code testing requirement will be. A country can have
no code testing, some code testing, or universal code testing for an
amateur license, and still be in accordance with the treaty.

This may seem a semantic point but it's not. A sizable number of
countries insisted on the wording that was finally adopted.
>
> They could have pre-empted all this by stating something to the effect of
> "based upon recent previous commnets on the subject, we are suspending the
> requirement for Element 1 for access to HF licensure"....But nooooooooooo...

The majority of comments to 98-143 *supported* code testing. In fact,
the majority of comments to 98-143 supported *at least* 2 code test
speeds. Based on the majority of those comments, we'd still have at
least 12-13 wpm.

Look at the comments on the various petitions since July - what is the
majority saying?
>
> >Firstly, I think the reason they didn't go for a memorandum report and
> >order is more mundane. They don't care about any catfight because they
> >don't care about amateur radio, period.
>
> They really don't care about ANY radio, if you pay close attention to
> thier "thought processes" in other actions, Alun. I really don't think there
> are too many people up there who have a clear picture of what's going on in

> ANY radio service.

Perhaps the view is that they regulate "communications", not
"radio"...
>
> >Secondly, I don't think they will wait for any more petitions.
>
> Sure they will! They are BUREAUCRATS! They are >>all about"<< petitions,
> applications, hearings, and the PROCESS of administering...They are poorly
> prepared to deal with the EFFECTS of thier actions!

It's not a question of waiting. It's a question of when the petitions
stop coming in. Anybody can file a petition - that's the American way.
Unless the petition is clearly "not serious" (such as several similar
petitions from the same person or group in a short period of time),
FCC *has to* deal with them. Which takes very little in the way of
resources - that's what ECFS and the FCC computer system are for.
Biggest resource drain is that somebody at FCC has to read the
petitions and comments. That's a lot less of a task than writing an
NPRM and rules revisions, and all the research connected with same.
>
> >Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
> >were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.

Maybe. Or maybe not. If a resounding majority say they want Element 1,
things might go differently.
>
> Months and months later.....
>
> >1) Re-farming the Novice frequencies an increasing the phone allocations.
> >Here there is already an NPRM, and I think they will carry it out. It just
> >gives the same amount of additional spectrum to phone as is now Novice CW.
> >This is what they are going to do. It's less than I wanted, and even less
> >than the ARRL or the NCVEC asked for, but I'm betting it's all done;
>
> I dunno.....
>
> There's been what...a half dozen petitions in the last five or six years
> asking for the same thing and the FCC keeps thumbing thier noses at it...I
> don't understand why since the Novice license hasn't generated much interest
> since 1987

Whole bunch of reasons. One is the "nobody loses" thing - where do the
Novices and Tech Pluses go if the "Novice bands" become 'phone?

Another is the basic reason we have subbands-by-mode in the first
place. If the US phone subbands are widened, there's less room for CW
and the data modes. It amounts to rewarding the use of
spectrum-inefficient modes, and penalizing the use of
spectrum-efficient modes. And the DX 'phones will move still further
down the band to get away from the US QRM.
>

> >2) Eliminating supefluous licence classes. They will ultimately just do the
> >obvious, i.e. give Novices and Advanceds a free upgrade.

Why?

> >They won't revive
> >the Novice and kill off the Tech. They will view that as a waste of time.
> >The FCC is all for simplification, and they will point to the petitions as
> >providing the consensus they were looking for, even thought they are
> >slightly different.

Maybe.
>
> I really doubt they will "upgrade" the Novice since it's rapidly withering
> to nothingness...The Advanced...?!?! Maybe, but a lot of the Advanced guys see
> >THIER< license as being the last readily evident class as having been
> 13WPM/Old School tested and want nothing to do with "upgrades".
>
Such thinking about the Advanced is faulty, of course. From 1990 until
2000, the Advanced was available with 5 wpm code via waivers. And
after the restructuring of 2000, someone with valid CSCEs for 5 wpm
code and the Advanced writtens could get an Advanced *without* 13 wpm.

The big questions about free upgrades are simply: What's in it for
FCC? What does it really cost them to keep 'legacy' license classes on
the books?

I think the answer to both questions is "not much!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3860. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 12:29:24 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <FAKnc.25935$fE.7278@fed1read02>
Source record: 91924
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:20040510080105.200$yv@newsreader.com...
> "Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com> wrote:
> > I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the
> > radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply
> > convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
> >
> That's what everyone has told wa3moj, but he insists it's possible.
>
> --
> I won't retire, but I might retread.

He's probably convinced that it's possible because he knows most CB sets
have UHF coax connectors.

Ed
WB6WSN

3861. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 12:50:48 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510085048.609$c7@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91925
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Ed Price" <edprice@cox.net> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20040510080105.200$yv@newsreader.com...
> > "Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com> wrote:
> > > I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in
> > > the radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot
> > > simply convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
> > >
> > That's what everyone has told wa3moj, but he insists it's possible.
> >
> > --
> > I won't retire, but I might retread.
>
> He's probably convinced that it's possible because he knows most CB sets
> have UHF coax connectors.
>
> Ed
> WB6WSN
>
Could be that the electric cord cornfuses him too, Ed. :)

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3862. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 12:58:56 UTC
From: Roger Conroy <rogerconroy@nospam.hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <c7nudo$2l0$1@ctb-nnrp2.saix.net>
Source record: 91926
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Snip....
>
> He's probably convinced that it's possible because he knows most CB sets
> have UHF coax connectors.
>
>
> Ed
> WB6WSN

It may interest some to know that the "UHF" coax connector does not mean
Ultra High Frequency. It actually comes from the US Military (and probably
NATO) designation: Universal High Frequency Coaxial Connector. In this sense
"Universal" means it is found on "practically all" military HF rigs.

73
Roger ZR3RC

3863. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:49:57 UTC
From: Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <332v90daq8tojvmanqv5ro0v0g8g8i8rde@4ax.com>
Source record: 91927
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

On 10 May 2004 12:01:05 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote:

>"Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com> wrote:
>> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the
>> radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply
>> convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
>>
>That's what everyone has told wa3moj, but he insists it's possible.

Meters are no good. You need metres.

-Barry
========
Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.

3864. Re: Mopedophile can run his mouth on men's dicks...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:53:44 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510095344.302$5k@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N8WWM cum_eeter_chukkee@yahoo.com (KEYKLOWNS EAT DRIPPING DOGGIE DICKS)
wrote:
> ...but his faggot ass cannot stop the AKC from outing his queerness.
> Utter and complete powerlessness is all faggot ass mopedophile has.
>
Did you kiss your mom with that mouth, doug?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3865. Re: Mopedophile's favorite thing to do...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:54:37 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510095437.313$Ra@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91929
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N8WWM cum_eeter_chukkee@yahoo.com (KEYKLOWNS EAT DRIPPING DOGGIE DICKS)
wrote:
> Give head to men in truckstops.
>
Why so frumpy dougie?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3866. Re: Moped the limpwristed fairyboy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:56:32 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510095632.822$XL@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91930
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

cum_eeter_chukkee@yahoo.com (KEYKLOWNS EAT DRIPPING DOGGIE DICKS) wrote:
> Admit it Mopedophile, you like eating dudez dix...admit it faggot ass.
>
Dayton Tall Timbers?

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3867. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:57:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510095707.530$eA@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91932
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote:
> On 10 May 2004 12:01:05 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com> wrote:
> >> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the
> >> radio spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply
> >> convert a UHF x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
> >>
> >That's what everyone has told wa3moj, but he insists it's possible.
>
> Meters are no good. You need metres.
>
> -Barry
> ========
> Web page: http://members.optusnet.com.au/~barry.og
> Atheist, radio scanner, LIPD information.
>
Imperial gallons.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3868. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 13:57:22 UTC
From: cum_eeter_chukkee@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <527e4a01.0405100557.50b24499@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED
IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A
FAGGOTBOY!MOPED IS A FAGGOTBOY!
```

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> wrote in message
news:<20040509234536.005$KO@newsreader.com>...
> kk4tl@aol.com (LW) wrote:
> > "Timmy" wrote >...
> >
> > > These guys are nut cases in the extreme. A bunch of cranks, kooks, and
> > > a conglomerate of conspiracy theorists.
> >
> > Dag Nabbit Timmy you been knowing what these guys are for years. Too
> > bad Riley came along and made everyone behave.
> >
> > I bet if Riley would leave us alone, Sir Sidney and Kind Jewish Indian
> > would show The Great Liberty Net a thing or two.
> >
> Donut matter..the bpl makes your ears fubar'd eventually, so it's
> every station for themselves.
>
> I'm gonna have to dust off an amp I swore I'd never use again.

3869. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 14:00:13 UTC
From: Chuck Harris <cfharris@erols.com>
Message-ID: <409f8aee$0$3020$61fed72c@news.rcn.com>
Source record: 91933
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

References?

This sounds more like a retroactive acronym.

NATO didn't even exist when the UHF connector series
was first made.

The UHF connector was designed as a mate for RG-8 coax. It
was found on virtually all radios designed to drive RG-8
during that era. Typical examples of WWII vintage non HF
radios that used UHF connectors were the ARC-1 (120-150MHz),
SCR522(108-150MHz), BC-645 IFF (VHF/UHF) ... much later, the
UHF connector was used on the ARC-27(220-400MHz), URR-13/35(220-
400MHz), all two way base station radios in the 400-500MHz
bands...

I am inclined to go with the "they just didn't know any better"
explanation.

73,

Chuck Harris

Roger Conroy wrote:

> It may interest some to know that the "UHF" coax connector does not mean
> Ultra High Frequency. It actually comes from the US Military (and probably
> NATO) designation: Universal High Frequency Coaxial Connector. In this sense
> "Universal" means it is found on "practically all" military HF rigs.
>
> 73
> Roger ZR3RC
>
>

3870. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 14:20:32 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c7o33goee1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 91934
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Roger Conroy wrote:
>
> It may interest some to know that the "UHF" coax connector does not mean
> Ultra High Frequency. It actually comes from the US Military (and probably
> NATO) designation: Universal High Frequency Coaxial Connector. In this sense
> "Universal" means it is found on "practically all" military HF rigs.

Of course. Also, the BNC connector was originally devised for military applications during the war because existing connectors would rust badly under field conditions. The improved BNC was called that because the Base Never Corrodes.

The SMA connector is just too small to be able to carry any reasonable power level, which is why it got that designation. SMA stands for Stops MicroAmps.

I'd tell you what the designation on the N connector stands for, but it's obscene.
--scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

3871. Re: Permanent Residents who want to become hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 14:29:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxh5yk6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 91935

Robert Casey wrote:

>> The only exception is a representative of a foreign country. I have
>> a relative who is a diplomat of another country ("Country B") and
>> held a US license by examination before moving to "Country B" and
>> becoming a diplomat of that country. AFAIK s/he is able to retain
>> the US license as long as s/he is not accredited as a diplomat to
>> the United States (which is not likely to happen for quite a while
>> if ever).

> If he did get that diplomat accreditation, the FCC then couldn't do
> anything to him. Hell, you can shoplift and go drunk driving and they
> can't touch you if you're a diplomat. The only way New York City gets
> diplomats to pay up on parking tickets is to tow his car away, and he
> has to pay the tickets to get it back.

The FCC sure has a handle on someone who has an FCC license and becomes a representative of a foreign country (other than an "honorary consul" which is a U S citizen handling certain business or tourism activities). They can - and will - invalidate the FCC license that s/he holds.

If s/he commits an offense such as continuing to operate as an amateur without a license from the "home" country and meeting all the requirements for alien operation in the US, the US can - and will - lodge a formal complaint with the "home" country and if nothing is done can declare the person as "persona non grata" and give him/her 48 hours to leave the country. I've seen it done to someone who held a U N passport who thought that he could get away with something because of that. It was handled very quietly without paper subject to the FOIA being passed back and forth.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3872. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:07:24 UTC
From: Cecil Moore <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <409f9b54$1_3@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 91936
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Scott M wrote:
> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the radio
> spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply convert a UHF
> x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.

My 1956 ITT "Reference Data for Radio Engineers" lists
460-470 Mc as "Citizens radio" along with 27.225 Mc.
--
73, Cecil http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

3873. N8WWM will not feed his kids

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:11:23 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <0ab18f87c10fcb8c7f5f71acde219b2e@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 91937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap

What a piece of human trash doud adair tuned out to be.

LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
700 ADAMS STREET
TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 11:06:34 AM
DATE: 5/10/2004

CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL

MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:

Party Counsel Prosecutor
Defendant 1:
ADAIR DOUGLAS W
5319 SECOR RD.
TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
4199365120
411 N MICHIGAN
TOLEDO , OH 436241606

COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4

DATE SEQ EVENT
6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
PARTY : -
5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD
803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10%.

JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED & JOURNALIZED
CAPIAS C-174-842
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED & JOURNALIZED
CAPIAS C-174-843
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFD'T ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
SERVED ON 11/13/00
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
SERVED ON 11/12/00
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
SWANSON appointed as counsel.
Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
Sue Swanson
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:REC'D PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED
671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON

present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
ADAIR present in court.
Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
of probation.
Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
Seek and maintain gainful employment; 2) Defendant to seek
mental health counseling; 3) Execute wage withholding
agreement.
Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
associated with being granted probation. Payment of
financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
fees.
JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
SENTENCE C-184-502
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
terminated unsuccesfully
PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W

Just one look says it all.

http://us.share.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/upclosenfugly-dogie2.bmp

3874. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:20:11 UTC
From: Lou <FFSTA17NO@SPAMACCESS995.COM>
Message-ID: <L4Nnc.431$Jp.56142@ord-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 91938
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"Cecil Moore" <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:409f9b54$1_3@corp.newsgroups.com...
> Scott M wrote:
> > I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the
radio
> > spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply convert a
UHF
> > x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
>
> My 1956 ITT "Reference Data for Radio Engineers" lists
> 460-470 Mc as "Citizens radio" along with 27.225 Mc.
> --
> 73, Cecil http://www.qsl.net/w5dxp
>

Which was along the lines of my post to this a few moons back. He may have
been referring to the UHF Citizen's band - which this conversion may have
then be possible from another UHF range. BUT to take it to 26-27 MHz, I
don't think so!

Lou

3875. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:21:27 UTC
From: kk4tl@aol.com
Message-ID: <2b98299d.0405100721.6f0be8e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91939
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"beefourzees" <thwaccck2@yahoo.com> wrote >...

> Try taping a kiebassa to your leg and take
> a walk down Castro street. Then in no time
> you'll be so 'complete' that you'll be able
> to catch a softball with your arse..

You might wanna explain in more detail. Not sure Mr. Davies is
familiar with the following terms:
kielbasa
Castro Street
'complete' (in the context to which you referred).

In the interest of travel time, he could possibly achieve the same
effect in midtown Atlanta. Or Key West. Or the French Quarter.

3876. Re: N8WWM will not feed his kids

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:34:53 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510113453.796$VV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap

"Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote:
> What a piece of human trash doud adair tuned out to be.
>
> LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
> J. BERNIE QUILTER, CLERK
> 700 ADAMS STREET
> TOLEDO, OHIO TIME: 11:06:34 AM
> DATE: 5/10/2004
>
> CASE: G -4801 -CR -199606161
> TITLE: S/O V DOUGLAS W ADAIR
> JUDGE: JAMES D. JENSEN
> FILING DATE: 6/12/1996 CASE TYPE: CR CRIMINAL
>
> ---
> --- ----
> MONETARY AMOUNT: DOCKET/PAGE:
> ORIGINAL COURT: TAX TYPE:
> PREVIOUS CASE NUMBER: STATE OF OHIO NUMBER:
>
> ---
> --- ----
> Party Counsel Prosecutor
> Defendant 1:
> ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 5319 SECOR RD.
> TOLEDO , OH 43623 MARY S. SWANSON
> 4199365120
> 411 N MICHIGAN
> TOLEDO , OH 436241606
>
> ---
> --- ----
> COUNT PARTY DESCRIPTION ABBREV.
> 1 (D -1)ADAIR DOUGLAS W NONSUPPORT OF DEPENDENTS F4
>
> ---
> --- ----
> DATE SEQ EVENT
> 6/12/1996 1 Title : JRE:CASE ACTIVATION IN FACTS
> PARTY : -
> 5/31/2000 1 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ORDERED PER LCAPD

> 803-00499 issued by PJ (CAPIAS REQUEST GRANTED)
> Pursuant to the request of probation a capias is ordered
> issued. Bond is set at $5,000.00 no 10%.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED & JOURNALIZED
> CAPIAS C-174-842
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 2 Title : EVT:ORDER FILED & JOURNALIZED
> CAPIAS C-174-843
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 6/1/2000 3 Title : WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> C01-02080 issued by 163 (8931) WAR:CAPIAS ISSUED BY CLERK
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 1 Title : WAR:DEFD'T ARREST WARR/CAPIAS
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 2 Title : WAR:CAPIAS SERVED ON DEFENDANT
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 3 Title : HRG:PV HEARING SET
> November 17, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 4 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> SERVED ON 11/13/00
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/13/2000 5 Title : WAR:CAPIAS RETURN FILED
> SERVED ON 11/12/00
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/17/2000 1 Title : BND:SUPERVISED OR BOND ISSUED
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/17/2000 2 Title : MIS:CASE CONT AT DEF REQUEST
> 772-28458 issued by JTS (GENERAL CONTINUANCE FOR CRIMINAL CA
> Dated November 15, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. Defendant, DOUGLAS
> ADAIR present in court. Indigency Hearing held. MARY S.
> SWANSON appointed as counsel.
> Matter called for Probation Violation Hearing. Pursuant to
> the request of Defendant, matter rescheduled for Probation
> Violation Hearing on Friday, December 1, 2000 at 8:30 a.m.
> Bond is reset at Supervised Own Recognizance.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/22/2000 1 Title : ORD:ATTORNEY APPOINTED
> Sue Swanson
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/27/2000 1 Title : EVT:ORD FILE/JOUR$ THRU9/23/03
> RESCHEDULED PV HEARING C-183-1483
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 11/29/2000 1 Title : MIS:REC'D PSI/PV/CCV REPORT
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 12/1/2000 1 Title : ORD: PV/PROBATION CONTINUED

> 671-01526 issued by JTS (PROBATION VIOL - PROBATION CONTINUE
> Dated December 1, 2000. Court Reporter SANDRA CORPE
> ordered. State of Ohio: ANNE KIRKHOPE. MARY S. SWANSON
> present on behalf of the defendant. Defendant, DOUGLAS
> ADAIR present in court.
> Defendant having admitted to a probation violation, and
> having waived oral hearing, defendant is found in violation
> of probation.
> Defendant having been convicted of the offense of Nonsupport
> of Dependents, in violation of Revised Code Section
> 2919.21(A)(2), a felony of the 4TH degree.
> Probation as ordered by this Court on April 11, 1997 is
> ordered continued with the following added conditions: 1)
> Seek and maintain gainful employment; 2) Defendant to seek
> mental health counseling; 3) Execute wage withholding
> agreement.
> Defendant ordered to pay the costs of prosecution including
> any fees associated with the appointment of counsel. It is
> further ordered that the defendant pay any supervision fees
> associated with being granted probation. Payment of
> financial obligations shall be prioritized as restitution,
> supervision fees, court costs, fines, and assigned counsel
> fees.
> JUDGE JAMES D. JENSEN
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 12/5/2000 1 Title : EVT:JE FILE/JOUR $ THRU9/23/03
> SENTENCE C-184-502
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> 3/15/2002 1 Title : COMMUNITY CONTROL TERMINATED
> terminated unsuccesfully
> PARTY : D1 - ADAIR DOUGLAS W
> --
> Just one look says it all.
>
> http://us.share.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/upclosenfugly-dogie2.bmp
>
Hey, he's gotta feed crisco kathy first, she eats anything
you throw on the floor.

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3877. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:37:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <QkNnc.4124$fw5.1253@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 91941

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:EPudndKJ2a6XQgPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> > Hello, Mike
> >
> > Yep, I *love* that suggestion about programming in 911. Now, instead of
> > having to hit three buttons (9-1-1), you simply hit "memory-0-1".
> >
> > Wow! I *am* impressed :))
>
> hehe. Just like I have said on other subjects, you can't make things
> easy enough for some people. Even if the convenience insn't any more
> convenient.
>
>
>
> > I also like the idea about buying more cell phones. If the lines are
all
> > busy due to overloading, you have your whole family try dialing on 10
cell
> > phones. You increase your chances *ten* times! Reminder to self: go
buy
> > 100 lottery tickets; instead of 1 chance in 12 million, I'd have one
chance
> > in 120 thousand. Golly gee. Who'd have thunk?
>
> That is an important consideration. When there is an emergency, such as
> ice storm or hurricane or the like, it is incredibly compelling. Parents
> want to call their parents, big sis wants to call her best friend to see
> if she is alright, and little brother want's to compare freaky disaster
> notes with his bud's.
>
> If you've ever been in one, it is almost impossible to resist. You know
> that loved ones are worried sick about your predicament, and if you have
> a family of 3, and 3 cell phones, I'll wager that all three will be tried.
>
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> And from your QTH, I know you've been involved in some wethear
> disasters lately! 8^) We've hade them here in State College over the
> last 10 years, and cell service has gone out almost immediately. More

> cell phones will simply put it out of commission a few seconds quicker.
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

One interesting thing, Mike

I keep hearing how the repeaters aren't useful and they go out when the power goes down. I dunno, but when we had the big blackout - almost all of the repeaters were still hummin' away ;) There are at least two repeaters that aren't even connected to the mains. One is solar powered; the other is windmill powered. Regardless, my HT through the repeaters, gives me excellent coverage from Syracuse to the East, to Pennsylvania to the South, past Buffalo to the West, and through Toronto to the North. That is pretty fair 24/7 coverage.

One exception - the 10 meter port can open up worldwide, but that doesn't count for emergency use LOL.

BTW, I also don't buy lottery tickets. That is one reason I never win ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.681 / Virus Database: 443 - Release Date: 5/10/04

3878. Re: Lib Nutz Over The Top Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:40:43 UTC
From: - XC - <nobody@home.net>
Message-ID: <cYKdnSIO_b7gPwLdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 91942
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Timmy" <DumbassVic@LibNutz> wrote in message
news:c7kj2v$799$0@pita.alt.net...
> Dumbass Vic, W1WCR, was spouting his lies on the Lib Net again tonight.
> Dumbass said the United States provided Iraq and Saddam Hussein with the
> poiseness gas Hussein used on the Kurds. Vic said the gas was used to kill
> "a few" Kurds and Sheites.

He knows his history.

Back in the 80s our big mid-east enemy was Iran, and Iraq was the enemy of Iran and was also at war with them.
(Starting to make sense now? Remember the hostage crisis?) Saddam Hussein was also dealing with his own civil wars and was equally brutal in dealing with his own people.

As distasteful as this sounds, back then the US supplied Iraq with weaponry, intelligence, munitions, export-banned dual-use technologies, and biological products including anthrax. This was all done under "the enemy of our enemy is our friend" philosophy.

Check out this link, it's an easy read. The photo of Reagan Envoy Rumsfeld shaking hands with Hussein is classic.

http://www.iranchamber.com/history/articles/arming_iraq.php

To see a lot more information on this topic just do a Google search for "US supplies Iraq poison technology"

XC

3879. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:45:20 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c7o82g$ot8$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 91943
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

In article <409f9b54$1_3@corp.newsgroups.com>,
Cecil Moore <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote:
>Scott M wrote:
>> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the radio
>> spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply convert a UHF
>> x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
>
>My 1956 ITT "Reference Data for Radio Engineers" lists
>460-470 Mc as "Citizens radio" along with 27.225 Mc.

Class A, however, is long gone.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

3880. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 15:48:00 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E577D5C8652elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91944

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0405100234.102930ff@posting.google.com:

> daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in message
> news:<20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>... In article
> <20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>, daviesl2003@aol.com
> (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) writes:
>
>>>It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?
>
> What mode are those folks using for their alleged violations? It isn't
> Morse Code!
>>>
>>
>>Yes man I know that, but does'nt that blow a hole for those folks who
>>code to stay as a filter?
>>
> Not really.
>
> No test can be a perfect filter that somehow guarantees perfect
> behavior by everyone who passes it. That doesn't mean we don't need
> testing.
>
> Consider this plain, simple fact: All of those violators mentioned
> above allegedly passed *written* tests which covered the rules,
> regulations and operating practices. In fact most of them passed
> several written tests. Yet those tests have not prevented them from
> running afoul of the regulations. Thus, the written exams are not a
> "filter" either, even though they deal directly with the rules and
> regs.
>
> So, should we just dump the written tests because they're not a
> perfect filter?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

We should test on the rules so they have no excuse

3881. Re: N8WWM will not feed his kids

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 17:13:01 UTC
From: Walt Davidson <g3nyy@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <mldv90d4pi40lsuc4df6j20cm224djeanj@4ax.com>
Source record: 91945
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap

On 10 May 2004 15:34:53 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
wrote:

>Hey, he's gotta feed crisco kathy first, she eats anything
>you throw on the floor.

I don't know the person whom this refers to, but if he is mentally ill
he deserves sympathy and help ... not abuse.

73 de G3NYY

--
Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @despammed.com

3882. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 17:30:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3%Onc.830$zO3.530@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91946

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E4EC7B22200elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:HRxnc.318$zO3.81@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
> >> news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: News from France
> >> >>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
> >> >>
> >> >>Alun wrote:
> >> >
> >> >>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a licence
> >> >>> but for the code test. I think we could have had them in the hobby
> >> >>> if we had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but I think it is
> >> >>> too late and we have blown it. Nobody is clamouring to becme a ham
> >> >>> anymore.
> >> >
> >> > WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the opportunity
> >> > to get a
> >> > code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
> >> >
> >>
> >> Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.
> >
> > Why is that Alun? Do you think that getting out a decent signal on HF
> > is a piece of cake?
> >
> > Daily I hear the newguys trying to contact someone. Getting sorry
> > pathetic signal reports and going away in frustration.
> >
> > Wonder how many new HFers we lose like that? You know the ones that
> > believe its soooooo easy to get up on HF? Probably hundreds per week.
> >
> > I do the best I can when I hear someone like that. But it gets really
> > old when you trying to have a conversation with a bud, to talk to all
> > the S2 signals.
> >

> > Perhaps 'giving' out HF is NOT the answer as you think.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> And knowing CW is going to enhance their knowledge of how to set up and HF
> station? I think not.

That response does not surprise me a bit Alun. Based on the fact that you
do not know CW. How could you be expected to understand how much easier it
is to operate a simple CW station, that it is a phone one.

Dan/W4NTI

3883. Re: N8WWM will not feed his kids

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 17:32:25 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
Message-ID: <20040510133225.145$Fa@newsreader.com>
Source record: 91947
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap

Walt Davidson <g3nyy@despammed.com> wrote:
> On 10 May 2004 15:34:53 GMT, Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Hey, he's gotta feed crisco kathy first, she eats anything
> >you throw on the floor.
>
> I don't know the person whom this refers to, but if he is mentally ill
> he deserves sympathy and help ... not abuse.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
One might try to help him, if he wasn't such a lost cause. Check
him out.

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=n8wwm

--
I won't retire, but I might retread.

3884. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 21:24:04 UTC
From: Cecil Moore <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <409ff39f_3@corp.newsgroups.com>
Source record: 91948
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Scott Dorsey wrote:
> Cecil Moore <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote:
>>My 1956 ITT "Reference Data for Radio Engineers" lists
>>460-470 Mc as "Citizens radio" along with 27.225 Mc.
>
> Class A, however, is long gone.

As is Mc. :-)

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

3885. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 22:24:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40A00106.2090201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 91949
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Class A, however, is long gone.
>--scott
>
Didn't it morph into FRS?

>
>
>

3886. Re: RILEY SAYS K1MAN BROADCASTS ARE LEGAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 22:30:50 UTC
From: Steve Nosko <suteuve.nosukowicuz@moutouroula.com>
Message-ID: <c7ovuo$qf6$1@newshost.mot.com>
Source record: 91951
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

OT, so to speak.

What ever happened to the K1MAN thing? When I got re-activated several years ago, I happened across his 'casts on the air, then the Riley activities, then nothing...or at least I missed it.
--
Steve N, K,9;d, c. i My email has no u's.

3887. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 22:31:02 UTC
From: "No Spam"@attglobal.net
Message-ID: <ifgU75G3LLdo-pn2-JcVtVQ2Mzj2U@localhost>
Source record: 91950
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 10 May 2004 09:27:53 UTC, "Scott M" <spamkiller@elp.rr.com>
wrote:

> I HIGHLY doubt it's even possible. UHF is so far from 11 meters in the radio
> spectrum that aside from scrounging parts, one cannot simply convert a UHF
> x-cvr to 11 m or vise-versa.
>
> "Gary hildebrand" <ghldbrd@ccp.com> wrote in message
> news:598dc4be.0405031436.6f51ff7f@posting.google.com...
> > WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com> wrote in message
> news:<c60cuk02d43@drn.newsguy.com>...
> > > Hi all, I'm looking for a good reference manual, pdf file, or web site's
> that
> > > will assist me in converting used UHF gear to operate on 11 meters. I'm
> finding
> > > there is a substantial market for such gear and I'll need some
> references for
> > > various solid state and tube conversions.
> > >
> > > Thanks in advance for any help.
> > >
> > > WA3MOJ
> >
> > First, the circuit techniques for UHF receiver front ends and
> > transmitter PA's are totally different than those on 11 meters.
> > Conversion becomes wholesale replacement of about half of the radio.
> >
> > Second, <<`ALL'>> CB radios must be type-accepted by the FCC for use
> > on the air. Unless you have the thousands of dollars for R&D, and
> > legal assistance to complete this, forget the whole thing.
> >
> > What you are trying to do is tantamount to modifing a VCR into a
> > satellite uplink to jam television satellites. Can't get there from
> > here, No how, now way. Zip. Nada. The BIG goose egg.
> >
> > Now you could use UHF commercial radios on the GMRS (former Class A CB
> > channels) with very little problem. Just change crystals or reprogram
> > the synthesizer in the radio, tweak, and you're in business. Any
> > competent two-way radio shop can do that.
> >
> > I'd suggest you study a LOT more on basic electronic theory, and
> > circuit design before you post such an asinine question.
> >

> > Gary Hildebrand WA7KKP

Couple things gang.

The original note was likely a Troll. It wasn't a serious request for information. I don't know the 3MOJ story but there's something odd going on, flame-war, troll baiting, etc.

The use of "UHF" might be a typo, where the intent was "HF".

The other possibility is the freebanders have a different terminology from standard radio talk.

VHF and UHF in freebander, bandit CB lingo isn't 100 mhz, 500 mhz, etc. VHF and UHF are band segments just above 27 mHz and below 30 mHz. .

3888. Re: Cingular Warns Of Weather Related Limitations In Hurricaine Areas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-10 23:30:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rpmdnSg2b589jT3dRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91952

Jim Hampton wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:EPudndKJ2a6XQgPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hello, Mike
>>>
>>>Yep, I *love* that suggestion about programming in 911. Now, instead of
>>>having to hit three buttons (9-1-1), you simply hit "memory-0-1".
>>>
>>>Wow! I *am* impressed :))
>>
>>hehe. Just like I have said on other subjects, you can't make things
>>easy enough for some people. Even if the convenience insn't any more
>>convenient.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>I also like the idea about buying more cell phones. If the lines are
>
> all
>
>>>busy due to overloading, you have your whole family try dialing on 10
>
> cell
>
>>>phones. You increase your chances *ten* times! Reminder to self: go
>
> buy
>
>>>100 lottery tickets; instead of 1 chance in 12 million, I'd have one
>
> chance
>
>>>in 120 thousand. Golly gee. Who'd have thunk?
>>
>>That is an important consideration. When there is an emergency, such as
>>ice storm or hurricane or the like, it is incredibly compelling. Parents
>>want to call their parents, big sis wants to call her best friend to see
>>if she is alright, and little brother want's to compare freaky disaster
>>notes with his bud's.

>>
>>If you've ever been in one, it is almost impossible to resist. You know
>>that loved ones are worried sick about your predicament, and if you have
>>a family of 3, and 3 cell phones, I'll wager that all three will be tried.
>>
>>
>>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>>And from your QTH, I know you've been involved in some wethear
>>disasters lately! 8^) We've hade them here in State College over the
>>last 10 years, and cell service has gone out almost immediately. More
>>cell phones will simply put it out of commission a few seconds quicker.
>>
>>- mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> One interesting thing, Mike
>
> I keep hearing how the repeaters aren't useful and they go out when the
> power goes down. I dunno, but when we had the big blackout - almost all of
> the repeaters were still hummin' away ;)

Our repeater system has diesel generators at each site that will
operate for over a week in the event of power failure. they hardly even
hiccup for loss of mains power!

There are at least two repeaters
> that aren't even connected to the mains. One is solar powered; the other is
> windmill powered.

Now that is cool. I've toyed around with the idea of going solar
myself. It is a great thing for a repeater tho'.

Regardless, my HT through the repeaters, gives me
> excellent coverage from Syracuse to the East, to Pennsylvania to the South,
> past Buffalo to the West, and through Toronto to the North. That is pretty
> fair 24/7 coverage.
>
> One exception - the 10 meter port can open up worldwide, but that doesn't
> count for emergency use LOL.
>
> BTW, I also don't buy lottery tickets. That is one reason I never win ;)

hehe, neither do I.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3889. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 00:13:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OoOdnUo838suhz3dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91953

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
>
>>My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation,
>
> there
>
>>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What
>
> they
>
>>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing
>
> interest
>
>>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".
>
>
> BANG! Drove that nail with a single blow, Mike!

What was it they used to say - "indisputable truth"?

>>Whether it is the Morse code requirement, or the cost of a rig or
>>effort of putting up an antenna, or the cost of a telescope or the
>> need
>>to travel to remote areas that are dark enough or the fact that you
>> have to stay up all night to observe, etc, etc.

>
> This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
> marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
> run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...

Some comedian needs to pick that one up. It is truly, classically funny!

>
>>People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the
>> hobby and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can
>> actually be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>>money.
>
> Is it really so much money, Mike? I've heard that there are some folks
> who make their own 'scopes, down to the grinding of lenses and mirrors
> and such. And of course there are used telescopes. But the telescope

> itself is probably the least of the issues.

I've made two telescopes so far. The only thing I bought was eyepieces and the eyepiece holder. While it is true that you can make one for very little money - especially when you get really lucky, like I did, and find 3 12.5 inch blanks for 15 dollars each. For most people it will cost some serious dough to get quality. Of course there is the definition of quality and serious dough!

BTW, 15 dollar 12.5 inch Pyrex blanks are the rough equivalent of finding an almost new, mint FT-1000 MV Field, loaded, for 100 dollars, so there is your luck!

But that kind of deal took patience and of course much luck. A commercial version of the larger scope I made would set you back around 3.5 to 4K dollars. And it probably wouldn't have as good a mirror.

Basic rule of thumb is department store scopes are truly junk.

The inexpensive Dobsonians (a type of alt-az mount, usually with a reflector mirror) often have passable optics, but usually need mechanical work to perform well. You can get some 6 inch variety for around 300 dollars. So if you are willing to put in the time....

Most refractors have a phenomenon called "color", in which not all wavelengths of light are focused to the same point. Drives me crazy. The better ones have what is called an APO lens, in which rare earth glasses are used to focus the light all at the same place. And yup, they cost money. I've looked through a number of 12K scopes. Lovely planet images, but not all that much light gathering power.

>>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
>
> be
>
>>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>>
>
> Here's another issue:
>
> If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
> and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
> hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
> pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
> a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
> equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
> knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
> what is seen, either.

simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)

> Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as
> seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.

I'm glad I saw that sentence! Yes the images provided by Hubble are
stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there) But
some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
alone, the experience is no comparison.

>
>>In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have
>> to be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on
>> a rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the
>> other
>>things we have to do to get on the air.
>>
>
> The biggest investments aren't monetary. It's the time and effort.

There is that!

>>Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
>>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so
>>happily upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field
>> day.
>
> 37 years ago I was one of those young hams, and got no help from the
> parental units. Today's kids are no different. The big difference
> today is that for too many folks the antenna is a really big deal.
> Heck, look how many *adult* hams can't figure out how to put up an
> effective HF antenna these days...
>
>>Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two.
>
>>Beyond the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time
>>keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical
>> acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?
>
>
> Since the advent of GUIs the whole point of personal computing has
> been to make it easier for *everyone* to use them. That's what has
> driven the industry for 20+ years.

Yup, Troubleshooting has become figuring out which software switch to
turn *off* for the "helpful" GUI.

Funny - I spend a lot of time getting peoples PC's running, but my main
computer at work is a G5, Dual Processor MAC. Oh so sweet!

>>My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
>>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like
>>saying that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is
>>deaf.
>
> I wish I knew where that one came from!
>
>
>>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
>
>
> Here's a datapoint for ya:
>
> In 1972 I graduated from a suburban Catholic boys' high school. This
> was in a solidly middle-class area, at a school that stressed math and
> science (AP courses available in those days were calculus, physics,
> chemistry, and history). My graduating class was over 600. IIRC
> exactly three of us graduates were hams. Of those three, only I am
> still licensed.
>
> The girls' high school next door (literally) was slightly larger - and
> had no hams at all. Out of maybe 5000 kids in grades 9 through 12
> there were perhaps 9 or 10 licensed hams.
>
> The reasons for the scarcity were many. For example, many
> extracurricular activities competed for our time and energy. (Like
> this blonde 11th grader who - no, wait, wrong newsgroup...). There was
> no organized school activity until we kids started a radio club of our
> own, which rose and fell on the efforts of us kids. More than a few
> kids back then though amateur radio was "square" - its conservative
> political nature (K7UGA) and military ties made more than a few look
> askance.
>
> Most of all, those were the boom times for cb. For less than the cost
> of a half-decent used receiver like a Drake 2B, one could head over to
> Lafayette Radio or one of its competitors and bring home a complete
> setup - 23 channel transceiver, groundplane antenna, coax, mounting
> hardware, etc. All brand new, ready to go. And if you had a car, a few
> more dollars bought a mobile mount and 102" whip antenna. License?
> Just fill out a form - but in fact many did not bother to do even that
> much. No tuneup, no fancy adjustments - just pick a channel, push the
> button and talk.

Ahhh, memories! Station KBM-8780 had a Lafayette HE-20C. 8 crystal
controlled channels and a tuner for the channels you didn't have
crystals for. A colinear on the roof, and having fun.

> I don't know how many kids in my school had cbs or access to them, but
> they outnumbered us hams back then. Some of them became hams, most
> lost interest when the cb boom ended.
>
> Things haven't changed all that much, except now it's the 'net that's

> a prime competitor.

I still don't think it is much of a competitor, but maybe to the participants, they think they are being hi-tech..

- Mike KB3EIA -

3890. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 03:31:25 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91954

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:3%Onc.830$zO3.530@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E4EC7B22200elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:HRxnc.318$zO3.81@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94E467C622572elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
>> >> news:20040509100853.23382.00001106@mb-m14.aol.com:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: News from France
>> >> >>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>> >> >>Date: 5/9/2004 8:38 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>Alun wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >>> I always used to meet people who told me they would get a
>> >> >>> licence but for the code test. I think we could have had them
>> >> >>> in the hobby if we had abolished code testing 20 years ago, but
>> >> >>> I think it is too late and we have blown it. Nobody is
>> >> >>> clamouring to becme a ham anymore.
>> >> >
>> >> > WE haven't "blown" anything..."They" have had the
>> >> > opportunity to get a
>> >> > code-free license for what...12-13 years now..?!?!
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Nope, we needed to give them HF while they were still interested.
>> >
>> > Why is that Alun? Do you think that getting out a decent signal on
>> > HF is a piece of cake?
>> >
>> > Daily I hear the newguys trying to contact someone. Getting sorry
>> > pathetic signal reports and going away in frustration.
>> >
>> > Wonder how many new HFers we lose like that? You know the ones that
>> > believe its soooooo easy to get up on HF? Probably hundreds per
>> > week.

>> >
>> > I do the best I can when I hear someone like that. But it gets
>> > really old when you trying to have a conversation with a bud, to
>> > talk to all the S2 signals.
>> >
>> > Perhaps 'giving' out HF is NOT the answer as you think.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> And knowing CW is going to enhance their knowledge of how to set up
>> and HF station? I think not.
>
> That response does not surprise me a bit Alun. Based on the fact that
> you do not know CW. How could you be expected to understand how much
> easier it is to operate a simple CW station, that it is a phone one.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued

3891. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 15:52:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040511115252.15479.00001256@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91955

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: Steve Stone spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net
>Date: 5/10/2004 6:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <MPG.1b092ca162e0dc149898ee@news.frontiernet.net>
>
>I think the most popular 2 meter repeater frequencies and simplex calling
>freqs should be
>added to new FRS/GMRS blister pack radios in WalMart with a little scrunched
>up
>application for an FCC license placed in the package just where you would put
>a knife thru
>it to open the blister pack.

I'd be careful about how you say that...

Some idiot will take it to Wally-world and it may happen!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3892. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 16:20:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405110820.45fb6328@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91956

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94E577D5C8652elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0405100234.102930ff@posting.google.com:
>
> > daviesl2003@aol.com (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) wrote in message
> > news:<20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>... In article
> > <20040508004752.16549.00000917@mb-m04.aol.com>, daviesl2003@aol.com
> > (Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord) writes:
> >
> >>>It is already headed that way. Ummmm K1MAN? 14.313? 75 meters?
> >
> > What mode are those folks using for their alleged violations? It isn't
> > Morse Code!
> >>>
> >>
> >>Yes man I know that, but does'nt that blow a hole for those folks who
> >>code to stay as a filter?
> >>
> > Not really.
> >
> > No test can be a perfect filter that somehow guarantees perfect
> > behavior by everyone who passes it. That doesn't mean we don't need
> > testing.
> >
> > Consider this plain, simple fact: All of those violators mentioned
> > above allegedly passed *written* tests which covered the rules,
> > regulations and operating practices. In fact most of them passed
> > several written tests. Yet those tests have not prevented them from
> > running afoul of the regulations. Thus, the written exams are not a
> > "filter" either, even though they deal directly with the rules and
> > regs.
> >
> > So, should we just dump the written tests because they're not a
> > perfect filter?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> We should test on the rules so they have no excuse

We *do* test on the rules, Alun! Every class of amateur radio license
in the USA includes rules'n'regs testing. And most hams follow the
rules. But it's not a perfect filter, as is proved by the violations.

If you mean there should be a completely separate test on rules, or that the written test should be scored in sections so that one cannot pass without knowing a significant amount of the rules'n'regs, I agree 100%. But I can guarantee you that no one-time written test will filter out 100% of rules violators.

Heck, some time back we had the case of new ham (I'll let you guess what license class) using a modified amateur transceiver to send phony distress calls on the VHF marine band. The Coast Guard had to take the calls seriously until they knew for sure they were fake. The written test didn't stop that fellow, just like the code test didn't stop the folks above. So why do we need either?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3893. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 16:27:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040511122730.15479.00001259@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 91957

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 5/10/2004 7:16 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0405100416.218548bc@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>> Despite supporting Code testing, I am also of the mind that once the
>> majority has spoken, it's time to move on.
>
>Which majority?
>
>What happened at WRC-2003 was *not* the abolition of code testing.
>Instead, the treaty was modified so that each country decides for
>itself what its code testing requirement will be. A country can have
>no code testing, some code testing, or universal code testing for an
>amateur license, and still be in accordance with the treaty.
>
>This may seem a semantic point but it's not. A sizable number of
>countries insisted on the wording that was finally adopted.

Therein lies your majority, Jim.

And let's not kid ourselves...there's been a growing number of people,
wether they commented directly to the FCC or not, that is in favor of doing
away with Code testing.

Again...I don't agree with it, but it's out there and unless there's some
epiphany at FCC, it will become the law of the land in some time, if not "due"
time. I just hope we (you, I, other Code test/use supporters) can move in some
constructive way to minimize the damage.

>> They could have pre-empted all this by stating something to the effect
>of
>> "based upon recent previous commnets on the subject, we are suspending the
>> requirement for Element 1 for access to HF licensure"....But
>noooooooooooo...
>
>The majority of comments to 98-143 *supported* code testing. In fact,
>the majority of comments to 98-143 supported *at least* 2 code test
>speeds. Based on the majority of those comments, we'd still have at
>least 12-13 wpm.
>
>Look at the comments on the various petitions since July - what is the
>majority saying?

I agree. But the FCC has almost always been a left-leaning agency, and
will continue to be so. I have no doubt that they will act to lose the code
tests. Thier previous comments have already set the tone for what they plan on
doing, comments to the contrary.

> >Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
> >were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.
>
>Maybe. Or maybe not. If a resounding majority say they want Element 1,
>things might go differently.

I see one of four things happening.

First of all is nothing. But the FCC never does "nothing", even when it's
the best course of action in the first place.

Secondly is to completely drop Code testing for all levels of licensure.
I am hoping-against-hope that they DON'T do this, but I am afraid that it is
EXACTLY what they will do.

Third is to drop the Code test for the General and leaving in the Code
test for the Extra. This is what I hope will happen.

Lastly is creating a new, Code-free HF license between the Technician
Plus-level folks and the General. However I can't see the FCC creating a NEW
license when they just went through all the hoop-laa of paring it down to
three. If they did this, I'd give the present Code-tested Generals access to
the Advanced Class sub-bands and let the new folks have the current General
allocations, minus the WARC bands and 160 meters.

Why? Why not..?!?!

> There's been what...a half dozen petitions in the last five or six years
> asking for the same thing and the FCC keeps thumbing thier noses at it...I
> don't understand why since the Novice license hasn't generated much interest
> since 1987

Whole bunch of reasons. One is the "nobody loses" thing - where do the
Novices and Tech Pluses go if the "Novice bands" become 'phone?

The question should be "where are they now?"...Access them to the General
class non-phone bands on the same bands they have allocations on
now....3525-3750, 7025-7150, 21025 to 21200 and 28000 to 28.300.

>Another is the basic reason we have subbands-by-mode in the first
>place. If the US phone subbands are widened, there's less room for CW
>and the data modes. It amounts to rewarding the use of
>spectrum-inefficient modes, and penalizing the use of
>spectrum-efficient modes. And the DX 'phones will move still further
>down the band to get away from the US QRM.

I agree.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3894. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 17:00:51 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net>
Message-ID: <qk12a0h5v8sean031qmqjvjleukps1b1v5@4ax.com>
Source record: 91958
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

On Mon, 10 May 2004 22:24:07 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>>
>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Class A, however, is long gone.
>>--scott
>>
>Didn't it morph into FRS?

Actually, it morphed into GMRS.

Dave
http://home.ptd.net/~n3cvj

3895. Re: N8WWM will not feed his kids

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 18:07:50 UTC
From: The Dub Tub <54321ernie@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <abc75$40a11668$d1cc5ac4$4457@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 91959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.swap

"Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in message
news:0ab18f87c10fcb8c7f5f71acde219b2e@news.teranews.com...
> What a piece of human trash doud adair tuned out to be.

Very good, Weber, we haven't seen this one before.
You've earned a carrot.

Well? Bend over! :)

3896. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 18:09:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tF8oc.2097$zO3.140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91960

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued

And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a callsign.
And I am not going to play detective.

Dan/W4NTI

3897. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 18:56:26 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <do72a0h2l84tstj6d6dj429amuge3019vg@4ax.com>
Source record: 91961

On Tue, 11 May 2004 18:09:29 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
>
>And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a callsign.
>And I am not going to play detective.

Let me help out with that....it's in many of Alun's posts:

N3KIP - Extra class. Issued March 10, 2004. (is that the original
date, or a renewal?)

Or G0VUK, in the UK.

>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

73, Leo

3898. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 19:26:15 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <rN9oc.27263$z06.4494709@attbi_s01>
Source record: 91962

> BTW, 15 dollar 12.5 inch Pyrex blanks are the rough equivalent of
> finding an almost new, mint FT-1000 MV Field, loaded, for 100 dollars,
> so there is your luck!

Excellent Mike ...I made a 4 inch reflector yrs ago ....this fellow had slabs of glass he got for free ...we made up a cutting saw out of brass and with patience ...a drill press and some slag ....we were able to cut out blanks. Grinding and polishing were fun ...but I gave the scope away years ago. About 4 yrs ago I bought a 6 inch reflector which I have a ball with ..... when I have the time ... We are worried about BPL qrm ...funny that the same hold true re light pollution for the astronomy set.

73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

3899. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-11 22:03:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405111403.6fbf514@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91963

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<OoOdnUo838suhz3dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
> >
> >>My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation,
> >
> > there
> >
> >>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What
> >
> > they
> >
> >>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing
> >
> > interest
> >
> >>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".
> >
> >
> > BANG! Drove that nail with a single blow, Mike!
>
> What was it they used to say - "indisputable truth"?

Yet some will dispute it anyway.
>
> >>Whether it is the Morse code requirement, or the cost of a rig or
> >>effort of putting up an antenna, or the cost of a telescope or the
> >> need
> >>to travel to remote areas that are dark enough or the fact that you
> >> have to stay up all night to observe, etc, etc.
>
> >
> > This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
> > marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
> > run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...
>
>Some comedian needs to pick that one up. It is truly, classically
funny!
>
For some folks it's not a joke, though. They really don't see why the
distance has to be 26.22 miles - after all, we'd have more marathoners

if it were shorter. Or if people were allowed to use rollerblades,
scooters, or bicycles to cover the distance. After all, running is
truly *ancient* transportation technology. As a communications
technology, (the marathon is based on ancient Greek runners, who were
primarily messengers, not athletes) running has been replaced by
methods that are faster, more error-free, less expensive...

> >>People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the
> >> hobby and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can
> >> actually be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
> >>money.
> >
> > Is it really so much money, Mike? I've heard that there are some folks
> > who make their own 'scopes, down to the grinding of lenses and mirrors
> > and such. And of course there are used telescopes. But the telescope
> > itself is probably the least of the issues.
>
> I've made two telescopes so far. The only thing I bought was eyepieces
> and the eyepiece holder. While it is true that you can make one for very
> little money - especially when you get really lucky, like I did, and
> find 3 12.5 inch blanks for 15 dollars each. For most people it will
> cost some serious dough to get quality. Of course there is the
> definition of quality and serious dough!
>
> BTW, 15 dollar 12.5 inch Pyrex blanks are the rough equivalent of
> finding an almost new, mint FT-1000 MV Field, loaded, for 100 dollars,
> so there is your luck!

I would imagine that one can have tremendous fun in astronomy with
less-than-state-of-the-art equipment. Just like amateur radio.
>
> But that kind of deal took patience and of course much luck. A
> commercial version of the larger scope I made would set you back around
> 3.5 to 4K dollars. And it probably wouldn't have as good a mirror.
>
> Basic rule of thumb is department store scopes are truly junk.
>
> The inexpensive Dobsonians (a type of alt-az mount, usually with a
> reflector mirror) often have passable optics, but usually need
> mechanical work to perform well. You can get some 6 inch variety for
> around 300 dollars. So if you are willing to put in the time....

There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
itself)
>
> Most refractors have a phenomenon called "color", in which not all
> wavelengths of light are focused to the same point. Drives me crazy. The
> better ones have what is called an APO lens, in which rare earth glasses
> are used to focus the light all at the same place. And yup, they cost
> money. I've looked through a number of 12K scopes. Lovely planet images,
> but not all that much light gathering power.

>
Various rig designs have different good and bad features. For example,
the wonderful K2 has really good dynamic range and very low phase
noise but its display accuracy is *only* about 20-30 Hz even if the
reference oscillator is set dead-on. This is a result of how the PLL
works. Most owners don't care but there are some hams who are not
satisfied with 20 Hz error.
>
> >>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
> >>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
> >>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
> >
> > be
> >
> >>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
> >>
> >
> > Here's another issue:
> >
> > If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
> > and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
> > hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
> > pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
> > a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
> > equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
> > knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
> > what is seen, either.
>
> simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)

Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?

> > Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as
> > seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.
>
> I'm glad I saw that sentence!

It's the same in amateur radio. Yet the point of *direct experience*
is simply something many people simply "don't get".

> Yes the images provided by Hubble are
> stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)

It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.

> But
> some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
> observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
> alone, the experience is no comparison.

Of course.

And some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all
night,
working CW/Morse on a wide open amateur band, sharing QSOs with fellow
hams all over the country. Or world. There is no comparison to the
experience.

Here's another point: Seeking the direct experience is also
unpredictable in that the seeker is usually at the mercy of Nature.
You can have the best 'scope imaginable, and an excellent site, but if
the weather doesn't cooperate you're out of luck. Also, the stars and
planets don't move to a human schedule - you may have to wait months
or years to see even some of the more common objects. (Want to see
Saturn on a moonless night when it is closest to Earth? Don't hold yer
breath!)

And most professional astronomers rarely if ever actually look through
a telescope. At most they do so for calibration. Actual observations
are almost all done by various sensors and instruments. Indeed, if my
information is correct, direct observation in visible light is pretty
"old fashioned" - that stuff was all done 100+ years ago, wasn't it?

Of course, every so often an amateur will make a real discovery, such
as finding a new comet or some such. Just like amateur radio.
> >
> >>In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have
> >> to be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on
> >> a rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the
> >> other
> >>things we have to do to get on the air.
> >>
> >
> > The biggest investments aren't monetary. It's the time and effort.
>
> There is that!

Which is why some recruiting efforts are misdirected.

> >>Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
> >>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
> >>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so
> >>happily upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
> >>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field
> >> day.
> >
> > 37 years ago I was one of those young hams, and got no help from the
> > parental units. Today's kids are no different. The big difference
> > today is that for too many folks the antenna is a really big deal.
> > Heck, look how many *adult* hams can't figure out how to put up an
> > effective HF antenna these days...
> >
> >>Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at

> >>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two.
>
> >>Beyond the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time
> >>keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical
> >> acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?
> >
> >
> > Since the advent of GUIs the whole point of personal computing has
> > been to make it easier for *everyone* to use them. That's what has
> > driven the industry for 20+ years.
>
> Yup, Troubleshooting has become figuring out which software switch to
> turn *off* for the "helpful" GUI.

To most of us the 'puter is a tool - a means to an end, not the end in
itself.
>
> Funny - I spend a lot of time getting peoples PC's running, but my main
> computer at work is a G5, Dual Processor MAC. Oh so sweet!
>
> >>My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
> >>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like
> >>saying that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is
> >>deaf.
> >
> > I wish I knew where that one came from!
> >
> >
> >>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
> >
> >
> > Here's a datapoint for ya:
> >
> > In 1972 I graduated from a suburban Catholic boys' high school. This
> > was in a solidly middle-class area, at a school that stressed math and
> > science (AP courses available in those days were calculus, physics,
> > chemistry, and history). My graduating class was over 600. IIRC
> > exactly three of us graduates were hams. Of those three, only I am
> > still licensed.
> >
> > The girls' high school next door (literally) was slightly larger - and
> > had no hams at all. Out of maybe 5000 kids in grades 9 through 12
> > there were perhaps 9 or 10 licensed hams.
> >
> > The reasons for the scarcity were many. For example, many
> > extracurricular activities competed for our time and energy. (Like
> > this blonde 11th grader who - no, wait, wrong newsgroup...). There was
> > no organized school activity until we kids started a radio club of our
> > own, which rose and fell on the efforts of us kids. More than a few
> > kids back then though amateur radio was "square" - its conservative

> > political nature (K7UGA) and military ties made more than a few look
> > askance.
> >
> > Most of all, those were the boom times for cb. For less than the cost
> > of a half-decent used receiver like a Drake 2B, one could head over to
> > Lafayette Radio or one of its competitors and bring home a complete
> > setup - 23 channel transceiver, groundplane antenna, coax, mounting
> > hardware, etc. All brand new, ready to go. And if you had a car, a few
> > more dollars bought a mobile mount and 102" whip antenna. License?
> > Just fill out a form - but in fact many did not bother to do even that
> > much. No tuneup, no fancy adjustments - just pick a channel, push the
> > button and talk.
>
> Ahhh, memories! Station KBM-8780 had a Lafayette HE-20C. 8 crystal
> controlled channels and a tuner for the channels you didn't have
> crystals for. A colinear on the roof, and having fun.

Lafayette was a big deal around here. All gone now.
>
> > I don't know how many kids in my school had cbs or access to them, but
> > they outnumbered us hams back then. Some of them became hams, most
> > lost interest when the cb boom ended.
> >
> > Things haven't changed all that much, except now it's the 'net that's
> > a prime competitor.
>
> I still don't think it is much of a competitor, but maybe to the
> participants, they think they are being hi-tech..

All depends who does the defining. For some folks, following the
directions and unpacking/setting up/getting their computer to work is
high tech. For others, assembling a custom one from boards/case/drives
and loading the software isn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3900. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 00:59:38 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040511205938.28360.00000016@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 91964

In article <qk12a0h5v8sean031qmqjvjleukps1b1v5@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
<nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> writes:

>On Mon, 10 May 2004 22:24:07 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>wrote:
>
>>>
>>>Class A, however, is long gone.
>>>--scott
>>>
>>Didn't it morph into FRS?
>
>Actually, it morphed into GMRS.

Actually NO. Class A and B of the original Citizens Band went the way
of all old, unused assignments and were swallowed up by a considerable
number of reallocations for other radio services. Happened over two
decades ago. GMRS and FRS are relative newcomers to U.S. civil
radio.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

3901. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 01:29:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040511212903.17668.00000339@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 91965

>Subject: Re: Radio Conversion
>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
>Date: 5/11/2004 7:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040511205938.28360.00000016@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
>In article <qk12a0h5v8sean031qmqjvjleukps1b1v5@4ax.com>, Dave Hall
><nojunk_n3cvj@ptd.net> writes:
>
>>On Mon, 10 May 2004 22:24:07 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>>wrote:
>>
>>>>>
>>>>Class A, however, is long gone.
>>>>--scott
>>>>
>>>Didn't it morph into FRS?
>>
>>Actually, it morphed into GMRS.
>
> Actually NO. Class A and B of the original Citizens Band went the way
> of all old, unused assignments and were swallowed up by a considerable
> number of reallocations for other radio services. Happened over two
> decades ago. GMRS and FRS are relative newcomers to U.S. civil
> radio.

Actually, yes..."morphed" into GMRS is EXACTLY what happened.

Read the definition of "morph", Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

3902. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 02:04:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405111804.1c3c8d5f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91966

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/7/2004 5:57 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405070257.78d83560@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040506215522.22537.00000010@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> >> >Steve, its obvious that you're nuts and I'm not.
> >>
> >> To WHO...?!?!
> >>
> >> YOU...?!?!
> >>
> >> A documented liar? A "man" who won't stand behind his own word?
> >>
> >> Am I supposed to be impressed by this?
> >>
> >> Sheeeeeeesh. You really ARE an idiot.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Poor demented Steve.
> >
> >I told you that the zero in my callsign stood for the tenth district,
> >not the zeroeth district.
>
> I understand that for Amateur Radio applications the ZERO in the callsign
> is for the tenth call district. Unlike you, I can think in the abstract.

Then why did it take me to point it out to you???

> I also understand there is only one numeral in your callsign. It >>IS<< a
> ZERO.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but there's also only one numeral in your
callsign, and it stands for only one numeral in the FCC's callsign
districts.

> So are you.

Obviously I'm a 10.

> It really is THAT simple.

Then why don't you get it???

> >And so you call me a liar and an idiot, and insinuate that I'm not a
> >man.
>
> You are a liar.

No, I am telling the truth.

You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done
> in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with ANY
> form of proof.

I've done them, yet I owe you no proof.

> You're an idiot because you keep exposing yourself to such ridicule even
> though you've been caught doing it over and over.

There you go calling me names again.

> I doubt you're much of a man because of your foolish regard for your own
> reputation and reckless behaviour in a public forum

Steve, you're broken. I can't help you - broken people aren't my area
of expertise. Go get fixed. Go get help.

> >Get help.
>
> For what? Making a fool out of you? That's what I HAVE you for,
> PuppetBoy! Now...Tell us all about your hero Lennie...How proud you are to be
> associated with him...How you worked "portable" from Somalia without proper
> authorization to do so. Then you can ALSO provide us with SOME sort of proof
> to substantiate YOUR claim that "unlicensed radio services play a major role in
> disaster communications....

Welp, Steve, I had proper authorization to operate amateur radio in
Somalia.

Len is my hero because he doesn't back down from rabid dogs like you.

Cellular phones help people in emergencies every day, probably much
more often than amateur radio and certainly more often than CW in any
service.

Too bad.

> We'll wait right here while you pony up an excuse for all of that....And
> THEN tell us who's "nuts"...

No excuse offered. I'm good with where I'm at. But you're broken.
Go get fixed.

> Steve, K4YZ

All you're good for are personal attacks. You have no honor.

3903. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 02:22:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405111822.307230e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91967

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/9/2004 5:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405091404.464d1e39@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040509143413.08524.00001199@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
> >> >They have MARS calls.
> >>
> >> Uh huh...And...?!?!
> >
> >and they have MARS calls.
>
> Uh huh...Guys in MARS do. You dodged again. Coward.

They don't have MARS calls???

There you go again with the personal attacks.

I'll allow you to answer your own question so that your invaluable
information will see the light of day.

> >> I doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your non-dominant
> hand
> >> without written permission.
> >
> >Please stay on subject and quit resorting to personal attacks.
>
> It's not "personal attacks" if it's true.

Its obviously not true, so they are personal attacks.

> And I STILL doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your
> non-dominant hand without written permission.

I bestow upon you the honor of wiping for me.

> >> Subtract the participation of licensed Radio Amateurs and what do you
> >> have...???
> >
> >Answer the question, if you can.
>
> I have.
>

> I continue to ask YOU what would be the result if all those licensed
> Amateurs quit the MARS programs tomorrow. You refuse to answer.

For an authoritative answer, please put your question to Don Rumsfeld.
>
> >> >Do you know the transitive property of your false little equation?
> >> >Doubt it.
> >>
> >> My statement is not false.
> >
> >Your statement is false.
>
> No. It is not. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

"Sorry Hans..."

> >> Sure. And while he's listening, I think we'll ask HIM what major role
> >> non-licensed radio services play in emergency communication.
> >
> >You won't be asking Reilly anything because you won't be conducting a
> >MARS net on amateur frequencies, or an amateur net on MARS
> >frequencies. The reason I say that is because MARS IS NOT AMATEUR
> >RADIO!
>
> Well, PuppetBoy, too bad you didn't pay closer attention to what I said.

For some stupid reason, I paid exacting attention to your reply.
Probably even more so than you paid.

> MARS members CAN conduct nets on Amatuer frequencies and can even discuss
> thier activities thereon...

Welp, BrokenBoy, too bad you didn't pay closer attention to what I
said.

Do you know the difference between MARS members who also happen to be
amateurs holding an amateur net on amateur frequencies, vice MARS
members holding a MARS net on amateur frequencies???

Thus, "Sorry, Hans..." is a wonderfully stupid and false statement
made by YOU.

Makes me wonder why you made it, why you won't retract it, and why
you'll defend it to the bitter end.

Maybe because you're broken?

> Again...GET YOUR HEAD OUT OF YOUR RECTUM, BURKE! Or at least wipe the
> brown stuff off your nose before you make a public appearance.

There you go with the personal attacks again.

And stay away from my rectum, nutter.

> I further suggest that before you further humiliate yourself about what
> MARS is or isn't that you take some time to actually LISTEN to MARS frequencies
> and then tell me exactly how much difference there is between the two.

You need to talk to Riley and any of the Mars Directors. Any of them.

But you won't because you'll know your on a fools mission.

They wouldn't even give the nutter the time of day.

> Now, you can keep running off at the mouth if you care to, Mr. Burke, but
> the ONLY person you are making a fool of here is yourself. And I might add
> you're doing a spectacular job of it.
>
> Idiot.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Personal attacks again, Broken Steve?

3904. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 02:44:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405111844.15ba3573@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91968

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/7/2004 5:53 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405070253.4e171c36@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040506220402.22537.00000011@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/6/2004 6:04 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405060304.7e1ba526@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Why is that, Steve? It's a wonderfully stupid statement. I enjoy
> >> >attaching it to your name.
> >>
> >> But YOU keep stating that I am allegedly repeating it.
> >>
> >> I am not.
> >
> >But you should; it's so wonderfully stupid. And it is the statement
> >(of fact) that got this ball rolling. You back-pedalled and are now
> >soft pedalling a different statement, which was also shown to be
> >wrong.
>
> When it comes to "so wonderfully stupid" you DO seem to have a propensity
> to get in knee deep.

Yet you're up to your eyeballs.

> You've done it again.

The deepness is of your making. Please don't attribute it to me.

> I am not "back-peddling" on anything.

Yes you are. Where is your original, "Sorry Hans..." statement? Huh?

No Amateur Radio = No MARS. You
> have yet to disprove this.

You said, with the exception of a few "AD" personnel, ALL MARS members
are hams.

You were wrong there, too.

So easy to prove you wrong.

> Otherwise, you just keep trying to dazzle us with your brilliance only to
> realize it the glare off the baldness of your ignorance.

Ther you go with the persoanal attacks again.

> Your problem, not mine.

Nope, your the one making absurdly false statements.

> >> >So, if you want vindicated for making such a wonderfully stupid
> >> >statement, you can look in the Army, Air Force, and Navy regulations,
> >> >as well as Part 97, Title 47, and give me -any- citation whatsoever
> >> >where your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
> >> >is substantially true.
> >>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>
> >> That is sufficient.
> >
> >No, it is not sufficient. Quote A Military Regulation or Title 47
> >document.
>
> Yes, it IS sufficient. Each MARS program is wholly dependent on the
> Amateur Radio Service to exist. It seems that everyone except you is aware of
> this.

No, it isn't.

> Again, ANOTHER one of your problems.

I didn't break you. You're not my problem, but I do wish you'd go get
fixed.

> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper. Perhaps
> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have a
> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into corners
> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...

But you're the one dragging out the false bravado. I think its all
you've got left at this point. You have no honor, you have no
dignity. You just keep piling one erroneous statement on top of
another, then call me names.

I take no joy in pointing this out to you. I sure wish someone else
would tell you to go get some help - maybe your pea-pod brother TAFKA
could break the news to you.

> >> >No, I don't expect Hans to be named in any regulation. That's not
> >> >what I'm after. Forcus on the part where you said, "MARS >>IS<<
> >> >"Amateur Radio."
> >>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >

> >Nope, not sufficient.
> >
> >Why do you keep running away from your statement,
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
> It's still correct.

Nope. That is your original statment.

Do you now reject it?

Do you now recognize it as stupid and false?

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

More backpedalling.

> >I knew you were qualified to research the DoD and Title 47 regs to
> >back up your statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >"
> >The only question now is when you'll post the applicable citation.
>
> No need, Brain. Again, it seems everyone knows about teh relationship
> between the MARS programs and Amateur Radio EXCEPT you.

You can lie to me, and you can lie to the others on RRAP.

But when you lie to yourself and believe your own lies? You're
broken.

> Must be kinda lonely on the outside looking in, huh...?!?!

Got lots of company. They just don't want to be attacked by a rabid
dog.

> >> >Best of luck in making me eat crow. Hope you enjoy yours.
> >>
> >> >>>I<<< don't have to "make" you do anything, Brain. >>>YOU<<<
> >> continually make assertions you can't/won't substantiate, make assertions
> of
> >> derring-do that are not documented ANYwhere, and you generally keep walking
> all
> >> over your own tail over and over while claiming others to be "nuts".
> >
> >Document this:
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

> >> I have no crow to eat here or anywhere, Brain.

That's what they all say before they shake that bottle of hot sauce.

> >> Stop lying in public. Stop making assertions you can't/won't
> substantiate.
> >> Be a man.
>
> >I am a man.
>
> No, you're not.

You're a broken man.

> >Now you be a man and post any DoD or Title 47 citation whatsoever that
> >substantially says,
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio", "
> >
> >without the "Sorry Hans" part, of course.
> >
> >"Caw, caw!"
>
> Now who's nuts?

Just having a little fun. Killjoy.

> >Steve, I hear your crow calling. You might want to locate some
> >Tobasco sauce.
>
> Sorry Brain...That's only your over-active imagination and wishful
> thinking.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> You can prove differently, of course?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Prove your original statement, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur
Radio". "

3905. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 03:34:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <loOdnX4eaujEBjzdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91969

garigue wrote:
>>BTW, 15 dollar 12.5 inch Pyrex blanks are the rough equivalent of
>>finding an almost new, mint FT-1000 MV Field, loaded, for 100 dollars,
>>so there is your luck!
>
>
> Excellent Mike ...I made a 4 inch reflector yrs ago ....this fellow had
> slabs of glass he got for free ...we made up a cutting saw out of brass and
> with patience ...a drill press and some slag ....we were able to cut out
> blanks. Grinding and polishing were fun ...but I gave the scope away years
> ago. About 4 yrs ago I bought a 6 inch reflector which I have a ball with
> ..... when I have the time ... We are worried about BPL qrm ...funny that
> the same hold true re light pollution for the astronomy set.

The longer I am on the web, the more Amateurs I find that are amateur astronomers. Amazing!

Making your own refractor is way cool! I want to do this someday.

And yes, Light pollution is a real problem, and is a bit analogous to BPL.

By the way, a bit of trivia if you're interested. I'm the pappy of the Black Forest Star Party, and chaired the first two versions of the party. Beautiful dark site, and especially the first year, a pitch black night. I was being interviewed by reporters after dinner, prior to taking them on a tour of the grounds to see different telescopes set up there. The interview took quite a while, and by the time we stepped out of the pavilion and under the night sky it was completely dark. When we walked out from under the pines at the edge of the field, the impact of seeing the Milky way MOVED these jaded reporters -and at least one of them - to tears.

Ya wanna lose THAT?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3906. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 04:03:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NbednRdztMuSPzzdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91970

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<OoOdnUo838suhz3dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>My life's experience has been that for every hobby or avocation,
>>>
>>>there
>>>
>>>
>>>>is a large group of people that "would do it except for....". What
>>>
>>>they
>>>
>>>
>>>>are actually tell you when they say this is " I have a passing
>>>
>>>interest
>>>
>>>
>>>>in this. But I'm not so interested that I will become a participant".
>>>
>>>
>>>BANG! Drove that nail with a single blow, Mike!
>>
>>What was it they used to say - "indisputable truth"?
>
>
> Yet some will dispute it anyway.
>
>>>>Whether it is the Morse code requirement, or the cost of a rig or
>>>>effort of putting up an antenna, or the cost of a telescope or the
>>>>need
>>>>to travel to remote areas that are dark enough or the fact that you
>>>>have to stay up all night to observe, etc, etc.
>>
>>

>>
>>>This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
>>>marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
>>>run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...
>>
>>Some comedian needs to pick that one up. It is truly, classically
>
> funny!
>
> For some folks it's not a joke, though. They really don't see why the
> distance has to be 26.22 miles - after all, we'd have more marathoners
> if it were shorter. Or if people were allowed to use rollerblades,
> scooters, or bicycles to cover the distance. After all, running is
> truly *ancient* transportation technology. As a communications
> technology, (the marathon is based on ancient Greek runners, who were
> primarily messengers, not athletes) running has been replaced by
> methods that are faster, more error-free, less expensive...

Funny how analogies pop up in th estrangest places! 8^)

>>>>People in amateur astronomy also obsess about the graying of the
>>>>hobby and how do we get the kids involved? Fact is, a scope that can
>>>>actually be used for any kind of passable observation costs a fair amount of
>>>>money.
>>>
>>>Is it really so much money, Mike? I've heard that there are some folks
>>>who make their own 'scopes, down to the grinding of lenses and mirrors
>>>and such. And of course there are used telescopes. But the telescope
>>>itself is probably the least of the issues.
>>
>> I've made two telescopes so far. The only thing I bought was eyepieces
>>and the eyepiece holder. While it is true that you can make one for very
>>little money - especially when you get really lucky, like I did, and
>>find 3 12.5 inch blanks for 15 dollars each. For most people it will
>>cost some serious dough to get quality. Of course there is the
>>definition of quality and serious dough!
>>
>>BTW, 15 dollar 12.5 inch Pyrex blanks are the rough equivalent of
>>finding an almost new, mint FT-1000 MV Field, loaded, for 100 dollars,
>>so there is your luck!
>
>
> I would imagine that one can have tremendous fun in astronomy with
> less-than-state-of-the-art equipment. Just like amateur radio.

Yes. a lot depends on the situation. While I have my 12.5 inch scope, I
also have a 6 inch that I made, and a small catadioptric scope that is
quite modest. But I can put the littel scope on the front seat of the
car or set up on a picnic table somewhere.

And binoculars are a great way to observe.

>> But that kind of deal took patience and of course much luck. A
>>commercial version of the larger scope I made would set you back around
>>3.5 to 4K dollars. And it probably wouldn't have as good a mirror.
>>
>>Basic rule of thumb is department store scopes are truly junk.
>>
>>The inexpensive Dobsonians (a type of alt-az mount, usually with a
>>reflector mirror) often have passable optics, but usually need
>>mechanical work to perform well. You can get some 6 inch variety for
>>around 300 dollars. So if you are willing to put in the time....
>
>
> There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
> itself)

I spent a lot of happy hours getting that mirror to perform well.

>>Most refractors have a phenomenon called "color", in which not all
>>wavelengths of light are focused to the same point. Drives me crazy. The
>>better ones have what is called an APO lens, in which rare earth glasses
>>are used to focus the light all at the same place. And yup, they cost
>>money. I've looked through a number of 12K scopes. Lovely planet images,
>>but not all that much light gathering power.
>>
>
> Various rig designs have different good and bad features. For example,
> the wonderful K2 has really good dynamic range and very low phase
> noise but its display accuracy is *only* about 20-30 Hz even if the
> reference oscillator is set dead-on. This is a result of how the PLL
> works. Most owners don't care but there are some hams who are not
> satisfied with 20 Hz error.

Hmm. could be we are putting together the reasons that a lot of Hams
are also amateur astronomers!

>>>>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>>>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>>>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
>>>
>>>be
>>>
>>>
>>>>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>>>>
>>>
>>>Here's another issue:
>>>
>>>If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
>>>and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
>>>hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
>>>pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
>>>a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special

>>>equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
>>>knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
>>>what is seen, either.
>>
>>simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)
>
>
> Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
> needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
> the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
> And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?

Right! See my response to Tom (garigue) on the repoters that were
interviewing me at a star party. Ohhh, do they understand!

>
>>>Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as
>>>seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.
>>
>>I'm glad I saw that sentence!
>
>
> It's the same in amateur radio. Yet the point of *direct experience*
> is simply something many people simply "don't get".

I'm an experience junkie. As long as it's legal and ethical, I'm in!

>
>>Yes the images provided by Hubble are
>>stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)
>
>
> It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.

What I don't like is that they are citing safety concerns. I'll go on
record that I would ride the shuttle to the thing right now to work on
it. In a heartbeat.

The world doesn't belong to those that are safe.

>>But
>>some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
>>observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
>>alone, the experience is no comparison.
>
>
> Of course.
>
> And some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all
> night,
> working CW/Morse on a wide open amateur band, sharing QSOs with fellow
> hams all over the country. Or world. There is no comparison to the

> experience.

Oh yeah!

> Here's another point: Seeking the direct experience is also
> unpredictable in that the seeker is usually at the mercy of Nature.
> You can have the best 'scope imaginable, and an excellent site, but if
> the weather doesn't cooperate you're out of luck. Also, the stars and
> planets don't move to a human schedule - you may have to wait months
> or years to see even some of the more common objects. (Want to see
> Saturn on a moonless night when it is closest to Earth? Don't hold yer
> breath!)

And it all makes the successful experience all the sweeter!

> And most professional astronomers rarely if ever actually look through
> a telescope. At most they do so for calibration. Actual observations
> are almost all done by various sensors and instruments. Indeed, if my
> information is correct, direct observation in visible light is pretty
> "old fashioned" - that stuff was all done 100+ years ago, wasn't it?

One evening we had a professional astronomer with us for an evening of observing. It was a lot of fun. We amateurs were locating various stars and stellar objects, and he was telling us all about them in great detail. A magic evening for both him and the rest of us, although I'm afraid I scared him half to death. I was telling everyone about the encounter I had with a huge black bear on the way to the site, with the bear crossing the dirt road in front of me, and I stopped to watch the bear, and the big guy stood up to watch me, maybe ten feet from my open passenger window. It was awsome, and everyone else was used to my quirky dealings with wild animals, but I heard him say in a quavery voice "th-th-that bear, it it wan't r-r-really anywhere n-n-near here was it? We never could get him to come out with us again. 8^(

> Of course, every so often an amateur will make a real discovery, such
> as finding a new comet or some such. Just like amateur radio.
>
>>>>In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have
>>>>to be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on
>>>>a rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the
>>>>other
>>>>things we have to do to get on the air.
>>>>
>>>
>>>The biggest investments aren't monetary. It's the time and effort.
>>
>> There is that!
>
>
> Which is why some recruiting efforts are misdirected.

big time.

>
>>>>Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
>>>>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often
>>>>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so
>>>>happily upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
>>>>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field
>>>>day.
>>>
>>>37 years ago I was one of those young hams, and got no help from the
>>>parental units. Today's kids are no different. The big difference
>>>today is that for too many folks the antenna is a really big deal.
>>>Heck, look how many *adult* hams can't figure out how to put up an
>>>effective HF antenna these days...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
>>>>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two.
>>
>>
>>
>>>>Beyond the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time
>>>>keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical
>>>>acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?
>>>
>>>
>>>Since the advent of GUIs the whole point of personal computing has
>>>been to make it easier for *everyone* to use them. That's what has
>>>driven the industry for 20+ years.
>>
>>Yup, Troubleshooting has become figuring out which software switch to
>>turn *off* for the "helpful" GUI.
>
>
> To most of us the 'puter is a tool - a means to an end, not the end in
> itself.
>
>> Funny - I spend a lot of time getting peoples PC's running, but my main
>>computer at work is a G5, Dual Processor MAC. Oh so sweet!
>>
>>
>>>>My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
>>>>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like
>>>>saying that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is
>>>>deaf.
>>>
>>>I wish I knew where that one came from!
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
>>>

>>>
>>>Here's a datapoint for ya:
>>>
>>>In 1972 I graduated from a suburban Catholic boys' high school. This
>>>was in a solidly middle-class area, at a school that stressed math and
>>>science (AP courses available in those days were calculus, physics,
>>>chemistry, and history). My graduating class was over 600. IIRC
>>>exactly three of us graduates were hams. Of those three, only I am
>>>still licensed.
>>>
>>>The girls' high school next door (literally) was slightly larger - and
>>>had no hams at all. Out of maybe 5000 kids in grades 9 through 12
>>>there were perhaps 9 or 10 licensed hams.
>>>
>>>The reasons for the scarcity were many. For example, many
>>>extracurricular activities competed for our time and energy. (Like
>>>this blonde 11th grader who - no, wait, wrong newsgroup...). There was
>>>no organized school activity until we kids started a radio club of our
>>>own, which rose and fell on the efforts of us kids. More than a few
>>>kids back then though amateur radio was "square" - its conservative
>>>political nature (K7UGA) and military ties made more than a few look
>>>askance.
>>>
>>>Most of all, those were the boom times for cb. For less than the cost
>>>of a half-decent used receiver like a Drake 2B, one could head over to
>>>Lafayette Radio or one of its competitors and bring home a complete
>>>setup - 23 channel transceiver, groundplane antenna, coax, mounting
>>>hardware, etc. All brand new, ready to go. And if you had a car, a few
>>>more dollars bought a mobile mount and 102" whip antenna. License?
>>>Just fill out a form - but in fact many did not bother to do even that
>>>much. No tuneup, no fancy adjustments - just pick a channel, push the
>>>button and talk.
>>
>> Ahhh, memories! Station KBM-8780 had a Lafayette HE-20C. 8 crystal
>>controlled channels and a tuner for the channels you didn't have
>>crystals for. A colinear on the roof, and having fun.
>
>
> Lafayette was a big deal around here. All gone now.
>
>>>I don't know how many kids in my school had cbs or access to them, but
>>>they outnumbered us hams back then. Some of them became hams, most
>>>lost interest when the cb boom ended.
>>>
>>>Things haven't changed all that much, except now it's the 'net that's
>>>a prime competitor.
>>
>> I still don't think it is much of a competitor, but maybe to the
>>participants, they think they are being hi-tech..
>

>
> All depends who does the defining. For some folks, following the
> directions and unpacking/setting up/getting their computer to work is
> high tech. For others, assembling a custom one from boards/case/drives
> and loading the software isn't.

Yeah, pretty well put.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3907. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 04:17:37 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E72C10DC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91971

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:tF8oc.2097$zO3.140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
>
> And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
> callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

I've posted my call from time to time. It's N3KIP. I was issued a no-code
UK licence in 1980 (callsign G8VUK, and you will find I've posted that
too), a US one in 1992, and then an Advanced and an Extra by 1993, which
was multiple guess 20wpm. I suppose it depends what you mean by knowing CW?
Certainly I don't know it at 35wpm and neither do I have any practical
experience of it, but the entire point is that I didn't _want_ to learn it
or use it.

3908. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 04:19:17 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E7309778C9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91972

Leo <nomail@noway.com> wrote in
news:do72a0h2l84tstj6d6dj429amuge3019vg@4ax.com:

> On Tue, 11 May 2004 18:09:29 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>>> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
>>
>>And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
>>callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
>
> Let me help out with that....it's in many of Alun's posts:
>
> N3KIP - Extra class. Issued March 10, 2004. (is that the original
> date, or a renewal?)
>
> Or G0VUK, in the UK.
>
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
> 73, Leo
>

Renewal, following an address correction in 1994.

3909. iraq murder video gi head cut off

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 13:01:35 UTC
From: nela <pdaejawn@odaejavm.com>
Message-ID: <rhVDXB.A.ckF.vAioAB@winnie.sbor.net>
Source record: 91973
Cross-posted to: microsoft.public.word.newusers,rec.arts.tv.uk.eastenders,alt.binaries.sounds.mp3.soundtracks,alt.binaries.sounds.mp3.new-age,uk.media.home-cinema,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general,misc.jobs.contract

Cancelled because of virus:

3910. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 15:45:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405120745.291899c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91974

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040511122730.15479.00001259@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/10/2004 7:16 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405100416.218548bc@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
> >> Despite supporting Code testing, I am also of the mind that once the
> >> majority has spoken, it's time to move on.
> >
> >Which majority?
> >
> >What happened at WRC-2003 was *not* the abolition of code testing.
> >Instead, the treaty was modified so that each country decides for
> >itself what its code testing requirement will be. A country can have
> >no code testing, some code testing, or universal code testing for an
> >amateur license, and still be in accordance with the treaty.
> >
> >This may seem a semantic point but it's not. A sizable number of
> >countries insisted on the wording that was finally adopted.
>
> Therein lies your majority, Jim.

Where?

The majority of countries who sent reps voted to change S25.5. Doesn't
matter how many people or hams a country has, each gets one vote.
That's not a majority of *people* or hams, it's a majority of
governments.
>
> And let's not kid ourselves...there's been a growing number of people,
> wether they commented directly to the FCC or not, that is in favor of doing
> away with Code testing.

Sure. I say they are a small but noisy *minority*. Heck, there's been
a group in existence for more than 8 years that says its sole purpose
is the elimination of code testing. Membership is absolutely free and
non-expiring, does not require a ham license or other qualifications
except agreement with the single stated goal. And yet in those 8 years
they have recruited maybe 5 or 6 thousand total members, world-wide.

Some "majority".
>
> Again...I don't agree with it, but it's out there and unless there's some
> epiphany at FCC, it will become the law of the land in some time, if not "due"
> time.

The fat lady ain't sung yet. Frankly I am amazed that after the Report
and Order for 98-143 we still have Element 1 - but we do.

> I just hope we (you, I, other Code test/use supporters) can move in
> some constructive way to minimize the damage.

Been doing that for years, Steve.
>
> >> They could have pre-empted all this by stating something to the effect
> of
> >> "based upon recent previous commnets on the subject, we are suspending the
> >> requirement for Element 1 for access to HF licensure"....But
> >noooooooooooo...
> >
> >The majority of comments to 98-143 *supported* code testing. In fact,
> >the majority of comments to 98-143 supported *at least* 2 code test
> >speeds. Based on the majority of those comments, we'd still have at
> >least 12-13 wpm.
> >
> >Look at the comments on the various petitions since July - what is the
> >majority saying?
>
> I agree.

Tell it to the noisy minority.

> But the FCC has almost always been a left-leaning agency, and
> will continue to be so.

WHOA THERE!

FCC a "left-leaning" agency? You gotta be kidding!

Let's look at the past 20 years or so:

- FCC created VE system and public question pools. Turned over 99% of
the testing functions to unpaid volunteers to "get the government off
your back". Reduces the size of government and regulatory complexity.
Is that what "the left" usually does?

- FCC created medical waivers because a Republican president wanted to
do a King a favor.

- FCC deregulated broadcast radio ownership under a Republican
administration because it would help Business and reduce regulatory
complexity. Is that what "the left" usually does?

- FCC pushes a spectrum-polluting broadband technology under a
Republican administration because it would supposedly help Business.

Is that what "the left" usually does?

Those are just the high points. The trend is clear: Less regulation,
more "free market" ideology, little concern about pollution of a
limited natural resource. Is that what "the left" is all about, or
"the right"?

> I have no doubt that they will act to lose the code
> tests. Thier previous comments have already set the tone for what they plan
> on doing, comments to the contrary.

I disagree. If that were really the case, they could have simply
stated that based on the detailed discussion of 98-143 and their
previous Report and Order that the last remaining reason for Element 1
(the treaty) was gone and they could now simply dump it. There were
two petitions to do just that filed soon after WRC-2003. Yet we are
obviously headed for an NPRM cycle and it will probably be 2005 or
even 2006 before we know the outcome. If the FCC's mind was made up,
why the delay?
>
> > >Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
> > >were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.
> >
> >Maybe. Or maybe not. If a resounding majority say they want Element 1,
> >things might go differently.
>
> I see one of four things happening.
>
> First of all is nothing. But the FCC never does "nothing", even when
> it's the best course of action in the first place.

Not true. FCC has repeatedly done "nothing" in response to a proposal.
Remember when the CSVHS petitioned for some narrow-bandwidth VHF
subbands? FCC said no.
>
> Secondly is to completely drop Code testing for all levels of licensure.
> I am hoping-against-hope that they DON'T do this, but I am afraid that it is
> EXACTLY what they will do.

Maybe.
>
> Third is to drop the Code test for the General and leaving in the Code
> test for the Extra. This is what I hope will happen.

I hope they keep it for HF at the very least. I think it would be best
if Element 1 were required for all ham licenses.
>
> Lastly is creating a new, Code-free HF license between the Technician
> Plus-level folks and the General.

Why?

Why not just create a new entry-level license ("NewNovice",
"Communicator", "Basic", whatever), then close off the Tech and Tech
Plus?

Existing Novices (all 32K of them) get the new entry license via
grandfathering. Existing Techs and Pluses keep all VHF/UHF and get the
same entry level HF as the new entry-level license.

What's the problem with that scenario?

> However I can't see the FCC creating a NEW
> license when they just went through all the hoop-laa of paring it down to
> three.

Look at the ARRL petition. They essentially reinvent the Novice, same
name, new privs. Exisitng Novices get the new privs. Some version of
that can fly.

> If they did this, I'd give the present Code-tested Generals access to
> the Advanced Class sub-bands and let the new folks have the current General
> allocations, minus the WARC bands and 160 meters.

Too complex.
>
> Why? Why not..?!?!
>
> > There's been what...a half dozen petitions in the last five or six years
> > asking for the same thing and the FCC keeps thumbing thier noses at it...I
> > don't understand why since the Novice license hasn't generated much interest
> > since 1987

Because the FCC sometimes *does* do 'nothing'. That's the point.
>
> Whole bunch of reasons. One is the "nobody loses" thing - where do the
> Novices and Tech Pluses go if the "Novice bands" become 'phone?

Slide 'em down - it was done before. 80 M novice used to be 3700-3750,
40 M Novice used to be 7150-7200.

Or give them General class CW privs at 200W on 80/40/15/10. Why not?
>
> The question should be "where are they now?"...Access them to the General
> class non-phone bands on the same bands they have allocations on
> now....3525-3750, 7025-7150, 21025 to 21200 and 28000 to 28.300.

Sure. In fact give 'em WARC bands while we're at it. Why not?
>
> >Another is the basic reason we have subbands-by-mode in the first
> >place. If the US phone subbands are widened, there's less room for CW
> >and the data modes. It amounts to rewarding the use of
> >spectrum-inefficient modes, and penalizing the use of
> >spectrum-efficient modes. And the DX 'phones will move still further
> >down the band to get away from the US QRM.
>

> I agree.

So write and submit a petition to FCC. Everybody's doing it....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3911. sick chick got to see to beleave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 16:15:23 UTC
From: nela <afde.sti@afceyqsi.com>
Message-ID: <2YBmXC.A.FJH.b2koAB@winnie.sbor.net>
Source record: 91975
Cross-posted to: microsoft.public.word.newusers,rec.arts.tv.uk.eastenders,alt.binaries.sounds.mp3.soundtracks,alt.binaries.sounds.mp3.new-age,uk.media.home-cinema,rec.radio.amateur.policy,neworleans.general,misc.jobs.contract

```
Cancelled because of virus:
```

3912. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 16:41:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405120841.77bda43a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91976

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<NbednRdztMuSPzzdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<OoOdnUo838suhz3dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
> >
> >>N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
> >>>
> >>
> >>>This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
> >>>marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
> >>>run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...
> >>
> >>Some comedian needs to pick that one up. It is truly, classically
> >
> > funny!
> >
> > For some folks it's not a joke, though. They really don't see why the
> > distance has to be 26.22 miles - after all, we'd have more marathoners
> > if it were shorter. Or if people were allowed to use rollerblades,
> > scooters, or bicycles to cover the distance. After all, running is
> > truly *ancient* transportation technology. As a communications
> > technology, (the marathon is based on ancient Greek runners, who were
> > primarily messengers, not athletes) running has been replaced by
> > methods that are faster, more error-free, less expensive...
>
> Funny how analogies pop up in th estrangest places! 8^)

The fact is that almost anyone in decent health who is willing to do
the training can finish a marathon. But you gotta do the training,
which 99% of people in decent health won't do.

> > I would imagine that one can have tremendous fun in astronomy with
> > less-than-state-of-the-art equipment. Just like amateur radio.
>
> Yes. a lot depends on the situation. While I have my 12.5 inch scope, I
> also have a 6 inch that I made, and a small catadioptric scope that is
> quite modest. But I can put the littel scope on the front seat of the
> car or set up on a picnic table somewhere.
>

> And binoculars are a great way to observe.

Exactly. Just like there are plenty of good simple rigs out there,
waiting to be bought or built.
>
> >> But that kind of deal took patience and of course much luck. A
> >>commercial version of the larger scope I made would set you back around
> >>3.5 to 4K dollars. And it probably wouldn't have as good a mirror.
> >>
> >>Basic rule of thumb is department store scopes are truly junk.
> >>
> >>The inexpensive Dobsonians (a type of alt-az mount, usually with a
> >>reflector mirror) often have passable optics, but usually need
> >>mechanical work to perform well. You can get some 6 inch variety for
> >>around 300 dollars. So if you are willing to put in the time....
> >
> >
> > There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
> > itself)
>
> I spent a lot of happy hours getting that mirror to perform well.

No experience quite like working 'em with a rig ya built from
scratch...
>
> >>Most refractors have a phenomenon called "color", in which not all
> >>wavelengths of light are focused to the same point. Drives me crazy. The
> >>better ones have what is called an APO lens, in which rare earth glasses
> >>are used to focus the light all at the same place. And yup, they cost
> >>money. I've looked through a number of 12K scopes. Lovely planet images,
> >>but not all that much light gathering power.
> >>
> >
> > Various rig designs have different good and bad features. For example,
> > the wonderful K2 has really good dynamic range and very low phase
> > noise but its display accuracy is *only* about 20-30 Hz even if the
> > reference oscillator is set dead-on. This is a result of how the PLL
> > works. Most owners don't care but there are some hams who are not
> > satisfied with 20 Hz error.
>
> Hmm. could be we are putting together the reasons that a lot of Hams
> are also amateur astronomers!

Lots of similarities.
>
> >>>>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
> >>>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
> >>>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
> >>>
> >>>be
> >>>

> >>>
> >>>>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Here's another issue:
> >>>
> >>>If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
> >>>and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
> >>>hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
> >>>pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
> >>>a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
> >>>equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
> >>>knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
> >>>what is seen, either.
> >>
> >>simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)
> >
> >
> > Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
> > needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
> > the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
> > And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?
>
> Right! See my response to Tom (garigue) on the repoters that were
> interviewing me at a star party. Ohhh, do they understand!

They were awed because it was a *new* experience for most of them. I
bet.

> >>>Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as
> >>>seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.
> >>
> >>I'm glad I saw that sentence!
> >
> >
> > It's the same in amateur radio. Yet the point of *direct experience*
> > is simply something many people simply "don't get".
>
> I'm an experience junkie. As long as it's legal and ethical, I'm in!

We are a small part of the population, and getting smaller
(percentagewise).

> >
> >>Yes the images provided by Hubble are
> >>stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)
> >
> >
> > It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.
>
> What I don't like is that they are citing safety concerns.

It's still all about $$. How much you think the shuttle disasters cost
in $$? And the truth is that even with all the upgrades they're an old
design that costs big money to keep alive.

One of the promises made about the shuttle was that it would save
money and be 'easily' reused. Neither has come true - it's cheaper to
launch satellites on an Ariane and the shuttles are extensively
rebuilt between flights.

> I'll go on
> record that I would ride the shuttle to the thing right now to work on
> it. In a heartbeat.

The next flight will probably be the safest because you *know* they
went over the thing with a fine tooth comb...
>
> The world doesn't belong to those that are safe.

Sure it does! The trick is understanding what safety is really all
about. Risk cannot be avoided but there's no point in being foolish.
>
> >>But
> >>some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
> >>observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
> >>alone, the experience is no comparison.
> >
> >
> > Of course.
> >
> > And some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all
> > night,
> > working CW/Morse on a wide open amateur band, sharing QSOs with fellow
> > hams all over the country. Or world. There is no comparison to the
> > experience.
>
> Oh yeah!

There are some who call me all sorts of unflattering names because of
those experiences...
>
> > Here's another point: Seeking the direct experience is also
> > unpredictable in that the seeker is usually at the mercy of Nature.
> > You can have the best 'scope imaginable, and an excellent site, but if
> > the weather doesn't cooperate you're out of luck. Also, the stars and
> > planets don't move to a human schedule - you may have to wait months
> > or years to see even some of the more common objects. (Want to see
> > Saturn on a moonless night when it is closest to Earth? Don't hold yer
> > breath!)
>
> And it all makes the successful experience all the sweeter!

If you could take your 'scope out at almost any time and place and get
clear images of most of the sky, it wouldn't be a special experience.

>
> > And most professional astronomers rarely if ever actually look through
> > a telescope. At most they do so for calibration. Actual observations
> > are almost all done by various sensors and instruments. Indeed, if my
> > information is correct, direct observation in visible light is pretty
> > "old fashioned" - that stuff was all done 100+ years ago, wasn't it?
>
> One evening we had a professional astronomer with us for an evening of
> observing. It was a lot of fun. We amateurs were locating various stars
> and stellar objects, and he was telling us all about them in great
> detail.

Sure. He knew the facts but I bet he hadn't seen most of them directly
in years, if at all.

> A magic evening for both him and the rest of us, although I'm
> afraid I scared him half to death. I was telling everyone about the
> encounter I had with a huge black bear on the way to the site, with the
> bear crossing the dirt road in front of me, and I stopped to watch the
> bear, and the big guy stood up to watch me, maybe ten feet from my open
> passenger window. It was awsome, and everyone else was used to my quirky
> dealings with wild animals, but I heard him say in a quavery voice
> "th-th-that bear, it it wan't r-r-really anywhere n-n-near here was it?
> We never could get him to come out with us again. 8^(
>

bwaahaahaa...

>
> > Of course, every so often an amateur will make a real discovery, such
> > as finding a new comet or some such. Just like amateur radio.
> >
> >>>>In ham radio, a person not only has to have the interest, they have
> >>>>to be willing and able to spend a fair amount of discretionary income on
> >>>>a rig, put up an antenna, (if they are even allowed to) and all the
> >>>>other
> >>>>things we have to do to get on the air.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>The biggest investments aren't monetary. It's the time and effort.
> >>
> >> There is that!
> >
> >
> > Which is why some recruiting efforts are misdirected.
>
> big time.
>
> >
> >>>>Any wonder why lots of the new guys are the shack on the belt types?
> >>>>For kids, usually dependent upon M&D for their money, M&D are often

> >>>>happy to spend 100-200 dollars on a HT. They might not look so
> >>>>happily upon laying out $800-3000 for an hf rig, and putting up that antenna.
> >>>>All the young hams in my area are repeater people, save for Field
> >>>>day.
> >>>
> >>>37 years ago I was one of those young hams, and got no help from the
> >>>parental units. Today's kids are no different. The big difference
> >>>today is that for too many folks the antenna is a really big deal.
> >>>Heck, look how many *adult* hams can't figure out how to put up an
> >>>effective HF antenna these days...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Finally, the comparison of ham radio to the internet is amusing at
> >>>>best. There is almost not technical comparison between the two.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>Beyond the technogeeks such as myself, that spend a fair amount of time
> >>>>keeping other peoples computers on the stinkin' Internet, the technical
> >>>>acumen level is mighty darn low. How much ability is needed to surf porn?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Since the advent of GUIs the whole point of personal computing has
> >>>been to make it easier for *everyone* to use them. That's what has
> >>>driven the industry for 20+ years.
> >>
> >>Yup, Troubleshooting has become figuring out which software switch to
> >>turn *off* for the "helpful" GUI.
> >
> >
> > To most of us the 'puter is a tool - a means to an end, not the end in
> > itself.
> >
> >> Funny - I spend a lot of time getting peoples PC's running, but my main
> >>computer at work is a G5, Dual Processor MAC. Oh so sweet!
> >>
> >>
> >>>>My points are that blaming the lack of growth (which is an arguable
> >>>>thing in the first place) on the Morse code test is kind of like
> >>>>saying that a frog with no legs that can't jump when you tell it to jump, is
> >>>>deaf.
> >>>
> >>>I wish I knew where that one came from!
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>It is a hobby for the dedicated and relative few.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Here's a datapoint for ya:

> >>>
> >>>In 1972 I graduated from a suburban Catholic boys' high school. This
> >>>was in a solidly middle-class area, at a school that stressed math and
> >>>science (AP courses available in those days were calculus, physics,
> >>>chemistry, and history). My graduating class was over 600. IIRC
> >>>exactly three of us graduates were hams. Of those three, only I am
> >>>still licensed.
> >>>
> >>>The girls' high school next door (literally) was slightly larger - and
> >>>had no hams at all. Out of maybe 5000 kids in grades 9 through 12
> >>>there were perhaps 9 or 10 licensed hams.
> >>>
> >>>The reasons for the scarcity were many. For example, many
> >>>extracurricular activities competed for our time and energy. (Like
> >>>this blonde 11th grader who - no, wait, wrong newsgroup...). There was
> >>>no organized school activity until we kids started a radio club of our
> >>>own, which rose and fell on the efforts of us kids. More than a few
> >>>kids back then though amateur radio was "square" - its conservative
> >>>political nature (K7UGA) and military ties made more than a few look
> >>>askance.
> >>>
> >>>Most of all, those were the boom times for cb. For less than the cost
> >>>of a half-decent used receiver like a Drake 2B, one could head over to
> >>>Lafayette Radio or one of its competitors and bring home a complete
> >>>setup - 23 channel transceiver, groundplane antenna, coax, mounting
> >>>hardware, etc. All brand new, ready to go. And if you had a car, a few
> >>>more dollars bought a mobile mount and 102" whip antenna. License?
> >>>Just fill out a form - but in fact many did not bother to do even that
> >>>much. No tuneup, no fancy adjustments - just pick a channel, push the
> >>>button and talk.
> >>
> >> Ahhh, memories! Station KBM-8780 had a Lafayette HE-20C. 8 crystal
> >>controlled channels and a tuner for the channels you didn't have
> >>crystals for. A colinear on the roof, and having fun.
> >
> >
> > Lafayette was a big deal around here. All gone now.
> >
> >>>I don't know how many kids in my school had cbs or access to them, but
> >>>they outnumbered us hams back then. Some of them became hams, most
> >>>lost interest when the cb boom ended.
> >>>
> >>>Things haven't changed all that much, except now it's the 'net that's
> >>>a prime competitor.
> >>
> >> I still don't think it is much of a competitor, but maybe to the
> >>participants, they think they are being hi-tech..
> >
> >
> > All depends who does the defining. For some folks, following the

> > directions and unpacking/setting up/getting their computer to work is
> > high tech. For others, assembling a custom one from boards/case/drives
> > and loading the software isn't.
>
> Yeah, pretty well put.
>
Thanks

73 de Jim,N2EY

3913. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 18:14:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AQtoc.3525$zO3.1314@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91977

"Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:do72a0h2l84tstj6d6dj429amuge3019vg@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 11 May 2004 18:09:29 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
> >
> >And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
callsign.
> >And I am not going to play detective.
>
> Let me help out with that....it's in many of Alun's posts:
>
> N3KIP - Extra class. Issued March 10, 2004. (is that the original
> date, or a renewal?)
>
> Or G0VUK, in the UK.
>
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> 73, Leo

Thanks Leo....

My comments stand. He knows nothing about CW operation. If anyone doubts
that, go to his QRZ biography and read the following ;
"100 percent phone operator".

And with a N call 1x3 that means he got his ''Extra" the easy way. Recently
no doubt. Guess even a hundred percent phone operator is capable of passing
the multiple guess 5wpm test for Extra...what a joke. I rest my case.

Dan/W4NTI

3914. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 18:17:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mTtoc.3537$zO3.1999@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91978

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E72C10DC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:tF8oc.2097$zO3.140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
> >
> > And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
> > callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> I've posted my call from time to time. It's N3KIP. I was issued a no-code
> UK licence in 1980 (callsign G8VUK, and you will find I've posted that
> too), a US one in 1992, and then an Advanced and an Extra by 1993, which
> was multiple guess 20wpm. I suppose it depends what you mean by knowing
CW?
> Certainly I don't know it at 35wpm and neither do I have any practical
> experience of it, but the entire point is that I didn't _want_ to learn it
> or use it.

Sorry Alun....hadn't gotten this far down the list before I sent my latest
to you.

I'll correct things a bit. You didn't earn a extra with that test either.
It was just a bit less of a give away then the 5wpm joke now.

You still know nothing about cw.

Why do you continue to argue the point? It is obvious I am right.

Dan/W4NTI

3915. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 21:51:14 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E7B5697EA87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91979

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:mTtoc.3537$zO3.1999@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E72C10DC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:tF8oc.2097$zO3.140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >
>> >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
>> >
>> > And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
>> > callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> I've posted my call from time to time. It's N3KIP. I was issued a
>> no-code UK licence in 1980 (callsign G8VUK, and you will find I've
>> posted that too), a US one in 1992, and then an Advanced and an Extra
>> by 1993, which was multiple guess 20wpm. I suppose it depends what you
>> mean by knowing CW? Certainly I don't know it at 35wpm and neither do
>> I have any practical experience of it, but the entire point is that I
>> didn't _want_ to learn it or use it.
>
> Sorry Alun....hadn't gotten this far down the list before I sent my
> latest to you.
>
> I'll correct things a bit. You didn't earn a extra with that test
> either. It was just a bit less of a give away then the 5wpm joke now.
>
> You still know nothing about cw.
>
> Why do you continue to argue the point? It is obvious I am right.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

>

The point is that I don't need to know anything about CW to respond to the statement "phone operators are lids". What does that have to do with CW?

You introduced the question of whether I know anything about CW, and I answered it, but it proves nothing.

3916. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 22:42:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%Kxoc.3798$zO3.3728@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91980

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E7B5697EA87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:mTtoc.3537$zO3.1999@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94E72C10DC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:tF8oc.2097$zO3.140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >
> >> >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
> >> >
> >> > And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
> >> > callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> I've posted my call from time to time. It's N3KIP. I was issued a
> >> no-code UK licence in 1980 (callsign G8VUK, and you will find I've
> >> posted that too), a US one in 1992, and then an Advanced and an Extra
> >> by 1993, which was multiple guess 20wpm. I suppose it depends what you
> >> mean by knowing CW? Certainly I don't know it at 35wpm and neither do
> >> I have any practical experience of it, but the entire point is that I
> >> didn't _want_ to learn it or use it.
> >
> > Sorry Alun....hadn't gotten this far down the list before I sent my
> > latest to you.
> >
> > I'll correct things a bit. You didn't earn a extra with that test
> > either. It was just a bit less of a give away then the 5wpm joke now.
> >
> > You still know nothing about cw.
> >
> > Why do you continue to argue the point? It is obvious I am right.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

> >
> >
> >
>
> The point is that I don't need to know anything about CW to respond to the
> statement "phone operators are lids". What does that have to do with CW?
>
> You introduced the question of whether I know anything about CW, and I
> answered it, but it proves nothing.

It has nothing to do with it. I just get tired of people that put on like
they know something and don't. So lets just agree to disagree. What dif
does it make anyway?

Dan/W4NTI

3917. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 23:51:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040512195117.07231.00001341@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 91981

>And yet in those 8 years
>they have recruited maybe 5 or 6 thousand total members, world-wide.
>
>Some "majority".

5or 6 Thousand, yea right, since NCI refuses to provide the correct INFO, they might as well say 40 Million, since no proof is required. My guess probably more like 200 to 300 hundred.

3918. Re: My new newspaper needs used laptops. WIll pay top $$

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-12 23:58:56 UTC
From: ++++++ <Morons@Cedartown.com>
Message-ID: <c7udo0$v25$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 91982
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
in message news:a4b92c1875cb24e6527dc9d9932c1895@cypherpunks.to...
Here is a picture of me with one of our laptops. More are needed.

http://homepage.ntlworld.com/omar.hempsall1/b3ta/mail.jpg

Thanks,
Jim O'Brien, W4AMP

....

Sure that's his house? Looks awful clean to me. No bird shit, no doobies, no
empty beer cans...

3919. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 02:11:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040512221115.12081.00001114@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91983

>Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 5/12/2004 10:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0405120745.291899c5@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040511122730.15479.00001259@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
>> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >Date: 5/10/2004 7:16 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405100416.218548bc@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>> Therein lies your majority, Jim.
>
>Where?

The majority of nations voting to drop the Code.

>The majority of countries who sent reps voted to change S25.5. Doesn't
>matter how many people or hams a country has, each gets one vote.
>That's not a majority of *people* or hams, it's a majority of
>*governments*.

True...But the tide'd been turning for a decade...More, really...

>> I just hope we (you, I, other Code test/use supporters) can move in
>> some constructive way to minimize the damage.
>
>Been doing that for years, Steve.

Yep. Mentoring new Hams...VE tests...Cutting Lennie off at the the
knees...

>> But the FCC has almost always been a left-leaning agency, and
>> will continue to be so.
>
>WHOA THERE!
>
>FCC a "left-leaning" agency? You gotta be kidding!
>
>Let's look at the past 20 years or so:
>
>- FCC created VE system and public question pools. Turned over 99% of

>the testing functions to unpaid volunteers to "get the government off
>your back". Reduces the size of government and regulatory complexity.
>Is that what "the left" usually does?

In this case, yes...

That it "reduced" the workload at FCC was incidental in my opnion, Jim.
That it markedly lowered the bar for the effectiveness of the written tests to
actaully insure some degree of technical competence was as left as you can get
without falling off the Huntington Beach pier.

>- FCC created medical waivers because a Republican president wanted to
>do a King a favor.
>
>- FCC deregulated broadcast radio ownership under a Republican
>administration because it would help Business and reduce regulatory
>complexity. Is that what "the left" usually does?

And who gained the majority of benefit from that move?

>- FCC pushes a spectrum-polluting broadband technology under a
>Republican administration because it would supposedly help Business.
>Is that what "the left" usually does?

The supposed "help" would be to those living in rural or under-served
areas, Jim. At least that's the pitch being pushed.

>Those are just the high points. The trend is clear: Less regulation,
>more "free market" ideology, little concern about pollution of a
>limited natural resource. Is that what "the left" is all about, or
>"the right"?
>
>> I have no doubt that they will act to lose the code
>> tests. Thier previous comments have already set the tone for what they
>plan
>> on doing, comments to the contrary.
>
>I disagree. If that were really the case, they could have simply
>stated that based on the detailed discussion of 98-143 and their
>previous Report and Order that the last remaining reason for Element 1
>(the treaty) was gone and they could now simply dump it. There were
>two petitions to do just that filed soon after WRC-2003. Yet we are
>obviously headed for an NPRM cycle and it will probably be 2005 or
>even 2006 before we know the outcome. If the FCC's mind was made up,
>why the delay?

Like I said...Bureaucrats. The more paperwork and the more
administratively burdensome, the better.

>> > >Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
>> > >were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.
>> >
>> >Maybe. Or maybe not. If a resounding majority say they want Element 1,

>> >things might go differently.
>>
>> I see one of four things happening.
>>
>> First of all is nothing. But the FCC never does "nothing", even when
>> it's the best course of action in the first place.
>
>Not true. FCC has repeatedly done "nothing" in response to a proposal.
>Remember when the CSVHS petitioned for some narrow-bandwidth VHF
>subbands? FCC said no.

If they said "no", they "did nothing"...Or do you consider the act of
saying no to be the "something"...?!?!

>> Secondly is to completely drop Code testing for all levels of
>licensure.
>> I am hoping-against-hope that they DON'T do this, but I am afraid that it
>is
>> EXACTLY what they will do.
>
>Maybe.

>> Third is to drop the Code test for the General and leaving in the Code
>> test for the Extra. This is what I hope will happen.
>
>I hope they keep it for HF at the very least. I think it would be best
>if Element 1 were required for all ham licenses.

I do too, but like I said...the die's cast. This is what "people" want,
so now they've gotten it.

>> Lastly is creating a new, Code-free HF license between the Technician
>> Plus-level folks and the General.
>
>Why?
>
>Why not just create a new entry-level license ("NewNovice",
>"Communicator", "Basic", whatever), then close off the Tech and Tech
>Plus?
>
>Existing Novices (all 32K of them) get the new entry license via
>grandfathering. Existing Techs and Pluses keep all VHF/UHF and get the
>same entry level HF as the new entry-level license.
>
>What's the problem with that scenario?
>
>> However I can't see the FCC creating a NEW
>> license when they just went through all the hoop-laa of paring it down to
>> three.
>
>Look at the ARRL petition. They essentially reinvent the Novice, same
>name, new privs. Exisitng Novices get the new privs. Some version of

>that can fly.

Like I said...I can't see the FCC creating a new (or re-opening the
old...) level of licensure...I was just offering it as an option.

>> If they did this, I'd give the present Code-tested Generals access to
>> the Advanced Class sub-bands and let the new folks have the current General
>> allocations, minus the WARC bands and 160 meters.
>
>Too complex.

Why? Techs would get VHF and above. The new "X" class would get old
General phone priv's minus WARC and 160. What's "too complex" about it....???

The Generals move up to the Advanced class allocations, and Extra's get
the new "farmed out" phone bands.

>> >Another is the basic reason we have subbands-by-mode in the first
>> >place. If the US phone subbands are widened, there's less room for CW
>> >and the data modes. It amounts to rewarding the use of
>> >spectrum-inefficient modes, and penalizing the use of
>> >spectrum-efficient modes. And the DX 'phones will move still further
>> >down the band to get away from the US QRM.
>>
>> I agree.
>
>So write and submit a petition to FCC. Everybody's doing it....

Yeah...one more glory hound seeking his fame and fortune in the "Federal
Register"... ! ! !

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

3920. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 02:27:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040512222746.12081.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91984

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/11/2004 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111804.1c3c8d5f@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>> >I told you that the zero in my callsign stood for the tenth district,
>> >not the zeroeth district.
>>
>> I understand that for Amateur Radio applications the ZERO in the
>callsign
>> is for the tenth call district. Unlike you, I can think in the abstract.
>
>Then why did it take me to point it out to you???

It didn't.

You still haven't got the message, I guess.

>> I also understand there is only one numeral in your callsign. It
>>>IS< ZERO.
>
>Correct me if I'm wrong, but there's also only one numeral in your
>callsign, and it stands for only one numeral in the FCC's callsign
>districts.

Yes...and it's NOT a ZERO.

>> So are you.
>
>Obviously I'm a 10.

Not when it comes to honesty you aren't.

>> It really is THAT simple.
>
>Then why don't you get it???

I "get it" just fine, Brain.

You're the one with a comprehension disorder.

Sucks to be you.

>> >And so you call me a liar and an idiot, and insinuate that I'm not a
>> >man.

>>
>> You are a liar.
>
>No, I am telling the truth.

Uh huh.

> You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done
>> in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with ANY
>> form of proof.
>
>I've done them, yet I owe you no proof.

You SAY you've done them.

I say I've operated from Okinawa Japan. I can provide copies of old logs,
and I bet if I wrote to 15th Air Force I could get a copy of my old
authorization. I can also pony up a couple folks who were there when I did it.

YOU say you operated from Somalia. You haven't supplied the callsign of
ONE contact you made...Haven't provided a copy of ANY authorization from that
operation, and can't even give us the name of your commander that allegedly
gave you the permission.

Heck...I'd be half tempted to give you the "benefit of the doubt" based ont
eh "I was following orders" ruse if you'd even provide THAT much information.

You haven't. SEVERAL folks have asked you to ante-up some facts.

No facts = Brain's a liar.

It really is THAT simple.

>> You're an idiot because you keep exposing yourself to such ridicule
>even
>> though you've been caught doing it over and over.
>
>There you go calling me names again.

It's not "calling names" if it's true, Brain.

>> I doubt you're much of a man because of your foolish regard for your
>own
>> reputation and reckless behaviour in a public forum
>
>Steve, you're broken. I can't help you - broken people aren't my area
>of expertise. Go get fixed. Go get help.

You don't seem to have ANY "area of expertise", Brain...Certainly not in
Amatuer Radio.

>> >Get help.
>>
>> For what? Making a fool out of you? That's what I HAVE you for,
>> PuppetBoy! Now...Tell us all about your hero Lennie...How proud you are to

>be
>> associated with him...How you worked "portable" from Somalia without proper
>> authorization to do so. Then you can ALSO provide us with SOME sort of
>proof
>> to substantiate YOUR claim that "unlicensed radio services play a major
>role in
>> disaster communications....
>
>Welp, Steve, I had proper authorization to operate amateur radio in
>Somalia.

Not from what you've posted here.

>Len is my hero because he doesn't back down from rabid dogs like you.

Lennie is a documented pathological liar. And just like a broken watch,
he get's one right once in a while. That still doen't make him any less of a
liar and antagonist.

If that's what you idolize, then just grit your teeth and take the flak
coming your way, PuppetBoy.

>Cellular phones help people in emergencies every day, probably much
>more often than amateur radio and certainly more often than CW in any
>service.
>
>Too bad.

No one sid it didn't.

YOU said "Unlicensed services play a MAJOR role in disaster
communications."

I've asked you to provide me ONE instance where "unlicensed (Part 95 other
than GMRS and Part 15) devices play a MAJOR role.

Again...ANOTHER assertion you've made unsubstantiated by facts.

>> We'll wait right here while you pony up an excuse for all of
>that....And
>> THEN tell us who's "nuts"...
>
>No excuse offered. I'm good with where I'm at. But you're broken.
>Go get fixed.

If you are "good with where (you're) at", then dysfunctional and mediocre
are your milestones.

Nice job.

>All you're good for are personal attacks. You have no honor.

A declaration about honor from a person who subsidises lying and
deception.

That's cute.

That's Brian Burke. Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3921. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 02:41:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040512224136.12081.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91985

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/11/2004 9:22 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111822.307230e5@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>...

>> Uh huh...Guys in MARS do. You dodged again. Coward.
>
>They don't have MARS calls???

What an idiot.

Is your wife looking over your shoulder right now? She should be.

>There you go again with the personal attacks.

No...that was not a "personal attack"

Here's one: "You're an idiot".

Of course it's not an attack if it's true. And it is.

>> It's not "personal attacks" if it's true.
>
>Its obviously not true, so they are personal attacks.

Sure it is.

You've been given countless opportunities to dig yourself out from under
the blanket of stupidity that you've woven for yourself, but you just keep
trying to pull it up over your head a bit higher by asserting that anyone (me
in particular) is a "nutter", "broken", etc...

Everyone except YOU seems to be responsible for making the stupid
assertions you make.

How is that...?!?!

>> And I STILL doubt you have adequate authority to wipe with your
>> non-dominant hand without written permission.
>
>I bestow upon you the honor of wiping for me.

Thanks. I have JUST the thing for you...Just go RIGHT ahead and bend
over...Just ignore that the "paper" I am opneing up is in a flat pack, not a
roll.....

>> >> Subtract the participation of licensed Radio Amateurs and what do
>you
>> >> have...???
>> >
>> >Answer the question, if you can.
>>
>> I have.
>>
>> I continue to ask YOU what would be the result if all those licensed
>> Amateurs quit the MARS programs tomorrow. You refuse to answer.
>
>For an authoritative answer, please put your question to Don Rumsfeld.

No...I have asked you.

YOU have made this a two-week long diatribe. YOU insist that MARS and
Amateur Radio are not interwoven. I am sure SECDEF thinks MARS is between the
orbit of Earth and Jupiter.

>> No. It is not. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
>"Sorry Hans..."

Still stands, unless YOU can prove differently, Brain:

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> >> Sure. And while he's listening, I think we'll ask HIM what major
>role
>> >> non-licensed radio services play in emergency communication.
>> >
>> >You won't be asking Reilly anything because you won't be conducting a
>> >MARS net on amateur frequencies, or an amateur net on MARS
>> >frequencies. The reason I say that is because MARS IS NOT AMATEUR
>> >RADIO!
>>
>> Well, PuppetBoy, too bad you didn't pay closer attention to what I
>said.
>
>For some stupid reason, I paid exacting attention to your reply.
>Probably even more so than you paid.

Obviously not.

>> MARS members CAN conduct nets on Amatuer frequencies and can even
>discuss
>> thier activities thereon...
>
>Welp, BrokenBoy, too bad you didn't pay closer attention to what I
>said.
>
>Do you know the difference between MARS members who also happen to be
>amateurs holding an amateur net on amateur frequencies, vice MARS
>members holding a MARS net on amateur frequencies???

>
>Thus, "Sorry, Hans..." is a wonderfully stupid and false statement
>made by YOU.

Not false.

We've gone this route, and it's quite apparent that you can't/won't ever
"get it".

Judging by your complete lack of understanding of what makes MARS tick,
you never will.

A fool...Just as I had surmised.

>> Again...GET YOUR HEAD OUT OF YOUR RECTUM, BURKE! Or at least wipe the
>> brown stuff off your nose before you make a public appearance.
>
>There you go with the personal attacks again.
>
>And stay away from my rectum, nutter.

Then quit baring it in public, Brain.

>> I further suggest that before you further humiliate yourself about
>what
>> MARS is or isn't that you take some time to actually LISTEN to MARS
>frequencies
>> and then tell me exactly how much difference there is between the two.
>
>You need to talk to Riley and any of the Mars Directors. Any of them.

Yep.

No Amateur Rado = No MARS.

>But you won't because you'll know your on a fools mission.

That's "fool's" mission, Brain, and I guess I am on one...I've been trying
to get you see just exactly how silly you look.
>
>They wouldn't even give the nutter the time of day.
>
>> Now, you can keep running off at the mouth if you care to, Mr. Burke,
>but
>> the ONLY person you are making a fool of here is yourself. And I might add
>> you're doing a spectacular job of it.
>>
>> Idiot.
>
>Personal attacks again, Broken Steve?

It's not an attack if it's true, Brain.

You are an idiot. Spectacularly.

Steve, K4YZ

3922. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 02:51:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040512225118.12081.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 91986

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/11/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111844.15ba3573@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...

>> When it comes to "so wonderfully stupid" you DO seem to have a
>propensity
>> to get in knee deep.
>
>Yet you're up to your eyeballs.
>
>> You've done it again.
>
>The deepness is of your making. Please don't attribute it to me.

Sorry, Brain, if you don't like being held up to the light of day.
>
>> I am not "back-peddling" on anything.
>
>Yes you are. Where is your original, "Sorry Hans..." statement? Huh?
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS. You
>> have yet to disprove this.
>
>You said, with the exception of a few "AD" personnel, ALL MARS members
>are hams.
>
>You were wrong there, too.
>
>So easy to prove you wrong.

So far YOU haven't disproven anything.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

So minus your ONE example of a civilian director (BTW..He's the Chief of
MARS...NOT a MEMBER...You should learn the difference, Brain...) and the AD
personnel that I had already cited, we still have over 98% of the participants
in MARS as licensed Amateurs.

>> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper.
>Perhaps
>> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have

>a
>> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into
>corners
>> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...
>
>But you're the one dragging out the false bravado. I think its all
>you've got left at this point. You have no honor, you have no
>dignity. You just keep piling one erroneous statement on top of
>another, then call me names.

No "erroneous statements", Brain.

Without LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS to fill it's ranks, there would be no MARS program.

As for "MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio", I again refer to your lack of ability to think in the abstract.

I also suggest you take a listen to almost ANY MARS net frequency during "informal" time and tell me what's different about many of the conversations that take place there as opposed to on "Amateur" frequencies, other than different callsigns.

Lastly, as for "dignity" or "honor", I am not the one with an honesty deficit.

That's you and Lennie.

Sucks to be you...Or should I say "Sucks to be the two of you"...?!?!

Deleted the rest. It's been beaten already. As have you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

3923. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 03:41:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ht2dnXkCROLEcz_dRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91987

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<NbednRdztMuSPzzdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<OoOdnUo838suhz3dRVn-gg@adelphia.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<r7OdnaLeG-jzqQPdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>...
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>This is true of *any* activity. Heck, when I was training for the
>>>>>marathon 20 years ago, I met plenty of folks who said they wanted to
>>>>>run a marathon - if only it wasn't 26.22 miles long...
>>>>
>>>>Some comedian needs to pick that one up. It is truly, classically
>>>
>>>funny!
>>>
>>>For some folks it's not a joke, though. They really don't see why the
>>>distance has to be 26.22 miles - after all, we'd have more marathoners
>>>if it were shorter. Or if people were allowed to use rollerblades,
>>>scooters, or bicycles to cover the distance. After all, running is
>>>truly *ancient* transportation technology. As a communications
>>>technology, (the marathon is based on ancient Greek runners, who were
>>>primarily messengers, not athletes) running has been replaced by
>>>methods that are faster, more error-free, less expensive...
>>
>> Funny how analogies pop up in th estrangest places! 8^)
>
>
> The fact is that almost anyone in decent health who is willing to do
> the training can finish a marathon. But you gotta do the training,
> which 99% of people in decent health won't do.

True enough. I don't have any interest in marathons, a combination of my physique and the abuse I've put upon my legs over the years. I'm built better for the 100 yard dash!

Side note: I had to give up Hockey temporarily to nurse a torn meniscus. At Christmas I couldn't walk down stairs, and long drives in a car were murder upon getting out. 6 weeks of rest, then followed by a daily weight lifting regimen, and it's a freakin' miracle. Pain is just gone! I can hardly wait to lay a good check on someone! 8^)

>>>I would imagine that one can have tremendous fun in astronomy with
>>>less-than-state-of-the-art equipment. Just like amateur radio.
>>
>> Yes. a lot depends on the situation. While I have my 12.5 inch scope, I
>>also have a 6 inch that I made, and a small catadioptric scope that is
>>quite modest. But I can put the littel scope on the front seat of the
>>car or set up on a picnic table somewhere.
>>
>> And binoculars are a great way to observe.
>
>
> Exactly. Just like there are plenty of good simple rigs out there,
> waiting to be bought or built.
>
>>>> But that kind of deal took patience and of course much luck. A
>>>>commercial version of the larger scope I made would set you back around
>>>>3.5 to 4K dollars. And it probably wouldn't have as good a mirror.
>>>>
>>>>Basic rule of thumb is department store scopes are truly junk.
>>>>
>>>>The inexpensive Dobsonians (a type of alt-az mount, usually with a
>>>>reflector mirror) often have passable optics, but usually need
>>>>mechanical work to perform well. You can get some 6 inch variety for
>>>>around 300 dollars. So if you are willing to put in the time....
>>>
>>>
>>>There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
>>>itself)
>>
>> I spent a lot of happy hours getting that mirror to perform well.
>
>
> No experience quite like working 'em with a rig ya built from
> scratch...

hehe, you are right there, Jim. I am PROUD of that thing. Won a some prizes with it too. I unseated the perennial champ at the MAson Dixon star party.

>>>>Most refractors have a phenomenon called "color", in which not all
>>>>wavelengths of light are focused to the same point. Drives me crazy. The
>>>>better ones have what is called an APO lens, in which rare earth glasses

>>>>are used to focus the light all at the same place. And yup, they cost
>>>>money. I've looked through a number of 12K scopes. Lovely planet images,
>>>>but not all that much light gathering power.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Various rig designs have different good and bad features. For example,
>>>the wonderful K2 has really good dynamic range and very low phase
>>>noise but its display accuracy is *only* about 20-30 Hz even if the
>>>reference oscillator is set dead-on. This is a result of how the PLL
>>>works. Most owners don't care but there are some hams who are not
>>>satisfied with 20 Hz error.
>>
>> Hmm. could be we are putting together the reasons that a lot of Hams
>>are also amateur astronomers!
>
>
> Lots of similarities.
>
>>>>>>And ohhh geee, the dufusses that wanted to get the little kids
>>>>>>interested in observing seem to have forgotten that Mommy and Daddy
>>>>>>don't want little Buffy or Jody (and by extension, Mommy or Daddy) to
>>>>>
>>>>>be
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>staying up all night and traveling to remote sites.....
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Here's another issue:
>>>>>
>>>>>If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
>>>>>and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
>>>>>hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
>>>>>pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
>>>>>a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
>>>>>equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
>>>>>knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
>>>>>what is seen, either.
>>>>
>>>>simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)
>>>
>>>
>>>Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
>>>needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
>>>the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
>>>And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?
>>
>> Right! See my response to Tom (garigue) on the repoters that were
>>interviewing me at a star party. Ohhh, do they understand!

>
>
> They were awed because it was a *new* experience for most of them. I
> bet.

Yup. I am always impressed by a good night sky, but these folks
couldn't normally see much in the sky at all. I also primed them with my
interview, and wham! I don' know if you've ever seen pristine sky, but
like the guy in 2001 says - "My God, its FULL of stars!"

>>>>>Of course looking at pictures taken by others is not the same thing as
>>>>>seeing something directly. But for most people, it's 'close enough'.
>>>>
>>>>I'm glad I saw that sentence!
>>>
>>>
>>>It's the same in amateur radio. Yet the point of *direct experience*
>>>is simply something many people simply "don't get".
>>
>> I'm an experience junkie. As long as it's legal and ethical, I'm in!
>
>
> We are a small part of the population, and getting smaller
> (percentagewise).
>
>>>>Yes the images provided by Hubble are
>>>>stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)
>>>
>>>
>>>It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.
>>
>> What I don't like is that they are citing safety concerns.
>
>
> It's still all about $$. How much you think the shuttle disasters cost
> in $$? And the truth is that even with all the upgrades they're an old
> design that costs big money to keep alive.
>
> One of the promises made about the shuttle was that it would save
> money and be 'easily' reused. Neither has come true - it's cheaper to
> launch satellites on an Ariane and the shuttles are extensively
> rebuilt between flights.

I'm betting on Bert Rutan to take us that next step. He's getting
close, BTW.

>
>>I'll go on
>>record that I would ride the shuttle to the thing right now to work on
>>it. In a heartbeat.
>

>
> The next flight will probably be the safest because you *know* they
> went over the thing with a fine tooth comb...
>
>> The world doesn't belong to those that are safe.
>

> Sure it does! The trick is understanding what safety is really all
> about. Risk cannot be avoided but there's no point in being foolish.

I dunno, Alan Shepard skirted the foolishness edge, and most people I
know wouldn't dream of a trip on the shuttle.

>>>>But
>>>>some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
>>>>observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
>>>>alone, the experience is no comparison.
>>>
>>>
>>>Of course.
>>>
>>>And some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all
>>>night,
>>>working CW/Morse on a wide open amateur band, sharing QSOs with fellow
>>>hams all over the country. Or world. There is no comparison to the
>>>experience.
>>
>> Oh yeah!
>
>
> There are some who call me all sorts of unflattering names because of
> those experiences...
>
>>>Here's another point: Seeking the direct experience is also
>>>unpredictable in that the seeker is usually at the mercy of Nature.
>>>You can have the best 'scope imaginable, and an excellent site, but if
>>>the weather doesn't cooperate you're out of luck. Also, the stars and
>>>planets don't move to a human schedule - you may have to wait months
>>>or years to see even some of the more common objects. (Want to see
>>>Saturn on a moonless night when it is closest to Earth? Don't hold yer
>>>breath!)
>>
>> And it all makes the successful experience all the sweeter!
>
>
> If you could take your 'scope out at almost any time and place and get
> clear images of most of the sky, it wouldn't be a special experience.

Although in Pennsylvania, the wx takes it to extremes! 8^) AS a matter
of fact, on of the big reasons I got into the ARS was because the skies
in PA were so often cloudy, I needed another hobby to give me something

to do in my spare spare time.

<the rest snipped>

- Mike KB3EIA -

3924. Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 10:20:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405130220.34e63f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91988

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040512221115.12081.00001114@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/12/2004 10:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405120745.291899c5@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040511122730.15479.00001259@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Let's debate: Should Amateur Radio be made a free for all?
> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >> >Date: 5/10/2004 7:16 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405100416.218548bc@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040509093501.23382.00001101@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
> >> Therein lies your majority, Jim.
> >
> >Where?
>
> The majority of nations voting to drop the Code.
>
> >The majority of countries who sent reps voted to change S25.5. Doesn't
> >matter how many people or hams a country has, each gets one vote.
> >That's not a majority of *people* or hams, it's a majority of
> >*governments*.
>
> True...But the tide'd been turning for a decade...More, really...

We really don't know what a majority of *hams* or *people* think -
just what a majority of *governments* voted for. Big difference.
>
> >> I just hope we (you, I, other Code test/use supporters) can move in
> >> some constructive way to minimize the damage.
> >
> >Been doing that for years, Steve.
>
> Yep. Mentoring new Hams...VE tests...

Exactly.

> Cutting Lennie off at the the
> knees...
>

Who?

> >> But the FCC has almost always been a left-leaning agency, and
> >> will continue to be so.
> >
> >WHOA THERE!
> >
> >FCC a "left-leaning" agency? You gotta be kidding!
> >
> >Let's look at the past 20 years or so:
> >
> >- FCC created VE system and public question pools. Turned over 99% of
> >the testing functions to unpaid volunteers to "get the government off
> >your back". Reduces the size of government and regulatory complexity.
> >Is that what "the left" usually does?
>
> In this case, yes...
>
> That it "reduced" the workload at FCC was incidental in my opnion, Jim.
> That it markedly lowered the bar for the effectiveness of the written tests to
> actaully insure some degree of technical competence was as left as you can get
> without falling off the Huntington Beach pier.

You've got it exactly backwards, Steve. The whole purpose of the VE system and published pools was to reduce the admin workload of the FCC. Get unpaid volunteers to do the work that used to be done by paid govt. employees. That's straight out of 'the right's' ideology of minimal government and privatization. And it happened during a popular Republican administration that was elected in large part to "get the government off your back".

The idea that it lowered the standards was dismissed at the time by those who wanted the new system.

>
> >- FCC created medical waivers because a Republican president wanted to
> >do a King a favor.

Can't blame that one on "the left"

> >
> >- FCC deregulated broadcast radio ownership under a Republican
> >administration because it would help Business and reduce regulatory
> >complexity. Is that what "the left" usually does?
>
> And who gained the majority of benefit from that move?

The Businesses (like Clear Channel) who were able to buy up lots more radio stations and homogenize radio broadcasting. The investors who sold the stations for big $$.

Listen to talk radio and see how many programs are on 'the left' vs. how many are on 'the right'.

>

> >- FCC pushes a spectrum-polluting broadband technology under a
> >Republican administration because it would supposedly help Business.
> >Is that what "the left" usually does?
>
> The supposed "help" would be to those living in rural or under-served
> areas, Jim. At least that's the pitch being pushed.

That's the smokescreen that's being used to sell it. Who would really
benefit?

Most of all, the selling points are the same: Less regulation, free
market for Business, this will help The Economy, homeland security,
etc., etc.

Who appoints the Commissioners? Who personally endorsed the new
technology? WHo is seeking reelection in a few months?

Sorry, Steve, your theory of FCC as "left leaning" just doesn't hold
water. At least not for the past 20-odd years.
>
> >Those are just the high points. The trend is clear: Less regulation,
> >more "free market" ideology, little concern about pollution of a
> >limited natural resource. Is that what "the left" is all about, or
> >"the right"?

Well?

> >> I have no doubt that they will act to lose the code
> >> tests. Thier previous comments have already set the tone for what they
> plan
> >> on doing, comments to the contrary.
> >
> >I disagree. If that were really the case, they could have simply
> >stated that based on the detailed discussion of 98-143 and their
> >previous Report and Order that the last remaining reason for Element 1
> >(the treaty) was gone and they could now simply dump it. There were
> >two petitions to do just that filed soon after WRC-2003. Yet we are
> >obviously headed for an NPRM cycle and it will probably be 2005 or
> >even 2006 before we know the outcome. If the FCC's mind was made up,
> >why the delay?
>
> Like I said...Bureaucrats. The more paperwork and the more
> administratively burdensome, the better.

Maybe. Or maybe it's just not a high priority. Or maybe the commentary
supporting code testing *has* had an effect.

In any event, if the code test *is* dropped, it will be right in line
with "the right's" agenda of less regulation and more access. That's a
plain, simple fact.

Ask any no-code-test person if their agenda is liberal or
conservative. 99% will say it's the conservative thing to do - less

regulation, "free market of modes", etc.
>
> >> > >Thirdly, I think that when the dust settles they will just do what they
> >> > >were going to do anyway. Eliminate Element 1.
> >> >
> >> >Maybe. Or maybe not. If a resounding majority say they want Element 1,
> >> >things might go differently.
> >>
> >> I see one of four things happening.
> >>
> >> First of all is nothing. But the FCC never does "nothing", even when
> >> it's the best course of action in the first place.
> >
> >Not true. FCC has repeatedly done "nothing" in response to a proposal.
> >Remember when the CSVHS petitioned for some narrow-bandwidth VHF
> >subbands? FCC said no.
>
> If they said "no", they "did nothing"...Or do you consider the act of
> saying no to be the "something"...?!?!

You just proved my point.
>
> >> Secondly is to completely drop Code testing for all levels of
> licensure.
> >> I am hoping-against-hope that they DON'T do this, but I am afraid that it
> is
> >> EXACTLY what they will do.
> >
> >Maybe.
>
> >> Third is to drop the Code test for the General and leaving in the Code
> >> test for the Extra. This is what I hope will happen.
> >
> >I hope they keep it for HF at the very least. I think it would be best
> >if Element 1 were required for all ham licenses.
>
> I do too, but like I said...the die's cast. This is what "people" want,
> so now they've gotten it.
>
> >> Lastly is creating a new, Code-free HF license between the Technician
> >> Plus-level folks and the General.
> >
> >Why?
> >
> >Why not just create a new entry-level license ("NewNovice",
> >"Communicator", "Basic", whatever), then close off the Tech and Tech
> >Plus?
> >
> >Existing Novices (all 32K of them) get the new entry license via
> >grandfathering. Existing Techs and Pluses keep all VHF/UHF and get the

> >same entry level HF as the new entry-level license.
> >
> >What's the problem with that scenario?
> >
> >> However I can't see the FCC creating a NEW
> >> license when they just went through all the hoop-laa of paring it down to
> >> three.
> >
> >Look at the ARRL petition. They essentially reinvent the Novice, same
> >name, new privs. Exisitng Novices get the new privs. Some version of
> >that can fly.
>
> Like I said...I can't see the FCC creating a new (or re-opening the
> old...) level of licensure...I was just offering it as an option.

They can do whatever they think practical.>
> >> If they did this, I'd give the present Code-tested Generals access to
> >> the Advanced Class sub-bands and let the new folks have the current General
> >> allocations, minus the WARC bands and 160 meters.
> >
> >Too complex.
>
> Why? Techs would get VHF and above. The new "X" class would get old
> General phone priv's minus WARC and 160. What's "too complex" about it....???
>
> The Generals move up to the Advanced class allocations, and Extra's get
> the new "farmed out" phone bands.

So write up a proposal...;-)
>
> >> >Another is the basic reason we have subbands-by-mode in the first
> >> >place. If the US phone subbands are widened, there's less room for CW
> >> >and the data modes. It amounts to rewarding the use of
> >> >spectrum-inefficient modes, and penalizing the use of
> >> >spectrum-efficient modes. And the DX 'phones will move still further
> >> >down the band to get away from the US QRM.
> >>
> >> I agree.
> >
> >So write and submit a petition to FCC. Everybody's doing it....
>
> Yeah...one more glory hound seeking his fame and fortune in the "Federal
> Register"... ! ! !
>
> =)
>
Why not? I know at least one "professional in radio" who has done
so...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3925. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 10:55:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91989

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040512225118.12081.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111844.15ba3573@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040507231931.01198.00000951@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
> >> When it comes to "so wonderfully stupid" you DO seem to have a
> propensity
> >> to get in knee deep.
> >
> >Yet you're up to your eyeballs.
> >
> >> You've done it again.
> >
> >The deepness is of your making. Please don't attribute it to me.
>
> Sorry, Brain, if you don't like being held up to the light of day.

I enjoy sunshine. It feels good.

So don't pretend or insinuate that you're "exposing" me. You're no
magician, and no matter how hard you try, people aren't buying into
your tricks.

Meanwhile, why have you been hiding from the first silly statement
that you made,

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

What frequency authorizations does MARS have in the amateur service?

What frequency authorizations does the amateur service have in MARS?

> >> I am not "back-peddling" on anything.
> >
> >Yes you are. Where is your original, "Sorry Hans..." statement? Huh?
> >
> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS. You
> >> have yet to disprove this.
> >
> >You said, with the exception of a few "AD" personnel, ALL MARS members
> >are hams.

> >
> >You were wrong there, too.
> >
> >So easy to prove you wrong.
>
> So far YOU haven't disproven anything.

I've disproved your statement. Isn't that what we're talking about?
Or have you veered somewhere else now?

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> So minus your ONE example of a civilian director

And that's all it takes. ONE Example!

(BTW..He's the Chief of
> MARS...NOT a MEMBER...You should learn the difference, Brain...)

You're just fool of foolish statments, aren't you?

That is like saying that the Joint -Chiefs- of Staff aren't military
members.

and the AD
> personnel that I had already cited, we still have over 98% of the participants
> in MARS as licensed Amateurs.

First you said it was ALL of them. Then you said it was 99%. Then
you said it was over 90%. Then you said it was over 80%. Now you're
back up to over 98%.

Do you have any idea at all what you're talking about?

Moving targetsand attempts at sleight of hand just aren't working.
You're no magician, and your tricks just aren't working.

> >> Maybe I ought to copy all this stuff and send it to Mrs. Beeper.
> Perhaps
> >> she can explain it to you. Perhaps she can also explain to US why you have
> a
> >> history of pathological lying and an inate ability to get yourself into
> corners
> >> with your mouth that your bravado can't bull you out of...
> >
> >But you're the one dragging out the false bravado. I think its all
> >you've got left at this point. You have no honor, you have no
> >dignity. You just keep piling one erroneous statement on top of
> >another, then call me names.
>
> No "erroneous statements", Brain.

Not even this one?

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

You're so silly.

> Without LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS to fill it's ranks, there would be no MARS
> program.

Yes there would be.

> As for "MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio", I again refer to your lack of ability
> to think in the abstract.

Equations are not abstract.

Steve, quit you're silly charade. Just admit that you were wrong.
All of this sand kicking just makes you look bad - like a cat trying
to cover up something stinky.

> I also suggest you take a listen to almost ANY MARS net frequency during
> "informal" time and tell me what's different about many of the conversations
> that take place there as opposed to on "Amateur" frequencies, other than
> different callsigns.

If they don't have information or traffic to pass, they should remain
silent.

> Lastly, as for "dignity" or "honor", I am not the one with an honesty
> deficit.

Huge, huge deficit. And you keep digging.

> That's you and Lennie.

Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
paraphrasing,

" ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "

When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.

Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII, but I
pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII. He clammed
up and won't respond.

His silence is truly golden

Meanwhile, you just pollute R.R.A.P. with your constant "Liar, Liar,
Pants On Fire," rhetoric and indefensible statements such as, "
Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

Good Grief!

Shouting all of the time, constantly repeating falsehoods, and making
false accusations takes no honor, gives no dignity.

Take a hint from Jim and when you get called on for making such
foolish and stupid statements, just remain silent.

You're broken. Best of luck getting yourself repaired.

> Sucks to be you...Or should I say "Sucks to be the two of you"...?!?!
>
> Deleted the rest. It's been beaten already. As have you, Brain.

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "

hi hi hi ;^)

3926. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 11:03:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405130303.77c0d5a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91990

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040512224136.12081.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:22 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111822.307230e5@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>...

> >For an authoritative answer, please put your question to Don Rumsfeld.
>
> No...I have asked you.
>
> YOU have made this a two-week long diatribe. YOU insist that MARS and
> Amateur Radio are not interwoven.

I have done no such thing. I simply proved that not ALL (as in 100%)
of MARS members are amateur radio operators as you unsuccessfully
tried to assert.

Meanwhile, I'm still waiting on you to prove that MARS=AMATEUR RADIO
as you have falsely asserted.

You keep kicking sand and making personal assaults. Your time would
be better spent gathering facts.

Just back up your statement with something from Part 97 or anything
from a DoD regulation.

That is all.

Dismissed.

3927. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 11:15:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405130315.34506ead@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91991

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040512222746.12081.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111804.1c3c8d5f@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>...

personal assault snipped

> > You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done
> >> in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with ANY
> >> form of proof.
> >
> >I've done them, yet I owe you no proof.
>
> You SAY you've done them.

OK. Both.

I did them, and I say I did them.

> I say I've operated from Okinawa Japan. I can provide copies of old logs,
> and I bet if I wrote to 15th Air Force I could get a copy of my old
> authorization. I can also pony up a couple folks who were there when I did it.

I'm not even interested.

> YOU say you operated from Somalia. You haven't supplied the callsign of
> ONE contact you made...Haven't provided a copy of ANY authorization from that
> operation, and can't even give us the name of your commander that allegedly
> gave you the permission.

I don't need to. I owe you no proof.

That's just the way it is.

Get over it.

Lots more personal attacks deleted.

3928. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 16:11:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405130811.118b98ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91992

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ht2dnXkCROLEcz_dRVn-tA@adelphia.com>...
>
> Side note: I had to give up Hockey temporarily to nurse a torn
> meniscus. At Christmas I couldn't walk down stairs, and long drives in a
> car were murder upon getting out. 6 weeks of rest, then followed by a
> daily weight lifting regimen, and it's a freakin' miracle. Pain is just
> gone! I can hardly wait to lay a good check on someone! 8^)

Glad to hear you're back in one piece and pain-free. I'll never win
any races but I've been able to run for 23 years without serious
injury.
>
> >>>
> >>>There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
> >>>itself)
> >>
> >> I spent a lot of happy hours getting that mirror to perform well.
> >
> >
> > No experience quite like working 'em with a rig ya built from
> > scratch...
>
> hehe, you are right there, Jim. I am PROUD of that thing.

But, Mike, it's not "state-of-the-art", is it? Do "professionals" use
such a telescope? ;-)

> Won a some
> prizes with it too. I unseated the perennial champ at the MAson Dixon
> star party.

bwaahaahaa

You'd make a good barracuda...

> >>>>>
> >>>>>Here's another issue:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
> >>>>>and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
> >>>>>hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
> >>>>>pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
> >>>>>a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
> >>>>>equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
> >>>>>knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret

> >>>>>what is seen, either.
> >>>>
> >>>>simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
> >>>needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
> >>>the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
> >>>And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?
> >>
> >> Right! See my response to Tom (garigue) on the repoters that were
> >>interviewing me at a star party. Ohhh, do they understand!
> >
> >
> > They were awed because it was a *new* experience for most of them. I
> > bet.
>
> Yup. I am always impressed by a good night sky, but these folks
> couldn't normally see much in the sky at all.

Most people can't.

Some weeks ago I was in Manhattan, among the canyons of the tall buildings. All anyone could see of the sky was a few patches almost directly overhead. Horizon? Folks in "the city" don't know what that means.

>I also primed them with my
> interview, and wham! I don' know if you've ever seen pristine sky, but
> like the guy in 2001 says - "My God, its FULL of stars!"

David Bowman. Full quote is "It's hollow - it goes on forever - and oh, my God, it's full of stars!"

And yes, I have seen the pristine sky. One memorable time was some years back in upstate New York, near the Montezuma Wildlife preserve. Waaaaay out in the country, no human lights for a mile or so. Wide open area, no buildings nearby, not even any big trees. Was out on a trouble call for [name of employer deleted] about 2 AM. Got out of the car and turned off the headlights to save the battery. (It was midwinter and about 15-20 below).

Clear moonless night, which is unusual for that area. Fixed the trouble and by then my eyes were very dark-adapted. You can imagine what the sky looked like, from horizon to horizon, 360 degrees all around.
> >
> >>>>Yes the images provided by Hubble are
> >>>>stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.

> >>
> >> What I don't like is that they are citing safety concerns.
> >
> >
> > It's still all about $$. How much you think the shuttle disasters cost
> > in $$? And the truth is that even with all the upgrades they're an old
> > design that costs big money to keep alive.
> >
> > One of the promises made about the shuttle was that it would save
> > money and be 'easily' reused. Neither has come true - it's cheaper to
> > launch satellites on an Ariane and the shuttles are extensively
> > rebuilt between flights.
>
>
> I'm betting on Bert Rutan to take us that next step. He's getting
> close, BTW.

I hope so.
> >
> >>I'll go on
> >>record that I would ride the shuttle to the thing right now to work on
> >>it. In a heartbeat.
> >
> >
> > The next flight will probably be the safest because you *know* they
> > went over the thing with a fine tooth comb...
> >
> >> The world doesn't belong to those that are safe.
> >
>
> > Sure it does! The trick is understanding what safety is really all
> > about. Risk cannot be avoided but there's no point in being foolish.
>
> I dunno, Alan Shepard skirted the foolishness edge, and most people I
> know wouldn't dream of a trip on the shuttle.

When did he skirt the edge?

Remember, until the Challenger disaster, the US had never lost anyone
on an actual spaceflight. The loss of astronauts Grissom, Chaffee and
White in the Apollo 1 fire was a tremendous shock because up to that
time we had never lost an astronaut.

What most people don't realize is that most if not all of the
astronauts up to the end of the Apollo program had been test pilots,
where the losses and near-losses were far higher than in the space
program.

> >>>>But
> >>>>some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all night,
> >>>>observing with a few good friends, sharing our views of the skies. Even
> >>>>alone, the experience is no comparison.

> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Of course.
> >>>
> >>>And some of the best times I've had on this planet are staying up all
> >>>night,
> >>>working CW/Morse on a wide open amateur band, sharing QSOs with fellow
> >>>hams all over the country. Or world. There is no comparison to the
> >>>experience.
> >>
> >> Oh yeah!
> >
> >
> > There are some who call me all sorts of unflattering names because of
> > those experiences...
> >
> >>>Here's another point: Seeking the direct experience is also
> >>>unpredictable in that the seeker is usually at the mercy of Nature.
> >>>You can have the best 'scope imaginable, and an excellent site, but if
> >>>the weather doesn't cooperate you're out of luck. Also, the stars and
> >>>planets don't move to a human schedule - you may have to wait months
> >>>or years to see even some of the more common objects. (Want to see
> >>>Saturn on a moonless night when it is closest to Earth? Don't hold yer
> >>>breath!)
> >>
> >> And it all makes the successful experience all the sweeter!
> >
> >
> > If you could take your 'scope out at almost any time and place and get
> > clear images of most of the sky, it wouldn't be a special experience.
>
> Although in Pennsylvania, the wx takes it to extremes! 8^) AS a matter
> of fact, on of the big reasons I got into the ARS was because the skies
> in PA were so often cloudy, I needed another hobby to give me something
> to do in my spare spare time.

You should try western New York. It's not unusual to have a month of overcast. One winter we had 43 continuous days when the temperature never went above freezing and the overcast never broke. When the sun finally burned through on the 44th day, we weren't sure if it was safe to be out in it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3929. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 16:24:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405130824.6c81d96f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91993

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<o1Qjc.16150$e4.9182@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
>
> > If you were the average ham, Hans......
>
> "Average" and "contesting" are incompatible concepts.

Agreed!
>
> "Nothing average ever stood as a monument to progress.

Not entirely true.

Look at the "average" ham HF transceiver of, say, 40 years ago. Now look at the "average" ham HF transceiver today. Not the top-of-the-line, but rather what the middle of the pack can afford. I'd say there's been some progress, particularly in what such sets cost to buy new in terms of how many hours you have to work to buy one.

Of course one of the big reasons the *average* rig is better is a trickle-down effect of techniques used on the top-of-the-line stuff. Which stuff exists in large part because of the market created by contesters and DXers.

Or look at the features, capabilities and cost of the average PC compared to 5 or 10 years ago. Heck, the average new PC today is more powerful (by a whole bunch of measures) than the top-of-the-line machine of a few years ago - and it costs far less.

So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.

> When
> progress is looking for a partner it doesn't turn to those who
> believe that they are only average. It turns instead to those who
> are forever searching and striving to become the best they
> possibly can. If we seek the average level, we cannot hope to
> achieve a higher level of success. Our only hope is to avoid
> being a failure."

I agree 100% with that part.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3930. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 17:08:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3YNoc.18775$Hs1.13461@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 91994

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.
>

Please never bother to apply for a position in my product development
group.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3931. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 17:57:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mYGdnRpw9PacKj7dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91995

N2EY wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<o1Qjc.16150$e4.9182@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
>>
>>
>>>If you were the average ham, Hans......
>>
>>"Average" and "contesting" are incompatible concepts.
>
>
> Agreed!
>
>>"Nothing average ever stood as a monument to progress.
>
>
> Not entirely true.
>
> Look at the "average" ham HF transceiver of, say, 40 years ago. Now
> look at the "average" ham HF transceiver today. Not the
> top-of-the-line, but rather what the middle of the pack can afford.
> I'd say there's been some progress, particularly in what such sets
> cost to buy new in terms of how many hours you have to work to buy
> one.

And if Hams simply bought the "average" rigs of yesteryear in
preference to the improved ones, we'd still be getting those same
average rigs.

> Of course one of the big reasons the *average* rig is better is a
> trickle-down effect of techniques used on the top-of-the-line stuff.
> Which stuff exists in large part because of the market created by
> contesters and DXers.
>
> Or look at the features, capabilities and cost of the average PC
> compared to 5 or 10 years ago. Heck, the average new PC today is more
> powerful (by a whole bunch of measures) than the top-of-the-line
> machine of a few years ago - and it costs far less.
>
> So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.

Gee Jim! average means just that. The newer better faster average rigs
and computers are getting their increased power or functionality FROM
the better than average machinery. No better than average machinery, no

increased capabilitied to eventually go into the average stuff.
>

- Mike KB3EIA -

3932. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 19:16:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2O-dndz1GfUUVD7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 91996

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ht2dnXkCROLEcz_dRVn-tA@adelphia.com>...
>
>> Side note: I had to give up Hockey temporarily to nurse a torn
>>meniscus. At Christmas I couldn't walk down stairs, and long drives in a
>>car were murder upon getting out. 6 weeks of rest, then followed by a
>>daily weight lifting regimen, and it's a freakin' miracle. Pain is just
>>gone! I can hardly wait to lay a good check on someone! 8^)
>
>
> Glad to hear you're back in one piece and pain-free. I'll never win
> any races but I've been able to run for 23 years without serious
> injury.
>
>>>>>There ya go. Also requires skill and effort. (The glass doesn't grind
>>>>>itself)
>>>>
>>>> I spent a lot of happy hours getting that mirror to perform well.
>>>
>>>
>>>No experience quite like working 'em with a rig ya built from
>>>scratch...
>>
>> hehe, you are right there, Jim. I am PROUD of that thing.
>
>
> But, Mike, it's not "state-of-the-art", is it? Do "professionals" use
> such a telescope? ;-)

Nahh. But this scope IS art! It is an art-deco sort of thing. Imagine a 6 foot faux granite tube in a bluish sort of color. The scope tube is attached to the bottom "rocker box" with wooden tubes that encircle the tube. The box is the traditional square shape with cutouts for the large circular 14 inch altitude bearings to sit in. Instead of the heavy rocker box that most tubes sit in, the box is lightweight, with tapering buttresses for strength. All wood parts are cherry finish. It has a combination of looking like something modern, crossed with 30's sci-fi.

>>Won a some
>>prizes with it too. I unseated the perennial champ at the MAson Dixon
>>star party.
>
>

> bwaahaahaa
>
> You'd make a good barracuda...

he thought so! ;^)

>
>>>>>>>Here's another issue:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If someone wants to look at the moon, planets and stars, the libraries
>>>>>>>and bookstores are full of books with pictures that no amateur could
>>>>>>>hope to equal. The 'net is an even more amazing resource. Look at the
>>>>>>>pictures of Saturn coming from Cassini - this is gonna be one heck of
>>>>>>>a summer for planetary science! And no staying up late, no special
>>>>>>>equipment, no disappointments due to clouds or rain or cold. No real
>>>>>>>knowledge of things like where to point the 'scope or how to interpret
>>>>>>>what is seen, either.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>simmer, simmer, simmer......;^)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Is it not true? If all someone wants is images, no telescope is
>>>>>needed. In fact, I would say the best images available *for free* on
>>>>>the net are probably better than can be obtained by 99% of amateurs.
>>>>>And I think you'd agree. But that's not the point, is it?
>>>>
>>>> Right! See my response to Tom (garigue) on the repoters that were
>>>>interviewing me at a star party. Ohhh, do they understand!
>>>
>>>
>>>They were awed because it was a *new* experience for most of them. I
>>>bet.
>>
>> Yup. I am always impressed by a good night sky, but these folks
>>couldn't normally see much in the sky at all.
>
>
> Most people can't.
>
> Some weeks ago I was in Manhattan, among the canyons of the tall
> buildings. All anyone could see of the sky was a few patches almost
> directly overhead. Horizon? Folks in "the city" don't know what that
> means.
>
>
>>I also primed them with my
>>interview, and wham! I don' know if you've ever seen pristine sky, but
>>like the guy in 2001 says - "My God, its FULL of stars!"
>
>
> David Bowman. Full quote is "It's hollow - it goes on forever - and

> oh, my God, it's full of stars!"
>
> And yes, I have seen the pristine sky. One memorable time was some
> years back in upstate New York, near the Montezuma Wildlife preserve.
> Waaaaay out in the country, no human lights for a mile or so. Wide
> open area, no buildings nearby, not even any big trees. Was out on a
> trouble call for [name of employer deleted] about 2 AM. Got out of the
> car and turned off the headlights to save the battery. (It was
> midwinter and about 15-20 below).
>
> Clear moonless night, which is unusual for that area. Fixed the
> trouble and by then my eyes were very dark-adapted. You can imagine
> what the sky looked like, from horizon to horizon, 360 degrees all
> around.
>
>>>>>>Yes the images provided by Hubble are
>>>>>>stunning. (I'll never forgive NASA if they just let it die up there)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>It's simply a matter of $$. Or lack thereof.
>>>>
>>>> What I don't like is that they are citing safety concerns.
>>>
>>>
>>>It's still all about $$. How much you think the shuttle disasters cost
>>>in $$? And the truth is that even with all the upgrades they're an old
>>>design that costs big money to keep alive.
>>>
>>>One of the promises made about the shuttle was that it would save
>>>money and be 'easily' reused. Neither has come true - it's cheaper to
>>>launch satellites on an Ariane and the shuttles are extensively
>>>rebuilt between flights.
>>
>>
>> I'm betting on Bert Rutan to take us that next step. He's getting
>>close, BTW.
>
>
> I hope so.
>
>>>>I'll go on
>>>>record that I would ride the shuttle to the thing right now to work on
>>>>it. In a heartbeat.
>>>
>>>
>>>The next flight will probably be the safest because you *know* they
>>>went over the thing with a fine tooth comb...
>>>
>>>
>>>> The world doesn't belong to those that are safe.

>>>
>>
>>
>>>Sure it does! The trick is understanding what safety is really all
>>>about. Risk cannot be avoided but there's no point in being foolish.
>>
>> I dunno, Alan Shepard skirted the foolishness edge, and most people I
>>know wouldn't dream of a trip on the shuttle.
>
>
> When did he skirt the edge?

Sitting on top of that little Redstone ought ot do it! Those ealy
astronauts had the nickname "Spam in a Can". My point is that if there
aren't people willing to take the risk, it won't happen

> Remember, until the Challenger disaster, the US had never lost anyone
> on an actual spaceflight. The loss of astronauts Grissom, Chaffee and
> White in the Apollo 1 fire was a tremendous shock because up to that
> time we had never lost an astronaut.
>
> What most people don't realize is that most if not all of the
> astronauts up to the end of the Apollo program had been test pilots,
> where the losses and near-losses were far higher than in the space
> program.

Sure. Most peole don't think anything of driving towards each other at
combined speeds of 160 mph while carring many gallons of almost
explosive fuel either. But they won't take what they consider a risk
either. Go figure!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3933. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-13 19:28:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <sK6dnfLbl5f8UT7d4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 91997

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:AQtoc.3525$zO3.1314@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
> news:do72a0h2l84tstj6d6dj429amuge3019vg@4ax.com...
> > On Tue, 11 May 2004 18:09:29 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> > mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > >news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >
> > >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
> > >
> > >And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
> callsign.
> > >And I am not going to play detective.
> >
> > Let me help out with that....it's in many of Alun's posts:
> >
> > N3KIP - Extra class. Issued March 10, 2004. (is that the original
> > date, or a renewal?)
> >
> > Or G0VUK, in the UK.
> >
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> >
> > 73, Leo
>
> Thanks Leo....
>
> My comments stand. He knows nothing about CW operation. If anyone doubts
> that, go to his QRZ biography and read the following ;
> "100 percent phone operator".
>
> And with a N call 1x3 that means he got his ''Extra" the easy way.
Recently
> no doubt. Guess even a hundred percent phone operator is capable of
passing
> the multiple guess 5wpm test for Extra...what a joke. I rest my case.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

>
>

No an N call 1x3 does not mean that he is necessarily a recent Extra. I pass my Tech with code in May of 1992 and received my original call sign (N8UZE) at that time, which I have kept. In late 1992, I passed my Extra, including 20wpm, and received my Extra class license in early 1993.

The sequentially assigned 1x3 calls beginning with N ran out in the early to mid 1990s, the exact date being dependent on the call area.

One cannot leap to conclusions based on call sign.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3934. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 00:06:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405131606.49e5830@posting.google.com>
Source record: 91998

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mYGdnRpw9PacKj7dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...

> Gee Jim! average means just that. The newer better faster average rigs
> and computers are getting their increased power or functionality FROM
> the better than average machinery. No better than average machinery, no
> increased capabilitied to eventually go into the average stuff.
> >
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Jim, even though he says he designs rigs and builds radios from
scratch, had to buy a kit to get a better than average CW rig.

3935. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 00:57:16 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E8D4F397D1Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 91999

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:sK6dnfLbl5f8UT7d4p2dnA@comcast.com:

>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:AQtoc.3525$zO3.1314@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Leo" <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
>> news:do72a0h2l84tstj6d6dj429amuge3019vg@4ax.com...
>> > On Tue, 11 May 2004 18:09:29 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
>> > mindspring.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > >
>> > >"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > >news:Xns94E5EF14B3D87elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > >
>> > >> Look up what class of licence I have and when it was issued
>> > >
>> > >And how am I to do that Alun? You have not seen fit to provide a
>> > >callsign. And I am not going to play detective.
>> >
>> > Let me help out with that....it's in many of Alun's posts:
>> >
>> > N3KIP - Extra class. Issued March 10, 2004. (is that the original
>> > date, or a renewal?)
>> >
>> > Or G0VUK, in the UK.
>> >
>> > >
>> > >Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> >
>> > 73, Leo
>>
>> Thanks Leo....
>>
>> My comments stand. He knows nothing about CW operation. If anyone
>> doubts that, go to his QRZ biography and read the following ;
>> "100 percent phone operator".
>>
>> And with a N call 1x3 that means he got his ''Extra" the easy way.
>> Recently no doubt. Guess even a hundred percent phone operator is
>> capable of passing the multiple guess 5wpm test for Extra...what a
>> joke. I rest my case.

>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
> No an N call 1x3 does not mean that he is necessarily a recent Extra.
> I pass my Tech with code in May of 1992 and received my original call
> sign (N8UZE) at that time, which I have kept. In late 1992, I passed
> my Extra, including 20wpm, and received my Extra class license in early
> 1993.
>
> The sequentially assigned 1x3 calls beginning with N ran out in the
> early to mid 1990s, the exact date being dependent on the call area.
>
> One cannot leap to conclusions based on call sign.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Indeed. I got my Extra the same time as you did, Dee, although I got a no-code licence in 1980, which of course I couldn't have done if I had been in the US at the time.

3936. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 01:32:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040513213255.10186.00001458@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92000

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/13/2004 5:55 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message

>> Sorry, Brain, if you don't like being held up to the light of day.
>
>I enjoy sunshine. It feels good.

It should. It helps air out your problems.

You ahve a LOT of airing out to do, Brain.

>So don't pretend or insinuate that you're "exposing" me. You're no
>magician, and no matter how hard you try, people aren't buying into
>your tricks.

I'm not "exposing" anything of yours, Brain...You do that all on your own.

>Meanwhile, why have you been hiding from the first silly statement
>that you made,
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
>What frequency authorizations does MARS have in the amateur service?
>
>What frequency authorizations does the amateur service have in MARS?

I am sure you consider it hiding.

You would. You've been getting your nose rubbed in your OWN "silly
statements" for the last several YEARS, now you think you've found something
you can latch on to.

You failed.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

As for the allocations, etc, it doesn't matter, Brain...No Amateur Radio =
No MARS.

>> So far YOU haven't disproven anything.
>
>I've disproved your statement. Isn't that what we're talking about?
>Or have you veered somewhere else now?
>

>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> So minus your ONE example of a civilian director
>
>And that's all it takes. ONE Example!

So, YOUR assertion is tht since there is ONE person in ALL of the MARS program, that if the licensed Amateurs in the program all quit tomorrow it wouldn't matter........

Uh huh.

Brain, if you think you've found the Holy grail, then far be it for me to let you down, but if you think holding on to that ONE example of ALL the members of MARS has found you a niche, then be happy in it.

> (BTW..He's the Chief of
>> MARS...NOT a MEMBER...You should learn the difference, Brain...)
>
>You're just fool of foolish statments, aren't you?
>
>That is like saying that the Joint -Chiefs- of Staff aren't military
>members.
>
> and the AD
>> personnel that I had already cited, we still have over 98% of the
>participants
>> in MARS as licensed Amateurs.
>
>First you said it was ALL of them. Then you said it was 99%. Then
>you said it was over 90%. Then you said it was over 80%. Now you're
>back up to over 98%.
>
>Do you have any idea at all what you're talking about?
>
>Moving targetsand attempts at sleight of hand just aren't working.
>You're no magician, and your tricks just aren't working.

No tricks, Brain.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Are YOU saying otherwise?

Is it YOUR assertion that the MARS program will function just fine without all those licensed Amateurs?

>> No "erroneous statements", Brain.
>
>Not even this one?
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio". "
>

>You're so silly.

No, not even that one.

It stands as it is. MARS exists as a direct decendant of an Amateur Radio program, and it exists today only because of the sacrifice and hard work of licensed Amatuers.

It represents the very essence of what Amateur Radio is all about.

>> Without LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS to fill it's ranks, there would be no
>MARS
>> program.
>
>Yes there would be.

You think MY statement is "silly", but then you make an utterly idiotic one.

Excuse me...ANOTHER utterly idiotic one.

>> As for "MARS >>IS<< Amateur Radio", I again refer to your lack of
>ability
>> to think in the abstract.
>
>Equations are not abstract.
>
>Steve, quit you're silly charade. Just admit that you were wrong.
>All of this sand kicking just makes you look bad - like a cat trying
>to cover up something stinky.

The "something stinky" is in Ohio...Shall I come bury it for you?

>> I also suggest you take a listen to almost ANY MARS net frequency
>during
>> "informal" time and tell me what's different about many of the
>conversations
>> that take place there as opposed to on "Amateur" frequencies, other than
>> different callsigns.
>
>If they don't have information or traffic to pass, they should remain
>silent.

It's called "informal traffic", Brain.

It's allowed.
>
>> Lastly, as for "dignity" or "honor", I am not the one with an honesty
>> deficit.
>
>Huge, huge deficit. And you keep digging.

Nope. This one's ALLLLLLLLLLLLLL yours, Mr. Burke. You've proven yourself untrustworthy and dishonest.

Live with it...Your family manages to.....

Steve, K4YZ

3937. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 01:34:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92001

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/13/2004 6:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405130303.77c0d5a3@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040512224136.12081.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:22 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111822.307230e5@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>
>> >For an authoritative answer, please put your question to Don Rumsfeld.
>>
>> No...I have asked you.
>>
>> YOU have made this a two-week long diatribe. YOU insist that MARS and
>> Amateur Radio are not interwoven.
>
>I have done no such thing. I simply proved that not ALL (as in 100%)
>of MARS members are amateur radio operators as you unsuccessfully
>tried to assert.
>
>Meanwhile, I'm still waiting on you to prove that MARS=AMATEUR RADIO
>as you have falsely asserted.
>
>You keep kicking sand and making personal assaults. Your time would
>be better spent gathering facts.
>
>Just back up your statement with something from Part 97 or anything
>from a DoD regulation.
>
>That is all.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

>Dismissed.

Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.

Steve, K4YZ

3938. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 01:41:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040513214118.10186.00001460@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92002

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/13/2004 6:15 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405130315.34506ead@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040512222746.12081.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111804.1c3c8d5f@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>personal assault snipped
>
>> > You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done
>> >> in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with
>ANY
>> >> form of proof.
>> >
>> >I've done them, yet I owe you no proof.
>>
>> You SAY you've done them.
>
>OK. Both.
>
>I did them, and I say I did them.

But you never proved it.

It's never been documented.

You can't provide ONE iota of proof in an avocation where documentation is
important and ritual in such matters. Most people are intesely proud of having
done what you claim and at LEAST have pictures of their "events".

So far you've not provided ANYthing. Ergo, until said proof is manifest,
as far as I am concerned, you're lying. You've had more than ample opportunity
to ante up, but all you do is make silly sandlot excuses.

You're a coward.

>> I say I've operated from Okinawa Japan. I can provide copies of old
>logs,

>> and I bet if I wrote to 15th Air Force I could get a copy of my old
>> authorization. I can also pony up a couple folks who were there when I did
>it.
>
>I'm not even interested.

Of course you're not. You don't like it when someone can PROVE they did
what YOU only claim.

>> YOU say you operated from Somalia. You haven't supplied the callsign
>of
>> ONE contact you made...Haven't provided a copy of ANY authorization from
>that
>> operation, and can't even give us the name of your commander that allegedly
>> gave you the permission.
>
>I don't need to. I owe you no proof.

I never said you "owe" me anything.

But you "owe" it to yourself to prove the assertions YOU made. I say
you've had more than ample opportunity to prove what you've said. You haven't.
All you've doen is dodge it. That makes me believe you are a liar.

>That's just the way it is.

Yep. That IS just the way it is. Brian Burke is a liar.

>Get over it.

Ain't me that's lying. Nothing to "get over".

>Lots more personal attacks deleted.

They aren't "personal attacks" if they're true. So far you've not done or
said anything to prove otherwise.

Steve, K4YZ

3939. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 03:09:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405131909.79bf4ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92003

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<sK6dnfLbl5f8UT7d4p2dnA@comcast.com>...

> One cannot leap to conclusions based on call sign.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dan and Bruce can always leap to conclusions. It is what the PCTA do best.

They have an upcoming feature in the June issue of Prevenchin Magazine extolling the virtues of leaping for exercise, weight control, and proof of manhood. No sense in counting Tara Root Carbs. I understand that they also have a contract with Tiny Lytle and a new leaping machine to be featured in Saturday afternoon infomercials. It is based upon the International Geographic aborigine leaping tower, and they must tie vines to their ankles when they leap. No one is really sure the actual vine length. Oh well. Almost everyone has their fingers crossed that they don't bash in their brains when they attempt such manly heroic feats. But hey, on a $250 dare, almost anything can happen.

3940. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 12:32:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405140432.6ade41e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92004

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040513214118.10186.00001460@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/13/2004 6:15 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405130315.34506ead@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040512222746.12081.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:04 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111804.1c3c8d5f@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040507233255.01198.00000952@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >
> >personal assault snipped
> >
> >> > You've made assertions about things you've allegedly done
> >> >> in Amateur Radio that you subsequently refuse to substantiate them with
> ANY
> >> >> form of proof.
> >> >
> >> >I've done them, yet I owe you no proof.
> >>
> >> You SAY you've done them.
> >
> >OK. Both.
> >
> >I did them, and I say I did them.
>
> But you never proved it.
>
> It's never been documented.
>
> You can't provide ONE iota of proof in an avocation where documentation is
> important and ritual in such matters. Most people are intesely proud of having
> done what you claim and at LEAST have pictures of their "events".
>
> So far you've not provided ANYthing. Ergo, until said proof is manifest,
> as far as I am concerned, you're lying. You've had more than ample opportunity
> to ante up, but all you do is make silly sandlot excuses.
>

> You're a coward.
>
> >> I say I've operated from Okinawa Japan. I can provide copies of old
> logs,
> >> and I bet if I wrote to 15th Air Force I could get a copy of my old
> >> authorization. I can also pony up a couple folks who were there when I did
> >it.
> >
> >I'm not even interested.
>
> Of course you're not. You don't like it when someone can PROVE they did
> what YOU only claim.
>
> >> YOU say you operated from Somalia. You haven't supplied the callsign
> of
> >> ONE contact you made...Haven't provided a copy of ANY authorization from
> that
> >> operation, and can't even give us the name of your commander that allegedly
> >> gave you the permission.
> >
> >I don't need to. I owe you no proof.
>
> I never said you "owe" me anything.
>
> But you "owe" it to yourself to prove the assertions YOU made. I say
> you've had more than ample opportunity to prove what you've said. You haven't.
> All you've doen is dodge it. That makes me believe you are a liar.
>
> >That's just the way it is.
>
> Yep. That IS just the way it is. Brian Burke is a liar.
>
> >Get over it.
>
> Ain't me that's lying. Nothing to "get over".
>
> >Lots more personal attacks deleted.
>
> They aren't "personal attacks" if they're true. So far you've not done or
> said anything to prove otherwise.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Now you've called me a coward and a liar. They are personal attacks
regardless of whether they're true or not, and they're not true.
You're just not a nice person.

Anyway, I know what I've done and that's enough for me. I don't need
a certificate on the wall to document my operations in foreign lands,
and as far as documention goes, even the FCC no longer requires us to
keep a log book. So much for you wanting me to do this just for me.

Get real, its for you.

Your continued insistance that I provide documention to you just isn't going to happen. You can get over it by getting over it.

So how 'bout them MARS regulations? Can you back up your statement,

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "

Best of Luck.

3941. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 12:38:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92005

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/13/2004 6:03 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405130303.77c0d5a3@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040512224136.12081.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/11/2004 9:22 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405111822.307230e5@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040509221423.21491.00001133@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>
> >> >For an authoritative answer, please put your question to Don Rumsfeld.
> >>
> >> No...I have asked you.
> >>
> >> YOU have made this a two-week long diatribe. YOU insist that MARS and
> >> Amateur Radio are not interwoven.
> >
> >I have done no such thing. I simply proved that not ALL (as in 100%)
> >of MARS members are amateur radio operators as you unsuccessfully
> >tried to assert.
> >
> >Meanwhile, I'm still waiting on you to prove that MARS=AMATEUR RADIO
> >as you have falsely asserted.
> >
> >You keep kicking sand and making personal assaults. Your time would
> >be better spent gathering facts.
> >
> >Just back up your statement with something from Part 97 or anything
> >from a DoD regulation.
> >
> >That is all.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Can you give me the volume and paragraph number for that?

> It really is THAT simple.

Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.

> >Dismissed.
>
> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.

3942. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 12:47:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405140447.7257ac43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92006

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040513213255.10186.00001458@mb-m15.aol.com>...

snip

> >Steve, quit you're silly charade. Just admit that you were wrong.
> >All of this sand kicking just makes you look bad - like a cat trying
> >to cover up something stinky.
>
> The "something stinky" is in Ohio...Shall I come bury it for you?

I perceive a threat in that question.

snip

> Steve, K4YZ

You keep making references to wanting to come to Ohio to do something
to me or for me. I suggest that you stay away.

bb

3943. RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/04

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 16:31:54 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <_v6pc.316$SZ4.11@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92007

The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in April 2004

[131] Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 10.4%
[108] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 8.5%
[89] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 7.0%
[78] K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 6.2%
[63] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 5.0%
[52] Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> 4.1%
[51] Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> 4.0%
[45] Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> 3.6%
[43] N2EY <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> 3.4%
[39] Dee D. Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> 3.1

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be construed."

3944. RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 16:32:14 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <iw6pc.317$SZ4.52@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92008

The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in May 2004

[60] Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 11.2%
[49] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 9.2%
[46] Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> 8.6%
[45] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 8.4%
[43] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 8.0%
[28] N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> 5.2%
[25] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> 4.7%
[24] K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 4.5%
[12] Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> 2.2%
[12] Lumushahs <lumushahs@aol.com> 2.2

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be construed."

3945. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 19:37:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040514153727.29049.00001038@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92009

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/14/2004 7:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140432.6ade41e8@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040513214118.10186.00001460@mb-m15.aol.com>...

>> They aren't "personal attacks" if they're true. So far you've not
>done or
>> said anything to prove otherwise.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Now you've called me a coward and a liar. They are personal attacks
>regardless of whether they're true or not, and they're not true.

Until proven otherwise, they are.

SO far you are both.

>You're just not a nice person.

I guess you consider me "not a nice person" because I don't tolerate your
mistruths and flights of fantasy.

Oh well. You'll excuse me if I don't lose any sleep over what a liar and a
coward thinks of me.

>Anyway, I know what I've done and that's enough for me.

I think you REALLy meant that what you THINK you've done is enough for
you.

>I don't need
>a certificate on the wall to document my operations in foreign lands,
>and as far as documention goes, even the FCC no longer requires us to
>keep a log book. So much for you wanting me to do this just for me.
>Get real, its for you.

>IF< you operated from Somalia, you didn't do it legally.

>IF< you operted from Somalia, you still ahve yet to prove it.

>IF< you were telling the truth about it you could have at least provided
the callsigns of a few folks you chatted with. I remember the calls of some
folks I "worked" from 1981 from Okinawa. What's YOUR problem?

>Your continued insistance that I provide documention to you just isn't
>going to happen. You can get over it by getting over it.

It's no skin off my nose, Brain...I am not the one who made far-out claims
that even a (pardon the pun) rank amateur in DXing could have avoided.

No Proof = Didn't happen.

>So how 'bout them MARS regulations? Can you back up your statement,
>
>" Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "

As long as the two are inter-dependent on each other, Brain, it's true.

As of today. it's true. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Amateur Radio-like conversations conducted by licensed Amateurs who happen
to be MARS members still, as I type this, occur on MARS allocations.

>Best of Luck.

For what?

Steve, K4YZ

3946. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 19:45:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92010

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...

>Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
>>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
>substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.

What's needed, Brain?

No Amateur Radio = No MARS

>> >Dismissed.
>>
>> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.

Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU insist on
calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no degree or
training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof" is that
I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.

That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!

So...we're even.

If you'd stop lying and hiding behind double-speak and dodging direct
questions put to you, I'd stop calling you a liar and coward, but the
likelyhood of THAT happening is, in my estimation, pretty poor.

And there we are...

Steve, K4YZ

3947. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 21:18:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405141318.386f756e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92011

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mYGdnRpw9PacKj7dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<o1Qjc.16150$e4.9182@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>>If you were the average ham, Hans......
> >>
> >>"Average" and "contesting" are incompatible concepts.
> >
> >
> > Agreed!
> >
> >>"Nothing average ever stood as a monument to progress.
> >
> >
> > Not entirely true.
> >
> > Look at the "average" ham HF transceiver of, say, 40 years ago. Now
> > look at the "average" ham HF transceiver today. Not the
> > top-of-the-line, but rather what the middle of the pack can afford.
> > I'd say there's been some progress, particularly in what such sets
> > cost to buy new in terms of how many hours you have to work to buy
> > one.
>
> And if Hams simply bought the "average" rigs of yesteryear in
> preference to the improved ones, we'd still be getting those same
> average rigs.

Exactly my point. Those who wanted something above average (like the
contesters and DXers) drove the market.

And as a result the *average* moved up over time.
>
> > Of course one of the big reasons the *average* rig is better is a
> > trickle-down effect of techniques used on the top-of-the-line stuff.
> > Which stuff exists in large part because of the market created by
> > contesters and DXers.
> >
> > Or look at the features, capabilities and cost of the average PC
> > compared to 5 or 10 years ago. Heck, the average new PC today is more
> > powerful (by a whole bunch of measures) than the top-of-the-line

> > machine of a few years ago - and it costs far less.
> >
> > So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.
>
> Gee Jim! average means just that. The newer better faster average rigs
> and computers are getting their increased power or functionality FROM
> the better than average machinery. No better than average machinery, no
> increased capabilitied to eventually go into the average stuff.

Exactly! But it is the *improvement in the average* that can stand as
a monument to true progress.

IOW, if some tiny percentage of top-end rigs have a new technology,
that's 'progress' for the few who can afford it. But when that new
technology becomes affordable and generally used so that the *average*
rig has it, that's 'progress' for most of us.

73 de Jim, N2EY

Which is more indicative of progress:

- Somebody custom-builds a few very expensive cars with new technology
that get 100 MPG

or

- Somebody mass-produces millions of affordable cars with new
technology that raise the fleet average to 40 MPG

?

Of course the first option will probably precede the second.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3948. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 21:30:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92012

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
>>
> Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> paraphrasing,
>
> " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "

Brian,

You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
>
> When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.

I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
time to read. I just don't have the time to read all the
back-and-forth between you and Steve.

I came across this one by chance and am responding.
>
> Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII, but I
> pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.

Another misquote.

I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our military
in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that they
were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled up
over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
happened over 60 years ago.

btw - ever hear of WERS?

> He clammed up and won't respond.

I'm responding now. You are misquoting what I wrote, probably because
you didn't understand it.
>
> His silence is truly golden

Time is money.

3949. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 21:36:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405141336.3b0853d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92013

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405131606.49e5830@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mYGdnRpw9PacKj7dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
>
> > Gee Jim! average means just that. The newer better faster average rigs
> > and computers are getting their increased power or functionality FROM
> > the better than average machinery. No better than average machinery, no
> > increased capabilitied to eventually go into the average stuff.
> > >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Jim, even though he says he designs rigs and builds radios from
> scratch,

It's a fact. I've designed and built many ham rigs from scratch over
the years. Also converted surplus, fixed up old 'basketcase' rigs,
built kits, and had the occasional manufactured set (last one was a
Ten Tec Argosy, which I sold in 1984).

Plus antennas, power supplies, test equipment, shack furniture, and
lots more. My current computer at home was assembled mostly from parts
of other computers. Had to buy the modem and CD-ROM burner new,
though.

>had to buy a kit to get a better than average CW rig.

Not true. Most of my homebrew rigs have been better than average,
particularly the ones built in the past 25 years or so.

Some rrap regulars have heard my homebrew rigs on the air. You can,
too. 40 CW is about the best bet.

3950. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 21:41:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405141341.1d3231d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92014

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3YNoc.18775$Hs1.13461@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> >
> > So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.
> >
>
> Please never bother to apply for a position in my product development
> group.
>
No bother at all, Hans. It says a lot that my little discourse
disproving one of your pet quotes would instantly disqualify me from
your group.

Funny how some folks say they value independent reasoning, new ideas,
different opinions, creativity and careful analysis - but when
actually confronted by those things, they tell the messenger he's not
wanted.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3951. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-14 22:29:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <4Lbpc.6124$zO3.5375@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92015

Great !! I finally made a top ten finish. Now if I could just do that in a major contest.

Dan/W4NTI

"Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl�" <Gr�mw�tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message news:iw6pc.317$SZ4.52@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in May 2004
>
> [60] Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 11.2%
> [49] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 9.2%
> [46] Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> 8.6%
> [45] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 8.4%
> [43] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 8.0%
> [28] N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> 5.2%
> [25] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> 4.7%
> [24] K�HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 4.5%
> [12] Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> 2.2%
> [12] Lumushahs <lumushahs@aol.com> 2.2
>
>
> --
> "All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
> construed."
>
>

3952. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 03:42:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <9OGdnakDv74mOTjdRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92021

Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½ wrote:

> The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in March 2004
>
>
> [291] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 13.1%
> [278] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.6%
> [239] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 10.8%
> [115] N2EY <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> 5.2%
> [103] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 4.7%
> [98] JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> 4.4%
> [69] CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com> 3.1%
> [67] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 3.0%
> [62] Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> 2.8%
> [57] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> 2.6%

So who cares?

3953. The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 03:55:03 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94E9F305373AEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92016

This is the latest update I could find on Google:-

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
K5TIT: June 1, 2008

Currently, if the code test was dropped before June 15, I would be the winner, but that isn't likely as we don't even have an NPRM. The most recent NPRM took 2 years to work it's way through. If we go by that, it makes Dee the most likely winner. By then the US could be one of the last countries with a code test, as per Len's humourous piece that he posted the other day.

Alun, N3KIP

3954. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 03:56:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40A594FB.4010205@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92017

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Great !! I finally made a top ten finish. Now if I could just do that in a
>major contest.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
I made #7 last month. But I don't show this month. Well, this month
ain't over yet.... :-)

3955. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 04:00:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uBgpc.984$H_3.219@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92018

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405141341.1d3231d4@posting.google.com...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3YNoc.18775$Hs1.13461@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to
progress.
> > >
> >
> > Please never bother to apply for a position in my product
development
> > group.
> >
> No bother at all, Hans. It says a lot that my little discourse
> disproving one of your pet quotes would instantly disqualify me from
> your group.

You didn't disprove the quote, Jim.

You disqualified yourself by accepting mediocrity, "good enough", and "average". My industry is too competitive to abide "average", and those who propose that "*average* can actually be a monument to progress" clearly have the wrong mindset to contribute to our success.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3956. RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 04:58:44 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <8shpc.1083$SZ4.447@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92019

The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in March 2004

[291] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 13.1%
[278] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.6%
[239] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 10.8%
[115] N2EY <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> 5.2%
[103] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 4.7%
[98] JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> 4.4%
[69] CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com> 3.1%
[67] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 3.0%
[62] Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> 2.8%
[57] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> 2.6%

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

3957. RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/02

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 05:01:47 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <%uhpc.1088$SZ4.1078@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92020

The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in February 2004

[189] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 13.2%
[122] N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> 8.5%
[113] Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> 7.9%
[106] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 7.4%
[77] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 5.4%
[53] Leo <nomail@noway.com> 3.7%
[46] Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> 3.2%
[43] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@enoughalreadyadelphia.net> 3.0%
[43] Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> 3.0%
[36] Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> 2.5%

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

3958. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 11:11:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405150311.bd6a508@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92022

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<uBgpc.984$H_3.219@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0405141341.1d3231d4@posting.google.com...
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3YNoc.18775$Hs1.13461@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to
> progress.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Please never bother to apply for a position in my product
> development
> > > > group.
> > > >
> > > No bother at all, Hans. It says a lot that my little discourse
> > > disproving one of your pet quotes would instantly disqualify me from
> > > your group.
> >
> You didn't disprove the quote, Jim.

I disproved the first sentence of it, Hans. The part about "Nothing
average ever stood as a monument to progress".
>
> You disqualified yourself by accepting mediocrity, "good enough", and
> "average".

Those three terms mean very different things. My disproof stands. You
just don't like that fact.

> My industry is too competitive to abide "average",

Your industry "abides" it all the time. Otherwise you'd never get any
products out the door.

> and those
> who propose that "*average* can actually be a monument to progress"
> clearly have the wrong mindset to contribute to our success.

That's bad logic on your part, Hans. The proof is right in front of
you, in the PC you're using. But you refuse to see it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3959. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 15:41:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pSqpc.1360$SZ4.382@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92023

"Monument to Mediocrity" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Your industry "abides" it all the time. Otherwise you'd never get any
> products out the door.

We get a LOT of product out the door. Our engineering groups software
defined radio and hybrid fiber-radio (do a web search on Digivance)
products are the industry leaders precisely because they are not
"average". If we designed "average" stuff, we'd be closing the doors,
not shipping product out them.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3960. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 16:15:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040515121553.13152.00001456@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92024

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/15/2004 10:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <pSqpc.1360$SZ4.382@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Monument to Mediocrity" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

I am always amazed at how you manage to express such outrage or disdain
for others who take such swipes at each other, but somehow seem to think such
swipes are OK for YOU to take, Hans.

What's up with that...?!?! I didn't see Jim take any such swipe at you.

Steve, K4YZ

3961. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-15 22:37:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <sYwpc.7744$zO3.1656@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92025

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94E9F305373AEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> This is the latest update I could find on Google:-
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> K5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
> Currently, if the code test was dropped before June 15, I would be the
> winner, but that isn't likely as we don't even have an NPRM. The most
> recent NPRM took 2 years to work it's way through. If we go by that, it
> makes Dee the most likely winner. By then the US could be one of the last
> countries with a code test, as per Len's humourous piece that he posted
> the other day.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

Your right Alun. I will make a prediction. The FCC will retain CW, but for the Extra class only.

After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex slave countries.

Dan/W4NTI

3962. ARRL and the local scene

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 00:26:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Vyypc.1860$SZ4.967@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92026

The growth in numbers of Amateurs over the past decade has been overwhelmingly via the Technician license. This segment of the Amateur population does not seem highly attracted to ARRL membership, nor affiliative with the "national association" nature of ARRL.

Interestingly, however, these new Amateurs are "local joiners". They attach some importance to public service communications events such as disaster drills, SkyWarn, flood relief, marathons, parade communications, and similar functions of a local nature. Interestingly, even though their on-the-air participation is limited, they represent a significant portion of the crew at Field Day, hamfest staffs, and similar "local" events. They are also well represented on the rosters of many local clubs.

Following is a PBI (Partially Baked Idea) to favorably position ARRL (and Amateur Radio in general) with these newcomers to our hobby.

I propose that the ARRL BoD consider an initiative to attract these newcomers to an interest in ARRL by establishment of a new "Department of Community Support".

The mission of this department of ARRL would be to organize, train, support, and nurture a system of tactical communications teams on the LOCAL level. I use the term "tactical" as opposed to "emergency" intentionally to broaden the scope of the mission to include a wide variety of community-level communications needs.

This "department" would be outside the current Field Organization, and given VISIBLE and COMMITTED volunteer leadership at Director or Vice President rank.

Did I hear someone muttering "Isn't that what ARES is all about?" or "Our current field organization already provides for this." Good points -- ARRL already has some of the pieces in place, and it looks good on paper. Unfortunately these "pieces" tend to be scattered around the ARRL organization and are not linked into a cohesive program. Support and leadership responsibility, from Newington all the way down to the local level, is often a collateral duty and the attention level is spotty and often diluted by competing responsibilities and personal interests. Leadership attention at the SM level is widely variable, and SM's have a diminished mindshare of the general membership by the unfortunate H.Q. decision to remove "Section News" from the national journal of our Association. Without dwelling overlong on the shortcomings of the current situation, I think we can all agree on four points:

1) A focused national program with Director (or higher) level leadership would have more impact than the current fragmented attention to "local" Amateur Radio.

2) Such a program, if successful, would give Amateur Radio valuable credibility in the regulatory and legislative arenas, and with national organizations like Homeland Security, FEMA, and the Red Cross.

3) Such a program, if successful, would serve to elevate the perceived value of Amateur Radio with local civil authorities, perhaps softening the effects of issues like tower ordinances, etc.

4) Such a program, strongly identified with the League, would provide a membership "attractor" to those classes of Amateurs that are now only locally "affiliative". Gaining some traction into this huge reservoir of potential members would be a godsend to the health and growth of ARRL.

What would need to be done to implement such a plan. Here are some "off the top of my head" thoughts.

-- Define the mission and organizational structure.

-- Many of the people (SEC/EC's, etc) are already in place. The organization structure would need to include a short chain-of-command headed by a focused leader at Newington.

-- Move Field Day and SET into this organization as "their" events.

-- Devise a recognition vehicle to give visibility to noteworthy work by individuals and teams in this Department. This visibility (QST?) should extend outside the organization to the "general population" of hams as a recruiting tool.

-- Establish a new periodical (like NCJ for contesters and QEX for experimenters) to help build a "sense of community" among the participants.

-- Educate local civil authorities about this organization, their capabilities, and how to best interface with them to take advantage of their capabilities.

In order to build some critical mass and gain traction, the outreach effort to build these teams should not initially stress ARRL membership for "grassroots" level players, but rather depend on a strong ARRL identity to build esprit de corps and lead to an attitude of support and affiliation with the parent organization. Perhaps appointment to team leadership positions would be conditioned on ARRL membership.

Obviously a lot of this proposal needs a great deal of "fleshing out" and refinement, but I present it in the spirit of a "topic for discussion". I'm sure that the minds gathered here will not be bashful about improving my PBI.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3963. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 00:30:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92027

Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own prediction, are in the past.

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
K0HB: January 1, 3000

Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3964. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 01:26:20 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EAD9D9D9C49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92028

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:sYwpc.7744$zO3.1656@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94E9F305373AEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> This is the latest update I could find on Google:-
>>
>> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
>> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>> K5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>
>> Currently, if the code test was dropped before June 15, I would be the
>> winner, but that isn't likely as we don't even have an NPRM. The most
>> recent NPRM took 2 years to work it's way through. If we go by that,
>> it makes Dee the most likely winner. By then the US could be one of
>> the last countries with a code test, as per Len's humourous piece that
>> he posted the other day.
>>
>> Alun, N3KIP
>
> Your right Alun. I will make a prediction. The FCC will retain CW,
> but for the Extra class only.
>
> After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex
> slave countries.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.

3965. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 01:28:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EADA3FEBFAFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92029

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com:

> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own
> prediction, are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

If Hans wins it will be over my dead body! Really.

3966. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 01:31:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Yvzpc.5038$on.1300@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92030

Hello, Jim

I'd venture another guess, but by that time it won't make any difference to me. Gad, the FCC is *slow*, huh?

Put me down for June 31, 3125 LOL ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - blew my chance big time - I only hope I'm wrong by a few centuries on this one ;)

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com...
> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will be
> eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my own
> prediction, are in the past.
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>
> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.686 / Virus Database: 447 - Release Date: 5/14/04

3967. Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 03:25:54 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@nospam>
Message-ID: <c86mvtrac0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92031

Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
respect for the man.
Thank you.

3968. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 03:49:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92032

Tim wrote:
>
> Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> respect for the man.
> Thank you.

I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.

Dave Heil K8MN

3969. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 04:09:34 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@nospam>
Message-ID: <c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92033

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
Tim wrote:
>
> Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> respect for the man.
> Thank you.

I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.

Dave Heil K8MN

Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and painful.
I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
Thank you for the response.

3970. I shoot radios with my shotgun !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 09:10:51 UTC
From: nice_snipper@yahoo.co.nz
Message-ID: <536e17d9.0405160110.4ab95b9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.gods

because radios are evil aliens from outer space that try to invade our planet.

They must DIE !

3971. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 11:11:04 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EB48D75C6Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92035

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
news:Yvzpc.5038$on.1300@news01.roc.ny:

> Hello, Jim
>
> I'd venture another guess, but by that time it won't make any
> difference to me. Gad, the FCC is *slow*, huh?
>
> Put me down for June 31, 3125 LOL ;)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> ps - blew my chance big time - I only hope I'm wrong by a few centuries
> on this one ;)
>
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com...
>> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will
>> be eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my
>> own prediction, are in the past.
>>
>> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
>> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
>> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>>
>> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.686 / Virus Database: 447 - Release Date: 5/14/04
>
>

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
K5TIT: June 1, 2008
K0HB: January 1, 3000
AA2QA: June 31, 3125 (Was April 1, 2004)

I'm not sure if we should let anyone change their date, but dates after 3000 are moot as none of us will be around by then.

Alun, N3KIP

3972. Re: ARRL and the local scene

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 12:16:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040516081649.07718.00000631@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92036

>Subject: ARRL and the local scene
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 5/15/2004 7:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Vyypc.1860$SZ4.967@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>I propose that the ARRL BoD consider an initiative to attract these
>newcomers to an interest in ARRL by establishment of a new "Department
>of Community Support".

Just what the ARRL needs...Yet another partially staffed, under-funded
program to manage.

>The mission of this department of ARRL would be to organize, train,
>support, and nurture a system of tactical communications teams on the
>LOCAL level. I use the term "tactical" as opposed to "emergency"
>intentionally to broaden the scope of the mission to include a wide
>variety of community-level communications needs.

Someone/somewhere already got THAT message becasue that's exactly what
most ARES organizations (at least hee in Tennessee) do.

>1) A focused national program with Director (or higher) level leadership
>would have more impact than the current fragmented attention to "local"
>Amateur Radio.

Wait-a-minute...First you're promoting a "local" ARRL prograsm, then you go
right back and put the "leadership" as a "national" proram.

>2) Such a program, if successful, would give Amateur Radio valuable
>credibility in the regulatory and legislative arenas, and with national
>organizations like Homeland Security, FEMA, and the Red Cross.

Huh....?!?!

Again, you ae NOT paying attention to current events, Master Chief. Again,
I can only make reference to Tennessee and what I know of programs on-going in
neighboring states (I sit right against AL and GA), but loal ARES managers are
knee-deep in those exact issues.

And the LAST thing the HS folks need is yet-another alphabet soup
organization showing up purporting to represent some other sector of an already
finite subset of responders.

>3) Such a program, if successful, would serve to elevate the perceived
>value of Amateur Radio with local civil authorities, perhaps softening
>the effects of issues like tower ordinances, etc.

Local civil authorities already HAVE that "perceived value",
Hans...otherwise UHF-REACT would suffice.

>4) Such a program, strongly identified with the League, would provide a
>membership "attractor" to those classes of Amateurs that are now only
>locally "affiliative". Gaining some traction into this huge reservoir of
>potential members would be a godsend to the health and growth of ARRL.

>What would need to be done to implement such a plan. Here are some "off
>the top of my head" thoughts.

Obviously you are sincerely motivated, but are having a bit of a "Senior
Moment" in as much as you've used a lot of bandwidth to suggest things that are
already in place.

Bunch of snippage....

>Obviously a lot of this proposal needs a great deal of "fleshing out"
>and refinement, but I present it in the spirit of a "topic for
>discussion". I'm sure that the minds gathered here will not be bashful
>about improving my PBI.

What you COULD do is take the existing programs and put a bit of polish on
them and more effectively accomplish them without creating yet-another ARRL
bureaucracy, Hans.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3973. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 12:19:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040516081905.07718.00000632@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92231

>Subject: Re: Dave Heil
>From: "Tim" Timothy@nospam
>Date: 5/15/2004 11:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>
>
>
>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
>Tim wrote:
>>
>> Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
>> respect for the man.
>> Thank you.
>
>I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
>
>Dave Heil K8MN
>
>Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
>passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
>painful.
>I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
>Thank you for the response.

I get the feeling this was a ruse, Dave...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3974. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 12:39:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405160439.1d07b5f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92037

"Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> Tim wrote:
> >
> > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > respect for the man.
> > Thank you.
>
> I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
>
> Dave Heil K8MN
>
> Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
> passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
> painful.
> I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> Thank you for the response.

Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?

3975. Re: I shoot radios with my shotgun !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 13:34:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <06Kpc.58736$iF6.5266163@attbi_s02>
Source record: 92038

> because radios are evil aliens from outer space that try to invade our planet.
>
> They must DIE !

In all honesty ...there have been times over the last 39 years in this endeavor .....that I have felt the same.

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

3976. Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 15:24:27 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EB73CCECC3Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92039

Here's a roster of recent posters. Mostly extras. Lots of people in Pannysylvania. So now you know.

All publicly available info, with street addresses and e-mails witheld to prevent junk mail/spam etc. If you didn't give a callsign and I couldn't find it then you're not listed.

AA2QA Jim Hampton Extra Ex-WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX , N2JH, KG6AAY
Rochester, NY
AB2OS Alan Beagley Extra Zeeland, MI
AB2RC Alex Flinsch Extra Ex-KC2IVL Mamilton, NJ
G3ZHI Ian Abel Advanced Maltby, England
K0HB Hans Brakob Extra Ex-KG6AQI, WA0PQF, WB9DLL, WB4GXH, WB0WFF
Plymouth, MN
K1KW Chuck O'Neal Extra Vanity Ex-WA1EKV Bolton, MA
K2ASP Phil Kane Extra Vanity Ex-N6SP Beaverton, OR
K2UNK Bill Sohl Extra Budd Lake, NJ
K3LT Larry Roll Extra Vanity Ex-WR2F, KA3HXE, N3CRA, DA1RZ, DA1ZW,
G0LYW Dover, DE
K4YKZ Andrew Kilpatrick Extra Vanity Ex-WZ8A, KN4YKZ, W7BZO, W1EFG
Laurel Pk, NC
K4YZ Steve Robeson Extra Vanity Ex-K4CAP, WN8OAH, WD4DEV,
KA8GRY, KC8M, KA6CM Winchester, TN
K8MN Dave Heil Extra Ex-J52US, A22MN, 5H3US, 9L1US, WB4KTR,
WN8LET Cameron, WV
K9DCI Steve Noskowicz Extra Wonder Lake, IL
KB0YZI Scott Dorsey General Cozad, NE
KB3EIA Mike Coslo Extra State College, PA
KC2ELS Jack Twilley Extra Martinez, CA
KC7GR Bruce Lane Extra Vanity Ex-WD6EOS Kent, WA
KC8EPO Leroy Klose Tech Portage, MI
KC8LDO Scott Leland Tech Madison Hts, MI
KC8PMX Ryan Lughermo Tech Midland, MI
KC9BGC Dan Jacobson Tech Lancaster, WI
KD1S Tony Pelliccio Extra Vanity Ex-KD1NR Providence, RI
KD6MSI Mathew Prosper Tech Victorville, CA
KF6TPT Jeffrey Burchell Tech San Francisco, CA
KI3R Tom Popovic Extra Belle Vernon, PA
N0VFP Lloyd Davies Tech Athens, AL
N2EY Jim Miccolis Extra Wayne, PA
N3CVJ Dave Hall Extra Douglassville, PA
N3KIP Alun Palmer Extra Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK Waldorf, MD
N7RVN Scott Crippen Tech Lincoln, NE
N7ZZT Eric Oyen Tech Phoenix, AZ
N8UZE Dee D Flint Extra Clinton Twp, MI

W3RV Brian Kelly Extra Secane, PA
W4NTI Dan Jeswald Extra Anniiston, AL
W5DXP Cecil Moore Extra Vanity Ex-W6RCA, WN5DXP Madisonville, TX
W5NET Dwight Stewart Tech Vanity Myrtle Beach, SC
W5TIT Kim Walker Tech + Vanity Ex-KC5HQJ Forney, TX
WA2ISE Robert Casey Extra Oradell, NJ
WA2SI Bert Craig Extra Vanity Ex-KC2HMN Centereach, NY
WA3MOJ George Busch Extra Allentown, PA
WA8ULX Bruce Beynon Extra Covington, LA
WB2TT Tam Tammaru Advanced Vanity Ex-WB2TMD Middletown, NJ
WK3C Carl Stevenson Extra Vanity Ex-WA6VSE Emmaus, PA

3977. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 15:43:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405160743.21047551@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92040

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514153727.29049.00001038@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/14/2004 7:32 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140432.6ade41e8@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040513214118.10186.00001460@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> >> They aren't "personal attacks" if they're true. So far you've not
> done or
> >> said anything to prove otherwise.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Now you've called me a coward and a liar. They are personal attacks
> >regardless of whether they're true or not, and they're not true.
>
> Until proven otherwise, they are.
>
> SO far you are both.

Hmmm?

I wonder what you would call a person who presumes guilt until proven
innocent? America fought a war to get rid of people who think that
way.

> >You're just not a nice person.
>
> I guess you consider me "not a nice person" because I don't tolerate your
> mistruths and flights of fantasy.
>
> Oh well. You'll excuse me if I don't lose any sleep over what a liar and a
> coward thinks of me.
>
> >Anyway, I know what I've done and that's enough for me.
>
> I think you REALLy meant that what you THINK you've done is enough for
> you.
>
> >I don't need
> >a certificate on the wall to document my operations in foreign lands,
> >and as far as documention goes, even the FCC no longer requires us to

> >keep a log book. So much for you wanting me to do this just for me.
> >Get real, its for you.
>
> >IF< you operated from Somalia, you didn't do it legally.
>
> >IF< you operted from Somalia, you still ahve yet to prove it.
>
> >IF< you were telling the truth about it you could have at least provided
> the callsigns of a few folks you chatted with. I remember the calls of some
> folks I "worked" from 1981 from Okinawa. What's YOUR problem?

I don't have a problem. I've told you before that I'm good with what
I did, and don't need your approval. Never did, and never will.
Sucks, huh?

> >Your continued insistance that I provide documention to you just isn't
> >going to happen. You can get over it by getting over it.
>
> It's no skin off my nose, Brain...I am not the one who made far-out claims
> that even a (pardon the pun) rank amateur in DXing could have avoided.

Dave Heil is a rank amateur? I don't think so. But like you, even he
didn't know that a military commander can approve amateur operation in
a foreign country without a government until I pointed it out to him.
And you see a commander behind every butter bar. I guess that's how
marines are trained. You really shouldn't bring up such embarassing
accusations. You look a fool, and here you go dragging Dave into this
again.

BTW, Dave and I get along just fine as long as we don't communicate
with each other. You might try the same tactic, but then you wouldn't
have anyone to talk to. And do try to keep from sending to me
personal e-mails.

> No Proof = Didn't happen.
>
> >So how 'bout them MARS regulations? Can you back up your statement,
> >
> >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> As long as the two are inter-dependent on each other, Brain, it's true.

True? Show that it's true. Post the regulation volume and paragraph
number. Unless there is no regulation that state's,

" Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "

without the "Sorry, Han's" part, of course.

> As of today. it's true. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> Amateur Radio-like conversations conducted by licensed Amateurs who happen
> to be MARS members still, as I type this, occur on MARS allocations.

I listened to a Canadian amateur the other day. Sounded just like an American. But I don't make the claim that "America = Canada," based upon that observation, do I? That would be a stupid statement, and I would be foolish for making it.

You are free to make such stupid statements, however. And I am free to point out just how stupid they are and how foolish you are for making them.

Don't like it? The fix is easy and easily within your control (and you do like control, don't you?).

1. Stop saying stupid stuff.

2. If you goof and say something stupid anyway, and I point it out to you, just acknowledge that it was a stupid thing to say.

> >Best of Luck.
>
> For what?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

For digging yourself out of yet another untenable position.

Best of Luck.

BTW, how was Dayton? Camping WX was lousy.

3978. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/03

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 15:46:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405160746.750a5e21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92041

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<8shpc.1083$SZ4.447@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in March 2004
>
>
> [291] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 13.1%
> [278] Steve Robeson, K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.6%
> [239] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 10.8%
> [115] N2EY <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> 5.2%
> [103] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 4.7%
> [98] JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> 4.4%
> [69] CL <does_it_matter@noreply.com> 3.1%
> [67] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 3.0%
> [62] Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> 2.8%
> [57] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> 2.6%

So what did I win?

How did I do in April?

3979. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 15:54:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <D8Mpc.2253$H_3.488@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92042

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

> Here's a roster of recent posters. Mostly extras. Lots of people in
> Pannysylvania. So now you know.

Alun,

Did you have a point, or did no-one rise to your stalking/trolling bait
when you posted the roster as "Grumwitch" so you had to try again?

73, de Hans, K0HB

(PS: You missed a LOT of ex-calls in your roster, and some are just
plain wrong. For example, Jim Hampton was never licensed as KG6AAY.)

3980. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 16:17:19 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92043

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> > paraphrasing,
> >
> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
>
> Brian,
>
> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.

From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST

In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:

For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code testing
at all.
>
> (1) Amateur Basic.
>
> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz, 21mHz,
> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.

Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
increasing
use of the band?

> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.

You mean same as Extras have now?

> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.

Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
an
incentive to use voice only!

Jim, I paraphrased your statment. You stated, and the idea was, if
the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it would
act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
band.

Is that correct?

> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
>
> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> time to read.

You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.

I just don't have the time to read all the
> back-and-forth between you and Steve.

Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.

> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
> >
> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII, but I
> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
>
> Another misquote.

I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.

> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our military
> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that they
> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled up
> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
> happened over 60 years ago.

I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
today. I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
amateurs. And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
amateur radio makes, was it not?

Do you agree with Steve that, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
Radio. "

> btw - ever hear of WERS?

Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where

"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."

> > He clammed up and won't respond.
>
> I'm responding now. You are misquoting what I wrote, probably because
> you didn't understand it.
> >
> > His silence is truly golden
>
> Time is money.

Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.

3981. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 16:45:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92044

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
> >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
>
> What's needed, Brain?

A citation from an applicable regulation.

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS

" Sorry Han's, MARS > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," is simply
untrue.

> >> >Dismissed.
> >>
> >> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.
>
> Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU insist on
> calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no degree or
> training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof" is that
> I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.

That's another reason why I think you're nuts. You are the one who
made a stupid assertion (Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio").
I'm the one dogging you.

So, please substantiate your silly, stupid statement with a citation
from an applicable regulation.

> That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!

Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you

don't respect civility.

> So...we're even.

Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other ways.

> If you'd stop lying and hiding behind double-speak and dodging direct
> questions put to you, I'd stop calling you a liar and coward, but the
> likelyhood of THAT happening is, in my estimation, pretty poor.
>
> And there we are...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Here we are.

You've lost all credibility. No one believes, " Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," and you can't seem to find a citation to prove it's true.

Best of Luck.

3982. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 19:03:48 UTC
From: Tampa Tom <dx@tamtomdxman.net>
Message-ID: <c88dr3gdu0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92232

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
>
> I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

Dave,

What is the story with Wiseman? Anybody who reads a few of his posts
can plainly see he has multiple mental health issues, but why does he
persist
in harassing certain people? A WV ham told us on 20m that Roger is very
obese and lives on public support. Many people wonder if that is true?

Tampa Tom (Call witheld, because Wiseman harassed me in the past)
14240 DX net

3983. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 20:24:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <l6Qpc.9331$zO3.6018@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92045

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94EAD9D9D9C49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:sYwpc.7744$zO3.1656@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94E9F305373AEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> This is the latest update I could find on Google:-
> >>
> >> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> >> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> >> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> >> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> >> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> >> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> >> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> >> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> >> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> >> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> >> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> >> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> >> K5TIT: June 1, 2008
> >>
> >> Currently, if the code test was dropped before June 15, I would be the
> >> winner, but that isn't likely as we don't even have an NPRM. The most
> >> recent NPRM took 2 years to work it's way through. If we go by that,
> >> it makes Dee the most likely winner. By then the US could be one of
> >> the last countries with a code test, as per Len's humourous piece that
> >> he posted the other day.
> >>
> >> Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Your right Alun. I will make a prediction. The FCC will retain CW,
> > but for the Extra class only.
> >
> > After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex
> > slave countries.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >

> >
>
> You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.

Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position. Glad to see I have you placed in the right hole.

Dan/W4NTI

3984. How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 20:28:40 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Y9Qpc.19686$MH.7158884@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92046

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> Tim wrote:
> >
> > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > respect for the man.
> > Thank you.
>
> I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX. Has anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail addresses have gone unanswered.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3985. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 21:21:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92047

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > Tim wrote:
> > >
> > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > > respect for the man.
> > > Thank you.
> >
> > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> >
> > Dave Heil K8MN
> >
> > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
> > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
> > painful.
> > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > Thank you for the response.
>
> Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?

Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM, glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site. Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to posting his material through various anonymous remailers.

He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and hasn't been back.

He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to local law enforcement.

Dave K8MN

3986. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 21:26:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92048

In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
>> >>
>> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
>> > paraphrasing,
>> >
>> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
>>
>> Brian,
>>
>> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
>--
>From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
>Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
>View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
>Original Format
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST
>
>In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
>
>For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code
testing
>at all.
>>
>> (1) Amateur Basic.
>>
>> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
21mHz,
>> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
>
>Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
>increasing
>use of the band?
>

>> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
>
>You mean same as Extras have now?
>
>> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
>> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
>
>Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
>an
>incentive to use voice only!
>---
>
>Jim, I paraphrased your statment.

No, you didn't. You isquoted it, in such a way that the meaning was
changed.

>You stated, and the idea was, if
>the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it
would
>act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
>band.

That's correct. *IF* such changes were made *in the future*, the test
would act as a disincentive.

Which is quite a different thing from what you wrote:

" ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "

are is present tense. *Would be* is future conditional tense. Your
misquote changes the meaning. So it's neither a quote nor a
paraphrase.
>
>Is that correct?

See above. Now you can argue the details all you want but the fact
remains your misquote does not have the same meaning.
>
>> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
>> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
>>
>> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
>> time to read.
>
>You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
>statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.

You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.
>
>> I just don't have the time to read all the
>> back-and-forth between you and Steve.
>

>Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.

I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.
>
>> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
>> >
>> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII,
but I
>> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
>>
>> Another misquote.
>
>I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.

That's true! You misquoted.
>
>> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our
military
>> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that
they
>> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled
up
>> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
>> happened over 60 years ago.
>
>I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
>today.

Then why did you misquote me? Why all the fuss about the historical
item I posted?

> I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
>amateurs.

Where was that done?

Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
is well documented fact.

>And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
>amateur radio makes, was it not?

Look it up. You obviously have more time for newsgrouping than I.

In fact I started a new thread with that post. It was a description of
radio station WAR at a specific point in time. I didn't write it, I
just quoted it - exactly as written.
>
>Do you agree with Steve that, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
>Radio. "

I have no opinion on the matter.
>
>> btw - ever hear of WERS?
>
>Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where
>
>"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."

You don't know what WERS was, then.
>
>> > He clammed up and won't respond.
>>
>> I'm responding now. You are misquoting what I wrote, probably
because
>> you didn't understand it.
>> >
>> > His silence is truly golden
>>
>> Time is money.
>
>Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.

Why? You don't do that.

3987. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 21:39:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92049

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> > >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
> > >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
> >
> > What's needed, Brain?
>
> A citation from an applicable regulation.

Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS
>
> " Sorry Han's, MARS > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," is simply
> untrue.

No, it's not.

That you are inadequately knowledgeable of MARS programs and
policies to know otherwise is also true.

> > >> >Dismissed.
> > >>
> > >> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
> > >>
> > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.
> >
> > Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU insist on
> > calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no degree or

> > training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof" is that
> > I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.
>
> That's another reason why I think you're nuts. You are the one who
> made a stupid assertion (Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio").
> I'm the one dogging you.

It's not stupid. Perhaps poorly worded, at least to a person such
as yourself who cannot understand the interdependence of the two.

And you're still a punk.

> So, please substantiate your silly, stupid statement with a citation
> from an applicable regulation.

Still need that peice of paper to know a slap in the facr hurts,
Brain?

> > That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!
>
> Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
> stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you
> don't respect civility.

Sure I do.

And right up to the part where you started in on your usual
crapola in THIS thread, I had made it a point of very carefully typing
B r i a n.

As for Lennie...the only "stops" he usually winds up pulling out
are the ones holding him and the rest of his fecally contaminated
verbal effluent back.

That he does it to himself (and now takes you along with him) is
evident. That he was once a person of accomplishment and
responsibility now fallen on his lack of character and honesty is
pitiful.

That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.

> > So...we're even.
>
> Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other
> ways.

You're right, but not for the reason I am sure YOU think...

SO FAR we are still waiting for you to back up your assertions
that "unlicensed radio services" play a "major role" in disaster
communications.

We're also waiting for you to back up your Somalia claims. You
continue to argue that "It's true because I say it's true", yet there
should be a paper trail wide enough to roller skate on to show where

your assertions are true.

And we still have your "Lennie is my hero" thing...Whew....

So you're right...it's not "even"...

> > If you'd stop lying and hiding behind double-speak and dodging direct
> > questions put to you, I'd stop calling you a liar and coward, but the
> > likelyhood of THAT happening is, in my estimation, pretty poor.
> >
> > And there we are...
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Here we are.
>
> You've lost all credibility. No one believes, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," and you can't seem to find a citation to
> prove it's true.

No one except everyone who knows enough about the current affairs
of the various MARS programs and thier dependence upon the Amateur
Radio service to make it work and sustain it.

Too bad YOU don't...Cudda saved yourself a lot of effort and
humiliation.

> Best of Luck.

None needed...You make it too easy...Again.

Steve, K4YZ

3988. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 21:54:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405161354.54c4e39f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92050

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405160743.21047551@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514153727.29049.00001038@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> > >Now you've called me a coward and a liar. They are personal attacks
> > >regardless of whether they're true or not, and they're not true.
> >
> > Until proven otherwise, they are.
> >
> > SO far you are both.
>
> Hmmm?
>
> I wonder what you would call a person who presumes guilt until proven
> innocent? America fought a war to get rid of people who think that
> way.

What guilt, Brain?

You've made assertions of fact then not backed them up.

I call a person like that a liar. You've had months and months
to prove it otherwise, yet you won't.

If you don't like the black eye you're getting, then either admit
you were making it up, or pony up some evidence to the contrary.

> > >Your continued insistance that I provide documention to you just isn't
> > >going to happen. You can get over it by getting over it.
> >
> > It's no skin off my nose, Brain...I am not the one who made far-out claims
> > that even a (pardon the pun) rank amateur in DXing could have avoided.
>
> Dave Heil is a rank amateur? I don't think so. But like you, even he
> didn't know that a military commander can approve amateur operation in
> a foreign country without a government until I pointed it out to him.
> And you see a commander behind every butter bar. I guess that's how
> marines are trained. You really shouldn't bring up such embarassing
> accusations. You look a fool, and here you go dragging Dave into this
> again.

And as of yet, you haven't even provided the name of that
"commander".

Furthermore, you wee under the auspices of the United Nations.
They ahd jurisdiction, not your LT or CPT.

As for your "commander behind every butter bar", you really need
to wake up, Brain. No such assertion was ever made.

> BTW, Dave and I get along just fine as long as we don't communicate
> with each other. You might try the same tactic, but then you wouldn't
> have anyone to talk to. And do try to keep from sending to me
> personal e-mails.

I am sure there are a LOT of people who enjoy not talking to you,
Brain...No doubt out of frustration from trying to have an INFORMED
discussion with you.

You wear ignorance and arrogance like a badge of honor. I just
don't get that.

> > No Proof = Didn't happen.
> >
> > >So how 'bout them MARS regulations? Can you back up your statement,
> > >
> > >" Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "
> >
> > As long as the two are inter-dependent on each other, Brain, it's true.
>
> True? Show that it's true. Post the regulation volume and paragraph
> number. Unless there is no regulation that state's,
>
> " Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< "Amateur Radio". "
>
> without the "Sorry, Han's" part, of course.

Don't need to, Brain. It's a fact.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.......Just like I don't need a piece
of paper to tell me that an abrupt application of force to the face
will hurt.

> > As of today. it's true. No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> > Amateur Radio-like conversations conducted by licensed Amateurs who happen
> > to be MARS members still, as I type this, occur on MARS allocations.
>
> I listened to a Canadian amateur the other day. Sounded just like an
> American. But I don't make the claim that "America = Canada," based
> upon that observation, do I? That would be a stupid statement, and I
> would be foolish for making it.

Sure it would be stupid.

But then it's not what we are talking about, now is it?

> You are free to make such stupid statements, however. And I am free
> to point out just how stupid they are and how foolish you are for
> making them.

That you disagree with how I worded it is fair game.

That the context is still valid isn't. No Amateur Radio = No
MARS.

> Don't like it? The fix is easy and easily within your control (and
> you do like control, don't you?).
>
> 1. Stop saying stupid stuff.

When I say something stupid, I will keep that in mind.

> 2. If you goof and say something stupid anyway, and I point it out to
> you, just acknowledge that it was a stupid thing to say.

If I say something stupid and you point it out, I will acknowledge
it. WHEN it happens, Brain...It hasn't yet.

> > >Best of Luck.
> >
> > For what?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> For digging yourself out of yet another untenable position.

What "untenable position"...?!?!

No Amateur Radio = No MARS. It's a fact.

> Best of Luck.
>
> BTW, how was Dayton? Camping WX was lousy.

Wouldn't know...Today (May 16th) was the fifth anniversary of my
daughter's passing, and my wife insisted I stay close to home. But no
matter where I go, there she is...She may ahve left my arms, but
she'll never leave my heart.

Steve, K4YZ

3989. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 22:09:55 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@nospam>
Message-ID: <c88ordobc0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92051

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net...
Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > Tim wrote:
> > >
> > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out
of
> > > respect for the man.
> > > Thank you.
> >
> > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> >
> > Dave Heil K8MN
> >
> > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you
had
> > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow
and
> > painful.
> > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > Thank you for the response.
>
> Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?

Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
posting his material through various anonymous remailers.

He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
hasn't been back.

He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his
character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to
local law enforcement.

Dave K8MN

..

I'm surprised nobody's slapped the snot out of him yet. Sounds like he richly deserves same.

Tim

3990. Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 22:13:01 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@nospam>
Message-ID: <c88p18puj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92052

What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does he work? Does he have a family?
It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.

Tim

3991. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 22:44:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <39Spc.4742$xu7.2251@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92053

Hello, Hans

You are correct; I never held that call. I have operated from that station on Guam, however (as you know) as well as from KG6NAC (I *think* that was the call sign of the Naval Hospital on Guam - am I correct?).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:D8Mpc.2253$H_3.488@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > Here's a roster of recent posters. Mostly extras. Lots of people in
> > Pannysylvania. So now you know.
>
> Alun,
>
> Did you have a point, or did no-one rise to your stalking/trolling bait
> when you posted the roster as "Grumwitch" so you had to try again?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> (PS: You missed a LOT of ex-calls in your roster, and some are just
> plain wrong. For example, Jim Hampton was never licensed as KG6AAY.)
>
>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.687 / Virus Database: 448 - Release Date: 5/16/04

3992. Re: ARRL and the local scene

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 23:02:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405161502.53c24a76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92054

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Vyypc.1860$SZ4.967@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...

> . . . . would have more impact than the current fragmented attention to "local"
> Amateur Radio.
>
>
> Obviously a lot of this proposal needs a great deal of "fleshing out"
> and refinement, but I present it in the spirit of a "topic for
> discussion". I'm sure that the minds gathered here will not be bashful
> about improving my PBI.

Hans your heart and head are clearly in several right directions.
Whilst, of course, some of it is utter nonsense too. No surprise there
eh?

I'm not a clubbie, I haven't been able to raise any interest in that
whole scene since my Novice days back in the stone age. However I do
know a bunch of 'em peripherally mostly via the machines and via
holding down a few CW seats during their Field Day operations, some
socializing here and there, etc. In a nutshell many if not a majority
of those in this group have no interest in highly-organized activities
and/or don't care enough about any of it to even cough up the forty
bucks a year for a subscription to QST. Methinks you'd have a very
hard sell on your hands with your proposal.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

3993. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 23:16:37 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pDSpc.2866$H_3.2537@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92055

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

> You are correct; I never held that call. I have operated from that
station
> on Guam, however (as you know) as well as from KG6NAC (I *think* that
was
> the call sign of the Naval Hospital on Guam - am I correct?).

KG6NAA -- Naval Air Station
KG6NAB -- NavSta Orote
KG6NAC -- NavHosp
KG6AAY -- NCS Finegayan
KG6ALU -- NRS Barrigada
KG6FAE -- AAFB

Trivia: Who was KG6AIG and what was his original call?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3994. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 23:47:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <14Tpc.5096$ay3.4796@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92056

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:pDSpc.2866$H_3.2537@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
> KG6NAA -- Naval Air Station
> KG6NAB -- NavSta Orote
> KG6NAC -- NavHosp
> KG6AAY -- NCS Finegayan
> KG6ALU -- NRS Barrigada
> KG6FAE -- AAFB
>
> Trivia: Who was KG6AIG and what was his original call?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
Hello, Hans.

I'll take a stab. KG6AIG - 1967 - Operator Luis Garrido. Just a google search, so fill me in.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.687 / Virus Database: 448 - Release Date: 5/16/04

3995. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-16 23:49:48 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <a4babbfd67dd7f4d41a75cc8bbfd26b5@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 92057

In article <40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
> Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.

While fatass high-el just pulls thing out of his fat ass. Since when is
Roger's street "by the river' you moron? I'd say the river was at least
a mile away.

> Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> posting his material through various anonymous remailers.

translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaahh!'

Hey, did you enjoy putting that child molesting daddy of yours in the
ground in march?

> He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> hasn't been back.

You're lying. Ray gave you both the tour of that building when the
meeting was over, you fatass slob. And, you kept whining at Roger all
through the meeting. You didn't dare actually *do* anything but whine,
did you? I suppose you should've been embarassed by your wrinkled
clothes and that cheap cologne that covered up the fact you didn't take
a shower, but you are too stupid.

> He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has

yeah, old fatassed bertie, your gay lover. you know, he didn't even know
the capacity of his hard drive, when asked about it he started to
describe it's outside physical demensions. his fatass looked like a big
bubble as he waddled past and out the door of the computer store.

> been retested by the FCC

too bad they didn't give any reason, did they imbecile? anybody who got
their license under he VE system can be retested at any time, you
stammering, bad-comb over wearing, overweight slob.
davey's about 300 pounds over 6 foot and his fat stomach hangs over his
cheap wrinkled clothes.

> and is in danger of losing his ticket over his character.

And davey lives in his own little world. they all wear jack boots and swastikas and say sieg heil.

> I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to local law enforcement.

bwhahahahahahahahahahaha...to that corrupt local law enforcement, you mean.

3996. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 00:33:48 UTC
From: Max Mustermann <anonymous@remail.amessage.info>
Message-ID: <d25ef4a4a3ef0f4a0288fbcaf590fc67@remail.amessage.info>
Source record: 92058

In article <d22b54c3.0405160439.1d07b5f1@posting.google.com>
kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) felched:
>
> Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?

Hey Kelly, do they really have TOS at starnetusa?

Search results for: 64.24.19.165

OrgName: Starnet, Inc.
OrgID: STNI
Address: 579 First Bank Drive,
Address: Suite 100
City: Palatine
StateProv: IL
PostalCode: 60067
Country: US

NetRange: 64.24.0.0 - 64.24.255.255
CIDR: 64.24.0.0/16
NetName: STARNET-CIDR-BLK-2
NetHandle: NET-64-24-0-0-1
Parent: NET-64-0-0-0-0
NetType: Direct Allocation
NameServer: NS1.STARNETINC.COM
NameServer: NS3.STARNETINC.COM
Comment: ADDRESSES WITHIN THIS BLOCK ARE NON-PORTABLE
RegDate: 1999-12-29
Updated: 2002-04-19

TechHandle: SH1253-ARIN
TechName: StarNet Hostmaster, StarNet
TechPhone: +1-847-963-0116
TechEmail: hostmaster@starnetusa.net

OrgAbuseHandle: SAD-ARIN
OrgAbuseName: StarNet Abuse Desk
OrgAbusePhone: +1-847-963-0116
OrgAbuseEmail: abuse@starnetusa.net

OrgNOCHandle: STARN-ARIN
OrgNOCName: StarNet NOC
OrgNOCPhone: +1-847-963-0116
OrgNOCEmail: noc@starnetusa.net

OrgTechHandle: SH1253-ARIN
OrgTechName: StarNet Hostmaster, StarNet

```
OrgTechPhone: +1-847-963-0116
OrgTechEmail: hostmaster@starnetusa.net

# ARIN WHOIS database, last updated 2004-05-15 19:15
# Enter ? for additional hints on searching ARIN's WHOIS database.
```

3997. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 00:48:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92059

>
>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
>>
>>
>
>Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position. Glad to
>see I have you placed in the right hole.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd keep
it for
extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on the
VE's giving
the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have to
keep and
maintain code test tapes.

3998. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 01:08:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GgUpc.3100$H_3.2402@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92060

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
.
>
> I'll take a stab. KG6AIG - 1967 - Operator Luis Garrido. Just a
google
> search, so fill me in.
>

I'm surprised that Luis showed up in Google, as I think he went SK in
about 1970.

Luis was the grand old Ham of Guam. He commissioned the TransPac cable
head at Orote (when it was telegraphy without repeaters) and was the
chief operator there under German, US, JA, and again US administration .
His first amateur license (OM6xx-something) was issued by the Germans
when they held the island, and in WW-II he was instrumental (via
clandestine radio) in helping the USN stage amphibious landings to root
out the JA's. A Navy dump huck RM1 (George Tweed -- "No Man is an
Island") who missed the last boat before the occupation because he was
laid up drink got a lot of undeserved credit for Luis' work in that,
because the Navy needed a hero and Luis was just native Chamorran who
wouldn't have played well in a war-bond drive.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3999. Re: ARRL and the local scene

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 01:30:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PNmdnaT57bEriDXdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92061

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> The growth in numbers of Amateurs over the past decade has been
> overwhelmingly via the Technician license. This segment of the Amateur
> population does not seem highly attracted to ARRL membership, nor
> affiliative with the "national association" nature of ARRL.

Therein lies the whole problem. Somewhere along the line Technicians were left out of the mix. ARRL has tried some things. When I got my Technician's license in '99, I received a nice introductory letter and even a little magazine supplement with a project or two in it. But I think even that is more oriented to Hams like myself, that intend to go on in the hobby beyond Technician.

I agree with you that many of the Tech's help with the public service. Many of the volunteers that help in events that I work are Technicians.

Rather than a "department", I would suggest that ARRL might have some articles that relate to these folk.

I suppose that will P**s off some hams, but that's okay, they were already that way.

I think the problem as you not it is a big part of ARRL wanting to give the Tech's a free General license. I think they figure if the give 'm HF access, they might join up.

Bad way to do it.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

4000. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 01:37:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405161737.7266ae8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92062

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > > >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> > > >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> > > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
> > > >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
> > >
> > > What's needed, Brain?
> >
> > A citation from an applicable regulation.
>
> Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
> you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
> be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?

Please, not another threat to injure me.

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS
> >
> > " Sorry Han's, MARS > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," is simply
> > untrue.
>
> No, it's not.
>
> That you are inadequately knowledgeable of MARS programs and
> policies to know otherwise is also true.

Now you lie.

> > > >> >Dismissed.
> > > >>
> > > >> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.

> > > >>
> > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > >Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.
> > >
> > > Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU insist on
> > > calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no degree or
> > > training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof" is that
> > > I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.
> >
> > That's another reason why I think you're nuts. You are the one who
> > made a stupid assertion (Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio").
> > I'm the one dogging you.
>
> It's not stupid. Perhaps poorly worded, at least to a person such
> as yourself who cannot understand the interdependence of the two.

Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!

It's just wrong.

> And you're still a punk.

Not really.

> > So, please substantiate your silly, stupid statement with a citation
> > from an applicable regulation.
>
> Still need that peice of paper to know a slap in the facr hurts,
> Brain?

Nope. I need a cite from any applicable regulation to convince me
that your statement is true. Got one?

> > > That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!
> >
> > Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
> > stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you
> > don't respect civility.
>
> Sure I do.

No, you don't.

> And right up to the part where you started in on your usual
> crapola in THIS thread, I had made it a point of very carefully typing
> B r i a n.

That was very sweet of you, but doesn't change just how wrong your
MARS=ARS claim was.

> As for Lennie...the only "stops" he usually winds up pulling out
> are the ones holding him and the rest of his fecally contaminated
> verbal effluent back.

Geee, it just doesn't look that way from my perspective.

> That he does it to himself (and now takes you along with him) is
> evident. That he was once a person of accomplishment and
> responsibility now fallen on his lack of character and honesty is
> pitiful.

Odd, but I haven't seen much of Len lately. How nice of him to be
taking me along with him.

> That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.

Its called, "The High Road."

> > > So...we're even.
> >
> > Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other
> > ways.
>
> You're right, but not for the reason I am sure YOU think...
>
> SO FAR we are still waiting for you to back up your assertions
> that "unlicensed radio services" play a "major role" in disaster
> communications.

So? I hope you won't mind if I keep you waiting?

> We're also waiting for you to back up your Somalia claims. You
> continue to argue that "It's true because I say it's true", yet there
> should be a paper trail wide enough to roller skate on to show where
> your assertions are true.

But I never needed your blessing. You'll just have to roller skate
elsewhere.

> And we still have your "Lennie is my hero" thing...Whew....
>
> So you're right...it's not "even"...

Not even a little bit.

> > > If you'd stop lying and hiding behind double-speak and dodging direct
> > > questions put to you, I'd stop calling you a liar and coward, but the
> > > likelyhood of THAT happening is, in my estimation, pretty poor.
> > >
> > > And there we are...
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Here we are.
> >
> > You've lost all credibility. No one believes, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> > >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," and you can't seem to find a citation to
> > prove it's true.
>

> No one except everyone who knows enough about the current affairs
> of the various MARS programs and thier dependence upon the Amateur
> Radio service to make it work and sustain it.

If its so obvious to "everyone," then anyone should be able to post
the citation.

But they aren't.

> Too bad YOU don't...Cudda saved yourself a lot of effort and
> humiliation.

I haven't felt the slightest humiliation. How are you coming with
that citation? How are all of you backers coming with any citation at
all?

> > Best of Luck.
>
> None needed...You make it too easy...Again.

Easy? I see no citation.

Best of Luck.

4001. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 01:49:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405161749.613d03eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92063

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
> >> >>
> >> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> >> > paraphrasing,
> >> >
> >> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> >>
> >> Brian,
> >>
> >> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
> >>--
> >From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
> >Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
> >View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
> >Original Format
> >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST
> >
> >In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
> >k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> >
> >For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code
> testing
> >at all.
> >>
> >> (1) Amateur Basic.
> >>
> >> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
> 21mHz,
> >> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
> >
> >Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
> >increasing

> >use of the band?
> >
> >> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
> >
> >You mean same as Extras have now?
> >
> >> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> >> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> >
> >Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
> >an
> >incentive to use voice only!
> >--
> >
> >Jim, I paraphrased your statment.
>
> No, you didn't. You isquoted it, in such a way that the meaning was
> changed.
>
> >You stated, and the idea was, if
> >the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it
> would
> >act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
> >band.
>
> That's correct. *IF* such changes were made *in the future*, the test
> *would act* as a disincentive.
>
> Which is quite a different thing from what you wrote:
>
> " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
>
> *are* is present tense. *Would be* is future conditional tense. Your
> misquote changes the meaning. So it's neither a quote nor a
> paraphrase.
> >
> >Is that correct?
>
> See above. Now you can argue the details all you want but the fact
> remains your misquote does not have the same meaning.

So a Morse Exam can only be a disincentive if it's in the future, even
though many, many, many amateurs have posted here that it has been a
disincentive in the past, and is currently a disincentive.

And only you can say what is a disincentive in the amateur world, and
all other opinions are wrong?

> >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
> >>

> >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> >> time to read.
> >
> >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
> >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
>
> You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.

Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.

> >> I just don't have the time to read all the
> >> back-and-forth between you and Steve.
> >
> >Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.
>
> I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
> his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.

So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.

> >> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
> >> >
> >> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII,
> but I
> >> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
> >>
> >> Another misquote.
> >
> >I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.
>
> That's true! You misquoted.

It would have to be presented as a quote to do that.

> >> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our
> military
> >> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that
> they
> >> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled
> up
> >> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
> >> happened over 60 years ago.
> >
> >I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
> >today.
>
> Then why did you misquote me? Why all the fuss about the historical
> item I posted?
>
> > I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
> >amateurs.
>

> Where was that done?
>
> Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
> were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
> is well documented fact.

Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.

> >And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
> >amateur radio makes, was it not?
>
> Look it up. You obviously have more time for newsgrouping than I.

I think we put out about equal time, despite your claim that you don't
read my posts.

> In fact I started a new thread with that post. It was a description of
> radio station WAR at a specific point in time. I didn't write it, I
> just quoted it - exactly as written.

Cool.

> >Do you agree with Steve that, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
> >Radio. "
>
> I have no opinion on the matter.

You're a funny guy.

> >> btw - ever hear of WERS?
> >
> >Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."
>
> You don't know what WERS was, then.

The article didn't say anything about -amateur- transmissions being
allowed. There were also community civil defense type radio
transmissions authorized, and amateurs were often the operators of
such community stations, but not in an amateur capacity.

> >> > He clammed up and won't respond.
> >>
> >> I'm responding now. You are misquoting what I wrote, probably
> because
> >> you didn't understand it.
> >> >
> >> > His silence is truly golden
> >>
> >> Time is money.
> >
> >Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.

>
> Why? You don't do that.

Time is money?

4002. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 01:49:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92064

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
> >> >>
> >> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> >> > paraphrasing,
> >> >
> >> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> >>
> >> Brian,
> >>
> >> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
> >>--
> >From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
> >Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
> >View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
> >Original Format
> >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST
> >
> >In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
> >k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> >
> >For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code
> testing
> >at all.
> >>
> >> (1) Amateur Basic.
> >>
> >> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
> 21mHz,
> >> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
> >
> >Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
> >increasing

> >use of the band?
> >
> >> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
> >
> >You mean same as Extras have now?
> >
> >> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> >> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> >
> >Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
> >an
> >incentive to use voice only!
> >--
> >
> >Jim, I paraphrased your statment.
>
> No, you didn't. You isquoted it, in such a way that the meaning was
> changed.
>
> >You stated, and the idea was, if
> >the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it
> would
> >act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
> >band.
>
> That's correct. *IF* such changes were made *in the future*, the test
> *would act* as a disincentive.
>
> Which is quite a different thing from what you wrote:
>
> " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
>
> *are* is present tense. *Would be* is future conditional tense. Your
> misquote changes the meaning. So it's neither a quote nor a
> paraphrase.
> >
> >Is that correct?
>
> See above. Now you can argue the details all you want but the fact
> remains your misquote does not have the same meaning.

So a Morse Exam can only be a disincentive if it's in the future, even
though many, many, many amateurs have posted here that it has been a
disincentive in the past, and is currently a disincentive.

And only you can say what is a disincentive in the amateur world, and
all other opinions are wrong?

> >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
> >>

> >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> >> time to read.
> >
> >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
> >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
>
> You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.

Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.

> >> I just don't have the time to read all the
> >> back-and-forth between you and Steve.
> >
> >Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.
>
> I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
> his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.

So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.

> >> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
> >> >
> >> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII,
> but I
> >> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
> >>
> >> Another misquote.
> >
> >I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.
>
> That's true! You misquoted.

It would have to be presented as a quote to do that.

> >> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our
> military
> >> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that
> they
> >> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled
> up
> >> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
> >> happened over 60 years ago.
> >
> >I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
> >today.
>
> Then why did you misquote me? Why all the fuss about the historical
> item I posted?
>
> > I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
> >amateurs.
>

> Where was that done?
>
> Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
> were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
> is well documented fact.

Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.

> >And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
> >amateur radio makes, was it not?
>
> Look it up. You obviously have more time for newsgrouping than I.

I think we put out about equal time, despite your claim that you don't
read my posts.

> In fact I started a new thread with that post. It was a description of
> radio station WAR at a specific point in time. I didn't write it, I
> just quoted it - exactly as written.

Cool.

> >Do you agree with Steve that, " Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
> >Radio. "
>
> I have no opinion on the matter.

You're a funny guy.

> >> btw - ever hear of WERS?
> >
> >Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."
>
> You don't know what WERS was, then.

The article didn't say anything about -amateur- transmissions being
allowed. There were also community civil defense type radio
transmissions authorized, and amateurs were often the operators of
such community stations, but not in an amateur capacity.

> >> > He clammed up and won't respond.
> >>
> >> I'm responding now. You are misquoting what I wrote, probably
> because
> >> you didn't understand it.
> >> >
> >> > His silence is truly golden
> >>
> >> Time is money.
> >
> >Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.

>
> Why? You don't do that.

Time is money?

4003. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 02:02:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405161802.600802fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92065

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Y9Qpc.19686$MH.7158884@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > Tim wrote:
> > >
> > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > > respect for the man.
> > > Thank you.
> >
> > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> >
> > Dave Heil K8MN
>
> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX. Has
> anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail addresses have
> gone unanswered.

Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.

> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

w3rv

4004. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 02:05:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ucWdnVd3vdJqgDXdRVn-jw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92066

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mYGdnRpw9PacKj7dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<o1Qjc.16150$e4.9182@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>If you were the average ham, Hans......
>>>>
>>>>"Average" and "contesting" are incompatible concepts.
>>>
>>>
>>>Agreed!
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Nothing average ever stood as a monument to progress.
>>>
>>>
>>>Not entirely true.
>>>
>>>Look at the "average" ham HF transceiver of, say, 40 years ago. Now
>>>look at the "average" ham HF transceiver today. Not the
>>>top-of-the-line, but rather what the middle of the pack can afford.
>>>I'd say there's been some progress, particularly in what such sets
>>>cost to buy new in terms of how many hours you have to work to buy
>>>one.
>>
>> And if Hams simply bought the "average" rigs of yesteryear in
>>preference to the improved ones, we'd still be getting those same
>>average rigs.
>
>
> Exactly my point. Those who wanted something above average (like the
> contesters and DXers) drove the market.
>
> And as a result the *average* moved up over time.

>
>>>Of course one of the big reasons the *average* rig is better is a
>>>trickle-down effect of techniques used on the top-of-the-line stuff.
>>>Which stuff exists in large part because of the market created by
>>>contesters and DXers.
>>>
>>>Or look at the features, capabilities and cost of the average PC
>>>compared to 5 or 10 years ago. Heck, the average new PC today is more
>>>powerful (by a whole bunch of measures) than the top-of-the-line
>>>machine of a few years ago - and it costs far less.
>>>
>>>So I'd say that the *average* can actually be a monument to progress.
>>
>> Gee Jim! average means just that. The newer better faster average rigs
>>and computers are getting their increased power or functionality FROM
>>the better than average machinery. No better than average machinery, no
>>increased capabilitied to eventually go into the average stuff.
>
>
> Exactly! But it is the *improvement in the average* that can stand as
> a monument to true progress.
>
> IOW, if some tiny percentage of top-end rigs have a new technology,
> that's 'progress' for the few who can afford it. But when that new
> technology becomes affordable and generally used so that the *average*
> rig has it, that's 'progress' for most of us.

But without the extraordinary, that progress is not made.

I understand your argument, but to me it is backwards.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4005. Dayton report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 03:03:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6M2dnVOnPpz4tjXdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92067

I just got back from Dayton.

As I expected, I had a good time.

I got to drool over the new Yaesu and Icom top end rigs. Not that I'm likely to ever own something that costs over 10K!

Friday was hot and muggy.
Saturday was rainy and cool (hey-it's Dayton, eh?)
At the flea, there was a lot more radio equipment than last year, thank goodness. And real radio equipment, not just old Motorola UHF Handi-talkies. I think maybe some of the bloom is off the Ebay seller's orgy.

Stuff I liked:

The better flea market.
Of course the new equipment to look at.
The couple funny pictures I got of people taking pictures of "Booth Babes" - that's right, not the ladies, but the people taking pix of them.

Parking at the Salem Mall beats heck out of parking in the grassy (muddy) fields next to the Hamvention. The short bus ride takes you and your purchases close to your car in a paved lot, so you don't get muddy.

At the flea beer stand, there was a rep giving out free samples of Michelob Ultra (yuck!) and Michelob amber bock (amazingly enough - yummmmm) I had to buy a couple.

Stuff I didn't like:

Seems every year, we get there on time, and the flea doesn't open until 20 minutes late.

Flea sellers that are firm on prices. I insulted a few people with my offers on equipment..... Seriously newbies, you are *supposed* to wrangle over the price. If you think that FT-101 is worth 600 dollars and won't haggle, you probably aren't going to sell it.

With all due respect - are those Collins rigs *really* worth it?

Ten-Tec wouldn't sell me the demo of the Capacitor kit they had for sale. I needed two for a tuner project, and they only had one plus the demo. And I just couldn't talk them into selling me the display unit! I kinda understand, but it was still frustrating.

Finally, this observation - and I really hate to make this, because of all the jokes about obese hams. I noted a number of those little three

wheeled carts at Dayton. Some of them were moving around people that obviously needed them. This is a wonderful thing, allowing people that might otherwise not be able to even attend the event. Unfortunately, fully 95 percent of the riders of the carts were people whose only apparent affliction was that they were very, very overweight! This is not good for a person, and it made me kind of sad to see it. If these good people want to do themselves a favor, they could rise off their backsides and get the exercise that they need. Good for the heart, and will help get rid of the excess baggage.

Note this is not only Amateur radio. I'm beginning to see grossly obese people doing the cart thing all over. SO this isn't aimed at Dayton or Hams.

But all the niggling over small things - and they were indeed very small - I had a hoot at Dayton this year, and if everything works out I'll be there again next year.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4006. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 03:19:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92071

Tim wrote:
> What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
> he work? Does he have a family?
> It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
>
> Tim
>
>
"somewhat" is putting it mildly.

4007. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 04:23:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405162023.6fd6fa9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92068

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > > Tim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > > > respect for the man.
> > > > Thank you.
> > >
> > > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> > >
> > > Dave Heil K8MN
> > >
> > > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
> > > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
> > > painful.
> > > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > > Thank you for the response.
> >
> > Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?
>
> Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
> Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
>
> He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> hasn't been back.
>
> He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
> been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his
> character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to
> local law enforcement.

He needs to be invited to a "party" . .

> Dave K8MN

4008. Re: The impact of the abolishment of CW in France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 04:29:00 UTC
From: Globern <Globern@la-neuf.org>
Message-ID: <XnF94EC41F326C5FGlobernlaneuf@193.252.19.141>
Source record: 92069

Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to> a cru
bon de raconter en ce si beau jour
news:a985062c4dda401fc13873ca0afd1c1e@cypherpunks.to:

>
...../Snip/......

JM Leclere aka F1DFR, fantastic fascist ham told :

Beurk.... !

As usual !

A te relire sur frra ou fsp, ma caille !
See you later on frra or fsp, sweet friend !

--
Globern
"Un jour le courage frappe a la porte de la peur et demande :
Qui est la ? La peur r&#65533;pond : La peur. Le courage entre, et il n'y a
personne." Marianne Muguet

4009. Re: News from France

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 04:33:02 UTC
From: Globern <Globern@la-neuf.org>
Message-ID: <XnF94EC42A27E112Globernlaneuf@193.252.19.141>
Source record: 92070

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> a cru bon de raconter en ce si beau jour
news:Xns94E37D290EF5Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4:

> The French have been waitng for some time for a government minister to
> sign the rule change abolishing their code test. It was signed on the
> 4th, and will take effect when published in the official journal,
> probably either on the 14th or 21st of May, 2004.
>

Yep ! It's done for 24 hours from now.

Regards !

--
Globern
"Un jour le courage frappe a la porte de la peur et demande :
Qui est la ? La peur r&#65533;pond : La peur. Le courage entre, et il n'y a
personne." Marianne Muguet

4010. Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 04:54:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A84591.A0FCA539@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92072

George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman under cover of yet another anonymous remailer wrote:

> dumbass davey's dad the episcopalian priest who died march 1 is probably > getting...
> terry his mommy was the...

Roger, I really want to thank you for providing confirmation of the things I wrote about your behavior.

> wiseman isn't
> even near the river, lardass. you lose as usual.

Glen Dale is near the river. Therefore, if you live in Glen Dale, you live near the river.

There is quite a bit of good information about your particular problem available on the web. One site says:

"Antisocial Personality Disorder: Lack of regard for the moral or legal standards in the local culture, marked inability to get along with others or abide by societal rules. Sometimes called psychopaths or sociopaths."

Another site provides the following material:

"Diagnostic Criteria"

"A.There is a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others occurring since age 15 years, as indicated by three (or more) of the following:
1.failure to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behaviors as indicated by repeatedly performing acts that are grounds for arrest
2.deceitfulness, as indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, or conning others for personal profit or pleasure
3.impulsivity or failure to plan ahead
4.irritability and aggressiveness, as indicated by repeated physical fights or assaults
5.reckless disregard for safety of self or others
6.consistent irresponsibility, as indicated by repeated failure to sustain consistent work behavior or honor financial obligations
7.lack of remorse, as indicated by being indifferent to or rationalizing having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another."

Yet another site has this to say:

"Definition"

"Antisocial personality disorder is a psychiatric condition characterized by chronic behavior that manipulates, exploits, or violates the rights of
others. This behavior is often criminal."

"Causes, incidence, and risk factors"

"Personality disorders are chronic behavioral and relationship patterns that intefere with a person's life over many years. To receive a diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder, a person must have first had behavior that qualifies for a diagnosis of conduct disorder during childhood."

"The cause of antisocial personality disorder is unknown, but genetic factors and child abuse are believed to contribute to the development of this condition. People with an antisocial or alcoholic parent are increased risk. Far more men than women are affected, and unsurprisingly, the condition is common in prison populations."

Take your medication, Roger or they'll end up putting you away.

Dave K8MN

4011. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 05:10:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A8492E.D8FFC8FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92073

George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman, using an anonymous remailer of
necessity wrote:
>
> In article <40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
> >
> > Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> > along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> > glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
>
> While fatass high-el just pulls thing out of his fat ass. Since when is
> Roger's street "by the river' you moron? I'd say the river was at least
> a mile away.

I welcome this chance for dialog, Roger but you'll have to show me that
you have enough common sense to know that I wrote nothing of your
street, but of the town of Glen Dale, which is situated along the Ohio
River. You live there--you ought to know these things.

> > Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> > child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> > posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
>
> translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaahh!'

Retranslation: You keep getting the boot from ISP's. You use anonymous
remailers of necessity.

> Hey, did you enjoy putting that child molesting daddy of yours in the
> ground in march?

Thanks, once again for proof of my initial statement.

> > He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> > hasn't been back.
>
> You're lying. Ray gave you both the tour of that building when the
> meeting was over, you fatass slob. And, you kept whining at Roger all
> through the meeting. You didn't dare actually *do* anything but whine,
> did you?

You left in mid-tour and bolted. It was noted and commented upon by
those in attendance. You have not attended another meeting.

> > He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
>
> yeah, old fatassed bertie, your gay lover.

Bzzzt. That's incorrect. N8NN was living in Germany and I was living
in Tanzania when you had your close encounter, Roger. It was someone
else.
You may drive yourself crazier by guessing who it might have been.

> > been retested by the FCC
>
> too bad they didn't give any reason, did they imbecile? anybody who got
> their license under he VE system can be retested at any time...

...but never without a reason. There's always a reason. Care to tell
us about the reason for your retest?
>
> > and is in danger of losing his ticket over his character.
>
> And davey lives in his own little world. they all wear jack boots and
> swastikas and say sieg heil.

I don't have any power over those who would yank your ticket over
character issues. You're about to stew in the cauldron which you
personally heated.

> > I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to local law enforcement.
>
> bwhahahahahahahahahahaha...to that corrupt local law enforcement, you
> mean.

You aren't doing yourself any favors by making such claims. You aren't
what your surname suggests.

Dave K8MN

4012. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 05:12:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A849A5.9794D67D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92074

```
Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86php$hl$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > > > Tim wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > > > > respect for the man.
> > > > > Thank you.
> > > >
> > > > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
> > > > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
> > > > painful.
> > > > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > > > Thank you for the response.
> > >
> > > Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?
> >
> > Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> > along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> > glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
> > Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> > child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> > posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
> >
> > He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> > hasn't been back.
> >
> > He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
> > been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his
> > character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to
> > local law enforcement.
>
> He needs to be invited to a "party" . .
```

Our problem child doesn't rank high on the local popularity charts in or out of amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

4013. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 11:03:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040517070319.10421.00001563@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92075

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/16/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161715.77df12bc@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405161354.54c4e39f@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> Wouldn't know...Today (May 16th) was the fifth anniversary of my
>> daughter's passing, and my wife insisted I stay close to home. But no
>> matter where I go, there she is...She may ahve left my arms, but
>> she'll never leave my heart.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, I am sorry. Maybe one day they'll move the dates of the Hamvention
>again.

Thanks, Brian.

For me, anyway, it really would have been better to go. I needed to be away for a bit, but hey...can't always have everything the way we want it, eh...???

At least I can look forward to Huntsville...If anyone is within a "relatively" reasonable drive time of Huntsville, AL, and has never been to this one, they should try to. It's the second or third weekend of August, and is always a lot of fun.

The "flea market" is indoors, but there's lots-and-lots of it. All the usual forums and a very reasonable showing of vendors and organizations. All-in-all it's a very well conducted regional hamfest. (Computers are there, but in an ancilliary role!)

73 & thanks again...

Steve, K4YZ

4014. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 11:22:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040517072244.10421.00001564@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92076

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/16/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161737.7266ae8c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...

>> Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
>> you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
>> be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?
>
>Please, not another threat to injure me.

Where's the threat?

I asked you if you need a piece of paper to know if a slap in the face
would hurt?

No one >>I<< know does, and no one >>I<< know who is invilved with or
knowledgeable of the MARS program argues with the concept that No Amateur Radio
= No MARS.

>> That you are inadequately knowledgeable of MARS programs and
>> policies to know otherwise is also true.
>
>Now you lie.

No, I do not.

You continue to argue that if the licensed Amateur participants in the
MARS program ceased to participate, that the program would carry on.

I know better. So do people who are in the program. Anyone who can
"argue" against common sense obviously is ill-prepared to REALLY "argue" the
facts.

>> It's not stupid. Perhaps poorly worded, at least to a person such
>> as yourself who cannot understand the interdependence of the two.
>
>Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
>
>It's just wrong.

Nope. No Amateur Radio = No MARS. And the MARS program is

>> Still need that peice of paper to know a slap in the facr hurts,
>> Brain?

>
>Nope. I need a cite from any applicable regulation to convince me
>that your statement is true. Got one?

Nope. But then I've been a member of all three programs at one time or
another.

I know from EXPERIENCE that all three programs are dependent upon licensed
Radio Amateurs to conduct thier programs.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

>> > > That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!
>> >
>> > Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
>> > stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you
>> > don't respect civility.
>>
>> Sure I do.
>
>No, you don't.

Sure I do.

>> And right up to the part where you started in on your usual
>> crapola in THIS thread, I had made it a point of very carefully typing
>> B r i a n.
>
>That was very sweet of you, but doesn't change just how wrong your
>MARS=ARS claim was.

It's not wrong.

The Amateur Radio serice CAN live without MARS. There's precious little
that MARS programs do that Amatuers can't do or aren't doing already.

If, for some obscure reason, every licensed Amateur withdrew from MARS,
MARS would have to fold.

On the otherhand, if MARS folded up tomorrow, there'd be a lot of
disappointed Amateurs, however the Amateur Service would continue.

>> As for Lennie...the only "stops" he usually winds up pulling out
>> are the ones holding him and the rest of his fecally contaminated
>> verbal effluent back.
>
>Geee, it just doesn't look that way from my perspective.

I am sure it doesn't. You have already proven that your perspective is
very...uhhhhhh...unique.

>> That he does it to himself (and now takes you along with him) is
>> evident. That he was once a person of accomplishment and

>> responsibility now fallen on his lack of character and honesty is
>> pitiful.
>
>Odd, but I haven't seen much of Len lately. How nice of him to be
>taking me along with him.
>
>> That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.
>
>Its called, "The High Road."

In the Marines we learned that being up high wasn't always a good idea.
In either case, you often arrive at the same destination, just more tired for
your effort and without any benefit of having made the trip the long way
around.

>> > > So...we're even.
>> >
>> > Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other
>> > ways.
>>
>> You're right, but not for the reason I am sure YOU think...
>>
>> SO FAR we are still waiting for you to back up your assertions
>> that "unlicensed radio services" play a "major role" in disaster
>> communications.
>
>So? I hope you won't mind if I keep you waiting?

No problem here, Brian...It's YOUR black eye.

>> We're also waiting for you to back up your Somalia claims. You
>> continue to argue that "It's true because I say it's true", yet there
>> should be a paper trail wide enough to roller skate on to show where
>> your assertions are true.
>
>But I never needed your blessing. You'll just have to roller skate
>elsewhere.

I never offered my "blessing".

I have simply stated that an assertion without validation can be
considered invalid. Asserting something to BE true while proactively refusing
to validate it is lying.

>> And we still have your "Lennie is my hero" thing...Whew....
>>
>> So you're right...it's not "even"...
>
>Not even a little bit.

And again you're right, but not for the rason I am sure you THINK you are!

>> No one except everyone who knows enough about the current affairs
>> of the various MARS programs and thier dependence upon the Amateur
>> Radio service to make it work and sustain it.
>
>If its so obvious to "everyone," then anyone should be able to post
>the citation.
>
>But they aren't.

Again...My analogy to being slapped in the face applies.

You will also notice that they AREN'T rushing to your defense, either.

>> Too bad YOU don't...Cudda saved yourself a lot of effort and
>> humiliation.
>
>I haven't felt the slightest humiliation. How are you coming with
>that citation? How are all of you backers coming with any citation at
>all?
>
>> > Best of Luck.
>>
>> None needed...You make it too easy...Again.
>
>Easy? I see no citation.

None needed.

>Best of Luck.

For what?

Steve, K4YZ

4015. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 11:30:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040517073044.10421.00001565@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92077

>Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/16/2004 8:49 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>
>
>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...

>> >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
>> >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
>> >>
>> >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
>> >> time to read.
>> >
>> >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
>> >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
>>
>> You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.
>
>Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.

He has. On several occassions. You and Lennie have simple tried to
"dismiss" him with your "TAKARJ" drivvel.

>> I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
>> his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.
>
>So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.

Or he read mine wherein a quote of your comment was made.

And I might point out that having read this one thing does NOT make his
reading of your posts "all-inclusive".

>> Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
>> were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
>> is well documented fact.
>
>Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.

Sealing of the receivers was too. Your point?

>> >> btw - ever hear of WERS?
>> >
>> >Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where
>> >
>> >"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."
>>
>> You don't know what WERS was, then.
>
>The article didn't say anything about -amateur- transmissions being
>allowed. There were also community civil defense type radio
>transmissions authorized, and amateurs were often the operators of
>such community stations, but not in an amateur capacity.

No...just as supervisors, watch standers, traffic handlers, technicians
and engineers.

That's all.

>> >Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.
>>
>> Why? You don't do that.
>
>Time is money?

In your case I'd say because the truth is embarrassing.

Steve, K4YZ

4016. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 12:34:11 UTC
From: Tampa Tom <dx@tamtomdxman.net>
Message-ID: <c8abchtva0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92078

Looks like Dave can claim "spank" on Roger. Wonder if Dave is
Stagger Lee, Roger's long time Nemesis?

Tampa Tom

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A84591.A0FCA539@earthlink.net...
> George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman under cover of yet another anonymous
> remailer wrote:
>
> > dumbass davey's dad the episcopalian priest who died march 1 is probably
> getting...
> > terry his mommy was the...
>
> Roger, I really want to thank you for providing confirmation of the
> things I wrote about your behavior.
>
> > wiseman isn't
> > even near the river, lardass. you lose as usual.
>
> Glen Dale is near the river. Therefore, if you live in Glen Dale, you
> live near the river.
>
> There is quite a bit of good information about your particular problem
> available on the web. One site says:
>
> "Antisocial Personality Disorder: Lack of regard for the moral or
> legal standards in the local culture, marked inability to get along with
> others or abide by societal rules. Sometimes called psychopaths or
> sociopaths."
>
> Another site provides the following material:
>
> "Diagnostic Criteria"
>
> "A.There is a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the
> rights of others occurring since age 15 years, as indicated
> by three (or more) of the following:
> 1.failure to conform to social norms with respect to lawful
> behaviors as indicated by repeatedly performing acts that are
> grounds for arrest
> 2.deceitfulness, as indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases,
> or conning others for personal profit or pleasure
> 3.impulsivity or failure to plan ahead
> 4.irritability and aggressiveness, as indicated by repeated

> physical fights or assaults
> 5.reckless disregard for safety of self or others
> 6.consistent irresponsibility, as indicated by repeated failure
> to sustain consistent work behavior or honor financial
> obligations
> 7.lack of remorse, as indicated by being indifferent to or
> rationalizing having hurt, mistreated, or stolen from another."
>
> Yet another site has this to say:
>
> "Definition"
>
> "Antisocial personality disorder is a psychiatric condition
> characterized by chronic behavior that manipulates, exploits, or
> violates the rights of
> others. This behavior is often criminal."
>
> "Causes, incidence, and risk factors"
>
> "Personality disorders are chronic behavioral and relationship patterns
> that intefere with a person's life over many years. To receive a
> diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder, a person must have first
> had behavior that qualifies for a diagnosis of conduct disorder
> during childhood."
>
> "The cause of antisocial personality disorder is unknown, but genetic
> factors and child abuse are believed to contribute to the
> development of this condition. People with an antisocial or alcoholic
> parent are increased risk. Far more men than women are
> affected, and unsurprisingly, the condition is common in prison
> populations."
>
> Take your medication, Roger or they'll end up putting you away.
>
> Dave K8MN

4017. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 12:34:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405170434.88e0a9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92079

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40A849A5.9794D67D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Tim wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking out of
> > > > > > respect for the man.
> > > > > > Thank you.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that you had
> > > > > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was slow and
> > > > > painful.
> > > > > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > > > > Thank you for the response.
> > > >
> > > > Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?
> > >
> > > Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> > > along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> > > glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
> > > Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> > > child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> > > posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
> > >
> > > He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> > > hasn't been back.
> > >
> > > He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
> > > been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his
> > > character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to
> > > local law enforcement.
> >
> > He needs to be invited to a "party" . .

>
> Our problem child doesn't rank high on the local popularity charts in or
> out of amateur radio.

One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .

> Dave K8MN

4018. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 13:52:06 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <edffbd010cd6e9a72fdacf3582f9d4ba@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 92080

In article <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>
> Tim wrote:
> > What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
> > he work? Does he have a family?
> > It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
> >
> > Tim
> >
> >
> "somewhat" is putting it mildly.

says "JJ" the kiddie raper.

4019. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 14:33:37 UTC
From: futureworlds <nobody@mail.futureworlds.it>
Message-ID: <901a353fc5540d11b7b132a4bdafd5e1@mail.futureworlds.it>
Source record: 92081

In article <40A84591.A0FCA539@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman under cover of yet another anonymous
> remailer wrote:
>
> > dumbass davey's dad the episcopalian priest who died march 1 is probably > getting...
> > terry his mommy was the...
>
> Roger, I really want to thank you for providing confirmation of the
> things I wrote about your behavior.

you're guessing again, dumbass.

> > wiseman isn't
> > even near the river, lardass. you lose as usual.
>
> Glen Dale is near the river. Therefore, if you live in Glen Dale, you
> live near the river.

except that isn't what you wrote. wiseman lives a mile from the river,
you claimed he lived on the river. as usual, you are backpedaling.

> There is quite a bit of good information

maybe you need to apply it on yourself.

>
> Take your medication, Roger or they'll end up putting you away.

roger isn't on medication, dumbass. you need to quit seeing him
everywhere you look, asshole.

4020. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 16:24:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405170824.21dacf9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92082

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> > >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
> > >> >>
> > >> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> > >> > paraphrasing,
> > >> >
> > >> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> > >>
> > >> Brian,
> > >>
> > >> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
> > >>--
> > >From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
> > >Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
> > >View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
> > >Original Format
> > >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > >Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST
> > >
> > >In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
> > >k4yz@aol.com
> > >(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > >
> > >>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> > >
> > >For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code
> testing
> > >at all.
> > >>
> > >> (1) Amateur Basic.
> > >>
> > >> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
> 21mHz,
> > >> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
> > >

> > >Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
> > >increasing
> > >use of the band?
> > >
> > >> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
> > >
> > >You mean same as Extras have now?
> > >
> > >> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > >> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > >
> > >Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
> > >an
> > >incentive to use voice only!
> > >--
> > >
> > >Jim, I paraphrased your statment.
> >
> > No, you didn't. You isquoted it, in such a way that the meaning was
> > changed.
> >
> > >You stated, and the idea was, if
> > >the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it
> would
> > >act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
> > >band.
> >
> > That's correct. *IF* such changes were made *in the future*, the test
> > *would act* as a disincentive.
> >
> > Which is quite a different thing from what you wrote:
> >
> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> >
> > *are* is present tense. *Would be* is future conditional tense. Your
> > misquote changes the meaning. So it's neither a quote nor a
> > paraphrase.
> > >
> > >Is that correct?
> >
> > See above. Now you can argue the details all you want but the fact
> > remains your misquote does not have the same meaning.
>
> So a Morse Exam can only be a disincentive if it's in the future,

It can only be a disincentive to Morse Code *use* if it is required
for Morse Code use but not for other mode use.

That's what I wrote. Not:

" ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "

which is what *you* wrote, and incorrectly said was a paraphrase of
what I wrote.

> even
> though many, many, many amateurs

How many?

> have posted here that it has been a
> disincentive in the past, and is currently a disincentive.

So what? They're entitled to their opinion, just as I am.

Or do you think that I am not entitled to express an opinion here?
>
> And only you can say what is a disincentive in the amateur world, and
> all other opinions are wrong?

Not at all. Just don't attribute an opinion to me that isn't what I
wrote.

> > >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> > >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
> > >>
> > >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> > >> time to read.
> > >
> > >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
> > >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
> >
> > You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.
>
> Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.

Your mistakes are not my responsibility.
>
> > >> I just don't have the time to read all the
> > >> back-and-forth between you and Steve.
> > >
> > >Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.
> >
> > I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
> > his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.
>
> So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.

Not at all. >
> > >> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
> > >> >
> > >> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII,
> but I
> > >> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
> > >>
> > >> Another misquote.

> > >
> > >I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.
> >
> > That's true! You misquoted.
>
> It would have to be presented as a quote to do that.

You're still mistaken about it.

>
> > >> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our
> military
> > >> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that
> they
> > >> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled
> up
> > >> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
> > >> happened over 60 years ago.
> > >
> > >I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
> > >today.
> >
> > Then why did you misquote me? Why all the fuss about the historical
> > item I posted?
> >
> > > I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
> > >amateurs.
> >
> > Where was that done?
> >
> > Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
> > were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
> > is well documented fact.
>
> Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.

Irrelevant to the post about WAR.

>
> > >And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
> > >amateur radio makes, was it not?
> >
> > Look it up. You obviously have more time for newsgrouping than I.
>
> I think we put out about equal time,

You're mistaken. Again.

> despite your claim that you don't read my posts.

I don't read most of them. Would you prefer that I read none of them?
OK, Done.

>>PLONK<<

4021. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 16:51:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405170851.46389303@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92083

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94EB48D75C6Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
> news:Yvzpc.5038$on.1300@news01.roc.ny:
>
> > Hello, Jim
> >
> > I'd venture another guess, but by that time it won't make any
> > difference to me. Gad, the FCC is *slow*, huh?
> >
> > Put me down for June 31, 3125 LOL ;)
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> > ps - blew my chance big time - I only hope I'm wrong by a few centuries
> > on this one ;)
> >
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com...
> >> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing will
> >> be eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates, including my
> >> own prediction, are in the past.
> >>
> >> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> >> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> >> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> >> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> >> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> >> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> >> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> >> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> >> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> >> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> >> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> >> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> >> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> >> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
> >> K0HB: January 1, 3000
> >>
> >> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY

> >
> >
> > ---
> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> > Version: 6.0.686 / Virus Database: 447 - Release Date: 5/14/04
> >
> >
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> WK3C: December 30, 2004
> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
> K5TIT: June 1, 2008
> K0HB: January 1, 3000
> AA2QA: June 31, 3125 (Was April 1, 2004)
>
> I'm not sure if we should let anyone change their date, but dates after
> 3000 are moot as none of us will be around by then.
>
> Alun, N3KIP

Poor Kim! She keeps falling in and out of the bit-bucket.

4022. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 16:58:01 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ta6qc.27069$MH.10446575@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92084

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405170824.21dacf9e@posting.google.com...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>...
> > even
> > though many, many, many amateurs
>
> How many?
>
> > have posted here that it has been a
> > disincentive in the past, and is currently a disincentive.

I get an entirely different feel OTA, where it counts. I've had the pleasure of meeting quite a few (Dare I say, many.) fellow newbies OTA and lemme tell ya, R.R.A.P ain't exactly the most accurate measure of how the amateur radio community feels re. the issue.

> OK, Done.
>
> >>PLONK<<

'Bout damn time!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4023. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 17:00:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Ic6qc.27070$MH.10452546@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92085

Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
>
> > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
>
> So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> and a place.
>

4024. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 17:08:47 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <bcda4083f5ff54da83f84b882ae1398e@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 92233

In article <c88dr3gdu0@pita.alt.net>
"Tampa Turd ke4tew" <dx@tamtomdxman.net> whined:
> Dave,
>
> What is the story with Wiseman? Anybody who reads a few of his posts
> can plainly see he has multiple mental health issues, but why does he
> persist in harassing certain people?

say Jimmy Jail Dale, did you get john Michael out of jail yet? And ol'
Jimmy here has a record for marijuana trafficing.

> A WV ham told us on 20m that Roger is very obese and lives on public support.

Wrong again, tampa turd.

>Many people wonder if that is true?

so do they about your felony marijuana conviction.

>
> Tampa Turd (KE4TEW)
> who jams the 14240 DX net

4025. Globern the red queer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 17:20:06 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <7847b9a4137c1590d2f1034a73889cef@dizum.com>
Source record: 92086

For those who don t know him, Globern alias F4ASK is a red queer belonging to a communist french union named CGT. He hates capitalism, USA and love arabs and all aliens who destroy christian countries. Avoid him on the bands.

4026. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 17:30:05 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <bd0cf6444bef806b87e9aa00345241d8@dizum.com>
Source record: 92087

In article <40A8492E.D8FFC8FD@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman, using an anonymous remailer of
> necessity wrote:
> >
> > In article <40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
> > >
> > > Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> > > along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> > > glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
> >
> > While fatass high-el just pulls thing out of his fat ass. Since when is
> > Roger's street "by the river' you moron? I'd say the river was at least
> > a mile away.
>
> I welcome this chance for dialog, Roger

guess again, asshole.

> but you'll have to show me that
> you have enough common sense to know that I wrote nothing of your
> street, but of the town of Glen Dale, which is situated along the Ohio
> River. You live there--you ought to know these things.

along = prep 1: in line with the direction of (sail~the coast) 2: at a
point on or during (stopped~the way)

since roger lives well inland from the river, your statement that he is
"along the river" is erroneous, much like all your statements. you
should have the common sense to know since you were born in that shit-
hole town with the corrupt law enforcement and city government.

> > > Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> > > child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> > > posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
> >
> > translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaahh!'
>
> Retranslation: You keep getting the boot from ISP's. You use anonymous
> remailers of necessity.

re-retranslation:
"whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa!"
"reduced", boy are you stupid. you can't post without an isp, dumbass,
and you have absolutely no idea who posts this since all headers are
stripped away by the chain of remailers.

> > Hey, did you enjoy putting that child molesting daddy of yours in the
> > ground in march?
>
> Thanks, once again for proof of my initial statement.

you didn't answer the question, backpedaler.

>
> > > He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> > > hasn't been back.
> >
> > You're lying. Ray gave you both the tour of that building when the
> > meeting was over, you fatass slob. And, you kept whining at Roger all
> > through the meeting. You didn't dare actually *do* anything but whine,
> > did you?
>
> You left in mid-tour and bolted. It was noted and commented upon by
> those in attendance. You have not attended another meeting.

wrong roger didn't leave in mid tour. sure it was, probably by you. why
would i attend someplace when it isn't in my area, stupid?

> > > He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
> >
> > yeah, old fatassed bertie, your gay lover.
>
> Bzzzt. That's incorrect. N8NN was living in Germany and I was living
> in Tanzania when you had your close encounter, Roger. It was someone
> else.
> You may drive yourself crazier by guessing who it might have been.

bzzzzzzzzzzzt? you think you are on a game show? quit lying, stupid.

> > > been retested by the FCC
> >
> > too bad they didn't give any reason, did they imbecile? anybody who got
> > their license under he VE system can be retested at any time...
>
> ...but never without a reason. There's always a reason. Care to tell
> us about the reason for your retest?

funny how roger's retest letter doesn't give any reason for a retest.
i'm sure you have a copy of it, don't you?

> >
> > > and is in danger of losing his ticket over his character.
> >
> > And davey lives in his own little world. they all wear jack boots and

> > swastikas and say sieg heil.
>
> I don't have any power

when are you going to realize that? you really shouldn't be pretending
to make medical/psychological diagnoses withouth a medical license. the
wv board of medicine will frown upon it.

> over those who would yank your ticket over character issues. You're about to stew in the
cauldron which you
> personally heated.

yeah right, miss cleo.

> > > I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to local law enforcement.
> >
> > bwhahahahahahahahahahaha...to that corrupt local law enforcement, you
> > mean.
>
> You aren't doing yourself any favors by making such claims.

really? when did congress repeal the first amendment? your local law
enforcement is corrupt.

>You aren't what your surname suggests.

you need to pull your head out from "along" your prostate.

4027. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 17:50:00 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8tednXpO7pCSlzTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92089

Anonymous Sender wrote:
> In article <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
> JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>>
>>Tim wrote:
>>
>>>What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
>>>he work? Does he have a family?
>>>It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
>>>
>>>Tim
>>>
>>>
>>
>>"somewhat" is putting it mildly.
>
>
> says "JJ" the kiddie raper.

I see you're only getting worse Wogie.

4028. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 18:23:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40A9032D.5060405@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92088

Alun wrote:

>K5TIT: June 1, 2008
>
>
I thought her call was W5TIT.

4029. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 19:41:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92090

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> > > >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> > > >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
>> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
>> > > >
>> > > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> > > >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>
>> > > >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
>> > > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
>> > > >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
>> > >
>> > > What's needed, Brain?
>> >
>> > A citation from an applicable regulation.
>>
>> Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
>> you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
>> be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?

>Please, not another threat to injure me.

The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
with him. That's a LOT of threats. :-)

The Military Affiliate Radio System is authorized by Department
of Defense Directive 4650.2, 26 Jan 98. Individual service
branches have specific regulations. For the Army it is Army
Regulation AR 25-6 as revised 29 Oct 98. For the USAF it is
AFI 33-106. For the USN-USMC is is MARS Communications
Instructions NTP 8(C), March 1998.

The United States Army is the birthplace of MARS, first
organized at the AARS or Army Amateur Radio System in 1925.
The purpose was to increase skills within the Army by using
amateur knowledge to improve Army communications. It was
not a terribly popular thing either in or out of the Army.
The AARS stopped at the start of the USA involvement with
WW2 and cessation of amateur operations. It resumed in 1946.

In 1948 the AARS was renamed with the organization of the
USAF as a part of the new MARS, dropping the "amateur" in
favor of the word "affiliate." By 1948 military radio was
rather far from amateur practice and techniques. In 1962
the USN and USMC were made a part of MARS.

The intent of MARS was basically a morale booster for all
military personnel assigned far from USA territory. The
role has changed (by directive and regulations) to become
a liason between the military and civilian emergency
organizations, principally FEMA. MARS also has ties with
SHARES, the group of government HF radio users throughout
the USA and foreign US locations. For morale purposes
the military has direct Internet connections through the
various DSN (Digital Switched Network) portals on land
and afloat.

>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS
>> >
>> > " Sorry Han's, MARS > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," is simply
>> > untrue.
>>
>> No, it's not.
>>
>> That you are inadequately knowledgeable of MARS programs and
>> policies to know otherwise is also true.
>
>Now you lie.

The gunnery nurse has distinct definitions of "lie" different
from other people. Those who disagree with him are "always
lying."

>> > > >> >Dismissed.
>> > > >>
>> > > >> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
>> > > >>
>> > > >> Steve, K4YZ
>> > > >
>> > > >Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.
>> > >
>> > > Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU
insist on
>> > > calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no
degree or
>> > > training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof"
is that
>> > > I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.
>> >

>> > That's another reason why I think you're nuts. You are the one who
>> > made a stupid assertion (Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio").
>> > I'm the one dogging you.
>>
>> It's not stupid. Perhaps poorly worded, at least to a person such
>> as yourself who cannot understand the interdependence of the two.
>
>Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
>
>It's just wrong.

The gunnery nurse will never concede any mistake he made.
He has his own definitions and commands all to obey those
unique definitions.

For example, name-calling is part of his tough-guy credo.
His personal "directive" allows that as part of his
"civility." It isn't in the normal definitions that all
others use.

>> And you're still a punk.
>
>Not really.

The gunnery nurse "permits" that form of "civility" by
his own "directive." Name-calling is SOP.

>> > So, please substantiate your silly, stupid statement with a citation
>> > from an applicable regulation.
>>
>> Still need that peice of paper to know a slap in the facr hurts,
>> Brain?
>
>Nope. I need a cite from any applicable regulation to convince me
>that your statement is true. Got one?

The gunnery nurse has had, what, three weeks, to cite one
and has not. A simple Internet search will turn up the
official documents from the DoD and all three service
branches. He is continuing a game of bluffing in trying
to intimidate others to concede to him.

MARS has never been an important part of military
communications, never a part of either tactical or
strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
and morale boosting of service personnel. However, the
affiliation with the military has terribly important
self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
grand scheme to 'serve their country'."

>> > > That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!
>> >
>> > Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
>> > stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you
>> > don't respect civility.
>>
>> Sure I do.
>
>No, you don't.

Gunnery nurse is a VERY sore loser. He can't abide by any
disagreements to his statements or opinions. Ergo, all who
disagree with him are "liars" and worthy of all kinds of
name-calling.

It must be the extension of the old USMC mythology where
NCOs are all gods who MUST be obeyed and never, ever
questioned. No "civility" is allowed within ranks.

The problem of this ex-USMC member is that neither amateur
radio nor the Internet is any part of the USMC.

>> And right up to the part where you started in on your usual
>> crapola in THIS thread, I had made it a point of very carefully typing
>> B r i a n.
>
>That was very sweet of you, but doesn't change just how wrong your
>MARS=ARS claim was.

Gunnery nurse cannot concede anything.

MARS exists because of the Department of Defense Directive
that says it does.

A close inspection of USN-USMC NTP 8(C) will reveal that
USN and USMC MARS operators do NOT need to possess amateur
radio licenses in order to operate MARS radio equipment.
In both USA and USAF regulations, MARS operations are done
by Army or Air Force personnel who are not required to have
amateur radio licenses.

VOLUNTEER civilians are welcomed by all three branches but
only the USA and USAF require volunteers to possess amateur
licenses. USN-USMC does not.

>> As for Lennie...the only "stops" he usually winds up pulling out
>> are the ones holding him and the rest of his fecally contaminated
>> verbal effluent back.
>
>Geee, it just doesn't look that way from my perspective.

:-)

Gunnery nurse has his own fantasy land perspective on
society and definitions and civil behavior. He hasn't

been able to adjust to civilian life after being rejected
by the USMC.

>> That he does it to himself (and now takes you along with him) is
>> evident. That he was once a person of accomplishment and
>> responsibility now fallen on his lack of character and honesty is
>> pitiful.
>
>Odd, but I haven't seen much of Len lately. How nice of him to be
>taking me along with him.

I've been gone, doing more important things in life. :-)

>> That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.
>
>Its called, "The High Road."

I'd call it "independent thought."

Some in amateur radio do NOT permit independent thought
and become outraged with anyone disagreeing with their
noble, righteous bigoted thoughts of amateurism.

>> > > So...we're even.
>> >
>> > Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other
>> > ways.
>>
>> You're right, but not for the reason I am sure YOU think...
>>
>> SO FAR we are still waiting for you to back up your assertions
>> that "unlicensed radio services" play a "major role" in disaster
>> communications.
>
>So? I hope you won't mind if I keep you waiting?

Gunnery nurse cannot concede anything on a subject. What
he stated is divine law and none may go against that.

>> We're also waiting for you to back up your Somalia claims. You
>> continue to argue that "It's true because I say it's true", yet there
>> should be a paper trail wide enough to roller skate on to show where
>> your assertions are true.
>
>But I never needed your blessing. You'll just have to roller skate
>elsewhere.

Actually, there's been NO third-party proof that gunnery
nurse was ever in the USMC. All we have to go on is his
"word" and his "I've got the proof in my wallet" sort of
statements. :-)

We have yet to see a "paper trail wide enough to roller skate
on to show where [gunnery nurse'] assertions are true."

No problem. Gunnery nurse, when confronted with the truth
and evidence, will, like the fictional Col. Jessup, will
simply state someone is a "liar" and then call them all sorts
of nasty names to show how "wrong" they are. :-)

>> No one except everyone who knows enough about the current affairs
>> of the various MARS programs and thier dependence upon the Amateur
>> Radio service to make it work and sustain it.
>
>If its so obvious to "everyone," then anyone should be able to post
>the citation.
>
>But they aren't.

The "citations" gunnery nurse claims are constructs within
his own little minds. MARS exists because of a DoD Directive
and that should be that. Of course, it isn't that, but that
doesn't stop the gunnery nurse from his virulent outrage.

Gunnery nurse felt "wronged" by statements of disagreement.
Such seems to be a cause for verbal warfare.

>> > Best of Luck.
>>
>> None needed...You make it too easy...Again.
>
>Easy? I see no citation.
>
>Best of Luck.

I've given the appropriate directive and regulations. Anyone
can find them on the Internet. Gunnery nurse doesn't know
them, therefore "they don't exist." :-)

333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333,
3333333333333333

LHA / WMD

4030. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 20:33:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Kk9qc.15717$KE6.2887@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92091

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position. Glad
to
> >see I have you placed in the right hole.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd keep
> it for
> extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on the
> VE's giving
> the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have to
> keep and
> maintain code test tapes.
>
Gee, ya really think so? And so what? Since when did the gobernmunt give
a hoot out of what the citizens want?

Dan/W4NTI

4031. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 22:19:42 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94ECBA30423F3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92092

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in
news:1e4e3692.0405170851.46389303@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94EB48D75C6Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
>> news:Yvzpc.5038$on.1300@news01.roc.ny:
>>
>> > Hello, Jim
>> >
>> > I'd venture another guess, but by that time it won't make any
>> > difference to me. Gad, the FCC is *slow*, huh?
>> >
>> > Put me down for June 31, 3125 LOL ;)
>> >
>> >
>> > 73 from Rochester, NY
>> > Jim AA2QA
>> > ps - blew my chance big time - I only hope I'm wrong by a few
>> > centuries on this one ;)
>> >
>> >
>> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > news:c2356669.0405151630.636b8bfc@posting.google.com...
>> >> Here's an update on various estimates of when Morse code testing
>> >> will be eliminated in the US. Note that seven predicted dates,
>> >> including my own prediction, are in the past.
>> >>
>> >> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> >> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> >> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> >> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> >> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> >> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>> >> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> >> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> >> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> >> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
>> >> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> >> WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> >> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> >> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement
>> >> drop") K0HB: January 1, 3000
>> >>

>> >> Closest date (before or after) wins. Anyone else?
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >
>> > ---
>> > Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>> > Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>> > Version: 6.0.686 / Virus Database: 447 - Release Date: 5/14/04
>> >
>> >
>>
>> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> WA2ISE: August 1, 2004
>> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> WK3C: December 30, 2004
>> N8UZE: July 1, 2005
>> KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
>> K5TIT: June 1, 2008
>> K0HB: January 1, 3000
>> AA2QA: June 31, 3125 (Was April 1, 2004)
>>
>> I'm not sure if we should let anyone change their date, but dates
>> after 3000 are moot as none of us will be around by then.
>>
>> Alun, N3KIP
>
> Poor Kim! She keeps falling in and out of the bit-bucket.
>

She asked Jim to remove her name as she preferred that he do that rather
than list everyone by callsign except her. Unfortunately I then got her
call wrong, it's W5TIT, not K5TIT. Sorry, Kim. Hence, the list should
read:-

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
WA2ISE: August 1, 2004

K3LT: September 15, 2004
WK3C: December 30, 2004
N8UZE: July 1, 2005
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007
W5TIT: June 1, 2008
K0HB: January 1, 3000
AA2QA: June 31, 3125 (Was April 1, 2004)

4032. Re: The Pool (Update)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 22:20:08 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94ECBA42BDE81elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92093

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in news:40A9032D.5060405
@ix.netcom.com:

> Alun wrote:
>
>>K5TIT: June 1, 2008
>>
>>
> I thought her call was W5TIT.
>
>

You are correct

4033. Re: Roster

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 22:31:32 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94ECBC326520Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92094

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:D8Mpc.2253$H_3.488 @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> Here's a roster of recent posters. Mostly extras. Lots of people in
>> Pannysylvania. So now you know.
>
> Alun,
>
> Did you have a point, or did no-one rise to your stalking/trolling bait
> when you posted the roster as "Grumwitch" so you had to try again?
>

???

I have never posted anything as Grumwitch the Unflappable. I thought that was Lenny?

> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> (PS: You missed a LOT of ex-calls in your roster, and some are just
> plain wrong. For example, Jim Hampton was never licensed as KG6AAY.)
>
>
>
>
>

If you have an ex-call I missed, let me know what it was. As for Jim Hampton, take it up with him. His entry on QRZ says that he held KG6AAY on Guam from 1967-1968. I have no way of checking that.

My main interest in doing this was to see who was posting. Not surprisingly I found that most of us are Extras. I find it a little harder to come up with any reason why so many long-term posters are from PA (?), let alone why most of the no-coders seem to be in Michigan? I suspect the latter group have possibly spoken to oneanother on air.

4034. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 22:44:06 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94ECBE536503Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92095

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:Kk9qc.15717$KE6.2887@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >> >>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position.
>> >> >Glad to see I have you placed in the right hole.
>> >> >
>> >> >Dan/W4NTI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd keep
>> >> it for
>> >> extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on the
>> >> VE's giving
>> >> the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have to
>> >> keep and
>> >> maintain code test tapes.
>> >>
>> > Gee, ya really think so? And so what? Since when did the gobernmunt
>> > give a hoot out of what the citizens want?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >

They don't, but the FCC is heavily into the concept of reducing the
regulatory burden by simplification of rules, a very Reaganesque idea.
Which is simpler, keeping a requirement for some licences only or making it
go away altogether? Abolishing Element 1 completely fits their philosophy,

and the alternative doesn't.

Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue that no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and secondly, VEs may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have to buy code tapes, so some paltry amount of money may in fact be saved.

4035. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 22:53:26 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94ECBFE6AB3E3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92096

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0405161802.600802fa@posting.google.com:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:<Y9Qpc.19686$MH.7158884@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
>> > Tim wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking
>> > > out of respect for the man.
>> > > Thank you.
>> >
>> > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
>> >
>> > Dave Heil K8MN
>>
>> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX.
>> Has anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail
>> addresses have gone unanswered.
>
> Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
> called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
> please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.
>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>
> w3rv

Dick's licence recently expired.

Alun, N3KIP

4036. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:04:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405171504.3d9d249b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92097

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040517073044.10421.00001565@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/16/2004 8:49 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>
> >
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> >> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
>
> >> >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> >> >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
> >> >>
> >> >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> >> >> time to read.
> >> >
> >> >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
> >> >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
> >>
> >> You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.
> >
> >Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.
>
> He has. On several occassions.

No, he hasn't. He did not respond at all. That's why I said, "Then
you could have corrected it a long, long time ago."

You and Lennie have simple tried to
> "dismiss" him with your "TAKARJ" drivvel.

You're such a "Brain."

> >> I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
> >> his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.
> >
> >So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.
>

> Or he read mine wherein a quote of your comment was made.

Or he read my posts.

> And I might point out that having read this one thing does NOT make his
> reading of your posts "all-inclusive".

Do you pretend to know what Jim reads?

> >> Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
> >> were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
> >> is well documented fact.
> >
> >Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.
>
> Sealing of the receivers was too. Your point?

"Oh Lord it's hard to be Ham-ble, when you're radio-less in every
way..."

> >> >> btw - ever hear of WERS?
> >> >
> >> >Is this the reciprocol of Steve's Law, where
> >> >
> >> >"Sorry Hans, Amateur Radio >>>IS<<< MARS."
> >>
> >> You don't know what WERS was, then.
> >
> >The article didn't say anything about -amateur- transmissions being
> >allowed. There were also community civil defense type radio
> >transmissions authorized, and amateurs were often the operators of
> >such community stations, but not in an amateur capacity.
>
> No...just as supervisors, watch standers, traffic handlers, technicians
> and engineers.

But NOT as hams. Get it?

> That's all.

Please.

> >> >Then be succinct, and do clear up any misunderstandings right away.
> >>
> >> Why? You don't do that.
> >
> >Time is money?
>
> In your case I'd say because the truth is embarrassing.

The truth is, I taught you and Dave a thing or two. But the
information is completely wasted on you because you'll never deploy to
a foreign country without a government. You're merely a has-been
ex-marine trying to fit into a CAP (Air Force-like) uniform. Suck it

up, Steve. People will think you're the bus driver in "The Honeymooners."

bb

4037. Re: Who are the FISTS members on RRAP?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:25:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405171525.3d67d915@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92098

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405170824.21dacf9e@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405161749.29b937c1@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405161326.1f2b380b@posting.google.com>...
> > > In article <1e4e3692.0405160817.6e81bad1@posting.google.com>,
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<c2356669.0405141330.395717be@posting.google.com>...
> > > >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405130255.38638d95@posting.google.com>...
> > > >> >>
> > > >> > Nope, like your pea-pod brother TAFKA Jim/N2EY saying, and I'm
> > > >> > paraphrasing,
> > > >> >
> > > >> > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> > > >>
> > > >> Brian,
> > > >>
> > > >> You're not paraphrasing what I wrote. You're misquoting me.
> > > >>--
> > > >From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
> > > >Subject: Re: My Idea For A New License Structure
> > > >View: Complete Thread (48 articles)
> > > >Original Format
> > > >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > >Date: 2004-01-31 07:50:35 PST
> > > >
> > > >In article <5c01b95b.0401301427.3202051c@posting.google.com>,
> > > >k4yz@aol.com
> > > >(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> > > >
> > > >>For implementation sometime AFTER the "code issue" is resolved:
> > > >
> > > >For some folks, it will only be resolved when there is no code
> testing
> > > >at all.
> > > >>
> > > >> (1) Amateur Basic.
> > > >>
> > > >> Forty question test with access to 144mHz, 50Mhz, 28mHz,
> 21mHz,

> > > >> 18mHz, 7mHz and 1.8mHz.
> > > >
> > > >Why no 80, 30, 20, or 12 meters? Why not allow 222 in hopes of
> > > >increasing
> > > >use of the band?
> > > >
> > > >> Same phone allocations as other licensees on HF bands.
> > > >
> > > >You mean same as Extras have now?
> > > >
> > > >> Morse Code endorsement required for opera-
> > > >> tion in lower 100kHz of any band.
> > > >
> > > >Bad idea. Acts as a disincentive to use CW and digital modes, and as
> > > >an
> > > >incentive to use voice only!
> > > >--
> > > >
> > > >Jim, I paraphrased your statment.
> > >
> > > No, you didn't. You isquoted it, in such a way that the meaning was
> > > changed.
> > >
> > > >You stated, and the idea was, if
> > > >the CW exam is dropped for voice, and if retained for CW use, it
> would
> > > >act as a disincentive for CW to be used in the lower 100 KHz of any
> > > >band.
> > >
> > > That's correct. *IF* such changes were made *in the future*, the test
> > > *would act* as a disincentive.
> > >
> > > Which is quite a different thing from what you wrote:
> > >
> > > " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "
> > >
> > > *are* is present tense. *Would be* is future conditional tense. Your
> > > misquote changes the meaning. So it's neither a quote nor a
> > > paraphrase.
> > > >
> > > >Is that correct?
> > >
> > > See above. Now you can argue the details all you want but the fact
> > > remains your misquote does not have the same meaning.
> >
> > So a Morse Exam can only be a disincentive if it's in the future,
>
> It can only be a disincentive to Morse Code *use* if it is required
> for Morse Code use but not for other mode use.

Can a Morse Code Exam be a disincentive for other modes?

> That's what I wrote. Not:
>
> " ~Morse Code exams are a disincentive to CW use.~ "

> which is what *you* wrote, and incorrectly said was a paraphrase of
> what I wrote.

But in the proposal quoted above, the Morse Code Exam is not a
disincentive for other modes.

If there were EVER a reason to have a Morse Code Exam, it would be to
ensure that a person operating (using) CW knew how to do so. The
above proposal does EXACTLY that. But you say it's a disincentive. I
say that's too bad.

> > even
> > though many, many, many amateurs
>
> How many?

Don't know, I haven't kept count.

> > have posted here that it has been a
> > disincentive in the past, and is currently a disincentive.
>
> So what? They're entitled to their opinion, just as I am.

> Or do you think that I am not entitled to express an opinion here?

You have before, and I saw no one stopping you.

> > And only you can say what is a disincentive in the amateur world, and
> > all other opinions are wrong?
>
> Not at all. Just don't attribute an opinion to me that isn't what I
> wrote.

So the Morse Code Exam has never been a disincentive to any mode,
including CW, ever in the history of the amateur radio service?

This is fascinating. I've known several NO CODE Technicians that
learned Morse Code and operated CW on 2M without having ever taken a
Morse Code Exam at the time.

Your position has always been that it's imperative for all amateurs
pass a Morse Code Exam prior to having CW privs. Except when they
don't have to pass a Morse Code Exam for other priveleges. In that
case, the Morse Code Exam is a disincentive to CW use!!!

Holy Cow!!!

> > > >> > When I pointed out that Morse Code exams have always been a
> > > >> > disincentive to amateur radio, he clammed up and won't respond.
> > > >>

> > > >> I don't respond to most of your posts because they're not worth my
> > > >> time to read.
> > > >
> > > >You could have responded immediately to my direct post to your
> > > >statement about the CW exam being a disincentive.
> > >
> > > You could have quoted me accurately, but you didn't.
> >
> > Then you could have corrected it a long, long time ago.
>
> Your mistakes are not my responsibility.

I think I nailed it.

> > > >> I just don't have the time to read all the
> > > >> back-and-forth between you and Steve.
> > > >
> > > >Nor does Steve, but he makes an effort.
> > >
> > > I'm not Steve. Despite your calling me names and characterizing me as
> > > his "pea-pod brother", I'm not him. Not even close.
> >
> > So you really do read all of my posts, or at least make an effort.
>
> Not at all.

So you just happened upon two (2) of my posts out of many hundreds
over the past several month. What are the odds?

You are one (1) lucky guy.

> > > >> I came across this one by chance and am responding.
> > > >> >
> > > >> > Or when he held up some OT amateurs who saved the day in WWII,
> but I
> > > >> > pointed out that we had no operating priveleges in WWII.
> > > >>
> > > >> Another misquote.
> > > >
> > > >I didn't quote nor did I paraphrase.
> > >
> > > That's true! You misquoted.
> >
> > It would have to be presented as a quote to do that.
>
> You're still mistaken about it.

Citation, please.

> > > >> I posted a historic item about the use of Morse Code by our
> military
> > > >> in WW2. Some of the operators were hams. No claim was made that

> they
> > > >> were operating amateur radio stations. But some folks get all riled
> up
> > > >> over *anything* positive being posted about Morse Code, even if it
> > > >> happened over 60 years ago.
> > > >
> > > >I don't have a problem with historical fact or even Morse Code use
> > > >today.
> > >
> > > Then why did you misquote me? Why all the fuss about the historical
> > > item I posted?
> > >
> > > > I do have a problem with inaccurately holding up soldiers as
> > > >amateurs.
> > >
> > > Where was that done?
> > >
> > > Fact is, many WW1 and WW2-era radio operators were also amateurs. Many
> > > were recruited specifically because they *were* radio amateurs. This
> > > is well documented fact.
> >
> > Silencing of the transmitters is also a well documented fact.
>
> Irrelevant to the post about WAR.

Relevant. Whatever they were doing, it was NOT amateur radio.

> > > >And the flavor of the post was about contributions that
> > > >amateur radio makes, was it not?
> > >
> > > Look it up. You obviously have more time for newsgrouping than I.
> >
> > I think we put out about equal time,
>
> You're mistaken. Again.

Of course. I think I nailed it. Again.

> > despite your claim that you don't read my posts.
>
> I don't read most of them.

Yet you manage to zing right into the doozies, somehow. You are one
(1) lucky guy.

> Would you prefer that I read none of them?

If you're going to be snippy about it, yes.

> OK, Done.

See? You didn't even wait for an answer.

> >>PLONK<<

You've made a series of astounding and rediculous statements over the past couple of months. If I weren't here to point them out, who would? The PCTA lock-step marches on.

Best of Luck.

4038. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:42:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405171542.54dbd939@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92099

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040517070319.10421.00001563@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/16/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161715.77df12bc@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0405161354.54c4e39f@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> Wouldn't know...Today (May 16th) was the fifth anniversary of my
> >> daughter's passing, and my wife insisted I stay close to home. But no
> >> matter where I go, there she is...She may ahve left my arms, but
> >> she'll never leave my heart.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, I am sorry. Maybe one day they'll move the dates of the Hamvention
> >again.
>
> Thanks, Brian.
>
> For me, anyway, it really would have been better to go. I needed to be
> away for a bit, but hey...can't always have everything the way we want it,
> eh...???

Shoot for something soon. I'm going to a wine tasting in Cleveland
tomorrow night, which ought to do a body good.

> At least I can look forward to Huntsville...If anyone is within a
> "relatively" reasonable drive time of Huntsville, AL, and has never been to
> this one, they should try to. It's the second or third weekend of August, and
> is always a lot of fun.

I used to meet a friend at the Indy hamfest in July, then I'd travel
up to Ft Wayne hamfest in November to see him again. He moved to
Montana last summer. I guess I could meet him at the Sturgis Hamfest.

> The "flea market" is indoors, but there's lots-and-lots of it. All the
> usual forums and a very reasonable showing of vendors and organizations.
> All-in-all it's a very well conducted regional hamfest. (Computers are there,
> but in an ancilliary role!)
>
> 73 & thanks again...
>

> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, it's kind of funny that the Hamvention folks moved the date back hoping for better weather, then we had such a bad weekend. Its even more sad that since Ohio is the home of the Hamvention, many of the other hamfests here are so tiny. Someday I'd like to go to another big fest other than Dayton, maybe Miami. I'd have to take some extra time off because I need a tour of the Nat'l Hurricane Center, and a trip to Margaritaville.

4039. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:47:17 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <c8biu0cmd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92100

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:bd0cf6444bef806b87e9aa00345241d8@dizum.com...
In article <40A8492E.D8FFC8FD@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> George Orwell, aka Roger Wiseman, using an anonymous remailer of
> necessity wrote:
> >
> > In article <40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
> > >
> > > Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath
from
> > > along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m
FM,
> > > glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web
site.
> >
> > While fatass high-el just pulls thing out of his fat ass. Since when is
> > Roger's street "by the river' you moron? I'd say the river was at least
> > a mile away.
>
> I welcome this chance for dialog, Roger

guess again, asshole.

> but you'll have to show me that
> you have enough common sense to know that I wrote nothing of your
> street, but of the town of Glen Dale, which is situated along the Ohio
> River. You live there--you ought to know these things.

along = prep 1: in line with the direction of (sail~the coast) 2: at a
point on or during (stopped~the way)

since roger lives well inland from the river, your statement that he is
"along the river" is erroneous, much like all your statements. you
should have the common sense to know since you were born in that shit-
hole town with the corrupt law enforcement and city government.

> > > Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or
a
> > > child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> > > posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
> >
> > translation: 'Whaaaaaaaaaaaaahh!'

>
> Retranslation: You keep getting the boot from ISP's. You use anonymous
> remailers of necessity.

re-retranslation:
"whaaaaaaaaaaaaaa
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa!"
"reduced", boy are you stupid. you can't post without an isp, dumbass,
and you have absolutely no idea who posts this since all headers are
stripped away by the chain of remailers.

....
Aw, come on, Wiseman. Everybody knows you have an account at
Stratuswave.net. You just don't dare posting from it lest I get you TOS'd
from it, too.
And what has you so upset, Roger? You are using just about all of your nyms
on this board but your filthy mouth, like your fingerprints, gives you away
every time.
Dave's comment that you are a Sociopath must really have hit your sore
spot!!!! You best calm down, Roger. Take your meds or it will be back to
booby hatch for you!

4040. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:49:38 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <h6cqc.14109$yF6.10556@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92101

"futureworlds" <nobody@mail.futureworlds.it> wrote in message
news:901a353fc5540d11b7b132a4bdafd5e1@mail.futureworlds.it...
>
> roger isn't on medication, dumbass. you need to quit seeing him
> everywhere you look, asshole.
>
>
>

Quit talking in the third person. You see me everywhere on Nim Busters too!

PKB

4041. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-17 23:50:08 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@Nospam>
Message-ID: <c8bj39ctk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92102

"Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:

> One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .

So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
and a place.

Why? So you can be 100 miles from there?

4042. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 00:46:17 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <STcqc.28416$5z5.20884@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92103

"Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
news:300238ab502ffb5805caaed6376dd914@paranoici.org...
> dumbass davey's dad the episcopalian priest who died march 1 is probably
getting
> roasted in hell for molesting the altar boys. little davey was molested
right
> along with them. it's no wonder they moved around so much when he was
growing
> up. terry his mommy was the original glen dale tunnel, doing it all for
$2.
> her cunt saw more traffic than the los angeles freeway. she'll probably
have
> to go back to that, now that her hubby has done a dirt dump. wiseman isn't
> even near the river, lardass. you lose as usual.

Shut up Wiseman, you're getting you butt kicked here and on Nim Busters!

4043. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 00:47:33 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <2Vcqc.28424$5z5.12016@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92104

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A849A5.9794D67D@earthlink.net...
> Our problem child doesn't rank high on the local popularity charts in or
> out of amateur radio.
>
> Dave K8MN

Thing is, Dave, Woger can not rank in anything! Let alone rank high in
something!

LOL!

4044. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 01:50:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405171750.6872b93e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92105

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Ic6qc.27070$MH.10452546@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> >
> > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> >
> > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > and a place.

Actually the river isn't such a good idea now that I think about it,
the EPA would get it's knickers in a real twist.

4045. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 02:58:20 UTC
From: Tampa Tom <dx@tamtomdxman.net>
Message-ID: <c8bu0nugp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92106

wassup Roger? looks like Dave has spanked you bad. He even
has you talking in the third person about yourself.

best of all, Dave spanked your butt and did not have to use a single
filthy word to do it!

ROTFLMAO

4046. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 03:24:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A981F6.1311CF91@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92107

Bert Craig wrote:
>
> Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> >
> > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> >
> > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > and a place.

...and thus it is with our Glen Dale sociopath. Now he's challenging Brian to fight him. The reality is: he wouldn't show up. Roger is quite brave, as long as it is from the safety of his home. Now that you've commented, brace yourself for a torrent of filth from the internet gnome.

Dave K8MN

4047. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 03:33:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A98415.7DDBAC4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92108

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Ic6qc.27070$MH.10452546@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> > news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> > >
> > > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> > >
> > > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > > and a place.
>
> Actually the river isn't such a good idea now that I think about it,
> the EPA would get it's knickers in a real twist.

If you told this guy you'd meet him by the river, he wouldn't go
anywhere near the place. He'd be far, far from the river--you know, at
his home nearly a mile away.

Dave K8MN

4048. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 03:38:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40A9854E.928A775@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92109

Tampa Tom wrote:
>
> wassup Roger? looks like Dave has spanked you bad. He even
> has you talking in the third person about yourself.
>
> best of all, Dave spanked your butt and did not have to use a single
> filthy word to do it!
>
> ROTFLMAO

He must post in the third person. If he admits to being Roger Wiseman, local authorities pay him a visit. This way he had some minimal amount of deniability--unless they obtain a warrant and decide to look at the material on his computer. He's tried this third person stuff before but has always slipped up. He forgets that he has posted most of his material under his own name previously. Wiseman ends up doing one of his, "Duh--How do you know it's me?" routines.

Roger has himself painted into a corner.

Dave K8MN

4049. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 04:05:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405172005.1f2a3ef5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92110

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94ECBFE6AB3E3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0405161802.600802fa@posting.google.com:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:<Y9Qpc.19686$MH.7158884@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> >> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> >> > Tim wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking
> >> > > out of respect for the man.
> >> > > Thank you.
> >> >
> >> > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> >> >
> >> > Dave Heil K8MN
> >>
> >> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX.
> >> Has anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail
> >> addresses have gone unanswered.
> >
> > Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
> > called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
> > please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.
> >
> >> 73 de Bert
> >> WA2SI
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Dick's licence recently expired.

Oops. I'll try postal mail.

> Alun, N3KIP

w3rv
```

4050. Is FCC ready to toss another bomb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 04:50:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YBgqc.5251$SZ4.4038@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92111

The following, written a few years back by my friend
Don Stoner, W6TNS, (SK) bears repeating. His
organization, NARA, is defunct, but the message
he states in his editorial is still absolutely valid.

73, de Hans, K0HB

- -
In My Opinion....

An editorial by Donald L. Stoner, W6TNS

In November of 1988, the Federal Communications Commission
slipped a bomb into our hamshacks and lit the fuse.. The FCC
announced they were reallocating a portion of the 220 MHz
band to a new communications service based on a petition
submitted by United Parcel Service. Our national
organization, The American Radio Relay League has tried to
snuff out the fuse and get the decision reversed. But as
far as I can tell, the 220-222 MHz part of the band is a
goner!

How could this have happened? Well, for starters, we took
the Amateur Radio Service and our fraternity for granted. It
never occurred to us that the FCC might give some of "our"
frequencies away just because we didn't use them.

The FCC even warned us of their intention. In 1984 Robert
Foosaner was Chief of the FCC Private Radio Bureau. He
indicated in a CQ Magazine interview that the band was not
being used adequately. Mr. Foosaner flatly stated it might
be assigned to other services. Unfortunately we didn't
believe him .

I have a theory that the FCC confiscated these frequencies
to send Amateurs a message. I believe the message is "shape
up or ship out." Warm up the tar and start collecting
feathers if you like, but in my opinion, the Commission did
Amateurs an enormous favor. A two MHz slice of radio
frequency spectrum is a small price to pay for awakening us
from our long sleep.

The Amateur Radio Service is coming back to life after 20 or
more years of being totally oblivious to the changes taking
place all around us. Amateurs are starting to ask how they
can contribute to the fraternity. They want to improve
themselves and they want to see the service revitalized.

They want more young people to enjoy Amateur Radio. Teachers, particularly those who are Amateurs, are beginning to realize how the service can be used to educate our youngsters in a number of disciplines.

This metamorphosis also happened to your humble editor in November of 1988. I've enjoyed Amateur Radio for almost 40 years. In the 50's and 60's I wrote a number of books and articles for Amateurs. I have also taken the Amateur Radio Service for granted. I'm as guilty as anyone. But that stopped when we lost part of the 220 MHz band. The National Amateur Radio Association became more than just a gleam in my eye.

What Are The Goals of NARA?

Broadly speaking, the goal of The National Amateur Radio Association is the promotion of ham radio. The organization has four specific goals within this broad framework. These are to a) publicize or market Amateur Radio to the general public, b) attract young people to the Amateur Radio Service, c) help existing Amateurs achieve the greatest benefit from the Amateur Radio Service and d) make Amateurs aware that our radio frequencies are in jeopardy from commercial interests. Here are some of my specific thoughts on these four areas:

Marketing Amateur Radio To The Public

Many people don't understand the significance of marketing and sales. The difference is very germane to this discussion.

Let's say you go into a ham radio store and tell the person behind the counter you want to buy an ICOM IC-781. He or she takes your order along with your money and hands you a radio. In this instance the person is simply an order taker and not even a sales person. A sales person tries to convince you to buy a specific product but they are not marketeers. The people who publish the brochures, run the advertisements and create your desire to own the IC-781 are the marketeers. Marketing creates the desire to have something.

For as long as I can remember, we hams have been order takers. We have not been salespersons and by no stretch of the imagination could be called marketeers of ham radio. If someone expressed their desire to be a ham, or an ex-CB'er convinced us they were a born-again communicator, we'd "take their order" and accept them into our ranks. Until recently, we never tried to be salespersons or marketeers for our hobby.

Deep down inside the human brain, is a little grey glob that scientists label the "I've got mine" lobe. In this area of the Amateur's brain is stored the feeling that we really don't want any more hams than we already have. We'll never admit it, even to ourselves, but the feeling is there. More hams equal more QRM, more problems with the FCC and more drift away from the way things used to be in the "good ole days."

More is not always better. More people with an Amateur Radio license may not have a positive or beneficial effect on the Amateur Service. We must mold and shape these people in the traditions that have guided us since the early part of the century. How we accomplish this will be the subject of articles in future issues of this journal.

Attracting Young People

When I was a kid, ham radio was a young peoples hobby. My best friend was a guy named Barry Windsor. Barry and I were fascinated by ham radio. We used to go over to Sid Dunn's house every Saturday morning. I never saw Sid without a cigar in his mouth. It was just another one of his appendages. When the end of his "stoggie" would get all goopy and slobbery,
he'd line it up on the edge of the
workbench, along with the other stubs, to dry out.

Anyway, Sid used to take time each week to teach us about ham radio. He'd work somebody in Upper Slobovia on 20 meters and our eyes would stand out on six inch stems. Then Sid would tell us the reason he could do this was (insert lecture here) his three element beam and how it worked, or the 304TL amplifier and how it worked, or radio propagation and how it worked. You get the idea.

Barry and I and some of the other kids pecked away at keys rather unsuccessfully trying to learn the Morse code. I lost track of the others but finally made the grade when the FCC, in their infinite wisdom, created the Novice and Technician license.

Somehow, someway, we must resurrect the magic aura that existed back in Sid's hamshack. Essentially, we must try to give something back to our fraternity in exchange for all the wonderful things it has given us.

It's not going to be easy! Today kids have computers, Nintendo games, cars, the opposite sex and Madonna, MTV and a million other distractions. We've taken the first step to redress the problem of attracting young people by creating a new "code-free" license. What this license becomes, and whether it is successful in attracting newcomers is entirely

up to us. If we don't tell anyone about the Amateur Radio Service and how easy it is to become a ham, the new Technician Class license will be a "dud." In short, we must all make an effort to /b1 market ham radio to the public.

In marketing, you commonly give away a sample which gets the "hook in and set", to use a fishing metaphor. That's what the new Technician license can do that for our fraternity. It can be the "hook" that we use to attract people to Amateur Radio.

But we must get out and hustle the service to young people. That's where NARA comes in. We intend to tell our members how to recruit youngsters. We intend to print stories about how others have done it successfully.

We believe the place to recruit youngsters is in the schools as early as possible. Again, we are going to have a lot to say about our schools in future issues of "The Amateur Radio Communicator".

Helping Existing Hams

Like it or not, a lot of hams passed their written test simply by memorizing the questions and the correct answer. Why not? What's wrong with that? You memorize the code don't you?

But these hams are not particularly proud of the fact they don't understand the answers or even the questions. They are curious about the technical aspects of the Amateur Radio Service.

I have yet to meet a ham that does not want to improve him or herself. Some Volunteer Examiners have established classes to teach people how to become a ham. Who has a class to teach you how to upgrade from Novice/Technician to General? Very few, I suspect.

Each issue of "The Amateur Radio Communicator" will have a theory article. Hopefully they will be as useful and interesting to existing hams as well as to newcomers. If you have specific questions that you would like to see answered in this publication, send them to "Editor- A Touch Of Class".

Preservation Of "Our" Frequencies-

I put the word "our" in quotes. We seem to think of the radio spectrum as "ours." A number of bands of frequencies are loaned for our use, by the Federal Communications Commission. We can continue to use them so long as it is in the national interest to do so. Make no mistake about it

fellow hams. The FCC did not let us use parts of the radio spectrum because they think we are nice guys or gals. They do so because it is more in the national interest to loan these frequencies to the Amateur Radio Service than to someone else. If that equation changes, more frequencies will be lost to other activities which are perceived by the FCC to better advance the national interest.

In November 1988, the FCC brought the point forcibly to our attention. They reminded us, once again, "If you don't use 'em, you're gonna lose 'em!" Some of our bands are barren waste-lands that we Amateurs seem to be saving for a "rainy day." Six meters is under utilized except for a few hardy souls in Southern California. The Commission knew the 220 MHz band was not adequately occupied. It won't be adequately occupied even when the FCC allocates the 220- 222 MHz portion for land mobile use. We have already lost the 902 MHz band and the fate of our satellite "S" band will be decided next year by the World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) in Spain.

The 1296 band is priceless. Do you know of anyone who operates this band? Does your ham store have any 1296 MHz equipment in stock or do they have to order it? Is there a 1296 MHz repeater in your town. I doubt it.

If we maintain our "business as usual" approach, we are going to lose more frequencies. A lot more!

73, de Don, W6TNS

4051. Re: Is FCC ready to toss another bomb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 07:41:35 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <P6jqc.5258$v73.3443@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92112

Hans,

What can I say? Here is the place to go:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/HamRadioHelpGroup

Everyone is welcome. I'm not going to worry as Don has a *heck* of a group going.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:YBgqc.5251$SZ4.4038@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> The following, written a few years back by my friend
> Don Stoner, W6TNS, (SK) bears repeating. His
> organization, NARA, is defunct, but the message
> he states in his editorial is still absolutely valid.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> ----------
> In My Opinion....
>
> An editorial by Donald L. Stoner, W6TNS
>
>
> In November of 1988, the Federal Communications Commission
> slipped a bomb into our hamshacks and lit the fuse.. The FCC
> announced they were reallocating a portion of the 220 MHz
> band to a new communications service based on a petition
> submitted by United Parcel Service. Our national
> organization, The American Radio Relay League has tried to
> snuff out the fuse and get the decision reversed. But as
> far as I can tell, the 220-222 MHz part of the band is a
> goner!
>
> How could this have happened? Well, for starters, we took
> the Amateur Radio Service and our fraternity for granted. It
> never occurred to us that the FCC might give some of "our"
> frequencies away just because we didn't use them.
>
> The FCC even warned us of their intention. In 1984 Robert
> Foosaner was Chief of the FCC Private Radio Bureau. He
> indicated in a CQ Magazine interview that the band was not
> being used adequately. Mr. Foosaner flatly stated it might

> be assigned to other services. Unfortunately we didn't
> believe him .
>
> I have a theory that the FCC confiscated these frequencies
> to send Amateurs a message. I believe the message is "shape
> up or ship out." Warm up the tar and start collecting
> feathers if you like, but in my opinion, the Commission did
> Amateurs an enormous favor. A two MHz slice of radio
> frequency spectrum is a small price to pay for awakening us
> from our long sleep.
>
> The Amateur Radio Service is coming back to life after 20 or
> more years of being totally oblivious to the changes taking
> place all around us. Amateurs are starting to ask how they
> can contribute to the fraternity. They want to improve
> themselves and they want to see the service revitalized.
> They want more young people to enjoy Amateur Radio.
> Teachers, particularly those who are Amateurs, are beginning
> to realize how the service can be used to educate our
> youngsters in a number of disciplines.
>
> This metamorphosis also happened to your humble editor in
> November of 1988. I've enjoyed Amateur Radio for almost 40
> years. In the 50's and 60's I wrote a number of books and
> articles for Amateurs. I have also taken the Amateur Radio
> Service for granted. I'm as guilty as anyone. But that
> stopped when we lost part of the 220 MHz band. The National
> Amateur Radio Association became more than just a gleam in
> my eye.
>
> What Are The Goals of NARA?
>
> Broadly speaking, the goal of The National Amateur Radio
> Association is the promotion of ham radio. The organization
> has four specific goals within this broad framework. These
> are to a) publicize or market Amateur Radio to the general
> public, b) attract young people to the Amateur Radio
> Service, c) help existing Amateurs achieve the greatest
> benefit from the Amateur Radio Service and d) make Amateurs
> aware that our radio frequencies are in jeopardy from
> commercial interests. Here are some of my specific thoughts
> on these four areas:
>
> Marketing Amateur Radio To The Public
>
> Many people don't understand the significance of marketing
> and sales. The difference is very germane to this
> discussion.
>

> Let's say you go into a ham radio store and tell the person
> behind the counter you want to buy an ICOM IC-781. He or she
> takes your order along with your money and hands you a
> radio. In this instance the person is simply an order taker
> and not even a sales person. A sales person tries to
> convince you to buy a specific product but they are not
> marketeers. The people who publish the brochures, run the
> advertisements and create your desire to own the IC-781 are
> the marketeers. Marketing creates the desire to have
> something.
>
> For as long as I can remember, we hams have been order
> takers. We have not been salespersons and by no stretch of
> the imagination could be called marketeers of ham radio. If
> someone expressed their desire to be a ham, or an ex-CB'er
> convinced us they were a born-again communicator, we'd "take
> their order" and accept them into our ranks. Until
> recently, we never tried to be salespersons or marketeers for
> our hobby.
>
> Deep down inside the human brain, is a little grey glob that
> scientists label the "I've got mine" lobe. In this area of the
> Amateur's brain is stored the feeling that we really
> don't want any more hams than we already have. We'll never
> admit it, even to ourselves, but the feeling is there. More
> hams equal more QRM, more problems with the FCC and more
> drift away from the way things used to be in the "good ole
> days."
>
> More is not always better. More people with an Amateur Radio
> license may not have a positive or beneficial effect on the
> Amateur Service. We must mold and shape these people in the
> traditions that have guided us since the early part of the
> century. How we accomplish this will be the subject of
> articles in future issues of this journal.
>
> Attracting Young People
>
> When I was a kid, ham radio was a young peoples hobby. My
> best friend was a guy named Barry Windsor. Barry and I were
> fascinated by ham radio. We used to go over to Sid Dunn's
> house every Saturday morning. I never saw Sid without a
> cigar in his mouth. It was just another one of his
> appendages. When the end of his "stoggie" would get all goopy and
> slobbery,
> he'd line it up on the edge of the
> workbench, along with the other stubs, to dry out.
>
> Anyway, Sid used to take time each week to teach us about

> ham radio. He'd work somebody in Upper Slobovia on 20 meters
> and our eyes would stand out on six inch stems. Then Sid
> would tell us the reason he could do this was (insert
> lecture here) his three element beam and how it worked, or
> the 304TL amplifier and how it worked, or radio propagation
> and how it worked. You get the idea.
>
> Barry and I and some of the other kids pecked away at keys
> rather unsuccessfully trying to learn the Morse code. I lost
> track of the others but finally made the grade when the FCC,
> in their infinite wisdom, created the Novice and Technician
> license.
>
> Somehow, someway, we must resurrect the magic aura that
> existed back in Sid's hamshack. Essentially, we must try to
> give something back to our fraternity in exchange for all
> the wonderful things it has given us.
>
> It's not going to be easy! Today kids have computers,
> Nintendo games, cars, the opposite sex and Madonna, MTV and
> a million other distractions. We've taken the first step to
> redress the problem of attracting young people by creating a
> new "code-free" license. What this license becomes, and whether
> it is successful in attracting newcomers is entirely
> up to us. If we don't tell anyone about the Amateur Radio
> Service and how easy it is to become a ham, the new
> Technician Class license will be a "dud." In short, we must
> all make an effort to /b1 market ham radio to the public.
>
> In marketing, you commonly give away a sample which gets the
> "hook in and set", to use a fishing metaphor. That's what
> the new Technician license can do that for our fraternity.
> It can be the "hook" that we use to attract people to
> Amateur Radio.
>
> But we must get out and hustle the service to young people.
> That's where NARA comes in. We intend to tell our members
> how to recruit youngsters. We intend to print stories about
> how others have done it successfully.
>
> We believe the place to recruit youngsters is in the schools
> as early as possible. Again, we are going to have a lot to
> say about our schools in future issues of "The Amateur Radio
> Communicator".
>
> Helping Existing Hams
>
> Like it or not, a lot of hams passed their written test
> simply by memorizing the questions and the correct answer.

> Why not? What's wrong with that? You memorize the code don't
> you?
>
> But these hams are not particularly proud of the fact they
> don't understand the answers or even the questions. They are
> curious about the technical aspects of the Amateur Radio
> Service.
>
> I have yet to meet a ham that does not want to improve him
> or herself. Some Volunteer Examiners have established
> classes to teach people how to become a ham. Who has a class
> to teach you how to upgrade from Novice/Technician to
> General? Very few, I suspect.
>
> Each issue of "The Amateur Radio Communicator" will have a
> theory article. Hopefully they will be as useful and
> interesting to existing hams as well as to newcomers. If you
> have specific questions that you would like to see answered
> in this publication, send them to "Editor- A Touch Of
> Class".
>
> Preservation Of "Our" Frequencies-
>
> I put the word "our" in quotes. We seem to think of the radio
> spectrum as "ours." A number of bands of frequencies
> are loaned for our use, by the Federal Communications
> Commission. We can continue to use them so long as it is in
> the national interest to do so. Make no mistake about it
> fellow hams. The FCC did not let us use parts of the radio
> spectrum because they think we are nice guys or gals. They
> do so because it is more in the national interest to loan
> these frequencies to the Amateur Radio Service than to
> someone else. If that equation changes, more frequencies
> will be lost to other activities which are perceived by the
> FCC to better advance the national interest.
>
> In November 1988, the FCC brought the point forcibly to our
> attention. They reminded us, once again, "If you don't use
> 'em, you're gonna lose 'em!" Some of our bands are barren
> waste-lands that we Amateurs seem to be saving for a "rainy
> day." Six meters is under utilized except for a few hardy
> souls in Southern California. The Commission knew the 220
> MHz band was not adequately occupied. It won't be adequately
> occupied even when the FCC allocates the 220- 222 MHz
> portion for land mobile use. We have already lost the 902
> MHz band and the fate of our satellite "S" band will be decided
> next year by the World Administrative Radio
> Conference (WARC) in Spain.
>

> The 1296 band is priceless. Do you know of anyone who
> operates this band? Does your ham store have any 1296 MHz
> equipment in stock or do they have to order it? Is there a
> 1296 MHz repeater in your town. I doubt it.
>
> If we maintain our "business as usual" approach, we are going
> to lose more frequencies. A lot more!
>
> 73, de Don, W6TNS
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.687 / Virus Database: 448 - Release Date: 5/16/04

4052. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 13:03:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405180503.b554fca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92113

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40A981F6.1311CF91@earthlink.net>...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> > news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> > >
> > > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> > >
> > > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > > and a place.
>
> ...and thus it is with our Glen Dale sociopath. Now he's challenging
> Brian to fight him. The reality is: he wouldn't show up. Roger is
> quite brave, as long as it is from the safety of his home. Now that
> you've commented, brace yourself for a torrent of filth from the
> internet gnome.

Been there, dealt with it.

<<snore>>.

> Dave K8MN

4053. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 13:05:51 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <b2af2d5942e649bef5a86f8664fde2e3@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 92114

In article <STcqc.28416$5z5.20884@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
>
>
> "Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
> news:300238ab502ffb5805caaed6376dd914@paranoici.org...
> > dumbass davey's dad the episcopalian priest who died march 1 is probably
> getting
> > roasted in hell for molesting the altar boys. little davey was molested
> right
> > along with them. it's no wonder they moved around so much when he was
> growing
> > up. terry his mommy was the original glen dale tunnel, doing it all for
> $2.
> > her cunt saw more traffic than the los angeles freeway. she'll probably
> have
> > to go back to that, now that her hubby has done a dirt dump. wiseman isn't
> > even near the river, lardass. you lose as usual.
>
> Shut up Wiseman, you're getting you butt kicked here and on Nim Busters!

Wrong guess, fatty! And here's what is happening on Nim Busters:

Kennewick_Man even notices Llardass is a LOSER in:
http://www.network54.com/Forum/message?forumid=279169&messageid=10837958
97

And how do we disagree?
by Kennewick_Man

Like I said, Lloyd is losing bigtime...

4054. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 13:17:30 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c8d2da04nb@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 92116

In article <Kk9qc.15717$KE6.2887@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
says...
>
>
>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com...
>> >
>> >
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position. Glad
>to
>> >see I have you placed in the right hole.
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd keep
>> it for
>> extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on the
>> VE's giving
>> the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have to
>> keep and
>> maintain code test tapes.
>>
>Gee, ya really think so? And so what? Since when did the gobernmunt give
>a hoot out of what the citizens want?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
I want my mtv.

4055. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 13:18:56 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c8d2g004v7@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 92115

In article <8tednXpO7pCSlzTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ says...
>
>Anonymous Sender wrote:
>> In article <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
>> JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>Tim wrote:
>>>
>>>>What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
>>>>he work? Does he have a family?
>>>>It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
>>>>
>>>>Tim
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>"somewhat" is putting it mildly.
>>
>>
>> says "JJ" the kiddie raper.
>
>I see you're only getting worse Wogie.
>
need your salad tossed?

4056. Re: Morse and Contests

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 13:58:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040518095801.22537.00000697@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92117

>Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/17/2004 6:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405171542.54dbd939@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040517070319.10421.00001563@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/16/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405161715.77df12bc@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0405161354.54c4e39f@posting.google.com>...
>> >>
>> >> Wouldn't know...Today (May 16th) was the fifth anniversary of my
>> >> daughter's passing, and my wife insisted I stay close to home. But no
>> >> matter where I go, there she is...She may ahve left my arms, but
>> >> she'll never leave my heart.
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Steve, I am sorry. Maybe one day they'll move the dates of the Hamvention
>> >again.
>>
>> Thanks, Brian.
>>
>> For me, anyway, it really would have been better to go. I needed to
>be
>> away for a bit, but hey...can't always have everything the way we want it,
>> eh...???
>
>Shoot for something soon. I'm going to a wine tasting in Cleveland
>tomorrow night, which ought to do a body good.

I am not too much on alcoholic beverages, however I'd love to find a local
ABC that sold Stroh's Beer! Haven't ahd one in 5-6 years.

>Steve, it's kind of funny that the Hamvention folks moved the date
>back hoping for better weather, then we had such a bad weekend. Its
>even more sad that since Ohio is the home of the Hamvention, many of
>the other hamfests here are so tiny.

What would be nice is if they could re-arrange the vendors to allow some
of the flea market indoors, although I kinda like the "bazaar" atmosphere

otherwise.

As for the size, yeah, I guess it's the bitter pill for being home to "The Big One"...

73

Steve, K4YZ

4057. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 14:01:15 UTC
From: futureworlds <nobody@mail.futureworlds.it>
Message-ID: <3182425776ddfd5e7f3683b730d23d67@mail.futureworlds.it>
Source record: 92119

```
In article <8tednXpO7pCSlzTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>
>
> Anonymous Sender wrote:
> > In article <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
> > JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>Tim wrote:
> >>
> >>>What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
> >>>he work? Does he have a family?
> >>>It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
> >>>
> >>>Tim
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>"somewhat" is putting it mildly.
> >
> >
> > says "JJ" the kiddie raper.
>
> I see you're only getting worse Wogie.

i see your guessing skills haven't gotten any better, smegma-lips.
```

4058. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 14:06:08 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <d81c376aefd232d73ec1d89fd6555b3c@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 92120

In article <h6cqc.14109$yF6.10556@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
>
>
> "futureworlds" <nobody@mail.futureworlds.it> wrote in message
> news:901a353fc5540d11b7b132a4bdafd5e1@mail.futureworlds.it...
> >
> > roger isn't on medication, dumbass. you need to quit seeing him
> > everywhere you look, asshole.
> >
> >
> >
>
> Quit talking in the third person. You see me everywhere on Nim Busters too!

pkb, fatty. you see roger everywhere and answer your own impostering
posts. now go change your depends.

4059. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 14:15:52 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <1904bc7ffae7020272f99874c6fb8798@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 92118

In article <40A981F6.1311CF91@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> > news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> > >
> > > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> > >
> > > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > > and a place.
>
> ...and thus it is with our Glen Dale sociopath. Now he's challenging
> Brian to fight him. The reality is: he wouldn't show up. Roger is
> quite brave, as long as it is from the safety of his home. Now that
> you've commented, brace yourself for a torrent of filth from the
> internet gnome.
>
> Dave K8MN

..and thus it it from the Cameron Cunt, who whines loudly to the local corrupt law enforcement. Davey's quite brave as well, isn't he, the bad comb over, coke bottle bottomed glasses wearing, smelly because of not bathing, couldn't get anything but a foreign whore for a wife, goosestepping nazi.

4060. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 15:00:44 UTC
From: An Metet <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org>
Message-ID: <70ccd56668577433ccae367474303936@aonymous.poster>
Source record: 92121

In article <2Vcqc.28424$5z5.12016@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> Thing is,

Mongolloyd make good sentence!
Why aren't you posting as "Tim" or "Brian Kelly" this time, fatty?

4061. Re: Is FCC ready to toss another bomb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 17:20:32 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <c8dgl0$3ud$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 92122

"K�HB" (groupk0hb@earthlink.net) writes:
> The following, written a few years back by my friend
> Don Stoner, W6TNS, (SK) bears repeating. His
> organization, NARA, is defunct, but the message
> he states in his editorial is still absolutely valid.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
The point about being visible has always been obvious to me,
and it makes me want to scream that often it does not seem obvious
to others.

I learned of amateur radio because it was out there. I can't even
remember where I read about it first, maybe a magazine for Scouting
here in Canada, maybe it was "Jack & Jill" or "HIghtlights for Children"
and both of those magazines were aimed at quite a young crowd.

Obviously when I found the hobby electronic magazines a year or so later,
after I had decided I would indeed get a ham licesne, there was still amateur
radio content in them. But while that would have steered people with
an existing predisposition to the hobby into the hobby, it doesn't do
a thing if somebody has no knowledge of the hobby.

But it's rare, and seems increasingly rare with each passing year, to
see references in common areas of society. The local ham clubs
do not promote the hamfests, which at the very least can be of interest
to the electronic and computer hobbyist and might let the hobby rub off
on them. Promoting hamfests is not merely about getting bodies to
the event, it's an excuse to be out there. I'm the one who posts
to the local buy and sell newsgroup about some of the local hamfests,
trying to provide a bit about the event and amateur radio (I always put
a link to the Radio Amateurs of Canada website), making sure it's not
merely the facts to bring in hams to the event. Maybe someone will see
the notice, and take enough interest to look further, and that's as
important as getting people to the event. It would be better if those
involved in the clubs, who were generating the information in the first
place, was doing the simple act of posting a message each time there is a
hamfest. Posting to amateur radio related newsgroups does not reach the
newcomer, or potential newcomer.

Likewise, for some years I've been putting up "bootleg" posters about
one of the local hamfests. I don't do a good job of it, but I do a near
infinitely better job than is done already (ie nothing at all). One year,
I even pointed out that there should be such a poster, hanging from the club's
website, so anyone interested could print up a few, and stick them up,

but no luck. So I just copy the information from the website, stick the club's logo at the top, and print out some. I think I put up 200 this year, putting them near some universities, getting them up at the local Ben & Jerry's putting them not where hams congregate, but where the general public might see them. Since they have the URL to the club's website, anyone seeing them has a chance to learn of the hobby, which is far better than in the days before the internet.

They rarely get the announcements in the various listings of upcoming events by non-profit groups, though I'm not sure if that's lack of trying or the publications have to choose what to list due to space.

But we do need to work on this. There was a time when amateur radio was likely part of the common language of society, even if most were not hams and might not even know much about the hobby. I think most were aware of the hobby, and had a vague idea of what it was about. This was because it was out there in public view. Local stories, friends of friends, big antennas in the neighbor's back yard.

But I'm not so sure this is the case anymore. It seemed to be much more visible when I was a kid, thirty five years ago. Someone would come across it, and something would tempt them enough for them to seek out more information. But if they don't come across the hobby in the first place, how could they be interested, how could they do any searches? It is far easier for us to get the details to them today, but unless we have a presence out in existing clusters, they will never find our websites (or whatever).

Michael VE2BVW

4062. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 18:25:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KfCdnSD-h8sj_jfdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92125

Bert Craig wrote:

>
> I got that already, Dave. I figure it's just some kid, maybe even an
> adolescent, playing on his/her parent's PC. In any case, the standard
> solution applies:

He's not a kid, just has the mentality of a kid. So sad for a grown man,
and I use the term loosely, to act this way.

4063. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 18:27:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <KfCdnSP-h8uI-TfdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92126

WA3MOJ wrote:

> In article <8tednXpO7pCSlzTd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ says...
>
>>Anonymous Sender wrote:
>>
>>>In article <RsOdneDtKr6D2TXd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
>>>JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Tim wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>What makes this Roger Wiseman guy tick? Does he have a call sign? Where does
>>>>>he work? Does he have a family?
>>>>>It sounds like he is somewhat mentally disturbed.
>>>>>
>>>>>Tim
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"somewhat" is putting it mildly.
>>>
>>>
>>>says "JJ" the kiddie raper.
>>
>>I see you're only getting worse Wogie.
>>
>
> need your salad tossed?
>

If you think you are big enough to toss it, go ahead.

4064. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 18:47:54 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <uTsqc.59022$MH.14628109@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92123

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:40A981F6.1311CF91@earthlink.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> >
> > Pretty brave...coming from behind the cloak of anonymity. LOL!
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> > news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
> > >
> > > > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
> > >
> > > So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> > > and a place.
>
> ...and thus it is with our Glen Dale sociopath. Now he's challenging
> Brian to fight him. The reality is: he wouldn't show up. Roger is
> quite brave, as long as it is from the safety of his home. Now that
> you've commented, brace yourself for a torrent of filth from the
> internet gnome.
>
> Dave K8MN

I got that already, Dave. I figure it's just some kid, maybe even an adolescent, playing on his/her parent's PC. In any case, the standard solution applies:

Message <click>
Block Sender <click>
Yes <click>
"Plonk!"

73 de Bert
WA2SI

BTW, Dave...do you frequent 40?

4065. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 18:48:55 UTC
From: An Metet <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org>
Message-ID: <508f6d260d797f245291e75dbdba94c1@aonymous.poster>
Source record: 92124

In article <c8bj39ctk0@pita.alt.net>
"Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> wrote:
>
>
>
> "Anonymous Sender" <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message
> news:4a5f9a0415c554723d5665e9d941bb7e@remailer.metacolo.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) whined:
>
> > One of those midnite surprise parties down by the river . .
>
> So where do you want to meet me chickenshit? give me a time
> and a place.
>
>
> Why? So you can be 100 miles from there?

Where? Athens, Alabama, Llardass
Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd?

4066. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 19:33:07 UTC
From: Anonymous <nobody@paranoici.org>
Message-ID: <7e86bcb02c06833d7979fb8486cd3b00@paranoici.org>
Source record: 92127

In article <c8biu0cmd0@pita.alt.net>
"Shelby and Michelle Molester N4CND Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
whined:

>Aw, come on, Wiseman. Everybody knows you have an account at
>Stratuswave.net. You just don't dare posting from it lest I get you
TOS'd
>from it, too.

I bet you have a terribly empty feeling in your skull, don't you?

>And what has you so upset, Roger?

If you were any more stupid, you would photosynthesize in sunlight.
Upset???? You mean, "yawn"? "Laugh my ass off"?

How very droll, fatty.

>You are using just about all of your nyms on this board but your filthy
mouth, like your fingerprints, >gives you away every time.

"My nyms" do I own USENET? Are you really that fucking retarded? You
sad, sad cunt.

>Dave's comment that you are a Sociopath must really have hit your sore
>spot!!!!

Davey the Cameron cunt couldn't hit the broad side of his wife's fat ass.
Yes. I'm very angry again. Hahaha! Now make my blood boil,
fatty.....BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..do you have any concept of
reality?

> You best calm down, Roger. Take your meds or it will be back to
>booby hatch for you!

Wrong guess,..... again, stupid.

4067. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 20:01:59 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <GStqc.2057$Wg6.916@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92128

"starwars""Wiseman is not 'wise' <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in
message news:b2af2d5942e649bef5a86f8664fde2e3@tatooine.homelinux.net...
>> Wrong guess, fatty! And here's what is happening on Nim Busters:
>
> Kennewick_Man even notices Llardass is a LOSER in:
> http://www.network54.com/Forum/message?forumid=279169&messageid=10837958
> 97
>
> And how do we disagree?
> by Kennewick_Man
>
> Like I said, Lloyd is losing bigtime...
>
>
>
>
>
>

Give it up loser, Kennewick_Man is a freind of mine, so is Holsten, so most
of NIM Busters.

You are losing everywhere, you don't even know who posts at Nim Busters
against you, do you?

Take you wares to Cigarwise.com and leave Dave Heil and myself alone!

4068. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 20:04:58 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <tVtqc.2070$Wg6.485@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92129

"An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
news:70ccd56668577433ccae367474303936@aonymous.poster...
> In article <2Vcqc.28424$5z5.12016@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
> "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
> >
> > Thing is,
>
> Mongolloyd make good sentence!
> Why aren't you posting as "Tim" or "Brian Kelly" this time, fatty?
>

1. I do not post a anyone but myself. You do, however imposter posting of kiddie porn and other things

2. I am now at 198 pounds, dummy! I started out the year at 225, and have lost close to 30 pounds. Soon, you will have to think of another name to call than "lardass"

Go ahead, make my day!

4069. Re: Chickenshit Brian Kelly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 20:07:05 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <tXtqc.2077$Wg6.525@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92130

"Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
news:3BG8Q8AM38125.6303472222@anonymous.poster...
> That's rich, from the whining pussy davey, who whines to the local
> corrupt law enforcement.

And that's even richer, coming from someone, who wishes to get me fired!

It will not work!

Enjoy your short stay at your new ISP!

4070. Re: Wiseman's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 20:17:56 UTC
From: nobody@See.Comments.Header
Message-ID: <7NW1DQZ038125.9291203704@anonymous.poster>
Source record: 92131

In article <40A9854E.928A775@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Tampa Turd wrote:
> >
> > wassup Roger? looks like Dave has spanked you bad. He even
> > has you talking in the third person about yourself.
> >
> > best of all, Dave spanked your butt and did not have to use a single
> > filthy word to do it!
> >
> > ROTFLMAO

wrong guess, asshole.

> He must post in the third person. If he admits to being Roger Wiseman,
> local authorities pay him a visit. This way he had some minimal amount
> of deniability--unless they obtain a warrant and decide to look at the
> material on his computer. He's tried this third person stuff before but
> has always slipped up. He forgets that he has posted most of his
> material under his own name previously. Wiseman ends up doing one of
> his, "Duh--How do you know it's me?" routines.

classic, textbook strawman. anyhow, you're sidestepping again,
backpedaler.
you have an intellect rivaled only by the village idiot's thicker
brother....
namely lloyd davies. who posted as "tim" and "brian kelly" by the way.

> Roger has himself painted into a corner.

wrong again, dumbass.

> Dave K8MN

poor davey, he's just all upset that he can't control what people post.

4071. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 20:56:30 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <70ccd56668577433ccae367474303936@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 92132

In article <2Vcqc.28424$5z5.12016@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> Thing is,

Mongolloyd make good sentence!
Why aren't you posting as "Tim" or "Brian Kelly" this time, fatty?

4072. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 21:12:58 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <u%uqc.75539$xw3.4174734@attbi_s04>
Source record: 92133

> Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue
that
> no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and secondly, VEs
> may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have to buy code tapes,
> so some paltry amount of money may in fact be saved.

Na Alun don't worry about those expenses for code tapes or programs or 33
RPM records etc. There have been many a VE out there who has taken his
significant other out for a "night on the town" after a VE session. Why
would some guys drive for a hundred miles to "take" a test when tests are
locally offered ???

Dare I say shenanigans ..... ??????

73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

4073. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 21:17:05 UTC
From: Tampa Tom <dx@tamtomdxman.net>
Message-ID: <c8ducq$l7l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92134

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:tVtqc.2070$Wg6.485@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
>
> 2. I am now at 198 pounds, dummy! I started out the year at 225, and
have
> lost close to 30 pounds. Soon, you will have to think of another name to
> call than "lardass"

Keep up the great job Lloyd! I lost 58 Lbs and am now the same
weight as when I joined the Coast Guard. Retired from the postal
service last month and got a bonus for losing all the weight!

Tampa Tom

4074. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 21:21:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <97vqc.520$Tn6.468@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92135

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote

> There have been many a VE out there who has taken his
> significant other out for a "night on the town" after a
> VE session.

I take K0CKB out for a "night on the town" anytime I damned well please,
but it has nothing to do with funds from a VE session.

If you can prove your accusation, then the FCC will be greatly
interested in hearing from you.

On the other hand, it's my guess that you're full of
male-bovine-fecal-matter up to your eyeballs, and somebody ought to
stomp a mudhole between them for your slander.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4075. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 22:06:55 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EDB80C09348elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92136

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in
news:u%uqc.75539$xw3.4174734@attbi_s04:

>
>
>> Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue
>> that no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and
>> secondly, VEs may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have
>> to buy code tapes, so some paltry amount of money may in fact be
>> saved.
>
> Na Alun don't worry about those expenses for code tapes or programs or
> 33 RPM records etc. There have been many a VE out there who has taken
> his significant other out for a "night on the town" after a VE session.
> Why would some guys drive for a hundred miles to "take" a test when
> tests are locally offered ???
>
> Dare I say shenanigans ..... ??????
>
> 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.
>
>
>

You do realise that the max that can be claimed back is a percentage of the
test fee?

4076. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 22:32:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <F9wqc.14239$zO3.2248@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92137

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94ECBE536503Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:Kk9qc.15717$KE6.2887@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>>
> >> >>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position.
> >> >Glad to see I have you placed in the right hole.
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd keep
> >> it for
> >> extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on the
> >> VE's giving
> >> the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have to
> >> keep and
> >> maintain code test tapes.
> >>
> > Gee, ya really think so? And so what? Since when did the gobernmunt
> > give a hoot out of what the citizens want?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> They don't, but the FCC is heavily into the concept of reducing the

> regulatory burden by simplification of rules, a very Reaganesque idea.
> Which is simpler, keeping a requirement for some licences only or making
it
> go away altogether? Abolishing Element 1 completely fits their philosophy,
> and the alternative doesn't.
>
> Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue
that
> no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and secondly, VEs
> may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have to buy code tapes,
> so some paltry amount of money may in fact be saved.

Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key and a
oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.

Dan/W4NTI

4077. Roger. Have you been discovered again?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 22:50:54 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@Nospam>
Message-ID: <c8e406$tk2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92138

Gee, Roger. Stagger Lee did it to you again over in r.r.a.m.

:
: > Even funnier, I heard on good authority that Woger got booted from
: > Stratuswave recently. He must be running out of ISPs that will take his
: > worthless ass.
:
: How fucking stupid can you get, PrisonBITCH??
: BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Then why is it that a traceback to you comes up with domain names like 1Cust127.tnt1.wheeling.wv.da.uu.net these days? (The digits in "1Cust127" may change, but the "tnt1.wheeling.wv.da.uu.net" seems to remain the same.) The last time I bothered with you, I traced you to poolA-042.stratuswave.net, but that address doesn't seem to show up any more.

That notwithstanding, the most important thing for the targets of your abuse to know is that the complaint address registered for the IP addresses you've been using recently (NetRange: 65.224.0.0 - 65.239.255.255; NetName: UUNET97DU-2BLK) is

abuse-mail@mci.com,

and that MCI can take things from there.

Once again, Woger, you are welcome.

4078. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 23:30:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxxcg02.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 92139

On 16 May 2004 19:02:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX. Has
>> anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail addresses have
>> gone unanswered.
>
>Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
>called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
>please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.

Quite a while ago a notice was posted here that Dick had passed away. Perhaps someone (not me) wants to Google-search RRAP to find it.

A search of the QRZ index showed that his license name was Richard S. Carroll and his last address was Willow Springs, MO. No DOB was listed.

A search of the Social Security Death Records Index shows a Richard S. Carroll, DOB 4/18/1942, passed away 10/25/2003. Although there was no place (city, county, state, ZIP) listed for last benefit, his Social Security card was issued in Missouri, and his passing was verified by Death Certificate submitted to Social Security (probably by his survivors to receive the lump sum burial benefit). IIRC Dick retired from the Missouri State Police communications division, so it would be plausible that he did not receive a retirement benefit from Social Security.

This all appears to fall into place. We'll miss him.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4079. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 23:30:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxxfam4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 92140

On Sat, 15 May 2004 22:37:12 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex slave
>countries.

What makes you think that real CW ops won't learn/use manual Morse
if the mandatory testing requirement is dropped?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4080. Re: Is FCC ready to toss another bomb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 23:30:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hxxd0l3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 92141

On 18 May 2004 17:20:32 GMT, Michael Black wrote:

>I learned of amateur radio because it was out there. I can't even
>remember where I read about it first, maybe a magazine for Scouting
>here in Canada, maybe it was "Jack & Jill" or "HIghtlights for Children"
>and both of those magazines were aimed at quite a young crowd.

I learned about SWL-ing and ham radio from "Boy's Life", the
magazine of the Boy Scouts of America, when I was in the 8th grade.
It helped that a close family friend (a non-ham) had been a radio
repair tech in WW-II which had ended only a few years before and he
steered me in the right direction.

After messinmg around listening to and repairing AM and SW radios of
the late 1930s-1940s era, I finally got hooked on ham radio in the
11th Grade at the high school radio club (W2CLE, the oldest HS radio
club in the country, founded before WW-I). I got my Novice/Tech
license at the end of 11th Grade (1952). Along the way I changed my
intended college major from chemistry to electrical engineering.

Neither I nor ham radio nor electrical engineering has been the same
ever since.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4081. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-18 23:33:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405181533.1da3b77a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92142

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of May 16, 2004:
Novice - 31,384 (decrease of 17,945)
Technician - 264,231 (increase of 58,837)
Technician Plus - 59,919 (decrease of 68,941)
General - 140,628 (increase of 27,802)
Advanced - 80,411 (decrease of 19,371)
Extra - 105,369 (increase of 26,619)
Total - 682,243 (increase of 7,451)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4082. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 00:24:42 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ePxqc.68392$MH.15635384@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92143

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxxcg02.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 16 May 2004 19:02:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX. Has
> >> anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail addresses
have
> >> gone unanswered.
> >
> >Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
> >called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
> >please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.
>
> Quite a while ago a notice was posted here that Dick had passed
> away. Perhaps someone (not me) wants to Google-search RRAP to find
> it.
>
> A search of the QRZ index showed that his license name was Richard
> S. Carroll and his last address was Willow Springs, MO. No DOB was
> listed.
>
> A search of the Social Security Death Records Index shows a Richard S.
> Carroll, DOB 4/18/1942, passed away 10/25/2003. Although there was
> no place (city, county, state, ZIP) listed for last benefit, his
> Social Security card was issued in Missouri, and his passing was
> verified by Death Certificate submitted to Social Security (probably
> by his survivors to receive the lump sum burial benefit). IIRC Dick
> retired from the Missouri State Police communications division, so
> it would be plausible that he did not receive a retirement benefit
> from Social Security.
>
> This all appears to fall into place. We'll miss him.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Indeed it does. Thanks for the leg work, Phil.

I will remember Dick as the guy who talked tough, but in the next breath,
would offer the proverbial "shirt off his back" to help you. This is
evidenced by many e-mails answering my curious questions and culminating
with his QSL on my wall.

We will miss him. (Hope he and N0BK are laughin' at us poor slobs down
here.)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4083. Re: Who IS Roger Wiseman And Why Is He Angry?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 03:08:25 UTC
From: BH <radiobillyy@zzgbronline.com>
Message-ID: <p9SdnXFaW7SuQzfdRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92144

futureworlds wrote:
> In article <KfCdnSP-h8uI-TfdRVn-hQ@gbronline.com> JJ whined:
>
>
>>If you think you are big enough to toss it, go ahead.
>
>
> ok kiddie raper, tell me when and where to meet you. it will be
> fun to tear your head off and shove it up your asshole.

Yea right, I'm really scared, I'm shaking so hard I can hardddd lllyy
ttttyyppe ttttthhhiss. What a putz.

4084. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 04:14:15 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92145

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:F9wqc.14239$zO3.2248@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94ECBE536503Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:Kk9qc.15717$KE6.2887@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>> > news:40A80BF9.1040003@ix.netcom.com...
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>You wish. I predict Element 1 will go.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> >Most people of limited drive and ambition will take that position.
>> >> >Glad to see I have you placed in the right hole.
>> >> >
>> >> >Dan/W4NTI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> The way the FCC has talked about code lately, I doubt that they'd
>> >> keep it for
>> >> extra only vs just dumping it entirely. "Reduction of burden on
>> >> the VE's giving
>> >> the tests" and all that. Keeping it for extra means that VEs have
>> >> to keep and
>> >> maintain code test tapes.
>> >>
>> > Gee, ya really think so? And so what? Since when did the
>> > gobernmunt give a hoot out of what the citizens want?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >

>> >
>> >
>>
>> They don't, but the FCC is heavily into the concept of reducing the
>> regulatory burden by simplification of rules, a very Reaganesque idea.
>> Which is simpler, keeping a requirement for some licences only or
>> making it go away altogether? Abolishing Element 1 completely fits
>> their philosophy, and the alternative doesn't.
>>
>> Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue
>> that no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and
>> secondly, VEs may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have
>> to buy code tapes, so some paltry amount of money may in fact be
>> saved.
>
> Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key and
> a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

You'll have to do better than that

4085. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 04:17:58 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EE2D03EFB7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92146

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxxfam4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On Sat, 15 May 2004 22:37:12 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>>After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex
>>slave countries.
>
> What makes you think that real CW ops won't learn/use manual Morse
> if the mandatory testing requirement is dropped?
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>

I might even use it if the test is dropped! Some of these guys are
terrified that they will have no-one to work. Not that I would want to work
Dan, who is on record as saying that all phone ops are lids..

4086. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 04:39:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GxBqc.1017$Tn6.35@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92147

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

> Not that I would want to work
> Dan, who is on record as saying
> that all phone ops are lids..

You must be mistaken. I just checked my log and I've worked W4NTI dozens of times over the past few years. Nearly half of the Q's were on SSB (I think that mode qualifies as "phone".) Certainly Dan wouldn't work people he considers "lids".

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

4087. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 04:56:17 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <9ee5c067897ba37f1fa97d032fc00f66@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 92148

In article <c8ducq$l7l$0@pita.alt.net>
"Tampa Turd" <dx@tamtomdxman.net> whined:
>
> Keep up the great job Lloyd! I lost 58 Lbs and am now the same
> weight as when I joined the Coast Guard.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..the Pussy squad.

> Retired from the postal
> service last month and got a bonus for losing all the weight!

Too bad it was a "forced retirement" for poor job performance.

4088. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 06:18:00 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <97cc6408d0966991f876360cb58ffe97@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 92149
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

In article <tVtqc.2070$Wg6.485@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
"LARDASS Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> whined:
>
>
>
> "An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
> news:70ccd56668577433ccae367474303936@aonymous.poster...
> > In article <2Vcqc.28424$5z5.12016@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
> > "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > Thing is,
> >
> > Mongolloyd make good sentence!
> > Why aren't you posting as "Tim" or "Brian Kelly" this time, fatty?
> >
>
> 1. I do not post a anyone but myself. You do, however imposter posting of
> kiddie porn and other things

wrong again, LARDASS. Shall I post some of your imposterings on the Nim
Busters board?

> 2. I am now at 198 pounds, dummy!

Sure you are, LARDASS!

> I started out the year at 225, and have

You started at 280 and still weigh 280!

> lost close to 30 pounds. Soon, you will have to think of another name to
> call than "lardass"

You ARE A LARDASS! Your neighbors say you weigh the same and are the
same short fat slob you've always been. even at "198" you are OBESE for
your height of 5'6".

> Go ahead, make my day!

Go change your depends that you have to wear. Your co-workers say you
have a permanent smell of feces.

4089. Re: Roger. Have you been discovered again?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 06:40:07 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <89ae57f4f00516d0d22ddc57db6d1fd8@dizum.com>
Source record: 92150

In article <c8e406$tk2$0@pita.alt.net>
"LARDASS Lloyd Davies aka Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> whined:
>
>
>
> Gee, Roger. Stagger Lee did it to you again over in r.r.a.m.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..did what, LARDASS.....good luck trying to explain to
abuse@bellsouth.net.

4090. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 08:14:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405190014.1bc3f4aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92152

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hxxcg02.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 16 May 2004 19:02:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> Glad to hear it. I too was concerned...and still am re. Dick, W0EX. Has
> >> anybody heard from/about him? My e-mails to his usual e-mail addresses have
> >> gone unanswered.
> >
> >Ditto here. A couple months ago I looked up his phone number and
> >called him. Got his answering machine, told him I was concerned,
> >please call or e-mail me, and left my number. Nothing heard yet.
>
> Quite a while ago a notice was posted here that Dick had passed
> away. Perhaps someone (not me) wants to Google-search RRAP to find
> it.
>
> A search of the QRZ index showed that his license name was Richard
> S. Carroll and his last address was Willow Springs, MO. No DOB was
> listed.
>
> A search of the Social Security Death Records Index shows a Richard S.
> Carroll, DOB 4/18/1942, passed away 10/25/2003. Although there was
> no place (city, county, state, ZIP) listed for last benefit, his
> Social Security card was issued in Missouri, and his passing was
> verified by Death Certificate submitted to Social Security (probably
> by his survivors to receive the lump sum burial benefit). IIRC Dick
> retired from the Missouri State Police communications division, so
> it would be plausible that he did not receive a retirement benefit
> from Social Security.
>
> This all appears to fall into place. We'll miss him.

Tnx Phil.

Brian

4091. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 12:15:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EE53B84D98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92153

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:GxBqc.1017$Tn6.35
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> Not that I would want to work
>> Dan, who is on record as saying that all phone ops are lids..
>
> You must be mistaken. I just checked my log and I've worked W4NTI
> dozens of times over the past few years. Nearly half of the Q's were on
> SSB (I think that mode qualifies as "phone".) Certainly Dan wouldn't
> work people he considers "lids".
>
> Good luck on this one now!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
>
>
>
```

He said that phone ops are lids in the group. He tried to backtrack on that, but google preserves his words indefinitely.

4092. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 12:41:22 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <xuIqc.5702$cJ1.3600@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92154

"privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
message news:de321c8ade0abab143e373ab317a0aa6@remailer.privacy.at...
>
> "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lard" squealed:
>
> > Shut up Wiseman, you're getting you butt kicked here and on Nim Busters!
>
> go back to somedayheaven and post. oh but you can't because they
> booted your 30 year old 300 lb virgin ass for posting filth.
>
> BWA HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!
>

Not by my doing, YOU runied me over there.

I am Not 300 pounds! 198 to be exact.

4093. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 12:56:34 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <MIIqc.5761$cJ1.5105@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

"A.Melon-Roger hides yet again" <juicy@melontraffickers.com> wrote in
message news:97cc6408d0966991f876360cb58ffe97@melontraffickers.com...
> > 1. I do not post a anyone but myself. You do, however imposter posting
of
> > kiddie porn and other things
>
> wrong again, LARDASS. Shall I post some of your imposterings on the Nim
> Busters board?
>
> > 2. I am now at 198 pounds, dummy!
>
> Sure you are, LARDASS!
>
> > I started out the year at 225, and have
>
> You started at 280 and still weigh 280!

You are a liar. I am hereby calling you a LIAR!

>
> > lost close to 30 pounds. Soon, you will have to think of another name
to
> > call than "lardass"
>
> You ARE A LARDASS! Your neighbors say you weigh the same and are the
> same short fat slob you've always been. even at "198" you are OBESE for
> your height of 5'6".
>

You don't even know who my neighbors at all. You are making up this
bullcrap to belittle me. It's not working!

> > Go ahead, make my day!
>
> Go change your depends that you have to wear. Your co-workers say you
> have a permanent smell of feces.
>

One of these days, just one of these days, you are reap what you have sown
all these years!

4094. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 12:57:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92156

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...

> >Please, not another threat to injure me.
>
> The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
> with him. That's a LOT of threats.

The only "threat" is to those people who think that lying is an
acceptable means of "representing" Amateur Radio.

> The Military Affiliate Radio System is...(SNIP)

...a lot older than the 1998 manual you cited.

Thanks for the history lesson. You cut and paste well.

It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.

> >Now you lie.
>
> The gunnery nurse has distinct definitions of "lie" different
> from other people. Those who disagree with him are "always
> lying."

Nice try. It's still not true.

> >Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
> >
> >It's just wrong.
>
> The gunnery nurse will never concede any mistake he made.
> He has his own definitions and commands all to obey those
> unique definitions.

Back up Putzy.

There many in this forum who can attest to my having offered an "I
stand corrected" on several occasions.

On the OTHER hand, we have caught you in NUMEROUS errors or
blatant misrepresentations of the facts, and YOU have NEVER
apologized, offered a correction, or otherwise admitted your errors,
even when they were corroborated as errors by several respondents.

> MARS has never been an important part of military
> communications, never a part of either tactical or
> strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
> Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
> and morale boosting of service personnel. However, the
> affiliation with the military has terribly important
> self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
> to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
> grand scheme to 'serve their country'."

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"....

Remember who said THAT Lennie?

You really have your moments of lowness and sliminess, but this
one was pretty well in the running with the lowest.

In as much as YOUR rear-area radio clerk duties were probably of
even less importance in :the grand scheme" of the Armed Forces, I
imagine it eats at you that MARS members do more for free than you
EVER did while on Uncle Sam's payroll.

> It must be the extension of the old USMC mythology where
> NCOs are all gods who MUST be obeyed and never, ever
> questioned. No "civility" is allowed within ranks.

Thanks for once again demonstrating that your current events
knowldege of the Armed Forces is even less now than it was when you
were in it....If that's at all possible.

> A close inspection of USN-USMC NTP 8(C) will reveal that
> USN and USMC MARS operators do NOT need to possess amateur
> radio licenses in order to operate MARS radio equipment.
> In both USA and USAF regulations, MARS operations are done
> by Army or Air Force personnel who are not required to have
> amateur radio licenses.
>
> VOLUNTEER civilians are welcomed by all three branches but
> only the USA and USAF require volunteers to possess amateur
> licenses. USN-USMC does not.

Well, Your Scumminess...why don't you go right ahead and apply
for membership and a station authorization in N/MC MARS...?!?!

I'd love to see the result.

> Gunnery nurse has his own fantasy land perspective on
> society and definitions and civil behavior. He hasn't
> been able to adjust to civilian life after being rejected
> by the USMC.

I am sure you think that those are the circumstances, Lennie.

We'll just add it to the ever-expanidng list of what you DON'T
know.

> Actually, there's been NO third-party proof that gunnery
> nurse was ever in the USMC. All we have to go on is his
> "word" and his "I've got the proof in my wallet" sort of
> statements.

Contact the VA, Lennie.

You've got my full name, branch of service, and my date of birth
is 18 Sept 1955. You'll excuse me if I don't offer you my SSAN, too.

Of course that's been offered to you before and like most REAL
facts, you never follow-up on it.

That would be because you're a coward.

> We have yet to see a "paper trail wide enough to roller skate
> on to show where [gunnery nurse'] assertions are true."

You've been offered access to the VA to verify it before, Lennie.
>
> No problem. Gunnery nurse, when confronted with the truth
> and evidence, will, like the fictional Col. Jessup, will
> simply state someone is a "liar" and then call them all sorts
> of nasty names to show how "wrong" they are.

Not "someone", Lennie...You. Because you are a liar.

Always have been...always will. What a loser.

Steve, K4YZ

4095. Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 13:02:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519090200.28263.00000736@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92157

>Subject: Re: How about Dick Carroll? (Was Re: Dave Heil)
>From: "Phil Kane" Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop
>Date: 5/18/2004 6:30 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <xnfcneeyarg.hxxcg02.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>

> Quite a while ago a notice was posted here that Dick had passed
> away. Perhaps someone (not me) wants to Google-search RRAP to find
> it.

Save your time...It was me.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4096. Roger Outed Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 14:09:55 UTC
From: anon <anon@nganonews.net>
Message-ID: <c8fpno$n64$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

Kudos to Stagger Lee for once again outing the infamous Glendale Gnome.
Woger Wussman, when will he ever learn?
LOL

4097. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 14:25:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40AB6E6D.2020107@psu.edu>
Source record: 92159

garigue wrote:
>>Of course, since the code tests are done by volunteers you could argue
>
> that
>
>>no money will be saved. Firstly, that won't stop them, and secondly, VEs
>>may be less likely to claim expenses if they don't have to buy code tapes,
>>so some paltry amount of money may in fact be saved.
>
>
> Na Alun don't worry about those expenses for code tapes or programs or 33
> RPM records etc. There have been many a VE out there who has taken his
> significant other out for a "night on the town" after a VE session. Why
> would some guys drive for a hundred miles to "take" a test when tests are
> locally offered ???

Zounds, Tom!!! I doubt that the proceeds from most tests would cover much of a night out on the town, once the VEC gets it's cut. Then you have the other VE's to split the booty with..... Heck, I doubt you could eat at Arby's by the end of the malfeasance.

All endeavors have the occasional bad egg, but at every test I ever attended - there were 4 of them - the VE's seemed as honest as can be, plus some of them that I personally knew are in no doubt as to their honesty.

And FWIW, I live in State College PA.

I took my Technician test in Williamsport, over an hour away.

I took my General test in Butler PA, a two hour + drive

I took my Element 1 test in State College PA (flunked it at Butler)

I took my Extra test at Lock Haven, around an hour drive.

Basically the reason that I traveled to the tests was because that was where a test was taking place when I had the time to take the test.

- Mike KB3EIA

4098. CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 14:50:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>
Source record: 92160

If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:

Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......

Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?

Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4099. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 15:24:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405190724.50d5167a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92161

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GxBqc.1017$Tn6.35@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > Not that I would want to work
> > Dan, who is on record as saying
> > that all phone ops are lids..
>
> You must be mistaken. I just checked my log and I've worked W4NTI
> dozens of times over the past few years. Nearly half of the Q's were on
> SSB (I think that mode qualifies as "phone".) Certainly Dan wouldn't
> work people he considers "lids".
>
> Good luck on this one now!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

That would make Dan a self-declared lid.

4100. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1396 May 14, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 15:48:12 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519114813.23031.00001123@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92162

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1396 May 14, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1396 with a release date of
Friday, May 14, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Hamvention 2004 is opening and B-P-L is
still in the
news. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number
1396
coming your way right now.

**

HAMVENTION COVERAGE

The 2004 Dayton Hamvention is about to open its doors. One of this
year's
Hamvention themes is going back to the future. Our producer Bill
Pasternak,
WA6ITF, flew in a few days early to find out what it really means for
those who
will be attending the show.

--
Audio report only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org
--

Bill, Mark Abramowicz NT3V and yours truly will all be at Hamvention
to bring
you all the highlights on next week's Amateur Radio Newsline
report. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: B-P-L EXPECTED TO DRAW ATTENTION AT DAYTON

While the latest in ham gear is certain to be grab the interest of
most of those
attending this year's Dayton Hamvention, the topic of Broadband Over
Power
Lines internet access is likely to be on the lips of many. Amateur
Radio
Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V has more...

--
While not much has happened in the past week on the B-P-L issue, look
for lots
of discussion on the Dayton Hamvention floor. You can expect to see

American
Radio Relay League President Jim Haynie W-5-J-B-P in the middle of it.

We told you here on Amateur Radio Newsline two weeks ago of Haynie's call to
arms and his direct appeal to President Bush to abandon support for B-P-L
technology.

Haynie is convinced Bush has been misled by his advisors. He and A-R-R-L's
Washington corps have asked for a meeting with the president. There's nothing
new to report on that front.

But Haynie says it's important for the ham community to continue to make its
voice heard by writing to the White House, your congressman and your senator
about B-P-L. Even though the Federal Communications Commission turned down
the A-R-R-L's request to extend the May 3 deadline for comments on B-P-L,
Haynie says there are still ways to be heard.

The A-R-R-L's website (www.arrl.org) has helpful tips on writing that letter or e-
mail or picking up the phone and calling your representative in Washington.

Meanwhile, the FCC is now studying the National Telecommunications and
Information Agency report on B-P-L. And while the glowing press release put out
by N-T-I-A touted the possibilities of B-P-L, the technical data in the report
presents another picture.

And that picture is anything but fuzzy. N-T-I-A cites major interference concerns
and suggests the methods used to measure B-P-L interference are inadequate.

It also cites worries B-P-L signals could affect aircraft operations and suggests
more stringent measurement standards and interference mitigation techniques
need to be explored.

Could that B-P-L fast-track train be slowing? No one is willing to speculate on
that, especially since President Bush and F-C-C Chairman Michael Powell appear

to be on the same page in their push for deployment of B-P-L.

Could the F-C-C be convinced to wait for the next N-T-I-A report and table the
issue for a few months? No one knows how to read the tea leaves in Washington.

Tune in weekly to Amateur Radio Newsline and we'll keep you on top of the
issue with the very latest news and views of those close to the B-P-L issue.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.
--

And look for Mark's report on the B-P-L buzz and other topics from the
Hamvention floor during our special program next week produced in Dayton.
(ARNewsline(tm))

**

Ham radio did all it could to help save the life of a stricken runner at a recent foot race in
Indianapolis. Jack Parker, W-8-I-S-H, has the details:

--
Audio report only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org
--

Thanks Jack. (W8ISH, ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO RULES: FCC MKES "MINOR AMMENDMENTS" TO PART 97

The FCC says that it has minor amendments to various Amateur Radio rules. A
bulletin from the ARRL highlights some of them including the most significant
one. It involved revising the wording of Section 97.307(d), which defines
spurious emissions. The updated language imposes a slightly higher standard on
newer transmitters or amplifiers of any power level.

The FCC also has redefined what constitutes an Amateur Radio operator to
reflect the advent of the Universal Licensing System electronic licensee database.
The current rule defines an amateur operator as "a person holding a written

authorization to be the control operator of an amateur station." Under the
revised Section 97.3(a)(1) an amateur operator is "a person named in an
amateur operator/primary license station grant on the U-L-S consolidated
licensee database to be the control operator of an amateur station."

The FCC made these and several other regulatory changes on its own motion
rather than in reaction to any petitions. The decision appeared May 5 in the
Federal Register. The changes become effective June 1st. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard
on bulletin stations around the world including the WB3ERZ repeater serving
South Central Pennsylvania.

**

ENFORCEMENT: CONVICTED MURDERER LOOSES HAM TICKET

A ham serving a prison sentence for the murder of his wife has had his Amateur
license revoked. Roger Thomas Scaggs, the now ex-W5EBC, had his ticket
pulled after the FCC determined that he no longer holds the requisite
requirements to remain a Commission licensee.

On March 6, 1996 Scaggs was convicted of murder in the death of Penny
Scaggs, his wife of thirty-five years. The court record in that case showed that
Scaggs beat his wife to death with a galvanized lead pipe and then stabbed her
several times. He was sentenced to a prison term of thirty-two years and fined
ten thousand dollars.

The Commission says that its character policies provide that any felony
conviction is a matter predictive of licensee behavior and is directly relevant to
the functioning of the Commission's regulatory mission. It says that Scaggs
conviction mandates the conclusion that he does not possess the requisite
qualifications to be or remain a Commission licensee and that his

license should
be revoked. (FCC)

**

ENFORCMENT: NO FISHING COMS HERE

The owners of four trucking companies, two seafood companies and one fishing
boat have all been cited by the FCC for operating without a license on amateur
frequencies. According to the C-Q magazine website, three of the trucking
companies are in North and South Carolina and the fourth is in Idaho. They
were allegedly operating on 10 meters. The fishing boats are in the Pacific
Northwest, purportedly using the 2 meter band. (CQ)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC AGAIN WRITES TO K1MAN

The FCC has again written to Glenn Baxter, K1MAN, and the commissions note
has both good and bad news for the Belgrade Lakes, Maine radio amateur. On
the positive side, the April 14th letter informs K1MAN that a review of his
transmissions indicates that he is complying with the Amateur Service regulations
regarding broadcasting and bulletins and station control.

The negative? The FCC alleges that K1MAN is in violation of rules regarding use
of his Amateur station for pecuniary interest and those regarding deliberate
interference to ongoing communications.

Also, the letter again told Baxter that his "felony affidavit complaints" will not be
accepted by the regulatory agency. He was also reminded that all frequencies in
the Amateur Radio Service are shared. No frequency is assigned for the
exclusive use of any station, and that Baxter's station has no greater rights to a
frequency at any particular time than does any other Amateur station. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: CONSERVATIVE GROUP CALLS ON CONGRESS TO REPRIMAND FCC

A faith based group is chiding the FCC for not acting more decisively in getting
dirty words off the public airwaves. Amateur Radio Newsline's Jim Davis, W-2-J-
K-D, has more:

--

AUDIO

--

Focus on the Family was founded by Dr. James Dobson, whose commentaries
are heard on radio stations world-wide. (Published reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC CHAIRMAN DOES NOT SUPPORT REVOKING BROADCAST LICENSES

F-C-C chairman Michael Powell says he doesn't support legislation that would pull
a broadcast station license after a third indecency violation. He is not opposed
to high fines to get the attention of broadcasters who step across the indecency
line.

Speaking at the recent National Association of Broadcasters convention in Las
Vegas, Powell suggested that he would support extending indecency regulations
beyond over-the-air broadcasting to other media, such as cable and satellite
broadcasts, but only if the FCC is given approval by Congress.

Powell labels as a "red herring" a proposal by Viacom president Mel Karmazin for
more specific decency guidelines. Viacom owns C-B-S. That's the network which
aired the controversial Super Bowl half-time show with rock star Janet Jackson. (Published
reports)

**

RESCUE RADIO: EMERGENCY TRAINING IN KANSAS

A day-long program on Amateur Radio emergency communications will take
place Saturday, July 24, 9 AM in Kansas. This, at The Salvation

Army, 420 E
Santa Fe, Olathe which is 15 miles southwest of Kansas City.

According to the ARRL Letter, the day begins with "New Ham Orientation,"
sponsored by Johnson County Amateur Radio Emergency Service. This session
will provide an overview of ARES and explain how amateurs can get involved.
Following a lunch break the Kansas Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio
Network will sponsor an ARRL Emergency Communications seminar.

Seats are limited. For additional information contact June Jeffers, KB0WEQ, by e-
mail to kssatern@att.net or call area code 913-856-8674 during normal business
hours, Central time. (ARRL)

* *

HAM RADIO CONFERENCES: CSVHFS IN CANADA IN JULY

More information is now available on the upcoming Central States V-H-F
Conference that has been mailed out and also posted to the conference website.
Included are the latest highlights of conference plans, border crossing tips and
Canadian currency tips. Also posted is the 2004 President's Message along with
last years Noise Figure Measurement Test results and the Antenna Test Range
results.

The conference is scheduled for July 22nd to the 25th at the Delta Meadowvale
Resort & Conference Center in Mississauga, Ontario, Canada. All the latest is in
cyberspace at www.csvhfs.org and the Ontario VHF Association's page at
www.ovhfa.com. We hope that you have a great time. (Peter Shilton VE3AX)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of
America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our
only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the

volunteer
services of the following radio amateur:

**

RADIO LAW: SAN DIEGO TV SHOP OWNER CONVICTED

Here's the kind of a story you probably have not heard of in
years. How about a
T-V repair shop owner convicted of duping his customers. Jim
Meachen, Zed-L-
2-B-H-F, has the rest of the story:

--
AUDIO
--

The store owner pleaded guilty to ten criminal counts, including
grand theft,
forgery, fraud and false advertising. (listeners reports)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: DTV AT A SNAILS PACE

The General Accounting Office has issued a report saying that more
than 80
percent of Americans are either unaware or only "somewhat aware" of
the
transition to digital television signals. They are also unaware that
Congress
plans to sell the analog spectrum that will become available when TV
stations
convert from analog to digital.

Lawmakers are counting on the money to help balance the budget.
However, the
digital transition may be years away unless more consumers start
buying digital
TVs to receive the new signals. Current sales of those expensive
digital sets
appear to be fairly flat at best. (Science OnLine)

**

WORLDBEAT - ALBANIA: NEWS FROM ALBANIA

Turning to news from around the world, many noticed the signals from
OH2BH
and OH2PM bouncing in from Albania not long ago. In fact, the pair
made some
6000 QSOs while visiting that nation. They were also there to remind
the world
of Amateur Radio about it's shared responsibility to help those

in need. You are
welcome to join this effort by making your old gear active from
Albania. For U.S.
tax payers, your donations can be processed by the Northern
California DX
Foundation. Contact W6OSP by e-mail to w6osp@aol.com for details.
(N4GN)

**

WORLDBEAT - CANADA: SOME RAC APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED

Radio Amateurs of Canada's Board of Directors has approved Eric
Ferguson, V-E-
3-C-R, as the organizations new Treasurer. This, for the term ending
Dec 31st,
2005. Feguson comes to Radio Amateurs of Canada with extensive
banking
experience at the Executive level at a major Canadian bank.

The Board of Directors has approved Dave Goodwin, V-Oh-1-A-U, as the
Director
for Radio Amateurs of Canada's Atlantic Region. Goodwin will
complete the term
of David Nimmo, VE1NN, who resigned in early March. (RAC)

**

WORLDBEAT - UK: NEW 6 METER BEACON ON THE AIR

And members of the United Kingdom's Blacksheep Contest Group have
activated
a new 6 meter propagation beacon located near the city of
Hertfordshire, in grid
square IO91. This, as a replacement for the GB3NHQ beacon which
closed down
some years ago.

The new GB3BAA beacon became operational on 50.016 MHz at 15:10 UTC
on
April 20th, and ground-wave reception reports from Normandy and
northern
England have already been received. Further reports would be most
welcome,
and should be sent to Mr. I. Phillips, G0RDI, by e-mail to
gb3baa@77hz.com (RSGB)

**

DX

In DX, 3-B-9-F-R has been heard operating from Rodrigues Island on 10
meter
FM. He was heard on the worldwide calling frequency of 29.600 MHz

between
1200 and 1400 U-T-C, working Europe. (GB2RS)

Also heard on is A-P-2-J-Z-B in Pakistan. He was monitored on 12 and 17 meters
SSB. Watch 24.955 MHz after 0930 U-T-C and also around 18.110 MHz after
1445 UTC. QSL direct to the operators call directory address.
(GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: WHO INVENTED THE SCANNER RADIO - REDUX

And finally this week, an update on our recent story of who really invented the
first scanner radio. We previously reported that a group of broadcast engineers
working at Cape Canaveral during the early days of the space race developed the
first scanner radio. This, so that the late NBC newsman Roy Neal, K-6-D-U-E,
could know when a launch was going to take place.

Well, that is quite true but Harvey Cronen, a S-W-L who is one of our listeners in
New Jersey has some further information. He says that musician and inventor
Raymond Scott is the person who holds a patent on at least one form of
automatic scanning radio.

Harvey sent us a web link to a site that chronicles the life of Scott. While he is
best known as the orchestra leader on the early NBC television show "Your Hit
Parade" and as the husband of the late songstress Dorothy Collins, there was
another side to Raymond Scott that few in the public knew about. It is all on the
website and it is there where it says that Scott actually patented a broadcast
band radio receiver which tunes in on stations around the country and changes
frequency by itself at any given interval. This, says the website, permitted Scott
to catch most of the nations disc-jockey shows in a brief span and find out what
tunes are being played.

There is lots of truly fascinating information at this very informative website

about Raymond Scott, his life, his inventions that impacted on the worlds of
recording and communications as well as his music. It is well worth visiting at
www.raymondscott.com. (H. Cronen)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the
RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm).
Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at
Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at
www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio
Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline
Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC
licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48
states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation
or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website.
That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for nominations this
year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st.

Next week, a full wrap-up on Hamvention 2004 which is opening as this newscast goes to air. Our Editor Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is in Dayton this week, sor for
now I am Don Wilbanks, AE5DW editing, anchoring saying 73 and we thank you for
listening."

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

4101. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 16:21:33 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92163

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
> Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
>
>
> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>
>
> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely for the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty crowded place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on any CW sub-bands.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4102. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 17:45:43 UTC
From: "Tony P." <kd1s@nospamplease.verizon.reallynospam.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1b156758585e6fd39899ed@news.verizon.net>
Source record: 92164

In article <40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>, mjc5@psu.edu says...
> If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
> Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
>
>
> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>
>
> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

We do that now. Those of us who did our element 1C are just a tiny bit peeved that people got upgraded to Extra and didn't have to take the test.

I needle a buddy of mine about it all the time. He got his 'extra' when the rules changed, having already passed the 4B test. I got my extra in 1993.

4103. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:20:04 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20040519192004.23176.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 92165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

In article <MIIqc.5761$cJ1.5105@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
LARDASS "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> whined:

> "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com> wrote in
> message news:97cc6408d0966991f876360cb58ffe97@melontraffickers.com...
> > > 1. I do not post a anyone but myself. You do, however imposter posting
> of
> > > kiddie porn and other things
> >
> > wrong again, LARDASS. Shall I post some of your imposterings on the Nim
> > Busters board?
> >
> > > 2. I am now at 198 pounds, dummy!
> >
> > Sure you are, LARDASS!
> >
> > > I started out the year at 225, and have
> >
> > You started at 280 and still weigh 280!
>
> You are a liar. I am hereby calling you a LIAR!

You sure are defensive about being 280 at only 5'6", but that's
allright, maybe someday you can afford that gastric bypass operation.
Like when you get your social security, part time pizza boy.

> >
> > > lost close to 30 pounds. Soon, you will have to think of another name
> to
> > > call than "lardass"
> >
> > You ARE A LARDASS! Your neighbors say you weigh the same and are the
> > same short fat slob you've always been. even at "198" you are OBESE for
> > your height of 5'6".
> >
>
> You don't even know who my neighbors at all.

Mongolloyd make good sentence!

> You are making up this bullcrap to belittle me. It's not working!
That why you are whining like a little girl?

Here's a list:
Barnett, Terry

710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-2980

Berryhill, Danny
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-771-7947
Bevis, C
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-6171

Bhatia, Bhupendra
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-771-0652

Bhatia, Daljeet
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-9250

Creel, Norma
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-1143

Crutcher, Nicole
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-771-7485

Fox, Ke
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-4595

French, Charles
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-216-0424

Gilmore, Josh
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-1212

Groce, L L
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-1527

Hargrove, Ross
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-1530

Harper, P R
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-4877

Holland, M J
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-0736

Holtzman, Robert D
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-5232

Hontiveros, Pio
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-3411

Isbell, T R
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-4485

Johnson, Steven
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-1613

Lee, Rena
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-2086

Looney, Lavon
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-2027

Madsen, Gil
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-9520

McBay, Lisa M
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-9192

Miller, Larry
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-230-2351

Pugh, Terry
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-3134

Rizzardi, Gail
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-771-2960

Rogers, Clara
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-6089

Sanders, K
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-216-0305

Sandpiper Apartments office
710 S Clinton St
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-5130

Sims, Steven
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-3770

Smith, Larry
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-5893

Thornton, M & K
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-216-1603

Verette, T
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-216-8479

Wylie, Daniel
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-233-3815

Yatco, Armando
710 Clinton St S
ATHENS, AL 35611
256-232-4756

>
> > > Go ahead, make my day!
> >
> > Go change your depends that you have to wear. Your co-workers say you
> > have a permanent smell of feces.
> >
>
> One of these days, just one of these days,

"To the moon, Alice!" ....you got the lines down, now that you look like
Jackie Gleason.

> you are reap what you have sown all these years!

<guffaw!> As opposed to *you*, posting what you post and claiming to be
such a "christian?"
Oh, and "<...you are reap what you have sown all these years!>....
Mongolloyd make good sentence!

4104. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:27:32 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <a298df7b17cf510a0df483cdda949af0@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 92166

In article <GStqc.2057$Wg6.916@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote:
>
> "starwars"<nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in
> message news:b2af2d5942e649bef5a86f8664fde2e3@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> >> Wrong guess, fatty! And here's what is happening on Nim Busters:
> > >
> > > Kennewick_Man even notices Llardass is a LOSER in:
> > > http://www.network54.com/Forum/message?forumid=279169&messageid=10837958
> > > 97
> > >
> > > And how do we disagree?
> > > by Kennewick_Man
> > >
> > > Like I said, Lloyd is losing bigtime...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> Give it up loser, Kennewick_Man is a freind of mine, so is Holsten, so most
> of NIM Busters.

Oh, then why is he posting you are a loser, loser? Shall I repost what
Ticker posted?
And Holsten is a well-known pedophile, lardass, why do you think
everybody calls him the pedo?

Here's what "Ticker" said about you:
http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=107
1750724
Fuck off asshole.
by Ticker
Just what the fuck is it that you'd like to debate? You're a clown. A
fat one. No debate there.
You're a whiney bitch that has to shit everywhere you type something.
You drag your friends from
board to board and intrude on a world that would rather you had a
girlfriend to keep you off the
computer. Most of all you're BORING. Your faggot friends are boring.
Even your passion for Daleks
is boring. Boa should have shit all over you instead of making a half
assed attempt at seeing any

value in your presence. You and your mental case rantings have managed to try and take advantage
of Boa's celebrity in order to gain some credibility for your extremely weak show. You were the
only one that had anything to gain from his interview with you. You are too stupid to act in
concert with someone that is apparently on your side. Stevo learned how to show respect.
You haven't. Being on your side is social suicide. You have nothing to defend.
"At least he (Lloyd) has a job."
A kid's job. The kind of job that white people should reserve for kids that need weekend money,
or for someone to supplement their "real" job's income for a few weeks or so. How long has your
underachieving ass been delivering pizzas? Nice planning for your retirement. If we don't have to
support you now, we will when you're too old to cart your fat ass off to Pizza Palace any more.
Fuck you Lloyd. And all your faggot friends.

Posted on Dec 18, 2003, 10:32 AM

And Schwartz, who isn't even a ham and knbows Morse Code says you are stupid and lazy:
http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=1071075686

Lloyd Davies demands affirmative action for himself
by Schwartz
All those others had to learn morse to get their license but Lloyd, because he is either
too stupid or lazy to learn morse, now wants to standards lowered so he can get his license.

Sounds like Affirmative Action to me! Lower the standard when you can't match them.

Posted on Dec 10, 2003, 3:01 PM

http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=1071080918

poor pizza boy getting his ass kicked in.....
by Schwartz
Boa found him guilty, just go back and read his postings from the past. Of course Boa saying
something has as much credibility as a flipping a coin in the air.

Are you too stupid and lazy to look at postings in the past like you are when it comes to
learning morse code? yes, you are.

By the way, adult men don't go around calling themselves "time lord"

Grow up.

Posted on Dec 10, 2003, 4:28 PM

http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=1071073934

Listen Lloyd
by Schwartz
Any truck driver will disagree with you, manual transmissions are far from dead, all big rigs
have them. And in Europe, most of the cars still are manual transmission. So your analogy is bad.

Morse is still useful - for example if your signal is really weak, morse is the best way to
communicate on a weak signal where data or voice breaksdown quicker.

Learning morse requires committment Lloyd, it's not a game like your childish Dalek games but
it takes committment. Maybe you lack the intelligence or patience to learn morse code. I don't
know.

.. -.-. .... .-- .- -.- --..

Posted on Dec 10, 2003, 2:44 PM

http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=1071074645

Listen idiot.... just because your too stupid
by Schwartz
Again idiot. Morse code should be a requirement. If your signal is really weak, morse is the
best way to transmit. Maybe if you actually copied morse intercept like me, you would understand
this simple concept. Just because you are too stupid and lazy to commit to learning doesn't mean
they should dump it.

I learned morse. I mastered it. Of course, going by your posting history I can't expect a pizza
delivery turd who is part of the "tin foil hat" crowd to actually attempt to learn something.

Or you are simply too stupid to learn morse code.

Posted on Dec 10, 2003, 2:32 PM

http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/message?forumid=243612&messageid=1071076097

Then don't whine about it since you are too lazy to learn it
by Schwartz
I bet if you were intelligent enough to learn it, you be the first one crying about someone
wanting to get rid of the requirement. Your just fat and lazy and don't want to do the tough
things in life. That is why you are a obese pizza driver instead of doing something productive
in your life. If you can't even commit to learning morse, then you will always be a fat pathetic
loser.

By the way, I'm not that old, I make a good living and go to college so I can even further myself
better. You are fat, ugly, balding, and a pizza driver who focuses on aliens and robots.

Grow up fat boy, and do something that requires effort in your life. Then you wouldn't have such
low self-esteem. Being drunk, fat, and stupid is no way to go through life.

Posted on Dec 10, 2003, 3:08 PM

Look in the mirror Lloyd
by Schwartz
The same can be said about your show. You get like 5 people listening? I've thought about it and I decline to come on the air live as I have nothing to gain from it, I can get a larger audience on a yahoo voice chat room. I will be happy to debate you in a forum where imposters can't reign though.

Your choice.

> You are losing everywhere,

No, stupid, I'm just posting words over the computer.

>you don't even know who posts at Nim Busters against you, do you?

Yeah, you with about 100 screen names and Holsten alweays talking about sucking dicks.

> Take you wares to Cigarwise.com

Why, since I don't smoke or care for people who do, dumbass?

>and leave Dave Heil and myself alone!

You brought this into here, by posting as "Tim" and bringing Dave Heil into this. He wouldn't have been brought into this if you hadn't brought all this up, lardass!

4105. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:38:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405191138.21251ac6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92167

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<u%uqc.75539$xw3.4174734@attbi_s04>...

> There have been many a VE out there who has taken his
> significant other out for a "night on the town" after a VE session.

As a reward for putting up with the demands of being a VE. Paperwork,
lots of extra stuff about the house, spending a good part of the
weekend at some hamfest or other giving tests to strangers for not
much more than a couple of donuts......

> Why
> would some guys drive for a hundred miles to "take" a test when tests are
> locally offered ???

Lots of reasons. Most of the VE sessions I know of are part of a
hamfest, so two things get done. Timing of the tests is another - if
someone is a "morning person", taking the test in the evening is
setting oneself up for failure. "Local" tests that are scheduled at
inconvenient times don't do the testee any good.

> Dare I say shenanigans .... ??????
>
Got any proof? Not aspersions on the character of unnamed persons, but
actual solid proof of wrongdoing? If so, tell Riley - FCC does care
about such things. If not, why besmirch the efforts of thousands of
honest volunteers?

The VEs who do the grunt work of actually giving the tests didn't
invent the system and they don't make the rules. In the 20 year
history of the system, only a tiny handful out of thousands of VEs
have been found guilty of any sort of wrongdoing in connection with
their VE activities. Perhaps an apology to the vast majority of honest
VEs is in order.

Yes, I wish FCC would do all the testing, and that the tests were
secret, etc., etc. But that's just not going to happen any time soon
because it costs $$$.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4106. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:43:38 UTC
From: Anonymous <nobody@paranoici.org>
Message-ID: <4181866a6510b983fb26098b2d56617b@paranoici.org>
Source record: 92168

In article <xuIqc.5702$cJ1.3600@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
"300 pound LARDASS Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
whined:
>
>
>
> "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
> message news:de321c8ade0abab143e373ab317a0aa6@remailer.privacy.at...
> >
> > "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lard" squealed:
> >
> > > Shut up Wiseman, you're getting you butt kicked here and on Nim Busters!
> >
> > go back to somedayheaven and post. oh but you can't because they
> > booted your 30 year old 300 lb virgin ass for posting filth.
> >
> > BWA HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!
> >
>
> Not by my doing, YOU runied me over there.

wrong again, 300 pound fatass, you did it to yourself.

> I am Not 300 pounds! 198 to be exact.

yeah right, 198 plus 102 more pounds.

4107. BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:51:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405191151.4635ba11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92169

I was deeply saddened to read of the passing of Dick Caroll, W0EX. He was a great guy and a fine radio amateur. I'm glad to have known him, online, by email and most of all on the air. He and N0BK are sorely missed. WA2SI and I were wondering about him during a CW QSO on 40 the other night, and the next day the bad news was in the newsgroup.

So in memorial of W0EX and N0BK, we're going to try for a regular sked. Tuesdays, 9 PM EDST (0100Z), 7037 kHz plus-minus QRM. Just a friendly discussion net. All are invited. We'll call "BXN" instead of "CQ". "BXN" derives from the B in N0BK and the X in W0EX, and of course N for net.

Join us.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4108. Re: Roger Outed Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 19:54:19 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <4daa59127cc0a924f584865e16121321@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 92170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

In article <c8fpno$n64$0@pita.alt.net>
"anon" <anon@nganonews.net> wrote:
>
>
> Kudos to <slurp slurp slurp>

Get your tongue up his rectum faster, lardass.
Too bad he got the wrong ip.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!

4109. Re: AB8MQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 20:18:56 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <mgPqc.10528$3W1.7146@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
news:c4f6db84c66e1ae0fef650483216de1d@paranoici.org...
> What is the MCI address for reporting TOS violations?
> I have several I want to report.
>
>

Would'nt hurt to call Chief Stenger too.

4110. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 21:01:07 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mWPqc.35297$6f5.3547319@attbi_s54>
Source record: 92171

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:97vqc.520$Tn6.468@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote
>
> > There have been many a VE out there who has taken his
> > significant other out for a "night on the town" after a
> > VE session.
>
> I take K0CKB out for a "night on the town" anytime I damned well please,
> but it has nothing to do with funds from a VE session.
>
> If you can prove your accusation, then the FCC will be greatly
> interested in hearing from you.
>
> On the other hand, it's my guess that you're full of
> male-bovine-fecal-matter up to your eyeballs, and somebody ought to
> stomp a mudhole between them for your slander.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

In other words Hans you are telling me that absolutely no money other than the legal "fees" EVER passes between tester and testee under our completely lilly white VE system. If you believe that one then you are the one that is in need of a bovine cleanout. It seems to me ..correct me if I am wrong ...that there have been instances where there were people recalled for testing due to "irregularities". The testing system even under the FCC was misused by fellows who
where "ghost" testees. Did I also say that all VEs were on the free ticket take? Nope .....so Hans don't get your shorts in a knot and keep taking the XYL out for dinner .....

God Bless ..73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa ...VE-21219

4111. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 21:10:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <K2Qqc.80773$xw3.4500543@attbi_s04>
Source record: 92172

There have been many a VE out there who has taken
> > his significant other out for a "night on the town" after a VE session.
> > Why would some guys drive for a hundred miles to "take" a test when
> > tests are locally offered ???
> >
> > Dare I say shenanigans ..... ??????
> >
> > 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.
> >
> >
> >
>
> You do realise that the max that can be claimed back is a percentage of
the
> test fee?

Yep there Alun ...I was referring not to the legal percentage that can be charged but to the "selling" of tickets via questionable testing practices. Again this is something that did happen even under the FCC testing via shills taking the tests and the conditional cheating. Call me jaded or whatever ...but I firmly believe that some where out there a ticket can be purchased . BTW Alun ...stop by if your heading this way.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

4112. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 21:26:29 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <9iQqc.1791$Vv.138993@attbi_s51>
Source record: 92173

>
> Zounds, Tom!!! I doubt that the proceeds from most tests would cover
> much of a night out on the town, once the VEC gets it's cut. Then you
> have the other VE's to split the booty with..... Heck, I doubt you
> could eat at Arby's by the end of the malfeasance.

I think that there are ways to cheat even with the trinity of examineers ...

> All endeavors have the occasional bad egg, but at every test I ever
> attended - there were 4 of them - the VE's seemed as honest as can be,
> plus some of them that I personally knew are in no doubt as to their
> honesty.

No doubt there Mike that the perponderance of testing is on the level ....
our "profit", if we can call it that, goes into the general club fund for
educational materials.

> And FWIW, I live in State College PA.

Neat place ..my daughter graduated from there in 01 ....If you see Jim
Breakall tell him I said hi ..haven't seen him since highschool ...

> I took my Technician test in Williamsport, over an hour away.

> I took my General test in Butler PA, a two hour + drive

Probably at the hamfest there ...those fellows do a real nice job ...

> I took my Element 1 test in State College PA (flunked it at Butler)

Flunked my advanced the first time ...missed it by 2 ....like a teacher of
mine once said ..close only counts in horseshoes and handgrandes.

> I took my Extra test at Lock Haven, around an hour drive.

> Basically the reason that I traveled to the tests was because that was
> where a test was taking place when I had the time to take the test.

Can understand that Mike .....

> - Mike KB3EIA

God Bless 73 ...Tom KI3R

4113. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:07:02 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <aUQqc.94765$MH.18953259@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92174

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405191151.4635ba11@posting.google.com...
> I was deeply saddened to read of the passing of Dick Caroll, W0EX. He
> was a great guy and a fine radio amateur. I'm glad to have known him,
> online, by email and most of all on the air. He and N0BK are sorely
> missed. WA2SI and I were wondering about him during a CW QSO on 40 the
> other night, and the next day the bad news was in the newsgroup.
>
> So in memorial of W0EX and N0BK, we're going to try for a regular
> sked. Tuesdays, 9 PM EDST (0100Z), 7037 kHz plus-minus QRM. Just a
> friendly discussion net. All are invited. We'll call "BXN" instead of
> "CQ". "BXN" derives from the B in N0BK and the X in W0EX, and of
> course N for net.
>
> Join us.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'll certainly be there.

Just for clarification, (Please correct me if I'm mistaken, Jim.) 0100z,
Tuesday is the same as 9 PM EDST, Monday. So we're talking about a Monday
eve. net here. Nuthin' more enjoyable than actually gettin' OTA.

Vy 73 de Bert, WA2SI

4114. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:16:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405191416.651297f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92175

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>...
> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >> > > >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> > > >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
> >> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
> >> > > >
> >> > > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> > > >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> >> > > >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's, MARS
> >> > > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
> >> > > >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
> >> > > >
> >> > > What's needed, Brain?
> >> >
> >> > A citation from an applicable regulation.
> >>
> >> Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
> >> you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
> >> be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?
>
> >Please, not another threat to injure me.
>
> The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
> with him. That's a LOT of threats. :-)

Perhaps not a direct threat, but the implications are violent - and
that's enough to be concerned.

> The Military Affiliate Radio System is authorized by Department
> of Defense Directive 4650.2, 26 Jan 98. Individual service
> branches have specific regulations. For the Army it is Army
> Regulation AR 25-6 as revised 29 Oct 98. For the USAF it is
> AFI 33-106. For the USN-USMC is is MARS Communications
> Instructions NTP 8(C), March 1998.

Now that you've done half of Steve's homework, he should have a
citation for us by the end of the week.
```

> The United States Army is the birthplace of MARS, first
> organized at the AARS or Army Amateur Radio System in 1925.
> The purpose was to increase skills within the Army by using
> amateur knowledge to improve Army communications. It was
> not a terribly popular thing either in or out of the Army.
> The AARS stopped at the start of the USA involvement with
> WW2 and cessation of amateur operations. It resumed in 1946.
> In 1948 the AARS was renamed with the organization of the
> USAF as a part of the new MARS, dropping the "amateur" in
> favor of the word "affiliate."

The Air Force was always forward tinking.

By 1948 military radio was
> rather far from amateur practice and techniques. In 1962
> the USN and USMC were made a part of MARS.

Hopefully they passed they entry exams rather than just being
appointed.

> The intent of MARS was basically a morale booster for all
> military personnel assigned far from USA territory. The
> role has changed (by directive and regulations) to become
> a liason between the military and civilian emergency
> organizations, principally FEMA. MARS also has ties with
> SHARES, the group of government HF radio users throughout
> the USA and foreign US locations.

They don't use CW anymore, either. They've gone digital.

For morale purposes
> the military has direct Internet connections through the
> various DSN (Digital Switched Network) portals on land
> and afloat.
>
> >> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>
> >> > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS
> >> >
> >> > " Sorry Han's, MARS > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," is simply
> >> > untrue.
> >>
> >> No, it's not.
> >>
> >> That you are inadequately knowledgeable of MARS programs and
> >> policies to know otherwise is also true.
> >
> >Now you lie.
>
> The gunnery nurse has distinct definitions of "lie" different
> from other people. Those who disagree with him are "always
> lying."
>

> >> > > >> >Dismissed.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> Never by a punk like you, Mr. Burke. You haven't got it in you.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> > > > >
> >> > > >Always calling people names. There's something wrong with you.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Well...You're a punk. I see no reason to pull my punches. YOU
> insist on
> >> > > calling me "nuts"...been doing it for several months, yet you have no
> degree or
> >> > > training with which to validate such a proclamation. Your only "proof"
> is that
> >> > > I constantly dog you about stupid assertions and claims YOU make.
> >> >
> >> > That's another reason why I think you're nuts. You are the one who
> >> > made a stupid assertion (Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio").
> >> > I'm the one dogging you.
> >>
> >> It's not stupid. Perhaps poorly worded, at least to a person such
> >> as yourself who cannot understand the interdependence of the two.
> >
> >Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
> >
> >It's just wrong.
>
> The gunnery nurse will never concede any mistake he made.
> He has his own definitions and commands all to obey those
> unique definitions.
>
> For example, name-calling is part of his tough-guy credo.
> His personal "directive" allows that as part of his
> "civility." It isn't in the normal definitions that all
> others use.
>
> >> And you're still a punk.
> >
> >Not really.
>
> The gunnery nurse "permits" that form of "civility" by
> his own "directive." Name-calling is SOP.
>
> >> > So, please substantiate your silly, stupid statement with a citation
> >> > from an applicable regulation.
> >>
> >> Still need that peice of paper to know a slap in the facr hurts,
> >> Brain?
> >
> >Nope. I need a cite from any applicable regulation to convince me

> >that your statement is true. Got one?
>
> The gunnery nurse has had, what, three weeks, to cite one
> and has not. A simple Internet search will turn up the
> official documents from the DoD and all three service
> branches. He is continuing a game of bluffing in trying
> to intimidate others to concede to him.

It isn't happening, is it? So the name calling escalates. Then
violent acts are mentioned. I've counted two so far.

> MARS has never been an important part of military
> communications, never a part of either tactical or
> strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
> Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
> and morale boosting of service personnel.

But it is important to have a back-up for certain communications. The
"Base Support Team" concept is fairly well thought through.

However, the
> affiliation with the military has terribly important
> self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
> to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
> grand scheme to 'serve their country'."

Until they discover that they can wear an actual uniform with "RANK"
on it via the Air Force's CAP program.

> >> > > That "Lennie is my hero" line REALLY put you out front!
> >> >
> >> > Yep, he pulls out all the stops when he rubs your nose in your silly,
> >> > stupid statments. I don't. I try to remain civil. Apparently, you
> >> > don't respect civility.
> >>
> >> Sure I do.
> >
> >No, you don't.
>
> Gunnery nurse is a VERY sore loser. He can't abide by any
> disagreements to his statements or opinions. Ergo, all who
> disagree with him are "liars" and worthy of all kinds of
> name-calling.
>
> It must be the extension of the old USMC mythology where
> NCOs are all gods who MUST be obeyed and never, ever
> questioned. No "civility" is allowed within ranks.

And all officers are "Commanders."

> The problem of this ex-USMC member is that neither amateur
> radio nor the Internet is any part of the USMC.

Nor is Steve part of the FCC, the United Nations, nor the Somalian
government (if it exists yet), to be demanding documents.

> >> And right up to the part where you started in on your usual
> >> crapola in THIS thread, I had made it a point of very carefully typing
> >> B r i a n.
> >
> >That was very sweet of you, but doesn't change just how wrong your
> >MARS=ARS claim was.
>
> Gunnery nurse cannot concede anything.
>
> MARS exists because of the Department of Defense Directive
> that says it does.

And it says it does.

> A close inspection of USN-USMC NTP 8(C) will reveal that
> USN and USMC MARS operators do NOT need to possess amateur
> radio licenses in order to operate MARS radio equipment.
> In both USA and USAF regulations, MARS operations are done
> by Army or Air Force personnel who are not required to have
> amateur radio licenses.

Steve estimated that it was no more than 1%, 2%, 10%, or 20% of the
total MARS personnel, depending on which day he said it.

> VOLUNTEER civilians are welcomed by all three branches but
> only the USA and USAF require volunteers to possess amateur
> licenses. USN-USMC does not.

Oh, My!!!

And wasn't Steve in the U.S. Marine Corps? Shouldn't he have already
known that? What he do with all that service time? Play
tiddly-winks?

> >> As for Lennie...the only "stops" he usually winds up pulling out
> >> are the ones holding him and the rest of his fecally contaminated
> >> verbal effluent back.
> >
> >Geee, it just doesn't look that way from my perspective.
>
> :-)
>
> Gunnery nurse has his own fantasy land perspective on
> society and definitions and civil behavior. He hasn't
> been able to adjust to civilian life after being rejected
> by the USMC.

Ditto the adjustment, but I'm not sure about the rejected part. When
did he leave the service? There was a big RIF starting in 92. The AF
was down to half-strength by the end of 96.

> >> That he does it to himself (and now takes you along with him) is
> >> evident. That he was once a person of accomplishment and
> >> responsibility now fallen on his lack of character and honesty is
> >> pitiful.
> >
> >Odd, but I haven't seen much of Len lately. How nice of him to be
> >taking me along with him.
>
> I've been gone, doing more important things in life. :-)

Well thanks for taking me along.

> >> That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.
> >
> >Its called, "The High Road."
>
> I'd call it "independent thought."
>
> Some in amateur radio do NOT permit independent thought
> and become outraged with anyone disagreeing with their
> noble, righteous bigoted thoughts of amateurism.

Independent thought does seem to be lacking in some circles.

Hey, have you read about the hams that are going to try to send an
amateur rocket into space?

Maybe if they donate a bunch of money to Kerry, they will receive a
personal visit from the Loral techs and get the thing off the ground.

> >> > > So...we're even.
> >> >
> >> > Maybe before God, or before the Law. But in very, very few other
> >> > ways.
> >>
> >> You're right, but not for the reason I am sure YOU think...
> >>
> >> SO FAR we are still waiting for you to back up your assertions
> >> that "unlicensed radio services" play a "major role" in disaster
> >> communications.
> >
> >So? I hope you won't mind if I keep you waiting?
>
> Gunnery nurse cannot concede anything on a subject. What
> he stated is divine law and none may go against that.

Papers! I demand to see your papers!

> >> We're also waiting for you to back up your Somalia claims. You
> >> continue to argue that "It's true because I say it's true", yet there
> >> should be a paper trail wide enough to roller skate on to show where
> >> your assertions are true.
> >
> >But I never needed your blessing. You'll just have to roller skate

> >elsewhere.
>
> Actually, there's been NO third-party proof that gunnery
> nurse was ever in the USMC. All we have to go on is his
> "word" and his "I've got the proof in my wallet" sort of
> statements. :-)
>
> We have yet to see a "paper trail wide enough to roller skate
> on to show where [gunnery nurse'] assertions are true."
>
> No problem. Gunnery nurse, when confronted with the truth
> and evidence, will, like the fictional Col. Jessup, will
> simply state someone is a "liar" and then call them all sorts
> of nasty names to show how "wrong" they are. :-)

Like the "US Cavalry" t-shirt; deny, deny, deny and make
counter-accusations.

Was Steve in INTEL?

> >> No one except everyone who knows enough about the current affairs
> >> of the various MARS programs and thier dependence upon the Amateur
> >> Radio service to make it work and sustain it.
> >
> >If its so obvious to "everyone," then anyone should be able to post
> >the citation.
> >
> >But they aren't.
>
> The "citations" gunnery nurse claims are constructs within
> his own little minds. MARS exists because of a DoD Directive
> and that should be that. Of course, it isn't that, but that
> doesn't stop the gunnery nurse from his virulent outrage.
>
> Gunnery nurse felt "wronged" by statements of disagreement.
> Such seems to be a cause for verbal warfare.

" Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". "

Maybe Steve could get Riley and/or Haney to verify his statement.

> >> > Best of Luck.
> >>
> >> None needed...You make it too easy...Again.
> >
> >Easy? I see no citation.
> >
> >Best of Luck.
>
> I've given the appropriate directive and regulations. Anyone
> can find them on the Internet. Gunnery nurse doesn't know
> them, therefore "they don't exist." :-)

>
>
> 3333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333,
> 33333333333333333
>
> LHA / WMD

70 three.

bb

4115. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:44:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519184426.17253.00001528@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92176

In article <40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?

Because then they couldn't call themselves "Pro CW Testing
Amateurs." :-)

> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.

I disagree. It would be Removal of Amateur Radio As They Know It
and they won't, can't have that. Blasphemy against the Church
of St. Hiram.

Liken this period of time to the Dark Days of the Catholic Church.
The late Don Stoner (the "S" in SGC Corporation*, makers of the
SG-2020 HF transceiver) may be the counterpart of a Martin Luther
from his editorial (quoted by Hans Brakob many times) in nailing
"theses" to the "church door...or the NECVEC petition (RM-10870)
may be part of that also.

"Tradition" of always having a code test for amateurism is so firmly
implanted (or brain-washed into) in minds that any suggestion of
removal of the code test is considered by those PCTA as heresy,
almost an abomination to some god.

Amateur radio = radiotelegraphy is an equation which those
stubborn soles of see-double-you require all to walk on.

* The "G" of SGC, Pierre Goral, passed on several months ago.

LHA / WMD

4116. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:48:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519184816.17253.00001529@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92177

In article <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(the gunnery nurse presently off his medications again) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
>
>> >Please, not another threat to injure me.

[the above line is from Brian Burke using the "Billy Beeper" name
which the gunnery nurse forgot to include in quote lines...]

>> The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
>> with him. That's a LOT of threats.
>
> The only "threat" is to those people who think that lying is an
>acceptable means of "representing" Amateur Radio.

Quoting the official titles and military branches who control MARS
is not lying.

>> The Military Affiliate Radio System is...(SNIP)
>
> ...a lot older than the 1998 manual you cited.

I did not cite "manuals." I cited the current Department of Defense
DIRECTIVE as well as the three major military branch
REGULATIONS that define MARS within each others' branch.

MARS was "born" in 1925 as the AARS or Army Amateur Radio
System. That is thirty years older than you.

> Thanks for the history lesson. You cut and paste well.

SOMEONE had to inform you since you were ignorant of the
beginnings of the Military Affiliate Radio System AND the pertinent
regulations of MARS.

> It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
>Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.

Incorrect. MARS functions - at its core - through military personnel
who man the headquarters such as Fort Huachuca, AZ, for the
Army and Scott AFB, IL, for the Air Force. Various military branch
net control stations around the country and the globe are manned
by military personnel who do NOT have to be licensed radio
amateurs.

Without the DoD DIRECTIVE, the Military Affiliate Radio System
would be defunct. It would no longer be military.

MARS seeks VOLUNTEERS for extensions of the MARS objective
and those come from amateur radio. Volunteers volunteer their
services but MUST abide by MARS regulations and operate for a
minimum amount of air time in any half-year period. In return, such
volunteers gain self-esteem plus a great deal of bragging rights to
fellow amateurs as if they "were somebody." Ho-hum.

>> >Now you lie.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse has distinct definitions of "lie" different
>> from other people. Those who disagree with him are "always
>> lying."
>
> Nice try. It's still not true.
>
>> >Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
>> >
>> >It's just wrong.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse will never concede any mistake he made.
>> He has his own definitions and commands all to obey those
>> unique definitions.
>
> Back up Putzy.

Who are you talking to? Do you call all who disagree with you
by Yiddish colloquialisms meaning "asshole" in English?

> There many in this forum who can attest to my having offered an "I
>stand corrected" on several occasions.

Those exist but they are BURIED under a torrent of verbal abuse
and denigrations you heap in hate of all those who disagree with
you. Google has it ALL.

> On the OTHER hand, we have caught you in NUMEROUS errors or
>blatant misrepresentations of the facts, and YOU have NEVER
>apologized, offered a correction, or otherwise admitted your errors,
>even when they were corroborated as errors by several respondents.

Incorrect again.

But, your newsgroup technique is noted. When confronted by a
challenge of misbehavior, you turn around and try the "mirror ploy"
of changing the subject of the accuser of the same "crime."

You have repeatedly tried to accuse Brian Burke of "not citing" any
military regulations pertaining to the Military Affiliate Radio System
for three weeks, yet were UNABLE to come up with any military
regulations or directives as any cite. Those were very easy to get
via a simple Internet search.

You can't "prove me wrong" on what I quoted about MARS since
all I had to do was to contact the appropriate directive and
regulations origins and repeat them. You were unable to do this.

There MIGHT be some DoD or military branch revisions that were
done since 1998 (six years ago) on MARS. If so, I will stand
corrected on proof of validity of such later revisions and being
presented with a publicly-accessible reference source for same.

However, YOU presented NOTHING in the way of MARS cites or
regulations that govern the existance of MARS. You had three
weeks to do that in and FAILED. You were attempting to "win
message points" by just bluster and bluff. That may work in the
USMC on lower ranks but it doesn't work in civilian society.

>> MARS has never been an important part of military
>> communications, never a part of either tactical or
>> strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
>> Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
>> and morale boosting of service personnel. However, the
>> affiliation with the military has terribly important
>> self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
>> to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
>> grand scheme to 'serve their country'."
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"....

The Military Affiliate Radio System does NOT employ any on-off
carrier keying communications modes such as "morse code."
:-)

You are trying to misdirect again by the "mirror ploy." That doesn't
work but you can't seem to understand that after six years of trying
to use it. You FAILED to come up with any cites of DoD Directives
of military branch Regulations after three weeks, and now you think
you can misdirect by more bluff and bluster? :-)

> Remember who said THAT Lennie?

Who is "Lennie?" A character out of a Steinbeck novel? :-)

[if so, the name is spelled wrong...]

I am TRYING to concentrate on the manual telegraphy testing issue
but am engulfed in a sea of hatred from the pro-telegraphy proponents
who engage in uncivil behavior against those against the test.

However, YOU told a number of LIES in describing the Military
Affiliate Radio System and YOU are held accountable for those LIES.

> You really have your moments of lowness and sliminess, but this
>one was pretty well in the running with the lowest.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nasty name-calling does not befit the rank, status,
and privileges of amateur extra. Not even amateur human being.

Telling the TRUTH about the Military Affiliate Radio System is NOT any form of "lying."

Challenging YOU on your inability to find appropriate cites for the creation and continued existance of the Military Affiliate Radio System is NOT any form of "lying." It may make you livid and outraged, but that is so much TS for you. [send me your TS card and I'll punch it for you]

> In as much as YOUR rear-area radio clerk duties were probably of
>even less importance in :the grand scheme" of the Armed Forces, I
>imagine it eats at you that MARS members do more for free than you
>EVER did while on Uncle Sam's payroll.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Livid and Outraged is an appropriate description of the gunnery nurse.

1. I was NEVER a "radio clerk" in any capacity, not even in a Radio Shack store. :-)

2. I was an MOS 281.6, microwave radio relay operations and maintenance SUPERVISOR as well as a fixed-station HF radio transmitter operations and maintenance SUPERVISOR.

3. I was assigned to the third-largest HF radio communications facility in the entirety of the Army Command Administrative Network for three years. The work I did during assignment resulted in promotion as well as increase in responsibility.

4. Nothing "eats at me" for any reason of the existance of the no-longer-primary HF radio communications networks of the past, present, or future. I did my duties well, was rewarded both professionally and personally (for liking what I did), and that resulted in a personal change of future career directions after completing military service.

5. Since the end of my military service obligations, I have worked IN radio communications of civilian, military, and commercial services, from VLF on up through about 25 GHz. While I've never worked ON the DSN, any part of it, I have used it for communications. [do you know what "DSN" is?]

> Well, Your Scumminess...why don't you go right ahead and apply
>for membership and a station authorization in N/MC MARS...?!?!
>
> I'd love to see the result.

Why? I have NO desire to become a part of MARS. I was simply injecting some official Directives and Regulations which you were unable to supply in support of your little tantrum against Brian Burke.

I'd love to see you return to regular medications to control your emotional outbursts of hatred and outrage against those who disagree with you. I don't expect to see that happen, but it would

be nice for all concerned.

>> Actually, there's been NO third-party proof that gunnery
>> nurse was ever in the USMC. All we have to go on is his
>> "word" and his "I've got the proof in my wallet" sort of
>> statements.
>
> Contact the VA, Lennie.
>
> You've got my full name, branch of service, and my date of birth
>is 18 Sept 1955. You'll excuse me if I don't offer you my SSAN, too.

We don't believe you.

I don't have any such data that you describe. All anyone has is
"your word." So far all anyone has is a lot of bluff and bluster,
NO referenced documents and NO references from others who
supposedly "know you."

> Of course that's been offered to you before and like most REAL
>facts, you never follow-up on it.
>
> That would be because you're a coward.

What "REAL facts?" NARA (National Archives and Records
Administration) in St. Louis has all the archived militrary service
records. It isn't worth 37 cents stamp and trouble of posting to
obtain your supposed "military record."

But, you are trying to misdirect again, trying to shift focus on
some supposed flaw of my character...and all I did was quote the
official Directive and branch Regulations of MARS. :-)

It wasn't "cowardice" to do a simple search and find all that
information. Took only a half hour at no cost. YOU failed to do
a simple thing like that in three weeks time in your tantrum
against Brian Burke. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> We have yet to see a "paper trail wide enough to roller skate
>> on to show where [gunnery nurse'] assertions are true."
>
> You've been offered access to the VA to verify it before, Lennie.

The Veterans Administration can't "verify" your service record.

NARA can. Try to understand your government.

> Not "someone", Lennie...You. Because you are a liar.
>
> Always have been...always will. What a loser.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still off the meds. A supposed "medical professional"
who can't get medical help. :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4117. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:48:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519184849.28360.00000054@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92178

In article <40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?

Because then they couldn't call themselves "Pro CW Testing
Amateurs." :-)

> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.

I disagree. It would be Removal of Amateur Radio As They Know It
and they won't, can't have that. Blasphemy against the Church
of St. Hiram.

Liken this period of time to the Dark Days of the Catholic Church.
The late Don Stoner (the "S" in SGC Corporation*, makers of the
SG-2020 HF transceiver) may be the counterpart of a Martin Luther
from his editorial (quoted by Hans Brakob many times) in nailing
"theses" to the "church door...or the NECVEC petition (RM-10870)
may be part of that also.

"Tradition" of always having a code test for amateurism is so firmly
implanted (or brain-washed into) in minds that any suggestion of
removal of the code test is considered by those PCTA as heresy,
almost an abomination to some god.

Amateur radio = radiotelegraphy is an equation which those
stubborn soles of see-double-you require all to walk on.

* The "G" of SGC, Pierre Goral, passed on several months ago.

LHA / WMD

4118. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:48:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519184855.28360.00000055@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92179

In article <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (the gunnery nurse presently off his medications again) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
>
>> >Please, not another threat to injure me.

[the above line is from Brian Burke using the "Billy Beeper" name which the gunnery nurse forgot to include in quote lines...]

>> The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
>> with him. That's a LOT of threats.
>
> The only "threat" is to those people who think that lying is an
>acceptable means of "representing" Amateur Radio.

Quoting the official titles and military branches who control MARS is not lying.

>> The Military Affiliate Radio System is...(SNIP)
>
> ...a lot older than the 1998 manual you cited.

I did not cite "manuals." I cited the current Department of Defense DIRECTIVE as well as the three major military branch REGULATIONS that define MARS within each others' branch.

MARS was "born" in 1925 as the AARS or Army Amateur Radio System. That is thirty years older than you.

> Thanks for the history lesson. You cut and paste well.

SOMEONE had to inform you since you were ignorant of the beginnings of the Military Affiliate Radio System AND the pertinent regulations of MARS.

> It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
>Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.

Incorrect. MARS functions - at its core - through military personnel who man the headquarters such as Fort Huachuca, AZ, for the Army and Scott AFB, IL, for the Air Force. Various military branch net control stations around the country and the globe are manned by military personnel who do NOT have to be licensed radio amateurs.

Without the DoD DIRECTIVE, the Military Affiliate Radio System
would be defunct. It would no longer be military.

MARS seeks VOLUNTEERS for extensions of the MARS objective
and those come from amateur radio. Volunteers volunteer their
services but MUST abide by MARS regulations and operate for a
minimum amount of air time in any half-year period. In return, such
volunteers gain self-esteem plus a great deal of bragging rights to
fellow amateurs as if they "were somebody." Ho-hum.

>> >Now you lie.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse has distinct definitions of "lie" different
>> from other people. Those who disagree with him are "always
>> lying."
>
> Nice try. It's still not true.
>
>> >Poorly worded? Naw, Wrongly Worded!
>> >
>> >It's just wrong.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse will never concede any mistake he made.
>> He has his own definitions and commands all to obey those
>> unique definitions.
>
> Back up Putzy.

Who are you talking to? Do you call all who disagree with you
by Yiddish colloquialisms meaning "asshole" in English?

> There many in this forum who can attest to my having offered an "I
>stand corrected" on several occasions.

Those exist but they are BURIED under a torrent of verbal abuse
and denigrations you heap in hate of all those who disagree with
you. Google has it ALL.

> On the OTHER hand, we have caught you in NUMEROUS errors or
>blatant misrepresentations of the facts, and YOU have NEVER
>apologized, offered a correction, or otherwise admitted your errors,
>even when they were corroborated as errors by several respondents.

Incorrect again.

But, your newsgroup technique is noted. When confronted by a
challenge of misbehavior, you turn around and try the "mirror ploy"
of changing the subject of the accuser of the same "crime."

You have repeatedly tried to accuse Brian Burke of "not citing" any
military regulations pertaining to the Military Affiliate Radio System
for three weeks, yet were UNABLE to come up with any military
regulations or directives as any cite. Those were very easy to get
via a simple Internet search.

You can't "prove me wrong" on what I quoted about MARS since
all I had to do was to contact the appropriate directive and
regulations origins and repeat them. You were unable to do this.

There MIGHT be some DoD or military branch revisions that were
done since 1998 (six years ago) on MARS. If so, I will stand
corrected on proof of validity of such later revisions and being
presented with a publicly-accessible reference source for same.

However, YOU presented NOTHING in the way of MARS cites or
regulations that govern the existance of MARS. You had three
weeks to do that in and FAILED. You were attempting to "win
message points" by just bluster and bluff. That may work in the
USMC on lower ranks but it doesn't work in civilian society.

>> MARS has never been an important part of military
>> communications, never a part of either tactical or
>> strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
>> Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
>> and morale boosting of service personnel. However, the
>> affiliation with the military has terribly important
>> self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
>> to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
>> grand scheme to 'serve their country'."
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"....

The Military Affiliate Radio System does NOT employ any on-off
carrier keying communications modes such as "morse code."
:-)

You are trying to misdirect again by the "mirror ploy." That doesn't
work but you can't seem to understand that after six years of trying
to use it. You FAILED to come up with any cites of DoD Directives
of military branch Regulations after three weeks, and now you think
you can misdirect by more bluff and bluster? :-)

> Remember who said THAT Lennie?

Who is "Lennie?" A character out of a Steinbeck novel? :-)

[if so, the name is spelled wrong...]

I am TRYING to concentrate on the manual telegraphy testing issue
but am engulfed in a sea of hatred from the pro-telegraphy proponents
who engage in uncivil behavior against those against the test.

However, YOU told a number of LIES in describing the Military
Affiliate Radio System and YOU are held accountable for those LIES.

> You really have your moments of lowness and sliminess, but this
>one was pretty well in the running with the lowest.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nasty name-calling does not befit the rank, status,
and privileges of amateur extra. Not even amateur human being.

Telling the TRUTH about the Military Affiliate Radio System is NOT any form of "lying."

Challenging YOU on your inability to find appropriate cites for the creation and continued existance of the Military Affiliate Radio System is NOT any form of "lying." It may make you livid and outraged, but that is so much TS for you. [send me your TS card and I'll punch it for you]

> In as much as YOUR rear-area radio clerk duties were probably of
>even less importance in :the grand scheme" of the Armed Forces, I
>imagine it eats at you that MARS members do more for free than you
>EVER did while on Uncle Sam's payroll.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Livid and Outraged is an appropriate description of the gunnery nurse.

1. I was NEVER a "radio clerk" in any capacity, not even in a Radio Shack store. :-)

2. I was an MOS 281.6, microwave radio relay operations and maintenance SUPERVISOR as well as a fixed-station HF radio transmitter operations and maintenance SUPERVISOR.

3. I was assigned to the third-largest HF radio communications facility in the entirety of the Army Command Administrative Network for three years. The work I did during assignment resulted in promotion as well as increase in responsibility.

4. Nothing "eats at me" for any reason of the existance of the no-longer-primary HF radio communications networks of the past, present, or future. I did my duties well, was rewarded both professionally and personally (for liking what I did), and that resulted in a personal change of future career directions after completing military service.

5. Since the end of my military service obligations, I have worked IN radio communications of civilian, military, and commercial services, from VLF on up through about 25 GHz. While I've never worked ON the DSN, any part of it, I have used it for communications. [do you know what "DSN" is?]

> Well, Your Scumminess...why don't you go right ahead and apply
>for membership and a station authorization in N/MC MARS...?!?!
>
> I'd love to see the result.

Why? I have NO desire to become a part of MARS. I was simply injecting some official Directives and Regulations which you were unable to supply in support of your little tantrum against Brian Burke.

I'd love to see you return to regular medications to control your emotional outbursts of hatred and outrage against those who disagree with you. I don't expect to see that happen, but it would

be nice for all concerned.

>> Actually, there's been NO third-party proof that gunnery
>> nurse was ever in the USMC. All we have to go on is his
>> "word" and his "I've got the proof in my wallet" sort of
>> statements.
>
> Contact the VA, Lennie.
>
> You've got my full name, branch of service, and my date of birth
>is 18 Sept 1955. You'll excuse me if I don't offer you my SSAN, too.

We don't believe you.

I don't have any such data that you describe. All anyone has is
"your word." So far all anyone has is a lot of bluff and bluster,
NO referenced documents and NO references from others who
supposedly "know you."

> Of course that's been offered to you before and like most REAL
>facts, you never follow-up on it.
>
> That would be because you're a coward.

What "REAL facts?" NARA (National Archives and Records
Administration) in St. Louis has all the archived militrary service
records. It isn't worth 37 cents stamp and trouble of posting to
obtain your supposed "military record."

But, you are trying to misdirect again, trying to shift focus on
some supposed flaw of my character...and all I did was quote the
official Directive and branch Regulations of MARS. :-)

It wasn't "cowardice" to do a simple search and find all that
information. Took only a half hour at no cost. YOU failed to do
a simple thing like that in three weeks time in your tantrum
against Brian Burke. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> We have yet to see a "paper trail wide enough to roller skate
>> on to show where [gunnery nurse'] assertions are true."
>
> You've been offered access to the VA to verify it before, Lennie.

The Veterans Administration can't "verify" your service record.

NARA can. Try to understand your government.

> Not "someone", Lennie...You. Because you are a liar.
>
> Always have been...always will. What a loser.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still off the meds. A supposed "medical professional"
who can't get medical help. :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4119. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:56:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92180

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
> Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
>
>
> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>
>
> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist to want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid of it are world class fools.

Dan/W4NTI

4120. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 22:58:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92181

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> >
> > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> >
> >
> >
> > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> >
> >
> > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely for
> the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty crowded
> place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
any
> CW sub-bands.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the exclusive
subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.

I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.

Dan/W4NTI

4121. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:05:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UKRqc.15313$zO3.13443@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92182

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxxfam4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 15 May 2004 22:37:12 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex
slave
> >countries.
>
> What makes you think that real CW ops won't learn/use manual Morse
> if the mandatory testing requirement is dropped?
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Because people are basically lazy and most likely won't bother. Unless a
ham that knows and loves CW is his Elmer.

Dan/W4NTI

4122. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:12:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <DRRqc.15322$zO3.11682@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92183

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94EE2D03EFB7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hxxfam4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> > On Sat, 15 May 2004 22:37:12 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >>After all someone has to be able to talk to those Russians and her ex
> >>slave countries.
> >
> > What makes you think that real CW ops won't learn/use manual Morse
> > if the mandatory testing requirement is dropped?
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
> >
>
> I might even use it if the test is dropped! Some of these guys are
> terrified that they will have no-one to work. Not that I would want to
work
> Dan, who is on record as saying that all phone ops are lids..

Good Hams that know CW are more than willing to reduce speed (QRS). In fact real CW ops know that it is idiotic to keep sending faster than your contact can receive. It's a waste of time.

As for you not wanting to talk to me for saying my opinion of phone only ops. That's ur choice Alun. And your loss. You would enjoy working W4NTI on CW.

Dan/W4NTI

4123. Re: High-el and his lavender lads run away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:15:41 UTC
From: anon <anon@angstnets.net>
Message-ID: <c8gpn2nvp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92184

Roger, Do share with us exactly what it is that you "won."

"An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
news:482d770712019676a8b90f8974c55f1a@aonymous.poster...
> And I win again!!!
>
> Mua HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
>

4124. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:18:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LWRqc.15326$zO3.11980@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92185

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:GxBqc.1017$Tn6.35@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > Not that I would want to work
> > Dan, who is on record as saying
> > that all phone ops are lids..
>
> You must be mistaken. I just checked my log and I've worked W4NTI
> dozens of times over the past few years. Nearly half of the Q's were on
> SSB (I think that mode qualifies as "phone".) Certainly Dan wouldn't
> work people he considers "lids".
>
> Good luck on this one now!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
>
>
Thank you Hans,

I actually do consider ALUN a lid. Because he has stated he is a phone operator ONLY. To me that is a lid.

Dan/W4NTI

4125. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:20:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IYRqc.15328$zO3.6853@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92186

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405190724.50d5167a@posting.google.com...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GxBqc.1017$Tn6.35@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > > Not that I would want to work
> > > Dan, who is on record as saying
> > > that all phone ops are lids..
> >
> > You must be mistaken. I just checked my log and I've worked W4NTI
> > dozens of times over the past few years. Nearly half of the Q's were on
> > SSB (I think that mode qualifies as "phone".) Certainly Dan wouldn't
> > work people he considers "lids".
> >
> > Good luck on this one now!
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
> That would make Dan a self-declared lid.

Not really. I operate phone, have so for years. It's just that if that is
ALL you do in ham radio, I think your a LID.

LID = Poor Operator

Dan/W4NTI

4126. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-19 23:23:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <I%Rqc.15332$zO3.3168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92187

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key and
> > a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> You'll have to do better than that

I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a real ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.

Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure you will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with you and your problem. However, I am not that person.

Have a good day.

Dan/W4NTI

4127. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 00:33:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ZrmdnYgBa59PYTbdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92188

garigue wrote:

> Neat place ..my daughter graduated from there in 01 ....If you see Jim
> Breakall tell him I said hi ..haven't seen him since highschool ...

Oh yeah, I see Jim all the time!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4128. Re: High-el and his lavender lads run away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 01:11:33 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@Nospam>
Message-ID: <c8h0js$51b$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92189

"anon" <anon@angstnets.net> wrote in message
news:c8gpn2nvp0@pita.alt.net...
Roger, Do share with us exactly what it is that you "won."

Well, he "wins" the contest for losing the most ISP's in two years!

"An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
news:482d770712019676a8b90f8974c55f1a@aonymous.poster...
> And I win again!!!
>
> Mua HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
>

4129. Re: Roger Outed Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 02:09:51 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@Nospam>
Message-ID: <c8h416dsn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92190
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
in message news:4daa59127cc0a924f584865e16121321@cypherpunks.to...
In article <c8fpno$n64$0@pita.alt.net>
"anon" <anon@nganonews.net> wrote:
>
>
> Kudos to <slurp slurp slurp>

Get your tongue up his rectum faster, lardass.
Too bad he got the wrong ip.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!

No he didn't. And you know it.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!

4130. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 02:17:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <izUqc.21923$KE6.3031@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92191

Sorry to hear about Dick.

I've been "off-net" for some time due to travel.

Regards,

Bill K2UNK

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405191151.4635ba11@posting.google.com...
> I was deeply saddened to read of the passing of Dick Caroll, W0EX. He
> was a great guy and a fine radio amateur. I'm glad to have known him,
> online, by email and most of all on the air. He and N0BK are sorely
> missed. WA2SI and I were wondering about him during a CW QSO on 40 the
> other night, and the next day the bad news was in the newsgroup.
>
> So in memorial of W0EX and N0BK, we're going to try for a regular
> sked. Tuesdays, 9 PM EDST (0100Z), 7037 kHz plus-minus QRM. Just a
> friendly discussion net. All are invited. We'll call "BXN" instead of
> "CQ". "BXN" derives from the B in N0BK and the X in W0EX, and of
> course N for net.
>
> Join us.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4131. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 02:20:37 UTC
From: Brian <brianCUT@iquestHERE.net>
Message-ID: <VBUqc.21935$KE6.14900@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92192

I run CW on any ham freq I want to.

The sub bands mean nothing to me.

MWAHAHAHAH

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> >
> > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> >
> >
> >
> > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> >
> >
> > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely for
> the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty crowded
> place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
any
> CW sub-bands.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

4132. Re: Is FCC ready to toss another bomb?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 02:41:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <sVUqc.5370$8t4.3958@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92193

Hello, Phil

Was it a shocking experience? :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hxxd0l3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 18 May 2004 17:20:32 GMT, Michael Black wrote:
>
> >I learned of amateur radio because it was out there. I can't even
> >remember where I read about it first, maybe a magazine for Scouting
> >here in Canada, maybe it was "Jack & Jill" or "HIghtlights for Children"
> >and both of those magazines were aimed at quite a young crowd.
>
> I learned about SWL-ing and ham radio from "Boy's Life", the
> magazine of the Boy Scouts of America, when I was in the 8th grade.
> It helped that a close family friend (a non-ham) had been a radio
> repair tech in WW-II which had ended only a few years before and he
> steered me in the right direction.
>
> After messinmg around listening to and repairing AM and SW radios of
> the late 1930s-1940s era, I finally got hooked on ham radio in the
> 11th Grade at the high school radio club (W2CLE, the oldest HS radio
> club in the country, founded before WW-I). I got my Novice/Tech
> license at the end of 11th Grade (1952). Along the way I changed my
> intended college major from chemistry to electrical engineering.
>
> Neither I nor ham radio nor electrical engineering has been the same
> ever since.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.688 / Virus Database: 449 - Release Date: 5/18/04

4133. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 02:50:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040519225023.13152.00001754@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92194

In article <1e4e3692.0405191416.651297f6@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0405161339.388b022c@posting.google.com>...
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0405160845.5b6ac8ff@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<20040514154519.29049.00001039@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> >> > > >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> > > >Date: 5/14/2004 7:38 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405140438.2673636b@posting.google.com>
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >> > > >news:<20040513213417.10186.00001459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> > > >Seems really difficult for you to back up your, " Sorry Han's,
>MARS
>> >> > > >>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". ," nonsense statement with anything
>> >> > > >substantive from either Part 97 or any DoD Regulation.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > What's needed, Brain?
>> >> >
>> >> > A citation from an applicable regulation.
>> >>
>> >> Brain, do you need to have a piece of paper in hand that says "If
>> >> you are abruptly slapped with the open hand across the face, it will
>> >> be markendly and acutely painful" in order to know that it's true?
>>
>> >Please, not another threat to injure me.
>>
>> The gunnery nurse seems always to threaten people who disagree
>> with him. That's a LOT of threats. :-)
>
>Perhaps not a direct threat, but the implications are violent - and
>that's enough to be concerned.

His Internet caliber is 155mm HE but his actual caliber is smaller
than a popgun. :-)

>> The Military Affiliate Radio System is authorized by Department
>> of Defense Directive 4650.2, 26 Jan 98. Individual service

>> branches have specific regulations. For the Army it is Army
>> Regulation AR 25-6 as revised 29 Oct 98. For the USAF it is
>> AFI 33-106. For the USN-USMC is is MARS Communications
>> Instructions NTP 8(C), March 1998.
>
>Now that you've done half of Steve's homework, he should have a
>citation for us by the end of the week.

Unlikely. He is off his meds again and is bound and determined
to call both of us by nastynames. :-)

>> The United States Army is the birthplace of MARS, first
>> organized at the AARS or Army Amateur Radio System in 1925.
>> The purpose was to increase skills within the Army by using
>> amateur knowledge to improve Army communications. It was
>> not a terribly popular thing either in or out of the Army.
>> The AARS stopped at the start of the USA involvement with
>> WW2 and cessation of amateur operations. It resumed in 1946.
>> In 1948 the AARS was renamed with the organization of the
>> USAF as a part of the new MARS, dropping the "amateur" in
>> favor of the word "affiliate."
>
>The Air Force was always forward tinking.

I know, but the USAF was "born" in the Army Signal Corps. :-)

Signal budget bought the very first "air force" airplane, a
Wright Flyer.

>> The intent of MARS was basically a morale booster for all
>> military personnel assigned far from USA territory. The
>> role has changed (by directive and regulations) to become
>> a liason between the military and civilian emergency
>> organizations, principally FEMA. MARS also has ties with
>> SHARES, the group of government HF radio users throughout
>> the USA and foreign US locations.
>
>They don't use CW anymore, either. They've gone digital.

Don't say that too loudly in here...the dittyboppers don't like it.

MARS exists via a DoD Directive, is managed by the military,
main stations are operated by the military using military
equipment, and doesn't transmit IN the amateur bands. I guess
that some folks think that "MARS is amateur radio." :-)

>> The gunnery nurse has had, what, three weeks, to cite one
>> and has not. A simple Internet search will turn up the
>> official documents from the DoD and all three service
>> branches. He is continuing a game of bluffing in trying
>> to intimidate others to concede to him.
>
>It isn't happening, is it? So the name calling escalates. Then

>violent acts are mentioned. I've counted two so far.

More will be mentioned, blurted out in another spasm of bluff,
bluster, and bravado. Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>> MARS has never been an important part of military
>> communications, never a part of either tactical or
>> strategic planning. At best it is an extension of
>> Special Services (in the Army old term) for entertainment
>> and morale boosting of service personnel.
>
>But it is important to have a back-up for certain communications. The
>"Base Support Team" concept is fairly well thought through.

MARS is "backup?" For what, Special Services? USO?

In today's battlefield, DIGITAL is the thing in everything from comms
to the now-ubiquitous little personal digital camera and the various
websites the Iraqi and Afghani GIs use to connect back home. How
else did the press get hold of the Iraq prison abuse pictures? They
got them first from the INTERNET.

MARS "might" be a good backup for civilian organization liason
such as REAL emergency interface with FEMA, etc., but it is an
old thing that never adapted beyond 1954. If nothing else, a few
MARS volunteers get to take home military commo equipment
that was declared surplus. Real green machines they can play
with...that the taxpayers once owned.

>> However, the
>> affiliation with the military has terribly important
>> self-image boost points for individual amateurs who want
>> to enoble themselves into thinking they are "part of the
>> grand scheme to 'serve their country'."
>
>Until they discover that they can wear an actual uniform with "RANK"
>on it via the Air Force's CAP program.

Wow, yeah, I forget the "frown" pictures of the mighty ace in his
grubbies. :-)

>> The problem of this ex-USMC member is that neither amateur
>> radio nor the Internet is any part of the USMC.
>
>Nor is Steve part of the FCC, the United Nations, nor the Somalian
>government (if it exists yet), to be demanding documents.

I know. That doesn't stop our intrepid CAP ace. The grande
obsession he has won't let him back down for ANYTHING. :-)

>> MARS exists because of the Department of Defense Directive
>> that says it does.
>

>And it says it does.

...and there we have it. :-)

>> A close inspection of USN-USMC NTP 8(C) will reveal that
>> USN and USMC MARS operators do NOT need to possess amateur
>> radio licenses in order to operate MARS radio equipment.
>> In both USA and USAF regulations, MARS operations are done
>> by Army or Air Force personnel who are not required to have
>> amateur radio licenses.
>
>Steve estimated that it was no more than 1%, 2%, 10%, or 20% of the
>total MARS personnel, depending on which day he said it.

He must have an imaginary roster of all "MARS personnel" and
thinks that volunteers are somehow enlisted for some kind of
duration. [of what we don't know...] :-)

>> VOLUNTEER civilians are welcomed by all three branches but
>> only the USA and USAF require volunteers to possess amateur
>> licenses. USN-USMC does not.
>
>Oh, My!!!
>
>And wasn't Steve in the U.S. Marine Corps? Shouldn't he have already
>known that? What he do with all that service time? Play
>tiddly-winks?

He sure wasn't in any military commo work. He can't name a single
military radio by either nomenclature or familiar name. Not even a
"plugger" (AN/PSN-11 GPS receiver).

I'm having a great deal of difficulty in thinking he was ever IN the USMC.

So far, all he's ever said is a bunch of words. No references, no scans
of any papers, nothing but a bunch of words in a newsgroup (when he
isn't sending nastygrams to those who disagree with him). All we know
is that he's in the FCC database for AMATEUR radio.

>Ditto the adjustment, but I'm not sure about the rejected part. When
>did he leave the service? There was a big RIF starting in 92. The AF
>was down to half-strength by the end of 96.

If he was born in 1955 as he says (I'd already made E-5 then,
working on microwave terminals), then he could have enlisted at 18,
making that 1973 (I was a senior staff engineer at RCA EASD in
Van Nuys, CA, then). If he did about 18 years in the corpse, then he
got his medical discharge about 1991. [if he did a full 20 it was 1993]

Supposedly he got out on a medical "due to an accident." Okay, so
if the accident resulted in physical damage to curtail a USMC career
completion, how come for why he got a private pilot's rating? Did the
FAA "dumb down" the private pilot physical?

The progression doesn't add up or make any logical routing. The
REAL story hasn't come out yet.

>> >Odd, but I haven't seen much of Len lately. How nice of him to be
>> >taking me along with him.
>>
>> I've been gone, doing more important things in life. :-)
>
>Well thanks for taking me along.

Sorry about that. :-)

>> >> That you voluntarilly get in step behind him is laughable at best.
>> >
>> >Its called, "The High Road."
>>
>> I'd call it "independent thought."
>>
>> Some in amateur radio do NOT permit independent thought
>> and become outraged with anyone disagreeing with their
>> noble, righteous bigoted thoughts of amateurism.
>
>Independent thought does seem to be lacking in some circles.

Ever body gotta march to the same beat, same music, chant the
1930s mantras about telegraphy skills in amateurism.

>Hey, have you read about the hams that are going to try to send an
>amateur rocket into space?
>
>Maybe if they donate a bunch of money to Kerry, they will receive a
>personal visit from the Loral techs and get the thing off the ground.

It will be about as effective as the fledgling ARRL's first try at
a national commo relay network cross-country trial.

Rocketry into outer space isn't as easy as it looks. Goddard spent
years in the southwest as an amateur rocketeer and didn't get very
high. The VfR (Verein fur Raumschfart) or German rocket society
did about the same but got an assist in monies from the Wehrmacht
and a nice test area called Peenemunde on the Baltic coast.

Look at the infamous Viking rocket that was supposed to launch on
the IGY. Got maybe a half foot off the pad and went kaBlooie.

Burt Rutan's outfit is well on the way to success in that area, having
completed the first of a series of flight trials. [Rutan built the first
circumnavigation-without-landing aircraft] Scaled Composites not
only built the manned rocket but also the launch aircraft. The first
flight went beyond the astronaut wings limit...except the 61-year-old
pilot is a civilian and won't get the fancy astronaut wing insignia.

>> Gunnery nurse cannot concede anything on a subject. What
>> he stated is divine law and none may go against that.

>
>Papers! I demand to see your papers!

He can't say that unless he rents a Gestapo uniform from Western
Costume out here...or gets a leather overcoat and old hat and hangs
around banhoffs (railroad stations). Tsk, tsk, tsk, he just won't play
the role by the rules!

>> No problem. Gunnery nurse, when confronted with the truth
>> and evidence, will, like the fictional Col. Jessup, will
>> simply state someone is a "liar" and then call them all sorts
>> of nasty names to show how "wrong" they are. :-)
>
>Like the "US Cavalry" t-shirt; deny, deny, deny and make
>counter-accusations.

Custer would have liked that. Been to the 7th Cavalry cemetary.
Also saw the battlefield. It's all credit to the a "military leader"
who graduated LAST in his West Point class. Geez.

>Was Steve in INTEL?

You ARE kidding. Aren't you? :-(

As a security guard at Intel Corporation, MAYBE...

>" Sorry Han's, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio". "
>
>Maybe Steve could get Riley and/or Haney to verify his statement.

Don Rumsfield...

>> >Easy? I see no citation.
>> >
>> >Best of Luck.
>>
>> I've given the appropriate directive and regulations. Anyone
>> can find them on the Internet. Gunnery nurse doesn't know
>> them, therefore "they don't exist." :-)
>>
>> 3333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333333,
>> 33333333333333333
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>70 three.
>
>bb

Now we await what form the next spasm of hate and outrage will
take as the intrepid ace vomits more personal insults. :-)

LHA / WMD

4134. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 04:08:56 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <77Wqc.6011$YB6.494@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 92195

"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
news:a298df7b17cf510a0df483cdda949af0@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> >and leave Dave Heil and myself alone!
>
> You brought this into here, by posting as "Tim" and bringing Dave Heil
> into this. He wouldn't have been brought into this if you hadn't brought
> all this up, lardass!
>

I only post with my name on my posts, unlike you, who is a mealy-mouthed
coward who uses remailers....

Grow up!

4135. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 04:47:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040520004728.21890.00001293@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92196
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article ,
"Dan/W4NTI" writes:

>"Alun" wrote in message
>news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key and
>> > a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> You'll have to do better than that
>
>I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a real
>ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.

Poor baby. Therapy not coming along well, is it?

"Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices

This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.

>Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure you
>will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with you and
>your problem. However, I am not that person.

We can sense your differences. And bigotry. And frustration.

Without the telegraphy test, an Amateur Extra has no real
self-perceived elitism over all other amateurs. It must be a
great blow to self-esteem to face the loss of status and rank.

>Have a good day.

Interesting. A Noo Yawker from the "south." :-)

LHA / WMD

4136. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 04:49:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040520004902.21890.00001294@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92197

In article <GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist to
>want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid of
>it are world class fools.

The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD GOT RID OF TELEGRAPHY.

Are all those other radio services "fools" that they got rid of
radiotelegraphy?

I guess you think so. <shrug>

How's your therapy coming along?

LHA / WMD

4137. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 07:47:38 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EF265C2AB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92203

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:I%Rqc.15332$zO3.3168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key
>> > and a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> You'll have to do better than that
>
> I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a
> real ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.
>
> Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure
> you will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with
> you and your problem. However, I am not that person.
>
> Have a good day.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

You are the one with the problem

4138. France dropped the Morse requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 09:24:04 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA <deleterene.altenaremovedelete@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <2h3bquF87abvU1@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92198
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,de.comm.ham,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

France dropped the Morse requirement.

http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/actualites/pdf/7_mai_Lettre_du_Ministre.pdf

The publication in the 'Journal Officiel de la Republique Franciase' took
place on the 16th of May, 2004. Please look at
http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/a_la_une_supplement/pdf/2004-316.pdf .

The strange thing is that Class 2 operaters are not (!) allowed to use A1A,
A2A and F1A on amateur bands below 30 MHz. This is strange!

If this official publication means that foreign Class 2 operators (CEPT-2)
may use HF bands in France, has not been clarified yet.

--

Ren&#65533; Altena - PE1RA
Nijverdal - The Netherlands - JO32FJ
pe1ra @ amsat.org - http://qsy.to/pe1ra

4139. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 13:26:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vm2rc.3350$be.3117@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92204

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

> He said that phone ops are lids in the group. He tried to backtrack on
> that, but google preserves his words indefinitely.

I just did a google search on the phrase "phone ops are lids in the group" and only your message came back. I don't believe Dan said "phone ops are lids in the group".

73, de Hans, K0HB

4140. Re: AB8MQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 13:34:31 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0405200534.504f039@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92202
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com> wrote in message
news:<mgPqc.10528$3W1.7146@bignews6.bellsouth.net>...
> "Anonymous" <nobody@paranoici.org> wrote in message
> news:c4f6db84c66e1ae0fef650483216de1d@paranoici.org...
> > What is the MCI address for reporting TOS violations?
> > I have several I want to report.
> >
> >
>
> Would'nt hurt to call Chief Stenger too.

It also "wouldn't" hurt for you to take a remedial English class, lardass!

WHINE TO THE CHIEF

played when Lavender Lads President and Founder
Lardass Lloyd Davies is present.....
(Melody: "Hail to the Chief")

Whine to the chief
When I get my ass handed to me
Time and time again
Whine to the chief
That's all I can do, you see
Because I'm not a man
Whine to the chief
And claim he's stalking me
Those mean words hurt me so
Whine to the chief
Because I can't fight my own battles
I'll do anything to make him go

4141. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 16:38:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92205

Len Over 21 wrote:
> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices

That is incorrect, Leonard. A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license. You don't. You have no stake whatever in amateur radio.

> This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.

...and despite your self-declared several decades interest in amateur radio, you have yet to show enough interest to become a participant.

Dave K8MN

4142. Re: France dropped the Morse requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 17:30:00 UTC
From: Jock <real_class_a@yahoo.co.uk>
Message-ID: <rkqpa094ujv2hoqpst4sp59r15gst6slab@4ax.com>
Source record: 92199
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,de.comm.ham,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Thu, 20 May 2004 11:24:04 +0200, "Rene PE1RA"
<deleterene.altenaremovedelete@gmx.net> wrote:

>France dropped the Morse requirement.
>
>http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/actualites/pdf/7_mai_Lettre_du_Ministre.pdf
>
>The publication in the 'Journal Officiel de la Republique Franciase' took
>place on the 16th of May, 2004. Please look at

I'm fairly sure it would have been la Rï¿½publique Franï¿½aise.

>http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/a_la_une_supplement/pdf/2004-316.pdf .
>
>The strange thing is that Class 2 operaters are not (!) allowed to use A1A,
>A2A and F1A on amateur bands below 30 MHz. This is strange!

>If this official publication means that foreign Class 2 operators (CEPT-2)
>may use HF bands in France, has not been clarified yet.

Let's hope it never is. We don't want class two people disrupting the
peace and quiet for the thousands of British white settlers in the
country.

--

Jock.
Genuine Class A.

4143. Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 18:01:29 UTC
From: "Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk>
Message-ID: <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>
Source record: 92206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Hi guys,

From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video transmitter with the following characteristics:

* very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts

* small size

* transmits mono audio and colour video

* transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483 MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either 800Mhz, 1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What I'm after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV transmission)!

* available in the UK

* costs less than 150 UK pounds

* comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.

Many thanks for your help,
Jack

PS
Sorry for sending to so many newsgroups. I've spent bloody ages trying to find a solution but with no luck yet so I'm eager to get as much advice as possible.

4144. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 18:03:41 UTC
From: "Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk>
Message-ID: <c8irs9$h8k$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>
Source record: 92207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

I only need to transmit about 20meters.

Jack

"Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote in message
news:c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk...
> Hi guys,
>
> From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
> transmitter with the following characteristics:
>
>
>
> * very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
>
> * small size
>
> * transmits mono audio and colour video
>
> * transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
> MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either 800Mhz,
> 1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What
I'm
> after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz
> certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV
> transmission)!
>
> * available in the UK
>
> * costs less than 150 UK pounds
>
> * comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.
>
>
>
> Many thanks for your help,
> Jack
>
>
> PS
> Sorry for sending to so many newsgroups. I've spent bloody ages trying to
> find a solution but with no luck yet so I'm eager to get as much advice as
> possible.
>

>
>
>
>

4145. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 18:19:45 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c8iss1$7ko$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 92208
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
>I only need to transmit about 20meters.

Ask your local motion picture sound folks. There are a number of short
distance wireless systems which use licensed frequencies, which are often
used for video taps on film jobs. I don't know of any under #150, but
you might find some used ones at a film sound rental place.
--scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

4146. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 18:37:45 UTC
From: Dave Plowman <dave.sound@argonet.co.uk>
Message-ID: <4cb22b7083dave.sound@argonet.co.uk>
Source record: 92209
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

In article <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>,
Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
> From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
> transmitter with the following characteristics:

> * very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts

> * small size

> * transmits mono audio and colour video

> * transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
> MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either
> 800Mhz, 1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the
> UK. What I'm after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the
> spectrum. 2.4GHz certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones,
> microwaves, AV transmission)!

Check with Black Box. They do a system to feed a director's monitor on
location. Works pretty well. No idea about cost, though.

--
*Why is the third hand on the watch called a second hand?

Dave Plowman dave.sound@argonet.co.uk London SW 12
RIP Acorn

4147. Re: France dropped the Morse requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 18:59:27 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA <deleterene.altenaremovedelete@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <2h4di7F8s143U1@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92200
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.morse,de.comm.ham,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Jock wrote:
> On Thu, 20 May 2004 11:24:04 +0200, "Rene PE1RA"
> <deleterene.altenaremovedelete@gmx.net> wrote:
>
>> France dropped the Morse requirement.
>>
>>
http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/actualites/pdf/7_mai_Lettre_du_Ministre.pdf
>>
>> The publication in the 'Journal Officiel de la Republique
>> Franciase' took place on the 16th of May, 2004. Please look at
>
> I'm fairly sure it would have been la R�publique Fran�aise.

Yes, but it is good practice on the internet not to use specific characters
like the cedille, accent aigu, accent grave, accent circonflex etc. etc.

In come ASCII-translation tables, these characters translate to nothing,
smileys etc. etc.

>
>> http://www.ref-union.org/accueil/a_la_une_supplement/pdf/2004-316.pdf
>> .
>>
>> The strange thing is that Class 2 operaters are not (!) allowed to
>> use A1A, A2A and F1A on amateur bands below 30 MHz. This is strange!
>
>> If this official publication means that foreign Class 2 operators
>> (CEPT-2) may use HF bands in France, has not been clarified yet.
>
> Let's hope it never is. We don't want class two people disrupting the
> peace and quiet for the thousands of British white settlers in the
> country.

LOL

--

Ren� Altena - PE1RA
Nijverdal - The Netherlands - JO32FJ
pe1ra @ amsat.org - http://qsy.to/pe1ra

4148. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 19:17:34 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40AD044C.6020507@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack) wrote:

>Hi guys,
>
>From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
>transmitter with the following characteristics:
>
>
>
>* very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
>
>* small size
>
>* transmits mono audio and colour video
>
>* transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
>MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either 800Mhz,
>1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What I'm
>after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz
>certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV
>transmission)!
>
>* available in the UK
>
>* costs less than 150 UK pounds
>
>* comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.
>
>
>
>
>
Maybe salvage the modulator from a dead VCR? Or for that matter, use a VCR
set to "video input" mode. It may need a small power amp to get a
decent signal
20 meters, though....

4149. Armed Forces Day Message - Navy - 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 19:24:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nB7rc.3623$be.2201@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92230
Cross-posted to: sci.military.naval,rec.radio.amateur.policy

http://tinyurl.com/3dnws

4150. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 19:27:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040520152739.07672.00001749@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92211

In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>
>That is incorrect, Leonard.

Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
Dan. :-)

>A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.

Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)

The FCC regulations don't define "ham" at all. The FDA does.

Why do you persist in all the confusion of colloquialisms?

>You don't.

Right!

>You have no stake whatever in amateur radio.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. All you want to do in here (which is newsgrouping,
not amateur radio) is drive a stake through any heart that doesn't
beat to the rhythm of classical radiotelegraphy in amateur radio.

Quit trying to play Van Helsing. Hollywood already done a movie
about that and you don't have a part in it. [Hugh Jackman doesn't
have an Aussie ham license either]

>> This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.
>
>...and despite your self-declared several decades interest in amateur
>radio, you have yet to show enough interest to become a participant.

Oh? Did you miss something in the past six years of messaging
in here? I've been a professional involved with radio and radio
communications. Interesting work. Paid well, too. I've
communicated on frequencies you aren't allowed to as a "licensed
amateur" or even as a State Department government employee.
:-)

Didn't need a bit of manual telegraphy skills or licensing (as an
amateur) to do any of that.

Where is it "written" that I have to demonstrate some "interest in radio" to the Great Heil?

You DEMAND amateur radio license acquisition in order to state anything on amateur radio regulations in here.

You should make public your "authorization" to make such demands.

Without that "authorization" you are just another bitchy whining complainer who can't hack any real discussion beyond the "official" words on amateur-radio-as-it-used-to-was when you first engaged in that hobby.

Without that "authorization" you are just another SS-wannabe who wants nothing more than to fight anyone who doesn't agree with your "orders" posted on this bulletin board. In other words, just another disagreeable gunnery nurse (but without bedpan).

Until you show your "authorization," you'll have to discuss it with the only Real Authority on this newsgroup, Paul Schleck. Hint: he is a licensed radio amateur of Amateur Extra rank.

What you seem to want this newsgroup to become is just another Chat Room where like-minded dittyboppers can commiserate in a mental commisary all about "real hams" (who know and love morse code) and follow the League's orders explicitly, complete with all the jargon and standards and practices of 1930's amateur radio.

Meanwhile, this newsgroup is still unmoderated and open to anyone with Internet access. No doubt you will redouble your efforts to put down anyone who doesn't think like you do and DEMAND certain things in order to satisfy your "authorized" orders. Pthththththth.

3333333

LHA / WMD

4151. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 20:34:47 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <ff5qa0dq3kpc2mooj1miq1nk7v9ffglsch@4ax.com>
Source record: 92212

On Thu, 20 May 2004 13:26:51 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote:

>I just did a google search on the phrase "phone ops are lids in the
>group" and only your message came back. I don't believe Dan said "phone
>ops are lids in the group".
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>

For the sake of getting things straight, guys, the statement Dan made
was as follows:

"I actually do consider ALUN a lid. Because he has stated he is a
phone operator ONLY. To me that is a lid."

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

4152. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 20:38:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405201238.681ee3fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92213

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040520004902.21890.00001294@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist to
> >want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid of
> >it are world class fools.
>
> The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD GOT RID OF TELEGRAPHY.

"THE REST OF THE RADIO WORLD" is NOT "Amateur Radio"

The purpose, practice and applications are NOT the same.

> Are all those other radio services "fools" that they got rid of
> radiotelegraphy?

Those "other radio services" are NOT "Amateur Radio".

> I guess you think so. <shrug>
>
> How's your therapy coming along?

Why is it that everyone who disagrees with you allegedly needs
"therapy"..?

It might be because YOU need it and are trying to deny it by
alledging everyone BUT you needs it.

Naaaaaaa...you're just a putz. Proven.

Steve, K4YZ

4153. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 22:07:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <h_9rc.23251$KE6.20964@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92214
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

What happened 'putz'? Did you sneak out of your booby bin again?

Crawl back under your rock. Better yet go somewhere and die.

Dan/W4NTI

"Len Over 21" wrote in message
news:20040520004728.21890.00001293@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article ,
> "Dan/W4NTI" writes:
>
> >"Alun" wrote in message
> >news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key
and
> >> > a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> You'll have to do better than that
> >
> >I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a real
> >ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.
>
> Poor baby. Therapy not coming along well, is it?
>
> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>
> This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.
>
>
> >Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure
you
> >will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with you and
> >your problem. However, I am not that person.
>
> We can sense your differences. And bigotry. And frustration.
>
> Without the telegraphy test, an Amateur Extra has no real
> self-perceived elitism over all other amateurs. It must be a
> great blow to self-esteem to face the loss of status and rank.
>
> >Have a good day.

>
> Interesting. A Noo Yawker from the "south." :-)
>
> LHA / WMD
>

4154. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 22:08:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <a%9rc.23252$KE6.3654@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92215

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>
> That is incorrect, Leonard. A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur
> radio license. You don't. You have no stake whatever in amateur radio.
>
> > This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.
>
> ...and despite your self-declared several decades interest in amateur
> radio, you have yet to show enough interest to become a participant.
>
> Dave K8MN

The words out. Whenever he tried to test the people in the white suits and
the butterfly nets got their first.

Dan/W4NTI

4155. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 22:09:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <10arc.23253$KE6.16783@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92216

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94EF265C2AB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:I%Rqc.15332$zO3.3168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key
> >> > and a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> You'll have to do better than that
> >
> > I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a
> > real ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.
> >
> > Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure
> > you will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with
> > you and your problem. However, I am not that person.
> >
> > Have a good day.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> You are the one with the problem

Because you say so? I think not.

Dan/W4NTI

4156. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 22:10:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <c1arc.23256$KE6.3655@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92217

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:ff5qa0dq3kpc2mooj1miq1nk7v9ffglsch@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 20 May 2004 13:26:51 GMT, "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I just did a google search on the phrase "phone ops are lids in the
> >group" and only your message came back. I don't believe Dan said "phone
> >ops are lids in the group".
> >
> >73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> For the sake of getting things straight, guys, the statement Dan made
> was as follows:
>
> "I actually do consider ALUN a lid. Because he has stated he is a
> phone operator ONLY. To me that is a lid."
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> Tonawanda, New York

And I still say that.

Dan/W4NTI

4157. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 22:10:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405201410.5a032142@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92218

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> >
> > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> >
> >
> >
> > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> >
> >
> > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist to
> want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid of
> it are world class fools.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

DAN, Dan, dan, it is the -EXAM- that we are getting rid of. If we got
rid of the psk practical exam, would you think we are trying to get
rid of the mode?

4158. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 23:11:09 UTC
From: Vic <jimmyjib@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <2h4s8dF97g6gU1@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Try www.teletest.co.uk

4159. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 23:20:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405201520.466b2282@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92220

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040519225023.13152.00001754@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0405191416.651297f6@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040517154157.11380.00001756@mb-m18.aol.com>...

> >But it is important to have a back-up for certain communications. The
> >"Base Support Team" concept is fairly well thought through.
>
> MARS is "backup?" For what, Special Services? USO?

Watch out, Your Scumminess...your lack of practical experience is
showing...

> In today's battlefield...(SNIP)

MARS is not, never was and never will be intended for "today's
battlefield".

I know that it's almost impossible for you to maintain relevance
while trolling, but please try and exceed our expectations JUST
ONCE...

> MARS "might" be a good backup for civilian organization liason
> such as REAL emergency interface with FEMA, etc., but it is an
> old thing that never adapted beyond 1954. If nothing else, a few
> MARS volunteers get to take home military commo equipment
> that was declared surplus. Real green machines they can play
> with...that the taxpayers once owned.

No "might" to it, Lennie...

Again...lack of experience...

> >And wasn't Steve in the U.S. Marine Corps? Shouldn't he have already
> >known that? What he do with all that service time? Play
> >tiddly-winks?
>
> He sure wasn't in any military commo work. He can't name a single
> military radio by either nomenclature or familiar name. Not even a
> "plugger" (AN/PSN-11 GPS receiver).

Too bad for you, Lennie.
>
> I'm having a great deal of difficulty in thinking he was ever IN the USMC.

You were once given my MOS's, dates of service, etc, both in this forum and in private e-mail.

You have again been given adequate information to call the VA yourself and verify my service.

Of course you won't...It would validate your liar status, even to you.

> If he was born in 1955 as he says (I'd already made E-5 then,
> working on microwave terminals), then he could have enlisted at 18,
> making that 1973 (I was a senior staff engineer at RCA EASD in
> Van Nuys, CA, then). If he did about 18 years in the corpse, then he
> got his medical discharge about 1991. [if he did a full 20 it was 1993]

Still not paying attention, Lennie...

As if THAT was a surprise...

> Supposedly he got out on a medical "due to an accident." Okay, so
> if the accident resulted in physical damage to curtail a USMC career
> completion, how come for why he got a private pilot's rating? Did the
> FAA "dumb down" the private pilot physical?

Nope.

> The progression doesn't add up or make any logical routing. The
> REAL story hasn't come out yet.

Sure it has. And it's made a liar out of you several times over.
Oh well...Sucks to be you.

> Now we await what form the next spasm of hate and outrage will
> take as the intrepid ace vomits more personal insults.

Nope. No "spasm"...That's YOUR schtick.

And it's not an "insult" if it's true.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4160. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 23:25:29 UTC
From: tony sayer <tony@bancom.co.uk>
Message-ID: <U9$mxIBp5TrAFwye@bancom.co.uk>
Source record: 92221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

In article <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>, Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)
<d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> writes
>Hi guys,
>
>From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
>transmitter with the following characteristics:
>
>
>
>* very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
>
>* small size
>
>* transmits mono audio and colour video
>
>* transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
>MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either 800Mhz,
>1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What I'm
>after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz
>certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV
>transmission)!
>
>* available in the UK
>
>* costs less than 150 UK pounds
>
>* comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.
>
>
>
>Many thanks for your help,
>Jack
>
>
>PS
>Sorry for sending to so many newsgroups. I've spent bloody ages trying to
>find a solution but with no luck yet so I'm eager to get as much advice as
>possible.
>
>
>
>
>

Contact Giles at www.G1MFG.com he does some small cheap 2.4 Ghz modules that you can put on frequencies around that band beware the odd police helicopter etc!.

Or ask him if he can do you a couple on 1394 MHz which is a licence exempt band with is intended for CCTV applications and hardly anyone uses it. You are supposed to use "approved" equipment but if your on frequency and don't use more than 500 milliwatts ERP then you shouldn't be troubled. Ofcom officers have better things to do:)

Or you could use a TV VCR type modulator and put the output of that into a small aerial amp and use a multi element Yagi TV aerial and that should carry a short distance. Chose a "quiet" channel in your area. Not that I'd suggest for a moment you break the WT act of course:!

--
Tony Sayer

4161. cmsg cancel <U9$mxIBp5TrAFwye@bancom.co.uk>

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 23:36:57 UTC
From: tony sayer <tony@bancom.co.uk>
Message-ID: <l6jaw7BZEUrAFwk1@bancom.co.uk>
Source record: 92201
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

```
Article cancel issued by author because ... [give the reason for the
cancel]
```

4162. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-20 23:39:05 UTC
From: tony sayer <tony@bancom.co.uk>
Message-ID: <Y6zVwHCZGUrAFwjy@bancom.co.uk>
Source record: 92222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

In article <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>, Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)
<d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> writes
>Hi guys,
>
>From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
>transmitter with the following characteristics:
>
>
>
>* very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
>
>* small size
>
>* transmits mono audio and colour video
>
>* transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
>MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either 800Mhz,
>1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What I'm
>after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz
>certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV
>transmission)!
>
>* available in the UK
>
>* costs less than 150 UK pounds
>
>* comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.
>
>
>
>Many thanks for your help,
>Jack
>
>
>PS
>Sorry for sending to so many newsgroups. I've spent bloody ages trying to
>find a solution but with no luck yet so I'm eager to get as much advice as
>possible.
>
>
>
>
>

Contact Giles at www.G1MFG.com he does some small cheap 2.4 Ghz modules that you can put on frequencies around that band beware the odd police helicopter etc!.

Or ask him if he can do you a couple on 1394 MHz which is a licence exempt band with is intended for CCTV applications and hardly anyone uses it. You are supposed to use "approved" equipment but if your on frequency and don't use more than 500 milliwatts ERP then you shouldn't be troubled. Ofcom officers have better things to do:)

You can buy equipment for this use but I think its a bit more expensive. AFAIK there aren't legal bands for TV transmission on 800 MHz.

Can you say what you want it for at all?...
--
Tony Sayer

4163. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 03:23:07 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EFEDA754187elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92223

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:vm2rc.3350$be.3117
@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> He said that phone ops are lids in the group. He tried to backtrack on
>> that, but google preserves his words indefinitely.
>
> I just did a google search on the phrase "phone ops are lids in the
> group" and only your message came back. I don't believe Dan said "phone
> ops are lids in the group".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
```

Hans, what I meant was he said "phone ops are lids" in the group, not that he said "phone ops are lids in the group". Obviously I need to spell things out for you to get it.

Here is his original post (in quotes below):-

```
> From: Dan/W4NTI (w4nti@get_rid_of_this_mindspring.com)
> Subject: Re: Morse and Contests
>
> View this article only
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2004-05-01 14:32:13 PST
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0405010815.9379c5d@posting.google.com...
>>
>>
>> Perhaps someone can explain a certain operating habit I hear on Field
>> Day - but only one 'phone:
>>
>> I hear most FD 'phone ops repeating the *received* exchange. That is,
>> you'll hear:
>>
>> "November Two Echo Yankee from November Three Kilo Zed, roger your One
>> Bravo Eastern Pennsylvania, OK on your 1B EPA, please copy my three
>> alfa ...."
```

>>
>> Why do so many deem it necessary to tell me what I just told them?
>> Heck, I know what class and section I'm in!
>>
>> On CW, the single letter "R" does the job, and some ops don't even
>> bother with the R - they send their exchange as an indication that
>> they got yours. Or they send "TU" - (thank you) which does the job of
>> "roger" and "73" both.
>>
>> --
>>
>> One other point: Neither FD nor SS have the signal report as part of
>> the contact. FD is callsign, section and class, SS is serial number,
>> class, callsign, check and section, plus date and time which you don't
>> have to send but which are part of the required logging.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Well Jim, I think it means that phone ops are lids and real hams do it
with
> continous wave.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

So now you can all see, he said exactly what I said he did.

4164. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 03:27:17 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92224

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:10arc.23253$KE6.16783@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94EF265C2AB2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:I%Rqc.15332$zO3.3168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94EE22EE9DE3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >>
>> >> > Back when I was giving CW tests for the license exams I used a key
>> >> > and a oscillator. So there is your arguement shot down.
>> >> >
>> >> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> You'll have to do better than that
>> >
>> > I understand it is difficult for you to understand how it is to be a
>> > real ham. You know one that knows and uses other modes than phone.
>> >
>> > Again you will simply have to learn to deal with that Alun. I am sure
>> > you will find someone out there that will agree, and simpathize with
>> > you and your problem. However, I am not that person.
>> >
>> > Have a good day.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> You are the one with the problem
>
> Because you say so? I think not.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

>

Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to sympathise
with "my problem", because I don't have one.

4165. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 05:38:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92225

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
> > >
> > >That is incorrect, Leonard.
>
> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
> Dan. :-)
>
> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
>
> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)

Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides by
1930s standards and practices"?

> The FCC regulations don't define "ham" at all. The FDA does.

> >You have no stake whatever in amateur radio.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. All you want to do in here (which is newsgrouping,
> not amateur radio) is drive a stake through any heart that doesn't
> beat to the rhythm of classical radiotelegraphy in amateur radio.

You've told us on numerous occasions all you want to do here. You never
seem to get around to doing what you've stated. Now you'd like to tell
me all I want to do. I've not stated all I want to do here so your
comments are conjecture on your part. Take your pick, Leonard:
classical telegraphy, classical SSB, classical AM phone. You aren't
doing any of them in amateur radio. You aren't a participant.

> >> This is the year 2004, over 6 decades later.
> > >
> > >...and despite your self-declared several decades interest in amateur
> > >radio, you have yet to show enough interest to become a participant.
>
> Oh? Did you miss something in the past six years of messaging
> in here? I've been a professional involved with radio and radio
> communications. Interesting work. Paid well, too. I've
> communicated on frequencies you aren't allowed to as a "licensed
> amateur" or even as a State Department government employee.
> :-)

1. I wrote "amateur radio". You're drifting off into a description of
your past professional radio experience once again.

2. I don't really care where on which frequencies you communicated as a
professional.

3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
U.S. Department of State.

> Didn't need a bit of manual telegraphy skills or licensing (as an
> amateur) to do any of that.

You wouldn't need any to obtain the most basic amateur radio license in
the U.S. either.

> Where is it "written" that I have to demonstrate some "interest in
> radio" to the Great Heil?

I didn't write anything about "some interest in radio".

> You DEMAND amateur radio license acquisition in order to state
> anything on amateur radio regulations in here.

I've DEMANDed nothing. I continue to point out that you have nothing to
do with amateur radio as a participant or a regulator.

> You should make public your "authorization" to make such demands.

You should look up the definition of the word "demand".

> Without that "authorization" you are just another bitchy whining
> complainer who can't hack any real discussion beyond the "official"
> words on amateur-radio-as-it-used-to-was when you first engaged
> in that hobby.

Wrong-o, Pops. I'm a licensed radio amateur. I have a vested interest
in any changes in regulations involving amateur radio license testing or
amateur radio operation. You, on the other hand...

> Without that "authorization" you are just another SS-wannabe who
> wants nothing more than to fight anyone who doesn't agree with
> your "orders" posted on this bulletin board. In other words, just
> another disagreeable gunnery nurse (but without bedpan).

"Fight"? "Orders"? If we were fighting, you'd best pack a lunch and
rest up beforehand, old timer. I haven't issued any orders.

> Until you show your "authorization," you'll have to discuss it with
> the only Real Authority on this newsgroup, Paul Schleck. Hint:
> he is a licensed radio amateur of Amateur Extra rank.

I'll have to discuss what with Paul Schleck?

> What you seem to want this newsgroup to become is just another
> Chat Room where like-minded dittyboppers can commiserate in a
> mental commisary all about "real hams" (who know and love morse
> code) and follow the League's orders explicitly, complete with all

> the jargon and standards and practices of 1930's amateur radio.

You aren't wrapped very tight.

> Meanwhile, this newsgroup is still unmoderated and open to anyone
> with Internet access. No doubt you will redouble your efforts to put
> down anyone who doesn't think like you do and DEMAND certain
> things in order to satisfy your "authorized" orders. Pthththththth.

No DEMANDs have been made of you, Len. You continue to post. I'll
continue to point out your lack of anything to do with amateur radio.
You've certainly kept mum about your childlike antics exemplified by
some of your comments to the FCC. Wanna discuss those?

Dave K8MN

4166. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 09:28:35 UTC
From: "Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk>
Message-ID: <c8ki2d$2vos$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>
Source record: 92226
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Hello,

tony sayer wrote:
> Can you say what you want it for at all?...

Sure. I need to built a wearable, covert video camera & transmitter. The camera, battery and TX all need to live in a hat and last for 16 hours without changing the battery. The receiver will be carried in a bag and will connect to a Riviera hard disk AV recorder.

It's for a psychology experiment. Nothing dodgy.

Many thanks for all the excellent help,
Jack

"tony sayer" <tony@bancom.co.uk> wrote in message
news:Y6zVwHCZGUrAFwjy@bancom.co.uk...
> In article <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>, Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)
> <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> writes
> >Hi guys,
> >
> >From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
> >transmitter with the following characteristics:
> >
> >
> >
> >* very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
> >
> >* small size
> >
> >* transmits mono audio and colour video
> >
> >* transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
> >MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either
800Mhz,
> >1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the UK. What
I'm
> >after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the spectrum. 2.4GHz
> >certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones, microwaves, AV
> >transmission)!
> >
> >* available in the UK
> >
> >* costs less than 150 UK pounds
> >

> >* comes with a compatible RX which also has very low power consumption.
> >
> >
> >
> >Many thanks for your help,
> >Jack
> >
> >
> >PS
> >Sorry for sending to so many newsgroups. I've spent bloody ages trying
to
> >find a solution but with no luck yet so I'm eager to get as much advice
as
> >possible.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Contact Giles at www.G1MFG.com he does some small cheap 2.4 Ghz modules
> that you can put on frequencies around that band beware the odd police
> helicopter etc!.
>
> Or ask him if he can do you a couple on 1394 MHz which is a licence
> exempt band with is intended for CCTV applications and hardly anyone
> uses it. You are supposed to use "approved" equipment but if your on
> frequency and don't use more than 500 milliwatts ERP then you shouldn't
> be troubled. Ofcom officers have better things to do:)
>
> You can buy equipment for this use but I think its a bit more expensive.
> AFAIK there aren't legal bands for TV transmission on 800 MHz.
>
> Can you say what you want it for at all?...
> --
> Tony Sayer
>

4167. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 09:43:11 UTC
From: "Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk>
Message-ID: <c8kitq$fl2$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>
Source record: 92227
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Dear Dave,

Many thanks for your reply. Do you have a URL for "Black Box"? I've had a look on Google but no joy. And unfortunately my subscription to The Knowledge Online has just expired.

Thanks,
Jack.

"Dave Plowman" <dave.sound@argonet.co.uk> wrote in message news:4cb22b7083dave.sound@argonet.co.uk...
> In article <c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>,
> Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
> > From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
> > transmitter with the following characteristics:
>
>
>
> > * very low power consumption (<70mA), ideally running at below 7.4volts
>
> > * small size
>
> > * transmits mono audio and colour video
>
> > * transmits outside the spectrum used by WiFi (802.11b/g uses 2401-2483
> > MHz). In practice I guess this means the video tx must use either
> > 800Mhz, 1400Mhz, 2300Mhz or 5800Mhz. It must be legal for use in the
> > UK. What I'm after is a video TX that uses a "quiet" part of the
> > spectrum. 2.4GHz certainly aint quiet (wifi, digital cordless phones,
> > microwaves, AV transmission)!
>
> Check with Black Box. They do a system to feed a director's monitor on
> location. Works pretty well. No idea about cost, though.
>
> --
> *Why is the third hand on the watch called a second hand?
>
> Dave Plowman dave.sound@argonet.co.uk London SW 12
> RIP Acorn

4168. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 12:05:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405210405.6d5fcc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92228

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> > >
> > > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> > >
> > >
> > > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely for
> > the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty crowded
> > place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
> any
> > CW sub-bands.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the exclusive
> subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.
>
> I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.

We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.

I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:

CW-only subbands:

160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz

30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz

Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good operating practice.

Why not?

You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the nocodetest folks...

73 de Jim, N2EY

4169. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 12:23:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92229

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040519184816.17253.00001529@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (the gunnery nurse presently off his medications again) writes:

> > It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
> >Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.
>
> Incorrect. MARS functions - at its core - through military personnel
> who man the headquarters such as Fort Huachuca, AZ, for the
> Army and Scott AFB, IL, for the Air Force. Various military branch
> net control stations around the country and the globe are manned
> by military personnel who do NOT have to be licensed radio
> amateurs.

As usual, only partially correct...more wrong than ocrrect.

Those programs are headquartered at the locations you cited.
Good job.

Those programs, beyond those confines, are mangaged by, conducted
by, and are "staffed" by volunteer licensed Amateur Radio operators.

I had already acknowledged that there are military personnel
assigned to certain MARS stations.

However those "net control stations" will have a hard time
"controlling" ANYthing if there was no one there to control.

Rest of usual "if you yell louder they will understand you"
trolling snipped.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

4170. French F1/F4 callsigns on HF bands

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 13:19:24 UTC
From: Daniel fy1fv <daniel.fy1fv@ouanadou.fr>
Message-ID: <c8kvkt$5g7$1@news-reader5.wanadoo.fr>
Source record: 92234

Hi,
The decree which permit F1/F4 callsigns to operate on HF bands in accordance with WRC-03 recommendations had been published on Official Journal of French Republic on Sunday, May 16th. You can see this information on REF's web site : www.ref-union.org (Click on English Flag thumbnail to translate)
Best 73's
Daniel, FY1FV

4171. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 13:28:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40AE0403.1010905@psu.edu>
Source record: 92235

N2EY wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>>>>
>>>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>>>>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely for
>>>the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty crowded
>>>place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
>>
>> any
>>
>>>CW sub-bands.
>>>
>>>73 de Bert
>>>WA2SI
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the exclusive
>>subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.
>>
>>I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
>
>
> We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.

>
> I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
>
> CW-only subbands:
>
> 160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
> 80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
> 40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
> 30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
> 20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
> 17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
> 15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
> 12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
> 10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
>
> Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
> all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
> subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
> operating practice.
>
> Why not?
>
> You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
> nocodetest folks...

Sorry Jim, they are busy with trying to lower the test requirements right now.

After all the Technicians are freebied up to General, they'll turn their attentions to those pesky and annoying gentleman's agreements for CW portions.

I'll bet you a pepperoni and cheese pizza that their bandplans will look quite different than yours. Theirs will be much simpler!

The rationale will be that it is SO much trouble for people to keep within bandplans that it is a big headache for hams to keep track of where they are supposed to be. And why do those CW people get half our bands anyhow?

The most amusing part will be when Carl and Bill show up with their spin on how it *isn't* a spectrum grab.

But you know, I suspect that in the brave new world of post-restructuring ARS, that the new hams will simply do squatters rights on the bandplan. It's only an agreement, so what can we do if they decide to work there?

I wonder when the first CW segment SSB contest will be held?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4172. Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 13:44:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <LInrc.4504$be.269@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92236

Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of ARRL in response to the BPL threat? Below is part of some correspondence I sent to my Division Director. If you feel it's time for more sound science and less hand-wringing, you should let YOUR Director know.

- -

Jay,

I understand all the arguments against BPL rollout and I agree with 98% of them. I also agreee that ARRL ought to mount the strongest possible technical rebuttal to relaxation of Part 15 rules. To that end the work of Ed Hare, et.al. is dead on target. I personally authorize you to double the amount of my dues to support sound science-based work which generates a technically convincing rebuttal to Michael Powell and his minions.

But this amateurish "whipping up the troops to write letters to the White House" and similar tactics are embarrassing. The typical ham (I'm sorry to report) hasn't the technical accumen to make any sort of persuasive case against BPL, so their protests take on the whining tone of "you can't do this to us because we do all this good stuff on HF.".

As someone with a lot of professional contacts in the wireless industry, I can tell you that our public and regulatory image is on a swift decline. We are increasing viewed as technically naive kneejerk obstructionists. For every Ed Hare doing good technical investigation and writing convincing counter arguments, there are thousands of clueless emotional emails and letters irresponsibly stoked up by Dave Sumner editorials. The valuable and responsible work of Ed Hare gets lost in the "noise and fury".

73, de Hans, K0HB

4173. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 14:16:26 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c8l2vq$8ks$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 92237
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
>
>Sure. I need to built a wearable, covert video camera & transmitter. The
>camera, battery and TX all need to live in a hat and last for 16 hours
>without changing the battery. The receiver will be carried in a bag and
>will connect to a Riviera hard disk AV recorder.

Sheesh! Why didn't you say that? What you want is a covert pack kit.
Markertek Video Supply (www.markertek.com) sells the V2CMS package for
$125 which uses the 2.4 GHz ISM band.

I do warn you that the system does have some problems dealing with large
amounts of rapid movement between the receiver and transmitter. At such
a high frequency, multipath effects get weird.

And I don't know if any of this stuff is legal to operate in the UK, or
who manufactures the unit for Markertek.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

4174. Re: High-el and his lavender lads run away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 15:40:28 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0405210740.17654391@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92238

In article <c8h0js$51b$0@pita.alt.net>
"Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> wrote:
>
>
>
> "anon" <anon@angstnets.net> wrote in message
> news:c8gpn2nvp0@pita.alt.net...
> Roger, Do share with us exactly what it is that you "won."

Wrong guess, AGAIN, LARDASS Lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllloyd.

> Well, he "wins" the contest for losing the most ISP's in two years!

BWHAHAHAHAHAHA.....you are such an imbecile, Davies.

>
> "An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
> news:482d770712019676a8b90f8974c55f1a@aonymous.poster...
> > And I win again!!!
> >
> > Mua HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> >

Good troll. You got them to 1) bite 2) Think it was somebody who it wasn't.

4175. Re: Dumbass hi-el was molested when he was a kid

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 15:42:44 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0405210742.330d355e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92239

In article <77Wqc.6011$YB6.494@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
300 pound LARDASS "Lloyd Davies - The Time Lord" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
whined as usual:

>
> "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
> news:a298df7b17cf510a0df483cdda949af0@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> > >and leave Dave Heil and myself alone!
> > >
> > You brought this into here, by posting as "Tim" and bringing Dave Heil
> > into this. He wouldn't have been brought into this if you hadn't brought
> > all this up, lardass!
> > >
>
> I only post with my name on my posts,

That is a lie. You even posted as Dave Heil on that board.

> unlike you, who is a mealy-mouthed coward who uses remailers....

BWHAHAHAHAHA...that's rich, "proxy boy." Go ahead, slit your wrists,
fatty. You know you've tried to before.

> Grow up!

Follow your *own* advice and go change your depends.

4176. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 15:50:37 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94F0783CD3E7Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92240

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:40AE0403.1010905@psu.edu:

> N2EY wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>
>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>>news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>>news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
>>>>
>>>>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>>>>>
>>>>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that
>>>>>they could get on the air and only associate with like minded
>>>>>individuals?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>>>>>
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely
>>>>for the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty
>>>>crowded place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn
>>>>CW won't be on
>>>
>>> any
>>>
>>>>CW sub-bands.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Bert
>>>>WA2SI
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the
>>>exclusive subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.
>>>

>>>I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
>>
>>
>> We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.
>>
>> I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
>>
>> CW-only subbands:
>>
>> 160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
>> 80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
>> 40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
>> 30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
>> 20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
>> 17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
>> 15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
>> 12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
>> 10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
>>
>> Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
>> all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
>> subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
>> operating practice.
>>
>> Why not?
>>
>> You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
>> nocodetest folks...
>
>
> Sorry Jim, they are busy with trying to lower the test
> requirements
> right now.
>
> After all the Technicians are freebied up to General, they'll turn
> their attentions to those pesky and annoying gentleman's agreements for
> CW portions.
>
> I'll bet you a pepperoni and cheese pizza that their bandplans
> will
> look quite different than yours. Theirs will be much simpler!
>
> The rationale will be that it is SO much trouble for people to
> keep
> within bandplans that it is a big headache for hams to keep track of
> where they are supposed to be. And why do those CW people get half our
> bands anyhow?
>
> The most amusing part will be when Carl and Bill show up with
> their

> spin on how it *isn't* a spectrum grab.
>
> But you know, I suspect that in the brave new world of
> post-restructuring ARS, that the new hams will simply do squatters
> rights on the bandplan. It's only an agreement, so what can we do if
> they decide to work there?
>
> I wonder when the first CW segment SSB contest will be held?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

I've never pretended I don't want more phone spectrum, but there again, I have no connection with NCI either.

There are a couple of different issues here, and they are getting mixed up. As a phone operator, it annoys me that the FCC rules give me _smaller_ subbands than in the gentleman's agreement known as the IARU Region 2 (North & South America) bandplan (not the one drawn up by the Antiquated Radio Relay League, which of course is a subset of the FCC rules, as they couldn't very well suggest illegal operation).

Repealing code testing will put more people on HF who don't do CW, although some of them will be into PSK31, etc., so there will be more pressure to do something about this. I actually agree that NCI is not the appropriate vehicle for that, unless the name were changed? I also agree that they said they would go away when they won, but I'm not them.

From the CW perspective, no doubt the CW segments of any bandplan are less than the sum total of the FCC CW and data allocations, but the data guys have to have somewhere to go! Do you really need CW only segments to protect yourselves from them? (I don't know the answer, this is a genuine question, and I'm not a data person so I really have no axe to grind).

If you do think that, and that may be a reasonable position to take, I only have one point of disagreement. Above 1842 is available to phone in the 160m bandplan, and no I'm not talking about the League, I mean the IARU bandplan again. Since 1810-1850 is the amateur exclusive part of the band, it just wouldn't be right for all of that to be reserved for CW (although you could have more CW somewhere else as far as I am concerned). 8 kHz is not too much to ask for as a DX window for phone, and at least the FCC doesn't prohibit it even of the League have failed to recognise it. If you ask the FCC to prohibit phone there, then you can be sure I will file a comment to the contrary.

Alun, N3KIP

4177. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 16:22:43 UTC
From: "Airy R. Bean" <ariy.r.bean@lycos.co.uk>
Message-ID: <2h6tgdF9jo72U3@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Since you have chosen to SPAM a Ham (poetic?) group,
the best video TX that meets your requirement is the one
that you design and build for yourself.

"Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote in message
news:c8iro6$22us$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk...
> From your vast collective knowledge, please could you recommend a video
> transmitter with the following characteristics:

4178. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 16:49:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405210849.3b61988f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92241

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>...
> If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>
> Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......

> Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>
> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>
The short answer is "because we're not 'elitist snobs' and our feet
are not 'firmly planted in the past'

The longer, more accurate answer is that it's not as simple as some
folks would like you to think.

For some, it really is "just about the code test". But for others, the
real issue is something variously called 'standards' or
'achievements'. That's where the real disagreement is. And it comes
out in a whole bunch of ways.

For example, how often have you heard the buzzphrases "it's a hobby"
or "it's just a hobby" or similar, given as an argument against some
requirement or another? Think about what the person pushing those
phrases really means. They're usually *not* saying "it's not a job".
Instead, what they're really saying is "don't expect much" or even
"don't expect anything".

Look at how the *written* exams have changed over the years, despite
claims that "it's just about the code test". Yet we have vocal support
for free upgrades and further written test reductions.

Did you see the article on "is training class efficient?" which
detailed a one-day-to-Tech cram course? They boasted an 85% success
rate - meaning that after just one day of class, 85% of their students
passed the Tech test. This was done by rote memorization of the
written exam question pool. Is this really what's best for the future
of the ARS? Some folks think so!

When you see arguments for "one class of license" ask "with what
requirements?" - but don't hold your breath waiting for an answer.

When you see people railing about "standards and requirements of the
1930s", ask what they propose as the "standards and requirements of
the 2000s" - but again, don't hold your breath waiting for a detailed
answer.

Some folks don't think there should be *any* standards or requirements beyond a bare bones set of rules and regs from FCC. Of course we know what happens in a radio service where that is the norm. It isn't pretty.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4179. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 16:54:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40AE3463.5090308@psu.edu>
Source record: 92242

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of ARRL
> in response to the BPL threat? Below is part of some correspondence I
> sent to my Division Director. If you feel it's time for more sound
> science and less hand-wringing, you should let YOUR Director know.
>
> -
>
> Jay,
>
> I understand all the arguments against BPL rollout and I agree with 98%
> of them. I also agreee that ARRL ought to mount the strongest possible
> technical rebuttal to relaxation of Part 15 rules. To that end the work
> of Ed Hare, et.al. is dead on target. I personally authorize you to
> double the amount of my dues to support sound science-based work which
> generates a technically convincing rebuttal to Michael Powell and his
> minions.
>
> But this amateurish "whipping up the troops to write letters to the
> White House" and similar tactics are embarrassing. The typical ham (I'm
> sorry to report) hasn't the technical accumen to make any sort of
> persuasive case against BPL, so their protests take on the whining tone
> of "you can't do this to us because we do all this good stuff on HF.".
>
> As someone with a lot of professional contacts in the wireless industry,
> I can tell you that our public and regulatory image is on a swift
> decline. We are increasing viewed as technically naive kneejerk
> obstructionists. For every Ed Hare doing good technical investigation
> and writing convincing counter arguments, there are thousands of
> clueless emotional emails and letters irresponsibly stoked up by Dave
> Sumner editorials. The valuable and responsible work of Ed Hare gets
> lost in the "noise and fury".

Hey Hans,

Once upon a time, in my naivety, I thought a good sound technical rebuttal of BPL would be sufficient to sway the regulators. After all, it is so technically awful that it *should* be easy to convince an intelligent person without much difficulty that it is a loser technology. Certainly other countries around the world have agreed it is such.

My old opinion can be googled up here. But times have changed.

I think the decision was made a long time ago based on other than technical reasons, and BPL *will* be rolled out, and I don't think there is one thing that we can do about it, save for the ballot box.

BPL is going to happen! All money spent fighting it, all letters to representatives, all comments to the FCC and all the hand wringing is 100 percent useless.

I am pegging my hopes on BPL being the failure that it will inevitably be. The utilities will run the fibers, start running the BPL portion of the lines, and after they find out how many of their transformers are putting out trash that interferes with the digital signal,(check the FCC actions on arrl.org to see how good the utilities are at replacing noisy transformers) and after the BPL users figure out that cable is faster and DSL is more reliable anyhow, BPL will become the 8 track of the internet.

Then what will happen is that they will step back, take a look, and figure out that they already have 95 percent of the job finished. The fiber is almost to the houses! simply run it the rest of the way, and LIB! decent speed internet connections! If the ill educated consumers at the other end want to they can go wireless, so they don't even have to connect their machines to a outlet in the wall.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4180. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:03:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92244

In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040519184816.17253.00001529@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (the gunnery nurse presently off his medications again) writes:
>
>> > It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
>> >Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.
>>
>> Incorrect. MARS functions - at its core - through military personnel
>> who man the headquarters such as Fort Huachuca, AZ, for the
>> Army and Scott AFB, IL, for the Air Force. Various military branch
>> net control stations around the country and the globe are manned
>> by military personnel who do NOT have to be licensed radio
>> amateurs.
>
> As usual, only partially correct...more wrong than ocrrect.

"Ocrrect?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!

You don't seem to understand that.

I can't make it any simpler. MARS IS MILITARY.

MARS is NOT amateur.

MARS doesn't operate ON amateur radio frequencies.

MARS doesn't use amateur radio callsigns.

MARS has its own callsigns.

Amateurs can't use MARS callsigns IN amateur radio.

> Those programs are headquartered at the locations you cited.
>Good job.

What is "good" about doing a simple, one-time search?

YOU were unable to do the same simple task in three weeks.

BAD JOB to you, Oddjob-wannabe.

> Those programs, beyond those confines, are mangaged by, conducted
>by, and are "staffed" by volunteer licensed Amateur Radio operators.

Beyond what "confines?"

Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to operate MARS in amateur
bands?

Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to use amateur call signs
outside of ham bands?

Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to use MARS callsigns IN
ham bands?

> I had already acknowledged that there are military personnel
>assigned to certain MARS stations.

MARS is MILITARY. [that's what the "M" refers to in the acronym]

> However those "net control stations" will have a hard time
>"controlling" ANYthing if there was no one there to control.

If you say so, Man from MARS. :-)

However, it's very easy for a thousand or so MILITARY MARS
personnel to communicate with OTHER military MARS stations,
including inter-service-branch communications.

MARS military stations have the equipment, have the personnel,
have the authorization.

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

You have it really SO WRONG. :-)

No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.

MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

...and that's the way it is.

LHA / WMD

4181. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:09:27 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <2h6utgF9hrniU1@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

"Airy R. Bean, village idiot" <ariy.r.bean@lycos.co.uk> wrote in message
news:2h6tgdF9jo72U3@uni-berlin.de...
> Since you have chosen to SPAM a Ham (poetic?) group,
> the best video TX that meets your requirement is the one
> that you design and build for yourself.
>
Please remind us of anything YOU have 'designed and built for yourself '
that actually works?
...(_!_)...

4182. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:14:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040521141425.19642.00001367@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92246

In article <h_9rc.23251$KE6.20964@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>What happened 'putz'? Did you sneak out of your booby bin again?
>
>Crawl back under your rock. Better yet go somewhere and die.

Nice strength of character and civility you do NOT show,
Danny Boy. :-)

LHA / WMD

4183. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:16:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040521141621.19642.00001368@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92247

In article <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>> >
>> >That is incorrect, Leonard.
>>
>> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
>> Dan. :-)
>>
>> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
>>
>> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
>
>Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides by
>1930s standards and practices"?

I'm not telling you that. All those who trumpet the 1930s standards
and practices do. :-)

You still want to maintain the ancient rules...because you got your
title, rank, status under that archaic standard.

Losing that title, rank, status, even if only to yourself, would be a
mighty blow to your self-esteem. [that's rather obvious]

>> The FCC regulations don't define "ham" at all. The FDA does.

Ham is the butchered meat of swine. :-)

>You've told us on numerous occasions all you want to do here.

I'm doing that. :-)

>You never seem to get around to doing what you've stated.

Less here where it doesn't count for much in the real world.

LOTS more at the FCC where it DOES count.

>Now you'd like to tell me all I want to do.

Nobody can tell Big Dave what to do...he da man! :-)

>I've not stated all I want to do here so your
>comments are conjecture on your part.

All you seem to do in here is bitch, moan, get nasty at folks who
don't agree with you. Not a likeable guy you are. :-)

>Take your pick, Leonard:
>classical telegraphy, classical SSB, classical AM phone. You aren't
>doing any of them in amateur radio. You aren't a participant.

None of THIS newsgrouping IS amateur radio, Big Dave.

The FCC is NOT a "participant" in U.S. amateur radio.

The FCC MAKES the rules and regulations for U.S. amateur radio.

You seem to have a terrible incognizance problem with those two
sentences! [mental Pampers would help you]

>1. I wrote "amateur radio". You're drifting off into a description of
>your past professional radio experience once again.

Boils you down to very pale meat, doesn't it? :-)

>2. I don't really care where on which frequencies you communicated as a
>professional.

You just don't "care" about anything but attempting to triumph over
others in a newsgroup! :-)

>3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
>U.S. Department of State.

Does State have its own MARS-like organization? :-)

Since when did State enter into this discussion...other than you want
to impress your neighbors about your mighty governmental career?

>> Didn't need a bit of manual telegraphy skills or licensing (as an
>> amateur) to do any of that.
>
>You wouldn't need any to obtain the most basic amateur radio license in
>the U.S. either.

I have no need for any amateur radio license. I'm "not a participant,"
remember? :-)

>> Where is it "written" that I have to demonstrate some "interest in
>> radio" to the Great Heil?
>
>I didn't write anything about "some interest in radio".

Now, now, don't get petulant. This isn't a quibble over semantics
or syntax or spelling.

You've written MUCH about the equate of "having an interest in
radio" with amateur radio. You can't deny that. It's in Google all

nice and archived for those so bruised and battered over losing
verbal battles that they have to quote endlessly from it. :-)

>> You DEMAND amateur radio license acquisition in order to state
>> anything on amateur radio regulations in here.
>
>I've DEMANDed nothing. I continue to point out that you have nothing to
>do with amateur radio as a participant or a regulator.

You DEMAND that ALL who "have an interest in radio" become
radio amateurs, all nicely licensed and mentally very important.

You can't deny that. [but you will vainly, and self-importantly try]

>> You should make public your "authorization" to make such demands.
>
>You should look up the definition of the word "demand".

You should take off that Luftwaffe Oberst costume and return it to
Western Casting. Otto Preminger imitations from "Stalag 17" are
outre' and trite, rather old.

>Wrong-o, Pops. I'm a licensed radio amateur. I have a vested interest
>in any changes in regulations involving amateur radio license testing or
>amateur radio operation.

Your "vest" is in bad need of tailoring. The importance of your self
has resulted in an expansion of your mental waist beyond limits.

You are LICENSED! Oh, my. Terribly important you are!

>> Without that "authorization" you are just another SS-wannabe who
>> wants nothing more than to fight anyone who doesn't agree with
>> your "orders" posted on this bulletin board. In other words, just
>> another disagreeable gunnery nurse (but without bedpan).
>
>"Fight"? "Orders"? If we were fighting, you'd best pack a lunch and
>rest up beforehand, old timer. I haven't issued any orders.

Sweetums, if this had been a real physical fight, you wouldn't have
been able to write anydamnthing in here. :-)

>I'll have to discuss what with Paul Schleck?

For starters, your "participation" in this newsgroup.

Do you have a "participation license" granted to you to bitch and
whine and moan in here about those who aren't licensed in
amateurism?

>> What you seem to want this newsgroup to become is just another
>> Chat Room where like-minded dittyboppers can commiserate in a
>> mental commisary all about "real hams" (who know and love morse
>> code) and follow the League's orders explicitly, complete with all
>> the jargon and standards and practices of 1930's amateur radio.

>
>You aren't wrapped very tight.

No problem. You are unable to open packages, gift or otherwise.

>No DEMANDs have been made of you, Len.

Irrelevant since you can't order anyone around, despite your mighty
psycho-war effort to bluff and bluster others off your "licensed"
turf. :-)

>You continue to post.

It's your time you are wasting. No problem for me. :-)

>I'll continue to point out your lack of anything to do with amateur radio.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still into the "turf" thing, aren't you? :-)

>You've certainly kept mum about your childlike antics exemplified by
>some of your comments to the FCC.

What "childlike" antics, little toddler? :-)

Poor baby. Can't take grown-up debate against opposite-to-yours
opinions, can you?

You have to call them "childlike" as if you were a "grown-up" trying
to spank children? [you must have been talking to Dee?]

You seem to have dysfunctional attributes in your "parenting." :-)

>Wanna discuss those?

Not with SS-wannabes like yourself.

The FCC makes and enforces the civil radio regulations in the United
States. If you have an old bone that you think needs gnawing on,
then go make your Comments to the FCC about regulations.

It probably busts your chops no end that actual civilians, citizens of
this country, can actually hold a discussion-debate with government.
You just can't stand it when others have opinions contrary to yours.
You have to call such folks names, denigrate them, pejorate them,
do all you can to stifle independent thought.

Hiram forbid that anyone should think opposite to your god-like
viewpoints! After all, you are federally LICENSED as an amateur!

You are a PARTICIPANT!

Only YOU RULE! ...nobody else allowed to say anydamnthing. :-)

The colonel just loves it when a dictatorial plan comes together...

LHA / WMD

4184. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:18:33 UTC
From: Gareth S Nemisis <nemisis@soldier.org.uk>
Message-ID: <2h6vjpF9c23aU2@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

"Airy R. Bean" <ariy.r.bean@lycos.co.uk> wrote in message
news:2h6tgdF9jo72U3@uni-berlin.de...
> Since you have chosen to SPAM a Ham (poetic?) group,
> the best video TX that meets your requirement is the one
> that you design and build for yourself.
>

Warning "Airy R Bean" real name Gareth Alun Evans is not someone to let near
you radio or other electonic equipment.

In fact, anything more technologically advanced that a flint axe is risky.

4185. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:19:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040521141901.19642.00001369@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92248

In article <1e4e3692.0405201410.5a032142@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
>> > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>> >
>> > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>> > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>> >
>> >
>> > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>> >
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>> >
>>
>> Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist
>to
>> want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid
>of
>> it are world class fools.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
>DAN, Dan, dan, it is the -EXAM- that we are getting rid of. If we got
>rid of the psk practical exam, would you think we are trying to get
>rid of the mode?

He doesn't understand that or cannot comprehend it. :-)

Everyone is a "fool" who is not a radiotelegrapher...

He needs therapy to understand the modern world.

LHA / WMD

4186. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:20:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040521142021.19642.00001370@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92250

In article <5c01b95b.0405201238.681ee3fd@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040520004902.21890.00001294@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>> >>
>> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
>> >
>> >Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being elitist
>to
>> >want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get rid
>of
>> >it are world class fools.
>>
>> The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD GOT RID OF TELEGRAPHY.
>
> "THE REST OF THE RADIO WORLD" is NOT "Amateur Radio"

That's what I wrote. You got it. Finally.

> The purpose, practice and applications are NOT the same.

Yes, quite. The rest of the radio world isn't anal-retentive about radiotelegraphy. They've gone beyond that. :-)

>
>> Are all those other radio services "fools" that they got rid of
>> radiotelegraphy?
>
> Those "other radio services" are NOT "Amateur Radio".

Okay, so where are all the "fools" that Dan was talking about?

Could it be that the "fools" are those IN amateur radio who are championing radiotelegraphy?

[oh, my, what a disturbing thought THAT is! :-)]

>> I guess you think so. <shrug>
>>
>> How's your therapy coming along?
>
> Why is it that everyone who disagrees with you allegedly needs

>"therapy"..?

Dan wants me to go elsewhere and DIE! That's serious mental
aberation.

> It might be because YOU need it and are trying to deny it by
>alledging everyone BUT you needs it.

So far, only yourself and Danny Boy have wanted me DEAD. :-)

I'm far from that...but I'm not wishing that on anyone else.

Primitive sociopaths want all who disagree with them to die or
otherwise disappear. They cannot abide opposite opinions.
Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Naaaaaaa...you're just a putz. Proven.

The gunnery nurse is back off his tranqs into abusive,
uncivil behavior. Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk! :-)

LHA / WMD

4187. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:28:25 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <2h7012F9hrniU6@uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 92251
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

"Gareth S Nemisis" <nemisis@soldier.org.uk> wrote in message
news:2h6vjpF9c23aU2@uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Airy R. Bean" <ariy.r.bean@lycos.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:2h6tgdF9jo72U3@uni-berlin.de...
> > Since you have chosen to SPAM a Ham (poetic?) group,
> > the best video TX that meets your requirement is the one
> > that you design and build for yourself.
> >
>
> Warning "Airy R Bean" real name Gareth Alun Evans is not someone to let
near
> you radio or other electonic equipment.
>
> In fact, anything more technologically advanced that a flint axe is risky.
>
Oh I don't know. I heard he once made a good job of fettling a casting...or
do I mean a different word beginning with 'F'?
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
http://turner-smith.co.uk

4188. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 18:49:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ebsrc.7$PQ.4@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92252

Hello, Hans

I've about made my mind up that it isn't going to be the hams that stop this mess.

Of course, there are other users of low band VHF who may raise a stink (especially once it gives them a problem). I am chuckling over one thought, however. Yes, the BPL industry *claims* that they can put bandpass filters on and largely eliminate nearby interference in a given band (such as amateur bands).

I do have on question. Has anyone else in this group worked in an emc lab? Especially an Open Air Test Site? I have. They are going to have to have one pretty wide *clean* band to be able to test for regulatory compliance. A band that will stretch from well below 10 meters up past our 900 MHz band. They cannot test from inside an anechoic chamber; it must be an open air site. I have seen a number of times that the ambient noise levels were too high to allow testing. I can only imagine what happens if BPL gets pumped through the power lines (street power is, perhaps, 200 feet away). Hopefully, everyone understands that every new product utilizing rf (or even digital signals above - I don't remember exactly - something like 10 kHz) has to be tested for unwanted rf radiation if it is to be sold in the United States (oh, and Europe, Canada, etc. etc.) Also, devices in current production also have samples pulled from production lines and tested periodically. Kinda hard if BPL is nearby.

Once the problem is finally figured out by the lawyers, the next problem is who will reimburse the power companies if they then disallow BPL (word to the wise: hang on tight to your wallet - us taxpayers to the rescue, once again LOL).

As for technical acumen, the current state of affairs is such that even if you really don't even know the difference between positive and negative, you may well pass the exams for an amateur radio license.

Just my ramblings - but, still, hang on to your wallet.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:LInrc.4504$be.269@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of ARRL
> in response to the BPL threat? Below is part of some correspondence I
> sent to my Division Director. If you feel it's time for more sound
> science and less hand-wringing, you should let YOUR Director know.

>
<<snip>>
> The valuable and responsible work of Ed Hare gets
> lost in the "noise and fury".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.689 / Virus Database: 450 - Release Date: 5/21/04

4189. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:32:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pPsrc.17611$zO3.8972@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92253

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0405201410.5a032142@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> > >
> > > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> > >
> > >
> > > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being
elitist to
> > want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get
rid of
> > it are world class fools.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> DAN, Dan, dan, it is the -EXAM- that we are getting rid of. If we got
> rid of the psk practical exam, would you think we are trying to get
> rid of the mode?

There is no psk practical exam. The ONLY PRACTICAL exam we have in ham
radio is the CW TEST. Most of the rest is mainly BS memorization, that for
the most part is not even relevant to real world ham radio.

Dan/W4NTI

4190. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:34:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RQsrc.17621$zO3.11421@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92254

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405210405.6d5fcc2@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > > > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> > > >
> > > > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that
they
> > > > could get on the air and only associate with like minded
individuals?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > > That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely
for
> > > the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty
crowded
> > > place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be
on
> > any
> > > CW sub-bands.
> > >
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the
exclusive
> > subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.
> >
> > I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
>

> We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.
>
> I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
>
> CW-only subbands:
>
> 160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
> 80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
> 40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
> 30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
> 20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
> 17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
> 15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
> 12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
> 10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
>
> Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
> all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
> subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
> operating practice.
>
> Why not?
>
> You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
> nocodetest folks...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I like it. And of course not.

Dan/W4NTI

4191. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:36:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ISsrc.17623$zO3.4513@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92255

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40AE0403.1010905@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >>news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >>>news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> >>>
> >>>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> >>>>
> >>>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> >>>>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >>>>
> >>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>>That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely
for
> >>>the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty
crowded
> >>>place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
> >>
> >> any
> >>
> >>>CW sub-bands.
> >>>
> >>>73 de Bert
> >>>WA2SI
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the
exclusive
> >>subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.

> >>
> >>I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
> >
> >
> > We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.
> >
> > I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
> >
> > CW-only subbands:
> >
> > 160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
> > 80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
> > 40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
> > 30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
> > 20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
> > 17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
> > 15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
> > 12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
> > 10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
> >
> > Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
> > all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
> > subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
> > operating practice.
> >
> > Why not?
> >
> > You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
> > nocodetest folks...
>
>
> Sorry Jim, they are busy with trying to lower the test requirements
> right now.
>
> After all the Technicians are freebied up to General, they'll turn
> their attentions to those pesky and annoying gentleman's agreements for
> CW portions.
>
> I'll bet you a pepperoni and cheese pizza that their bandplans will
> look quite different than yours. Theirs will be much simpler!
>
> The rationale will be that it is SO much trouble for people to keep
> within bandplans that it is a big headache for hams to keep track of
> where they are supposed to be. And why do those CW people get half our
> bands anyhow?
>
> The most amusing part will be when Carl and Bill show up with their
> spin on how it *isn't* a spectrum grab.
>
> But you know, I suspect that in the brave new world of

> post-restructuring ARS, that the new hams will simply do squatters
> rights on the bandplan. It's only an agreement, so what can we do if
> they decide to work there?
>
> I wonder when the first CW segment SSB contest will be held?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

And I wonder how a DSP filter will handle a drifty, chirping CW signal?

Dan/W4NTI

4192. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:47:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Z0trc.17631$zO3.3266@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92256

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:LInrc.4504$be.269@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of ARRL
> in response to the BPL threat? Below is part of some correspondence I
> sent to my Division Director. If you feel it's time for more sound
> science and less hand-wringing, you should let YOUR Director know.
>
> ----------
>
> Jay,
>
> I understand all the arguments against BPL rollout and I agree with 98%
> of them. I also agreee that ARRL ought to mount the strongest possible
> technical rebuttal to relaxation of Part 15 rules. To that end the work
> of Ed Hare, et.al. is dead on target. I personally authorize you to
> double the amount of my dues to support sound science-based work which
> generates a technically convincing rebuttal to Michael Powell and his
> minions.
>
> But this amateurish "whipping up the troops to write letters to the
> White House" and similar tactics are embarrassing. The typical ham (I'm
> sorry to report) hasn't the technical accumen to make any sort of
> persuasive case against BPL, so their protests take on the whining tone
> of "you can't do this to us because we do all this good stuff on HF.".
>
> As someone with a lot of professional contacts in the wireless industry,
> I can tell you that our public and regulatory image is on a swift
> decline. We are increasing viewed as technically naive kneejerk
> obstructionists. For every Ed Hare doing good technical investigation
> and writing convincing counter arguments, there are thousands of
> clueless emotional emails and letters irresponsibly stoked up by Dave
> Sumner editorials. The valuable and responsible work of Ed Hare gets
> lost in the "noise and fury".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Just a minute here Hans. Several of the Alabama hams, including myself, have sent letters off to our various state and federal congressmen and women, also to the public utilities that may be involved.

Our replies from these people have been quite complimentary and indicate we are taken seriously.

I think you are dead wrong on this one Hans.

Dan/W4NTI

4193. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:50:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <14trc.17633$zO3.2919@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92257

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40AE3463.5090308@psu.edu...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
> > Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of ARRL
> > in response to the BPL threat? Below is part of some correspondence I
> > sent to my Division Director. If you feel it's time for more sound
> > science and less hand-wringing, you should let YOUR Director know.
> >
> > -
> >
> > Jay,
> >
> > I understand all the arguments against BPL rollout and I agree with 98%
> > of them. I also agreee that ARRL ought to mount the strongest possible
> > technical rebuttal to relaxation of Part 15 rules. To that end the work
> > of Ed Hare, et.al. is dead on target. I personally authorize you to
> > double the amount of my dues to support sound science-based work which
> > generates a technically convincing rebuttal to Michael Powell and his
> > minions.
> >
> > But this amateurish "whipping up the troops to write letters to the
> > White House" and similar tactics are embarrassing. The typical ham (I'm
> > sorry to report) hasn't the technical accumen to make any sort of
> > persuasive case against BPL, so their protests take on the whining tone
> > of "you can't do this to us because we do all this good stuff on HF.".
> >
> > As someone with a lot of professional contacts in the wireless industry,
> > I can tell you that our public and regulatory image is on a swift
> > decline. We are increasing viewed as technically naive kneejerk
> > obstructionists. For every Ed Hare doing good technical investigation
> > and writing convincing counter arguments, there are thousands of
> > clueless emotional emails and letters irresponsibly stoked up by Dave
> > Sumner editorials. The valuable and responsible work of Ed Hare gets
> > lost in the "noise and fury".
>
>
> Hey Hans,
>
> Once upon a time, in my naivety, I thought a good sound technical
> rebuttal of BPL would be sufficient to sway the regulators. After all,
> it is so technically awful that it *should* be easy to convince an
> intelligent person without much difficulty that it is a loser
> technology. Certainly other countries around the world have agreed it is

> such.
>
> My old opinion can be googled up here. But times have changed.
>
> I think the decision was made a long time ago based on other than
> technical reasons, and BPL *will* be rolled out, and I don't think there
> is one thing that we can do about it, save for the ballot box.
>
> BPL is going to happen! All money spent fighting it, all letters to
> representatives, all comments to the FCC and all the hand wringing is
> 100 percent useless.
>
> I am pegging my hopes on BPL being the failure that it will inevitably
> be. The utilities will run the fibers, start running the BPL portion of
> the lines, and after they find out how many of their transformers are
> putting out trash that interferes with the digital signal,(check the
> FCC actions on arrl.org to see how good the utilities are at replacing
> noisy transformers) and after the BPL users figure out that cable is
> faster and DSL is more reliable anyhow, BPL will become the 8 track of
> the internet.
>
> Then what will happen is that they will step back, take a look, and
> figure out that they already have 95 percent of the job finished. The
> fiber is almost to the houses! simply run it the rest of the way, and
> LIB! decent speed internet connections! If the ill educated consumers at
> the other end want to they can go wireless, so they don't even have to
> connect their machines to a outlet in the wall.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I hope you are right here Mike. And I think you are. It only took Alabama power 5 years to clean up my 30 some sources of noise in my immediate neighborhood. This is going to get interesting when I trash their BPL signals.

Dan/W4NTI

4194. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 19:55:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <q8trc.17635$zO3.10674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92258

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

> Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to sympathise
> with "my problem", because I don't have one.

See? There it is....that's your problem. You don't even recognize you have
it.

Dan/W4NTI

4195. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 20:24:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405211224.1ef1398f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92259

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:

> You've told us on numerous occasions all you want to do here. You never
> seem to get around to doing what you've stated. Now you'd like to tell
> me all I want to do. I've not stated all I want to do here so your
> comments are conjecture on your part. Take your pick, Leonard:
> classical telegraphy, classical SSB, classical AM phone. You aren't
> doing any of them in amateur radio. You aren't a participant.

It seems to me that Lennie's UNaccomplishments in "radio" far
exceed anything he MAY have accomplished.

And his "word" as to what he says he's going to do is useless.

> > Oh? Did you miss something in the past six years of messaging
> > in here? I've been a professional involved with radio and radio
> > communications. Interesting work. Paid well, too. I've
> > communicated on frequencies you aren't allowed to as a "licensed
> > amateur" or even as a State Department government employee.
> > :-)
>
> 1. I wrote "amateur radio". You're drifting off into a description of
> your past professional radio experience once again.
>
> 2. I don't really care where on which frequencies you communicated as a
> professional.

Lennie may be allowed to "communicate" on any number of of
DISCREET channels at any one time, and then only as the parameters of
the contract he may be presently working on allow.

He has never been allowed, and at present will not be allowed, to
select the frequency, the mode, or the parameters under which he
"operates".

> > You DEMAND amateur radio license acquisition in order to state
> > anything on amateur radio regulations in here.
>
> I've DEMANDed nothing. I continue to point out that you have nothing to
> do with amateur radio as a participant or a regulator.
>
> > You should make public your "authorization" to make such demands.

>
> You should look up the definition of the word "demand".

Common sense would dictate that anyone "commenting" on how others
"do" something actually have some EXPERIENCE in what they are
commenting about.

It goes without saying that Lennie has absolutely NO experience
in Amateur Radio practice. He can cut-and-paste from various websites
all day long about the THEORY of Amateur practice (noting that I am
NOT addressing "technical" theory")

> > Without that "authorization" you are just another bitchy whining
> > complainer who can't hack any real discussion beyond the "official"
> > words on amateur-radio-as-it-used-to-was when you first engaged
> > in that hobby.
>
> Wrong-o, Pops. I'm a licensed radio amateur. I have a vested interest
> in any changes in regulations involving amateur radio license testing or
> amateur radio operation. You, on the other hand...
>
> > Without that "authorization" you are just another SS-wannabe who
> > wants nothing more than to fight anyone who doesn't agree with
> > your "orders" posted on this bulletin board. In other words, just
> > another disagreeable gunnery nurse (but without bedpan).
>
> "Fight"? "Orders"? If we were fighting, you'd best pack a lunch and
> rest up beforehand, old timer. I haven't issued any orders.

Ahhhhh yes...As soon as he's backed into yet another corner,
Lennie switches back to making analogies to the Nazis.

How predictable.

> > Until you show your "authorization," you'll have to discuss it with
> > the only Real Authority on this newsgroup, Paul Schleck. Hint:
> > he is a licensed radio amateur of Amateur Extra rank.
>
> I'll have to discuss what with Paul Schleck?
>
> > What you seem to want this newsgroup to become is just another
> > Chat Room where like-minded dittyboppers can commiserate in a
> > mental commisary all about "real hams" (who know and love morse
> > code) and follow the League's orders explicitly, complete with all
> > the jargon and standards and practices of 1930's amateur radio.
>
> You aren't wrapped very tight.

I am wondering what "orders" he refers to, Dave...?!?!

I've never received any "directives" or other "orders" from
Newington or any League representitive.

> > Meanwhile, this newsgroup is still unmoderated and open to anyone
> > with Internet access. No doubt you will redouble your efforts to put
> > down anyone who doesn't think like you do and DEMAND certain
> > things in order to satisfy your "authorized" orders. Pthththththth.
>
> No DEMANDs have been made of you, Len. You continue to post. I'll
> continue to point out your lack of anything to do with amateur radio.
> You've certainly kept mum about your childlike antics exemplified by
> some of your comments to the FCC. Wanna discuss those?

And he'll continue to post, regardless of how silly or obviously
uninformed or ill-prepared his rantings may be.

Works for me...Only serves to prove what we've been saying about
him all along.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4196. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 22:29:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92260

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
>
> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> > It really is THAT simple.
>
> You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
>
> No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
>
> MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> ...and that's the way it is.
>
> LHA / WMD

Yup.

4197. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 22:35:07 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <c8m06r017ij@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 92262

In article <14trc.17633$zO3.2919@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI says...
>
> It only took Alabama
>power 5 years to clean up my 30 some sources of noise in my immediate
>neighborhood. This is going to get interesting when I trash their BPL
>signals.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
An Alabama State trooper pulls over Dan on I-20. He says to him, "Got any ID?"

Dan says, "Bout what?"

4198. Re: Dave Heil

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-21 22:37:29 UTC
From: Grandpa Needlemauer <vabarr4@nospam.wans.net>
Message-ID: <64218$40ae848d$d1cc599d$1865@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 92261

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:40A7DB19.91118D30@earthlink.net...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > "Tim" <Timothy@nospam> wrote in message
news:<c86phphl0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:40A6E4AA.1CF9E5E9@earthlink.net...
> > > Tim wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Can anybody tell me if Mr. Dave Heil has passed away? I am asking
out of
> > > > respect for the man.
> > > > Thank you.
> > >
> > > I'm pleased to inform you that he still lives.
> > >
> > > Dave Heil K8MN
> > >
> > > Thank God! One of your antagonists, Roger Wiseman, had posted that
you had
> > > passed on. He even nastily commented that he hoped your demise was
slow and
> > > painful.
> > > I am SO glad to hear that you are alive and well.
> > > Thank you for the response.
> >
> > Hey Dave - Iz Wiseman the odd job from "downtown"?
>
> Yep, the mentally unbalanced Wiseman is the filth-posting sociopath from
> along the river in Glen Dale. He picks things up by listening to 2m FM,
> glancing through the local paper or reading them here or on a web site.
> Then he manufacturers little perversities about a spouse, a parent or a
> child. He keeps getting booted from various ISP's and is reduced to
> posting his material through various anonymous remailers.
>
> He attended one county ARES group meeting, left early out of fear and
> hasn't been back.
>
> He's been turned in by at least one local for deliberate QRM on 20m, has
> been retested by the FCC and is in danger of losing his ticket over his
> character. I just keeping forwarding anything he posts about me to
> local law enforcement.
>

> Dave K8MN

Besides 20M, don't forget he was also a major league
big time QRM'er on several 75 Meter Frequencies also...

4199. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 01:27:47 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94F0DA18E6B98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92263

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:q8trc.17635$zO3.10674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>> Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to
>> sympathise with "my problem", because I don't have one.
>
> See? There it is....that's your problem. You don't even recognize you
> have it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

So, let's see if I have this right, according to you I have a problem
because I only operate one mode? Well, you're right about one thing, I do
fail to see what part of that is a problem.

4200. Enjoy!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 01:42:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hamdnZh8Xu-MLTPdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92264

For those that find antenna work intimidating or mysterious, go here:

http://www.qsl.net/kf4bwg/ant.html

I think I like this guy!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4201. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 02:01:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <S-6dnRw3XoQVKTPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92265

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu>...
>
>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>>
>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>
>
>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>>
>> Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>>
>
> The short answer is "because we're not 'elitist snobs' and our feet
> are not 'firmly planted in the past'
>
> The longer, more accurate answer is that it's not as simple as some
> folks would like you to think.
>
> For some, it really is "just about the code test". But for others, the
> real issue is something variously called 'standards' or
> 'achievements'. That's where the real disagreement is. And it comes
> out in a whole bunch of ways.

For me, it is about standards.

> For example, how often have you heard the buzzphrases "it's a hobby"
> or "it's just a hobby" or similar, given as an argument against some
> requirement or another? Think about what the person pushing those
> phrases really means. They're usually *not* saying "it's not a job".
> Instead, what they're really saying is "don't expect much" or even
> "don't expect anything".

Right. "Mongo say Learning BAD"!

> Look at how the *written* exams have changed over the years, despite
> claims that "it's just about the code test". Yet we have vocal support
> for free upgrades and further written test reductions.

> Did you see the article on "is training class efficient?" which
> detailed a one-day-to-Tech cram course? They boasted an 85% success
> rate - meaning that after just one day of class, 85% of their students
> passed the Tech test. This was done by rote memorization of the
> written exam question pool. Is this really what's best for the future

> of the ARS? Some folks think so!

This is what almost all university students do. It's "cramming". And it kind of works. The "kind of" part is that the knowledge does not make it into long term memory. So while a person can take and pass a test using this method, the knowledge gained goes away right after the test for the most part.

But it isn't the fault of question pools - it is how they are used. I used the pools and on line tests when I went for my tickets. First thing I did was take an on line test. Then with the aid of the pool, reference books and even the web, I looked up the answers to the questions that I missed. I kept taking tests, and kept going back and learning what I missed.

By the time I was finished, I KNEW the answers, and it wasn't from memorization, save the band edge stuff.

I put forth the proposition that it is just as easy to cram with textbooks as it is with question pools. I can read a textbook as easily as I can a question pool. It is all a question of how we use th etools we are given. And no one can control that.

> When you see arguments for "one class of license" ask "with what
> requirements?" - but don't hold your breath waiting for an answer.

I like one class - Amateur Extra.

> When you see people railing about "standards and requirements of the
> 1930s", ask what they propose as the "standards and requirements of
> the 2000s" - but again, don't hold your breath waiting for a detailed
> answer.

> Some folks don't think there should be *any* standards or requirements
> beyond a bare bones set of rules and regs from FCC. Of course we know
> what happens in a radio service where that is the norm. It isn't
> pretty.

Amazing that some of those people are otherwise smart.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4202. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 02:02:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <S-6dnR83XoRUKTPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92266

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40AE0403.1010905@psu.edu...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>>>news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>>>news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
>>>>>>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>
>>>>>That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely
>
> for
>
>>>>>the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty
>
> crowded
>
>>>>>place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
>>>>
>>>>any

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>CW sub-bands.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Bert
>>>>>WA2SI
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the
>
> exclusive
>
>>>>subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.
>>>>
>>>>I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
>>>
>>>
>>>We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.
>>>
>>>I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
>>>
>>>CW-only subbands:
>>>
>>>160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
>>>80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
>>>40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
>>>30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
>>>20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
>>>17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
>>>15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
>>>12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
>>>10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
>>>
>>>Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
>>>all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
>>>subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
>>>operating practice.
>>>
>>>Why not?
>>>
>>>You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
>>>nocodetest folks...
>>
>>
>>Sorry Jim, they are busy with trying to lower the test requirements
>>right now.
>>
>>After all the Technicians are freebied up to General, they'll turn
>>their attentions to those pesky and annoying gentleman's agreements for

>>CW portions.
>>
>>I'll bet you a pepperoni and cheese pizza that their bandplans will
>>look quite different than yours. Theirs will be much simpler!
>>
>>The rationale will be that it is SO much trouble for people to keep
>>within bandplans that it is a big headache for hams to keep track of
>>where they are supposed to be. And why do those CW people get half our
>>bands anyhow?
>>
>>The most amusing part will be when Carl and Bill show up with their
>>spin on how it *isn't* a spectrum grab.
>>
>>But you know, I suspect that in the brave new world of
>>post-restructuring ARS, that the new hams will simply do squatters
>>rights on the bandplan. It's only an agreement, so what can we do if
>>they decide to work there?
>>
>>I wonder when the first CW segment SSB contest will be held?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> And I wonder how a DSP filter will handle a drifty, chirping CW signal?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I've never tried it, but I suspect that it might be a great method to
make the signal go away?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4203. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 02:20:54 UTC
From: Tim <Timothy@Nospam>
Message-ID: <c8mddssnj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92271
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster...
What is the address for reporting AB8MQ TOS violations

to Earthlink?

What? Is Roger using Earthlink now? I read that Stagger Lee was getting close to finding out yet another of Rogers accounts but I didn't realize he had done so. I bet Little Roger is fuming!
I read that Stagger had somehow tracked Roger and even exposed him but Roger claims that Stagger was lying. Funny. Roger lies about everything and anything so I gotta believe that Stagger did out him big time. Who would you believe?
Poor old Roger should be getting close to running out of local ISP accounts if he has not done so already. No wonder he had to go to Earthlink. Nobody in his area will let him have an account.
Do you think this sociopath will ever learn?
Sicko Roger could probably keep an ISP if he'd learn to act in a decent and civilized manner but the psycho apparently does not know how.
Roger's foul mouth, his cruelty, his libel and his antisocial behaviour have earned him nothing but disdain and even pity. I don't know anybody who pities him...I just tossed that in there. Most everybody simply cannot stand the little bastard and that seems to be the bottom line.
Dave said it when he referred to Roger Wiseman, AB8MQ, as a sociopath.

4204. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 11:28:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405220328.2356f80f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92267

In article <LInrc.4504$be.269@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of
ARRL
>in response to the BPL threat?

I'm not, Hans.

What would you have ARRL do?

So far, there have been QST and website articles on BPL, detailed
comments that included actual observations as well as serious models
and simulations, and W1RFI doing a first-class presentation to amateur
and industry groups. (I got to see it here in Philly). Also suggested
letters and emails, etc.

In addition, ARRL has been banging the drum for well thought out and
well written comments and other feedback.

Most hams don't have the resources to make actual measurements or
simulations of something like BPL. That's one reson we need a strong
national organization like ARRL.

Would you rather they keep quiet? Tell hams not to comment?

What's really embarrassing is that any "professional in
radio-electronics" - in any engineering or regulatory capacity - would
even consider an HF-VHF based BPL-type system.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4205. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 13:22:18 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0405220522.6dae8a01@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92272
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LARDASS LLoyd Davies "Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> wrote in message
news:<c8mddssnj0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
> news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster...
> What is the address for reporting AB8MQ TOS violations
>
> to Earthlink?

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..you dumbfuck. Yeah, I'm on
Earthlink, all right........BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!

Saggytits Lee couldn't even find the correct Marshall County ARES
website, (He incorrectly stated that a Marshall County AL ARES website
was the one for Marshall County, WV) simply because his oblong,
malformed head is tickling his prostate most of the time.

4206. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 13:26:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405220526.59aaabc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92268

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> >
> > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> > >
> > > It really is THAT simple.
> >
> > You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> >
> > No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> >
> > MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> >
> > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> >
> > ...and that's the way it is.
>
>
> Yup.

Nope.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Steve,K4YZ

4207. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 13:47:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92269

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040519184816.17253.00001529@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0405190457.71415c83@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (the gunnery nurse presently off his medications again) writes:
> >
> >> > It still does not change the fact that without licensed Amateur
> >> >Radio operators to man it, it would be defunct.
> >>
> >> Incorrect. MARS functions - at its core - through military personnel
> >> who man the headquarters such as Fort Huachuca, AZ, for the
> >> Army and Scott AFB, IL, for the Air Force. Various military branch
> >> net control stations around the country and the globe are manned
> >> by military personnel who do NOT have to be licensed radio
> >> amateurs.
> >>
> > As usual, only partially correct...more wrong than ocrrect.
>
> "Ocrrect?"

My apologies, Lennie...I forgot that YOU are the only one allowed
to make typos in RRAP...Forgive me, Your Worminess...

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!

The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.

The civilian, licensed Radio Amateurs make it work.

> You don't seem to understand that.

I understand it just fine. You and PuppetBoy are the one's with
comprehension problems.

> I can't make it any simpler. MARS IS MILITARY.

MARS is supported and subsidized by the military. If MARS folded
tomorrow, the Armed Forces would manage just fine.

> MARS is NOT amateur.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> MARS doesn't operate ON amateur radio frequencies.

You just noticed that, eh?

> MARS doesn't use amateur radio callsigns.

Whoopie doo, Lennie.

> MARS has its own callsigns.

And I said othrwise WHERE...?!?!

> Amateurs can't use MARS callsigns IN amateur radio.

Sure they can.

> > Those programs are headquartered at the locations you cited.
> >Good job.
>
> What is "good" about doing a simple, one-time search?

Nothing at all in your case, Lennie. I was trying to be civil.

> YOU were unable to do the same simple task in three weeks.

Why? It's not necessary. They could be headquartered on the Sea
of Tranqulity and my assertion of No Amateur Radio = No MARS would
still be correct.

> BAD JOB to you, Oddjob-wannabe.

You think I want to be a fat Japanese dude in an old James Bond
movie...?

> > Those programs, beyond those confines, are mangaged by, conducted
> >by, and are "staffed" by volunteer licensed Amateur Radio operators.
>
> Beyond what "confines?"
>
> Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to operate MARS in amateur
> bands?

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to use amateur call signs
> outside of ham bands?

No Amateur Radio = No MARS

> Confines of being UNABLE LEGALLY to use MARS callsigns IN
> ham bands?

No Amatuer Radio = No MARS

> > I had already acknowledged that there are military personnel
> >assigned to certain MARS stations.
>
> MARS is MILITARY. [that's what the "M" refers to in the acronym]

And the "A" is "A"ffiliate...Amateur Radio being the organization
it (MARS) is affiliated with.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> > However those "net control stations" will have a hard time
> >"controlling" ANYthing if there was no one there to control.
>
> If you say so, Man from MARS.

And they'd be talking to...whom...?!?!

Those messages would be getting delivered by...whom..?!?!

> However, it's very easy for a thousand or so MILITARY MARS
> personnel to communicate with OTHER military MARS stations,
> including inter-service-branch communications.

A THOUSAND...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHA
! ! ! ! ! !

ANDERSCUM, every time I think you've exhausted your last stupid
assertion about Amateur Radio or anything associated with it, you
prove me wrong and add ONE MORE to the till!

> MARS military stations have the equipment, have the personnel,
> have the authorization.

Authorization...Yes...almost every Marine Corps unit I was
attached to had a Navy/MC callsign assigned to it.

In almost every case, I was the ONLY person in the unit who knew
what it was, and that was only because I found out from some personal
interest.

I know of at least four Navy vessels that had MARS callsigns
assigned that had NO operators, and in two of those cases the CEO had
no idea what his MARS call was nor how to go about using it!

Two local Army Reserve units have MARS calls. They are only
active because the local, civilian, licensed Amateurs who happen to be
MARS members have approached the commanders of the units to which they
are assigned and got them "active".

> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> > It really is THAT simple.
>
> You have it really SO WRONG.
>
> No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
>
> MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.

>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> ...and that's the way it is.

The "way it is" is that you ahve once again unzipped your fly and
let us see just how little you really have to show, Lennie!

You make a loud rant "on paper", but what you have shown us is
that beyond the "theoretical" of searchable public documents, you have
absolutely NO IDEA of what you are talking about.

You are the very epitiome of the ABUSE of free speech...A big
mouth with no facts to back it up...

Oh well...Nothing new from you, Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4208. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 13:48:22 UTC
From: "Fag-lame Freddy, The Lamenetter" <jesus@lamenet.com>
Message-ID: <c8nluo$1e48$3@news.wplus.net>
Source record: 92273
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

AB8MQ wrote:

> LARDASS LLoyd Davies "Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> wrote in message
news:<c8mddssnj0@pita.alt.net>...
>
>>"Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
>>news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster...
>>What is the address for reporting AB8MQ TOS violations
>>
>>to Earthlink?
>
>
> BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..you dumbfuck. Yeah, I'm on
> Earthlink, all right.....BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
>
> Saggytits Lee couldn't even find the correct Marshall County ARES
> website, (He incorrectly stated that a Marshall County AL ARES website
> was the one for Marshall County, WV) simply because his oblong,
> malformed head is tickling his prostate most of the time.

You can run and lie but you can't hide...

--
New Woger Buster Message Forum:
http://www.network54.com/Forum/290803

Cool Links:
Meet the Lamenetters:
http://www.geocities.com/meet_the_lamenetters
http://www.geocities.com/meet_the_lamenetters/legend.html

OFFICIAL WOGER WISEMAN WEB PAGES:
http://www.network54.com/Realm/dick_suck_wiseman/poo.jpg
http://www.network54.com/Realm/woger/index.html

ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½

Ab8mq@stratuswave.net (Woger Wussman)
Skinflutist
ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½ï¿½,ï¿½`ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½
"Love is the answer... Now bend over and touch your toes, grit
your teeth, and take it like a big boy." -Woger Wiseman misquoting

John Lennon to Glen Dale 5 year olds.

"There you have it: Just start talking about fags, asses, or
cocksucking, and Woger comes stumbling in stepping on his crank, with
both cap guns blazing." -- John Kimball

Of course I must give credit where credit is due, and that is to Stagger Lee
for besting you at every turn of your sick and sordid endeavors.
This is fun. You are SO easy and your filthy mouth and pea brain makes it
so. Getting you booted from ISP's is like taking candy from a baby.
-Arf! Arf! Discusses retard Woger.

4209. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 13:59:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405220559.67cef1c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92270

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS

> MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.

Which SHOULD be good news to you....BUT...

> MARS is NOT amateur radio.

And NEITHER ARE YOU!

> ...and that's the way it is.

Yup.

BTW...You gonna put that application through to N/MC MARS and see
what happens or what...???

Steve, K4YZ

4210. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 16:18:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92274

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>>>
>>>> It really is THAT simple.
>>>
>>> You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
>>>
>>> No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
>>>
>>> MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
>>>
>>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>>
>>> ...and that's the way it is.
>>
>>
>>Yup.
>
>
> Nope.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> Steve,K4YZ

Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.

4211. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-22 22:09:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <scQrc.27390$KE6.16667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92275

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94F0DA18E6B98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:q8trc.17635$zO3.10674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> >> Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to
> >> sympathise with "my problem", because I don't have one.
> >
> > See? There it is....that's your problem. You don't even recognize you
> > have it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> So, let's see if I have this right, according to you I have a problem
> because I only operate one mode? Well, you're right about one thing, I do
> fail to see what part of that is a problem.

You need to stop now Alun. All you are doing is proving my point over and
over. You are a lid because you operate only phone.

Have a Good day mate.

Dan/W4NTI

4212. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1397 – May 21, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 00:55:02 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040522205502.10186.00001871@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92276

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1397 – May 21, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1397 with a release date of Friday, May 21, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Mr. Haynie goes to Washington D C and Dayton, Ohio comes alive with the sound of ham radio. These stories and more on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1397 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: MR. HAYNIE TO MEET WITH WHITE HOUSE TELECOM ADVISORS

This weeks top story starts in Dayton Ohio and ends in Washington D-C. It was at the Dayton Hamvention that ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, announced that he would be meeting with presidential advisors art the White House Telecommunications Office to discuss the Broadband Over Powerline situation. Amateur Radio Newsline was there when a horse but upbeat W5JBP thanked the ham radio community for making the meeting come about:

--

Haynie: “When we ran the story about my FAX’ing the President of the United States a powerful letter, what you helped me do with your letters and your e-mails was to get me an appointment Thursday morning, 10 a.m. in Washington. So you helped me to do that. (applause).

--

The meeting between President Haynie and those advising Peresident Bush on telecommunicastions matters was scheduled for Thursday, May 20th. We will have a full report on it, next week. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE BPL FIGHT: HAM TURNS THE TABLE ON BPL PROPVIDER

Still with BPL news, word that a ham attending an industry sponsored demonstration of the technology in Australia came prepared to do battle. From Brisbane, Q-News reports:

--

A presentation was given by Piero Peroni, who is the Business Manager for the BPL trial within Aurora Energy and Adrian Wild who is the Corporate Affairs

Manager within Aurora Energy.

Martin, VK7GN gave an audible demonstration of the interference on his portable HF receiver and I think it would be fair to say by all accounts the Corporate Affairs Manager was quietly horrified at the noise!

--

Whether or not the ham radio counter demonstration to Aurora Energy will slow down or stop the rollout of BPL down-under is, at this time unknown. (Q-News)

**

DAYTON HAMVENTION NEWS: A BIG SUCCESS

Back here in the U-S-A, Jim Haynie’s White House meeting announcement was just another layer of frosting on the very sweet ham radio cake known as the Dayton Hamvention. By all accounts, Hamvention 2004 was as good as any of those in the past and maybe better than some. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mark Abramovich, NT3V, takes us on an audio tour of this years show:

--
The big buzz at Dayton was the introduction of two new, top-of-the-line HF radios.

Yaesu introduced thousands of visitors to its booth here to the FT DX 9000 - a radio the company has been developing four years. Here's Chip Margelli K7JA of Yaesu - Vertex Standard.

Over at the competition, Icom introduced showgoers to its sleek, new IC7800. It's already been out for more than a month and Icom representatives concede they underestimated the market demand for this high-end radio.

Here's Ron Rotino, W9WL, represting Icom.

In other Dayton news, Alinco announced a new distributor relationship. Evelyn Garrison WS7A tells Amateur Radio Newsline about the new partnership.

Now Amateur Radio Newsline Editor Bill Pasternak WA6ITF also took in the show besides running his annual Town Hall forum. Bill couldn't help himself when he stopped a the U.S. Towers booth where two lovely sales, eh, models were posing for pictures. Here's the exchange between our own California guy and some young ladies who came to the Dayton Hamvention for the first time..

Behind any Dayton Hamvention is the general chairman. This year Gary De Combes N8EMO took on that enormous responsibility. At the close of the show, he summed it all up for Amateur Radio Newsline.
And how did one of the big radio manufacturers we didn't mention yet think things went. Kenwood's Leo Famie was pleased with this year's event…

And, of course, Chip Margelli, summed up what Yaesu Vertex Standard thought.

Finally, there were lots of new friends and acquaintances made during the Dayton Hamvention 2004. And, despite the rain, spirits of those scouring the flea market for goodies weren't dampened.

It was one for the record books, too, in terms of participation.

Hope to see you here, next year.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, from the convention floor at the Hara Arena - home of the Dayton Hamvention.

--

As of the time this report is being prepared the Hamvention Committee has not announced a final attendance figure, but several vendors told Amateur Radio Newsline that their sales were way up over the past few years. And thats good news for both the United States economic recovery as well as for Amateur Radio. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

DAYTON HAMVENTION NEWS: N8EMO AND WX8F ASKED TO RUN HAMVENTION 2005

In a related development, on Monday night, May 17th the Dayton Amateur Radio Association’s Planning Council unanimously recommended the clubs Board of Directors reappoint Gary De Combes, N8EMO and Jim Nies, WX8F as General Chairman and Assistant General Chairman respectively, for Hamvention 2005. The two were affirmed to lead the 2005 show on Tuesday night the 18th. That's only two days after the close of this years show. Normally , no action is taken to fill these positions until the June Board of Directors meeting.

More on the 2004 Dayton Hamvention in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K9OQO repeater serving Appleton Wisconsin.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS TAKE PART IN SIMULATED AIRPORT DISASTER

Over a hundred ham radio operators from seven counties in two Eastern states, provided emergency communications support for the Saturday, May 8th disaster drill at Dulles International Airport. The exercise consisted of a simulated plane crash and fire. The aim of the session was to provide treatment and transport of 200 volunteer "victims" to area hospitals by helicopter, ambulance and bus. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, picks up the story from here:

--

Larry Hughs, K3HE, is the Public Information Officer for for the ARRL’s Virginia Section. He tells Newsline that the job of Amateur Radio was to provide communications between agencies at the simulated crash site, those providing patient transportation, and the participating hospitals. To

accomplish this, hams from a number of the regions Amateur Radio Emergency Service groups set up several portable repeaters in and around the airport grounds. They also provided a live Amateur Television link between the site and the airport Operations Center. This allowed airport management to monitor the progress of the drill.

Hams also accompanied some of the officials at the simulated crash site to provide instant communications to other temporary operational areas. Others rode the buses that transported ambulatory victims to local hospitals. This gave planners voice communications and real-time position data via Automatic Position Reporting System. Meantime, other radio amateurs were stationed at ten area hospitals. They helped to coordinate the arrival and departure of those simulating the victims of the crash.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, reporting.

--

Dulles International Airport is in Northern Virginia, near Washington, DC.. Its also not that far from where Al Quida terrorists crashed a jumbo jet into the Pentagon building on September 11th of 2001. Back then ham radio was among the first of the “First Responders” on scene and is credited in helping to save numerous lives. (K3HE, ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: SUIT BLAMES MOTOROLA HT’S IN 911 DEATHS

The families of twelve firefighters killed when the World Trade Center in New York City collapsed on 9-11 have sued the manufacturer of the hand held radios the men were carrying. According to Popular Communications magazine, the five billion dollar action against Motorola and the City of New York claims that Motorola failed to warn the Fire Department that its hand-helds could not transmit or receive in a high rise building. Because of this, the plaintiffs contend that firefighters could not hear an order to evacuate. (Popular Communications)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NC HAM MAY FACE LICENSE RENEWAL HEARING

A North Carolina ham who allegedly interfered with repeater operation in that area may not get his license renewed. This, as FCC chief rules enforcer Riley Hollingsworth writes to Daniel Barrett, KE4NOK of Kings Mountain to tell him that his application to renew his ticket has been referred to the enforcement arm of the agency by the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

According to Hollingsworth’s letter, the action was based on information coming to the Commission's attention that Barrett is alleged to have used his station to interfere with various repeater operations on 145.350, 145.450 and 147.120 MHz and that he ignored requests of repeater control operators to refrain from using their repeaters. Hollingsworth’s note also says that Barrett ignored the Commission Warning letter dated December 24th of 2003 regarding use of and interference to the repeaters and that apparently

Barrett’s use of, and interference to, these repeaters continues.

Hollingsworth’s letter tells Barrett that his renewal application will not be routinely granted. Rather, that the Commission may need additional information from KE4NOK in order to determine his qualifications to remain a Commission license. The letter also tells Barrett that it may be necessary to designate his application for an evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. In such a proceeding Barrett would be required to appear at a hearing in Washington, DC. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNLICENSED BROADCASTER CHALLENGES FCC’s AUTHORITY

An unlicensed radio station taken off the air by the FCC last fall has challenged the regulatory agency in federal court. Attorney Mark Vermeulen, representing San Francisco Liberation Radio, says that the seizure of the station's equipment in an October 2003 raid came without proper notice and violated Constitutional protections of due process and the First Amendment.

In an appearance before U.S. District Judge Susan Illston, Vermeulen argued that -- quote -- "It's a bedrock principle that parties have a right to pre-seizure notice and a right to be heard.

But government attorney Sarah Winslow disagreed with Vermeulen's free speech arguments. She told Judge Illston that there is no First Amendment right to broadcast without a license from the FCC.

The FCC had monitored San Francisco Liberation Radio for years. They eventually tracked the station to a laundry room basement in the San Francisco home of James and Charlotte Hatch. The Hatches never made a secret of their operations. They also claim that they had unsuccessfully sought an FCC license to operate legally. (Published reports)

**

FOR THE BIRDS: FCC RETAINS BIOLOGICAL CONSULTANT

Remember all those stories about thousands of migratory birds getting killed by running into radio towers? Well the FCC has now retained the services of Avatar Environmental Services of West Chester, Pennsylvania as a biological consultant. This, to assist in fulfilling the FCC's role under the National Environmental Policy Act and other federal environmental statutes.

The CGC Communicator reports that Avatar will give the Commission access to the services of experts with training and experience in evaluating the impact of construction projects on animal and plant species.

According to CGC, Avatar has performed similar services for other agencies. The possible impact of communications towers on migratory birds is one of the immediate pressing issues. (CGC)

**

RADIO CELEBRATIONS: W6RO AT AGE 25

A big celebration out West in the world of Amateur Radio. This as the Queen Mary Ocean liner ham radio station W6RO turned 25 on April 29th.

W6RO is actually the club call sign of the Associated Radio Amateurs of Long Beach, California. Long Beach is where the retired ocean voyager is permanently birthed and open to the public as a tourist attraction. The club operates the W6RO station which is located in the Wireless Room adjoining the ships historic radio museum.

In its two and a half decades of operation, visiting hams from around the world have called C-Q and made numerous contacts using its gear, and its well known call sign phonetics of W-6-Rolling Ocean. (W6RO)

**

HAM RADIO BOOKS: NEW VHF PROPAGATION BOOK FROM CQ

CQ Communications has announced the publication of a new resource book for hams active on VHF and UHF bands. Its a book for those who want to learn more about long-distance propagation possibilities available to them.

Titled "VHF Propagation - A Practical Guide for Radio Amateurs" the book examine each of the most common long-distance propagation "modes" found on these bands. Topics covered include tropospheric scatter and ducting, Sporadic-E, Aurora, 6-meters and the F-layer, transequatorial and more. The book then explains how each mode occurs and offer tips on making the most of these band openings.

"VHF Propagation - A Practical Guide for Radio Amateurs" was written by Ken Neubeck, WB2AMU, and Gordon West, WB6NOA. It is available from many ham radio dealers or direct from CQ anytime through the CQ online bookstore. To find it take your web browser to www.cq-amateur-radio.com and then click on “Visit the CQ Store." (CQ)

**

THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT: ROCHESTER HAMFEST IN JUNE

With the 2004 Dayton Hamvention now a part of history, we turn to the ham radio social circuit for the rest of 2004. Next up is the giant Rochester Hamfest the weekend of June 4th through the 6th. As usual, it takes place at the Monroe County Fairgrounds and is combined with the ARRL Atlantic Division Convention.

Chairman Harold Smith, K2HC, tells Newsline that this years outing features over 100 inside exhibitors, 1200 flea market spaces and that very much coveted on site free parking. He also says that area hotels can be found for $69 a nmight or less.

Interested in finding out more? You can do it right on-line at www.rochesterhamfest.org or by calling the hamfest office at 584-424-7184 during business hours Eastern Daylight Time. (Rochester Hamfest)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO HONORS: HAM HONORED FOR SERVICE IN IRAQ

The United States Department of Commerce has honored Fredrick Matos, W3ICM, of Annapolis, Maryland. This by presenting him with its Gold Medal Award for Distinguished Achievement.

The ARRL Letter says that Matos is an employee of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. He was given the honor for his work to help establish telecommunications in Iraq, where he was deployed for nine months.

While in Iraq, Matos who also holds the Iraqi call YI3DX helped establish a central telecommunications authority along with assigning frequencies to local law enforcement groups. He was also responsible for issuing YI Amateur Radio licenses to both nationals and visitors.

In presenting the award April 13, Commerce Secretary Donald L. Evans welcomed Matos home and thanked him for his role in "expanding freedom around the world." (ARRL, Daily DX)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: BEWARE OF FOREIGN PET CHIPS

Heres a communications story of a different sort, but one that affects anyone with a four legged friend around the house. The United States Humane Society and other animal care organizations are cautioning pet owners that the nation's animal shelters may not have the proper scanning devices to detect and read some foreign manufactured pet identification microchip.

The warning comes as a European company has entered the microchip market and is selling its microchips in approximately 440 veterinary clinics housed in one of the nation's largest pet product retailers. But the company has not yet provided many of the nation's shelters, humane societies and veterinary hospitals with compatible scanners needed to read all the microchips currently in pets. As a result, the animal protection groups recommend that pet owners thinking about getting their pets micro-chipped contact both the chip manufacturer and their local shelter. This, to make certain that compatible 125 kHz scanners are present in their community. (Science OnLine)

**

WORLDBEAT - INDIA: FREE FOR ALL

On the international scene, Amateur Radio training classes have just started at the National Institute of Amateur Radio in India and there is a very pleasant twist. According to Administration Manager Jose Jacob, VU2JOS, the course is

available free of charge to anyone in that nation who is age 12 or older. (Q-News)

**

WORLDBEAT - UK: NEW BARTG AWARDS MANAGER NAMED

Over in the U-K the British Amateur Radio Teledata Group has a new Awards Manager. This, as the group announces that Phil Cooper, GU0SUP, has taken over from Nigel Roberets, G4KZZ, in that post. Cooper will handle all awards, including the well-known Quarter-Century Award. For more information e-mail awards@bartg.demon.co.uk (RSGB)

**

WORLDBEAT - SPAIN: A WEDDING OPERATION

Spanish special event station A00FL will be on the air between the 21st and 30th of May. This, to celebrate the wedding of Prince Felipe and Doña Letizia Ortiz. If you work this one, QSL as directed on the air. (Q-News)

**

ON THE AIR OPERATIONS: THE MORRIS CANAL SPECIAL

Closer to home, July 10th and 11th are the dates when New Jersey’s Nutley Amateur Radio Society activates station W2GLQ. This, for the first ever Historic Morris Canal Special Event.

Stations will operate from various locations along the 109 miles route of he canal from 1300 to 2200 U-T-C. Operations will continue thru 2005.

More information is on the Nutley Amateur Radio Society website. Its in cyberspace at at www.hometown.aol.com/kc2aup (Press release)

**

DX

In D-X, kook for K9OT and KB9LIE to be active portable F P from Miquelon from the evening of July 2nd until noon local July 11th. This is a 100 watt operation on 160 through 6 meters from the
ham radio friendly Maxotel Hotel. They will also have a 6 meter breakable beacon on 50.120 Mhz. Emphasis will be on 6, 12 and 17 meters SSB for Peg and 160 through 30 meters CW for Paul. QSL via K9OT direct with SASE or bureau. Sorry, no electronic Q-S-L are available for this one. (Various DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: UP - UP - AND AWAY

And finally this week, we go back to the Dayton Hamvention where Amateur Radio Newsline ran into one of the nations best known experts in Amateur Radio balloon launches. And does Bill Brown, WB8ELK have a story about recruiting new young hams using high altitude ham radio carrying balloons. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, has the details:

--

Bill Brown's class is all about going up up and away--and getting college credit at the same time. Brown teaches a course on building balloon payloads at the University of Alabama in Huntsville--and he makes amateur radio a big part of the curriculum.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

The ham bands get used not just by the students--but by what goes up. Amateur radio experiments are aboard the payloads students assemble.

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

Brown's class is also creating a positive effect on amateur radio—by helping bring new people into the service:

--

Audio only: Hear it at www.arnewsline.org

--

About five students become licensed each semester. From the South - East bureau in Birmingham Alabama, I'm David Black , KB4KCH, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again that website for more information on this very interesting project is www.WB8ELK.com (ARNewsline)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That’s in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 31st.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."

This weeks newscast was recorded in part at the 2004 Dayton Hamvention and at our studios in New Orleans, Louisiana. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

4213. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 03:16:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40B01771.2A0C1658@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92277

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
> >> >
> >> >That is incorrect, Leonard.
> >>
> >> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
> >> Dan. :-)
> >>
> >> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
> >>
> >> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
> >
> >Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides by
> >1930s standards and practices"?
>
> I'm not telling you that.

Excuse me. Yes, you personally told us that.

> All those who trumpet the 1930s standards
> and practices do. :-)

No, nobody here except you has written that. Now you've backtracked and
have told us that it is something different. The several of you
inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson need to come to an agreement.

> You still want to maintain the ancient rules...because you got your
> title, rank, status under that archaic standard.

Y'know Len? I got my four different classes of license under several
different standards. When you've obtained a license under any standard,
perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
radio licensing.

> Losing that title, rank, status, even if only to yourself, would be a
> mighty blow to your self-esteem. [that's rather obvious]

It might appear that way to an outsider like you. From my perspective, you're a guy who doesn't want to participate in an endeavor where anyone has more status than you. Tough it out, old timer.

> >> The FCC regulations don't define "ham" at all. The FDA does.
>
> Ham is the butchered meat of swine. :-)

That conflicts with what you wrote in the very recent past.

> >You've told us on numerous occasions all you want to do here.
>
> I'm doing that. :-)

Actually, you aren't.

> >You never seem to get around to doing what you've stated.
>
> Less here where it doesn't count for much in the real world.
>
> LOTS more at the FCC where it DOES count.

Okay, Mr. Mitty. I'm sure folks at the FCC find your sheer volume of material fascinating.

> >Now you'd like to tell me all I want to do.
>
> Nobody can tell Big Dave what to do...he da man! :-)

I respect authority, Len. You aren't authority.

> >I've not stated all I want to do here so your
> >comments are conjecture on your part.
>
> All you seem to do in here is bitch, moan, get nasty at folks who
> don't agree with you.

Are the several of you inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson having a group discussion among yourselves?

> Not a likeable guy you are. :-)

...not by you or "William". I can certainly live with that.

> >Take your pick, Leonard:
> >classical telegraphy, classical SSB, classical AM phone. You aren't
> >doing any of them in amateur radio. You aren't a participant.
>
> None of THIS newsgrouping IS amateur radio, Big Dave.

That's right. If this was amateur radio, you wouldn't be a participant.

> The FCC is NOT a "participant" in U.S. amateur radio.

Yes, the Commission participates. You don't participate.

> The FCC MAKES the rules and regulations for U.S. amateur radio.

> You seem to have a terrible incognizance problem with those two
> sentences! [mental Pampers would help you]

Your perception is incorrect. I understand that the Commission
participates in that it regulates amateur radio.

> >1. I wrote "amateur radio". You're drifting off into a description of
> >your past professional radio experience once again.
>
> Boils you down to very pale meat, doesn't it? :-)

Actually, no.

> >2. I don't really care where on which frequencies you communicated as a
> >professional.
>
> You just don't "care" about anything but attempting to triumph over
> others in a newsgroup! :-)

I wrote what I meant to convey, that I don't care on which frequencies
you communicated as a professional.

> >3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
> >U.S. Department of State.
>
> Does State have its own MARS-like organization? :-)

Do a web search.

> Since when did State enter into this discussion...

Since you brought it up.

> other than you want
> to impress your neighbors about your mighty governmental career?

My neighbors don't read this newsgroup.

> >> Didn't need a bit of manual telegraphy skills or licensing (as an
> >> amateur) to do any of that.
> >
> >You wouldn't need any to obtain the most basic amateur radio license in
> >the U.S. either.
>
> I have no need for any amateur radio license. I'm "not a participant,"
> remember? :-)

Having a need or desire and actually doing something about obtaining a
license are two very different things.

> >> Where is it "written" that I have to demonstrate some "interest in
> >> radio" to the Great Heil?
> >
> >I didn't write anything about "some interest in radio".
>
> Now, now, don't get petulant. This isn't a quibble over semantics

> or syntax or spelling.

That's right. It isn't a quibble over semantics. I wrote "amateur
radio" no matter how badly you want it to be "radio".

> You've written MUCH about the equate of "having an interest in
> radio" with amateur radio. You can't deny that.

I certainly can deny it. I've written nothing about "interest in
radio". I've written of "interest in amateur radio".

> It's in Google all
> nice and archived for those so bruised and battered over losing
> verbal battles that they have to quote endlessly from it. :-)

Good. You can research it and prove your claim then.

> >> You DEMAND amateur radio license acquisition in order to state
> >> anything on amateur radio regulations in here.
> >
> >I've DEMANDed nothing. I continue to point out that you have nothing to
> >do with amateur radio as a participant or a regulator.
>
> You DEMAND that ALL who "have an interest in radio" become
> radio amateurs, all nicely licensed and mentally very important.

I've DEMANDed nothing.

> You can't deny that. [but you will vainly, and self-importantly try]

Denying it is quite easy. I've made no demands of you. You rise or fall
on your own efforts. I've pointed out that you have not obtained even
the most basic amateur radio license.

> You are LICENSED! Oh, my. Terribly important you are!
>
> >> Without that "authorization" you are just another SS-wannabe who
> >> wants nothing more than to fight anyone who doesn't agree with
> >> your "orders" posted on this bulletin board. In other words, just
> >> another disagreeable gunnery nurse (but without bedpan).
> >
> >"Fight"? "Orders"? If we were fighting, you'd best pack a lunch and
> >rest up beforehand, old timer. I haven't issued any orders.
>
> Sweetums, if this had been a real physical fight, you wouldn't have
> been able to write anydamnthing in here. :-)

You mean for all the laughing I'd be doing, old timer? You're probably
right.

> >I'll have to discuss what with Paul Schleck?
>
> For starters, your "participation" in this newsgroup.

If I have need of Paul Schleck. I'll get in touch with him. As of
right now, I don't need him.

> Do you have a "participation license" granted to you to bitch and
> whine and moan in here about those who aren't licensed in
> amateurism?

As you pointed out earlier, this isn't amateur radio. I need no more
license to target you than you need for taking potshots at radio
amateurs and their traditions, Mr. Professional.

> >No DEMANDs have been made of you, Len.
>
> Irrelevant since you can't order anyone around, despite your mighty
> psycho-war effort to bluff and bluster others off your "licensed"
> turf. :-)

It can't be irrelevant. You brought it up. You accused me of making
DEMANDS but you haven't come up with a single example. What demand has
been made of you?

> >You continue to post.
>
> It's your time you are wasting. No problem for me. :-)

Let's see....This is an amateur radio newsgroup dealing with amateur
radio policy. I am a radio amateur. It seems to make sense for me to
be here.
You aren't a radio amateur. You, on the other hand, aren't involved in
amateur radio. Which one of us is wasting time?

> >I'll continue to point out your lack of anything to do with amateur radio.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still into the "turf" thing, aren't you? :-)

The turf is amateur radio. You aren't in on the action. You're a
bystander.

> >You've certainly kept mum about your childlike antics exemplified by
> >some of your comments to the FCC.
>
> What "childlike" antics, little toddler? :-)

Those on the Commission's web site; the ones deriding the comments of
others.

> Poor baby. Can't take grown-up debate against opposite-to-yours
> opinions, can you?

You haven't exhibited any "grown-up debate" here, ever. I'll find out
if I can take it when and if you ever do so.

> You have to call them "childlike" as if you were a "grown-up" trying
> to spank children? [you must have been talking to Dee?]

I call them childlike because I read them.

> You seem to have dysfunctional attributes in your "parenting." :-)

I'm not your parent.

> >Wanna discuss those?
>
> Not with SS-wannabes like yourself.

Is the sentence above your idea of grownup behavior?

> The FCC makes and enforces the civil radio regulations in the United
> States. If you have an old bone that you think needs gnawing on,
> then go make your Comments to the FCC about regulations.

Quit making DEMANDS, Len.

> It probably busts your chops no end that actual civilians, citizens of
> this country, can actually hold a discussion-debate with government.
> You just can't stand it when others have opinions contrary to yours.
> You have to call such folks names, denigrate them, pejorate them,
> do all you can to stifle independent thought.

Most radio amateurs are civilians. We can and do comment to and
petition our government. I've never had the opportunity to debate with
government.
You might tell us how you accomplished such debate.

Your thought is certainly independent. Independent doesn't mean that it
is rational thought.

> Hiram forbid that anyone should think opposite to your god-like
> viewpoints! After all, you are federally LICENSED as an amateur!

Right. I'm involved in amateur radio. You are on the sidelines and
have been for what is it?--several decades.

> You are a PARTICIPANT!

Yes, I am.

> Only YOU RULE! ...nobody else allowed to say anydamnthing. :-)

The FCC rules. I participate. You say much but you aren't involved.

> The colonel just loves it when a dictatorial plan comes together...

The colonel is dead. KFC is owned by a big corporation.

Dave K8MN

4214. Re: Is anyone else embarrassed?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 03:22:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40B018ED.4C1F5566@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92278

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <LInrc.4504$be.269@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Is anyone else embarrassed by the 'public sound and fury' antics of
> ARRL
> >in response to the BPL threat?
>
> I'm not, Hans.
>
> What would you have ARRL do?
>
> So far, there have been QST and website articles on BPL, detailed
> comments that included actual observations as well as serious models
> and simulations, and W1RFI doing a first-class presentation to amateur
> and industry groups. (I got to see it here in Philly). Also suggested
> letters and emails, etc.
>
> In addition, ARRL has been banging the drum for well thought out and
> well written comments and other feedback.
>
> Most hams don't have the resources to make actual measurements or
> simulations of something like BPL. That's one reson we need a strong
> national organization like ARRL.
>
> Would you rather they keep quiet? Tell hams not to comment?
>
> What's really embarrassing is that any "professional in
> radio-electronics" - in any engineering or regulatory capacity - would
> even consider an HF-VHF based BPL-type system.

I'm not embarrassed by the League's actions in the least. It would serve us well if each radio amateur were to draft letters to his congressman and senators. These folks do pay attention to their constituents. This type of letter writing campaign is what put the heat on Michael Powell over the proposed radio-TV station ownership changes. Those in the Congress don't understand BPL but they understand all about votes.

Dave K8MN

4215. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 03:33:00 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92279

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:scQrc.27390$KE6.16667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94F0DA18E6B98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:q8trc.17635$zO3.10674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >
>> >> Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to
>> >> sympathise with "my problem", because I don't have one.
>> >
>> > See? There it is....that's your problem. You don't even recognize
>> > you have it.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> So, let's see if I have this right, according to you I have a problem
>> because I only operate one mode? Well, you're right about one thing, I
>> do fail to see what part of that is a problem.
>
> You need to stop now Alun. All you are doing is proving my point over
> and over. You are a lid because you operate only phone.
>

How does that prove anything? Do you think if you repeat something often
enough it becomes true?

> Have a Good day mate.

Are you Australian?

>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

4216. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 03:48:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92280

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> >
> > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> > >
> > > It really is THAT simple.
> >
> > You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> >
> > No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> >
> > MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> >
> > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> >
> > ...and that's the way it is.
> >
> > LHA / WMD
>
> Yup.

Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?

4217. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 14:05:09 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0405230605.77e27c98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92281
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

PRISONBITCH "Fag-lame Freddy, The Lamenetter" <jesus@lamenet.com>
whine in message news:<c8nluo$1e48$3@news.wplus.net>...
> AB8MQ wrote:
>
> > LARDASS LLoyd Davies "Tim" <Timothy@Nospam> wrote in message
news:<c8mddssnj0@pita.alt.net>...
> >
> >>"Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
> >>news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster...
> >>What is the address for reporting AB8MQ TOS violations
> >>
> >>to Earthlink?
> >
> >
> > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..you dumbfuck. Yeah, I'm on
> > Earthlink, all right........BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> >
> > Saggytits Lee couldn't even find the correct Marshall County ARES
> > website, (He incorrectly stated that a Marshall County AL ARES website
> > was the one for Marshall County, WV) simply because his oblong,
> > malformed head is tickling his prostate most of the time.
>
>
> You know I can run and lie but I can't hide the fact I'm a clueless idiot...

That is so true, PRSIONBITCH, you are a clueless idiot. Get that
Rogaine yet?

4218. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 22:00:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405231400.638ddcec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92282

JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>>In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>>(Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >>>>
> >>>> It really is THAT simple.
> >>>
> >>> You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> >>>
> >>> No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> >>>
> >>> MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> >>>
> >>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> >>>
> >>> ...and that's the way it is.
> >>
> >>
> >>Yup.
> >
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> >
> > Steve,K4YZ
>
> Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.

That's not what Steve means.

He said, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," and he meant it.

4219. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 22:06:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92283

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > > In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> > >
> > > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> > > >
> > > > It really is THAT simple.
> > >
> > > You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> > >
> > > No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> > >
> > > MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> > >
> > > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> > >
> > > ...and that's the way it is.
> > >
> > > LHA / WMD
> >
> > Yup.
>
> Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?

Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.

However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
each TALCE deployment.

Best of Luck.

4220. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 22:15:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92284

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
>
> The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.

Wow! No wonder you got put out.

Directives "enable" something or some action.

Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.

Where does that leave you?

4221. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 22:17:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405231417.70678e09@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92285

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:scQrc.27390$KE6.16667@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94F0DA18E6B98elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:q8trc.17635$zO3.10674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns94EFEE5C08D49elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >
> >> >> Well, I am a bit puzzled why I would need to find someone to
> >> >> sympathise with "my problem", because I don't have one.
> >> >
> >> > See? There it is....that's your problem. You don't even recognize
> >> > you have it.
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> So, let's see if I have this right, according to you I have a problem
> >> because I only operate one mode? Well, you're right about one thing, I
> >> do fail to see what part of that is a problem.
> >
> > You need to stop now Alun. All you are doing is proving my point over
> > and over. You are a lid because you operate only phone.
> >
>
> How does that prove anything? Do you think if you repeat something often
> enough it becomes true?

Thats the PCTA way.

4222. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 23:24:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Hoasc.30958$KE6.3543@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92286

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

>
> Are you Australian?
>
> >
No. But I have known several.

Dan/W4NTI

4223. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-23 23:32:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kbWdnQUYZ5DsqSzdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92287

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>
>>Are you Australian?
>>
>>
> No. But I have known several.

I thought sure you were going to say "No, but I play one on TV!", Dan ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4224. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 03:25:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040523232558.21890.00001463@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92288

In article <40B01771.2A0C1658@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Herr Robust uf das newsgroup polizei> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>> >> >
>> >> >That is incorrect, Leonard.
>> >>
>> >> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
>> >> Dan. :-)
>> >>
>> >> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
>> >>
>> >> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
>> >
>> >Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides by
>> >1930s standards and practices"?
>>
>> I'm not telling you that.
>
>Excuse me. Yes, you personally told us that.

Anyone who espouses the 1930s standards and practices, such as requiring manual telegraphy skills in order to be licensed in amateur radio, says that. It doesn't have to be overtly stated (this is not a court of law and you are NO judge...).

>> All those who trumpet the 1930s standards
>> and practices do. :-)
>
>No, nobody here except you has written that.

Like I said, this is NOT a court of law and you are NO judge.

>Now you've backtracked and
>have told us that it is something different.

No. Nothing different. I've said that all along. You haven't been
paying attention. :-)

>The several of you
>inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson need to come to an agreement.

NO "agreement" needed with a single body, single personality.

I suggest that YOUR multiple personalities can't reach any
agreement on what this one person wrote.

Call a meeting and discuss that among YOUR personalities.

>> You still want to maintain the ancient rules...because you got your
>> title, rank, status under that archaic standard.
>
>Y'know Len? I got my four different classes of license under several
>different standards.

Wonderful. Keep on doing that until you get it right. :-)

>When you've obtained a license under any standard,
>perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
>radio licensing.

I already have several licenses.

Your "rationality" is on short ration.

YOU define "rational" as strict and utter obediance to a SINGLE
set of standards AND take the arrogant, UNofficial role of being a
judge (plus jury and executioner) of who can say what and to whom.

That is NOT "rational," herr robust. That is DICTATORIAL.

>> Losing that title, rank, status, even if only to yourself, would be a
>> mighty blow to your self-esteem. [that's rather obvious]
>
>It might appear that way to an outsider like you.

:-) An "outsider" is it? [of course, no official license, absolute
inability to say anydamnthing according to Herr Heil]

>From my perspective,
>you're a guy who doesn't want to participate in an endeavor where anyone
>has more status than you.

Ol' Dozer Davie is busy, busy, busy moving soil to make a mountain
out of metaphoric molehill. [your OSHA backup beeper is not working
old timer, get it fixed...at an appropriate service place that knows how
to work on simple circuitry]

Dozer Davie is also busy, busy, busy trying to cover up the subject of
WHEN the manual telegraphy test will be eliminated in U.S. amateur
radio licensing. He wanna keep shifting to denigrating others that
don't think as arrogantly and self-importantly as Him. :-)

>Tough it out, old timer.

I do that constantly. That's how I've survived that long. :-)

By the way, did you return that SS costume to Western Casting?
The rental prices are going up soon.

>> >> The FCC regulations don't define "ham" at all. The FDA does.
>>
>> Ham is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
>
>That conflicts with what you wrote in the very recent past.

No conflict. I've written before (roughly over a year ago) that a W6
already defined "ham" as "the butchered meat of swine" a number
of years ago.

That fits with one dictionary definition.

As far as I know, without bothering to check with the Food and Drug
Administration, the FDA still has rules on ham and can approve it
or disapprove it. Also beef, fish, and poultry. Are you too chicken
to defy the FDA? :-)

>> >You've told us on numerous occasions all you want to do here.
>>
>> I'm doing that. :-)
>
>Actually, you aren't.

Not in this message, true. I'm replying to nothing more than some
idiot's heckling and cat-calling about "cannot say anydamnthing
about amateur radio without a amateur radio license."

Except for its personal amusement value, your constant mention of
needing an amateur radio license in order to discuss matters of
amateur radio policy, is just a time-wasting exercise. :-)

You don't have a single bit of authority to judge who can say what
and to whom in here.

All you have is a big keyboard and wayyyyy too much time on your
hands to satisfy that warped thought-control police mind one of your
personalities has.

>> >You never seem to get around to doing what you've stated.
>>
>> Less here where it doesn't count for much in the real world.
>>
>> LOTS more at the FCC where it DOES count.
>
>Okay, Mr. Mitty. I'm sure folks at the FCC find your sheer volume of
>material fascinating.

How would you know? [did you add Thurber to your schiz ids?]

Oh, yes...you are one of those claiming "insider information" on U.S.
government...because you once got a regular salary for working for
working in one part of it. You claim to KNOW things. Uh huh.

>> >Now you'd like to tell me all I want to do.
>>
>> Nobody can tell Big Dave what to do...he da man! :-)
>
>I respect authority, Len. You aren't authority.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. You only respect Davie Heil.

YOU ARE NOT AUTHORITY.

[can you understand it better if written all-caps?]

Davie, all you've got is a Big Ego and all you have is a Big keyboard
in front of a control-freak personality problem.

>> >I've not stated all I want to do here so your
>> >comments are conjecture on your part.
>>
>> All you seem to do in here is bitch, moan, get nasty at folks who
>> don't agree with you.
>
>Are the several of you inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson having a
>group discussion among yourselves?

I'm not the schizoid, herr robust.

Your own multiple personalities badly need to seek consensus there.

:-)

>> Not a likeable guy you are. :-)
>
>...not by you or "William". I can certainly live with that.

So, you are unable to live with dissent.

Must be hell to be so royal. Or "heil." :-)

>> >Take your pick, Leonard:
>> >classical telegraphy, classical SSB, classical AM phone. You aren't
>> >doing any of them in amateur radio. You aren't a participant.
>>
>> None of THIS newsgrouping IS amateur radio, Big Dave.
>
>That's right. If this was amateur radio, you wouldn't be a participant.

If this were a "rational discussion," you would have LOST long ago.

>> The FCC is NOT a "participant" in U.S. amateur radio.
>
>Yes, the Commission participates. You don't participate.

The FCC makes regulations and - sometimes - enforces those
regulations.

The FCC does NOT promote amateur radio, nor does it put amateur
radio over and above all other radio services it is required to regulate.

NO staff or commissioner is required to have any "participatory"
amateur radio license in order to exercise regulatory power over
amateur radio.

Ain't that a bitch, though? :-)

Imagine that...THE regulatory power over amateur radio and not a
single FCC person is required to have any amateur radio license!

You precipitate in here, little snowflake, not participate.

You are a crystalized form of ego condensed out of a fog of old-
time ideas, standards, and practices, trying to clump in drifts to
disable independent thought of others.

The weather is too hot for your rigid, arrogant assertion of mandatory
old-time ideas, standards, and practices. Your precipitation only
leaves a wet smudge on the surface of rational discussion.

A paper towel can quickly wipe up your mess.

>> The FCC MAKES the rules and regulations for U.S. amateur radio.
>
>> You seem to have a terrible incognizance problem with those two
>> sentences! [mental Pampers would help you]
>
>Your perception is incorrect. I understand that the Commission
>participates in that it regulates amateur radio.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. There you go with the "participation" thing again.

Hello? Did your ancient dictionary dry up and blow away?

The FCC is somehow a "participator" like the ARRL? :-)

NOT ONE SINGLE FCC STAFFER NEED HAVE ANY AMATEUR
RADIO LICENSE TO *REGULATE* U.S. AMATEUR RADIO.

You are a precipitate. Dried sludge at the bottom of a Petrie dish.

>> >1. I wrote "amateur radio". You're drifting off into a description of
>> >your past professional radio experience once again.
>>
>> Boils you down to very pale meat, doesn't it? :-)
>
>Actually, no.

Actually, YES. :-)

>> >2. I don't really care where on which frequencies you communicated as a
>> >professional.

>>
>> You just don't "care" about anything but attempting to triumph over
>> others in a newsgroup! :-)
>
>I wrote what I meant to convey, that I don't care on which frequencies
>you communicated as a professional.

Poor precipitate.

You "care" only to denigrate all those who disagree with you and
stand up to you, tossing back the same sort of thing (and in greater
quantity) as you try to heap on others.

Doesn't feel good to your noble, royal ego, does it?

>> >3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
>> >U.S. Department of State.
>>
>> Does State have its own MARS-like organization? :-)
>
>Do a web search.

All I find is Heilian spiders squeaking "you can't talk about amateur
radio without an amateur radio license!" :-)

>> Since when did State enter into this discussion...
>
>Since you brought it up.

You never mentioned the U.S. Department of State before?!?!?

>> other than you want
>> to impress your neighbors about your mighty governmental career?
>
>My neighbors don't read this newsgroup.

Then they can't be "rational," can they?

They aren't "participatory?" :-)

>> >> Didn't need a bit of manual telegraphy skills or licensing (as an
>> >> amateur) to do any of that.
>> >
>> >You wouldn't need any to obtain the most basic amateur radio license in
>> >the U.S. either.
>>
>> I have no need for any amateur radio license. I'm "not a participant,"
>> remember? :-)
>
>Having a need or desire and actually doing something about obtaining a
>license are two very different things.

Oh? Now it is a finer Heilian definition of "NEED OR DESIRE?"

Of course, according to the arrogant Heilian definition, one MUST have
an amateur radio license in order to discuss amateur radio!

>> >> Where is it "written" that I have to demonstrate some "interest in
>> >> radio" to the Great Heil?
>> >
>> >I didn't write anything about "some interest in radio".
>>
>> Now, now, don't get petulant. This isn't a quibble over semantics
>> or syntax or spelling.
>
>That's right. It isn't a quibble over semantics. I wrote "amateur
>radio" no matter how badly you want it to be "radio".
>
>> You've written MUCH about the equate of "having an interest in
>> radio" with amateur radio. You can't deny that.
>
>I certainly can deny it. I've written nothing about "interest in
>radio". I've written of "interest in amateur radio".

Quibble, quibble, just so much dribble. :-)

Up near the beginning of your message you said:
"When you've obtained a license under any standard,
perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
radio licensing."

Hello? I've got SEVERAL licenses by SEVERAL STANDARDS.

Had them (plural) before you got a single one. :-)

Want to "quibble" more about what YOU wrote...and all readers have
read?

>> You DEMAND that ALL who "have an interest in radio" become
>> radio amateurs, all nicely licensed and mentally very important.
>
>I've DEMANDed nothing.

Sure you have. Many times. It's getting to be a standard bit of
off-key singing done in falsetto.

>> You can't deny that. [but you will vainly, and self-importantly try]
>
>Denying it is quite easy. I've made no demands of you.

Yes you have. Demands on TIME.

Except for its amusement value, replies to you WASTE TIME.

>You rise or fall on your own efforts.

Yes. I've risen to this occasion more than once, Dozer Davie.

Must really gripe your big, sorry butt that I keep telling things
like they are. :-)

>I've pointed out that you have not obtained even
>the most basic amateur radio license.

There you go again. :-)

Oberst Heil adjusts his monocle and addresses the troops:

"You cannot have a rational discussion about amateur radio
without FIRST getting an amateur radio license!!!"

>As you pointed out earlier, this isn't amateur radio.

No kidding? Ah, but, the Grate Heil said that an amateur radio
license is REQUIRED in order to have a "rational" discussion
about getting an amateur radio license!

That's a "chicken-egg paradox" thing painted different colors and
repackaged. :-)

>I need no more
>license to target you than you need for taking potshots at radio
>amateurs and their traditions, Mr. Professional.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. One of your personalities getting paranoid pot-shots?

Bandage that personality's wounds and continue on...

You need some (unlicensed) ability to take adversity, Mr. Amateur.

You've shown repeatedly that YOU CAN'T TAKE IT. You become
petulant, irritated, sometimes outraged at the slightest negativism
of your arrogant, follow-my-directive authority. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>It can't be irrelevant. You brought it up. You accused me of making
>DEMANDS but you haven't come up with a single example. What demand has
>been made of you?

Something about "one has to have an amateur radio license in
order to 'rationally' discuss anything about amateur radio." :-)

>Let's see....This is an amateur radio newsgroup dealing with amateur
>radio policy. I am a radio amateur. It seems to make sense for me to
>be here.

In general, it would, but you go FAR beyond that in your arrogant
petulance of constantly trying to heckle, jeer, denigrate all those
who disagree with you.

Social-wise, you are rated a "LID" as a human being on newsgroups.

>You aren't a radio amateur. You, on the other hand, aren't involved in
>amateur radio. Which one of us is wasting time?

According to Heilian Law, obviously the one without OFFICIAL
AMATEUR RADIO LICENSE to do the "rational" ritual. :-)

>> >You've certainly kept mum about your childlike antics exemplified by
>> >some of your comments to the FCC.
>>
>> What "childlike" antics, little toddler? :-)
>
>Those on the Commission's web site; the ones deriding the comments of
>others.

Poor baby. Can't take the heat of the discussions?

Precipitates are like that. Snowflake condensates melt quickly and
turn into hot vapor when exposed to heat. They steam and try to
burn others but quickly cool down and do no more. It's a return to
room temperature. :-)

>> Poor baby. Can't take grown-up debate against opposite-to-yours
>> opinions, can you?
>
>You haven't exhibited any "grown-up debate" here, ever. I'll find out
>if I can take it when and if you ever do so.

Poor baby. Still angry, still trying to get the last word, still trying
to bluff and bluster like you are some kind of "leader." :-)

>> You have to call them "childlike" as if you were a "grown-up" trying
>> to spank children? [you must have been talking to Dee?]
>
>I call them childlike because I read them.

Slowly, with a finger tracing out each letter? :-)

>> You seem to have dysfunctional attributes in your "parenting." :-)
>
>I'm not your parent.

Darwinian Law comes to humanity's rescue! :-)

>> The FCC makes and enforces the civil radio regulations in the United
>> States. If you have an old bone that you think needs gnawing on,
>> then go make your Comments to the FCC about regulations.
>
>Quit making DEMANDS, Len.

A CONDITIONAL phrase begins with "if," senior. That wasn't a demand,
just a conditional statement.

But, if you CAN'T take any controversy, much less negative opinion,
by all means stay away from making any comments in public to the
FCC. Stay in here where you have the fictional equivalent of King of
the Loud Hill, where you can safely send nastygrams to those who
won't agree with you.

>Most radio amateurs are civilians. We can and do comment to and
>petition our government.

Ah, but amateur radio is DIFFERENT according to Heilian Law.

In order to comment to government on amateur radio, Heilian Law
states that commenter MUST have an amateur radio license!

Well, so much for the First Amendment...

>Your thought is certainly independent. Independent doesn't mean that it
>is rational thought.

Neither is your arrogant petulant whining over your perceived "hurts"
in this newsgroup...done for years...

Poor baby.

LHA / WMD

4225. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 03:27:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040523232710.21890.00001464@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92289

In article <1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
>> > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
>>
>> The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>
>Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>
>Directives "enable" something or some action.
>
>Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
>
>Where does that leave you?

UNABLE. :-)

LHA / WMD

4226. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 03:53:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92290

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> > > >
> > > > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> > > > >
> > > > > It really is THAT simple.
> > > >
> > > > You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> > > >
> > > > No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> > > >
> > > > MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> > > >
> > > > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > ...and that's the way it is.
> > > >
> > > > LHA / WMD
> > >
> > > Yup.
> >
> > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?
>
> Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.

Catch up with the definition of "morphed".

> However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> each TALCE deployment.

What, exactly, does that have to do with my question? I'll try again:
How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?

> Best of Luck.

4227. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 06:35:37 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.05.24.06.35.34.32754@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 92291
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 21 May 2004 21:20:54 -0500, Tim wrote:

>
> "Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
> news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster... What is the address for
> reporting AB8MQ TOS violations
>
> to Earthlink?
>
>
<rest of the BS snipped>

I really hate to say it folks, but if someone REALLY wanted to track you via the net, it would be relatively easy to do so (unless one not only uses an anonymous remailer, but does so from an anonymous shell account via remote access from yet another shell account, etc).

I should know this as I *DO* have some professional training in this particular subject.

IMHO, both stagger lee and roger are lying and trying to bluff each other (and the rest of us).

its just easier to slap them in an ignore bozo filter and be done with it! Thats what I suggest y'all do.

just my 2 pennies worth.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence has its limits.

4228. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 08:56:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405240056.347fb9ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92292

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<aUQqc.94765$MH.18953259@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
>
> Just for clarification, (Please correct me if I'm mistaken, Jim.) 0100z,
> Tuesday is the same as 9 PM EDST, Monday. So we're talking about a Monday
> eve. net here.

You are correct sir!

9 PM EDST tonight

> Nuthin' more enjoyable than actually gettin' OTA.
>
Hope to CU then

73 de Jim, N2EY

4229. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 10:36:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92293

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
> > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <5c01b95b.0405210423.20031861@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > > > > (Stevie the gunnery nurse) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It really is THAT simple.
> > > > >
> > > > > You have it really SO WRONG. :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > No Department of Defense authorization for MARS means NO MARS.
> > > > >
> > > > > MARS operates OUTSIDE of civil amateur radio bands.
> > > > >
> > > > > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> > > > >
> > > > > ...and that's the way it is.
> > > > >
> > > > > LHA / WMD
> > > >
> > > > Yup.
> > >
> > > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?
> >
> > Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.
>
> Catch up with the definition of "morphed".

Why would you assume that there were a "morphed" version?

> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> > each TALCE deployment.

>
> What, exactly, does that have to do with my question?

Tell us again how you have "real military experience" but never wore a uniform.

Handling MARS traffic might give you real military experience, but I've got plenty.

I'll try again:
> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?

What's it to you?

4230. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 12:42:52 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <g5msc.39955$cz5.12416481@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92294

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405240056.347fb9ce@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<aUQqc.94765$MH.18953259@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> >
> > Just for clarification, (Please correct me if I'm mistaken, Jim.) 0100z,
> > Tuesday is the same as 9 PM EDST, Monday. So we're talking about a
Monday
> > eve. net here.
>
> You are correct sir!
>
> 9 PM EDST tonight
>
> > Nuthin' more enjoyable than actually gettin' OTA.
> >
> Hope to CU then
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You will. Hope some other folks from r.r.a.p make it.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4231. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 16:08:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405240808.2a2cbe1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92295

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040523232558.21890.00001463@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <40B01771.2A0C1658@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Herr Robust uf das
> newsgroup polizei> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
> >> >> >
> >> >> >That is incorrect, Leonard.
> >> >>
> >> >> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real Ham"
> >> >> Dan. :-)
> >> >>
> >> >> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
> >> >>
> >> >> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
> >> >
> >> >Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides by
> >> >1930s standards and practices"?
> >>
> >> I'm not telling you that.
> >
> >Excuse me. Yes, you personally told us that.
>
> Anyone who espouses the 1930s standards and practices, such as
> requiring manual telegraphy skills in order to be licensed in
> amateur radio, says that. It doesn't have to be overtly stated (this
> is not a court of law and you are NO judge...).

Neither are you, yet YOU presume to know what is better for all
of us based upon non-Amateur Radio knowledge or experience.

> >When you've obtained a license under any standard,
> >perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
> >radio licensing.

>
> I already have several licenses.

None of them on FCC form 660, and none of them granting operating
priviledges in the Amateur Radio Service.

> Your "rationality" is on short ration.

Your's is short on ANY rationale.

> >From my perspective,
> >you're a guy who doesn't want to participate in an endeavor where anyone
> >has more status than you.
>
> Ol' Dozer Davie is busy, busy, busy moving soil to make a mountain
> out of metaphoric molehill. [your OSHA backup beeper is not working
> old timer, get it fixed...at an appropriate service place that knows how
> to work on simple circuitry]
>
> Dozer Davie is also busy, busy, busy trying to cover up the subject of
> WHEN the manual telegraphy test will be eliminated in U.S. amateur
> radio licensing. He wanna keep shifting to denigrating others that
> don't think as arrogantly and self-importantly as Him.

While Lennie the Lame is busy attempting to hide his lack of
experience behind piles of obfuscation, Dave has DECADES of it.

> >Tough it out, old timer.
>
> I do that constantly. That's how I've survived that long.

You've "survived" so long at the expense of others work.

> All you have is a big keyboard and wayyyyy too much time on your
> hands to satisfy that warped thought-control police mind one of your
> personalities has.

Actually, the one with way too much time on his hands is you,
Lennie...Perhaps if YOU had an Amateur Radio license and spent some
time on the air you'd have less to waste...?!?!

> >I respect authority, Len. You aren't authority.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. You only respect Davie Heil.
>
> YOU ARE NOT AUTHORITY.

You keep wanting to argue about who's "in authority", Lennie.

No doubt due to YOUR desire to be the one IN authority.

However your lack of maturity (in terms of character, not
chronological years) and experience will keep you from EVER being that
in ANY Amateur Radio forum or event.

> [can you understand it better if written all-caps?]

LEONARD H. ANDERSON IS A FOOL.

Did YOU understand THAT, Lennie...?!?!

> Davie, all you've got is a Big Ego and all you have is a Big keyboard
> in front of a control-freak personality problem.

Pot/Kettle/Black.

You're awash in it, Your Scumminess. Everyone here except you
and Brian see it. Sucks to be you.

> >Are the several of you inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson having a
> >group discussion among yourselves?
>
> I'm not the schizoid, herr robust.

Sure you are. There's the Lennie who makes claims that he's
going to do things, then there's the Lennie who makes excuses about
why he didn't do them.

Pretty "schizoid" to me, Lennie, and I am far more qualified to
know the difference than you are.

> >Yes, the Commission participates. You don't participate.

> The FCC does NOT promote amateur radio, nor does it put amateur
> radio over and above all other radio services it is required to regulate.

The FCC >>DOES<< promote Amateur Radio. Please refer to the
Basis and Purpose of the service as set forth in 97.1.

> You precipitate in here, little snowflake, not participate.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> You are a crystalized form of ego condensed out of a fog of old-
> time ideas, standards, and practices, trying to clump in drifts to
> disable independent thought of others.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> The weather is too hot for your rigid, arrogant assertion of mandatory
> old-time ideas, standards, and practices. Your precipitation only
> leaves a wet smudge on the surface of rational discussion.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> A paper towel can quickly wipe up your mess.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> NOT ONE SINGLE FCC STAFFER NEED HAVE ANY AMATEUR
> RADIO LICENSE TO *REGULATE* U.S. AMATEUR RADIO.

You keep trying to hide behind the skirts of the "FCC staffers".

None of them are in here trying to invoke thier "greater wisdom"
on anyone. They are REQUIRED to "regulate" by an Act of COngress.

YOU are NOT.

> You are a precipitate. Dried sludge at the bottom of a Petrie dish.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> Poor precipitate.
>
> You "care" only to denigrate all those who disagree with you and
> stand up to you, tossing back the same sort of thing (and in greater
> quantity) as you try to heap on others.
>
> Doesn't feel good to your noble, royal ego, does it?

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >> >3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
> >> >U.S. Department of State.
> >>
> >> Does State have its own MARS-like organization? :-)
> >
> >Do a web search.
>
> All I find is Heilian spiders squeaking "you can't talk about amateur
> radio without an amateur radio license!"

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >I certainly can deny it. I've written nothing about "interest in
> >radio". I've written of "interest in amateur radio".
>
> Quibble, quibble, just so much dribble.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> Up near the beginning of your message you said:
> "When you've obtained a license under any standard,
> perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
> radio licensing."
>
> Hello? I've got SEVERAL licenses by SEVERAL STANDARDS.

None of them an Amateur Radio license, and none of them with ANY
experience in practical Amateur Radio applications.

> Had them (plural) before you got a single one.

Had ONE before he got a single one, according to what you've
posted in here before, if we are to believe ANYthing you've posted
before.

> Want to "quibble" more about what YOU wrote...and all readers have
> read?

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >> You DEMAND that ALL who "have an interest in radio" become
> >> radio amateurs, all nicely licensed and mentally very important.
> >
> >I've DEMANDed nothing.
>
> Sure you have. Many times. It's getting to be a standard bit of
> off-key singing done in falsetto.

And you HAVEN'T, Scummy one?

You have "point blank" demanded that I or others "shut up"..."go
away", etc etc etc.

But then stand-up-manship was never your forte.

> >> You can't deny that. [but you will vainly, and self-importantly try]
> >
> >Denying it is quite easy. I've made no demands of you.
>
> Yes you have. Demands on TIME.
>
> Except for its amusement value, replies to you WASTE TIME.

Then stop replying. So far, you've only proven that all
assertions about YOUR lack of character, honesty and practical
knowledge of the Amateur Radio Service were correct all-along.

> >You rise or fall on your own efforts.
>
> Yes. I've risen to this occasion more than once, Dozer Davie.

Only to have fallen on your own, dull, sword.

> Must really gripe your big, sorry butt that I keep telling things
> like they are. :-)
>
> >I've pointed out that you have not obtained even
> >the most basic amateur radio license.
>
> There you go again. :-)

>
> Oberst Heil adjusts his monocle and addresses the troops:
>
> "You cannot have a rational discussion about amateur radio
> without FIRST getting an amateur radio license!!!"

Only an idiot would argue with the concept of having some sort of
first-person based experience in a topic before trying to comment on
it.

So far, all YOU have been able to offer is what you can glean
from various websites or second hand opinions.

Dave, on the otherhand, has "credentials" in the Amateur Radio
Service that YOU could not hope to duplicate if you and Mrs Scummy hit
the road for the next 10 years in pursuit of nothing else but.

> >As you pointed out earlier, this isn't amateur radio.
>
> No kidding? Ah, but, the Grate Heil said that an amateur radio
> license is REQUIRED in order to have a "rational" discussion
> about getting an amateur radio license!
>
> That's a "chicken-egg paradox" thing painted different colors and
> repackaged.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >I need no more
> >license to target you than you need for taking potshots at radio
> >amateurs and their traditions, Mr. Professional.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. One of your personalities getting paranoid pot-shots?

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> Bandage that personality's wounds and continue on...
>
> You need some (unlicensed) ability to take adversity, Mr. Amateur.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> You've shown repeatedly that YOU CAN'T TAKE IT. You become
> petulant, irritated, sometimes outraged at the slightest negativism
> of your arrogant, follow-my-directive authority. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Pot/Kettle/Black...Witness your own frequent "demands" peppered
with liberal doses of profanity and lack of facts.

> >Let's see....This is an amateur radio newsgroup dealing with amateur
> >radio policy. I am a radio amateur. It seems to make sense for me to

> >be here.
>
> In general, it would, but you go FAR beyond that in your arrogant
> petulance of constantly trying to heckle, jeer, denigrate all those
> who disagree with you.
>
> Social-wise, you are rated a "LID" as a human being on newsgroups.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >Those on the Commission's web site; the ones deriding the comments of
> >others.
>
> Poor baby. Can't take the heat of the discussions?
>
> Precipitates are like that. Snowflake condensates melt quickly and
> turn into hot vapor when exposed to heat. They steam and try to
> burn others but quickly cool down and do no more. It's a return to
> room temperature.

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >> Poor baby. Can't take grown-up debate against opposite-to-yours
> >> opinions, can you?
> >
> >You haven't exhibited any "grown-up debate" here, ever. I'll find out
> >if I can take it when and if you ever do so.
>
> Poor baby. Still angry, still trying to get the last word, still trying
> to bluff and bluster like you are some kind of "leader."

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >> You seem to have dysfunctional attributes in your "parenting." :-)
> >
> >I'm not your parent.
>
> Darwinian Law comes to humanity's rescue!

"I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> >Your thought is certainly independent. Independent doesn't mean that it
> >is rational thought.
>
> Neither is your arrogant petulant whining over your perceived "hurts"
> in this newsgroup...done for years...

Dave has not "whined" about 'perceived "hurts"

He HAS accurately pointed out YOUR shortcomings of facts and
practical experience, that lack most often manifesting in your errors
about Amateur Radio programs or practice.

> Poor baby.

Sucks to be you, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

4232. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 16:13:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92296

JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.

We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
being a licensed Amateur.

I will preempt Brain and state OTHER than those appointed or
hired to oversee the program by DoD.

This one caveat notwithstanding, I am still awaiting Lennie'e
presentation of his Navy-Marine Corps MARS callsign and credentials of
membership.

Thankfully, I know better than to hold by breath!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4233. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 16:22:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405240822.74a0e96a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92297

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...

> > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?
>
> Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.
>
> However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> each TALCE deployment.

The Marines had NO difficulty getting "authorized".

They had trouble getting the schedule arranged for gateways and
getting appropriate equipment to the deployed units. Callsigns and
"authorization" were already in place.

Seems the Marines have a nasty habit of carrying combat equipment
into combat areas as a first priority. MWR gear comes after that.

> Best of Luck.

Back at ya!

Steve, K4YZ

4234. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 16:24:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92298

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
> >
> > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>
> Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>
> Directives "enable" something or some action.
>
> Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
>
> Where does that leave you?

With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
on it.

The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4235. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 16:26:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405240826.24973d11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92299

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040523232710.21890.00001464@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >
> >> > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
> >>
> >> The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
> >
> >Wow! No wonder you got put out.
> >
> >Directives "enable" something or some action.
> >
> >Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
> >
> >Where does that leave you?
>
> UNABLE.

Still waiting on your "Extra Lite out of the box", Lennie...Seems
YOU are the one "unable"...

And how's that application for Navy/MC MARS coming? "Unable" to
do that too, no doubt...

Steve, K4YZ

4236. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 19:08:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92300

In article <5c01b95b.0405240808.2a2cbe1e@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (gunnery nurse trying to impersonate an offizier uf das newsgroup polizei) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040523232558.21890.00001463@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <40B01771.2A0C1658@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <Herr Robust uf
das
>> newsgroup polizei> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <40AD95D4.57BE367A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >> In article <40ACDF0F.1BEE6377@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> >> >> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >> >> "Real ham" = One who abides by 1930s standards and practices
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >That is incorrect, Leonard.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Not in the context of the particular give-and-take with "Real
Ham"
>> >> >> Dan. :-)
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >A "real ham" is one who holds an amateur radio license.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Actually, a "real ham" is the butchered meat of swine. :-)
>> >> >
>> >> >Then why are you trying to tell us that " "Real ham' = One who abides
>by
>> >> >1930s standards and practices"?
>> >>
>> >> I'm not telling you that.
>> >
>> >Excuse me. Yes, you personally told us that.
>>
>> Anyone who espouses the 1930s standards and practices, such as
>> requiring manual telegraphy skills in order to be licensed in
>> amateur radio, says that. It doesn't have to be overtly stated (this

>> is not a court of law and you are NO judge...).
>
> Neither are you, yet YOU presume to know what is better for all
>of us based upon non-Amateur Radio knowledge or experience.

Based upon published regulations and directives. :-)

>> >When you've obtained a license under any standard,
>> >perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
>> >radio licensing.
>>
>> I already have several licenses.
>
> None of them on FCC form 660, and none of them granting operating
>priviledges in the Amateur Radio Service.

tsk, tsk, tsk...you should read what was WRITTEN, little man.

Herr Robust said NOTHING about any "FCC form 660." :-)

>> Your "rationality" is on short ration.
>
> Your's is short on ANY rationale.

Now, now, don't get all hot and bothered and start calling folks by
nastynames again.

>> >From my perspective,
>> >you're a guy who doesn't want to participate in an endeavor where anyone
>> >has more status than you.
>>
>> Ol' Dozer Davie is busy, busy, busy moving soil to make a mountain
>> out of metaphoric molehill. [your OSHA backup beeper is not working
>> old timer, get it fixed...at an appropriate service place that knows
how
>> to work on simple circuitry]
>>
>> Dozer Davie is also busy, busy, busy trying to cover up the subject of
>> WHEN the manual telegraphy test will be eliminated in U.S. amateur
>> radio licensing. He wanna keep shifting to denigrating others that
>> don't think as arrogantly and self-importantly as Him.
>
> While Lennie the Lame is busy attempting to hide his lack of
>experience behind piles of obfuscation, Dave has DECADES of it.

...as an AMATEUR...as a self-trained stuffed shirt. :-)

>> >Tough it out, old timer.
>>
>> I do that constantly. That's how I've survived that long.
>
> You've "survived" so long at the expense of others work.

How do you know, gunnery nurse? You couldn't hold a job as an
electronics purchasing agent more than half a year...what other
jobs "in electronics" have you had?

>> All you have is a big keyboard and wayyyyy too much time on your
>> hands to satisfy that warped thought-control police mind one of your
>> personalities has.
>
> Actually, the one with way too much time on his hands is you,
>Lennie...Perhaps if YOU had an Amateur Radio license and spent some
>time on the air you'd have less to waste...?!?!

I'm retired, gunnery nurse. Comfortable income, money in the bank,
good health, nice home, wonderful wife. I've got U.S. patent
3,848,191. You haven't got any. [which may be your problem...]

>> >I respect authority, Len. You aren't authority.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. You only respect Davie Heil.
>>
>> YOU ARE NOT AUTHORITY.
>
> You keep wanting to argue about who's "in authority", Lennie.

I'm not arguing who has lawful authority, gunnery nurse.

It isn't you, it isn't Davie.

> No doubt due to YOUR desire to be the one IN authority.

No.

> However your lack of maturity (in terms of character, not
>chronological years) and experience will keep you from EVER being that
>in ANY Amateur Radio forum or event.

Ooooo...aren't you sweet and respectful this morning. Fail to swipe
some of the good stuff from the hospital medicine room?

>> [can you understand it better if written all-caps?]
>
> LEONARD H. ANDERSON IS A FOOL.

Nope.

> Did YOU understand THAT, Lennie...?!?!

No, your nastygram was over-driven resulting in signal distortion.

You are splattering all over the band, out of control...(again).

>> Davie, all you've got is a Big Ego and all you have is a Big keyboard
>> in front of a control-freak personality problem.
>
> Pot/Kettle/Black.

Out of curiosity, how many keyboards do you go through in a month?

Four? Six? They sure take a beating when you get all fired up in
outrage and hatred...

> You're awash in it, Your Scumminess. Everyone here except you
>and Brian see it. Sucks to be you.

"Awash?" No floods here like in the midwest.

At a ground elevation of about 840 feet MSL there's not much danger
of flooding at this location.

We have a General Electric washer and dryer used on a regular basis.
Front-load washer, five years old. Very efficient. Got rebates for
energy efficiency. Not overworked.

>> >Are the several of you inhabiting the body of Leonard Anderson having a
>> >group discussion among yourselves?
>>
>> I'm not the schizoid, herr robust.
>
> Sure you are. There's the Lennie who makes claims that he's
>going to do things, then there's the Lennie who makes excuses about
>why he didn't do them.

I'm still trying to invent anti-gravity. Something is holding me down.

> Pretty "schizoid" to me, Lennie, and I am far more qualified to
>know the difference than you are.

From gunnery nurse to Dr. Sigmund Rosebud, Docktor of
Sinkiatry. Nice morph, murph.

>> >Yes, the Commission participates. You don't participate.
>
>> The FCC does NOT promote amateur radio, nor does it put amateur
>> radio over and above all other radio services it is required to
>regulate.
>
> The FCC >>DOES<< promote Amateur Radio. Please refer to the
>Basis and Purpose of the service as set forth in 97.1.

Please jump in the water to cool down the inflamation in your brain
and eyes.

The FCC have a Ham Website? No? Don't they "promote" hamming?

The FCC sponsors Ham Events? No? Don't they "promote" it?

The FCC publishes all kinds of Ham Books? No? Don't they "promote"
Ham Radio stuff?

The FCC issues nice little radio contest awards? No? [the FCC only
issues amateur radio licenses to amateurs]

>> You precipitate in here, little snowflake, not participate.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> You are a crystalized form of ego condensed out of a fog of old-
>> time ideas, standards, and practices, trying to clump in drifts to
>> disable independent thought of others.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> The weather is too hot for your rigid, arrogant assertion of mandatory
>> old-time ideas, standards, and practices. Your precipitation only
>> leaves a wet smudge on the surface of rational discussion.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.
>
>> A paper towel can quickly wipe up your mess.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.
>
>> NOT ONE SINGLE FCC STAFFER NEED HAVE ANY AMATEUR
>> RADIO LICENSE TO *REGULATE* U.S. AMATEUR RADIO.
>
> You keep trying to hide behind the skirts of the "FCC staffers".

Only Commissioner Abernathy wears a skirt. The rest are suits.

> None of them are in here trying to invoke thier "greater wisdom"
>on anyone. They are REQUIRED to "regulate" by an Act of COngress.

You DO have a problem relating to other people...tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

> YOU are NOT.

Never claimed to be, gunnery nurse. :-)

[you REALLY can't take dissention, can you? tsk, tsk, tsk]

>> You are a precipitate. Dried sludge at the bottom of a Petrie dish.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> Poor precipitate.
>>
>> You "care" only to denigrate all those who disagree with you and
>> stand up to you, tossing back the same sort of thing (and in greater
>> quantity) as you try to heap on others.
>>
>> Doesn't feel good to your noble, royal ego, does it?
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> >> >3. You have no idea which frequencies are used or may be used by the
>> >> >U.S. Department of State.
>> >>
>> >> Does State have its own MARS-like organization? :-)
>> >
>> >Do a web search.
>>
>> All I find is Heilian spiders squeaking "you can't talk about amateur
>> radio without an amateur radio license!"
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
> From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> >I certainly can deny it. I've written nothing about "interest in
>> >radio". I've written of "interest in amateur radio".
>>
>> Quibble, quibble, just so much dribble.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> Up near the beginning of your message you said:
>> "When you've obtained a license under any standard,
>> perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of
amateur
>> radio licensing."

>>
>> Hello? I've got SEVERAL licenses by SEVERAL STANDARDS.
>
> None of them an Amateur Radio license, and none of them with ANY
>experience in practical Amateur Radio applications.

Poor deluded gunnery nurse...thinks amateur radios work by different
laws of physics than any other radio...thinks amateur radios won't
work without passing a test for manual telegraphy. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> Had them (plural) before you got a single one.
>
> Had ONE before he got a single one, according to what you've
>posted in here before, if we are to believe ANYthing you've posted
>before.

Make up your deluded little mind, gunnery nurse.

You keep saying I'm always LYING but now you think I've told a
truth?

You are very confused. Get mental help.

>> Want to "quibble" more about what YOU wrote...and all readers have
>> read?
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

See? There you went ahead and said I "LIE" again...yet you try to
say I've told a truth. Very mixed up you are...

>> >> You DEMAND that ALL who "have an interest in radio" become
>> >> radio amateurs, all nicely licensed and mentally very important.
>> >
>> >I've DEMANDed nothing.
>>
>> Sure you have. Many times. It's getting to be a standard bit of
>> off-key singing done in falsetto.
>
> And you HAVEN'T, Scummy one?

I've not learned to type in falsetto... :-)

> You have "point blank" demanded that I or others "shut up"..."go
>away", etc etc etc.

I don't shoot blanks, little gunnery nurse.

> But then stand-up-manship was never your forte.

"Stand-up-manship?" :-)

You mean like the puerile little penwomanship you exhibit all the
time with such cute phrases like "putz," "your scumminess,"
"sucks to be you," etc., etc., etc. :-)

>> >> You can't deny that. [but you will vainly, and self-importantly
try]
>> >
>> >Denying it is quite easy. I've made no demands of you.
>>
>> Yes you have. Demands on TIME.
>>
>> Except for its amusement value, replies to you WASTE TIME.
>
> Then stop replying. So far, you've only proven that all
>assertions about YOUR lack of character, honesty and practical
>knowledge of the Amateur Radio Service were correct all-along.

"Stop replying?" Ooooo...issuing Orders, gunnery nurse?

This is just an amusing morning word workout, gunnery nurse.

Your name isn't "Dave Heil," gunnery nurse.

You don't need to jump in and disrupt a dispute between two
others...but you are OBSESSED with "getting certain folks."

Poor baby. You are frustrated that your tactic DOES NOT WORK!

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> >You rise or fall on your own efforts.
>>
>> Yes. I've risen to this occasion more than once, Dozer Davie.
>
> Only to have fallen on your own, dull, sword.

Nope. :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, to try for wordsmithing you need to control the
selection of words in your phrases. You should have written:

"Only to fall on your own blade."

Bulldozers have a BLADE. See the connection? "Blade" on a
bulldozer and "blade" on a knife?

Your "knife" is unsharp and you can't handle it properly.

BULL you can do and "bulldozing" you attempt...but you don't know
how to control anything yet.

>> Must really gripe your big, sorry butt that I keep telling things
>> like they are. :-)
>>
>> >I've pointed out that you have not obtained even
>> >the most basic amateur radio license.

>>
>> There you go again. :-)
>>
>> Oberst Heil adjusts his monocle and addresses the troops:
>>
>> "You cannot have a rational discussion about amateur radio
>> without FIRST getting an amateur radio license!!!"
>
> Only an idiot would argue with the concept of having some sort of
>first-person based experience in a topic before trying to comment on
>it.

tsk, tsk, tsk...[all in lower-case due to pitifulness of reply]

You are OBSESSED with hatred of certain other people. You are
still mentally unbalanced. Get help.

> So far, all YOU have been able to offer is what you can glean
>from various websites or second hand opinions.

Not "glean" but rather reveal, as in regulations and directives of the
latest effective dates.

Gunnery nurse was UNABLE to name or reference a single MARS
directive or regulation in three weeks of give-and-take with Brian
Burke. UNABLE. Despite holding an "amateur extra" license
(suitable for framing), gunnery nurse tried to bluff and bluster through
an argument, NOT ONCE being ABLE to reference a single directive
or regulation concerning MARS. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Poor gunnery nurse is sick and disgusted that anyone not licensed
in amateur radio EVER worked in other radio on a professional
basis...and for half a century!

> Dave, on the otherhand, has "credentials" in the Amateur Radio
>Service that YOU could not hope to duplicate if you and Mrs Scummy hit
>the road for the next 10 years in pursuit of nothing else but.

Not a problem. A good digital scanner can duplicate all sorts of
"credentials." :-)

Is there a "change in requirements" now?

One has to join the Department of State, spend years in foreign
lands, in order to obtain a U.S. amateur radio license?!?!?!?

I have to commit adultery with some "Mrs. Scummy" to do all that?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...

>> >As you pointed out earlier, this isn't amateur radio.
>>
>> No kidding? Ah, but, the Grate Heil said that an amateur radio
>> license is REQUIRED in order to have a "rational" discussion

>> about getting an amateur radio license!
>>
>> That's a "chicken-egg paradox" thing painted different colors and
>> repackaged.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
> From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> >I need no more
>> >license to target you than you need for taking potshots at radio
>> >amateurs and their traditions, Mr. Professional.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. One of your personalities getting paranoid pot-shots?
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
> From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> Bandage that personality's wounds and continue on...
>>
>> You need some (unlicensed) ability to take adversity, Mr. Amateur.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
> From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> You've shown repeatedly that YOU CAN'T TAKE IT. You become
>> petulant, irritated, sometimes outraged at the slightest negativism
>> of your arrogant, follow-my-directive authority. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> Pot/Kettle/Black...Witness your own frequent "demands" peppered
>with liberal doses of profanity and lack of facts.

"Liberal doses of 'profanity?'"

Tsk, tsk, tsk...talk about the deep black pot with continued use of
a Yiddish colloquialism for "asshole" (the word "putz") trying to call
anyone else nasty... :-)

>> >Let's see....This is an amateur radio newsgroup dealing with amateur
>> >radio policy. I am a radio amateur. It seems to make sense for me to
>> >be here.
>>
>> In general, it would, but you go FAR beyond that in your arrogant
>> petulance of constantly trying to heckle, jeer, denigrate all those
>> who disagree with you.

>>
>> Social-wise, you are rated a "LID" as a human being on newsgroups.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> >Those on the Commission's web site; the ones deriding the comments of
>> >others.
>>
>> Poor baby. Can't take the heat of the discussions?
>>
>> Precipitates are like that. Snowflake condensates melt quickly and
>> turn into hot vapor when exposed to heat. They steam and try to
>> burn others but quickly cool down and do no more. It's a return to
>> room temperature.
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
> From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

[this reply seems to "write itself"... :-)]

>> >> Poor baby. Can't take grown-up debate against opposite-to-yours
>> >> opinions, can you?
>> >
>> >You haven't exhibited any "grown-up debate" here, ever. I'll find out
>> >if I can take it when and if you ever do so.
>>
>> Poor baby. Still angry, still trying to get the last word, still
trying
>> to bluff and bluster like you are some kind of "leader."
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

>> >> You seem to have dysfunctional attributes in your "parenting." :-)
>> >
>> >I'm not your parent.
>>
>> Darwinian Law comes to humanity's rescue!
>
> "I am only here to civillly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

[yup...real easy reply this one... :-)]

>> >Your thought is certainly independent. Independent doesn't mean that it
>> >is rational thought.
>>
>> Neither is your arrogant petulant whining over your perceived "hurts"
>> in this newsgroup...done for years...
>
> Dave has not "whined" about 'perceived "hurts"

And what is your busy, but poorly constructed "reply" but another
obsessive NEED to "get someone" he hates?

YOU are NOT Davie Heil, will never be.

Get some mental therapy and work on your ability to get along
with others. It will help you and those around you.

So far, your identity crisis has resulted only in some mild amusement
for me and a a lot of irritation to other readers in here. That is NOT
good for your image.

LHA / WMD

4237. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 19:09:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040524150936.13355.00001061@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92301

In article <5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
>> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
>> Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
>
> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
>being a licensed Amateur.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...then what is written in an official USN-USMC Communications Instruction is "wrong?" :-)

> I will preempt Brain and state OTHER than those appointed or
>hired to oversee the program by DoD.

What are you trying to state in that sentence?

"Preempt?" You have NO authority, can't "preempt" anything.

> This one caveat notwithstanding, I am still awaiting Lennie'e
>presentation of his Navy-Marine Corps MARS callsign and credentials of
>membership.

"Caveat?" Are you having pretensions of literary expertise as well?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Read the ENTIRETY of a dictionary some time... :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk, more obsessive NEED to "get hated others" in here.

The USN-USMC Communications Instruction is a regulation for USN, USMC Military Affiliate Radio System operation. It says what it says and all working in the USN-USMC MARS program are obliged to obey it.

That does NOT mean anyone talking about it or showing what it contains "must be a participant." :-)

> Thankfully, I know better than to hold by breath!

Trying regular breathing sometime, gunnery nurse.

That way your brain could receive the necessary oxygen to function (at least somewhat) close to normalcy.

Get some mental therapy for that obsessive hatred you have. It will
better for all concerned.

LHA / WMD

4238. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 19:11:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040524151145.13355.00001062@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92302

In article <5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
>> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>> > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
>> >
>> > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>>
>> Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>>
>> Directives "enable" something or some action.
>>
>> Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
>>
>> Where does that leave you?
>
> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
>on it.

A DD-214 only shows Release from Active Duty.

A Discharge from military service is a different form. THAT form would
have the conditions of discharge on it.

Your "credentials" are very confused (still).

> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
>disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!

The Department of Defense Directive ESTABLISHED the Military
Affiliate Radio System.

Note the words "military" and "affliate."

Department of State does NOT direct any military activity.

Department of Justice does NOT direct any military activity.

Try to understand your government.

Quit holding your breath so much. It deprives your brain of oxygen.

LHA / WMD

4239. 160 Years Ago Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 20:17:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405241217.19ecb96d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92303

On May 24, 1844, exactly 160 years ago today, the historic "What Hath God Wrought" telegraph message was sent from Baltimore MD to Washington DC.

http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/today/may24.html

73 de Jim, N2EY

4240. Re: 160 Years Ago Today

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 22:32:20 UTC
From: David 01 <ifiwantspam@illask.org>
Message-ID: <10b4tvmql2vnrae@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92304

The forerunner of Echolink.

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0405241217.19ecb96d@posting.google.com...
> On May 24, 1844, exactly 160 years ago today, the historic "What Hath
> God Wrought" telegraph message was sent from Baltimore MD to
> Washington DC.
>
> http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/today/may24.html
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4241. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 23:36:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405241536.267fdf5c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92305

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240826.24973d11@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040523232710.21890.00001464@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>,
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> > >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > >news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> > >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> > >news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >> > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
> > >>
> > >> The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
> > >
> > >Wow! No wonder you got put out.
> > >
> > >Directives "enable" something or some action.
> > >
> > >Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
> > >
> > >Where does that leave you?
> >
> > UNABLE.
>
> Still waiting on your "Extra Lite out of the box", Lennie...Seems
> YOU are the one "unable"...
>
> And how's that application for Navy/MC MARS coming? "Unable" to
> do that too, no doubt...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

In the grand scheme of things, I think not getting an amateur license,
and getting put out of the US Marine Corps are magnitudes apart.

Your mileage may vary.

4242. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 23:40:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405241540.41dd13b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92306

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240822.74a0e96a@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Ni¿½IMD handle?
> >
> > Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.
> >
> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> > each TALCE deployment.
>
> The Marines had NO difficulty getting "authorized".

They did until the Air Force offered to handle the MWR traffic.

> They had trouble getting the schedule arranged for gateways and
> getting appropriate equipment to the deployed units. Callsigns and
> "authorization" were already in place.

No, they had a local problem allowing it.

> Seems the Marines have a nasty habit of carrying combat equipment
> into combat areas as a first priority. MWR gear comes after that.

One marine had a pallet of amateur radio gear, "enabled" by heavy airlift.

> > Best of Luck.
>
> Back at ya!

Don't need luck when you work smarter.

4243. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 23:48:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405241548.76015c9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92307

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
> JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
>
> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
> person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
> being a licensed Amateur.

And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
in Google) human history to declare:

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

It's just too ridiculous to ignore.

But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").

4244. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-24 23:50:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92308

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> > > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
> > >
> > > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
> >
> > Wow! No wonder you got put out.
> >
> > Directives "enable" something or some action.
> >
> > Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
> >
> > Where does that leave you?
>
> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
> on it.
>
> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
> disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What amazes me are the number of military retirees with a disability
check and still capable of pulling in a full-time income from - work.

4245. Re: Earthlink TOS Violations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 00:40:53 UTC
From: Who Cares? <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <c8u4m8$t9c$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92309
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.05.24.06.35.34.32754@127.0.0.1...
On Fri, 21 May 2004 21:20:54 -0500, Tim wrote:

>
> "Italy Anonymous Remailer" <nobody@See.Comments.Header> wrote in message
> news:ZRJ1QSU738128.6243518519@anonymous.poster... What is the address for
> reporting AB8MQ TOS violations
>
> to Earthlink?
>
>
<rest of the BS snipped>

I really hate to say it folks, but if someone REALLY wanted to track you
via the net, it would be relatively easy to do so (unless one not only
uses an anonymous remailer, but does so from an anonymous shell account
via remote access from yet another shell account, etc).

I should know this as I *DO* have some professional training in this
particular subject.

IMHO, both stagger lee and roger are lying and trying to bluff each other
(and the rest of us).

its just easier to slap them in an ignore bozo filter and be done with it!
Thats what I suggest y'all do.

just my 2 pennies worth.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

...and you've reached yours.

4246. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 02:03:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4OOdneibD-vJNC_dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92310

William wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
>
>>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
>>
>>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
>>
>> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
>>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
>>being a licensed Amateur.
>
>
> And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
> Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
> in Google) human history to declare:
>
> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
> It's just too ridiculous to ignore.
>
> But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").

We're just sitting back and letting you two have your back alley brawl!
8^) T'aint a good idea to get involved in it....

- Mike KB3EIA -

4247. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 02:29:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0405241829.2e7cb233@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92311

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240822.74a0e96a@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Ni¿½IMD handle?
> >
> > Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.
> >
> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> > each TALCE deployment.
>
> The Marines had NO difficulty getting "authorized".
>
> They had trouble getting the schedule arranged for gateways and
> getting appropriate equipment to the deployed units. Callsigns and
> "authorization" were already in place.
>
> Seems the Marines have a nasty habit of carrying combat equipment
> into combat areas as a first priority. MWR gear comes after that.

Well geez, thanks for the clarification Steve. I've been laboring
under the misimpression that USAF supply clerks led the . . . ah,
Never Mind . . Zero.

> > Best of Luck.
>
> Back at ya!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

4248. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 09:53:50 UTC
From: "Daniel Kelly (AKA Jack)" <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk>
Message-ID: <c8v51g$2vp2$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>
Source record: 92312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

Hi Scott,

Thanks for your suggestion. I have looked at several "ready made" wireless cameras. None of them really cut it for me though. I need a good camera with a very low power consumption. From what I've seen, the only way I'm going to get a decent camera & TX is if I buy them separately. Here's the current draw of my present draft design:

camera = 20mA
tx = 35mA

A 66gram lithium polymer battery back will power this sytem for 16 hours.

Thanks,
Jack

"Scott Dorsey" <kludge@panix.com> wrote in message
news:c8l2vq$8ks$1@panix2.panix.com...
> Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
> >
> >Sure. I need to built a wearable, covert video camera & transmitter.
The
> >camera, battery and TX all need to live in a hat and last for 16 hours
> >without changing the battery. The receiver will be carried in a bag and
> >will connect to a Riviera hard disk AV recorder.
>
> Sheesh! Why didn't you say that? What you want is a covert pack kit.
> Markertek Video Supply (www.markertek.com) sells the V2CMS package for
> $125 which uses the 2.4 GHz ISM band.
>
> I do warn you that the system does have some problems dealing with large
> amounts of rapid movement between the receiver and transmitter. At such
> a high frequency, multipath effects get weird.
>
> And I don't know if any of this stuff is legal to operate in the UK, or
> who manufactures the unit for Markertek.
> --scott
>
>
> --
> "C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

4249. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 12:37:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0405250437.245a56f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92313

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0405240808.2a2cbe1e@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (gunnery nurse trying to impersonate an offizier uf das newsgroup polizei)
> writes:

All of Lennie's usual "look at how much smarter I am than you"
rantings snipped.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue",
from the laundry list of lies and other obfuscations of Leonard H.
Anderson.

Scumbag, liar, putz.

All in one package. Did your wifey do the ribbon, Lennie...???

Steve, K4YZ

4250. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 12:39:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250439.56c56396@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92314

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405241829.2e7cb233@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240822.74a0e96a@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405231406.7343d99b@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0405221948.2c64af9b@posting.google.com>...
> > > > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0405211429.6bf2b606@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > Yo Bleeper . . this thread brings up a question . . how many pieces of
> > > > MARS traffic did your morphed version of T5/Nï¿½IMD handle?
> > >
> > > Yo spud, Amateur Radio Operators don't handle MARS traffic.
> > >
> > > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> > > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> > > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> > > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> > > each TALCE deployment.
> >
> > The Marines had NO difficulty getting "authorized".
> >
> > They had trouble getting the schedule arranged for gateways and
> > getting appropriate equipment to the deployed units. Callsigns and
> > "authorization" were already in place.
> >
> > Seems the Marines have a nasty habit of carrying combat equipment
> > into combat areas as a first priority. MWR gear comes after that.
>
> Well geez, thanks for the clarification Steve. I've been laboring
> under the misimpression that USAF supply clerks led the . . . ah,
> Never Mind . . Zero.

Somebody has to get the Marines to where they're going. If they don't
mind a long ride, they take a boat. If they're needed a bit quicker,
they take a plane. Airplanes typically require a runway, and
Mogadishu had one. What they didn't have was atc and weather. Too
bad the Marines aren't self-propelled. It would save everyone a lot
of trouble.

4251. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 12:43:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250443.6474fd9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92315

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<4OOdneibD-vJNC_dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> >>
> >>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
> >>
> >> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
> >>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
> >>being a licensed Amateur.
> >
> >
> > And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
> > Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
> > in Google) human history to declare:
> >
> > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
> >
> > It's just too ridiculous to ignore.
> >
> > But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").
>
>
> We're just sitting back and letting you two have your back alley brawl!
> 8^) T'aint a good idea to get involved in it....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I think something as absurd as what Steve is trying to defend is worth
rubbing his nose in it again and again.

Do you agree with "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" ?

4252. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 13:42:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92316

>Subject: Re: The Pool
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/24/2004 2:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>

>>> >When you've obtained a license under any standard,
>>> >perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
>>> >radio licensing.
>>>
>>> I already have several licenses.
>>
>> None of them on FCC form 660, and none of them granting operating
>>priviledges in the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...you should read what was WRITTEN, little man.
>
> Herr Robust said NOTHING about any "FCC form 660."

But >>I<< did.

You are still not a licensed Amateur Radio operator. Too incompetent to
pass the test, obviously.

>> Actually, the one with way too much time on his hands is you,
>>Lennie...Perhaps if YOU had an Amateur Radio license and spent some
>>time on the air you'd have less to waste...?!?!
>
> I'm retired, gunnery nurse. Comfortable income, money in the bank,
> good health, nice home, wonderful wife. I've got U.S. patent
> 3,848,191. You haven't got any. [which may be your problem...]

Don't need a "patent", Lennie.

I'll accept all of your assertions as true, especialloy the ones about
your wife...It would take a woman with a heart of gold (or too broken and
depressed) to tolerate a creep like you.

I guess SOMEONE had to do it, though.

>>> [can you understand it better if written all-caps?]
>>
>> LEONARD H. ANDERSON IS A FOOL.
>
> Nope.

Yep. YOU continue to prove it.

>> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...
>>From the archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> The gunnery nurse is here only to attempt personal attacks on
> humans he can't get along with. Poor baby.

First of all, you're not what I consider to be human.

Secondly, you provide me the stuff to work with.

Lastly, it's not an "attack" if it's true.

>>> Hello? I've got SEVERAL licenses by SEVERAL STANDARDS.
>>
>> None of them an Amateur Radio license, and none of them with ANY
>>experience in practical Amateur Radio applications.
>
> Poor deluded gunnery nurse...thinks amateur radios work by different
> laws of physics than any other radio...thinks amateur radios won't
> work without passing a test for manual telegraphy. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You continue to avoid the fact that "physics" are not the issue.

And I have never suggested that the ONLY test to take was the Morse test.

I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since it
doesn't require a Morse Code examination.

However you still seem stymied byt the process. Actually, I think it's
because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge base...Your
ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the test
in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.

Poor baby. Sucks to be Lennie.

>> You have "point blank" demanded that I or others "shut up"..."go
>>away", etc etc etc.
>
> I don't shoot blanks, little gunnery nurse.

Obviously you do.

Tell us about those kids you raised that helped you to formulate an
informed opinion on the ability of teenagers (and younger) to be competent
Amateur licensees...?!?!

Oh yeah...I forgot, that's yet another arena in which you slobbered your
ill-prepared vulgarities in.

>> But then stand-up-manship was never your forte.
>
> "Stand-up-manship?" :-)
>
> You mean like the puerile little penwomanship you exhibit all the
> time with such cute phrases like "putz," "your scumminess,"
> "sucks to be you," etc., etc., etc.

But you ARE a putz, Lennie. It DOES suck to be you, and you are scummy.

So what's the problem?

>> So far, all YOU have been able to offer is what you can glean
>>from various websites or second hand opinions.
>
> Not "glean" but rather reveal, as in regulations and directives of the
> latest effective dates.

And absolutely NO practical experience...Not one second's worth.

> Gunnery nurse was UNABLE to name or reference a single MARS
> directive or regulation in three weeks of give-and-take with Brian
> Burke. UNABLE. Despite holding an "amateur extra" license
> (suitable for framing), gunnery nurse tried to bluff and bluster through
> an argument, NOT ONCE being ABLE to reference a single directive
> or regulation concerning MARS. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Didn't need to, Lennie.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Just like the slap in the face, it doesn't need to be documented that it
hurts to KNOW it hurts...

> Poor gunnery nurse is sick and disgusted that anyone not licensed
> in amateur radio EVER worked in other radio on a professional
> basis...and for half a century!

I think it's great, Lennie.

I just think you're a scumbag for trying to push your oblivious weight
around in THIS forum over Amateur PRACTICE when you have abasolutely ZERO
experience in it.

The real pitiful part is knowing that you probably were a lot of the
things you claim, only to have it all undone by your now well documented
propensity for lying and antagonism.

Again...Sucks to be you.

> I have to commit adultery with some "Mrs. Scummy" to do all that?

Nope...Just roll over and tap her on the shoulder tonight. Or is that
walk down the hall and tap on the door...?!?!

>> Pot/Kettle/Black...Witness your own frequent "demands" peppered
>>with liberal doses of profanity and lack of facts.
>
> "Liberal doses of 'profanity?'"
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...talk about the deep black pot with continued use of
> a Yiddish colloquialism for "asshole" (the word "putz") trying to call
> anyone else nasty...

But you ARE a putz, Lennie.

The very post I am responding to has only served to revalidate that assertion.

> Get some mental therapy and work on your ability to get along
> with others. It will help you and those around you.

I am still waiting for you to enlighten us as to what credentials in "mental health" you have that qualify you to make that suggestion.

> So far, your identity crisis has resulted only in some mild amusement
> for me and a a lot of irritation to other readers in here. That is NOT
> good for your image.

The amusement IS all yours, Lennie. I quite clearly imagine you laughing at a lot of things, not all of them perceptible to those around you.

Laugh on, Lennie. You're the putz the REST of us are laughing at.

Steve, K4YZ

4253. Re: Low power video transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 13:42:45 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <c8vigl$83p$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 92343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

In article <c8v51g$2vp2$1@uns-a.ucl.ac.uk>,
Daniel Kelly \(AKA Jack\) <d.kellyNOSPAM@NOSPAM.ucl.ac.uk> wrote:
>Hi Scott,
>
>Thanks for your suggestion. I have looked at several "ready made" wireless
>cameras. None of them really cut it for me though. I need a good camera
>with a very low power consumption. From what I've seen, the only way I'm
>going to get a decent camera & TX is if I buy them separately.

Yes, this is true. The covert pack kit is designed that way. the V2CMS
is _only_ a transmitter/receiver pair and does not come with a camera.
This is because there is a huge variety of body plant cameras out there
intended for different applications, and so you want a transmitter that
will work with any of them.
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

4254. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 13:48:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525094830.15096.00001848@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92317

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/24/2004 6:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241536.267fdf5c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405240826.24973d11@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040523232710.21890.00001464@mb-m23.aol.com>...

>> Still waiting on your "Extra Lite out of the box", Lennie...Seems
>> YOU are the one "unable"...
>>
>> And how's that application for Navy/MC MARS coming? "Unable" to
>> do that too, no doubt...
>
>In the grand scheme of things, I think not getting an amateur license,
>and getting put out of the US Marine Corps are magnitudes apart.
>
>Your mileage may vary.

I am sure YOUR mileage varies, Brain, but only since you've not been paying attention.

Try to read what OTHERS say, and not make third hand interpretations based upon Lennie's rantings and antagonisms. The enlightenment will be astounding.

Steve, K4YZ

4255. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 13:53:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92318

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
>> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>> > > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
>> > >
>> > > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>> >
>> > Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>> >
>> > Directives "enable" something or some action.
>> >
>> > Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
>> >
>> > Where does that leave you?
>>
>> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
>> on it.
>>
>> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
>> disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>What amazes me are the number of military retirees with a disability
>check and still capable of pulling in a full-time income from - work.

From "work" that is NOT the same as what I was required to do in the US
Marine Corps.

From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
physical rehab after I was retired out.

Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing their
"work".

Steve, K4YZ

4256. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 13:58:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525095828.15096.00001851@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92319

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/24/2004 5:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
>
>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...

>> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
>> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
>> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
>> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
>> > each TALCE deployment.
>>
>> What, exactly, does that have to do with my question?
>
>Tell us again how you have "real military experience" but never wore a
>uniform.
>
>Handling MARS traffic might give you real military experience, but I've got
>plenty.
>
> I'll try again:
>> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?
>
>What's it to you?

Hey Brian (W3RV)...I think Brain answered your question right there...

Just like he answered the questions about his alleged "T5" operation...

"I didn't REALLY go to Somalia, but I did spend the night at a Holiday Inn Express....."

I am sure he's in Hog Heaven now that his BoyToy, Lennie the Liar is back in action...

THERE'S two "peas in a pod"...

Steve, K4YZ

4257. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 14:01:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525100150.15096.00001852@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92320

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/24/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241540.41dd13b9@posting.google.com>

>Don't need luck when you work smarter.

Then buy TWO lottery tickets, Brain...

At this rate you're gonna need a LOT of luck. "Smarter" is NOT your
better suit.

Matter of fact, I don't think you can even get into the fitting room.

Steve, K4YZ

4258. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 14:06:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525100642.15096.00001853@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92321

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/25/2004 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250439.56c56396@posting.google.com>

>Somebody has to get the Marines to where they're going. If they don't
>mind a long ride, they take a boat. If they're needed a bit quicker,
>they take a plane. Airplanes typically require a runway, and
>Mogadishu had one. What they didn't have was atc and weather. Too
>bad the Marines aren't self-propelled. It would save everyone a lot
>of trouble.

Why?

According to a SecDef inteview on Sixty Minutes a few years back, the Commander-in-Chief wants to know two things when the stuff hits the fan...Where are the nearest carriers, and is the MEF ready to hit the beach...?!?!

No runways or ATC needed. And no particular interest in the USAF or it's MWR department.

Just a mission.

Steve, K4YZ

4259. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 14:15:35 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <byIsc.32875$KE6.26413@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92322

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0405250437.245a56f4@posting.google.com:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0405240808.2a2cbe1e@posting.google.com>,
>> k4yz@aol.com (gunnery nurse trying to impersonate an offizier uf das
>> newsgroup polizei) writes:
>
> All of Lennie's usual "look at how much smarter I am than you"
> rantings snipped.
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue",
> from the laundry list of lies and other obfuscations of Leonard H.
> Anderson.
>
> Scumbag, liar, putz.
>
> All in one package. Did your wifey do the ribbon, Lennie...???
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

LOL, Thanks steve. Good one.

KB7ADL

4260. Re: Low power video transmitter - suppliers and tech info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 15:47:44 UTC
From: ukmonitor@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <ed985fdb.0405250747.7e2daf6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

For cheap 900MHz, 1.2GHz and 2.3GHz wireless video cameras, TX's and RX's see the following websites.

http://www.chaners2000.com

http://www.flyonthewall.uk.com/

http://www.pakatak.com

Note that in the UK only 1394MHz and 2.4GHz wireless video cameras are licence exempt.

You could of course use a 1.2GHz or 2.4GHz TX legally at a higher power level if you have an amateur radio licence.

Most of the cheap miniature wireless video cameras use a free-running oscillator so it is relatively easy to retune them to a suitable frequency. I bought a 900MHz camera and could tune it up to about 1.6GHz without too much difficulty.

Range for typical 5mW o/p camera is in the order of 10m with simple antennas. If the camera is body worn you need to improve the RX antenna, or increase the TX power.

For technical discussions about monitoring microwave video see:-

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MicrowaveTVmonitors

some useful notes can also be found at:-

http://www.geocities.com/radproject.geo/Mvideo.html

UKM

4261. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 17:38:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250938.6d92d426@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92324

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525100642.15096.00001853@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/25/2004 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250439.56c56396@posting.google.com>
>
> >Somebody has to get the Marines to where they're going. If they don't
> >mind a long ride, they take a boat. If they're needed a bit quicker,
> >they take a plane. Airplanes typically require a runway, and
> >Mogadishu had one. What they didn't have was atc and weather. Too
> >bad the Marines aren't self-propelled. It would save everyone a lot
> >of trouble.
>
> Why?
>
> According to a SecDef inteview on Sixty Minutes a few years back, the
> Commander-in-Chief wants to know two things when the stuff hits the fan...Where
> are the nearest carriers, and is the MEF ready to hit the beach...?!?!

AEF can be quicker than any carrier group, especially if the beach is
hundreds or thousands of miles away from the hotspot. Or not.

Need a TALCE to deploy AEF and its logistics tail. Create Air Bridge.
TALCE in First. And get everything there before the Navy could.

> No runways or ATC needed. And no particular interest in the USAF or it's
> MWR department.

Get real. Were you a reservist or something like that? The Navy
slobbered over our BX and "MWR department."

> Just a mission.

Which often involves the Air Force, even if just to expedite MWR
calls.

Ditto 10th Mountain. Didn't see the Navy transporting those folks,
and there was a big beach just inches from the Mog runway.

Hey, ever wonder why the Navy stencils their names over their
dungarees back pocket?

4262. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 17:42:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250942.7172dad4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92325

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525095828.15096.00001851@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/24/2004 5:36 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
> >
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...
>
> >> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
> >> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
> >> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
> >> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
> >> > each TALCE deployment.
> >>
> >> What, exactly, does that have to do with my question?
> >
> >Tell us again how you have "real military experience" but never wore a
> >uniform.
> >
> >Handling MARS traffic might give you real military experience, but I've got
> >plenty.
> >
> > I'll try again:
> >> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?
> >
> >What's it to you?
>
> Hey Brian (W3RV)...I think Brain answered your question right there...
>
> Just like he answered the questions about his alleged "T5" operation...
>
> "I didn't REALLY go to Somalia, but I did spend the night at a Holiday Inn
> Express....."
>
> I am sure he's in Hog Heaven now that his BoyToy, Lennie the Liar is back
> in action...
>
> THERE'S two "peas in a pod"...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I realy would have liked to check into the Holiday Inn, Express or not. Slept on top of a pallet for the first few days.

Nothing at all like your "seven hostile actions" which were probably just seven cases of self-abuse.

No wonder you're out.

4263. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 17:45:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92326

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> >> > > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
> >> > >
> >> > > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
> >> >
> >> > Wow! No wonder you got put out.
> >> >
> >> > Directives "enable" something or some action.
> >> >
> >> > Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
> >> >
> >> > Where does that leave you?
> >>
> >> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
> >> on it.
> >>
> >> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
> >> disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >What amazes me are the number of military retirees with a disability
> >check and still capable of pulling in a full-time income from - work.
>
> From "work" that is NOT the same as what I was required to do in the US
> Marine Corps.
>
> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
> physical rehab after I was retired out.

>
> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing their
> "work".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
for duty in the USMC?

4264. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 17:47:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405250947.7fb62f52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92327

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525100150.15096.00001852@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241540.41dd13b9@posting.google.com>
>
> >Don't need luck when you work smarter.
>
> Then buy TWO lottery tickets, Brain...
>
> At this rate you're gonna need a LOT of luck. "Smarter" is NOT your
> better suit.
>
> Matter of fact, I don't think you can even get into the fitting room.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, how do you think I got into the USAF? Why do you think so many
have to go Army, Navy, or USMC?

Best of Luck on that one.

4265. Re: Low power video transmitter - suppliers and tech info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:36:03 UTC
From: Ivor Jones <this.address@notvalid.inv>
Message-ID: <c903mm$ab7$1@news6.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 92328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.noncomm,rec.radio.swap,uk.radio.amateur,uk.tech.broadcast

"ukmonitor" <ukmonitor@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ed985fdb.0405250747.7e2daf6e@posting.google.com...
> For cheap 900MHz, 1.2GHz and 2.3GHz wireless video cameras, TX's and
> RX's see the following websites.
>
> http://www.chaners2000.com
>
> http://www.flyonthewall.uk.com/
>
> http://www.pakatak.com
>
>
> Note that in the UK only 1394MHz and 2.4GHz wireless video cameras are
> licence exempt.
>
> You could of course use a 1.2GHz or 2.4GHz TX legally at a higher
> power level if you have an amateur radio licence.

But surely not for a non-amateur application..?

Ivor G6URP

4266. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144014.09295.00000260@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92335

In article <20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Pool
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/24/2004 2:08 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>>>> >When you've obtained a license under any standard,
>>>> >perhaps you'll be able to engage in a rational discussion of amateur
>>>> >radio licensing.
>>>>
>>>> I already have several licenses.
>>>
>>> None of them on FCC form 660, and none of them granting operating
>>>priviledges in the Amateur Radio Service.
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...you should read what was WRITTEN, little man.
>>
>> Herr Robust said NOTHING about any "FCC form 660."
>
> But >>I<< did.
>
> You are still not a licensed Amateur Radio operator. Too incompetent to
>pass the test, obviously.

:-) Nursie is beyond rational thought...or any reasoning.

>>> Actually, the one with way too much time on his hands is you,
>>>Lennie...Perhaps if YOU had an Amateur Radio license and spent some
>>>time on the air you'd have less to waste...?!?!
>>
>> I'm retired, gunnery nurse. Comfortable income, money in the bank,
>> good health, nice home, wonderful wife. I've got U.S. patent
>> 3,848,191. You haven't got any. [which may be your problem...]
>
> Don't need a "patent", Lennie.

You should get one. You have made the grade of original, but
rather disordered thought, on advancing the state of the known art
on insulting others. :-)

> I'll accept all of your assertions as true, especialloy the ones about
>your wife...It would take a woman with a heart of gold (or too broken and
>depressed) to tolerate a creep like you.

"Gold especialloy?!?" :-) :-) :-)

Sorry, you've called me a "liar" too many times for you to "accept"
anything I've written.

You've insulted my wife way too many times, in public, without knowing
a single thing about her, to "accept" any turnaround in your attitude.

> I guess SOMEONE had to do it, though.

You are really and truly bitter and frustrated, aren't you? You can't
stop your obsessive hatred of certain other people.

You really need some mental therapy.

> First of all, you're not what I consider to be human.

Hoo boy, you are on a hatred roll there. Don't slip in the bitter.

> Secondly, you provide me the stuff to work with.

No. That's your own fevered, angry mind busy fantasizing.

> Lastly, it's not an "attack" if it's true.

It's not true. It IS a personal attack.

You aren't a divinity and cannot define what is "right" or "wrong."

You are unable to relate to civil society.

>> Poor deluded gunnery nurse...thinks amateur radios work by different
>> laws of physics than any other radio...thinks amateur radios won't
>> work without passing a test for manual telegraphy. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> You continue to avoid the fact that "physics" are not the issue.

Then why are you so insistent that I take some kind of amateur test?

I've already passed commercial and industry tests long ago. Made
a good living at that kind of work.

You keep denigrating a career in radio-electronics by others. Why?
Are you THAT resentful of others having success at a chosen field
of endeavor? [that's not a good mental picture, all that resentment]

> And I have never suggested that the ONLY test to take was the Morse
>test.

A manual telegraphy test is NECESSARY for a U.S. amateur radio
license examination having below-30-MHz-privileges. That's LAW.

> I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since it
>doesn't require a Morse Code examination.

To adopt nursie's own line of response, "you are LYING SOB*."

You've NEVER "encouraged" anyone, you crock of salacious snit.

You've COMMANDED as if you were some kind of Dill instructor
in the murines. :-)

* SOB = Son Of a Beeper.

> However you still seem stymied byt the process.

There is NO REQUIREMENT to have any amateur radio license in a
newsgroup.

Quit trying to COMMAND something that isn't "regulation." :-)

>Actually, I think it's
>because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge
>base...

Define "REAL knowledge," nursie. Being able to sing hymns in the
Church of St. Hiram? Memorizing stacks of advertisements in QST?
Memorizing the Amateur's Code as if it were military General Orders?

Your mind has flipped out of reality long ago. Hint: One doesn't
get regular paychecks for demonstrating false knowledge on the
job. [engineering isn't like purchasing parts in a small company
for less than a half year]

Your mind has flipped out of reality long ago. Hint: One doesn't
get magazine articles reviewed and accepted by editors for being
false. [just because you can't understand them doesn't make them
false]

Your mind has flipped out of reality long ago. Hint: Nightime
college classes are rated the same way as daytime college
classes and tests there are rated and graded the same.

>Your ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the
>test in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.

I would have NO "ego problems" with being in any room full of
grade school kids whether there was a test or not.

Is it required in amateur radio to sink down to the knowledge level
of grade school kids in order to be a "real ham?"

I've been a commercial illustrator and still capable of working in
several media from pencil through oils. Do you expect me to
"test in fingerpainting" (a la kindergarten classes) to show my
skills in art?

If "real ham radio" can be accomplished by "grade school kids,"
is that some kind of inducement for adult activity?

You are way to childish for me to take you seriously as an adult.

> Tell us about those kids you raised that helped you to formulate an
>informed opinion on the ability of teenagers (and younger) to be competent
>Amateur licensees...?!?!

Tell us about your "normal" teenagers.

This isn't a hobby of child welfare.

> Oh yeah...I forgot, that's yet another arena in which you slobbered your
>ill-prepared vulgarities in.

? I am supposed to sire children in order to obtain a "real ham license?"

You are becoming obscene, not heard...

> But you ARE a putz, Lennie. It DOES suck to be you, and you are scummy.
>
> So what's the problem?

I have no problem. YOU have one.

Basically, YOUR problem is this terrible obsession of being unable to
let go your hatred of anyone who stands up to you and shows you
what you are doing wrong. You can't just drop a subject and go on
to another. You have to bring up that hatred time and time again.

That isn't normal behavior.

>>> So far, all YOU have been able to offer is what you can glean
>>>from various websites or second hand opinions.
>>
>> Not "glean" but rather reveal, as in regulations and directives of the
>> latest effective dates.
>
> And absolutely NO practical experience...Not one second's worth.

"No practical experience" in MARS? Sorry, I do. MARS had
second priority on one of the transmitter circuits at ADA in Japan
long ago.

>> Gunnery nurse was UNABLE to name or reference a single MARS
>> directive or regulation in three weeks of give-and-take with Brian
>> Burke. UNABLE. Despite holding an "amateur extra" license
>> (suitable for framing), gunnery nurse tried to bluff and bluster through
>> an argument, NOT ONCE being ABLE to reference a single directive
>> or regulation concerning MARS. Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> Didn't need to, Lennie.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

> Just like the slap in the face, it doesn't need to be documented that it
>hurts to KNOW it hurts...

You have to understand that MARS did NOT grow out your fantasy
or myths that you cherish when unable to comprehend reality.

MARS was "born" in 1925 as the AARS or Army Amateur Radio
System. After WW2 and silencing of the AARS, it was reborn in
1948 in both the Army and the new USAF as MARS, or Military
Affiliate Radio System. The USN joined in a few years later.
The Directive and all Regulations are quite clear, unambiguous,
and available to anyone.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

> I just think you're a scumbag for trying to push your oblivious weight
>around in THIS forum over Amateur PRACTICE when you have abasolutely ZERO
>experience in it.

Tough on you, isn't it? :-)

> The real pitiful part is knowing that you probably were a lot of the
>things you claim, only to have it all undone by your now well documented
>propensity for lying and antagonism.

Ooooo...trying for new distinctive literary imagery, are you? :-)

You are resentful and bitter that anyone else can have experience in
REAL COMMUNICATIONS as well as holding a REAL JOB in the
radio-electronics industry. Tsk, tsk, tsk...you triumph amateur radio
as "better" because you've not done any of that REAL
communicating.

> Again...Sucks to be you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all that hatred and bitterness showing again. YOU
don't have experience in REAL communications or in REAL
radio-electronics work so you insult those that have done it.

Amateur radio is supposed to be an enjoyable avocational
radio activity carried on for personal enjoyment. You don't
demonstrate that at all. You USE amateur radio as a spring-
board to dive into another ranting spate of personal insults.

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...talk about the deep black pot with continued use of
>> a Yiddish colloquialism for "asshole" (the word "putz") trying to call
>> anyone else nasty...
>
> But you ARE a putz, Lennie.

Is nursie Jewish? [oy, gevalt!]

>> Get some mental therapy and work on your ability to get along
>> with others. It will help you and those around you.
>

> I am still waiting for you to enlighten us as to what credentials in
>"mental health" you have that qualify you to make that suggestion.

"Credentials" to observe a demented person vent bile time and
again in public, insulting anyone who has the slightest
disagreement with him? Not necessary. It is plain to everyone.

> The amusement IS all yours, Lennie. I quite clearly imagine you
laughing
>at a lot of things, not all of them perceptible to those around you.
>
> Laugh on, Lennie. You're the putz the REST of us are laughing at.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...your multiple personalities got together to stage a
protest, did they?

Sorry you are (said Yoda).

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4267. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144015.09295.00000261@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92329

In article <5c01b95b.0405250437.245a56f4@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040524150800.13355.00001060@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0405240808.2a2cbe1e@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (gunnery nurse trying to impersonate an offizier uf das newsgroup polizei)
>> writes:
>
> All of Lennie's usual "look at how much smarter I am than you"
>rantings snipped.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...really and truly frustrated by something? Poor
nursie.

> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue",
>from the laundry list of lies and other obfuscations of Leonard H.
>Anderson.
>
> Scumbag, liar, putz.

Nice environment you are the model of... :-)

ARRL turned you down for a PR job, did they? [wonder why...]

This thread was originally just a list of names of those picking
certain dates for the elimination of the manual telegraphy test for
a United States amateur radio license.

This thread has mutated (as usual) into yet-another pile of h-s
personal attack diatribe, hatred spewing denigrations of those
not favored by nursie.

Nursie needs mental help. Has needed it for a long time.

Obviously the "rehab" wasn't complete.

Remember, MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4268. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144016.09295.00000262@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92330

In article <20040525100642.15096.00001853@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 7:39 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250439.56c56396@posting.google.com>
>
>>Somebody has to get the Marines to where they're going. If they don't
>>mind a long ride, they take a boat. If they're needed a bit quicker,
>>they take a plane. Airplanes typically require a runway, and
>>Mogadishu had one. What they didn't have was atc and weather. Too
>>bad the Marines aren't self-propelled. It would save everyone a lot
>>of trouble.
>
> Why?
>
> According to a SecDef inteview on Sixty Minutes a few years back, the
>Commander-in-Chief wants to know two things when the stuff hits the
>fan...Where are the nearest carriers, and is the MEF ready to hit the
beach...?!?!

According to a DoD Directive and three Regulations -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT "amateur radio."

The only thing that "hit the fan" in this thread is nursie's cursing and foul-mouthed, foul-minded pejoratives and denigrations connected with his psychosis of being unable to separate a civilian hobby radio activity from the murine corps.

Try to stay focussed, EX-murine. Amateur radio is NOT the same as the USMC.

> No runways or ATC needed.

You are fantasizing again. Amateur radio is NOT the same as the USMC.

> And no particular interest in the USAF or it's MWR department.
>
> Just a mission.

Nursie could convert to Catholicsm in order to take a Retreat at some Mission. The peace and quiet might soothe the savage, disordered beast within him.

MARS is NOT "amateur radio."

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4269. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144017.09295.00000263@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92331

In article <20040525095828.15096.00001851@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/24/2004 5:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
>>
>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...
>
>>> > However, the Marines did have trouble getting authorized to activate
>>> > Navy MARS. So I requested that we activate an AF MARS station to
>>> > provide MWR traffic for the Marines. In the space of two dits, the
>>> > Navy authorized MARS use. An AF MARS authorization is written into
>>> > each TALCE deployment.
>>>
>>> What, exactly, does that have to do with my question?
>>
>>Tell us again how you have "real military experience" but never wore a
>>uniform.
>>
>>Handling MARS traffic might give you real military experience, but I've got
>>plenty.
>>
>> I'll try again:
>>> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?
>>
>>What's it to you?
>
> Hey Brian (W3RV)...I think Brain answered your question right there...
>
> Just like he answered the questions about his alleged "T5" operation...
>
> "I didn't REALLY go to Somalia, but I did spend the night at a Holiday
Inn
>Express....."

Brian Burke was THERE. Nursie wasn't there. Kellie Katapult wasn't there.

Kellie wasn't even IN any military.

> I am sure he's in Hog Heaven now that his BoyToy, Lennie the Liar is
>back in action...

Nursie needs to acquire social skills. ANY social skills. Very
few in evidence.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT "amateur radio." By Directive, by Regulation.

Those who live constantly in Fantasyland cannot be rational.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

>
> THERE'S two "peas in a pod"...

4270. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144018.09295.00000264@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92332

In article <20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>...
>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>>news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
>>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
>>> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>>
>>> > > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO MARS!
>>> > >
>>> > > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>>> >
>>> > Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>>> >
>>> > Directives "enable" something or some action.
>>> >
>>> > Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian life.
>>> >
>>> > Where does that leave you?
>>>
>>> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
>>> on it.
>>>
>>> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
>>> disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!
>>>
>>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>>What amazes me are the number of military retirees with a disability
>>check and still capable of pulling in a full-time income from - work.
>
> From "work" that is NOT the same as what I was required to do in the
>US Marine Corps.
>
> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required

>physical rehab after I was retired out.
>
> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
>their "work".

Obviously, the "physical rehab" wasn't complete. A DD-214 is NOT an
honorable discharge...it is just a Release from active duty.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT "amateur radio."

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4271. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144019.09295.00000265@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92333

In article <20040525094830.15096.00001848@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(gunnery nurse of the gurney blabbers while off his meds) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/24/2004 6:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241536.267fdf5c@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<5c01b95b.0405240826.24973d11@posting.google.com>...
>>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040523232710.21890.00001464@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>>> Still waiting on your "Extra Lite out of the box", Lennie...Seems
>>> YOU are the one "unable"...
>>>
>>> And how's that application for Navy/MC MARS coming? "Unable" to
>>> do that too, no doubt...
>>
>>In the grand scheme of things, I think not getting an amateur license,
>>and getting put out of the US Marine Corps are magnitudes apart.
>>
>>Your mileage may vary.
>
> I am sure YOUR mileage varies, Brain, but only since you've not been
>paying attention.

It's almost impossible to NOT notice all the curses, denigrations, and
general personal attacks of hatred and outrage from frustrated
ex-murines who still can't understand they aren't in the military
service anymore.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio. It is based on a Department of
Defense Directive, not by the FCC or ARRL.

> Try to read what OTHERS say, and not make third hand interpretations based
>upon Lennie's rantings and antagonisms.

What "others," nursie?

Did all of your split personalities get together and hold a group protest?

Did you see the Department of Defense Directive? Are you able to
read it? Did you see the USN-USMC Communications Instruction?
Are you able to read it? How about the USAF or USA Regulations?

NO "third-hand interpretations" from four documents from the
authorities on the Military Affiliate Radio System. No "interpretation"
necessary at all.

Without the MILITARY authority, MARS ceases to exist.

It's as simple as that.

But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
of rational thought.

Get some medical help for your psychosis.

LHA / WMD

The enlightenment will be
>astounding.

4272. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 18:40:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92334

In article <1e4e3692.0405250443.6474fd9b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<4OOdneibD-vJNC_dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
>> William wrote:
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
>> >>
>> >>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>>Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
>> >>
>> >> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
>> >>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
>> >>being a licensed Amateur.
>> >
>> >
>> > And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
>> > Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
>> > in Google) human history to declare:
>> >
>> > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>> >
>> > It's just too ridiculous to ignore.
>> >
>> > But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").
>>
>>
>> We're just sitting back and letting you two have your back alley brawl!

>> 8^) T'aint a good idea to get involved in it....
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>I think something as absurd as what Steve is trying to defend is worth
>rubbing his nose in it again and again.
>
>Do you agree with "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" ?

Someone's "medical rehabilitation" wasn't finished.

"M" in MARS = MILITARY

"A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

Yon leatherneck (and rest of body) is unable to differentiate between Amateur Radio and Military Affiliate Radio System.

Maybe medical science wasn't up to the task of finishing the "rehabilitation" program?

Mike is unable to compete in this arena. [ice is too cold for him]

TAFKARJ is busy with 160 years ago and the first COMMERCIAL use of manual telegraphy done by PROFESSIONALS. :-)

Herr Robust has gone out to buy more poison with which to flavor his "replies." [or maybe his pen dissolved in the acid]

Katapult Kellie is scrounging up a camera to snap more bears for Navy intelligence.

Hans has been hitting the gym so that he could "throw out with great force." [or throw up, unknown...]

Wince Ficus bloomed early with a teeny, tiny nastygram.

Gunnery nurse can't think for all the noise of singing "Halls of Montezuma" and other little gems of murine brainwashing while confusing the Amateur's Code with code of civil, civilian conduct.

Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.

What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris goad in order to talk legally via SSB." :-)

LHA / WMD

4273. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:36:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92336

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>

>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>>
>> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
>their
>> "work".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
>various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
>for duty in the USMC?

OK, PuppetBoy...let's go back up a couple lines and see if you can figure
out why you are such an idiot...

QUOTE:

>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
>> physical rehab after I was retired out.

UNQUOTE

"...required physical rehab..."

Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!

"I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."

Steve, K4YZ

4274. Re: Radio Conversion

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:37:20 UTC
From: gonetopot@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <c907a2$ia1$1@newsg3.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 92337
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

you would have to make a special transverter box, and find room for it in
the rig..
To convert UHF to 11 meters and 11 meters to UHF
something like,,,
http://www.tentec.com/Xvertkit.HTM

4275. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:43:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525154346.16651.00001901@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92338

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/25/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250947.7fb62f52@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525100150.15096.00001852@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241540.41dd13b9@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Don't need luck when you work smarter.
>>
>> Then buy TWO lottery tickets, Brain...
>>
>> At this rate you're gonna need a LOT of luck. "Smarter" is NOT your
>> better suit.
>>
>> Matter of fact, I don't think you can even get into the fitting room.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, how do you think I got into the USAF?

On your knees, I assume.

>Why do you think so many
>have to go Army, Navy, or USMC?

Quick: Which branch of the Armed Forces has the higher percentage of
college completed >>enlisted<< personnel?

Who has the highest degree of highschool graduates? (HS can still be
waived in some cases)

Which branch has the highest percentage of personnel presnetly enrolled in
degree completion programs right now? (hint, it's NOT the USAF)

>Best of Luck on that one.

Why? Why do I need "luck" dealing with you...?!?!

You (and your "mentor", Lennie the Lame) are your own worst enemies.

Steve, K4YZ

4276. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:50:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525155015.16651.00001902@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92339

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525144019.09295.00000265@mb-m11.aol.com>

>In article <20040525094830.15096.00001848@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(gunnery nurse of the gurney blabbers while off his meds) writes:

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the
collected NG Mistruths of Leonard H Anderson.

> MARS is NOT amateur radio. It is based on a Department of
> Defense Directive, not by the FCC or ARRL.

MARS, without Amateur Radio, would be defunct.

> Without the MILITARY authority, MARS ceases to exist.
>
> It's as simple as that.

Without the civilian, Amateur Radio licensed participants, it would not be
able to function, civil, military or otherwise.

It really is THAT simple.

> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
> of rational thought.

P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".

> Get some medical help for your psychosis.

"Medical" help for a mental health diagnosis would be inappropriate.

However since you are neither trained or educated in medical OR mental
health issues, you wouldn't know that.

Once again, lack of knowledge AND experience have betrayed you.

You really ARE a putz, Leonard.

Steve, K4YZ

4277. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:56:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525155659.16651.00001903@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92340

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525144017.09295.00000263@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040525095828.15096.00001851@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 5/24/2004 5:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>>news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...

>>> I'll try again:
>>>> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?
>>>
>>>What's it to you?
>>
>> Hey Brian (W3RV)...I think Brain answered your question right there...
>>
>> Just like he answered the questions about his alleged "T5" operation...
>>
>> "I didn't REALLY go to Somalia, but I did spend the night at a Holiday
>Inn
>>Express....."
>
> Brian Burke was THERE. Nursie wasn't there. Kellie Katapult wasn't
> there.

Brain Burke CLAIMS to have been there.

So far he's not been able to produce even ONE trophy photo from Somalia.

I don't know a single Ham Radio operator who, having ahd a chance to
allegedly operate from an exotic location, can't produce at least ONE photo,
QSL card, or some other "proof" of having been there.

I have my doubts as to wether he ever left the confines of a protected US
facility in Europe, let alone deployed from CONUS.

> Kellie wasn't even IN any military.

Doesn't matter.

W3RV asked a question. Brain retorted with a smart alec answer that has once again left him in the position of looking like a liar with insinuations of "knowing" something, yet not being able to document it or have experience to back it up.

Kinda like you.

> Those who live constantly in Fantasyland cannot be rational.

You're right...and you DO have a California address, so I guess you CAN'T be "rational".

Sucks to be you.

> Temper fry...

You're a putz (still).

Steve, K4YZ

4278. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 19:59:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525155936.16651.00001904@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92341

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>

> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.

Please remind us about all the off-spring YOU ahve raised, Lennie?

> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."

Hot Flash, Hot Rod...

It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.

Hasn't been for 13 years.

Steve, K4YZ

4279. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 20:03:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525160316.16651.00001906@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92342

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525144018.09295.00000264@mb-m11.aol.com>

> Obviously, the "physical rehab" wasn't complete. A DD-214 is NOT an
> honorable discharge...it is just a Release from active duty.

Yep. And when I was released, I was given one.

I'll get another one in September of this year.

If you're gonna presume to demonstrate knowledge of administrative
proceeses of the Armed Forces, Lennie, ya need to spend some more time learning
about them. Then you can plagerize those sites too.

Steve, K4YZ

4280. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192010.17843.00000151@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92344

In article <20040525160316.16651.00001906@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525144018.09295.00000264@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>> Obviously, the "physical rehab" wasn't complete. A DD-214 is NOT an
>> honorable discharge...it is just a Release from active duty.
>
> Yep. And when I was released, I was given one.

Which was it, a DD-214 or an "honorable discharge?"

> I'll get another one in September of this year.

When did you "re-enlist?"

One service period = one discharge. Not two.

You can have a discharge any time you want. Some folks call
that "physical abuse."

> If you're gonna presume to demonstrate knowledge of administrative
>proceeses of the Armed Forces, Lennie, ya need to spend some more time
>learning about them. Then you can plagerize those sites too.

Apparently there's a gross lack of your understanding of military
procedure. For example, the Department of Defense (they are in
charge of ALL U.S. militaries) issued a Directive describing and
establishing MARS.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Nursie, get some mental therapy. You need it.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4281. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192010.17843.00000152@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92345

In article <20040525155936.16651.00001904@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.
>
> Please remind us about all the off-spring YOU ahve raised, Lennie?

You really don't want to go there, little man.

It should be obvious to you but you can't see it...

>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>
> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>
> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.

I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.

I did much the same late last year talking from a moored sailboat in a California marina.

Both times and all times in between WITHOUT needing an amateur radio license!

But, without passing a manual telegraphy test, it is NOT LEGAL to do that on U.S. amateur bands below 30 MHz.

> Hasn't been for 13 years.

You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can you?

What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of us can help you out...

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Get some mental help...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4282. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192012.17843.00000153@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92349

In article <20040525155659.16651.00001903@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525144017.09295.00000263@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040525095828.15096.00001851@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>Date: 5/24/2004 5:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405240236.7e6dfb6d@posting.google.com>
>>>>
>>>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>>>news:<d22b54c3.0405231953.148f5788@posting.google.com>...
>
>>>> I'll try again:
>>>>> How many pieces of MARS traffic did you handle?
>>>>
>>>>What's it to you?
>>>
>>> Hey Brian (W3RV)...I think Brain answered your question right there...
>>>
>>> Just like he answered the questions about his alleged "T5" operation...
>>>
>>> "I didn't REALLY go to Somalia, but I did spend the night at a Holiday
Inn
>>>Express....."
>>
>> Brian Burke was THERE. Nursie wasn't there. Kellie Katapult wasn't
>> there.
>
> Brain Burke CLAIMS to have been there.
>
> So far he's not been able to produce even ONE trophy photo from Somalia.

Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his "seven hostile actions."

Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
the 3rd Marine Division.

Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his so-called murine life
that was supposed to be a close to 20 years.

Nursie couldn't find the appropriate Directive or service branch
Regulations of the Military Affliliate Radio System in order to back
up his assertion about "MARS is amateur radio."

> I don't know a single Ham Radio operator who, having ahd a chance to
>allegedly operate from an exotic location, can't produce at least ONE photo,
>QSL card, or some other "proof" of having been there.

Yah, yah, yah...big old nursie "I've got it in my wallet" "proof" of doing
what he LIES about sure has at least ONE photo, don' he?

Where did all those "hostile actions" you were in take place?

Were they all plot-lines on "JAG?"

> I have my doubts as to wether he ever left the confines of a protected US
>facility in Europe, let alone deployed from CONUS.

You say everyone else "LIES" (because you do?).

WHERE did all your "hostile actions" take place?

>> Kellie wasn't even IN any military.
>
> Doesn't matter.

Ho ho ho, YES IT DOES.

Don't forget Kellie claimed to "do work for USN intelligence!" :-)

Another truth-stretcher.

> W3RV asked a question. Brain retorted with a smart alec answer that has
>once again left him in the position of looking like a liar with insinuations
of
>"knowing" something, yet not being able to document it or have experience to
>back it up.

Ho, ho, ho! MORE truth-stretching.

WHERE did nursies "hostile actions" take place?

Where are all those photos of the 3rd Marine Division duty?

Where is your scanned copy of your DD-214 with its infamous
"honoroble discharge" on it?

> Kinda like you.

I have no less than 600 photos of my three years at ADA, trimmed
down to a 20-page narrative with lots of color photographs, 6 MB
in PDF form (readable on any PC or MAC). A couple of the black
and white photos are Signal Corps origin (and have the proper
credits).

Ed Hare and a few others got paper copies of the old 30-page
version via surface mail.

Anyone else "need" an electronic copy and they are able to handle
a 6 MB file, they are welcome to one as an e-mail attachment.

If worst comes to worst, I can always retrieve my DD-214, scan it
and upload it as an e-mail attachment as proof. I can even scan
my REAL honorable discharge paper, forwarded the same way.
That even goes as far as scanning the backs of the Signal Corps
photos to show the legends mimeographed there.

But, I'm not going to do so on command of some lying insulter
who can't offer ONE shred of "proof" he actually did some of the
lies he states.

>
>> Those who live constantly in Fantasyland cannot be rational.
>
> You're right...and you DO have a California address, so I guess you CAN'T
>be "rational".

You really ARE an UGLY little person...mentally hateful and
frustrated...resorting to insulting the entirety of the most populous
state of the Union.

You are mentally SICK. No "training" or "credentials" needed to
show that.

But, you ARE an Amateur Extra, the very model of what manual
telegraphy and too much RF exposure can produce.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4283. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92347

In article <20040525155015.16651.00001902@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525144019.09295.00000265@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>>In article <20040525094830.15096.00001848@mb-m10.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(gunnery nurse of the gurney blabbers while off his meds) writes:
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the
>collected NG Mistruths of Leonard H Anderson.

I was never in any National Guards unit ("NG"). Four years in Reserves.

What is nursie here for?

Easy rhetorical answer: Nursie is here to talk nasty to folks in order to relieve his everyday stresses and make hisself real big in his own eyes for being so "brave."

>> MARS is NOT amateur radio. It is based on a Department of
>> Defense Directive, not by the FCC or ARRL.
>
> MARS, without Amateur Radio, would be defunct.
>
>> Without the MILITARY authority, MARS ceases to exist.
>>
>> It's as simple as that.
>
> Without the civilian, Amateur Radio licensed participants, it would not be
>able to function, civil, military or otherwise.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

A Department of Defense Directive ESTABLISHED the MILITARY AFFILIATE Radio System. Three separate military branch Regulations further define those branch-specific MILITARY activities.

> It really is THAT simple.

MARS is MILITARY and it is NOT "amateur."

You are unable to understand military service regulations. No
wonder you are no longer in any military.

>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>> of rational thought.
>
> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".

REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
pen.

If you were a REAL private pilot you would know such things.

>> Get some medical help for your psychosis.
>
> "Medical" help for a mental health diagnosis would be inappropriate.

You are acting nuts. No "training" needed to prove that.

> However since you are neither trained or educated in medical OR mental
>health issues, you wouldn't know that.

You are acting nuts. No "training" needed to prove that.

> Once again, lack of knowledge AND experience have betrayed you.

You are acting nuts. No "training" needed to prove that.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4284. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192014.17843.00000155@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92346

In article <20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
>>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>>>
>>> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
their
>>> "work".
>>>
>>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>>Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
>>various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
>>for duty in the USMC?
>
> OK, PuppetBoy...let's go back up a couple lines and see if you can figure
>out why you are such an idiot...
>
>QUOTE:
>
>>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
>>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>
>UNQUOTE
>
> "...required physical rehab..."

Was that on your "DD-214" form along with "honorable discharge?"

So, you couldn't stay IN the murines on duty and still receive
this "rehab?"

Lots and lots of military personnel spend time IN rehab and
return to duty, continuing on with their military careers.

But you could NOT.

That strikes a discordant note...very much like you fabricated
the whole "accident-rehab-honorable-discharge" thing.

Maybe because the MEDICAL discharge was NOT for some
kind of "accident" during duty.

For one thing, a DD-214 form is simply a release from active
duty. It is NOT a "discharge" paper.

For another, you've not yet described this "accident" in detail
sufficient to prove you aren't defrauding the government of anything
or, for that matter, the newsgroup readers.

> Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
>inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!

Try Yiddish, putz-man.

You think that bluff and bombast is going to snow all us readers of
the newsgroup? If you do, you are seriously deluded.

It's easy to put a few things in order and arrive at the conclusion
that you've been LYING to us newsgroup readers.

> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."

Those who have no intellect at all are easily amused.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4285. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:20:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040525192015.17843.00000156@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92348

In article <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0405240824.3a3a91e5@posting.google.com>...
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0405231415.1b30cff1@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0405220547.7c697c72@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> news:<20040521140350.19642.00001365@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> > > > Tsk, tsk, tsk...without the DoD Directive there would be NO
>MARS!
>> >> > >
>> >> > > The DoD directive >>ENABLES<< MARS.
>> >> >
>> >> > Wow! No wonder you got put out.
>> >> >
>> >> > Directives "enable" something or some action.
>> >> >
>> >> > Unable to adapt to military service and unable to adapt to civilian
>life.
>> >> >
>> >> > Where does that leave you?
>> >>
>> >> With a DD214 that provides a nice income and the words "Honorable"
>> >> on it.
>> >>
>> >> The DoD directives do indeed "enable" the MARS program. Do you
>> >> disagree? Perhaps it was a DoS directive? DoJ...?!?!
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >What amazes me are the number of military retirees with a disability
>> >check and still capable of pulling in a full-time income from - work.
>>

>> From "work" that is NOT the same as what I was required to do in the
>US
>> Marine Corps.
>>
>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>>
>> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
>their
>> "work".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
>various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
>for duty in the USMC?

Brian, don't forget the private piloting (as a CAP air ace), hang-
gliding, and rollerblading, plus claims of hoisting a big field
pack in some kind of civilian "forced march." :-)

His "rehab" didn't extend to his mind, judging by his ugly little
behavior in here...or maybe it is post-traumatic stress syndrome
from those "seven hostile actions."

Who knows? The real story has yet to be revealed.

Meanwhile nursie flashes around that DD-214 "discharge paper"
like he wuz a hero...(sandwich)...

LHA / WMD

4286. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-25 23:53:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <0tm7b0dad692q0sd4qbuk0ipfrdk1hsd10@4ax.com>
Source record: 92350

On 25 May 2004 23:20:12 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <20040525155659.16651.00001903@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>snip

>
> Where did all those "hostile actions" you were in take place?

Um, a large number of them seem to happen here!

(sorry, couldn't resist) :)

>snip

> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD
>

73, Leo

4287. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 00:07:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92351

```
>
>
>
>
>
>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>>
>>>
>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>
>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>>
>>
>
> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.
>
>
>>
>>
>
> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
> you?
>
> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
> us can help you out...
>
There are SSB subbands on 6 and 2 meter bands. And that requires only a
code free
tech license.

>
> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>
> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
>
>
Sure MARS is not ham radio, but are not most MARS operators also
ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
```

operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military traffic?

4288. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:37:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251737.42bee459@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92352

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>
> >> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
> >> physical rehab after I was retired out.
> >>
> >> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
> their
> >> "work".
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
> >various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
> >for duty in the USMC?
>
> OK, PuppetBoy...let's go back up a couple lines and see if you can figure
> out why you are such an idiot...
>
> QUOTE:
>
> >> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
> >> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> "...required physical rehab..."
>
> Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
> inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!
>
> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."
>

> Steve, K4YZ

You neglect to talk about the mental rehab...

4289. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:44:07 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251744.5d49481d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92353

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040525144019.09295.00000265@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
> What "others," nursie?
>
> Did all of your split personalities get together and hold a group protest?

They could hold their very own CW net if they all knew Morse Code.

I wonder which one would send "QFU" first?

4290. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:46:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251746.19c19047@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92354

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525155015.16651.00001902@mb-m18.aol.com>...

>
> "Medical" help for a mental health diagnosis would be inappropriate.
>

So what does the VA have you on?

4291. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:50:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251750.4eb5805f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92355

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525154346.16651.00001901@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/25/2004 12:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250947.7fb62f52@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040525100150.15096.00001852@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241540.41dd13b9@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Don't need luck when you work smarter.
> >>
> >> Then buy TWO lottery tickets, Brain...
> >>
> >> At this rate you're gonna need a LOT of luck. "Smarter" is NOT your
> >> better suit.
> >>
> >> Matter of fact, I don't think you can even get into the fitting room.
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Steve, how do you think I got into the USAF?
>
> On your knees, I assume.

Nope.

I had a High School diploma, no police record, peed clean, and scored
real high on the exams.

> >Best of Luck on that one.
>
> Why? Why do I need "luck" dealing with you...?!?!

Because you are stumbling. That is a prelude to you falling down.

Best of Luck.

4292. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:54:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251754.603ba61f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92356

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040525144016.09295.00000262@mb-m11.aol.com>...

> MARS is NOT "amateur radio."
>
> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

Whatta Whacko! I'll bet the VA loves seeing him roll up to the pharmacy.

4293. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 01:58:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405251758.69dd4cb9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92357

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0405250443.6474fd9b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:<4OOdneibD-vJNC_dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
> >> William wrote:
> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> >>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
> >> >>
> >> >>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
> >> >>
> >> >> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
> >> >>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
> >> >>being a licensed Amateur.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
> >> > Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
> >> > in Google) human history to declare:
> >> >
> >> > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
> >> >
> >> > It's just too ridiculous to ignore.
> >> >
> >> > But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").
> >>
> >>
> >> We're just sitting back and letting you two have your back alley brawl!
>
> >> 8^) T'aint a good idea to get involved in it....
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >I think something as absurd as what Steve is trying to defend is worth
> >rubbing his nose in it again and again.

> >
> >Do you agree with "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" ?
>
> Someone's "medical rehabilitation" wasn't finished.
>
> "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>
> "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>
> Yon leatherneck (and rest of body) is unable to differentiate between
> Amateur Radio and Military Affiliate Radio System.
>
> Maybe medical science wasn't up to the task of finishing the
> "rehabilitation" program?
>
> Mike is unable to compete in this arena. [ice is too cold for him]
>
> TAFKARJ is busy with 160 years ago and the first COMMERCIAL
> use of manual telegraphy done by PROFESSIONALS. :-)
>
> Herr Robust has gone out to buy more poison with which to flavor
> his "replies." [or maybe his pen dissolved in the acid]
>
> Katapult Kellie is scrounging up a camera to snap more bears for
> Navy intelligence.
>
> Hans has been hitting the gym so that he could "throw out with
> great force." [or throw up, unknown...]
>
> Wince Ficus bloomed early with a teeny, tiny nastygram.
>
> Gunnery nurse can't think for all the noise of singing "Halls of
> Montezuma" and other little gems of murine brainwashing while
> confusing the Amateur's Code with code of civil, civilian conduct.
>
> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.
>
> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
> goad in order to talk legally via SSB." :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

When asked if "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," was true,
TAFKARJ had no opinion!!!

Hi hi hi!

The PCTA has all but fallen apart. They are impotent.

4294. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 05:06:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526010602.22498.00000116@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92362

In article <1e4e3692.0405251758.69dd4cb9@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0405250443.6474fd9b@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<4OOdneibD-vJNC_dRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>...
>> >> William wrote:
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0405240813.3c53956d@posting.google.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> >>JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> news:<Y5adnaUjPu24ETLdRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>...
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>Maybe it should be No Amateur Radio = No MARS participation.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> We'll never know, JJ...Lennie the Lame is the first and only
>> >> >>person I know of to claim that he could participate in MARS without
>> >> >>being a licensed Amateur.
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > And Steve "I got a Uniform >and< Rank in the USAF Civil Air Patrol"
>> >> > Gunnery Nurse K4YZ/K4CAP Robeson is the only person in >recorded< (as
>> >> > in Google) human history to declare:
>> >> >
>> >> > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>> >> >
>> >> > It's just too ridiculous to ignore.
>> >> >
>> >> > But the PCTA ignore it ("TAFKARJ has no opinion").
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> We're just sitting back and letting you two have your back alley brawl!
>>
>> >> 8^) T'aint a good idea to get involved in it....
>> >>
>> >> - Mike KB3EIA -

>> >
>> >I think something as absurd as what Steve is trying to defend is worth
>> >rubbing his nose in it again and again.
>> >
>> >Do you agree with "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" ?
>>
>> Someone's "medical rehabilitation" wasn't finished.
>>
>> "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>>
>> "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>>
>> Yon leatherneck (and rest of body) is unable to differentiate between
>> Amateur Radio and Military Affiliate Radio System.
>>
>> Maybe medical science wasn't up to the task of finishing the
>> "rehabilitation" program?
>>
>> Mike is unable to compete in this arena. [ice is too cold for him]
>>
>> TAFKARJ is busy with 160 years ago and the first COMMERCIAL
>> use of manual telegraphy done by PROFESSIONALS. :-)
>>
>> Herr Robust has gone out to buy more poison with which to flavor
>> his "replies." [or maybe his pen dissolved in the acid]
>>
>> Katapult Kellie is scrounging up a camera to snap more bears for
>> Navy intelligence.
>>
>> Hans has been hitting the gym so that he could "throw out with
>> great force." [or throw up, unknown...]
>>
>> Wince Ficus bloomed early with a teeny, tiny nastygram.
>>
>> Gunnery nurse can't think for all the noise of singing "Halls of
>> Montezuma" and other little gems of murine brainwashing while
>> confusing the Amateur's Code with code of civil, civilian conduct.
>>
>> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.
>>
>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB." :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>When asked if "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," was true,
>TAFKARJ had no opinion!!!
>
>Hi hi hi!

>
>The PCTA has all but fallen apart. They are impotent.

Maybe we can take up a collection to have Mark Martin deliver
some "Hamagra" to the PCTA after NASCAR racing season
is over. :-)

LHA / WMD

4295. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 05:06:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526010603.22498.00000118@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92358

In article <1e4e3692.0405251746.19c19047@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525155015.16651.00001902@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
>>
>> "Medical" help for a mental health diagnosis would be inappropriate.
>>
>
>So what does the VA have you on?

Fantasy Island.

"Mr. Roarke" left the show and Tatoo is gone. Someone has to mind
the property...

LHA / WMD

4296. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 05:06:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526010603.22498.00000117@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92360

In article <1e4e3692.0405251754.603ba61f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040525144016.09295.00000262@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>> MARS is NOT "amateur radio."
>>
>> Temper fry...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Whatta Whacko! I'll bet the VA loves seeing him roll up to the pharmacy.

Probably in a pickup truck to haul all the meds away. [needs the
cargo-carrying space]

Probably free, too. After all, anyone who got an "honorable discharge"
on his DD-214 deserves it...or some paper cleaner to take up the
mess.

LHA / WMD

4297. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 05:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526010604.22498.00000119@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92359

In article <1e4e3692.0405251744.5d49481d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040525144019.09295.00000265@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>> What "others," nursie?
>>
>> Did all of your split personalities get together and hold a group
>protest?
>
>They could hold their very own CW net if they all knew Morse Code.
>
>I wonder which one would send "QFU" first?

...I'd say ALL of them at once, each personality demanding to be
heard. :-)

LHA / WMD

4298. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 05:06:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526010606.22498.00000120@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92361

In article <40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>>>
>>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>>
>>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>>>
>> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
>> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.

>> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
>> you?
>>
>> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
>> us can help you out...
>>
>There are SSB subbands on 6 and 2 meter bands. And that requires only a
>code free tech license.

Take a look at the tables in Part 97. You will see that ALL bands
from 50.1 upward (except for 144.0 to 144.1 MHz) are marked
"MCW, phone, image, RTTY, data." (page 640 of Volume 5, the
table above 97.307, 1 Oct 03 edition of Title 47 C.F.R.)

Thank you for the illuminating offer of explanation but the regulations
are easy enough to read. I'm not the one needing the explanation.

By the way, there's no indication of "SSB subbands" in the real
official regulations from the government. "Phone" is phone, meaning
the same as voice.

>> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>>
>> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>
>Sure MARS is not ham radio, but are not most MARS operators also
>ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
>operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
>traffic?

According to one Amateur Extra, "MARS is ham radio."

According to the Department of Defense, the U.S. Army, the U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Navy, it is the MILITARY AFFILIATE Radio System. I gave the necessary document identification in here.

Once MARS got the AN/FRC-93 transceiver after 1965, MARS operators in Vietnam were making phone patches to the States at a rate of 40,000-plus per month. [that's four decades back in time] [source: Copy of "Communications-Electronics, Vietnam, 1964-1970," viewable/downloadable at the U.S. Army Center for Military History]

Can you identify the AN/FRC-93? You should be able to as it is a familiar radio to most U.S. amateurs. Need a TM on it? That's available for free download from LOGSA.

What's your point in your reply? I am familiar with several Parts in Title 47 C.F.R. Not difficult with Part 97, the shortest one in Volume 5 of the five published volumes (published biannually by the U. S. Government Printing Office).

I'm not any role-model for U.S. amateur radio public relations. That's the task of the Amateur Extra who keeps shouting that "MARS is amateur radio!" If you want better PR for ham radio then I'd suggest you have a long chat with that Amateur Extra. I'd say he reflects badly on U.S. amateur radio which is your avocation too.

LHA / WMD

4299. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 12:20:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405260420.3ec22eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92363

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
> >>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
> >>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
> >>>
> >>>
> >> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
> >>
> >> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
> >>
> >>
> >
> > I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
> > the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> > You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
> > you?
> >
> > What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
> > us can help you out...
> >
> There are SSB subbands on 6 and 2 meter bands. And that requires only a
> code free
> tech license.
>
> >
> > The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
> >
> > The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
> >
> > MARS is NOT amateur radio.
> >
> >
> >

> Sure MARS is not ham radio,

But Steve says, Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

but are not most MARS operators also
> ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
> operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
> traffic?

Most municipal radio operators wear a police uniform.

4300. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 14:25:00 UTC
From: Bada Bing <BadaBing@implant.com>
Message-ID: <097a0f4cdea318a9eff39a4f9995832b@news.teranews.com>
Source record: 92364

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Hoasc.30958$KE6.3543@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> >
> > Are you Australian?
> >
> > >
> No. But I have blown several.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
Too much info.

4301. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 14:41:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526104124.13769.00001427@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92365

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 5/25/2004 7:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>

>>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>>>
>>>>
>>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>>
>>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>>
>> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
>> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.

Lennie the Lame refuses to admit that Amateur licensees have had Morse
Code free access to the SSB mode for 13 years now.

>> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
>> you?
>>
>> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
>> us can help you out...
>>
>There are SSB subbands on 6 and 2 meter bands. And that requires only a
>code free
>tech license.

He knows it, Robert.

He's just an antagonist. He has absolutely nothing left to offer, so
being argumenitive and idiotic are his methods of expression.

>Sure MARS is not ham radio, but are not most MARS operators also
>ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
>operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
>traffic?

Yes, they are. And without the contibutions of those licensed Amateur
Radio operators, there'd be no MARS program today...At least not in it's
present form.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4302. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 14:46:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526104604.13769.00001428@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92366

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525192010.17843.00000151@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040525160316.16651.00001906@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040525144018.09295.00000264@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>
>>> Obviously, the "physical rehab" wasn't complete. A DD-214 is NOT an
>>> honorable discharge...it is just a Release from active duty.
>>
>> Yep. And when I was released, I was given one.
>
> Which was it, a DD-214 or an "honorable discharge?"
>
>> I'll get another one in September of this year.
>
> When did you "re-enlist?"
>
> One service period = one discharge. Not two.

Sorry, Lennie.

Things changed since you were in uniform. Not in YOUR mind, of course,
but the rest of the world moved on.

And September of 2004 will be 30 years since I first went on Active Duty.
That's when you are eligible for full retirement. Up until then you are in the
"Fleet Marine Reserve"

> You can have a discharge any time you want. Some folks call
> that "physical abuse."

The last "discharge" I had was 25 years ago, and kinda looked like you do
now.

A shot of Penicillin took care of it, though.

>> If you're gonna presume to demonstrate knowledge of administrative
>>proceeses of the Armed Forces, Lennie, ya need to spend some more time

>>learning about them. Then you can plagerize those sites too.
>
> Apparently there's a gross lack of your understanding of military
> procedure. For example, the Department of Defense (they are in
> charge of ALL U.S. militaries) issued a Directive describing and
> establishing MARS.
>
> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>
> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> Nursie, get some mental therapy. You need it.

Uh huh...right.

Steve, K4YZ

4303. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 14:57:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526105750.13769.00001429@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92367

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525192010.17843.00000152@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040525155936.16651.00001904@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>
>>> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.
>>
>> Please remind us about all the off-spring YOU have raised, Lennie?
>
> You really don't want to go there, little man.

Sure, Lennie.

YOU have suggested that you know something about child growth and development, and have suggested that there should be an age limit placed upon Amatuer Radio licensure based upon the supposed lack of maturity and responsibility of same.

That would presume that either (1) you have a degree in a health care or mental health discipline that would prepare you educationally to make such a suggestion, or (2) you raised to maturity an offspring or several offspring that allowed you to make an informed opinion.

You have no degree in ANY healthcare discipline that I am aware of.

You refuse to acknowledge any parenting experience.

Ergo you have ventured into yet another realm of human endeavor for which you have no knowledge or experience from which to make said suggestion.

> It should be obvious to you but you can't see it...

In as much as all I can see at this moment is the screen upon which these words appear, you'd be correct.

If you suggest that I draw some conclusion from your silence, well, that's already done.

>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>
>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>
>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>
> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.
>
> I did much the same late last year talking from a moored
> sailboat in a California marina.
>
> Both times and all times in between WITHOUT needing an
> amateur radio license!
>
> But, without passing a manual telegraphy test, it is NOT LEGAL
> to do that on U.S. amateur bands below 30 MHz.

"...below 30 MHz." is NOT what you said in the first post.

You insinuated that it was necessary to know Morse Code to use SSB.

SSB is used all throughout the VHF and UHF ranges by Amateurs.

Your exploits in 1954 are irrelevent, both to discusssions about Morse
Code examinations and the use of SSB by licensed Amateurs.

>> Hasn't been for 13 years.
>
> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
> you?
>
> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
> us can help you out...
>
> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>
> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> Get some mental help...

Lennie, YOU are the idiot that keeps jumping from trying to make some
analogy between your Army radio clerk days in the 1950's and the present day
Amateur Radio examination requirements, then jump to trying to tell me what the
MARS program is all about.

Seems to me YOU are the one in need of help.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4304. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 15:08:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526110818.13769.00001430@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92368

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/26/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405260420.3ec22eb@posting.google.com>
>
>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:<40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>...

> but are not most MARS operators also
>> ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
>> operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
>> traffic?
>
>Most municipal radio operators wear a police uniform.

I am sure in your weak, irratic PuppetBoy mind this was supposed to "mean"
something, but it got lost between your (dubiously labeled) brain and your
fingers.

What an idiot.

Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine statement
about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.

That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are only a
fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire Department, EMS,
Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.

Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if there is
even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.

Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military frequencies to
"municipal radio operators"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4305. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 15:24:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92369

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>

>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>> of rational thought.
>>
>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>
> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
> pen.

Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was determined
that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't preceeded
by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.

And I've been a licensed pilot for thirty YEARS this August, and I have
NEVER heard the term "P-51 time" in any other term than that used by people who
actually logged time in a North American P-51.

Guess that's the difference between us, Lennie...You hang out with liars
and cheats.

I don't.

Perhaps that's why you find it easy to BE a liar and find it equally hard
to understand why others don't accept your conduct.

> If you were a REAL private pilot you would know such things.

Uh huh. You're welcome to review the FAA data base.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4306. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 15:40:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92370

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525192012.17843.00000153@mb-m19.aol.com>

>> So far he's not been able to produce even ONE trophy photo from Somalia.
>
> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his "seven hostile actions."

I had better things to do, Lennie.
>
> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
> the 3rd Marine Division.

I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.

Please get things right if you're going to TRY and "embarrass" me, Lennie.

> Nursie couldn't find the appropriate Directive or service branch
> Regulations of the Military Affliliate Radio System in order to back
> up his assertion about "MARS is amateur radio."

No "directive" was needed.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> But, I'm not going to do so on command of some lying insulter
> who can't offer ONE shred of "proof" he actually did some of the
> lies he states.

I've already given you the "shred" you need, Lennie...

Sufficient information to verify my service record with VA...

Did it right here in THIS forum.

Now who's "lying", Scumbag?

>>> Those who live constantly in Fantasyland cannot be rational.
>>
>> You're right...and you DO have a California address, so I guess you
>CAN'T
>>be "rational".
>
> You really ARE an UGLY little person...mentally hateful and
> frustrated...resorting to insulting the entirety of the most populous
> state of the Union.

It's not an insult if it's true. Let's see...California has Charlie Manson, is home to the Crips and Bloods, has the largest (by far) percentage of drug abusers and is known as the worlds first drive-by shooting range. More cities in CA have smog and other pollution control issues than almost anywhere else in the United States, and typically has a tax burden on it's citizens that chokes any "lifestyle" benefits out of them.

And then there's you. California has you.

> You are mentally SICK. No "training" or "credentials" needed to
> show that.

No, Lennie...I am just very adept at proving what a liar and idiot you've become in your waning years.

That you don't like having your dirty laundry aired so frequently is YOUR fault for hanging it out there.

> But, you ARE an Amateur Extra, the very model of what manual
> telegraphy and too much RF exposure can produce.

If that's your best shot, Lennie, you've failed again.

Steve, K4YZ

4307. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 15:47:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526114753.13769.00001433@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92371

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040525192014.17843.00000155@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>

>>>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC
>required
>>>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>>
>>UNQUOTE
>>
>> "...required physical rehab..."
>
> Was that on your "DD-214" form along with "honorable discharge?"
>
> So, you couldn't stay IN the murines on duty and still receive
> this "rehab?"

Might could have. But I didn't.

> Lots and lots of military personnel spend time IN rehab and
> return to duty, continuing on with their military careers.

Sure they do. And many do not.

> But you could NOT.

"Did" not...Not "could not".

> That strikes a discordant note...very much like you fabricated
> the whole "accident-rehab-honorable-discharge" thing.
>
> Maybe because the MEDICAL discharge was NOT for some
> kind of "accident" during duty.
>
> For one thing, a DD-214 form is simply a release from active
> duty. It is NOT a "discharge" paper.

There you go presuming to be qualified in military administrative matters
again, Lennie.

>> Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
>>inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!
>
> Try Yiddish, putz-man.

Yes, you are a putz, man...Thanks for reminding me.

> You think that bluff and bombast is going to snow all us readers of
> the newsgroup? If you do, you are seriously deluded.

"Snow" who?

There one who's "seriously deluded" here Lennie is you.

You seem to think that we can't see through you. You try to hide behind
YOUR false bravado, even being bullying and profane, but we, especially >>I<<,
don't accept it.

You are a liar. Documented and archived.

You continue to be an antagonist with no defensible argument.

Oh well....Sucks to be you.

Steve, K4YZ

4308. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 15:55:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526115510.13769.00001434@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92372

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/26/2004 12:06 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040526010606.22498.00000120@mb-m29.aol.com>

> By the way, there's no indication of "SSB subbands" in the real
> official regulations from the government. "Phone" is phone, meaning
> the same as voice.

Ooooops.

Another example of no practical experience in Amateur Radio.

The FCC has VERY clearly stated that "gentleman's agreements" and compliance with them IS "good Amateur practice". Persons who have violated these band plans have been censured and fined by the FCC even though the "sub bands" they may ahve violated were not exactly specified by the FCC.

Please refer to just about any current day training text and you will see that there ARE areas set aside for SSB communications in the VHF and above spectrum.

That you don't considerthem "valid" since they are not specifically delineated in Part 97 is irrelevent. Those 670,000+ licensed Amateurs >>DO<< consider them valid.

Back to sleep, Your Putziness.

Steve, K4YZ

4309. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 17:09:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92373

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>
> I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since it
> doesn't require a Morse Code examination.

Why, Steve?

Why do you encourage Mr. Anderson to get an amateur radio license,
given the way he behaves here towards anyone who disagrees with him?
Do you really *want* him to join the ARS?

Mr. Anderson told us way back in January of 2000 (almost 4-1/2 years
ago) that he was "going for Extra right out of the box". Didn't
happen, probably won't happen any time soon, if ever.

The Tech hasn't had a code test in over 13 years and medical waivers
for all code tests except 5 wpm were available in 1990. None of this
is news or any sort of secret. If Mr. Anderson were interested in
being a radio amateur, he would have gotten a license long ago. So
there's only one logical conclusion left.

Do you think that calling him "Lennie" or various versions of "scummy"
or "liar" will change his behavior, or opinions, or get him to admit
any of his many mistakes? Or do you think that maybe, just maybe,
getting *you* to behave in a manner similar to *his* might be one of
his real goals?

I snipped out all of the name calling and insults in the post I
replied to - and there wasn't much left. Nowadays I don't even read
most rrap posts past the first insult. Many I don't read past the
author line.
>
> However you still seem stymied byt the process. Actually, I think it's
> because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge base...Your
> ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the test
> in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.

Did it ever occur to you, Steve, that Mr. Anderson could pass the test
if he wanted to - but that he doesn't want to? That his hobby is
something very different?

Look back over the past several years. Do you really think Mr.
Anderson will *ever* engage in civil debate here on *any* subject? Or
that Mr. Burke will answer any questions that he doesn't want to
answer (while at the same time asking all sorts of questions of
others)?

Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on 7037 next Monday night?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4310. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 18:58:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40B4E8BC.6060704@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92374

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Most municipal radio operators wear a police uniform.
>
And some wear firefighter outfits.

>
>

But they are not hams using ham radio licenses and ham radio frequencies.

Cell phone users are not using ham radio either.

4311. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152528.19470.00000155@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92375

In article <20040526115510.13769.00001434@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/26/2004 12:06 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040526010606.22498.00000120@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>> By the way, there's no indication of "SSB subbands" in the real
>> official regulations from the government. "Phone" is phone, meaning
>> the same as voice.
>
> Oooooops.
>
> Another example of no practical experience in Amateur Radio.
>
> The FCC has VERY clearly stated that "gentleman's agreements" and
>compliance with them IS "good Amateur practice". Persons who have violated
>these band plans have been censured and fined by the FCC even though the "sub
>bands" they may ahve violated were not exactly specified by the FCC.

Look in volume 5 of the 1 October 2003 edition of Title 47 C.F.R. on page 640, the table accompanying 97.307.

Does it state "gentlemen's agreements" there? No, it says "Emission Types Authorized." Look at the 19 bands above 30 MHz. Does "SSB" appear anywhere? No? :-)

Gosh, I guess nursie always right but FCC wrong!

How about that? :-)

> Please refer to just about any current day training text and you will see
>that there ARE areas set aside for SSB communications in the VHF and above
>spectrum.

Okay, we'll just put you down in saying "current day training texts" authorize amateur radio and the FCC does not.

So, does MARS exist because of "current day training texts?"

> That you don't considerthem "valid" since they are not specifically
>delineated in Part 97 is irrelevent. Those 670,000+ licensed Amateurs >>DO<<
>consider them valid.

You did a poll of everyone?

[you missed about 50K or so licensed radio amateurs...]

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

DoD defines MARS.

FCC does not define MARS.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

4312. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152531.19470.00000156@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92377

In article <20040526114753.13769.00001433@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525192014.17843.00000155@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>>>> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC
>>required
>>>>> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>>>
>>>UNQUOTE
>>>
>>> "...required physical rehab..."
>>
>> Was that on your "DD-214" form along with "honorable discharge?"
>>
>> So, you couldn't stay IN the murines on duty and still receive
>> this "rehab?"
>
> Might could have. But I didn't.
>
>> Lots and lots of military personnel spend time IN rehab and
>> return to duty, continuing on with their military careers.
>
> Sure they do. And many do not.
>
>> But you could NOT.
>
> "Did" not...Not "could not".
>
>> That strikes a discordant note...very much like you fabricated
>> the whole "accident-rehab-honorable-discharge" thing.
>>

>> Maybe because the MEDICAL discharge was NOT for some
>> kind of "accident" during duty.
>>
>> For one thing, a DD-214 form is simply a release from active
>> duty. It is NOT a "discharge" paper.
>
> There you go presuming to be qualified in military administrative
>matters again, Lennie.

If "qualified" means being able to read DoD documents correctly,
then I am very much QUALIFIED. :-)

>>> Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
>>>inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!
>>
>> Try Yiddish, putz-man.
>
> Yes, you are a putz, man...Thanks for reminding me.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still with ethnic profanities.

>> You think that bluff and bombast is going to snow all us readers of
>> the newsgroup? If you do, you are seriously deluded.
>
> "Snow" who?

Everyone. :-)

> There one who's "seriously deluded" here Lennie is you.

Nursie is always right, everyone else is always wrong. :-)

> You seem to think that we can't see through you.

You are Stuporman with X-ray vision! :-)

>You try to hide behind
>YOUR false bravado, even being bullying and profane, but we, especially
>>>I<<, don't accept it.

Which one of your personalities is stating that? [for the record]

> You are a liar. Documented and archived.

No. However, if you are going to argue that, then everyone else in
the world is LYING but you always tell the truth. :-)

> You continue to be an antagonist with no defensible argument.

The DoD LIES but nursie is always right?

DoD defines MARS.

FCC does not define MARS.

Nursie say "MARS is amateur radio!"

> Oh well....Sucks to be you.

Hoover sucks. :-)

LHA / WMD

4313. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92379

In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525192012.17843.00000153@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>>> So far he's not been able to produce even ONE trophy photo from
>Somalia.
>>
>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his "seven hostile actions."
>
> I had better things to do, Lennie.

Like trying to think up more LIES?

>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>
> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.

3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.

OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.

> Please get things right if you're going to TRY and "embarrass" me,
>Lennie.

You wouldn't admit to being caught LYING red-handed. :-)

FCC defines amateur radio.

FCC does not define MARS

DoD defines MARS

Nursie say "MARS is amateur radio."

Nursie very confused.

>> Nursie couldn't find the appropriate Directive or service branch
>> Regulations of the Military Affliliate Radio System in order to back
>> up his assertion about "MARS is amateur radio."
>
> No "directive" was needed.

Department of Defense says otherwise. :-)

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

OK, so you've redefined your original claim. [this one is wrong, too]

DoD does not define amateur radio.

FCC defines amateur radio.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

>> But, I'm not going to do so on command of some lying insulter
>> who can't offer ONE shred of "proof" he actually did some of the
>> lies he states.
>
> I've already given you the "shred" you need, Lennie...

All shredded... :-)

> Sufficient information to verify my service record with VA...

Veterans Administration does not define MARS.

> Did it right here in THIS forum.

You've consistently tried to define MARS by saying "MARS is
amateur radio."

> Now who's "lying", Scumbag?

You are.

> It's not an insult if it's true. Let's see...California has Charlie
>Manson, is home to the Crips and Bloods, has the largest (by far) percentage
of
>drug abusers and is known as the worlds first drive-by shooting range. More
>cities in CA have smog and other pollution control issues than almost
>anywhere else in the United States, and typically has a tax burden on it's
citizens
>that chokes any "lifestyle" benefits out of them.

The State of California does not define MARS.

So, one can assume you HATE California and all 30+ million citizens?

:-)

> No, Lennie...I am just very adept at proving what a liar and idiot you've
>become in your waning years.

Whatever. DoD lies about MARS. Only nursie defines MARS.

> That you don't like having your dirty laundry aired so frequently is YOUR
>fault for hanging it out there.

We have a nice General Electric dryer here. Works fine. Nothing is
hanging out when laundry is done.

BTW, General Electric doesn't define MARS either...

>> But, you ARE an Amateur Extra, the very model of what manual
>> telegraphy and too much RF exposure can produce.
>
> If that's your best shot, Lennie, you've failed again.

You are no longer an extra? Poor baby. Sorry we feel for you (Yoda).

LHA / WMD

4314. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92376

In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>> of rational thought.
>>>
>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>
>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>> pen.
>
> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was determined
>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.

Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham bands. :-)

> And I've been a licensed pilot for thirty YEARS this August, and I have
>NEVER heard the term "P-51 time" in any other term than that used by people
>who actually logged time in a North American P-51.

You've never heard the term "P-51 time?!?" :-)

You should get around more...when not flying all those "missions" for the CAP. :-)

> Perhaps that's why you find it easy to BE a liar and find it equally hard
>to understand why others don't accept your conduct.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Looking in the mirror again? :-)

Have you read the DoD Directive on MARS yet, ace?

Are you still claiming the DoD Directive says "MARS is amateur radio?"

If you do, YOU are LYING.

Try the USN-USMC Communications Instruction. Does it say "MARS is amateur radio?"

If you do, YOU are LYING.

> Uh huh. You're welcome to review the FAA data base.

FAA doesn't define MARS. FCC doesn't define MARS.

Nursie defines MARS.

Nursie is not right in the head.

LHA / WMD

4315. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152536.19470.00000159@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92381

In article <20040526105750.13769.00001429@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525192010.17843.00000152@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040525155936.16651.00001904@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040525144021.09295.00000266@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> Mama Dee is silent, apparently out disciplining other children.
>>>
>>> Please remind us about all the off-spring YOU have raised, Lennie?
>>
>> You really don't want to go there, little man.
>
> Sure, Lennie.
>
> YOU have suggested that you know something about child growth and
>development, and have suggested that there should be an age limit placed upon
>Amatuer Radio licensure based upon the supposed lack of maturity and
>responsibility of same.

You stubbornly insist on going into this non-subject. OK.

The DoD may have a directive on parenting somewhere (irrelevant to this subject) but there is NO connection of parenting to MARS activities or regulations.

You are attempting to misdirect the subject again. Stay focussed on the subject instead of letting your ADD take over again. [it does so often]

> That would presume that either (1) you have a degree in a health care or
>mental health discipline that would prepare you educationally to make such a
>suggestion, or (2) you raised to maturity an offspring or several offspring
>that allowed you to make an informed opinion.

You presume too much. While you may not be able to observe other humans, most of us are able to do so.

Proper mental health includes the ability to understand directives and regulations and not try to redefine them for the sake of making some message points in a newsgroup. You failed in that regard and refuse to acknowledge that. That's mental aberration by yourself.

There is no "degree" or "credential" required to be a parent. Human reproduction is done by unskilled people. Raising children to maturity is more akin to a trial-and-error process...where, if the original result is defective, there is no real hope of success. [that's life, tough as it is] Even with a good product, it takes sensitivity and observation and considerable compassion to raise a child to "maturity."

The degree of "maturity" is at question in your case. For example, you've been given the identification of DoD Directive plus Regulations of the Army, Air Force, and Navy in regards to MARS existance and activities. Still, you stubbornly insist "MARS is amateur radio." It is not.

> You have no degree in ANY healthcare discipline that I am aware of.

A "degree in any healthcare discipline" is NOT required to operate, design, or manufacture a radio.

A "degree in any healthcare discipline" is NOT required to obtain any sort of radio license, operator or station.

> You refuse to acknowledge any parenting experience.

Parenting is not a requirement to operate, design, or build a radio.

Parenting is not a requirement to obtain any sort of radio license, operator or station.

> Ergo you have ventured into yet another realm of human endeavor for which
>you have no knowledge or experience from which to make said suggestion.

The subject is the Military Affiliate Radio System.

It is not parenting.

>> It should be obvious to you but you can't see it...

The subject is the Military Affiliate Radio System.

It is not parenting.

Look at the top of your AOL mail screen display. It should say "Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio"."

Fairly obvious to me...and anyone else using AOL software, even with other browsers.

> In as much as all I can see at this moment is the screen upon which these
>words appear, you'd be correct.

I have only to repeat the official documents of the DoD and the three
major U.S. military branches in regards to MARS. Nowhere do
these documents state that "MARS is amateur radio."

You MAY have seen those, but it is difficult to discern. You keep
saying contrary statements when not personally attacking people.

> If you suggest that I draw some conclusion from your silence, well,
that's
>already done.

I wasn't speaking - at any time - of producing damaged children.

>>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>>
>>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>>
>>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>>
>> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
>> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.
>>
>> I did much the same late last year talking from a moored
>> sailboat in a California marina.
>>
>> Both times and all times in between WITHOUT needing an
>> amateur radio license!
>>
>> But, without passing a manual telegraphy test, it is NOT LEGAL
>> to do that on U.S. amateur bands below 30 MHz.
>
> "...below 30 MHz." is NOT what you said in the first post.

Don't try to quibble on words, you only dribble on the keyboard.

Part 97 of Title 47 C.F.R. is one of the smallest Parts and can
be understood by anyone...anyone without preconceived or
imaginary ideas.

> You insinuated that it was necessary to know Morse Code to use SSB.

U.S. amateur radio regulations state that all amateurs must
demonstrate manual telegraphy skill by test in order to receive a
grant having privileges below 30 MHz. That's straightforward and
applies to ANY allocated modulation type.

> SSB is used all throughout the VHF and UHF ranges by Amateurs.

Regulations say "phone" or voice communications.

When was the last time you used SSB on the 4mm band?

> Your exploits in 1954 are irrelevent, both to discusssions about Morse
>Code examinations and the use of SSB by licensed Amateurs.

Using SSB is a simple matter of operating, by adjusting the proper
radio controls. That can be done by NON-amateurs. :-) Some
private boat owners do it all time...just like I did in late 2003 from
a marina-moored sailboat. :-)

>>> Hasn't been for 13 years.
>>
>> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
>> you?
>>
>> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
>> us can help you out...
>>
>> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>>
>> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>
>> Get some mental help...
>
> Lennie, YOU are the idiot that keeps jumping from trying to make some
>analogy between your Army radio clerk days in the 1950's and the present day
>Amateur Radio examination requirements, then jump to trying to tell me what
>the MARS program is all about.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still on Fantasy Island?

I was NEVER an "Army radio clerk." My MOS was 281.6, Microwave
Radio Relay Operations and Maintenance Supervisor. That's what it
says on my DD-214. That's what I did...as well as being a Fixed
Station Radio Operations and Maintenance Supervisor plus a number
of other secondary (brevet) MOSs such as VHF radio relay and
carrier equipment.

I don't "jump to trying to tell you anything." [nobody can] Since you
FAILED to provide any references for your statements about MARS,
for three weeks time, I just did a simple Internet search and found the
appropriate documents and their identification and then posted that
here. I've downloaded all those documents for reference.

NONE of those downloaded documents says "MARS is amateur
radio."

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS frequencies are NOT in allocated amateur bands. MARS
callsigns are not legal to use as identification within amateur radio
bands and amateur radio callsigns are not legal to use as
identification outside of amateur radio bands.

MARS is not defined in the U.S. amateur radio regulations nor is it
regulated by the FCC.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

> Seems to me YOU are the one in need of help.

The world is wrong but nursie is right? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> Putz.

You keep on with filthy profanities as a salutation. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

You need another shot of penicillin. You are still discharging.

LHA / WMD

4316. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152537.19470.00000160@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92380

In article <20040526104604.13769.00001428@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040525192010.17843.00000151@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040525160316.16651.00001906@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 1:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040525144018.09295.00000264@mb-m11.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> Obviously, the "physical rehab" wasn't complete. A DD-214 is NOT an
>>>> honorable discharge...it is just a Release from active duty.
>>>
>>> Yep. And when I was released, I was given one.
>>
>> Which was it, a DD-214 or an "honorable discharge?"
>>
>>> I'll get another one in September of this year.
>>
>> When did you "re-enlist?"
>>
>> One service period = one discharge. Not two.
>
> Sorry, Lennie.
>
> Things changed since you were in uniform. Not in YOUR mind, of course,
>but the rest of the world moved on.

Nursie is still trying to bluff and bluster his way through an "argument."

:-)

DD-214s are still only a Release from Active Duty.

Military service discharges are a different form.

> And September of 2004 will be 30 years since I first went on Active Duty.

>That's when you are eligible for full retirement. Up until then you are in
the
>"Fleet Marine Reserve"

I'm not in any Fleet Marine Reserve. Never was. :-)

Nobody really cares how long you were some kind of murine hero
in the service of your country (or other self-defined patriotic crapola).

You never engaged in any military radio communications while in
the murines. You don't know the systems, you don't know the
procedures, you can't identify familiar pieces of equipment which
all real military communications people would know.

>> You can have a discharge any time you want. Some folks call
>> that "physical abuse."
>
> The last "discharge" I had was 25 years ago, and kinda looked like you
>do now.
>
> A shot of Penicillin took care of it, though.

Not quite. There is public evidence that your mind was affected.

All military activities are governed by directives and regulations.
MARS exists because a DoD Directive says it does. [not by the
FCC and not by the ARRL]

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

>>> If you're gonna presume to demonstrate knowledge of administrative
>>>proceeses of the Armed Forces, Lennie, ya need to spend some more time
>>>learning about them. Then you can plagerize those sites too.
>>
>> Apparently there's a gross lack of your understanding of military
>> procedure. For example, the Department of Defense (they are in
>> charge of ALL U.S. militaries) issued a Directive describing and
>> establishing MARS.
>>
>> The "M" in MARS = MILITARY
>>
>> The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE
>>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Incorrect in the real world. The MILITARY AFFILIATE Radio System
is NOT amateur radio.

Bluster, bluff, and bombast will not dissuade anyone and it certainly doesn't override any Department of Defense Directorate.

MARS is as MARS is directed and regulated. It is NOT amateur radio.

>> Nursie, get some mental therapy. You need it.
>
> Uh huh...right.

Agreement that you DO have a problem is an optimistic sign.

The next step is to act on that realization. Good luck on that.

LHA / WMD

4317. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 19:25:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526152539.19470.00000161@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92378

In article <20040526104124.13769.00001427@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>Date: 5/25/2004 7:07 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>
>
>>>>> What a cast of characters to convince anyone of "enjoying the
>>>>> magic of having one's very own radio station by learning morris
>>>>> goad in order to talk legally via SSB."
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>> Hot Flash, Hot Rod...
>>>>
>>>> It's not required to learn Morse Code to use SSB.
>>>
>>> I know that...in military and commercial radio. I used SSB voice
>>> the first time in 1954 communicating with Hawaii from Tokyo.
>
> Lennie the Lame refuses to admit that Amateur licensees have had Morse
>Code free access to the SSB mode for 13 years now.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still in the name-calling activity.

U.S. amateur radio regulations define the modulations and frequencies which radio amateurs are allowed to operate.

U.S. amateur radio regulations do NOT define the Military Affiliate Radio System.

Nursie is trying to misdirect the thread from the subject, MARS.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

>>> You really CANNOT read Part 97 with any comprehension, can
>>> you?
>>>
>>> What part of Part 97 stumps you? Let us know and maybe one of
>>> us can help you out...
>>>
>>There are SSB subbands on 6 and 2 meter bands. And that requires only a
>>code free tech license.

>
> He knows it, Robert.

There are NO "SSB subbands" on 6 and 2 meter bands.

Regulations state "phone" which is voice communications.

> He's just an antagonist. He has absolutely nothing left to offer, so
>being argumenitive and idiotic are his methods of expression.

No "antagonism," just an attempt to get stubborn mules to move
off of their Fantasy Island imaginations.

>>Sure MARS is not ham radio, but are not most MARS operators also
>>ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
>>operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
>>traffic?
>
> Yes, they are. And without the contibutions of those licensed Amateur
>Radio operators, there'd be no MARS program today...At least not in it's
>present form.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, trying to equate a justification by a conditional.

Bad form, OM. Poor rationalization.

Throughout its existance, MARS has NOT normally "carried military
traffic." That is done by regular military communications systems
which are not recreational activities.

What is left of MARS is now realigned to be an additional radio
system for liason with real emergency agencies such as FEMA.
With the spread of the Internet (plus VoIP), service members can
now communicate with "home" directly...and do, even from field
locations in the Middle East.

What MARS did in the past was a very valuable service for the
morale of distant service members such as in Vietnam of 39 to
34 years ago. That is acknowledged and appreciated...but it WAS,
and is not a present-day large activity.

Without the Department of Defense Directive, there would be NO
MARS. Not in ANY "present day form."

LHA / WMD

4318. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 20:06:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526160602.06606.00000201@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 92382

In article <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>>
>> I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since
>it
>> doesn't require a Morse Code examination.
>
>Why, Steve?
>
>Why do you encourage Mr. Anderson to get an amateur radio license,
>given the way he behaves here towards anyone who disagrees with him?
>Do you really *want* him to join the ARS?

Well, TAFKARJ, it's difficult to work up enthusiasm for anyone who continually insults me with cute little Yiddish-ethic pejoratives...or makes other irrelevant insults about my person.

Remember that nursie is an Amateur Extra and is thus a role-model of what all radio amateurs of "top rank" should be! :-)

>Mr. Anderson told us way back in January of 2000 (almost 4-1/2 years
>ago) that he was "going for Extra right out of the box". Didn't
>happen, probably won't happen any time soon, if ever.

I'm also trying to invent anti-gravity but something is holding me down...

>The Tech hasn't had a code test in over 13 years and medical waivers
>for all code tests except 5 wpm were available in 1990. None of this
>is news or any sort of secret. If Mr. Anderson were interested in
>being a radio amateur, he would have gotten a license long ago. So
>there's only one logical conclusion left.

Is it written somewhere that all accessing this newsgroup MUST be "interested in getting an amateur radio license?"

Some HAVE written that, but so far, there's no regulation or directive saying It Is So.

>Do you think that calling him "Lennie" or various versions of "scummy"
>or "liar" will change his behavior, or opinions, or get him to admit
>any of his many mistakes? Or do you think that maybe, just maybe,
>getting *you* to behave in a manner similar to *his* might be one of
>his real goals?

Nursie is an Amateur Extra. He can say and do anything he wants.

And does! :-)

>I snipped out all of the name calling and insults in the post I
>replied to - and there wasn't much left. Nowadays I don't even read
>most rrap posts past the first insult. Many I don't read past the
>author line.

Amateur puritanism? :-)

Or didn't the party for the 160th Anniversary last long?

>> However you still seem stymied byt the process. Actually, I think it's
>> because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge
base...Your
>> ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the
test
>> in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.
>
>Did it ever occur to you, Steve, that Mr. Anderson could pass the test
>if he wanted to - but that he doesn't want to? That his hobby is
>something very different?

How could a hobby involving electronics be "different?"

Everyone "interested" in radio MUST get a ham license.

Everyone "interested" in communication by radio MUST
use morse code.

Etc., etc., etc...

>Look back over the past several years. Do you really think Mr.
>Anderson will *ever* engage in civil debate here on *any* subject? Or
>that Mr. Burke will answer any questions that he doesn't want to
>answer (while at the same time asking all sorts of questions of
>others)?

Oh, yes, by all means LOOK BACK. :-)

[rehash old arguments archived in Google, etc., etc.]

What "Mr. Miccolis" defines as "civil debate" is best described
as CAPITULATION to whatever "Mr. Miccolis" has stated.

No more, no less. If "Mr. Miccolis" defines "civility" as
AGREEING with him...in whatever he says. No problem.

Nice notes on drafting another Sermon On The Antenna Mount.

Will we hear the completed version Sunday from W1AW? :-)

LHA / WMD

4319. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-26 22:35:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2Z8tc.26853$zO3.8169@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92383

Gee everybody...look...another creative editor.

How unique.

Idiot.

Dan/W4NTI

"Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in message
news:097a0f4cdea318a9eff39a4f9995832b@news.teranews.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Hoasc.30958$KE6.3543@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> > >
> > > Are you Australian?
> > >
> > > >
> > No. But I have blown several.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> Too much info.
>
>

4320. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 00:19:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405261619.7dbab9c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92384

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<40B4E8BC.6060704@ix.netcom.com>...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Most municipal radio operators wear a police uniform.
> >
> And some wear firefighter outfits.

And dog catchers and street sweepers and sewer workers.

Doesn't make them MARS ops, does it?

>
> But they are not hams using ham radio licenses and ham radio frequencies.
>

And MARS ops use MARS frequencies.

> Cell phone users are not using ham radio either.

Cell phone users could be Hams, Police, Firefighters, Dog Catchers,
Street Sweepers, Sewer Workers, MARS Ops, Moms, Dads, kids, War
Planners, and Senators.

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

4321. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 00:28:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405261628.7a060e86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92385

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040526110818.13769.00001430@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/26/2004 7:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405260420.3ec22eb@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >news:<40B3DF9E.6030705@ix.netcom.com>...
>
> > but are not most MARS operators also
> >> ham radio licensees? Hams that have been authorized by the military to
> >> operate on MARS radio systems using military owned stations for military
> >> traffic?
> >
> >Most municipal radio operators wear a police uniform.
>
> I am sure in your weak, irratic PuppetBoy mind this was supposed to "mean"
> something, but it got lost between your (dubiously labeled) brain and your
> fingers.
>
> What an idiot.

I'm not the one who said, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine statement
> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.

So?

> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are only a
> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire Department, EMS,
> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.

Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?

> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if there is
> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.

I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.

Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"

> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military frequencies to
> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!

How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?

4322. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 00:52:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405261652.107dd77d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92386

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >
> > I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since it
> > doesn't require a Morse Code examination.
>
> Why, Steve?
>
> Why do you encourage Mr. Anderson to get an amateur radio license,
> given the way he behaves here towards anyone who disagrees with him?
> Do you really *want* him to join the ARS?

Now wait just a minute. You idly stood by for years while Dick,
Larry, Steve, Steve, Bruce, Kelly, et all, grossly misbehaved, then
you beg them to join your CW nets.

Where were your words of caution then? Why do you intentionally
associate with such people?

They said they were good as gold because they made it through the
filter, and they wouldn't behave so horribly while on the air.

> Mr. Anderson told us way back in January of 2000 (almost 4-1/2 years
> ago) that he was "going for Extra right out of the box". Didn't
> happen, probably won't happen any time soon, if ever.

You told us just last week that you have no opinion of "Sorry Hans,
MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Jim does have an opinion. One day he just might voice it. But not
while whacked out Steve is doing his battle for him.

Just as Jim had an opinion of Bruce. An opinion that he sat on for
years and years, until Bruce's outrages became even too much for Jim
to bear.

> The Tech hasn't had a code test in over 13 years and medical waivers
> for all code tests except 5 wpm were available in 1990. None of this
> is news or any sort of secret. If Mr. Anderson were interested in
> being a radio amateur, he would have gotten a license long ago. So
> there's only one logical conclusion left.

What might that be, Jim?

> Do you think that calling him "Lennie" or various versions of "scummy"
> or "liar" will change his behavior, or opinions, or get him to admit
> any of his many mistakes? Or do you think that maybe, just maybe,
> getting *you* to behave in a manner similar to *his* might be one of
> his real goals?

So you think Steve is so easily and blatantly manipulated?

I do.

> I snipped out all of the name calling and insults in the post I
> replied to - and there wasn't much left. Nowadays I don't even read
> most rrap posts past the first insult. Many I don't read past the
> author line.

I try to look for some good in everything rather than dismissing it
outright.

> > However you still seem stymied byt the process. Actually, I think it's
> > because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge base...Your
> > ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the test
> > in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.
>
> Did it ever occur to you, Steve, that Mr. Anderson could pass the test
> if he wanted to - but that he doesn't want to? That his hobby is
> something very different?

I think Mr. Anderson is not interested in a VHF license. Just my
opinion. You'll have to ask him.

> Look back over the past several years. Do you really think Mr.
> Anderson will *ever* engage in civil debate here on *any* subject?

I don't seem to have a problem. And I've always been civil with the
other Jim, KH2D.

Gee!

Or
> that Mr. Burke will answer any questions that he doesn't want to
> answer (while at the same time asking all sorts of questions of
> others)?

You're free to disclose as much or as little as you like. For
instance, you disclosed no opinion when asked if, "Sorry Hans, MARS
>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" were a valid statement. But worse, you lied
and said that you had no opinion.

Of course you have an opinion.

> Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
> 7037 next Monday night?

Best of Luck.

4323. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 00:56:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <QPadnb3hUaCQoCjd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92387

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40AE0403.1010905@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<gERqc.15311$zO3.9214@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >>news:hQLqc.84684$MH.18077219@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >>>news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> >>>
> >>>>If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> >>>>
> >>>>Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> >>>>could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> >>>>
> >>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>>That'll likely happen, Mike. If and when Element 1 is retained solely
for
> >>>the Extra, I suspect the Extra CW sub-bands will become a pretty
crowded
> >>>place. Kinda silly as those who won't (Not can't.) learn CW won't be on
> >>
> >> any
> >>
> >>>CW sub-bands.
> >>>
> >>>73 de Bert
> >>>WA2SI
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>I've been a Extra for 30 years now. I hardly ever operate in the
exclusive
> >>subbands, either phone or cw. But here lately I have been.

> >>
> >>I have no problem with leaving 50 khz per band for CW.
> >
> >
> > We don't have that now! On HF/MF, there are *no* CW-only subbands.
> >
> > I think such subbands are a very good idea. Something like this:
> >
> > CW-only subbands:
> >
> > 160 meters: 1800-1850 kHz
> > 80 meters: 3500-3575 kHz
> > 40 meters: 7000-7050 kHz
> > 30 meters: 10100-10120 kHz
> > 20 meters: 14000-14075 kHz
> > 17 meters: 18068-18088 kHz
> > 15 meters: 21000-21075 kHz
> > 12 meters: 24890-24910 kHz
> > 10 meters: 28000-28100 kHz
> >
> > Bottom 25 kHz of 80/40/20/15 reserved for Extras. Rest is available to
> > all other classes of license. CW would still be legal outside these
> > subbands but observance of the subbands would be encouraged as good
> > operating practice.
> >
> > Why not?
> >
> > You'd think that such a move would be offered by at least some of the
> > nocodetest folks...
>
>
> Sorry Jim, they are busy with trying to lower the test requirements
> right now.
>
> After all the Technicians are freebied up to General, they'll turn
> their attentions to those pesky and annoying gentleman's agreements for
> CW portions.
>
> I'll bet you a pepperoni and cheese pizza that their bandplans will
> look quite different than yours. Theirs will be much simpler!
>
> The rationale will be that it is SO much trouble for people to keep
> within bandplans that it is a big headache for hams to keep track of
> where they are supposed to be. And why do those CW people get half our
> bands anyhow?
>
> The most amusing part will be when Carl and Bill show up with their
> spin on how it *isn't* a spectrum grab.
>
> But you know, I suspect that in the brave new world of

> post-restructuring ARS, that the new hams will simply do squatters
> rights on the bandplan. It's only an agreement, so what can we do if
> they decide to work there?
>
> I wonder when the first CW segment SSB contest will be held?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike, it sounds like you are confusing band plans and regulated segment divistions. The HF bands have segments where only CW and data modes are allowed by regulation. Phone and slow scan TV cannot be used at all in those segments. However there is the "gentleman's agreement band plan" layered on top of that. For example, in the CW/data portion, RTTY is operated in certain segments by agreement. Up in the phone portions, the SST enthusiasts operate in certain segments by agreement. If new hams try to operate voice outside the voice segments on HF, they will not only be in violation of the bandplans but will be in violation of FCC regulations, which could cost them their licenses.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4324. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 01:26:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526212604.10886.00000284@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92389

In article <1e4e3692.0405261652.107dd77d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040525094244.15096.00001847@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >
>> > I have repeatedly encouraged you to take the Amateur Technician since
it
>> > doesn't require a Morse Code examination.
>>
>> Why, Steve?
>>
>> Why do you encourage Mr. Anderson to get an amateur radio license,
>> given the way he behaves here towards anyone who disagrees with him?
>> Do you really *want* him to join the ARS?
>
>Now wait just a minute. You idly stood by for years while Dick,
>Larry, Steve, Steve, Bruce, Kelly, et all, grossly misbehaved, then
>you beg them to join your CW nets.

Dick, Larry, Steve, Steve, Bruce, Kelly et al, are PCTA.

That makes them "correct" and "civil."

PCTA can do no wrong. All others can do no right.

>Where were your words of caution then? Why do you intentionally
>associate with such people?

PCTA are PCTA. They need not be civil or correct.

They simply are. :-)

>They said they were good as gold because they made it through the
>filter, and they wouldn't behave so horribly while on the air.

They might not have said it openly in those words, but they
sure acted like it.

>> Mr. Anderson told us way back in January of 2000 (almost 4-1/2 years
>> ago) that he was "going for Extra right out of the box". Didn't
>> happen, probably won't happen any time soon, if ever.
>
>You told us just last week that you have no opinion of "Sorry Hans,
>MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Rev. Jim may be too busy celebrating the 160th anniversary
of the first (commercial) morse code message. :-)

>Jim does have an opinion. One day he just might voice it. But not
>while whacked out Steve is doing his battle for him.

PCTA are very forgiving of one another. They can do no wrong.

They are Morsemen! [hear them roar...]

>Just as Jim had an opinion of Bruce. An opinion that he sat on for
>years and years, until Bruce's outrages became even too much for Jim
>to bear.

Broose is tangential to everyone else. :-)

>> The Tech hasn't had a code test in over 13 years and medical waivers
>> for all code tests except 5 wpm were available in 1990. None of this
>> is news or any sort of secret. If Mr. Anderson were interested in
>> being a radio amateur, he would have gotten a license long ago. So
>> there's only one logical conclusion left.
>
>What might that be, Jim?

PCTA demand that all "interested in radio" take a code test.

It was so in the beginning and it will be so to their bitter end.

>> Do you think that calling him "Lennie" or various versions of "scummy"
>> or "liar" will change his behavior, or opinions, or get him to admit
>> any of his many mistakes? Or do you think that maybe, just maybe,
>> getting *you* to behave in a manner similar to *his* might be one of
>> his real goals?
>
>So you think Steve is so easily and blatantly manipulated?
>
>I do.

Nursie manipulates himself. :-)

>> I snipped out all of the name calling and insults in the post I
>> replied to - and there wasn't much left. Nowadays I don't even read
>> most rrap posts past the first insult. Many I don't read past the
>> author line.
>
>I try to look for some good in everything rather than dismissing it
>outright.

PCTA are very snobbish and elite. They be better than others.

Sort of like the Daughters of the American Revolution.

>> > However you still seem stymied byt the process. Actually, I think
>it's
>> > because you might have to actually demonstrate your REAL knowledge
>base...Your

>> > ego wouldn't allow you to expose yourself to the ridicule of failing the
>test
>> > in a room full of grade school kids who just passed it.
>>
>> Did it ever occur to you, Steve, that Mr. Anderson could pass the test
>> if he wanted to - but that he doesn't want to? That his hobby is
>> something very different?
>
>I think Mr. Anderson is not interested in a VHF license. Just my
>opinion. You'll have to ask him.

I've HAD a VHF radio license. It wasn't amateur.

I was operating VHF and low-UHF back in 1954. PM, not FM.

>> Look back over the past several years. Do you really think Mr.
>> Anderson will *ever* engage in civil debate here on *any* subject?
>
>I don't seem to have a problem. And I've always been civil with the
>other Jim, KH2D.
>
>Gee!

As I said, PCTA are the ONLY "civil" and "correct" people.

All others are "uncivil" and "incorrect." :-)

> Or
>> that Mr. Burke will answer any questions that he doesn't want to
>> answer (while at the same time asking all sorts of questions of
>> others)?
>
>You're free to disclose as much or as little as you like. For
>instance, you disclosed no opinion when asked if, "Sorry Hans, MARS
>>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio" were a valid statement. But worse, you lied
>and said that you had no opinion.
>
>Of course you have an opinion.

Of course. PCTA are the only ones "civil" and "correct."

That's a given in here.

All others are "lids," like tops of garbage cans.

According to the PCTA.

However, Dan has done something with Australians and I'm not sure
I want to hear more about that...

>> Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
>> 7037 next Monday night?
>
>Best of Luck.

Interesting. The PCTA need a high-speed Internet forum in order to organize a schedule. :-)

Says something right there...

LHA / WMD

4325. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 01:26:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040526212606.10886.00000285@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92388

In article <2Z8tc.26853$zO3.8169@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Gee everybody...look...another creative editor.
>
>How unique.
>
>Idiot.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in message
>news:097a0f4cdea318a9eff39a4f9995832b@news.teranews.com...
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:Hoasc.30958$KE6.3543@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> >
>> > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >
>> > > Are you Australian?
>> > >
>> > No. But I have blown several.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>> >
>> Too much info.

Hilarious!

"Too much info!" Too much...and with so few general words. :-)

4326. Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 02:59:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 92390

Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now and then...

Kim W5TIT

4327. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 03:44:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405261944.3c2ea0e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92391

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040525192012.17843.00000153@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
> >>> So far he's not been able to produce even ONE trophy photo from
> Somalia.
> >>
> >> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his "seven hostile actions."
> >>
> > I had better things to do, Lennie.
>
> Like trying to think up more LIES?
>
> >> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
> >> the 3rd Marine Division.
> >>
> > I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
> >3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>
> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>
> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.

Perhaps one of the seven hostile actions occurred in Okinawa. Fiendly
Fire.

> > Please get things right if you're going to TRY and "embarrass" me,
> >Lennie.
>
> You wouldn't admit to being caught LYING red-handed. :-)
>
> FCC defines amateur radio.
>
> FCC does not define MARS
>
> DoD defines MARS
>
> Nursie say "MARS is amateur radio."
>

> Nursie very confused.

Insanely confused. TAFKARJ bak him up.

> >> Nursie couldn't find the appropriate Directive or service branch
> >> Regulations of the Military Affliliate Radio System in order to back
> >> up his assertion about "MARS is amateur radio."
> >
> > No "directive" was needed.
>
> Department of Defense says otherwise. :-)

"I AM the DoD and I vote!"

Hi, hi, hi.

> > No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> OK, so you've redefined your original claim. [this one is wrong, too]
>
> DoD does not define amateur radio.
>
> FCC defines amateur radio.
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.

But, but, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!!!"

Hi, hi, hi.

> >> But, I'm not going to do so on command of some lying insulter
> >> who can't offer ONE shred of "proof" he actually did some of the
> >> lies he states.
> >
> > I've already given you the "shred" you need, Lennie...
>
> All shredded... :-)

Tangled in shroud.

> > Sufficient information to verify my service record with VA...
>
> Veterans Administration does not define MARS.
>
> > Did it right here in THIS forum.
>
> You've consistently tried to define MARS by saying "MARS is
> amateur radio."

Welp, he immediately followed it with something still wrong, but less
imperfect.

> > Now who's "lying", Scumbag?
>

> You are.

Obviously.

> > It's not an insult if it's true. Let's see...California has Charlie
> >Manson, is home to the Crips and Bloods, has the largest (by far) percentage
> of
> >drug abusers and is known as the worlds first drive-by shooting range. More
> >cities in CA have smog and other pollution control issues than almost
> >anywhere else in the United States, and typically has a tax burden on it's
> citizens
> >that chokes any "lifestyle" benefits out of them.

And Tennessee has the Gores. But no matter how hard they might try,
they don't define MARS.

> The State of California does not define MARS.
>
> So, one can assume you HATE California and all 30+ million citizens?
>
> :-)

He hates hisself. He's driven himself absolutely crazy.

> > No, Lennie...I am just very adept at proving what a liar and idiot you've
> >become in your waning years.
>
> Whatever. DoD lies about MARS. Only nursie defines MARS.

Yep, and JJ speaks for the Joint Chiefs. We are truly blessed.

> > That you don't like having your dirty laundry aired so frequently is YOUR
> >fault for hanging it out there.
>
> We have a nice General Electric dryer here. Works fine. Nothing is
> hanging out when laundry is done.
>
> BTW, General Electric doesn't define MARS either...

We just got a nice Maytag side by side fridge. Amazingly enough,
Maytag doesn't define MARS either.

> >> But, you ARE an Amateur Extra, the very model of what manual
> >> telegraphy and too much RF exposure can produce.
> >
> > If that's your best shot, Lennie, you've failed again.
>
> You are no longer an extra? Poor baby. Sorry we feel for you (Yoda).
>
> LHA / WMD

Steve, Dave, Bruce, Larry, Kelly, and Dick represented the very worst
in the ARS via their RRAP postings. They thought they meant well, for
the good of all involved, but it eventually evolved into war crimes.

Some people just don't know when to quit. Meanwhile, Jim is like the benevolent senior looking on as the thugs committed atrocities, but had "no opinion."

Please don't judge the rest of us by Steve's actions or even his seven hostile actions (of self abuse).

Good night.

bb

4328. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 03:48:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405261948.7445f94d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92392

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040526104604.13769.00001428@mb-m26.aol.com>...

>
> And September of 2004 will be 30 years since I first went on Active Duty.
> That's when you are eligible for full retirement. Up until then you are in the
> "Fleet Marine Reserve"

In disability status?

Thought you were found unsuitable for further service, thus retired?

Then rehabilitated, now working a full-time, labor-intensive and
stressful job, while collecting a disability check and a paycheck?

4329. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 05:53:06 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86hdu2ct6l.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 92393

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

[...]

Dee> Mike, it sounds like you are confusing band plans and regulated
Dee> segment divistions. The HF bands have segments where only CW and
Dee> data modes are allowed by regulation. Phone and slow scan TV
Dee> cannot be used at all in those segments. However there is the
Dee> "gentleman's agreement band plan" layered on top of that. For
Dee> example, in the CW/data portion, RTTY is operated in certain
Dee> segments by agreement. Up in the phone portions, the SST
Dee> enthusiasts operate in certain segments by agreement. If new
Dee> hams try to operate voice outside the voice segments on HF, they
Dee> will not only be in violation of the bandplans but will be in
Dee> violation of FCC regulations, which could cost them their
Dee> licenses.

Hmm. Any chance you could provide some citations for these
"gentleman's agreements"? I do not doubt their existence, I'd just
like to find some online pointers to them. Recently I had to ask
around where to find some RTTY so I could test my setup -- if I'd
known about these agreements, I'd have a better chance of finding it
on my own. Also, I'd like to avoid accidentally operating on a
portion of the band which is traditionally for a different type of
mode -- I'm more likely to get a response from a CW CQ if I'm not
calling on the RTTY portion, etc.

Dee> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAtYJJGPFSfAB/ezgRAkpGAKCrcL+B7tVTtQGPgaD85JFIa/jDBgCg3+lp
8KEIKeHmbpIIG0zArUPBL/E=
=FrQo
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4330. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 11:58:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405270358.5e2da997@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92394

><kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net>...
> Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now and
> then...

Welcome back, Kim.

Hope the new home is all you expected it to be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4331. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 14:11:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405270611.55acfe3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92395

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net>...
> Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now and
> then...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, Larry's been gone since you left. Group has just about
disintegrated. PCTA's have all but imploded. Otherwise, same stuff,
different millenium.

bb

4332. Cool Morse Code Accessories ;^)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 14:16:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405270616.31529435@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92396

http://www.cafeshops.com/kh2d

4333. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 15:11:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <ceCdnd52QPDXmCvdRVn-ug@comcast.com>
Source record: 92397

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86hdu2ct6l.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> Hmm. Any chance you could provide some citations for these
> "gentleman's agreements"? I do not doubt their existence, I'd just
> like to find some online pointers to them. Recently I had to ask
> around where to find some RTTY so I could test my setup -- if I'd
> known about these agreements, I'd have a better chance of finding it
> on my own. Also, I'd like to avoid accidentally operating on a
> portion of the band which is traditionally for a different type of
> mode -- I'm more likely to get a response from a CW CQ if I'm not
> calling on the RTTY portion, etc.

www.arrl.org - The website has a page listing the basics
The ARRL Operating Manual
Various ARRL publications on data modes and slow scan TV
For VHF/UHF, the ARRL repeater directory

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4334. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 15:25:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527112557.23857.00000194@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92398

In article <1e4e3692.0405261944.3c2ea0e3@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Steve, Dave, Bruce, Larry, Kelly, and Dick represented the very worst
>in the ARS via their RRAP postings. They thought they meant well, for
>the good of all involved, but it eventually evolved into war crimes.
>Some people just don't know when to quit. Meanwhile, Jim is like the
>benevolent senior looking on as the thugs committed atrocities, but
>had "no opinion."
>
>Please don't judge the rest of us by Steve's actions or even his seven
>hostile actions (of self abuse).

I don't. :-)

LHA / WMD

4335. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 16:41:17 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86brk9ddqq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 92399

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

Jack> Hmm. Any chance you could provide some citations for these
Jack> "gentleman's agreements"? I do not doubt their existence, I'd
Jack> just like to find some online pointers to them. Recently I had
Jack> to ask around where to find some RTTY so I could test my setup
Jack> -- if I'd known about these agreements, I'd have a better chance
Jack> of finding it on my own. Also, I'd like to avoid accidentally
Jack> operating on a portion of the band which is traditionally for a
Jack> different type of mode -- I'm more likely to get a response from
Jack> a CW CQ if I'm not calling on the RTTY portion, etc.

Dee> www.arrl.org - The website has a page listing the basics The ARRL
Dee> Operating Manual Various ARRL publications on data modes and slow
Dee> scan TV For VHF/UHF, the ARRL repeater directory

I was more interested in URLs to specific agreements. I've cruised
through the website from time to time but I hadn't happened to see
them. I lost my repeater directory in a car accident (how bizarre)
otherwise I'd check the front of that. I'm more interested in HF, of
course, so if you could point me to specific agreements, I'd be
dearly appreciative. Stuff like "weak signal work is done here,
beacons are done there, blah blah blah" are exactly what I'd like to
keep posted in my shack, and this kind of information should be
consolidated in a single source online.

Dee> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAtho2GPFSfAB/ezgRAuvpAJ9sG6DBnHCksZysr5NDBzsr2S2tbQCgndNm
JDX8dp+0QzDcMIL4yIwuDp4=
=9pTV
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4336. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 17:03:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <ooOdnfzcX58rgivdRVn-gw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92400

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86brk9ddqq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:
>
> Jack> Hmm. Any chance you could provide some citations for these
> Jack> "gentleman's agreements"? I do not doubt their existence, I'd
> Jack> just like to find some online pointers to them. Recently I had
> Jack> to ask around where to find some RTTY so I could test my setup
> Jack> -- if I'd known about these agreements, I'd have a better chance
> Jack> of finding it on my own. Also, I'd like to avoid accidentally
> Jack> operating on a portion of the band which is traditionally for a
> Jack> different type of mode -- I'm more likely to get a response from
> Jack> a CW CQ if I'm not calling on the RTTY portion, etc.
>
> Dee> www.arrl.org - The website has a page listing the basics The ARRL
> Dee> Operating Manual Various ARRL publications on data modes and slow
> Dee> scan TV For VHF/UHF, the ARRL repeater directory
>
> I was more interested in URLs to specific agreements. I've cruised
> through the website from time to time but I hadn't happened to see
> them. I lost my repeater directory in a car accident (how bizarre)
> otherwise I'd check the front of that. I'm more interested in HF, of
> course, so if you could point me to specific agreements, I'd be
> dearly appreciative. Stuff like "weak signal work is done here,
> beacons are done there, blah blah blah" are exactly what I'd like to
> keep posted in my shack, and this kind of information should be
> consolidated in a single source online.
>
> Dee> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to do is enter
the words "band plan" in the box to search the site. Then scroll down until
you see the listing for band plans. I will NOT do this for you. The type
of information you seek is contained on the web page.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4337. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:12:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92401

>Subject: Re: The Pool
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>

>Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
>7037 next Monday night?

I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now. I am also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4338. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:15:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527141554.09801.00000003@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92402

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>
>>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>>> of rational thought.
>>>>
>>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>>
>>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>>> pen.
>>
>> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was determined
>>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.
>
> Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham
> bands.

Lennie...WHAT is the prefered voice mode for most of the satellites?

And what mode is prevelent below 144.400?

Especially between 144.100 and 144.250?

No experience = flawed opinions.

Steve, K4YZ

4339. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:21:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92403

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>
>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>
> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>
> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.

Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.

Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense
websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of 3rd
MARDIV.

Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

4340. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:23:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527142303.09801.00000006@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92404

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/27/2004 10:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040527112557.23857.00000194@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <1e4e3692.0405261944.3c2ea0e3@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>Steve, Dave, Bruce, Larry, Kelly, and Dick represented the very worst
>>in the ARS via their RRAP postings. They thought they meant well, for
>>the good of all involved, but it eventually evolved into war crimes.
>>Some people just don't know when to quit. Meanwhile, Jim is like the
>>benevolent senior looking on as the thugs committed atrocities, but
>>had "no opinion."
>>
>>Please don't judge the rest of us by Steve's actions or even his seven
>>hostile actions (of self abuse).
>
> I don't.

Good for you, Lennie.

Minus the Amateur license, you're in the same pile.

Steve, K4YZ

4341. project & skills database www.inforelation.com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:30:46 UTC
From: Inforelation - Mike Baran <noupsampromotion@nouinforelation.psamcom>
Message-ID: <c95d0e$g1k$11@atlantis.news.tpi.pl>
Source record: 92406

Dear newsgroup member!

My name is Mike Baran. I am the author of www.inforelation.com database.
It helps You offer Your specific experience, skills or knowledge
and in exchange contact people with specific experience,
knowledge and skills in each science field !
You can also organize project team with them!
This service is at present free of charge.

Best regards,
Mike Baran

P.S. If you find www.inforelation.com useful, please inform your friends.

DATA PROTECTION

At inforelation your registration e-mail is not presented to others. Do not
put your email (or telephone) into your messages to avoid the potential
misuse.

4342. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 18:41:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527144116.09269.00000004@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92405

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/26/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405261628.7a060e86@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040526110818.13769.00001430@mb-m26.aol.com>...

>> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
>> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine
>statement
>> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.
>
>So?

"So?", indeed.

>> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are only
>a
>> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire Department,
>EMS,
>> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
>> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.
>
>Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?

Does it make any difference to you that youw ere AGAIN shown to have been
wrong?

Does it make any difference to you that it's an easy thing to do?

>> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if there
>is
>> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.
>
>I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.

I see that.

That's what's wrong, PuppetBoy.

The police department does NOT constitute the "most" of any municipal pool
of employees. Even in the smallest towns that I have lived in the police force
represented, at the MOST, 1/4th of the municipal payroll.

YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police uniforms".

That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.

>Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"

>> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military frequencies
>to
>> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!
>
>How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?

MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio. No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

Steve, K4YZ

4343. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 19:29:17 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <9qfcb09qlpbd8el0ql93nf4ukduchasug6@4ax.com>
Source record: 92408

On Wed, 26 May 2004 21:59:05 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now and
>then...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Welcome back. I recently rejoined the group here myself, after a
hiatus of several months due to getting fed up with trying to
participate using open servers.

Having just switched to a new ISP that has proper NNTP access, I've
been lurking for a few weeks, amusing myself by reading the running
battle between two of the regulars (you'll no doubt discover that
thread soon enough)...have noticed several of the regulars that I can
remember through the years seem to have vanished. In the case of one
or two of those, you'll probably find that a good thing.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

4344. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 19:29:18 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <49gcb0hk14r0m82ku3rpa8fgoi8tmq3f35@4ax.com>
Source record: 92409

On 27 May 2004 07:11:52 -0700, billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote:

>Kim, Larry's been gone since you left.

Poor guy...probably heartbroken.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

4345. BPL comment deadline extended to 22 June

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 19:51:39 UTC
From: johnbartley@email.com
Message-ID: <f90c7f43.0405271151.3856bba6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92407

<snip>
"We find that a brief extension of time to file comments in this proceeding is in the public interest. It is the policy of the Commission that extensions of time shall not be routinely granted. However, NTIA has indicated that it will submit comments and a Technical Appendix in this proceeding by May 28, 2004 and in light of the potential utility of the NTIA submission and our interest in receiving public comment on that study, an extension of time is warranted here. We believe that three weeks should provide ample time for review and analysis of this information, and accordingly grant the extension for that period."
<snip>
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-04-1552A1.doc

4346. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 21:21:33 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <xZstc.417$fo5.247@fed1read07>
Source record: 92410

You came back - to news group like this (:-(

Famous quote from Eli Wallach in the Magnificent Seven, The (1960)

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net...
> Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now
and
> then...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

4347. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-27 21:51:47 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Spttc.1263$pt3.844@attbi_s03>
Source record: 92411

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net...
> Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now
and
> then...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Hi Kim ....ya ain't missed a thing ......if fact I am sure your time was
put to better use ...

God Bless .... KI3R Tom

4348. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:12:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Htvtc.28166$zO3.4393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92412

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c93lej$6e5@library2.airnews.net...
> Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now
and
> then...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Who cares wanna bee hippie.

Dan/W4NTI

4349. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:28:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527202857.12940.00000113@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92415

In article <20040527144116.09269.00000004@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/26/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405261628.7a060e86@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040526110818.13769.00001430@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
>>> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
>>> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine
>>statement
>>> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.
>>
>>So?
>
> "So?", indeed.
>
>>> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are
>only
>>a
>>> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire Department,
>>EMS,
>>> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
>>> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.
>>
>>Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
>
> Does it make any difference to you that youw ere AGAIN shown to have
>been
>wrong?
>
> Does it make any difference to you that it's an easy thing to do?
>
>>> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if
>there
>>is
>>> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.
>>
>>I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.
>
> I see that.

>
> That's what's wrong, PuppetBoy.
>
> The police department does NOT constitute the "most" of any municipal
>pool
>of employees. Even in the smallest towns that I have lived in the police
>force
>represented, at the MOST, 1/4th of the municipal payroll.
>
> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police uniforms".
>
> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.
>
>>Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"
>
>>> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military frequencies
>>to
>>> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!
>>
>>How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?
>
> MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio. No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

TRY to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

FCC doesn't define MARS. ARRL doesn't define MARS.

Department of Defense Directive defines MARS.

MARS is a MILITARY system.

LHA / WMD

4350. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527202858.12940.00000114@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92413

In article <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>>
>>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
>>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>>
>> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>>
>> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>
> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.
>
> Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense
>websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of 3rd
>MARDIV.
>
> Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.

Nursie's self-proclaimed "career" is NOT the SUBJECT.

It is irrelevant since none of it involved radio communications.

It is as "relevant" as those fictional "hostile actions." :-)

Try to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

4351. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:28:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527202859.12940.00000115@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92414

In article <20040527141554.09801.00000003@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>>
>>>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>>>> of rational thought.
>>>>>
>>>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>>>
>>>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>>>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>>>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>>>> pen.
>>>
>>> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was determined
>>>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>>>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.
>>
>> Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham
>> bands.
>
> Lennie...WHAT is the prefered voice mode for most of the satellites?

Nursie, satellites don't speak...they use TELEMETRY to "tell" the ground their status.

> And what mode is prevelent below 144.400?
>
> Especially between 144.100 and 144.250?
>
> No experience = flawed opinions.

TRY to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

FCC doesn't define MARS. ARRL doesn't define MARS.

Department of Defense Directive defines MARS.

MARS is a MILITARY system.

LHA / WMD

4352. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:31:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405271631.2cd3ab0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92416

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527144116.09269.00000004@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/26/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405261628.7a060e86@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040526110818.13769.00001430@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>
> >> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
> >> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine
> statement
> >> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.
> >
> >So?
>
> "So?", indeed.
>
> >> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are only
> a
> >> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire Department,
> EMS,
> >> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
> >> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.
> >
> >Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
>
> Does it make any difference to you that youw ere AGAIN shown to have been
> wrong?
>
> Does it make any difference to you that it's an easy thing to do?

Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?

"Sorry Hans, Dispatcher >>>IS<<< MARS."

Hi hi!

> >> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if there
> is
> >> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.
> >
> >I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.
>

> I see that.
>
> That's what's wrong, PuppetBoy.

No. It is not. It is not all inclusive, such as your use of the word
">>>IS<<<."

> The police department does NOT constitute the "most" of any municipal pool
> of employees. Even in the smallest towns that I have lived in the police force
> represented, at the MOST, 1/4th of the municipal payroll.

Oh, I see what you're desperately trying to do.

You're including all of the non-radio users in your computation in an
attempt to find a leg to stand on.

Grasping, grasping; and still sliding downward.

> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police uniforms".
>
> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.

No, it isn't. We're kind of heavy on LE here.

> >Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"
>
> >> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military frequencies
> to
> >> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!
> >
> >How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?
>
> MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio. No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

Sure they are. They use up all them amateur frequencies and rely upon
Riley for enforcement. Subject to Part 97. Hi hi!

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Hi hi! Ho ho!

Best of Luck.

4353. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:38:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405271638.35c20240@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92417

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527142303.09801.00000006@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/27/2004 10:25 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040527112557.23857.00000194@mb-m18.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <1e4e3692.0405261944.3c2ea0e3@posting.google.com>,
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> >>Steve, Dave, Bruce, Larry, Kelly, and Dick represented the very worst
> >>in the ARS via their RRAP postings. They thought they meant well, for
> >>the good of all involved, but it eventually evolved into war crimes.
> >>Some people just don't know when to quit. Meanwhile, Jim is like the
> >>benevolent senior looking on as the thugs committed atrocities, but
> >>had "no opinion."
> >>
> >>Please don't judge the rest of us by Steve's actions or even his seven
> >>hostile actions (of self abuse).
> >
> > I don't.
>
> Good for you, Lennie.
>
> Minus the Amateur license, you're in the same pile.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Wow Len, I didn't know that you were involved in Seven Hostile Actions
(of self abuse).

Better extract yourself from that pile.

4354. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:40:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405271640.58ae971f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92418

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
> >>> the 3rd Marine Division.
> >>
> >> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
> >>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
> >
> > 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
> >
> > OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>
> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.

Probably dispensing prop wash. Hostile prop wash.

4355. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:45:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92419

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>
> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
> >7037 next Monday night?
>
> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now. I am
> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.

4356. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 00:53:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405271653.49ca9dea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92420

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<pPsrc.17611$zO3.8972@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0405201410.5a032142@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<GCRqc.15308$zO3.891@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:40AB743A.5040607@psu.edu...
> > > > If Pro CW Testing Amateurs are:
> > > >
> > > > Feet firmly planted in the past folks and elitist snobs......
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Why wouldn't they WANT the Morse code testing eliminated so that they
> > > > could get on the air and only associate with like minded individuals?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Removing the test would be the ultimate filter.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > >
> > > Because we can do that right now Mike. I don't consider it being
> elitist to
> > > want to continue with a known effective mode. Those that want to get
> rid of
> > > it are world class fools.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > DAN, Dan, dan, it is the -EXAM- that we are getting rid of. If we got
> > rid of the psk practical exam, would you think we are trying to get
> > rid of the mode?
>
> There is no psk practical exam.

Well, whaddayaknow? You finally got it.

Since there is no psk practical exam, how can there be psk???

If the Morse Code exam goes away, how can there be CW???

> The ONLY PRACTICAL exam we have in ham
> radio is the CW TEST.

But it's become imPRACTICAL to continue to exclude people based upon a Morse Code exam.

> Most of the rest is mainly BS memorization, that for
> the most part is not even relevant to real world ham radio.

Which is exactly how you got into amateur radio. So now what???

If I said it once, I've said it a thousand times.

"What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of restructuring."

Most people are basically good. Some aren't. People like Riley are necessary.

You need to reconcile the hatred you have for your fellow ham.

4357. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 01:25:15 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <d45db05refe3bev3vsjkgsegmop8rnej55@4ax.com>
Source record: 92421

On Thu, 27 May 2004 13:03:51 -0400, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:

>I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to do is enter
>the words "band plan" in the box to search the site. Then scroll down until
>you see the listing for band plans. I will NOT do this for you.

OK...then I will:

AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
Reprinted from "The Considerate Operator's Frequency Guide",
January 1993 QST, page 61 and the ARRL Repeater Directory.
Copyright 1993 by the American Radio Relay League, Inc.
All rights reserved.

This information is for quick reference only - refer to the
band plan listings in the Operators Manual, The FCC Rule Book
or the ARRL Repeater Directory for full details. For sharing
arrangements, see Section 97.303 of the FCC Rules. For
detailed packet frequencies, see QST, September 1987, page 54
and March 1988, page 51.

160 METERS (1.8-2.0 MHz):
1.800-1.830 CW, RTTY and other narrowband modes
1.830-1.840 CW, RTTY and other narrowband modes,
Intercontinental QSOs only
1.840-1.850 CW, SSB, SSTV, other wideband modes,
Intercontinental QSOs only
1.850-2.000 CW, phone, SSTV and other wideband modes

80 METERS (3.5-4.0 MHz): 40 METERS (7.0-7.3 MHz):
3.590 RTTY DX 7.040 RTTY DX
3.580-3.620 RTTY 7.080-7.100 RTTY
3.620-3.635 Packet 7.171 SSTV
3.790-3.800 DX window 7.290 AM
3.845 SSTV
3.885 AM calling frequency

30 METERS (10.1-10.15 MHz): 17 METERS (18.068-18.168 MHz):
10.130-10.140 RTTY 18.100-18.105 RTTY
10.140-10.150 Packet 18.105-18.110 Packet

20 METERS (14.0-14.35 MHz): 15 METERS (21.0-21.45 MHz):
14.070-14.095 RTTY 21.070-21.090 RTTY
14.095-14.0995 Packet 21.090-21.100 Packet
14.100 NCDXF Beacons 21.340 SSTV
14.1005-14.112 Packet

14.230 SSTV 12 METERS (24.89-24.99 MHz):
14.286 AM calling frequency 24.920-24.925 RTTY
24.925-24.930 Packet

10 METERS (28-29.7 MHz):
28.000-28.070 CW
28.070-28.150 RTTY
28.150-28.190 CW
28.190-28.200 New Beacon subband *
28.200-28.300 Old Beacon subband *
28.300-29.300 Phone
28.680 SSTV
29.000-29.200 AM
29.300-29.510 Satellite Downlinks
29.510-29.590 Repeater Inputs
29.600 FM Simplex
29.610-29.700 Repeater Outputs
* Note: The FCC states in 97.203(d) that automatically controlled
beacons may only operate on 28.20-28.30 MHz.

6 METERS (50-54 MHz):
50.0-50.1 CW, beacons
50.060-50.080 beacon subband
50.1-50.3 SSB, CW
50.10-50.125 DX window
50.125 SSB calling
50.3-50.6 All modes
50.6-50.8 Nonvoice communications
50.62 Digital (packet) calling
50.8-51.0 Radio remote control (20-kHz channels)
51.0-51.1 Pacific DX window
51.12-51.48 Repeater inputs (19 channels)
51.12-51.18 Digital repeater inputs
51.62-51.98 Repeater outputs (19 channels)
51.62-51.68 Digital repeater outputs
52.0-52.48 Repeater inputs (except as noted; 23 channels)
52.02, 52.04 FM simplex
52.2 TEST PAIR (input)
52.5-52.98 Repeater output (except as noted; 23 channels)
52.525 Primary FM simplex
52.54 Secondary FM simplex
52.7 TEST PAIR (output)
53.0-53.48 Repeater inputs (except as noted; 19 channels)
53.0 Remote base FM simplex
53.02 Simplex
53.1, 53.2, Radio remote control
53.3, 53.4
53.5-53.98 Repeater outputs (except as noted; 19 channels)
53.5, 53.6, Radio remote control
53.7, 53.8
53.52-53.9 Simplex

Note: The 6-meter band plan was adopted by the ARRL Board of
Directors at the July 1991 meeting. The band plan is
currently being studied by the ARRL Ad Hoc Spectrum
Management Committee.

2 METERS (144-148 MHz):
144.00-144.05 EME (CW)
144.05-144.10 General CW and weak signals
144.10-144.20 EME and weak-signal SSB
144.200 National calling frequency
144.200-144.275 General SSB operation
144.275-144.300 Propagation beacons
144.30-144.50 New OSCAR subband
144.50-144.60 Linear translator inputs
144.60-144.90 FM repeater inputs
144.90-145.10 Weak signal and FM simplex
(145.01,03,05,07,09 are widely used for packet)
145.10-145.20 Linear translator ouputs
145.20-145.50 FM repeater outputs
145.50-145.80 Miscellaneous and experimental modes
145.80-146.00 OSCAR subband
146.01-147.37 Repeater inputs
146.40-146.58 Simplex
146.61-146.97 Repeater outputs
147.00-147.39 Repeater outputs
147.42-147.57 Simplex
147.60-147.99 Repeater inputs
Notes: The frequency 146.40 MHz is used in some areas as a repeater
input. This band plan has been proposed by the ARRL VHF-UHF
Advisory Committee.

1.25 METERS (222-225 MHz):
222.0-222.150 Weak-signal modes
222.0-222.025 EME
222.05-222.06 Propagation beacons
222.1 SSB & CW calling frequency
222.10-222.15 Weak-signal CW & SSB
222.15-222.25 Local coordinator's option; weak
signal, ACSB, repeater inputs, control
222.25-223.38 FM repeater inputs only
222.40-223.52 FM simplex
223.52-223.64 Digital, packet
223.64-223.70 Links, control
223.71-223.85 Local coordinator's option; FM simplex,
packet, repeater outputs
223.85-224.98 Repeater outputa only
Note: The 222 MHz band plan was adopted by the ARRL Board of
Directors in July 1991.

70 CENTIMETERS (420-450 MHz):
420.00-426.00 ATV repeater or simplex with 421.25 MHz video

carrier control links and experimental
426.00-432.00 ATV simplex with 427.250-MHz video carrier frequency
432.00-432.07 EME (Earth-Moon-Earth)
432.07-432.10 Weak-signal CW
432.10 70-cm calling frequency
432.10-432.30 Mixed-mode and weak-signal work
432.30-432.40 Propagation beacons
432.40-433.00 Mixed-mode and weak-signal work
433.00-435.00 Auxiliary/repeater links
435.00-438.00 Satellite only (internationally)
438.00-444.00 ATV repeater input with 439.250-MHz video carrier
frequency and repeater links
442.00-445.00 Repeater inputs and outputs (local option)
445.00-447.00 Shared by auxiliary and control links, repeaters
and simplex (local option)
446.00 National simplex frequency
447.00-450.00 Repeater inputs and outputs (local option)
Note: The 440 MHz band plan is under review by the ARRL VHF-UHF
Advisory Committee

33 CENTIMETERS (902-928 MHz):
902.0-903.0 Narrow-bandwidth, weak-signal communications
902.0-902.8 SSTV, FAX, ACSSB, experimental
902.1 Weak-signal calling frequency
902.8-903.0 Reserved for EME, CW expansion
903.1 Alternate calling frequency
903.0-906.0 Digital communications
906-909 FM repeater outputs
909-915 ATV
915-918 Digital communications
918-921 FM repeater inputs
921-927 ATV
927-928 FM simplex and links
Note: The 902 MHz band plan was adopted by the ARRL Board of
Directors in July 1989

23 CENTIMETERS (1240-1300 MHz):
1240-1246 ATV #1
1246-1248 Narrow-bandwidth FM point-to-point links and
digital, duplex with 1258-1260.
1248-1258 Digital Communications
1252-1258 ATV #2
1258-1260 Narrow-bandwidth FM point-to-point links and
digital, duplexed with 1246-1252
1260-1270 Satellite uplinks, reference WARC '79
1260-1270 Wide-bandwidth experimental, simplex ATV
1270-1276 Repeater inputs, FM and linear, paired with 1282-1288,
239 pairs every 25 kHz, eg 1270.025, .050, etc.
1271-1283 Non-coordinated test pair
1276-1282 ATV #3
1282-1288 Repeater outputs, paired with 1270-1276

1288-1294 Wide-bandwidth experimental, simplex ATV
1294-1295 Narrow-bandwidth FM simplex services, 25-kHz channels
1294.5 National FM simplex calling frequency
1295-1297 Narrow bandwidth weak-signal communications (no FM)
1295.0-1295.8 SSTV, FAX, ACSSB, experimental
1295.8-1296.0 Reserved for EME, CW expansion
1296.00-1296.05 EME-exclusive
1296.07-1296.08 CW beacons
1296.1 CW, SSB calling frequency
1296.4-1296.6 Crossband linear translator input
1296.6-1296.8 Crossband linear translator output
1296.8-1297.0 Experimental beacons (exclusive)
1297-1300 Digital Communications

2300-2310 and 2390-2450 MHz:
2300.0-2303.0 High-rate data
2303.0-2303.5 Packet
2303.5-2303.8 TTY packet
2303.9-2303.9 Packet, TTY, CW, EME
2303.9-2304.1 CW, EME
2304.1 Calling frequency
2304.1-2304.2 CW, EME, SSB
2304.2-2304.3 SSB, SSTV, FAX, Packet AM, Amtor
2304.30-2304.32 Propagation beacon network
2304.32-2304.40 General propagation beacons
2304.4-2304.5 SSB, SSTV, ACSSB, FAX, Packet AM,
Amtor experimental
2304.5-2304.7 Crossband linear translator input
2304.7-2304.9 Crossband linear translator output
2304.9-2305.0 Experimental beacons
2305.0-2305.2 FM simplex (25 kHz spacing)
2305.20 FM simplex calling frequency
2305.2-2306.0 FM simplex (25 kHz spacing)
2306.0-2309.0 FM Repeaters (25 kHz) input
2309.0-2310.0 Control and auxiliary links
2390.0-2396.0 Fast-scan TV
2396.0-2399.0 High-rate data
2399.0-2399.5 Packet
2399.5-2400.0 Control and auxiliary links
2400.0-2403.0 Satellite
2403.0-2408.0 Satellite high-rate data
2408.0-2410.0 Satellite
2410.0-2413.0 FM repeaters (25 kHz) output
2413.0-2418.0 High-rate data
2418.0-2430.0 Fast-scan TV
2430.0-2433.0 Satellite
2433.0-2438.0 Satellite high-rate data
2438.0-2450.0 WB FM, FSTV, FMTV, SS experimental
Note: The 2300 MHz band plan was adopted by the ARRL Board of
Directors in January 1991

Note: The following band plans were adopted by the ARRL Board
of Directors in July 1988

3300-3500 MHz:
3456.3-3456.4 Propagation beacons

5650-5925 MHz:
5760.3-5760.4 Propagation beacons

10.00-10.50 GHz:
10.368 Narrow band calling frequency
10.3683-10.3684 Propagation beacons
10.3640 Calling frequency

All modes and licensees (except Novices) are authorized on
the following bands:
24.0-24.25 GHz 165.0-170.0
48.0-50.0 240.0-250.0
71.0-76.0 All above 300

The ARRL members and HQ staff would like to thank the following people
for their contributions to this information file:
K1CE WB8IMY NU0X

Send any additional information or changes to mtracy@arrl.org.
73 from ARRL HQ.

73 DE John D. Kasupski, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York, USA
ARRL Western New York PIO

4358. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 01:28:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527212813.16279.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92422

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040527202858.12940.00000114@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>>>
>>>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
>>>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>>>
>>> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>>>
>>> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>>
>> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.
>>
>> Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense
>>websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of 3rd
>>MARDIV.
>>
>> Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.
>
> Nursie's self-proclaimed "career" is NOT the SUBJECT.

But you MADE it the "SUBJECT", Lennie, right up until THIS post, in which
it's obvious that you once again found oput that you DON'T have all the facts
and you DON'T know what you are talking about.

Nice try to shift the focus off of your faux pas.

Caught again.

> It is irrelevant since none of it involved radio communications.

You're right, Lennie...It's NOT "relevant"...But YOU brought it up and YOU tried to use it against me.

You failed.

But what you got was your tail stepped on...And YOU did the stepping.

That HAD to hurt.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4359. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 01:32:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527213214.16279.00000024@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92423

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040527202859.12940.00000115@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040527141554.09801.00000003@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>>>>> of rational thought.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>>>>
>>>>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>>>>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>>>>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>>>>> pen.
>>>>
>>>> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was
>determined
>>>>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>>>>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.
>>>
>>> Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham
>>> bands.
>>
>> Lennie...WHAT is the prefered voice mode for most of the satellites?
>

> Nursie, satellites don't speak...they use TELEMETRY to "tell" the
> ground their status.

Once again the "radio professional" tries to worm his way out of the
corner that he painted himself into...

>> And what mode is prevelent below 144.400?
>>
>> Especially between 144.100 and 144.250?
>>
>> No experience = flawed opinions.
>
> TRY to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.

Lennie...YOU are the one who said it was necessary to learn Morse Code in
order to use SSB.

You were, AGAIN, porven wrong.

Not that it was hard to do....

> MARS is a MILITARY system.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

4360. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 01:40:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527214021.16314.00000022@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92424

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/27/2004 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271631.2cd3ab0b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527144116.09269.00000004@mb-m03.aol.com>...

>> >> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
>> >> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine
>> statement
>> >> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.
>> >
>> >So?
>>
>> "So?", indeed.
>>
>> >> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are
>only
>> a
>> >> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire
>Department,
>> EMS,
>> >> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
>> >> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.
>> >
>> >Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
>>
>> Does it make any difference to you that youw ere AGAIN shown to have
>been
>> wrong?
>>
>> Does it make any difference to you that it's an easy thing to do?
>
>Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
>
>"Sorry Hans, Dispatcher >>>IS<<< MARS."
>
>Hi hi!

"Hi hi" indeed, Brain.

I am sure you hear quite a bit of laughter.

>> >> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if
>there
>> is
>> >> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.
>> >
>> >I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.
>>
>> I see that.
>>
>> That's what's wrong, PuppetBoy.
>
>No. It is not. It is not all inclusive, such as your use of the word
>">>>IS<<<."

OK, Brain.

If you insist.

>> The police department does NOT constitute the "most" of any municipal
>pool
>> of employees. Even in the smallest towns that I have lived in the police
>force
>> represented, at the MOST, 1/4th of the municipal payroll.
>
>Oh, I see what you're desperately trying to do.
>
>You're including all of the non-radio users in your computation in an
>attempt to find a leg to stand on.
>
>Grasping, grasping; and still sliding downward.

Brain....YOU said that "most" MUNICIPAL radio operators wore police
uniforms.

It's not me doing the grasping.

Now...Try again, PuppetBoy. Your mentor is watching.

>> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police uniforms".
>>
>> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.
>
>No, it isn't. We're kind of heavy on LE here.

Yes, It it.

But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is "kind
of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.

>> >Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"
>>
>> >> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military
>frequencies
>> to

>> >> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!
>> >
>> >How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?
>>
>> MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio. No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.
>
>Sure they are. They use up all them amateur frequencies and rely upon
>Riley for enforcement. Subject to Part 97. Hi hi!
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Brian..TRY and get ONE thing right today, OK...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4361. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 01:45:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040527214556.16314.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92425

>Subject: Re: The Pool
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/27/2004 7:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: The Pool
>> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
>> >7037 next Monday night?
>>
>> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now. I
>am
>> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
>> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
>> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.

Depends on who you want to talk to and where they are.

Yes, from my QTH to yours would probably present a several db difference.

But remember what NVIS is for. It's for using HF spectrum for local to
regional communications. It's NOT for continental or DX purposes. I have a
very specific need to have reliable comms on 3.5, 3.9, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and
7.9MHz. Especially within Tennessee and the Southeastern United States.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4362. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 06:41:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528024109.23857.00000200@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92428

In article <20040527213214.16279.00000024@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040527202859.12940.00000115@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040527141554.09801.00000003@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>>>>>>>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>>>>>>>>>> of rational thought.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>>>>>>>>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>>>>>>>>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>>>>>>>>> pen.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was
>>determined
>>>>>>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>>>>>>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.
>>>>>
>>>>> Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham
>>>>> bands.

>>>
>>> Lennie...WHAT is the prefered voice mode for most of the satellites?
>>
>> Nursie, satellites don't speak...they use TELEMETRY to "tell" the
>> ground their status.
>
> Once again the "radio professional" tries to worm his way out of the
>corner that he painted himself into...

The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

It is not. As per DoD Directive 4650.2 (26 Jan 98) -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
Instruction NTP8 (C).

>>> And what mode is prevelent below 144.400?
>>>
>>> Especially between 144.100 and 144.250?
>>>
>>> No experience = flawed opinions.
>>
>> TRY to stay focussed on the SUBJECT.
>
> Lennie...YOU are the one who said it was necessary to learn Morse Code
>in order to use SSB.
>
> You were, AGAIN, porven wrong.
>
> Not that it was hard to do....
>
>> MARS is a MILITARY system.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

It is not. As per DoD Directive 4650.2 (26 Jan 98) -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
Instruction NTP8 (C).

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

4363. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 06:41:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528024110.23857.00000201@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92427

In article <20040527212813.16279.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040527202858.12940.00000114@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>>>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>>>>
>>>>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part of
>>>>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>>>>
>>>> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>>>>
>>>> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>>>
>>> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.
>>>
>>> Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense
>>>websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of
>3rd
>>>MARDIV.
>>>
>>> Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.
>>
>> Nursie's self-proclaimed "career" is NOT the SUBJECT.
>
> But you MADE it the "SUBJECT", Lennie, right up until THIS post, in which
>it's obvious that you once again found oput that you DON'T have all the facts

>and you DON'T know what you are talking about.
>
> Nice try to shift the focus off of your faux pas.

The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

It is not. As per DoD Directive 4650.2 (26 Jan 98) -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
Instruction NTP8 (C).

> Caught again.

The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

It is not. As per DoD Directive 4650.2 (26 Jan 98) -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
Instruction NTP8 (C).

> You failed.

The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

It is not. As per DoD Directive 4650.2 (26 Jan 98) -

The "M" in MARS = MILITARY

The "A" in MARS = AFFILIATE

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
Instruction NTP8 (C).

> But what you got was your tail stepped on...And YOU did the stepping.
>
> That HAD to hurt.

No "hurt." MARS is NOT amateur radio.

MARS exists because the DoD says it does.

The FCC does not cause MARS to exist. The ARRL does not
cause MARS to exist.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

4364. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 06:41:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528024111.23857.00000202@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92426

In article <1e4e3692.0405271638.35c20240@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527142303.09801.00000006@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 5/27/2004 10:25 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040527112557.23857.00000194@mb-m18.aol.com>
>> >
>> >In article <1e4e3692.0405261944.3c2ea0e3@posting.google.com>,
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >
>> >>Steve, Dave, Bruce, Larry, Kelly, and Dick represented the very worst
>> >>in the ARS via their RRAP postings. They thought they meant well, for
>> >>the good of all involved, but it eventually evolved into war crimes.
>> >>Some people just don't know when to quit. Meanwhile, Jim is like the
>> >>benevolent senior looking on as the thugs committed atrocities, but
>> >>had "no opinion."
>> >>
>> >>Please don't judge the rest of us by Steve's actions or even his seven
>> >>hostile actions (of self abuse).
>> >
>> > I don't.
>>
>> Good for you, Lennie.
>>
>> Minus the Amateur license, you're in the same pile.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Wow Len, I didn't know that you were involved in Seven Hostile Actions
>(of self abuse).
>
>Better extract yourself from that pile.

I thought about putting that pile on my lawn to make the grass
grow better.

It didn't. A little test section just died off. :-(

We will never hear the where or when of all those "hostile actions."

They never happened...except on his Fantasy Island.

He might not have a Tatoo either...

LHA / WMD

4365. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 07:11:46 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86fz9lf2kt.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 92429

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Thank you for the useful information.

Out of curiosity, do you know how these agreements came about, and who
agreed to what? Is this something the ARRL just announced one day, or
did these band plans arise out of years of usage clustering, or what?
I figure you might know, considering your position in the organization,
or at least you'd be able to find out. :-)

Thanks again.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAtuY3GPFSfAB/ezgRAo1UAJ9oIKCGVAE8qs26jUrmVzSHtq/7UACfRmNg
XbrP/dBWjW/1EstdC21rp3k=
=ulCL
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

4366. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 12:22:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40B72F07.7060202@psu.edu>
Source record: 92430

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040526152533.19470.00000158@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040526112414.13769.00001431@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/25/2004 6:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040525192013.17843.00000154@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>>
>>>>>> But only to those capable of rational thought. Fantasy fliers with
>>>>>> too much P-51 time in their frequency flyer program aren't capable
>>>>>> of rational thought.
>>>>>
>>>>> P-51's are great, but not my idea of a "fantasy flight".
>>>>
>>>> REAL private pilots are acquainted with the term "P-51 time." That's
>>>> a nastyphrase of those private pilots who LIE in their log-books
>>>> by writing in more time than they really have...using a Parker 51
>>>> pen.
>>>
>>> Well, in as much as I know what would happen to me if it was determined
>>>that I had falsified my logbook, I've never made an entry that wasn't
>>>preceeded by an actual flight or logable training with a CFI or CGI.
>>
>> Riiiiiight...just like you did all that "SSB" in VHF and UHF ham
>> bands.
>
>
> Lennie...WHAT is the prefered voice mode for most of the satellites?
>
> And what mode is prevelent below 144.400?
>
> Especially between 144.100 and 144.250?
>
> No experience = flawed opinions.

SSB is one of the modes we see on VHF and above. It's not used as often as say, FM, but used nonetheless. A fellow in our club put on a nice Powerpoint presentation about his satellite ops a couple months ago. On one of the slides, we listened to a recording of a SSB contact he had with another ham via satellite.

There is plenty of 2 meter SSB also. I've listened to it at our mountaintop shack.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4367. Re: Howdy All!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 12:40:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40B73358.50706@psu.edu>
Source record: 92431

On Wed, 26 May 2004 21:59:05 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:
>
>
>>Wahoo! It's been a long, long time! But, I'll be checking back in now and
>>then...

Hello again, Kim. Hope you're all settled in in the new house and all
is well.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4368. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 14:56:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Zo6dndD-joLFzirdRVn-sA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92432

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:d45db05refe3bev3vsjkgsegmop8rnej55@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 27 May 2004 13:03:51 -0400, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> >I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to do is
enter
> >the words "band plan" in the box to search the site. Then scroll down
until
> >you see the listing for band plans. I will NOT do this for you.
>
> OK...then I will:
>
> AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
>
> [snip]

It's never a good idea to do a student's homework for them. It leads to laziness and dependency on other people for info that is easily found by checking basic references.. I'd already referenced the site and documentation he needed to check previously. Then I gave specific instructions on how to find the info. That is all that should have been required.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4369. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 16:03:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0405280803.6e489cef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92433

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>
> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
> >7037 next Monday night?
>
> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now.

http://www.g3tpw.ukgateway.net/

Not a new idea but I just came upon it. Could be adapted to 40m attic use, I think.

> I am
> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
>
I'll look that one up.

--

But you haven't answered my other questions, Steve.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4370. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 17:01:23 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86aczsfpuk.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 92434

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dee" == Dee D Flint <deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

Dee> >I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to
Dee> do is enter >the words "band plan" in the box to search the site.
Dee> Then scroll down until >you see the listing for band plans. I
Dee> will NOT do this for you.

KC2HMZ> OK...then I will:
KC2HMZ>
KC2HMZ> AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
KC2HMZ>
KC2HMZ> [snip]

Dee> It's never a good idea to do a student's homework for them.

Attempting to answer a question in a condescending manner (and failing to answer the question correctly) does not imply a teacher-student relationship. Frankly, it's not clear to me that you have the capability to build or maintain such a relationship, based on what I've seen here. That's neither here nor there, however.

Dee> It leads to laziness and dependency on other people for info that
Dee> is easily found by checking basic references.. I'd already
Dee> referenced the site and documentation he needed to check
Dee> previously. Then I gave specific instructions on how to find the
Dee> info. That is all that should have been required.

You spent a thousand characters where twenty would have been acceptable. In fact, both you and KC2HMZ gave me information on "the band plans", not "the gentleman's agreements", which was the specific bit I asked about, repeatedly. It's not just "where can I find RTTY traffic?", it's "why is RTTY found there" that interests me the most.

You were so lost in your sophistry that you lost sight of the actual question being asked. Reread the original question I posed, your response, my response which included a restating of the original question, and your second response, and honestly tell me what you were trying to accomplish.

Now, if you have any information about the gentleman's agreements that led to the band plans, please, share with me and the others. I am interested in the actual content you may be able to provide, but I have no patience for attitude or condescension. The last thing I need is someone trying to teach me to fish when my question concerns how

night-crawlers on barbed hooks became the approach of choice.

Dee> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFAt3BrGPFSfAB/ezgRAtqpAJ4rLC4EORt2obdbtbkXi+XWE07ocACgjKfW
LhWllQXbLD0WlygMr8hsGbU=
=Lj+y
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

4371. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1398 May 28, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:00:06 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528150006.15234.00000100@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92435

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1398 May 28, 2004

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1398 with a release date of Friday, May 28, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Ham radio helps in the wake of an outbreak of tornadoes and a proposed California law could make operating a mobile station a driving distraction. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1398 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: TORNADOES ACROSS THE MID-WEST BRING OUT HAM RADIO COMMUNICATORS

Dozens of tornadoes and severe storms hammered the northern Plains and Midwest in the past week. As phone lines went out and cellular systems got overloaded it was ham radio that was again called on to provide storm spotting and other communications. Amateur Radio Newsline's Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, is here with more:

--

More than a dozen tornadoes swept across southern Nebraska the weekend of May 22nd. According to news reports the tornadoes were part of three days of severe weather that knocked out telephone service and power to hundreds of thousands of people from Nebraska to Michigan to West Virginia.

Hardest hit was Hallam, Nebraska. Hallam is located 25 miles north to Lincoln and is where a 73 year old woman was killed from flying debris. Every building in Hallam was damaged or destroyed and all normal communications was cut off. This prompted the activation of local A-R-E-S units under the leadership of Section Emergency Coordinator Reynolds Davis, K-Zero-G-N-D.

In Lincoln, Joe Eisenberg, K-Zero-N-E-B, was active with the local ham radio Stormwatch. He described this as a terrible weather front and said that ham radio played a key role in the emergency:

--

Eisenberg: "We went out on Stormewatch early in the evening and had

spotters throughout the whole county and our spotters in the South part of the county began observing the extremely heavy rain, wind and hale, especially near the Hallem area. One of our spotters saw a semi that had been blown off the road."

--

Downed power lines and leaking propane tanks littered the Hallam, prompting the Nebraska National Guard to surround the community Sunday to keep people from entering. Newsline spoke to Sandy Ramsey of the Office of Emergency Management in Lincoln who had a lot of praise for the role that Amateur Radio is playing:

--

Ramsy: "The hams out there as storm spotters. They are just invaluable to us. They're our eyes and ears. We are in the E-O-C
and they're our eyes in the field and we just couldn't do this
without them. They are really an invaluable part of what we do."

--

But Nebraska was not the only place where hams were put on alert or activated. Iowa and central Michigan were also hard hit and the front also caused power and phone outages in southern Michigan, Wisconsin, northern Illinois and Iowa and northwest Ohio. On Monday night the 24th, Iowa was drenched by yet another wave of powerful thunderstorms, even as residents of the town of Independence waited for a flooded local stream to recede.

The wave of storms swept eastward early Tuesday. Illinois had high wind that damaged several structures near Jacksonville. State Police said a twister damaged a home south of Springfield.

And all across the region ham radio operators remained on alert. As we go to air their work is still ongoing and we will have more in future reports.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW in New Orleans.

--

A total of 81 tornadoes were confirmed to have touched down in the region on Saturday as a weather front stalled over the area. As we go to air, ham radio is still involved in the aftermath of the storms. (ARNewsline, K0NEB)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: MR. HAYNIE GOES TO WASHINGTON REDUX

ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, says his meeting with White House telecommunications advisors on B-P-L issues was both revealing and encouraging. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, has the
latest:

--
Haynie says he and ARRL representatives met with Richard Russell, the White House associate director of technology in the Office of Science and Technology Policy in Washington D.C.

Haynie knew going in that the Bush administration's policy was clear: B-P-L is something that's good for America. But Haynie says Russell did offer assurances, especially in light of the interference findings about B-P-L contained in the National Telecommunications and Information Administration report.

"He did emphasize the fact that they would address the interference issues aggressively," Haynie says. "And I'm going to take him at his word at that. That they will do that.

"And I'm sure the FCC has taken note of the interference issues that NTIA has raised and as the representative for the amateur radio community, I intend to stay on top of it.

"We're not going to let this thing slide from that standpoint. They have the rules and they're printed and they're there. And we're going to make sure that they abide by those rules."

Haynie says it was clear from the start that Russell is beholden to the political agenda of the Bush administration.

"Mr. Russell heard what we had to say all right, but I think he was already predisposed to the fact that to anybody on the street - and I'm talking about the uninformed person that doesn't know about technology, broadband over powerline, where you can just plug your computer into the wall ,any wall outlet -does sound like a good thing," Haynie says. "And, I understand that.

"But on the other hand, there are issues that have to be dealt with and one of the examples I gave Mr. Russell was the fact that we could all lower our electric bills if we could burn high-sulfur coal.

"And he said, 'Well the EPA wouldn't let you do that.' I said, 'That's my point exactly. The FCC should be standing there, overseeing the rules about spectrum pollution.' I think I made my point."

Haynie says, upon reflection, one reality in the whole B-P-L debate is becoming crystal clear.

"I honestly do believe there's a disconnect between the engineers in the field, the engineers at the commission who actually understand the physics of the issue versus the politicians who are driving it," Haynie says. " I'm convinced now that's what it is. This is no longer

a science issue, an issue of facts, it's an issue of politics and that disappoints me."

However, Haynie says in recent weeks certain admissions by utilities trying to work with the amateur community are significant.

"In the beginning, everybody said from the industry side that there was no interference," Haynie says. "Now they're actually saying, 'Yes, there is and we'll try to mitigate it, we'll try to work with you.' That in itself is a big step."

Haynie says there also are admissions that one major interference solution touted by B-P-L proponents - notching - just doesn't do the job across the board.

"Finally some of the people are admitting, 'OK we don't have a point-source radiator anymore, we have a continuous-source radiator such as a power line.' And they're saying that the notching techniques will work and we've actually found out that they don't work that well," Haynie says.

"The notches are not that exact. And, when it says that they notch something about 3db or 6db, that's still not enough. It has to be notched by at least 30 in order to get back down to where the amateurs can function. And that's going to be a big challenge for the industry."

Haynie says anybody studying the issue of broadband technology sees the B-P-L investment is not a good one because of the growing emphasis on creating a wireless network.

"Quite frankly, in my personal opinion, the broadband over powerlines is going to be a real flash-in-the-pan because other technologies are going to overtake it very quickly," Haynie says.

"Whenever people say they want to plug their computer into any outlet in the wall, then my question is: 'Then, why do you have a cordless phone?' And WiFi and WiMax enter that challenge by being able to go anywhere in your house and let your laptop down whether it be on your couch or in your easychair and operate broadband.

"And I think that technology is going to be the real answer to people that need that type of high-speed internet access."

Haynie says the B-P-L battle is far from over. He says the strategy now is to press regulators - especially the FCC - to enforce the interference rules.

"Hold everybody's feet to the fire on the rules," Haynie says. "And the encouraging sign I've seen in the last week or so is the fact that more and more utilities have said that they didn't think it was a viable option for them and have opted out.

"Interestingly enough, the city of Manassas now is advertising for another provider. I found that extremely curious and very interesting."

Finally, Haynie concedes the ARRL has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the B-P-L issue and it's looking to the amateur community to get behind the league and its work.

"People are working overtime," Haynie says. "We are burning the candle at both ends and all I would ask is the amateurs support the organization and what we're trying to do in this effort."

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

More on the fight to stop B-P-L in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm), ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W7FTX repeater serving Hamilton Montana.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAWS: CALIFORNIA TO FINE DISTRACTED DRIVERS

California drivers who are distracted for any reason and whose actions attract law enforcement may soon face fines by eating, combing their hair or talking on a cellular telephone. This if a bill passed on May 18th by the state senate and bend to the Assembly is eventually made law. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more in this report:

--

It was called S B 1800 when Senator Kevin Murray introduced it to the California State Senate back in February. It went unnoticed by the Amateur Radio community until about a week ago when the Senate passed it and delivered to the State Assembly for further action.
That's
when news outlets state wide ran banner headlines saying that the state legislature might make it a crime to be distracted in any way -- while operating a motor vehicle in the Golden state. And that is exactly what the measure would do.

As written, the Murray bill would make it an crime for a person to operate a vehicle in an unsafe manner that results from engaging in a distracting activity while driving. What is a distracting activity?

Well according to the Senator it is just about anything. Eating or drinking, smoking, reading or writing, interacting with children, animals, passengers, or objects in the vehicle, adjusting the controls of an audio or other entertainment device, or even talking on a hands free cellular telephone. And it is the last two items that could easily impact on ham radio operators or any other two way radio user that a police officer might regard as distracted just because he or she has a microphone in hand or is changing frequencies on a radio.

The bill does say that a law enforcement officer may not stop a vehicle when a driver is engaging in a distracting activity unless the officer observes that the vehicle is being operated in an unsafe manner. But it is left to the officer to decide what unsafe really is under other areas of California state law.

The proposed law does not single out or target Amateur Radio operators for enforcement, but it does not exempt hams either. In fact, the only exemptions are police, fire and emergency services but even this is limited. The measure states that an emergency service professional would be exempt from these restrictions when using a wireless telephone or other electronic device, but only as part of the course and scope of his or her duties.

What about penalties? The bill would require a first offense to be punished by a fine of $35, and a second or subsequent offense that occurs within 2 years of a prior conviction for the infraction to be punished by a fine of $150.

Also, being permitted to continue driving in California and get insurance means that you have to keep your violation points count low. Any person whose driving record shows a violation count of 4 or more points in 12 months, 6 or more points in 24 months, or 8 or more points in 36 months be presumed to be a negligent operator of a motor vehicle. This bill would prohibit a first-time violation from being given a point value, but would mandate that a 2nd or subsequent violation within 2 years to be given a value of one point. And even 2 points can cost a lot of dollars when you go to renew an auto insurance policy.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in
Los
Angeles.

--

Supporters of the proposed law cite studies blaming distractions for 25 to 30 percent of all vehicle crashes. Opponents say that the bill goes too far in meddling with the civil rights of individuals. This group vows a court fight if the measure gets signed into law. (ARNewsline(tm) from published news reports)

**

RESTRUCTURING: FCC CHAIRMAN SAYS RESTRUCTURING CONTINUING

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has told U-S representatives Greg Walden, W7EQI, and Mike Ross, WD5DVR, that the Commission will act 'as expeditiously as possible' on Amateur Radio restructuring. This, in response to a letter from Walden and Ross a month ago that urged the FCC to adopt the ARRL's restructuring Petition for Rule Making in its entirety along with rules changes needed to put it into place.

But in his response, Powell said the League's petition was one of many. There are 18 in all. An ARRL bulletin says that judging from the FCC Chairman's letter to Walden and Ross, it would appear as if
the regulatory agency plans to address all 18 petitions within the framework of a single rule making proceeding. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: 75 METER IN INTERFERENCE BRINGS FAA REFERRAL

A California ham is under FCC scrutiny for alleged interference to ongoing Amateur Radio communications. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, is here with more:

--

Duckworth: "AE6QD, Steve L. Wingate, of Corte Madera, California, has
been sent a warning letter regarding malicious interference on 75 meters. This consists of jamming, making threats to other operators and to law enforcement officers, and broadcasts in which he appears incoherent."

--

The FCC warned Wingate that continued incidents of such interference will subject him to license suspension and revocation proceedings, as well as a possible fine of $7,500 to $10,000. And in an unusual twist, the FCC says that since Wingate also holds a pilot's license, this matter is also being referred to the Federal Aviation Administration as well. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FINES AFFIRMED AGAINST TWO ALLEGED PIRATES

Fines of $10,000 each have been affirmed by the FCC against Jason Green and Gary Feldman. The regulatory agency alleges that the two are pirate broadcasters in Florida who reportedly operated on 91.9 Mhz. The FCC says that neither filed a responses to the Commission's initial findings in the case. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: A "RADIO SUMMER CAMP" TO TRAIN MORE PIRATES

Now here's one that we know will interest the FCC enforcement folks.
Writers to the CGC Communicator report that budding radio pirates can learn how to buy or build FM transmitters and get on the air this summer. This at four-day "workshop" sessions, at least one of which will be bilingual.

Not only that. CGC readers also report that the event promoters will have transmitter and antenna kits available to attendees. For more on these strange educational check out www.freeradio.org. (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: AIR FORCE JAMS GARAGE DOOR OPENERS

A new military radio system is jamming remote-control garage doors in communities near this Florida Panhandle base. During testing of the $5.5 million two-way radio system at Eglin Air Force Base, homeowners in Niceville, Valparaiso and the Crestview area reported that their garage door openers failed to work or went wild by themselves.

According to Air Force officials the contractor, Motorola Inc., will try to minimize the problem. Technicians will run the system on slightly different frequencies from those used by garage door openers when another test is conducted.

But an FCC spokesperson had some bas news for local homeowners. Lauren Van Wazer, said that if the Air Force has been running the system within its licensed frequencies then the users of garage door openers may have to change the operating frequencies of theirs.

By the way, the Navy says that a similar radio system has been requested for Pensacola Naval Air Station and other nearby installations. (Published reports)

**

NEW PRODUCTS: THE TNC WIZARD

Creative Services Software has announced the release of version 1.0 of the Kantronics and Timewave TNC Wizard. This program searches for your TNC and sound card on both serial ports and TCP/IP networks.

Creative's Rick Ruhl, W4PC, says that the TNC wizard works with built
in serial ports in the TNC, USB to serial adapters and TCP/IP to serial interfaces. It also has an option to detect the soundcard in the computer and add that information to the PacTerm or PkTerm startup files without any additional setup needed at install time.

The TNC Wizard requires Windows 98 or later, with TCP/IP installed. There is no cost for the TNC wizard and it can be downloaded from the CSS website at http://www.cssincorp.com (CSS)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: INDUCTEES NAMED TO THE CQ HALLS OF FAME

CQ Amateur Radio magazine has inducted fifteen people into its Amateur Radio Hall of Fame and two into the CQ Contest Hall of Fame.

Those elected to the CQ Amateur Radio Hall of Fame include Ned Carman, Ned, W0ZSW, and Sister Alverna O'Laughlin, WA0SGJ, who co founded the Handi-Ham System to aid the handicapped. Also inducted was Ten-Tec co-founder Jack Burchfield, Jack, K4JU. His partner Al Kahn, K4FW was made a member in 2002.

Others named include Bob Heil, K9EID, whose inventions revolutionized audio in rock music live performances and amateur radio and writer Tom Kneitel, K2AES and Amateur Radio Newsline's own Bill Pasternak,
WA6ITF. Bill as honored for his quarter of a century of producing these newscasts and for creating the "Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award.

The new members of the CQ Contest Hall of Fame include Steve Bolia, N8BJQ. Steve is the longtime Director of the CQ World Wide W-P-X Contests and a pioneer in computer log-checking. Also inducted was Trey Garlough, N5KO. Garlough, who also holds the call sign HC8N is a world-class contester and the creator of two major contesting e-mail reflectors.

The CQ Amateur Radio Hall of Fame was established in January, 2001, to recognize those individuals, whether licensed radio amateurs or not, who significantly affected the course of amateur radio. The CQ Contest Hall of Fame was established in 1986 to recognize those amateurs who have made major contributions to contesting. The complete list of names is on line at www dot c q dash amateur radio dot com. (CQ)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United
States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: ARNOLD O. BECKMAN S.K.

Arnold Beckman, whose invention of a simple method to measure the acidity of California lemons spawned a scientific instrument empire has died at the age of 104. Beckman passed away on May 18th at Scripps Green Hospital in La Jolla, California, after a long illness.

Arnold O. Beckman was born in Cullom, Illinois, on April 10, 1900. In 1934 he invented the pH meter that is sill used use in citrus processing plants worldwide. The following year he founded National Technical Laboratories, and later renamed he company Beckman Instruments. Over the years, Beckman and his electronic test gear became synonymous with high quality and extreme accuracy. In 1997 the company was acquired Coulter Corporation of Miami, Florida which renamed it renamed Beckman Coulter later that same year.

Arnold Beckman, is survived by his son, Arnold Stone Beckman, daughter Patricia Beckman, two grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. His wife Mabel Meinzer Beckman died in 1989.

A complete biography of this inventor, businessman and philanthropist can be found on-line at
http://www.beckman.com/hr/memorial/mem_news.asp (Beckman-Coulter)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ASTRONAUT TRAINING TO BECOME HAM

The AMSAT News Service reports that Astronaut Leroy Chiao is scheduled to train at the Johnson Space Center in early June. This, to prepare for his Amateur Radio license exam. Once he passes the test and receives his call sign, he will be able to participate in the ARISS program during his stay as Expedition 10 commander on board the International Space Station. He is scheduled to fly this October. (ARISS)

**

WORLDBEAT - IRAN: IARU TRAINING PRESENTED

Turning to international news, word that the I-A-R-U recently presented an Amateur Radio Administration Course in Iran. Amateur Radio Newsline's Jim Meachen Zed-L-2-B-H-F in Auckland New Zealand
brings the details:

--

PKG HERE: In response to an invitation from the administration of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Fred Johnson ZL2AMJ representing the IARU Region 3 and Daniel Lamoureux VE2KA representing the IARU International Secretariat visited Iran to present a three-day Amateur Radio Administration Course, 26 to 28 April 2004. Fred Johnson ZL2AMJ takes up his story:

ZL2AMJ:

Since the early 1980s this course has been conducted by IARU in various forms in countries all over the world and in response to invitations from administrations to train regulators and prospective regulators in the administering of the amateur service and amateur satellite service. Related objectives include managing disaster

relief communications and organizing an amateur radio society.

Our recent course in Tehran was arranged by Mr T. Shafiee and Mr M. Zomorodi of the Directorate General of Telecommunications. An excellent training room was provided for us with full support facilities including a data projector and access to a photocopier. Daniel and myself presented our course using PowerPoint displays prepared by IARU and each of the 16 participants received printed copies of the displays and many other documents and two CD-ROMs with documentation about amateur radio.

We had discussions with many radio amateurs in Tehran, some of whom attended the course. The course participants visited EP3PTT, a station established in the Ministry's office premises in Tehran. The equipment in this station was provided for Iran amateurs by from the IARU Region 3 Stars*** program and may be operated by licensed Iranian operators by arrangement.

There have been amateur radio societies in Iran in earlier years but there has not been an IARU member society. An amateur radio "club", a social meeting group, presently meets in Tehran.

ZL2BHF: ZL2AMJ reported the course as a most memorable experience. He said that Daniel and himself were warmly received.

From Auckland New Zealand I'm Jim Meachen ZL2BHF for Newsline.

--

Contact between the IARU and the amateurs and the administration of Iran is to continue with further Amateur Radio information to be provided. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

WORLDBEAT - ALBANIA: PROJECT GOODWILL AT DAYTON 2004

Len Geraldi, K6ANP, who is the President of the Northern California DX Foundation has announced that his organization is teaming up with Vertex Standard . The two will combine forces to donate ten complete Yaesu FT 840 stations to Project Goodwill Albania. The gear will be set up at the University of Tirana to boost the successful completion of the project.

The announcement was made at the recent Dayton D-X dinner in Ohio. At the same time Bob Ferrero, W6RJ, stepped forward on behalf of Ham Radio Outlet. He offered up a matching number of antennas. Bob Heil, K9EID, of Heil Sound said that he would supply the needed p sound gear. Other equipment was pledged by AA4XR, N3BNA, K3LP, K7JA, VE1JF, W3BTX, W4MYA, W6EUF, W6OSP, W6UM and W9JUV in addition to those already reported earlier. (Various)

**

ON THE AIR: NEW MID-AMERICA 6 METER BEACON

The Legion of Indianapolis DXers has activated a 24-hour a day 6 meter beacon. Operating as W9VW slash B on 50.069 MHz, the automated 12 watt station is located in the heart of Indianapolis in grid square E M 69 WT. The antenna is an omnidirectional horizontally polarized turnstile at 70 feet. Q-S-N reports go to W9VW, P.O. Box 18495, Indianapolis, Indiana, 46218. (W9IND, QRZ.COM)

**

DX

In D-X, word that IN3ASW and IN3DYG will be active as TU2WL. This, from Cote d'Ivoire or the Ivory Coast through the 1st of June. They plan to operate SSB and possibly PSK31 and RTTY. (GB2RS)

And SM0CMH will be active as SM8C portable SV5 from the island of Kalymnos in the Dodecanese group to the 5th of June. He will operate CW on 10 to 80 meters and perhaps even 160 meters. For both operations, please Q-S-L as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: BAY TO BREAKERS

And finally this week, the story of ham radio assisting in a truly fun public service event. It called the Bay to Breakers race and its held every year in the San Francisco. David Hirtz, KG6CEL, reports from the City by the Bay:

--

Audio Only: Hear it at www.anewsline.org
--

By the way, it's called the Bay to Breakers Race because it starts
in the financial district not far from San Francisco Bay and ends at the western most edge of Golden Gate Park overlooking the mighty blue Pacific. More information on this event is on line at www.baytobreakers.com. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for
nominations this year is midnight on Tuesday, June 30th.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim
Damron, N8TMW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

4372. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:04:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40B78D4F.5000701@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92436

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

>>
>>
>
>OK...then I will:
>
>AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
>Reprinted from "The Considerate Operator's Frequency Guide",
>
>
Another method is to just scan a band until you find another ham calling
CQ in
a mode you want to operate in, and respond to him. Be careful in that,
on HF,
some foreign hams can operate SSB on a frequency the FCC rules say CW/data
only. Conversely, there's no point in calling CQ using CW in the middle
of a SSB
subband. It's legal, but you are not likely to find another ham to QSO
with there.
As ham radio is about 2 way radio, people need agreements, formal or
informal,
as to where to do what mode. Otherwise it starts sounding like CB...
And no,
despite no code licenses and "extra lite" licensees, ham radio doesn't
sound anything
like CB except for a few spots (14313) and even that is by informal
agreement.

4373. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:35:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528153545.07445.00000068@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92437

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>Date: 5/28/2004 9:56 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Zo6dndD-joLFzirdRVn-sA@comcast.com>
>
>
>"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
>news:d45db05refe3bev3vsjkgsegmop8rnej55@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 27 May 2004 13:03:51 -0400, "Dee D. Flint"
>> <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:
>>
>> >I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to do is
>enter
>> >the words "band plan" in the box to search the site. Then scroll down
>until
>> >you see the listing for band plans. I will NOT do this for you.
>>
>> OK...then I will:
>>
>> AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
>>
>> [snip]
>
>It's never a good idea to do a student's homework for them. It leads to
>laziness and dependency on other people for info that is easily found by
>checking basic references.. I'd already referenced the site and
>documentation he needed to check previously. Then I gave specific
>instructions on how to find the info. That is all that should have been
>required.

Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming desire
to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.

His "debating" techniques have cost him a couple of ISP's, I understand,
and got him in trouble with local law enforcement. He was also listowner of a
fairly well populated Yahoo group that went ka-put due to his escapades.

As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
You" streak in him that Lennie has...

Welcome back, John. Worn out your welcome elsewhere again...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4374. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:42:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528154203.07445.00000069@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92439

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 1:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528024110.23857.00000201@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040527212813.16279.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040527202858.12940.00000114@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>>(Steve
>>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>>>>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part
>of
>>>>>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>>>>>
>>>>> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>>>>>
>>>>> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>>>>
>>>> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.
>>>>
>>>> Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense
>>>>websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of
>>3rd
>>>>MARDIV.

>>>>
>>>> Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.
>>>
>>> Nursie's self-proclaimed "career" is NOT the SUBJECT.
>>
>> But you MADE it the "SUBJECT", Lennie, right up until THIS post, in
>which
>>it's obvious that you once again found oput that you DON'T have all the
>facts
>>and you DON'T know what you are talking about.
>>
>> Nice try to shift the focus off of your faux pas.
>
> The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.

Uh huh...

Got Willie caught under the rocking chair again, and it hurt.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Your strict dependence upon published directives would have made you very popular in the Third Reich, Lennie, but it's no good here.

Now...YOU brought up my USMC service and made insinuating comments vis-a-vis same. I gave you MORE than enough information on now to verify that which YOU claim is UNverified.

So NOW you're ducking out from acknowedging the FACTS.

Putz, liar AND coward ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

4375. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:42:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528154228.29277.00000257@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92438

In article <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: The Pool
>> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
>> >7037 next Monday night?
>>
>> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now. I
>am
>> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
>> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
>> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.

Be kind to someone who just found out about "Nevis." That's
important stuff for effective (but illegal) homegrown "militia"
defense of the Homeland. [remember his need for a "real military"
handset for an SG-2020? :-)]

Maybe he is "activating" a special "amateur only MARS" unit?

["Hostile action" in TN?]

:-)

LHA / WMD

4376. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 19:44:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528154441.07445.00000070@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92440

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 1:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528024109.23857.00000200@mb-m18.aol.com>

> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
> Instruction NTP8 (C).
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Amateur Radio is the entity with which the MILITARY is AFFILIATED with...

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

4377. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 20:04:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528160420.09295.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92441

In article <20040528153545.07445.00000068@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>>From: "Dee D. Flint" deeflint01@comcast.net
>>Date: 5/28/2004 9:56 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <Zo6dndD-joLFzirdRVn-sA@comcast.com>
>>
>>"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
>>news:d45db05refe3bev3vsjkgsegmop8rnej55@4ax.com...
>>> On Thu, 27 May 2004 13:03:51 -0400, "Dee D. Flint"
>>> <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> >I already referenced the web site of the ARRL. All you have to do is enter
>>> >the words "band plan" in the box to search the site. Then scroll down until
>>> >you see the listing for band plans. I will NOT do this for you.
>>>
>>> OK...then I will:
>>>
>>> AMATEUR FREQUENCY OPERATION RECOMMENDATIONS (ARRL Band Plans)
>>>
>>> [snip]
>>
>>It's never a good idea to do a student's homework for them. It leads to
>>laziness and dependency on other people for info that is easily found by
>>checking basic references.. I'd already referenced the site and
>>documentation he needed to check previously. Then I gave specific
>>instructions on how to find the info. That is all that should have been
>>required.
>
> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
>desire to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...looking in the mirror again? :-)

> His "debating" techniques have cost him a couple of ISP's, I understand,
>and got him in trouble with local law enforcement. He was also listowner of a
>fairly well populated Yahoo group that went ka-put due to his escapades.

Remember who manufactured a very libelous "home page" on AOL?

Lasted for all of three days before AOL removed it. Nearly removed nursie from its subscribers, too. :-)

> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>You" streak in him that Lennie has...

Poor baby. Nursie has to understand that MANY know more than he
does. :-)

There's the "MARS is amateur radio" claim...which remains just a
claim since the DoD defines MARS, not the FCC or ARRL.

No one goes to as great lengths as the gunnery nurse in trying to
damn others. Nursie DOES have top honors in that. :-)

LHA / WMD

4378. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 20:58:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528165849.17843.00000164@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92442

In article <20040528154441.07445.00000070@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 1:41 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528024109.23857.00000200@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>
>> That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
>> Instruction NTP8 (C).
>>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> Amateur Radio is the entity with which the MILITARY is AFFILIATED
>with...
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

Your intelligence is "THAT simple." :-)

If MARS required amateur radio to exist, then it would not need the military documents creating it and regulating it.

The FCC doesn't define MARS or regulate MARS or anything else about MARS.

MARS is MILITARY. The Department of Defense has explained it.

Have you found out what an AN/FRC-93 is yet?

[we know you haven't seen, let alone read DoD Directive 4650.2, much less NTP 8(C)...quit trying to bluff your way out of this]

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

[except in your imagination...]

Dismissed.

LHA / WMD

4379. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 20:58:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528165850.17843.00000165@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92443

In article <20040528154203.07445.00000069@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Nursie, off work and with too much caffeine) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 1:41 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528024110.23857.00000201@mb-m18.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040527212813.16279.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 5/27/2004 7:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040527202858.12940.00000114@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040527142112.09801.00000005@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>>Date: 5/26/2004 2:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>>Message-id: <20040526152532.19470.00000157@mb-m22.aol.com>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <20040526114036.13769.00001432@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>>>(Steve
>>>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Nursie hasn't produced even ONE photo of his described duty with
>>>>>>>> the 3rd Marine Division.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I've never described any duty with 3rdMARDIV. I was never a part
>>of
>>>>>>>3rdMARDIV. Never said I was.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 3rd Marine Division is based on Okinawa. You said you were there.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> OK, so we've established you were never on Okinawa.
>>>>>
>>>>> Lennie....I was ALWAYS an airwinger in the USMC.
>>>>>
>>>>> Now...GO BACK and do some MORE websurfing and see if your immense

>>>>>websurfing talents can figure out how I was on Okinawa and NOT a part of
>>>3rd
>>>>>MARDIV.
>>>>>
>>>>> Sheeeeeesh....what an idiot.
>>>>
>>>> Nursie's self-proclaimed "career" is NOT the SUBJECT.
>>>
>>> But you MADE it the "SUBJECT", Lennie, right up until THIS post, in
>>which
>>>it's obvious that you once again found oput that you DON'T have all the
>>facts
>>>and you DON'T know what you are talking about.
>>>
>>> Nice try to shift the focus off of your faux pas.
>>
>> The SUBJECT is the claim that "MARS is amateur radio.
>
> Uh huh...

That's what the SUBJECT line is...

> Got Willie caught under the rocking chair again, and it hurt.

Always a problem to the well-endowed...

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> Your strict dependence upon published directives would have made you very
>popular in the Third Reich, Lennie, but it's no good here.

Okay, so explain the 35 print pages required by Part 97, Title 47 C.F.R.

Nowhere in those printed - and very official - U.S. amateur radio
regulations
is MARS (Military Affiliate Radio System) defined by the FCC.

MARS isn't authorized to use amateur radio frequencies.

The "M" in MARS stands for MILITARY.

MARS exists through DoD Directive 4650.2 with particular military
service branch regulations AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN NTP8(C).

MARS nets and stations can communicate directly with other
MARS stations and with federal authorities using military radio
equipment and military radio personnel.

Without Directive 4650.2 there would be NO MARS.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

> Now...YOU brought up my USMC service and made insinuating comments
>vis-a-vis same. I gave you MORE than enough information on now to verify that

>which YOU claim is UNverified.

No. Tell us all about those "hostile action" incidents, the where and when.

No one can "verify" things that don't exist. Outside of your imagination, that is... :-)

> So NOW you're ducking out from acknowedging the FACTS.

"Facts?" Fantasy facts?

Of course. If you imagined it, it HAPPENED! :-)

> Putz, liar AND coward ! ! ! !

Tsk, tsk, tsk... still acting the schoolyard bully all the way to your mid-life crisis...:-)

LHA / WMD

4380. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 21:13:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528171312.13413.00000098@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92444

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 3:04 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528160420.09295.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com>

>> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
>>desire to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...looking in the mirror again?

Nope.

> Remember who manufactured a very libelous "home page" on AOL?

No one I know, Lennie.

If somethings true, it's not libelous.

You are a lair. You DID misrepresent your intentions with an e-mail that
contained OTHER than what you attested to it being.

> Lasted for all of three days before AOL removed it. Nearly removed
> nursie from its subscribers, too.

That's OK. It wouldn't have lasted too long. That's what lawyers are
for.

>> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>>You" streak in him that Lennie has...
>
> Poor baby. Nursie has to understand that MANY know more than he
> does.

No doubt. But when it comes to Amateur Radio, I >>DO<< know more than
>>YOU<<, Lennie!

And that's ALL that counts!

> There's the "MARS is amateur radio" claim...which remains just a
> claim since the DoD defines MARS, not the FCC or ARRL.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

> No one goes to as great lengths as the gunnery nurse in trying to
> damn others. Nursie DOES have top honors in that.

Just you, Lennie. The others "damn" themselves.

Steve, K4YZ

4381. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 21:38:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528173813.13413.00000099@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92445

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 3:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528165849.17843.00000164@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040528154441.07445.00000070@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 5/28/2004 1:41 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040528024109.23857.00000200@mb-m18.aol.com>
>>
>>
>>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>>
>>> That is repeated in AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN-USMC Communications
>>> Instruction NTP8 (C).
>>>
>>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>>
>> Amateur Radio is the entity with which the MILITARY is AFFILIATED
>>with...
>>
>> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> It really is THAT simple.
>
> Your intelligence is "THAT simple."
>
> If MARS required amateur radio to exist, then it would not need the
> military documents creating it and regulating it.

Sure it would.

Any authorized interaction between the Armed Forces and any civilian entity requires that it be authorized by appropriate headquarters. The Red Cross, Civil Air Patrol, US Coast Guard Auxiliary, etc etc are "civilian" organizations, yet there are MILITARY regulations that enable interaction between the Armed Forces and those entities.

Are you telling me that those organizations wouldn't exist without a "military document creating and regulating it"...?!?!

I understand that YOUR point is that MARS is a program promulgated BY the Armed Forces.

The FACTS are that MARS needs those civilian operators to make the program work.

The FACTS are that almost all of the persons running the program are NOT military personnel and are NOT on the payroll of DoD to be there.

> The FCC doesn't define MARS or regulate MARS or anything else
> about MARS.

It doesn't have to.

> MARS is MILITARY. The Department of Defense has explained it.

Sure it is.

And without licensed Amateur Radio operators to "staff" the program with, it wouldn't be able to function. It would be "defunct".

> Have you found out what an AN/FRC-93 is yet?

Have you been issued an NNN0xxx/T callsign yet?

How about a KG6xxx callsign?

How does it pertain to Amateur Radio and it's interaction with the MARS program...???

Why do you find it necessary to try and redirect when you know you are in a corner?

> [we know you haven't seen, let alone read DoD Directive 4650.2,
> much less NTP 8(C)...quit trying to bluff your way out of this]

I am not trying to "bluff" my way "out" of anything, Sir Scumbag.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> [except in your imagination...]
>
> Dismissed.

Not by a documented pathological liar like you, Lennie. Not in this life or forum, nor any other.

Now...How's that MARS application coming?

Passed that "Extra Lite" out of the box yet?

How about that Part 15-legal station you were going to put on 20 meters?

Or perhaps you'd like to regale us with more of your exploits as a student pilot in the 50's? You certainly got your tailed rocked on when you tried ot demonstrate your knowledge about current NAVAID systems and CAP's active aircraft inventory, yet you continue to denigrate my licensure as a pilot. That's available on the Internet.

Then we can move along to your investigation as to wheter or not my "service claims" are valid or not. You've certainly been provided more than enough information to get THAT right by now. That's available on the Internet, too.

And while you're at it, please tell us once again how many pieces of traffic YOU were directly responsible for handling in 1953 while assigned as a rear area radio clerk? "1.2 million", was it...?!?!?

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4382. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 21:41:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528174104.13413.00000100@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92446

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 3:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528165850.17843.00000165@mb-m19.aol.com>

> MARS exists through DoD Directive 4650.2 with particular military
> service branch regulations AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN NTP8(C).
>
> MARS nets and stations can communicate directly with other
> MARS stations and with federal authorities using military radio
> equipment and military radio personnel.
>
> Without Directive 4650.2 there would be NO MARS.
>
> MARS is NOT amateur radio.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> Now...YOU brought up my USMC service and made insinuating comments
>>vis-a-vis same. I gave you MORE than enough information on now to verify
>that
>>which YOU claim is UNverified.
>
> No. Tell us all about those "hostile action" incidents, the where
> and when.
>
> No one can "verify" things that don't exist. Outside of your
> imagination, that is.

Uh uh, Lennie!

YOU said my very service in the USMC was bogus.

Still waiting for you to substantiate THAT claim!

>> Putz, liar AND coward ! ! ! !
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk... still acting the schoolyard bully all the way to
> your mid-life crisis.

It ain't bullying if it's true.

You are a putz, you are a liar, and you ARE a coward.

Steve, K4YZ

4383. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-28 21:42:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528174226.13897.00000081@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92447

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 5/28/2004 4:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528171312.13413.00000098@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 3:04 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528160420.09295.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>>> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>>>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
>>>desire to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...looking in the mirror again?
>
> Nope.
>
>> Remember who manufactured a very libelous "home page" on AOL?
>
> No one I know, Lennie.
>
> If somethings true, it's not libelous.
>
> You are a lair

Ooops! TYPO !

But it doesn't change anything...You ARE a L I A R...!

Steve, K4YZ

4384. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 01:34:12 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <6vofb0pv668pv6pp4ivobab9q1he87a56o@4ax.com>
Source record: 92448

On 28 May 2004 19:35:45 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming desire
>to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.

Various? There is only one CB newsgroup, rec.radio.cb - and if I'm well-known there it's because of telling certain regulars there what I thought of their blatant disregard for Part 95.

Any of the folks in the scanner newsgroups who know me, know me from material published in Popular Communications, or from when I was a member of NYSING, or both.

> His "debating" techniques have cost him a couple of ISP's, I understand,
>and got him in trouble with local law enforcement.

That what KF2TI told you? That's bull. I've never had an account yanked by an ISP, nor had any trouble with local law enforcement. On the other hand, I've been known to work *with* local law enforcement on occasion.

> He was also listowner of a
>fairly well populated Yahoo group that went ka-put due to his escapades.

At the time I owned it, it was not a Yahoo group, it was a onelist.com group, and it did not go kaput - it became a Yahoo group when onelist.com and Yahoo merged, and it still exists - the current list owner is Al Stern of Satellite Beach, Florida who is an old buddy of mine from the #monitor channel on IRCNet.

he only reason you're pissed about all of this is that I refused to let you and KF2TI join that list, which I did because after observing your antics in rec.radio.amateur.policy - particularly your penchant for trading personal attacks with Len Anderson and others in this NG, which has been going on for years now - I decided I did not want people of your ilk polluting the Radiomonitors list.

> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>You" streak in him that Lennie has...

If you wish to draw that conclusion based on the fact that I responded to a request for information by posting information, it's no skin off my fanny, Steve. Besides, somebody in this NG has to post something besides personal attacks on other users, or the whole NG will consist of nothing but half a dozen trolls such as yourself, and the hobby deserves better than that.

> Welcome back, John. Worn out your welcome elsewhere again...?!?!

Actually, I just switched to a different ISP, which has an NNTP
server, among other things that my old ISP did not (the old one was a
dialup and an e-mail account, period).

4385. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 02:56:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040528225612.28114.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92449

In article <20040528171312.13413.00000098@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 3:04 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528160420.09295.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com>
>
>>> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>>>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
>>>desire to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...looking in the mirror again?
>
> Nope.
>
>> Remember who manufactured a very libelous "home page" on AOL?
>
> No one I know, Lennie.
>
> If somethings true, it's not libelous.

AOL thought it was VERY libelous and cancelled that alternate screen name you used then.

You went ballistic on that "home page" and were clearly deep into libelous personal attack. AOL concurred.

> You are a lair.

A "lair?!?" :-)

Do you imagine yourself in some sort of jungle surrounded by carnivorous animals? :-)

>You DID misrepresent your intentions with an e-mail that
>contained OTHER than what you attested to it being.

Poor baby. A simple mistake and you go BALLISTIC! :-)

>>> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>>>You" streak in him that Lennie has...
>>
>> Poor baby. Nursie has to understand that MANY know more than he
>> does.
>
> No doubt. But when it comes to Amateur Radio, I >>DO<< know more than

>>>YOU<<, Lennie!

Actually no. You still can't read Part 97 clearly and you were unable
to post references for MARS documents. :-)

> And that's ALL that counts!

Only on your mythical amateur Fantasy Island. :-)

>> There's the "MARS is amateur radio" claim...which remains just a
>> claim since the DoD defines MARS, not the FCC or ARRL.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Still incorrect. MARS is MILITARY, not civilian.

Haven't you understood that yet?

Just read DoD Directive 4650.2 and then USN-USMC Communication
Instruction NTP 8(C).

MARS can and does function solely with military personnel.

It's nice that amateurs have volunteered to help in MARS, but MARS
is a MILITARY radio service. By definition.

LHA / WMD

4386. Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 03:11:36 UTC
From: bitbucket@linkline.com
Message-ID: <sgvfb0lll2ctnsesln2j7f1sv8cq5ebtb0@4ax.com>
Source record: 92450

Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That 'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think). Is the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and passed the 5 wpm code?

Thanks.

Ron KE6OJD

4387. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 05:07:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529010732.23322.00000154@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 92451

In article <20040528173813.13413.00000099@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Then we can move along to your investigation as to wheter or not my
>"service claims" are valid or not. You've certainly been provided more than
>enough information to get THAT right by now. That's available on the
>Internet, too.

The United States government put up a web page referencing nursie's "military career?!?" [I think not...can't find one]

The Veterans Administration has a web page referencing the "hero of hostile actions?!?" [I think not...can't find one]

Has ANY government agency put up a web page all about nursie, the "hero of hostile actions?!?" [I think not...not there]

"Provided more than enough information?" Hardly. We don't know squat about the date and location of those "hostile actions."

Lots of bluff and bluster, shouting, hollering, and nursie name-calling. Tsk, tsk, tsk...

> And while you're at it, please tell us once again how many pieces of
>traffic YOU were directly responsible for handling in 1953 while assigned as
>a rear area radio clerk? "1.2 million", was it...?!?!?

Now, now, you're still doing the personal attack thing. I was never a "radio clerk." :-)

MOS 281.6, Microwave Radio Relay Operations and Maintenance Supervisor [the dot-six in that old MOS nomenclature stood for supervisor]. Also brevet to Fixed Station Operations and Maintenance Supervisor as a team leader at ADA before the microwave equipment arrived. The Pacific Stars & Stripes military newspaper checked up on that when they did an interview on me for their 10 November 2002 edition (in their archives section on the 'web).

ADA relayed about 220 thousand TTY messages a month in 1955. Since ADA had 36 to 43 transmitters on at any one time, some of them SSB with 8 to 12 TTY circuits and three transmitters were doing 4-TTY-channel time-division multiplexing, the total estimate I wrote long ago is still an estimate based on 9-out-of-12 days at the station and 8 hour shifts. Any way you slice it, nursie, that's a LOT of message traffic...and every shift supervisor is responsible for keeping those messages going out.

Had you ever done any military communications, you would understand that. But, you didn't, so you don't. All you can do is try to intimidate others, bluff and bluster to make yourself far more important than you were in real life. Not good, not healthy to do that, nursie.

But, you can't control yourself, can you? [no emotional stability] Lack of control is very bad for emergency work.

Memorable. And I'm not refering to Memorial Day.

LHA / WMD

4388. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 05:07:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529010733.23322.00000155@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 92452

In article <20040528174104.13413.00000100@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 3:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528165850.17843.00000165@mb-m19.aol.com>
>
>> MARS exists through DoD Directive 4650.2 with particular military
>> service branch regulations AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, USN NTP8(C).
>>
>> MARS nets and stations can communicate directly with other
>> MARS stations and with federal authorities using military radio
>> equipment and military radio personnel.
>>
>> Without Directive 4650.2 there would be NO MARS.
>>
>> MARS is NOT amateur radio.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

MARS exists as a MILITARY radio service. It can continue to
do so on its own, without civilian volunteers.

The FCC doesn't define MARS, never has. MARS is MILITARY.

>>> Now...YOU brought up my USMC service and made insinuating comments
>>>vis-a-vis same. I gave you MORE than enough information on now to verify
that
>>>which YOU claim is UNverified.
>>
>> No. Tell us all about those "hostile action" incidents, the where
>> and when.
>>
>> No one can "verify" things that don't exist. Outside of your
>> imagination, that is.
>
> Uh uh, Lennie!
>
> YOU said my very service in the USMC was bogus.

No. We really don't know what nursie did with any credence.

The "hostile action" brags have never ever been detailed as to
place and date.

> Still waiting for you to substantiate THAT claim!

It's not up to me to "verify" YOUR bragging.

You made the "hostile action" claim. YOU reference it.

>>> Putz, liar AND coward ! ! ! !
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk... still acting the schoolyard bully all the way to
>> your mid-life crisis.
>
> It ain't bullying if it's true.

Okay, verify, by references and proof, those "hostile actions."

Your imagination doesn't count. [nature abhors a vacuum...]

You really can't verify what you did through any third-party
sources, can you?

All you do is demand others "call up the VA" or some other
bogus source, never supplying any factual data or any
names of associated parties who were also in those
"hostile actions."

All you can do in response is holler and swear at others,
typical bully behavior.

That doesn't work, doesn't stop anyone else from challenging
your brags.

Memorial Day is coming up. Try to remember the where and
when of those "hostile actions" and then state it in here.

Otherwise, retract that brag of "hostile actions." Memorial
Day is for REAL heroes, not the big-mouth bass jumping for
attention in this little pond.

> You are a putz, you are a liar, and you ARE a coward.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More hollering and swearing. Wipe off your
monitor, the saliva is running down the faceplate. What
will Mrs. Nursie think?

LHA / WMD

4389. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 05:07:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529010735.23322.00000156@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 92453

In article <6vofb0pv668pv6pp4ivobab9q1he87a56o@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:

>On 28 May 2004 19:35:45 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
desire
>>to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.
>
>Various? There is only one CB newsgroup, rec.radio.cb - and if I'm
>well-known there it's because of telling certain regulars there what I
>thought of their blatant disregard for Part 95.
>
>Any of the folks in the scanner newsgroups who know me, know me from
>material published in Popular Communications, or from when I was a
>member of NYSING, or both.

Belated welcome back, John. :-)

As you can tell (obviously), few have departed from their
usual style of attacking all who do not agree with them. :-)

>> His "debating" techniques have cost him a couple of ISP's, I understand,

>>and got him in trouble with local law enforcement.
>
>That what KF2TI told you? That's bull. I've never had an account
>yanked by an ISP, nor had any trouble with local law enforcement. On
>the other hand, I've been known to work *with* local law enforcement
>on occasion.

Nursie is on his usual smearing of snit routine again. :-)

Adell has been - gratefully - not present, leaving only a few
of the PCTAs to attempt attacking others. [he might be
trying to sort out which of the several personalities he's used
in this newsgroup]

>> He was also listowner of a
>>fairly well populated Yahoo group that went ka-put due to his escapades.
>
>At the time I owned it, it was not a Yahoo group, it was a onelist.com
>group, and it did not go kaput - it became a Yahoo group when
>onelist.com and Yahoo merged, and it still exists - the current list
>owner is Al Stern of Satellite Beach, Florida who is an old buddy of
>mine from the #monitor channel on IRCNet.

True facts interfere with obsessive hatred. Disagree with him
and you will be added to the top of his snit list. [nothing much
changed in the last 5 or so years]

>he only reason you're pissed about all of this is that I refused to
>let you and KF2TI join that list, which I did because after observing
>your antics in rec.radio.amateur.policy - particularly your penchant
>for trading personal attacks with Len Anderson and others in this NG,
>which has been going on for years now - I decided I did not want
>people of your ilk polluting the Radiomonitors list.

Poor guy lives for the moment of upsetting normalcy of
discussion of others. It's become an obsession with him,
far from a penchant. :-)

>> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>>You" streak in him that Lennie has...
>
>If you wish to draw that conclusion based on the fact that I responded
>to a request for information by posting information, it's no skin off
>my fanny, Steve. Besides, somebody in this NG has to post something
>besides personal attacks on other users, or the whole NG will consist
>of nothing but half a dozen trolls such as yourself, and the hobby
>deserves better than that.

The hobby DOES deserve better than what they are, but,
according to them, they do no wrong, can never do wrong,
for they are privileged (because they say they are).

This particular newsgrope has become nothing but a giant
flamefest.

Pity that, the forum polluted by those wanting only to FIGHT.

It's worse, actually. The politicians at the FCC want to permit
BPL to continue on and truly pollute HF and low-VHF for ALL,
not just amateurs. The fighters such as nursie only want to
fight, fight, fight with others for newsgrope supremacy, thinking
they will "win" something. They only win emotional candy for
the moment, unable to understand that others don't agree
with them. <shrug>

Add to that the spectre of even more radical revisions with
Part 97 restructuring and the loss of international regulation
on manual telegraphy testing and this newsgroup has become
nothing more than a chat room for a small group nattering
about everything but Policy as They See It.

>> Welcome back, John. Worn out your welcome elsewhere again...?!?!
>
>Actually, I just switched to a different ISP, which has an NNTP
>server, among other things that my old ISP did not (the old one was a
>dialup and an e-mail account, period).

Explanations of what you actually did are irrelevant and just waste your time replying.

I don't think it matters really what anyone says, the "fighters" will manufacture some kind of "cause" and then say their imaginary product is "fact." :-)

On the other hand, Brian Burke (screen name of "BillyBeeper" now) thinks that the PCTA are becoming tired and impotent. There IS something to that faced with the revision of 25.5 and their inability to control the newsgroup content.

The tide is turning but the old cliches' of the PCTA are littering the beach, drying up instead of washing back out to sea, losing their threats, imprecations, and "superiority" (as amateur telegraphers).

Have fun here if you can, John. :-)

Len

LHA / WMD

4390. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:17:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529041754.18493.00000134@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92454

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>Date: 5/28/2004 8:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <6vofb0pv668pv6pp4ivobab9q1he87a56o@4ax.com>
>
>On 28 May 2004 19:35:45 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>> Although not a regular in this forum (any more, any way) John is well
>>known in various CB radio and scanner NG's, usually for his overwhelming
>desire
>>to be king of the hill and lack of regard for how he gets there.
>
>Various? There is only one CB newsgroup, rec.radio.cb - and if I'm
>well-known there it's because of telling certain regulars there what I
>thought of their blatant disregard for Part 95.

I think it has more to do with the manner in which you tell them...Much in the same way Lennie the Lame tries to lambaste Amateurs.

>Any of the folks in the scanner newsgroups who know me, know me from
>material published in Popular Communications, or from when I was a
>member of NYSING, or both.

Yes. Your reputation preceeds you.

>> His "debating" techniques have cost him a couple of ISP's, I
>understand,
>>and got him in trouble with local law enforcement.
>
>That what KF2TI told you? That's bull. I've never had an account
>yanked by an ISP, nor had any trouble with local law enforcement. On
>the other hand, I've been known to work *with* local law enforcement
>on occasion.

Allowing them to practice search and seizure techniques or proper handcuffing...?!?!

>> He was also listowner of a
>>fairly well populated Yahoo group that went ka-put due to his escapades.
>
>At the time I owned it, it was not a Yahoo group, it was a onelist.com
>group, and it did not go kaput - it became a Yahoo group when
>onelist.com and Yahoo merged, and it still exists - the current list
>owner is Al Stern of Satellite Beach, Florida who is an old buddy of
>mine from the #monitor channel on IRCNet.
>

>he only reason you're pissed about all of this is that I refused to
>let you and KF2TI join that list, which I did because after observing
>your antics in rec.radio.amateur.policy - particularly your penchant
>for trading personal attacks with Len Anderson and others in this NG,
>which has been going on for years now - I decided I did not want
>people of your ilk polluting the Radiomonitors list.

Actually, if you were honest (and why start now, John...?!?!) I was already a "member" of your OneList (later YahooGroup) list and you deleted my membership as a reprecussion of THIS newsgroup...NOT anything that was said in the other. As a matter of fact, I received several e mails from others of the scanner list which stated that exercising your "clout" in such a manner is routine.

Guess they knew you pretty well...eh?

Unless the archives have been deleted (which can be done with YahooGroups) I imagine what few exchanges that ever transpired are still there.

>> As you can see, Dee, he's got a bit of the same "See, I Know More Than
>>You" streak in him that Lennie has...
>
>If you wish to draw that conclusion based on the fact that I responded
>to a request for information by posting information, it's no skin off
>my fanny, Steve. Besides, somebody in this NG has to post something
>besides personal attacks on other users, or the whole NG will consist
>of nothing but half a dozen trolls such as yourself, and the hobby
>deserves better than that.

If this newsgroup actually DID do anything about Amateur Radio's policies, John, you might be right. Several of us have submitted occassional comments to FCC NPRMs, etc, but nothing as a group, and certainly not as the result of any concerted, responsible effort.

As for "personal attacks", well, you've got a long history of that, predating anything I have ever said or done in this forum. Please don't be shy about taking a bow when it's due, John.

And now that you're back with us, it a half dozen plus one.

>> Welcome back, John. Worn out your welcome elsewhere again...?!?!
>
>Actually, I just switched to a different ISP, which has an NNTP
>server, among other things that my old ISP did not (the old one was a
>dialup and an e-mail account, period).

Well...Welcome back.

Steve, K4YZ

4391. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:23:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529042353.18493.00000135@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92455

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/28/2004 9:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040528225612.28114.00000227@mb-m10.aol.com>

>> If somethings true, it's not libelous.
>
> AOL thought it was VERY libelous and cancelled that alternate
> screen name you used then.
>
> You went ballistic on that "home page" and were clearly deep
> into libelous personal attack. AOL concurred.

AOL did what AOL always does...they took the path of least resistance.

>>You DID misrepresent your intentions with an e-mail that
>>contained OTHER than what you attested to it being.
>
> Poor baby. A simple mistake and you go BALLISTIC!

"Ballistic"...?!?!

Hardly. I simply find it incomrehensible that an alleged "professional"
in electronics makes such idiotic "errors" as you tried to pass your escapade
off as.

It only served to substantiate my position that you are not only the liar
I had suggested you were (witness your offer to do one thing but then do
another), but then you compounded it by claiming it was an "error"...One that
any 10 year old with a week's worth of web-surfing experience would ahve not
made.

> It's nice that amateurs have volunteered to help in MARS, but MARS
> is a MILITARY radio service. By definition.

It is a program sponsored by the Armed Forces, "staffed", for the most
part, by civilian volunteers.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple

Steve, K4YZ

4392. Re: CW Testing Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:24:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529042443.18493.00000136@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92456

>Subject: Re: CW Testing Question
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/29/2004 12:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040529010735.23322.00000156@mb-m27.aol.com>

> As you can tell (obviously), few have departed from their
> usual style of attacking all who do not agree with them.

Yes, Lennie...he could see you're still here.

Steve, K4YZ

4393. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:35:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529043545.18493.00000138@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92457

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/29/2004 12:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040529010732.23322.00000154@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040528173813.13413.00000099@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Then we can move along to your investigation as to wheter or not my
>>"service claims" are valid or not. You've certainly been provided more than
>>enough information to get THAT right by now. That's available on the
>>Internet, too.
>
> The United States government put up a web page referencing
> nursie's "military career?!?" [I think not...can't find one]
>
> The Veterans Administration has a web page referencing the
> "hero of hostile actions?!?" [I think not...can't find one]
>
> Has ANY government agency put up a web page all about
> nursie, the "hero of hostile actions?!?" [I think not...not there]
>
> "Provided more than enough information?" Hardly. We don't
> know squat about the date and location of those "hostile
> actions."
>
> Lots of bluff and bluster, shouting, hollering, and nursie name-
> calling. Tsk, tsk, tsk...

The bluffing, bluster, shouting and hollering are yours, Lennie.

Guess you'd rather get your nose rubbed in your weakness and inability to
confirm my having served in the Armed Forces than to acutally do the research
and find out that you were, once again, proven wrong.

>> And while you're at it, please tell us once again how many pieces of
>>traffic YOU were directly responsible for handling in 1953 while assigned as
>>a rear area radio clerk? "1.2 million", was it...?!?!?
>
> Now, now, you're still doing the personal attack thing. I was never
> a "radio clerk."

Sure you were.

You claimed that YOU were responsible for handling "1.2 million" pieces of traffic during your tenure at ADA.

Technicians and maintenence personnel do not handle traffic. They fix the boxes that the radio clerks use to pass the traffic.

> MOS 281.6, Microwave Radio Relay Operations and Maintenance...(SNIP)

YaddaYaddaYadda.

If YOU handled the traffic, then you are misleading us as to what your real MOS was.

> Supervisor [the dot-six in that old MOS nomenclature stood for
> supervisor].....(SNIP TO>>>)

> I wrote long ago is still an estimate based on 9-out-of-12 days at
> the station and 8 hour shifts. Any way you slice it, nursie, that's
> a LOT of message traffic...and every shift supervisor is responsible
> for keeping those messages going out.

Still doesn't wash Lennie.

You were either responsible for the maintenence of the equipment or you were responsible for the operation of it, ie: traffic handling.

> Had you ever done any military communications, you would under-
> stand that. But, you didn't, so you don't.

I did and I do.

You were either a radio clerk or a technician...now which was it?

> All you can do is try to
> intimidate others, bluff and bluster to make yourself far more
> important than you were in real life. Not good, not healthy to do
> that, nursie.

Hey, Lennie...YOU set the precedent, fella! That paragraph RIGHT THERE sums up your entire RRAP career.

> But, you can't control yourself, can you? [no emotional stability]
> Lack of control is very bad for emergency work.
>
> Memorable. And I'm not refering to Memorial Day.

What's memorable is your lack of ability to follow your own mantra, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

4394. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:49:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529044924.18493.00000139@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 92458

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/29/2004 12:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040529010733.23322.00000155@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040528174104.13413.00000100@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> MARS exists as a MILITARY radio service. It can continue to
> do so on its own, without civilian volunteers.

Oh...Really?

Lennie, how many MARSGRAMS have you ever delivered?

How many phonepatches have you conducted for AFLOAT units?

How many MARSGRAMS have you initiated?

I ask because I had the opportunity to handle a LOT of MARSGRAMS over the years, and almost every one I sent wound up being delivered by a volunteer member. I know this since most of the ones I ever sent usually generated a reply message...And the initiating station was almost always an individual's station.

Also, I had the opportunity to be on the AFLOAT end of the patches. Don't suppose you'd care to guess who handled the Stateside end of the patches, would you?

> The FCC doesn't define MARS, never has. MARS is MILITARY.

I am still trying to figure out why you keep trying to reference the FCC when I've never said WHAT the FCC's "definition" is.

>> Still waiting for you to substantiate THAT claim!
>
> It's not up to me to "verify" YOUR bragging.
>
> You made the "hostile action" claim. YOU reference it.

Who's talking about "hostile action", Lennie...?!?! YOU said that I never served PERIOD. That was only a few days ago.

Afterall I WAS able to "substantiate" some of YOUR claims about your "CV"...it didn't take much...Your windiness and brogaddacio led me to the doorstep of people I knew and who could verify your claims.

It wasn't a pretty picture.

> All you do is demand others "call up the VA" or some other
> bogus source, never supplying any factual data or any
> names of associated parties who were also in those
> "hostile actions."

The VA is a bogus source for verifying past military service...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

WHOOOOOOOHOOOOOOO!

> Memorial Day is coming up. Try to remember the where and
> when of those "hostile actions" and then state it in here.
>
> Otherwise, retract that brag of "hostile actions." Memorial
> Day is for REAL heroes, not the big-mouth bass jumping for
> attention in this little pond.

I do remember who that day is for, Lennie.

It's NOT for rear-area radio clerks who tried to embellish thier one-tour
Army hitch on the sacrifices of men who died three years before you were even
in Boot Camp.

Specifically one Leonard H. Anderson.

>> You are a putz, you are a liar, and you ARE a coward.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More hollering and swearing. Wipe off your
> monitor, the saliva is running down the faceplate. What
> will Mrs. Nursie think?

Mrs Nursie would probably tolerate your charades even less than I.

Steve, K4YZ

4395. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 08:50:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>
Source record: 92459

On 28 May 2004 21:38:13 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/28/2004 3:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040528165849.17843.00000164@mb-m19.aol.com>
>>
>snip

> The FACTS are that MARS needs those civilian operators to make the program
>work.

For interest's sake, I did a bit of research on the Web, and found the
following information on the home page for the US Military Alliliate
Radio System:

http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/default.htm

******

"MARS is a Department of Defense sponsored program, established as a
separately managed and operated program by the Army, Navy, and Air
Force. The program consists of licensed amateur radio operators who
are interested in military communications on a local, national, and
international basis as an adjunct to normal communications."

"MARS has a long and proud history of providing world-wide auxiliary
emergency communications during times of need. The combined three
service MARS programs (Army, Air Force, and Navy-Marine Corps)
volunteer force of over 5,000 dedicated and skilled amateur radio
operators is the backbone of the MARS program. The benefit of MARS
membership is enjoying an amateur radio hobby through the
ever-expanding horizon of MARS. Our affiliate members' continued
unselfish support of our mission keeps Army MARS Proud, Professional,
and Ready."

Note the phrase "The program consists of licensed Amateur Radio
Operators" above.

******

"How to Join Army MARS

Eligibility

The applicant must -

Be 17 years of age or older. (Signature of parent or legal guardian is required when an applicant is under 18 years of age.)
Be a United States Citizen or resident alien. (Possess a valid amateur radio license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) or other competent U.S. Authority.)
Possess a station capable of operating on MARS VHF and/or HF frequencies.
Agree to operate a minimum of 12 hours per calendar quarter with 6 hours being on VHF and or HF networks."

Note again the requiremant for participants to be licensed US radio amateurs.

******

"Benefits of Membership

Add to the enjoyment of your amateur radio hobby through the expanded horizon of MARS.

Join a group of dedicated fellow radio amateurs participating in meaningful public service.

Become part of the Army, Navy-Marine Corps, or Air Force MARS worldwide communications system. There are Army MARS stations in Japan, Korea, the Trust Territories, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Central America, Alaska, Germany, Africa, and the continental United States.

Increase your communications skills and capabilities. Selected correspondence courses in communications - electronics subjects are available free to MARS members from their respective affiliated service after completion of six months active membership. Qualified Army MARS members may apply for such courses at the Army Correspondence Course Program web site.

Operate on specially assigned military radio frequencies in voice, teletype, and packet modes of communications."

Once again, note the references to the amateur radio hobby above.

******

From these paragraphs, and the remainder of valuable information on this web site, I'd conclude that the MARS program relies upon the Amateur community to make it work, as it is currently defined. Without amateur operators, the MARS program would have to affiliated with some other communications group to carry their traffic.

This thread is, however, hopelessly mired in a battle over semantics.

Is MARS amateur radio? Well, no, No more so than Amateur Radio is MARS. It is a military radio service, defined and mandated by the military and operating on military frequencies outside of the Amateur bands..

But, without amateur operators to affiliate their communications resources with, the MARS program would not be able to operate as currnetly defined - it exists as a partnership between the military operators and their 5,000-plus volunteer Amateur operator counterparts.

Quite similar to the CFARS program in Canada, and perhaps others around the world.

Just my $.02

>snip
>
>Steve, K4YZ

73, Leo

4396. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 11:44:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040529074414.13985.00000042@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92460

>Subject: Upgrade Questions
>From: bitbucket@linkline.com
>Date: 5/28/04 11:11 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <sgvfb0lll2ctnsesln2j7f1sv8cq5ebtb0@4ax.com>
>
>Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
>safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
>and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
>questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
>'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think).

Yes.

>Is
>the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
>passed the 5 wpm code?

Yes - even if the license is expired. Any Novice license document, Technician Plus license document, or before-February-14-1991 Technician license document carries credit for Element 1 (5 wpm code).

So all you need for a General is your Tech Plus license and a passing grade on Element 3 (General written).

73 de Jim, N2EY

4397. scanner online

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 15:00:14 UTC
From: "h.reijnierse" <reijnierse@home.nl>
Message-ID: <c9a8i3$sm1$1@news4.tilbu1.nb.home.nl>
Source record: 92461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.scanner,uk.radio.amateur

http://members.home.nl/reijnierse/

4398. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 15:23:50 UTC
From: bitbucket@linkline.com
Message-ID: <9jahb0tei855f3ei2jkakeribe900gubc0@4ax.com>
Source record: 92462

On 29 May 2004 11:44:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote:

|>Subject: Upgrade Questions
|>From: bitbucket@linkline.com
|>Date: 5/28/04 11:11 PM Eastern Daylight Time
|>Message-id: <sgvfb0lll2ctnsesln2j7f1sv8cq5ebtb0@4ax.com>
|>
|>Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
|>safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
|>and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
|>questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
|>'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think).
|
|Yes.
|
|>Is
|>the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
|>passed the 5 wpm code?
|
|Yes - even if the license is expired. Any Novice license document, Technician
|Plus license document, or before-February-14-1991 Technician license document
|carries credit for Element 1 (5 wpm code).
|
|So all you need for a General is your Tech Plus license and a passing grade on
|Element 3 (General written).
|
|73 de Jim, N2EY

Thank you Jim. I go test this morning then. Believe I'm up for
Extra, at least have had the theory for years just couldn't get up the
code speed, then couldn't get me a 'round tuit' to go test.

Ron KE6OJD

4399. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 15:24:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <sfCdnfk6u6rxNiXdRVn-gw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92463

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040529074414.13985.00000042@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >Subject: Upgrade Questions
> >From: bitbucket@linkline.com
> >Date: 5/28/04 11:11 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <sgvfb0lll2ctnsesln2j7f1sv8cq5ebtb0@4ax.com>
> >
> >Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
> >safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
> >and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
> >questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
> >'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think).
>
> Yes.
>
> >Is
> >the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
> >passed the 5 wpm code?
>
> Yes - even if the license is expired. Any Novice license document,
Technician
> Plus license document, or before-February-14-1991 Technician license
document
> carries credit for Element 1 (5 wpm code).
>
> So all you need for a General is your Tech Plus license and a passing
grade on
> Element 3 (General written).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Try to find the original though as it is always a good idea to take both the original and a copy if possible. Be sure you have a spare copy at home as the VEs will keep one to attach to your upgrade application.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4400. Re: An open letter to high-el

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 15:35:12 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@swlantman.net>
Message-ID: <c9aaf3vpa0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92464

"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
news:971d2e488fbfd4b1caa354cd16ea0eec@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> Get railed, assmonkey.
>

It is not too difficult to understand why Roger, a.k.a. The Glendale Gnome
has so much resentment for Dave Heil. Dave is everything that Wogie
is not. Dave has a beautiful family, a nice home, and served honorably
as a representative of his country overseas. Moreover, Dave is
respected, something no one has for Woger. And Wogie, that
ample body weight of yours is unhealthy, especially with your 5' 6" frame.

73s de Lloyd

4401. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 21:57:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529175703.16314.00000158@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92465

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: Leo nomail@noway.com
>Date: 5/29/2004 3:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>

>But, without amateur operators to affiliate their communications
>resources with, the MARS program would not be able to operate as
>currnetly defined - it exists as a partnership between the military
>operators and their 5,000-plus volunteer Amateur operator
>counterparts.

Thanks, Leo...This is what I have been saying.

Billy Booper wants to transleate it literally, and Lennie...Well, Lennie
is Lennie and he STILL hasn't produced anything substantial of an Amateur Radio
"career".

73

Steve, K4YZ

4402. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 22:48:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529184847.10886.00000303@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92466

In article <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>> The FACTS are that MARS needs those civilian operators to make the
>>program work.

Actually, no. :-) See the Army Communicator write-up on "Grecian
Firebolt 2002" at -

www.gordon.army.mil/AC/Wntr02/MARS.htm

Army Communicator is the Signal Center's quarterly magazine,
distributed only to Signal Corps folks but archives are open to the
public on the 'net.

>For interest's sake, I did a bit of research on the Web, and found the
>following information on the home page for the US Military Alliliate
>Radio System:
>
>http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/default.htm

That one is maintained at Fort Huachuca, AZ, the NETCOM Hq
for MARS for the U.S. Army. For the other branches -

www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/pdf/d46502_01298/d46502p.pdf

for the current (21 Nov 03) issue of Directive 4650.2 from DoD, PDF
version. That Directive spells it out for all U.S. military branches.

http://public.afca.af.mil/LIBRARY/MARS.HTM

for the Scott AFB USAF Communications Agency Hq.

http://www.navymars.org/ for USN-USMC

There's a bunch more, such as a brief mention on the bottom half of
page 128 of "Vietnam studies Communications-Electronics 1962-1970"
monograph by Major General Rienzi at the U.S. Army Center For
Military History (CMH). That shows a photo of an AN/FRC-93 in use
in Vietnam, making a phone patch back to the states. Rienzi says
that 42,000 phone patches a month were being done by MARS
stations in Vietnam at the close of that period. That's an excellent
record and something to be proud of, but it was also over 30 years
ago when the U.S. had about a third of a million military serving in
southeast Asia.

Closer to date, Grecian Firebolt 2002 was an exercise of 600 MARS
stations (all branches of the military) simulating a terrorist attack on

the USA. That is reported to have gone off well in liason with several civilian emergency services. [Army Communicator issue cited] The article doesn't specify that civilians were involved although it mentioned several Guard units (National and Air, not independent state "guard" units).

The quick timeline of MARS -

1925 AARS or Army Amateur Radio Service organized, small, Army only, never more than 5600 up to 7 Dec 41.
1941-1946 pause for WW2.
1946 AARS resumes operation.
1948 Reorganization, includes new separate AF, renamed MARS.
1962 USN-USMC joins MARS, all military branches now in MARS.

In the overall U.S. military picture, MARS was never a significant communications service. It was, in the '65 to '70 period, very good as a morale-boosting service for servicepeople such as those in Vietnam (who could get to a 'Nam MARS station...not always possible). MARS facilities were never required to support, let alone supplant the very large communications structure of the U.S. military and most MARS stations used (to be delicate) cast-offs for their station equipments. The exception was the procurement of the AN/FRC-93 HF transceiver, the commercial version (full crystal bank) of the Collins KWM2. [I have the TM on it and can tell where to get it for free PDF download...even for Canadians... :-)]

The Army Communicator is a good source of information on U.S. military land radios and is open to public access. So are older issues of Signal (monthly) published by AFCEA at that website. Army Communicator is found at Fort Gordon, GA, website at

http://www.gordon.army.mil/

AFCA (Air Force Communications Agency) has a nice website out of Scott AFB (near St. Louis, on the Illinois side of the Mississippi). There's a nice small museum there at the public lobby of AFCA but their standout is their publications. For an overall history of Air Force oriented communications, the free download of "From Flares To Satellites" is most informative, well-written, good illustrations of past to present. [rather a large download, good for a coffee break while it rolls in]

Note: At the end of the 1950s, the USAF started phasing into taking over of land-based HF communications while the US Army phased slowly into implementing the DSN (Digital Switched Network) and higher-speed data communications. Army was still the mainstay of field communications by radio in southeast Asia from Saigon to all other parts by everything from UHF radio relay through underwater cable to troposcatter relay for 200 to 300 mile shoots over all terrain. Army pioneered the communications satellite use on a 24-hour, multi-channel basis in the mid-60s,

linking southeast Asia with Hawaii. Advancement, breaking new ground. Things changing, new paradigms in all communications.

Something to remember on our national holiday of Memorial.

LHA / WMD

4403. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-29 23:05:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040529190508.28114.00000234@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92467

In article <20040529175703.16314.00000158@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: Leo nomail@noway.com
>>Date: 5/29/2004 3:50 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>
>
>>But, without amateur operators to affiliate their communications
>>resources with, the MARS program would not be able to operate as
>>currnetly defined - it exists as a partnership between the military
>>operators and their 5,000-plus volunteer Amateur operator
>>counterparts.
>
> Thanks, Leo...This is what I have been saying.
>
> Billy Booper wants to transleate it literally, and Lennie...Well, Lennie
>is Lennie and he STILL hasn't produced anything substantial of an Amateur
>Radio "career".

"Transleate?!?" :-)

"Career in amateurism" is necessary?!?

Poor nursie, still hurting. Never did work in military communications, therefore no one else is worth anything... :-)

By Directive, by definition, MARS is MILITARY, not amateur.

MARS can stand on its own, netting with other government radio services.

Yes, MARS did good for morale using lots of civilian amateur radio volunteers, doing phone patches from places like Vietnam and other overseas locations. That time has passed with the advent of the Internet and ability to access the 'net in most world locations. That's been proven in the second Gulf War.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Try to get used to it. Get another flag to wave.

LHA / WMD

4404. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 04:05:59 UTC
From: KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <6fnib09t4ngv0c3egb9msehj5offqcuogf@4ax.com>
Source record: 92468

On Fri, 28 May 2004 20:11:36 -0700, <bitbucket@linkline.com> wrote:

>Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
>safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
>and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
>questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
>'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think). Is
>the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
>passed the 5 wpm code?
>
>Thanks.
>
>Ron KE6OJD

Ron,
Yes. And Yes.

Raymond Sirois KU2S
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

4405. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 04:52:04 UTC
From: bitbucket@linkline.com
Message-ID: <l7oib0hgne57fgh5i9jp0t1lislq3346j6@4ax.com>
Source record: 92469

On Fri, 28 May 2004 20:11:36 -0700, <bitbucket@linkline.com> wrote:

|Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
|safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
|and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
|questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
|'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think). Is
|the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
|passed the 5 wpm code?
|
|Thanks.
|
|Ron KE6OJD

Thanks for the replies guys. I did go in there cold this morning, and flubbed the dub for General. What was good about 10 years ago isn't good enough today. I was surprised by all the questions about radiation protection, some digital questions, plus probably a few that I simply forgot. Can't say I'm too disappointed as what I feel I missed was all brand new to me (wish I could have seen which questions I missed, but guess that is verboten). As long as I'm studying, guess I'll practice the code again too. CW was neat, though I haven't touched a key in over seven years and couldn't copy today if I tried. (I'm told that code comes back rather quickly--is that so?) Another surprise was the $12 to take the test. Wasn't it about $3 or so 10 years ago? Anyway the interest level has gone back up, so I'll be back.

Cheers.

Ron KE6OJD

4406. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 12:50:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040530085053.06079.00000118@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 92470

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/29/2004 5:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040529184847.10886.00000303@mb-m05.aol.com>
>
>In article <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@noway.com>
>writes:
>
>>> The FACTS are that MARS needs those civilian operators to make the
>>>program work.
>
> Actually, no.

Actually, yes.

Withdrawl of Amatuer assets would result in an overall loss that would cripple the program. Without those participants there'd be nothing to be "affiliated" with.

> Something to remember on our national holiday of Memorial.

It's enlightening to see what you consider memorable, considering that you seem to forget honor and respect the rest of the year.

Thanks for the historical piece on MARS. Your cut-and-paste skills are at an all time high.

No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

4407. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 15:37:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <WrudnRgVEtBoYiTdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92471

<bitbucket@linkline.com> wrote in message
news:l7oib0hgne57fgh5i9jp0t1lislq3346j6@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 28 May 2004 20:11:36 -0700, <bitbucket@linkline.com> wrote:
>
> |Almost 10 years ago I got my Tech Plus license. Figuring I'd play it
> |safe, I put the original in a 'safe' place, and have copies of it here
> |and there. Now, I want to upgrade instead of simply renewing. Two
> |questions: Is a copy sufficient when I go for the exams? (That
> |'safe' place remains safe from ever finding it again, I think). Is
> |the 'Plus' in the Tech Plus, sufficient proof that I have taken and
> |passed the 5 wpm code?
> |
> |Thanks.
> |
> |Ron KE6OJD
>
> Thanks for the replies guys. I did go in there cold this morning, and
> flubbed the dub for General. What was good about 10 years ago isn't
> good enough today. I was surprised by all the questions about
> radiation protection, some digital questions, plus probably a few that
> I simply forgot. Can't say I'm too disappointed as what I feel I
> missed was all brand new to me (wish I could have seen which questions
> I missed, but guess that is verboten). As long as I'm studying, guess
> I'll practice the code again too. CW was neat, though I haven't
> touched a key in over seven years and couldn't copy today if I tried.
> (I'm told that code comes back rather quickly--is that so?) Another
> surprise was the $12 to take the test. Wasn't it about $3 or so 10
> years ago? Anyway the interest level has gone back up, so I'll be
> back.
>
> Cheers.
>
> Ron KE6OJD

The VEs simply don't know what questions you missed. Telling you that it was question 4, for example, doesn't tell you the topic. On one version of the exam, it might be radiation safety and on another it might be band limits.

By the way the question pool canges on July 1 of this year, so either get the current study guide and take the test before then or get the new one and take it after that. Although if you actually learn the material rather than just memorizing the answers, the subjects covered in the pool generally don't change that much so you would still be able to pass if you use the "wrong" study guide.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4408. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 16:58:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040530125823.17756.00000359@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92472

In article <20040530085053.06079.00000118@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/29/2004 5:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040529184847.10886.00000303@mb-m05.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <m6hgb01mio0isrhj9mh91f2tss8ujpvitq@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@noway.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>> The FACTS are that MARS needs those civilian operators to make the
>>>>program work.
>>
>> Actually, no.
>
> Actually, yes.
>
> Withdrawl of Amatuer assets would result in an overall loss that would
>cripple the program. Without those participants there'd be nothing to be
>"affiliated" with.

MARS never worked with "amatuer assets." :-)

You've never read DoD Directive 4650.2 (21 Nov 03) have you?

MARS was never created, implemented, or directed to be a PART
of regular military tactical or strategic communications. It was
created - essentially - for morale and public relations activities, a
link between civilians and military. Over the years the role of MARS
has shifted from the morale and PR aspect to being a "go-between"
between established military communications and government
emergency and aid agencies.

> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.

Again, MARS never worked with "amatuer radio." :-)

Your original assertion was (see thread title) "MARS is amateur
radio."

That original assertion is WRONG.

MARS is (obviously) MILITARY.

MARS was originally created BY the military. It exists today on its own as organic with the military structure and can function by itself. The 2002 exercise of Grecian Firebolt over four weeks back two years ago proved that.

You try to backpedal by changing your assertion that "No amateur radio = no MARS." That too is WRONG.

MARS hasn't had the word "amateur" in its acronym since 1948.

The FCC didn't create MARS nor does it regulate it. Department of Defense authorizes MARS (see Directive 4650.2).

> It really is THAT simple.

Yes, what I've explained IS simple...but you REFUSE to accept reality outside your imagination. Twice, really, first in the original assertion and then in the revised form, both of which are incorrect. You stubbornly insist you are right, almost in outrage (once again misspelling "amateur" twice, as done in previous postings).

That's a sign of a disordered mind (along with refusal to accept reality and constant displayed sociopathy). Get mental help.

LHA / WMD

4409. Re: Upgrade Questions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 20:02:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <N5ruc.4386$ia6.3502@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92473

<bitbucket@linkline.com> wrote in message
news:l7oib0hgne57fgh5i9jp0t1lislq3346j6@4ax.com...
> Thanks for the replies guys. I did go in there cold this morning, and
> flubbed the dub for General. What was good about 10 years ago isn't
> good enough today. I was surprised by all the questions about
> radiation protection, some digital questions, plus probably a few that
> I simply forgot. Can't say I'm too disappointed as what I feel I
> missed was all brand new to me (wish I could have seen which questions
> I missed, but guess that is verboten). As long as I'm studying, guess
> I'll practice the code again too. CW was neat, though I haven't
> touched a key in over seven years and couldn't copy today if I tried.
> (I'm told that code comes back rather quickly--is that so?) Another
> surprise was the $12 to take the test. Wasn't it about $3 or so 10
> years ago? Anyway the interest level has gone back up, so I'll be
> back.
>
> Cheers.
>
> Ron KE6OJD

Hello, Ron

Dee had an excellent answer concerning theory. The reality is that if you have a good grasp of theory, you can miss a lot of the other stuff (like band edges) and still pass quite handily.

Code does come back; a lot has to do with what speed you obtained in the past. I've seen it posted (but am not sure, myself) that if you got past 10 or 12 words per minute in the past, you'll be rusty - but it comes back quickly. I had, in the past, memorized the land-line morse and even used it; however, I was using a mental look-up table for the characters that were different. I have totally forgotten it (with the exception of the letters "c" and "q" LOL). First licensed as a novice in 1962, I obtained my extra and commercial telegraph (2nd class) in 1966. In 1967 I copied, without any errors, 40 words per minute cw on a typewriter. My last cw contact was either late 1969 or early 1970, just before I left the service. I let my licenses expire.

I decided to get my amateur license back in 1993. I found out when and where the test was given (the Rochester Amateur Radio Association starts in the fall and ends sometime around May or June, I'm not sure) about 5 hours before the test. I had neither sent nor received Morse in well over twenty years. I passed my extra. It wasn't pretty (likely no more than 15 to 20 characters/numbers in a row), but was enough to answer the questions. After that, I wrote some software to send and receive Morse. Not wishing to debug

at 15 or 20 words per minute, the writing and debugging (and trying) the software got me up a bit. I'm not back to 50 over the air and perfect copy at 40, but would likely have little trouble at 30. Regardless, if you have copied cw before, it will come back. More rapidly if you had gotten to 12 words per minute or higher. If you still know all the letter/number/prosigns/punctuation, I can assure you it will come back quite quickly.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.692 / Virus Database: 453 - Release Date: 5/28/04

4410. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-30 22:33:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040530183347.27620.00000169@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92474

```
>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/30/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040530125823.17756.00000359@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040530085053.06079.00000118@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Withdrawl of Amatuer assets would result in an overall loss that would
>>cripple the program. Without those participants there'd be nothing to be
>>"affiliated" with.
>
> MARS never worked with "amatuer assets."

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

So, Lennie...Those thousands of persons who have membership in the various
branch progrmas are NOT an ASSET to those programs...?!?!

WHAT AN IDIOT ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

> You've never read DoD Directive 4650.2 (21 Nov 03) have you?

You've never been a member of those programs and have PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE
in what makes them tick, have you...?!?!?

> MARS was never created, implemented, or directed to be a PART
> of regular military tactical or strategic communications. It was
> created - essentially - for morale and public relations activities, a
> link between civilians and military. Over the years the role of MARS
> has shifted from the morale and PR aspect to being a "go-between"
> between established military communications and government
> emergency and aid agencies.

OK...SO you AGREE with what I've been saying all along then!

>> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.
>
> Again, MARS never worked with "amatuer radio."

And again, your ignorance is showing!

> Your original assertion was (see thread title) "MARS is amateur
> radio."
>
> That original assertion is WRONG.
```

That you cannot think in the abstract is flamingly obvious!

> MARS is (obviously) MILITARY.

A "military" program that DEPENDS upon licnesed Amateurs to run.

> MARS was originally created BY the military. It exists today on its
> own as organic with the military structure and can function by
> itself. The 2002 exercise of Grecian Firebolt over four weeks back
> two years ago proved that.
>
> You try to backpedal by changing your assertion that "No amateur
> radio = no MARS." That too is WRONG.
>
> MARS hasn't had the word "amateur" in its acronym since 1948.

Doesn't matter.

In order to accomplish it's tasked goals, MARS needs those lincesed
Amateurs in order to function.

> The FCC didn't create MARS nor does it regulate it. Department
> of Defense authorizes MARS (see Directive 4650.2).

Why do you keep trying to make an issue of this, Lennie? I've never
mentioned the FCC in any of these exchanges?

>> It really is THAT simple.
>
> Yes, what I've explained IS simple...but you REFUSE to accept
> reality outside your imagination. Twice, really, first in the original
> assertion and then in the revised form, both of which are incorrect.
> You stubbornly insist you are right, almost in outrage (once again
> misspelling "amateur" twice, as done in previous postings).

You've only quoted from published manuals and directives. It still does
not accurately reflect the true character of the MARS programs.

There's nothing INaccurate in what you've QUOTED when you've quoted it,
it's just that YOU refuse to accept that CURRENT MARS PRACTICE AND NEEDS are
DEPENDENT upon LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS to fulfill.

> That's a sign of a disordered mind (along with refusal to accept
> reality and constant displayed sociopathy). Get mental help.

What YOU have demonstrated is that YOU are trying to express an opinion
based upon purely theoretical or stricty "by the book" definitions and DO NOT
understand the actual functionings of ANY of the programs.

I again ask you how many MARSGRAMS have YOU processed?

How many phonepatches for AFLOAT units have you ran?

How's that Navy-Marine Corps MARS application going?

Please, Lennie...show us what PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE you have in ANY MARS program....Of course you can always regale us with your exploits of 63 years ago...

Steve, K4YZ

4411. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 00:08:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040530200855.15095.00000159@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92475

In article <20040530183347.27620.00000169@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/30/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040530125823.17756.00000359@mb-m03.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040530085053.06079.00000118@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Withdrawl of Amatuer assets would result in an overall loss that would
>>>cripple the program. Without those participants there'd be nothing to be
>>>"affiliated" with.
>>
>> MARS never worked with "amatuer assets."
>
>BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
>HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !
>
> So, Lennie...Those thousands of persons who have membership in the
>various branch progrmas are NOT an ASSET to those programs...?!?!
>
> WHAT AN IDIOT ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

You wrote "amatuer" twice instead of the proper word "amateur."

Neither MARS nor the FCC has used "amatuers."

You have a near-constant tendency to misspell "amateur" in the
haste you seem to have (or possibly outrage, anger) to attempt
"cutting me off at the knees." :-)

>> You've never read DoD Directive 4650.2 (21 Nov 03) have you?
>
> You've never been a member of those programs and have PRACTICAL
>EXPERIENCE in what makes them tick, have you...?!?!?

Actually, I've operated one MARS transmitter allowed at the ADA
site long ago. Otherwise, no, I've never "operated MARS."

Closest I got to interplanetary communications was with the ALSEP
stations placed on the moon. Did supervise unmanned spacecraft
assembly that (eventually) orbited Mars.

On Terra, I've not been required to be an attorney of any kind in
reading and understanding of various laws from the government,
nor did I need to be any kind of commissioned officer in the
military to read and understand military specifications.

>> MARS was never created, implemented, or directed to be a PART
>> of regular military tactical or strategic communications. It was
>> created - essentially - for morale and public relations activities, a
>> link between civilians and military. Over the years the role of MARS
>> has shifted from the morale and PR aspect to being a "go-between"
>> between established military communications and government
>> emergency and aid agencies.
>
> OK...SO you AGREE with what I've been saying all along then!

Not at all.

You've said "MARS is amateur radio."

That's false. MARS is MILITARY.

>>> No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.
>>
>> Again, MARS never worked with "amatuer radio."
>
> And again, your ignorance is showing!

MARS likes to get volunteers from amateur radio, NOT "amatuer radio."

There's no such thing as "amatuer radio." :-)

>> Your original assertion was (see thread title) "MARS is amateur
>> radio."
>>
>> That original assertion is WRONG.
>
> That you cannot think in the abstract is flamingly obvious!

I'd say it is a case of you not being able to "think" at all.

MARS is MILITARY by DoD Directive, by regulations from all
three military branches.

The FCC doesn't define MARS, doesn't and cannot regulate it.

>> MARS is (obviously) MILITARY.
>
> A "military" program that DEPENDS upon licnesed Amateurs to run.

No. MARS is "run" by military personnel. U.S. Army MARS Hq
is NETCOM at Fort Huachuca, AZ. They use military radio
equipment for MARS there.

>> MARS was originally created BY the military. It exists today on its
>> own as organic with the military structure and can function by
>> itself. The 2002 exercise of Grecian Firebolt over four weeks back

>> two years ago proved that.
>>
>> You try to backpedal by changing your assertion that "No amateur
>> radio = no MARS." That too is WRONG.
>>
>> MARS hasn't had the word "amateur" in its acronym since 1948.
>
> Doesn't matter.

It did to the U.S. Army. It created the predecessor of MARS in
the AARS or Army Amateur Radio Service in 1925. Newly-
created USAF joined in 1948 and the AARS was renamed
MARS.

> In order to accomplish it's tasked goals, MARS needs those lincesed
>Amateurs in order to function.

MARS doesn't use "lincesed amateurs."

VOLUNTEERS for MARS operations come from "licensed amateurs."

>> The FCC didn't create MARS nor does it regulate it. Department
>> of Defense authorizes MARS (see Directive 4650.2).
>
> Why do you keep trying to make an issue of this, Lennie? I've never
>mentioned the FCC in any of these exchanges?

MARS is MILITARY.

Radio amateurs are licensed (not "lincesed") by the FCC. FCC
can only license (not "lincese") CIVIL radio, not military.

>
>>> It really is THAT simple.
>>
>> Yes, what I've explained IS simple...but you REFUSE to accept
>> reality outside your imagination. Twice, really, first in the original
>> assertion and then in the revised form, both of which are incorrect.
>> You stubbornly insist you are right, almost in outrage (once again
>> misspelling "amateur" twice, as done in previous postings).
>
> You've only quoted from published manuals and directives. It still
>does not accurately reflect the true character of the MARS programs.

Your "reflections on true character" exist only in your mind.

MARS is adequately described by MILITARY directives and
regulations. Some MARS operations have been written up in
the Army Center for Military History.

If you wish to imagine that your volunteerism with any MARS
makes you a part of the military service, that is just your
imagination working too hard.

> There's nothing INaccurate in what you've QUOTED when you've quoted it,
>it's just that YOU refuse to accept that CURRENT MARS PRACTICE AND NEEDS >are
DEPENDENT upon LICENSED RADIO AMATEURS to fulfill.

No again. MARS can operate by itself, using just military personnel.

It did that in Grecian Thunderbolt 2002 for four weeks according to
the quarterly Army Communicator.

> What YOU have demonstrated is that YOU are trying to express an opinion
>based upon purely theoretical or stricty "by the book" definitions and DO NOT
>understand the actual functionings of ANY of the programs.

No. I've merely stated the reality of MARS along with some of its
known history.

As a licensed radio amateur (not a "lincesed" one) you have to
both operate and conduct yourself "by the book" of Part 97 in order
to retain your amateur radio license (not "lincese") grant.

> I again ask you how many MARSGRAMS have YOU processed?

I've tried to send three of those MARS messages through the
local FEC Hq. MARS detachment. They never got forwarded.
Surface mail was far more reliable. :-)

> How many phonepatches for AFLOAT units have you ran?

"AFLOAT?" Is that some kind of MARS auxilliary? :-)

> How's that Navy-Marine Corps MARS application going?

Why are you so concerned about "applying to Navy MARS?"

I've never said that I wanted to participate in MARS.

> Please, Lennie...show us what PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE you have in ANY MARS
>program....Of course you can always regale us with your exploits of 63 years
>ago...

"Regale exploits of 63 years ago?!?" :-)

63 years ago would make it the year 1941. I was 8 years
old then.

You didn't exist in 1941. Your parents were never able
to bear children in 1941.

They should have stayed with that ability. :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4412. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 18:29:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040531142907.19885.00000261@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92476

9 PM EDST tonight, 7037 kHz CW

73 de Jim, N2EY

4413. Re: BXN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 18:44:10 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_1Luc.33757$DC1.6335866@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92477

Count me in!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040531142907.19885.00000261@mb-m06.aol.com...
> 9 PM EDST tonight, 7037 kHz CW
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4414. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 22:30:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405311430.61263fa0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92478

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040525153620.16651.00001900@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/25/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405250945.355bfb2a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040525095344.15096.00001850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/24/2004 6:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405241550.5260e680@posting.google.com>
>
> >> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
> >> physical rehab after I was retired out.
> >>
> >> Those "disabilities" came from service connected injuries. Doing
> their
> >> "work".
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Yeh, yeh. You claim to work in an ER where lifting of patients and
> >various other intense stressors are at work. Why wouldn't you be fit
> >for duty in the USMC?
>
> OK, PuppetBoy...let's go back up a couple lines and see if you can figure
> out why you are such an idiot...
>
> QUOTE:
>
> >> From "work" I was cleared to do AFTER I completed the USMC required
> >> physical rehab after I was retired out.
>
> UNQUOTE
>
> "...required physical rehab..."
>
> Now, do ya need it in any other language, or is your cranial-rectal
> inversion quota filled for the day...?!?!
>
> "I'm laughing at the superior intellect..."
>

> Steve, K4YZ

Why do you need disability if you've been rehabilitated?

Why do you draw two checks, but only work for one of them?

4415. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 22:40:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405311440.33e20bbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92479

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527214021.16314.00000022@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/27/2004 7:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271631.2cd3ab0b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040527144116.09269.00000004@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> Robert asks you a question about Amateurs operating on military
> >> >> frequencies for military purposes and YOU respond with some assinine
> statement
> >> >> about "most municipal radio operators" wearing police uniforms.
> >> >
> >> >So?
> >>
> >> "So?", indeed.
> >>
> >> >> That in ITSELF is completely foolish since police departments are
> only
> a
> >> >> fractional part of most municipal payrolls. There's the Fire
> Department,
> EMS,
> >> >> Department of Sanitation, the utilities departments, roads and highways,
> >> >> etc...all of whom hav SOME sort of radio service that they use.
> >> >
> >> >Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
> >>
> >> Does it make any difference to you that youw ere AGAIN shown to have
> been
> >> wrong?
> >>
> >> Does it make any difference to you that it's an easy thing to do?
> >
> >Does it make them Policemen? Does it make them MARS Ops?
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, Dispatcher >>>IS<<< MARS."
> >
> >Hi hi!
>
> "Hi hi" indeed, Brain.
>

> I am sure you hear quite a bit of laughter.

I do.

> >> >> Remember, Brain, YOU are the one who set the "precedent" that if
> there
> is
> >> >> even ONE example to the contrary, you have been proven WRONG.
> >> >
> >> >I kindly direct you to the word, "most" in my response.
> >>
> >> I see that.
> >>
> >> That's what's wrong, PuppetBoy.
> >
> >No. It is not. It is not all inclusive, such as your use of the word
> >">>>IS<<<."
>
> OK, Brain.
>
> If you insist.

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," you keep insisting.

> >> The police department does NOT constitute the "most" of any municipal
> pool
> >> of employees. Even in the smallest towns that I have lived in the police
> force
> >> represented, at the MOST, 1/4th of the municipal payroll.
> >
> >Oh, I see what you're desperately trying to do.
> >
> >You're including all of the non-radio users in your computation in an
> >attempt to find a leg to stand on.
> >
> >Grasping, grasping; and still sliding downward.
>
> Brain....YOU said that "most" MUNICIPAL radio operators wore police
> uniforms.
>
> It's not me doing the grasping.
>
> Now...Try again, PuppetBoy. Your mentor is watching.

So what. I didn't take all of one group and say that it is equal to
another group, just because there may be a relationship. You did.

> >> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police uniforms".
> >>
> >> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.
> >
> >No, it isn't. We're kind of heavy on LE here.

>
> Yes, It it.

I like it that way. Keeps the creepy crawlies away.

> But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is "kind
> of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.

People with good incomes.

> >> >Would you say that "most" means, "is" or "equal to?"
>
> >> >> Now...HOW did you go from discussing operating on military
> frequencies
> to
> >> >> "municipal radio operators"...?!?!
> >> >
> >> >How did you go from MARS to Amateur Radio?
> >>
> >> MARS is dependent upon Amateur Radio. No Amatuer Radio = No MARS.
> >
> >Sure they are. They use up all them amateur frequencies and rely upon
> >Riley for enforcement. Subject to Part 97. Hi hi!
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
> Brian..TRY and get ONE thing right today, OK...?!?!

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Hi hi.

4416. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-05-31 22:50:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92480

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:<Rk8uc.11367$oi5.4004@fed1read07>...
> FYI: A MARS and Veterans Communicators Reunion is in the making -- a
> friend AC6V has posted it on his website.
>
> MARS = Military Affiliate Radio System
>
> http://ac6v.com/MARSREUNION.htm
>
> Please don't e-mail me (I'm Anon) or AC6V
>
> See web page for contacts and further info.

This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
providing such interesting topics.

4417. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 07:01:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601030151.13318.00000138@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92481

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 5/30/2004 7:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040530200855.15095.00000159@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040530183347.27620.00000169@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> So, Lennie...Those thousands of persons who have membership in the
>>various branch progrmas are NOT an ASSET to those programs...?!?!
>>
>> WHAT AN IDIOT ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !
>
> You wrote "amatuer" twice instead of the proper word "amateur."
>
> Neither MARS nor the FCC has used "amatuers."
>
> You have a near-constant tendency to misspell "amateur" in the
> haste you seem to have (or possibly outrage, anger) to attempt
> "cutting me off at the knees."

I see.

You make idiotic replies based solely upon a typo.

Which makes you even MORE idiotic, considering your alleged education.

> VOLUNTEERS for MARS operations come from "licensed amateurs."

So other than your attempt to "undermine" my points based upon a
transposed letter, we can again assume that you agree with me that MARS depends
upon these licensed Amateurs to run the program.

> If you wish to imagine that your volunteerism with any MARS
> makes you a part of the military service, that is just your
> imagination working too hard.

If YOU wish to try and suppose that, then you are welcome to.

It seems to me that you have an unwavering hatred of anyone who's done
anything you HAVEN'T done, or HAS done, only better.

>> I again ask you how many MARSGRAMS have YOU processed?
>
> I've tried to send three of those MARS messages through the
> local FEC Hq. MARS detachment. They never got forwarded.

> Surface mail was far more reliable.

Uh huh.

>> How many phonepatches for AFLOAT units have you ran?
>
> "AFLOAT?" Is that some kind of MARS auxilliary?

Yet another demosntration of your lack of experience.

>> How's that Navy-Marine Corps MARS application going?
>
> Why are you so concerned about "applying to Navy MARS?"

You said that N/MC MARS regualtions didn't specify a need for licensure
in the Amateur Radio Service to be a member. You said you could do it. I was
waiting to see if you could/would, if only to prove you could.

You didn't, obviously, which is exactly what I would expect of you.

A lot of blustery brogadaccio with no net effect.

> I've never said that I wanted to participate in MARS.

Under current circumstances, you won't be allowed to.

>> Please, Lennie...show us what PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE you have in ANY MARS
>>program....Of course you can always regale us with your exploits of 63 years
>>ago...
>
> "Regale exploits of 63 years ago?!?" :-)
>
> 63 years ago would make it the year 1941. I was 8 years
> old then.
>
> You didn't exist in 1941. Your parents were never able
> to bear children in 1941.

Oh? You know my parents? You know when they married? You know that I am
the youngest/oldest of the family?

Forgive my math error. I forgive you many of yours. None the less, it
remains that the ONLY "military" communications experience you have was over
half a century ago. NONE of it in any MARS program.

> They should have stayed with that ability.

As should have yours.

Speaking of which, when are we gonna get the scopp on YOUR child rearing
experiences? Still waiting on the source of your background for the assertion
that Amateur licenses should be age-limitied

> Temper fry...

Not here...

Steve, K4YZ

4418. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 07:12:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601031218.13318.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92482

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/31/2004 5:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311440.33e20bbd@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527214021.16314.00000022@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> "Hi hi" indeed, Brain.
>>
>> I am sure you hear quite a bit of laughter.
>
>I do.

No doubt.

>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," you keep insisting.

No, Brian...YOU keep insisting.

I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.

You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
disporve any other assertion I have made.

Suvks to be you, PuppetBoy!

>> Brain....YOU said that "most" MUNICIPAL radio operators wore police
>> uniforms.
>>
>> It's not me doing the grasping.
>>
>> Now...Try again, PuppetBoy. Your mentor is watching.
>
>So what. I didn't take all of one group and say that it is equal to
>another group, just because there may be a relationship. You did.

"So what", indeed.

YOU said that "MOST" municipal "radio operators" wore police uniforms.

I (accurately) pointed out that that police force is only one segment of
municipal workers that use two-way radios, and do NOT comprise "most" of the
municipal work force.

Also, >>I<< did not make ANY analogy to municipal workers in this or any
other thread.

You did.

Now...try as you might, it's already archived that you did this. Now you are trying to wiggle out of it.

STILL sucks to be you.

>> >> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police >uniforms".
>> >>
>> >> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.
>> >
>> >No, it isn't. We're kind of heavy on LE here.
>>
>> Yes, It it.
>
>I like it that way. Keeps the creepy crawlies away.

Obviously not. You're still there.

>> But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is >"kind
>> of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.
>
>People with good incomes.

Ahhhhhhhhhhhhh....Now you base the character of your neighbors based upon thier paychecks?

What a FREAKIN' SCUMBAG you are!

Geeeze-Loweeze, Burke! You sink just a bit lower EVERY TIME YOU POST!

>> Brian..TRY and get ONE thing right today, OK...?!?!
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
>Hi hi.

Keep laughing, Burkie. It's the only thing funny about you. The rest is just plain pitiful.

Steve, K4YZ

4419. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 07:15:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92483

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>

>This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
>"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
>providing such interesting topics.

Hmmmmm....I just might go.

Sere you in Vegas, Brain?...Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out that weekend?

Steve, K4YZ

4420. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 14:08:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406010608.5eef0874@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92484

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040527214556.16314.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/27/2004 7:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
> >> >7037 next Monday night?
> >>
> >> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now. I
> am
> >> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
> >> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
> >> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
> >>
> >> 73
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.
>
> Depends on who you want to talk to and where they are.

As always.

> Yes, from my QTH to yours would probably present a several db difference.
>
> But remember what NVIS is for. It's for using HF spectrum for local to
> regional communications. It's NOT for continental or DX purposes. I have a
> very specific need to have reliable comms on 3.5, 3.9, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and
> 7.9MHz. Especially within Tennessee and the Southeastern United States.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I know exactly what NVIS is for.

I was trained by the inventor of the whip-tilt adapter at Hurlburt Field, FL.

Brian

4421. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 16:41:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406010841.3c1b6bf5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92485

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of May 31, 2004:

Novice - 31,545 (decrease of 17,784)
Technician - 264,100 (increase of 58,706)
Technician Plus - 59,576 (decrease of 69,284)
General - 140,048 (increase of 27,371)
Advanced - 80,012 (decrease of 19,770)
Extra - 105,358 (increase of 26,608)
Total - 680,639 (increase of 5,847)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4422. The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 17:23:20 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0406010923.378b4dc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92486

The progress-blocking dam that the foot-draggers have erected is
leaking badly, and can not be maintained much longer.

- Stewart (N0MHS)

4423. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 19:29:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40BCD901.8070104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92487

stewart wrote:

>The progress-blocking dam that the foot-draggers have erected is
>leaking badly, and can not be maintained much longer.
>
>- Stewart (N0MHS)
>
>
Damn! ;-)

4424. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 19:53:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <k95vc.19459$be.2562@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92488

"stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote

> The progress-blocking dam that the foot-draggers have erected is
> leaking badly, and can not be maintained much longer.

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll.

Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never!

The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!

They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

4425. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 20:00:03 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92489

Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use - where?

I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the continuing movement to reduce technical requirements. This would include grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect towers. Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually know something.

Just my opinion ;)

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.693 / Virus Database: 454 - Release Date: 5/31/04

4426. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 21:42:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601174206.23112.00000324@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92491

In article <1e4e3692.0406010608.5eef0874@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040527214556.16314.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: The Pool
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 5/27/2004 7:45 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: The Pool
>> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>> >> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
>> >> >7037 next Monday night?
>> >>
>> >> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now.
>I
>> am
>> >> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
>> >> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
>> >> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
>> >>
>> >> 73
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.
>>
>> Depends on who you want to talk to and where they are.
>
>As always.

Brian, don't try to discuss anything with nursie. He/she will get
it wrong and waste anothe rmonth trying to state he/she is right
when he/she is not right. :-)

>Steve, I know exactly what NVIS is for.
>
>I was trained by the inventor of the whip-tilt adapter at Hurlburt Field, FL.

NVIS (pronounced "neviss") has been in U.S. military HF-low-VHF doctrine for communications for over two decades. Nursie never worked any military communications so is unaware of that.

Nursie just learned about NVIS from reading this newsgroup. :-)

Nursie failed to provide a single government document name or other identification in trying to argue that "MARS is amateur radio" and will now try to "prove" he/she is right about NVIS, whatever he/she says. :-)

LHA / WMD

4427. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 21:42:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601174207.23112.00000325@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92490

In article <20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
>
>>This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
>>"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
>>providing such interesting topics.
>
> Hmmmmm....I just might go.
>
> Sere you in Vegas, Brain?...Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out
>that weekend?

MARS is a military radio service. Has always been so since 1925.

We will only see nursie "in Vegas" as a victim on CSI. :-)

[Autopsy report states "unknown causes, might have been due to stubborn insistence of being correct when proved wrong...]

Gil Grissom will eventually determine stubborness as the cause of death. No real mystery to viewers, but interesting lab gadgets and procedures.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4428. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 21:42:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601174208.23112.00000326@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92492

In article <20040601031218.13318.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 5/31/2004 5:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311440.33e20bbd@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040527214021.16314.00000022@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>>> "Hi hi" indeed, Brain.
>>>
>>> I am sure you hear quite a bit of laughter.
>>
>>I do.
>
> No doubt.

We are all laughing at your constant refusal to admit your statement ("MARS is amateur radio") was wrong. :-)

>>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," you keep insisting.
>
> No, Brian...YOU keep insisting.

The Department of Defense Directive 4650.2 defined it. AR 25-6, AFI 33-106, NTP 8(C) of the three major military branches regulated it. MARS is military.

> I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.

"Metaphors be with you?" [are you now Luke Skywalker? :-)]

["Use the phors, Luke, use the phors!" - Obi Wan Kenobi]

> You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
>disporve any other assertion I have made.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie Luke keeps insisting he/she was right.

MARS is military. The DoD defined it.

> Suvks to be you, PuppetBoy!

"Suvks?" How does one do that? :-)

Admit you are wrong, nursie.

Quit trying to put words in DoD documents that aren't there.

> Now...try as you might, it's already archived that you did this. Now you
>are trying to wiggle out of it.

The only one "trying to wiggle out" is nursie.

Nursie is not man enough to admit it he/she is wrong.

> STILL sucks to be you.

Show us the military documents that define "MARS is amateur radio."

Show us the FCC documents that define "MARS is amateur radio."

You cannot because they don't exist. MARS is a MILITARY radio
service, has always been so since 1925.

You are a puppet of your own mixed-up imagination. Tsk, tsk.

> What a FREAKIN' SCUMBAG you are!
>
> Geeeze-Loweeze, Burke! You sink just a bit lower EVERY TIME YOU POST!

Personal insults don't make you "correct."

MARS is a military radio service. The DoD defines that.

Do you wish to personally insult the Department of Defense?

> Keep laughing, Burkie. It's the only thing funny about you. The rest
>is just plain pitiful.

What is pitiful in here is nursie's stubborn insistence that he/she is
"right" when the government has defined MARS as a military radio
service.

Nursie is WRONG.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4429. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 21:42:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040601174210.23112.00000327@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92493

In article <20040601030151.13318.00000138@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 5/30/2004 7:08 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040530200855.15095.00000159@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040530183347.27620.00000169@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> So, Lennie...Those thousands of persons who have membership in the
>>>various branch progrmas are NOT an ASSET to those programs...?!?!
>>>
>>> WHAT AN IDIOT ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !
>>
>> You wrote "amatuer" twice instead of the proper word "amateur."
>>
>> Neither MARS nor the FCC has used "amatuers."
>>
>> You have a near-constant tendency to misspell "amateur" in the
>> haste you seem to have (or possibly outrage, anger) to attempt
>> "cutting me off at the knees."
>
> I see.

It's about time... :-)

> You make idiotic replies based solely upon a typo.

I just reply to your idiocy of claiming "MARS is amateur radio."

MARS is military, by directive, by definition.

> Which makes you even MORE idiotic, considering your alleged education.

No. The only thing that could be considered "idiotic" is the vain
hope that you could understand government directives and
regulations.

You do not.

>> VOLUNTEERS for MARS operations come from "licensed amateurs."
>
> So other than your attempt to "undermine" my points based upon a
>transposed letter, we can again assume that you agree with me that MARS

>depends upon these licensed Amateurs to run the program.

No, "we" cannot. MARS has worked okay by itself, such as in
the four-week exercise Grecian Firebolt 2002.

You have constantly stated an obvious error that "MARS is amateur
radio." It is not. MARS is military.

>> If you wish to imagine that your volunteerism with any MARS
>> makes you a part of the military service, that is just your
>> imagination working too hard.
>
> If YOU wish to try and suppose that, then you are welcome to.

You have constantly stated that "MARS is amateur radio."

It is not. MARS is militrary.

Everyone can come to the conclusion that you wish to associate
yourself with the military even though you your military service
was terminated. One way to do that is make the false, misleading
statement that "MARS is amateur radio."

> It seems to me that you have an unwavering hatred of anyone who's done
>anything you HAVEN'T done, or HAS done, only better.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Correcting a false statement (such as your "MARS
is amateur radio") is nothing involving hatred.

Your stubborn and ill-tempered attempt to convince all that you
are "correct" makes you want to misdirect the "argument" into
personal attacks on others or that others are "incorrect."

MARS is military. By directive, by regulation.

> You said that N/MC MARS regualtions didn't specify a need for licensure
>in the Amateur Radio Service to be a member. You said you could do it. I
>was waiting to see if you could/would, if only to prove you could.

Anyone can look at USN-USMC Communications Instruction
NTP 8(C) and see that for themselves.

No one has to "join" a USN MARS group (by volunteering) in order
to read that.

> You didn't, obviously, which is exactly what I would expect of you.

Incorrect. I found the appropriate USN-USMC regulation, named it,
gave a website for others to get it and read it.

Nothing has changed in the interim.

> A lot of blustery brogadaccio with no net effect.

Nothing of the kind. I presented information.

That information, indeed all sources of MARS information, makes
your statement "MARS is amateur radio" false.

You need to admit your statement was false and carry on.

Refusal to deny your falsity fools no one...except yourself.

>>> Please, Lennie...show us what PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE you have in ANY MARS
>>>program....Of course you can always regale us with your exploits of 63 years
>>>ago...
>>
>> "Regale exploits of 63 years ago?!?" :-)
>>
>> 63 years ago would make it the year 1941. I was 8 years
>> old then.
>>
>> You didn't exist in 1941. Your parents were never able
>> to bear children in 1941.
>
> Oh? You know my parents? You know when they married? You know that I
>am the youngest/oldest of the family?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Another case of refusing to admit you made another
wrong statement or error in typing. :-)

A marriage ceremony and legal papers thereto is not a requirement
to have a child. [nature and biology have their own rules...]

Are you now saying you are illegitimate? :-)

> Forgive my math error. I forgive you many of yours. None the less, it
>remains that the ONLY "military" communications experience you have was over
>half a century ago. NONE of it in any MARS program.

Incorrect. One of the 43 transmitters at U.S. Army radio station ADA
was allowed second priority in use for the U.S. Army MARS group
attached to Headquarters, United States Forces, Far East in 1953
to 1955. That MARS group (approximately four service personnel)
obtained their own HF radio station moved to Hardy Barracks in
1955 after ADA transmitters had moved from Tsukishima to Kashiwa.
They had a nice multiband beam, rotatable, on a tower at Hardy in
1955.

> Speaking of which, when are we gonna get the scopp on YOUR child rearing
>experiences? Still waiting on the source of your background for the
>assertion that Amateur licenses should be age-limitied

Tsk, tsk, tsk. [the word should be "scoop" not 'scopp.' :-)]

Misdirection. The six-year-old ranting about my Comment on
Docket 98-143 is not a part of this subject thread and has nothing
to do with MARS. That other thread was ranted by long-timers
two years after my Comment had been made public. Sore heads.
Can't let dead horses be, have to beat them incessantly. :-)

"Necro-equine flaggelation." :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4430. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 22:43:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406011443.675b67ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92494

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
>
> >This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
> >"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
> >providing such interesting topics.
>
> Hmmmmm....I just might go.

You ought to go. Be sure to wear your Civil Air Patrol uniform with
real rank on it.

> Sere you in Vegas, Brain?

I hope not. I'd rather not cross paths with you. I don't think
you're mentally stable.

Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out that
> weekend?

I don't know what weekend the reunion is, so I don't know if I have a
Scout trip or not. But I did have an enjoyable Memorial Day weekend
camping with all of my sons, without the Scouts.

Do you realize that I was never in a comm career field? Do you know
that I resigned from the BST when I left Illinois, and have not
rejoined MARS at this new location?

What qualifications would I attend under?

> Steve, K4YZ

bb

4431. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 22:51:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406011451.1a2ba198@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92495

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040601031218.13318.00000140@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 5/31/2004 5:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311440.33e20bbd@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040527214021.16314.00000022@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> >> "Hi hi" indeed, Brain.
> >>
> >> I am sure you hear quite a bit of laughter.
> >
> >I do.
>
> No doubt.
>
> >"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," you keep insisting.
>
> No, Brian...YOU keep insisting.
>
> I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.

Yet you have not retracted it. You continue to defend the
indefensible.

> You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
> disporve any other assertion I have made.

Steve, I have "disporved" your assertions.

> Suvks to be you, PuppetBoy!

Thanks for that little tidbit, Sven.

> >> Brain....YOU said that "most" MUNICIPAL radio operators wore police
> >> uniforms.
> >>
> >> It's not me doing the grasping.
> >>
> >> Now...Try again, PuppetBoy. Your mentor is watching.
> >
> >So what. I didn't take all of one group and say that it is equal to
> >another group, just because there may be a relationship. You did.
>

> "So what", indeed.
>
> YOU said that "MOST" municipal "radio operators" wore police uniforms.
>
> I (accurately) pointed out that that police force is only one segment of
> municipal workers that use two-way radios, and do NOT comprise "most" of the
> municipal work force.

Does that make them MARS members, too?

> Also, >>I<< did not make ANY analogy to municipal workers in this or any
> other thread.
>
> You did.

You're catching on.

> Now...try as you might, it's already archived that you did this. Now you
> are trying to wiggle out of it.
>
> STILL sucks to be you.

Don't you mean "Suvks?" It's archived in Google.

> >> >> YOU said that MOST "municipal radio operators (wore) police
> uniforms".
> >> >>
> >> >> That is wrong. Even in YOUR community.
> >> >
> >> >No, it isn't. We're kind of heavy on LE here.
> >>
> >> Yes, It it.
> >
> >I like it that way. Keeps the creepy crawlies away.
>
> Obviously not. You're still there.

But you're not. And that's what matters.

> >> But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is
> "kind
> >> of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.
> >
> >People with good incomes.
>
> Ahhhhhhhhhhhhh....Now you base the character of your neighbors based upon
> thier paychecks?

Their paychecks.

> What a FREAKIN' SCUMBAG you are!
>
> Geeeze-Loweeze, Burke! You sink just a bit lower EVERY TIME YOU POST!

Welp, I'm not surrounded by people dipping into workman's comp or
other entitlement programs.

> >> Brian..TRY and get ONE thing right today, OK...?!?!
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
> >
> >Hi hi.
>
> Keep laughing, Burkie. It's the only thing funny about you. The rest is
> just plain pitiful.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You're so defensive about your separation from the USMC.

4432. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-01 23:25:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040601192544.23112.00000328@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92496

In article <5f4fe4c2.0406010923.378b4dc2@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>The progress-blocking dam that the foot-draggers have erected is
>leaking badly, and can not be maintained much longer.
>
Whatever in the world does that mean?

4433. What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 02:07:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92497

After listening to the MARS argument going on in here, I did a little looking around.

If you wish to participate in Army Mars, the qualifications are:

Eligibility

The applicant must -

* Be 17 years of age or older. (Signature of parent or legal guardian is required when an applicant is under 18 years of age.)
* Be a United States Citizen or resident alien. (Possess a valid amateur radio license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) or other competent U.S. Authority.)
* Possess a station capable of operating on MARS VHF and/or HF frequencies.
* Agree to operate a minimum of 12 hours per calendar quarter with 6 hours being on VHF and or HF networks.

Source: http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/join.htm

Navy/Marine Corps MARS

Eligibility to Join NAVMARCORMARS
An applicant must:

1. be 18 years of age or older,
2. be a United States Citizen or Legal Resident Alien,
3. possess a valid amateur radio license issued by the Federal Communications Commission or other competent U.S. authority -- Technician class or above, and
4. possess a station capable of operating on the MARS HF frequencies (2.0 - 30 Mhz).

Source: http://navymars.org/

Notes from the Washington State Army MARS webpages as to what MARS is:

Welcome to the Washington State Army Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) Website.

The Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) is an organization of FCC licensed Amateur radio operators who work with military stations for the furthering of professional communications and electronics. Washington State Army MARS is part of US Army MARS.

Source: http://wa.mars.hfradio.org/

Plus,

MARS is used as a training ground for use of Military communications procedures THe MARS operators provide a pool of trained operators for communications alternatives.

Many people look at MARS as a morale booster for sending MARS grams to military personnel, but besides their obvious use, the messages serve as training for operating skills.

If a person doesn't like or agree with that statement, they can take it up with the website owners, I just paraphrased from them.

I couldn't get to the Air Force MARS site, but the localized AF sites said basically the same thing.

In looking at the purposes and the qualifications for MARS service, a person needs to be a licensed Radio amateur to participate as part of the group that are training their skills in the desired operations.

No doubt that on the Military side of things, there is a trained operator or operators that may or may not be a Ham. I'm not certain of the details of this, but these people are already trained in the protocols needed, so that is just a part of their job. They are the connection point, as it were.

If we try to distill what exactly MARS is, it is a training ground for non-military operators in military technique. These operators in training are licensed Amateurs.

In that light, it becomes pretty evident that the Amateurs are what it is all about. Without licensed Amateur Radio operators there might be an analog of the service, but it would almost certainly be called something else, the the operators would already be trained in operations, which would call into question the need for such a program at all!

The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is continuing to get his chops busted over:

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"

Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of having an amateur license.

However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a member unless they had such a license.

Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.

So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of hyperbole his own good self.

So whatever you think about that statement, It is pretty hard to imagine a program without the intended participants.

In other words.............

- Mike KB3EIA -

4434. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 02:21:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406011821.17234e91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92498

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040601174206.23112.00000324@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406010608.5eef0874@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040527214556.16314.00000023@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 5/27/2004 7:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405271645.27865396@posting.google.com>
> >> >
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040527141215.09801.00000002@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: The Pool
> >> >> >From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >> >> >Date: 5/26/2004 12:09 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <c2356669.0405260909.5350667f@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >Meanwhile, Amateur Radio continues. OTA, not here. Will we hear you on
> >> >> >7037 next Monday night?
> >> >>
> >> >> I hope so, Jim. I am trying to put up a new attic loop right now.
> I
> am
> >> >> also experimenting with the MFJ version of the manual bandspanner as an
> >> >> "emergency" antenna. I am trying to see if it can be used in an NVIS
> >> >> configuration, or if it is too mechanically short.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73
> >> >>
> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> >NVIS prop is usually several db down ordinary skywave.
> >>
> >> Depends on who you want to talk to and where they are.
> >
> >As always.
>
> Brian, don't try to discuss anything with nursie. He/she will get
> it wrong and waste anothe rmonth trying to state he/she is right
> when he/she is not right. :-)
>
>

> >Steve, I know exactly what NVIS is for.
> >
> >I was trained by the inventor of the whip-tilt adapter at Hurlburt Field, FL.
>
> NVIS (pronounced "neviss") has been in U.S. military HF-low-VHF
> doctrine for communications for over two decades. Nursie never
> worked any military communications so is unaware of that.
>
> Nursie just learned about NVIS from reading this newsgroup. :-)
>
> Nursie failed to provide a single government document name or
> other identification in trying to argue that "MARS is amateur radio"
> and will now try to "prove" he/she is right about NVIS, whatever
> he/she says. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

I actually have an "amateur" version of the whip-tilt adapter. It uses 3/8x24 threads rather than military fittings. It runs a hamstick or 102" whip in the normal vertical position, and then has an angle off of vertical (probably 15 or 20deg) for NVIS use. It was given to me by a long-time colleague of the inventor.

I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows. But I won't.

After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!

70 tree, bb

4435. Re: An open letter to high-el

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 02:25:57 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0406011825.45e15550@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92499

5'6 280 pound fatass "Lloyd" <lloyd@swlantman.net> whined in message
news:<c9aaf3vpa0@pita.alt.net>...
> "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
> news:971d2e488fbfd4b1caa354cd16ea0eec@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> > Get railed, assmonkey.
> >
>
> It is not too difficult

Apparently, everything is difficult for *you*, dumbass Lloyd!

> Dave is everything that Wogie
> is not.

Yeah, Roger isn't a fucking asshole which Dave is.

> Dave has a beautiful family, a nice home, and served honorably
> as a representative of his country overseas.

Yeah, he was the best repairman anbd courier boy to the cashew capital
of Africa, where they send the dregs of the State Dept. Sort of like
how they traded useless baseball players to Japan.

> Moreover, Dave is
> respected, something no one has for Woger.

Say Dave, you writing your own press releases again, or is your shill
LARDASS Lloyd Davies N0VFP the no code tech of over 10 years because
he can't pass 5 wpm morse code doing it for you??

> And Wogie, that ample body weight of yours is unhealthy,

Which ample weight is that? Since I don't even weigh close to 190
pounds, dumbass!
While davey is overweight and his belly makes his wrinkled shirts
strain their buttons. And his butt buddy Bertie is a real fatass, he
looked like he needed a wide load on his fatass in that computer
store.

> especially with your 5' 6" frame.

Too bad I'm taller than 5'6" dumbass.

You are the one 5'6 and 280 pounds, Davies. Want me to post those
christian retreat pics that prove what a fat hog you are?

4436. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 02:28:35 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406011828.70b32d8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92500

Gee Dan, you don't mind being jerky to everyone else, but don't like anyone getting jerky with you.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:<2Z8tc.26853$zO3.8169@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Gee everybody...look...another creative editor.
>
> How unique.
>
> Idiot.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Bada Bing" <BadaBing@implant.com> wrote in message
> news:097a0f4cdea318a9eff39a4f9995832b@news.teranews.com...
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Hoasc.30958$KE6.3543@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Xns94F1EF501271Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >
> > > > Are you Australian?
> > > >
> > > > No. But I have blown several.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Too much info.
> >
> >

4437. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 02:31:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92501

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny>...
> Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use -
> where?
>
> I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the
> continuing movement to reduce technical requirements. This would include
> grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
> towers. Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> know something.
>
> Just my opinion ;)
>
>
> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.

4438. Re: An open letter to high-el

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 03:52:03 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@swltennan.net>
Message-ID: <c9jioc$2no$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92502

Spin it any way you want Curtains Boy, but the truth is known.
And why did Riley make you restest?
Got caught with your hand in the cookie jar jamming on 20 meters?
How many FCC letters is that now?

73 de Lloyd

"AB8MQ" <ab8mq@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:737588ee.0406011825.45e15550@posting.google.com...
> 5'6 280 pound fatass "Lloyd" <lloyd@swlantman.net> whined in message
> news:<c9aaf3vpa0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
> > news:971d2e488fbfd4b1caa354cd16ea0eec@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> > > Get railed, assmonkey.
> > >
> >
> > It is not too difficult
>
> Apparently, everything is difficult for *you*, dumbass Lloyd!
>
> > Dave is everything that Wogie
> > is not.
>
> Yeah, Roger isn't a fucking asshole which Dave is.
>
> > Dave has a beautiful family, a nice home, and served honorably
> > as a representative of his country overseas.
>
> Yeah, he was the best repairman anbd courier boy to the cashew capital
> of Africa, where they send the dregs of the State Dept. Sort of like
> how they traded useless baseball players to Japan.
>
> > Moreover, Dave is
> > respected, something no one has for Woger.
>
> Say Dave, you writing your own press releases again, or is your shill
> LARDASS Lloyd Davies N0VFP the no code tech of over 10 years because
> he can't pass 5 wpm morse code doing it for you??
>
> > And Wogie, that ample body weight of yours is unhealthy,
>
> Which ample weight is that? Since I don't even weigh close to 190
> pounds, dumbass!
> While davey is overweight and his belly makes his wrinkled shirts
> strain their buttons. And his butt buddy Bertie is a real fatass, he

> looked like he needed a wide load on his fatass in that computer
> store.
>
> > especially with your 5' 6" frame.
>
> Too bad I'm taller than 5'6" dumbass.
>
> You are the one 5'6 and 280 pounds, Davies. Want me to post those
> christian retreat pics that prove what a fat hog you are?

4439. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 04:56:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602005633.23857.00000247@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92504

In article <a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>After listening to the MARS argument going on in here, I did a little
>looking around.

Did you use the links I posted twice? No matter, a simple search
for "Military Affiliate Radio System" will turn up the same things.

>If you wish to participate in Army Mars, the qualifications are:
>
>Eligibility
>
>The applicant must -
>
> * Be 17 years of age or older. (Signature of parent or legal
>guardian is required when an applicant is under 18 years of age.)
> * Be a United States Citizen or resident alien. (Possess a valid
>amateur radio license issued by the Federal Communications Commission
>(FCC) or other competent U.S. Authority.)
> * Possess a station capable of operating on MARS VHF and/or HF
>frequencies.
> * Agree to operate a minimum of 12 hours per calendar quarter with
>6 hours being on VHF and or HF networks.
>
>Source: http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/join.htm

You can find that in Army Regulation AR 25-6.

>Navy/Marine Corps MARS
>
>Eligibility to Join NAVMARCORMARS
>An applicant must:
>
> 1. be 18 years of age or older,
> 2. be a United States Citizen or Legal Resident Alien,
> 3. possess a valid amateur radio license issued by the Federal
>Communications Commission or other competent U.S. authority --
>Technician class or above, and
> 4. possess a station capable of operating on the MARS HF frequencies
>(2.0 - 30 Mhz).

That's in USN-USMC Communications Instruction NTP 8(C).

Please read the fine print on "who may be a member." :-)

>Source: http://navymars.org/

>Notes from the Washington State Army MARS webpages as to what MARS is:
>
>Welcome to the Washington State Army Military Affiliate Radio System
>(MARS) Website.
>
>The Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) is an organization of FCC
>licensed Amateur radio operators who work with military stations for the
>furthering of professional communications and electronics. Washington
>State Army MARS is part of US Army MARS.
>
>Source: http://wa.mars.hfradio.org/
>
>Plus,
>
> MARS is used as a training ground for use of Military communications
>procedures THe MARS operators provide a pool of trained operators for
>communications alternatives.
>
> Many people look at MARS as a morale booster for sending MARS grams to
>military personnel, but besides their obvious use, the messages serve as
>training for operating skills.
>
> If a person doesn't like or agree with that statement, they can take it

>up with the website owners, I just paraphrased from them.

Try not to get defensive BEFORE someone objects... :-)

> I couldn't get to the Air Force MARS site, but the localized AF sites
>said basically the same thing.

You can get USAF MARS Air Instructions at AFCA, Air Force Communication
Agency, Scott AFB. The number ID is AFI 33-106.

At the AFCA website you can get a very good history of Air Force
communications titled "From Flares To Satellites." If you don't
mind a 12+ MB download, then I'd recommend it for history of
communications in the Air Force.

> In looking at the purposes and the qualifications for MARS service, a
>person needs to be a licensed Radio amateur to participate as part of
>the group that are training their skills in the desired operations.

Mostly, I think, they are just having fun playing around. :-)

Like grown-ups playing at being sojers (or swabbies or whatever).

> No doubt that on the Military side of things, there is a trained
>operator or operators that may or may not be a Ham. I'm not certain of
>the details of this, but these people are already trained in the
>protocols needed, so that is just a part of their job. They are the
>connection point, as it were.

You may not be aware of it, but there are a whole bunch of DoD Directives and individual service branch Regulations which are intended PRINCIPALLY for Public Relations work, to promote the "good" side of the military with/without radio amateurs.

If you read the Army Communicator write-up on "Grecial Firebolt 2002" then you will understand that MARS can function quite well on its own without civilian radio amateurs.

DoD has been highlighting Emergency Preparedness since before 11 Sep 01 and MARS, as a Military Affiliate structure, can circumvent some of the normal protocols required with regular, organic military units communicating with other government agencies. "Grecian Firebolt 2002" was one such exercise and involved Guard units as well as MARS.

> If we try to distill what exactly MARS is, it is a training ground for
>non-military operators in military technique. These operators in
>training are licensed Amateurs.

Not for manual telegraphy... :-)

Face it, Mike, MARS is basically for inter-government communications so that military can talk to everyone else in government without going through the usual channels.

Once upon a time, way back three decades ago, MARS was excellent on providing phone patches for Vietnam service personnel in Vietnam being able to talk to their friends and loved ones. MARS was handling about 42,000 such phone patches a month back then.

Was there "training" in making a phone patch? Did MARS teach the civilian members how to dial a telephone? :-)

All the "training" is simply Following Procedure which is amply provided in examples in many different military training manuals. Don't make it into some BFD because it isn't. Procedure is simply organization to get a message through to the recipient by the most expeditious means.

> In that light, it becomes pretty evident that the Amateurs are what it
>is all about.

Public relations.

>Without licensed Amateur Radio operators there might be an
>analog of the service, but it would almost certainly be called something
>else, the the operators would already be trained in operations, which
>would call into question the need for such a program at all!

The "A" in MARS stands for AFFILIATE, not 'amateur.'

Back in 1925 when the U.S. Army organized the immediate predecessor of MARS, the AARS, there weren't many "radio operators" around, especially those with manual telegraphy skills. The psychomotor skill of manual telegraphy does need lots of training

to become proficient at it...but MARS no longer uses manual
telegraphy.

If "MARS is amateur radio," then it should have civilian head-
quarters such as Newington. But, the Army Hq is at Fort
Huachuca, AZ, under NETCOM and the USAF MARS Hq is
at Scott AFB.

If "MARS is amateur radio," then it should be defined somewhere
in Title 47 C.F.R. and thus regulated by the FCC. It isn't.

> The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>continuing to get his chops busted over:
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"

Nursie "busted his own chops" when he REFUSED to yield on
a WRONG statement.

> Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of

>having an amateur license.

MARS "membership" (six-month voluntary "duty") is voluntary.

MARS callsigns are distinctly different from civilian amateur radio
callsigns.

MARS doesn't operate IN the civilian amateur radio bands.

> However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a

>member unless they had such a license.

Who cares? :-)

Military communications function just dandy WITHOUT any MARS
structure. They don't use any manual telegraphy, either...:-)

> Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
>traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.

Okay, "proper traffic handling" to keep an RTTY net up and running?
Dialing a telephone for a phone patch from some distant military
outpost that doesn't have any DSN or Internet connection? :-)

"Proper traffic handling" is for Military Police units.

> So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
>"amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
>reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
>hyperbole his own good self.
>
> So whatever you think about that statement, It is pretty hard to
>imagine a program without the intended participants.
>

>In other words.............

The "M" in MARS stands for MILITARY.

The "A" in MARS stands for AFFILIATE.

MARS is a military radio service.

See Department of Defense Directive 4650.2 dated 21 Nov 03.

LHA / WMD

4440. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 04:56:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602005635.23857.00000248@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92503

In article <1e4e3692.0406011821.17234e91@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>I actually have an "amateur" version of the whip-tilt adapter. It
>uses 3/8x24 threads rather than military fittings. It runs a hamstick
>or 102" whip in the normal vertical position, and then has an angle
>off of vertical (probably 15 or 20deg) for NVIS use. It was given to
>me by a long-time colleague of the inventor.
>
>I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent
>numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows.
>But I won't.

Don't forget the QSL cards to "prove" you used a tilted whip
to work somebody...AND the signature of your authorizing
officer plus the appropriate directive/regulation! :-)

>After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!

Don Rumsfeld and company might take some issue with that,
but then someone here "knows" all about MARS.

Maybe he/she went there... :-)

"QRM Interplanetary" is the title of a short story by George O.
Smith, appeared in Astounding Science Fiction of the late
1940s. It was part of the "Venus Equilateral" series, had very
little to do with Mars. :-)

LHA / WMD

4441. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 05:12:36 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0406012112.587d949d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92505

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny>...
> Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use -
> where?
>
> I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the
> continuing movement to reduce technical requirements.

There is virtually no difference between the current General and
Technician written exams.

> This would include
> grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
> towers.

That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
pool.

> Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> know something.

Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4442. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 12:39:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40BDCA92.4020905@psu.edu>
Source record: 92506

steward wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny>...
>
>>Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use -
>>where?
>>
>>I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the
>>continuing movement to reduce technical requirements.
>
>
> There is virtually no difference between the current General and
> Technician written exams.

I took both. You are wrong.

>
>> This would include
>>grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
>>towers.
>
>
> That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
> on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
> pool.

Technicians have towers too. And a general has taken the Technician
test, so they got the info.

>
>>Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
>>know something.
>
>
> Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
> regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.

Litmus tests, dams breaking? WTH, mate?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4443. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 12:48:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>
Source record: 92507

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
> [snip]
> The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
> continuing to get his chops busted over:
>
> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>
> Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
> having an amateur license.
>
> However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
> member unless they had such a license.
>
> Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
> traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
>
> So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
> "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
> reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
> hyperbole his own good self.
>

Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on the rules of logic, is correct as it stands. However, one must keep in mind that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is not necessarily true in the reverse direction. In this case, the statement "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of amateur radio and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and activities of amateur radio. That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."

> So whatever you think about that statement, It is pretty hard to
> imagine a program without the intended participants.
>
> In other words.............
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4444. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 14:21:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406020621.248b611@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92508

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040602005635.23857.00000248@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406011821.17234e91@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >I actually have an "amateur" version of the whip-tilt adapter. It
> >uses 3/8x24 threads rather than military fittings. It runs a hamstick
> >or 102" whip in the normal vertical position, and then has an angle
> >off of vertical (probably 15 or 20deg) for NVIS use. It was given to
> >me by a long-time colleague of the inventor.
> >
> >I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent
> >numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows.
> >But I won't.
>
> Don't forget the QSL cards to "prove" you used a tilted whip
> to work somebody...AND the signature of your authorizing
> officer plus the appropriate directive/regulation! :-)
>
> >After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!
>
> Don Rumsfeld and company might take some issue with that,
> but then someone here "knows" all about MARS.

Donnie better start kissing the former Marine's butt before Steve
decides to pull all of -his- Amateurs out of MARS.

> Maybe he/she went there... :-)
>
> "QRM Interplanetary" is the title of a short story by George O.
> Smith, appeared in Astounding Science Fiction of the late
> 1940s. It was part of the "Venus Equilateral" series, had very
> little to do with Mars. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!!!" Hi hi

4445. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 14:56:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92509

"stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> There is virtually no difference between the current General and
> Technician written exams.
>
>
> That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
> on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
> pool.
>
> > Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> > know something.
>
> Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
> regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
>

Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
though, doesn't it!

With all kind regards,

de Hans, K0HB

4446. Re: Roger and Lloyd?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 15:06:52 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@tennanets.net>
Message-ID: <c9kq9l$q21$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92510
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

My oh my, Woger keeps getting letters from Riley!
See the latest enforcement log Wogie. Riley is pulling tickets, based
on charcter issues. ROTFLMAO!

Lloyd

>
> GLENDALE, WV: The FCC sent a Warning Notice November 9, 1999, to
> General licensee Roger L. Wiseman, KC8JBO, citing evidence that the
> licensee had been "deliberately and maliciously interfering with the
> radio operations of other licensed amateurs" on 20 meters. "This
> interference has occurred at various times in the last several months
> and includes broadcasting music and other unidentified transmissions,"
> said a letter from FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement
> Riley Hollingsworth. Hollingsworth warned that continued operation of
> the type described could result in a fine or license revocation
> proceeding, and he requested that the licensee contact him to discuss
> the allegations.
>
> FREEPORT, OH/GLENDALE, WV: The FCC wrote Advanced licensee Steven A.
> Tunder, N8WGM, and General licensee Roger L. Wiseman, KC8JBO, on March
> 29, 2000, advising that it had been made aware of "an ongoing personal
> dispute" between the two men that included allegations of interference
> or jamming on 20 meters. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur Radio
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth cautioned Tunder and Wiseman to review
> ?97.1 of the Amateur Radio rules and "to make certain that whatever
> disputes that may exist are not carried over to Amateur Radio
> frequencies." Hollingsworth invited the two licensees to contact him
> to discuss the matter. Last November 9, the FCC sent Wiseman a Warning
> Notice in response to allegations of deliberate and malicious
> interference on 20 meters.
>
> GLENDALE, WV [UPDATE]: The FCC had written General licensee Roger L.
> Wiseman, KC8JBO, on March 29, 2000, advising that it had been made
> aware of "an ongoing personal dispute" between Wiseman and Advanced
> licensee Steven A. Tunder, N8WGM, that included allegations of
> interference or jamming on 20 meters. FCC Special Counsel for Amateur
> Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth cautioned Tunder and Wiseman to
> review ?97.1 of the Amateur Radio rules and "to make certain that
> whatever disputes that may exist are not carried over to Amateur Radio
> frequencies." Hollingsworth invited the two licensees to contact him
> to discuss the matter. Wiseman alleged in a subsequent communication
> to the ARRL that Tunder had been harassing him and that he had made

> the FCC aware of it in the first place. Wiseman indicated that he had
> been in touch with Hollingsworth to clarify the situation. The FCC had
> sent Wiseman a Warning Notice last November in response to allegations
> of deliberate and malicious interference on 20 meters.
>
> GLENDALE, WV: The FCC requested July 11, 2000, that Roger L. Wiseman,
> KC8JBO, retake the General examination elements under the supervision
> of an ARRL-VEC volunteer examiner team. Wiseman must appear for
> retesting by September 11, 2000, or his license will be canceled.
> Applicants appearing for re-examination are granted an Amateur Radio
> license consistent with the elements passed. The FCC had written
> Wiseman on March 29, 2000, advising that it had been made aware of "an
> ongoing personal dispute" between Wiseman and another licensee that
> included allegations of interference or jamming on 20 meters. FCC
> Special Counsel for Amateur Radio Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth
> invited the two licensees to contact him to discuss the matter.
> Additionally, the FCC had sent Wiseman a Warning Notice last November
> in response to allegations of deliberate and malicious interference on
> 20 meters.
>
>
>

4447. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 20:15:29 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0406021215.76dae1fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92511

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > There is virtually no difference between the current General and
> > Technician written exams.
> >
> >
> > That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
> > on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
> > pool.
> >
> > > Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> > > know something.
> >
> > Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
> > regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
> >
>
>
> Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
> enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
> requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
> Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
> tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
> Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
> though, doesn't it!

> With all kind regards,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.

Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?

Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be made.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4448. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 20:39:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40BE3AFA.1060606@psu.edu>
Source record: 92512

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>
>>[snip]
>>The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>>continuing to get his chops busted over:
>>
>>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>>
>>Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
>>having an amateur license.
>>
>>However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
>>member unless they had such a license.
>>
>>Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
>>traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
>>
>>So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
>>"amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
>>reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
>>hyperbole his own good self.
>>
>
>
> Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on the
> rules of logic, is correct as it stands. However, one must keep in mind
> that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is not
> necessarily true in the reverse direction. In this case, the statement
> "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
> amateur radio and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
> activities of amateur radio. That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
> the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."

True enough - I was just noting that it might be a little more clear
if the words were added. i did know what he was saying from the get-go.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4449. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 20:58:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40BE3F93.1040804@psu.edu>
Source record: 92513

stewart wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>>>There is virtually no difference between the current General and
>>>Technician written exams.
>>>
>>>
>>>That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
>>>on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
>>>pool.
>>>
>>>
>>>>Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
>>>>know something.
>>>
>>>Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
>>>regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
>>>
>>
>>
>>Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
>>enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
>>requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
>>Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
>>tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
>>Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
>>though, doesn't it!
>
>
>
>>With all kind regards,
>>
>>de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.

What Hans said was not only logical, but 100 percent correct. I took a
Technician's exam, then I took a General exam, then I took an Extra
exam. All three were needed to get to Extra. And the tests were quite
different.

>
> Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?

And yet you come in here and argue with us. Welcome to the fold.

> Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be made.

Your progress is defined as what? Progress for me is increased knowledge
and improved skills, while for you it appears to be allowing Technician
tested people to have what were once General tested priveliges.

4450. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:05:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92514

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40BE3AFA.1060606@psu.edu...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>[snip]
> >>The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
> >>continuing to get his chops busted over:
> >>
> >>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
> >>
> >>Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
> >>having an amateur license.
> >>
> >>However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
> >>member unless they had such a license.
> >>
> >>Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
> >>traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
> >>
> >>So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
> >>"amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
> >>reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
> >>hyperbole his own good self.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on
the
> > rules of logic, is correct as it stands. However, one must keep in mind
> > that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is
not
> > necessarily true in the reverse direction. In this case, the statement
> > "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
> > amateur radio and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
> > activities of amateur radio. That is to say, one cannot legitimately
turn
> > the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."
>
> True enough - I was just noting that it might be a little more clear
> if the words were added. i did know what he was saying from the get-go.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>

All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a change.

Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator. Or as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.

I of course had a license, but those working for me did not. This was at Hanau Germany, Frankfurt Germany and Ft. McClellan Al.

Hope that helps.

Dan/W4NTI

4451. Re: Roger and Lloyd?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:19:38 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <Kvrvc.35955$zO3.6155@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92515
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <lloyd@tennanets.net> wrote in message
news:c9kq9l$q21$0@pita.alt.net...
: My oh my, Woger keeps getting letters from Riley!
: See the latest enforcement log Wogie. Riley is pulling tickets, based
: on charcter issues. ROTFLMAO!
:
:
: Lloyd

Who gives a shit?!?!?!?

4452. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602172417.23112.00000339@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92516

In article <1e4e3692.0406020621.248b611@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> >I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent
>> >numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows.
>> >But I won't.
>>
>> Don't forget the QSL cards to "prove" you used a tilted whip
>> to work somebody...AND the signature of your authorizing
>> officer plus the appropriate directive/regulation! :-)
>>
>> >After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!
>>
>> Don Rumsfeld and company might take some issue with that,
>> but then someone here "knows" all about MARS.
>
>Donnie better start kissing the former Marine's butt before Steve
>decides to pull all of -his- Amateurs out of MARS.

Nursie may be cutting orders to that effect even now... :-)

>> Maybe he/she went there... :-)
>>
>> "QRM Interplanetary" is the title of a short story by George O.
>> Smith, appeared in Astounding Science Fiction of the late
>> 1940s. It was part of the "Venus Equilateral" series, had very
>> little to do with Mars. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!!!" Hi hi

That statement is rather like Fantasy Fiction...not enough science
to be Science Fiction, though.

George O. Smith was a ham also, spent WW2 as a civilian on
the first proximity fuse production and development as an
engineer. His "Venus Equilateral" series was based on a future
communications relay station in solar orbit between Earth and
Venus...not knowing as we found out later that Venus is un-
inhabitable for humans.

So, we have nursie being a MARS volunteer thinking that "MARS
is amateur radio." Unlike Smith, he should have known from
DoD documents that MARS is a military radio service. MARS,
as such by name, existed since 1948, rather before nursie's time.

Hi hi hi. :-)

LHA / WMD

4453. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602172417.23112.00000340@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92517

In article <5f4fe4c2.0406021215.76dae1fc@posting.google.com>,
horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) writes:

>> de Hans, K0HB
>
>Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.
>
>Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?

They are absolutely RIGHT (whether or not they are). :-)

That MUST be expressed on everyone's screens so as not to
make any mistake as to who is "boss" in a newsgroup. :-)

>Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be made.

There are others waiting in the wings to take their place... :-)

"Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain." - Anon.

LHA / WMD

4454. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:24:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602172420.23112.00000341@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92518

In article <A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>>
>> [snip]
>> The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>> continuing to get his chops busted over:
>>
>> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>>
>> Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
>> having an amateur license.
>>
>> However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
>> member unless they had such a license.
>>
>> Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
>> traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
>>
>> So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
>> "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
>> reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
>> hyperbole his own good self.
>>
>
>Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on the
>rules of logic, is correct as it stands.

Based on the "rules of logic" on Fantasy Island, perhaps. :-)

The statement was "MARS is amateur radio."

IFF that were true, then MARS would be defined somewhere in
Title 47 C.F.R. It isn't.

["IFF" is not a typo...it stands for "If and only if"]

IFF that were true, then the Department of Defense would not
have bothered to issue Directive 4650.2. It did and the current
version is dated 21 Nov 03.

>However, one must keep in mind
>that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is not
>necessarily true in the reverse direction.

Here we go, rationalization to reinforce some brother extra...

>In this case, the statement
>"MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
>amateur radio and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
>activities of amateur radio. That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
>the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."

Tsk, tsk, tsk...misdirection. No one was "turning a phrase around."

A statement was made that "MARS is amateur radio."

That was it.

That statement is WRONG. MARS is a military radio service.

MARS does have civilian radio amateur volunteers. Despite the
volunteers, MARS is a military radio service. It exists by
military Directive and Regulation. Without those documents,
MARS would disappear but amateur radio would continue.

MARS is a military radio service.

LHA / WMD

4455. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 21:57:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406021357.66ffef3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92519

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> >
> > [snip]
> > The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
> > continuing to get his chops busted over:
> >
> > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
> >
> > Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
> > having an amateur license.
> >
> > However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
> > member unless they had such a license.
> >
> > Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
> > traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
> >
> > So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
> > "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
> > reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
> > hyperbole his own good self.
> >
>
> Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on the
> rules of logic, is correct as it stands.

Actually, No. But you're thinking in the right direction.

Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.

If Steve were to say that some (few, many, most, 99%, 90%, more than
80%, and/or 98%) MARS operators are also amateur radio operators, he
would have been correct. But he's switched his position on it so many
times, without ever having rejected his original statement, "Sorry
Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," that we cannot tell where he
really stands on the subject.

A good first start to clearing up his position would be for him to
admit that MARS >>>IS NOT<<< Amateur Radio.

However, one must keep in mind
> that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is not

> necessarily true in the reverse direction.

It must be true in both directions. If it is not, then Algebra
contains only false statements. Is this the case?

In this case, the statement
> "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
> amateur radio

It does imply that. Nothing about a subset was uttered or implied.

> and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
> activities of amateur radio.

It does imply that. It implies that MARS is Amateur Radio. Even if
Steve were to have merely said that , "MARS >>>IS<<< _Exactly Like_
Amateur Radio," he would still have been wrong. He said that they
weren't exactly alike, he said that they were the very same thing!

That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
> the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."

For the statement to be true, "turning the statement around" must also
be true. Transitive property.

Thanks, Dee, for setting the record straight.

4456. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 23:25:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WIudnQUXWod__CPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92520

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:40BE3AFA.1060606@psu.edu...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>[snip]
>>>>The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>>>>continuing to get his chops busted over:
>>>>
>>>>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>>>>
>>>>Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of
>>>>having an amateur license.
>>>>
>>>>However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be a
>>>>member unless they had such a license.
>>>>
>>>>Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
>>>>traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
>>>>
>>>>So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
>>>>"amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
>>>>reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
>>>>hyperbole his own good self.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on
>
> the
>
>>>rules of logic, is correct as it stands. However, one must keep in mind
>>>that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is
>
> not
>
>>>necessarily true in the reverse direction. In this case, the statement
>>>"MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
>>>amateur radio and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and

>>>activities of amateur radio. That is to say, one cannot legitimately
>
> turn
>
>>>the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."
>>
>>True enough - I was just noting that it might be a little more clear
>>if the words were added. i did know what he was saying from the get-go.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a change.
>
> Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
> branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
> individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator. Or
> as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and
> overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made
> being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.

> I of course had a license, but those working for me did not. This was at
> Hanau Germany, Frankfurt Germany and Ft. McClellan Al.

Yup, I noted in my original post that:

>> No doubt that on the Military side of things, there is a trained operator
>> or operators that may or may not be a Ham. I'm not certain of the details of
>> this, but these people are already trained in the protocols needed, so that
>> is just a part of their job. They are the connection point, as it were.

I would imagine that already being a Ham might help you get that job,
but there are no doubt plenty of trained operators in the service that
aren't Hams, and some of them are the connection points for the Hams.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4457. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 23:30:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WIudnQQXWodi_yPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92521

stewart wrote:

<snip>

First you say:

> There is virtually no difference between the current General and
> Technician written exams.

<snip>

Then you say:

> That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
> on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
> pool.

Seems different to me!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4458. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 23:32:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92522

William wrote:

> Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.

Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4459. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-02 23:33:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10bsp015oujcpb1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92523

Or is it natural selection at work?

Ryan KC8PMX

> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.

4460. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 00:04:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Qc-dnVMldLcZ9iPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92524

```
"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406021357.66ffef3b@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> > >
> > > [snip]
> > > The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
> > > continuing to get his chops busted over:
> > >
> > > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
> > >
> > > Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue
of
> > > having an amateur license.
> > >
> > > However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be
a
> > > member unless they had such a license.
> > >
> > > Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
> > > traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
> > >
> > > So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
> > > "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
> > > reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
> > > hyperbole his own good self.
> > >
> >
> > Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on
the
> > rules of logic, is correct as it stands.
>
> Actually, No. But you're thinking in the right direction.
>
> Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>
> If Steve were to say that some (few, many, most, 99%, 90%, more than
> 80%, and/or 98%) MARS operators are also amateur radio operators, he
> would have been correct. But he's switched his position on it so many
> times, without ever having rejected his original statement, "Sorry
> Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," that we cannot tell where he
```

> really stands on the subject.
>
> A good first start to clearing up his position would be for him to
> admit that MARS >>>IS NOT<<< Amateur Radio.
>
> However, one must keep in mind
> > that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is
not
> > necessarily true in the reverse direction.
>
> It must be true in both directions. If it is not, then Algebra
> contains only false statements. Is this the case?
>
> In this case, the statement
> > "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
> > amateur radio
>
> It does imply that. Nothing about a subset was uttered or implied.
>
> > and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
> > activities of amateur radio.
>
> It does imply that. It implies that MARS is Amateur Radio. Even if
> Steve were to have merely said that , "MARS >>>IS<<< _Exactly Like_
> Amateur Radio," he would still have been wrong. He said that they
> weren't exactly alike, he said that they were the very same thing!
>
> That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
> > the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."
>
> For the statement to be true, "turning the statement around" must also
> be true. Transitive property.
>
> Thanks, Dee, for setting the record straight.

Math rules on IS being the same as EQUALS do not apply to logic statements.

One can say that "Marigolds are flowers" yet cannot say that "Flowers are
marigolds." The statement is NOT true in both directions because it is NOT
math.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4461. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 00:07:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Y8mdnaQqkvPF8SPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92525

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
> William wrote:
>
>
> > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>
> Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

It turns out it is necessary to define "is" as it does NOT always mean
"equal to". As noted in the post I just sent, one can say "Marigolds are
flowers", which is a true statement but you cannot turn it around and say
"Flowers are marigolds" as this latter isn't always true.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4462. Re: Roger and Lloyd?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 01:58:41 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0406021758.4899f41d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92526
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd the 30 year old fatassed VIRGIN" <lloyd@tennanets.net> wrote in message news:<c9kq9l$q21$0@pita.alt.net>...
> My oh my, Woger keeps getting letters from Riley!
> See the latest enforcement log Wogie. Riley is pulling tickets, based
> on charcter issues.

Yeah, yours is next, from what he told me.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!

4463. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 02:45:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406021845.2dc93e87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92527

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040602005633.23857.00000247@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
> If you read the Army Communicator write-up on "Grecial Firebolt
> 2002" then you will understand that MARS can function quite well
> on its own without civilian radio amateurs.

Appears one participant from Fort Huacucha used a "flyaway" hf radio.
The Transworld TW100-F briefcase radio was one of the components of
the Quick Reaction Communication Terminal (QRCT) used by weather
forces to communicate weather data within a deployed theater. Imagine
that!

4464. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 03:34:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602233423.28114.00000253@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92528

In article <Y8mdnaQqkvPF8SPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
>> William wrote:
>>
>> > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
>> > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>>
>> Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>It turns out it is necessary to define "is" as it does NOT always mean
>"equal to". As noted in the post I just sent, one can say "Marigolds are
>flowers", which is a true statement but you cannot turn it around and say
>"Flowers are marigolds" as this latter isn't always true.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

If MARS were amateur radio, it would have rules defining and
regulating it in Title 47 C.F.R. It does not.

If MARS were amateur radio, the Department of Defense would
not have released Directive 4650.2. They did, so that defines
MARS as a military radio service.

If a seventy tree falls on a florist, will he cry "Marigolds?"

LHA / WMD

4465. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 03:34:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040602233424.28114.00000254@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92529

In article <Qc-dnVMldLcZ9iPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0406021357.66ffef3b@posting.google.com...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:<A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>...
>> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> > news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
>> > >
>> > > [snip]
>> > > The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>> > > continuing to get his chops busted over:
>> > >
>> > > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>> > >
>> > > Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue
>of
>> > > having an amateur license.
>> > >
>> > > However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be
>a
>> > > member unless they had such a license.
>> > >
>> > > Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
>> > > traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
>> > >
>> > > So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
>> > > "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
>> > > reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
>> > > hyperbole his own good self.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on the
>> > rules of logic, is correct as it stands.
>>
>> Actually, No. But you're thinking in the right direction.
>>
>> Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
>> equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>>
>> If Steve were to say that some (few, many, most, 99%, 90%, more than
>> 80%, and/or 98%) MARS operators are also amateur radio operators, he
>> would have been correct. But he's switched his position on it so many

>> times, without ever having rejected his original statement, "Sorry
>> Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," that we cannot tell where he
>> really stands on the subject.
>>
>> A good first start to clearing up his position would be for him to
>> admit that MARS >>>IS NOT<<< Amateur Radio.
>>
>> However, one must keep in mind
>> > that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is not
>> > necessarily true in the reverse direction.
>>
>> It must be true in both directions. If it is not, then Algebra
>> contains only false statements. Is this the case?
>>
>> In this case, the statement
>> > "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
>> > amateur radio
>>
>> It does imply that. Nothing about a subset was uttered or implied.
>>
>> > and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
>> > activities of amateur radio.
>>
>> It does imply that. It implies that MARS is Amateur Radio. Even if
>> Steve were to have merely said that , "MARS >>>IS<<< _Exactly Like_
>> Amateur Radio," he would still have been wrong. He said that they
>> weren't exactly alike, he said that they were the very same thing!
>>
>> That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
>> > the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."
>>
>> For the statement to be true, "turning the statement around" must also
>> be true. Transitive property.
>>
>> Thanks, Dee, for setting the record straight.
>
>Math rules on IS being the same as EQUALS do not apply to logic statements.

DoD didn't rule on MARS. MARS is a military radio service.

The "A" in MARS stands for affiliate, not amateur.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

>One can say that "Marigolds are flowers" yet cannot say that "Flowers are
>marigolds." The statement is NOT true in both directions because it is NOT
>math.

Send a Hallmark card, not flowers, next time a certifiable
WRONG statement is issued from the hospital.

Don't put your petal to the metal on defending the undefendable.

LHA / WMD

4466. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:02:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603040253.08222.00000335@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92530

>Subject: The dam is leaking...
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 6/1/2004 12:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0406010923.378b4dc2@posting.google.com>
>
>The progress-blocking dam that the foot-draggers have erected is
>leaking badly, and can not be maintained much longer.
>
>- Stewart (N0MHS)

Only to be supplanted by idiots who think adding kiddie-channels to
Amateur allocations will fix anything.

Steve, K4YZ

4467. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:05:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603040537.08222.00000336@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92531

>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 6/2/2004 12:12 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0406012112.587d949d@posting.google.com>

>> This would include
>> grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
>> towers.
>
>That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
>on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
>pool.

Perhaps this is because in order to BE a General you have to take the
TECHNICIAN written first, Stewart? Do you see some need to duplicate the
effort?

>> Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
>> know something.
>
>Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
>regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.

Perhaps this is becasue in order to BE a General you have to take the
TECHNICIAN written first, Stewart? Do you see some need to duplicate the
effort?

Get the point?

Steve, K4YZ

4468. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:12:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603041249.08222.00000337@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92532

>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart)
>Date: 6/2/2004 3:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <5f4fe4c2.0406021215.76dae1fc@posting.google.com>
>
>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> "stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
>> >
>> > There is virtually no difference between the current General and
>> > Technician written exams.
>> >
>> >
>> > That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
>> > on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
>> > pool.
>> >
>> > > Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
>> > > know something.
>> >
>> > Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
>> > regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
>> >
>>
>>
>> Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
>> enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
>> requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
>> Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
>> tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
>> Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
>> though, doesn't it!
>
>
>> With all kind regards,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>
>Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.
>
>Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?
>
>Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be made.

"Losing battle with "non-logic"...?!?!

You're the flaming idiot that wants to populate the 70cm band with kiddie channels, and NOW it appears that you you have absolutely NO understanding of the current licensing/testing structure, yet you are making assinine assertions in a public forum about it.

There's a "non-logic" here, alright, Teaze, and it has to do with why a person would make such idiotic statements in the face of evidence to the contrary...?!?!

Go back to your VHF CB group. It's where you belong...All five channels of it.

Steve, K4YZ

4469. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:20:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603042054.08222.00000338@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92533

>Subject: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/1/2004 9:07 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
>
>
>After listening to the MARS argument going on in here, I did a little
>looking around.

Snip to...

>Navy/Marine Corps MARS
>
>Eligibility to Join NAVMARCORMARS
>An applicant must:
>
> 1. be 18 years of age or older,
> 2. be a United States Citizen or Legal Resident Alien,
> 3. possess a valid amateur radio license issued by the Federal
>Communications Commission or other competent U.S. authority --
>Technician class or above, and
> 4. possess a station capable of operating on the MARS HF frequencies
>(2.0 - 30 Mhz).
>
>Source: http://navymars.org/

WHOA! Don't let Lennie the Lame know he's wrong again...He stated right
here in this forum that there was NO requirement for an Amateur license to be a
member of N/MC MARS.

> The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
>continuing to get his chops busted over:
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
>
> Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue of

>having an amateur license.

Mike, my comment was meant to be that the MARS program is the very essence
of what being an Amateur is all about, and my later statements further exemplfy
that one cannot be a part of MARS without Amateur Radio.

Of course Brain and his mentor have been trying to use a literal
definition of it, but I've tried to redirect them. Guess I've exposed thier
dirty laundry one time too many and they will hold on to any tidbit that they

think will give them an opportunity to "get back" at me.

Oh well.

Steve, K4YZ

4470. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:26:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92534

>Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
>From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>

>All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a change.

Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.

I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC MARS program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.

He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result of having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related program.

>Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
>branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
>individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator. Or
>as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and
>overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made
>being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.

Agreed on the lack of need for a license if you are in a MILITARY unit and assigned to a MARS unit for duty. I was CHOP of NNN0MOC/MOF and had several Marines assigned to me under exactly those circumstances. All except two eventually DID get a license, though.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4471. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:27:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603042734.08222.00000340@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92535

>Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/2/2004 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
>
>William wrote:
>
>
>> Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
>> equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>
> Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)

Of course he will, Mike.

It's the only way he can express an assertion of validity to his arguments otherwise.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4472. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:33:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603043313.08222.00000341@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92536

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/1/2004 4:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040601174208.23112.00000326@mb-m04.aol.com>

> Nursie is WRONG.

I am sure you wish it were true, Lennie. repeating it over and over won't make it so, however.

How's that N/MC MARS application coming? (I'd reconsider sending it since you were wrong about that TOO, Your Putziness....)

Steve, K4YZ

4473. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 08:48:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603044813.08222.00000342@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92537

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/1/2004 5:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406011451.1a2ba198@posting.google.com>

>> I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.
>
>Yet you have not retracted it. You continue to defend the
>indefensible.
>
>> You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
>> disporve any other assertion I have made.
>
>Steve, I have "disporved" your assertions.

You have disproved nothing, Brain.

You have argued the litteral translation of what I said.

I have expounded and explained myself thouroughly. That you do not seem
to be able top accept anything other than a Kindergarten-level definition is
not my problem.

>> >> But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is
>> "kind
>> >> of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.
>> >
>> >People with good incomes.
>>
>> Ahhhhhhhhhhhhh....Now you base the character of your neighbors based
>upon
>> thier paychecks?
>
>Their paychecks.

How narrow-minded can you be?

>> What a FREAKIN' SCUMBAG you are!
>>
>> Geeeze-Loweeze, Burke! You sink just a bit lower EVERY TIME YOU POST!
>
>Welp, I'm not surrounded by people dipping into workman's comp or
>other entitlement programs.

I'm not "dipping" into Workman's Comp either. Nor am I being disbursed
any funds from ANY "entitlement" program.

Care to try again?

>You're so defensive about your separation from the USMC.

I don't know why you think this, Brain. All my paperwork says "Honorable" on it.

Also, it seems the ONLY person who brings it up is Lennie the Loser. Lennie, who often feigns disgust at any perceived sleight towards Veterans and claims to "support and respect any Honorably seperated veteran regardless of the nature of thier seperation."

However everytime I get His Scumminess backed into yet another corner with his OWN words, he rolls this out, thinking it's some supermarket tabloid headline announcing some great abuse of government funds.

If it is, then there's about 3 or more MILLION veterans who are "abusing" the system.

Leonard H. Anderson is a scumbag, Brian. He decries as "patriotic buffonery" anyone who dares to even remotely mention ANY "service" at ANY level, yet he also signs many of his posts with an Army service number, the type of which the Armed Forces hasn't used in almost forty years.

His verbosity and ability to wordsmith his posts does NOT make him right...It just makes him LOUD.

He's an idiot...but YOU have voluntarily linked your fortunes to him, which makes you even MORE laughable.

Kerplunk.

Steve, K4YZ

4474. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 12:21:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030421.229e3616@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92538

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>...
> William wrote:
>
>
> > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>
> Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

You have to with guys like Slick Willie, err, ahh, Steve/K4CAP.

;^0

4475. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 12:24:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030424.428b13f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92539

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Y8mdnaQqkvPF8SPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
> > William wrote:
> >
> >
> > > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> > > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
> >
> > Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>
> It turns out it is necessary to define "is" as it does NOT always mean
> "equal to".

However, it meant >>>EQUAL TO<<< in Steve's use of the word.

As noted in the post I just sent, one can say "Marigolds are
> flowers", which is a true statement but you cannot turn it around and say
> "Flowers are marigolds" as this latter isn't always true.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Welp, if we were to use a subject a little closer to the task at hand, and say,

"MARS Ops >>>ARE<<< Amateur Ops" it would be false, and if we were to say,

"Amateur Ops >>>ARE<<< MARS Ops" it would again be false.

4476. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 12:25:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030425.48adcda9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92540

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Qc-dnVMldLcZ9iPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406021357.66ffef3b@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:<A_OdnUsQJLpOUCDdRVn-ig@comcast.com>...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:a-KdnVBL2-TuqyDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com...
> > > >
> > > > [snip]
> > > > The only thing left is to examine the statement that Steve is
> > > > continuing to get his chops busted over:
> > > >
> > > > "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio,"
> > > >
> > > > Strictly speaking, One is not necessarily a member of MARS by virtue
> of
> > > > having an amateur license.
> > > >
> > > > However, if a person was a civilian, they might be hard pressed to be
> a
> > > > member unless they had such a license.
> > > >
> > > > Certainly, the amateur radio operator receiving training in the proper
> > > > traffic handling is the purpose of MARS.
> > > >
> > > > So where one might want Steve to add "a part of" between "is" and
> > > > "amateur", I would remind everyone that this was in the context of a
> > > > reply to our good Hans, who has been known to engage in a bit of
> > > > hyperbole his own good self.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Actually based on the material you quoted, Steve's statement, based on
> the
> > > rules of logic, is correct as it stands.
> >
> > Actually, No. But you're thinking in the right direction.
> >
> > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
> >
> > If Steve were to say that some (few, many, most, 99%, 90%, more than
> > 80%, and/or 98%) MARS operators are also amateur radio operators, he
> > would have been correct. But he's switched his position on it so many

> > times, without ever having rejected his original statement, "Sorry
> > Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," that we cannot tell where he
> > really stands on the subject.
> >
> > A good first start to clearing up his position would be for him to
> > admit that MARS >>>IS NOT<<< Amateur Radio.
> >
> > However, one must keep in mind
> > > that under the rules of logic, a statement that is true as written, is
> not
> > > necessarily true in the reverse direction.
> >
> > It must be true in both directions. If it is not, then Algebra
> > contains only false statements. Is this the case?
> >
> > In this case, the statement
> > > "MARS is amateur radio" does NOT imply that it is the only element of
> > > amateur radio
> >
> > It does imply that. Nothing about a subset was uttered or implied.
> >
> > > and does NOT imply anything about the characteristics and
> > > activities of amateur radio.
> >
> > It does imply that. It implies that MARS is Amateur Radio. Even if
> > Steve were to have merely said that , "MARS >>>IS<<< _Exactly Like_
> > Amateur Radio," he would still have been wrong. He said that they
> > weren't exactly alike, he said that they were the very same thing!
> >
> > That is to say, one cannot legitimately turn
> > > the statement around to say that "amateur radio is MARS."
> >
> > For the statement to be true, "turning the statement around" must also
> > be true. Transitive property.
> >
> > Thanks, Dee, for setting the record straight.
>
> Math rules on IS being the same as EQUALS do not apply to logic statements.
>
> One can say that "Marigolds are flowers" yet cannot say that "Flowers are
> marigolds." The statement is NOT true in both directions because it is NOT
> math.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

If only that were true, your rescue of Steve would be complete.

4477. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 17:07:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030907.46e29158@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92541

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
> >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a change.
>
> Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
>
> I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC MARS
> program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.

I don't recall him stating that he was applying for N/MC MARS. I
think that is something that you made up.

> He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result of
> having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related program.

Yep, its amazing how many holes are left on the application form when
you aren't applying.

Did you ever find those sites that Len posted? They were clickable,
so you shouldn't have had too much trouble.

4478. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 17:08:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030908.7b90b1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92542

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603042734.08222.00000340@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> >From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
> >Date: 6/2/2004 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
> >
> >William wrote:
> >
> >
> >> Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
> >> equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
> >
> > Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
>
> Of course he will, Mike.
>
> It's the only way he can express an assertion of validity to his arguments
> otherwise.

huh?

4479. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 17:11:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030911.2491499c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92543

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603042054.08222.00000338@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
> Mike, my comment was meant to be that the MARS program is the very essence
> of what being an Amateur is all about,

"The Amateur's Code" says nothing about MARS.

and my later statements further exemplfy
> that one cannot be a part of MARS without Amateur Radio.

There are numerous examples of how your statement is false.

Why do I always have to go back to the beginning with you???

4480. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 17:30:23 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406030930.6b0be524@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92544

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603044813.08222.00000342@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/1/2004 5:51 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406011451.1a2ba198@posting.google.com>
>
> >> I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.
> >
> >Yet you have not retracted it. You continue to defend the
> >indefensible.
> >
> >> You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
> >> disporve any other assertion I have made.
> >
> >Steve, I have "disporved" your assertions.
>
> You have disproved nothing, Brain.
>
> You have argued the litteral translation of what I said.
>
> I have expounded and explained myself thouroughly. That you do not seem
> to be able top accept anything other than a Kindergarten-level definition is
> not my problem.

It is your problem as you've not retracted, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<<
Amateur Radio."

> >> >> But I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to know your community is
> "kind
> >> >> of heavy on LE"...considering who lives there.
> >> >
> >> >People with good incomes.
> >>
> >> Ahhhhhhhhhhhhh....Now you base the character of your neighbors based
> upon
> >> thier paychecks?
> >
> >Their paychecks.
>
> How narrow-minded can you be?

How narrow minded can you be?

> >> What a FREAKIN' SCUMBAG you are!
> >>
> >> Geeeze-Loweeze, Burke! You sink just a bit lower EVERY TIME YOU POST!
> >
> >Welp, I'm not surrounded by people dipping into workman's comp or
> >other entitlement programs.
>
> I'm not "dipping" into Workman's Comp either. Nor am I being disbursed
> any funds from ANY "entitlement" program.
>
> Care to try again?

Are you classified as disabled by the Veteran's Administration?

> >You're so defensive about your separation from the USMC.
>
> I don't know why you think this, Brain. All my paperwork says "Honorable"
> on it.

I think it because of your every reaction to anything that has to do
with your service.

> Also, it seems the ONLY person who brings it up is Lennie the Loser.
> Lennie, who often feigns disgust at any perceived sleight towards Veterans and
> claims to "support and respect any Honorably seperated veteran regardless of
> the nature of thier seperation."

Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.

> However everytime I get His Scumminess backed into yet another corner with
> his OWN words, he rolls this out, thinking it's some supermarket tabloid
> headline announcing some great abuse of government funds.

I've never read that in his posts.

> If it is, then there's about 3 or more MILLION veterans who are "abusing"
> the system.

If you say so.

4481. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:36:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603183627.22098.00000254@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92549

In article <20040603044813.08222.00000342@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/1/2004 5:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406011451.1a2ba198@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I said it metaphorically, and explained my rationale for it.
>>
>>Yet you have not retracted it. You continue to defend the
>>indefensible.
>>
>>> You have based a whole months worth of trolls on that, and have yet to
>>> disporve any other assertion I have made.
>>
>>Steve, I have "disporved" your assertions.
>
> You have disproved nothing, Brain.

Brian (not "Brain") has disproved every statement you made that "MARS is amateur radio."

> You have argued the litteral translation of what I said.

There's NO "translation" necessary. DoD Directive 4650.2 establishes MARS as a military radio service...and does it in English.

> I have expounded and explained myself thouroughly.

You've backtracked, backpedalled, rationalized, and outright LIED trying to make your statement true. Didn't work.

MARS is a military radio service.

You never once referenced the DoD, USA, USAF, or USN documents to prove your statement.

One reason is that the DoD, USA, USAF, and USN don't agree with your statement.

MARS is a military radio service.

>That you do not seem
>to be able top accept anything other than a Kindergarten-level definition is
>not my problem.

Incorrect. YOUR problem is that you cannot face reality and
understand the Directives and Regulations of the military.

Shame on you, big burly (but medically-discharged) veteran
of "seven hostile actions."

> I don't know why you think this, Brain. All my paperwork says
"Honorable"
>on it.

Then why did you claim a "medical discharge" in this very newsgroup?

You've never offered to scan and distribute your "official paperwork"
to prove one way or the other. All we have is your "word" on it.

Given that you can't understand DoD Directives and "interpret" things
to fit your agendas (you call that "lying" but won't admit it of yourself),
nursie's "word" has very little value.

> Also, it seems the ONLY person who brings it up is Lennie the Loser.
>Lennie, who often feigns disgust at any perceived sleight towards Veterans and
>claims to "support and respect any Honorably seperated veteran regardless of
>the nature of thier seperation."

[it's "their" and "separation" hostile action hero...]

You are constantly denigrating other veterans that don't agree with
your views of amateur radio. That's not "respect" for others.

As an example, you consistently lower my Army military occupation
specialty to "radio clerk" despite being given the proper MOS and
summary description. I not only have documentation which can be
scanned and forwared in e-mail to interested parties, but I have a
withness in Eugene Rosenbaum, a veteran who served in my Army
unit at the same time I did, plus an interview with Rick Chernitzer
written up in the Pacific Edition of Stars and Stripes military
newspaper in their 10 November 2002 issue on Hardy Barracks,
one of the few remaining U.S. military locations in Tokyo today.
[it's in their website archives] I have no reason to "lie" about any
of that verifiable experience, yet you constantly denigrate that
service.

You consistently denigrate Brian Burke's USAF meteorological
experience and claim his activity in Somalia while on USAF
assignment was "illegal." Everytime you disagree with Brian
Burke, you attempt denigrating him and call him nasty names.

For three weeks you failed to come up with any documents,
even if only ID or nomenclature on your claim that "MARS is
amateur radio." I had to do it for you.

You have consistently displayed ignorance of military
communications by not being able to name one single piece
of communications equipment, either by official nomenclature
or familiar name, things which are well known to those who

have been engaged in that. Both I and Brian Burke have given some of those names. Your only response has been vague and insulting along with specious claims that "it is classified." What we have given is NOT classified and is public knowledge.

> However everytime I get His Scumminess backed into yet another corner with
>his OWN words, he rolls this out, thinking it's some supermarket tabloid
>headline announcing some great abuse of government funds.

Nursie compares himself with some newsstand publication. The public is not interested. Nursie stated that he was medically discharged due to a service related accident, his military career terminated. Stated in here.

However, nursie claims having passed a flight physical to obtain a private pilot license and made other claims of physical strength such as "hiking with [considerable] load" and then claimed on top of that his medical discharge was disavowed.

We readers don't know what to think anymore since all claims seem to be contradictory.

> If it is, then there's about 3 or more MILLION veterans who are
>"abusing" the system.

Numbers from WHAT source? Fantasy Island Hall of Records?

> Leonard H. Anderson is a scumbag, Brian. He decries as "patriotic
>buffonery" anyone who dares to even remotely mention ANY "service" at ANY
>level, yet he also signs many of his posts with an Army service number, the
>type of which the Armed Forces hasn't used in almost forty years.

I've given my ARMY Service Number assigned to me as RA16408336.

At that time each military branch had their own service numbers, did not, as miltary does now, use Social Security numbers.

ASN prefixes denote the kind of service for the Army. An "RA" prefix (standing for Regular Army) was for those who volunteered. A "US" prefix (for army of the United States) was for those who were drafted. An "NG" stood for National Guard. An "O" prefix was for commissioned officers or commissioned reservists [the First Sergeant of C Company, FEC Sig Svc Bn, was a reserve Captain and his ASN stood out among all the other NCOs].

The draft ended in 1975, 29 years ago. The U.S. military is entirely voluntary now.

> His verbosity and ability to wordsmith his posts does NOT make him
>right...It just makes him LOUD.

By showing the proper references, that makes me CORRECT.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

MARS is a military radio service.

There are no MARS regulations in Title 47 C.F.R. Had it been amateur radio, it would have been so noted in Part 97. It is not.

Department of Defense causes MARS to be a military radio service through Directive 4650.2, effective 21 Nov 03.

> He's an idiot...but YOU have voluntarily linked your fortunes to him,
>which makes you even MORE laughable.

Nursie is continuing with consistent personal insults and attempted denigration of anyone who disagrees with his fantasies and opinions.

Nursie should admit that he was wrong in his statement that "MARS is amateur radio." It is not. Nursie is wrong.

Nursie is without honor. QED.

LHA / WMD

4482. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:36:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603183628.22098.00000255@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92545

In article <20040603043313.08222.00000341@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/1/2004 4:42 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040601174208.23112.00000326@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>> Nursie is WRONG.
>
> I am sure you wish it were true, Lennie. repeating it over and over won't
>make it so, however.

The Department of Defense "makes it so" with Directive 4650.2 effective 21 Nov 03.

DoD has final say in what MARS is.

MARS is a military radio service.

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

LHA / WMD

4483. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:36:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603183629.22098.00000256@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92547

In article <1e4e3692.0406030911.2491499c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040603042054.08222.00000338@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>>
>> Mike, my comment was meant to be that the MARS program is the very
essence
>> of what being an Amateur is all about,
>
>"The Amateur's Code" says nothing about MARS.

"The Amateur's Code" also says that amateurs "owe their
allegiance to the ARRL" which is a bunch of propaganda
to self-elevate ARRL.

Department of Defense says what MARS is.

Amateur it is not. MARS is a military radio service.

> and my later statements further exemplfy
>> that one cannot be a part of MARS without Amateur Radio.
>
>There are numerous examples of how your statement is false.
>
>Why do I always have to go back to the beginning with you???

Probably because he never STARTED at the beginning. :-)

MARS began officially in 1948 (renamed from the original
AARS started in 1925). Nursie wasn't born yet in 1948,
therefore he not "in" it from the beginning...except in the
alternate reality his mind inhabits. :-)

On the other hand, he might have a "green card" obtained
as a Man From Mars, infiltrating us earthbeings and
causing dissention so that Forces From Mars can
conquer Earth. That may take "seven hostile actions."
[it all comes together...? :-)]

LHA / WMD

4484. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:36:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603183630.22098.00000257@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92548

In article <1e4e3692.0406030907.46e29158@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
>> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
>> >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>>
>> >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a change.
>>
>> Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
>>
>> I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC
MARS
>> program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.
>
>I don't recall him stating that he was applying for N/MC MARS. I
>think that is something that you made up.

Nursie makes up a LOT of things...but they are very real to him
on his Fantasy Island.

Nursie "cuts and pastes" things not realizing that the material is
from his imagination. After each "cut" there is a slight loss of
neurons available for thinking.

>> He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result of
>> having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related program.
>
>Yep, its amazing how many holes are left on the application form when
>you aren't applying.

The only problem with nursie's little fantasy is that I did indeed, relay
some MARS TTY messages as part of my duty at ADA 1953 to
1955. Army MARS in Tokyo got their own full station at Hardy
Barracks early in 1955. [Army was the starter of MARS with the
AARS in 1925, that being renamed MARS in 1948 when the USAF
was formed as a separate service branch...USAF also getting
involved in MARS at the same time...took the USN-USMC 14
more years to get involved in MARS]

Other than that, I've only been involved with Mars on the Mariner-67
unmanned spacecraft and seeing the JPL Deep Space Network
control room at Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

>Did you ever find those sites that Len posted? They were clickable,
>so you shouldn't have had too much trouble.

Nursie is afraid they contain "pornographic material" if its a link
I posted. Poor guy is soooooo sensitive... :-)

LHA / WMD

4485. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:36:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603183631.22098.00000258@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92546

In article <1e4e3692.0406030424.428b13f7@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:<Y8mdnaQqkvPF8SPdRVn-gg@comcast.com>...
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:WIudnQcXWocA_iPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...
>> > William wrote:
>> >
>> > > Using logic, where ">>>IS<<<" means ">>>EQUAL TO<<<," MARS is not
>> > > equal to, or the same as Amateur Radio. The statement is false.
>> >
>> > Yoiks! Brian. We're not going to be defining "is" now are we? 8^)
>> >
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>> It turns out it is necessary to define "is" as it does NOT always mean
>> "equal to".
>
>However, it meant >>>EQUAL TO<<< in Steve's use of the word.
>
> As noted in the post I just sent, one can say "Marigolds are
>> flowers", which is a true statement but you cannot turn it around and say
>> "Flowers are marigolds" as this latter isn't always true.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Welp, if we were to use a subject a little closer to the task at hand, and
>say,
>
>"MARS Ops >>>ARE<<< Amateur Ops" it would be false, and if we were to say,
>
>"Amateur Ops >>>ARE<<< MARS Ops" it would again be false.

Careful, Brian, Dee might send you a bouquet of marigolds.

Nursie can't reply with bouquets, only brickbats. :-)

[well, he IS bats and the thinking is on the order of brickwork...]

LHA / WMD

4486. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:55:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <30Ovc.10863$Yd3.4536@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92600

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WIudnQUXWod__CPdRVn-uA@adelphia.com...

> I would imagine that already being a Ham might help you get that job,
> but there are no doubt plenty of trained operators in the service that
> aren't Hams, and some of them are the connection points for the Hams.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Correct Mike. As an example....when I was chop (Chief operator) at the ARMY MARS Station AE1AYY in Frankfurt Germany I had several assigned operators. None had a license but me. But....to be NCOIC (Sergeant in charge) or CHOP I would not have HAD TO have a license. As long as there was someone in the unit that had the callsign with the German authorities and we had Army authorization as a MARS station. I am sure these rules would vary depending on the country however. But the above would be basically the same I am sure.

Dan/W4NTI

4487. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-03 22:58:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92601

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
> >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a
change.
>
> Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
>
> I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC
MARS
> program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.
>
> He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result
of
> having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related
program.
>
> >Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
> >branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
> >individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator.
Or
> >as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and
> >overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made
> >being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.
>
> Agreed on the lack of need for a license if you are in a MILITARY
unit and
> assigned to a MARS unit for duty. I was CHOP of NNN0MOC/MOF and had
several
> Marines assigned to me under exactly those circumstances. All except two
> eventually DID get a license, though.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license stateside
without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.

Dan/W4NTI

4488. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 01:03:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406031703.a92b6fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92602

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040602172417.23112.00000339@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406020621.248b611@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> >I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent
> >> >numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows.
> >> >But I won't.
> >>
> >> Don't forget the QSL cards to "prove" you used a tilted whip
> >> to work somebody...AND the signature of your authorizing
> >> officer plus the appropriate directive/regulation! :-)
> >>
> >> >After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!
> >>
> >> Don Rumsfeld and company might take some issue with that,
> >> but then someone here "knows" all about MARS.
> >
> >Donnie better start kissing the former Marine's butt before Steve
> >decides to pull all of -his- Amateurs out of MARS.
>
> Nursie may be cutting orders to that effect even now... :-)

Donnie just screwed with the wrong ex-Marine. I think he'll be
treated to some close order drill followed by some one-handed pushups
in a gravel parking lot.

> >> Maybe he/she went there... :-)
> >>
> >> "QRM Interplanetary" is the title of a short story by George O.
> >> Smith, appeared in Astounding Science Fiction of the late
> >> 1940s. It was part of the "Venus Equilateral" series, had very
> >> little to do with Mars. :-)
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!!!" Hi hi
>
> That statement is rather like Fantasy Fiction...not enough science
> to be Science Fiction, though.

Look Boss, Da Pain, Da Pain!

> George O. Smith was a ham also, spent WW2 as a civilian on
> the first proximity fuse production and development as an

> engineer. His "Venus Equilateral" series was based on a future
> communications relay station in solar orbit between Earth and
> Venus...not knowing as we found out later that Venus is un-
> inhabitable for humans.

But not for the ex-Marine... Once he puts on his space cadet uniform,
he's nearly there.

> So, we have nursie being a MARS volunteer thinking that "MARS
> is amateur radio." Unlike Smith, he should have known from
> DoD documents that MARS is a military radio service. MARS,
> as such by name, existed since 1948, rather before nursie's time.
>
> Hi hi hi. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Definitely hi hi.

4489. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 01:51:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92603

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny>...
> > Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use -
> > where?
> >
> > I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the
> > continuing movement to reduce technical requirements. This would
include
> > grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
> > towers. Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you
actually
> > know something.
> >
> > Just my opinion ;)
> >
> >
> > Best regards from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.

I didn't know that the FCC exams covered driving vehicles. My concern is
that people have little idea of rf safety, lightning safety (proper earth
ground), conductor sizing and many other nifty items that might become
somewhat important.

Reminds me of the time we had to run a 115 volt , 30 amp circuit some 250
feet one way. One fool couldn't understand why we needed wire heavier than
10 gauge. "gee, 10 gauge wire will handle 30 amps). Yep, IR loss. Then
there was the guy at work that took some 16 gauge wire to run a 12 volt 25
amp circuit. I tried to explain. Another knucklehead said it would work.
He was lucky; the wire melted and didn't start a fire.

I also don't want some idiot running 200 watts into a 5/8 wave groundplane
on 2 meters next door to me. He may be ignorant, but I am not.

So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car have to
do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.698 / Virus Database: 455 - Release Date: 6/2/04

4490. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 02:13:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92604

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> > >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> > >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
> > >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a
> change.
> >
> > Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
> >
> > I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC
> MARS
> > program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.
> >
> > He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result
> of
> > having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related
> program.
> >
> > >Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
> > >branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
> > >individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator.
> Or
> > >as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and
> > >overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made
> > >being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.
> >
> > Agreed on the lack of need for a license if you are in a MILITARY
> unit and
> > assigned to a MARS unit for duty. I was CHOP of NNN0MOC/MOF and had
> several
> > Marines assigned to me under exactly those circumstances. All except two
> > eventually DID get a license, though.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> >

> Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license stateside
> without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."

4491. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 02:16:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <IYQvc.4751$3v1.712@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92605

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0406021215.76dae1fc@posting.google.com...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
> > >
> > > There is virtually no difference between the current General and
> > > Technician written exams.
> > >
> > >
> > > That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
> > > on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
> > > pool.
> > >
> > > > Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> > > > know something.
> > >
> > > Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
> > > regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
> > >
> >
> >
> > Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
> > enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
> > requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
> > Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
> > tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
> > Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
> > though, doesn't it!
>
>
> > With all kind regards,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.
>
> Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?
>
> Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be
made.
>
> - Stewart

> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

Hello, Stewart

Ok, let me pose a simple question for you. Assume you have a base and a mobile MURS station. Both have very good antennas and you have a minimum 10 mile solid range of communications. You are talking to your wife. She is 7 miles away from you. 11 miles away, another mobile MURS station comes over a hill and is now in your range. He has a base station 8 miles further away that you can't hear. He is using the same channel that you and your wife are using. He is running a 5/8 wave on his car. Oh, and he is using a modified 50 watt 2 meter rig (both at his base and in his car).

Do the math. He can be on the opposite side of you from your wife in the mobile. His electric field is 5 times your wife's (and likely at least twice yours). Can we spell "capture effect"? Without extensive f layer propogation that exists on 11 meters at times, these problems won't become apparent until there are more MURS users and even then, most of the problem will be in urban areas .... but .... meanwhile, you won't be able to communicate with your wife (most likely).

I darn well think that amateurs should be tested in at least basic rules and safety for an entry level class license. I tend to get nervous when I see questions about SWR and coax lengths from amateur extra class licenses.

As far as the old timers wasting their time, there is one older guy around here whose repeaters won't go down easily. One is windmill powered; the other is solar powered. Then there are a *ton* of others in his system. All interconnected and cover 10 meters to 1.2 GHz.

We have lives beyond both this newsgroup and Morse code ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.698 / Virus Database: 455 - Release Date: 6/2/04

4492. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 02:30:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603223018.15095.00000176@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92606

In article <1e4e3692.0406031703.a92b6fc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040602172417.23112.00000339@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406020621.248b611@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> >I suppose now I'll be commanded to provide names and dates, patent
>> >> >numbers, and a portfolio of 8x10 glossies with circles and arrows.
>> >> >But I won't.
>> >>
>> >> Don't forget the QSL cards to "prove" you used a tilted whip
>> >> to work somebody...AND the signature of your authorizing
>> >> officer plus the appropriate directive/regulation! :-)
>> >>
>> >> >After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!
>> >>
>> >> Don Rumsfeld and company might take some issue with that,
>> >> but then someone here "knows" all about MARS.
>> >
>> >Donnie better start kissing the former Marine's butt before Steve
>> >decides to pull all of -his- Amateurs out of MARS.
>>
>> Nursie may be cutting orders to that effect even now... :-)
>
>Donnie just screwed with the wrong ex-Marine. I think he'll be
>treated to some close order drill followed by some one-handed pushups
>in a gravel parking lot.
>
>> >> Maybe he/she went there... :-)
>> >>
>> >> "QRM Interplanetary" is the title of a short story by George O.
>> >> Smith, appeared in Astounding Science Fiction of the late
>> >> 1940s. It was part of the "Venus Equilateral" series, had very
>> >> little to do with Mars. :-)
>> >>
>> >> LHA / WMD
>> >
>> >"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!!!" Hi hi
>>
>> That statement is rather like Fantasy Fiction...not enough science
>> to be Science Fiction, though.
>

>Look Boss, Da Pain, Da Pain!
>
>> George O. Smith was a ham also, spent WW2 as a civilian on
>> the first proximity fuse production and development as an
>> engineer. His "Venus Equilateral" series was based on a future
>> communications relay station in solar orbit between Earth and
>> Venus...not knowing as we found out later that Venus is un-
>> inhabitable for humans.
>
>But not for the ex-Marine... Once he puts on his space cadet uniform,
>he's nearly there.
>
>> So, we have nursie being a MARS volunteer thinking that "MARS
>> is amateur radio." Unlike Smith, he should have known from
>> DoD documents that MARS is a military radio service. MARS,
>> as such by name, existed since 1948, rather before nursie's time.
>>
>> Hi hi hi. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Definitely hi hi.

And so "da blane" landed and another episode of Fantasy Island
begins. I wonder what nursie will come up with for a plot next
episode? All stay tuned for the next exciting (yawn) chapter...

[I'd rather watch my hard disk defrag but, if nursie wants to revise
DoD, ain't many that will take the time to point it out to him...]

LHA / WMD

4493. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 02:40:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92607

>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
>
>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...

>> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
>> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.

>So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car have to
>do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?

A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)

A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our attention from
thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4494. Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 03:49:37 UTC
From: TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>
Source record: 92608

I used to be active on the air about 12 years ago. I will be moving out of my assigned call area. I'd like to get back on the air when I move.

What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call when one moves out of their area?

For example, if I was visiting W4 area from W3, I would identify as W3--- "portable W4" or W3---/W4. Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc? Is this a big deal these days?

Thanks.

--
NOTE: To reply, DELETE the obvious word in my e-mail address you need to DELETE in order to reply.

4495. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 04:21:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92609

William wrote:

> Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.

You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
of late, "William".

Dave K8MN

4496. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 08:05:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040604040516.02692.00000449@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92610

>Subject: Call Area Etiquette
>From: TeleTech tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com
>Date: 6/3/2004 10:49 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>
>
>I used to be active on the air about 12 years ago. I will be moving out of
>my assigned call area. I'd like to get back on the air when I move.
>
>What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when
>one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call
>when one moves out of their area?
>
>For example, if I was visiting W4 area from W3, I would identify as W3---
>"portable W4" or W3---/W4. Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
>Is this a big deal these days?
>
>Thanks.

Greetings, and welcome back.

Unfortunately too few folks still observe the call districts in thier callsigns. Thier "point" is that ""...I don't HAVE to do it, so I won't...". The requirement to identify which area you ae operating from was dropped quite a long time ago.

I am a "4" living in 4-land, but when I still had my 8 call, I always signed "/4" on CW or stated "mobile" or "portable" on phone. I don't like it when I am looking for a specific area only to find out that the "W1" I just called is actually in in San Francisco.

Some contests (and of course, Field Day) require it, but that's just for the contest rules, not "regulations".

Hope to catch you on the air some day.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4497. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 08:06:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040604040628.02692.00000450@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92611

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/3/2004 11:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>
>
>William wrote:
>
>> Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.
>
>You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
>You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
>of late, "William".

"...of late"...?!?!

Being a bit generous today, are we, Dave...?!?! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ

4498. So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 12:08:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92612

Department of Communications/News Bureau
22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872

URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116

KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the University of Rhode Island’s Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the mother of invention.

An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)

Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of the radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4499. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 12:18:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406040418.3bc690cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92613

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
>
> > Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.
>
> You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
> You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
> of late, "William".
>
> Dave K8MN

Anyone can remove one of their more embarassing posts.

4500. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 12:25:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40C06A54.6030904@psu.edu>
Source record: 92615

Jim Hampton wrote:
> "stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0406021215.76dae1fc@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>
> news:<pUlvc.19048$Tn6.182@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>"stewart" <horseshitstew7@yahoo.com> wrote
>>>
>>>>There is virtually no difference between the current General and
>>>>Technician written exams.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>That's funny... there are 11 questions in the Technician question pool
>>>>on TOWER SAFETY... and there are 0 questions in the General question
>>>>pool.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
>>>>>know something.
>>>>
>>>>Apparently, recent Technicians know MORE than recent Generals, in
>>>>regards to your litmus test issue of TOWER SAFETY.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Uh, don't look now, but each new recent General has to first take the
>>>enty level Technician examination. Since tower safety is a basic
>>>requirement for any class operator it is tested on the basic test.
>>>Wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to ask the same questions on both
>>>tests, so the General examination does not repeat the same material.
>>>Kinda puts the lie to your assertion about "virtually no difference"
>>>though, doesn't it!
>>
>>
>>>With all kind regards,
>>>
>>>de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>Still fighting the LOSING battle with non-logic, I see.
>>
>>Man! Don't you fools have ANYTHING better to do with your lives?
>>

>>Don't look now, but there's only a few of you left... progress WILL be
>
> made.
>
>>- Stewart
>>http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN
>
>
> Hello, Stewart
>
> Ok, let me pose a simple question for you. Assume you have a base and a
> mobile MURS station. Both have very good antennas and you have a minimum 10
> mile solid range of communications. You are talking to your wife. She is 7
> miles away from you. 11 miles away, another mobile MURS station comes over
> a hill and is now in your range. He has a base station 8 miles further away
> that you can't hear. He is using the same channel that you and your wife
> are using. He is running a 5/8 wave on his car. Oh, and he is using a
> modified 50 watt 2 meter rig (both at his base and in his car).
>
> Do the math. He can be on the opposite side of you from your wife in the
> mobile. His electric field is 5 times your wife's (and likely at least
> twice yours). Can we spell "capture effect"? Without extensive f layer
> propogation that exists on 11 meters at times, these problems won't become
> apparent until there are more MURS users and even then, most of the problem
> will be in urban areas .... but .... meanwhile, you won't be able to
> communicate with your wife (most likely).

My suspicion is that this is the first time that one has heard of the capture effect. Remember, nothing makes for a solid and simple argument like ignorance of the details.

> I darn well think that amateurs should be tested in at least basic rules and
> safety for an entry level class license. I tend to get nervous when I see
> questions about SWR and coax lengths from amateur extra class licenses.

I'm not sure what can be done about that one, Jim. When the increasing Morse code speed requirements were in place, the prospective Extra was likely on the air and learning more about things as he or she went. It was simply a slowing of the process that enabled knowledge gain and practical experience in the interim. Now with 5wpm and testing, those brakes aren't there.

I became an Extra "too quickly" and I know of others that got it much more too quickly than me! 8^)

I've wanted to propose a waiting period between General and Extra, (2 years) but I seem to be the only person that thinks that is a good idea.

> As far as the old timers wasting their time, there is one older guy around
> here whose repeaters won't go down easily. One is windmill powered; the
> other is solar powered. Then there are a *ton* of others in his system.
> All interconnected and cover 10 meters to 1.2 GHz.

Most excellent!

Hey Jim, Are you going to be at the Rochester Hamfest this Saturday?
i'm thinking of making it there on Saturday, then swinging down to catch
the Butler fest on Sunday.

- Mike KB3EIA

4501. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 12:26:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406040426.7923f3c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92614

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
> >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> >Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
> >
> >
> >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
>
> >> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
> >> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.
>
> >So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car have to
> >do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?
>
> A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)
>
> A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our attention from
> thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The point was, "We'll never know (if they knew the material).

Some of you OF's try to make it sound like getting to the FCC office
for an examination was inconvenient at best, or even dangerous. So
you petitioned your government to let you get a mail order license, or
to have some other local ham(s) test you. Lots of hand wringing and
whining.

4502. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 16:46:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92616

TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
> I used to be active on the air about 12 years ago. I will be moving out of
> my assigned call area. I'd like to get back on the air when I move.

That's great!
>
> What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when
> one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call
> when one moves out of their area?
>
> For example, if I was visiting W4 area from W3, I would identify as W3---
> "portable W4" or W3---/W4.

When away from the permanent station location, a lot of us do the
"mobile 3" thing. I do it so that people know I'm mobile or portable,
and will understand if I don't respond to a call or my signal drops
out.

But at the permanent station location, most hams just use their
callsign even if their call doesn't match the callsign district.

With the current regulations, you can choose your callsign by means of
the vanity call program. So if you want a call that matches your
location, you can have one (for a fee).

> Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> Is this a big deal these days?
>
No and no.

It's not a new thing, either. Here's my story:

I was licensed in 1967 and got a six-character 3 land callsign, which
I kept until I moved to New York State in 1977. This was a permanent
move, and under the rules back then I could request a 1x2, 2x1, 1x3,
2x2 or 2x3 callsign - sequentially issued, no fee and no choice other
than the format. So I asked for a 1x2 and got N2EY.

Then in 1979 I moved back to 3-land. But in the 2 years that had
elapsed, the FCC had changed the rules. I could have gotten a 3-land
call, in any of the above formats, but if I gave up N2EY the FCC would
not reissue it to anybody. So I kept it, rather than deny another ham
a 1x2 or 2x1 call.

Eventually the rules changed and they began reissuing old 1x2 calls.
But by then I was so used to N2EY that I just kept it. Never been a

problem on the air.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4503. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1399 June 4, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 17:34:51 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040604133451.16591.00000453@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92617

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1399 June 4, 2004

Amateur Radio Nerwsline Report number 1399 will follow in a few moments. First, this important announcement from our Support Fund Administrator Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--

The following is not necessarilly for retransmission. I guess you already know that if you are hearing my voice on a closed-circuit advisory it means that Newsline is again facing a financial crisis.

Well, you're right. The funds are so low that we may not be able to pay the bills from May. Worse, for the first time in our history, we even do not have the money to send a representative to Huntsville this
summer to present the 2004 Young Ham of the Year Award. And in two words --- "that's bad." "Real bad."

The solution to both of these problems really lies with you. Our world-wide all volunteer staff produces these newscasts for you. The all volunteer Young Ham of the Year Committee labors tirelessly each year to select a youngster to receive the Award. Joe Eisenberg, K0NEB, oversees the Newsline sponsored Roy Neal, K6DUE, Amateur Radio Mentoring Project database, doing so at no cost. The list goes on and on.

I too am a volunteer, but I have to be the realist. I'm the accountant
who has to look at the bottom line and when it turns red, I have to say -- hold on -- there is no more money to continue. And that's about where we are right now.

So, here's the bottom line. If you want the newscasts to continue. If you want the mentoring program to continue and the Young Ham of the Year Award to continue, we need you to show it now -- right now -- through your financial support of Amateur Radio Newsline.

Remember that Amateur Radio Newsline is a federally chartered 501(C)(3) and California state not-for-profit corporation. This makes your donations tax deductible, whether you're an individual or a club.
The address to send them to is the Amateur Radio Newsline Support Fund, Post Office Box 660937, Arcadia California 91066. If you missed the address don't worry. It will be repeated at the end of this week's report.

For now I thank you for listening, for responding and offer you this weeks newscast which follows immediately.

--

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1399 with a release date of Friday, June 4, 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio on alert on a stormy Memorial Day
weekend, a BPL deadline is extended, another country says goodbye to Morse code and June is Amateur Radio month. We'll tell you where on
Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1399 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS AID AS TORNADOES CONTINUE

Strong storms with funnel clouds raced across Indiana during the Memorial Day holiday forcing thousands of Indianapolis residents and race fans alike to take shelter from tornadoes. Jack Parker W8ISH was
tracking the storm that left behind a train of devastation while putting radio amateurs on alert.

--

For the city of Indianapolis, the Race Day storms could not have happened at a worse time. Hundreds of thousands of people were in town for the 88th running of the Indianapolis 500 mile race and for the NBA Playoff game between the Indiana Pacers and the Detroit Pistons. The rain delayed race was nearing the end when race officials threw out the checkered flag and warned nearly 400 thousand race fans to immediately take shelter.

Accordling to early reports an F3 tornado passed just south of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway and began its destructive path across the south and east side of Marion county. Hundreds of central Indiana amateur radio operators were kept busy from Sunday morning until late Sunday evening tracking the funnel clouds and reporting ground truth observations back to the National Weather Service office in Indlianapolis.

While the Pacers took on the Detroit Pistons, tornado sirens blared outside, motorists got stuck in traffic jams, and tree limbs and debris were tossed into roadways. A funnel cloud described as two blocks wide, tore the roof off a nursing home leaving nearly fifty bed-ridden patients without shelter. They spent over an hour out in the pouring rain as rescue personel attended to their injuries. Downed
power lines, flooded streets and massive amounts of debris from damaged homes made it difficult for Indianapolis police and fire

personnel to reach those in need.

According to the National Weather Service more than a dozen tornadoes had touched down in 10 Indiana counties. This was the third time in three years that powerful tornadoes have ripped across central and southern Indiana.

Reporting from Indianapolis, for Amateur Radio Newsline, this is Jack Parker W8ISH

--

Marengo in southern Indiana was hard hit, with at least one fatality, four injuries and numerous homes damaged or destroyed. But Indiana was not alone in dealing with weather related problems. According to news reports several people in Kansas and Nebraska were injured by the
weekend's tornadoes which also ripped through parts of those states. Ham radio was on alert there as well. More on this ongoing story in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm), W8ISH)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: REPLY COMMENT DEADLINE EXTENDED TO JUNE 22

The FCC has extended the deadline to file reply comments on already filed responses in its broadband over power line Notice of Proposed Rule Making ET Docket 04-37. The FCC granted the extension based on requests from the National Antenna Consortium and the Amherst Alliance.

The two organizations had sought to have the FCC postpone the filing comment deadline until either September 1 or two months after the public release of the NTIA's Phase 2 study -- whichever was later. The Commission responded that in its view an additional three weeks should be ample time to respond to any NTIA submission.

The FCC does not routinely grant such time extensions, and it denied earlier petitions, including filings from the ARRL. Now it has relented and has set a new Reply Comment deadline of Tuesday, June 22nd. (ARRL)

**

RESTRUCTURING: MORE COUNTRIES DROP CW

More restructuring has taken place in Europe. The GB2RS News Service reports that Finland has now officially dropped the Morse code requirement for that nations hams to have access to the High Frequency
bands. GB2RS says that Finland actually deleted the Morse requirement
on the 1st of November of 2003. Now, with the latest rules revisions there are now there are only two classes of amateur license in that

European nation.

Also from GB2RS word that former French Class 2 licensees with F1 and F4 callsign prefixes are now being heard on the High Frequency bands.
According to the French national amateur radio society, this change was implemented on May 16th.

But C-W is far from dying or dead on the other side of the Atlantic. In fact the fourth European High Speed Telegraphy Championships take place the 15th through the 19th of September in Montenegro and Serbia.
(GB2RS)

**
RESTRUCTURING: NEW ZEALAND SAYS GOODBYE TO MORSE

Finland and France are not alone in saying goodbye to Morse code testing. So has a nation down-under.

On June 4th New Zealand's Telecommunications regulators issued a decree that says Morse proficiency testing has ended and thatNew Zealand Limited Class operators will soom have access to the high frequency bands. In fact, regulators have decided to upgrade Limited Class operators to the New Zealand General Class.

According to the notice, operators will not be required change their callsigns or take any other action.. The new rules go into effect on June 17th. (ZL2BHF)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N5JGX repeater serving Austin Texas.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: POLICE JAMMER GETS 8 YEARS IN PRISON

A man convicted of jamming a Wisconsin emergency service radio system will spend the next 8 years behind Federal prison bars. Amateur Radio
Newsline's David Black, KB4KCH, is at the south-east bureau with the
details:

--

University of Wisconsin graduate student Rajib Mitra faces eight years

in prison after being convicted of intentionally jamming public safety
radio communications. The 25-year-old Mitra was sentenced by a federal judge as a domestic terrorist under the Patriot Act which punishes substantial disruption of a critical public infrastructure.

The computer science student converted a radio receiver to transmit tones that interfered with the 800 MHz emergency radio system used by Madison police, fire and paramedics. In all, Mitra was accused of interfering with public safety communications 37 times last year. He told a federal judge the incidents were accidental--the result of a loose wire. But the judge likened that to a fairy tale, and increased
Mitra's sentence for perjury. The disruptions happened between January and October, 2003.

Assistant U-S Attorney Tim O'Shea says Mitra's crime stems more from immaturity than ideology. O'Shea says the case was about domestic terrorism, not like what happened in New York City September 11th 2001, but by the immaturity of the defendant.

Testimony included reports about disruptions that prevented police officers from communicating with each other while making arrests, keeping paramedics from getting patient information to hospital staffs
and decreased safety for firefighters while on calls.

In one incident, Mitra was accused of interfering with communications for three hours on Halloween night. He was also convicted of downloading pornographic sounds from the Internet and broadcasting them over police channels.

Mitra could have been sentenced to two years in prison. He also faces
three years probation and has been ordered to pay more than 6-thousand
dollars to the Madison Police Department.

From the South-East bureau in Birmingham, Alabama, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Its not known if the government will use Mitra's conviction under the
Patriot Act as the basis of prosecution of others acused of the same type of crime. (ARNewsline(tm) from Capital Times, others)

**

ENFORCEMENT: RESTERAUNT FINED $10,000 FOR USING 2 METERS

Remember the case of Best Wok? The New Jersey resteraunt that was warned by the FCC to stop using an illegal high power 2 meter

cordless
telephone to coordinate deliveries but which continued to do so
anyhow?

Well, that decision by the store manager is going to cost the company
$10,000. Thats the amount of the fine that the FCC has levvied
against Best Work for transmitting on 145.8376 MHz without Commission
authorization. The resteraunt was given the customary 30 days rto
pay
up or to file an appeal. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: RIGHT APPLICATION - WRONG BURTON

The FCC admits that it made a mistake when it announced that it had
sent a warning letter to a former California ham and designated his
GMRS radio service application for a hearing. What happened?
Amateur
Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, tries to sort it all out:

--

The FCC recently announced that it had sent another warning letter to
Richard A. Burton, the ex-WB6JAC. This, warning him about operating
without a license and designating his GMRS application for review.

Only one problem. The regulatory agency had the wrong Richard A.
Burton.

It turns out that it was a Richard A. Burton in another state who,
this time, applied for a GMRS license. It was not the Richard A.
Burton who lives in California.

Complicating thins further the California Richard A. Burton had filed
for a GMRS license over a year ago. He voluntarily rescinded his
application after the FCC set it aside for review.

So what happened? According to a note in the ARRL Letter, the FCC
was
acting on the belief that the latest GMRS application had come from
the California Richard A. Burton. And mistakenly, the regulatory
agency designated it for hearing.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennnant, K6PZW, in Los
Angeles.

--

By the way, we did a search on the QRZ.com callsign supersite. We
found that there are 12 hams that have the name Richard Burton living
in North America. Of these one is a Richard A. Burton but he does
not
live anyplace near the Richard Burton who was seeking the GMRS

license. (ARRL, others)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TO MANY CALL SIGN CHANGES

The FCC is asking a New York, ham why he has filed over a dozen call sign change requests with the agency in the past four years. Since August 29, 2000, Kiyoshi L. Nakamura of Buffalo has held the call signs K3DJ, KJ6UZ, AD1L, K3DJ again, KH6DJ, AD1L again, K3DJ for a third time, AD2R, AD1L for a third time , AD2R, WH7S, AD1L for a forth
time and AD2R for a second time. And on May 4th, he again filed a call sign change request. This time he wants to give up AD2R and get back to K3DJ for the fourh time.

In its letter to Nakamura, the FCC says that his numerous call sign change applications raise questions about apparent abuse of the licensing system. This says the FCC that with limited exceptions, each call sign would be blocked by Commission rules from being reassigned to another licensee for two years.

So, the FCC gave Nakamura 20 days from the date of its inquiry letter to respond. He was told to state his intentions regarding the filing
of these applications. He was also told to coose one and only one call sign that he actually wants to keep. (FCC)

**

RADIO HONORS: AMATEUR RADIO MONTH IN NH

June is now Amateur Radio Month in New Hampshire. This, as Governor Craig Benson issues a proclamation honoring the states radio amateurs for their dedication and the service for its almost 100 year history of contributions to the advancement of communications technology.

First issued by the New Hampshire State Legislature in 1985, each succeeding Governor has recognized the role of the states Amateur Radio operators during the month of June. 2004 marks the 19th consecutive year that these proclamations have been issued. (Via e-mail)

**

TECHNOLOGY: IS IT BYE-BYE TO VHS?

Home recording using tape as a medium seems to be on its way out. According to the Consumer Electronics Association, in 2003, movie watchers rented more DVDs than VHS tapes. Also, DVD sales increased by 30% while the sale of VHS VCR's dropped by an unexpected 50% in
2003.

Whats replacing the venerable VHS system? Hard disk recorders like TIVO which have been dropping in price over the last twelve months. When combined with satellite or cable TV, these devices make delaying a program to watch later as easy as 1-2-3. (Science OnLine)

**

THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT: HAM-COM IN DALLAS TEXAS IN JUNE

Turning to the ham radio social calander, if you will be in the Dallas., Texas area the weekend of June 18th and 19th, make it a point to attend Ham-Com 2004. This is the ARRL West Gulf Convention held at the Arlington Convention Center in the Dallas suburb of Arlington. This years features include indoor and outdoor flea markets, numerous commercial exhibits, a D-X luncheon, an APRS workshop and much more.

Information on this one is on line at www.hamcom.org or by writing to Ham-Com 2004. P.O. Box 12774, Dallas, Texas, 75225. The phone and fax number is area code 214-361-7574 (Ham-Com)

**

THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT: KNOXVIOLLE TN. IN JUNE

And the 38th annual Knoxville Hamfest and Electronics Exposition is slated for June 11th and 12th. The venue is the Knoxville Exhibition, World's Fair Park in Knoxville, Tennessee. The theme this year for the event is "Promoting Youth in Amateur Radio." More information is on-line at www.w4bbb.org (K4PZT)

**

THE SOCIAL CIRCUIT: A TALE OF HAM RADIO AT NAB

Also, if you want to read more about ham radio at the recent National Association of Broadcasters Convention in Las Vegas, take your web browser over to www.haleisner.com. Then click on the column titled "The Other Side of the Control Room Glass" by our own Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF. This month Bill not only takes reads to the N-A-B show but also tells of his recent exploits at the Dayton Hamvention. Again, its all on-line at www.haleisner.com (ARNewsline(tm))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to

the
world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being
relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: FREQUENCY COORDINATION FOR THE 2004 NATIONAL POLITICAL
CONVENTIONS

Remember a few years ago when the ARRL became the FCC's
"single Point
of Contact" or spoc on repeater related matters? Well how about
one
for this years political conventions? Well that honor has gone to a
New York based consulting engineer. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

At the request of the Frequency Coordinating Committee for the 2004
Political Conventions the FCC has designated Louis Libin, as the
single point of contact -- or spoc -- for coordinating broadcast R-F
operations. This, under Section 74.24 of the agency's Rules.

Libin will oversee all RF operations for broadcasters in Boston from
July 26th through July 29th and in New York City from August 30th
through September 2nd. Nor is this the first time for him to do so
either. Louis Libin is considered one of the worlds foremost
authorities in the area of RF compatibility and has worked on
numerous
televised events over the years.

For the Amateur Rafio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in
Los
Angeles.

--

More on this story is at the cyberspace at
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-04-1494A1.doc
(FCC, CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: 811 PROPOSED AS A NATIONWIDE CALL-BEFORE-DIGGING NUMBER

The FCC is asking for comments on a proposal to adopt "811" as a
nationwide call-before-digging number. The regulatory agency
believes
that this will give excavators one simple number to call to avoid
cutting buried cables, gas lines and other important infrastructure.

Currently there are 70 nationwide "One Call" centers that serve
different geographic areas. They are generally accessed by dialing

toll-free or local telephone numbers. The FCC however believes that having one simple number to call like 811 should promote safety and lead to fewer utility outages.

Want to know more? It's all on-line at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-247171A1.doc (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: COURT UPHOLDS CABLE RULING

Meantime, the FCC is considering a Supreme Court appeal in cable Internet access dispute. This, after a federal appeals court says that it is standing by its October ruling that cable TV operators should open their lines to rivals who also want to use them to sell high-speed Internet service.

The Federal Communications Commission asked the 9th U.S. Circuit Court
of Appeals to revisit the decision, but the court declined to do. If upheld, the circuit's decision would likely subject cable operators to
the same rules as local phone companies, who are forced to lease their
lines to rival providers of phone service and D-S-L Internet access. (Published reports)

**

WORLDBEAT-UK: 2004 AMSAT COLLOQUIUM IN THE UK

Turning to news from around the world, the 2004 AMSAT-UK Colloquium will be held on Friday, July 30th through Sunday, August 1. This, at
the University of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom.

A feature of this year's meeting will be a talk and Question and Answer session with Professor Colin Pilinger of the Beagle 2 project. More information is on-line at www.uk.amsat.org. (AMSAT-UK)

**

WORLDBEAT-ALBANIA: TIRANA ALBANIA FOR DX'ERS IN JUNE

And Albania's first ever DX Convention, is scheduled for 19th to the
20th of June in the city Tirana. Attendees will get to meet many figures from the DX community who donated equipment to put Albania on the air. This includes G3LQP, W6UM, OH2BH and T93Y. United States Amateurs should contact K2WR, at k2wr@njdxa.org for advice how to travel to this gathering. (Via e-mail)

**

ON THE AIR: FRENCH RULES CHANGE SPAWNS DX OPERATION

FT1ZL is on Amsterdam Island and is expected to become active soon. This, after the French have change their licensing structure to grant holders of that nations VHF only license operating privileges on the High Frequency bands.

French stations with the numeral 1 or 4 in their prefix can now operate the low bands using all modes except A1A, A2A, F1A and F2A. FT1ZL will use his new found privileges on 20, 17, 15, 12 and 10 meters SSB during his Amsterdam Island stay. (Internet)

**

DX

In D-X, IK4RUX says that he plans to operate portable IF1 from Favignana. He will be found on SSB and C-W from the June 19 to the 26
th. QSL this operation direct or via the ARI Bureau. (GB2RS)

And K8AQM reports that his upcoming trip to Samoa will take place July
7th to the 21st. He will operate as 5WZ0TR from the Samoan Village Resort on 160 though 10 meters. Modes will be CW, SSB, RTTY and PSK. All QSLs are via K8AA at his callbook address. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: BANNED BY ONE WORD

And finally this week, the tale of why hams in Thailand were not allowed to talk to hams in other parts of the world for a number of years. The truth be known, it was all because of a three letter word. Here's Q-News Graham Kemp. VK4BB, with the rest of the story:

--

Audio report only. No text available. Lisen on-line at www.arnewsline.org/

--

And for those of you who do not speak French, the word oui -- sometimes pronounced as the English word "we" -- means "yes."

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain,
the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio

Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official
website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff for
nominations this year is midnight on June 30th.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don
Wilbasnks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

4504. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 17:45:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <az2wc.1199$vG7.1058@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92618

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406040426.7923f3c7@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
> > >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> > >Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
> > >
> > >
> > >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > >news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
> >
> > >> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They
might
> > >> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.
> >
> > >So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car
have to
> > >do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?
> >
> > A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)
> >
> > A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our
attention from
> > thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> The point was, "We'll never know (if they knew the material).
>
> Some of you OF's try to make it sound like getting to the FCC office
> for an examination was inconvenient at best, or even dangerous. So
> you petitioned your government to let you get a mail order license, or
> to have some other local ham(s) test you. Lots of hand wringing and
> whining.

Huh?

I thought most of the OFs were trying to get the tests a bit more difficult.
You can't have it both ways.

Next, you'll blame the OFs because your washing machine is over-sudsing LOL!

The reality is that the real flamers on both ends of the spectrum are the hold up. That mention of a trip to the FCC being dangerous had no relation to the material on the test. We could say the same thing about sending our kids to school. A very few have been killed and/or raped. That is hardly a reason for not attending school.

These newsgroups get sillier every month, if not every week.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.698 / Virus Database: 455 - Release Date: 6/2/04

4505. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 18:02:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <VO2wc.1203$xK7.331@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92619

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Department of Communications/News Bureau
> 22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
> Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872
>
>
> --
> ------
> URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
> Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
>
> KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the
University of
> Rhode Island's Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
> mother of invention.
>
> An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)
>
> --
> --------
>
> Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of
the
> radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Hello, Steve

Most folks that invent or discover something are doing something they enjoy. We can likely look at almost anything and most folks are having fun and only a few are actually "inventing" something. Of course, it is totally ignorant to assume than no ham is doing anything constructive any more than it would be to assume that no NASCAR racer, or baseball player, or any other person in a given field is "doing" anything ;)

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.698 / Virus Database: 455 - Release Date: 6/2/04

4506. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 20:04:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92620

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> Department of Communications/News Bureau
> 22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
> Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872
>
>
> ---
> ------
> URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
> Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
>
> KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the University of
> Rhode Island’s Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
> mother of invention.
>
> An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)
>
> ---
> --------
>
> Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of the
> radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it. bb

4507. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 21:52:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40C0EF29.60307@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92621

>
>
>
> I am a "4" living in 4-land, but when I still had my 8 call, I always
>signed "/4" on CW or stated "mobile" or "portable" on phone.
>

Was living in Texas and got on 6 meters. Forgot to add /5 and someone
at a college ham club
thought that I was comming in during a band opening. No so once I
mentioned that I was
located on the other end of town....

>
>

4508. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 22:47:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040604184709.19885.00000308@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92622

In article <1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it. bb

There was NO "rant." Since nursie didn't include either a link or
enough of the news article, here it is -

==========
URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an
employee in the University of Rhode Island's Physics
Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
mother of invention.

An amateur radio operator since he was 14, Vincent has
always lived in houses situated on small lots. Because
he couldn't erect a large antenna on a confined
property, he has been continually challenged over the
years to find a way to get better reception.

"I was always tinkering in the basement. Thank
goodness, my parents were tolerant. I can still
remember my poor father driving up our driveway after
a hard day's work to see wires wrapped around the
house," Vincent recalls.

"The Holy Grail of antenna technology is to create a
small antenna with high efficiency and wide
bandwidth," explains Vincent. "According to current
theory, you have to give up one of the three - size,
efficiency, or bandwidth - to achieve the other two."

After decades of experimentation, combined with a
30-year engineering career and Yankee ingenuity,
Vincent has invented a revolutionary antenna
technology. The distributed- load, monopole
antennas are smaller, produce high efficiency, and
retain good to excellent bandwidth. And they have
multiple applications.

With this technology it will be possible to double, at
minimum, the range of walkie-talkies used by police,
fire, and other municipal personnel. Naval ships, baby
monitors, and portable antennas for military use are
other applications. An antenna could be mounted on a

chip in a cell phone and be applied to wireless local area networks. Another application deals with radio frequency identification, which is expected someday to replace the barcode system.

"It could even make the Dick Tracy wrist radio with all the features, such as Internet access, a possibility," Vincent says.

The inventor pursued his quest to build a better antenna in earnest eight years ago when he and his significant other moved into a house situated on a 50-foot by 100-foot lot in Warwick. There was nothing on the commercial market that could fit the lot that would provide the performance Vincent needed to be heard in distant lands and that would be acceptable to his neighbors. All the small antennas being sold were inefficient and lacked bandwidth, which resulted in low performance and high frustration.

Vincent looked at the techniques that were currently used to reduce antenna size and realized something was missing in the way everyone was approaching the problem.

He began to model various combinations into a computer program called MathCad. His first attempt produced a 21 MHz band antenna that was 18 inches high. Normally, antennas for this band are 12 to 24 feet high.

Vincent installed the antenna in his back yard. The legal limit that amateurs can operate is 1,000 watts with the norm being 100 watts.
The amateur radio operator experimented with 5 to 10 watts. He reached a station in Chile and made contacts in various European countries. Meanwhile he kept adding power until it reached 100 watts. That's when things suddenly went bad. Walking outside in the backyard, he understood why. The antenna had melted.

After examining the molten matter, Vincent wasn't discouraged. This was only a small model and not designed to handle much power. The part of the antenna that failed proved to be the key to the design. After analyzing the failure, Vincent realized that he was able to transform a lot of current along the antenna with even relatively low power.

"Antennas radiate by setting up large amounts of current flow through various parts of their structure," he says. "The larger the current the more radiation and the better the output of the antenna."

Vincent went back to the drawing board and continued to improve the technology. Relying on his nearly 30 years at Raytheon Co. and at KVH Industries in Middletown R.I., which provided him with a diversified background in electronics and electronic systems, Vincent overcame a myriad of problems and succeeded.

He established three test sites for various prototypes. Antennas were placed in Westport, Mass. in a salt marsh, the best ground for transmission and reception. Another set of antennas was placed on rocky ground in Cumberland, R.I., the worst kind of site, and at a Warwick site which is in between the two in terms of grounding. The antennas, which resemble flagpoles, worked well at all locations.

Tests confirmed that Vincent has created antennas at one third to one ninth of their full size counterparts. Normally smaller antennas are only 8 to 15 percent efficient. Vincent's antennas achieved 80 to 100 percent efficiency as compared to the larger antennas.

A patent is pending on Vincent's technology. The inventor has made the University of Rhode Island and its Physics Department partners that will benefit from any revenue his invention earns. "The University and its Physics Department has been very supportive and given me time and space to work on this project," says Vincent who was recently presented the 2004 Outstanding Intellectual Property Award by URI's Research Office. "I couldn't have done this without the University's support. It's only fair that it share in the profits."

Copyright ï¿½ 2002 University of Rhode Island
(Disclaimer)
==========

Firstly, the "article" was published by the University of Rhode Island and all such things from all organizations and schools are in the "self-love" category or better known as PR/Public Relations.

Secondly, Rob Vincent is a PRO with 30+ years working for a salary and has access to MathCad tools (any of the NEC programs could have done it...such as Roy Lewallen's EZNEC).

Thirdly, small antennas aren't new...they've been used for a half century and more. The USMC-contract T-195 (via Collins) had a built-in HF antenna tuner to work with any vehicular whip. The AN/PRC-104, a manpack HF transceiver (Hughes Ground Sys. Div., early 1980s) has an automatic antenna tuner built-in for the

single manpacked whip antenna. SGC has been building and
selling HF antenna tuners for many and various radio services,
ham included. The Navy Postgraduate School has some slightly
old double-whip antenna designs on the web (PDFs) intended for
shipboard use on HF.

Fourth, one has to note who made everyone notice this piece,
as well as the lack of link or other references other than having to
go to the University of Rhode Island site and go down two levels
to get it. Nursie's qualifications as an antenna "expert" are in
question since he went gung-ho on the "ham" part and seriously
neglected the other facts of the invention.

Fifth, the URI must have funded the application for the patent since
a patent search (required by patent office to show any prior art) is
going to cost somewhere between $4K and $6K nowadays. [why
would Vincent set up some experimental antenna on a salt marsh
plus two ohter places unless it was for some URI project?] That
little squib has "PR" written all over it. Might work, though, but
lots and lots of folks be working on small antennas trying to get the
golden "100% efficiency" qualification.

Jim Hampton was right. Newsgroups ARE getting sillier and
sillier, with such gems as "MARS is amateur radio." :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4509. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 22:50:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <417wc.12553$Yd3.7712@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92623

No need to do either. Just use your FCC assigned call. Course it helps to let folks know the general area your in, so they can point the antenna at you.

Dan/W4NTI

"TeleTech" <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203...
> I used to be active on the air about 12 years ago. I will be moving out of
> my assigned call area. I'd like to get back on the air when I move.
>
> What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when
> one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call
> when one moves out of their area?
>
> For example, if I was visiting W4 area from W3, I would identify as W3---
> "portable W4" or W3---/W4. Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> Is this a big deal these days?
>
> Thanks.
>
> --
> NOTE: To reply, DELETE the obvious word in my e-mail address you need to
> DELETE in order to reply.

4510. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 22:54:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <S47wc.12555$Yd3.6470@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92624

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> > > >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> > > >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> > >
> > > >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a
> > change.
> > > >
> > > Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
> > > >
> > > I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the
N/MC
> > MARS
> > > program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license
for.
> > > >
> > > He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct
result
> > of
> > > having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related
> > program.
> > > >
> > > >Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
> > > >branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
> > > >individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur
operator.
> > Or
> > > >as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside
and
> > > >overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it
made
> > > >being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.
> > > >
> > > Agreed on the lack of need for a license if you are in a MILITARY
> > unit and
> > > assigned to a MARS unit for duty. I was CHOP of NNN0MOC/MOF and had
> > several
> > > Marines assigned to me under exactly those circumstances. All except

two
> > > eventually DID get a license, though.
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license stateside
> > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."

Perhaps still today, but it used to be allowed to get into MARS with a
Novice ticket. That was a long time ago, when a Novice ticket really had
to be earned.

Of course now-a-days there is no Novice ticket. And those that still have
one are of no importance to worry about in the scheme of things.

Dan/W4NTI

4511. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 23:34:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041534.7c09cb37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92625

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<az2wc.1199$vG7.1058@news01.roc.ny>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406040426.7923f3c7@posting.google.com...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
> > > >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> > > >Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
>
> > > >> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They
> might
> > > >> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.
>
> > > >So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car
> have to
> > > >do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?
> > >
> > > A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)
> > >
> > > A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our
> attention from
> > > thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > The point was, "We'll never know (if they knew the material).
> >
> > Some of you OF's try to make it sound like getting to the FCC office
> > for an examination was inconvenient at best, or even dangerous. So
> > you petitioned your government to let you get a mail order license, or
> > to have some other local ham(s) test you. Lots of hand wringing and
> > whining.
>
> Huh?
>
> I thought most of the OFs were trying to get the tests a bit more difficult.

Yep, now that they got theirs, they're trying to make things more
difficult. Can you recall when Amateur Radio got mail order upgrades
and hams testing hams?

> You can't have it both ways.

I never have.

> Next, you'll blame the OFs because your washing machine is over-sudsing LOL!

Stay away from my washing machine.

> The reality is that the real flamers on both ends of the spectrum are the
> hold up. That mention of a trip to the FCC being dangerous had no relation
> to the material on the test. We could say the same thing about sending our
> kids to school. A very few have been killed and/or raped. That is hardly
> a reason for not attending school.

Wow! I hope that didn't happen because of frustrated amateurs on
their way to an exam.

> These newsgroups get sillier every month, if not every week.

Actually, No. Fewer and fewer PCTA post each month, and the newsgroup
is improving.

4512. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-04 23:48:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041548.5a92eda8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92626

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...

>
> > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > Is this a big deal these days?
> >
> No and no.
>

Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
I'd still put it on my card.

bb

4513. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 00:01:37 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <B38wc.39215$oi5.18967@fed1read07>
Source record: 92627

My 2 cents -- When DXing give your present district as a cw slash or on phone -- slant district. Folks calling you want to know where you are at.

In a DX pileup calling by district -- same as above and call when the DX station calls for the district you are in. Some DX stations get very upset when they call for sixes and a Ham in NY calls who has a 6 call

When operating a repeater that is in your home area -- no need for the /district -- folks will know you are local.

When travelling or a visit away from your home state -- give a /district so folks know you are a visitor and might invite you to some Ham activities or assist with directions etc.

When on 6M and no skip --- just your call

For 6M skip give the /district you are in. I've called several W1 and W2's only to find they were in a western state. Not good for WAS hunting and band openings can be very short

For QSL cards a /district would be in order so the incoming ARRL burro cards will go to your present district. Some QSL cards may not include the /district and the card will go to the old district -- best have envelopes in both districts I would suppose.

Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but "right on"

>
> "TeleTech" <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203...
> > I used to be active on the air about 12 years ago. I will be moving out
> of
> > my assigned call area. I'd like to get back on the air when I move.
> >
> > What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when
> > one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call
> > when one moves out of their area?
> >
> > For example, if I was visiting W4 area from W3, I would identify as
W3---
> > "portable W4" or W3---/W4. Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards,
etc?
> > Is this a big deal these days?
> >

> > Thanks.
> >
> > --
> > NOTE: To reply, DELETE the obvious word in my e-mail address you need to
> > DELETE in order to reply.
>
>

4514. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1399 June 4, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 00:03:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041603.7ea2c02c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92628

radionews@aol.com (Radionews) wrote in message
news:<20040604133451.16591.00000453@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1399 June 4, 2004
>
snip
>
> RESTRUCTURING: MORE COUNTRIES DROP CW
>
snip
>
> More restructuring has taken place in Europe. The GB2RS News Service
> reports that Finland has now officially dropped the Morse code
> requirement for that nations hams to have access to the High
> Frequency
> bands. GB2RS says that Finland actually deleted the Morse
> requirement
> on the 1st of November of 2003. Now, with the latest rules revisions
> there are now there are only two classes of amateur license in that
> European nation.
>
>
> Also from GB2RS word that former French Class 2 licensees with F1 and
> F4 callsign prefixes are now being heard on the High Frequency
> bands.
> According to the French national amateur radio society, this change
> was implemented on May 16th.
>

But according to Heyle and apologists, we must remain ignorant of
other countries operating priveleges and licensing requirements by
class. This is so that we can continue to work out of band Frenchmen
on 6M or anywhere else we find them. QSL?

snip

4515. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 00:13:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041613.5b0305ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92629

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040603042610.08222.00000339@mb-m12.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?
> > > >From: "Dan/W4NTI" w4nti@getrid of this mindspring.com
> > > >Date: 6/2/2004 4:05 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <Birvc.35936$zO3.33755@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> >
> > > >All this has been very interesting. And Lenny has it right, for a
> change.
> > > >
> > > Only that which he has cut-and-paste direct from directives, Dan.
> > > >
> > > I am still awaiting to hear the status of his application to the N/MC
> MARS
> > > program which he asserted that he wouldn't need an Amateur license for.
> > > >
> > > He's left a lot of holes in there. Most of those as a direct result
> of
> > > having no practical experience in ANY MARS or Amateur Radio related
> program.
> > > >
> > > >Now for my two cents worth. I have been involved in MARS, all three
> > > >branches at one time or another, for nearly 40 years. This is as a
> > > >individual station, which required me to be a licensed amateur operator.
> Or
> > > >as a assigned operator at a military MARS station, both stateside and
> > > >overseas. Which did NOT REQUIRE I have a amateur license. But it made
> > > >being assigned to a MARS station more likely if you did.
> > > >
> > > Agreed on the lack of need for a license if you are in a MILITARY
> unit and
> > > assigned to a MARS unit for duty. I was CHOP of NNN0MOC/MOF and had
> several
> > > Marines assigned to me under exactly those circumstances. All except two
> > > eventually DID get a license, though.
> > > >
> > > 73
> > > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >

> > >
> > >
> > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license stateside
> > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."

Hello? No comments? Anyone?

Why am I not suprised?

Here we have a whole class of radio amateurs being barred from MARS
participation. Maybe there was a speck of truth in what Steve said
about MARS being the essense of Amateur Radio. It's exclusionary!

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!"

Hi, hi, hi.

4516. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 00:18:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406041618.2dd047da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92630

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406030908.7b90b1c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040603042734.08222.00000340@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> >
> > It's the only way he can express an assertion of validity to his arguments
> > otherwise.
>
> huh?

I hope you were wearing your Medi-lert bracelet when you typed that.

4517. Cosmic audiophile website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 01:49:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <bJOdnZ-6C95du1zdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92631

Enjoy!

http://www.magnan.com/column.shtml

4518. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 02:23:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <r8awc.4860$uo4.2593@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92632

Hello, Len

I won't even go into the MARS is amateur radio since you won't find their signals inside of any amateur band (at least I don't think so, but I am not very familiar with Military Affiliate Radio Station).

The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been professional; my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they *don't* like?

As far as small antennas, we know that magnetic monopoles (loops) are quite efficient. If very small, the conductor must be quite large as there will be large circulating currents (and this also puts demands on the capacitor). Generally, it has been difficult to make a *very* small loop efficient simply due to IR losses; however, loops can be quite small compared to a half-wave dipole and still run at 90% efficiency.

What with the crossed-field antenna, e-h antenna, fractal antenna, and more, I'm interested in finding out what this guy has. What I'd love is a 6 inch antenna that is 90% efficient with a 1.1 SWR on 160 meters on up. LOL, wouldn't we all? Of course, even if we had such a beast, we must remember that where the thing is mounted (height, in terms of wavelength) will likely affect its' performance considerably. The ground type also comes into play. Come to think of it, there were some arguements over the published "efficiency" of the cross-field antennas at one point too.

Of course, this particular newsgroup is not really the place to discuss antennas; I'd just like something beyond the code vs no code arguements and the flame wars.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.699 / Virus Database: 456 - Release Date: 6/4/04

4519. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 02:31:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1gawc.4861$3n4.207@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92633

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40C06A54.6030904@psu.edu...
<<snip>>
> Most excellent!
>
> Hey Jim, Are you going to be at the Rochester Hamfest this Saturday?
> i'm thinking of making it there on Saturday, then swinging down to catch
> the Butler fest on Sunday.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>
Mike,

I wish I was going to be there. I dunno, but some friends are going to be over here tomorrow so I suspect that I won't. I haven't had a chance to talk to Tim, WB2KAO and see when he may be there .... sigh .... I made it to the hamfest perhaps 4 years ago :(

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.699 / Virus Database: 456 - Release Date: 6/4/04

4520. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 04:24:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406042024.484c030@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92634

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> Department of Communications/News Bureau
> 22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
> Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872
>
>
> ---
> ------
> URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
> Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
>
> KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the University of
> Rhode Island’s Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
> mother of invention.
>
> An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)
>
> ---
> --------
>
> Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of the
> radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!

It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
defies both Physics 101 and common sense.

> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

4521. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 04:49:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C150C3.E2E17AED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92635

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> >
> > > Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.
> >
> > You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
> > You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
> > of late, "William".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Anyone can remove one of their more embarassing posts.

Are you out of your gourd?

Dave K8MN

4522. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 04:55:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92636

William wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> >
> > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > > Is this a big deal these days?
> > >
> > No and no.
> >
>
> Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
> definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> I'd still put it on my card.
>
> bb

Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.

Dave K8MN

4523. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 04:55:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605005552.27012.00000265@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 92637

In article <1e4e3692.0406041618.2dd047da@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406030908.7b90b1c@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040603042734.08222.00000340@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
>> >
>> > It's the only way he can express an assertion of validity to his
>arguments
>> > otherwise.
>>
>> huh?
>
>I hope you were wearing your Medi-lert bracelet when you typed that.

I don't think the clasp was fully fastened... :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4524. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 04:55:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605005555.27012.00000266@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 92638

In article <r8awc.4860$uo4.2593@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Hello, Len
>
>I won't even go into the MARS is amateur radio since you won't find their
>signals inside of any amateur band (at least I don't think so, but I am not
>very familiar with Military Affiliate Radio Station).

Military Affiliate Radio SYSTEM... :-)

>The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been professional;
>my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to
>think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they
>*don't* like?

Irrelevant. Another stressed that the "invention" was because of his
being a radio amateur. Solely so, so much that nearly all of the
URI news release was omitted.

There have been TWO significant amateur radio related inventions
(or innovations, the line is blurred in reality) in Dan Tayloe's unique
CMOS switch mixer which is capable of making a direct-
conversion receiver for a sensitive QRP rig that receives either
on-off keyed telegraphy signals or SSB signals...and the several
who publicized the relatively-easy-to-make crystal filter using only
matched-measured individual quartz crystal resonators (which may
have been unpatented trade secrets in the relatively small crystal
filter biz).

For everything else in hardware, the radio world came up with it
and used it in commercial-military equipment and also in some of
the amateur radio stuff.

It's fun and personally satisfying to receive a piece of paper saying
one is an inventor. Nice brag item for those not in the biz. :-)
However, being one (an inventor that is) is not a guarantor of
big smarts or of the guru-dom since a lot of really weird (and
usually unworkable) stuff has been patented. Besides that, in
electronics, the patent search costs are rather stiff on the order
of 6 grand average and may wind up showing that someone else
invented the whatever the inventor is trying to patent. Patent
searches are NOT a part of the patent office but the office requires
some sort of showing...if you want the patent within 6 or so years
from now.

Mine is U.S. number 3,848,191, granted in 1974 and assigned to
RCA Corporation. The only reasons that RCA bothered with the
patent at all are: (1) RCA began in the radio-electronics business
to keep "radio" patents in the USA back in the late 1920s; (2) My
project group was on a company-funded R&D program at the time
with some potential for the Corporation. At least a dozen patents
were granted out of that one project, an aircraft collision avoidance
system.

Most corporations simply don't bother with the patent work since
radio-electronics is still on such an up-slope of changing state of
the art that a typical 2 or 3 year wait for a grant plus another year
to arrange rights, etc., may not be worth the cost. Industry makes
do with the "trade secret" policy and, if someone copies an un-
patented thingy, will go to the attorneys and their expensive billing
at that time.

Also, in a typical HF transceiver of today, there may be as many as
a hundred different patents applying to the circuitry and subsystems
and keeping all that straight requires more personpower on the
payroll to keep track of which patent is still in force and which has
lapsed.

>As far as small antennas, we know that magnetic monopoles (loops) are quite
>efficient. If very small, the conductor must be quite large as there will
>be large circulating currents (and this also puts demands on the capacitor).
>Generally, it has been difficult to make a *very* small loop efficient
>simply due to IR losses; however, loops can be quite small compared to a
>half-wave dipole and still run at 90% efficiency.

A wideband, two-mast HF antenna has already been developed
for the U.S. Navy, extensively measured, plotted, etc. There's a
paper on it in PDF floating around. I downloaded it about a year or
so ago out of curiosity. Covers the whole HF territory...but does
need an antenna tuner to maximize RF power into the antenna.
[getting as much RF as possible INTO the antenna is the REAL
"efficiency"] You've still got Maxwell's Equations to contend with
and the fact that the antenna size and pattern will determine how
much signal gets to a far, far-field receiver. Most of the other
propaganda on antennas is mostly BS to convince others to buy
a product.

If the U.S. military wants to use HF in the field, the standard little
20 W RF out AN/PRC-104 is good for it. ONE whip plus an
internal automatic antenna tuner is good enough there, has been
since before 1986. SSB with synthesized tuning, no-sweat use.
[it could do on-off keying CW but the military don' do dat no more]

>What with the crossed-field antenna, e-h antenna, fractal antenna, and more,
>I'm interested in finding out what this guy has. What I'd love is a 6 inch
>antenna that is 90% efficient with a 1.1 SWR on 160 meters on up. LOL,
>wouldn't we all? Of course, even if we had such a beast, we must remember
>that where the thing is mounted (height, in terms of wavelength) will likely

>affect its' performance considerably. The ground type also comes into play.
>Come to think of it, there were some arguements over the published
>"efficiency" of the cross-field antennas at one point too.

Back around 1960 (give or take a couple), Northrup Corporation
came out with the DDRR (Directional Discontinuity Ring Radiator).
Was ideal for limited bandwidth, VERY small size v. wavelength
provided there was a handy conductive ground plane the ring was
mounted above. In terms of "effective antenna area" it wasn't too
swift but you could make it within 25 foot circle or so just a
couple feet above the ground plane at 3 MHz. Omnidirectional.

The Discone had already been invented in 1960 and the log-
periodic was close on its heels. Muy wideband, great for those
who needed almost-instant QSYs anywhere in VHF-UHF
(discone) or HF (log-periodic)...like military folks.

The software to simulate an antenna structure and to analyze it
for 3D pattern, gain, impedance, etc., came out courtesy of the
Navy again...the Numerical Electromagnetic Code or NEC. Free
for anyone to use but commercial software houses write their
own softstuff to display patterns, etc., all based on the free NEC
kernel. Roy Lewallen, a long-time ham, does this with EZNEC.

Anyone can find out more about antennas and NEC packages
at website Antennex. Interesting stuff even if some of it looks
like Chalabi's electronic brother is putting stuff over on everyone.
:-)

However, there are thousands of little PR pieces put out as "news
releases" each year in the overall electronics industry. They have
a terrible sameness about them...like literary con-jobs. Whatever
they tout has got to be the "most" the "best" the "wonderful new"
the "new concept" or other BS which usually doesn't mean squat.
Those "news releases" are just come-ons to get folks to investigate
and see products or (in the case of universities) people. The
Nobel Prize committee isn't going to be swayed by those things.

>Of course, this particular newsgroup is not really the place to discuss
>antennas; I'd just like something beyond the code vs no code arguements and
>the flame wars.

Some folks have no real interest in anything BUT flaming. Whatever
the general newsgroup topic line is is just used for them to express
their anger, frustration, or whatever they gots inside to relieve them-
selves (both psychologically and physiologically as in waste
relief). Those will try to monopolize a particular thread and bring it
up (as in vomitus interruptus) in other threads as well. They like
the noteriety, apparently.

The newsgroup focus could be anything and they would get angry
and abusive over anyone daring to defy them with some opposite
viewpoint. That happened way back on ARPANET, then USENET

(that came after ARPANET), branched over to BBS networks, and finally on the Internet. Seen it all for three decades. Some of it is funny, most of it is tragic with all the self-pitying and so-called psychological trauma of the angry and irritated who are very busy abusing others. <shrug> Way of life in all computer-modem communications that isn't fully monitored and moderated 24/7.

"Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain!" - anon.

:-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4525. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 10:44:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92639

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...

> Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.

Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.

Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)

Steve, K4YZ

4526. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 10:50:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406050250.75217c0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92640

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040605005555.27012.00000266@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <r8awc.4860$uo4.2593@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

> >The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been professional;
> >my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to
> >think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they
> >*don't* like?
>
> Irrelevant. Another stressed that the "invention" was because of his
> being a radio amateur. Solely so, so much that nearly all of the
> URI news release was omitted.

The rest of the post was irrelevent since the antenna itself was
not of importance.

What WAS of importance was that a non-Amateur Radio media source
felt compelled to mention, early on I might add, that the person
responsible for this project was a licensed Amateur.

The POINT being that Sir Scummy of Lanark was once again proven
wrong...Amateurs ARE still involved in "advancement of the radio art",
and someone felt stongly enouhg about it to emphasize it in a news
release.

Lennie often raves in this forum about how Amateurs don't do this
kind of thing.

And of course he can't stand it and will spin this into the
ground.

Too late. The egg's already been cracked and he's wearing it.

Sorry Lennie. Proven wrong by example again.

Steve, K4YZ

4527. Bit of BPL News

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 12:01:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040605080114.19885.00000311@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92641

From the ARRL Letter:

VIRGINIA CITY, BPL PROVIDER PART WAYS; PEPCO OPTS OUT OF BPL INVESTMENT

The City of Manassas, Virginia, and broadband over power line (BPL) franchisee Prospect Street Broadband have parted company, and the city is seeking a new business partner. The decision to terminate the joint venture was mutual, according to city officials, and the city has acquired Prospect Street's interests. Manassas was planning to open bids from prospective replacement BPL providers June 7.

ARRL CEO David Sumner, K1ZZ, called the failure of the Prospect Street-Manassas deal just another example of a BPL deployment decision gone awry. He also predicted that BPL would not prove to be the revenue generator the city anticipates. Under the franchise agreement, Manassas receives 10.5 percent of BPL revenue and is responsible only for the relatively small cost of equipment installation. The failure of the franchise agreement leaves the city with obligations that far exceed revenues, however.

The first municipally owned utility to offer citywide BPL, Manassas has changed the name of its project from the Broadband over Powerline Enterprise to the Telecommunications Services Enterprise. City budget documents indicate that Manassas is prepared to loan $400,000 to the Telecommunications Services Enterprise Fund "to finance operating expenses" in Fiscal Year 2005.

The city's small BPL field trial involved fewer than a dozen homes and businesses in an area with underground utility wiring and no nearby Amateur Radio licensees. "Results of the eighteen-month pilot program were favorable and demonstrated BPL as a viable technology for the delivery of data services," the city's bid invitation declares. The city approved full-scale BPL deployment last October and started offering the service in February. The contract with Prospect Street Broadband apparently was terminated several weeks later.

The city's glowing pro-BPL comments on the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket 04-37, filed May 3, neglect to mention the cancellation of the Prospect Street agreement.

The comments also say the city "remains sensitive" to Amateur Radio's interference fears. Manassas Utilities Director Allen P. Todd, W4VUB, has met with members of the Ole Virginia Hams (OVH) Amateur Radio Club to address their concerns, the comments note, and a BPL connection was set up in the home of OVH member Bob Zaepfel, K4HJF. The city made a letter from Todd describing its efforts to cooperate with local amateurs part of its

comments to the FCC. That letter says that during informal tests in early April, OVH members were "unable to identify any interference in the amateur bands being caused by BPL installation." Todd's letter did not provide test details.

The Manassas Journal Messenger reported this week that two neighborhoods now are fully equipped for the service, and, to date, 200 customers are using the service, although the bid proposal says the city's deployment of BPL "passes more than 2000 homes with the fiber infrastructure passing more than 4,000 homes, and fiber construction continuing each day." Manassas charges $28.95 a month for its BPL service. The city is supposed to complete its citywide BPL rollout by this fall. City officials told the Journal Messenger that the Prospect Street contract termination will not affect BPL delivery.

Elsewhere, Pepco, a utility serving 700,000 Washington, DC, and Maryland customers, and its parent company, Pepco Holdings Inc, have decided to forgo any investment in BPL. Pepco continues to operate a BPL field test in Potomac, Maryland. The utility is continuing discussions with BPL partner Current Technologies and has indicated it's open to proposals to lease access to their power lines to deliver broadband service.

Pepco was said to be less interested in delivering broadband than in finding ways to improve its billing systems. A company spokesperson said the decision not to invest in BPL applies to all Pepco Holdings Inc companies.

Additional information on BPL and video clips from field trial sites are on the ARRL Web site <http://www.arrl.org/bpl/>.

4528. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:32:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605103249.02657.00000599@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92642

```
>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 6/4/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <az2wc.1199$vG7.1058@news01.roc.ny>
>
>
>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:1e4e3692.0406040426.7923f3c7@posting.google.com...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> > >Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>> > >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>> > >Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
>> > >
>> > >
>> > >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > >news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
>> >
>> > >> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They
>might
>> > >> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.
>> >
>> > >So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car
>have to
>> > >do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?
>> >
>> > A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)
>> >
>> > A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our
>attention from
>> > thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!
>> >
>> > 73
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> The point was, "We'll never know (if they knew the material).
>>
>> Some of you OF's try to make it sound like getting to the FCC office
>> for an examination was inconvenient at best, or even dangerous. So
>> you petitioned your government to let you get a mail order license, or
>> to have some other local ham(s) test you. Lots of hand wringing and
>> whining.
```

>
>Huh?
>
>I thought most of the OFs were trying to get the tests a bit more difficult.
>You can't have it both ways.

It wasn't the "OF's" who were trying to get the tests thinned out. It was
the Johhny-come-lately 10-4 Good Buddy crowd that wanted NO code test and
written questions that were "in the public domain".

>Next, you'll blame the OFs because your washing machine is over-sudsing LOL!

He'll blame anyone for anything as long as it means defering any
responsibility from himself.

>The reality is that the real flamers on both ends of the spectrum are the
>hold up. That mention of a trip to the FCC being dangerous had no relation
>to the material on the test. We could say the same thing about sending our
>kids to school. A very few have been killed and/or raped. That is hardly
>a reason for not attending school.
>
>These newsgroups get sillier every month, if not every week.

I had high expectations that there would be some sort of meaningful
exchanges here.

Boy did I ever get my bubble broken.

It's a nice place to get that "stomping in the mud puddle" thing out of
your system so you can wash up and go back to "the real world".

73

Steve, K4YZ

4529. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:38:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406050638.8eee59a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92643

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0406050250.75217c0a@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040605005555.27012.00000266@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > In article <r8awc.4860$uo4.2593@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> > >The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been professional;
> > >my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to
> > >think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they
> > >*don't* like?
> >
> > Irrelevant. Another stressed that the "invention" was because of his
> > being a radio amateur. Solely so, so much that nearly all of the
> > URI news release was omitted.
>
> The rest of the post was irrelevent since the antenna itself was
> not of importance.

Oh, my! There was no rant, and the invention/patent is not of
importance.

So what we have is is a lie wrapped up in a lack of judgement.

Exactly why did you post anything at all except to troll and flame?

> What WAS of importance was that a non-Amateur Radio media source
> felt compelled to mention, early on I might add, that the person
> responsible for this project was a licensed Amateur.

People everywhere lack judgement, including those in media. Bless
your heart, you're not alone.

> The POINT being that Sir Scummy of Lanark was once again proven
> wrong...

Wrong?

I saw him make no "assertion of fact" for you to refute, and the only
ranting is your own.

> Amateurs ARE still involved in "advancement of the radio art",
> and someone felt stongly enouhg about it to emphasize it in a news
> release.

What are you doing in "state of the art?" Bandspanner?

> Lennie often raves in this forum about how Amateurs don't do this
> kind of thing.

They do it first as paid employees of someone else. They just happen
to be amateurs.

> And of course he can't stand it and will spin this into the
> ground.

You're doing a good enough job of that.

> Too late. The egg's already been cracked and he's wearing it.

Insanity. There was no rant, and then you claim the invention was of
no importance. You're wearing the egg.

> Sorry Lennie. Proven wrong by example again.

In another galaxy far, far away... "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

hihi

4530. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:41:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92644

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
>
> Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
> you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
> HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
>
> Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum. More like your head
is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
the "POP" heard round the world!

If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

hihi

4531. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:42:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406050642.1fb58d47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92645

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406042024.484c030@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> > Department of Communications/News Bureau
> > 22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
> > Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872
> >
> >
> > ---
> > ------
> > URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
> > Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
> >
> > KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the University of
> > Rhode Island’s Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
> > mother of invention.
> >
> > An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)
> >
> > ---
> > --------
> >
> > Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of the
> > radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!
>
> It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
> defies both Physics 101 and common sense.

Maybe - or maybe not.

Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much real data for a while anyway.

One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4532. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:45:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92646

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> > >
> > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> > > >
> > > No and no.
> > >
> >
> > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
> > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> > I'd still put it on my card.
> >
> > bb
>
> Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>
> Dave K8MN

I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.

I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact there.

4533. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 14:57:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406050657.55aae6fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92647

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40C150C3.E2E17AED@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > >
> > > > Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.
> > >
> > > You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
> > > You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
> > > of late, "William".
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Anyone can remove one of their more embarassing posts.
>
> Are you out of your gourd?
>
> Dave K8MN

How can I remove articles from Google's archive?

Google will honor requests to remove messages that you have posted
yourself (known as nuking a post). You may even be able to do this
yourself using our Automatic Removal Tool. Please find the
circumstance below that applies to you and follow the instructions
there.

Messages posted from your current e-mail address
If the email address you used to post your message(s) is still active,
we recommend you use our Automatic Removal Tool. This is the fastest
and easiest way to have your posts removed. Note- that in order to use
this option, you must be able to send and receive email using the same
account from which your messages were originally posted to Usenet.

Messages posted with an e-mail address that is no longer valid
If you would like to request the removal of posts made by you, but the
email address from which you posted is no longer valid, you may send
an e-mail to groups-support@google.com that contains the following
items:

your full name and contact information, including an email address
that can be verified;
the complete Google Groups URL (or message ID) for each individual
message you would like to have suppressed;

a statement that says "I swear under penalty of civil or criminal laws that I am the person who posted each of the foregoing messages or am authorized to request removal by the person who posted those messages."; and
your signature (electronic).

To prevent articles from being added to the Google Groups index in the future, add 'X-No-Archive: yes' in the header of the article when you post. If your news posting software does not allow you to edit headers, type 'X-No-Archive: yes' as the first line of your post.

Messages posted by other people
By its very nature, Usenet consists of information posted by many people. Google does not monitor or control the content of this information. Instead, we simply provide access to the public forum in which people post their comments.

Accordingly, if you are concerned about a message that someone has posted, you need to resolve that problem directly with the person who posted it. Except in extreme circumstances, Google will not act upon an individual's request to remove another person's messages. We firmly believe it is not Google's role to resolve disputes among the users who have posted millions of messages on Usenet, nor would it be possible to fulfill that role if we chose to undertake it.

It is Google's policy to respond to notices of alleged infringement that comply with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act in an appropriate manner under such Act and other applicable intellectual property laws, including the removal or disabling of access to material claimed to be the subject of infringing activity. For more information, see our Terms of Service.

4534. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 15:04:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406050704.def0410@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92648

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<S47wc.12555$Yd3.6470@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> > > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license stateside
> > > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."
>
> Perhaps still today, but it used to be allowed to get into MARS with a
> Novice ticket. That was a long time ago, when a Novice ticket really had
> to be earned.

Oh yeh, it was uphill both ways in the snow with a piece of cardboard
in my shoe. I remember. Pffft.

> Of course now-a-days there is no Novice ticket. And those that still have
> one are of no importance to worry about in the scheme of things.

So 31,545 amateur radio operators are of no consequence? I thought
that only the ARRL could be so cavalier about such a large block of
amateurs.

> Dan/W4NTI

bb

4535. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 16:31:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <czmwc.4888$_D3.1771@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92649

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0406050642.1fb58d47@posting.google.com...
>
> Maybe - or maybe not.
>
> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
> real data for a while anyway.
>
> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
> numbers.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Hello, Jim

Your point about matching network and ground losses is well taken.

We keep hoping for that "perfect" antenna. An IEEE publication back in 1995 pointed out that the Northern Lights are caused by ions that are far too small to be efficient radiators of light - and yet they radiate light. In theory, an antenna can be vanishingly small and yet be efficient - and even possess gain!

If any one has a 6 inch whip with a 3 dBi gain on 75 meters, let me know. I'd like to try it first, however. Don't ask for money up front like all of the notes I receive about transferring $10,000,000.00 US for which I receive $1,000,000.00 - uh, but have to send someone some up front cash to ensure the account is good :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.699 / Virus Database: 456 - Release Date: 6/4/04

4536. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 18:43:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C2144C.DEE69E4B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92550

Jim Hampton wrote:

> The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been professional;
> my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to
> think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they
> *don't* like?

Well, there's Leonard *snicker*.

Dave K8MN

4537. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 18:50:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C215F8.10B56693@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92551

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40C150C3.E2E17AED@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40BFF8E9.C6ED1AE9@earthlink.net>...
> > > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Heil spoke of Veterans always having their hands out.
> > > >
> > > > You made this claim a year or so back. You were asked for specifics.
> > > > You provided none. You seem to be playing fast and loose with the truth
> > > > of late, "William".
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Anyone can remove one of their more embarassing posts.
> >
> > Are you out of your gourd?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> How can I remove articles from Google's archive?
>
> Google will honor requests to remove messages that you have posted
> yourself (known as nuking a post). You may even be able to do this
> yourself using our Automatic Removal Tool. Please find the
> circumstance below that applies to you and follow the instructions
> there.
>
> Messages posted from your current e-mail address
> If the email address you used to post your message(s) is still active,
> we recommend you use our Automatic Removal Tool. This is the fastest
> and easiest way to have your posts removed. Note- that in order to use
> this option, you must be able to send and receive email using the same
> account from which your messages were originally posted to Usenet.
>
> Messages posted with an e-mail address that is no longer valid
> If you would like to request the removal of posts made by you, but the
> email address from which you posted is no longer valid, you may send
> an e-mail to groups-support@google.com that contains the following
> items:

>
> your full name and contact information, including an email address
> that can be verified;
> the complete Google Groups URL (or message ID) for each individual
> message you would like to have suppressed;
> a statement that says "I swear under penalty of civil or criminal laws
> that I am the person who posted each of the foregoing messages or am
> authorized to request removal by the person who posted those
> messages."; and
> your signature (electronic).
>
> To prevent articles from being added to the Google Groups index in the
> future, add 'X-No-Archive: yes' in the header of the article when you
> post. If your news posting software does not allow you to edit
> headers, type 'X-No-Archive: yes' as the first line of your post.
>
> Messages posted by other people
> By its very nature, Usenet consists of information posted by many
> people. Google does not monitor or control the content of this
> information. Instead, we simply provide access to the public forum in
> which people post their comments.
>
> Accordingly, if you are concerned about a message that someone has
> posted, you need to resolve that problem directly with the person who
> posted it. Except in extreme circumstances, Google will not act upon
> an individual's request to remove another person's messages. We firmly
> believe it is not Google's role to resolve disputes among the users
> who have posted millions of messages on Usenet, nor would it be
> possible to fulfill that role if we chose to undertake it.
>
> It is Google's policy to respond to notices of alleged infringement
> that comply with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act in an
> appropriate manner under such Act and other applicable intellectual
> property laws, including the removal or disabling of access to
> material claimed to be the subject of infringing activity. For more
> information, see our Terms of Service.

I ask again, are you out of your gourd? You make some absurd claim
about what I'm supposed to have stated about veterans. There is nothing
to back your claim in archives. Therefore I'm supposed to defend against
that what does not exist.

Under like circumstances, why not defend yourself against the obsession
you have with Cher? Can't find it? Obviously you've deleted it from
Google.

Dave K8MN

4538. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 18:55:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92552

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
> >
> > > > >
> > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> > > > >
> > > > No and no.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
> > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> > > I'd still put it on my card.
> > >
> > > bb
> >
> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.

> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.

We don't know that the logbook exists. We don't know that T5/N0IMD
existed. No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
have cancelled everything through Google.

> I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact there.

I didn't ask for the first one. You requested one of mine through my
QSL manager.

Dave K8MN

4539. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 20:09:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605160926.23112.00000350@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92555

In article <20040605103249.02657.00000599@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>>Date: 6/4/2004 12:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <az2wc.1199$vG7.1058@news01.roc.ny>
>>
>>"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:1e4e3692.0406040426.7923f3c7@posting.google.com...
>>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040603224029.11399.00000379@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>> > >Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>>> > >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>>> > >Date: 6/3/2004 8:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>> > >Message-id: <GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny>
>>> > >
>>> > >
>>> > >"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>>> > >news:1e4e3692.0406011831.2ffc0576@posting.google.com...
>>> >
>>> > >> Folks have been killed while driving to the FCC for exams. They might
>>> > >> have known the material, and they might not have. We'll never know.
>>> >
>>> > >So, back to your statement and my question: what does driving a car have
to
>>> > >do with radio/electronics/rf/ac/dc and safety?
>>> >
>>> > A rhetorical question at best, isn't it, Jim...?!?! =)
>>> >
>>> > A skilled LennieRanter uses such diversions to redirect our
attention from
>>> > thier lack of substance in the exchange, Jim!
>>> >
>>> > 73
>>> >
>>> > Steve, K4YZ
>>>
>>> The point was, "We'll never know (if they knew the material).
>>>
>>> Some of you OF's try to make it sound like getting to the FCC office
>>> for an examination was inconvenient at best, or even dangerous. So
>>> you petitioned your government to let you get a mail order license, or
>>> to have some other local ham(s) test you. Lots of hand wringing and

>>> whining.
>>
>>Huh?
>>
>>I thought most of the OFs were trying to get the tests a bit more difficult.
>>You can't have it both ways.
>
> It wasn't the "OF's" who were trying to get the tests thinned out. It
was
>the Johhny-come-lately 10-4 Good Buddy crowd that wanted NO code test and
>written questions that were "in the public domain".

By definition, AMATEUR radio is not professional. Ergo, a HOBBY,
done for personal recreation, enjoyment, without accepting any
money for communications services rendered anyone.

As such, the rules and regulations need only to reflect the radio
environment, other radio services, and, of course, the international
radio world effect (which involves some politicking). Hobbies don't
need any professional guild-union-craft structure of apprentice-
journeyman-master kind of hierarchy...except in the imagination
of those who use an amateur license to merely show off.

The public question (and answer) pool came about through other
government regulations as Phil pointed out years ago. In reality,
such public data has been around for over a half century
beginning with the "Q&A" books that were once on the market
right after WW2. The Dick Bash material came later and was
not the start of such things. Bash did better marketing,
combining his radio schools with the books, plus some
noteriety, all added up to his being "known" better. The "Q&A"
books began it with commercial radio operator licenses plus
the amateur radio operator licenses.

The "no code movement" existed over four decades ago and
has grown in that time, finally achieving organizations (NCI is
the largest to date) which emphasized that. The use of manual
telegraphy has continued to decline in non-amateur radio for
half a century and the hoary old maxims of "a good radio op
is a good telegrapher" went out of date long, long ago...every-
where but among the greying heads of old amateurs.

>>Next, you'll blame the OFs because your washing machine is over-sudsing LOL!
>
> He'll blame anyone for anything as long as it means defering any
>responsibility from himself.

Jim Hampton made a little remark with humor and should be
taken as such. That wasn't a springboard for you to suddenly
turn on fury and go on yet-another personal attack.

>>The reality is that the real flamers on both ends of the spectrum are the
>>hold up. That mention of a trip to the FCC being dangerous had no relation
>>to the material on the test. We could say the same thing about sending our
>>kids to school. A very few have been killed and/or raped. That is hardly
>>a reason for not attending school.
>>
>>These newsgroups get sillier every month, if not every week.
>
> I had high expectations that there would be some sort of meaningful
exchanges here.
>
> Boy did I ever get my bubble broken.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you broke it yourself.

You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
on those who do not agree with you.

"Meaningful exchanges" do not equate with capitulation to your
personal ideas of what amateur radio is (fantasy or otherwise).

> It's a nice place to get that "stomping in the mud puddle" thing out of
>your system so you can wash up and go back to "the real world".

That's just the opposite of what you just said about "meaningful
exchanges."

You DO play in lots of mud. If there isn't any mud, you hose down
the ground and MAKE mud...then whine and complain that all
others are being so nasty to poor little you.

Poor nursie...no TLC received because of throwing all that mud.

You broke the levees over five years ago along with all the
other mud bulldozers in here and think you are mighty and powerful
for saying what's on your mind...and then getting angrier when
anyone throws the mud right back at you. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

On top of that, you can't get government regulations straight or
what they mean, such as "MARS is amateur radio," a statement
that is incorrect.

Stewart started off this thread with some rather vague generality
that wasn't any "rant" but just a general comment. I really don't
know, nor can I decrypt what Stewart meant (from many possible
choices). I can see that the Personal Attack mode has been
turned on by yourself. Again. On specifics of what certain others
say so that you can claim bulldoze rights of breaking the
behavior dam to add more troubled waters over calm land.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4540. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 20:09:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605160927.23112.00000351@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92553

In article <1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
>>
>> Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
>> you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
>> HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
>>
>> Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum. More like your head
>is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
>the "POP" heard round the world!
>
>If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.

There must be MANY "rants" floating around in his troubled
personal mind waters.

So much so, that a link or meaningful part of the URI news release
was never quoted. Nursie took only the part about Rob Vincent
being a ham as important, then trying to connect it with some old,
imagined insults against his person-as-a-ham that only he can
think up.

Nursie must consider this newsgroup as His Own Battleground
where he can Fight His Battles and avenge his self-definition
of something or other.

In reality, a small (less than quarter wavelength), efficient, wide-
band antenna concept IS important to radio amateurs working
in HF bands. THAT should be the focus, not a bunch of pain
from individuals' bruised egos.

Lots of different groups/organizations are working such antenna
problems and coming up with some (usually) different solutions.
Such solutions ARE of importance, not the petty squabblings of
a few individuals.

>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

:-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4541. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 20:09:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040605160929.23112.00000352@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92554

In article <1e4e3692.0406050638.8eee59a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0406050250.75217c0a@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040605005555.27012.00000266@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>> > In article <r8awc.4860$uo4.2593@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
>> > <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>> > >The gentleman in question with the antenna may well have been
professional;
>> > >my point is that most inventors are doing something they enjoy. Come to
>> > >think of it, how many folks are continually involved in something they
>> > >*don't* like?
>> >
>> > Irrelevant. Another stressed that the "invention" was because of his
>> > being a radio amateur. Solely so, so much that nearly all of the
>> > URI news release was omitted.
>>
>> The rest of the post was irrelevent since the antenna itself was
>> not of importance.
>
>Oh, my! There was no rant, and the invention/patent is not of
>importance.

According to the University of Rhode Island, an academic
institution that includes paid, professional electronic engineers,
the whole topic of Small Antennas was the point of the news
release.

Nursie's interpretation went off into some personal dialect of
"ranting" (and raving) when there was no actual rant going on.

We know nothing yet on the details of this small antenna
with patent pending (?). Actual patent grants might not occur
until 1 to 3 years after submission of the application and the
patent search information (seprate from the patent application
itself). Once the patent is granted it becomes public
knowledge, available for a modest fee from the patent office.

But, patent applications aren't available for full disclosure so
we don't know the details of this "invention."

If the patent application is denied, then it is NOT a "new
invention." [there is lots of prior art in this field and may have

been done by others, therefore making it not patentable]

>So what we have is is a lie wrapped up in a lack of judgement.

Well, I think of it more like a festering (perhaps gangrenous)
ego wound from long ago. :-) It must personally hurt a
great deal and thus cause a new "rant" to be done.

>Exactly why did you post anything at all except to troll and flame?

That seems to be his reason for being in here. All the angries
on display for all to wonder and praise... :-)

>> What WAS of importance was that a non-Amateur Radio media source
>> felt compelled to mention, early on I might add, that the person
>> responsible for this project was a licensed Amateur.
>
>People everywhere lack judgement, including those in media. Bless
>your heart, you're not alone.

Thousands and thousands of "news releases" of new technologies
appear every year in many, many electronic industry publications.
The subscription-free "controlled circulation" periodicals have
regular columns containing nothing but them. Academic
institutions started on that trend years ago.

>> The POINT being that Sir Scummy of Lanark was once again proven
>> wrong...
>
>Wrong?
>
>I saw him make no "assertion of fact" for you to refute, and the only
>ranting is your own.

It is...but that isn't the brake for the bulldozer driven levee-breaking.

It only adds more diesel to push the bull dozing harder into whatever
ground the bull thinks is fun to throw more mud.

OHSA needs to be informed about this. :-)

[it ought to be "Sir of Sun Valley" to complete the nastygram and
be correct with the USPS...very sibilant that way...good for the
nastygrammers to hiss between their teeth on reading newsgroups]

>> Amateurs ARE still involved in "advancement of the radio art",
>> and someone felt stongly enouhg about it to emphasize it in a news
>> release.
>
>What are you doing in "state of the art?" Bandspanner?

Advancing the state of the art in insulting all those without amateur
radio licenses. :-)

>> Lennie often raves in this forum about how Amateurs don't do this
>> kind of thing.
>
>They do it first as paid employees of someone else. They just happen
>to be amateurs.

Licensed amateur radio operators DO advance some of the radio
communication arts. I named Dan Tayloe specifically, plus the
several authors of articles in QST on do-it-yourself crystal filter
theory-measurement-construction. There are others, such as the
various amateur-specific multi-band antennas on the market.

My point - lost on the very angry nursie - is that amateurs do NOT
get credit for ALL of the radio communications advancements and
those few (out of 710K total licensees) who DO innovate and
invent are a decided minority among the constantly-advancing
state of radio arts just in the HF region. The ARRL's claim of
"amateurs advancing the state of the radio arts" is specious in
light of ALL the radio advancements done in the last half century.

>> And of course he can't stand it and will spin this into the
>> ground.
>
>You're doing a good enough job of that.

As usual. Old bitterness of losing newsgroup discussions
lingers on. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

The evidence is Out There...beyond the ARRL publication
dominance for radio amateur information.

>> Too late. The egg's already been cracked and he's wearing it.
>
>Insanity. There was no rant, and then you claim the invention was of
>no importance. You're wearing the egg.

He took a trip to Fantasy Island again...without "da blane."

>> Sorry Lennie. Proven wrong by example again.

Poor nursie. Tries to rant and rave, can't even copy enough of
the news release or give the link to the URL...then claims it
"refutes some (nonexistant) rant."

Insanity.

>In another galaxy far, far away... "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

I don't think George Lucas has that planned for any future
Star Wars sequels-prequels. :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4542. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 20:20:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92556

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> > > > >
> > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> > > > >
> > > > No and no.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
> > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> > > I'd still put it on my card.
> > >
> > > bb
> >
> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.

Who, exactly, did ever get one?

> I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact there.

w3rv

4543. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 21:29:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <aFadnbvIbLsQpl_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 92557

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:7f5vc.4533$sB1.2801@news02.roc.ny...
> Yes, I and can see a lot of 2 meter gear being sold/modified for use -
> where?
>
> I personally see no need for Morse, but do have a concern about the
> continuing movement to reduce technical requirements. This would include
> grandfathering techs to general. Folks have been killed trying to erect
> towers. Perhaps everyone believes that if you have a license you actually
> know something.

And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???

Carl - wk3c

4544. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 21:32:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <DVGdnZiOJZvNoV_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 92558

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny...
[snip]
>
> I also don't want some idiot running 200 watts into a 5/8 wave groundplane
> on 2 meters next door to me. He may be ignorant, but I am not.

And what is to stop a tech from doing so? (as long as he/she does the RF exposure analysis ... which will probably show that it's just fine from the RF exposure standpoint ...)

Jim, your class elitism/prejudice is showing - why don't you stop acting like all techs are dimwits? Many are more technically accomplished than many extras.

Carl - wk3c

4545. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 21:36:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92559

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406050642.1fb58d47@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406042024.484c030@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040604080851.16422.00000491@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> > > Department of Communications/News Bureau
> > > 22 Davis Hall, 10 Lippitt Road, Kingston, RI 02881
> > > Phone: 401-874-2116 Fax: 401-874-7872
> > >
> > >
> > > ---
> > > ------
> > > URI physics employee invents new antenna technology
> > > Media Contact: Jan Wenzel, 401-874-2116
> > >
> > > KINGSTON, R.I. -- June 2, 2004 -- Rob Vincent, an employee in the University of
> > > Rhode Island’s Physics Department, proves the adage that necessity is the
> > > mother of invention.
> > >
> > > An amateur radio operator since he was 14...(SNIP)
> > >
> > > ---
> > > --------
> > >
> > > Guess we can forget the "Hams don't contibute to the "advancement of the
> > > radio art" rant...Eh...?!?!
> >
> > It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
> > defies both Physics 101 and common sense.
>
> Maybe - or maybe not.
>
> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
> real data for a while anyway.
>
> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system

> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
> numbers.

Physics is physics is physics and we all know the implications of short antennas *and* we've read the similar hype which surrounded the farcical CFA and EH antennas to name just a couple of this thing's predecessors. I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty until proven innocent.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

4546. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 22:46:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <r3swc.14229$Yd3.13929@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92560

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406050704.def0410@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<S47wc.12555$Yd3.6470@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license
stateside
> > > > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."
> >
> > Perhaps still today, but it used to be allowed to get into MARS with a
> > Novice ticket. That was a long time ago, when a Novice ticket really
had
> > to be earned.
>
> Oh yeh, it was uphill both ways in the snow with a piece of cardboard
> in my shoe. I remember. Pffft.
>
> > Of course now-a-days there is no Novice ticket. And those that still
have
> > one are of no importance to worry about in the scheme of things.
>
> So 31,545 amateur radio operators are of no consequence? I thought
> that only the ARRL could be so cavalier about such a large block of
> amateurs.
>
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> bb

Thats right, no consequence and of no value. Just ask the FCC. There is
no longer a Novice, and soon will be no 'exclusive sub bands'. See what I
mean ?

Dan/W4NTI

4547. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 23:59:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040605195905.28360.00000204@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92563

In article <czmwc.4888$_D3.1771@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0406050642.1fb58d47@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Maybe - or maybe not.
>>
>> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
>> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
>> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
>> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
>> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
>> real data for a while anyway.
>>
>> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
>> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
>> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
>> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
>> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
>> numbers.
>>
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Hello, Jim

Greetings.
>
>Your point about matching network and ground losses is well taken.

TNX
>
>We keep hoping for that "perfect" antenna.

I just hope for a better one.

>An IEEE publication back in 1995
>pointed out that the Northern Lights are caused by ions that are far too
>small to be efficient radiators of light - and yet they radiate light.

If it happens, it must be possible.

>In
>theory, an antenna can be vanishingly small and yet be efficient - and even
>possess gain!

>
Sure. But try to match to it!

>If any one has a 6 inch whip with a 3 dBi gain on 75 meters, let me know.
>I'd like to try it first, however. Don't ask for money up front like all of
>the notes I receive about transferring $10,000,000.00 US for which I receive
>$1,000,000.00 - uh, but have to send someone some up front cash to ensure
>the account is good :))

If it was easy, anybody could do it.

OTOH we don't have anything to go on other than "continuously loaded monopole".
Maybe he's got a real advance, maybe it's all just hype. I'll reserve judgement
until there's some real info available.

If somebody told you, back about 1975, that in 25 years you'd have a computer
on your desk that had a 500 MHz CPU, over 100 MB of memory and 10 GB of disk
space, and cost about $200 complete (1975 dollars) what would you have said?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4548. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 23:59:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040605195906.28360.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92562

In article <d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> > It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
>> > defies both Physics 101 and common sense.
>>
>> Maybe - or maybe not.
>>
>> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
>> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
>> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
>> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
>> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
>> real data for a while anyway.
>>
>> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
>> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
>> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
>> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
>> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
>> numbers.
>
>Physics is physics is physics and we all know the implications of
>short antennas *and* we've read the similar hype which surrounded the
>farcical CFA and EH antennas to name just a couple of this thing's
>predecessors. I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
>until proven innocent.

Maybe. Or maybe it's for-real.

Without detailed info it's all academic anyway.

But I remember a time when it was said that "physics" would not permit microprocessors faster than about 25 MHz. Nor with more than a few thousand transistors. Etc.

There was also a very learned "professional in radio" who, when informed of the intent of the 1921 ARRL Transatlantic Tests, proclaimed that it was physically impossible for a kilowatt input 200 meter transmitter to be heard at that distance. Waves were just too short, doncha know. Physics wouldn't allow it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4549. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 23:59:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92561

In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>
>> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
>
>We don't know that the logbook exists.

I think it does.

>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.

I think it did.

>No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
>cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
>have cancelled everything through Google.

Maybe.

Or consider this:

Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning government.

Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say on 2
meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.

Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us to
use the radio sets.

Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?

Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4550. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-05 23:59:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040605195908.28360.00000207@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92564

In article <DVGdnZiOJZvNoV_dUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny...
>[snip]
>>
>> I also don't want some idiot running 200 watts into a 5/8 wave groundplane
>> on 2 meters next door to me. He may be ignorant, but I am not.
>
>And what is to stop a tech from doing so? (as long as he/she does the RF
>exposure analysis ... which will probably show that it's just fine from the
>RF exposure standpoint ...)
>
>Jim, your class elitism/prejudice is showing - why don't you stop acting
>like all techs are dimwits? Many are more technically accomplished than
>many extras.
>
Carl,

Please read the thread from the beginning to see the context of the comments.
Note the claims and tone of the person who started the thread.

Jim is *supporting* the idea of meaningful written tests for all - including
the entry-level license, whatever it is.

He is not saying all or even some techs are "dimwits" - just that we need
appropriate technical testing in place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4551. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 00:00:21 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0406051600.68943bb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92565

TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote

> What is the accepted practice relative to identifying the call area when
> one has moved permanently, given that the FCC does not assign a new call
> when one moves out of their area?

Whatever works for you. The FCC has implicitly acknowledged that we
are a mobile society and that we become 'attached' to our callsigns
sort of as a second name, so changing calls just because we've moved
makes no more sense than changing our name just because we've moved.
Just sign your call as issued without 'attachments'.

73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

4552. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 00:47:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40C269B3.9080803@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92566

Hans K0HB wrote:

>>
>>
>
>Whatever works for you. The FCC has implicitly acknowledged that we
>are a mobile society and that we become 'attached' to our callsigns
>sort of as a second name, so changing calls just because we've moved
>makes no more sense than changing our name just because we've moved.
>
>
Never quite understood it, but it used to be that a callsign belonged to
the "station" and
not the operator, or something like that. Once it happened many years
ago that two
brothers got licenses but the FCC gave out only one callsign, as they
used the same
"station". The FCC recently decided to change that theory to one that
more closely
matches the way hams think of their callsigns. That a ham "owns" a
callsign and uses
it on whatever ham equipment he happens to be using at the moment. If I
borrow your
ham shack, I would still use my callsign. Once I'm satisfied that your
equipment works
correctly. "Looks like a kenwood TS440SAT, receives like one, and seems
to transmit
like it should."

4553. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 01:40:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0LednSbKrvGZ61_dRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92567

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny...
> [snip]
>
>>I also don't want some idiot running 200 watts into a 5/8 wave groundplane
>>on 2 meters next door to me. He may be ignorant, but I am not.
>
>
> And what is to stop a tech from doing so? (as long as he/she does the RF
> exposure analysis ... which will probably show that it's just fine from the
> RF exposure standpoint ...)
>
> Jim, your class elitism/prejudice is showing - why don't you stop acting
> like all techs are dimwits? Many are more technically accomplished than
> many extras.

I think you are pulling this out of context, Carl. The original poster said that (paraphrasing here) the people opposed to the upgrade are wrong in part because the Technician and General tests are nearly identical.

Oddly enough, in a later post that same poster went on to note how many Tower questions there are on the Tech test, yet not on the General test - a seeming contradiction for nearly identical tests.

I am a "new" Ham, having taken all my tests in modern times. There are significan differences between the Technician test and the General test and the Extra test.

Jim was merely supporting adequate testing. As do I. Of course there is a wide gap in what people consider adequate.

I know I do not consider the Technician test adequate to be classed as a General. And I doubt I'll ever apologize for thinking that knowledge is good.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4554. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 02:24:14 UTC
From: TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94FFE3E784A30teletech1212@207.69.154.201>
Source record: 92568

Thanks for all of the, um, "feedback", folks!

--
NOTE: To reply, DELETE the obvious word in my e-mail address you need to
DELETE in order to reply.

4555. Getting started.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 06:36:10 UTC
From: Mike <spamtrap@zbuffer.com>
Message-ID: <uXywc.3269$uX2.1752@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92569

Well, I've had my ticket since 99, but I really don't have any idea of what to do with it. Some friends asked me to recommend a 2-way radio set for them, and in looking I stumbled back into the old ham web sites. The sad truth is that I really don't know what I'm doing.

Sure, I've googled, but what do people in the know like as a good online source of the nitty-gritty information like band usage and such? I'm not all that clear as to where I can transmit what, and what best practices are.

If I wanted to operate on a US military camp in Iraq, does anyone know who I would contact for a license? Is it even possible?

-mike

4556. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 08:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406060055.1ac4ea19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92570

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
> >
> > Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
> > you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
> > HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
> >
> > Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum.

Yes, it is.

> More like your head
> is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
> the "POP" heard round the world!

I am sure you wiash this were true.

> If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.

Sorry, Brain...No need to waste that much bandwidth with material
that Lennie already wasted bandwidth on in the first place.

Now, try and find something you KNOW something about to talk
about, Brain. So far you can discount DXpeditions, reciprocal
licensing, MARS, and emergency communications. You've failed
miserably in ALL of these subjects.

Steve, K4YZ

4557. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 09:01:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406060101.7b605527@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92571

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040605160929.23112.00000352@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> Nursie's interpretation went off into some personal dialect of
> "ranting" (and raving) when there was no actual rant going on.

Sure there has been, Lennie.

From my own experience, over six years of assertions of how
Amatuers are allegedly NOT involved in any kind of research. Goggle
archives attest.

I don't care about the intimate details of the project. The
POINT was (and still is) that Amateurs ARE involved in research and
they ARE recognized for thier contributions AS Amateurs by entities
OTHER than Amateur Radio-related sources.

You have asserted on numrous occassions that since no one except
ARRL sources routinely report on such things, they obviously don't
occur.

You were (again) proven wrong.

The rest of your "more smoke = less credibility" spin deleted.

Try again, Grampa Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

4558. Re: Getting started.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 10:02:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406060202.5b5759fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92572

Mike <spamtrap@zbuffer.com> wrote in message
news:<uXywc.3269$uX2.1752@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> Well, I've had my ticket since 99, but I really don't have any idea of
> what to do with it. Some friends asked me to recommend a 2-way radio set
> for them, and in looking I stumbled back into the old ham web sites. The
> sad truth is that I really don't know what I'm doing.
>
> Sure, I've googled, but what do people in the know like as a good online
> source of the nitty-gritty information like band usage and such? I'm not
> all that clear as to where I can transmit what, and what best practices are.
>
> If I wanted to operate on a US military camp in Iraq, does anyone know
> who I would contact for a license? Is it even possible?

http://www.arrl.org/hamradio.html

>
> -mike

w3rv

4559. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 11:05:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406060305.447833f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92573

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040605195906.28360.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> > It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
> >> > defies both Physics 101 and common sense.
> >>
> >> Maybe - or maybe not.
> >>
> >> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
> >> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
> >> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
> >> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
> >> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
> >> real data for a while anyway.
> >>
> >> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
> >> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
> >> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
> >> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
> >> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
> >> numbers.
> >
> >Physics is physics is physics and we all know the implications of
> >short antennas *and* we've read the similar hype which surrounded the
> >farcical CFA and EH antennas to name just a couple of this thing's
> >predecessors. I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> >until proven innocent.
>
> Maybe. Or maybe it's for-real.
>
> Without detailed info it's all academic anyway.
>
> But I remember a time when it was said that "physics" would not permit
> microprocessors faster than about 25 MHz. Nor with more than a few thousand
> transistors. Etc.

Had nothing to do with "physics", had to do with musings posted by a
few gloms who were clueless about how rapidly developed chip
manufacturing technologies could leap past the limits of their own
imaginations. Hoof. Mouf. Classic.

> There was also a very learned "professional in radio" who, when informed of the
> intent of the 1921 ARRL Transatlantic Tests, proclaimed that it was physically

> impossible for a kilowatt input 200 meter transmitter to be heard at that
> distance. Waves were just too short, doncha know. Physics wouldn't allow it.

This is not 1921. 83 years later the physics of antennas has been
milked to the extent that the probability of anybody inventing an
antenna which does not utilize long-applied physics lies somewhere
'way out the asymptote of the curve.

Per previous I'll stick.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

4560. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 13:21:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92574

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:

>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>
>I think it did.

Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!

>>No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
>>cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
>>have cancelled everything through Google.
>
>Maybe.
>
>Or consider this:
>
>Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning government.
>
>Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say on
>2
>meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
>
>Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us to
>use the radio sets.
>
>Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
>
>Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?

Sure you can...ie: Antarctica

However even there there are international agreements on who can grant what
authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.

Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices, and
it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he CLAIMED
to do.

He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
while in Somalia.

No proof = Didn't happen.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4561. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 13:30:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92575

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>

>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>there.

Funny.

You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet you
"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.

How inept.

Steve, K4YZ

4562. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 13:38:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606093807.13387.00000323@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92576

>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/5/2004 3:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040605160926.23112.00000350@mb-m04.aol.com>

> You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you.

Whew....

Coming from YOU this means absolutely NOTHING.

You are the epitome of newsgroup antagonist and troll. You laid waste to your own name and "character" a long time ago. You are a documented liar and deceiver.

YOU "soiled the communications enviroment" when you started in with the "jackbooted thugs", "elitists" and other demeaning adjectives and then followed it up with ream after ream of cowardly, spiteful anti-Amateur rhetoric.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4563. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 15:00:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92577

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

>
> And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
>

I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the ill-concieved proposal of ARRL which would extend a "free pass" to hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4564. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 16:58:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92578

In article <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 06 Jun 2004 13:21:45 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>
>>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>>
>>I think it did.
>
> Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!

That's one reason. Lacking any proof to the contrary, I'm not going to call someone a liar.
>
>>>No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
>>>cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
>>>have cancelled everything through Google.
>>
>>Maybe.
>>
>>Or consider this:
>>
>>Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning government.

>>Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say
>>on 2 meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
>>
>>Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us
>>to use the radio sets.
>>
>>Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
>>
>>Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?
>
> Sure you can...ie: Antarctica

>
Well, there you have it. It could have happened, and all of the above-named conditions would have been met.

> However even there there are international agreements on who can grant
>what authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.

Of course. I didn't say such operation would be 100% in agreement with international requirements, just that it could happen.
>
>Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices,
>and
>it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he
>CLAIMED to do.

Maybe. But that has no bearing on whether the alleged /T5 operation took place, whether logbooks existed, and whether QSLs were exchanged.

Remember that all it would take to meet all of these conditions would be one QSO in a ham band using stateside calls and portable designation.
>
>He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
>while in Somalia.

Of course not. Same goes for bands/modes/antennas/rigs used. But the lack of detail doesn't mean the alleged operation didn't happen.

The lack of detail is a different issue completely.

> No proof = Didn't happen.
>
Not at all.

No proof = Reasonable doubt.

Nothing more or less.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4565. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:01:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606140151.15095.00000178@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92581

In article <5c01b95b.0406060055.1ac4ea19@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (the Meaningful Dis-Cusser) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
>> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> > > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
>> >
>> > Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
>> > you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
>> > HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
>> >
>> > Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
>> >
>> > Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum.
>
> Yes, it is.
>
>> More like your head
>> is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
>> the "POP" heard round the world!
>
> I am sure you wiash this were true.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still making typos when oh, so angry? :-)

You have a "wiashing machine" there? A "clothes driaer?"

Appliance technology marches on...

>> If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.
>
> Sorry, Brain...No need to waste that much bandwidth with material
>that Lennie already wasted bandwidth on in the first place.

Everyone just loves all this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)

> Now, try and find something you KNOW something about to talk
>about, Brain. So far you can discount DXpeditions, reciprocal
>licensing, MARS, and emergency communications. You've failed

>miserably in ALL of these subjects.

"MARS is amateur radio."

Nursie is a veteran of "hostile actions."

Nursie shopped at the HRO in Burbank, CA, before they even
moved out of their Van Nuys location...

Everyone just loves this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4566. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:01:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92583

In article <5c01b95b.0406060101.7b605527@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040605160929.23112.00000352@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
>> Nursie's interpretation went off into some personal dialect of
>> "ranting" (and raving) when there was no actual rant going on.
>
> Sure there has been, Lennie.

Only on nursie's side... :-)

[poor person thinks his every utterance is "truth"...]

> From my own experience, over six years of assertions of how
>Amatuers are allegedly NOT involved in any kind of research. Goggle
>archives attest.

No "amatuer" is involved in any kind of research.

A few amateurs are.

What is a "goggle" other than an eye shield?

Do you get little archives on your helmet goggles while flying?

Try GOOGLE instead.

[no, you don't grow archives in the garden to put on salads...]

> I don't care about the intimate details of the project. The
>POINT was (and still is) that Amateurs ARE involved in research and
>they ARE recognized for thier contributions AS Amateurs by entities
>OTHER than Amateur Radio-related sources.

You "don't care about the intimate details" because you can't
get intimate with basic electronics enough to understand what
is being talked about. Not the newsgroup's problem...except to
to see your blabbering of injured ego...

> You have asserted on numrous occassions that since no one except
>ARRL sources routinely report on such things, they obviously don't
>occur.

I don't make a career of such "numrous occasions" but the
"research" into radio technology is still, overwhelmingly, done
by corporations and academicians...VERY little by licensed
radio amateurs.

Of course, if the only source of your information is the ARRL, then
you will appear thoroughly brainwashed into believing them and
that hams are busy, busy, busy "advancing the state of the
radio art" all over the place.

Yoda asks, "What state of any art has nursie advanced...hmmm?"

> You were (again) proven wrong.

"Wrong?" By a news release from URI that gave NO details on
this wondrous new antenna other than more snake-oil sales
pitching? Hundreds of those news releases appear every month.

Those inventions assume some legitimacy when they appear as
papers in known publications or presentations at conferences.

The fields on your antenna are crossed but you are still not
a Stone's Throw from Antennex.

[a pun for those who know Jack...]

[nursie won't understand]

> The rest of your "more smoke = less credibility" spin deleted.

I gave up smoking a long time ago. :-)

You didn't. Your "hostile actions" claim is still on fire.

So is "MARS is amateur radio."

Smokey the Bear say, "Only YOU can put out forest fires..."

> Try again, Grampa Lennie...

That's GREAT in front of that to be a "meaningful discussion" thing.

Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
the URI micro-antennas.

Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4567. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:01:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606140153.15095.00000180@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92579

In article <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>
>>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>there.
>
> Funny.
>
> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet you
>"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.

Where are nursie's logs from Okinawa?

No proof = Nothing happened.

Where are nursie's other claims?

No proof = Nothing happened.

[are you calling continued "meaningful discussions' in here as one of those "hostile actions?" :-)]

> How inept.

As Yoda would say, "How meaningful your discussions are not..."

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4568. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:01:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606140154.15095.00000181@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92582

In article <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>
>>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>>
>>I think it did.
>
> Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!
>
>>>No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
>>>cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
>>>have cancelled everything through Google.
>>
>>Maybe.
>>
>>Or consider this:
>>
>>Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning government.
>>
>>Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say on
>>2 meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
>>
>>Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us to
>>use the radio sets.
>>
>>Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
>>
>>Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?
>
> Sure you can...ie: Antarctica

When are you leaving for this DX hot-spot? :-)

> However even there there are international agreements on who can grant
what
>authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.

The ITU doesn't list nursie as one of those "authorities." :-)

> Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices, and
>it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he
>CLAIMED to do.

Nursie has claimed a LOT of things in here and NEVER offered any
"proof."

[190 proof doesn't count...]

> He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
>while in Somalia.
>
> No proof = Didn't happen.

No proof of "hostile actions" = Didn't happen.

No proof of all those ham claims = Didn't happen.

Your "proofing filter" is mistuned...

LenAnderson@ieee.com

4569. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:01:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040606140155.15095.00000182@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 92580

In article <20040606093807.13387.00000323@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/5/2004 3:09 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040605160926.23112.00000350@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>> You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
>> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
>> on those who do not agree with you.
>
> Whew....
>
> Coming from YOU this means absolutely NOTHING.

Poor baby. So far, not a single "meaningful discussion." :-)

Example is just following...

> You are the epitome of newsgroup antagonist and troll. You laid waste to
>your own name and "character" a long time ago. You are a documented liar and
>deceiver.

"Liar?" In one way, to one pair of eyes, that is true

I disrupt the fantasies and wish-fulfillment of someone with reality.

That can be a distinct ego blow.

"Deceiver?" In what way? Not following your imaginations and fantasies as "truth?"

Reality can be harsh. Try to accept reality as it exists.

> YOU "soiled the communications enviroment" when you started in with the
>"jackbooted thugs", "elitists" and other demeaning adjectives and then followed
>it up with ream after ream of cowardly, spiteful anti-Amateur rhetoric.

Your jackboots wear out? :-)

If being a "ham" means living in a fantasy world of great derring-do in radio, then I'm certainly not one of those deceivers.

> Putz.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still into cussing and personal attacks as "meaningful discussions?" [not at all a good image of an amateur extra...]

LenAnderson@ieee.com

4570. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 18:58:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040606145804.09295.00000359@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 92584

In article <_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>>
>> And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
>>
>
>I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a
>concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the
>ill-concieved proposal of ARRL

[and NCVEC]

> which would extend a "free pass" to
>hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by

[written]

>examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.

Well said! That's exactly the point.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4571. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 20:37:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406061237.19d96f68@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92585

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>
> >> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
> >
> >We don't know that the logbook exists.
>
> I think it does.
>
> >We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>
> I think it did.
>
> >No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
> >cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
> >have cancelled everything through Google.
>
> Maybe.
>
> Or consider this:
>
> Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning government.
>
> Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say on 2
> meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
>
> Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us to
> use the radio sets.

This ain't Don Miller time, the topic is the imaginary T5/N0mind.
There are no "suppositions" about his case. There *was* a radio
licensing authority in Somalia throughout that operation and there
was a long-standing clearly prescribed procedure other members of
the U.S. military followed in order to obtain perission to operate a
ham station in Somalia when he was there. The procedure is a matter of
long-standing gummint policy which existed long before Brainiac landed
in Somalia and all the legit YIs who are popping up today are
following the same policy requirements.

Quite some time ago I posted a copy here of a detailed e-mail written
by another member of the U.S. military who was also in Somalia during

that military expedition, followed the procedure and got official
hard-copy permission to go on the air. He went on to work scads of
stations, kept his logs and passed out piles of ARRL-acceptable cards
for a new one. Brainiac did none of the preceding = **bogus**.

Brainiac's excuse at the time was something like "well, he was later
than I was".

Yeah, right . .

> Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
>
> Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?
>
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

4572. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 21:11:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040606171137.13325.00000329@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92586

In article <d22b54c3.0406061237.19d96f68@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>>
>> >> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
>> >
>> >We don't know that the logbook exists.
>>
>> I think it does.
>>
>> >We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>>
>> I think it did.
>>
>> >No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
>> >cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
>> >have cancelled everything through Google.
>>
>> Maybe.
>>
>> Or consider this:
>>
>> Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning
>government.
>>
>> Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say
>on 2
>> meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
>>
>> Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us
>to
>> use the radio sets.
>
>This ain't Don Miller time,

Maybe it is. Ol' Don *was* on the air using various exotic callsigns.

Sometimes he actually was where he said he was, too.

> the topic is the imaginary T5/N0mind.
>There are no "suppositions" about his case.

Sure there are.

>There *was* a radio
>licensing authority in Somalia throughout that operation and there
>*was* a long-standing clearly prescribed procedure other members of
>the U.S. military followed in order to obtain perission to operate a
>ham station in Somalia when he was there. The procedure is a matter of
>long-standing gummint policy which existed long before Brainiac landed
>in Somalia and all the legit YIs who are popping up today are
>following the same policy requirements.

I'm not saying the above supposes would result in a legitimate operation. I'm
just saying that it could be done, and if the operation were confined to a
couple of local VHF/UHF QSOs the people involved might not get in any trouble.
>
>Quite some time ago I posted a copy here of a detailed e-mail written
>by another member of the U.S. military who was also in Somalia during
>that military expedition, followed the procedure and got official
>hard-copy permission to go on the air. He went on to work scads of
>stations, kept his logs and passed out piles of ARRL-acceptable cards
>for a new one.

IOW, the person you quoted did a legit operation.

>Brainiac did none of the preceding = **bogus**.
>
>Brainiac's excuse at the time was something like "well, he was later
>than I was".
>
>Yeah, right . .
>
>> Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
>>
>> Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?
>>
I'm simply saying what *could* be done. I'm not saying it would be legit, or
that anyone other than those directly involved would know anyhting about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4573. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 23:24:53 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <9JNwc.1441$OL6.374@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92587

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040605195905.28360.00000204@mb-m28.aol.com...
>
>
> Greetings.
>
> >Your point about matching network and ground losses is well taken.
>
> TNX
> >
> >We keep hoping for that "perfect" antenna.
>
> I just hope for a better one.
>
> >An IEEE publication back in 1995
> >pointed out that the Northern Lights are caused by ions that are far too
> >small to be efficient radiators of light - and yet they radiate light.
>
> If it happens, it must be possible.
>
<<snip>>
>
> If it was easy, anybody could do it.
>
> OTOH we don't have anything to go on other than "continuously loaded
monopole".
> Maybe he's got a real advance, maybe it's all just hype. I'll reserve
judgement
> until there's some real info available.
>
> If somebody told you, back about 1975, that in 25 years you'd have a
computer
> on your desk that had a 500 MHz CPU, over 100 MB of memory and 10 GB of
disk
> space, and cost about $200 complete (1975 dollars) what would you have
said?
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

In 1976, I purchased a Heathkit H-8. With 16 big K of ram (and I ordered a
12 K memory board from another vendor - a total of 28 K in the computer),
and a text only monitor and tape recorder for mass storage, the thing set me

back way over $2,000.00 - *in 1976*!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.699 / Virus Database: 456 - Release Date: 6/4/04

4574. The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-06 23:30:26 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <e166802b50888ee3a74c073c084eb9d2@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 92588

When you are drunk, please go to the
11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
not to talk between US buddies.

4575. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 01:06:22 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <DdednQzyaNd2UF7dRVn-hw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92591

George Orwell wrote:
> When you are drunk, please go to the
> 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> not to talk between US buddies.
>
>
>
Care to quote the rule that states 20m is only for dxing, and not for
general communications?

4576. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 01:24:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406061724.12aa4315@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92589

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> >
> > And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
> >
>
> I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a
> concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the
> ill-concieved proposal of ARRL which would extend a "free pass" to
> hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by
> examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.

The theory behind the exams is run a rough check on an individual's
competence to operate therefore reducing perceived assorted problems
on the bands. What's missing from the Tech written which would lead to
problems on the low bands if they were simply grandfathered to HF as
Generals? What problems?

-or-

What's the difference between Techs running 1.5 kW of ssb on 6M which
they're allowed to do under the current regs and the same individuals
running 1.5 kW of ssb on 20M which they're not allowed to do? Besides
the positions of the station's bandswitches.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

4577. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 01:42:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92590

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040606171137.13325.00000329@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406061237.19d96f68@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>
> >> >> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
> >> >
> >> >We don't know that the logbook exists.
> >>
> >> I think it does.
> >>
> >> >We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
> >>
> >> I think it did.
> >>
> >> >No one seems to have worked it. It doesn't show up in packet
> >> >cluster records. It doesn't show up in DXCC applications. You must
> >> >have cancelled everything through Google.
> >>
> >> Maybe.
> >>
> >> Or consider this:
> >>
> >> Suppose you and I found ourselves in a place with no functioning
> government.
> >>
> >> Suppose we had radio sets capable of operation on amateur frequencies. Say
> on 2
> >> meters, or 440, or 6 meters, or whatever.
> >>
> >> Suppose whatever authority existed there at the time said it was OK for us
> to
> >> use the radio sets.
> >
> >This ain't Don Miller time,
>

> Maybe it is. Ol' Don *was* on the air using various exotic callsigns.
>
> Sometimes he actually was where he said he was, too.
>
> > the topic is the imaginary T5/N0mind.
> >There are no "suppositions" about his case.
>
> Sure there are.
>
> >There *was* a radio
> >licensing authority in Somalia throughout that operation and there
> >*was* a long-standing clearly prescribed procedure other members of
> >the U.S. military followed in order to obtain perission to operate a
> >ham station in Somalia when he was there. The procedure is a matter of
> >long-standing gummint policy which existed long before Brainiac landed
> >in Somalia and all the legit YIs who are popping up today are
> >following the same policy requirements.
>
> I'm not saying the above supposes would result in a legitimate operation. I'm
> just saying that it could be done, and if the operation were confined to a
> couple of local VHF/UHF QSOs the people involved might not get in any trouble.
> >
> >Quite some time ago I posted a copy here of a detailed e-mail written
> >by another member of the U.S. military who was also in Somalia during
> >that military expedition, followed the procedure and got official
> >hard-copy permission to go on the air. He went on to work scads of
> >stations, kept his logs and passed out piles of ARRL-acceptable cards
> >for a new one.
>
> IOW, the person you quoted did a legit operation.
>
> >Brainiac did none of the preceding = **bogus**.
> >
> >Brainiac's excuse at the time was something like "well, he was later
> >than I was".
> >
> >Yeah, right . .
> >
> >> Could we not work each other and use our stateside callsigns?
> >>
> >> Could we not keep logbooks and exchange QSL cards?
> >>
> I'm simply saying what *could* be done. I'm not saying it would be legit, or
> that anyone other than those directly involved would know anyhting about it.

It's not a "could be", it's already out there all over the world all
over the RF spectrum. We call it "freebanding". Which, is exactly what
Burke was doing if he actually did get on the air from T5 without the
paperwork.

The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went freebanding.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

4578. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 03:30:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BKSdnfBHfeGjfF7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92592

N2EY wrote:
> In article <czmwc.4888$_D3.1771@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>>news:c2356669.0406050642.1fb58d47@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>Maybe - or maybe not.
>>>
>>>Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
>>>thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
>>>things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
>>>a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
>>>since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
>>>real data for a while anyway.
>>>
>>>One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
>>>the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
>>>itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
>>>be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
>>>losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
>>>numbers.
>>>
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Hello, Jim
>
>
> Greetings.
>
>>Your point about matching network and ground losses is well taken.
>
>
> TNX
>
>>We keep hoping for that "perfect" antenna.
>
>
> I just hope for a better one.
>
>
>>An IEEE publication back in 1995

>>pointed out that the Northern Lights are caused by ions that are far too
>>small to be efficient radiators of light - and yet they radiate light.
>
>
> If it happens, it must be possible.
>
>
>
>>In
>>theory, an antenna can be vanishingly small and yet be efficient - and even
>>possess gain!
>>
>
> Sure. But try to match to it!
>
>
>>If any one has a 6 inch whip with a 3 dBi gain on 75 meters, let me know.
>>I'd like to try it first, however. Don't ask for money up front like all of
>>the notes I receive about transferring $10,000,000.00 US for which I receive
>>$1,000,000.00 - uh, but have to send someone some up front cash to ensure
>>the account is good :))
>
>
> If it was easy, anybody could do it.
>
> OTOH we don't have anything to go on other than "continuously loaded monopole".

Just what is that anyhow? a 50 ohm resistor on the end of a pole?

> Maybe he's got a real advance, maybe it's all just hype. I'll reserve judgement
> until there's some real info available.

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. I'll not only reserve
judgment, but am highly skeptical about it at the same time. This sort
of thing is almost like the audiophile stuff I posted the other day.

And what I have seen so far on this breakthrough is feelgood stuff. I
just wonder why an 80 to 100 percent efficient antenna melts when hit
with a "whopping" 100 watts of power?

> If somebody told you, back about 1975, that in 25 years you'd have a computer
> on your desk that had a 500 MHz CPU, over 100 MB of memory and 10 GB of disk
> space, and cost about $200 complete (1975 dollars) what would you have said?

First I would have said "kewl" or whatever I was saying in 1975.
(probably more like "Far out, Dude!")

I wouldn't have seen any mechanical limitations however. I would have
marveled at getting so much stuff on one integrated circuit, noting that
the size was limited by the limitations of light. I don't think I would
have thought of X-ray lithography at the time. But I would have believed
that such a thing could be done.

The areas that I would be most surprised at would be that the computer would have a single CPU that did all the processing. I would wonder why on earth we weren't using massively parallel processing. In fact, I still do. Love my G5 dual processor!

The most mind boggling thing to me would have been the software and applications for the computer of 2000 or 2004. Soundcard applications, GUI's, graphics and all that other stuff was simply not on my radar screen at that point.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4579. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 03:37:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <wZ6dnSRvaaqMfl7dRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92593

JJ wrote:

> George Orwell wrote:
>
>> When you are drunk, please go to the
>> 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
>> not to talk between US buddies.
>>
>>
>>
> Care to quote the rule that states 20m is only for dxing, and not for
> general communications?

More importantly, is it okay to use 20 meters for Drunken DX'ing?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4580. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 03:49:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <u8qdncKR_sojeF7dRVn-vw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92594

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
>>>
>>
>>I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a
>>concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the
>>ill-concieved proposal of ARRL which would extend a "free pass" to
>>hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by
>>examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.
>
>
> The theory behind the exams is run a rough check on an individual's
> competence to operate therefore reducing perceived assorted problems
> on the bands. What's missing from the Tech written which would lead to
> problems on the low bands if they were simply grandfathered to HF as
> Generals? What problems?

Hf type questions? I also have a question along these lines. I
personally think that not having Technicians take and pass a test that
was considered to prepare the applicant for operation on HF is ripping
them off! The question is "Why would anyone support screwing over half
the Ham population out of something they should have?

Honest, Folks, knowledge is good!

> -or-
>
> What's the difference between Techs running 1.5 kW of ssb on 6M which
> they're allowed to do under the current regs and the same individuals
> running 1.5 kW of ssb on 20M which they're not allowed to do? Besides
> the positions of the station's bandswitches.

Well, the Techs are vetted on safety issues, so I'm not all that
worried about letting them use QRO. But specifically, I think that RFI
problems are different between HF and VHF and above.

As opposed to the "nolege is bad" folks, that simply want to reduce
power to levels considered "safe" so that we don't upset the applicants
with silly questions about RF safety.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4581. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 04:01:48 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <MMRwc.5024$kR1.4543@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92595

20 meters is the hangout for the 11 meter types who happen to have valid amateur licenses. 14.313 has been a favorite haunt of theirs. In fact, I shouldn't put down CBers by even comparing some (not a lot, but some) 20 meter operators to 11 meter operators.

Can't help but remember calling from the US Naval Hospital (KG6NAC) with phone patch traffic - the frequency was clear and I had checked - and some idiot from Hawaii told me to take my phone patch traffic elsewhere as there was an important DX contest going on. Yep, you youngsters go get shot up in Vietnam and leave me and my DX alone.

So much for amateur "service". Maybe Len is correct in some of his observations. Unfortunately, there were a couple of patients, a doctor, and a nurse present to hear that idiot. I did offer to give him the phone number as I wanted to tell him what I thought of him but didn't want to say it over the air as I didn't want to loose my license. He didn't take me up on it :)

About the only thing that has no limits is stupidity.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"JJ" <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:DdednQzyaNd2UF7dRVn-hw@gbronline.com...
> George Orwell wrote:
> > When you are drunk, please go to the
> > 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> > not to talk between US buddies.
> >
> >
> >
> Care to quote the rule that states 20m is only for dxing, and not for
> general communications?
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.700 / Virus Database: 457 - Release Date: 6/7/04

4582. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 11:06:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040607070638.22498.00000224@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92596

In article <d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> I'm simply saying what *could* be done. I'm not saying it would be legit, >or
>> that anyone other than those directly involved would know anyhting about >it.
>
>It's not a "could be", it's already out there all over the world all >over the RF spectrum. We call it "freebanding". Which, is exactly what >Burke was doing if he actually did get on the air from T5 without the >paperwork.

Of course.
>
>The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went >freebanding.
>
That's you. Others might not be so concerned. And if the "logbook" consists of a few local QSOs and the cards delivered in person, all of the above would still be true, wouldn't they?

Heck, I could jam the door interlock on a microwave oven, bring it out in the back yard and point it at the sky, power it up and proceed to call CQ by opening and closing the door. Then I could claim I was "operating high power UHF" and it would be true, wouldn't it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4583. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 11:06:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040607070640.22498.00000225@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92597

In article <BKSdnfBHfeGjfF7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> OTOH we don't have anything to go on other than "continuously loaded
>monopole".
>
> Just what is that anyhow?

A term that can mean all sorts of things.

>a 50 ohm resistor on the end of a pole?

HAW!

No.

Here's one implementation:

Imagine a large vertical helix. The length of the helix is such that resonance
occurs at the operating frequency. The wire size, diameter, and spacing of the
helix is such that efficiency is maximized. Whole thing is operated as a
vertical against ground. Not a new idea at all, but perhaps some new tricks
were applied.

(I don't know if that's what the guy invented, just that it's one form of
continuously loaded monopole).
>
>> Maybe he's got a real advance, maybe it's all just hype. I'll reserve
>> judgement until there's some real info available.
>
>Extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. I'll not only reserve
>judgment, but am highly skeptical about it at the same time. This sort
>of thing is almost like the audiophile stuff I posted the other day.

I don't see the need for "extraordinary proof" - just proof! I won't rush to
judgement either way.

And in real life, this development has no effect at all - yet. We cannot go out
and buy these antennas, nor obtain the needed info to build them ourselves. We
don't even know if and when such will be available. So they're unobtanium.

>And what I have seen so far on this breakthrough is feelgood stuff. I
>just wonder why an 80 to 100 percent efficient antenna melts when hit
>with a "whopping" 100 watts of power?
>
Read the article again. The melting antenna was his *first attempt*, 30+ years
ago.
>

>> If somebody told you, back about 1975, that in 25 years you'd have a
>> computer
>> on your desk that had a 500 MHz CPU, over 100 MB of memory and 10 GB of
>> disk
>> space, and cost about $200 complete (1975 dollars) what would you have
>> said?
>
>First I would have said "kewl" or whatever I was saying in 1975.
>(probably more like "Far out, Dude!")

"Bummer, man!"
>
>I wouldn't have seen any mechanical limitations however. I would have
>marveled at getting so much stuff on one integrated circuit, noting that
>the size was limited by the limitations of light. I don't think I would
>have thought of X-ray lithography at the time. But I would have believed
>that such a thing could be done.

But at that price? Heck, single TTL ICs of any complexity were over a dollar
apiece back then.
>
>The areas that I would be most surprised at would be that the computer
>would have a single CPU that did all the processing. I would wonder why
>on earth we weren't using massively parallel processing. In fact, I
>still do. Love my G5 dual processor!

Lots of problems with parallel processing. For example, you still need a single
control processor or its equivalent to run the show. Second, parallel
processing only helps when the tasks can be split up efficiently between
processors. Thsi is true in some situations and not true at all in others.
Third and most important, the cost climbs faster than the benefit. All else
equal, a 1 GHz computer doesn't cost ten times as much as one with ten 100 MHz
processors and the supporting circuitry.
>
>The most mind boggling thing to me would have been the software and
>applications for the computer of 2000 or 2004. Soundcard applications,
>GUI's, graphics and all that other stuff was simply not on my radar
>screen at that point.

Almost all of which was in existence back then, due to work at Xerox's Palo
Alto Research Center.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4584. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 11:11:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406070311.b1f22a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92598

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040606140155.15095.00000182@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <20040606093807.13387.00000323@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> > You are the epitome of newsgroup antagonist and troll. You laid waste
> to
> >your own name and "character" a long time ago. You are a documented liar and
> >deceiver.
>
> "Liar?" In one way, to one pair of eyes, that is true
>
> I disrupt the fantasies and wish-fulfillment of someone with reality.

Lennie, you really DO believe the lies and rhetoric you spew
about Amateur Radio, don't you..?!?! Despite having been corrected
and redirected to countless sources of data that contradicts almost
everything you say, you still insist that your putrid lies are valid.

Sheeeesh.

> That can be a distinct ego blow.

There's been no blow to MY ego over anything you've "presented" in
this forum. I get aggitated that someone can so overtly lie and
attempt to mislead people without some sort of resounding recourse,
but hey, every creep eventually ahs his day...you will too.

> "Deceiver?" In what way? Not following your imaginations and fantasies
> as "truth?"

"I am going to get my "extra lite" out of the box".

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"

"I'll send a scanned image of my FCC License to anyone who asks
for it"

> Reality can be harsh. Try to accept reality as it exists.

That's not my problem, Lennie...Accepting that mere mortal,
non-engineer lay persons with an FCC license can do more with a radio
than you ever THOUGHT about doing is YOURS.

> > YOU "soiled the communications enviroment" when you started in with the
> >"jackbooted thugs", "elitists" and other demeaning adjectives and then
> followed
> >it up with ream after ream of cowardly, spiteful anti-Amateur rhetoric.

>
> Your jackboots wear out?

I'll specifically buy a pair next time I visit California, then
see just how much it takes to wear them down...How's that, Lennie?

> If being a "ham" means living in a fantasy world of great derring-do in
> radio, then I'm certainly not one of those deceivers.

You've never been in ANY world of radio operating, Lennie...You
have been around them, used them as a tool, maybe even played with one
on a bench, but you're incompetent when it comes to OPERATING one.

> > Putz.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still into cussing and personal attacks as "meaningful
> discussions?" [not at all a good image of an amateur extra...]

It's not my image, Lennie. It's yours. You're the putz.

> LenAnderson@ieee.com

They ought to sue you for defamation by association.

Steve, K4YZ

4585. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 11:16:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92599

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406011443.675b67ef@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > >Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
>
> > >This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
> > >"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
> > >providing such interesting topics.
> >
> > Hmmmmm....I just might go.
>
> You ought to go. Be sure to wear your Civil Air Patrol uniform with
> real rank on it.
>
> > Sere you in Vegas, Brain?
>
> I hope not. I'd rather not cross paths with you. I don't think
> you're mentally stable.

Of course you don't.

Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
you in person that I do via this forum.

I imagine it wouldn't be that hard to do.

> Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out that
> > weekend?
>
> I don't know what weekend the reunion is, so I don't know if I have a
> Scout trip or not. But I did have an enjoyable Memorial Day weekend
> camping with all of my sons, without the Scouts.

Congratulations.

> Do you realize that I was never in a comm career field?

Your point is?

What part of "former members" did you have a problem with?

> Do you know
> that I resigned from the BST when I left Illinois, and have not

> rejoined MARS at this new location?
>
> What qualifications would I attend under?

What part of "former members" did you not understand?

Sheeeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

4586. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 14:34:46 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <a2%wc.16327$Yd3.14647@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92700

George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it> wrote in
news:e166802b50888ee3a74c073c084eb9d2@mixmaster.it:

>
> When you are drunk, please go to the
> 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> not to talk between US buddies.

That's what happens when testing standards are lowered. Dunks and retards
can get licensed. Thank you ARRL! NOT.

KB7ADL

4587. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 14:38:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <f5%wc.5388$uX2.3621@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92701

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote

> That's what happens when testing standards are lowered. Dunks and
retards
> can get licensed. Thank you ARRL! NOT.

ARRL has no direct control over testing standards.

Don't you just hate it when someone spoils your rant/bash with a fact?

73, de Hans, K0HB

4588. Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 14:56:47 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <Pm%wc.1728$Y3.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92702

Nothing against K5KSR but it says something about the level of QST readers when they vote his article "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in our national Journal for May.

73, Avery

4589. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 15:40:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406070740.32cbe89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92703

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<u8qdncKR_sojeF7dRVn-vw@adelphia.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>>And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
> >>>
> >>
> >>I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a
> >>concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the
> >>ill-concieved proposal of ARRL which would extend a "free pass" to
> >>hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by
> >>examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.
> >
> >
> > The theory behind the exams is run a rough check on an individual's
> > competence to operate therefore reducing perceived assorted problems
> > on the bands. What's missing from the Tech written which would lead to
> > problems on the low bands if they were simply grandfathered to HF as
> > Generals? What problems?
>
> Hf type questions?

Being able to correctly answer "HF type questions" gets one an
upgrade? I see (??!).

> I also have a question along these lines. I
> personally think that not having Technicians take and pass a test that
> was considered to prepare the applicant for operation on HF is ripping
> them off! The question is "Why would anyone support screwing over half
> the Ham population out of something they should have?
>
> Honest, Folks, knowledge is good!
>
> > -or-
> >
> > What's the difference between Techs running 1.5 kW of ssb on 6M which
> > they're allowed to do under the current regs and the same individuals
> > running 1.5 kW of ssb on 20M which they're not allowed to do? Besides
> > the positions of the station's bandswitches.

>
> Well, the Techs are vetted on safety issues,

'Nother piece of nonsense. Any number of EEs who worked with HV for a living have killed themselves on the job and in ham shacks over the years professional experience and ham radio test questions aside. I never had to answer any questions on tower climbing or RF exposure topics to get my Extra. I've dangled by my whatchmacallit up towers at 150+ feet more times than I can recall and I'm no more RF brain-fried than any of the rest of you RRAP lurkers.

> so I'm not all that
> worried about letting them use QRO. But specifically, I think that RFI
> problems are different between HF and VHF and above.

Different freqs, same ballgame, the basics are the same. Should not have anything to do with segregating the Tech/General operating priveleges.

> As opposed to the "nolege is bad" folks, that simply want to reduce
> power to levels considered "safe" so that we don't upset the applicants
> with silly questions about RF safety.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

4590. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 16:10:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <zJOdnfowKrhuPFndRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92706

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:

> That's what happens when testing standards are lowered. Dunks and retards
> can get licensed. Thank you ARRL! NOT.
>
>
>
>
> KB7ADL
>

Drunks and retards were getting licensed long before any standards were changed.

4591. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 16:12:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Pt0xc.1506$341.185@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92704

Vince,

We've always had a few brain dead. W2OY (not the current holder, the guy back in the 60s) comes to mind. A good theory test won't filter 'em out (nor a cw test either). Unfortunately, there are no mental exams required to obtain a license ;)

I wish I was running on 160 again. I've never witnessed poor operation on the top band. It seems the quantity of lids is proportional to the propogation.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message news:a2%wc.16327$Yd3.14647@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it> wrote in
> news:e166802b50888ee3a74c073c084eb9d2@mixmaster.it:
>
> > >
> > > When you are drunk, please go to the
> > > 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> > > not to talk between US buddies.
>
>
>
> That's what happens when testing standards are lowered. Dunks and retards
> can get licensed. Thank you ARRL! NOT.
>
>
>
>
> KB7ADL
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.700 / Virus Database: 457 - Release Date: 6/6/04

4592. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 16:14:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Gv0xc.1508$ok1.409@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 92705

Hello, Avery

Fortunately, that (phonetics) problem doesn't exist on cw ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> wrote in message
news:Pm%wc.1728$Y3.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Nothing against K5KSR but it says something about the level of QST readers
> when they vote his article "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article
in
> our national Journal for May.
>
> 73, Avery
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.700 / Virus Database: 457 - Release Date: 6/6/04

4593. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 18:34:29 UTC
From: Rant <rant@rantscoms.net>
Message-ID: <ca2cal$m49$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92707
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Wogie,

You were retested by the FCC because *Evidence* linked continual
intentional malicious interference to you, from your qth. Even you
with your correspondence DeVry Masters Degree can certainly figure
that out, or are you still trying to figure out how to calculate negative
SWR and RMS voltage?????
ROTFLMAO!

4594. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 19:22:17 UTC
From: applecores <blapper555@yahoo.nospm.com>
Message-ID: <bf406$40c4c197$d1cc566a$8750@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 92708

"George Orwell" <nobody@mixmaster.it> wrote in message
news:e166802b50888ee3a74c073c084eb9d2@mixmaster.it...
>
> When you are drunk, please go to the
> 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> not to talk between US buddies.

Oh POOOOOOH on you!

Everyone knows that 20 Meters is meant for running
phone patches by rich (yet cheap) retired Fla yacht owners
and xian missionaries to order things like air conditioners
and music CD's....

4595. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 19:32:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406071132.faadc1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92709

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<a2%wc.16327$Yd3.14647@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it> wrote in
> news:e166802b50888ee3a74c073c084eb9d2@mixmaster.it:
>
> >
> > When you are drunk, please go to the
> > 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
> > not to talk between US buddies.
>
>
>
> That's what happens when testing standards are lowered. Dunks and retards
> can get licensed. Thank you ARRL! NOT.

You oughta been around when the midnite drunk nets were on 20 & 75M AM
. . and they passed "real exams" by golly. How 'bout that, huh?

The VKs could really tie 'em on . .

>
> KB7ADL

w3rv

4596. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 20:12:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607161236.16194.00000712@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92710

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/6/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>

>>>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>>writes:

>>>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>>>
>>>I think it did.
>>
>> Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!
>
>That's one reason. Lacking any proof to the contrary, I'm not going to call
>someone a liar.

Then you're a bit more liberal than I am, I guess! =)

I figure after two years of being asked yet proactively dodging the ante
earns Brain the title.

>> Sure you can...ie: Antarctica
>>
>Well, there you have it. It could have happened, and all of the above-named
>conditions would have been met.

And I have yet to meet anyone who WAS "there" that didn't have SOME
memento of the occassion. I know three guys who were /KC4 who at least had
pics taken at the McMurdo and Little America signs outside the outpost's
complex.

>> However even there there are international agreements on who can grant
>>what authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.
>
>Of course. I didn't say such operation would be 100% in agreement with
>international requirements, just that it could happen.

Sure it could...and J.Lo might leave her NEW husband and show up on my doorstep begging for me to pleasure her...

I ain't holding my breath. However if she DOES show up, you can be darned sure I will have SOME sort of proof before making outlandish claims!

>>Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices,
>>and
>>it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he
>>CLAIMED to do.
>
>Maybe. But that has no bearing on whether the alleged /T5 operation took
>place,
>whether logbooks existed, and whether QSLs were exchanged.

It has all the bearing in the world, Jim.

How can you say that a lack of proper authorization to operate DOESN'T ahve bearing on the operation...?!?! There's not a single Amateur Radio award by any organization that I am aware of that is not predicated on the legitimacy of the operating credentials of the claimant.

He can "operate" all he wants to and exchange a ton of QSL cards, but no license (or authorization or permit or certificate...what ever you want to call it...) and all that operation is worthless.

>Remember that all it would take to meet all of these conditions would be one
>QSO in a ham band using stateside calls and portable designation.

As long as the legal criteria was met.

In Brain's case, it appears as though it wasn't. He was not in Antarctica...he was allegedly in Somalia.

>>He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
>>while in Somalia.
>
>Of course not. Same goes for bands/modes/antennas/rigs used. But the lack of
>detail doesn't mean the alleged operation didn't happen.

Please tell me you're just playing "Devil's Advocate", Jim...!

>The lack of detail is a different issue completely.

You've GOT to be kidding me.

I can tell you in INTIMATE detail the sation I had set up in my barracks on Oki in 81...Equipment, antennas, I even still have the log. Although I don't have my copy of the AMRS authorization, I can give specifics about who/what/where, callsign, and even have a couple of QSL cards from folks I worked...

He can't even TELL us ONE callsign of anyone he worked...?!?!

>> No proof = Didn't happen.
>>

>Not at all.
>
>No proof = Reasonable doubt.

No proof on short notice = reasonable doubt.

No proof after two years = didn't happen.

>Nothing more or less.

His "nothing more" can't be much less than what it's been, Jim!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4597. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 20:18:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607161824.15303.00000707@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92711

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 6/6/2004 8:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>
>
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040606171137.13325.00000329@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406061237.19d96f68@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> I'm simply saying what *could* be done. I'm not saying it would be legit,
>or
>> that anyone other than those directly involved would know anyhting about
>it.
>
>It's not a "could be", it's already out there all over the world all
>over the RF spectrum. We call it "freebanding". Which, is exactly what
>Burke was doing if he actually did get on the air from T5 without the
>paperwork.
>
>The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
>freebanding.

Exactly.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4598. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 20:25:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607162500.15303.00000708@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92712

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/6/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040606140153.15095.00000180@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>
>>>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>>there.
>>
>> Funny.
>>
>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet you
>>"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>
> Where are nursie's logs from Okinawa?
>
> No proof = Nothing happened.

Unlike Brain, I can refer you to 15th Air Force Auxiliary Military Radio
Service station callsign KA6CM, issued from Yakota, Japan, in August of 1981.

> Where are nursie's other claims?
>
> No proof = Nothing happened.

You were provided adequate information to inquire directly of the
Veteran's Administration, Lennie.

Since you didn't do it, your assertions of "no proof" are your own
undoing, Putzster.

If the archives of the federal government aren't good enough for you,
Scumboy, I don't know what else I can do.

Steve, K4YZ

4599. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 20:57:42 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <aF4xc.16891$Yd3.1020@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92713

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com...

> No proof = Reasonable doubt.
>
> Nothing more or less.

You just don't get it, do you Jim. On rrap you must either agree with
K4CAP/K4YZ and accede to every whimsical demand of his, or you are a
low-life lying scum sucking weasel. Reasonable doubt is not an option.

K4CAP/K4YZ >>** IS **<< amateur radio.

73,

Avery

4600. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-07 22:22:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2V5xc.17009$Yd3.10171@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92714

"Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> wrote in message
news:Pm%wc.1728$Y3.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Nothing against K5KSR but it says something about the level of QST readers
> when they vote his article "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article
in
> our national Journal for May.
>
> 73, Avery
>
>
>

Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your Novice Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I guess that means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm

Make your own conclusions there.

Dan/W4NTI

4601. R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 00:04:56 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <lo7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92715

Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)

7037 kHz

CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4602. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 00:13:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406071613.65c97dfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92716

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040607070638.22498.00000224@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> I'm simply saying what *could* be done. I'm not saying it would be legit,
> or
> >> that anyone other than those directly involved would know anyhting about
> >it.
> >
> >It's not a "could be", it's already out there all over the world all
> >over the RF spectrum. We call it "freebanding". Which, is exactly what
> >Burke was doing if he actually did get on the air from T5 without the
> >paperwork.
>
> Of course.
> >
> >The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
> >freebanding.
> >
> That's you. Others might not be so concerned. And if the "logbook" consists of
> a few local QSOs and the cards delivered in person, all of the above would
> still be true, wouldn't they?
>
> Heck, I could jam the door interlock on a microwave oven, bring it out in the
> back yard and point it at the sky, power it up and proceed to call CQ by
> opening and closing the door. Then I could claim I was "operating high power
> UHF" and it would be true, wouldn't it?

. . . calm down Son, you're getting a bit too close to the edge . .

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4603. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 00:53:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071653.6748f9fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92717

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406011443.675b67ef@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > > >Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
>
> > > >This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
> > > >"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
> > > >providing such interesting topics.
> > >
> > > Hmmmmm....I just might go.
> >
> > You ought to go. Be sure to wear your Civil Air Patrol uniform with
> > real rank on it.
> >
> > > Sere you in Vegas, Brain?
> >
> > I hope not. I'd rather not cross paths with you. I don't think
> > you're mentally stable.
>
> Of course you don't.
>
> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
> you in person that I do via this forum.
>
Actually, No. I fear that you'll go postal and people will get hurt.
>
> > Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out that
> > > weekend?
> >
> > I don't know what weekend the reunion is, so I don't know if I have a
> > Scout trip or not. But I did have an enjoyable Memorial Day weekend
> > camping with all of my sons, without the Scouts.
>
> Congratulations.
>
> > Do you realize that I was never in a comm career field?
>
> Your point is?

>
> What part of "former members" did you have a problem with?
>
> > Do you know
> > that I resigned from the BST when I left Illinois, and have not
> > rejoined MARS at this new location?
> >
> > What qualifications would I attend under?
>
> What part of "former members" did you not understand?
>
> Sheeeeesh.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST volunteer at SAFB?

Sheeeeeeesh!

4604. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:08:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071708.473f6be7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92718

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
>
> The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
> freebanding.
>
> w3rv

Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.

Best of luck.

4605. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:10:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92719

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> > > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> > > > > >
> > > > > No and no.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> > > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4, I'd
> > > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> > > > I'd still put it on my card.
> > > >
> > > > bb
> > >
> > > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
>
> Who, exactly, did ever get one?

Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.

4606. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:15:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92720

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>
> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
> >there.
>
> Funny.

Nope. True.

> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,

Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
KH0.

yet you
> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.

Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?

> How inept.

What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
quota. Better go easy.

4607. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:16:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40C5135C.8010102@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92721

Mike Coslo wrote:

> JJ wrote:
>
>> George Orwell wrote:
>>
>>> When you are drunk, please go to the
>>> 11m band, not the 20m. 20m is for DXing
>>> not to talk between US buddies.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>> Care to quote the rule that states 20m is only for dxing, and not for
>> general communications?
>
>
> More importantly, is it okay to use 20 meters for Drunken DX'ing?
>
>

only on 14313 :-)

4608. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:29:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071729.76a6396f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92722

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>...

> I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> until proven innocent.
>
> w3rv

Were you one of the "destroy fractal at any cost" gang?

4609. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:33:37 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071733.608a9b14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92723

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<r3swc.14229$Yd3.13929@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406050704.def0410@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<S47wc.12555$Yd3.6470@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > > > > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license
> stateside
> > > > > > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps still today, but it used to be allowed to get into MARS with a
> > > > Novice ticket. That was a long time ago, when a Novice ticket really
> had
> > > > to be earned.
> > >
> > > Oh yeh, it was uphill both ways in the snow with a piece of cardboard
> > > in my shoe. I remember. Pffft.
> > >
> > > > Of course now-a-days there is no Novice ticket. And those that still
> have
> > > > one are of no importance to worry about in the scheme of things.
> > >
> > > So 31,545 amateur radio operators are of no consequence? I thought
> > > that only the ARRL could be so cavalier about such a large block of
> > > amateurs.
> > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > bb
> >
> > Thats right, no consequence and of no value. Just ask the FCC. There is
> > no longer a Novice,

Jim/N2EY says there are 31,545 novices.

4610. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:37:25 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406071737.43008fc7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92724

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40C215F8.10B56693@earthlink.net>...
>
> I ask again, are you out of your gourd? You make some absurd claim
> about what I'm supposed to have stated about veterans. There is nothing
> to back your claim in archives. Therefore I'm supposed to defend against
> that what does not exist.
>
> Under like circumstances, why not defend yourself against the obsession
> you have with Cher? Can't find it? Obviously you've deleted it from
> Google.
>
> Dave K8MN

Cher IS fairly hot.

But she doesn't return my mail, and never a thank you card for the roses.

4611. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 01:58:32 UTC
From: Howdy <mail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 92725

Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>
> 7037 kHz
>
> CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

4612. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:12:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Sf9xc.55887$3x.33920@attbi_s54>
Source record: 92726

> Drunks and retards were getting licensed long before any standards were
> changed.

Yepper there JJ ...you got that one right ....I remember a fellow from 0 land who used to progressively slur every Friday night .... sort of entertaining for a SWLer back in the early 60s.

Take care all ... 73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

4613. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:24:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <H4SdnW8aLefRvljdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92727

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<u8qdncKR_sojeF7dRVn-vw@adelphia.com>...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<_jGwc.3629$uX2.3449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>And what makes you think that techs don't erect towers, Jim???
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I don't think Jim said that Techs don't erect towers, but that he has a
>>>>concern (which I share) that many amateurs (including you) support the
>>>>ill-concieved proposal of ARRL which would extend a "free pass" to
>>>>hundreds of thousands of licensees who have not demonstrated by
>>>>examination that they are qualified for a license upgrade to General.
>>>
>>>
>>>The theory behind the exams is run a rough check on an individual's
>>>competence to operate therefore reducing perceived assorted problems
>>>on the bands. What's missing from the Tech written which would lead to
>>>problems on the low bands if they were simply grandfathered to HF as
>>>Generals? What problems?
>>
>> Hf type questions?
>
>
> Being able to correctly answer "HF type questions" gets one an
> upgrade? I see (??!).
>
>
>>I also have a question along these lines. I
>>personally think that not having Technicians take and pass a test that
>>was considered to prepare the applicant for operation on HF is ripping
>>them off! The question is "Why would anyone support screwing over half
>>the Ham population out of something they should have?

>>
>> Honest, Folks, knowledge is good!
>>
>>
>>>-or-
>>>
>>>What's the difference between Techs running 1.5 kW of ssb on 6M which
>>>they're allowed to do under the current regs and the same individuals
>>>running 1.5 kW of ssb on 20M which they're not allowed to do? Besides
>>>the positions of the station's bandswitches.
>>
>> Well, the Techs are vetted on safety issues,
>
>
> 'Nother piece of nonsense. Any number of EEs who worked with HV for a
> living have killed themselves on the job and in ham shacks over the
> years professional experience and ham radio test questions aside.

Nonsense? There is no doubt that an engineer can fry themselves. But
that really isn't the point. There is no level of education that can
insure complete safety.

What the idea - and the point is - is to provide the exposure to some
relevent material, and hope it sinks in. It is an excercise for the
student to use or not to use.

> I
> never had to answer any questions on tower climbing or RF exposure
> topics to get my Extra. I've dangled by my whatchmacallit up towers at
> 150+ feet more times than I can recall and I'm no more RF brain-fried
> than any of the rest of you RRAP lurkers.

Times change, Brian. Safety is considered important these days.

>
>>so I'm not all that
>>worried about letting them use QRO. But specifically, I think that RFI
>>problems are different between HF and VHF and above.
>
>
> Different freqs, same ballgame, the basics are the same. Should not
> have anything to do with segregating the Tech/General operating
> priveleges.
>
>
>
>> As opposed to the "nolege is bad" folks, that simply want to reduce
>>power to levels considered "safe" so that we don't upset the applicants
>>with silly questions about RF safety.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

>
> w3rv

4614. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:25:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607222510.12940.00000209@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92729

In article <5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406011443.675b67ef@posting.google.com>...
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040601031500.13318.00000141@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> > >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>> > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> > >Date: 5/31/2004 5:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0405311450.6d2739bc@posting.google.com>
>>
>> > >This might be a good place to bring up a discussion on "Sorry Hans,
>> > >"MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," thanks to Steve/K4YZ/K4CAP for
>> > >providing such interesting topics.
>> >
>> > Hmmmmm....I just might go.
>>
>> You ought to go. Be sure to wear your Civil Air Patrol uniform with
>> real rank on it.
>>
>> > Sere you in Vegas, Brain?
>>
>> I hope not. I'd rather not cross paths with you. I don't think
>> you're mentally stable.
>
> Of course you don't.
>
> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
>you in person that I do via this forum.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie's obsessional psychosis is advancing.

> I imagine it wouldn't be that hard to do.

Fantasy Island imagination is coloring his reality perception.

Wrong color.

>> Or do you have another Boy Scout camp-out that
>> > weekend?
>>
>> I don't know what weekend the reunion is, so I don't know if I have a
>> Scout trip or not. But I did have an enjoyable Memorial Day weekend
>> camping with all of my sons, without the Scouts.
>

> Congratulations.

Did you get a "medical discharge" from the Scouts, too?

[just wondering what was on your "DD-214" from BSA...]

>> Do you realize that I was never in a comm career field?
>
> Your point is?
>
> What part of "former members" did you have a problem with?

Poor nursie never do no military comms. Tsk, tsk.

>> Do you know
>> that I resigned from the BST when I left Illinois, and have not
>> rejoined MARS at this new location?
>>
>> What qualifications would I attend under?
>
> What part of "former members" did you not understand?
>
> Sheeeeesh.

Your member got cut off? Oh, no, you only ACT like John Wayne
whatsisname. Sorry about dat.

Are you claiming that Boy Scouts make up MARS now?

It's very difficult to follow where nursie are going wid dis...

LHA / WMD

4615. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:25:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607222511.12940.00000210@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92728

In article <20040607162500.15303.00000708@mb-m16.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (He's
got it in his wallet Superham) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/6/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040606140153.15095.00000180@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>>>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>>>there.
>>>
>>> Funny.
>>>
>>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet you
>>>"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>>
>> Where are nursie's logs from Okinawa?
>>
>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>
> Unlike Brain, I can refer you to 15th Air Force Auxiliary Military Radio
>Service station callsign KA6CM, issued from Yakota, Japan, in August of 1981.

"Yakota?" :-)

"Refer me?" "Refer anyone?" A USAF MARS station? Oh, my!

An whut it say on dat "referral?" Is it hidden from view again?

>> Where are nursie's other claims?
>>
>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>
> You were provided adequate information to inquire directly of the
>Veteran's Administration, Lennie.

Not good enough. NARA is the place. National Archives and
Records Administration. St. Louis.

> Since you didn't do it, your assertions of "no proof" are your own
>undoing, Putzster.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discussion" again. :-)

Where and when all dem "hostile actions" Air Force MARSman?

> If the archives of the federal government aren't good enough for you,
>Scumboy, I don't know what else I can do.

You can try by reading and UNDERSTANDING DoD Directive
4650.2 data 21 Nov 03. It don' say no ham be da hole MARS.

"MARS is amateur radio" be da WRONG statement...

Temper fry...

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4616. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:25:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607222513.12940.00000211@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92730

In article <20040607161236.16194.00000712@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Mighty Morphing Power Ham Newsgroup Ranger) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/6/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
>>>>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>>>writes:
>
>>>>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
>>>>
>>>>I think it did.
>>>
>>> Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!
>>
>>That's one reason. Lacking any proof to the contrary, I'm not going to call
>>someone a liar.
>
> Then you're a bit more liberal than I am, I guess! =)
>
> I figure after two years of being asked yet proactively dodging the ante
>earns Brain the title.

"Dodging?" :-)

Nursie, the Hero of "seven hostile actions?"

[as yet unidentified as to where and when... :-)]

Nursie who stated (flatly): "MARS is amateur radio?"

Nursie who knows all about electronics engineering whose entire
electronics career has been a few months at a mid-sized TN
set-top box maker as a Purchasing Agent?

>>> Sure you can...ie: Antarctica
>>>
>>Well, there you have it. It could have happened, and all of the above-named
>>conditions would have been met.
>
> And I have yet to meet anyone who WAS "there" that didn't have SOME
>memento of the occassion. I know three guys who were /KC4 who at least had
>pics taken at the McMurdo and Little America signs outside the outpost's
>complex.

Right..."seven hostile actions!" Lots of identifying "mementos" there.

:-)

>>> However even there there are international agreements on who can grant
>>>what authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.
>>
>>Of course. I didn't say such operation would be 100% in agreement with
>>international requirements, just that it could happen.
>
> Sure it could...and J.Lo might leave her NEW husband and show up on my
>doorstep begging for me to pleasure her...

Oh, my...Fantasy Island time again! :-)

> I ain't holding my breath. However if she DOES show up, you can be
darned
>sure I will have SOME sort of proof before making outlandish claims!

You must have gotten some 190 proof to even think such a thing!

:-)

>>>Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices, and
>>>it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he
>>>CLAIMED to do.
>>
>>Maybe. But that has no bearing on whether the alleged /T5 operation took
place,
>>whether logbooks existed, and whether QSLs were exchanged.
>
> It has all the bearing in the world, Jim.
>
> How can you say that a lack of proper authorization to operate DOESN'T
>ahve bearing on the operation...?!?! There's not a single Amateur Radio award
>by any organization that I am aware of that is not predicated on the
legitimacy
>of the operating credentials of the claimant.

Oh, my, there he goes...drinking and deriving... :-)

Ah...there was NO mention of any "awards" or even "dxpedition"
or anything like that.

Brian was THERE, on assignment, in the military, and subject to
military authority.

But, nursie doesn't seem to want to obey any military since he
stated "MARS is amateur radio" and never once admitted that
the military (from DoD downwards) stated that MARS is a
military radio service.

> He can "operate" all he wants to and exchange a ton of QSL cards, but no
>license (or authorization or permit or certificate...what ever you want to
call
>it...) and all that operation is worthless.

Nursie be da Final Authority.

Nothing in radio takes place without he be da Judge! :-)

>>Remember that all it would take to meet all of these conditions would be one
>>QSO in a ham band using stateside calls and portable designation.
>
> As long as the legal criteria was met.

It's called "obeying the UCMJ." [ever hear of it?]

> In Brain's case, it appears as though it wasn't. He was not in
>Antarctica...he was allegedly in Somalia.

Nursie is also supposed to have "seven hostile actions" in his
jacket. :-)

Where and when be those "hostile actions?" :-)

>>>He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
>>>while in Somalia.
>>
>>Of course not. Same goes for bands/modes/antennas/rigs used. But the lack of
>>detail doesn't mean the alleged operation didn't happen.
>
> Please tell me you're just playing "Devil's Advocate", Jim...!

Running out of support for your nastygram statements? :-)

>>The lack of detail is a different issue completely.
>
> You've GOT to be kidding me.

Nursie obviously cannot take any view opposite of his. :-)

> I can tell you in INTIMATE detail the sation I had set up in my barracks
>on Oki in 81...Equipment, antennas, I even still have the log. Although I
>don't have my copy of the AMRS authorization, I can give specifics about
>who/what/where, callsign, and even have a couple of QSL cards from folks I
>worked...

Okay, tell us. In "INTIMATE" detail. [dreams about J.Lo. don't have
to be included]

FULL DETAIL. Official permission, da whole magilla.

> He can't even TELL us ONE callsign of anyone he worked...?!?!
>
>>> No proof = Didn't happen.
>>>
>>Not at all.
>>
>>No proof = Reasonable doubt.
>
> No proof on short notice = reasonable doubt.
>
> No proof after two years = didn't happen.

Proof on "seven hostile actions?" [didn't happen]

Proof on "MARS is amateur radio?" [DoD says otherwise]

>>Nothing more or less.
>
> His "nothing more" can't be much less than what it's been, Jim!

Poor nursie, still hating and raging, meanmouthing everyone who
doesn't believe him...and then wanting "meaningful discussion" !

Fine example of an amateur extra class radio amateur.

Too bad the ARRL doesn't have a "Cover Plague" award. :-)

LHA / WMD

4617. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:25:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040607222518.12940.00000212@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92731

In article <5c01b95b.0406070311.b1f22a@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Superham, able to leap tall
pilups at a single boundary equation) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040606140155.15095.00000182@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040606093807.13387.00000323@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > You are the epitome of newsgroup antagonist and troll. You laid
waste to
>> >your own name and "character" a long time ago. You are a documented liar
and
>> >deceiver.
>>
>> "Liar?" In one way, to one pair of eyes, that is true
>>
>> I disrupt the fantasies and wish-fulfillment of someone with reality.
>
> Lennie, you really DO believe the lies and rhetoric you spew
>about Amateur Radio, don't you..?!?! Despite having been corrected
>and redirected to countless sources of data that contradicts almost
>everything you say, you still insist that your putrid lies are valid.

1. Nursie hasn't "directed" anyone...except AWAY from here.

2. Nursie hasn't given any "countless sources of data."

3. That (supposed) data does NOT "contradict" anything I've
written in here.

4. Nursie's "meaningful dialogue" consists of nothing more
that personal insults.

5. I "spew" NO "lies" about amateur radio. I give some
personal opinions on subjects...which nursie can't abide.

6. Too bad for nursie.

>> That can be a distinct ego blow.
>
> There's been no blow to MY ego over anything you've "presented" in
>this forum. I get aggitated that someone can so overtly lie and
>attempt to mislead people without some sort of resounding recourse,
>but hey, every creep eventually ahs his day...you will too.

"aggitated?" "ahs?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...when aggravated into another rage, nursie begins
confusing spellings again...:-)

>> "Deceiver?" In what way? Not following your imaginations and fantasies
>> as "truth?"
>
> "I am going to get my "extra lite" out of the box".

Why should I do that? :-)

> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"

That's what I originally thought way back when...but then all
those OFs of the morse persuasion got so evil, wicked, mean
and nasty towards anyone who didn't love, honor, and cherish
telegraphy. :-)

> "I'll send a scanned image of my FCC License to anyone who asks
>for it"

I did that already. :-)

>> Reality can be harsh. Try to accept reality as it exists.
>
> That's not my problem, Lennie...Accepting that mere mortal,
>non-engineer lay persons with an FCC license can do more with a radio
>than you ever THOUGHT about doing is YOURS.

Nursie is a "mere mortal?" Good grief...I thought nursie was a
Warrior of the Newsgroup, able to benchpress a KWM2,
faster than a speeding ballot, leap tall pileups at a single bound...

I'm still trying to invent antigravity...but something is holding me
down... :-)

>> > YOU "soiled the communications enviroment" when you started in with
the
>> >"jackbooted thugs", "elitists" and other demeaning adjectives and then
followed
>> >it up with ream after ream of cowardly, spiteful anti-Amateur rhetoric.
>>
>> Your jackboots wear out?
>
> I'll specifically buy a pair next time I visit California, then
>see just how much it takes to wear them down...How's that, Lennie?

I'll get the group down at the Burbank HRO store to notify the
newspapers that you will give them a photo opportunity. :-)

You DO know what's right next door to that HRO store, don't
you? :-)

>> If being a "ham" means living in a fantasy world of great derring-do in
>> radio, then I'm certainly not one of those deceivers.

>
> You've never been in ANY world of radio operating, Lennie...You
>have been around them, used them as a tool, maybe even played with one
>on a bench, but you're incompetent when it comes to OPERATING one.

Love all nursie's "meaningful dialogue." :-)

I could recite again my experience, but nursie gets SO upset
about that! Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Actually, I began in radio by doing some operations of military
transmitters...and receivers...and FSK exciters...and teleprinters
...and handheld transceivers...and Jeep-mounted transceivers...
and manpack transceivers.

Then I got out of active duty, got the commercial First Phone
and operated broadcast transmitters and all the other electronic
stuff around a TV studio. Came out west and did some radar
and missle transmitting-receiving. Got a personal radio on CB
(for fun communications), even designed and built a couple of
CB transceiver prototypes for a company that went Chapter 11
a rather long time ago. As time went on, I did real civil airways
radio operating from a real cockpit, handled UHF two-ways,
got into a partnership which installed and used a VHF two-way,
communicated with a station ON the moon, did a bunch of
DoD and military radio field work, and eventually communicated
on HF from a moored sailboat in a marina.

That's just a quick summary of things I did since 1952. There's
other little things that will make you angry because your mighty
morphing hamradiolicense forbids you to do those. :-)

Never once since 1952 have I needed or been required to use
manual telegraphy to "work" anyone on any radio frequency
from VLF on up to 25 GHz.

Never once did I have to "QSL" anyone that "contact work" had
been done. Never once did I have to join any ARRL in order to
verify anything I did in radio-electronics. But...I've written a lot
of reports on radio performance which were all accurate and true.

>> > Putz.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still into cussing and personal attacks as "meaningful
>> discussions?" [not at all a good image of an amateur extra...]
>
> It's not my image, Lennie. It's yours. You're the putz.

You don't have an image? Tsk, tsk, you should swear and cuss
some more then... :-)

Other readers of this newsgroup have an "image" of nursie. :-)

>> LenAnderson@ieee.com
>
> They ought to sue you for defamation by association.

IEEE is a professional association. I joined them late, like in
1973. By now I've become a Life Member in the IEEE with all
the benefits of regular working members after 31 years in
the electronics engineering profession.

Life Membership in the IEEE is automatic, no extra dues,
no one-time charge, nothing extra once you have so much
membership time plus age. There's about 220 thousand IEEE
members all around the world. It is truly international.

You want to suggest legal action by the IEEE against me?
The quickest way for you to contact them is to go to
www.ieee.org and get an address or send them some of
your filthymouth e-mail. IEEE has automatic virus detection
software to detect badness in e-mail...they just don't always
detect badasses in e-mail. :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4618. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 02:46:53 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92732

We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)

Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on the NG. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >
> > 7037 kHz
> >
> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
>

4619. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 03:01:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ecKdnS9X7fCesVjdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92733

N2EY wrote:

> In article <BKSdnfBHfeGjfF7d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>OTOH we don't have anything to go on other than "continuously loaded
>>
>>monopole".
>>
>> Just what is that anyhow?
>
>
> A term that can mean all sorts of things.
>
>
>>a 50 ohm resistor on the end of a pole?
>
>
> HAW!
>
> No.
>
> Here's one implementation:
>
> Imagine a large vertical helix. The length of the helix is such that resonance
> occurs at the operating frequency. The wire size, diameter, and spacing of the
> helix is such that efficiency is maximized. Whole thing is operated as a
> vertical against ground. Not a new idea at all, but perhaps some new tricks
> were applied.
>
> (I don't know if that's what the guy invented, just that it's one form of
> continuously loaded monopole).
>
>>>Maybe he's got a real advance, maybe it's all just hype. I'll reserve
>>>judgement until there's some real info available.
>>
>>Extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. I'll not only reserve
>>judgment, but am highly skeptical about it at the same time. This sort
>>of thing is almost like the audiophile stuff I posted the other day.
>
>
> I don't see the need for "extraordinary proof" - just proof! I won't rush to
> judgement either way.

>
> And in real life, this development has no effect at all - yet. We cannot go out
> and buy these antennas, nor obtain the needed info to build them ourselves. We
> don't even know if and when such will be available. So they're unobtanium.

Indeed.

>
>>And what I have seen so far on this breakthrough is feelgood stuff. I
>>just wonder why an 80 to 100 percent efficient antenna melts when hit
>>with a "whopping" 100 watts of power?
>>
>
> Read the article again. The melting antenna was his *first attempt*, 30+ years
> ago.

Yeah, but I mean was it filament wire or maybe number 40 or something?
100 watts is only so much energy, and an antenna that melts when faced
with 100 watts must be pretty fragile. I could have accepted maybe that
the antenna caught one of the local trees on fire, or something like
that, but we're talking about total destruction of the antenna, (as an
antenna anyhoo) with 100 watts of power!

>>>If somebody told you, back about 1975, that in 25 years you'd have a
>>>computer
>>>on your desk that had a 500 MHz CPU, over 100 MB of memory and 10 GB of
>>>disk
>>>space, and cost about $200 complete (1975 dollars) what would you have
>>>said?
>>
>>First I would have said "kewl" or whatever I was saying in 1975.
>>(probably more like "Far out, Dude!")
>
>
> "Bummer, man!"
>
>>I wouldn't have seen any mechanical limitations however. I would have
>>marveled at getting so much stuff on one integrated circuit, noting that
>>the size was limited by the limitations of light. I don't think I would
>>have thought of X-ray lithography at the time. But I would have believed
>>that such a thing could be done.
>
>
> But at that price? Heck, single TTL ICs of any complexity were over a dollar
> apiece back then.
>
>>The areas that I would be most surprised at would be that the computer
>>would have a single CPU that did all the processing. I would wonder why
>>on earth we weren't using massively parallel processing. In fact, I
>>still do. Love my G5 dual processor!
>

>
> Lots of problems with parallel processing. For example, you still need a single
> control processor or its equivalent to run the show.

Yup, and each processor can loaf right along. Year ago, the Commodore
Amiga had it right. All those dedicated chipsets in it were
co-processors, not specifically parallel processors, but the concept was
valid and very sound.

> Second, parallel
> processing only helps when the tasks can be split up efficiently between
> processors. Thsi is true in some situations and not true at all in others.

I've been using dual processor computers since y2K, and it is truly
amazing just how superior they are. I do understand that the PC world
may be different archetecture-wise, in a way that makes multi processor
computers work less well for that platform. But that should not be
confused with parallel computing being not very efficient.

Intel-centric is the concept I think! ;^)

> Third and most important, the cost climbs faster than the benefit. All else
> equal, a 1 GHz computer doesn't cost ten times as much as one with ten 100 MHz
> processors and the supporting circuitry.
>
>>The most mind boggling thing to me would have been the software and
>>applications for the computer of 2000 or 2004. Soundcard applications,
>>GUI's, graphics and all that other stuff was simply not on my radar
>>screen at that point.
>
>
> Almost all of which was in existence back then, due to work at Xerox's Palo
> Alto Research Center.

http://www.boka-software.com/Articles/Xerox/essay.html

An interesting little piece on the subject.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4620. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 03:25:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <gkaxc.5164$g86.2287@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92734

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:0LednSbKrvGZ61_dRVn-tw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:GAQvc.4749$J81.2916@news02.roc.ny...
> > [snip]
> >
> >>I also don't want some idiot running 200 watts into a 5/8 wave
groundplane
> >>on 2 meters next door to me. He may be ignorant, but I am not.
> >
> >
> > And what is to stop a tech from doing so? (as long as he/she does the
RF
> > exposure analysis ... which will probably show that it's just fine from
the
> > RF exposure standpoint ...)
> >
> > Jim, your class elitism/prejudice is showing - why don't you stop acting
> > like all techs are dimwits? Many are more technically accomplished than
> > many extras.
>
>
> I think you are pulling this out of context, Carl. The original poster
> said that (paraphrasing here) the people opposed to the upgrade are
> wrong in part because the Technician and General tests are nearly
identical.
>
> Oddly enough, in a later post that same poster went on to note how many
> Tower questions there are on the Tech test, yet not on the General test
> - a seeming contradiction for nearly identical tests.
>
> I am a "new" Ham, having taken all my tests in modern times. There are
> significan differences between the Technician test and the General test
> and the Extra test.
>
> Jim was merely supporting adequate testing. As do I. Of course there is
> a wide gap in what people consider adequate.
>
> I know I do not consider the Technician test adequate to be classed as
> a General. And I doubt I'll ever apologize for thinking that knowledge

> is good.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hello, Mike

You stated that very well. The question of "what is adaquate testing?" will likely be a big bone of contention between a lot of folks. Certainly there are many *very* well qualified techs. A friend of mine was a tech for something like 25 years until they lowered the code for general to 5 words per minute. He then got an automatic upgrade to general. His theory test, however, was identical to a general back when he took his test. He does have a degree in electronics and is *highly* qualified; that does not assure me that all techs are *highly* qualified for an automatic promotion to general. That was my only point.

Amateur radio should not be elitist; however, certain basic fundamentals should be known before issuing a license (at least in my mind).

Most likely, since the tech license is to be phased out, the ARRL doesn't want to upset more people than necessary (whatever decision is made, some folks are not going to be happy).

Of course, if the FCC started cracking down hard on some of the "problem children" of 75 and 20 meters, things might fall in line a lot better. There exists no sanity test for an amateur license, unfortunately ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.700 / Virus Database: 457 - Release Date: 6/6/04

4621. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 03:30:34 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92735

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of
> these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>
> Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> the NG.
>:-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
>> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>>
>>
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>> >
>> > 7037 kHz
>> >
>> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>

It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?

4622. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 10:53:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608065351.16349.00000644@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92736

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: "Avery Hightower" Hightower@cosmos.net
>Date: 6/7/2004 3:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <aF4xc.16891$Yd3.1020@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com...
>
>> No proof = Reasonable doubt.
>>
>> Nothing more or less.
>
>You just don't get it, do you Jim. On rrap you must either agree with
>K4CAP/K4YZ and accede to every whimsical demand of his, or you are a
>low-life lying scum sucking weasel. Reasonable doubt is not an option.

What "reasonable doubt"...?!?! Two years of dodging requests for
validation of claims made...?!?!

And what "demands"...?!?! Again...Someone makes claims of having had
experiences that allegedly makes them "knowldegeable" of certain skills or
techniques, yet NO EVIDENCE of having actually done them...

Eh, Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4623. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:01:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92737

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/7/2004 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071653.6748f9fc@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>...

>> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
>> you in person that I do via this forum.
>>
>Actually, No. I fear that you'll go postal and people will get hurt.

Only if you raise your hands above your waist with a blunt object in it.
And that would be " a person"...not "people".

Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing for
the last two years. That I can do from here.

>So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
>volunteer at SAFB?
>
>Sheeeeeeesh!

Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest in
the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
program.

But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that your
being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
appropriate.

Steve, K4YZ

4624. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:04:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92738

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/7/2004 8:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071708.473f6be7@posting.google.com>
>
>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
>> freebanding.
>>
>> w3rv
>
>Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
>competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.

There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.

Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.

That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further
substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up in order to be
able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"

It's your bed, Brain. Comfy?

Steve, K4YZ

4625. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:07:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92739

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
>
>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>...
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
>> > > William wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>>
>> > > > >
>> > > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
>> > > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > No and no.
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
>> > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4,
>I'd
>> > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
>> > > I'd still put it on my card.
>> > > >
>> > > bb
>> > >
>> > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>> >
>> I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
>>
>> Who, exactly, did ever get one?
>
>Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.

Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.

He didn't ask "..did I?"

He asked "..who did?"

Nice try.

Steve, K4YZ

4626. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:10:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92740

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/7/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>> >there.
>>
>> Funny.
>
>Nope. True.
>
>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,
>
>Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
>KH0.
>
> yet you
>> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>
>Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?

From you, Brain.

On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
"logs".

THAT says "lost".

>> How inept.
>
>What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
>quota. Better go easy.

Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".

So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have previously
told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or misplaced.

I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting tied up in your own mistruths.

Steve, K4YZ

4627. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:16:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608071633.16349.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92741

```
>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/7/2004 9:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040607222511.12940.00000210@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040607162500.15303.00000708@mb-m16.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (He's
>got it in his wallet Superham) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/6/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040606140153.15095.00000180@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>>>
>>>>>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>>>>there.
>>>>
>>>> Funny.
>>>>
>>>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet
>you
>>>>"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>>>
>>> Where are nursie's logs from Okinawa?
>>>
>>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>>
>> Unlike Brain, I can refer you to 15th Air Force Auxiliary Military
>Radio
>>Service station callsign KA6CM, issued from Yakota, Japan, in August of
>1981.
>
> "Yakota?" :-)
>
> "Refer me?" "Refer anyone?" A USAF MARS station? Oh, my!
```

Whoi said anything about MARS, Sir Putzy?

I said AMRS.

AMRS was the program underwhich US Armed Forces personnel were "licensed"
to operate those 2-by-2 KA callsigns in Japan until Japan finally created a
reciprocal licensing program for foreigners.

> An whut it say on dat "referral?" Is it hidden from view again?
>
>>> Where are nursie's other claims?
>>>
>>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>>
>> You were provided adequate information to inquire directly of the
>>Veteran's Administration, Lennie.
>
> Not good enough. NARA is the place. National Archives and
> Records Administration. St. Louis.

And you can get the same questions answered via VA. The VA will
acknowledge requests for verification of service. As for the rest, you don't
need my entire service record.

Be my guest. Of course you won't...The answers would put a cork in YOUR
silliness.

> You can try by reading and UNDERSTANDING DoD Directive
> 4650.2 data 21 Nov 03. It don' say no ham be da hole MARS.

Lennie what did you do with that 14 years of college-level night school
you claim to have attended...?!?!

Another lie?

Steve, K4YZ

4628. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:18:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608071835.16349.00000652@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92742

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/7/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071737.43008fc7@posting.google.com>

>But she doesn't return my mail, and never a thank you card for the roses

Perhaps she has ONE redeeming quality.

Steve, K4YZ

4629. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:26:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608072658.16349.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 92743

>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/7/2004 9:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040607222518.12940.00000212@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>In article <5c01b95b.0406070311.b1f22a@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
writes:

>> "I am going to get my "extra lite" out of the box".
>
> Why should I do that?

Why, indeed, Lennie?

We ahve learned, of course, that anything you say youa re going to do
trutly is a "flight of fantasy"...

>> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"
>
> That's what I originally thought way back when...but then all
> those OFs of the morse persuasion got so evil, wicked, mean
> and nasty towards anyone who didn't love, honor, and cherish
> telegraphy.

Actually a review of the "evil, wicked, mean and nasty" would reveal that
one "NOCWTEST@aol.com", then "owned" by you, was the one slinging rather
inciteful and uncivil epithets towrds others.

Of course the truth is not one of your stronger suits.

And you never did explain to us how the FCC tested for CW. Oscilliscope?
Spectrum Analyzer?

>> "I'll send a scanned image of my FCC License to anyone who asks
>>for it"
>
> I did that already.

Then you have again expressed yet ANOTHER lie.

We'll just heap it up on the others.

> You want to suggest legal action by the IEEE against me?
> The quickest way for you to contact them is to go to
> www.ieee.org and get an address or send them some of
> your filthymouth e-mail. IEEE has automatic virus detection
> software to detect badness in e-mail...they just don't always
> detect badasses in e-mail.

Obviously.

They also "don't always detect" who is bruising thier propfessional reputation by association.

Steve, K4YZ

4630. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:42:06 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0406080342.17b2ad18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Lardass Lloyd's fatass "Rant" <rant@rantscoms.net> whined in message
news:<ca2cal$m49$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Wogie,

Lardass, you really should quit trying to suck Roger's "woger" you've
got quite a cocksucking lisp!

> You were retested by the FCC because *Evidence* <lies flushed>

Oh, so you are speaking for the FCC, now Lardass? Funny how the retest
letter doesn't give a reason except that the FCC has the authority to
retest.
But you don't let the truth stand in the way of your lies, do you?

Here's the letter, where does it say *anything* about interference?

July 11, 2000

CERTIFIED MAIL--RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Roger L. Wiseman

610 Glen Haven Avenue

Glendale, WV 26038-1302

SUBJECT: Amateur Radio license KC8JBO

Dear Mr. Wiseman:

Pursuant to Section 97.519(d)(2) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R.
Section 97.519(d)(2), the Commission has the authority to
re-administer any
examination element previously administered by Volunteer Examiners
(VE's).
The Commission may either administer the examination itself, or under
the
supervision of a Volunteer Examiner Coordinator (VEC) or VE designated
by
the Commission.

Accordingly, we are requiring you to re-take the General Class Amateur
Examination, (Elements 2, 3(A) and 3(B)) under the supervision of an
American Radio Relay League Volunteer Examiner Coordinator. This
examination
must be completed on or before September 11, 2000. The required code

speed
that you must demonstrate is 5 words per minute.

Please be prepared to verify your current address and to present a
photo
identification. Pursuant to Commission rules, your license will be
cancelled
if you do not appear for re-examination. You will be granted an
Amateur
Radio license consistent with the elements you pass upon
re-examination.

Sincerely,

W. Riley Hollingsworth

Special Counsel, Amateur Radio

Enforcement Bureau

Oh, that's right, you got it from the ARRL Enforcement log releases on
the subject. You string together that release that states that Roger
got a warning letter which may or may not indicate inappropriate
activity occuring
(despite this disclaimer, posted along with the logs, which you
somehow "forgot" to include with your retelling:
NOTE: Issuance by the FCC of a Warning Notice indicates that the FCC
has what it believes to be reliable evidence of possible rules
infractions and not necessarily that the recipient has violated FCC
rules. The FCC has the authority, pursuant to ï¿½97.519(d)(2) of the
rules to readminister any examination element previously administered
by a volunteer examiner.) a preemtive letter to Wiseman and
Gopherface Tunder and the above retest letter, which gives no
indication that interference had ANYTHING to do with the letter being
sent out. BTW, explain why Wiseman PASSED the retest and the code test
(while you couldn't the first time) and even upgraded.
(space reserved for your backpedaling)

4631. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 11:58:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92745

Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of
> > these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> >
> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> > the NG.
> >:-)
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >>
> >>
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >> >
> >> > 7037 kHz
> >> >
> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >
>
> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?

Hee, hee, hee, YES!

w3rv

4632. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 14:19:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406080619.452b4fab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92746

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<H4SdnW8aLefRvljdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> >> Well, the Techs are vetted on safety issues,
> >
> >
> > > 'Nother piece of nonsense. Any number of EEs who worked with HV for a
> > > living have killed themselves on the job and in ham shacks over the
> > > years professional experience and ham radio test questions aside.
>
> Nonsense? There is no doubt that an engineer can fry themselves. But
> that really isn't the point. There is no level of education that can
> insure complete safety.

Agreed.

> What the idea - and the point is - is to provide the exposure to some
> relevent material, and hope it sinks in. It is an excercise for the
> student to use or not to use.

Where in the charter of the FCC does it state that one of it's
missions is to provide any form of education as part of it's radio
operators licensing processes?? The FCC is a federal regulatory
agency, not an academic institution at any level. In the context of
ham radio it's *sole* missison is to take a reasonable poke at
maintaining law and order within the portions of the RF spectrum
allocated for ham radio operations. It does this via testing the
technical and operating competence levels of ham radio license
applicants. Period.

I've long held the view that peripheral issues like HV and tower
climbing safety questions creeping into the tests are for the most
part out of place because they have no implications with respect to
the public interest in the RF spectrum. I disagree with the concept of
the FCC trying to "teach" personal safety as part of the licensing
process. RF safety questions on the other hand are germain to the
testing process because the public does have a stake in radiation
exposure issues.

My bottom line in all this is that the FCC is testing for subjects
which have nothing to do with it's role as a regulator and is failing
to include topics which should be included in the tests like emergency
communications procedures and others I could dredge up.

> > I
> > never had to answer any questions on tower climbing or RF exposure
> > topics to get my Extra. I've dangled by my whatchmacallit up towers at
> > 150+ feet more times than I can recall and I'm no more RF brain-fried
> > than any of the rest of you RRAP lurkers.
>
> Times change, Brian. Safety is considered important these days.

You're lecturing the choir . . . I've spent over a half century in the manufacturing sector much of it out on the production floors in various roles in the bowels of smokestack America. I've seen the blood and gore up close and personal, nobody around here supports safety education any more strongly than I do. The question is where that education should come from.

Twisting your comment a bit "Personal safety education in ham radio should be
left as an exercise for the individual".

> >> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

4633. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 15:47:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C5DF93.F10E9C0F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92747

William wrote:
>
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
> > freebanding.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
> competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.
>
> Best of luck.

"William"'s definition of "blowhard": Anyone who questions the legality
or the very existence of his claimed operation from Somalia. Kinda
dangled your participle in the breeze there, "William".

Dave K8MN

4634. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 16:12:36 UTC
From: "Haywood Jablomee." <mornings@ten.com>
Message-ID: <i8pbc0pqtromcr1n1v36ku4vulb7is5mht@4ax.com>
Source record: 92748
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 8 Jun 2004 04:42:06 -0700, ab8mq@yahoo.com (AB8MQ) wrote:

>Oh, so you are speaking for the FCC, now Lardass? Funny how the retest
>letter doesn't give a reason except that the FCC has the authority to
>retest.

What's funny is how you think that everyone is Lloyd.

4635. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 17:07:07 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@swlstennhq.net>
Message-ID: <ca4rirhfr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92749

Yes, he thinks Lloyd is everywhere.
LOL

73s

lloyd

"Haywood Jablomee." <mornings@ten.com> wrote in message
news:i8pbc0pqtromcr1n1v36ku4vulb7is5mht@4ax.com...
> On 8 Jun 2004 04:42:06 -0700, ab8mq@yahoo.com (AB8MQ) wrote:
>
>
> >Oh, so you are speaking for the FCC, now Lardass? Funny how the retest
> >letter doesn't give a reason except that the FCC has the authority to
> >retest.
>
> What's funny is how you think that everyone is Lloyd.

4636. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 17:28:02 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <CGmxc.13891$IQ2.7543924@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92650

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of
> > these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> >
> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> > the NG.
> >:-)
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >>
> >>
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >> >
> >> > 7037 kHz
> >> >
> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >
>
> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?

I'm not exactly sure what you're trying to say, Alun? Just come on out and say it, if you'd please. Any licensed ARO who is familiar with the current bandplans (Including all "gentlemen's" agreements.) should easily surmise

that this is indeed a CW net.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4637. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 17:36:50 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <SOmxc.2917$Y3.1038@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92651

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

> b****y

Could you translate that word to conversational English, please.

Thank you.

Avery

4638. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 18:00:07 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <H8nxc.2926$Y3.646@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92652

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com...

> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding.

In my experience (yours may differ) the 'afficiondoes' (sic) tend toward socially-inept ill-groomed gentlemen in quasi-officious looking jumpsuits with lots of embroidered badges, and ballcaps with 'scrambled eggs' on the bill. Distinctly unrewarding!

73,

Avery

4639. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 18:26:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406081026.4b97a3cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92653

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406071729.76a6396f@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> > until proven innocent.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Were you one of the "destroy fractal at any cost" gang?

No Brainiac, not at all. In fact Chip shipped me a piece of
humor-laced e-mail about a week ago. I've taken umbrage with some of
his jottings here and there but I'm not into destructive posts like a
certain PUTZ we know does for jollies.

4640. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 19:06:06 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2>
Source record: 92654

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:

> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
>> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
>> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
>> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>> >
>> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
>> > the NG.
>> >:-)
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>> >
>> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
>> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>> >> >
>> >> > 7037 kHz
>> >> >
>> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> > WA2SI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
>

> Hee, hee, hee, YES!
>
> w3rv

Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.

73 de N3KIP

4641. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 20:17:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <o9pxc.13974$IQ2.7996163@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92655

```
"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> >> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> >> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
> >> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> >> >
> >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> >> > the NG.
> >> >:-)
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 7037 kHz
> >> >> >
> >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> >> > WA2SI
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
```

> >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
> >
> > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.
>
> 73 de N3KIP

Name a night, perhaps Mondays at 8:00 PM (0000z) before the CW net? I'd have to dig up a mic thoough.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4642. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 21:35:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081335.24c8efdb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92656

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608071835.16349.00000652@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071737.43008fc7@posting.google.com>
>
> >But she doesn't return my mail, and never a thank you card for the roses
>
> Perhaps she has ONE redeeming quality.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Perhaps, but I am so smitten with her that I can overlook it.

4643. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 21:45:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081345.350d924a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92657

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
> >> >there.
> >>
> >> Funny.
> >
> >Nope. True.
> >
> >> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,
> >
> >Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
> >KH0.
> >
> > yet you
> >> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
> >
> >Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
>
> From you, Brain.

Couldn't have. I've never said that.

> On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
> "logs".
>
> THAT says "lost".

You've got 24 hours to Google that up, or you will forever be branded
a LIAR.

> >> How inept.
> >

> >What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
> >quota. Better go easy.
>
> Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".

No, you did. You've asserted that I "lost" my /T5 logs, or that I
"can't find" them. That is false. Completely false.

Now Google up where I said that.

> So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have previously
> told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or misplaced.

I have logs. I've always said that I have the logas, and know that
you're not in them. I know exactly where the logs are. I've never
said that my logs were "lost" or that I "can't find" or that I
"misplaced" them.

You have made a false assertion.

You have been challenged to Google up the post where I've said the
things that you say I've said.

> I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting tied up
> in your own mistruths.

Absolutely not. I know exactly what I've said. So Google it up, you
peddler of mistruths.

> Steve, K4YZ

By the way, did you know that "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
Radio?"

Hihihi!

bb

4644. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 21:54:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081354.39600971@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92658

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/7/2004 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071653.6748f9fc@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>...
>
> >> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
> >> you in person that I do via this forum.
> >>
> >Actually, No. I fear that you'll go postal and people will get hurt.
>
> Only if you raise your hands above your waist with a blunt object in it.
> And that would be " a person"...not "people".

I don't think it would take that much to get a violent reaction from
you, so please stay away from me.

> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing for
> the last two years. That I can do from here.

I offer you some constructive criticism (get mental health help), but
you point and snicker? You libs are all alike.

> >So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
> >volunteer at SAFB?
> >
> >Sheeeeeeesh!
>
> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
> solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest in
> the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
> program.

I've always participated to a greater extent than required. However,
I am no longer a participant.

> But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
> been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that your
> being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
> appropriate.

Perhaps you'll find some handicap parking when you get there.

4645. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180823.17756.00000448@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92659

In article <20040608071835.16349.00000652@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071737.43008fc7@posting.google.com>
>
>>But she doesn't return my mail, and never a thank you card for the roses
>
> Perhaps she has ONE redeeming quality.

Perhaps gunnery nurse should safe her M-16 and understand the bit of humor Brian wrote? :-)

I'm still waiting to hear how nursie "pleasured J.Lo on his doorstep." But, I realize that was overt imagination on overdrive with nursie.

Has the gunnery nurse read and understood DoD Directive 4650.2 (effective 21 Nov 03) yet?

MARS is NOT amateur radio.

Beep, beep.

LHA / WMD

4646. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180824.17756.00000449@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92663

In article <20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Meaningful Discussionist percussionist) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071653.6748f9fc@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>...
>
>>> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
>>> you in person that I do via this forum.
>>>
>>Actually, No. I fear that you'll go postal and people will get hurt.
>
> Only if you raise your hands above your waist with a blunt object in it.
>
>And that would be " a person"...not "people".
>
> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing for
>the last two years. That I can do from here.

No guts, gunnery nurse? Don't you need to "strike some blow
for freedom" or other patriotic sloganeering about keeping
hum radio as you know it?

You HAVE flipped off the edge of sanity.

>>So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
>>volunteer at SAFB?
>>
>>Sheeeeeeesh!
>
> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
>solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest in
>the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
>program.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...if gunnery nurse isn't at this convention, then she
isn't really interested or dedicated to the program! :-)

[it's "afficionadoes" nursie...try keeping some typing control there]

> But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
>been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that your
>being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
>appropriate.

The state of the art of military ordinance would be greatly in debt
to the gunnery nurse's secrets on exploding random sayings into
nuclear-style blasting! :-)

That and the USOC on such prodigious Leaps of subjects...greater
than Bob Beamon's record-setting long-jump performance in
Mexico City.

It must be nursie's "seven hostile actions" experience... :-)

LHA / WMD

4647. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180826.17756.00000450@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92666

In article <20040608071633.16349.00000651@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 9:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040607222511.12940.00000210@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040607162500.15303.00000708@mb-m16.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(He's
>>got it in his wallet Superham) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/6/2004 1:01 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040606140153.15095.00000180@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>>>>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>>>>>Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>>>>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>>I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>>>>>there.
>>>>>
>>>>> Funny.
>>>>>
>>>>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location, yet
>>you
>>>>>"lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>>>>
>>>> Where are nursie's logs from Okinawa?
>>>>
>>>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>>>
>>> Unlike Brain, I can refer you to 15th Air Force Auxiliary Military
Radio
>>>Service station callsign KA6CM, issued from Yakota, Japan, in August of
1981.
>>

>> "Yakota?" :-)
>>
>> "Refer me?" "Refer anyone?" A USAF MARS station? Oh, my!
>
> Whoi said anything about MARS, Sir Putzy?
>
> I said AMRS.

No, you did NOT write "AMRS" (therefore you did not "say anything").

You sound like you are making up things as you go along. Not
a new thing with nursie...

> AMRS was the program underwhich US Armed Forces personnel were "licensed"
>to operate those 2-by-2 KA callsigns in Japan until Japan finally created a
>reciprocal licensing program for foreigners.

Sounds like you are describing "underwhich odor," nursie.

Better practice aespsis more. Your words be getting stinky.

Let's have some REAL "references" to this "AMRS" like from
governments.

>> An whut it say on dat "referral?" Is it hidden from view again?
>>
>>>> Where are nursie's other claims?
>>>>
>>>> No proof = Nothing happened.
>>>
>>> You were provided adequate information to inquire directly of the
>>>Veteran's Administration, Lennie.
>>
>> Not good enough. NARA is the place. National Archives and
>> Records Administration. St. Louis.
>
> And you can get the same questions answered via VA. The VA will
>acknowledge requests for verification of service. As for the rest, you don't
>need my entire service record.

Yes we do. It would explain your "seven hostile actions."

It would explain your REAL discharge type.

It would also give your REAL MOS.

> Be my guest. Of course you won't...The answers would put a cork in YOUR
>silliness.

Knowing all about the gunnery nurse's heroic military career is
not high on anyone's agenda. :-)

>> You can try by reading and UNDERSTANDING DoD Directive
>> 4650.2 data 21 Nov 03. It don' say no ham be da hole MARS.

>
> Lennie what did you do with that 14 years of college-level night school
>you claim to have attended...?!?!

I got paid better. :-)

Here's a clue: Night school remedial English would help you
(touch typing in adverse stress environments doesn't hurt, either)
understand government and military directive/regulation wording.
However, none of that works if there isn't any intelligence behind
the squinty, reddened eyeballs to process the information.

DoD Directive 4650.2 explains MARS. MARS is a military
radio service. MARS is NOT amateur radio. [hasn't been so
since 1948] No amount of schooling, classes, whatever seems
to have any effect on your understanding a rather simple DoD
Directive.

> Another lie?

No lie. <sigh> Poor nursie, still can't keep from tossing snit
at those who have done things nursie hasn't done? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...I have to repeat my resume in here (again) plus
giving references of (still living) radio amateurs who can attest
to that? Gunnery nurse would go even more ape-snit about
"CV" and yelling everything was a "lie." :-)

All these "meaningful discussions!" :-)

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

4648. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92664

In article <20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
>>> >there.
>>>
>>> Funny.
>>
>>Nope. True.
>>
>>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,
>>
>>Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
>>KH0.
>>
>>> yet you "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>>
>>Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
>
> From you, Brain.
>
> On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
>"logs".
>
> THAT says "lost".

Looks like nursie is trying to dump a log in here once more...

>>> How inept.
>>
>>What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
>>quota. Better go easy.
>

> Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".

Go back and sit down, you aren't finished...

> So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have previously
>told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or misplaced.

Poor nursie, still trying to make a mountain out of a little pile of
dust (that fell out of his overloaded imagination).

> I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting tied
>up in your own mistruths.

"Seven hostile actions."

"MARS is amateur radio."

The medical discharge that turned "honorable" and so marked on
his DD-214.

Knows exactly where the Burbank, CA, HRO store is because
he "shopped there with some friends" yet he can't recall anything
of the surroundings before the store moved there.

Knows all about Naval Air Development Center because he was
assigned there (long after NADC was moved) which was really
Warminster NAS (across the road).

Has tutored "countless" newbies and "broken bread" with
more (countless?) visiting hams. [one has to wonder why he
has never been caught after trashing all those bakeries...]

Thinks all military radios are classified and therefore can't talk
about them...even though they've not been so for decades.

That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
ever makes any "untruths." :-)

Aren't all these "meaningful discussions" fun? :-)

LHA / WMD

4649. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180828.17756.00000452@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92661

In article <20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
>>
>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>news:<d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>...
>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>>news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
>>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
>>> > > William wrote:
>>> > > >
>>> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
>>> > > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>>>
>>> > > > >
>>> > > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
>>> > > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
>>> > > > > >
>>> > > > > No and no.
>>> > > > >
>>> > > >
>>> > > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
>>> > > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4,
>>I'd
>>> > > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
>>> > > > I'd still put it on my card.
>>> > > >
>>> > > > bb
>>> > >
>>> > > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
>>> > >
>>> > > Dave K8MN
>>> >
>>> > I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
>>>
>>> Who, exactly, did ever get one?
>>

>>Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.
>
> Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.

The gunnery nurse put on his Military Interlocutor brassard?

[arm band says "MI" but trust me, folks, the second letter
doesn't stand for "intelligence."]

> He didn't ask "..did I?"
>
> He asked "..who did?"

Kellie wrote: "Who, exactly, did ever get one?"

That's exact. :-)

> Nice try.

Temper fry.

LHA / WMD

[these things just seem to write themselves...:-)]

4650. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180829.17756.00000453@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92660

In article <20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 8:08 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071708.473f6be7@posting.google.com>
>>
>>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>>news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
>>>
>>> The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
>>> freebanding.
>>>
>>> w3rv
>>
>>Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
>>competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.
>
> There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.

Several newsgroup fully-licensed blowhards have demanded
proof, nursie. You be one of them.

> Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...that nasty old mirror reflecting yourself as you
write these nastygrams.

Hello? Where and when those "seven hostile actions?"

> That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further
>substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up in order to be
>able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"

It's Mirror Time! :-)

"Mirror, mirror, on the wall, who's the mightiest ham of all?"

"Nursie, of course," said the mirror...who was really just another
personality in USMC class A full dress... :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4651. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180830.17756.00000454@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92662

In article <20040608065351.16349.00000644@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: "Avery Hightower" Hightower@cosmos.net
>>Date: 6/7/2004 3:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <aF4xc.16891$Yd3.1020@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>news:20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com...
>>
>>> No proof = Reasonable doubt.
>>>
>>> Nothing more or less.
>>
>>You just don't get it, do you Jim. On rrap you must either agree with
>>K4CAP/K4YZ and accede to every whimsical demand of his, or you are a
>>low-life lying scum sucking weasel. Reasonable doubt is not an option.
>
> What "reasonable doubt"...?!?! Two years of dodging requests for
>validation of claims made...?!?!

"Seven hostile actions."

ALL the bragging about nursie's doing this, doing that, being the most wonderfullest radio communicator, knowing exactly what electronic engineering is, etc., etc., etc. :-)

> And what "demands"...?!?! Again...Someone makes claims of having had
>experiences that allegedly makes them "knowldegeable" of certain skills or
>techniques, yet NO EVIDENCE of having actually done them...

I suppose all those years of memorizing all the advertisements in QST must be good for something... :-)

However, we (the newsgroup readers) have NO proof whatsoever about those "hostile actions" claims. We (the newsgroup readers) haven't even been informed of their place and date.

> Eh, Brain...?!?!

Who do you think you are messaging to?

Paranoia setting in again?

Did you invade Fantasy Island again?

LHA / WMD

4652. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180832.17756.00000455@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92665

In article <d22b54c3.0406080619.452b4fab@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:<H4SdnW8aLefRvljdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>...
>> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> >> Well, the Techs are vetted on safety issues,
>> >
>> > 'Nother piece of nonsense. Any number of EEs who worked with HV for a
>> > living have killed themselves on the job and in ham shacks over the
>> > years professional experience and ham radio test questions aside.
>>
>> Nonsense? There is no doubt that an engineer can fry themselves. But
>> that really isn't the point. There is no level of education that can
>> insure complete safety.
>
>Agreed.
>
>> What the idea - and the point is - is to provide the exposure to some
>> relevent material, and hope it sinks in. It is an excercise for the
>> student to use or not to use.
>
>Where in the charter of the FCC does it state that one of it's
>missions is to provide any form of education as part of it's radio
>operators licensing processes?? The FCC is a federal regulatory
>agency, not an academic institution at any level.

Heh heh...I've been saying that all along.

[maybe persistence pays off... :-)]

>In the context of
>ham radio it's *sole* missison is to take a reasonable poke at
>maintaining law and order within the portions of the RF spectrum
>allocated for ham radio operations. It does this via testing the
>technical and operating competence levels of ham radio license
>applicants. Period.

According to the political aspects of regulation, the safety of
OTHERS reared its anxious head.

RF exposure safety is involved at reducing the amount of RF
energy radiated towards others not directly involved in radio.

>I've long held the view that peripheral issues like HV and tower
>climbing safety questions creeping into the tests are for the most
>part out of place because they have no implications with respect to
>the public interest in the RF spectrum. I disagree with the concept of
>the FCC trying to "teach" personal safety as part of the licensing
>process. RF safety questions on the other hand are germain to the
>testing process because the public does have a stake in radiation
>exposure issues.

Quite true...from the political context of regulations.

In the history of radio communications, there are no real physical
threats of RF damage to humans from communications RF
radiation. The RF safety levels regulated by the Commission
are well below any danger observed by scientists and researchers
for years and years of radio communications.

>My bottom line in all this is that the FCC is testing for subjects
>which have nothing to do with it's role as a regulator and is failing
>to include topics which should be included in the tests like emergency
>communications procedures and others I could dredge up.

Excellent point!

>> > never had to answer any questions on tower climbing or RF exposure
>> > topics to get my Extra. I've dangled by my whatchmacallit up towers at
>> > 150+ feet more times than I can recall and I'm no more RF brain-fried
>> > than any of the rest of you RRAP lurkers.
>>
>> Times change, Brian. Safety is considered important these days.
>
>You're lecturing the choir . . . I've spent over a half century in the
>manufacturing sector much of it out on the production floors in
>various roles in the bowels of smokestack America. I've seen the blood
>and gore up close and personal, nobody around here supports safety
>education any more strongly than I do. The question is where that
>education should come from.
>
>Twisting your comment a bit "Personal safety education in ham radio
>should be left as an exercise for the individual".

It should be common sense. :-)

But, given this place is full of "barracks lawyers" all involved in
"legalities," the public RF exposure safety issues got all
changed around to "personal safety of the amateur" with all the
blabbering about RF burns and assorted physical accidents
not really involving radio per se.

Thousands and thousands of military personnel have cycled
through tours of radio communications facilities where far more
than 2 KW of RF was being radiated and they haven't been
harmed in any measureable way.

[I'm not talking about mental harm from just listening to too
much telegraphy...BTASE :-)]

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4653. Re: The dam is leaking...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:08:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608180833.17756.00000456@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92667

In article <20040608072658.16349.00000653@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The dam is leaking...
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/7/2004 9:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040607222518.12940.00000212@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <5c01b95b.0406070311.b1f22a@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>writes:
>
>>> "I am going to get my "extra lite" out of the box".
>>
>> Why should I do that?
>
> Why, indeed, Lennie?
>
> We ahve learned, of course, that anything you say youa re going to do
>trutly is a "flight of fantasy"...

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mavis Bacon certainly never taught nursie how to type during an outrage session... :-)

[this must be one of those "hostile actions" nursie is in... :-)]

>>> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"
>>
>> That's what I originally thought way back when...but then all
>> those OFs of the morse persuasion got so evil, wicked, mean
>> and nasty towards anyone who didn't love, honor, and cherish
>> telegraphy.
>
> Actually a review of the "evil, wicked, mean and nasty" would reveal that
>one "NOCWTEST@aol.com", then "owned" by you, was the one slinging rather
>inciteful and uncivil epithets towrds others.

Poor baby. Still hurt and angry from 5 years ago? Awwww...

Not loving telegraphy = Inciteful and uncivil epithets?

I don't think so. See the Google archives for "communications" from Jim Kehler back then. [a CWholic if there ever was one]

Anyone can search and find KH2D's new site now (in the states) and see how he feels about "brain-dead old farts." :-)

> Of course the truth is not one of your stronger suits.

Did nursie put on his Colonel Jessup uniform again?

Re: Jack Nicholson's wonderful portrayal of a USMC officer in
"A Few Good Men." [character was an ultraconservative
nutso] Famous line, "You can't handle the TRUTH!!!" :-)

I have no reason to lie about anything. Been there, done
lots of things, got the T-shirts...and a comfortable income
as a result.

> And you never did explain to us how the FCC tested for CW.
>Oscilliscope? Spectrum Analyzer?

What prompted THAT question? Are you flipping out even
more?

[the instrument is spelled "oscilloscope" or, in familiar terms,
just "scope"]

>>> "I'll send a scanned image of my FCC License to anyone who asks
>>>for it"
>>
>> I did that already.
>
> Then you have again expressed yet ANOTHER lie.

No lie. I scanned it and sent it as an e-mail attachment.

More than once.

Nursie can't handle the truth so she lied and said I never sent it.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Not "meaningful discussion" at all.

> We'll just heap it up on the others.

Heap big nutso nursie need mental therapy.

>> You want to suggest legal action by the IEEE against me?
>> The quickest way for you to contact them is to go to
>> www.ieee.org and get an address or send them some of
>> your filthymouth e-mail. IEEE has automatic virus detection
>> software to detect badness in e-mail...they just don't always
>> detect badasses in e-mail.
>
> Obviously.
>
> They also "don't always detect" who is bruising thier propfessional
>reputation by association.

Speaking of associations, I was a member of the Association
for Computing Machinery (ACM) for three years as a courtesy of
the IEEE membership. ACM is the first and the biggest of the
professional associations on computing and information
technology.

Ever written any computer code, nursie? I have. Taught myself how to write FORTRAN through Jim McCracken's book on FORTRAN IV. Used it to write six engineering-analysis programs that became a part of the RCA Corporate Software Library. Used it to write five more programs that became shareware on the 'net and are now freeware. [McCracken later became president of the ACM]

Ever get down to Assembler level? I learned Morotola 6800 Assembler first, then 6502 Assembler (thanks to the nice macro assembler program from Call-A.P.P.L.E., the Apple Puget Sound Program Library Exchange that was based in Seattle), got published in the Call-A.P.P.L.E. monthly magazine (but I don't count that as part of my professional resume). See also Microcomputing and BYTE magazines for more of the same. I've done some 8051 and Intel Assembler programming but not a great deal of it despite having MASM in the PC.

Writing computer code is lots of intellectual fun, sort of like a super crossword but the end product is very useful for lots of things. Sending and receiving telegraphy code is old stuff, outdated, no real usefulness except for some OFs to brag about in their boasts of "superiority."

I've been an IEEE member for 31 years. It is a professional association involved in reality, of pushing the technical envelope constantly outwards, advancing the electrical and electronic arts. I'm proud to have been a member of that distinguished group and continue to be involved and still learning with each technological plateau jump after reaching Life Member status.

IEEE doesn't require any morse code knowledge for any membership level. :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4654. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:24:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406081424.5d05d064@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92668

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040607161236.16194.00000712@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/6/2004 11:58 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040606092145.13387.00000321@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >>>Date: 6/5/2004 6:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >>>Message-id: <20040605195907.28360.00000206@mb-m28.aol.com>
>
> >>>In article <40C2170E.7889E4A0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>>writes:
>
> >>>>We don't know that T5/N0IMD existed.
> >>>
> >>>I think it did.
> >>
> >> Why? Because he "said so"...?!?!
> >
> >That's one reason. Lacking any proof to the contrary, I'm not going to call
> >someone a liar.
>
> Then you're a bit more liberal than I am, I guess! =)

Not liberal. Accurate.
>
> I figure after two years of being asked yet proactively dodging the ante
> earns Brain the title.

Nope. A liar is someone who intentionally says things he/she knows are
untrue in an attempt to deceive. For all we know, the statements made
about the alleged operation by the alleged operator could all be true.
>
> >> Sure you can...ie: Antarctica
> >>
> >Well, there you have it. It could have happened, and all of the above-named
> >conditions would have been met.
>

> And I have yet to meet anyone who WAS "there" that didn't have SOME
> memento of the occassion. I know three guys who were /KC4 who at least had
> pics taken at the McMurdo and Little America signs outside the outpost's
> complex.

But the alleged operation wasn't allegedly in Antartica.
>
> >> However even there there are international agreements on who can grant
> >>what authority, to whom, and under what circumstances.
> >
> >Of course. I didn't say such operation would be 100% in agreement with
> >international requirements, just that it could happen.
>
Heck, it might not even be 1% in agreement. But it still could have
happened.

> Sure it could...and J.Lo might leave her NEW husband and show up on my
> doorstep begging for me to pleasure her...
>
> I ain't holding my breath. However if she DOES show up, you can be darned
> sure I will have SOME sort of proof before making outlandish claims!

That's you.

>
> >>Brain was allegedly in a military unit under United Nations auspices,
> >>and
> >>it seems he did NOTHING to get the PROPER authorizations to do what he
> >>CLAIMED to do.
> >
> >Maybe. But that has no bearing on whether the alleged /T5 operation took
> >place,
> >whether logbooks existed, and whether QSLs were exchanged.
>
> It has all the bearing in the world, Jim.

Not at all. Either it happened or it didn't. If it was unauthorized,
yet it happened, it still happened. It just doesn't count for any
awards.

> How can you say that a lack of proper authorization to operate DOESN'T
> ahve bearing on the operation...?!?!

I'm saying it doesn't have any bearing on whether it happened or not.

There's not a single Amateur Radio award
> by any organization that I am aware of that is not predicated on the legitimacy
> of the operating credentials of the claimant.
>
Sure. And to our knowledge nobody has claimed any QSOs with the
alleged operation for any awards.

> He can "operate" all he wants to and exchange a ton of QSL cards, but no
> license (or authorization or permit or certificate...what ever you want to call
> it...) and all that operation is worthless.
>
Of course. But the *claims* that there was an operation would still be
true.

> >Remember that all it would take to meet all of these conditions would be one
> >QSO in a ham band using stateside calls and portable designation.
>
> As long as the legal criteria was met.

Even if they weren't, it would still be an operation. Just not a legit
one.
>
> In Brain's case, it appears as though it wasn't. He was not in
> Antarctica...he was allegedly in Somalia.
>
> >>He won't even provide us with the callsign of ONE station he "worked"
> >>while in Somalia.
> >
> >Of course not. Same goes for bands/modes/antennas/rigs used. But the lack of
> >detail doesn't mean the alleged operation didn't happen.
>
> Please tell me you're just playing "Devil's Advocate", Jim...!

I'm simply being accurate.

Folks keep focusing on the wrong things.

What has actually been claimed? Operation from /T5, nothing more. No
mention of modes, bands, rigs, number of QSOs, etc.

Can't you see that if even *one* QSO was made, on *any* ham band, over
any distance, it would constitute "operation from /T5"? Even if said
operation was not in agreement with international agreements?
>
> >The lack of detail is a different issue completely.
>
> You've GOT to be kidding me.

Not at all.
>
> I can tell you in INTIMATE detail the sation I had set up in my barracks
> on Oki in 81...Equipment, antennas, I even still have the log. Although I
> don't have my copy of the AMRS authorization, I can give specifics about
> who/what/where, callsign, and even have a couple of QSL cards from folks I
> worked...
>
That's you.

Being secretive isn't lying. It's...being secretive. Of course the
lack of detail reduces credibility, but it doesn't make the secretive
person a liar.

> He can't even TELL us ONE callsign of anyone he worked...?!?!

Not can't.

Won't.

Big difference.

> >> No proof = Didn't happen.
> >>
> >Not at all.
> >
> >No proof = Reasonable doubt.
>
> No proof on short notice = reasonable doubt.
>
> No proof after two years = didn't happen.

Not at all, Steve. Objective reality states that if a thing happened,
it happened whether anyone believes it happened or not.
>
> >Nothing more or less.
>
> His "nothing more" can't be much less than what it's been, Jim!
>
Of course.

Don't you realize by now that you won't get answers to your questions?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4655. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:50:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608185052.19470.00000215@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92669

In article <SOmxc.2917$Y3.1038@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> writes:

>"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>> b****y
>
>Could you translate that word to conversational English, please.
>
>Thank you.

That can't be done in this newsgroup. Newsgroup nabobs, ever vigilant on keeping hum radio as it was when they were young, forbid any sort of nasty words in regards to "CW."

It's perfectly permissible for Them to cuss, swear, and generally talk down to those not favoring telegraphy...it just CANNOT be done in return. SOP.

[Alun is not fond of telegraphy in case you wondered...]

It's the OF double standard (as usual).

LHA / WMD

4656. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:50:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608185053.19470.00000216@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92670

In article <1e4e3692.0406081354.39600971@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/7/2004 7:53 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071653.6748f9fc@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0406070316.77202b6d@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> >> Your "fear" is that I will be able to make an even bigger fool of
>> >> you in person that I do via this forum.
>> >>
>> >Actually, No. I fear that you'll go postal and people will get hurt.
>>
>> Only if you raise your hands above your waist with a blunt object in
it.
>> And that would be " a person"...not "people".
>
>I don't think it would take that much to get a violent reaction from
>you, so please stay away from me.

The gunnery nurse explodes at regular intervals in here.

In that case, the label "OF" should apply..."Old Faithful."

[he is in everyoneth's faith a lot...'specially when his faith is
somehow challenged]

>> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing
for
>> the last two years. That I can do from here.
>
>I offer you some constructive criticism (get mental health help), but
>you point and snicker? You libs are all alike.

The psychotics never understand that they are the nutsos.

Might be "post-traumatic stress syndrome" from all those
"hostile actions" in the "service."

>> >So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
>> >volunteer at SAFB?
>> >

>> >Sheeeeeeesh!
>>
>> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
>> solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest in
>> the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
>> program.
>
>I've always participated to a greater extent than required. However,
>I am no longer a participant.

Not good enough for nursie.

Everyone must obey His directives...as stated. :-)

>> But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
>> been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that
your
>> being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
>> appropriate.
>
>Perhaps you'll find some handicap parking when you get there.

:-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4657. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:50:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608185054.19470.00000217@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92672

In article <H8nxc.2926$Y3.646@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding.
>
>In my experience (yours may differ) the 'afficiondoes' (sic) tend toward
>socially-inept ill-groomed gentlemen in quasi-officious looking jumpsuits
>with lots of embroidered badges, and ballcaps with 'scrambled eggs' on the
>bill. Distinctly unrewarding!

Sounds like a bunch of CAP air aces... :-)

LHA / WMD

4658. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 22:50:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608185056.19470.00000218@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92671

In article <d22b54c3.0406081026.4b97a3cf@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406071729.76a6396f@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
>> > until proven innocent.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> Were you one of the "destroy fractal at any cost" gang?
>
>No Brainiac, not at all. In fact Chip shipped me a piece of
>humor-laced e-mail about a week ago. I've taken umbrage with some of
>his jottings here and there but I'm not into destructive posts like a
>certain PUTZ we know does for jollies.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...are you saying nasty about Dan? He has STATED that a "dipole is always a half wavelength." :-)

You are being overly sensitive to criticsm, catapult kellie. :-)

And stay away from "humor-laced e-mail." Some of it might make sense. We can't have such corruption of the CW.

Beep, beep.

LHA / WMD

4659. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:06:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92673

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406081026.4b97a3cf@posting.google.com>...
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406071729.76a6396f@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> > > until proven innocent.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Were you one of the "destroy fractal at any cost" gang?
>
> No Brainiac, not at all. In fact Chip shipped me a piece of
> humor-laced e-mail about a week ago. I've taken umbrage with some of
> his jottings here and there but I'm not into destructive posts like a
> certain PUTZ we know does for jollies.

Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
years ago, it really didn't look that way.

4660. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:13:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92674

Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of work are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles etc.)

Ryan KC8PMX

> Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your Novice
> Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I guess that
> means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm
>
> Make your own conclusions there.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

4661. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:17:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SNrxc.3250$Y3.535@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92675

```
"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> >> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> >> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
> >> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> >> >
> >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> >> > the NG.
> >> >:-)
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 7037 kHz
> >> >> >
> >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> >> > WA2SI
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
```

> >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
> >
> > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.
>
> 73 de N3KIP

Why would any real ham want to do it with phone?

Dan/W4NTI

4662. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:17:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10cci95fv69naed@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92676

Let me know if you get a six meter sked going.....

Ryan KC8PMX

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
looking
> for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his untimely passing.
> Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of these two SK's. (n0Bk
&
> w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>
> Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on the
NG.
> :-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> > Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> > >
> > > 7037 kHz
> > >
> > > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> > >
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4663. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:18:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081518.18c710e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92677

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406060305.447833f8@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040605195906.28360.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >> > It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
> > >> > defies both Physics 101 and common sense.
> > >>
> > >> Maybe - or maybe not.
> > >>
> > >> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
> > >> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
> > >> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
> > >> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
> > >> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
> > >> real data for a while anyway.
> > >>
> > >> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
> > >> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
> > >> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
> > >> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
> > >> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
> > >> numbers.
> > >
> > >Physics is physics is physics and we all know the implications of
> > >short antennas *and* we've read the similar hype which surrounded the
> > >farcical CFA and EH antennas to name just a couple of this thing's
> > >predecessors. I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> > >until proven innocent.
> >
> > Maybe. Or maybe it's for-real.
> >
> > Without detailed info it's all academic anyway.
> >
> > But I remember a time when it was said that "physics" would not permit
> > microprocessors faster than about 25 MHz. Nor with more than a few thousand
> > transistors. Etc.
>
> Had nothing to do with "physics", had to do with musings posted by a
> few gloms who were clueless about how rapidly developed chip
> manufacturing technologies could leap past the limits of their own
> imaginations. Hoof. Mouf. Classic.

Holy Cow! PCTA refer to backward thinking people as "gloms."

From this point forward, I must refer to PCTA as "CW Gloms."

> > There was also a very learned "professional in radio" who, when informed of the
> > intent of the 1921 ARRL Transatlantic Tests, proclaimed that it was physically
> > impossible for a kilowatt input 200 meter transmitter to be heard at that
> > distance. Waves were just too short, doncha know. Physics wouldn't allow it.
>
> This is not 1921.

As Len Anderson has pointed out repeatedly. But you didn't need him
to point that out. You could see it published on the front page of
any daily newspaper. Even the ARRL puts it on the front cover of QST,
just prior to launching another edition of memory lane.

83 years later the physics of antennas has been
> milked to the extent that the probability of anybody inventing an
> antenna which does not utilize long-applied physics lies somewhere
> 'way out the asymptote of the curve.

Are you sure it's not back at the inflection point?

> Per previous I'll stick.

Ditto my opinion of the CW Gloms (previously known as PCTA).

4664. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:18:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XOrxc.3251$Y3.470@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92678

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:o9pxc.13974$IQ2.7996163@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> > news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
> >
> > > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> > >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> > >>
> > >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> > >> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> > >> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
> > >> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> > >> >
> > >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than
on
> > >> > the NG.
> > >> >:-)
> > >> >
> > >> > 73 de Bert
> > >> > WA2SI
> > >> >
> > >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> > >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> > >> >>
> > >> >>
> > >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > 7037 kHz
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> > 73 de Bert
> > >> >> > WA2SI
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> >
> > >> >>
> > >> >>
```

> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
> > >
> > > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.
> >
> > 73 de N3KIP
>
> Name a night, perhaps Mondays at 8:00 PM (0000z) before the CW net? I'd
have
> to dig up a mic thoough.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Come to think of that...it is a good idea. That way real hams can make fun
of the phone only types and they wont have a clue.

Dan/W4NTI

4665. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:19:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bQrxc.3252$Y3.1907@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92679

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:CGmxc.13891$IQ2.7543924@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> > news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >
> > > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> > > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> > > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of
> > > these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> > >
> > > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> > > the NG.
> > >:-)
> > >
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> > >
> > > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> > > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> > >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> > >> >
> > >> > 7037 kHz
> > >> >
> > >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> > >> >
> > >> > 73 de Bert
> > >> > WA2SI
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
>
> I'm not exactly sure what you're trying to say, Alun? Just come on out and

> say it, if you'd please. Any licensed ARO who is familiar with the current
> bandplans (Including all "gentlemen's" agreements.) should easily surmise
> that this is indeed a CW net.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
Alun is 'phoneonly' It's a new class of license.

Some of us call it phoney.

Dan/W4NTI

4666. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:21:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yRrxc.3253$Y3.2295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92680

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040608185052.19470.00000215@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <SOmxc.2917$Y3.1038@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Avery
> Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> writes:
>
> >"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> >> b****y
> >
> >Could you translate that word to conversational English, please.
> >
> >Thank you.
>
> That can't be done in this newsgroup. Newsgroup nabobs,
> ever vigilant on keeping hum radio as it was when they were
> young, forbid any sort of nasty words in regards to "CW."
>
> It's perfectly permissible for Them to cuss, swear, and
> generally talk down to those not favoring telegraphy...it just
> CANNOT be done in return. SOP.
>
> [Alun is not fond of telegraphy in case you wondered...]
>
> It's the OF double standard (as usual).
>
> LHA / WMD

Hey Les.....stop putting lemon extract on that thumb of yours. Your getting
too sour.

Dan/W4NTI

4667. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:23:16 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081523.ea769f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92681

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040606140151.15095.00000178@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0406060055.1ac4ea19@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (the
> Meaningful Dis-Cusser) writes:
>
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >news:<1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>...
> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
> >> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> > > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
> >> >
> >> > Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
> >> > you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
> >> > HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
> >> >
> >> > Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
> >> >
> >> > Steve, K4YZ
> >>
> >> Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum.
> >
> > Yes, it is.
> >
> >> More like your head
> >> is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
> >> the "POP" heard round the world!
> >
> > I am sure you wiash this were true.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still making typos when oh, so angry? :-)
>
> You have a "wiashing machine" there? A "clothes driaer?"
>
> Appliance technology marches on...

Lockstep.

> >> If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.
> >
> > Sorry, Brain...No need to waste that much bandwidth with material
> >that Lennie already wasted bandwidth on in the first place.
>

> Everyone just loves all this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)

Is it time for Carl to spank Steve again?

Naw!

The definition of insanity is to spank an insane guy again and expect
different results.

> > Now, try and find something you KNOW something about to talk
> >about, Brain. So far you can discount DXpeditions, reciprocal
> >licensing, MARS, and emergency communications. You've failed
> >miserably in ALL of these subjects.
>
> "MARS is amateur radio."
>
> Nursie is a veteran of "hostile actions."
>
> Nursie shopped at the HRO in Burbank, CA, before they even
> moved out of their Van Nuys location...
>
> Everyone just loves this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Steve is only here for meaningful discourse.

4668. Re: What is the deal with the MARS stuff?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:23:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dUrxc.3257$Y3.1548@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92682

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406071733.608a9b14@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<r3swc.14229$Yd3.13929@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0406050704.def0410@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<S47wc.12555$Yd3.6470@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:1e4e3692.0406031813.410953ea@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > news:<v2Ovc.10869$Yd3.4209@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > Well of course Steve. You can't get a MARS station license
> > stateside
> > > > > > without having a ham radio ticket. That is obvious.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > > Not quite true. Novices have "ham radio tickets."
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps still today, but it used to be allowed to get into MARS with
a
> > > > Novice ticket. That was a long time ago, when a Novice ticket
really
> > had
> > > > to be earned.
> > >
> > > Oh yeh, it was uphill both ways in the snow with a piece of cardboard
> > > in my shoe. I remember. Pffft.
> > >
> > > Of course now-a-days there is no Novice ticket. And those that
still
> > have
> > > one are of no importance to worry about in the scheme of things.
> > >
> > > So 31,545 amateur radio operators are of no consequence? I thought
> > > that only the ARRL could be so cavalier about such a large block of
> > > amateurs.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > bb

> >
> > Thats right, no consequence and of no value. Just ask the FCC. There
is
> > no longer a Novice,
>
> Jim/N2EY says there are 31,545 novices.

None of which matter, according to the FCC. There will be no more Novice issued. And when the present holder dies, its over. Unless they 'upgrade' of course.

Course you know that.

Dan/W4NTI

4669. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:25:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92683

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...

> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
> the URI micro-antennas.
>
> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting.

4670. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:31:03 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081531.5d567e10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92684

"Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> wrote in message
news:<H8nxc.2926$Y3.646@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
> > Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
> > like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding.
>
> In my experience (yours may differ) the 'afficiondoes' (sic) tend toward
> socially-inept ill-groomed gentlemen in quasi-officious looking jumpsuits
> with lots of embroidered badges, and ballcaps with 'scrambled eggs' on the
> bill. Distinctly unrewarding!
>
> 73,
>
> Avery

It's quite sad that an quasi-adult (ok, ok, so he's closing in on 50)
has to continually scramble for recognition from some kind of uniform
or badge or license or callsign.

That would probably indicate some kind of insecurity or lack of
self-worth.

4671. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:36:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081536.581562d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92685

"Avery Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> wrote in message
news:<SOmxc.2917$Y3.1038@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> > b****y
>
> Could you translate that word to conversational English, please.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Avery

bRIAN KELLy?

4672. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:40:42 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081540.31354fe2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92686

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40C5DF93.F10E9C0F@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
> > > freebanding.
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
> > competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.
> >
> > Best of luck.
>
> "William"'s definition of "blowhard": Anyone who questions the legality
> or the very existence of his claimed operation from Somalia. Kinda
> dangled your participle in the breeze there, "William".
>
> Dave K8MN

Welp, Dave, The World's Greatest DXer, your initial comments were so far off base that it took "little ole me" to educate you re: amateur operations from places without a government.

And all without a single "thank you."

You might as well go back to working out of band Frenchmen for all the good it did.

Best of Luck.

4673. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:51:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081551.7ebe5211@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92687

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071708.473f6be7@posting.google.com>
> >
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
> >> freebanding.
> >>
> >> w3rv
> >
> >Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
> >competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.
>
> There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.

Your first correct statement in about four years.

> Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.

I stand by my claims. I know they're true. It's enough for me.

> That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further

"Fight so hard???"

Hi, hi, hi.

It's easy, really. You're no authority.

> substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up

Your daily posts substantiate that you're nuts.

in order to be
> able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"

I was one of the first. No need to say, "ME TOO..." Everyone after
Jan 1993 is "me too."

> It's your bed, Brain. Comfy?

I'm quite comfortable. Thanks for asking.

Your bed must be tormented.

Make an appointment.

Accept help.

Get rest.

Come back human.

Best of Luck.

4674. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:56:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081556.25742d44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92688

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608065351.16349.00000644@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: "Avery Hightower" Hightower@cosmos.net
> >Date: 6/7/2004 3:57 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <aF4xc.16891$Yd3.1020@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> >
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >news:20040606125823.23857.00000270@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >
> >> No proof = Reasonable doubt.
> >>
> >> Nothing more or less.
> >
> >You just don't get it, do you Jim. On rrap you must either agree with
> >K4CAP/K4YZ and accede to every whimsical demand of his, or you are a
> >low-life lying scum sucking weasel. Reasonable doubt is not an option.
>
> What "reasonable doubt"...?!?! Two years of dodging requests for
> validation of claims made...?!?!
>
> And what "demands"...?!?! Again...Someone makes claims of having had
> experiences that allegedly makes them "knowldegeable" of certain skills or
> techniques, yet NO EVIDENCE of having actually done them...
>
> Eh, Brain...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.

Please post your discharge physical to RRAP.

Thanks, B-r-i-a-n

4675. Re: The 20m band is a band used by US drunkards

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-08 23:59:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406081559.73223e29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92689

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message news:<Sf9xc.55887$3x.33920@attbi_s54>...
> > Drunks and retards were getting licensed long before any standards were
> > changed.
>
> Yepper there JJ ...you got that one right ....I remember a fellow from 0
> land who used to progressively slur every Friday night .... sort of
> entertaining for a SWLer back in the early 60s.
>
> Take care all ... 73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

Hmmmm. I wonder if there's a corrollary for all of Steve's mistypings?

4676. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 00:43:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608204341.29588.00000686@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92690

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/8/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406081424.5d05d064@posting.google.com>

>Don't you realize by now that you won't get answers to your questions?

We've been looking for signs of intelligent life in space, haven't found it
so far, but we keep looking.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4677. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 00:46:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608204614.29588.00000688@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92691

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: "Avery Hightower" Hightower@cosmos.net
>Date: 6/8/2004 1:00 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <H8nxc.2926$Y3.646@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding.
>
>In my experience (yours may differ) the 'afficiondoes' (sic) tend toward
>socially-inept ill-groomed gentlemen in quasi-officious looking jumpsuits
>with lots of embroidered badges, and ballcaps with 'scrambled eggs' on the
>bill. Distinctly unrewarding!

Several of those "embroidered badges" include one's for having saved
someone's life.

Distinctly REwarding.

Steve, K4YZ

4678. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 00:50:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608205054.29588.00000689@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92692

>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 4:35 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081335.24c8efdb@posting.google.com>

>Perhaps, but I am so smitten with her that I can overlook it.

I see.

You accuse others of "stalking" and "obsessive compulsive behaviour", but
here we have an ADMISSION on YOUR part of actually BEING obsessive.

As if we had any doubts.

Steve, K4YZ

4679. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 00:58:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608205832.29588.00000690@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92693

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081345.350d924a@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> > yet you
>> >> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>> >
>> >Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
>>
>> From you, Brain.
>
>Couldn't have. I've never said that.

Uh huh.

>> On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
>> "logs".
>>
>> THAT says "lost".
>
>You've got 24 hours to Google that up, or you will forever be branded
>a LIAR.

I could wade through Google for days through one manifestation of "lost"
or another of yours, Brain.

>> >> How inept.
>> >
>> >What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
>> >quota. Better go easy.
>>
>> Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".
>
>No, you did. You've asserted that I "lost" my /T5 logs, or that I
>"can't find" them. That is false. Completely false.

Then why can't you provide us with any information from them?

You said you couldn't find them.

Now you say that's not true.

Are you a pathological liar or are you inept?

>Now Google up where I said that.

And if I do...?!?! I've "Googled up" other assertions by you and the Lame One before and you just tried to spin out of those too. What's the use?

>> So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have
>previously
>> told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or
>misplaced.
>
>I have logs. I've always said that I have the logas, and know that
>you're not in them. I know exactly where the logs are. I've never
>said that my logs were "lost" or that I "can't find" or that I
>"misplaced" them.
>
>You have made a false assertion.
>
>You have been challenged to Google up the post where I've said the
>things that you say I've said.

You've said you "can't find them".

THEN when pressed on that, no one is IN your logs.

Then you won't tell us ANYONE who was in your logs.

>> I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting
>tied up
>> in your own mistruths.
>
>Absolutely not. I know exactly what I've said. So Google it up, you
>peddler of mistruths.

Nice try on the reversal, Brain...but you've had two years to make good on your claims.

You've not done it.

Brian Burke is either a liar or grossly inept.

It really is THAT simple.

Steve, K4YZ

4680. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:05:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92694

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081540.31354fe2@posting.google.com>

>> "William"'s definition of "blowhard": Anyone who questions the legality
>> or the very existence of his claimed operation from Somalia. Kinda
>> dangled your participle in the breeze there, "William".
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Welp, Dave, The World's Greatest DXer, your initial comments were so
>far off base that it took "little ole me" to educate you re: amateur
>operations from places without a government.

And so far it's taken every OTHER person (except for Lennie, whose
practical knowledge of such things are ZERO) on RRAP to point out that you were
wrong, Brain.

You've been very resillient to accepting the truth, but in doing so you'd
have to admit you were wrong, and we know THAT would never happen.

>And all without a single "thank you."

For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your tall
tale SOUND valid?

Brain Burke trying to tell Dave Heil about DXing skills is like The Three
Stooges trying to tell Fred Astaire how to dance.

Steve, K4YZ

4681. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:17:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211725.29588.00000693@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92695

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081551.7ebe5211@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.
>
>Your first correct statement in about four years.

I am sure you wish it were true.

>> Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.
>
>I stand by my claims. I know they're true. It's enough for me.

Then I guess looking like a fool for assinine assertions fits you, Brain.

But when I think of it....It does!

>> That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further
>
>"Fight so hard???"

Yep.

>Hi, hi, hi.

I am sure you hear LOTS of laughter, Brain.

>It's easy, really. You're no authority.

You're right. I'm not.

But if you THOUGHT about it, Brain, you've had over TWO YEARS of
opportunity to squarely splat the raw egg on my face by coming up with just ONE
valid contact you made from Somalia.

Soooooooo....egg's on you, PuppetBoy.

>> substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up
>
>Your daily posts substantiate that you're nuts.
>
> in order to be
>> able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"
>

>I was one of the first. No need to say, "ME TOO..." Everyone after
>Jan 1993 is "me too."

Others had some valid documentation of thier operation.

Others proudly point to some recognized memento of thier operation. You BRAG of it, but so far, nothing to back it up.

>> It's your bed, Brain. Comfy?
>
>I'm quite comfortable. Thanks for asking.

I guess it's all what you're used to.

>Come back human.

Already there.

Now what can we do to get you to acknowledge the lack of truth in your assertions about your alleged Somalia operation....?!?! Or what can we do to get you to back up your assertion about unlicensed devices playing a "major role" in "emergency comms", etc etc etc....?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4682. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211922.07368.00000217@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92698

In article <yRrxc.3253$Y3.2295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040608185052.19470.00000215@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> In article <SOmxc.2917$Y3.1038@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Avery
>> Hightower" <Hightower@cosmos.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >
>> >> b****y
>> >
>> >Could you translate that word to conversational English, please.
>> >
>> >Thank you.
>>
>> That can't be done in this newsgroup. Newsgroup nabobs,
>> ever vigilant on keeping hum radio as it was when they were
>> young, forbid any sort of nasty words in regards to "CW."
>>
>> It's perfectly permissible for Them to cuss, swear, and
>> generally talk down to those not favoring telegraphy...it just
>> CANNOT be done in return. SOP.
>>
>> [Alun is not fond of telegraphy in case you wondered...]
>>
>> It's the OF double standard (as usual).
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Hey Les.....stop putting lemon extract on that thumb of yours. Your getting
>too sour.

"Les?"

My wife and I have a wonderful lemon tree in the back yard. I planted
it over three decades ago. Continues to produce great lemons.
Great with salmon cooked in Puget Sound barbecue style.

Wife got a recipe for candied lemon peel from a French food store
next to the airport. Delicious. REAL lemon, not that "phoney"
lemon extract one buys in the market in a plastic bottle trying to
look like a real lemon.

Sort of like the old futz "REAL ham" that knows nothing more
than beeping telegraphy. "Real" state of the art THAT is. Whenever
someone invents a time machine to go back to 1920 and stay there,
you ought to be first on the line to go.

Les Besser is a known name in RF design, was the one that sparked
the computer analysis program that ARRL couldn't sell (and dropped).

Too bad you beepers can't bring yourself to USE computers. Nothing
like that in the 1920s when telegraphy meant "real hams." Now polish
up that Spark transmitter and get ready to send...

Beep, beep.

LHA / WMD

4683. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211924.07368.00000218@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92697

In article <bQrxc.3252$Y3.1907@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:CGmxc.13891$IQ2.7543924@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> > news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> >
>> > > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
>> > > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
>> > > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor of
>> > > these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>> > >
>> > > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
>> > > the NG.
>> > >:-)
>> > >
>> > > 73 de Bert
>> > > WA2SI
>> > >
>> > > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
>> > >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>> > >>
>> > >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> > >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>> > >> >
>> > >> > 7037 kHz
>> > >> >
>> > >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>> > >> >
>> > >> > 73 de Bert
>> > >> > WA2SI

>> > It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
>>
>> I'm not exactly sure what you're trying to say, Alun? Just come on out and
>> say it, if you'd please. Any licensed ARO who is familiar with the current
>> bandplans (Including all "gentlemen's" agreements.) should easily surmise
>> that this is indeed a CW net.
>>
>> 73 de Bert

>> WA2SI
>>
>Alun is 'phoneonly' It's a new class of license.
>
>Some of us call it phoney.

Looks like more of the gunnery nurse's "meaningful discourse."
Are you related?!?

The "P" in PCTA is what is Phoney. Don't "P" on us.

Pardon us while the rest of the world continues to advance. You
stay back there in the 1920s and have lotsa fun.

And ante up for a new pad of "official ARRL Radiograms." Your
old one is getting rather yellow with age.

Beep, beep.

LHA / WMD

4684. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211925.07368.00000219@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92751

In article <XOrxc.3251$Y3.470@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>news:o9pxc.13974$IQ2.7996163@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2...
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> > news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
>> >
>> > > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> > >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> > >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> > >>
>> > >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
>> > >> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
>> > >> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
>> > >> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>> > >> >
>> > >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than
>on
>> > >> > the NG.
>> > >> >:-)
>> > >> >
>> > >> > 73 de Bert
>> > >> > WA2SI
>> > >> >
>> > >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>> > >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
>> > >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> > >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>> > >> >> >
>> > >> >> > 7037 kHz
>> > >> >> >
>> > >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>> > >> >> >
>> > >> >> > 73 de Bert
>> > >> >> > WA2SI
>> > >> >> >

>> > >> >> >
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >>
>> > >> >
>> > >> >
>> > >>
>> > >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
>> > >
>> > > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
>> > >
>> > > w3rv
>> >
>> > Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.
>> >
>> > 73 de N3KIP
>>
>> Name a night, perhaps Mondays at 8:00 PM (0000z) before the CW net? I'd
>have
>> to dig up a mic thoough.
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>
>Come to think of that...it is a good idea. That way real hams can make fun
>of the phone only types and they wont have a clue.

The PCTA claim they aren't elitist.

One more posting showing how old-fashioned and ELITIST they
really are.

Dan, get a new eyeshade and little garters to hold up your
shirtsleeves. Be a good little telegrapher. The 1920s may come
again and you will be ready as ever for that time...polish up that
Spark transmitter...

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4685. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211927.07368.00000220@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92699

In article <1e4e3692.0406081551.7ebe5211@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:08 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071708.473f6be7@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>> >news:<d22b54c3.0406061742.59ee2b7d@posting.google.com>...
>> >>
>> >> The last thing I'd do is keep logs and send cards if I went
>> >> freebanding.
>> >>
>> >> w3rv
>> >
>> >Same here. But I don't accept some blowhard(s) on r.r.a.p. as a
>> >competent authority for me to have to produce proof for.
>>
>> There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.
>
>Your first correct statement in about four years.

Just from the randomness of nature he has to produce ONE
correct thing. :-)

>> Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.
>
>I stand by my claims. I know they're true. It's enough for me.

No matter what the subject or who says it, if the gunnery nurse
don't like it, it be a "lie." :-)

He ought to take up golf. Golf has a lot of "lie" on the ball.

>> That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further
>
>"Fight so hard???"
>
>Hi, hi, hi.
>
>It's easy, really. You're no authority.

Replies to nursie "just seem to write themselves!" :-)

>> substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up
>
>Your daily posts substantiate that you're nuts.

Fairly classic behavior pattern it are, too. Jr. College Psych 101
typical.

> in order to be
>> able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"
>
>I was one of the first. No need to say, "ME TOO..." Everyone after
>Jan 1993 is "me too."

Problem is, nursie wasn't among the "first." That must hurt.

Well, he does have those "hostile actions" on his record.

Trouble is, the record is broken and it's archived on Fantasy
Island. [our tax dollars at work...]

>> It's your bed, Brain. Comfy?
>
>I'm quite comfortable. Thanks for asking.
>
>Your bed must be tormented.

Especially if J.Lo is at the door "begging him to pleasure her."

...and he doesn't open the door. :-)

LHA / WMD

4686. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211928.07368.00000221@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92696

In article <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
>> the URI micro-antennas.
>>
>> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting.

Pity he don't live in "Feenix." He could be a columnist in CQ
magazine, telling us all about the strife and times of Hashacodey
Scrunchy, a "reel ham."

Might not last too long, that job. About as long as the "Purchasing
Agent" job did. Moeson wouldn't like to be called "putz" when the
great gunnery nurse gets a disagreement going.

Gotta love all those "meaningful discussions" in here. :-)

LHA / WMD

4687. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:19:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608211929.07368.00000222@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 92750

In article <1e4e3692.0406081523.ea769f4@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040606140151.15095.00000178@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0406060055.1ac4ea19@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (the Meaningful Dis-Cusser) writes:
>>
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> >news:<1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>...
>> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> > > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
>> >> >
>> >> > Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
>> >> > you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
>> >> > HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
>> >> >
>> >> > Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
>> >> >
>> >> > Steve, K4YZ
>> >>
>> >> Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum.
>> >
>> > Yes, it is.
>> >
>> >> More like your head
>> >> is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
>> >> the "POP" heard round the world!
>> >
>> > I am sure you wiash this were true.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still making typos when oh, so angry? :-)
>>
>> You have a "wiashing machine" there? A "clothes driaer?"
>>
>> Appliance technology marches on...
>
>Lockstep.

Remember, "real hams" do it with telegraphy. And LOGS.

And with AUTHORITY. [tension-hutt, gunnery nurse on da
bridge! all rise!]

>> >> If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.
>> >
>> > Sorry, Brain...No need to waste that much bandwidth with material
>> >that Lennie already wasted bandwidth on in the first place.
>>
>> Everyone just loves all this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)
>
>Is it time for Carl to spank Steve again?
>
>Naw!

Carl be busy with true productive work with the IEEE.

Gunnery nurse incapable of anything but trying to suppress
those with differing opinions.

>The definition of insanity is to spank an insane guy again and expect
>different results.

Good point! I need a vacation...but, it's so EASY to reply
to the gunnery nurse...why, the posts just seem "to write
themselves!" :-)

>> > Now, try and find something you KNOW something about to talk
>> >about, Brain. So far you can discount DXpeditions, reciprocal
>> >licensing, MARS, and emergency communications. You've failed
>> >miserably in ALL of these subjects.
>>
>> "MARS is amateur radio."
>>
>> Nursie is a veteran of "hostile actions."
>>
>> Nursie shopped at the HRO in Burbank, CA, before they even
>> moved out of their Van Nuys location...
>>
>> Everyone just loves this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>Steve is only here for meaningful discourse.

Of course. All us newsgrope readers can SEE that. :-)

By the way, that Burbank HRO store is right next to a Radio
Shack store. Ain't dat sometin? :-)

Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
it really existed! :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4688. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:20:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608212051.29588.00000694@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92752

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:56 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081556.25742d44@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.

I have no evidence of the validity of your assertions of operation from
Somalia.

>Please post your discharge physical to RRAP.

Please post something that validates your assertions of Somalia opertion
or use of unlicensed communications devices being a "major role" to RRAP.

>Thanks, B-r-i-a-n

You're welcome, B-r-a-i-n.

Steve, K4YZ

4689. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:32:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608213209.29588.00000695@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92753

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 4:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081354.39600971@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>...

>> And that would be " a person"...not "people".
>
>I don't think it would take that much to get a violent reaction from
>you, so please stay away from me.

You'll only get a "violent reaction" if you brandish a weapon.

As for staying away, I doubt that will be a problem...You seem to haev a
strong aversion to doing anything in a positive interactive manner with other
Amateurs.

You do, however, seem to prefer the company of young boys.

>> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing
>for
>> the last two years. That I can do from here.
>
>I offer you some constructive criticism (get mental health help), but
>you point and snicker? You libs are all alike.

I am sure you wish I was a liberal.

And I am still awaiting your presentation of credentials that would
substantiate your recommendation for seeking "mental health help".

I on the otherhand DO have experience in dealing with people who have
various mental problems, and you seem to manifest examples of those problems.
Telling tales that can't be validated is one of them.

Making excuses for failures is another.

>> >So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
>> >volunteer at SAFB?
>> >
>> >Sheeeeeeesh!
>>
>> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
>> solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest

>in
>> the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
>> program.
>
>I've always participated to a greater extent than required. However,
>I am no longer a participant.

I doubt you ever were. You've already set a precedent for doubting your word. What about this should change anyone's mind to the contrary? I wonder if you were ever more than an name on a list...?!?!

>> But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
>> been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that
>your
>> being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
>> appropriate.
>
>Perhaps you'll find some handicap parking when you get there.

Perhaps you'll find it within you to own up to your claims.

I doubt it, but there's always hope.

Steve, K4YZ

4690. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:34:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92754

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>

>Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
>can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
>years ago, it really didn't look that way.

Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
happened....

Steve, K4YZ

4691. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:35:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608213553.29588.00000697@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92755

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
>> the URI micro-antennas.
>>
>> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting

Is that as opposed as to posting your crap with your hands, Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4692. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 01:39:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608213930.29588.00000698@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 92756

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/8/2004 6:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081531.5d567e10@posting.google.com>

>It's quite sad that an quasi-adult (ok, ok, so he's closing in on 50)
>has to continually scramble for recognition from some kind of uniform
>or badge or license or callsign.

Hmmmmm...Coming from a Boy Scout Leader, the "some kind of uniform" and
badges comment was cute!

>That would probably indicate some kind of insecurity or lack of
>self-worth.

Or sense of accomplishment.

Please remind me of the last significant public service accomplishment YOU
fulfilled, Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4693. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 02:18:27 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0406081818.3f499891@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Haywood Jablomee. <mornings@ten.com> wrote in message
news:<i8pbc0pqtromcr1n1v36ku4vulb7is5mht@4ax.com>...
> On 8 Jun 2004 04:42:06 -0700, ab8mq@yahoo.com (AB8MQ) wrote:
>
>
> >Oh, so you are speaking for the FCC, now Lardass? Funny how the retest
> >letter doesn't give a reason except that the FCC has the authority to
> >retest.
>
> What's funny is how you think that everyone is Lloyd.

What's equally funny is how you think everyone is Roger, too.

4694. Re: High-el is dialing up from DC but pretending he is home, the liar

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 02:19:22 UTC
From: ab8mq@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <737588ee.0406081819.606b5950@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92770

"Lloyd" <lloyd@swlstennhq.net> wrote in message news:<ca4rirhfr0@pita.alt.net>...
> Yes, he thinks Lloyd is everywhere.
> LOL
>
> 73s
>
> lloyd

PKB, fatty!

4695. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 02:36:14 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9502E596AFFAEelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2>
Source record: 92757

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:o9pxc.13974$IQ2.7996163@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> >>
>> >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am
>> >> > always looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX
>> >> > before his untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is
>> >> > named in honor of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
>> >> >
>> >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than
>> >> > on the NG.
>> >> >:-)
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> > WA2SI
>> >> >
>> >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
>> >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > 7037 kHz
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> >> > WA2SI
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >>
>> >> >>

>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
>> >
>> > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.
>>
>> 73 de N3KIP
>
> Name a night, perhaps Mondays at 8:00 PM (0000z) before the CW net? I'd
> have to dig up a mic thoough.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

OK

73 de Alun, N3KIP

4696. Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232340.23112.00000390@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92759

In article <20040608205054.29588.00000689@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: MARS >>IS<< "Amateur Radio".
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 4:35 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081335.24c8efdb@posting.google.com>
>
>>Perhaps, but I am so smitten with her that I can overlook it.
>
> I see.
>
> You accuse others of "stalking" and "obsessive compulsive behaviour", but
>here we have an ADMISSION on YOUR part of actually BEING obsessive.

Whoooeyyy...gunnery nurse gots da rage agin!

Maybe he couldn't "pleasure J.Lo when she begged him to?"

:-)

> As if we had any doubts.

Most of the newsgrope readers have NO doubts. You've flipped out, over the edge, nuts.

Is this more of the "meaningful discussion" thing nursie wanted?

LHA / WMD

4697. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232342.23112.00000391@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92760

In article <20040608204614.29588.00000688@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>>From: "Avery Hightower" Hightower@cosmos.net
>>Date: 6/8/2004 1:00 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <H8nxc.2926$Y3.646@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
>>
>>
>>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>>> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
>>> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding.
>>
>>In my experience (yours may differ) the 'afficiondoes' (sic) tend toward
>>socially-inept ill-groomed gentlemen in quasi-officious looking jumpsuits
>>with lots of embroidered badges, and ballcaps with 'scrambled eggs' on the
>>bill. Distinctly unrewarding!
>
> Several of those "embroidered badges" include one's for having saved
>someone's life.
>
> Distinctly REwarding.

No badges for cussing at others using languages you can't understand?

How about a badge for "Official Log Inspector?"

How about a badge for enforcement of amateur radio in a country which doesn't have a government?

Lots and lots of badge possibilities there...could cover the whole jump suit...wouldn't need any cloth.

How about a nice shiny Badge of Authority on who can say what and where in newsgroups? You'd shine there along with a couple more PCTAs.

Here, have a whouff-hong...and maybe a rittysnitch.

LHA / WMD

4698. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232343.23112.00000392@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92762

In article <20040608211725.29588.00000693@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 6:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081551.7ebe5211@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040608070420.16349.00000647@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>>> There's no "authority" here to "produce proof" for, Brain.
>>
>>Your first correct statement in about four years.
>
> I am sure you wish it were true.
>
>>> Only your own reputation. YOU made the claims.
>>
>>I stand by my claims. I know they're true. It's enough for me.
>
> Then I guess looking like a fool for assinine assertions fits you,
>Brain.
>
> But when I think of it....It does!
>
>>> That you fight so hard to keep from validating them only further
>>
>>"Fight so hard???"
>
> Yep.
>
>>Hi, hi, hi.
>
> I am sure you hear LOTS of laughter, Brain.

It's all around the gunnery nurse...and at him. Tsk, tsk.

>>It's easy, really. You're no authority.
>
> You're right. I'm not.

Wow! Another admission of real truth!

Eventually, randomness will come up with something true.

> But if you THOUGHT about it, Brain, you've had over TWO YEARS of
>opportunity to squarely splat the raw egg on my face by coming up with just
>ONE valid contact you made from Somalia.

Poor nursie. No THINK.

"MARS is amateur radio?" DoD doesn't think so.

Gunnery nurse thinks she is Dill Insructor again advising "maggots."

> Soooooooo....egg's on you, PuppetBoy.

More "meaningful discussion" from the gunnery nurse.

>>> substantiates my suspicisions that you made the whole thing up
>>
>>Your daily posts substantiate that you're nuts.
>>
>> in order to be
>>> able to say "ME TOO...ME TOO! ! !"
>>
>>I was one of the first. No need to say, "ME TOO..." Everyone after
>>Jan 1993 is "me too."
>
> Others had some valid documentation of thier operation.

Of course, especially those who claim "hostile actions." :-)

> Others proudly point to some recognized memento of thier operation. You
>BRAG of it, but so far, nothing to back it up.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still exaggerating all the "meaningful discussion"
again?

You never learn. Pity that. A Dill Inspector who can't tell one dill
from another. A fine pickle you got yourself into.

>>> It's your bed, Brain. Comfy?
>>
>>I'm quite comfortable. Thanks for asking.
>
> I guess it's all what you're used to.

Is that all you can muster for a "comeback?" :-)

>>Come back human.
>
> Already there.

That's only in surface appearance. Like the wax figures in Madam
Tussaud's was museum.

> Now what can we do to get you to acknowledge the lack of truth in your
>assertions about your alleged Somalia operation....?!?! Or what can we do to
>get you to back up your assertion about unlicensed devices playing a "major
>role" in "emergency comms", etc etc etc....?!?!

Oooooo...trotting out the old "lack of truth" again?

Where, when those "hostile actions" you claimed, big hero?

Where was the HRO store again when you visited it "with friends?"

What "emergency comms" has the gunnery nurse done in amateur radio? When? [sorry, lots and lots of times doesn't count]

Gunnery nurse wasn't in Somalia. Not enough "hostile action" there for the big hero?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, TSK!

LHA / WMD

4699. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232344.23112.00000393@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92761

In article <20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081540.31354fe2@posting.google.com>
>
>>> "William"'s definition of "blowhard": Anyone who questions the legality
>>> or the very existence of his claimed operation from Somalia. Kinda
>>> dangled your participle in the breeze there, "William".
>>>
>>> Dave K8MN
>>
>>Welp, Dave, The World's Greatest DXer, your initial comments were so
>>far off base that it took "little ole me" to educate you re: amateur
>>operations from places without a government.
>
> And so far it's taken every OTHER person (except for Lennie, whose
>practical knowledge of such things are ZERO) on RRAP to point out that you
>were wrong, Brain.

Not so. The only one agreeing with the gunnery nurse is the Dill Instructor. [two different personalities in same corpus]

> You've been very resillient to accepting the truth, but in doing so you'd
>have to admit you were wrong, and we know THAT would never happen.

Ah! It's Mirror Time again!

Let's see..."hostile actions"...invents radio services...won't accept documentary proof in terms of e-mailed scans...doesn't know the language he cusses others out in...wrong data entries on government forms...all those blunders besides typos.

>>And all without a single "thank you."
>
> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your tall
>tale SOUND valid?

Brian's remarks were FAR more plausible than the whiny, angry, wants-to-fight-all-the-time gunnery nurse ever wrote.

Everyone that doesn't agree with the gunnery nurse is described by her as a "liar" and gets cussed at in a language she doesn't know. That's a mental case syndrome if there ever was one.

> Brain Burke trying to tell Dave Heil about DXing skills is like The
>Three Stooges trying to tell Fred Astaire how to dance.

Too bad there's NO "Brain Burke" here.

Sucking up to your SS commander, gunnery nurse?

How do you clean his monocle? [don't answer, none really wants
to know...]

You trying to tell the experienced in HF communications "how it is
done" for 24/7 ops is a very bad silent comedy when the projector
has its lamp burned out.

So, big fella, how was Somalia when you were there supervising
amateur radio and checking everyone's logs? Were the logs
properly placed in the latrines? See any "hostile action" there?
Or were you as openly hostile there are you are in here?

[I just love these "meaningful discussions" nursie does...]

LHA / WMD

4700. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232346.23112.00000394@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92763

In article <20040608205832.29588.00000690@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081345.350d924a@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>>> > yet you
>>> >> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>>> >
>>> >Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
>>>
>>> From you, Brain.
>>
>>Couldn't have. I've never said that.
>
> Uh huh.
>
>>> On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
>>> "logs".
>>>
>>> THAT says "lost".
>>
>>You've got 24 hours to Google that up, or you will forever be branded
>>a LIAR.
>
> I could wade through Google for days through one manifestation of "lost"
>or another of yours, Brain.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...still with the "meaningful discussion" thing, nursie?

No real problem. Everyone knows that any disagreement with your holiness will result in personal attacks and charges of "lying."

Scanned documentation sent you in e-mail is ignored and you continue to call those who send it for "liars."

Government documents, such as DoD Directive 4650.2 (effective 21 Nov 03) are disregarded so that you can make weird, wired statements of "truth" which are quite wrong.

You get totally pissed when someone has some REAL experience
and demand all kinds of "proof" which you then ignore and proceed
to attack the person very personally (and using cuss words from
languages you don't know...in weird belief that "makes it okay").

>>> >> How inept.
>>> >
>>> >What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
>>> >quota. Better go easy.
>>>
>>> Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".
>>
>>No, you did. You've asserted that I "lost" my /T5 logs, or that I
>>"can't find" them. That is false. Completely false.
>
> Then why can't you provide us with any information from them?

Who the hell do you think you are, the Attorney General?

You aren't. You HAVE made an ash of yourself without much croft.

> You said you couldn't find them.
>
> Now you say that's not true.
>
> Are you a pathological liar or are you inept?

Poor nursie. Mind gone in a rage of hatred of certain others.

Never used "pathology" in the correct sense, then calls those
he hates for "liars." Sad case.

>>Now Google up where I said that.
>
> And if I do...?!?! I've "Googled up" other assertions by you and the
Lame
>One before and you just tried to spin out of those too. What's the use?

More "meaningful discussion" which consists of calling others names
and trying to avenge past losing arguments in this newsgroup.

Poor baby.

>>> So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have
>>previously
>>> told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or
>>misplaced.
>>
>>I have logs. I've always said that I have the logas, and know that
>>you're not in them. I know exactly where the logs are. I've never
>>said that my logs were "lost" or that I "can't find" or that I
>>"misplaced" them.
>>
>>You have made a false assertion.

>>
>>You have been challenged to Google up the post where I've said the
>>things that you say I've said.
>
> You've said you "can't find them".
>
> THEN when pressed on that, no one is IN your logs.
>
> Then you won't tell us ANYONE who was in your logs.

Gunnery nurse has laid lots of logs out in this newsgroup.

Problem is, those don't have any writing on them and don't
belong in here...yet they keep coming.

The sanitary detail ought to get to work in here.

>
>>> I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting
>>tied up
>>> in your own mistruths.
>>
>>Absolutely not. I know exactly what I've said. So Google it up, you
>>peddler of mistruths.
>
> Nice try on the reversal, Brain...but you've had two years to make good
>on your claims.
>
> You've not done it.
>
> Brian Burke is either a liar or grossly inept.
>
> It really is THAT simple.

Gunnery nurse has totally flipped out.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie needs mental therapy for all that hatred and
desire for revenge burning deep. Straightjacket and rubber room
is a good start, followed by a real MD prescribing an appropriate
medication to calm the raving beastie within.

It's amazing how FAR from the original topic some of these threads
achieve once the gunnery nurses are let loose to roam and cuss
and call everyone "liars!"

Not quite what I'd call a good feeling for getting a ham license.

LHA / WMD

4701. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:23:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040608232347.23112.00000395@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92758

In article <20040608204341.29588.00000686@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406081424.5d05d064@posting.google.com>
>
>>Don't you realize by now that you won't get answers to your questions?
>
> We've been looking for signs of intelligent life in space, haven't found it
>so far, but we keep looking.

Who are you...Captain Video? Buck Rogers?

So far you've not made any "meaningful discussion" let alone "intelligence" in here.

How many SETI data units have you processed?

"Countless" units?

Let's all hear it for Amateur Astronaut Captain Buck Video!

LHA / WMD

4702. Re: R.R.A.P Net reminder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 03:32:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406081932.6e9ece9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92764

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns950299469345Eelektrosmdonet@192.168.0.2>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0406080358.34374d74@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns9501EED006609elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:xM9xc.7535$IQ2.5171978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> > We're trying. So far I've logged two r.r.a.p regulars and am always
> >> > looking for more. Was also lucky enough to work W0EX before his
> >> > untimely passing. Sadly, not N0BK though. The net is named in honor
> >> > of these two SK's. (n0Bk & w0eX, hence BXNet.)
> >> >
> >> > Please feel free to check in. It's a whole lot more fun OTA, than on
> >> > the NG.
> >> >:-)
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> > "Howdy" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:c39xc.3357$k01.2306@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >> Wow, pretty cool. Is this a regular event?
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> >> news:Io7xc.6727$IQ2.4629257@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> >> > Tonight (6/7/04) at 2100 EST or 0100z (6/8/04)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 7037 kHz
> >> >> >
> >> >> > CQ CQ BXN BXN de WA2SI QNI? K
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> >> > WA2SI
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
```

> >> It would be b****y CW though, wouldn't it?
> >
> > Hee, hee, hee, YES!
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Perhaps we could do a phone net on 7237? Not tonight, though.

Yeah, why not ssb and CW versions?

Getting past the usual RRAP nonsense and getting a bit serious for once I'd like toss out a thought. RRAP on-the-air getogethers have a (very short) history and some lessons came out of that history. In the first of these sessions a few years ago it turned out to be something of a "long distance" CW round table. PA to CA, MN to TX, everybody copied everybody Q5 at 0130Z +/-. Almost. Helluva lot of fun. But copy this: Both N2EY and I are both in the Philly area. AC6XG didn't exactly overload the front end of my RX but nearby N2EY was even weaker and I had a bad time with copying him. There wasn't much groundwave propagation between Jim and so poof, he skipped right over me. No surprise there considering the freq and time of day.

So I have a suggestion. Or two. From what I can tell all the current crop of parties interested in pulling off another one of these sessions be it CW or ssb or both are all rather close together in the mid-Atlantic states. Without further droning on on my part here you guys might consider moving the effort to 80/75M if you try it after dark or maybe on 40M during some weekend mid-afternoon when the gods of propagation usually smile more favorably on medium and short haul HF comms.

> 73 de N3KIP

w3rv

4703. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 04:36:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609003639.29277.00000371@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92768

In article <20040608213553.29588.00000697@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>>
>>> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
>>> the URI micro-antennas.
>>>
>>> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
>>>
>>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>>
>>Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting
>
> Is that as opposed as to posting your crap with your hands, Brain...?!?!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Still the angry, snarling Log Inspector not understanding a little humor from the newsgroup of the past?

Have you worked Rob Vincent yet on any antenna?

Has nursie told the When and Where of all those "hostile actions" along with documented proof for a reference?

Was J.Lo any good? What was she wearing at your front door, begging to be pleasured? Did she like the whips and chains you prefer?

Did you wow her with your ham radio expertise? [others would call that a "quickie."]

How was it on the air for the RRAPnet?

The world wants to know...

LHA / WMD

4704. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 04:36:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609003640.29277.00000372@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92765

In article <20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
>
>>Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
>>can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
>>years ago, it really didn't look that way.
>
> Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
>happened....

So, was there a lot of gunfire and gore in all your "hostile actions?"

Was J.Lo any good at begging? How was she?

Did nursie sign into the RRAPnet at 9 PM eastern? No? Got your code key hand battered doing all that "public service work?"

Did you "tune your frequency so carefully that you 'deserve' that extra class"? Missed them, ey? Too bad.

No problem. You've got all those "credentials" and "awards" and your full "honorable" service record to fall back on...

Still off the meds, huh? Not good.

LHA / WMD

4705. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 04:36:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609003641.29277.00000373@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92766

In article <20040608213930.29588.00000698@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 6:31 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081531.5d567e10@posting.google.com>
>
>>It's quite sad that an quasi-adult (ok, ok, so he's closing in on 50)
>>has to continually scramble for recognition from some kind of uniform
>>or badge or license or callsign.
>
> Hmmmmm...Coming from a Boy Scout Leader, the "some kind of uniform" and
>badges comment was cute!
>
>>That would probably indicate some kind of insecurity or lack of
>>self-worth.
>
> Or sense of accomplishment.

Sewing on all those patches and badges takes skill and perseverance.
Of course it is an accomplishment for all that sewing!

"As ye sew so shall ye rip" or something like that.

See? Your all tied up in nuts and can't move anything but snarly
lips muttering angry comments...and sometimes in languages
you can't understand.

[such a goyim, such a schmuck...oy, gevalt!]

It must be this wonderful nature of "meaningful discussion" going
on... :-)

Too bad no one is really "discussing" amateur radio, only other
personalities. Tsk, tsk.

LHA / WMD

4706. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 04:36:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609003642.29277.00000374@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92767

In article <20040608213209.29588.00000695@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/8/2004 4:54 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081354.39600971@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
>>> And that would be " a person"...not "people".
>>
>>I don't think it would take that much to get a violent reaction from
>>you, so please stay away from me.
>
> You'll only get a "violent reaction" if you brandish a weapon.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...getting angry because someone interrupted your time "pleasuring J.Lo as she begged you to?" :-)

You've opened the bottle of brandish again, haven't you?

Don't drink and newsgroup...

> As for staying away, I doubt that will be a problem...You seem to haev a
>strong aversion to doing anything in a positive interactive manner with other
>Amateurs.

Whoa! It's Mirror Time!

> You do, however, seem to prefer the company of young boys.

And the gunnery nurse prefers the company of his fantasies and dreams of "pleasuring Jennifer Lopez as she 'begged' him to."

...and then getting in here when unable to play well with others.

>>> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing for
>>> the last two years. That I can do from here.
>>
>>I offer you some constructive criticism (get mental health help), but
>>you point and snicker? You libs are all alike.
>
> I am sure you wish I was a liberal.

Most of us wish you were a homo sapiens. :-)

You DO act like you are homogenized hatred in a bottle.

> And I am still awaiting your presentation of credentials that would
>substantiate your recommendation for seeking "mental health help".

No problem. No "credentials" needed to see someone rant and
rave, misspell words in the rage of angry reply typing, refuse to
accept military directives and government regulations when they
are explained to you, cuss out others in languages you don't
know, pretend to know so much about "radio" but demonstrate
you know squat, tell tall tales of derring-do that can't be proved
by anyone, calling everyone that disagrees with for "liar" and
lots of other nutso behavior.

Not even an AA in psychology is needed for "diagnosing" mental
instability on the part of the gunnery nurse.

> I on the otherhand DO have experience in dealing with people who have
>various mental problems, and you seem to manifest examples of those problems.

Yes you do, as is proved by your "J.Lo at your door begging you to
pleasure her." [weird...]

It must be Mirror Time!

[the glass is cracked...]

>Telling tales that can't be validated is one of them.
>
> Making excuses for failures is another.

"Failures?" What "failures?"

You still looking into that cracked mirror?

"MARS is amateur radio!" "Hostile actions" in your records!

Nursie do da commissioning of amateur radio on Fantasy
Island? Did Mr. Roarke appoint him as chief Ham hocker?

Lots of disturbed, angry folks on that Island. Not at all like
the TV version. Must be some "TVI."

Meaningful Discussion = Nursie cussing out all who disagree.

LHA / WMD

4707. KPH Morse To Air July 13 @ 0001 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 13:45:24 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <632ec0tgpv8j9ammg2372hsjo7etbgkged@4ax.com>
Source record: 92771

OM's and YL's,

I have received a heads up via the Worldwide Utility News reflector on oth.net that historic commercial Morse radio station KPH will return to the air for the fifth annual "Night Of Noghts" commemoration of the last commercial Morse message sent in the United States.

According to an announcement posted to the WUN list, KPH, the ex-RCA coast station located north of San Francisco, will return to the air for commemorative broadcasts on 12 July at 1701 PDT (13 July at 0001 UTC), 5 years and one minute after the last commercial Morse transmission in the US. This on-the-air event is intended to honor the men and women who followed the radiotelegraph trade on ships and at coast stations around the world and made it one of honor and skill.

Transmissions are expected to continue until at least midnight PDT, or 0700 UTC.

According to Richard Dillman, W6AWO, a member of the Maritime Radio Historical Society, work is now under way to repair an antenna so that one frequency for station KFS might also possibly be activated. Dillman indicated that veteran Morse operators, including former KPH staff members, will be on duty at the receiving station at Point Reyes, CA listening for calls from ships and sending messages just as they did for so many years before Morse operations were shut down.

For those interested in listening for KPH/KFS, the transmitters are located 18 miles south of Point Reyes in Bolinas, CA at the transmitting station established in 1913 by the American Marconi Co. The original KPH transmitters, receivers and antennas will be used to activate frequencies in all the commercial maritime HF bands and on MF as well.

KPH will transmit on 4247.0, 6477.5, 8642.0, 12808.5, 17016.8 and 22477.5kc on HF and 500 and 426kc on MF. If KFS is activated, transmissions will be on 12695.5kc. These frequencies have been made available through the cooperation of Globe Wireless, the current owner of the KPH and KFS station licenses.

Dillman notes that many of the transmitters will be 50s vintage RCA sets. Power output will be 4 to 5kW. The transmitting antennas include a Marconi T for MF, double extended Zepps for 4, 6 and 8Mc and H over 2s for 12, 16m and 22Mc.

Operators will listen for calls from ships on 4184.0, 6276.0, 8368.0, 12552.0, 16736.0 and 22280.5kc on HF and 500kc on MF.

KPH, and KFS if activated, will send traffic lists, weather and press broadcasts as well as special commemorative messages, many of which will be sent by hand. At other times the KPH and KFS "wheel" will be sent to mark the transmitting frequencies.

Reception reports may be sent to:

Ms. DA Stoops
P.O. Box 381
Bolinas CA 94924-0381
USA

Ms. Stoops is a former KPH operator and was the first female telegrapher hired at the station.

Members of the public are invited to visit the receiving station for this event. The station will be open to visitors beginning at 1500PDT (3:00pm). The station is located at 17400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd. and is on the route to the Point Reyes lighthouse. Watch for a cypress lined driveway on the right about a mile past the entry to Coast Guard station NMC.

KPH is operated by the Maritime Radio Historical Society in cooperation with the Point Reyes National Seashore, part of the National Park Service.

Further information may be found on the Maritime Radio Historical Society Web site at http://www.radiomarine.org or by contacting Richard Dillman at +1 415-990-7090 (email: ddillman@igc.org) or Tom Horsfall at +1 510-237-9535 (email: wa6ope@hotmail.com).

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARRL, ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

4708. Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 14:24:52 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <U4Fxc.480$tI2.74@fed1read07>
Source record: 92772

Had an inquiry that sed his Dad's call was W10XEG

Before 1946 -- I think there were just call areas one thru nine.

Sometime around 1946, the 10th call area was established -- the zero district, but was this ever the W10 area ??

Also the X in the suffix -- I thought was for experimental stations ???

Any old timers recall what this callsign indicated ???? Special event, shipboard ???

Thanks

Post any answers here please

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but "right on"

4709. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 15:15:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C72981.FCE61D45@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92773

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Too bad no one is really "discussing" amateur radio, only other
> personalities. Tsk, tsk.

Leonard, you don't seem to be discussing amateur radio and you do seem quite involved in discussing personalities. You have nothing to do with amateur radio but you've chosen to entertain us with your IEEE tales. A short sampling of some of your output for just the past week may be found below:

"Sewing on all those patches and badges takes skill and perseverance."

"So, was there a lot of gunfire and gore in all your 'hostile actions?'"

"Did nursie sign into the RRAPnet at 9 PM eastern?"

"Still off the meds, huh? Not good."

"Let's all hear it for Amateur Astronaut Captain Buck Video!"

"Gunnery nurse has laid lots of logs out in this newsgroup."

"Nursie needs mental therapy for all that hatred and
desire for revenge burning deep. Straightjacket and rubber room
is a good start..."

"The only one agreeing with the gunnery nurse is the Dill
Instructor. [two different personalities in same corpus]"

"Sucking up to your SS commander, gunnery nurse?"

"Might not last too long, that job. About as long as the "Purchasing
Agent" job did. "

"Dan, get a new eyeshade and little garters to hold up your
shirtsleeves. Be a good little telegrapher."

"Too bad you beepers can't bring yourself to USE computers."

"You are being overly sensitive to criticsm, catapult kellie. :-)"

"Did nursie put on his Colonel Jessup uniform again?"

"Heap big nutso nursie need mental therapy."

"Did you invade Fantasy Island again?"

"Several newsgroup fully-licensed blowhards have demanded
proof, nursie. You be one of them."

You are to amateur radio what a nine iron is to a basketball game.

Dave K8MN

4710. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 16:10:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <gEGxc.27040$Tn6.20966@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92774

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:U4Fxc.480$tI2.74@fed1read07...

> Had an inquiry that sed his Dad's call was W10XEG
>
> Before 1946 -- I think there were just call areas one thru nine.
>
> Sometime around 1946, the 10th call area was established -- the zero
> district, but was this ever the W10 area ??

No, the FCC never routinely issued amateur calls with "10" as the
numeric portion.

However, when ITU held their plenipot meeting here in 1998, we were
assigned the special-event calls N98ITU and W98ITU. Those are the only
examples I know which included two numeric characters in a US amateur
callsign.

>
> Also the X in the suffix -- I thought was for experimental stations
???
>

Our company holds several experimental (non-amateur) callsigns in the
WB2X-- and KA6X-- formats. These callsigns are assigned from the
KA2XAA-KZ9XZZ and WA2XAA-WZ9XZZ 2x3 blocks which are not assigned to
amateurs. Note that amateurs **can** get calls with an "X" as the
leading character in the suffix any other call format (ie, W9XAA, K2XA,
WA2XA, etc.) or with a "1" or "0" numeric character (ie, KA0XAA,
WB1XAA).

73, de Hans, K0HB

4711. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 16:37:43 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <r1Hxc.5341$5s2.1836@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92775

Yep, Ryan

10 years ago I went for a civil service exam. They asked both phonetic alphabets (alpha bravo charlie delta echo foxtrot ... and adam baker charlie david edward ... etc). I scored 100% with no veterens' points. I wasn't even called. I assumed it had something to do with age.

I figured something out. About 1 year ago, a shift supervisor asked me if I could copy one of his report's resume into the computer. As I proceeded to type the resume into the computer he was flabbergasted. "What the heck! You aren't even looking at the monitor!" Yawn.

Of course. I have typed 65 words per minute on a manual typewriter and over 90 words per minute on a 100 word per minute teletype machine. I have copied 40 words per minute perfect copy for a number of minutes (a full page of typewritten copy) in the Navy on a manual typewriter (the fastest speed they had on tape at Bainbridge, MD).

I was asked when I was looking for a job some years ago if I had ever used a computer. I won't repeat what I said. Well, maybe. I asked "did you read the f*ck*ng resume? I've been programming PCs and mainframes for three years! I walked out on them. I have come to the conclusion that I no longer care.

I was even called "elitist", which I am not. I am just fed up with certain things that are happening. I wish we all could just get along ....

One guy had a problem on a repeater. He was squawking about the need for CW. So .... I switched to F2 emission (or whatever they want to call it ... I no longer worry about it). I was gentle. I only sent about 40 words per minute. I could have sent 55. Maybe 60, but it wouldn't have been good code at that point.

My new attitude is "do whatever you want, just make sure you want it". Raise, call or fold.

BTW, I've never heard of "boy" being one of the recognized phonetics.

I think I'm developing an attitude ;)

BTW, no slam intended. I just would like some of the folks in the newsgroup to understand what is going on with some of us older folks who are still to young to retire. This is absolutely *not* aimed at you.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com...
> Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of work
> are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles etc.)
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
> > Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your
> Novice
> > Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I guess
> that
> > means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm
> >
> > Make your own conclusions there.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.701 / Virus Database: 458 - Release Date: 6/7/04

4712. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 16:38:24 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <42Hxc.1358$tI2.308@fed1read07>
Source record: 92776

Thanks Hans -- way back when --- amateurs had the X suffix for expermental and Y for college and schools

What I have found is as follows:

In the 1920's and the 1930's, Stations in the 48 States had a 1x2 or 1x3 call sign beginning with W and containing a numeral from 1 to 9. Stations in Alaska, Hawaii, or other US Possessions had a K prefix. See Pre WWII K calls. The zero numeral was not available. Boundaries were considerably different than today - for example the western sections of New York and Pennsylvania were in the 8th call district. See Old District boundaries 4 Note that the suffixes beginning with X was reserved for experimental stations.

In the 1954 callbook -- there are no listings in any district with the letter X as the first letter of the suffix.

Eventually, the FCC relaxed their position on the 1x2 and 1x3 X suffix calls, but the 2x3 call signs (such as KB6XYZ) are still reserved for experimental use. W#X** calls were also portable calls - a separate authorization was needed for portable operation and their suffixes began with X. Apparently there was a very limited "vanity call" program - if a ham wanted a 1X2 call and met several criteria, such a call would be issued. If a ham moved to a different call area, he/she had to get a new callsign that matched the district of the new location. Unlike today, you could always tell where a ham station was located by the callsign.

At one time in the 1920's and 30's, college club stations were issued W#Yx calls. So W6YX (1922) is Stanford, W9YB (1920) is Purdue, etc. Many of these are still extant -- try QRZ.com for your college.

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:gEGxc.27040$Tn6.20966@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:U4Fxc.480$tI2.74@fed1read07...
>
> > Had an inquiry that sed his Dad's call was W10XEG
> >
> > Before 1946 -- I think there were just call areas one thru nine.

> >
> > Sometime around 1946, the 10th call area was established -- the zero
> > district, but was this ever the W10 area ??
>
> No, the FCC never routinely issued amateur calls with "10" as the
> numeric portion.
>
> However, when ITU held their plenipot meeting here in 1998, we were
> assigned the special-event calls N98ITU and W98ITU. Those are the only
> examples I know which included two numeric characters in a US amateur
> callsign.
>
> >
> > Also the X in the suffix -- I thought was for experimental stations
> ???
> >
>
> Our company holds several experimental (non-amateur) callsigns in the
> WB2X-- and KA6X-- formats. These callsigns are assigned from the
> KA2XAA-KZ9XZZ and WA2XAA-WZ9XZZ 2x3 blocks which are not assigned to
> amateurs. Note that amateurs **can** get calls with an "X" as the
> leading character in the suffix any other call format (ie, W9XAA, K2XA,
> WA2XA, etc.) or with a "1" or "0" numeric character (ie, KA0XAA,
> WB1XAA).
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>

4713. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 16:50:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <s8udnUEmGNXf3VrdRVn-hw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92777

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:42Hxc.1358$tI2.308@fed1read07...
> [snip]
> Unlike today, you could always
> tell where a ham station was located by the callsign.
> [snip]

Nonsense. Even if people were still required to change their calls when moving, in many call areas you cannot tell where someone is located by their numerical character. An 8 call can be anywhere from the upper peninsula of Michigan down through West Virginia. Someone with a zero call can be anywhere from the Minnesota northern border down through Missouri.

For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again nonsense. If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities for pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4714. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:03:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZpHxc.27085$Tn6.8664@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92778

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote

> For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
nonsense.
> If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities for
> pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.

I was pretty good in Mrs. Scheiders geography class, but if we include
only normal great circle routes (and exclude long-path propagation and
KH8 stations) I can't find any part of of W8-land which lies on an
azimuth SW from Illinois.

73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

4715. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:20:00 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <4FHxc.1778$tI2.910@fed1read07>
Source record: 92779

Come on Dee -- if a W8 came on the air back then -- I knew the general
district and certainly knew he/she wasn't in California
was my point. Helpful for chasing WAS

Now a W1 comes on a California repeater and turns out he/she has had
residence in CA for 10 years.

And the DX stations have no idea who is where over here (;-(

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:s8udnUEmGNXf3VrdRVn-hw@comcast.com...
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:42Hxc.1358$tI2.308@fed1read07...
> > [snip]
> > Unlike today, you could always
> > tell where a ham station was located by the callsign.
> > [snip]
>
> Nonsense. Even if people were still required to change their calls when
> moving, in many call areas you cannot tell where someone is located by
their
> numerical character. An 8 call can be anywhere from the upper peninsula
of
> Michigan down through West Virginia. Someone with a zero call can be
> anywhere from the Minnesota northern border down through Missouri.
>
> For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
nonsense.
> If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities for
> pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4716. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ??? OOPS!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:38:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <VuSdndBD8-wq1lrdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92780

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ZpHxc.27085$Tn6.8664@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
>
> > For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
> nonsense.
> > If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities for
> > pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.
>
> I was pretty good in Mrs. Scheiders geography class, but if we include
> only normal great circle routes (and exclude long-path propagation and
> KH8 stations) I can't find any part of of W8-land which lies on an
> azimuth SW from Illinois.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

Sorry, that should have been NW. I was thinking one thing and typed another
or maybe I just got tired of Ns!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4717. Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:47:31 UTC
From: ka9tgn@arrl.net
Message-ID: <5f81cec2.0406090947.4bf882f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92781

Just a curious question. During public service events is it manatory the net control keep logs? I myself keep logs as it is very helpful during the event to know what has transpired. But was wondering if this an FCC requirement? Some of other net controls I know do not keep logs.

Thanks
Mike
KA9TGN

4718. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:50:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92782

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608213553.29588.00000697@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
> >> the URI micro-antennas.
> >>
> >> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
> >>
> >> LenAnderson@ieee.org
> >
> >Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting
>
> Is that as opposed as to posting your crap with your hands, Brain...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

4719. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:51:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <b7qdnUuTJfI001rdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92783

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:4FHxc.1778$tI2.910@fed1read07...
> Come on Dee -- if a W8 came on the air back then -- I knew the general
> district and certainly knew he/she wasn't in California
> was my point. Helpful for chasing WAS
>
> Now a W1 comes on a California repeater and turns out he/she has had
> residence in CA for 10 years.
>
> And the DX stations have no idea who is where over here (;-(
>

In this day and age with the majority of hams having internet access, they can look it up easily.

Also keep in mind that these days in the US we are all out of sequentially assigned 1x3, 1x2 and 2x1 calls. Any General or Tech who moved out of the area would either have to settle for a 2x3 call or PAY for a vanity call if they could find one not taken. Similarly Extras would have to settle for 2x2s beginning with A or PAY for a vanity call. And it wouldn't be too many years before these 2x2 calls are gone.

I was licensed in Ohio in 1992. Got my 8 call there. Then I moved to Illinois, then South Dakota, and then finally to Michigan. If I had been required to change, I'd have had 4 calls in 10 years ending with an 8 call different than what I have now. That would have been quite a nuisance.

However, the solution is simple. Simply sign /x instead of requiring call sign changes. If you think this is truly an important issue, petition the FCC to make it a requirement instead of voluntary.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4720. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ??? OOPS! Again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:53:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <6JOdnbfKv_ur0lrdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92786

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:VuSdndBD8-wq1lrdRVn-sw@comcast.com...
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:ZpHxc.27085$Tn6.8664@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
> >
> > > For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
> > nonsense.
> > > If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities for
> > > pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.
> >
> > I was pretty good in Mrs. Scheiders geography class, but if we include
> > only normal great circle routes (and exclude long-path propagation and
> > KH8 stations) I can't find any part of of W8-land which lies on an
> > azimuth SW from Illinois.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
> Sorry, that should have been NW. I was thinking one thing and typed
another
> or maybe I just got tired of Ns!
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I really shouldn't be typing when I'm tired (I'm recovering from severe
pneumonia and still spend most of the day sleeping). That should be SE.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
```

4721. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:54:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406090954.7da80d97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92784

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
>
> >Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
> >can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
> >years ago, it really didn't look that way.
>
> Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
> happened....
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I lived it, and you didn't. Got the medal.

4722. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:54:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406090954.5408e219@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92785

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608213553.29588.00000697@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081525.41142df4@posting.google.com>
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040606140152.15095.00000179@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Now show us your logs on working Rob Vincent in RI on one of
> >> the URI micro-antennas.
> >>
> >> Remember...No proof = Doesn't exist.
> >>
> >> LenAnderson@ieee.org
> >
> >Steve. What a "losser." I'll "crap" my hands when he stops posting
>
> Is that as opposed as to posting your crap with your hands, Brain...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

4723. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 17:54:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <D7KdnUC1Ju7y0lrdRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92787

"ka9tgn" <ka9tgn@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:5f81cec2.0406090947.4bf882f9@posting.google.com...
> Just a curious question. During public service events is it manatory
> the net control keep logs? I myself keep logs as it is very helpful
> during the event to know what has transpired. But was wondering if
> this an FCC requirement? Some of other net controls I know do not
> keep logs.
>
>
> Thanks
> Mike
> KA9TGN

No there is no logging requirement. However many people do prefer to do so.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4724. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 18:02:36 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <0hIxc.2182$tI2.1829@fed1read07>
Source record: 92788

Read Part 97 of FCC rules for your answer
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"ka9tgn" <ka9tgn@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:5f81cec2.0406090947.4bf882f9@posting.google.com...
> Just a curious question. During public service events is it manatory
> the net control keep logs? I myself keep logs as it is very helpful
> during the event to know what has transpired. But was wondering if
> this an FCC requirement? Some of other net controls I know do not
> keep logs.
>
>
> Thanks
> Mike
> KA9TGN

4725. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 18:13:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091013.602b11f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92789

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608213930.29588.00000698@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081531.5d567e10@posting.google.com>
>
> >It's quite sad that an quasi-adult (ok, ok, so he's closing in on 50)
> >has to continually scramble for recognition from some kind of uniform
> >or badge or license or callsign.
>
> Hmmmmm...Coming from a Boy Scout Leader, the "some kind of uniform" and
> badges comment was cute!

Badges? I don't need no stinking badges.

I put on a hat so that the other parents can see that they have
someone to come to if they have an issue. Not into the whole
"authority" thing. Your mileage absolutely varies.

> >That would probably indicate some kind of insecurity or lack of
> >self-worth.
>
> Or sense of accomplishment.

I've accomplished enough in this lifetime. Now I want to make sure my
son's have a good environment to begin their accomplishments.

> Please remind me of the last significant public service accomplishment YOU
> fulfilled, Brain...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I killed some invasive species a couple of weeks ago. I'm going to do
the same next week.

4726. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ??? OOPS!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 18:15:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OsIxc.27126$Tn6.16709@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92790

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:VuSdndBD8-wq1lrdRVn-sw@comcast.com...
>
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:ZpHxc.27085$Tn6.8664@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
> >
> > > For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
> > nonsense.
> > > If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities
for
> > > pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.
> >
> > I was pretty good in Mrs. Scheiders geography class, but if we
include
> > only normal great circle routes (and exclude long-path propagation
and
> > KH8 stations) I can't find any part of of W8-land which lies on an
> > azimuth SW from Illinois.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
>
> Sorry, that should have been NW.

Hmmm..... maybe I need to recalibrate my astrolabe. I can't make
anything with "W" fit the conditions.

73, de Hans, K0HB (somewhere in Zero-land)

4727. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 19:08:43 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07>
Source record: 92791

Yep agreed

Re: running out of callsigns There is always WAA6X -- hey its a 3 by one for extras (26x26= 676 new calls) bring back the 20wpm code test for extras and they will last a lot longer (:-)

And there are tons of 1x3's available from silent keys and upgraders - Check QRZ

And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled calls will be available

Now back to W10XEG any ideas what this call was ???
--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but "right on"
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message news:b7qdnUuTJfI001rdRVn-tA@comcast.com...
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:4FHxc.1778$tI2.910@fed1read07...
> > Come on Dee -- if a W8 came on the air back then -- I knew the general
> > district and certainly knew he/she wasn't in California
> > was my point. Helpful for chasing WAS
> >
> > Now a W1 comes on a California repeater and turns out he/she has had
> > residence in CA for 10 years.
> >
> > And the DX stations have no idea who is where over here (;-(
> >
>
>
> In this day and age with the majority of hams having internet access, they
> can look it up easily.
>
> Also keep in mind that these days in the US we are all out of sequentially
> assigned 1x3, 1x2 and 2x1 calls. Any General or Tech who moved out of the
> area would either have to settle for a 2x3 call or PAY for a vanity call if
> they could find one not taken. Similarly Extras would have to settle for
> 2x2s beginning with A or PAY for a vanity call. And it wouldn't be too many
> years before these 2x2 calls are gone.
>

> I was licensed in Ohio in 1992. Got my 8 call there. Then I moved to
> Illinois, then South Dakota, and then finally to Michigan. If I had been
> required to change, I'd have had 4 calls in 10 years ending with an 8 call
> different than what I have now. That would have been quite a nuisance.
>
> However, the solution is simple. Simply sign /x instead of requiring call
> sign changes. If you think this is truly an important issue, petition the
> FCC to make it a requirement instead of voluntary.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4728. RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 20:10:57 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <l9Kxc.8111$uX2.7102@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92792

```
The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in May 2004 Final Count
```

[131] Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.7%
[98] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 9.5%
[76] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 7.4%
[66] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 6.4%
[66] Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> 6.4%
[52] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 5.0%
[47] N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> 4.5%
[36] K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 3.5%
[25] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> 2.4%
[19] Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> 1.8%

```
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."
```

4729. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ??? OOPS!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 20:19:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <JsqdnWpVPunB7FrdRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92793

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:OsIxc.27126$Tn6.16709@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:VuSdndBD8-wq1lrdRVn-sw@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:ZpHxc.27085$Tn6.8664@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote
> > >
> > > > For those who say that it helps them point their beam, once again
> > > nonsense.
> > > > If someone in Illinois hears an 8 call, the range of possibilities
> for
> > > > pointing that beam goes from NNE to SW.
> > >
> > > I was pretty good in Mrs. Scheiders geography class, but if we
> include
> > > only normal great circle routes (and exclude long-path propagation
> and
> > > KH8 stations) I can't find any part of of W8-land which lies on an
> > > azimuth SW from Illinois.
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID
> >
> > Sorry, that should have been NW.
>
> Hmmm..... maybe I need to recalibrate my astrolabe. I can't make
> anything with "W" fit the conditions.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB (somewhere in Zero-land)

I shouldn't write replies when I'm tired. I've been recuperating from a
very severe case of pneumonia and still sleep most of the day and night.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4730. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 20:23:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <J6Kdnd-QHID971rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 92794

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07...
>
> Yep agreed
>
> Re: running out of callsigns There is always WAA6X -- hey its a 3 by one
for
> extras (26x26= 676 new calls) bring back the 20wpm code test for extras
and
> they will last a lot longer (:-)
>
> And there are tons of 1x3's available from silent keys and upgraders -
Check
> QRZ
>

Available ONLY as VANITY calls. Thus the ham would have to pay for the
call.

> And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled
calls
> will be available
>

At this time the FCC is not recyling any calls except by request through the
vanity program.

> Now back to W10XEG any ideas what this call was ???
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4731. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 20:32:26 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <utKxc.4939$tI2.4127@fed1read07>
Source record: 92795

So its not a lack of callsigns it is a matter of _____________
oh well

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:J6Kdnd-QHID971rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07...
> >
> > Yep agreed
> >
> > Re: running out of callsigns There is always WAA6X -- hey its a 3 by one
> for
> > extras (26x26= 676 new calls) bring back the 20wpm code test for extras
> and
> > they will last a lot longer (:-)
> >
> > And there are tons of 1x3's available from silent keys and upgraders -
> Check
> > QRZ
> >
>
> Available ONLY as VANITY calls. Thus the ham would have to pay for the
> call.
>
> > And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled
> calls
> > will be available
> >
>
> At this time the FCC is not recyling any calls except by request through
the
> vanity program.
>
> > Now back to W10XEG any ideas what this call was ???
> > --
> > Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4732. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 20:35:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609163500.29277.00000384@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 92796

In article <40C72981.FCE61D45@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Too bad no one is really "discussing" amateur radio, only other
>> personalities. Tsk, tsk.
>
>Leonard, you don't seem to be discussing amateur radio and you do seem
>quite involved in discussing personalities.

They dis-cuss me, now they get dis-cussed right back. Very
easy..."it just seems to write itself," those replies... :-)

I didn't start the cussing of personalities, big state honcho.

If you don't like this "dis-cussing" then cancel everyone's access.
You seem to think you have the Power. Go for it. Just don't
cry and whine about others when your power is ineffective.

>You have nothing to do with
>amateur radio but you've chosen to entertain us with your IEEE tales.

Awww...poor baby...doing the "dis-cussing" think yourself, aren't
you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Now you are going to start a whole other series of thinly-disguised
personal attack messages all about how you are some kind of
"moral authority" on newsgroup manners and all those not talking
specifically on your approved mode of amateur radio should be
excluded from this newsgroup!

Go for it, big ex-state honcho. Waste bandwidth for all I care.
You DO waste everyone's time with all that preaching of old-tyme
"moral amateur authority."

If you are going to turn your collar around, try to get your head to
go with it, okay?

I have many friends and acquaintences who are professionals, IEEE
members, and also licensed radio amateurs. KD6JG is one of
those, so is W6MJN. N2JTV may not be an IEEE member but his
with another professional group of FAA employees.

Gene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, was assigned to the same military job
I had at Army station ADA, same duties initially but on a different
shift. Our billet was at Hardy Barracks, one of the last of the old
U.S. military sites (much reduced in size) in Tokyo. That was "big
time radio communications" on HF with a 24/7 schedule...which
you said "never happened." Tsk, tsk, tsk. Army disagres with you.

You've FAILED to correct another personal attack percussionist in here who said "MARS is amateur radio." MARS is a military radio service and so defined by the Department of Defense in Directive 4650.2 effective 21 Nov 03.

You should keep better control over those who are under your command, Herr Robust.

Gruss gott.

LHA / WMD

4733. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 21:08:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <tIydnXighsRB4VrdRVn-vw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92797

No, it is more a matter of principle. I have a perfectly nice 1x3 call. If I had to change it when I moved, the call that would be sequentially assigned would have been a 2x3. The FCC would NOT have assigned a 1x3. At the times of my first two moves, the vanity program did not even exist so I would not even have had the option of getting a 1x3 to replace my old 1x3.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:utKxc.4939$tI2.4127@fed1read07...
> So its not a lack of callsigns it is a matter of _____
> oh well
>
>
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> "right on"
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:J6Kdnd-QHID971rdRVn-iQ@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> > news:%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07...
> > >
> > > Yep agreed
> > >
> > > Re: running out of callsigns There is always WAA6X -- hey its a 3 by
one
> > for
> > > extras (26x26= 676 new calls) bring back the 20wpm code test for
extras
> > and
> > > they will last a lot longer (:-)
> > >
> > > And there are tons of 1x3's available from silent keys and upgraders -
> > Check
> > > QRZ
> > >
> >
> > Available ONLY as VANITY calls. Thus the ham would have to pay for the
> > call.
> >
> > > And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled
> > calls

> > > will be available
> > >
> >
> > At this time the FCC is not recyling any calls except by request through
> the
> > vanity program.
> >
> > > Now back to W10XEG any ideas what this call was ???
> > > --
> > > Keyboard In The Noise
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
>

4734. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 21:47:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40C78582.F60707CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92798

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40C72981.FCE61D45@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Too bad no one is really "discussing" amateur radio, only other
> >> personalities. Tsk, tsk.
> > >
> > >Leonard, you don't seem to be discussing amateur radio and you do seem
> > >quite involved in discussing personalities.
> >
> > They dis-cuss me, now they get dis-cussed right back. Very
> > easy..."it just seems to write itself," those replies... :-)

You've done it before, doing and after.

> I didn't start the cussing of personalities, big state honcho.

Actually, you've done such since your appearance in r.r.a.p. West
Virginia, by the way, is actually a small state. I've not been elected
to public office--but it's early.

> If you don't like this "dis-cussing" then cancel everyone's access.
> You seem to think you have the Power. Go for it. Just don't
> cry and whine about others when your power is ineffective.

Your lament was: "Too bad no one is really "discussing" amateur radio,
only other personalities. Tsk, tsk." Shouldn't you be the individual
to request cancellation of access? Just don't cry and whine (as you've
been doing) when your power is ineffective.

> >You have nothing to do with
> >amateur radio but you've chosen to entertain us with your IEEE tales.
> >
> > Awww...poor baby...doing the "dis-cussing" think yourself, aren't
> > you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Poor Leonard, I'm drawing your attention to that which you decry in
others but in which you are a constant participant.

> Now you are going to start a whole other series of thinly-disguised
> personal attack messages all about how you are some kind of
> "moral authority" on newsgroup manners and all those not talking
> specifically on your approved mode of amateur radio should be
> excluded from this newsgroup!

Talking on my approved mode of amateur radio? You aren't talking via amateur radio at all.

> Go for it, big ex-state honcho.

West Virginia is a currently a state. I'm not a honcho. I just live here.

> Waste bandwidth for all I care.

Bandwidth? Tell us how the bandwidth is wasted. It is either there or it isn't.

> You DO waste everyone's time with all that preaching of old-tyme
> "moral amateur authority."

Everyone hasn't spoken on the topic, Len. That must be your opinion but then, you aren't involved in amateur radio so it shouldn't be your concern.

> If you are going to turn your collar around, try to get your head to
> go with it, okay?

Izzat how you do it?

> I have many friends and acquaintences who are professionals, IEEE
> members, and also licensed radio amateurs. KD6JG is one of
> those, so is W6MJN. N2JTV may not be an IEEE member but his
> with another professional group of FAA employees.

That's fine. They are involved in amateur radio. You aren't.
>
> Gene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, was assigned to the same military job
> I had at Army station ADA, same duties initially but on a different
> shift. Our billet was at Hardy Barracks, one of the last of the old
> U.S. military sites (much reduced in size) in Tokyo.

Super. Gene is a radio amateur. You are not.

> That was "big
> time radio communications" on HF with a 24/7 schedule...which
> you said "never happened."

That's quite incorrect. I wrote that you've never worked 24/7.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Army disagres with you.

To my knowledge, the Army hasn't issued an opinion of whether you ever worked 24/7.

> You've FAILED to correct another personal attack percussionist
> in here who said "MARS is amateur radio."

Since when is it my responsibility to defend and protect you?

> MARS is a military
> radio service and so defined by the Department of Defense in

> Directive 4650.2 effective 21 Nov 03.

Without radio amateurs, there'd be no MARS program worth implementing. You go on writing what you believe to be truth, Leonard. You are no more involved with the MARS program than you are with amateur radio.

> You should keep better control over those who are under your
> command, Herr Robust.

Ummm....Len? I don't have a command. Do you have a command?

> Gruss gott.

To this point, you've had difficulty deciding whether I am a "gott" or am not a "gott".

Be that as it may, you are to amateur radio like a motorcycle to a rodeo.

Dave K8MN

4735. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-09 22:36:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QP-dnf1BwtpSDVrdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92799

Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½ wrote:
> The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in May 2004 Final Count
>
> [131] Steve Robeson K4CAP <k4yz@aol.com> 12.7%
> [98] William <billybeeper@juno.com> 9.5%
> [76] Dan/W4NTI <"Dan/W4NTI"> 7.4%
> [66] Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> 6.4%
> [66] Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> 6.4%
> [52] Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> 5.0%
> [47] N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> 4.5%
> [36] Kï¿½HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> 3.5%
> [25] Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam.com> 2.4%
> [19] Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> 1.8%

Gawlee, Grï¿½mwï¿½tch! Glad you cared enough to make the count. Any prize
for the winner (s)?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4736. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 00:27:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bWNxc.4302$Y3.1616@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92800

Wasn't aware they were still being used.

Go for it.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com...
> Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of work
> are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles etc.)
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
>
> > Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your
> Novice
> > Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I guess
> that
> > means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm
> >
> > Make your own conclusions there.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

4737. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 00:35:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <O1Oxc.27459$Tn6.6282@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92801

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote

>
> At this time the FCC is not recyling any calls except by request
through the
> vanity program.
>

That's not entirely accurate. One of my previous station calls, KG6AQI,
has recently been recycled and was assigned to a gentleman from
California.

73, de Hans, ex-KG6AQI

4738. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:25:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609212517.16492.00000847@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92802

>Subject: Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???
>From: "Keyboard In The Noise" KITN@cat.net
>Date: 6/9/2004 2:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07>

>And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled calls
>will be available.

A cycle is eleven years in duration.

Nine cycles is a pretty long time. That's 99 years. Average human life
is still only about 76. Be very liberal and "assume" every Amateur get's
licensed at 16. That's only 6 cycles, and then that's stretching it.

Don't know that I'd want to actrually be able to witness all 9 of those!
=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

4739. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:31:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609213152.16492.00000848@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92803

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/9/2004 4:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40C78582.F60707CC@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40C72981.FCE61D45@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:

>> >You have nothing to do with
>> >amateur radio but you've chosen to entertain us with your IEEE tales.
>>
>> Awww...poor baby...doing the "dis-cussing" think yourself, aren't
>> you? Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
>Poor Leonard, I'm drawing your attention to that which you decry in
>others but in which you are a constant participant.

BAAAAAM!

(Hammer hitting nail on the head)

Lennie is famous (infamous) for demanding certain "rules of engagement",
but then breaks them with each subsequent post.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"....Leonard H.
Anderson...alleged engineer

73

Steve, K4YZ

4740. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:34:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609213416.16492.00000849@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92804

>Subject: Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/9/2004 5:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <QP-dnf1BwtpSDVrdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>

> Gawlee, Gri¿½mwï¿½tch! Glad you cared enough to make the count. Any prize
>for the winner (s)?

I am sure Grumwitch the Troller is in that roll call, Mike. Might be
conflict of interest to award himself a prize!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4741. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:37:36 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <zXOxc.10941$tI2.5629@fed1read07>
Source record: 92805

As I sed if your careful -- our club has a 98 year old Ham (:-)
And Hams are born not issued (:-) so for Hams count from birth

All in good fun.

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040609212517.16492.00000847@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???
> >From: "Keyboard In The Noise" KITN@cat.net
> >Date: 6/9/2004 2:08 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <%eJxc.2826$tI2.1793@fed1read07>
>
> >And every Ham gets 9 sunspot cycles (if they are careful) so recycled
calls
> >will be available.
>
> A cycle is eleven years in duration.
>
> Nine cycles is a pretty long time. That's 99 years. Average human
life
> is still only about 76. Be very liberal and "assume" every Amateur get's
> licensed at 16. That's only 6 cycles, and then that's stretching it.
>
> Don't know that I'd want to actrually be able to witness all 9 of
those!
> =)
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4742. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:43:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609214327.16492.00000850@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92806

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 12:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>

>Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
>things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

I haven't stated that in weeks, Brain. You have, however... Dozens of
times.

You've repeated it over and over despite the fact that I acknowledged it
was poorly worded, and have explained my intent.

That you won't acknowledge that and move on is evidence that this is ALL
you have to try and deflect attention from your every expanding list of NG faux
pax.

It's apparent that this is ALL you have to "argue" about, Brain.

Sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4743. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:53:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609215333.16492.00000851@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92807

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090954.7da80d97@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
>> >can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
>> >years ago, it really didn't look that way.
>>
>> Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
>> happened....
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I lived it, and you didn't. Got the medal.

Congratulations. You were in-theater. That still does NOT prove ANY
authorized Amateur operation from T5 occured.

I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and several
other places if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
grounds at least once.

No Proof = Didn't happen.

Steve, K4YZ

4744. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 01:57:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <HbOdnS-HUPJpIlrdRVn-gw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92808

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/9/2004 5:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <QP-dnf1BwtpSDVrdRVn-uQ@adelphia.com>
>
>
>> Gawlee, Grï¿½mwï¿½tch! Glad you cared enough to make the count. Any prize
>>for the winner (s)?
>
>
> I am sure Grumwitch the Troller is in that roll call, Mike. Might be
> conflict of interest to award himself a prize!

At least we wold be able to truly see if he is flappable or not.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

4745. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:05:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609220538.16492.00000852@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92809

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 1:13 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091013.602b11f6@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608213930.29588.00000698@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:31 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081531.5d567e10@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >It's quite sad that an quasi-adult (ok, ok, so he's closing in on 50)
>> >has to continually scramble for recognition from some kind of uniform
>> >or badge or license or callsign.
>>
>> Hmmmmm...Coming from a Boy Scout Leader, the "some kind of uniform"
>and
>> badges comment was cute!
>
>Badges? I don't need no stinking badges.

A Boy Scout Leader without a shirt full of "been there-done that" patches?
That's all that hold some of thier shirts together!

>I put on a hat so that the other parents can see that they have
>someone to come to if they have an issue. Not into the whole
>"authority" thing. Your mileage absolutely varies.

Luckily in the organization I participate in, many of the molestation and
abuse issues that pop up in other organizations is no where near as prevelent
due to the "authority thing".

>> >That would probably indicate some kind of insecurity or lack of
>> >self-worth.
>>
>> Or sense of accomplishment.
>
>I've accomplished enough in this lifetime. Now I want to make sure my
>son's have a good environment to begin their accomplishments.

"Enough"...?!?!

Sounds to me like "mediocrity" is your goal. I am sure you have
accomplished it.

I see every day as yet another opportunity to accomplish even one more thing.

And in doing so, I am ALSO able to "make sure my (daughter has) a good enviroment to begin (her) accomplishments".

Sounds to me like "multi-tasking" is yet another one of your failings.

Sucks to be you.

>> Please remind me of the last significant public service accomplishment
>YOU
>> fulfilled, Brain...?!?!
>
>I killed some invasive species a couple of weeks ago. I'm going to do
>the same next week.

Headlice again, Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4746. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:37:12 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091837.74d69698@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92810

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608213209.29588.00000695@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 4:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081354.39600971@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608070112.16349.00000645@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> >> And that would be " a person"...not "people".
> >
> >I don't think it would take that much to get a violent reaction from
> >you, so please stay away from me.
>
> You'll only get a "violent reaction" if you brandish a weapon.

Open carry is legal.

> As for staying away, I doubt that will be a problem...

Just keep it that way.

You seem to haev a
> strong aversion to doing anything in a positive interactive manner with other
> Amateurs.

don't forget MARS.

> You do, however, seem to prefer the company of young boys.

In an Akela sort of way.

> >> Otherwise I'll just point and snicker...Kinda like I have been doing
> for
> >> the last two years. That I can do from here.
> >
> >I offer you some constructive criticism (get mental health help), but
> >you point and snicker? You libs are all alike.
>
> I am sure you wish I was a liberal.
>
> And I am still awaiting your presentation of credentials that would
> substantiate your recommendation for seeking "mental health help".

I'm sure after Columbine some people stood around and said "I had no
idea those two boys were nuts," and others stood around saying, "I

told you those two were nuts."

In any case, no one in a position of authority took notice.

> I on the otherhand DO have experience in dealing with people who have
> various mental problems, and you seem to manifest examples of those problems.
> Telling tales that can't be validated is one of them.

Which of your personalities told tales of seven hostile actions?

> Making excuses for failures is another.

Failure? I don't recall any failure, except for you to show how,
"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Hi, hi.

> >> >So you want me to travel across the country because I used to be a BST
> >> >volunteer at SAFB?
> >> >
> >> >Sheeeeeeesh!
> >>
> >> Only if you thought that your being at a social function with other
> >> like-minded radio afficiondoes was something you'd find rewarding. The
> >> solicitation invited all persons who had some past participation/interest
> in
> >> the program. Obviously you weren't that interested or dedicated to the
> >> program.
> >
> >I've always participated to a greater extent than required. However,
> >I am no longer a participant.
>
> I doubt you ever were. You've already set a precedent for doubting your
> word.

I've never doubted my word.

> What about this should change anyone's mind to the contrary? I wonder
> if you were ever more than an name on a list...?!?!

I'm sure that you're a name on a list. Probably multiple lists. I
hope someone in authority takes notice.

> >> But since I doubt that you were much more help to that BST than you've
> >> been to the "DXing Community" with your T5 experiences, no, I doubt that
> your
> >> being at a convention of past or present MARS participants would be
> >> appropriate.
> >
> >Perhaps you'll find some handicap parking when you get there.
>
> Perhaps you'll find it within you to own up to your claims.

I claim that MARS is NOT Amateur Radio.

> I doubt it, but there's always hope.

I just proved you wrong again.

4747. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:45:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091845.182ce6fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92811

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
> >
> >kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >news:<d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>...
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
> >> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > William wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> >> > > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> >> > > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > No and no.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> >> > > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4,
> I'd
> >> > > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> >> > > > I'd still put it on my card.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > bb
> >> > >
> >> > > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave K8MN
> >> >
> >> > I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
> >>
> >> Who, exactly, did ever get one?
> >
> >Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.

>
> Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.
>
> He didn't ask "..did I?"
>
> He asked "..who did?"
>
> Nice try.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Sorry Steve, you don't get one either. You've got to get on the air once in a while to snag the good ones. As it is, you're NIL.

Best of Luck.

4748. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:47:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406091847.68ec917b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92812

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406081518.18c710e8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406060305.447833f8@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040605195906.28360.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <d22b54c3.0406051336.4178bf62@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> > > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> > >
> > > >> > It's another "crossed fields antenna" type heap of nonsense which
> > > >> > defies both Physics 101 and common sense.
> > > >>
> > > >> Maybe - or maybe not.
> > > >>
> > > >> Fact is that without more info we're not in a position to judge the
> > > >> thing one way or another. Maybe it's a breakthrough, maybe it's one of
> > > >> things that is great in theory but totally impractical, or maybe it's
> > > >> a dud. Without more info, any judgement is just raw speculation. And
> > > >> since a patent application is involved we're not going to see much
> > > >> real data for a while anyway.
> > > >>
> > > >> One point to watch for, though: What matters in practical antennas is
> > > >> the performance of the entire antenna system, not just the antenna
> > > >> itself. For example, a short (in terms of wavelength) whip antenna can
> > > >> be quite efficient - it's the matching network and ground system
> > > >> losses that reduce antenna system efficiency, and bandwidth, to low
> > > >> numbers.
> > > >
> > > >Physics is physics is physics and we all know the implications of
> > > >short antennas *and* we've read the similar hype which surrounded the
> > > >farcical CFA and EH antennas to name just a couple of this thing's
> > > >predecessors. I'll stick with my "snap judgement", the thing is guilty
> > > >until proven innocent.
> > >
> > > Maybe. Or maybe it's for-real.
> > >
> > > Without detailed info it's all academic anyway.
> > >
> > > But I remember a time when it was said that "physics" would not permit
> > > microprocessors faster than about 25 MHz. Nor with more than a few thousand
> > > transistors. Etc.
> >
> > Had nothing to do with "physics", had to do with musings posted by a
> > few gloms who were clueless about how rapidly developed chip

> > manufacturing technologies could leap past the limits of their own
> > imaginations. Hoof. Mouf. Classic.
>
> Holy Cow! PCTA refer to backward thinking people as "gloms."
>
> From this point forward, I must refer to PCTA as "CW Gloms."
>
> > > There was also a very learned "professional in radio" who, when informed of the
> > > intent of the 1921 ARRL Transatlantic Tests, proclaimed that it was physically
> > > impossible for a kilowatt input 200 meter transmitter to be heard at that
> > > distance. Waves were just too short, doncha know. Physics wouldn't allow it.
> >
> > This is not 1921.
>
> As Len Anderson has pointed out repeatedly. But you didn't need him
> to point that out. You could see it published on the front page of
> any daily newspaper. Even the ARRL puts it on the front cover of QST,
> just prior to launching another edition of memory lane.
>
> 83 years later the physics of antennas has been
> > milked to the extent that the probability of anybody inventing an
> > antenna which does not utilize long-applied physics lies somewhere
> > 'way out the asymptote of the curve.
>
> Are you sure it's not back at the inflection point?
>
> > Per previous I'll stick.
>
> Ditto my opinion of the CW Gloms (previously known as PCTA).

http://www.opengroup.com/hubooks/089/0898048044.shtml

Cheers.

4749. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:52:20 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091852.584feb23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92813

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040608180828.17756.00000452@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
> >>news:<d22b54c3.0406051220.6288df96@posting.google.com>...
> >>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>...
> >>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<40C15240.905BBB02@earthlink.net>...
> >>> > > William wrote:
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<c2356669.0406040846.5e6739d8@posting.google.com>...
> >>> > > > > TeleTech <tele_tech1212DELETE@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns94FDF25FD2CA5teletech1212@207.69.154.203>...
>
> >>> > > > >
> >>> > > > > > Do people put the /W4 on their QSL cards, etc?
> >>> > > > > > Is this a big deal these days?
> >>> > > > > >
> >>> > > > > No and no.
> >>> > > > >
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > Maybe, maybe not. Depends if the portable designation makes you a
> >>> > > > different "country." If you were portable KL7 or KH6 or even KP4,
> I'd
> >>> > > > definitely put that on my card. Even if it weren't antoher country,
> >>> > > > I'd still put it on my card.
> >>> > > >
> >>> > > > bb
> >>> > >
> >>> > > Yeah, sort of like T5/N0IMD. Just put it on a card.
> >>> > >
> >>> > > Dave K8MN
> >>> >
> >>> > I did. But you're not in that log book so you don't get one. Sorry.
> >>>

> >>> Who, exactly, did ever get one?
> >>
> >>Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.
> >
> > Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.
>
> The gunnery nurse put on his Military Interlocutor brassard?
>
> [arm band says "MI" but trust me, folks, the second letter
> doesn't stand for "intelligence."]
>
> > He didn't ask "..did I?"
> >
> > He asked "..who did?"
>
> Kellie wrote: "Who, exactly, did ever get one?"
>
> That's exact. :-)
>
> > Nice try.
>
> Temper fry.
>
> LHA / WMD
>
>
>
> [these things just seem to write themselves...:-)]

You should write an auto-reply script.

Start with a standard statement such as, "That's not true," which is invariably correct whenever referring to anything Steve says. Then write a search script to find and quote the misquoted part, and then close it with "Best of Luck" or "Temper Fry" or "Hi, hi."

4750. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 02:59:56 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92814

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081540.31354fe2@posting.google.com>
>
> >> "William"'s definition of "blowhard": Anyone who questions the legality
> >> or the very existence of his claimed operation from Somalia. Kinda
> >> dangled your participle in the breeze there, "William".
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >Welp, Dave, The World's Greatest DXer, your initial comments were so
> >far off base that it took "little ole me" to educate you re: amateur
> >operations from places without a government.
>
> And so far it's taken every OTHER person (except for Lennie, whose
> practical knowledge of such things are ZERO) on RRAP to point out that you were
> wrong, Brain.

Steve, you were wrong. Still are.

> You've been very resillient to accepting the truth, but in doing so you'd
> have to admit you were wrong, and we know THAT would never happen.
>
> >And all without a single "thank you."
>
> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your tall
> tale SOUND valid?

A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
in a country where there is no other legal authority.

Eat it.

> Brain Burke trying to tell Dave Heil about DXing skills is like The Three
> Stooges trying to tell Fred Astaire how to dance.

But the Three Stooges never worked out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.
David Heil did and he knows it.

4751. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:06:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406091906.2a5fd163@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92815

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608212051.29588.00000694@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:56 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081556.25742d44@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.
>
> I have no evidence of the validity of your assertions of operation from
> Somalia.

Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.

> >Please post your discharge physical to RRAP.
>
> Please post something that validates your assertions of Somalia opertion
> or use of unlicensed communications devices being a "major role" to RRAP.

Please post legal credentials for making such a request?

Just because a stalker wants to look in my windows doesn't mean I have to open them.

> >Thanks, B-r-i-a-n
>
> You're welcome, B-r-a-i-n.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

bb

4752. Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:24:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609232451.12038.00000571@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92816

>Subject: Re: Old call sign was W10XEG ???
>From: "Keyboard In The Noise" KITN@cat.net
>Date: 6/9/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <zXOxc.10941$tI2.5629@fed1read07>
>
>As I sed if your careful -- our club has a 98 year old Ham (:-)
>And Hams are born not issued (:-) so for Hams count from birth
>
>All in good fun.

I stand corrected!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4753. Re: RRAP Drivel Roster 2004/05 Final Score

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:25:55 UTC
From: Avery Hightower <Hightower@cosmos.net>
Message-ID: <7xQxc.19926$Yd3.7003@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92817

"Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl�" <Gr�mw�tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
wrote in message
news:l9Kxc.8111$uX2.7102@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...

> The top 10 rrap drivel-mongers in May 2004 Final Count

You could get rich by purchasing all those opinions for what they're worth,
then selling them for what the authors *thought* they were worth!

73,

Avery

4754. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:30:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609233050.12038.00000572@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92818

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 6/9/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0406091847.68ec917b@posting.google.com>

>http://www.opengroup.com/hubooks/089/0898048044.shtml

Dang near choked to death laughing, Brian! WTG! I am half tempted to just splurge and get a copy mailed to You-Know-Who and his trusty sidekick, PuppetBoy!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4755. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:50:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609235010.12038.00000575@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92819

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 9:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091837.74d69698@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608213209.29588.00000695@mb-m05.aol.com>...

>> You'll only get a "violent reaction" if you brandish a weapon.
>
>Open carry is legal.

More ignorance, Brain.

Do you not know the difference between "brandish" and "carry" as it
pertains to firearms in the State of Ohio?

I do, and I ahven't lived there for 30 years!

>> As for staying away, I doubt that will be a problem...
>
>Just keep it that way.

No. I'll come and go as I please.

>> You do, however, seem to prefer the company of young boys.
>
>In an Akela sort of way.

More like in a NAMBLA kind of way.

>> And I am still awaiting your presentation of credentials that would
>> substantiate your recommendation for seeking "mental health help".
>
>I'm sure after Columbine some people stood around and said "I had no
>idea those two boys were nuts," and others stood around saying, "I
>told you those two were nuts."
>
>In any case, no one in a position of authority took notice.

Yes, they did.

The problem was one of those Constitutional nightmares. Do they "do
something" BEFORE the fact, violating their "civil rights", or do they wait
until some actual infraction of civil or criminal law takes place? This has
been discussed thouroughly vis-a-vis Columbine.

America has been hamstringed for decades by this problem.

The same circumstances existed prior to September 11th. All of the "intelligence" agencies had information that "something" was going to happen, but no one thing done by any of the plotters had violated anything serious enough to get them arrested pre-emptively.

If, on September 10th, the President had announced the arrest of those 20 plotters and thier "alleged" plot, the ACLU, the Arab-American League, etc etc would have been screaming bloddy murder, claiming the "plotters" were only being harrassed due to thier nationality or religion.

>Which of your personalities told tales of seven hostile actions?

The one who told you in private of some of them, only to have you discuss those private e mails in the NG.

Just like Lennie, you are not to be trusted.

>> Making excuses for failures is another.
>
>Failure? I don't recall any failure, except for you to show how,
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>Hi, hi.

It's "ha ha"...."Hi Hi" is a Morse Code abbreviation.

>> I doubt you ever were. You've already set a precedent for doubting
>your
>> word.
>
>I've never doubted my word.

And I am sure that you beleive every word you say, no matter how unfactual they are.

>> Perhaps you'll find it within you to own up to your claims.
>
>I claim that MARS is NOT Amateur Radio.

Congratualtions. Other than your name and callsign, you've got ONE thing you can claim as being correct. However you have yet to DISprove my assertion that without Amateur Radio, MARS, as it presently exists, would not be able to function.

(Lennie jumps in at this point to cut-and-paste various military directives, none of which disprove the assertion made.)

>> I doubt it, but there's always hope.
>
>I just proved you wrong again.

Hardly. The other evidence to the contrary is overwhelming.

Steve, K4YZ

4756. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:54:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609235409.12038.00000576@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92820

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 9:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091845.182ce6fb@posting.google.com>

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>

>> >Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.
>>
>> Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.
>>
>> He didn't ask "..did I?"
>>
>> He asked "..who did?"
>>
>> Nice try.

>Sorry Steve, you don't get one either. You've got to get on the air
>once in a while to snag the good ones. As it is, you're NIL.

Sorry, Brain. I already have DXCC. You're welcome to peruse ARRL
archives to determine that for yourself. As for the rest, not all endeavours
in Amateur Radio are "DXing"...

I am "on the air" almost daily.

And you STILL haven't answered the question.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4757. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 03:57:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92821

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...

>> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your tall
>> tale SOUND valid?
>
>A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
>in a country where there is no other legal authority.

Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.

The United Nations was the governing authority.

>Eat it.

Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a desperate
last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.

Sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4758. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 04:02:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040610000225.12038.00000578@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 92822

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/9/2004 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091906.2a5fd163@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040608212051.29588.00000694@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:56 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081556.25742d44@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.
>>
>> I have no evidence of the validity of your assertions of operation
>from
>> Somalia.
>
>Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.

I ahve no evisence that you're not a child molester.

>> >Please post your discharge physical to RRAP.
>>
>> Please post something that validates your assertions of Somalia
>opertion
>> or use of unlicensed communications devices being a "major role" to RRAP.
>
>Please post legal credentials for making such a request?

None are needed.

I keep asking you to do so for your own good. You continue to make
yourself look like a liar and tall-tale-teller with your assertions of
accomplishment, yet without any evidence that what you say is true.

That you continue to run and hide makes it even worse.

>Just because a stalker wants to look in my windows doesn't mean I have to
>open them.

No one's stalking you, Brain. You littered the NG with your mistruths
voluntarily.

I just keep trying to get you to own up to your lying and get the facts
out in the open.

Steve, K4YZ

4759. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 11:40:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406100340.41de4839@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92823

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040610000225.12038.00000578@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091906.2a5fd163@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608212051.29588.00000694@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:56 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081556.25742d44@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.
> >>
> >> I have no evidence of the validity of your assertions of operation
> from
> >> Somalia.
> >
> >Steve, I have no evidence that you're sane.
>
> I ahve no evisence that you're not a child molester.

Doesn't matter. I've made no claims to be a child molester, or not.

Yet you have made claims to sanity, and I see no evidence of it.

If you behave yourself and quit calling everyone that you disagree
with a liar, at least you can hide your problem.

4760. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 12:17:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406100417.67bd21f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92824

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609215333.16492.00000851@mb-m10.aol.com>...

> I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and several
> other places if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
> grounds at least once.
>
What if the criteria were "set foot on their territorial grounds *and*
made at least one QSO on a ham band"?

Note that the criteria doesn't specify *which* ham band, mode,
distance, rig, antenna, etc. Nor does it specify accordance with any
regulations, agreements or nongovernment criteria. Just "I was there,
and I made at least one ham band QSO"

Wouldn't that count as "operation"?

A logbook with only one entry is still a logbook, isn't it?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4761. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 12:25:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406100425.795a0856@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92825

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
> >> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your tall
> >> tale SOUND valid?
> >
> >A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
> >in a country where there is no other legal authority.
>
> Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.

Nope. See what happens when you weren't there but you start making assumptions?

> The United Nations was the governing authority.

I've never been chopped to the UN.

> >Eat it.
>
> Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a desperate
> last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.

That is rich coming from a 50 year old guy who throws tantrums every day.

> Sucks to be you, Brain.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Infinitely better than being you.

4762. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 12:27:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406100427.d3c83c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92826

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040608205832.29588.00000690@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/8/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081345.350d924a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> >> > yet you
> >> >> "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
> >> >
> >> >Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
> >>
> >> From you, Brain.
> >
> >Couldn't have. I've never said that.
>
> Uh huh.
>
> >> On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
> >> "logs".
> >>
> >> THAT says "lost".
> >
> >You've got 24 hours to Google that up, or you will forever be branded
> >a LIAR.
>
> I could wade through Google for days through one manifestation of "lost"
> or another of yours, Brain.

Then it should have been really easy for you.

However, due to your own laziness, you will now be referred to as Liar Steve.

4763. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 12:31:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <qKednbcIGqWAyFXdRVn_iw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92827

Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bWNxc.4302$Y3.1616@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Wasn't aware they were still being used.
>
> Go for it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
> news:10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com...
> > Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of
work
> > are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles etc.)
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> > > Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your
> > Novice
> > > Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I
guess
> > that
> > > means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm
> > >
> > > Make your own conclusions there.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4764. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 12:46:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406100446.5c4bfb74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92828

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609233050.12038.00000572@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 9:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <d22b54c3.0406091847.68ec917b@posting.google.com>
>
>
> >http://www.opengroup.com/hubooks/089/0898048044.shtml
>
> Dang near choked to death laughing, Brian! WTG! I am half tempted to just
> splurge and get a copy mailed to You-Know-Who and his trusty sidekick,
> PuppetBoy!

I think it was Hans who used it here originally some time ago. I knew
the Putzlet would eventually provide me an appropriate opportunity to
turn it loose on him so I bookmarked it. He did so I did.

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

w3rv

4765. W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 14:12:55 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <H%Zxc.27959$tI2.9651@fed1read07>
Source record: 92829

The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:

Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were several 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio, and then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is for experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on. The first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One of the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just have no data about it at all.

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but "right on"

4766. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 14:13:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406100613.74fecaee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92830

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609215333.16492.00000851@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090954.7da80d97@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
> >> >can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
> >> >years ago, it really didn't look that way.
> >>
> >> Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
> >> happened....
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >I lived it, and you didn't. Got the medal.
>
> Congratulations. You were in-theater. That still does NOT prove ANY
> authorized Amateur operation from T5 occured.

I owe you no proof.

> I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and several
> other places

What other places?

if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
> grounds at least once.

Setting foot on "thier" territorial grounds doesn't make for hostile
actions either.

> No Proof = Didn't happen.

Liar Steve, you could even show us some of those medals that you have,
but didn't earn. Walter Mittyism at its very finest. Get help.

4767. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 14:16:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92831

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609214327.16492.00000850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>
>
> >Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
> >things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
> I haven't stated that in weeks, Brain. You have, however... Dozens of
> times.
>
> You've repeated it over and over despite the fact that I acknowledged it
> was poorly worded, and have explained my intent.

Flat out wrong, not poorly worded.

> That you won't acknowledge that and move on is evidence that this is ALL
> you have to try and deflect attention from your every expanding list of NG faux
> pax.
>
> It's apparent that this is ALL you have to "argue" about, Brain.
>
> Sucks to be you, Brain.

You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
getting to you.

"Sorry Hans...."

Hi, hi.

4768. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 15:14:48 UTC
From: K Networking <mike@knetsworkings.net>
Message-ID: <ca9tnv$a3l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92832

There is a pirate (unlicensed) station which has used a call sign very
similar to that for years. Wonder if the operator has any relation to
what you are talking about?

Mike

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:H%Zxc.27959$tI2.9651@fed1read07...
> The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:
>
> Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were
several
> 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio,
and
> then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is for
> experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on. The
> first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the
> Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One of
> the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just
> have no data about it at all.
>
>
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> "right on"
>
>

4769. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 17:10:26 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <5C0yc.32148$tI2.8919@fed1read07>
Source record: 92833

Nope don't think so as the W10XEG dates back to the 1930's
Latest is it was probably an experimental commercial call issued for a
station in NY. Holder worked for RCA

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"K Networking" <mike@knetsworkings.net> wrote in message
news:ca9tnv$a3l$0@pita.alt.net...
> There is a pirate (unlicensed) station which has used a call sign very
> similar to that for years. Wonder if the operator has any relation to
> what you are talking about?
>
> Mike
>
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:H%Zxc.27959$tI2.9651@fed1read07...
> > The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:
> >
> > Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were
> several
> > 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio,
> and
> > then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is
for
> > experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on.
The
> > first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the
> > Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One
of
> > the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just
> > have no data about it at all.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Keyboard In The Noise
> >
> > Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> > "right on"
> >
> >
>

>

4770. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 20:29:19 UTC
From: K Networking <mike@knetsworkings.net>
Message-ID: <caag5o$da2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92834

I am sure you are correct, but I am wondering if the person(s) operating this pirate know something about radio history and want to be nostalgic. Seems they have an axe to grind agains the commission and are in fact operating right under the nose of a local office......wonder why they haven't been shut down yet?

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message news:5C0yc.32148$tI2.8919@fed1read07...
> Nope don't think so as the W10XEG dates back to the 1930's
> Latest is it was probably an experimental commercial call issued for a
> station in NY. Holder worked for RCA
>
>

4771. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 20:31:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406101231.ee2fbd5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92835

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<qKednbcIGqWAyFXdRVn_iw@comcast.com>...
> Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Yep, in every rerun of One Adam Twelve.

4772. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 22:42:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406101442.3b3608c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92836

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609235010.12038.00000575@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 9:37 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091837.74d69698@posting.google.com>

> >I claim that MARS is NOT Amateur Radio.
>
> Congratualtions. Other than your name and callsign, you've got ONE thing
> you can claim as being correct.

Are we to understand that you have capitulated?

> Hardly. The other evidence to the contrary is overwhelming.

Just as I thought. You're hopeless. May God have mercy on your soul.

4773. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 23:26:44 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <U66yc.37105$tI2.13027@fed1read07>
Source record: 92837

Maybe out of US Jurisdiction ???

--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"
"K Networking" <mike@knetsworkings.net> wrote in message
news:caag5o$da2$0@pita.alt.net...
> I am sure you are correct, but I am wondering if the person(s) operating
> this pirate know something about radio history and want to be
> nostalgic. Seems they have an axe to grind agains the commission and
> are in fact operating right under the nose of a local office......wonder
why
> they haven't been shut down yet?
>
>
>
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:5C0yc.32148$tI2.8919@fed1read07...
> > Nope don't think so as the W10XEG dates back to the 1930's
> > Latest is it was probably an experimental commercial call issued for a
> > station in NY. Holder worked for RCA
> >
> >
>
>

4774. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-10 23:31:08 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Noise <KITN@cat.net>
Message-ID: <%a6yc.37193$tl2.19197@fed1read07>
Source record: 92838

The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
country
From URL:
http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html

Used by police in New York City:

Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra

[Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]

Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:

Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra

Used by police in San Diego, California:

Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
--
Keyboard In The Noise

Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
"right on"

> > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
> >

4775. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 00:27:17 UTC
From: K Networking <mike@knetsworkings.net>
Message-ID: <caau3t$9lp$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 92839

No, they are stateside. They give a U.S. telephone number for call
in, and the location of the phone number matches about where we
have noted the strongest sigs from our company vehicle.

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:U66yc.37105$tI2.13027@fed1read07...
> Maybe out of US Jurisdiction ???
>
>

4776. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 01:06:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040610210604.19470.00000233@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92840

In article <20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/9/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
>>> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your
>tall
>>> tale SOUND valid?
>>
>>A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
>>in a country where there is no other legal authority.
>
> Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.
>
> The United Nations was the governing authority.

You are very confused again on authorities.

Sounds like the ex-murine had to leave the corpse because he not know Chain of Command or any military history, much less understand directives, regulations, or even the Order of the Day.

>>Eat it.
>
> Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a desperate
>last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.
>
> Sucks to be you, Brain.

Now THERE's the "really profound, mature response" used many, many times by nursie in here...almost a signature.

[we could go to really far adventures with nursie's use of the word "suck" so much, but that's another story entirely (BTASE)]

Eat DoD Directive 4650.2, nursie.

Digest it. Regurgitate it and eat it again if you can't digest it.

Or call on the UN Security Council to pass a Resolution saying "MARS is amateur radio" if you can't stomach correction.

[too bad we can't babble on ham radio policy in here for all the
"hostile actions" mounted by nursie and herr robust]

LHA / WMD

4777. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 01:06:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040610210605.19470.00000234@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92841

In article <1e4e3692.0406091852.584feb23@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> [these things just seem to write themselves...:-)]
>
>You should write an auto-reply script.
>
>Start with a standard statement such as, "That's not true," which is
>invariably correct whenever referring to anything Steve says. Then
>write a search script to find and quote the misquoted part, and then
>close it with "Best of Luck" or "Temper Fry" or "Hi, hi."

Sounds like a plan!

I once tried something like that with Herr Robust's arrogant
ordering in here but the script editor program just froze with
an error message box appearing stating that the "program was
in comedy mode, must wait for Saturday Night to make a Live
restart." That was on a Sunday afternoon and the wait was too
long.

If it was a movie script instead of a DOS script it might sell.
Hollywood producers buy all kinds of fiction, even SF that
isn't scientific or logical. Nursie sure isn't logical, only rock-
bound, rock-anchored Twilight Zone material. Too bad Rod
Serling is long departed..."At the signpost up ahead, MARS
is amateur radio!" [has a catchy ring to it, I think...:-)]

Hi hi and a J.Lo begging...

LHA / WMD

4778. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 01:06:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040610210606.19470.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92842

In article <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040609214327.16492.00000850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
>> >things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>>
>> I haven't stated that in weeks, Brain. You have, however... Dozens of
>> times.
>>
>> You've repeated it over and over despite the fact that I acknowledged
it
>> was poorly worded, and have explained my intent.
>
>Flat out wrong, not poorly worded.

Nursie did NOT "explain his intent" in the beginning.

Nursie backpedalled AFTER the proper documents were
identified and locations given to him after three weeks of
stating "MARS is amateur radio."

Nursie's "intent explanation" was ALSO poorly worded.

Nursie will never ever admit he do wrong.

>> That you won't acknowledge that and move on is evidence that this is
ALL
>> you have to try and deflect attention from your every expanding list of NG
faux
>> pax.

"MARS is amateur radio" statement is not a faux pas?

Nursie never once in three weeks of arguments identified or located
the documents which define and detail the Military Affiliate Radio
System. It took two others only a short search to find them on the
Internet and post that here.

Nursie has never once acknowledged that MARS is a MILITARY
radio system, not even when the predecessor, AARS, was

shown to be the Army Amateur Radio System. [he must not
think the U.S. Army is a military branch...a bad case of murine
brainwashing]

>> It's apparent that this is ALL you have to "argue" about, Brain.
>>
>> Sucks to be you, Brain.
>
>You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
>getting to you.
>
>"Sorry Hans...."
>
>Hi, hi.

Brian, one might as well give up trying to make a chunk of igneous
rock understand anything, much less agree to have made a wrong
statement any time in his alleged life. [rock as a sentient life form
has only been portrayed as "life" on science-fiction shows...]

If nursie say MARS is amateur radio, then that is all he (or she)
understands as "correct." It is nothing else. That's why there isn't
any definition or regulations on MARS in Part 97.

<shrug> Decomposed granite cannot be argued with... :-)

LHA / WMD

4779. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 01:06:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040610210607.19470.00000236@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 92843

In article <1e4e3692.0406100613.74fecaee@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040609215333.16492.00000851@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:54 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090954.7da80d97@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040608213426.29588.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 6/8/2004 6:06 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406081506.23b6499@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >Welp, its nice to see that at least somewhere on r.r.a... that people
>> >> >can seperate their disagreements from their hatreds. But several
>> >> >years ago, it really didn't look that way.
>> >>
>> >> Now if we could get YOU to seperate your fantasies from what really
>> >> happened....
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >I lived it, and you didn't. Got the medal.
>>
>> Congratulations. You were in-theater. That still does NOT prove ANY
>> authorized Amateur operation from T5 occured.
>
>I owe you no proof.

Nursie say all who disagree with him MUST show "proof."

Nursie ignores such proof and say disagreer is a "liar."

Nursie define all that is "right" in his fantasyland domain.

>> I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and
several
>> other places
>
>What other places?

Fantasy places. "At the signpost up ahead, the Twilight
Zone..."

>> if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
>> grounds at least once.
>
>Setting foot on "thier" territorial grounds doesn't make for hostile
>actions either.

Nursie "sets foot" on territorial grounds LOOKING for hostile
action! [sort of like he does in here... :-)]

>> No Proof = Didn't happen.
>
>Liar Steve, you could even show us some of those medals that you have,
>but didn't earn. Walter Mittyism at its very finest. Get help.

It's quite easy to scan a photo (nursie wearing some kind of
uniform...SOP for that) and send it as an attachment in
e-mail. Nursie no do dat.

Medals can be identified by their general shape and color of
the ribbon if the photo quality is poor.

However, that doesn't explain his not understanding the DoD
Directive 4650.2 (21 Nov 03) which defines MARS. [MARS is a
military radio service] Therefore nursie be making up own
medals and calling them true...

Another prime example of modern U.S. amateur radio
operators for others to follow and learn from...?

LHA / WMD

4780. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 03:59:55 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9504F3B5012DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92844

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in news:%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197
@fed1read07:

> The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
> country
> From URL:
> http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
>
> Used by police in New York City:
>
> Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
> Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>
> [Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
>
>
> Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
>
> Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
> John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
> Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>
>
> Used by police in San Diego, California:
>
> Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
> Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> "right on"
>
> ------------------------------------
>> > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
>> >
>
>
>

There's only one correct international set of phonetics -

Alpha Bravo Charlie Delta Echo Foxtrot Golf Hotel India Juliet Kilo Lima Mike Novenber Oscar Papa Quebec Romeo Sierra Tango Uniform Victor Whisky X-ray Yankee Zulu

I have a P at the end of my US call, and that is the one letter that causes me problems. Papa is supposed to be pronounced the British way, not the American way, so as to be correct (don't blame me, all the phonetics have only one official pronounciation, and that happens to be it). As a Brit operating from America, I find that when I do so, people copy it as 'Japan', hence converting my call from N3KIP to N3KIJ in the mind of the DX.

Now, I understand that anyone is free to use whatever phonetics they like, but 'Japan' is a bad one, as it sounds too much like the official way of saying 'Papa', at least through QRM, although not like the way Americans say it. Unfortunately it is common to use country names as phonetics. No doubt 'Papa' was a bad choice originally, as there is more than one way of saying it, but I can't do much about that.

I have tried using 'Pacific' or 'Peter', both of which seem to be common. I have also tried saying 'Papa' the American way, although there is considerable irony in that, i.e. for me that is both putting on a foreign accent and departing from the official way of saying it, which happens to be the way that is natural for me to begin with!

4781. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 05:14:05 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92845

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/7/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>
> >>> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit contact
> >>> >there.
> >>>
> >>> Funny.
> >>
> >>Nope. True.
> >>
> >>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,
> >>
> >>Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
> >>KH0.
> >>
> >>> yet you "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
> >>
> >>Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
> >
> > From you, Brain.
> >
> > On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
> >"logs".
> >
> > THAT says "lost".
>
> Looks like nursie is trying to dump a log in here once more...

Hope he wipes afterwards. Bad etiquette to dump and not wipe. But
what can you 'spect from Liar Steve.

> >>> How inept.
> >>
> >>What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
> >>quota. Better go easy.
> >
> > Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".
>
> Go back and sit down, you aren't finished...

Liar Steve wants a passing grade. Doesn't look likely.

> > So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have previously
> >told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or misplaced.
>
> Poor nursie, still trying to make a mountain out of a little pile of
> dust (that fell out of his overloaded imagination).
>
> > I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting tied
> >up in your own mistruths.
>
> "Seven hostile actions."
>
> "MARS is amateur radio."

No, no, no. "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!

> The medical discharge that turned "honorable" and so marked on
> his DD-214.

Berry berry spetchal.

> Knows exactly where the Burbank, CA, HRO store is because
> he "shopped there with some friends" yet he can't recall anything
> of the surroundings before the store moved there.

Ooooh! How does that happen?

> Knows all about Naval Air Development Center because he was
> assigned there (long after NADC was moved) which was really
> Warminster NAS (across the road).

Maybe he's psychotic and has tarot cards and all that stuff.

> Has tutored "countless" newbies and "broken bread" with
> more (countless?) visiting hams. [one has to wonder why he
> has never been caught after trashing all those bakeries...]

Most bakers are patriotic and don't want a hobo ex-marine to do time.

> Thinks all military radios are classified and therefore can't talk
> about them...even though they've not been so for decades.

Authenticate!

> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never

> ever makes any "untruths." :-)

Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
disgusting.

> Aren't all these "meaningful discussions" fun? :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

bb

4782. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 10:50:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406110250.6f6c266e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92846

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040609235409.12038.00000576@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/9/2004 9:45 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091845.182ce6fb@posting.google.com>
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608070731.16349.00000648@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 6/7/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071710.5039e37b@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Sorry, Kellie, but you're not in there either.
> >>
> >> Now that doesn't answer the question he asked, Brain.
> >>
> >> He didn't ask "..did I?"
> >>
> >> He asked "..who did?"
> >>
> >> Nice try.
>
> >Sorry Steve, you don't get one either. You've got to get on the air
> >once in a while to snag the good ones. As it is, you're NIL.
>
> Sorry, Brain. I already have DXCC. You're welcome to peruse ARRL
> archives to determine that for yourself. As for the rest, not all endeavours
> in Amateur Radio are "DXing"...

How true! Some of them are MARS. Hi, hi.

> I am "on the air" almost daily.

You're still not in my log.

4783. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 11:30:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406110330.51f979c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92847

"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
news:<%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197@fed1read07>...
> The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
> country
> From URL:
> http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
>
> Used by police in New York City:
>
> Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
> Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>
> [Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
>
>
> Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
>
> Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
> John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
> Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>
>
> Used by police in San Diego, California:
>
> Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
> Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> "right on"
>
> ------------------------------------
> > > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
> > >

"In 1956 the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) adopted the
ICAO phonetic alphabet. Today it is THE worldwide standard for
military, naval, civilian aeronautical and maritime, search and rescue
groups, public safety, (law enforcement being an exception); and...the
A.R.R.L."

http://www.emcomm.org/svares/training/itu_phonetics_10_30_2001.htm

http://vatusa.org/training/study_guides/voc1.html

w3rv

4784. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 16:50:38 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92848

```
Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9504F3B5012DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in news:%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197
> @fed1read07:
>
> > The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
> > country
> > From URL:
> > http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
> >
> > Used by police in New York City:
> >
> > Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> > King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
> > Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
> >
> > [Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
> >
> >
> > Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
> >
> > Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
> > John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
> > Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
> >
> >
> > Used by police in San Diego, California:
> >
> > Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> > King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
> > Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
> > --
> > Keyboard In The Noise
> >
> > Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> > "right on"
> >
> > ------------------------------------
> >> > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
> >> >
> >
> >
> >
>
```

> There's only one correct international set of phonetics -
>
> Alpha Bravo Charlie Delta Echo Foxtrot Golf Hotel India Juliet Kilo Lima
> Mike Novenber Oscar Papa Quebec Romeo Sierra Tango Uniform Victor Whisky X-
> ray Yankee Zulu
>
> I have a P at the end of my US call, and that is the one letter that causes
> me problems. Papa is supposed to be pronounced the British way, not the
> American way, so as to be correct (don't blame me, all the phonetics have
> only one official pronounciation, and that happens to be it). As a Brit
> operating from America, I find that when I do so, people copy it as
> 'Japan', hence converting my call from N3KIP to N3KIJ in the mind of the
> DX.
>
> Now, I understand that anyone is free to use whatever phonetics they like,
> but 'Japan' is a bad one, as it sounds too much like the official way of
> saying 'Papa', at least through QRM, although not like the way Americans
> say it. Unfortunately it is common to use country names as phonetics. No
> doubt 'Papa' was a bad choice originally, as there is more than one way of
> saying it, but I can't do much about that.
>
> I have tried using 'Pacific' or 'Peter', both of which seem to be common. I
> have also tried saying 'Papa' the American way, although there is
> considerable irony in that, i.e. for me that is both putting on a foreign
> accent and departing from the official way of saying it, which happens to
> be the way that is natural for me to begin with!

I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:

ahoy
boy
coy
dee
eee
flew
glue
hoy
igloo
joy
koi
lew
moo
noy
oy
poise
quoi
roy
soy
toy
upper
viceroy

```
double upper
ex
why
zee
```

4785. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 17:07:03 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <XElyc.54147$tl2.41685@fed1read07>
Source record: 92849

Using your fenetics
Ahoy Boy Why Toy

with a perfectly good well accepted international phonetic set

Quoi Soy Lew

Available at all Chinese resturants and B & W Root Beer Stands

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

Some one wrote
> I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>
> ahoy
> boy
> coy
> dee
> eee
> flew
> glue
> hoy
> igloo
> joy
> koi
> lew
> moo
> noy
> oy
> poise
> quoi
> roy
> soy
> toy
> upper
> viceroy
> double upper
> ex
> why
> zee

4786. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 20:27:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040611162719.28114.00000367@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92850

In article <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040608071056.16349.00000650@mb-m29.aol.com>, >> k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/7/2004 8:15 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406071715.50240680@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040606093030.13387.00000322@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> >>> >Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>> >Date: 6/5/2004 9:45 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406050645.7171a019@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>> >I could send you another N0IMD/KH2 card, though. You're a legit
contact
>> >>> >there.
>> >>>
>> >>> Funny.
>> >>
>> >>Nope. True.
>> >>
>> >>> You kept logs from Guam, a semi-rare but hardly unique location,
>> >>
>> >>Guam IS unique. All of the rest of the Marianas Islands have to share
>> >>KH0.
>> >>
>> >>> yet you "lost" your logs from a once-in-a-lifetime locale.
>> >>
>> >>Where did you get THAT piece of misinformation?
>> >
>> > From you, Brain.
>> >
>> > On more than one occassion you've insisted that you "can't find" your
>> >"logs".
>> >
>> > THAT says "lost".
>>

>> Looks like nursie is trying to dump a log in here once more...
>
>Hope he wipes afterwards. Bad etiquette to dump and not wipe. But
>what can you 'spect from Liar Steve.

Not much to expect except a lot of snit... :-)

>> >>> How inept.
>> >>
>> >>What a stupid assertion. I think you've already used up this month's
>> >>quota. Better go easy.
>> >
>> > Hey Brainy...YOU made the "stupid assertion".
>>
>> Go back and sit down, you aren't finished...
>
>Liar Steve wants a passing grade. Doesn't look likely.

Nursie no understand this are a "no passing zone." :-)

[he must be driven man, certainly not the driver...]

>> > So NOW you're insinuating that you HAVE the logs that you have
previously
>> >told us you either don't have, can't find or were otherwise lost or
misplaced.
>>
>> Poor nursie, still trying to make a mountain out of a little pile of
>> dust (that fell out of his overloaded imagination).
>>
>> > I think YOU are the one who had better "go easy". You are getting
tied
>> >up in your own mistruths.
>>
>> "Seven hostile actions."
>>
>> "MARS is amateur radio."
>
>No, no, no. "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio." Hi, hi!

[I'm still working on "J.Lo at his door begging him to pleasure her..."]

>> The medical discharge that turned "honorable" and so marked on
>> his DD-214.
>
>Berry berry spetchal.

DoD revised their beaurocracy and procedures just to fit the veteran
of all those "hostile actions!"

>> Knows exactly where the Burbank, CA, HRO store is because
>> he "shopped there with some friends" yet he can't recall anything
>> of the surroundings before the store moved there.

>
>Ooooh! How does that happen?

The "Magic" of r.r.a.p. Anything can happen in here...and often
does...

>> Knows all about Naval Air Development Center because he was
>> assigned there (long after NADC was moved) which was really
>> Warminster NAS (across the road).
>
>Maybe he's psychotic and has tarot cards and all that stuff.

...or just nuts...or eaten too much "tarot take" in the mess.

>> Has tutored "countless" newbies and "broken bread" with
>> more (countless?) visiting hams. [one has to wonder why he
>> has never been caught after trashing all those bakeries...]
>
>Most bakers are patriotic and don't want a hobo ex-marine to do time.

Yeah, but nursie "broke bread" with lots of visiting foreign hams
according to messages in here... hi hi hi.

>> Thinks all military radios are classified and therefore can't talk
>> about them...even though they've not been so for decades.
>
>Authenticate!

Roger that and a big FM 24-24.

>> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
>> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
>> ever makes any "untruths." :-)
>
>Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
>disgusting.

No problem. If nursie no like you, you be da "odd man out" with
all the allegations of homosexuality he's implied before.

>> Aren't all these "meaningful discussions" fun? :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD

They seem to "write themselves" as one herr robust put it... :-)

LHA / WMD

4787. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 20:27:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040611162721.28114.00000368@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92851

In article <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>
>ahoy
>boy
>coy
> ...

Heh heh heh. I wonder how many uptight newsgroupies in here
will think you are serious? :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4788. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 20:27:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040611162722.28114.00000369@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92852

In article <d22b54c3.0406110330.51f979c5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in message
>news:<%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197@fed1read07>...
>> The police and other civil entities used many different variants across country
>> From URL:
>> http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
>>
>> Used by police in New York City:
>>
>> Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
>> Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>
>> [Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
>>
>> Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
>>
>> Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
>> John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
>> Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>
>> Used by police in San Diego, California:
>>
>> Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>> King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
>> Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
>> --
>> Keyboard In The Noise
>>
>> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
>> "right on"
>>
>> ------------------------------------
>> > > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
>> > >
>
>"In 1956 the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) adopted the
>ICAO phonetic alphabet. Today it is THE worldwide standard for
>military, naval, civilian aeronautical and maritime, search and rescue
>groups, public safety, (law enforcement being an exception); and...the
>A.R.R.L."

>
>http://www.emcomm.org/svares/training/itu_phonetics_10_30_2001.htm
>
>http://vatusa.org/training/study_guides/voc1.html

Kellie should note that the U.S. MILITARY adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955, not 1956. [as one who was IN the U.S. Army at the time, and in radio communications work, I am quite familiar with that adoption, about as first-hand as one can get (without shooting off his catapult)]

1955 was 49 years ago.

Is Kellie POSITIVE the ARRL adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet 49 years ago? Or even 48 years ago?

The ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) may also have selected the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955, rather than 1956, but I expect a lot of outraged protests on that... :-)

I do know it is NOT the "ICAO phonetic alphabet" except for a bunch of anti-military peacenik hardliners will never admit to the existance of NATO, therefore they want to rename it for "ICAO."

Kellie will now start mumbling "putz" and other Yiddish endearments... :-)

LHA / WMD

4789. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 21:12:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10cka5ul2mmjtb0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92854

No problem Jim, I am one of those that is required to use the APCO (or damned close similarity) phonetics in both of what I do for a living. As a ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......

I am first to admit, every once in a while the two different phonetic groups do get intermingled...... not on purpose though. :)

Ryan KC8PMX

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:r1Hxc.5341$5s2.1836@news02.roc.ny...
> Yep, Ryan
>
> 10 years ago I went for a civil service exam. They asked both phonetic
> alphabets (alpha bravo charlie delta echo foxtrot ... and adam baker charlie
> david edward ... etc). I scored 100% with no veterens' points. I wasn't
> even called. I assumed it had something to do with age.
>
> I figured something out. About 1 year ago, a shift supervisor asked me if I
> could copy one of his report's resume into the computer. As I proceeded to
> type the resume into the computer he was flabbergasted. "What the heck!
> You aren't even looking at the monitor!" Yawn.
>
> Of course. I have typed 65 words per minute on a manual typewriter and over
> 90 words per minute on a 100 word per minute teletype machine. I have
> copied 40 words per minute perfect copy for a number of minutes (a full page
> of typewritten copy) in the Navy on a manual typewriter (the fastest speed
> they had on tape at Bainbridge, MD).
>
> I was asked when I was looking for a job some years ago if I had ever used a
> computer. I won't repeat what I said. Well, maybe. I asked "did you read
> the f*ck*ng resume? I've been programming PCs and mainframes for three
> years! I walked out on them. I have come to the conclusion that I no
> longer care.
>
> I was even called "elitist", which I am not. I am just fed up with certain
> things that are happening. I wish we all could just get along ....

>
> One guy had a problem on a repeater. He was squawking about the need for
> CW. So .... I switched to F2 emission (or whatever they want to call it
...
> I no longer worry about it). I was gentle. I only sent about 40 words
per
> minute. I could have sent 55. Maybe 60, but it wouldn't have been good
> code at that point.
>
> My new attitude is "do whatever you want, just make sure you want it".
> Raise, call or fold.
>
> BTW, I've never heard of "boy" being one of the recognized phonetics.
>
> I think I'm developing an attitude ;)
>
> BTW, no slam intended. I just would like some of the folks in the
newsgroup
> to understand what is going on with some of us older folks who are still
to
> young to retire. This is absolutely *not* aimed at you.
>
> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
> news:10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com...
> > Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of
work
> > are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles etc.)
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> >
> > > Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like 'Your
> > Novice
> > > Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I
guess
> > that
> > > means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ? Hmmmmmmmm
> > >
> > > Make your own conclusions there.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>

>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.701 / Virus Database: 458 - Release Date: 6/7/04
>
>

4790. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 21:17:49 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10cka5v1o58vsb1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92855

Actually during a public service event or an actual emergency event, keeping some form of log or at least a "message log" is actually a good idea. If there is some type of problem discovered later on, at least having a record of what occurred can possibly help to save the proverbial posterior....

Keeping a personal log is not required anymore, but can serve to help in some regards. I only log now new contacts/first time contacts. If I kept a log for each contact, regardless of how many times I chatted with each person, I would be killing a ton of trees.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:D7KdnUC1Ju7y0lrdRVn-hg@comcast.com...
>
> "ka9tgn" <ka9tgn@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:5f81cec2.0406090947.4bf882f9@posting.google.com...
> > Just a curious question. During public service events is it manatory
> > the net control keep logs? I myself keep logs as it is very helpful
> > during the event to know what has transpired. But was wondering if
> > this an FCC requirement? Some of other net controls I know do not
> > keep logs.
> >
> >
> > Thanks
> > Mike
> > KA9TGN
>
> No there is no logging requirement. However many people do prefer to do
so.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4791. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 21:28:30 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <40CA23FE.8247BD31@firstinter.net>
Source record: 92853

Keyboard In The Noise wrote:
>
> The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:
>
> Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were several
> 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio, and
> then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is for
> experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on. The
> first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the
> Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One of
> the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just
> have no data about it at all.
>
> --
> Keyboard In The Noise
>
> Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> "right on"

I had heard that the early "Channel 1" TV stations in NY and
Chicago were in part of the later 6M amateur band; 48-54 MHz
if I remember correctly. That is why there is no TV Channel
1 today. After WWII, the 6 M band was carved out about the
time the VHF TV channels were allocated. Do you have any
hard info about the use of 21 MHz for TV Ch-1?

Rick Tannehill
W7RT

4792. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 22:24:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4tmdnenV0OCvrFfdRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92856

```
William wrote:
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9504F3B5012DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>>"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in news:%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197
>>@fed1read07:
>>
>>
>>>The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
>>>country
>>>From URL:
>>>http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
>>>
>>>Used by police in New York City:
>>>
>>>Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>>>King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
>>>Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>>
>>>[Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
>>>
>>>
>>>Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
>>>
>>>Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
>>>John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
>>>Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>>
>>>
>>>Used by police in San Diego, California:
>>>
>>>Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>>>King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
>>>Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
>>>--
>>>Keyboard In The Noise
>>>
>>>Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
>>>"right on"
>>>
>>>-------------------------------------
>>>
>>>>>Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
>>>>>
```

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>There's only one correct international set of phonetics -
>>
>>Alpha Bravo Charlie Delta Echo Foxtrot Golf Hotel India Juliet Kilo Lima
>>Mike Novenber Oscar Papa Quebec Romeo Sierra Tango Uniform Victor Whisky X-
>>ray Yankee Zulu
>>
>>I have a P at the end of my US call, and that is the one letter that causes
>>me problems. Papa is supposed to be pronounced the British way, not the
>>American way, so as to be correct (don't blame me, all the phonetics have
>>only one official pronounciation, and that happens to be it). As a Brit
>>operating from America, I find that when I do so, people copy it as
>>'Japan', hence converting my call from N3KIP to N3KIJ in the mind of the
>>DX.
>>
>>Now, I understand that anyone is free to use whatever phonetics they like,
>>but 'Japan' is a bad one, as it sounds too much like the official way of
>>saying 'Papa', at least through QRM, although not like the way Americans
>>say it. Unfortunately it is common to use country names as phonetics. No
>>doubt 'Papa' was a bad choice originally, as there is more than one way of
>>saying it, but I can't do much about that.
>>
>>I have tried using 'Pacific' or 'Peter', both of which seem to be common. I
>>have also tried saying 'Papa' the American way, although there is
>>considerable irony in that, i.e. for me that is both putting on a foreign
>>accent and departing from the official way of saying it, which happens to
>>be the way that is natural for me to begin with!
>
>
> I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>
> ahoy
> boy
> coy
> dee
> eee
> flew
> glue
> hoy
> igloo
> joy
> koi
> lew
> moo
> noy
> oy
> poise
> quoi

> roy
> soy
> toy
> upper
> viceroy
> double upper
> ex
> why
> zee

lessee, koi boy three eee igloo ahoy?

Howl!

This is a darn funny Phonetic, Brian

4793. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 22:29:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Wmqyc.2021$Wr.120@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92857

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote

> As a ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......

No you're not.

Regardless of the article in QST, there is no requirement for hams to
use the ICAO phonetics. You are free to use whatever phonetics you
wish, or none at all if that strikes your fancy.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC #291 http://www.qsl.net/soc

4794. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 22:35:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e96dna0OaelVrlfdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92858

Alun wrote:

> I have a P at the end of my US call,

Me too, sometimes, especially if I've been drinking coffee.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4795. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 23:40:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sOKdnVRbe-5h31fdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92859

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote
>
>
>>As a ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......
>
>
> No you're not.
>
> Regardless of the article in QST, there is no requirement for hams to
> use the ICAO phonetics. You are free to use whatever phonetics you
> wish, or none at all if that strikes your fancy.

I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a person's call better if they just SAY it. Of course that only goes for the languages I recognize.

- Mike -

4796. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-11 23:51:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7Aryc.2100$Wr.1723@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92860

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a
> person's call better if they just SAY it.
>

Absolutely! Under most conditions the use of phonetics isn't much
needed.

Interestingly, in the amateur radio activities where speed and
readability under marginal conditions count the most (contesting and
dx'ing), the predominate phonetic set mostly uses international place
names.

A......AMERICA
B......BRAZIL
C......CANADA
D......DENMARK
E......ENGLAND
F......FRANCE
G.....GERMANY
H.....HONOLULU
I.......ITALY
J......JAPAN
K......KILOWATT
L......LONDON
M......MEXICO
N......NORWAY
O......ONTARIO
P......PORTUGAL
Q......QUEBEC
R......RADIO
S......SANTIAGO
T......TOKYO
U......UNITED
V...... VICTORIA
W......WASHINGTON
X......X-RAY
Y......YOKOHAMA
Z...... ZANZIBAR

73, de Hans, K0HB

4797. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:29:40 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9505D006CF015elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92861

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:4tmdnenV0OCvrFfdRVn-sw@adelphia.com:

> William wrote:
>> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns9504F3B5012DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>>>"Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in
>>>news:%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197 @fed1read07:
>>>
>>>
>>>>The police and other civil entities used many different variants
>>>>across country From URL:
>>>>http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
>>>>
>>>>Used by police in New York City:
>>>>
>>>>Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>>>>King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
>>>>Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>>>
>>>>[Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
>>>>
>>>>Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
>>>>John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
>>>>Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Used by police in San Diego, California:
>>>>
>>>>Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
>>>>King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
>>>>Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra --
>>>>Keyboard In The Noise
>>>>
>>>>Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown
>>>>but "right on"
>>>>
>>>>-----------------------------------
>>>>
>>>>>>Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?

>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>There's only one correct international set of phonetics -
>>>
>>>Alpha Bravo Charlie Delta Echo Foxtrot Golf Hotel India Juliet Kilo
>>>Lima Mike Novenber Oscar Papa Quebec Romeo Sierra Tango Uniform Victor
>>>Whisky X- ray Yankee Zulu
>>>
>>>I have a P at the end of my US call, and that is the one letter that
>>>causes me problems. Papa is supposed to be pronounced the British way,
>>>not the American way, so as to be correct (don't blame me, all the
>>>phonetics have only one official pronounciation, and that happens to
>>>be it). As a Brit operating from America, I find that when I do so,
>>>people copy it as 'Japan', hence converting my call from N3KIP to
>>>N3KIJ in the mind of the DX.
>>>
>>>Now, I understand that anyone is free to use whatever phonetics they
>>>like, but 'Japan' is a bad one, as it sounds too much like the
>>>official way of saying 'Papa', at least through QRM, although not like
>>>the way Americans say it. Unfortunately it is common to use country
>>>names as phonetics. No doubt 'Papa' was a bad choice originally, as
>>>there is more than one way of saying it, but I can't do much about
>>>that.
>>>
>>>I have tried using 'Pacific' or 'Peter', both of which seem to be
>>>common. I have also tried saying 'Papa' the American way, although
>>>there is considerable irony in that, i.e. for me that is both putting
>>>on a foreign accent and departing from the official way of saying it,
>>>which happens to be the way that is natural for me to begin with!
>>
>>
>> I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>>
>> ahoy
>> boy
>> coy
>> dee
>> eee
>> flew
>> glue
>> hoy
>> igloo
>> joy
>> koi
>> lew
>> moo
>> noy
>> oy

>> poise
>> quoi
>> roy
>> soy
>> toy
>> upper
>> viceroy
>> double upper
>> ex
>> why
>> zee
>
> lessee, koi boy three eee igloo ahoy?
>
> Howl!
>
> This is a darn funny Phonetic, Brian
>

noy three koi igloo poise

4798. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:30:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9505D01EA63D8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92862

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in news:e96dna0OaelVrlfdRVn-iQ@adelphia.com:

>
>
> Alun wrote:
>
>
>> I have a P at the end of my US call,
>
> Me too, sometimes, especially if I've been drinking coffee.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Or beer

4799. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:32:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9505D075BF013elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92863

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:7Aryc.2100$Wr.1723 @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>>
>> I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a
>> person's call better if they just SAY it.
>>
>
> Absolutely! Under most conditions the use of phonetics isn't much
> needed.
>
> Interestingly, in the amateur radio activities where speed and
> readability under marginal conditions count the most (contesting and
> dx'ing), the predominate phonetic set mostly uses international place
> names.
>
> A......AMERICA
> B......BRAZIL
> C......CANADA
> D......DENMARK
> E......ENGLAND
> F......FRANCE
> G.....GERMANY
> H.....HONOLULU
> I.......ITALY
> J......JAPAN
> K......KILOWATT
> L......LONDON
> M......MEXICO
> N......NORWAY
> O......ONTARIO
> P......PORTUGAL
> Q......QUEBEC
> R......RADIO
> S......SANTIAGO
> T......TOKYO
> U......UNITED
> V...... VICTORIA
> W......WASHINGTON
> X......X-RAY
> Y......YOKOHAMA

> Z..... ZANZIBAR
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

I already explained that Japan is suceptible of confusion with Papa.
Jamaica would be better.

4800. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:36:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040611203622.17756.00000475@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 92864

In article <Wmqyc.2021$Wr.120@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

> there is no requirement for hams to
>use the ICAO phonetics. You are free to use whatever phonetics you
>wish, or none at all if that strikes your fancy.

That's true as long as the phonetics used don't obscure the meaning of words or
the actual callsign.

73 de Jim, November Two Echo Yankee

4801. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:36:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <0vjkc01elrfck8pi7381cd1dds5hr7hu2e@4ax.com>
Source record: 92865

On 11 Jun 2004 20:27:22 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>snip
>
> 1955 was 49 years ago.

Unfortunately true, as I was reminded on my birthday back in May....
>
>snip

> LHA / WMD

73, Leo

4802. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:39:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Pgsyc.2138$Wr.1801@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92866

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9505D075BF013elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:7Aryc.2100$Wr.1723
> @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >
> >>
> >> I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a
> >> person's call better if they just SAY it.
> >>
> >
> > Absolutely! Under most conditions the use of phonetics isn't much
> > needed.
> >
> > Interestingly, in the amateur radio activities where speed and
> > readability under marginal conditions count the most (contesting and
> > dx'ing), the predominate phonetic set mostly uses international
place
> > names.
> >
> > A......AMERICA
> > B......BRAZIL
> > C......CANADA
> > D......DENMARK
> > E......ENGLAND
> > F......FRANCE
> > G.....GERMANY
> > H.....HONOLULU
> > I.......ITALY
> > J......JAPAN
> > K......KILOWATT
> > L......LONDON
> > M......MEXICO
> > N......NORWAY
> > O......ONTARIO
> > P......PORTUGAL
> > Q......QUEBEC
> > R......RADIO
> > S......SANTIAGO
> > T......TOKYO
> > U......UNITED

> > V..... VICTORIA
> > W.....WASHINGTON
> > X.....X-RAY
> > Y.....YOKOHAMA
> > Z..... ZANZIBAR
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> I already explained that Japan is suceptible of confusion with Papa.
> Jamaica would be better.

But it hasn't ever been confused with Portugal.

You are free to use Jamaica if you wish, but most experienced contesters
will have to do a mental double-clutch to copy you. There goes your
Q-rate spiraling down the crapper.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Hamming for 45 years this month, and it just keeps getting better.

4803. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:50:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_qsyc.2148$Wr.1460@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92867

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote

> That's true as long as the phonetics used don't obscure the meaning of
words or
> the actual callsign.

Thank you, Captain Obvious.

73, de Hans, Kilowatt-Zero-Handsome Boy

4804. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 00:58:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406111658.412448a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92868

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>...
> Alun <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9504F3B5012DFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > "Keyboard In The Noise" <KITN@cat.net> wrote in news:%a6yc.37193$tI2.19197
> > @fed1read07:
> >
> > > The police and other civil entities used many different variants across
> > > country
> > > From URL:
> > > http://www.bckelk.uklinux.net/phon.full.html
> > >
> > > Used by police in New York City:
> > >
> > > Adam Boy Charlie David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> > > King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam Tom
> > > Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
> > >
> > > [Variants: Eddie Larry Nancy Thomas Yankee Yellow]
> > >
> > >
> > > Used by police in Nassau County, Long Island, New York:
> > >
> > > Adam Boston Chicago Denver Edward Frank George Henry Ida
> > > John King Lincoln Mary Nancy Ocean Peter Queen Robert Sam
> > > Thomas Union Victor William X-ray Young Zebra
> > >
> > >
> > > Used by police in San Diego, California:
> > >
> > > Adam Boy Charles David Edward Frank George Henry Ida John
> > > King Lincoln Mary Nora Ocean Paul Queen Robert Sam Tom Unit
> > > Victor William Xray Yellow Zebra
> > > --
> > > Keyboard In The Noise
> > >
> > > Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> > > "right on"
> > >
> > > ------------------------------------
> > >> > Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
> > >> >
> > >
> > >

> > >
> >
> > There's only one correct international set of phonetics -
> >
> > Alpha Bravo Charlie Delta Echo Foxtrot Golf Hotel India Juliet Kilo Lima
> > Mike Novenber Oscar Papa Quebec Romeo Sierra Tango Uniform Victor Whisky X-
> > ray Yankee Zulu
> >
> > I have a P at the end of my US call, and that is the one letter that causes
> > me problems. Papa is supposed to be pronounced the British way, not the
> > American way, so as to be correct (don't blame me, all the phonetics have
> > only one official pronounciation, and that happens to be it). As a Brit
> > operating from America, I find that when I do so, people copy it as
> > 'Japan', hence converting my call from N3KIP to N3KIJ in the mind of the
> > DX.
> >
> > Now, I understand that anyone is free to use whatever phonetics they like,
> > but 'Japan' is a bad one, as it sounds too much like the official way of
> > saying 'Papa', at least through QRM, although not like the way Americans
> > say it. Unfortunately it is common to use country names as phonetics. No
> > doubt 'Papa' was a bad choice originally, as there is more than one way of
> > saying it, but I can't do much about that.
> >
> > I have tried using 'Pacific' or 'Peter', both of which seem to be common. I
> > have also tried saying 'Papa' the American way, although there is
> > considerable irony in that, i.e. for me that is both putting on a foreign
> > accent and departing from the official way of saying it, which happens to
> > be the way that is natural for me to begin with!
>
> I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>
> ahoy
> boy
> coy
> dee
> eee
> flew
> glue
> hoy
> igloo
> joy
> koi
> lew
> moo
> noy
> oy
> poise
> quoi
> roy
> soy

> toy
> upper
> viceroy
> double upper
> ex
> why
> zee

You din read the book didja?

4805. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 01:05:33 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <xFsyc.56772$tl2.27932@fed1read07>
Source record: 92869

Richard -- this all started when an inquiry was made by a gentleman whose Dad worked for RCA and had license W10XEG in the 1930's

It appears he worked for RCA conducting early TV experiments and the following quote heralds the early TV experiments on top of the Empire stae building

Quote from URL: http://www.earlytelevision.org/pendletonpaper.html

"The first all-electronic American systems in 1932 used only 120 scanning lines at 24 frames per second. This produced a blurry image with visible, thick scanning lines and a noticeable amount of flicker. RCA transmitted from both their Camden, New Jersey laboratories as well as from atop the Empire State Building to a handful of experimental television receivers located within a few miles of both areas.14 "

Also note that some early TV experimental stations operated around 2 Mcs -- see URL:
http://members.aol.com/jeff560/chronotv.html
Quote:
"Mar. 30, 1929. Radio Service Bulletin lists these new stations: W9XAO Chicago IL (Nelson Brothers Bond and Mortgage Co.) 2.0-2.1 MHz, 500 watts; W2XCR Jersey City NJ (Jenkins Television Corporation) 2.1-2.2 MHz, 5000 watts; W2XCL Brooklyn NY (Pilot Electric Manufacturing Co.) 2.0-2.1, 2.75-2.85 MHz, 250 watts; W2XCO New York (RCA) 2.1-2.2 MHz, 5000 watts; W2XR New York (John V. L. Hogan), 500 watts (visual broadcasting and experimental); W2XCW Schenectady (General Electric) 2.1-2.2 MHz 20,000 watts."

So I suspect that the sender meant 2.1 Mcs not 21 Mcs

You are correct about the later TV allotments which can be seen at URL:
http://members.aol.com/jeff560/jeff.html

Also What happened to Channel one at
http://members.aol.com/jeff560/tvch1.html
--
Keyboard

"Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net> wrote in message news:40CA23FE.8247BD31@firstinter.net...
> Keyboard In The Noise wrote:
> >
> > The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:
> >
> > Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were

several
> > 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio,
and
> > then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is
for
> > experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on.
The
> > first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the
> > Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One
of
> > the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just
> > have no data about it at all.
> >
> > --
> > Keyboard In The Noise
> >
> > Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> > "right on"
>
> I had heard that the early "Channel 1" TV stations in NY and
> Chicago were in part of the later 6M amateur band; 48-54 MHz
> if I remember correctly. That is why there is no TV Channel
> 1 today. After WWII, the 6 M band was carved out about the
> time the VHF TV channels were allocated. Do you have any
> hard info about the use of 21 MHz for TV Ch-1?
>
> Rick Tannehill
> W7RT

4806. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 03:08:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406111908.13932bcb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92870

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040611162721.28114.00000368@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
> >
> >ahoy
> >boy
> >coy
> > ...
>
> Heh heh heh. I wonder how many uptight newsgroupies in here
> will think you are serious? :-)
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Welp, if the air traffic controllers adopt it...

;^)

4807. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 04:56:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612005605.23112.00000496@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92872

In article <_qsyc.2148$Wr.1460@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote
>
>> That's true as long as the phonetics used don't obscure the meaning of words
or
>> the actual callsign.
>
>Thank you, Captain Obvious.

No, thank YOU, Captain Oblivious... :-)

LHA / WMD

[Armenian judges are tuning up their chant machines right now...]

4808. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 04:56:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92871

In article <0vjkc01elrfck8pi7381cd1dds5hr7hu2e@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@noway.com>
writes:

>On 11 Jun 2004 20:27:22 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>snip
>>
>> 1955 was 49 years ago.
>
>Unfortunately true, as I was reminded on my birthday back in May....
>>
>>snip
>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>73, Leo

No, FORTUNATELY!

Glad you made it! Now the FUN begins. :-)

After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
:-)

Just the same, in 1955 we in the U.S. military got some mass-
mimeos on the "new" NATO phonetic alphabet to memorize
since it would become effective in a few months from that issue.
[the xerocopy machine wasn't a thing then and all orders, etc.,
were done in mimeograph form...which were "cut" on a type-
writer...hence the term "cutting orders (for this or that)."]

Good for some guffaws in discussion...like "foxtrot" for "fox"
(even the term "fox trot" had gone out of style in dancing in
favor of Latin American dances in that year...the "twist" had
several years to appear and Chubby Checker was probably
still thin). We learned "love" was out and "lima" was in (a lot
of beans that). Since we all knew "how," the "H" still became
"hotel." "Quebec" was a nice touch favoring the Canadians.
We learned a bit more respect for "mama" and "papa" and
"juliet" (for those of us who knew here, too).

"Zulu time" entered the military jargon (for the Z time zone equal to GMT) and eventually entered TV entertainment through the series "JAG." Scientists and metrologists were just then beginning to argue UTC or Coordinated Universal Time (instead of Zulu...smarts folks thought they were too good for the military or something, which we would see in the 60s).

I sort of liked the old phonetic alphabet since my initials came out Love How Able! "Lima Hotel Alpha" just doesn't have any zing to it. (hi, hi...hotel india, hotel india...)

Hang in there for 50-plus! :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4809. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:06:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612030613.11516.00001111@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92873

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 6:40 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100340.41de4839@posting.google.com>

>If you behave yourself and quit calling everyone that you disagree
>with a liar, at least you can hide your problem.

My only "problem", Brain, is not tolerating persons who have been proven
to be liars.

Two names come to immediate mind.

Steve, K4YZ

4810. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:09:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612030913.11516.00001112@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92874

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100425.795a0856@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>...

>> Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.
>
>Nope. See what happens when you weren't there but you start making
>assumptions?

No assumption.

The Somalia mission was a United Nations effort.

>> The United Nations was the governing authority.
>
>I've never been chopped to the UN.

You were if you were there for Restore Hope.

>> >Eat it.
>>
>> Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a
>desperate
>> last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.
>
>That is rich coming from a 50 year old guy who throws tantrums every day.

Who's 50?

>> Sucks to be you, Brain.

>Infinitely better than being you.

How would you know? You can't even get your own stories straight.

STILL sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4811. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:11:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612031116.11516.00001113@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92875

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100427.d3c83c8@posting.google.com>

>> I could wade through Google for days through one manifestation of
>"lost"
>> or another of yours, Brain.
>
>Then it should have been really easy for you.
>
>However, due to your own laziness, you will now be referred to as Liar Steve.

OK...

One problem. It wouldn't be true.

Unfortunately, however, you've already established a two year long history
of not telling the truth.

Sucks to be you, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4812. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:17:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612031709.11516.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92876

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/11/2004 5:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110250.6f6c266e@posting.google.com>

>> I am "on the air" almost daily.
>
>You're still not in my log.

And highly unlikely that I ever WILL be, Brain.

In most cases when I am on HF, it would take you a moderate amount of skill or dedicated software to communicate with me.

Even if you had the software, you'd still have to be able to know what to listen to. I don't think you have either.

Steve, K4YZ

4813. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:20:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612032049.11516.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92877

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100613.74fecaee@posting.google.com>

>> I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and
>several
>> other places
>
>What other places?

Noe of your business. You aren't in any of THOSE logs, Brain.

> if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
>> grounds at least once.
>
>Setting foot on "thier" territorial grounds doesn't make for hostile
>actions either.

Did I say it did? I just said I was there.

>> No Proof = Didn't happen.
>
>Liar Steve, you could even show us some of those medals that you have,
>but didn't earn. Walter Mittyism at its very finest. Get help.

Ahhhhhh...I see....In Brain's book, it's "Walter Mittyism" to collect
anything.

Uh huh.

At least the medals I didn't earn ARE in a box and were clearly reported
as such. SOME people in this forum have a habit of reporting that they did
things and went places that they have no proof for.

THOSE people are the liars.

Steve, K4YZ

4814. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:25:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612032528.11516.00001117@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92878

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 9:16 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>

>You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
>getting to you.

People who are trying to berate others over thier choice of words should
take a couple of seconds to proof read what they write BEFORE they send it,
Brain.

What a PUTZ!

Brian, you're an idiot. It really is THAT simple.

But hey, THANKS for making my job that much easier!

Steve, K4YZ

4815. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:28:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92879

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>

>I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>
>ahoy
>boy...(SNIP)

Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came up with it?

Steve, K4YZ

4816. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:34:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612033449.11516.00001119@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92880

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/11/2004 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040611162722.28114.00000369@mb-m10.aol.com>

> I do know it is NOT the "ICAO phonetic alphabet" except for a
> bunch of anti-military peacenik hardliners will never admit to the
> existance of NATO, therefore they want to rename it for "ICAO."

Hmmmmmm.....

That's funny...

APCO calls it the ICAO phonetic alphabet.

The FAA calls it the ICAO phonetic alphabet.

It's refered to as the ICAO phonetic alphabet in about a dozen different
military aeronatutical publications that I recall including the FLIP charts.

I've seen it refered to as the ICAO phonetic is several European radio
hobby magazines.

Ya figger all them folks know something YOU don't, Lennie...?!?!

> Kellie will now start mumbling "putz" and other Yiddish
> endearments... :-)

If it fits, Lennie...

Ya PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

4817. Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 07:35:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040612033554.11516.00001120@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 92881

>Subject: Re: Attention MARS & Ex MARS Operators
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/10/2004 5:42 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406101442.3b3608c2@posting.google.com>

>Just as I thought. You're hopeless. May God have mercy on your soul.

At least I have one, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4818. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 11:10:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406120310.35e9babc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92882

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040611162722.28114.00000369@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406110330.51f979c5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> Kellie should note that the U.S. MILITARY adopted the NATO
> phonetic alphabet in 1955, not 1956.

The ICAO and the ITU globally and the FAA, ANSI and the ARRL inside
the U.S. all agreed upon the same phonetic alphabet and it lives on
today. That's a documented 100% correct statement. What's your point
Putz?

Answer: "I'm just the local neighborhood putz, I don't have a point, I
never did and I never will".

> [as one who was IN the
> U.S. Army at the time, and in radio communications work, I am
> quite familiar with that adoption, about as first-hand as one can
> get (without shooting off his catapult)]

Golly dayum and holy cow, I wish I was there when you used them there
NATO phonetics on the Army RTTY repeaters you babysat. NATO-issued
RTTY microphones?

> 1955 was 49 years ago.
> Is Kellie POSITIVE the ARRL adopted the NATO phonetic
> alphabet 49 years ago? Or even 48 years ago?
>
> The ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) may also
> have selected the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955, rather than
> 1956, but I expect a lot of outraged protests on that... :-)
>
> I do know it is NOT the "ICAO phonetic alphabet"

> except for a
> bunch of anti-military peacenik hardliners will never admit to the
> existance of NATO, therefore they want to rename it for "ICAO."

<<SNORES>>

> Kellie will now start mumbling "putz" and other Yiddish
> endearments... :-)

Can't even start to be bothered, "The Putz" obviously works just fine
for everybody around here.

SK dit dit.

>
> LHA / WMD

4819. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 12:17:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406120417.76a0dc1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92883

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7Aryc.2100$Wr.1723@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a
> > person's call better if they just SAY it.
> >
>
> Absolutely! Under most conditions the use of phonetics isn't much
> needed.
>
> Interestingly, in the amateur radio activities where speed and
> readability under marginal conditions count the most (contesting and
> dx'ing), the predominate phonetic set mostly uses international place
> names.
>
> A......AMERICA
> B......BRAZIL
> C......CANADA
> D......DENMARK
> E......ENGLAND
> F......FRANCE
> G.....GERMANY
> H.....HONOLULU
> I.......ITALY
> J......JAPAN
> K......KILOWATT
> L......LONDON
> M......MEXICO
> N......NORWAY
> O......ONTARIO
> P......PORTUGAL
> Q......QUEBEC
> R......RADIO
> S......SANTIAGO
> T......TOKYO
> U......UNITED
> V...... VICTORIA
> W......WASHINGTON
> X......X-RAY
> Y......YOKOHAMA
> Z...... ZANZIBAR

Back when my call was w3yik and I used Washington Thuree Yokohama Italy Kilowatt the guy on the other end of the pileup often worked three whilst waiting for me to finish my long-winded ID speil. Hideous phonetics. Whiskey Thuree Yolk Ida Kilo worked much better. I think those were some sort of ancient military standard phonetics.

Then I "transitioned" from ham radio to a bit of flying. Early in that experience I called Philips Army on Unicom and used "my" phonetics to ask permission to pass thru their control zone at 1200. The freq lit up like the tower of babble, Philips tower simply ignored me so I had to wind a couple spot 360s up to 3500 and climb over the control zone instead getting their permission to fly thru it.

I dunno how many others reamed me a new one good for using squirrely phonetics. It didn't get any better when I got back on the ground and to deal with the hanger bums who also heard it all.

I ain't never going thru anything like that again no way nohow.

Today "Romeo Victor" cuts thru the crap like a knife. You couldn't pay me enough to use "radio victoria" if the guy is a new one. And "we" don't much bother with our prefixes in the pileups these days huh Hans?

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

4820. Some W10 Stations found! (Was W10XEG Callsign ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 14:25:42 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <GnEyc.63304$tI2.50402@fed1read07>
Source record: 92884

Some W10 stations were found
At US Television Chronology URL:
http://members.aol.com/jeff560/chronotv.html

Quote
May 31, 1930. Radio Service Bulletin lists these new stations: W10XAL United States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 2.392 MHz, 50 watts; W10XAO United States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 1.584 MHz, 50 watts.

Thanks to all who responded

4821. Re: Some W10 Stations found! (Was W10XEG Callsign ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 14:39:45 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <RAEyc.63311$tI2.56195@fed1read07>
Source record: 92885

So from all this one can asume that W10XEG was a portable experimental
station -- probably for early TV

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
news:GnEyc.63304$tI2.50402@fed1read07...
> Some W10 stations were found
> At US Television Chronology URL:
> http://members.aol.com/jeff560/chronotv.html
>
> Quote
> May 31, 1930. Radio Service Bulletin lists these new stations: W10XAL
United
> States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 2.392 MHz, 50 watts; W10XAO
> United States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 1.584 MHz, 50 watts.
>
> Thanks to all who responded
>
>
>

4822. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 17:53:56 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns95068CE6FFFC7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92886

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:Pgsyc.2138$Wr.1801
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9505D075BF013elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:7Aryc.2100$Wr.1723
>> @newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>> >
>> >>
>> >> I often don't. I don't know about other hams, but I can make out a
>> >> person's call better if they just SAY it.
>> >>
>> >
>> > Absolutely! Under most conditions the use of phonetics isn't much
>> > needed.
>> >
>> > Interestingly, in the amateur radio activities where speed and
>> > readability under marginal conditions count the most (contesting and
>> > dx'ing), the predominate phonetic set mostly uses international
>> > place names.
>> >
>> > A.....AMERICA
>> > B.....BRAZIL
>> > C.....CANADA
>> > D.....DENMARK
>> > E.....ENGLAND
>> > F.....FRANCE
>> > G.....GERMANY
>> > H.....HONOLULU
>> > I.....ITALY
>> > J.....JAPAN
>> > K.....KILOWATT
>> > L.....LONDON
>> > M.....MEXICO
>> > N.....NORWAY
>> > O.....ONTARIO
>> > P.....PORTUGAL
>> > Q.....QUEBEC
>> > R.....RADIO

>> > S.....SANTIAGO
>> > T.....TOKYO
>> > U.....UNITED
>> > V..... VICTORIA
>> > W.....WASHINGTON
>> > X.....X-RAY
>> > Y.....YOKOHAMA
>> > Z..... ZANZIBAR
>> >
>> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> I already explained that Japan is suceptible of confusion with Papa.
>> Jamaica would be better.
>
> But it hasn't ever been confused with Portugal.
>
> You are free to use Jamaica if you wish, but most experienced contesters
> will have to do a mental double-clutch to copy you. There goes your
> Q-rate spiraling down the crapper.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Hamming for 45 years this month, and it just keeps getting better.
>
>
>
>

Any word that sounds like a different letter in the international phonetic alphabet should be avoided like the plague

4823. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 18:03:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%zHyc.2703$Wr.1505@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92887

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
> >> I already explained that Japan is suceptible of confusion with
Papa.
> >> Jamaica would be better.
> >
> > But it hasn't ever been confused with Portugal.
> >
> > You are free to use Jamaica if you wish, but most experienced
contesters
> > will have to do a mental double-clutch to copy you. There goes your
> > Q-rate spiraling down the crapper.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > Hamming for 45 years this month, and it just keeps getting better.
> >
>
> Any word that sounds like a different letter in the international
phonetic
> alphabet should be avoided like the plague

Experience trumps theory, and in my experience using "Jamaica" as
phonetics for "J" would call for an instant fill and put a 3dB
down-spike on my rate meter.

If it's all the same with you, I'll just run down to the clinic and get
a plague shot and then continue my sinful ways.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4824. Re: Some W10 Stations found! (Was W10XEG Callsign ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 18:54:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <IjIyc.5777$rN7.3945@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 92888

Wow! It has been so many years since I worked at WROC AM/FM/TV and WOKR (TV). Their microwave links had some weird call signs. I don't recall, but remember thinking at the time that they resembled amateur call signs. Note I said "resembled". They wouldn't be assigned a call that could possibly be issued to an amateur, but your example of W10 would be a distinct possibility.

The calls you list appear to be remote links for radio back when. Thanks for an interesting post!

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
news:GnEyc.63304$tI2.50402@fed1read07...
> Some W10 stations were found
> At US Television Chronology URL:
> http://members.aol.com/jeff560/chronotv.html
>
> Quote
> May 31, 1930. Radio Service Bulletin lists these new stations: W10XAL
United
> States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 2.392 MHz, 50 watts; W10XAO
> United States (portable) (National Broadcasting Co.), 1.584 MHz, 50 watts.
>
> Thanks to all who responded
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.705 / Virus Database: 461 - Release Date: 6/12/04

4825. Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 22:34:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121434.b154c13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92889

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
>
> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
> >
> >ahoy
> >boy...(SNIP)
>
> Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came up with
> it?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, no thanks for the private email, even though I've asked you repeatedly not to communicate with me privately. I really do prefer to keep all comms with you strictly public. You broke the rules, but certainly in keeping with your mode of operation.

So how is it that you can call people liars all day long, give people a deadline to produce some google search, hound and hound those who disagree with you, and in general be the sweetheart pariah of the PCTA?

But when someone else calls you a liar, when you have lied, you threaten a summons. Are you nuts? No. Don't answer that question. I don't want any more lies out of you.

So congratulations on earning persona non grata. You've truly worked hard at ii. Earned, Never Given.

And FWIW, the fenetic alfabet was a joke, but leave it to the mentally impaired to think is was a serious effort.

Sayonara and have a great life.

4826. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 22:59:58 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121459.5349b6fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92890

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040610210606.19470.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20040609214327.16492.00000850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:50 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
> >> >things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
> >>
> >> I haven't stated that in weeks, Brain. You have, however... Dozens of
> >> times.
> >>
> >> You've repeated it over and over despite the fact that I acknowledged
> it
> >> was poorly worded, and have explained my intent.
> >
> >Flat out wrong, not poorly worded.
>
> Nursie did NOT "explain his intent" in the beginning.

Certainly took a lot of explanation and I'm still not satisfied with
any of his answers.

But something else is not satisfactory. He started this thread from
scratch, and claimed there was a "Rant." I didn't see the rant. I
asked where the rant was. Apparently, there was no rant.

I'm searching for a word used to describe a person wha says there was
something when there was not.

> Nursie backpedalled AFTER the proper documents were
> identified and locations given to him after three weeks of
> stating "MARS is amateur radio."
>
> Nursie's "intent explanation" was ALSO poorly worded.
>
> Nursie will never ever admit he do wrong.

It's enough that we know. It's also enough that we know everyone else
here has given him a pass on it.

> >> That you won't acknowledge that and move on is evidence that this is
> ALL
> >> you have to try and deflect attention from your every expanding list of NG
> faux
> >> pax.
>
> "MARS is amateur radio" statement is not a faux pas?

Not only is it wrong, it's not true.

> Nursie never once in three weeks of arguments identified or located
> the documents which define and detail the Military Affiliate Radio
> System. It took two others only a short search to find them on the
> Internet and post that here.

Deliberate stupidity (playing dumb).

> Nursie has never once acknowledged that MARS is a MILITARY
> radio system, not even when the predecessor, AARS, was
> shown to be the Army Amateur Radio System. [he must not
> think the U.S. Army is a military branch...a bad case of murine
> brainwashing]

Earned. Never Given.

> >> It's apparent that this is ALL you have to "argue" about, Brain.
> >>
> >> Sucks to be you, Brain.
> >
> >You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
> >getting to you.
> >
> >"Sorry Hans...."
> >
> >Hi, hi.
>
> Brian, one might as well give up trying to make a chunk of igneous
> rock understand anything, much less agree to have made a wrong
> statement any time in his alleged life. [rock as a sentient life form
> has only been portrayed as "life" on science-fiction shows...]

Remember, his assertion was too stupid to be science related. It was
more like fantasy or pulp.

> If nursie say MARS is amateur radio, then that is all he (or she)
> understands as "correct." It is nothing else. That's why there isn't
> any definition or regulations on MARS in Part 97.

It's gotta be in there somewhere or else Dee would certainly provide a
correction.

> <shrug> Decomposed granite cannot be argued with... :-)

True Grit.

> LHA / WMD

4827. Re: W10XEG -- new info

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 23:00:51 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <40CB8B23.A8D3B3A5@firstinter.net>
Source record: 92891

Da Shadow wrote:
>
> Richard -- this all started when an inquiry was made by a gentleman whose
> Dad worked for RCA and had license W10XEG in the 1930's
>
> It appears he worked for RCA conducting early TV experiments and the
> following quote heralds the early TV experiments on top of the Empire stae
> building
>
> Quote from URL: http://www.earlytelevision.org/pendletonpaper.html
>
> "The first all-electronic American systems in 1932 used only 120 scanning
> lines at 24 frames per second. This produced a blurry image with visible,
> thick scanning lines and a noticeable amount of flicker. RCA transmitted
> from both their Camden, New Jersey laboratories as well as from atop the
> Empire State Building to a handful of experimental television receivers
> located within a few miles of both areas.14 "
>
> Also note that some early TV experimental stations operated around 2 Mcs --
> see URL:
> http://members.aol.com/jeff560/chronotv.html
> Quote:
> "Mar. 30, 1929. Radio Service Bulletin lists these new stations: W9XAO
> Chicago IL (Nelson Brothers Bond and Mortgage Co.) 2.0-2.1 MHz, 500 watts;
> W2XCR Jersey City NJ (Jenkins Television Corporation) 2.1-2.2 MHz, 5000
> watts; W2XCL Brooklyn NY (Pilot Electric Manufacturing Co.) 2.0-2.1,
> 2.75-2.85 MHz, 250 watts; W2XCO New York (RCA) 2.1-2.2 MHz, 5000 watts; W2XR
> New York (John V. L. Hogan), 500 watts (visual broadcasting and
> experimental); W2XCW Schenectady (General Electric) 2.1-2.2 MHz 20,000
> watts."
>
> So I suspect that the sender meant 2.1 Mcs not 21 Mcs
>
> You are correct about the later TV allotments which can be seen at URL:
> http://members.aol.com/jeff560/jeff.html
>
> Also What happened to Channel one at
> http://members.aol.com/jeff560/tvch1.html
> --
> Keyboard

Thanks for the good info. There were more revisions of the
television bandplan that I thought between 1930 and 1947.

Rick Tannehill
W7RT

> ----------
> "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net> wrote in message
> news:40CA23FE.8247BD31@firstinter.net...
> > Keyboard In The Noise wrote:
> > >
> > > The originator of the W10XEG question supplies the following new info:
> > >
> > > Actually, the W10 call is most likely a commercial call. There were
> several
> > > 'repeaters' that were used very early in the establishment of the radio,
> and
> > > then commercial television networks - it may be one of those. The X is
> for
> > > experimental, no doubt. My Dad was very active with RCA very early on.
> The
> > > first experimental TV signals in NYC were on 21 MHz, broadcast from the
> > > Empire State Bldg - my Dad was chief engineer for the transmitter. One
> of
> > > the many experimental transmitters he put on the air was W10XEG - I just
> > > have no data about it at all.
> > >
> > > --
> > > Keyboard In The Noise
> > >
> > > Opinions are the cheapest commodities in the world. Author unknown but
> > > "right on"
> >
> > I had heard that the early "Channel 1" TV stations in NY and
> > Chicago were in part of the later 6M amateur band; 48-54 MHz
> > if I remember correctly. That is why there is no TV Channel
> > 1 today. After WWII, the 6 M band was carved out about the
> > time the VHF TV channels were allocated. Do you have any
> > hard info about the use of 21 MHz for TV Ch-1?
> >
> > Rick Tannehill
> > W7RT

4828. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 23:03:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92892

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040608211929.07368.00000222@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406081523.ea769f4@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040606140151.15095.00000178@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0406060055.1ac4ea19@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (the Meaningful Dis-Cusser) writes:
> >>
> >> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >> >news:<1e4e3692.0406050641.5ce616a0@posting.google.com>...
> >> >> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0406050244.78666efc@posting.google.com>...
> >> >> > billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> news:<1e4e3692.0406041204.3d58aab1@posting.google.com>...
> >> >> >
> >> >> > > Steve, I didn't see the rant. Please repost it.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Perhaps if you didn't have your head so far up Lennie's rectum,
> >> >> > you might have had the opporutnity to read it in any one of several
> >> >> > HUNDRED anti-Amateur rants he's posted here.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Sorry you missed it. (More like IGNORED it.)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Steve, K4YZ
> >> >>
> >> >> Sorry, Steve, but my head is not up Len's rectum.
> >> >
> >> > Yes, it is.
> >> >
> >> >> More like your head
> >> >> is up your own rectum. If you should ever pull it out, it will become
> >> >> the "POP" heard round the world!
> >> >
> >> > I am sure you wiash this were true.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...still making typos when oh, so angry? :-)
> >>
> >> You have a "wiashing machine" there? A "clothes driaer?"
> >>
> >> Appliance technology marches on...
> >
> >Lockstep.

>
> Remember, "real hams" do it with telegraphy. And LOGS.
>
> And with AUTHORITY. [tension-hutt, gunnery nurse on da
> bridge! all rise!]
>
> >> >> If you cannot produce the rant, you'll just have to troll elsewhere.
> >> >
> >> > Sorry, Brain...No need to waste that much bandwidth with material
> >> >that Lennie already wasted bandwidth on in the first place.
> >>
> >> Everyone just loves all this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)
> >
> >Is it time for Carl to spank Steve again?
> >
> >Naw!
>
> Carl be busy with true productive work with the IEEE.
>
> Gunnery nurse incapable of anything but trying to suppress
> those with differing opinions.
>
> >The definition of insanity is to spank an insane guy again and expect
> >different results.
>
> Good point! I need a vacation...but, it's so EASY to reply
> to the gunnery nurse...why, the posts just seem "to write
> themselves!" :-)
>
> >> > Now, try and find something you KNOW something about to talk
> >> >about, Brain. So far you can discount DXpeditions, reciprocal
> >> >licensing, MARS, and emergency communications. You've failed
> >> >miserably in ALL of these subjects.
> >>
> >> "MARS is amateur radio."
> >>
> >> Nursie is a veteran of "hostile actions."
> >>
> >> Nursie shopped at the HRO in Burbank, CA, before they even
> >> moved out of their Van Nuys location...
> >>
> >> Everyone just loves this "meaningful discussion" stuff. :-)
> >>
> >> LenAnderson@ieee.org
> >
> >Steve is only here for meaningful discourse.
>
> Of course. All us newsgrope readers can SEE that. :-)
>
> By the way, that Burbank HRO store is right next to a Radio

> Shack store. Ain't dat sometin? :-)
>
> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
> it really existed! :-)
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
that you did it anyway?

4829. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 23:16:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121516.7876833c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92893

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040610210604.19470.00000233@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/9/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
> >>> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your
> tall
> >>> tale SOUND valid?
> >>
> >>A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
> >>in a country where there is no other legal authority.
> >
> > Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.
> >
> > The United Nations was the governing authority.
>
> You are very confused again on authorities.

They put him on a "need to know" basis. All Steve needed to know was
that everyone else outranked him. Everything was much simpler that
way.

> Sounds like the ex-murine had to leave the corpse because he not
> know Chain of Command or any military history, much less
> understand directives, regulations, or even the Order of the Day.

He expert bay orderly.

> >>Eat it.
> >
> > Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a desperate
> >last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.
> >
> > Sucks to be you, Brain.
>
> Now THERE's the "really profound, mature response" used many,
> many times by nursie in here...almost a signature.

>
> [we could go to really far adventures with nursie's use of the word
> "suck" so much, but that's another story entirely (BTASE)]
>
> Eat DoD Directive 4650.2, nursie.
>
> Digest it. Regurgitate it and eat it again if you can't digest it.
>
> Or call on the UN Security Council to pass a Resolution saying
> "MARS is amateur radio" if you can't stomach correction.

They would convene a committee of ITU and Security Council members.
There would be lots of meetings, lots of trips to Paris and Zurich,
lots of pizza and beer. In the end they would ask, "What idiot
suggested that MARS and Amateur Radio are the same thing or even could
become the same thing?"

> [too bad we can't babble on ham radio policy in here for all the
> "hostile actions" mounted by nursie and herr robust]
>
> LHA / WMD

4830. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 23:32:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121532.76d1d791@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92894

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040611162719.28114.00000367@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> >> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
> >> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
> >> ever makes any "untruths." :-)
> >
> >Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
> >disgusting.
>
> No problem. If nursie no like you, you be da "odd man out" with
> all the allegations of homosexuality he's implied before.

It's his insinuation that I might be molesting cub scouts that I
resent. He's a sick man.

Welp, I'm going to go call CQ on a MARS freq. Might as well use my
ham call too, since I don't have a MARS call anymore. Shouldn't make
any difference ayway. After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
Radio." Hi, hi.

4831. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-12 23:35:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406121535.205ae80d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92895

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406071613.65c97dfd@posting.google.com>...
>
> . . . calm down Son, you're getting a bit too close to the edge . .

I especially liked the time he said that a Morse Exam was a disincentive to CW use.

4832. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 03:18:49 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9506ECA908413elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92896

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in news:%zHyc.2703$Wr.1505
@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote
>> >> I already explained that Japan is suceptible of confusion with
>> >> Papa. Jamaica would be better.
>> >
>> > But it hasn't ever been confused with Portugal.
>> >
>> > You are free to use Jamaica if you wish, but most experienced
>> > contesters will have to do a mental double-clutch to copy you.
>> > There goes your Q-rate spiraling down the crapper.
>> >
>> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> > Hamming for 45 years this month, and it just keeps getting better.
>> >
>>
>> Any word that sounds like a different letter in the international
>> phonetic alphabet should be avoided like the plague
>
> Experience trumps theory, and in my experience using "Jamaica" as
> phonetics for "J" would call for an instant fill and put a 3dB
> down-spike on my rate meter.
>
> If it's all the same with you, I'll just run down to the clinic and get
> a plague shot and then continue my sinful ways.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

You can do whatever you like, but it is precisely _because_ you and others
use 'Japan' as a phonetic that I have problems with people who think that
was what I said when I correctly pronounce the correct phonetic for the
letter P. This sucks!
```

4833. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 04:35:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aQQyc.3210$Wr.3034@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 92897

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote

> You can do whatever you like, but it is precisely _because_ you and
others
> use 'Japan' as a phonetic that I have problems with people who think
that
> was what I said when I correctly pronounce the correct phonetic for
the
> letter P. This sucks!

Suck it may, but "Papa" and "Japan" do not sound alike to me. If you
say "Papa", I'll never type "J" into my log.

"Bravo" and "Papa" are much more often confused in my experience, and
both of them are on the "approved" phonetic set. "Oscar" and "Bravo"
are similarly often copied one for the other.

I've never known anyone to confuse "Portugal" for "Japan", "Brazil" for
"Portugal", or "Ontario" for "Brazil". Perhaps that's why this set is
so widely preferred over the ICAO set.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4834. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 13:07:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 92898

In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
> :-)

Gee, Len, that's interesting....

You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?

Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children, yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?

Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its historical importance?

Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?

4835. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 13:40:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613094047.08293.00000969@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92899

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/13/2004 8:07 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>> :-)
>
>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>
>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor been
>involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims
>what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>
>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>yet
>proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of
>not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>
>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>historical
>importance?
>
>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on
>a
>civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
>the
>other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
>class,
>education, name, ethnicity, and military service?

You forgot a few, Jim:

Like someone who has never been a licensed aviator who tries to advise
current aviators on navigation aid functions and techniques.

Like somone who has no training, certification or licensure in ANY healthcare profession trying to one-upmanship those who are.

Let us not forget those who have attempted to embellish thier military service record with the sacrifices of Soldiers who were KIA three years before the commenter was ever IN the military.

And there are those who make scathing comments on the nature and character of various volunteer organizations although they themselves have never been in any of these organizations, and in one case where they hadn't even reached puberty when they made thier "observations" on those organizations.

The list goes on.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4836. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 13:49:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613094919.08293.00000970@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92950

>Subject: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/12/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121434.b154c13@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>> >
>> >ahoy
>> >boy...(SNIP)
>>
>> Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came up
>with
>> it?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Steve, no thanks for the private email, even though I've asked you
>repeatedly not to communicate with me privately. I really do prefer
>to keep all comms with you strictly public. You broke the rules, but
>certainly in keeping with your mode of operation.

No problem, Brain.

YOU made promises about certain "private" e mails before that you overtly
broke...

Just like your mentor...

>So how is it that you can call people liars all day long, give people
>a deadline to produce some google search, hound and hound those who
>disagree with you, and in general be the sweetheart pariah of the
>PCTA?
>
>But when someone else calls you a liar, when you have lied, you
>threaten a summons. Are you nuts? No. Don't answer that question.
>I don't want any more lies out of you.

I've not uttered any lies here, Brain.

You've made THAT accusation before and never substantiated it. Just like you've never justified ANY of the claims YOU'VE made.

You make accusations and claims you don't justify then cry "foul!" when you get spoon fed your own silliness.

Sucks to be you, Brain. Seems it's a well worn path, though.

>So congratulations on earning persona non grata. You've truly worked
>hard at ii. Earned, Never Given.

According to YOU...?!?!

HAH!

>And FWIW, the fenetic alfabet was a joke, but leave it to the mentally
>impaired to think is was a serious effort.

I KNOW it was a joke. I have yet to see a whole lot come out of you that I could take seriously. How could I?

>Sayonara and have a great life.

As long as I have folks like you and Lennie against which I can benchmark what is bad as compared to what is good, it IS a great life.

You REALLY don't get it, do you?

Steve, K4YZ

4837. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 13:57:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613095723.08293.00000971@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92951

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/12/2004 5:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121459.5349b6fe@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040610210606.19470.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>...

>> Nursie did NOT "explain his intent" in the beginning.
>
>Certainly took a lot of explanation and I'm still not satisfied with
>any of his answers.

That's OK, Brain.

At least there ARE answers.

Still have many, many questions for YOU out there. NONE answered,
satisfactorly or othrwise.

>But something else is not satisfactory. He started this thread from
>scratch, and claimed there was a "Rant." I didn't see the rant. I
>asked where the rant was. Apparently, there was no rant.

Sure there was...still is...You refuse to acknowledge it since it would
acknowledge the true nature of your "mentor, and subsequently YOUR relationship
with said "mentor".

>I'm searching for a word used to describe a person wha says there was
>something when there was not.

It's there. Now you look even MORE ignorant that you already do for so
aggressively trying to disclaim it.

>> Nursie backpedalled AFTER the proper documents were
>> identified and locations given to him after three weeks of
>> stating "MARS is amateur radio."
>>
>> Nursie's "intent explanation" was ALSO poorly worded.
>>
>> Nursie will never ever admit he do wrong.
>
>It's enough that we know. It's also enough that we know everyone else
>here has given him a pass on it.

Not "everyone else".

You and Lennie. Only one of you who as any "experience" in MARS at all,
and neither of you who knows how MARS operates.

>> "MARS is amateur radio" statement is not a faux pas?
>
>Not only is it wrong, it's not true.

When quoted out of context, it is. You ignore the rest hoping it won't be
fed back to you.

Too bad for you.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> Nursie never once in three weeks of arguments identified or located
>> the documents which define and detail the Military Affiliate Radio
>> System. It took two others only a short search to find them on the
>> Internet and post that here.
>
>Deliberate stupidity (playing dumb).

Nope. Those "documents" were not needed.

No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

>> Nursie has never once acknowledged that MARS is a MILITARY
>> radio system...(SNIP)

Untrue...Again....

>> (UNSNIP)...not even when the predecessor, AARS, was
>> shown to be the Army Amateur Radio System. [he must not
>> think the U.S. Army is a military branch...a bad case of murine
>> brainwashing]
>
>Earned. Never Given.

Keep trying, Brain. You MIGHT get SOMETHING right one day.

Not likely, but you might...

Steve, K4YZ

4838. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 14:00:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613100014.08293.00000972@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92952

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/12/2004 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>

>> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
>> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
>> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
>> it really existed! :-)
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
>that you did it anyway?

Lennie would like you to think that, Brain.

Of course it's apparent he's got you believing a LOT of untrue things, so
I don't know why THIS would be any different.

Just another LennieLie, now propagated by Son of Lennie.

Putz and Putz Jr.

Steve, K4YZ

4839. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 14:04:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613100455.08293.00000973@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 92953

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/12/2004 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121532.76d1d791@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040611162719.28114.00000367@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
>> >> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
>> >> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
>> >> ever makes any "untruths." :-)
>> >
>> >Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
>> >disgusting.
>>
>> No problem. If nursie no like you, you be da "odd man out" with
>> all the allegations of homosexuality he's implied before.
>
>It's his insinuation that I might be molesting cub scouts that I
>resent. He's a sick man.

I didn't insinuate you're molesting scouts, Brain.

I said it's apparent you prefer the company of little boys to adults.
That is true. When asked about several Amateur Radio related activities, you
are always predisposed.

>Welp, I'm going to go call CQ on a MARS freq. Might as well use my
>ham call too, since I don't have a MARS call anymore. Shouldn't make
>any difference ayway. After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
>Radio." Hi, hi.

And I am sure you'll get an appropriate QSL card for the effort, Brain.

Maybe you'll show us THAT QSL card...You don't seem to ahve any others to
show off....

Maybe you'll work Lennie and his Part 15 station that he's going to put on
20 meters.

Steve, K4YZ

4840. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 14:48:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92954

N2EY wrote:
> In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>> :-)
>
>
> Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>
> You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor been
> involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims
> what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>
> Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children, yet
> proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of
> not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>
> Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
> repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its historical
> importance?
>
> Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on a
> civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to the
> other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license class,
> education, name, ethnicity, and military service?

You forgot to add:

"Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
in certain areas only serves as more bait.

I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this! You
(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
irresistable.

Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and

those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.

This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4841. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 15:50:19 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10couu7n7fbt0e3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92955

Yep, the still do, or at least something extremely close to it.....

Ryan
KC8PMX

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:qKednbcIGqWAyFXdRVn_iw@comcast.com...
> Don't the police and other services use the APCO phonetics?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bWNxc.4302$Y3.1616@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Wasn't aware they were still being used.
> >
> > Go for it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
> > news:10cci0l89tin00e@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Just for kicks and giggles..... what about those who in their line of
> work
> > > are required to know APCO phonetics?? (Adam, Boy, Charlie/Charles
etc.)
> > >
> > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > >
> > >
> > > Yeah.....something like that belongs in a beginners columb like
'Your
> > > Novice
> > > > Accent' .. Oh excuse me. They cancelled that one years ago. I
> guess
> > > that
> > > > means most of the readers of QST are novice equivilants ?
Hmmmmmmmm
> > > >
> > > > Make your own conclusions there.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >

> > >
> >
> >
>

4842. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 15:55:13 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10couu82sohnqe4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 92956

If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some level of operational courtesy though.

Ryan
KC8PMX

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Wmqyc.2021$Wr.120@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote
>
> > As a ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.....
>
> No you're not.
>
> Regardless of the article in QST, there is no requirement for hams to
> use the ICAO phonetics. You are free to use whatever phonetics you
> wish, or none at all if that strikes your fancy.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> SOC #291 http://www.qsl.net/soc
>
>
>
>

4843. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 19:23:53 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff66@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <pa2dnWsHvLe-JVHdRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 92957

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> As a
> ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......

There is no rule that a ham must use a certain set if phonetics.

4844. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162838.18863.00000367@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92972

In article <20040613094919.08293.00000970@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/12/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121434.b154c13@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>>> >
>>> >ahoy
>>> >boy...(SNIP)
>>>
>>> Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came up
>>> with it?
>>>
>>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>>Steve, no thanks for the private email, even though I've asked you
>>repeatedly not to communicate with me privately. I really do prefer
>>to keep all comms with you strictly public. You broke the rules, but
>>certainly in keeping with your mode of operation.
>
> No problem, Brain.
>
> YOU made promises about certain "private" e mails before that you
>overtly broke...
>
> Just like your mentor...

Poor baby. Still fretting over AOL tossing off your private home page that was totally libelous? :-)

And all because of a simple mistake in private e-mails which nursie complained long and loudly about in public in here? :-)

PCTA Exta double standard at work. QED.

>>So how is it that you can call people liars all day long, give people
>>a deadline to produce some google search, hound and hound those who
>>disagree with you, and in general be the sweetheart pariah of the
>>PCTA?
>>
>>But when someone else calls you a liar, when you have lied, you
>>threaten a summons. Are you nuts? No. Don't answer that question.
>>I don't want any more lies out of you.
>
> I've not uttered any lies here, Brain.

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" :-)

> You've made THAT accusation before and never substantiated it. Just
>like you've never justified ANY of the claims YOU'VE made.

Nursie never ever do anything wrong. Everyone else do wrong! :-)

> You make accusations and claims you don't justify then cry "foul!" when
>you get spoon fed your own silliness.
>
> Sucks to be you, Brain. Seems it's a well worn path, though.

More "meaningful discourse." :-)

>>So congratulations on earning persona non grata. You've truly worked
>>hard at ii. Earned, Never Given.
>
> According to YOU...?!?!
>
> HAH!
>
>>And FWIW, the fenetic alfabet was a joke, but leave it to the mentally
>>impaired to think is was a serious effort.
>
> I KNOW it was a joke. I have yet to see a whole lot come out of you
>that I could take seriously. How could I?
>
>>Sayonara and have a great life.
>
> As long as I have folks like you and Lennie against which I can benchmark
>what is bad as compared to what is good, it IS a great life.
>
> You REALLY don't get it, do you?

Nobody does. Nursie's personal reality is there and this is
it for him.

Meanwhile, DoD Directive 4650.2, AR 25-4, NTP 8(C) are still
there, defining and regulating MARS for the Military.

NATO did adopt its phonetic alphabet in 1955...the next to the
last year I was on active duty in the U.S. Army.

None of that happened according to nursie. All of us "Lie."
The real truth is in his imagination. Tsk, tsk.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4845. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162839.18863.00000368@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92964

In article <20040613100014.08293.00000972@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/12/2004 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>
>
>>> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
>>> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
>>> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
>>> it really existed! :-)
>>>
>>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>>
>>Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
>>that you did it anyway?
>
> Lennie would like you to think that, Brain.
>
> Of course it's apparent he's got you believing a LOT of untrue things,
>so I don't know why THIS would be any different.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. It should be an easy recall for anyone with fabled Recon Marine training to describe the location, the general vicinity, background, etc. That HRO location isn't in a large mall at all. [it's off the intersection of Victory Blvd and Buena Vista, major streets]

The old HRO in Van Nuys is, by comparison nondescript for locality. However, the new location has many noticeable features. But, WHICH location of HRO was nursie talking about? There's three, not two. :-)

> Just another LennieLie, now propagated by Son of Lennie.
>
> Putz and Putz Jr.

Ah, more of the nursie "meaningful discourse." :-)

I do hope Rev. Jim is looking in...much food for thought for another Sermon on the Antenna Mount!

LHA / WMD

4846. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162841.18863.00000370@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92958

In article <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
>> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
>> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
>> it really existed! :-)
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
>that you did it anyway?

All PCTA Extras possess that mystical quality.

It's like deja vu all over again...

LHA / WMD

4847. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162841.18863.00000369@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92974

In article <20040613095723.08293.00000971@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/12/2004 5:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121459.5349b6fe@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040610210606.19470.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
>>> Nursie did NOT "explain his intent" in the beginning.
>>
>>Certainly took a lot of explanation and I'm still not satisfied with
>>any of his answers.
>
> That's OK, Brain.
>
> At least there ARE answers.

Wrong ones. But, in this newsgroup, whatever nursie defines as right is "right." Anything else is a "lie." :-)

> Still have many, many questions for YOU out there. NONE answered,
>satisfactorly or othrwise.

Poor baby. Not the answers you wanted? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>>But something else is not satisfactory. He started this thread from
>>scratch, and claimed there was a "Rant." I didn't see the rant. I
>>asked where the rant was. Apparently, there was no rant.
>
> Sure there was...still is...You refuse to acknowledge it since it would
>acknowledge the true nature of your "mentor, and subsequently YOUR
>relationship with said "mentor".

Ah...here we go with the nursie-style "meaningful discussion" thing.

As I explained in another message, nursie's concept of a "rant" is whatever is in its personal fantasyland.

Nursie must have taken out a long lease and had the rant all paid up until next year or later...

>>I'm searching for a word used to describe a person wha says there was
>>something when there was not.
>

> It's there. Now you look even MORE ignorant that you already do for so
>aggressively trying to disclaim it.
>
>>> Nursie backpedalled AFTER the proper documents were
>>> identified and locations given to him after three weeks of
>>> stating "MARS is amateur radio."
>>>
>>> Nursie's "intent explanation" was ALSO poorly worded.
>>>
>>> Nursie will never ever admit he do wrong.
>>
>>It's enough that we know. It's also enough that we know everyone else
>>here has given him a pass on it.
>
> Not "everyone else".
>
> You and Lennie. Only one of you who as any "experience" in MARS at all,
>and neither of you who knows how MARS operates.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. MARS is a military radio service. Army MARS Hq is
in Fort Huachuca, AZ. [a bit too hot and dry for me, having been
there] That's also home for the Army's Military Intelligence school.
[it's obvious who wouldn't be allowed to enter that school...:-)]

>>> "MARS is amateur radio" statement is not a faux pas?
>>
>>Not only is it wrong, it's not true.
>
> When quoted out of context, it is. You ignore the rest hoping it won't
>be fed back to you.

"Quoted out of context?!?" Nursie write "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<<
amateur radio!"

If MARS were amateur radio, then Part 97 would define and regulate
it. Part 97 does not.

If MARS were amateur radio, then there would be no need for DoD
Directive 4650.2. But there IS that Directive.

Ergo, MARS is a military radio service.

> Too bad for you.
>
> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Untrue. Read DoD Directive 4650.2 if at all possible. It defines what
MARS is. MARS can and does exist without amateur radio as is
witness to the reporting of exercise Grecian Firebolt 2002.

Nursie's second statement (trying to backpedal from the first one) is
as invalid as the first.

>>> Nursie never once in three weeks of arguments identified or located
>>> the documents which define and detail the Military Affiliate Radio
>>> System. It took two others only a short search to find them on the
>>> Internet and post that here.
>>
>>Deliberate stupidity (playing dumb).
>
> Nope. Those "documents" were not needed.

They were for the sake of reality of the rest of us. In nursie's case,
an alternate reality exists.

> No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

This second statement, not identical to the first, is as incorrect as
the first.

>>> Nursie has never once acknowledged that MARS is a MILITARY
>>> radio system...(SNIP)
>
> Untrue...Again....

True. Google has it in all the glaring inaccuracies of the original. :-)

>>> (UNSNIP)...not even when the predecessor, AARS, was
>>> shown to be the Army Amateur Radio System. [he must not
>>> think the U.S. Army is a military branch...a bad case of murine
>>> brainwashing]
>>
>>Earned. Never Given.
>
> Keep trying, Brain. You MIGHT get SOMETHING right one day.
>
> Not likely, but you might...

Poor nursie, still harboring rage and resentment at not being believed.

Goodbye, meaningful discourse.

Hello, alternate nursie reality.

LHA / WMD

4848. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162844.18863.00000371@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92975

In article <1e4e3692.0406121459.5349b6fe@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040610210606.19470.00000235@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040609214327.16492.00000850@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >Date: 6/9/2004 12:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406090950.241c1687@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >Steve, if you don't like me giving you crap, stop posting such stupid
>> >> >things as, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>> >>
>> >> I haven't stated that in weeks, Brain. You have, however...Dozens
of
>> >> times.
>> >>
>> >> You've repeated it over and over despite the fact that I
>> >> acknowledged it
>> >> was poorly worded, and have explained my intent.
>> >>
>> >Flat out wrong, not poorly worded.
>>
>> Nursie did NOT "explain his intent" in the beginning.
>
>Certainly took a lot of explanation and I'm still not satisfied with
>any of his answers.
>
>But something else is not satisfactory. He started this thread from
>scratch, and claimed there was a "Rant." I didn't see the rant. I
>asked where the rant was. Apparently, there was no rant.

In nursie's personal reality, "the rant" is on-going and is done by
anyone disagreeing with nursie.

He thinks that every subject thread is involved in "a rant" against
him and therefore is compelled to yell, cuss, swear, and say cute
little Yiddish nasties (he not speak or understand Yiddish, the goy)
against his pet enemies.

>I'm searching for a word used to describe a person wha says there was
>something when there was not.

In any other venue, that is a four-letter word spelled L-I-A-R.

In here, a "liar" is simply anyone who disagrees with nursie.

It's that simple. :-)

>> Nursie backpedalled AFTER the proper documents were
>> identified and locations given to him after three weeks of
>> stating "MARS is amateur radio."
>>
>> Nursie's "intent explanation" was ALSO poorly worded.
>>
>> Nursie will never ever admit he do wrong.
>
>It's enough that we know. It's also enough that we know everyone else
>here has given him a pass on it.

Ah, but his "rant" is on-going, sort of an obsessional perpetual
motion thing... :-)

>> >> That you won't acknowledge that and move on is evidence that this is
>> >> ALL you have to try and deflect attention from your every expanding list
of
>> >> NG faux pax.
>>
>> "MARS is amateur radio" statement is not a faux pas?
>
>Not only is it wrong, it's not true.

Irrelevant in here. Definitions of reality don't apply in this newsgroup.

If any PCTA says we "lie," then we "lie" even if we have the evidence.

Ol' George Orwell had it right... :-)

>> Nursie never once in three weeks of arguments identified or located
>> the documents which define and detail the Military Affiliate Radio
>> System. It took two others only a short search to find them on the
>> Internet and post that here.
>
>Deliberate stupidity (playing dumb).

...or just stupidity on his part.

>> Nursie has never once acknowledged that MARS is a MILITARY
>> radio system, not even when the predecessor, AARS, was
>> shown to be the Army Amateur Radio System. [he must not
>> think the U.S. Army is a military branch...a bad case of murine
>> brainwashing]
>
>Earned. Never Given.
>

>> >> It's apparent that this is ALL you have to "argue" about, Brain.
>> >>
>> >> Sucks to be you, Brain.
>> >
>> >You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
>> >getting to you.
>> >
>> >"Sorry Hans...."
>> >
>> >Hi, hi.
>>
>> Brian, one might as well give up trying to make a chunk of igneous
>> rock understand anything, much less agree to have made a wrong
>> statement any time in his alleged life. [rock as a sentient life form
>> has only been portrayed as "life" on science-fiction shows...]
>
>Remember, his assertion was too stupid to be science related. It was
>more like fantasy or pulp.

Nursie must have pulped all the DoD Directives then... :-)

>> If nursie say MARS is amateur radio, then that is all he (or she)
>> understands as "correct." It is nothing else. That's why there isn't
>> any definition or regulations on MARS in Part 97.
>
>It's gotta be in there somewhere or else Dee would certainly provide a
>correction.

She might have ordered a new spanking paddle to use on her "children"
in here and it hasn't arrived yet?

>> <shrug> Decomposed granite cannot be argued with... :-)
>
>True Grit.

Har! :-)

LHA / WMD

4849. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162845.18863.00000372@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92959

In article <20040612032528.11516.00001117@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy Steve Nursie of the TN State CAP storms again) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/10/2004 9:16 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>
>
>>You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
>>getting to you.
>
> People who are trying to berate others over thier choice of words should
>take a couple of seconds to proof read what they write BEFORE they send it,
>Brain.
>
> What a PUTZ!
>
> Brian, you're an idiot. It really is THAT simple.
>
> But hey, THANKS for making my job that much easier!

Oh, my, all that "meaningful discourse" going on.

Rev. Jim approves, of course. :-)

LHA / WMD

4850. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162846.18863.00000373@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92967

In article <20040612032049.11516.00001116@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/10/2004 9:13 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100613.74fecaee@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I could "claim" operation from TA, 9K, HZ, DU, HR, VP2, VE, SU and
>>> several other places
>>
>>What other places?
>
> Noe of your business. You aren't in any of THOSE logs, Brain.

"Noe?" :-)

Secret military logs? TN STATE Guard logs? TN paramilitary militia logs? :-)

>> if the criteria was just having set foot on thier territorial
>>> grounds at least once.
>>
>>Setting foot on "thier" territorial grounds doesn't make for hostile
>>actions either.
>
> Did I say it did? I just said I was there.

Okay, so Where and When of your fabled "hostile actions?" :-)

>>> No Proof = Didn't happen.
>>
>>Liar Steve, you could even show us some of those medals that you have,
>>but didn't earn. Walter Mittyism at its very finest. Get help.
>
> Ahhhhhh...I see....In Brain's book, it's "Walter Mittyism" to collect
>anything.
>
> Uh huh.

No, it's Fantasy Island stuff with nursie. Nursie just say he do and it was done. Proof is irrelevant. In our reality. In his personal reality it really happened.

> At least the medals I didn't earn ARE in a box and were clearly reported
>as such. SOME people in this forum have a habit of reporting that they did
>things and went places that they have no proof for.

Does Western Costume know you have those movie props?

Or did you get them from some southeastern US scab movie company that went bankrupt?

> THOSE people are the liars.

Everyone who disagree with nursie are the liars. :-)

LHA / WMD

4851. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162847.18863.00000375@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92963

In article <1e4e3692.0406121532.76d1d791@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040611162719.28114.00000367@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
>> >> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
>> >> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
>> >> ever makes any "untruths." :-)
>> >
>> >Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
>> >disgusting.
>>
>> No problem. If nursie no like you, you be da "odd man out" with
>> all the allegations of homosexuality he's implied before.
>
>It's his insinuation that I might be molesting cub scouts that I
>resent. He's a sick man.

True, but he is an Extra and therefore can say anything he
wants in full protection of the something-or-other.

If nursie wants to call you a NAMBLA member, then you ARE
one and that's okay. In his fantasy reality. Anyone speaking
against that is a "documented pathological liar." :-(

Nursie "never lies." Not in his fantasy reality.

Tsk, tsk.

>Welp, I'm going to go call CQ on a MARS freq. Might as well use my
>ham call too, since I don't have a MARS call anymore. Shouldn't make
>any difference ayway. After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
>Radio." Hi, hi.

OK. :-)

LHA / WMD

4852. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162847.18863.00000374@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92968

In article <20040613100455.08293.00000973@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/12/2004 6:32 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121532.76d1d791@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040611162719.28114.00000367@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>>> In article <1e4e3692.0406102114.3608bcbd@posting.google.com>,
>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040608180827.17756.00000451@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>>
>>> >> That's just a partial list of nursie's claims made in five years.
>>> >> He has yet to make good on all that because nursie never
>>> >> ever makes any "untruths." :-)
>>> >
>>> >Did a search on MANBLA. Not exactly my cup of tea. He's fairly
>>> >disgusting.
>>>
>>> No problem. If nursie no like you, you be da "odd man out" with
>>> all the allegations of homosexuality he's implied before.
>>
>>It's his insinuation that I might be molesting cub scouts that I
>>resent. He's a sick man.
>
> I didn't insinuate you're molesting scouts, Brain.
>
> I said it's apparent you prefer the company of little boys to adults.

Oh, my, the nursie alternate reality again...

Nursie never insinuates. Yet nursie insinuates.

>That is true. When asked about several Amateur Radio related activities, you
>are always predisposed.

Nursie should be prescribed.

By a real MD.

>>Welp, I'm going to go call CQ on a MARS freq. Might as well use my
>>ham call too, since I don't have a MARS call anymore. Shouldn't make

>>any difference ayway. After all, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur
>>Radio." Hi, hi.
>
> And I am sure you'll get an appropriate QSL card for the effort, Brain.
>
> Maybe you'll show us THAT QSL card...You don't seem to ahve any others
>to show off....
>
> Maybe you'll work Lennie and his Part 15 station that he's going to put
>on 20 meters.

We haven't heard of THAT fantasy reality. Please tell more.

I need to know to be sure I have all the parts I'm going to build this
station with... :-)

Get help, nursie.

LHA / WMD

4853. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162849.18863.00000377@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92960

In article <20040612031709.11516.00001115@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/11/2004 5:50 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110250.6f6c266e@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I am "on the air" almost daily.
>>
>>You're still not in my log.
>
> And highly unlikely that I ever WILL be, Brain.

Have you considered stringing up an antenna longer than six inches?

> In most cases when I am on HF, it would take you a moderate amount of
>skill or dedicated software to communicate with me.

"Dedicated" to what? :-)

Are you on those MARS frequencies just outside the hum bands?

> Even if you had the software, you'd still have to be able to know what to
>listen to. I don't think you have either.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Meaningful discussion." :-)

LHA / WMD

4854. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162849.18863.00000376@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92969

In article <1e4e3692.0406121516.7876833c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040610210604.19470.00000233@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/9/2004 9:59 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406091859.4cad7562@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040608210549.29588.00000691@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>>
>> >>> For what? Giving him bogus information? For trying to make your
>tall
>> >>> tale SOUND valid?
>> >>
>> >>A military commander has the authority to approve amateur operations
>> >>in a country where there is no other legal authority.
>> >
>> > Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.
>> >
>> > The United Nations was the governing authority.
>>
>> You are very confused again on authorities.
>
>They put him on a "need to know" basis. All Steve needed to know was
>that everyone else outranked him. Everything was much simpler that
>way.

His blackhawk was down. [u/s, sitting on the pad...]

>> Sounds like the ex-murine had to leave the corpse because he not
>> know Chain of Command or any military history, much less
>> understand directives, regulations, or even the Order of the Day.
>
>He expert bay orderly.

:-)

>> >>Eat it.
>> >

>> > Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a
desperate
>> >last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.
>> >
>> > Sucks to be you, Brain.
>>
>> Now THERE's the "really profound, mature response" used many,
>> many times by nursie in here...almost a signature.
>>
>> [we could go to really far adventures with nursie's use of the word
>> "suck" so much, but that's another story entirely (BTASE)]
>>
>> Eat DoD Directive 4650.2, nursie.
>>
>> Digest it. Regurgitate it and eat it again if you can't digest it.
>>
>> Or call on the UN Security Council to pass a Resolution saying
>> "MARS is amateur radio" if you can't stomach correction.
>
>They would convene a committee of ITU and Security Council members.
>There would be lots of meetings, lots of trips to Paris and Zurich,
>lots of pizza and beer. In the end they would ask, "What idiot
>suggested that MARS and Amateur Radio are the same thing or even could
>become the same thing?"

Wouldn't matter. If nursie thunk something up, however incorrect,
it be "right" and anyone saying otherwise is a "liar." :-)

>> [too bad we can't babble on ham radio policy in here for all the
>> "hostile actions" mounted by nursie and herr robust]

Rev. Jim checked in with a hellfire-and-brimstone denunciation of
godless souls who don't Believe in morse code, etc., so I gues it
is back to the infamous Gang of Four, risen like the Feenix out of
the ashes...

[if you can have a "fenetic alfabet," I have the "Feenix" in honor of
Hashafisti Scratchi...:-)]

LHA / WMD

4855. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162850.18863.00000378@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92962

In article <20040612031116.11516.00001113@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/10/2004 7:27 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100427.d3c83c8@posting.google.com>
>
>>> I could wade through Google for days through one manifestation of
>>"lost"
>>> or another of yours, Brain.
>>
>>Then it should have been really easy for you.
>>
>>However, due to your own laziness, you will now be referred to as Liar
>Steve.
>
> OK...
>
> One problem. It wouldn't be true.

Not in your personal reality inside your head.

To the rest of us, all living in the real reality, Brian is right.

> Unfortunately, however, you've already established a two year long
history
>of not telling the truth.
>
> Sucks to be you, Brain.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...there goes the "meaningful discussion" thing again.

Must be that "Amateur Extra double standard" of messaging - they can say anything with any words, but all others must be polite, respectful, and obediant to their wishes. :-)

LHA / WMD

4856. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162851.18863.00000380@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92961

In article <20040612030613.11516.00001111@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/10/2004 6:40 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100340.41de4839@posting.google.com>
>
>>If you behave yourself and quit calling everyone that you disagree
>>with a liar, at least you can hide your problem.
>
> My only "problem", Brain, is not tolerating persons who have been proven
>to be liars.

You hate yourself in the morning. And at night. And during the day.

> Two names come to immediate mind.

Should be three. Steven, James, and Robeson. :-)

And those unnamed other personalities: Nursie, the Dill Sergeant,
the Air Ace of the CAP, Dr. Killgore, etc., etc.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. So much intolerance there!

Check around, maybe you can get an industrial-strength mass
shipment of tranquilizers at bargain prices...

LHA / WMD

4857. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162851.18863.00000379@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92965

In article <20040612030913.11516.00001112@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/10/2004 7:25 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100425.795a0856@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040609235721.12038.00000577@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
>>> Your "military commander" was under United Nations auspices.
>>
>>Nope. See what happens when you weren't there but you start making
>>assumptions?
>
> No assumption.
>
> The Somalia mission was a United Nations effort.

Way to go, Chief of Staff! [the TN STATE Guard have 4-star ranks?]

>>> The United Nations was the governing authority.
>>
>>I've never been chopped to the UN.
>
> You were if you were there for Restore Hope.

There sure isn't any "hope" around here with nursie on the loose...

>>> >Eat it.
>>>
>>> Now there's a really profound, mature response. Sounds like a
desperate
>>> last-ditch effort to be obnoxious where other options have failed.
>>
>>That is rich coming from a 50 year old guy who throws tantrums every day.
>
> Who's 50?

It's coming up FAST, nursie. Hair falling out, cookie duster turning grey, no longer trim in the flight suits. Have you gotten new teeth yet?

>>> Sucks to be you, Brain.
>

>>Infinitely better than being you.
>
> How would you know? You can't even get your own stories straight.
>
> STILL sucks to be you, Brain.

Poor baby. Not the "meaningful discussions" he wants (another name for agreeing with everything nursie says or be called "liar").

Now, there could be some actual discussion of "call area etiquette," but nursie has to turn every subject into a battleground for his personal hatreds. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Roger that...

LHA / WMD

4858. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162852.18863.00000381@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92970

In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> (jumping in on the Sermon On The Antenna
Mount trolling) writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
<snip of today's hellfire sermon...>

> You forgot to add:
>
> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>in certain areas only serves as more bait.

Awww...poor Mike got his ego perceived as stepped on?

Mike, I've been involved with radio communications since the beginning
of that in early 1953. That's 51 years.

The subject thread is supposed to be on phonetic alphabets. No
problem, I've used those since 1953 and the NATO phonetic
alphabet since 1955 (49 years for that). Is that "lack of experience?"
:-)

> I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this! You
>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>irresistable.

In other words, you DEMAND that ALL like, honor, love, and cherish
your own preferences and cannot stomach an opposite viewpoint?
:-)

Whhhooooo...you guys are in the WRONG venue to have such an
attitude on the Internet!!! :-)

> Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.

"Leading posters?" :-)

You mean all those wonderful folks who yell "PUTZ" and "Son of
Lennie" and "Sucks to be you" or the snarly types tawkin tuff and
trying to stuff opposite opinions into the ground?

Yup. "Leading posters." Like the ads for some up-coming horror fantasy movie showing blood, agony, and gore all over the wall. :-)

> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.

The only ones asking for "respect" are the telegraphy gods of hum radio, demanding all love, honor, and cherish their "superior" mode of modes, and thus Rule over all "inferior" beings. :-)

But, the subject title was "phonetic alphabets," wasn't it?

Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)

"These things just seem to write themselves" - another hum god

LHA / WMD

4859. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162854.18863.00000382@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92976

In article <20040613094047.08293.00000969@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steaming Steve der STASI Unteroffizier who has to ride the coattails of those
specifically attacking personalities) scribbles:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/13/2004 8:07 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>> :-)
>>
>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>>
>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor been
>>involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims
>>what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>>
>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
yet
>>proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of
>>not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>
>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>historical importance?
>>
>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on
a
>>civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
the
>>other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
class,
>>education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>
> You forgot a few, Jim:
>

> Like someone who has never been a licensed aviator who tries to advise
>current aviators on navigation aid functions and techniques.

Oooooo...der CAP Ace SPEAKS! :-)

[single-engine rated private pilot tries to sound like multi-engine air
transport rated commercial captain or some figher jock...]

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor nursie, the wonderham doesn't understand that
air navigation, radio navigation aids, and techniques are NOT a part
of the NATO phonetic alphabet use. :-)

No problem. I know how TACAN, VOR, Localizer, Glideslope,
Marker Beacons, ATCRBS Transponders, Airborne radars all work
because I've been intimately involved with such hardware in design
engineering...in the labs as well as the fixed bases (airports to
civilians). Nursie doesn't know ARINC from an earache, has never
met Bill Cairns of ARINC, doesn't know what an "ATR box" is but
probably (after years of military study) got to know what a "station"
on an aircraft is...:-)

None of that really involves the NATO phonetic alphabet because
nursie is too deep in his hatred of individual personalities to be able
to distinguish right from wrong.

ICAO did adopt the NATO phonetic alphabet and made it a part of
the Air Traffic Control language...which was adopted as English
internationally back in the mid-1950s. I've used that on civil aviation
radio in voice communications about 1960 for the first time. No
biggie, but nursie can't let his hatred die and must tell a bunch of
LIES about my past experience. :-)

> Like somone who has no training, certification or licensure in ANY
>healthcare profession trying to one-upmanship those who are.

Nursie, trying to masquerade as Dr. Killgore, Knows All, thinks he
wrote "Gray's Anatomy" or the "Physicians' Desk Companion." :-)

Nursie can't stand being "one-upped" on ANYTHING. :-)

> Let us not forget those who have attempted to embellish thier military
>service record with the sacrifices of Soldiers who were KIA three years before
>the commenter was ever IN the military.

Two years. My assignment was to the 71st Signal Service Battalion,
8235th Army Unit. The "71st" lost 20 members on 1 Jul 50 in an air
crash in Korea, en route to bolster U.S. Army communications there.
I honor their memory and of that military unit. Hardy Barracks, the
last surviving U.S. military location in Tokyo, was named for one of
those 20, Corporal Elmer Hardy. I was billeted at Hardy Barracks.
The new transmitter site at Kashiwa was, in 1956, renamed Camp
Tomlinson in honor of one of the "71st" officers on that fatal crash.
I was in the first of C Company to move into the Kashiwa site and
help enabling the start of HF radio operations for station ADA.

I don't "embellish" anything. I was there, as assigned, did my work,
and honored those who went before. I would dishonor the names of
all 23 of my unit if I did not mention them or keep them in my heart.

> And there are those who make scathing comments on the nature and
character
>of various volunteer organizations although they themselves have never been in
>any of these organizations, and in one case where they hadn't even reached
>puberty when they made thier "observations" on those organizations.

Poor baby. Still in need of mental counsel. His obsessional hatred
abounds. "Meaningful discussion" isn't possible.

LHA

4860. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162856.18863.00000383@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92973

In article <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(Rev. Jim puts on his Evangelistic robes for
a hellfire-and-brimstone Sermon On The Antenna Mount which is
really a nasty old Troll for his series of shouting and hollering in the
disguise of a "polite" reply) writes:

>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>> :-)
>
>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>
>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor been
>involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims
>what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?

Poor baby. Got your ego all in a dither because you aren't the
"renowned historian" and truthsayer in all things amateur?

Well, heck yes and gosh darn, Rev. Jim are all upset again.

This could be the start of REAL truthtelling in reply which would last
(probably) months and result in long, long, "refutations" that Rev. Jim
never ever tells any untruth and speaks with the voice of the gods.

>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children, yet
>proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of
>not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?

Yup, Rev. Jim, the "renowned pediatrician" has to voice an old, bitter
"cause" of his left over from 6 years ago. :-)

[see last item in my Comments on docket 98-143...which the teen
avenger was Hot and Heavy in denunciation of...(still in the ECFS
under 13 Jan 99 filing date)]

>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>historical importance?

Rev. Jim got his BP up over 200/100 again on manual telegraphy.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...then manufactures a falsehood that I "denied its historical importance." In any other venue that would be a LIE. :-)

In the first days of ALL radio, the ONLY way to use it for any sort of communication was by on-off keying telegraphy. That first demo of radio was in 1896, in Italy and in Russia. The telegraphy codes used were the "morse code" (presumably with some local country variants for some characters, unknown to exact details). The first Morse-Vail Telegraph (commercial) service was in 1844 or 52 years before the first radio-as-communications medium demonstration.

There's no question that "morse code" has historical significance. It does. But, the first radio demo was 108 years ago...roughly five generations in the past. Today, the only real use of manual telegraphy codes is in amateur radio where its advocates go on angry benders of denunciation of anyone who even frowns on its "usefulness." All the other radio services just dropped "morse" as being too slow, too error-prone, and requiring comm specialists at each end that weren't useful anymore.

>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on a
>civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to the
>other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license class,
>education, name, ethnicity, and military service?

I should "show respect" for those self-empowered paragons of pride who insist (to the point of angry jumping up and down) that all must respect those olde-tyme manual radio telegraphers? Because telegraphy is Their Favorite and all should honor Their favorite?

Wow, ol' Rev. Jim really got cooking on his Hellfire-And-Brimstone denunciation of all who don't Believe in the True God of Radio, Morse!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Hell Hath No Fury Like A Telegrapher Scorned! :-)

Uh, Rev. Jim, send me your TS Card. I'll punch it. Save everyone all the time and trouble of reading your raving of madness.

You DO know what a "TS Card" is, don't you? No? Tsk, tsk, an old military service term-phrase. You weren't IN the military, were you? Tsk, tsk. You did NOT work any military comms or even any civilian comms, did you? No? Tsk, tsk.

Gosh, golly, and heckanddarn, all this fuss and Fury over some NATO phonetic alphabet that went in force in the NATO militaries of 1955 and was the forerunner of such adoption worldwide. Even in the ICAO...whose working air carriers were, in the majority, in NATO-member countries back in the mid-1950s. :-)

Beep, beep

LHA / WMD

>

4861. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162857.18863.00000384@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92971

In article <d22b54c3.0406120310.35e9babc@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Kellie after his divine words got tromped on) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040611162722.28114.00000369@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406110330.51f979c5@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>> Kellie should note that the U.S. MILITARY adopted the NATO
>> phonetic alphabet in 1955, not 1956.
>
>The ICAO and the ITU globally and the FAA, ANSI and the ARRL inside
>the U.S. all agreed upon the same phonetic alphabet and it lives on
>today. That's a documented 100% correct statement. What's your point
>Putz?

Not quite the "100%" you state, but you will cuss and swear and
act real tuff about it. As you did here. :-)

NATO started it in 1955.

I was a member of the U.S. Army when NATO started it and the
U.S. military made the directives that had the military change over
and use it. Kellie wasn't. Kellie was never a part of the United
States military.

>Answer: "I'm just the local neighborhood putz, I don't have a point, I
>never did and I never will".

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Following your "NCOIC" in "meaningful discussions,"
are you? :-)

>> [as one who was IN the
>> U.S. Army at the time, and in radio communications work, I am
>> quite familiar with that adoption, about as first-hand as one can
>> get (without shooting off his catapult)]
>
>Golly dayum and holy cow, I wish I was there when you used them there
>NATO phonetics on the Army RTTY repeaters you babysat. NATO-issued
>RTTY microphones?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the troll tries insult mode again when he MIGHT (in the
best of all possible worlds) have had "meaningful discussions." :-)

"Army RTTY repeaters?" You call a 10 KW water-cooled HF
transmitter a "repeater?" :-) [BC-310 driven by a BC-339]

The U.S. military never had "NATO-issued RTTY microphones."
Still don't.

Kellie all "knowledgeable" about an AN/FRC-22 40 KW SSB
transmitter? He ever tune one up? He ever keep it going 24/7?

>> 1955 was 49 years ago.
>> Is Kellie POSITIVE the ARRL adopted the NATO phonetic
>> alphabet 49 years ago? Or even 48 years ago?

Kellie in Nap Mode, can't be bothered to check it out... :-)

>> The ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) may also
>> have selected the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955, rather than
>> 1956, but I expect a lot of outraged protests on that... :-)

Kellie still in Nap Mode (old folks seem to do a lot of that).

But, Kellie can't tell the difference between a challenging statement
or a question through his tri-focals, so I let that pass. :-)

>> I do know it is NOT the "ICAO phonetic alphabet"
>
>> except for a
>> bunch of anti-military peacenik hardliners will never admit to the
>> existance of NATO, therefore they want to rename it for "ICAO."
>
><<SNORES>>

Poor baby. All tuckered out from all that reading of someone you
perceive walked all over your words? Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

>> Kellie will now start mumbling "putz" and other Yiddish
>> endearments... :-)
>
>Can't even start to be bothered, "The Putz" obviously works just fine
>for everybody around here.

Kellie woke up to stumble his way around a trolling reply. :-)

>SK dit dit.

You passed on? How sad. Or did you just pass CW gas?

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4862. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:28:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613162859.18863.00000385@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92966

In article <20040612033449.11516.00001119@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/11/2004 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040611162722.28114.00000369@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>> I do know it is NOT the "ICAO phonetic alphabet" except for a
>> bunch of anti-military peacenik hardliners will never admit to the
>> existance of NATO, therefore they want to rename it for "ICAO."
>
> Hmmmmmm.....
>
> That's funny...
>
> APCO calls it the ICAO phonetic alphabet.

APCO isn't a military organization.

Police agencies had the "10 codes" before CBers did. :-)

> The FAA calls it the ICAO phonetic alphabet.

FAA is (through the USA) part of the ICAO. :-)

Where did the ICAO get their phonetic alphabet? :-)

NATO had it first in 1955. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> It's refered to as the ICAO phonetic alphabet in about a dozen different
>military aeronatutical publications that I recall including the FLIP charts.

You've "FLIPed" out, nursie.

Ain't no "aeronatutical publications." Lots of aeronautical ones... :-)

> I've seen it refered to as the ICAO phonetic is several European radio
>hobby magazines.

You've also said "MARS is amateur radio" despite DoD Directive 4650.2 (effective 21 Nov 03). :-)

You NOW refer to amateur radio as a "hobby?" Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Where is that enormous pride and esprit de corps in that very special "service" you honor by keeping it like a quasi-paramilitary something or other?

Remember, "ham radio" doesn't work like all other radios. It is
very different in your reality, extra special and never, never, ever
"just a hobby" in that fantasyland.

> Ya figger all them folks know something YOU don't, Lennie...?!?!

NATO knows. The made the NATO phonetic alphabet a reality
in 1955. Hasn't changed any since that year.

>> Kellie will now start mumbling "putz" and other Yiddish
>> endearments... :-)
>
> If it fits, Lennie...
>
> Ya PUTZ!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More of that "meaningful discussion?" :-)

LHA / WMD

4863. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 20:46:14 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <q23zc.67564$tl2.22042@fed1read07>
Source record: 92977

But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio Socities
that you do.

And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some DX
operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

"JJ" <radiobuff66@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:pa2dnWsHvLe-JVHdRVn-tw@gbronline.com...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
>
> > As a
> > ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......
>
> There is no rule that a ham must use a certain set if phonetics.
>

4864. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 21:50:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6PadnTNf3MW2UVHdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92978

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> (jumping in on the Sermon On The Antenna
> Mount trolling) writes:

> Awww...poor Mike got his ego perceived as stepped on?

Absolutely not! I was complementing you on something. You are pretty
good at this.

> Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)

I hate almost no one. Whether you like it or not, I like you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4865. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 21:52:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RPadne_XMMkLUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92979

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some level of
> operational courtesy though.
>
> Ryan
> KC8PMX

I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
to me?

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:Wmqyc.2021$Wr.120@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>As a ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......
>>
>>No you're not.
>>
>>Regardless of the article in QST, there is no requirement for hams to
>>use the ICAO phonetics. You are free to use whatever phonetics you
>>wish, or none at all if that strikes your fancy.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>--
>>SOC #291 http://www.qsl.net/soc
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

4866. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 21:54:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92980

Da Shadow wrote:

> But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio Socities
> that you do.
>
> And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some DX
> operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
>
> --
> Lamont Cranston

Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo their blessed contact.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4867. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 21:57:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040613175754.28114.00000385@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 92981

In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>
>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>> :-)
>>
>>
>> Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>>
>> You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>been
>> involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
>proclaims
>> what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>>
>> Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>yet
>> proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point
>of
>> not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>
>> Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>> repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>historical
>> importance?
>>
>> Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
>on a
>> civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
>the
>> other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
>class,
>> education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>

> You forgot to add:
>
> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>
Well, if the shoe fits...

>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!

I'm not.

>You
>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>irresistable.

Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.

>Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.

Nothing new there, Mike.
>
> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.

I don't.

There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
insult, and destroy - or attempt to.

Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
p.aol.com&output=gplain

73 de Jim, N2EY

4868. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-13 22:38:58 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <6l4zc.67573$tl2.25915@fed1read07>
Source record: 92982

Perhaps Mike -- But they sometimes are the only game in town

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> Da Shadow wrote:
>
> > But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
Socities
> > that you do.
> >
> > And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some
DX
> > operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
> >
> > --
> > Lamont Cranston
>
>
> Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a
> person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
> their blessed contact.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

4869. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 00:56:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <1smdnbVGKKDAZVHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92983

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:RPadne_XMMkLUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some level
of
> > operational courtesy though.
> >
> > Ryan
> > KC8PMX
>
> I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
> me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
> to me?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call correct even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least once phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently repeated back to me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who don't make that mistake are those who have known me for a while and are familiar with my call.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4870. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 01:01:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <eNadnVwQgfgXZFHdRVn-uA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92984

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> Da Shadow wrote:
>
> > But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
Socities
> > that you do.
> >
> > And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some
DX
> > operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
> >
> > --
> > Lamont Cranston
>
>
> Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a
> person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
> their blessed contact.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

There's often quite a good reason for it. Many DX stations only have a
minimal grasp of English and departing from the ICAO phonetics can cause
them real problems in getting the call sign correct.

In addition, if everyone is using the same phonetics, the brain becomes
trained to them and can pick it out even if mispronounced, heavily accented,
or incompletely heard due to noise or interference.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4871. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 01:18:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PPidnY_NsoNRYVHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92985

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
>
>>Da Shadow wrote:
>>
>>
>>>But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
>
> Socities
>
>>>that you do.
>>>
>>>And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some
>
> DX
>
>>>operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
>>>
>>>--
>>>Lamont Cranston
>>
>>
>>Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a
>>person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
>>their blessed contact.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> There's often quite a good reason for it. Many DX stations only have a
> minimal grasp of English and departing from the ICAO phonetics can cause
> them real problems in getting the call sign correct.

Do they really have that bad a grasp, I wonder? Language barrier would argue in favor of the "country" type phonetics instead of the ICAU versions. In the short time I have been a ham, I have made use of the languages I have learned in the past, and worked at picking up others. I sure as anything would work hard at picking up English if I was planning on working DX.

p.s. no Anglo-centrism here - I would pick up Swahili if need be.

> In addition, if everyone is using the same phonetics, the brain becomes
> trained to them and can pick it out even if mispronounced, heavily accented,
> or incompletely heard due to noise or interference.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4872. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 01:39:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hz9qby2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 92986

On Sun, 13 Jun 2004 17:52:22 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:

>I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
>me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
>to me?

We have an individual (respected old-timer at that) who, when he
takes his turn-in-the-barrel as net control of our daily ARES/RACES
check-in, gets confused over people's call signs regardless of
whether phonetics are used or not, and even if one identifies with
phonetics, he will acknowledge with some ad-hoc inconsistent mixture
of ITU, old military, and old telco (cities) phonetics.

For one, it drives me nuts even though he's a nice guy.

And on another score, the last letter in my call is "P", and how can
"pa-PA" - or even the popular pronunciation "poppuh" be confused with
"Japan" ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4873. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:00:54 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9507DF921C51Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92987

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:1smdnbVGKKDAZVHd4p2dnA@comcast.com:

>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:RPadne_XMMkLUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
>>
>>
>> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>> > If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some
>> > level of operational courtesy though.
>> >
>> > Ryan
>> > KC8PMX
>>
>> I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
>> me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
>> to me?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call
> correct even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least
> once phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently
> repeated back to me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who
> don't make that mistake are those who have known me for a while and are
> familiar with my call.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Likewise, without phonetics my call is often copied as N3KRP or N3KAP
instead of N3KIP. Unfortunately, using international phonetics my November
3 Kilo India Papa is often copied as November 3 Kilo India Japan (see the
argument above with Hans who favours the alternate set that uses Japan
instead of Juliet).

4874. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:01:33 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9507DFAE6ECB9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92988

JJ <radiobuff66@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:pa2dnWsHvLe-JVHdRVn-tw@gbronline.com:

> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
>
>> As a
>> ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......
>
> There is no rule that a ham must use a certain set if phonetics.
>
>

No indeed, but I wish there was.

4875. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:05:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <j72dnSWECJQflVDdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92989

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:PPidnY_NsoNRYVHdRVn-tA@adelphia.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> >
> >>Da Shadow wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
> >
> > Socities
> >
> >>>that you do.
> >>>
> >>>And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and
some
> >
> > DX
> >
> >>>operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
> >>>
> >>>--
> >>>Lamont Cranston
> >>
> >>
> >>Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a
> >>person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
> >>their blessed contact.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > There's often quite a good reason for it. Many DX stations only have a
> > minimal grasp of English and departing from the ICAO phonetics can cause
> > them real problems in getting the call sign correct.
>
> Do they really have that bad a grasp, I wonder? Language barrier would
> argue in favor of the "country" type phonetics instead of the ICAU
> versions. In the short time I have been a ham, I have made use of the
> languages I have learned in the past, and worked at picking up others. I
> sure as anything would work hard at picking up English if I was planning
> on working DX.

>

It actually is not rare for a DX station to know practically no English at all (it is even more true in a contest that includes DX). Some are simply interested in running contacts. All they can handle is a signal report and call sign. So using the phonetics THEY want or are accustomed to is the polite thing to do.

Keep in mind that the ICAO phonetics were developed with certain criteria in mind. One of these is that they be relatively easy to pronounce even if the person doesn't otherwise speak English. Another criterion was that even if mispronounced, listeners could still ascertain what letter was intended. For example, the French may actually pronounce "Charlie" as "Sharlie" but the listener is still able to get the right letter. Germans may pronounce "Whiskey" as "Viskey" but we still get the letter correct. Americans will mispronounce "Quebec" and "Papa" but again the other station has a very good chance of getting it correct. Another criterion was that the words be of reasonable length, neither excessively short or excessively long. Although the ICAO phonetics sometimes are poor in meeting all the criteria, the country name approach is often poorer in this regard (e.g. Zanzibar is just way too long).

Now I have used phonetics other than the ICAO upon occasion. However I always start with the ICAO and switch only if they can't seem to understand, which happens on shortwave with the noise and interference. Fortunately that is rare for me. My call seems to work quite well with the ICAO phonetics. On the other hand, my OM sometimes finds it necessary to use "Sugar" instead of "Sierra" and "Germany" instead of "Golf". The soft, sibilant sound of "Sierra" often gets lost in the hiss of noise and the throaty "Golf" seems almost to get "swallowed" when spoken and sometimes doesn't come through well. Still this does not mean one should disregard the ICAO set.

The objective is always clarity of communication. Standardization of approach generally helps this. That is why the ICAO developed its phonetics and why amateur organizations encourage the use of this set.

Again it goes back to what the brain has been trained to do. To someone who is accustomed to using "Zulu", the phonetic "Zanzibar" can cause the brain to momentarily stumble in getting the letter. Then a repeat is required. Would you rather repeat the phonetic several times or use one that the station is accustomed to so they can get it on the first try?

In looking at your call, you are fortunate (just as I am) to have one composed of letters that comes across easily using the ICAO phonetics. There should be no need to use any other set with a call such as yours and other phonetics could actually be confusing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4876. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:10:09 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9507E12383428elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92990

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com:

> Da Shadow wrote:
>
>> But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
>> Socities that you do.
>>
>> And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and
>> some DX operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
>>
>> --
>> Lamont Cranston
>
>
> Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If
> a
> person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
> their blessed contact.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

If they don't know much English, it's a bit rough on them to use non-
standard words, and even if they do, it increases the chance of a busted
call in the log.

4877. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:42:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40CD10A1.69E891C8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 92991

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> >lenover21@aol.com
> >> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
> >>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
> >>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
> >>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
> >>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
> >>> :-)
> >>
> >>
> >> Gee, Len, that's interesting....
> >>
> >> You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
> >been
> >> involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
> >proclaims
> >> what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
> >>
> >> Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
> >yet
> >> proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point
> >of
> >> not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
> >>
> >> Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
> >> repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
> >historical
> >> importance?
> >>
> >> Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
> >on a
> >> civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
> >the
> >> other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
> >class,

> >> education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
> >
> > You forgot to add:
> >
> > "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
> >e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
> >in certain areas only serves as more bait.
> >
> Well, if the shoe fits...
>
> >I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>
> I'm not.
>
> >You
> >(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
> >know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
> >irresistable.
>
> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>
> >Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
> >group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
> >those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.
>
> Nothing new there, Mike.
> >
> > This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>
> I don't.
>
> There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
> insult, and destroy - or attempt to.
>
> Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
> p.aol.com&output=gplain

I hear tell that those air raids on Tokyo in the fifties were exercises in sheer terror. I have to admit to being a little puzzled by what appears to be a reference to the writer's multiple sphincters (in the next to last paragraph).

Dave K8MN

4878. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:44:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92992

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613162838.18863.00000367@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040613094919.08293.00000970@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/12/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121434.b154c13@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>> >Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>> >Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
> >>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
> >>>
> >>> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
> >>> >
> >>> >ahoy
> >>> >boy...(SNIP)
> >>>
> >>> Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came up
> >>> with it?
> >>>
> >>> Steve, K4YZ
> >>
> >>Steve, no thanks for the private email, even though I've asked you
> >>repeatedly not to communicate with me privately. I really do prefer
> >>to keep all comms with you strictly public. You broke the rules, but
> >>certainly in keeping with your mode of operation.
> >
> > No problem, Brain.
> >
> > YOU made promises about certain "private" e mails before that you
> >overtly broke...
> >
> > Just like your mentor...
>
> Poor baby. Still fretting over AOL tossing off your private home page
> that was totally libelous? :-)
>
> And all because of a simple mistake in private e-mails which nursie
> complained long and loudly about in public in here? :-)

>
> PCTA Exta double standard at work. QED.

Len, I don't see Steve's post in Google. Is he using the "no
archive?"

Can't blame him what with such a litiguous society.

> >>So how is it that you can call people liars all day long, give people
> >>a deadline to produce some google search, hound and hound those who
> >>disagree with you, and in general be the sweetheart pariah of the
> >>PCTA?
> >>
> >>But when someone else calls you a liar, when you have lied, you
> >>threaten a summons. Are you nuts? No. Don't answer that question.
> >>I don't want any more lies out of you.
> >
> > I've not uttered any lies here, Brain.
>
> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" :-)
>
> > You've made THAT accusation before and never substantiated it. Just
> >like you've never justified ANY of the claims YOU'VE made.
>
> Nursie never ever do anything wrong. Everyone else do wrong! :-)

He's an idiot.

> > You make accusations and claims you don't justify then cry "foul!" when
> >you get spoon fed your own silliness.
> >
> > Sucks to be you, Brain. Seems it's a well worn path, though.
>
> More "meaningful discourse." :-)

Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage. A simple 5
minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
USA stations.

> >>So congratulations on earning persona non grata. You've truly worked
> >>hard at ii. Earned, Never Given.
> >
> > According to YOU...?!?!
> >
> > HAH!
> >
> >>And FWIW, the fenetic alfabet was a joke, but leave it to the mentally
> >>impaired to think is was a serious effort.
> >
> > I KNOW it was a joke. I have yet to see a whole lot come out of you

> >that I could take seriously. How could I?
> >
> >>Sayonara and have a great life.
> >
> > As long as I have folks like you and Lennie against which I can benchmark
> >what is bad as compared to what is good, it IS a great life.
> >
> > You REALLY don't get it, do you?
>
> Nobody does. Nursie's personal reality is there and this is
> it for him.

Nobody does. Nobody "gets it." Hannibal Lector might get it, but I
don't.

> Meanwhile, DoD Directive 4650.2, AR 25-4, NTP 8(C) are still
> there, defining and regulating MARS for the Military.

Sad that Steve can't read, can't google. It would save him a lot of
grief. He can only make untrue accusations about sexual orientation
and preferences for minors.

> NATO did adopt its phonetic alphabet in 1955...the next to the
> last year I was on active duty in the U.S. Army.

Why didn't they just wait for IGY?

> None of that happened according to nursie. All of us "Lie."
> The real truth is in his imagination. Tsk, tsk.

He has demons inside.

> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

4879. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:47:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4rGdneHL1bA1jFDdRVn-sQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92993

Alun wrote:

> JJ <radiobuff66@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:pa2dnWsHvLe-JVHdRVn-
> tw@gbronline.com:
>
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>As a
>>>ham I am required to use the ITU phonetics.......
>>
>>There is no rule that a ham must use a certain set if phonetics.
>>
>>
>
>
> No indeed, but I wish there was.

It would be even better if we had rules that say exactly what we can say during the contact. 8^) Yer getting a tad rigid here, Alun.

73's!! - Mike KB3EIA -

4880. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:52:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406131852.696379b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92994

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613162851.18863.00000380@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040612030613.11516.00001111@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/10/2004 6:40 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100340.41de4839@posting.google.com>
>
> >>If you behave yourself and quit calling everyone that you disagree
> >>with a liar, at least you can hide your problem.
> >
> > My only "problem", Brain, is not tolerating persons who have been proven
> >to be liars.
>
> You hate yourself in the morning. And at night. And during the day.
>
> > Two names come to immediate mind.
>
> Should be three. Steven, James, and Robeson. :-)
>
> And those unnamed other personalities: Nursie, the Dill Sergeant,
> the Air Ace of the CAP, Dr. Killgore, etc., etc.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. So much intolerance there!
>
> Check around, maybe you can get an industrial-strength mass
> shipment of tranquilizers at bargain prices...
>
> LHA / WMD

The idiot said my T5 logs were lost. They've been in storage since my
move to Ohio. 5 minutes on Google would have shown him that. But he
refused to look it up and continued to spread falsehoods.

I agree with the list of three names above.

4881. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 02:53:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92995

Alun wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com:
>
>
>>Da Shadow wrote:
>>
>>
>>>But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
>>>Socities that you do.
>>>
>>>And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and
>>>some DX operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
>>>
>>>--
>>>Lamont Cranston
>>
>>
>> Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If
>> a
>>person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
>>their blessed contact.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> If they don't know much English, it's a bit rough on them to use non-
> standard words, and even if they do, it increases the chance of a busted
> call in the log.

Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself (though
prefering plain callsigns).

I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say on
the air as long as it is decent language.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4882. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 03:00:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613230001.28360.00000274@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92997

In article <20040613175754.28114.00000385@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo ><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>> In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, >>lenover21@aol.com
>>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>>> :-)

>> You forgot to add:
>>
>> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>>
>Well, if the shoe fits...
>
>>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>
>I'm not.

Awwwww... :-)

>>You
>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>irresistable.
>
>Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.

Rev. Jim just CAN'T resist, can he? :-)

>>Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
>>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
>>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.
>
>Nothing new there, Mike.

>>
>> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>
>I don't.

Awwwww... :-)

>There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
>insult, and destroy - or attempt to.

Yup, yup, the "good old days" of classic amateur CW" are going
down the tubes and the righteous Rev. Jim is invoking the wrath
of the ham gods against those anti-CW heretic unbelievers!

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":

Rev. Jim has lots of "sphincter" problems, do he? :-)

Hoo, hoo...the Extra Double Standard is in full swing again!

Now the SUBJECT thread here is about phonetic alphabets but
Rev. Jim is way into the hellfire and damnation of the unbelievers
wishing to smite all heretics anywhichway he can. Subject, no,
attacking personalities, yes. :-)

He is on a roll and keeps forgetting he slips on the butter. :-)

LHA / WMD

4883. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 03:00:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613230002.28360.00000275@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92996

In article <6PadnTNf3MW2UVHdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> (jumping in on the Sermon On The Antenna
>> Mount trolling) writes:
>
>> Awww...poor Mike got his ego perceived as stepped on?
>
> Absolutely not! I was complementing you on something. You are pretty
>good at this.

Those replies "just seem to write themselves..." :-)

About two decades ago I started computer-modem communications.
I've seen and met lots of discussors and just dis-cussers in person
via the BBS gatherings. How folks write here is indicative of how
they really feel, up close and personal. :-)

>
>> Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)
>
> I hate almost no one. Whether you like it or not, I like you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mike. Your words in other messages betray you...

It is totally irrelevant whether anyone is "liked" or not. This is
computer-modem comms and the in-person social rules don't
apply here. The SUBJECT is the thing, but so few beginners
can't grasp that. [so few have been in real debate so they are
inexperienced]

The SUBJECT title is about phonetic alphabets. It isn't about
"being liked" or "being disliked." On the phonetics, some folks
don't like phonetic alphabets, others think they belong...a sort of
quasi-jargon to hang with all the others. Me, I got them way,
way back as part of the military procedures, used them, and
the NATO set has become standard for me and I think nothing
more about it.

Perhaps one exception: "One-three-whiskey at the brewery"
has two sets of meanings to anyone on normal downwind leg
at VNY. [Anheiser-Busch brewery is just across the runways
from the VNY tower...controllers know it, so do all the local
pilots...:-)]

LHA / WMD

4884. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 03:34:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613233429.23857.00000354@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92999

In article <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040613162838.18863.00000367@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040613094919.08293.00000970@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/12/2004 5:34 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121434.b154c13@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040612032841.11516.00001118@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >>> >Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>> >Date: 6/11/2004 11:50 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406110850.122b4628@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>> >I'm going to start a new fenetic alfabet:
>> >>> >
>> >>> >ahoy
>> >>> >boy...(SNIP)
>> >>>
>> >>> Ebonics goes Caucasian. Why am I not surprised Son Of Lennie came
up
>> >>> with it?
>> >>>
>> >>> Steve, K4YZ
>> >>
>> >>Steve, no thanks for the private email, even though I've asked you
>> >>repeatedly not to communicate with me privately. I really do prefer
>> >>to keep all comms with you strictly public. You broke the rules, but
>> >>certainly in keeping with your mode of operation.
>> >
>> > No problem, Brain.
>> >
>> > YOU made promises about certain "private" e mails before that you
>> >overtly broke...
>> >
>> > Just like your mentor...
>>

>> Poor baby. Still fretting over AOL tossing off your private home page
>> that was totally libelous? :-)
>>
>> And all because of a simple mistake in private e-mails which nursie
>> complained long and loudly about in public in here? :-)
>>
>> PCTA Exta double standard at work. QED.
>
>Len, I don't see Steve's post in Google. Is he using the "no
>archive?"

Dunno...haven't been in Google for months and months. No reason
to go there for this newsgroup. :-)

>Can't blame him what with such a litiguous society.

I doubt he understands that he could be sued. In his reality, he
is absolutely and totally "correct" and any opposition is terribly
"wrong." Ergo, he is not ever going to be sued by anyone.

AOL knows that. :-) They took down his libelous Home Page
as soon as I made them aware of it... :-)

>> >>So how is it that you can call people liars all day long, give people
>> >>a deadline to produce some google search, hound and hound those who
>> >>disagree with you, and in general be the sweetheart pariah of the
>> >>PCTA?
>> >>
>> >>But when someone else calls you a liar, when you have lied, you
>> >>threaten a summons. Are you nuts? No. Don't answer that question.
>> >>I don't want any more lies out of you.
>> >
>> > I've not uttered any lies here, Brain.
>>
>> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" :-)
>>
>> > You've made THAT accusation before and never substantiated it. Just
>> >like you've never justified ANY of the claims YOU'VE made.
>>
>> Nursie never ever do anything wrong. Everyone else do wrong! :-)
>
>He's an idiot.

I'll be kinder. He is stuck in that alternate reality where he is always
right and never has to answer to anyone else. He hasn't understood
that everyone else lives in the real reality. :-)

>> > You make accusations and claims you don't justify then cry "foul!"
when
>> >you get spoon fed your own silliness.
>> >
>> > Sucks to be you, Brain. Seems it's a well worn path, though.

>>
>> More "meaningful discourse." :-)
>
>Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage. A simple 5
>minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
>up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
>I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
>USA stations.

Half of the Gang of Four still want your head on a platter for even
being IN that country and because you talked back to them. Those
PCTAs can say and do anything they want but NOBODY can talk
back to them without incurring their divine wrath. <shrug>

>> >>So congratulations on earning persona non grata. You've truly worked
>> >>hard at ii. Earned, Never Given.
>> >
>> > According to YOU...?!?!
>> >
>> > HAH!
>> >
>> >>And FWIW, the fenetic alfabet was a joke, but leave it to the mentally
>> >>impaired to think is was a serious effort.
>> >
>> > I KNOW it was a joke. I have yet to see a whole lot come out of you
>> >that I could take seriously. How could I?
>> >
>> >>Sayonara and have a great life.
>> >
>> > As long as I have folks like you and Lennie against which I can
benchmark
>> >what is bad as compared to what is good, it IS a great life.
>> >
>> > You REALLY don't get it, do you?
>>
>> Nobody does. Nursie's personal reality is there and this is
>> it for him.
>
>Nobody does. Nobody "gets it." Hannibal Lector might get it, but I
>don't.

Maybe nursie grows his own cilantro. "Tastes <slurp> good with a
little cilantro..."

>> Meanwhile, DoD Directive 4650.2, AR 25-4, NTP 8(C) are still
>> there, defining and regulating MARS for the Military.
>
>Sad that Steve can't read, can't google. It would save him a lot of
>grief. He can only make untrue accusations about sexual orientation
>and preferences for minors.

Anyone who doesn't think and do exactly as him is "perverse."

>> NATO did adopt its phonetic alphabet in 1955...the next to the
>> last year I was on active duty in the U.S. Army.
>
>Why didn't they just wait for IGY?

NATO, not NASA. Remember what happened to the all-USA-made
Viking Rocket? That was NASA's and Martin's... :-)

>> None of that happened according to nursie. All of us "Lie."
>> The real truth is in his imagination. Tsk, tsk.
>
>He has demons inside.

Maybe he uses a mouth wash and gargoyles after that?

:-)

Or, post-traumatic stress disorder after all those "hostile actions?"

LHA / WMD

4885. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 03:34:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040613233430.23857.00000355@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 92998

In article <1e4e3692.0406131852.696379b5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040613162851.18863.00000380@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040612030613.11516.00001111@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/10/2004 6:40 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100340.41de4839@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>If you behave yourself and quit calling everyone that you disagree
>> >>with a liar, at least you can hide your problem.
>> >
>> > My only "problem", Brain, is not tolerating persons who have been
>proven
>> >to be liars.
>>
>> You hate yourself in the morning. And at night. And during the day.
>>
>> > Two names come to immediate mind.
>>
>> Should be three. Steven, James, and Robeson. :-)
>>
>> And those unnamed other personalities: Nursie, the Dill Sergeant,
>> the Air Ace of the CAP, Dr. Killgore, etc., etc.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. So much intolerance there!
>>
>> Check around, maybe you can get an industrial-strength mass
>> shipment of tranquilizers at bargain prices...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>The idiot said my T5 logs were lost. They've been in storage since my
>move to Ohio. 5 minutes on Google would have shown him that. But he
>refused to look it up and continued to spread falsehoods.

...and he will continue to do all that spreading. :-)

Nursie thinks it is fine and dandy for him to say anything he wants
but others can't talk back to him...those others are "liars" and

"putzes." And Rev. Jim is on his hellfire/brimstone bicycle, busy pedalling as fast as he can without getting tripped every foot of the way on a nursie nasty. :-)

>I agree with the list of three names above.

There's a far richer panopoly of Yiddish phrases which could be used but those are good only for those who understand that curious hybrid language...and none of the three names would fit such profiling. :-)

We now return everybody to the personal attack modes of the PCTAs hell-bent on smiting the unbeliever NCTA. Morse Evangelism rules! :-)

LHA / WMD

4886. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 04:12:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LfSdnZIh4NYFuFDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92900

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <6PadnTNf3MW2UVHdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>>In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> (jumping in on the Sermon On The Antenna
>>>Mount trolling) writes:
>>
>>> Awww...poor Mike got his ego perceived as stepped on?
>>
>> Absolutely not! I was complementing you on something. You are pretty
>>good at this.
>
>
> Those replies "just seem to write themselves..." :-)
>
> About two decades ago I started computer-modem communications.

Those days were something by comparison. Phone cradle modems and slow
as molasses. Can't say as I'm all that sorry they are gone.

> I've seen and met lots of discussors and just dis-cussers in person
> via the BBS gatherings.

Yeah, me too.

> How folks write here is indicative of how
> they really feel, up close and personal. :-)

You are 100 percent correct.

>
>>> Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)
>>
>> I hate almost no one. Whether you like it or not, I like you.
>
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mike. Your words in other messages betray you...

I'm sorry you feel that way.

> It is totally irrelevant whether anyone is "liked" or not.

100 percent correct. That doesn't change the fact that I do like you.

> This is
> computer-modem comms and the in-person social rules don't
> apply here.

If you do not wish them to apply to you, they don't have to. You are
the master of what you say and do in person or in a newsgroup.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Kiki-Bueno-3-Encarta-Insipid-Autogyro

hmmm, that's beginning to sound like some of the spam I've been getting
lately! 8^)

4887. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 04:15:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <bYqdnZrNbP7Ru1DdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92901

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Sun, 13 Jun 2004 17:52:22 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
>>me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
>>to me?
>
>
> We have an individual (respected old-timer at that) who, when he
> takes his turn-in-the-barrel as net control of our daily ARES/RACES
> check-in, gets confused over people's call signs regardless of
> whether phonetics are used or not, and even if one identifies with
> phonetics, he will acknowledge with some ad-hoc inconsistent mixture
> of ITU, old military, and old telco (cities) phonetics.
>
> For one, it drives me nuts even though he's a nice guy.
>
> And on another score, the last letter in my call is "P", and how can
> "pa-PA" - or even the popular pronunciation "poppuh" be confused with
> "Japan" ??

pa-PA could under some circumstances sound a teeny bit like Japan if
some one pronounced it Jaw-pawn. Who would do that, I'm not sure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4888. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 07:06:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406132306.5ff8f67a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92902

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message news:<20040613162859.18863.00000385@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More of that "meaningful discussion?" :-)

Too bad that all of your "arguments" were over spelling errors.

Nothing substantial or meaningful.

Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4889. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 07:17:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406132317.33f9c4d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92903

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613162846.18863.00000373@mb-m02.aol.com>...

> Everyone who disagree with nursie are the liars.

Nope.

Only those who tell tales that can't be substantiated by some
third party source of some presentation of documentation.

So far YOUR only "point" is that I won't discuss the details of
actions I was involved in in the Marines. The fact is I mention the
Corps only when it's brought up by you, and then only because you
can't seem to get things right.

No wonder you're no longer an "engineer working regular hours".

Judging from what I've been able to ascertain from people who
actually knew you, your best skill was getting away with mediocrity
until you were given the "opportunity to expand your horizons" with
some other employer. That you invested your monies wisely is your
only milestone.

You can continue to make your silly assertions and feign
indignation at the berating you receive in this forum. Obviously it
wasn't the first time anyone was able to see through you and your
ineptness. It's just that in this forum you can get away with it and
claim "First Amendment" privilege.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4890. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 09:58:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040614055809.18863.00000388@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 92904

Y'know, with all this discussion about different phonetic alphabets, people confusing "Papa" with "Japan" and DX/contest folks using a completely different set and being cornfuzed by anything else, it makes me wonder.

Doesn't all this add up to 'phone modes being "slow", "limited" and "error-prone"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4891. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 10:10:53 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406140210.2fbe4c50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92905

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613233429.23857.00000354@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage. A simple 5
> >minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
> >up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
> >I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
> >USA stations.
>
> Half of the Gang of Four still want your head on a platter for even
> being IN that country and because you talked back to them. Those
> PCTAs can say and do anything they want but NOBODY can talk
> back to them without incurring their divine wrath. <shrug>

I'll probably find my storage unit broken into and the contents
scattered over hells half acre. Those logs have become quite valuable
to the Gang of Four.

4892. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 10:57:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040614065737.23322.00000300@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 92906

In article <d22b54c3.0406120417.76a0dc1e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Today "Romeo Victor" cuts thru the crap like a knife.

"Echo Yankee" does almost as well.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4893. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 12:25:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <jJidnfo2EKVFBFDdRVn-gg@comcast.com>
Source record: 92907

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> [snip]
> Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself (though
> prefering plain callsigns).
>
> I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say on
> the air as long as it is decent language.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Actually the DX station is not so much trying to tell people what to say as telling them what works for him so that those calling the DX can maximize their chances of getting through and the DX can maximize his results. I personally would look at it as simply trying to facilitate communication.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4894. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 12:30:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <hN6dnSgXfZCPBlDdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 92908

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:bYqdnZrNbP7Ru1DdRVn-hA@adelphia.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Sun, 13 Jun 2004 17:52:22 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >
> >>I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
> >>me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
> >>to me?
> >
> >
> > We have an individual (respected old-timer at that) who, when he
> > takes his turn-in-the-barrel as net control of our daily ARES/RACES
> > check-in, gets confused over people's call signs regardless of
> > whether phonetics are used or not, and even if one identifies with
> > phonetics, he will acknowledge with some ad-hoc inconsistent mixture
> > of ITU, old military, and old telco (cities) phonetics.
> >
> > For one, it drives me nuts even though he's a nice guy.
> >
> > And on another score, the last letter in my call is "P", and how can
> > "pa-PA" - or even the popular pronunciation "poppuh" be confused with
> > "Japan" ??
>
>
> pa-PA could under some circumstances sound a teeny bit like Japan if
> some one pronounced it Jaw-pawn. Who would do that, I'm not sure.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

In many languages, the English unaccented sound of a as in the first
syllable of Japan and the hard, short sound of a as in the second syllable
of Japan simply don't exist. Those learning English have to make a special
effort to learn to pronounce them. I've heard several foreign stations
pronounce it more like "jaw-pawn" than the standard English pronunciation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4895. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:02:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614090243.13387.00000576@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92909

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/13/2004 11:12 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <LfSdnZIh4NYFuFDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> About two decades ago I started computer-modem communications.
>
> Those days were something by comparison. Phone cradle modems and slow
>as molasses. Can't say as I'm all that sorry they are gone.

Me too.

However, if you pay close attention, Mike, you'll see yet another
LennieTroll in this exchange.

You see Lennie spends a great deal of time berating anone in this forum
that dares to express ANY degree of "experience" in ANY communications related
discipline. He then gets off in a tangent about how anyone who discusses
anything older than an hour is "archaic" and otherwise backwards.

However it's obviously not against HIS rules for HIM to do the very same
thing.

I haven't figgured that out yet...Seems a bit two-faced to me.

But then nothing about pathological liars is easy to understand.

>>>> Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)
>>>
>>> I hate almost no one. Whether you like it or not, I like you.
>>
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mike. Your words in other messages betray you...
>
> I'm sorry you feel that way.
>
>> It is totally irrelevant whether anyone is "liked" or not.
>
> 100 percent correct. That doesn't change the fact that I do like you.

I LOVE this, Mike!

If this isn't a cut-and-dried effort by His Scumminess to dig his heels in
and create yet another bloodbath in the NG, I don't know what is.

Sir Putzy did essentially the same thing with me. No amount of "thanks
for your opinion but I don't agree" satisfied him. He dug in with the Nazi
epithets and cries foul when it is visited back upon him.

>> This is
>> computer-modem comms and the in-person social rules don't
>> apply here.
>
> If you do not wish them to apply to you, they don't have to. You are
>the master of what you say and do in person or in a newsgroup.

Lennie percieves himself as a MasterDebator. And no doubt, he is...

73

Steve, K4YZ

4896. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:22:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614092217.13387.00000581@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92910

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/13/2004 4:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040613175754.28114.00000385@mb-m10.aol.com>

>There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
>insult, and destroy - or attempt to.
>
>Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
>p.aol.com&output=gplain

A quote from that post:

>From: lenof21@aol.com (Lenof21)
>Subject: Re: Morse monkeys are the worst!
>Date: 2000/03/28
>Message-ID: <20000328122107.02129.00001001@nso-fp.aol.com>
>References: <8bokskosu1@news.hawaii.edu>
>Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>X-Admin: news@aol.com

>Jeff, you've never been under Incoming, have you? While
>trying to get return artillery support on a radio while your
>ears, your whole body is numbed by HE infall on your
>position? Most folks in that position don't wet their
>pants...every sphincter tightens up, ears go deaf, eyes
>close tight, and every breath may be the last.

>I just helped plant my bro-in-law, another veteran.
>Why don't you quit the shore station histrionics and go
>back to ancient radio history. It will ease your troubled
>mind...and keep your pants dry.

>Len Anderson
>ex-RA16408336

It never fails to amaze me how Lennie the Lame always finds a way to
insinuate that he has some insight or knowledge about topics that he will, at
some other time, try to deminish the experiences in...

Of course the obvious question for His Creepiness is "What practical
experience do you have in being the recipient of "incomming" artillery...?!?!"

But Lennie's attempt to lambaste Jeff was colorful...right out of a Clancy novel.

Then there's the comment about his "bro-in'law".

That creates two more questions...First of all is WHAT did this have to do with ANYTHING about Morse Code, Amateur, military or "professional" radio, and TWO, Lennie had an ethnic relative...?!?!

Lastly we can ask Lennie what his service number has to do with anything. He was never in combat. He was never anything more than a rear area radio clerk, babysitting a handful of RTTY positions that were not his to decide how to operate.

Please, Lennie...TELL US how you were in a foxhole, taking "HE" mortar rounds, and how despite not peeing your pants, you still managed to pass 1.2 million messages at ADA...

Leonard H Anderson is one of the biggest, most prolific liars and antagonists in NG history...Isn't there a medal for THAT we can recommend him for? It will be the ONLY thing he ever earned honestly.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4897. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:28:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614092847.13387.00000583@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92911

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/13/2004 4:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <RPadne7XMMlgUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
>
>Da Shadow wrote:
>
>> But there are strong recommendations from the various Amateur Radio
>Socities
>> that you do.
>>
>> And I have heard many times in pile-ups --- ITU Phonetics only and some DX
>> operators won't answer you with any other phonetics.
>>
>> --
>> Lamont Cranston
>
>
> Wow, it must be something for these "operators" to be so anal! If a
>person only answers me because I speak a certain way, then I'll forgo
>their blessed contact.

There may be a legitimate reason for that, Mike...It's not that the other guy is particularly "anal', but English may not be his native language. You start throwing "cute" or non-traditional "phonetics" at him and he is lost...

73

Steve, K4YZ

4898. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:36:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614093646.13387.00000584@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92912

>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/13/2004 9:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406131852.696379b5@posting.google.com>

>The idiot said my T5 logs were lost.

No, I said YOU said your....

Oh...wait...

That STILL works!...Never mind..carry on!

>They've been in storage since my
>move to Ohio. 5 minutes on Google would have shown him that. But he
>refused to look it up and continued to spread falsehoods.

Then why don't YOU show us, Brain?

Do you REALLY want me to spend the time, come up with one of the posts
where you feigned having "lost" them, only to ONCE AGAIN prove that you are not
trustworthy?

>I agree with the list of three names above.

I am sure you do.

You THINK it detracts from you.

It doesn't.

Steve, K4YZ

4899. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:41:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614094135.13387.00000585@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92913

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/13/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>

>Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage.

No, you've not, but it's your story and I am sure you think it's true.

>A simple 5
>minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
>up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
>I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
>USA stations.

Then WHY haven't YOU taken five minutes to walk out to the garage, dig
them out, then PROVE your assertions are truthful?

(knock knock...because they are not...)

Steve, K4YZ

4900. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:43:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614094325.13387.00000586@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92914

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/14/2004 5:10 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406140210.2fbe4c50@posting.google.com>

>I'll probably find my storage unit broken into and the contents
>scattered over hells half acre. Those logs have become quite valuable
>to the Gang of Four.

"Storage unit"...?!?!

Two posts ago you said they were in your garage...

So now you've set us up for the adult version of "...but my dog ate my homework!..."

Sheeesh...

Steve, K4YZ

4901. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 13:46:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614094630.13387.00000587@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 92915

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/13/2004 3:28 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040613162854.18863.00000382@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040613094047.08293.00000969@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steaming Steve der STASI Unteroffizier who has to ride the coattails of
>those
>specifically attacking personalities) scribbles:

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

From the archived mistruths and fantasies of Leonard H. Anderson, a known pathological liar and ex-test bench technician (no longer able to work regular hours because most anyone who might hire him has finally gotten the word about him...)

Steve, K4YZ

4902. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 14:03:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406140603.34e8f95d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92916

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613162845.18863.00000372@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040612032528.11516.00001117@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steamy
> Steve Nursie of the TN State CAP storms again) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/10/2004 9:16 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>
>
> >>You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
> >>getting to you.
> > >
> > > People who are trying to berate others over thier choice of words should
> > >take a couple of seconds to proof read what they write BEFORE they send it,
> > >Brain.
> > >
> > > What a PUTZ!
> > >
> > > Brian, you're an idiot. It really is THAT simple.
> > >
> > > But hey, THANKS for making my job that much easier!
>
> Oh, my, all that "meaningful discourse" going on.
>
> Rev. Jim approves, of course. :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Len, it's kind of interesting what Steve thinks his job is. He is
here to call people "PUTZ," and "idiot." Wonder how much it pays?

Steve thinks he can brag about 7-Hostile Actions, but never
substantiate it. He is as pure as the driven snow. Steve can make an
assertion of fact that I lost my T5 logs, but never substantiate it.

Everyone else is a LIAR. 'cept Steve. He's here for meaningful
discourse.

4903. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 14:04:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406140604.35a84f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92917

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040613162839.18863.00000368@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040613100014.08293.00000972@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/12/2004 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>
> >
> >>> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
> >>> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
> >>> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
> >>> it really existed! :-)
> >>>
> >>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
> >>
> >>Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
> >>that you did it anyway?
> >
> > Lennie would like you to think that, Brain.
> >
> > Of course it's apparent he's got you believing a LOT of untrue things,
> >so I don't know why THIS would be any different.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. It should be an easy recall for anyone with fabled
> Recon Marine training to describe the location, the general
> vicinity, background, etc.

Yup. He ought to be able to call in the coordinates in MGRS.

That HRO location isn't in a large mall
> at all. [it's off the intersection of Victory Blvd and Buena Vista,
> major streets]
>
> The old HRO in Van Nuys is, by comparison nondescript for locality.
> However, the new location has many noticeable features. But,
> WHICH location of HRO was nursie talking about? There's three,
> not two. :-)
>
> > Just another LennieLie, now propagated by Son of Lennie.
> >
> > Putz and Putz Jr.
>
> Ah, more of the nursie "meaningful discourse." :-)

>
> I do hope Rev. Jim is looking in...much food for thought for another
> Sermon on the Antenna Mount!
>
> LHA / WMD

Love all this meaningful discourse.

4904. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 16:03:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406140803.68df5904@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92918

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<1smdnbVGKKDAZVHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:RPadne_XMMkLUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> >
> >
> > Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> >
> > > If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some level
> of
> > > operational courtesy though.
> > >
> > > Ryan
> > > KC8PMX
> >
> > I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
> > me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
> > to me?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call correct
> even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least once
> phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently repeated back to
> me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who don't make that mistake
> are those who have known me for a while and are familiar with my call.

There's an ancient quick fix for that problem. Use N 8 U Zed E.

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

4905. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 16:13:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <XtOdnUPYb7HZUlDdRVn-ug@comcast.com>
Source record: 92919

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0406140803.68df5904@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<1smdnbVGKKDAZVHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:RPadne_XMMkLUVHdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > >
> > > > If not required by laws or rules, then it is required out of some
level
> > of
> > > > operational courtesy though.
> > > >
> > > > Ryan
> > > > KC8PMX
> > >
> > > I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
> > > me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
> > > to me?
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call
correct
> > even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least once
> > phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently repeated
back to
> > me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who don't make that
mistake
> > are those who have known me for a while and are familiar with my call.
>
> There's an ancient quick fix for that problem. Use N 8 U Zed E.
>
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> w3rv

I am aware of that but am not used to it, not having grown up around
speakers of French or people from Canada or near the Canadian border.
Besides, I like to make absolutely sure that someone I've never spoken to
before gets it right. Occasionally the "E" also causes problems.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4906. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 17:06:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040614130623.09069.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 92920

In article <20040614094135.13387.00000585@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 14 Jun 2004 13:41:35 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/13/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage.
>
> No, you've not, but it's your story and I am sure you think it's true.
>
>>A simple 5
>>minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
>>up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
>>I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
>>USA stations.
>
> Then WHY haven't YOU taken five minutes to walk out to the garage, dig
>them out, then PROVE your assertions are truthful?
>
> (knock knock...because they are not...)
>
Steve,

What's the problem?

You never worked T5/N0IMD.

I never worked T5/N0IMD

Nobody else has yet come forward and said they worked T5/N0IMD. Nor has anyone claimed they didn't get a QSL that for such a contact.

And Mr. Burke has confirmed - repeatedly - that various people are not in his logs.

All of which is quite consistent and logical. Makes perfect sense.

After all, "/T5 logs" could be pieces of wood. I don't recall the word "logbook" being used by Mr. Burke in that connection.

Also, a logbook with no entries in it is still a logbook, isn't it?

So what's the problem?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4907. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144306.12940.00000232@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92922

In article <20040614094135.13387.00000585@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (gunnery nurse trying to imitate Joe Biden) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/13/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406131844.3a4ce672@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, I've always said that my /T5 logs are in storage.
>
> No, you've not, but it's your story and I am sure you think it's true.
>
>>A simple 5
>>minute google search could have borne that out. But Steve had to make
>>up stories. Untrue stories. They're not lost, never have been. And
>>I know that Steve and Kelly aren't in them because I didn't work any
>>USA stations.
>
> Then WHY haven't YOU taken five minutes to walk out to the garage, dig
>them out, then PROVE your assertions are truthful?

How does one PROVE anything to a nursie who can't accept any evidence? :-)

"Storage unit" of Brian's is NOT a "garage."

DoD Directive 4650.2 exists, as does NCP 8(C), yet nursie keeps on stating that "MARS is amateur radio!" :-)

> (knock knock...because they are not...)

Knock, knock...knock it off. Go pay your "rant," nursie.

Time for nursie to take his medications...the ones prescribed by a real MD.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4908. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144307.12940.00000234@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92923

In article <20040614092217.13387.00000581@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Please, Lennie...TELL US how you were in a foxhole, taking "HE" mortar
>rounds, and how despite not peeing your pants, you still managed to pass 1.2
>million messages at ADA...

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Gunnery nurse got some wrong medications from
the hospital drug cabinet. Again.

Lay off the wrong stuff, gunnery nurse. It's warping your mind.

> Leonard H Anderson is one of the biggest, most prolific liars and
>antagonists in NG history...Isn't there a medal for THAT we can recommend him
>for? It will be the ONLY thing he ever earned honestly.

Poor baby. Still on a "rant." Get mental help.

LHA / WMD

4909. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144307.12940.00000233@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92924

In article <20040614094630.13387.00000587@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/13/2004 3:28 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040613162854.18863.00000382@mb-m02.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040613094047.08293.00000969@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steaming Steve der STASI Unteroffizier who has to ride the coattails of
>>those specifically attacking personalities) scribbles:
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

It's rather obvious that the PCTA do NOT want to debate any morse code test issue. :-)

Anyone who is the slightest against manual telegraphy gets the "rant" treatment by the PCTA. :-)

> From the archived mistruths and fantasies of Leonard H. Anderson, a known
>pathological liar and ex-test bench technician (no longer able to work regular
>hours because most anyone who might hire him has finally gotten the word about
>him...)

Poor baby. Finally went over the edge totally, ey?

Must be the Dr. Killgore personna writing that, with the "pathological liar" label. :-)

Someone call CSI. A radio hum is ready for spontaneous combustion now that the red fire in his eyes have spread...best to get some forensic evidence before he makes an ash of himself...

Beep, beep...

LHA / WMD

4910. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144311.12940.00000236@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92921

In article <5c01b95b.0406132306.5ff8f67a@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >news:<20040613162859.18863.00000385@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More of that "meaningful discussion?" :-)
>
> Too bad that all of your "arguments" were over spelling errors.

Incorrect. See statement "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio." :-)

> Nothing substantial or meaningful.
>
> Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "In the valley of the blind, the one-eyed man is king." I have both eyes seeing. Nursie shuts down his. :-)

LHA / WMD

4911. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144311.12940.00000235@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92929

In article <20040614090243.13387.00000576@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/13/2004 11:12 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <LfSdnZIh4NYFuFDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> About two decades ago I started computer-modem communications.
>>
>> Those days were something by comparison. Phone cradle modems and slow
>>as molasses. Can't say as I'm all that sorry they are gone.
>
> Me too.
>
> However, if you pay close attention, Mike, you'll see yet another
>LennieTroll in this exchange.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. The Troll crawls from under the bridge, looks around, can see only trolls when he is alone...

> You see Lennie spends a great deal of time berating anone in this forum
>that dares to express ANY degree of "experience" in ANY communications related
>discipline.

I do?!? Most of the time it seems to be intense return fire against the un-aiming message warriors' (of "hostile action" rep) pot-shots.

Poor baby. I've had radio communications experience. Big-time stuff in the beginning. As "disciplined" as any military effort can be.

Nursie never did military radio comms in the service? Tsk, tsk.

>He then gets off in a tangent about how anyone who discusses
>anything older than an hour is "archaic" and otherwise backwards.

Where is nursie reading THAT? :-)

In one of those mythical "rants?"

[he must be ahead of himself in paying rant to his landlord...]

> However it's obviously not against HIS rules for HIM to do the very same
>thing.

So, nursie wants the uneven playing field where he can say
and do anything but all in opposition must be respectful,
loving, and kind to all that libel stuff? :-)

> I haven't figgured that out yet...Seems a bit two-faced to me.

"Figgured?" :-)

Nursie looks in mirror, sees only himself, then describes himself
as that which others are supposed to be. :-)

> But then nothing about pathological liars is easy to understand.

Poor baby. Broke another mirror again?

>>>>> Got a tad off the subject into Personal Hatred, dintcha? :-)
>>>>
>>>> I hate almost no one. Whether you like it or not, I like you.
>>>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mike. Your words in other messages betray you...
>>
>> I'm sorry you feel that way.
>>
>>> It is totally irrelevant whether anyone is "liked" or not.
>>
>> 100 percent correct. That doesn't change the fact that I do like you.
>
> I LOVE this, Mike!
>
> If this isn't a cut-and-dried effort by His Scumminess to dig his heels
in
>and create yet another bloodbath in the NG, I don't know what is.

"Bloodbath?!?" :-)

Like "the new math" this must be the "new meaningful discussion." :-)

> Sir Putzy did essentially the same thing with me. No amount of "thanks
>for your opinion but I don't agree" satisfied him. He dug in with the Nazi
>epithets and cries foul when it is visited back upon him.

Poor baby. Wrong size in newsgrope jackboots again?

Try leaving off the socks, they might fit better, less pinching...

>>> This is
>>> computer-modem comms and the in-person social rules don't
>>> apply here.
>>
>> If you do not wish them to apply to you, they don't have to. You are
>>the master of what you say and do in person or in a newsgroup.
>
> Lennie percieves himself as a MasterDebator. And no doubt, he is...

This is "debate?!?" :-) Hardly.

Somewhere, someplace, someone is actually discussing NATO phonetic alphabets and other phonetic alphabets. Not here.

Here there be only the on-going outraged "rants" of der gunnery nurse. :-)

Must be the "new amateur radio" too... :-)

LHA / WMD

4912. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144316.12940.00000237@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92930

In article <LfSdnZIh4NYFuFDdRVn-ug@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <6PadnTNf3MW2UVHdRVn-tw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> (jumping in on the Sermon On The Antenna
>>>>Mount trolling) writes:
>>>
>>>> Awww...poor Mike got his ego perceived as stepped on?
>>>
>>> Absolutely not! I was complementing you on something. You are pretty
>>>good at this.
>>
>> Those replies "just seem to write themselves..." :-)
>>
>> About two decades ago I started computer-modem communications.
>
> Those days were something by comparison. Phone cradle modems and >slow
as molasses. Can't say as I'm all that sorry they are gone.

In the beginning of BBSing, everyone was limited by modems
which, in 1970 had 300 WPM as "fast" rates. Ten years later
they had gotten past 1200 WPM. By 1990 modems could go
better than 28,800 WPM. It was relatively easy for the computer
to keep up on single-user lines. For 30 MHz clock computers,
some better software and interrupt-handlers could handle two
dozen callers simultaneously at BBS terminals.

I got access to the RCA corporate net in 1972 and generally
used the 100 WPM Model 33 TTY terminals. Good for moderate
character-plot "graphics" in black on white paper. Saved lots of
engineering time once one knew how to program in FORTRAN.
No inkjet printers then (Sanders Associates was just beginning
the first ones) so we just pasted printouts on backing paper and
xerocopied them. :-)

IBM's ECAP was king in 1972 for circuit analysis and it was
good. Don Pedersen's group at Berkeley was thinking about
the first SPICE (based on several other time-domain programs

such as Ohio State's OSUCAD and more), but had not yet thunk up the acronym SPICE. RCA used LECAP, a frequency-domain-only short version of ECAP and it was terrific for the limited user storage of 256K space. :-)

The first HP pocket scientific calculators were on the market (HP-35) and the programmable (!) version (HP-45) was just being packaged up. At an NADC visit in '72 I talked to an H-P rep whose territory included Bell Labs...the Labs had ordered 700 (!) to be GIVEN to staff. RCA corporate arranged a bulk order staff purchase for selected employees to buy the $395 calculator for $200. Three of us at EASD in Van Nuys (myself, Ken Adam, another in EW) got reimbursed for the difference...a relief since all three were constantly pestered by other staff wanting to "borrow" them. :-)

>> I've seen and met lots of discussors and just dis-cussers in person
>> via the BBS gatherings.
>
> Yeah, me too.

The first BBS I joined was Lynzie Flynn's "Motherboard," in December, 1984. A social BBS, the "Motherboard" had monthly Gatherings of subscribers, usually at the popular 945h Aerosquadron (restaurant) at Van Nuys airport. "Talk Channel" BBS soon opened, followed by "KBBS" and all had fun competing for subscribers and social events. I was on "The Ledge" which sysop Joe Sheppard made into an international network (!) once the higher-speed modems got really fast. "US Pompeii" was networked with "Pompeii" in Holland and run by my Talk Channel buddy Zippy Manus (managed by husband Stan Manus). Regular Gatherings at the Manus house in Hollywood Hills and there were two large Gatherings combining the Motherboard and US Pompeii at Warner Center (300+ in attendance). One of the ten oldest BBSs in the USA was "Mog-Ur's EMS" (for Electronic Message System) run by double Emmy-winning Tom Tcimpidis.

At least three amateur radio oriented BBSs existed in the northern Los Angeles region but none of them got large before the Internet went public in 1991. With the advent of the Internet, all the BBSs (all subscriber funded) had to close due to competition. Lynzie's Motherboard was sold after owner became Lynzie Flynn Zimmerman, Talk Channel's prime owner Gary died, and the KBBS sysop took his computers and subscriber funds and skipped town! :-) Three Motherboard/Pompeii competitor BBSs started up very late, notably Karen's "Modem Butterfly," all on the social themes but those could not hold up financially when the Internet grew.

>> How folks write here is indicative of how
>> they really feel, up close and personal. :-)
>
> You are 100 percent correct.

One gets further insight by private messaging on BBSs. Users
think they are absolutely private, but every terminal software
written allows sysops to constantly monitor communications
live. I was co-sysop on two of the BBSs.

Some get VERY into their computer personna. One guy on Talk
Channel had two subscriptions, one for himself and one for his
"girlfriend" (non-existant) who also "wrote public messages." :-)
There existed some feuds and weirdos on the BBSs which makes
this newsgroup look pale by comparison. I had the displeasure of
being in the group that "fired" one user who was on all known
social BBSs in the immediate area, causing trouble for most other
subscribers. A real closet sociopath. One was a real attorney
who adopted a completely opposite personna of an outgoing, rather
outrageous person named "Floyd," but done in humor, not spite.

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Mike. Your words in other messages betray you...
>
> I'm sorry you feel that way.
>
>> It is totally irrelevant whether anyone is "liked" or not.
>
> 100 percent correct. That doesn't change the fact that I do like you.

Anyone "looking for love" on either BBSs or the Internet is deluded
or too imaginative. I say that from observation even though I know
at least four local couples (besides sysop Lynzie) who met and got
married via BBSs. It happens on the Internet, too, but with mixed
results. Everyone is subject to their ability to write words for that
is solely how anyone first "meets" them.

The beginner at computer-modem communications tends to get
lost in their personal screen which contains only the words of the
other person. They want to interpret what they read into their own
thoughts and expectations. Only slightly better than monotonic
telegraphy, the words-on-a-screen have nothing else for normal
social clues, no tone of voice, no body language, no expressions
to read. Combine that with those who are intensly competititive
(or want to assume superiority) and you get the Flame Wars where
winning message points is the ultimate game.

The time and distance displacement afforded by computer-modem
comms has an inherent "safety" feature for those who want to be
"ruler" (in any way). They can toss aside their social inhibitions
and be as outrageous or superior or whatever in relative safety.
Sometimes those slip off the edge and start getting libelous. One
case that many have seen is the special angry home page done
by one of those here who went beyond the bounds of propriety. :-)

Some are just too righteous for words and Their words must be
taken as the Ultimate Truth...regardless of the subject. Irritation
(using that term very kindly) by those with such righteousness at
not being respected-for-Their-existance-as-Superior will result in

all kinds of nastygrams sent, regardless of the subject thread. :-)

>> This is
>> computer-modem comms and the in-person social rules don't
>> apply here.
>
> If you do not wish them to apply to you, they don't have to. You are
>the master of what you say and do in person or in a newsgroup.

Yes and no. :-) The time-and-distance separation of computer networking, plus the vast spread of the Internet internationally, can give some a sort of god-hood on their righteousness (and using themselves as role models for all of homo sap.) As I said, some fall off the edge and go totally libelous in other venues. Those who've not seen or experienced such a build-up of intense outrage will be influenced by the one-sided libel...and then the victim is unfairly judged.

In most browsers, a simple Return/Enter key will skip to the next message. Some newsgroupies can't seem to find that key. :-)

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Kiki-Bueno-3-Encarta-Insipid-Autogyro
>
> hmmm, that's beginning to sound like some of the spam I've been getting

>lately! 8^)

:-) BTASE (But That's Another Story Entirely) but me, too.

This has gotten off the subject of phonetic alphabets. Most threads do that, given enough Flame Warriors chomping on their bits ready to do message battle to the death, unable to skip a single message. :-)

NATO came up with the original "international" phonetic alphabet and released it in 1955 to all members. A lot of thought and quite a bit of study and research went into that to fit a lot of the western languages of NATO members.

Some communicators want-desire-need-demand "special" jargon for Their way of doing things. Human territorial imperative, their "turf." English-speaking radio hums seem to think that English as she are spoke is "international" just by using capitol city names. They don't realize that such capitol city names are NOT pronounced or spelled as they are in English. :-)

The ICAO decided that standard international spoken language for air traffic control shall be English. That was in the mid-1950s when, coincidentally, the surviving air carriers mostly came from English-speaking countries (as well as the aircraft makers). Just the same, the ICAO adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet as part

of that spoken language regulation. It works. Even if some public safety organizations use different phonetics such as "One Adam Twelve." :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4913. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144318.12940.00000238@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92925

In article <20040614093646.13387.00000584@mb-m26.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Call Area Etiquette
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/13/2004 9:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406131852.696379b5@posting.google.com>
>
>>The idiot said my T5 logs were lost.
>
> No, I said YOU said your....
>
> Oh...wait...
>
> That STILL works!...Never mind..carry on!

What "works?" Nursie working again?

>>They've been in storage since my
>>move to Ohio. 5 minutes on Google would have shown him that. But he
>>refused to look it up and continued to spread falsehoods.
>
> Then why don't YOU show us, Brain?
>
> Do you REALLY want me to spend the time, come up with one of the posts
>where you feigned having "lost" them, only to ONCE AGAIN prove that you are
>not trustworthy?

Poor nursie. Suffers from all that time and trouble on looking up posts. Valuable time that could be spent doing productive work like ethnic cleansing of this newsgroup of what he calls "undesireable elements" (those he cannot cow into submission to his wishes). :-)

Nursie can't be "shown" anything contradictory to his original statements. Never mind that at least four publicly-accessible documents on the Military Affiliate Radio System exist, nursie said "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" :-)

>>I agree with the list of three names above.
>
> I am sure you do.
>
> You THINK it detracts from you.
>
> It doesn't.

True, it detracts from the "three names:" Steven, James, and Robeson. :-)

Well, so far, there's been very little amateur radio policy brought up by nursie. It's all been about nursie and her, excuse me, his mighty rep as a "meaningful discourser." :-)

LHA / WMD

4914. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144319.12940.00000239@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92927

In article <1e4e3692.0406140604.35a84f1@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040613162839.18863.00000368@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040613100014.08293.00000972@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/12/2004 6:03 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406121503.3266be3a@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>> Betcha da gunnery nurse didn't know that, too busy "shopping
>> >>> with friends" there...like back at a time when that HRO store
>> >>> wasn't there! Amazing. Like Quantum Leap wasn't a TV show,
>> >>> it really existed! :-)
>> >>>
>> >>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>> >>
>> >>Hmmm? How can you shop at a store before it was there, but then say
>> >>that you did it anyway?
>> >
>> > Lennie would like you to think that, Brain.
>> >
>> > Of course it's apparent he's got you believing a LOT of untrue things,
>> >so I don't know why THIS would be any different.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. It should be an easy recall for anyone with fabled
>> Recon Marine training to describe the location, the general
>> vicinity, background, etc.
>
>Yup. He ought to be able to call in the coordinates in MGRS.
>
>> That HRO location isn't in a large mall
>> at all. [it's off the intersection of Victory Blvd and Buena Vista,
>> major streets]
>>
>> The old HRO in Van Nuys is, by comparison nondescript for locality.
>> However, the new location has many noticeable features. But,
>> WHICH location of HRO was nursie talking about? There's three,
>> not two. :-)
>>

>> > Just another LennieLie, now propagated by Son of Lennie.
>> >
>> > Putz and Putz Jr.
>>
>> Ah, more of the nursie "meaningful discourse." :-)
>>
>> I do hope Rev. Jim is looking in...much food for thought for another
>> Sermon on the Antenna Mount!
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Love all this meaningful discourse.

Yes!

"Mean," yes. "Full," yes. "Dis," yes. "Course?" Not set.

We are both waiting for the identity of the "rant." It must be one
of those things documented in "his jacket." Maybe I'll call the VA
to ask them if they know what nursie's "rant" is about...? :-)

LHA / WMD

4915. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144320.12940.00000240@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92928

In article <5c01b95b.0406132317.33f9c4d6@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040613162846.18863.00000373@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
>> Everyone who disagree with nursie are the liars.
>
> Nope.
>
> Only those who tell tales that can't be substantiated by some
>third party source of some presentation of documentation.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, that sound like nursie. :-)

> So far YOUR only "point" is that I won't discuss the details of
>actions I was involved in in the Marines.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...are the murines involved in hum radio?

"Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" :-)

>The fact is I mention the
>Corps only when it's brought up by you, and then only because you
>can't seem to get things right.

Oh, my, "only when others bring it up!" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

> No wonder you're no longer an "engineer working regular hours".

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."regular hours" are getting to work on time on a regular employer's schedule.

Have you heard of something called "retirement?" No?

Call the VA, maybe they can explain it to you...in short, easy-to-understand syllables...

> Judging from what I've been able to ascertain from people who
>actually knew you, your best skill was getting away with mediocrity
>until you were given the "opportunity to expand your horizons" with
>some other employer.

Oh? You can actually "ascertain" something? From "people who actually knew me?" Who might those folks be? Hmmm?

I've given you three long-time radio amateur's names in here.
There's others I haven't mentioned.

Just WHO are those radio amateurs - or anyone else - that
"actually knew me?" Until nursie fesses up with some ID on
them, we readers can only assume nursie be LYING again.

>That you invested your monies wisely is your only milestone.

Poor baby. Drawing all the disability-and-retirement military
pay plus a (steady?) job as a nurse, you get all fussy about
"money?" Tsk, tsk, tsk. Not enough there for your elegant
tastes?

Poor baby. I've spent a bit over a half century on fairly steady
employment (as "steady" as the aerospace industry is). Doesn't
take any Wall Street smarts to prepare for and enjoy comfortable
retirement.

> You can continue to make your silly assertions and feign
>indignation at the berating you receive in this forum.

"Berating?!?" What, from some sociopath who can't take the
mild environment of a newsgroup? :-)

Been there, seen them, got lots of T-shirts. :-)

>Obviously it
>wasn't the first time anyone was able to see through you and your
>ineptness.

"Ineptness?!?" Poor baby. Too much return fire getting through
your armor, big sojer in da woods? :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you're taking lots of hits. Quit painting the target
all over yourself.

>It's just that in this forum you can get away with it and
>claim "First Amendment" privilege.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor baby. Can't get away with one-sided libel,
can you? [thank you, AOL... :-)]

> Putz.

Wow! All that "meaningful discourse!" :-)

Goyim...

LHA / WMD

4916. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 18:43:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614144321.12940.00000241@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 92926

In article <1e4e3692.0406140603.34e8f95d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040613162845.18863.00000372@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040612032528.11516.00001117@mb-m04.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steamy Steve Nursie of the TN State CAP storms again) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/10/2004 9:16 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406100616.576d1b8b@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>You're stupid words being shown to you again and again must finally be
>> >>getting to you.
>> >
>> > People who are trying to berate others over thier choice of words
>should
>> >take a couple of seconds to proof read what they write BEFORE they send
>it,
>> >Brain.
>> >
>> > What a PUTZ!
>> >
>> > Brian, you're an idiot. It really is THAT simple.
>> >
>> > But hey, THANKS for making my job that much easier!
>>
>> Oh, my, all that "meaningful discourse" going on.
>>
>> Rev. Jim approves, of course. :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Len, it's kind of interesting what Steve thinks his job is. He is
>here to call people "PUTZ," and "idiot." Wonder how much it pays?

I surmise it is a "duty." A duty as in ethnic cleansing.

Nursie do this willingly, almost gleefully, because it cleanses
him partially of hate, anger, and outrage. :-)

>Steve thinks he can brag about 7-Hostile Actions, but never
>substantiate it. He is as pure as the driven snow. Steve can make an
>assertion of fact that I lost my T5 logs, but never substantiate it.

>
>Everyone else is a LIAR. 'cept Steve. He's here for meaningful
>discourse.

Gotta be that post-traumatic stress disorder from all dem
"hostile actions." :-)

LHA / WMD

4917. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 19:50:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40CE0185.7090105@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92931

Phil Kane wrote:

>On Sun, 13 Jun 2004 17:52:22 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>
>>I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics annoy
>>me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing courtesy
>>to me?
>>
>>
>
> We have an individual (respected old-timer at that) who, when he
> takes his turn-in-the-barrel as net control of our daily ARES/RACES
> check-in, gets confused over people's call signs regardless of
> whether phonetics are used or not, and even if one identifies with
> phonetics, he will acknowledge with some ad-hoc inconsistent mixture
> of ITU, old military, and old telco (cities) phonetics.
>
> For one, it drives me nuts even though he's a nice guy.
>
>
>

That's probably not trouble with phonetics, but memory trouble. A lot
of times
during a contest (I don't compete, but just answer people who are competing)
I do a QSO and after listen to a subsequent QSO or his CQ to get the
call right in
the log book. That way I avoid wasting their time.

4918. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 19:58:45 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40CE0375.2030002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 92932

>
>
> "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in
>our national Journal for May.
>
>
>
>
>
>
Dang! I wanted to get the vanity call "K2EO" and use phonetics
"Knife Two Experiment Opposum"

:-)

>
>

4919. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 22:08:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406141408.655a8451@posting.google.com>
Source record: 92933

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<XtOdnUPYb7HZUlDdRVn-ug@comcast.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message

> > > I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call
> correct
> > > even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least once
> > > phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently repeated
> back to
> > > me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who don't make that
> mistake
> > > are those who have known me for a while and are familiar with my call.
> >
> > There's an ancient quick fix for that problem. Use N 8 U Zed E.
> >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > w3rv
>
> I am aware of that but am not used to it, not having grown up around
> speakers of French or people from Canada or near the Canadian border.

I didn't realize "Zed" has a "French connection". Live and learn. I
never noticed that there are any regional trends to it's use, I'm ten
minutes from the Mason-Dixon line and it's been SOP everywere I've
tuned since AM days. It's used unconsciously even on the machines and
in face-to-face conversation. N 3 N Zed is one of the locals, I
suspect that if somebody called him N 3 N Zee it would cause a
back-up-and-think-about-it moment. Maybe it's just an Old Fart thing.
Heh.

> Besides, I like to make absolutely sure that someone I've never spoken to
> before gets it right. Occasionally the "E" also causes problems.

I have a long-established policy: I *always* use phonetics to open
every QSO with somebody I haven't worked previously, on HF or on the
machines. I really don't care if the machine politically-correctness
cops like it or not.

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

4920. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 22:28:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <xM6dnaKSrOE43FPdRVn-hA@comcast.com>
Source record: 92938

```
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0406141408.655a8451@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<XtOdnUPYb7HZUlDdRVn-ug@comcast.com>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>
>
> > > > I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my call
> > correct
> > > > even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give it at least once
> > > > phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z is frequently repeated
> > back to
> > > > me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V. The only people who don't make that
> > mistake
> > > > are those who have known me for a while and are familiar with my
call.
> > >
> > > There's an ancient quick fix for that problem. Use N 8 U Zed E.
> > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > I am aware of that but am not used to it, not having grown up around
> > speakers of French or people from Canada or near the Canadian border.
>
> I didn't realize "Zed" has a "French connection". Live and learn. I
> never noticed that there are any regional trends to it's use, I'm ten
> minutes from the Mason-Dixon line and it's been SOP everywere I've
> tuned since AM days. It's used unconsciously even on the machines and
> in face-to-face conversation. N 3 N Zed is one of the locals, I
> suspect that if somebody called him N 3 N Zee it would cause a
> back-up-and-think-about-it moment. Maybe it's just an Old Fart thing.
> Heh.
>

Yup, zed is the French name for the letter Z. It is NOT part of a phonetic
alphabet. Outside of ham radio (which I got into in 1992) you only hear it
in areas subject to French influence.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
```

4921. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 23:15:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <SYqdnXZG2KA-rFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92934

N2EY wrote:
> Y'know, with all this discussion about different phonetic alphabets, people
> confusing "Papa" with "Japan" and DX/contest folks using a completely different
> set and being cornfuzed by anything else, it makes me wonder.
>
> Doesn't all this add up to 'phone modes being "slow", "limited" and
> "error-prone"?

No. Just as with Morse, there is proficiency built up by use. With a set uof headphones, and the ability to adjust the volume and tone to where I like it, even my rotten ears can work phone nicely. In the field days and contests where I have worked high power, I have spent a lot of time with weak phone signals. I have gone from asking for repeats in about 25 percent of the cases to almost never.

In fact, the whole phonetic debate is a little funny, since despite the kvetching, an experienced operator can pick out the different phonetics without getting his/her knickers in a twist.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4922. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 23:16:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <SYqdnXFG2KBOrFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92935

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>
>>[snip]
>>Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself (though
>>prefering plain callsigns).
>>
>>I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say on
>>the air as long as it is decent language.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Actually the DX station is not so much trying to tell people what to say as
> telling them what works for him so that those calling the DX can maximize
> their chances of getting through and the DX can maximize his results. I
> personally would look at it as simply trying to facilitate communication.

Not communicating is not facilitating!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4923. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 23:18:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <SYqdnXBG2KDYr1PdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 92936

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>> I prefer that people simply say their callsign to me. Phonetics
>> annoy me mostly. When they use their phonetics, are they practicing
>> courtesy to me?
>>
>>
>
>
> Only if the channel is low noise. On SSB HF DX, you need phonetics.
> Pretty sure that there is no need for phonetics on CW.... :-)
>

Well, I know what seems to work for me. I even use straight callsign to
break through pileups.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4924. Reminder: 7037 @ 0100z

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-14 23:45:17 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <hMqzc.16902$uh1.6522448@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 92937

CQ BXN de WA2SI QNI? K

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Sri Alun, using a CW-only rig tonight so I'll have to miss the SSB
net on 20. Next time.

4925. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 03:45:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614234536.23151.00000767@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 92939

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/14/2004 12:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040614130623.09069.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>

>Also, a logbook with no entries in it is still a logbook, isn't it?

Good point!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4926. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 03:48:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614234816.23151.00000768@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 92940

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 6/14/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40CE0375.2030002@ix.netcom.com>

>> "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in
>>our national Journal for May.

>Dang! I wanted to get the vanity call "K2EO" and use phonetics
>"Knife Two Experiment Opposum"

How about "Kill to End Oppression"...!?!?

Kissed Two Eager Ogres...?!?!

Or one reeeeeeeeally tacky one......Kinky two easy organsms...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4927. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 03:53:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614235307.23151.00000769@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 92941

>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/14/2004 9:03 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406140603.34e8f95d@posting.google.com>

>Len, it's kind of interesting what Steve thinks his job is. He is
>here to call people "PUTZ," and "idiot." Wonder how much it pays?

The "reawrds" are strictly etherical.

>Steve thinks he can brag about 7-Hostile Actions, but never
>substantiate it. He is as pure as the driven snow. Steve can make an
>assertion of fact that I lost my T5 logs, but never substantiate it.

I've never "bragged" about "seven hostile actions". I simply acknowledged
that I HAD been in actions while in the Armed Forces. That is true.

You and Lennie are the one's who keep recycling the "seven hostile
actions" phrase. Goggle refers.

>Everyone else is a LIAR. 'cept Steve. He's here for meaningful
>discourse.

I am not the one who, on the one hand, lambastes others for thier lack of
focus on "the topic", then resorts to my own discourse. You and Lennie pull
the cart off the trail enough for 10 persons.

Steve, K4YZ

4928. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 03:56:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040614235600.23151.00000771@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 92942

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/14/2004 1:43 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040614144306.12940.00000232@mb-m25.aol.com>

> DoD Directive 4650.2 exists, as does NCP 8(C), yet nursie keeps
> on stating that "MARS is amateur radio!" :-)

Thanks for once again proving my assertions on your lack of credibility,
Lennie.

YOU keep saying that.

>>I<< keep saying No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

You put things in quotes and attribute them to me when such is not true.

Leonard H. Anderson caught lying again.

And again...

and again...

and....

4929. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:17:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615001726.22098.00000358@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92945

In article <20040614235307.23151.00000769@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 9:03 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406140603.34e8f95d@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, it's kind of interesting what Steve thinks his job is. He is
>>here to call people "PUTZ," and "idiot." Wonder how much it pays?
>
> The "reawrds" are strictly etherical.
>
>>Steve thinks he can brag about 7-Hostile Actions, but never
>>substantiate it. He is as pure as the driven snow. Steve can make an
>>assertion of fact that I lost my T5 logs, but never substantiate it.
>
> I've never "bragged" about "seven hostile actions". I simply
>acknowledged
>that I HAD been in actions while in the Armed Forces. That is true.

Nobody seems to know the Where or When of that claim.

Where were they...and at what date?

> You and Lennie are the one's who keep recycling the "seven hostile
>actions" phrase. Goggle refers.

"Google." :-)

Your CAP Air Ace personna is trying to speak. Don't let it.
Put those goggles away. Or get a new windscreen...

Where and When were those "hostile actions?"

>>Everyone else is a LIAR. 'cept Steve. He's here for meaningful
>>discourse.
>
> I am not the one who, on the one hand, lambastes others for thier lack of
>focus on "the topic", then resorts to my own discourse. You and Lennie pull
>the cart off the trail enough for 10 persons.

One can baste a lamb, but only you can lambast others with
undocumented claims and then argue until red in the face that
they were "true."

Neither Brian nor myself ever had to "pull any cart." Nursie put that cart together all by himself. Except it is made of air.

Such air-heavy objects are very easy to pull.

Now Where and When were those "hostile actions?" Furnish some reference so that anyone can check it out themselves.

You made a claim that "MARS is amateur radio" and cannot back it up. Not even the DoD will support that claim...and the DoD has DEFINED MARS.

4930. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:17:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92943

In article <20040614234536.23151.00000767@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 12:06 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040614130623.09069.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>>Also, a logbook with no entries in it is still a logbook, isn't it?
>
> Good point!

So, you refused to answer the other questions posed to you.

Why?

You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?

You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.

LHA / WMD

4931. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:17:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615001727.22098.00000360@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 92944

In article <20040614234816.23151.00000768@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>Date: 6/14/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40CE0375.2030002@ix.netcom.com>
>
>>> "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in
>>>our national Journal for May.
>
>>Dang! I wanted to get the vanity call "K2EO" and use phonetics
>>"Knife Two Experiment Opposum"
>
> How about "Kill to End Oppression"...!?!?

How about calming down before you get too eager to "kill?"

[still off your meds?]

> Kissed Two Eager Ogres...?!?!

[not getting enough?]

> Or one reeeeeeeeally tacky one......Kinky two easy organsms...?!?!

Definitely not getting enough. Try a kumquat, not a "cumquat."

Why are you against the NATO phonetic alphabet?

Radio communications around the world have adopted the 1955
NATO phonetic alphabet.

The U.S. military adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955.
Not good enough for you? Tsk, tsk.

LHA / WMD

4932. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:31:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 92946

In article <20040614235600.23151.00000771@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 1:43 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040614144306.12940.00000232@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>> DoD Directive 4650.2 exists, as does NCP 8(C), yet nursie keeps
>> on stating that "MARS is amateur radio!" :-)
>
> Thanks for once again proving my assertions on your lack of credibility,
>Lennie.
>
> YOU keep saying that.
>
> >>I<< keep saying No Amateur Radio = No MARS.
>
> You put things in quotes and attribute them to me when such is not true.

Nursie originally wrote "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio."

That's the full one-sentence quote.

Much later (about 3 weeks) nursie tried to backpedal and say
a different thing.

Too bad. The second sentence was still incorrect.

> Leonard H. Anderson caught lying again.

No. Just trying to keep the truth afloat in your imaginary sea
of deceptive fantasy.

When are you going to read (and understand) DoD Directive
4650.2 (effective 21 Nov 03)? How about USN-USMC
Communications Instruction NCP 8 (C)? Never?

You COULD find out the truth...but the truth hurts you, doesn't
it? It doesn't let you claim all those outrageous things you
state. Poor baby.

You could have said you made a mistake. You didn't. For
3 weeks you couldn't even furnish anyone a link or ID to the
military regulations describing MARS. That was easy enough
to do on a simple search for two others.

You were given the links. Why didn't you follow through?

No, you couldn't do that. Instead you insist on blaming others for your own failures. Not nice. Not gentlemanly. Not being a good amateur extra. Not being a man.

This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.

Bon apetit and temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4933. Re: So Much For THAT Rant....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:40:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615004036.28360.00000288@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 92947

In article <20040614235307.23151.00000769@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: So Much For THAT Rant....
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 9:03 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406140603.34e8f95d@posting.google.com>
>
>>Len, it's kind of interesting what Steve thinks his job is. He is
>>here to call people "PUTZ," and "idiot." Wonder how much it pays?
>
> The "reawrds" are strictly etherical.

What are "reawrds," nursie? [that is NOT Yiddish...]

And what is "etherical?" Something to do with 'ether?'

Why are you trying to pass gas?

If you meant "ethical," we might get some idea. However, a lot of braggadoccio about some unsubstantiated military action is hardly "ethical," is it? More like a fish story.

Maybe you meant "ethereal?" Like 'out of this world...'

Some of those claims of yours are that way...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4934. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:52:38 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950988873F77elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92948

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040614055809.18863.00000388@mb-m02.aol.com:

> Y'know, with all this discussion about different phonetic alphabets,
> people confusing "Papa" with "Japan" and DX/contest folks using a
> completely different set and being cornfuzed by anything else, it makes
> me wonder.
>
> Doesn't all this add up to 'phone modes being "slow", "limited" and
> "error-prone"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I wondered when someone would pop up with that comment. I think CW is
generally slower, though.

4935. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:54:13 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns95098CCFE170elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 92949

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:SYqdnXZG2KA-rFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com:

> N2EY wrote:
>> Y'know, with all this discussion about different phonetic alphabets,
>> people confusing "Papa" with "Japan" and DX/contest folks using a
>> completely different set and being cornfuzed by anything else, it
>> makes me wonder.
>>
>> Doesn't all this add up to 'phone modes being "slow", "limited" and
>> "error-prone"?
>
> No. Just as with Morse, there is proficiency built up by use. With a
> set uof headphones, and the ability to adjust the volume and tone to
> where I like it, even my rotten ears can work phone nicely. In the
> field days and contests where I have worked high power, I have spent a
> lot of time with weak phone signals. I have gone from asking for
> repeats in about 25 percent of the cases to almost never.
>
> In fact, the whole phonetic debate is a little funny, since
> despite the
> kvetching, an experienced operator can pick out the different phonetics
> without getting his/her knickers in a twist.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Whilst that is true, I am more concerned about the op who is in a country I
need and isn't experienced.

4936. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 04:59:54 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns95099C393755elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93000

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:xM6dnaKSrOE43FPdRVn-hA@comcast.com:

>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0406141408.655a8451@posting.google.com...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
>> news:<XtOdnUPYb7HZUlDdRVn-ug@comcast.com>...
>> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>>
>>
>> > > > I find that people have a high error percentage in getting my
>> > > > call correct even with a clear, strong FM signal unless I give
>> > > > it at least once phonetically. While my call is N8UZE, the Z
>> > > > is frequently repeated back to me as B, C, D, G, P, T, or V.
>> > > > The only people who don't make that mistake are those who have
>> > > > known me for a while and are familiar with my call.
>> > >
>> > > There's an ancient quick fix for that problem. Use N 8 U Zed E.
>> > >
>> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> > >
>> > > w3rv
>> >
>> > I am aware of that but am not used to it, not having grown up around
>> > speakers of French or people from Canada or near the Canadian
>> > border.
>>
>> I didn't realize "Zed" has a "French connection". Live and learn. I
>> never noticed that there are any regional trends to it's use, I'm ten
>> minutes from the Mason-Dixon line and it's been SOP everywere I've
>> tuned since AM days. It's used unconsciously even on the machines and
>> in face-to-face conversation. N 3 N Zed is one of the locals, I
>> suspect that if somebody called him N 3 N Zee it would cause a
>> back-up-and-think-about-it moment. Maybe it's just an Old Fart thing.
>> Heh.
>>
>
> Yup, zed is the French name for the letter Z. It is NOT part of a
> phonetic alphabet. Outside of ham radio (which I got into in 1992) you
> only hear it in areas subject to French influence.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

>

Zed is the _English_ as well as French name for the last letter of the
alphabet. Zee is American, and likely also not understood in VK, ZL, etc.

4937. new kenwood ts480 voip internet ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 06:57:29 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <40ce9b67.1347815@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 93001

new kenwood ts480 voip internet ready

anyone using one of these radios?

if so do you have it connected to the internet?

http://www.kenwood.com/i/products/info/amateur/ts_480/

http://www.kenwood.com/i/products/info/amateur/ts_480/network_command.
html

http://www.kenwood.com/i/products/info/amateur/ts_480/image/A480101.ex
e
73 Ian G3ZHI

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - many ham radio links
http://www.ukirlp.co.uk

G4NJI IRLP 5200 Echolink 135909
Rotherham simplex 145.2875mhz

GB3XN IRLP 5708 Echolink 153126
Langold 430.925 Mhz

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0783 338 0578

4938. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 07:58:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93002

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>

> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?

As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
claims he made, yes.

> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.

It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what PuppetBoy
can produce to substantiate his claims.

Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage unit, his
bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT is fact.

Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if they
really DID work T5/N0IMD.

I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
"logbook" somewhere.

It's just that it's empty.

Steve, K4YZ

4939. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 08:01:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615040116.00101.00000621@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93003

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000360@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040614234816.23151.00000768@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>>Date: 6/14/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <40CE0375.2030002@ix.netcom.com>
>>
>>>> "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in
>>>>our national Journal for May.
>>
>>>Dang! I wanted to get the vanity call "K2EO" and use phonetics
>>>"Knife Two Experiment Opposum"
>>
>> How about "Kill to End Oppression"...!?!?
>
> How about calming down before you get too eager to "kill?"
>
> [still off your meds?]
>
>> Kissed Two Eager Ogres...?!?!
>
> [not getting enough?]
>
>> Or one reeeeeeeeally tacky one......Kinky two easy organsms...?!?!
>
> Definitely not getting enough. Try a kumquat, not a "cumquat."

Either way, I was not the one who suggested the word.

> Why are you against the NATO phonetic alphabet?

Where did I say I was?

> Radio communications around the world have adopted the 1955
> NATO phonetic alphabet.

And now it's the ICAO alphabet. Says so in more places than I can count.

> The U.S. military adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955.
> Not good enough for you? Tsk, tsk.

You're offered this opportunity to attribute the post wherein I made such a suggestion, Your Cowardliness.

Steve, K4YZ

4940. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 08:03:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93004

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>

> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.

As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft some
witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts, Lennie!

> Bon apetit and temper fry...

Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

4941. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 08:58:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93005

In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>
> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>claims he made, yes.

Why?

He may know just where they are.

They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.
>
>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>
>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>
Can produce or will produce?

> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage unit, his
>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT is
>fact.

So what's the problem?

Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's pretty much a given.

So why bother about it?
>
>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if they
>really DID work T5/N0IMD.

Maybe.

Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away, etc.

>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>"logbook" somewhere.
>
IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces of wood.

> It's just that it's empty.
>
Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.

Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig, etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?

if that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?

And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4942. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 13:14:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <UYednXicz7dCa1PdRVn-ug@comcast.com>
Source record: 93006

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns95099C393755elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
> news:xM6dnaKSrOE43FPdRVn-hA@comcast.com:
>[snip]
>
> Zed is the _English_ as well as French name for the last letter of the
> alphabet. Zee is American, and likely also not understood in VK, ZL, etc.
>

However if you will check the etymology in the dictionary, it is of French
origin. Interestingly enough no etymology is given for zee.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4943. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 14:32:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406150632.39b6d0e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93007

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <20040614234536.23151.00000767@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >>Date: 6/14/2004 12:06 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040614130623.09069.00000248@mb-m17.aol.com>
> >
> >>Also, a logbook with no entries in it is still a logbook, isn't it?
> > >
> > > Good point!
> >
> So, you refused to answer the other questions posed to you.
>
> Why?
>
> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>
> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>
> LHA / WMD

Nope, he sure doesn't know. Then he tells untruths about his telling
of untruths. I'm beginning to see a pattern here.

4944. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 14:36:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93008

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> And why get all upset about it?

Because he cannot control his emotions.

> Nobody is claiming they worked T5/N0IMD.

Jim, you're not in my T5 log either.

> Nobody
> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.

Correct. I QSL'd 100%.

4945. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 14:38:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406150638.2e04e67a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93009

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
>
> Bon apetit and temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

He does look a littly "puffy" in that flight suit.

BTW, is he a real pilot in the CAP?

4946. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 19:29:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615152946.22498.00000298@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93012

In article <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>>
>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>>claims he made, yes.
>
>Why?
>
>He may know just where they are.
>
>They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.

Rev. Jim doesn't KNOW? Tsk, tsk!

>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>>
>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>>
>Can produce or will produce?

All us readers are still waiting for nursie to document his
"hostile action" When and Where. :-)

>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage unit, his
>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT is
>>fact.
>
>So what's the problem?

Tsk, tsk. Nursie is suffering post-traumatic stress disorder
after all those "hostile actions" is the problem. :-)

>Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply avoid/refuse
>any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's pretty much a given.

Gotta love how Rev. Jim KNOWS what will happen in the future!

A regular seer, that sucker. Tailor made. Suits him. :-)

>So why bother about it?

This newsgrope would be so empty about nursie's emotional
outbursts. Worry that they might quit. :-)

>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if they
>>really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>
>Maybe.

Gosh and golly, seer Rev. Jim, nursie never once contacted any
of the radio amateurs who knew me, and still know me. Yet nursie
claimed he did because he said they "all" spoke badly of me. :-)

>Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away, etc.

My references haven't. One just got back from a nice cruise he
and his wife took. :-)

>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>>"logbook" somewhere.
>>
>IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces of
>wood.

There's a lot of licensed deadwood in here, Rev. Jim... :-)

>> It's just that it's empty.
>>
>Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.

Doesn't Rev. Jim KNOW how many? Tsk, tsk...

>Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig, etc. One
>local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>
>*if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?

Nursie will NEVER admit anything. :-)

Remember, birds of a feather flock around a lot in newsgroups.

:-)

>And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked T5/N0IMD.
>Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.

Nursie gets all a-twitter from any disagreement, however slight.

If he gets all upset (again), the nastygrams just keep on
coming, and coming, and coming...

[he has "organsms" over that... :-)]

Temple fry, Rev. Jim...keep the faith... :-)

LHA / WMD

4947. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 19:29:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93013

In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
>
> As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft some
>witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts, Lennie!

"Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?

>> Bon apetit and temper fry...
>
> Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.

Have you seen a doctor about your problem, puppetnursie?

Or do you do your own diagnoses, like practicing medicine
without the legal license? [a big no-no in most states]

Get some mental therapy, puppetnursie. That would help all
those around you...if not yourself...

Sociopathy CAN be cured.

LHA / WMD

4948. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 19:29:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615152948.22498.00000300@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93010

In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>
> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>claims he made, yes.

You first. Where and When those "hostile actions?" :-)

>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>
> It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.

Tsk, tsk. Where and When Puppetnurse's "hostile actions?"

> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage unit, his
>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT is
>fact.

Neither are those "hostile actions." :-)

> Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if they
>really DID work T5/N0IMD.

That's like that other member of the Gang of Four "contacting those out of band Frenchmen." :-)

We all know that when Puppetnursie makes another claim like the "hostile action" bit, none of us can get any corroboration on it except from your alternate personnae. :-)

> I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>"logbook" somewhere.

Rev. Jim is ALWAYS right. He says so repeatedly, chiding others for being "incorrect." ["incorrect" as not Believing as Rev. Jim does]

> It's just that it's empty.

Tsk, tsk. Puppetnursie's reality is EMPTY except for discarded
brags and boasts.

More "meaningful discourse" from the Puppetnursie. Only problem
is that the "discourse" keeps getting defined as "dis-curse." :-)

LHA / WMD

4949. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 19:29:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615152949.22498.00000301@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93011

In article <20040615040116.00101.00000621@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000360@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040614234816.23151.00000768@mb-m21.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)
>>>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>>>Date: 6/14/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <40CE0375.2030002@ix.netcom.com>
>>>
>>>>> "Use the Right Phonetics" as the best article in
>>>>>our national Journal for May.
>>>
>>>>Dang! I wanted to get the vanity call "K2EO" and use phonetics
>>>>"Knife Two Experiment Opposum"
>>>
>>> How about "Kill to End Oppression"...!?!?
>>
>> How about calming down before you get too eager to "kill?"
>>
>> [still off your meds?]
>>
>>> Kissed Two Eager Ogres...?!?!
>>
>> [not getting enough?]
>>
>>> Or one reeeeeeeeally tacky one......Kinky two easy organsms...?!?!
>>
>> Definitely not getting enough. Try a kumquat, not a "cumquat."
>
> Either way, I was not the one who suggested the word.

Suggested which word? Kinky? Easy? Organsms? [sic]

>> Why are you against the NATO phonetic alphabet?
>
> Where did I say I was?

True...you haven't acknowledged that NATO adopted anything
before the ICAO did... :-)

>> Radio communications around the world have adopted the 1955
>> NATO phonetic alphabet.
>
> And now it's the ICAO alphabet. Says so in more places than I can
>count.

Ten places? Twenty places? :-)

So, the NATO military now use the "ICAO phonetics?" :-)

>> The U.S. military adopted the NATO phonetic alphabet in 1955.
>> Not good enough for you? Tsk, tsk.
>
> You're offered this opportunity to attribute the post wherein I made
>such a suggestion, Your Cowardliness.

Tsk, tsk. On top of most curious sentence structures, you deny
the existance of anything but your imagination?

Tsk, tsk. You might acknowledge all if it had been the USMC
phonetic alphabet, I bet... :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4950. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 21:08:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615170855.23951.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93014

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/15/2004 3:58 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>>
>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>>claims he made, yes.
>
>Why?
>
>He may know just where they are.

I have no doubt that he knows just where they are!

>They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.

Maybe...maybe not.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4951. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 21:10:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93015

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>

>> Nobody
>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
>
>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.

It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.

Steve, K4YZ

4952. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-15 23:59:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040615195938.22498.00000308@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93016

In article <20040615170855.23951.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 15 Jun 2004 21:08:55 GMT
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/15/2004 3:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>>>
>>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>>>claims he made, yes.
>>
>>Why?
>>
>>He may know just where they are.
>
> I have no doubt that he knows just where they are!

Then what's the problem?
>
>>They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.
>
> Maybe...maybe not.

And the problem with that is?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4953. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 04:03:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93018

In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>
>>> Nobody
>>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
>>
>>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>
> It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.

Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his stinger got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)

"Nothing to send."

That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.

Nursie's big negative nothing. Less rest mass than a neutrino.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4954. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 04:03:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616000329.00536.00000288@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93017

In article <20040615170855.23951.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/15/2004 3:58 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Stubborn Steve da Puppet Nursie) writes:
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
>>>
>>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
>>>claims he made, yes.
>>
>>Why?
>>
>>He may know just where they are.
>
> I have no doubt that he knows just where they are!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Why do you keep on with this, then?

>>They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.
>
> Maybe...maybe not.

Now, now...neither one of you know anything for certain. Both of you just speculate except nursie is so obsessed with painting opponents in false black that he can't reason.

...all that wasted bandwidth just because one extra is so damn obsessed-dumb in hatred. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

That must be the "new" amateur radio...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4955. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 09:57:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93019

In article <40CD10A1.69E891C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
>> insult, and destroy - or attempt to.
>>
>> Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":
>>
http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
p.aol.com&output=gplain
>
>I hear tell that those air raids on Tokyo in the fifties were exercises
>in sheer terror.

I dunno, I've never been to Tokyo. Not even for 30 seconds.

Remember the exchanges about how far it is from air bases in North Korea and
Vladivostok to Tokyo, Bear bombers and such? Someone was very unhappy when it
was pointed out that the distance is well over 650 miles, not "about 500
miles". And that the statement "about an hour in a Bear bomber" meant little
because that aircraft did not enter service until the late 1950s.

Pointing out the fact that any American *under* a certain age grew up with the
knowledge that hostile ICBMs could reach us in a matter of minutes sets off a
predictable response, too.

That sequence (in "34 Years Ago Today") was a classic. ;-)

>I have to admit to being a little puzzled by what
>appears to be a reference to the writer's multiple sphincters (in the
>next to last paragraph).
>
Perhaps multiple ones are needed in order to handle his prodigious output ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4956. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 11:58:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040616075805.10886.00000418@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93020

In article <20040613162856.18863.00000383@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(Rev. Jim puts on his Evangelistic robes for
>a hellfire-and-brimstone Sermon On The Antenna Mount which is
>really a nasty old Troll for his series of shouting and hollering in the
>disguise of a "polite" reply) writes:

"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
on those who do not agree with you."

>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>> :-)
>>
>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>>
>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>>been
>>involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly proclaims
>>what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>
> Poor baby.

Why didn't you answer the question, Len?

> Got your ego all in a dither because you aren't the
> "renowned historian" and truthsayer in all things amateur?

Nope. That's not me at all. It does, however, describe the behavior of certain
other people who post here.
>
> Well, heck yes and gosh darn, Rev. Jim are all upset again.

Who is "Rev. Jim"? The only one I know is a character on the classic comedy
series "Taxi".
>
> This could be the start of REAL truthtelling in reply which would last

> (probably) months and result in long, long, "refutations" that Rev. Jim
> never ever tells any untruth and speaks with the voice of the gods.

"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
on those who do not agree with you."
>
>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>>yet
>>proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point of
>>not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>
> Yup, Rev. Jim, the "renowned pediatrician" has to voice an old, bitter
> "cause" of his left over from 6 years ago. :-)
>
> [see last item in my Comments on docket 98-143...which the teen
> avenger was Hot and Heavy in denunciation of...(still in the ECFS
> under 13 Jan 99 filing date)]

In those Reply Comments, you proposed a minumum age requirement of 14 years for
any class of US amateur license, even sthough such a requirement has never
existed in the USA. You gave no evidence of how the lack of such a requirement
has had a negative effect on amateur radio or any other radio service, yet you
wanted such a requirement (which would not affect you, of course) created.

Here's a few simple, direct questions, Len. In fact, I'll direct them to the
entire group:

1) Should there be an age requirement for an amateur license?

2) If so, what should the requirement be for the various ages?

3) If so, why should there be such an age requirement?
>
>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>historical importance?
>
> Rev. Jim got his BP up over 200/100 again on manual telegraphy.
>
Who? You cannot be referring to me, because I find Morse Code radiotelegraphy
to be a relaxing experience.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...then manufactures a falsehood that I "denied its
> historical importance." In any other venue that would be a LIE. :-)

For something to be a lie it must be untrue.

And how do you know that the person I referred to is you?
>
> In the first days of ALL radio, the ONLY way to use it for any sort
> of communication was by on-off keying telegraphy. That first demo
> of radio was in 1896, in Italy and in Russia. The telegraphy codes

> used were the "morse code" (presumably with some local country
> variants for some characters, unknown to exact details). The first
> Morse-Vail Telegraph (commercial) service was in 1844 or 52 years
> before the first radio-as-communications medium demonstration.
>
> There's no question that "morse code" has historical significance.
> It does. But, the first radio demo was 108 years ago...roughly five
> generations in the past.

That's all true.

And what's also true is that the person referred to in the preceding post denies and distorts the role Morse Code radiotelegraphy has played since those early days. Such as its role in World War 2 radio communications. Or its role in maritime communications well into the 1990s. Or its widespread use by radio amateurs.

Some would call that "lying by omission". ;-)

> Today, the only real use of manual
> telegraphy codes is in amateur radio where its advocates go on
> angry benders of denunciation of anyone who even frowns on its
> "usefulness."

"benders"?

"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
on those who do not agree with you."

> All the other radio services just dropped "morse" as
> being too slow, too error-prone, and requiring comm specialists
> at each end that weren't useful anymore.

Only the last reason is true. Other services wanted to dispose of the need for and cost of skilled operators.

But amateur radio is largely *about* skilled radio operation.
>
>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry on
>>a
>>civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
>>the
>>other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
>>class,
>>education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>
> I should "show respect" for those self-empowered paragons of pride
> who insist (to the point of angry jumping up and down) that all must
> respect those olde-tyme manual radio telegraphers?

How do you know the person described is you, Len?

You don't have to "respect" anyone. But someone who can discuss in a civil manner - without name calling or ad-hominem insults - earns the respect of almost everyone, including those who disagree.

For example, I have great respect for K2UNK, Bill Sohl, even though we disagree on almost all amateur radio policy matters. I cannot recall a single instance where Bill made fun of anoter's age, work, gender, license class, education, name, ethnicity, and/or military service.

That's "civil debate".

> Because
> telegraphy is Their Favorite and all should honor Their favorite?
>
> Wow, ol' Rev. Jim really got cooking on his Hellfire-And-Brimstone
> denunciation of all who don't Believe in the True God of Radio, Morse!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Hell Hath No Fury Like A Telegrapher Scorned! :-)
>
> Uh, Rev. Jim, send me your TS Card. I'll punch it. Save everyone
> all the time and trouble of reading your raving of madness.
>
> You DO know what a "TS Card" is, don't you? No? Tsk, tsk, an
> old military service term-phrase. You weren't IN the military, were
> you? Tsk, tsk. You did NOT work any military comms or even any
> civilian comms, did you? No? Tsk, tsk.
>
> Gosh, golly, and heckanddarn, all this fuss and Fury over some
> NATO phonetic alphabet that went in force in the NATO militaries
> of 1955 and was the forerunner of such adoption worldwide. Even
> in the ICAO...whose working air carriers were, in the majority, in
> NATO-member countries back in the mid-1950s. :-)
>

"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
on those who do not agree with you."

There's a very wise bit of advice that says a person should treat others as they wish to be treated.

4957. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 13:09:10 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <WDXzc.5229$0b.4876051@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 93021

Jim, Jim, Jim...

Message <click>
Block Sender <click>
Yes <click>

A dose of 'Troll-Be-Gone' works almost every time.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040616075805.10886.00000418@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <20040613162856.18863.00000383@mb-m02.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >(Rev. Jim puts on his Evangelistic robes for
> >a hellfire-and-brimstone Sermon On The Antenna Mount which is
> >really a nasty old Troll for his series of shouting and hollering in the
> >disguise of a "polite" reply) writes:
>
> "You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you."
>
> >>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>> After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
> >>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
> >>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
> >>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
> >>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
> >>> :-)
> >>
> >>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
> >>
> >>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
> >>been
> >>involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly

proclaims
> >>what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
> >
> > Poor baby.
>
> Why didn't you answer the question, Len?
>
> > Got your ego all in a dither because you aren't the
> > "renowned historian" and truthsayer in all things amateur?
>
> Nope. That's not me at all. It does, however, describe the behavior of
certain
> other people who post here.
> >
> > Well, heck yes and gosh darn, Rev. Jim are all upset again.
>
> Who is "Rev. Jim"? The only one I know is a character on the classic
comedy
> series "Taxi".
> >
> > This could be the start of REAL truthtelling in reply which would last
> > (probably) months and result in long, long, "refutations" that Rev.
Jim
> > never ever tells any untruth and speaks with the voice of the gods.
>
> "You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you."
> >
> >>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of
children,
> >>yet
> >>proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the
point of
> >>not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
> >
> > Yup, Rev. Jim, the "renowned pediatrician" has to voice an old, bitter
> > "cause" of his left over from 6 years ago. :-)
> >
> > [see last item in my Comments on docket 98-143...which the teen
> > avenger was Hot and Heavy in denunciation of...(still in the ECFS
> > under 13 Jan 99 filing date)]
>
> In those Reply Comments, you proposed a minumum age requirement of 14
years for
> any class of US amateur license, even sthough such a requirement has never
> existed in the USA. You gave no evidence of how the lack of such a
requirement
> has had a negative effect on amateur radio or any other radio service, yet
you

> wanted such a requirement (which would not affect you, of course) created.
>
> Here's a few simple, direct questions, Len. In fact, I'll direct them to
the
> entire group:
>
> 1) Should there be an age requirement for an amateur license?
>
> 2) If so, what should the requirement be for the various ages?
>
> 3) If so, why should there be such an age requirement?
> >
> >>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly
and
> >>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
> >>historical importance?
> >
> > Rev. Jim got his BP up over 200/100 again on manual telegraphy.
> >
> Who? You cannot be referring to me, because I find Morse Code
radiotelegraphy
> to be a relaxing experience.
>
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk...then manufactures a falsehood that I "denied its
> > historical importance." In any other venue that would be a LIE. :-)
>
> For something to be a lie it must be untrue.
>
> And how do you know that the person I referred to is you?
> >
> > In the first days of ALL radio, the ONLY way to use it for any sort
> > of communication was by on-off keying telegraphy. That first demo
> > of radio was in 1896, in Italy and in Russia. The telegraphy codes
> > used were the "morse code" (presumably with some local country
> > variants for some characters, unknown to exact details). The first
> > Morse-Vail Telegraph (commercial) service was in 1844 or 52 years
> > before the first radio-as-communications medium demonstration.
> >
> > There's no question that "morse code" has historical significance.
> > It does. But, the first radio demo was 108 years ago...roughly five
> > generations in the past.
>
> That's all true.
>
> And what's also true is that the person referred to in the preceding post
> denies and distorts the role Morse Code radiotelegraphy has played since
those
> early days. Such as its role in World War 2 radio communications. Or its
role
> in maritime communications well into the 1990s. Or its widespread use by

radio
> amateurs.
>
> Some would call that "lying by omission". ;-)
>
> > Today, the only real use of manual
> > telegraphy codes is in amateur radio where its advocates go on
> > angry benders of denunciation of anyone who even frowns on its
> > "usefulness."
>
> "benders"?
>
> "You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you."
>
> > All the other radio services just dropped "morse" as
> > being too slow, too error-prone, and requiring comm specialists
> > at each end that weren't useful anymore.
>
> Only the last reason is true. Other services wanted to dispose of the need
for
> and cost of skilled operators.
>
> But amateur radio is largely *about* skilled radio operation.
> >
> >>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not
carry on
> >>a
> >>civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers
to
> >>the
> >>other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
> >>class,
> >>education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
> >
> > I should "show respect" for those self-empowered paragons of pride
> > who insist (to the point of angry jumping up and down) that all must
> > respect those olde-tyme manual radio telegraphers?
>
> How do you know the person described is you, Len?
>
> You don't have to "respect" anyone. But someone who can discuss in a civil
> manner - without name calling or ad-hominem insults - earns the respect of
> almost everyone, including those who disagree.
>
> For example, I have great respect for K2UNK, Bill Sohl, even though we
disagree
> on almost all amateur radio policy matters. I cannot recall a single
instance

> where Bill made fun of anoter's age, work, gender, license class,
education,
> name, ethnicity, and/or military service.
>
> That's "civil debate".
>
> > Because
> > telegraphy is Their Favorite and all should honor Their favorite?
> >
> > Wow, ol' Rev. Jim really got cooking on his Hellfire-And-Brimstone
> > denunciation of all who don't Believe in the True God of Radio, Morse!
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk. Hell Hath No Fury Like A Telegrapher Scorned! :-)
> >
> > Uh, Rev. Jim, send me your TS Card. I'll punch it. Save everyone
> > all the time and trouble of reading your raving of madness.
> >
> > You DO know what a "TS Card" is, don't you? No? Tsk, tsk, an
> > old military service term-phrase. You weren't IN the military, were
> > you? Tsk, tsk. You did NOT work any military comms or even any
> > civilian comms, did you? No? Tsk, tsk.
> >
> > Gosh, golly, and heckanddarn, all this fuss and Fury over some
> > NATO phonetic alphabet that went in force in the NATO militaries
> > of 1955 and was the forerunner of such adoption worldwide. Even
> > in the ICAO...whose working air carriers were, in the majority, in
> > NATO-member countries back in the mid-1950s. :-)
> >
>
> "You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you."
>
> There's a very wise bit of advice that says a person should treat others
as
> they wish to be treated.
>
>

4958. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 13:29:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <-4udneVRjv5_1k3dRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 93022

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:SYqdnXFG2KBOrFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
> > >
> >>[snip]
> >>Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself (though
> >>prefering plain callsigns).
> >>
> >>I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say on
> >>the air as long as it is decent language.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> > >
> > >
> > > Actually the DX station is not so much trying to tell people what to say
as
> > > telling them what works for him so that those calling the DX can
maximize
> > > their chances of getting through and the DX can maximize his results. I
> > > personally would look at it as simply trying to facilitate
communication.
>
> Not communicating is not facilitating!
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Well I have to disagree. The DX has attempted to facilitate communication by conveying what works for him since English is almost never his native language or he/she may be so accustomed to a specific set that other sets cause him to "stumble" mentally.

It's like they teach you in classes on giving speeches. You need speak in a manner that the target audience will understand. In this case the target is the DX. You are the one trying to break through to him/her. He's not trying to break through to you.

The teacher in one of my speech classes gave the following example:

A plumber writes to a PhD chemist asking if it is OK to use hydrochloric acid to clean pipes. The chemist writes back that the acid is highly corrosive and its use is contraindicated. The plumber writes back thanking the chemist for OKing the use of hydrochloric acid. The chemist tries again using similar wording. Once again the plumber thanks the chemist for his approval. This goes on for a couple more rounds of letter writing. Finally the chemist breaks down and writes "Do not use hydrochloric acid. It eats the hell out of the pipes."

The chemist had to switch to the "language" of his target audience (the plumber) rather than the "language" that he used in his own work.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4959. Re: W4NTI and W7CPA, more errant enforcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 15:34:03 UTC
From: joe <joe@joe.com>
Message-ID: <ZGZzc.32$nA1.16@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 93023
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Some asshole lied to Riley, what else is new?

Christy D wrote:
> On Wed, 16 Jun 2004 10:00:01 +0000 (UTC), Anonymous Sender wrote:
>
>>Someone wrote:
>>
>>>Anybody know the details as to why W4NTI and
>>>W7CPA got enforcement letters?
>>
>>Some rumors from 75 meters claim that attorneys for N0VFP are
>>writing letters of complaint to the FCC as a part of a series
>>of actions against hams who have libeled him. There is a lot
>>more to come according to the 75M crowd who picked that info
>>up from echolinked repeaters.
>
>
> Grown men ought to have better things to do with their time than to
> make such ill-informed and cowardly posts. The truth will be known
> soon enough, and it will then be known beyond the shadow of a doubt.

4960. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 15:51:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93024

N2EY wrote:
> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>>> :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>>>
>>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>>>been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
>>>proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>>>
>>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>>>yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point
>>>of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>>
>>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>>historical importance?
>>>
>>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
>>>on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
>>>the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
>>>class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>>
>> You forgot to add:
>>

>> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>>
>
> Well, if the shoe fits...
>

Sorry for replies to some older posts. I've been through two weeks of hell at work, and didn't get to respond to everything. Now I'm taking a well deserved day off and can get back to it.

Yes, the shoe does fit.

>>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>
> I'm not.

There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort of text based adventure game.

With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.

If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of filtering or ignoring him or her.

Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream of willing participants in his game.

Face it, he is good at it. It may not be what you are in here for, but he succeeds in his game.

Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

>>You
>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>irresistable.
>
> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.

And yet you are now involved once more!

>>Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
>>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
>>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.
>
>
> Nothing new there, Mike.
>
>> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>
> I don't.

You don't have to, that much is true.

4961. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 16:16:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <c-idnW_Q5aP5703d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93025

```
Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:SYqdnXFG2KBOrFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>
>>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>[snip]
>>>>Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself (though
>>>>prefering plain callsigns).
>>>>
>>>>I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say on
>>>>the air as long as it is decent language.
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Actually the DX station is not so much trying to tell people what to say
>
> as
>
>>>telling them what works for him so that those calling the DX can
>
> maximize
>
>>>their chances of getting through and the DX can maximize his results. I
>>>personally would look at it as simply trying to facilitate
>
> communication.
>
>>Not communicating is not facilitating!
>>
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Well I have to disagree. The DX has attempted to facilitate communication
```

> by conveying what works for him since English is almost never his native
> language or he/she may be so accustomed to a specific set that other sets
> cause him to "stumble" mentally.

When I work DX, I try to include a little bit of the other Ham's
language in the QSO, if I can. I'm no genius, but I can pick language up
fairly quickly.

My point is most Hams are fairly intelligent people. The basic language
of an exchange is English, like it or not. A ham in a small country
speaking an obscure language is going to enjoy a lot more success if he
or she pick up the language that the communication is done in.

> It's like they teach you in classes on giving speeches. You need speak in a
> manner that the target audience will understand. In this case the target is
> the DX. You are the one trying to break through to him/her. He's not
> trying to break through to you.

Well, in my version of Hamworld, we are both trying to communicate with
each other. Perhaps I am wrong.

> The teacher in one of my speech classes gave the following example:
>
> A plumber writes to a PhD chemist asking if it is OK to use hydrochloric
> acid to clean pipes. The chemist writes back that the acid is highly
> corrosive and its use is contraindicated. The plumber writes back thanking
> the chemist for OKing the use of hydrochloric acid. The chemist tries again
> using similar wording. Once again the plumber thanks the chemist for his
> approval. This goes on for a couple more rounds of letter writing. Finally
> the chemist breaks down and writes "Do not use hydrochloric acid. It eats
> the hell out of the pipes."
>
> The chemist had to switch to the "language" of his target audience (the
> plumber) rather than the "language" that he used in his own work.

Language being what it is, does the person that is justified in
ignoring "improper" phonetics also justified if they don't like the
pronunciation? Or inflection? Should we listen and pronounce the worked
exacltly the same as they do? What if they *want* different phonetics?

Like I say, my version of being a ham is two people that *want* to
communicate with each other and will do what they can to facilitate
that. Sometimes that takes proper phonetics, sometimes that takes
several rounds of trying to get the call, when proper phonetics may be
followed by *improper ones*. Sometimes it means straight csllsigns. And
yes, I can copy callsigns in several languages.

Unfortunately, the refusal to answer "improper" phonetics or whatever
reminds me of "No Kids, No Lids, and No Space Cadets". or an exchange I
heard in a contest a few weeks ago, where one ham told (ordered is more
like it) another to stop using "Please copy" before the exchange. Told
him he sounded like a stupid idiot when he did that.

Too many hams are entirely too rigid.

- Mike

4962. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 17:11:34 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950A85D0F1743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93026

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:c-idnW_Q5aP5703d4p2dnA@adelphia.com:

> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:SYqdnXFG2KBOrFPdRVn-sA@adelphia.com...
>>
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:s4CdnYYYfcyxjlDd4p2dnA@adelphia.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>[snip]
>>>>>Quite possibly. I use the so called "proper" phonetics myself
>>>>>(though prefering plain callsigns).
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm just not terribly into telling people what they can or can't say
>>>>>on the air as long as it is decent language.
>>>>>
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Actually the DX station is not so much trying to tell people what to
>>>>say
>>
>> as
>>
>>>>telling them what works for him so that those calling the DX can
>>
>> maximize
>>
>>>>their chances of getting through and the DX can maximize his results.
>>>> I personally would look at it as simply trying to facilitate
>>
>> communication.
>>
>>>Not communicating is not facilitating!
>>>
>>>

>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>> Well I have to disagree. The DX has attempted to facilitate
>> communication by conveying what works for him since English is almost
>> never his native language or he/she may be so accustomed to a specific
>> set that other sets cause him to "stumble" mentally.
>
> When I work DX, I try to include a little bit of the other Ham's
> language in the QSO, if I can. I'm no genius, but I can pick language
> up fairly quickly.
>
> My point is most Hams are fairly intelligent people. The basic
> language
> of an exchange is English, like it or not. A ham in a small country
> speaking an obscure language is going to enjoy a lot more success if he
> or she pick up the language that the communication is done in.
>
>
>> It's like they teach you in classes on giving speeches. You need
>> speak in a manner that the target audience will understand. In this
>> case the target is the DX. You are the one trying to break through to
>> him/her. He's not trying to break through to you.
>
> Well, in my version of Hamworld, we are both trying to communicate
> with
> each other. Perhaps I am wrong.
>
>> The teacher in one of my speech classes gave the following example:
>>
>> A plumber writes to a PhD chemist asking if it is OK to use
>> hydrochloric acid to clean pipes. The chemist writes back that the
>> acid is highly corrosive and its use is contraindicated. The plumber
>> writes back thanking the chemist for OKing the use of hydrochloric
>> acid. The chemist tries again using similar wording. Once again the
>> plumber thanks the chemist for his approval. This goes on for a
>> couple more rounds of letter writing. Finally the chemist breaks down
>> and writes "Do not use hydrochloric acid. It eats the hell out of the
>> pipes."
>>
>> The chemist had to switch to the "language" of his target audience
>> (the plumber) rather than the "language" that he used in his own work.
>
> Language being what it is, does the person that is justified in
> ignoring "improper" phonetics also justified if they don't like the
> pronunciation? Or inflection? Should we listen and pronounce the worked
> exacltly the same as they do? What if they *want* different phonetics?
>
> Like I say, my version of being a ham is two people that *want* to
> communicate with each other and will do what they can to facilitate

> that. Sometimes that takes proper phonetics, sometimes that takes
> several rounds of trying to get the call, when proper phonetics may be
> followed by *improper ones*. Sometimes it means straight csllsigns. And
> yes, I can copy callsigns in several languages.
>
> Unfortunately, the refusal to answer "improper" phonetics or
> whatever
> reminds me of "No Kids, No Lids, and No Space Cadets". or an exchange I
> heard in a contest a few weeks ago, where one ham told (ordered is more
> like it) another to stop using "Please copy" before the exchange. Told
> him he sounded like a stupid idiot when he did that.
>
> Too many hams are entirely too rigid.
>
> - Mike
>
>

Where I am originally from (the UK) the international phonetics are on the test, and I suspect that this is true elsewhere. Consequently, I had to learn them so that I could instantly come up with the correct phonetic for any letter and vicea versa. Many people can do that who can't even speak English, as they had to learn it to get a licence. They weren't tested on using Japan and Zanzibar, though.

Most of the 'Avocado, Bascule, Cumquat' variety of phonetics comes from US hams, I imagine because it isn't on the FCC tests, and this is then dressed up as 'freedom of choice', rather than admit that they don't know their phonetics. Also, many people end up learning a different set or just use any phonetics they have heard on air, but this is not conducive to being understood. There is a useful American expression here, it's what you call 'all being on the same page', and that's where we should aim to be.

That isn't to say that you can't use altenative phonetics if the standard ones don't succeed. I do that.

I suppose I ought to submit some questions on phonetics for the question pools. I wonder if I could succeed in getting it tested? I beleive it should be tested. Even the most diehard CW ops seem to use 2m FM, and there are occasions where phonetics can be useful there too.

4963. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 17:19:40 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93027

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:

> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>
>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>>> you?
>>
>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>> the claims he made, yes.
>
> Why?
>
> He may know just where they are.
>
> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
> another.
>>
>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>>
>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>>
> Can produce or will produce?
>
>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
>> unit, his
>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>>is fact.
>
> So what's the problem?
>
> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's

> pretty much a given.
>
> So why bother about it?
>>
>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>
> Maybe.
>
> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
> etc.
>
>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>>"logbook" somewhere.
>>
> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
> of wood.
>
>> It's just that it's empty.
>>
> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>
> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>

Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via the local repeater in PJ7.

> *if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?
>
> And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked
> T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the
> alleged operation.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

4964. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 17:46:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616134613.23857.00000367@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93029

In article <WDXzc.5229$0b.4876051@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>Jim, Jim, Jim...
>
>Message <click>
>Block Sender <click>
>Yes <click>
>
>A dose of 'Troll-Be-Gone' works almost every time.

Bert, Bert, Bert...it works the other way, too! :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4965. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 17:46:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616134616.23857.00000368@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93030

In article <20040616075805.10886.00000418@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(Rev. Jim of the amateur moral majority crusade) writes:

>In article <20040613162856.18863.00000383@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(Rev. Jim puts on his Evangelistic robes for
>>a hellfire-and-brimstone Sermon On The Antenna Mount which is
>>really a nasty old Troll for his series of shouting and hollering in the
>>disguise of a "polite" reply) writes:
>
>"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
>communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
>on those who do not agree with you."

Neither can one do that by:

1. Constantly bringing up years-old exchanges from archives
and trying to win one for your gypper.

2. Using cute lil Yiddish cuss words (mild), especially when
the user doesn't know whatinheck it means.

3. Trying to be a Fundamentalist Believer in telegraphy mode
long after other radio services have given it up as any sort of
"necessary" skill in this new millennium.

4. Acting the shocked (perhaps outraged) moralist by chiding
others of impropriety in giving return fire to those who are
overtly sniping at certain individuals. Hypocrisy is clearly
seen by all readers.

>Why didn't you answer the question, Len?

I do. You don't like the answers! Awww...poor baby!

>> Got your ego all in a dither because you aren't the
>> "renowned historian" and truthsayer in all things amateur?
>
>Nope. That's not me at all. It does, however, describe the behavior of certain
>other people who post here.

Such as Rev. Jim who seems to be stuck in past events
and can't go with the reality of now.

>> Well, heck yes and gosh darn, Rev. Jim are all upset again.
>
>Who is "Rev. Jim"? The only one I know is a character on the classic comedy
>series "Taxi".

That character was also fictional. :-)

>> This could be the start of REAL truthtelling in reply which would last
>> (probably) months and result in long, long, "refutations" that Rev. Jim
>> never ever tells any untruth and speaks with the voice of the gods.
>
>"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
>communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
>on those who do not agree with you."

Poor baby, you tried that schtick in here before and that one didn't
work well, either, did it? :-)

>In those Reply Comments, you proposed a minumum age requirement of 14 years
for
>any class of US amateur license, even sthough such a requirement has never
>existed in the USA. You gave no evidence of how the lack of such a requirement
>has had a negative effect on amateur radio or any other radio service, yet you
>wanted such a requirement (which would not affect you, of course) created.

See? The date of acceptance of that Comment on docket 98-143
is on public view as 13 January 1999.

That's over FIVE YEARS AGO. It's been argued and bitched about by
olde-tyme hammes in here at least twice after that. Now Rev. Jim
keeps on regurgitating it...he should see a doctor about not being able
to keep opinions of others down...vomitus hate-opinion-itis is a serious
thing that may indicate a more serious malady.

R&O 99-412 rather ended any further discussion on docket 98-143 but
lots and lots of hum radio guys had to keep on commenting and
commenting and commenting and commenting and...<yawn>

>Here's a few simple, direct questions, Len. In fact, I'll direct them to the
>entire group:

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are Feenix risen from your own ash, Rev. Jim.

[if you don't know "Hashafisti Scratchi" then the above doesn't
make any humor...:-)]

The NO-AGE non-issue is just that. No age thing on licensing for
hum radio licensees. Period. End. Full stop.

It's fairly obvious that chronologically-long-in-the-tooth radio hums
can get terribly immature and childish about their divine, sacred
olde-tyme hamme raddio traditions being scoffed. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> Rev. Jim got his BP up over 200/100 again on manual telegraphy.
>>

>Who? You cannot be referring to me, because I find Morse Code radiotelegraphy
>to be a relaxing experience.

"Opiate of the masses" for the fundamentalist telegraphic evangelist.

Yawn.

>> In the first days of ALL radio, the ONLY way to use it for any sort
>> of communication was by on-off keying telegraphy. That first demo
>> of radio was in 1896, in Italy and in Russia. The telegraphy codes
>> used were the "morse code" (presumably with some local country
>> variants for some characters, unknown to exact details). The first
>> Morse-Vail Telegraph (commercial) service was in 1844 or 52 years
>> before the first radio-as-communications medium demonstration.
>>
>> There's no question that "morse code" has historical significance.
>> It does. But, the first radio demo was 108 years ago...roughly five
>> generations in the past.
>
>That's all true.

That CANNOT be! I posted it. Therefore (in Rev. Jim fanstasy) it must
be IN ERROR! INCORRECT! Full of flaws! :-)

>And what's also true is that the person referred to in the preceding post
>denies and distorts the role Morse Code radiotelegraphy has played since those
>early days. Such as its role in World War 2 radio communications. Or its role
>in maritime communications well into the 1990s. Or its widespread use by
>radio amateurs.

Good news: Plenty of space on the Mall in DC for a great big
MONUMENT TO TELEGRAPHY! Start an organization to lobby
for its erection. Sounds like your sort of thing...!

Hello? World War 2 ended FIFTY-NINE YEARS AGO.

Rev. Jim took no part in WW2 nor in any of the military conflicts that
followed in all those 59 years.

Try to keep up with current events or reality might shock you.

[by the way, what has WW2 telegraphy to do with NATO
phonetic alphabets?!?!? try to stay focussed...]

>You don't have to "respect" anyone. But someone who can discuss in a civil
>manner - without name calling or ad-hominem insults - earns the respect of
>almost everyone, including those who disagree.

Ooooo...Rev. Jim done beat hisself to a pulpit.

Sermon on the Antenna Mount! And it's only Wednesday! :-)

>For example, I have great respect for K2UNK, Bill Sohl, even though we
disagree
>on almost all amateur radio policy matters. I cannot recall a single instance

>where Bill made fun of anoter's age, work, gender, license class, education,
>name, ethnicity, and/or military service.
>
>That's "civil debate".

I'd call the above MISDIRECTION. :-)

Bill can wade in as he wants...or doesn't want. Bill's option, not
yours.

This thread is about PHONETIC ALPHABETS. Or is it? :-)

"Able, baker, charlie..." phonetic alphabet was used by the U.S.
military prior to 1955. In 1955, the entire U.S. military adopted
the NATO Phonetic Alphabet ("alpha, bravo..."). That's factual.

Not only factual, I was in the U.S. Army at the time (1955), read
the AR, memorized the new phonetic alphabet and used it. Also
factual.

Gosh and golly, Rev. Jim, had I your gift of prescience, I would
have kept the mimeographed pages intact from 49 years ago,
had them in a safety deposit box vault for safekeeping to show
those of today! :-)

[no xerocopy machines back then, no job-printing run-offs for
most military documents, just mimeographed on rather easily
oxidizeable paper]

>"You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
>communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
>on those who do not agree with you."

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Rev. Jim, speak softly and quit trying to use
your Big Schtick.

Look out or someone will beat you to a pulpit. :-)

[which has happened many times in here but those on
anaesthetic can't feel it... :-)]

"You can't have 'meaningful exchanges' with Rev. Jim unless
you cherish, love, honor, and obey the Belief in manual
telegraphy and the radio times of before the Rev. existed."

Beep, beep...

LHA / WMD

>
>There's a very wise bit of advice that says a person should treat others as
>they wish to be treated.

4966. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 17:46:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93028

In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <40CD10A1.69E891C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>>> There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
>>> insult, and destroy - or attempt to.
>>>
>>> Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":
>>>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
>p.aol.com&output=gplain
>>
>>I hear tell that those air raids on Tokyo in the fifties were exercises
>>in sheer terror.
>
>I dunno, I've never been to Tokyo. Not even for 30 seconds.

Troll, troll, troll your boat...madly down the steam (puffing away prodigiously).

>Remember the exchanges about how far it is from air bases in North Korea and
>Vladivostok to Tokyo, Bear bombers and such? Someone was very unhappy when it
>was pointed out that the distance is well over 650 miles, not "about 500
>miles". And that the statement "about an hour in a Bear bomber" meant little
>because that aircraft did not enter service until the late 1950s.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Rev. Jim pulled out his Military Google-isms of the past and tried to make an amphibious bridge over his troubled waters. [he was all wet]

>Pointing out the fact that any American *under* a certain age grew up with the
>knowledge that hostile ICBMs could reach us in a matter of minutes sets off a
>predictable response, too.

Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)

Rev. Jim IS predictable. Lives in the PAST. He MUST keep on fighting the good fight over ancient postings, again and again and again and again and...<yawn>

>That sequence (in "34 Years Ago Today") was a classic. ;-)
>
>>I have to admit to being a little puzzled by what

>>appears to be a reference to the writer's multiple sphincters (in the
>>next to last paragraph).
>>
>Perhaps multiple ones are needed in order to handle his prodigious output ;-)

Perhaps Rev. Jim ought to change religious orders away from
the hypocratic hellfire-and-brimstone telegraphy cult. That way
he would not be so mortally wounded again...and again and
again and again and...<yawn>

Some of these postings "just write themselves." :-)

LHA / WMD

4967. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 18:27:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <A4KdnX-D2b0sDE3dRVn-hQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 93031

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns950A85D0F1743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> I suppose I ought to submit some questions on phonetics for the question
> pools. I wonder if I could succeed in getting it tested? I beleive it
> should be tested. Even the most diehard CW ops seem to use 2m FM, and
there
> are occasions where phonetics can be useful there too.

Actually there are questions on the test. Theoretically, the prospective ham is supposed to learn the phonetic alphabet. However, there's only one or two questions on the test pertaining to the phonetic alphabet. So if the student just memorizes the answers to the questions, he won't have a strong grasp of it. There's often a question about why it is used but some of this info doesn't stick with the person past the test itself.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4968. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1400 June 11, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 19:35:30 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616153530.06903.00000051@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 93032

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1400 June 11, 2004

The following is an advisory and not necessarily for air. Ladies and gentlemen, Amateur Radio Newslines' Support Fund Administrator, Andy
Jarema, N6TCQ:

--

This is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Newsline Support Fund Administrator, getting caught up with our supporters. In the month of August of last year we heard from The Reading, PA Radio Club, W3BN; Joseph Bartzi, Jr., KC8DKF of Columbus, OH; The North Hills Radio Club in Sacramento, CA; monthly contributor William Walters, WA2IBM, of San Jose and monthly contributor Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, also in San Jose

Thank you to everyone, and we promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support. A reminder that Newsline is a federally chartered 501c 3 California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. That address will be repeated at the end of the newscast.

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thank you Andy. Now, Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1400 with a release date of Friday, June 11 2004 follows in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Australia to make big changes in its Amateur Radio service, Greece will welcome hams at the 2004 Summer Olympics and Amateur Radio Newsline celebrates 1400 weeks of service to the world-wide ham radio community. It all comes your way, right now!

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: BIG CHANGES DOWN-UNDER

Big changes are coming to ham radio down-under. This, as Australia announces some sweeping changes that are about to take place in that nations Amateur Radio service. Owen Duffy reports:

--

The ACA has released their report entitled "Outcomes of the Review of Amateur Service Regulation". The report contains the ACA's intended changes to the Amateur service following stakeholder response to the recent discussion paper entitled "A Review of Amateur Service Regulation."

The key changes are removal of the Morse qualification requirements for all grades of amateur radio license; introduction of a new entry level license (the Foundation License) along the lines of the UK Foundation License, although it will be adapted to suit Australian preferences.

A three tier licensing structure: Advanced, Standard, and Foundation; translation of Unrestricted, Limited and Intermediate licenses to Advanced; translation of Novice and Novice Limited licenses to Standard; a privileges package for the Standard License that is much greater than enjoyed by Novice Licenses today.

A generous privileges package for the Foundation License allows voice or Morse code at low power (10W PEP) using only unmodified commercial transmitting equipment on all of 80m, 40m, 15m, 10m, 2m, and most of 70cm.

Australian participation in CEPT Recommendation T/R 61-01 (reciprocal licensing) is in progress. The status-quo is essentially preserved in respect to higher operating power; interference and interference management built on current arrangements.

Apparatus Licensing as the vehicle for licensing Australian amateur stations (though stations licensed under CEPT Recommendation T/R 61-01 would be class licensed). State significance of callsigns remains.

This has been Owen Duffy for the CQVK project on Q-News Australia.

--

As we go to air, no effective date for these changes to take place has been announced by the Australian Communications Agency. (Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL: THE BIG DISPUTE

Two Asian Pacific nations are embroiled in a territorial dispute and Amateur Radio appears to be caught right in the middle. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is in Brisbane with the details:

--

A centuries-old territorial dispute between Japan and South Korea is again escalating with the South Koreans placing a group of amateur radio operators on the rocky islets known in Korea as the Lonely Islands. To the Japanese they are the Bamboo Islands.

The radio station, licensed by South Korea, was seen as a provocation by the Japanese. Some amateur radio operators in JA are

said to have interfered with the South Korean stations transmissions.

I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News for the Amateur Radio Newsline.
--

Kemp says that hams around the world were surprised to hear about the dispute. This is because our hobby stresses development of technologic skill along with friendly international communications. (Q-News)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE NEBRASKA TORNADO AFTERMATH

Back on this side of the Pacific Amateur Radio operators were on duty aiding tornado-stricken communities in Nebraska and elsewhere in the Midwest. Norm Seeley, KI7UP, picks up the story from here:

--

As we reported last week, a May 22nd tornado virtually destroyed most structures in the small town of Hallam, Nebraska. Hallam is located some 20 miles south of Lincoln and one death there was attributed to the storm.

During and after the tornado ham radio was an important part of the overall emergency service effort. The ARRL Letter quotes Nebraska Section Emergency Coordinator Reynolds Davis, K-zero-G-N-D, as saying that Lancaster County ARES and SKYWARN spotters were activated that evening in response to a report of an approaching front. Within a half-hour, W0NWS at the National Weather Service office was receiving tornado damage reports via the Lincoln Amateur Radio Club K0KKV repeater.

The storm severely damaged a high school in Norris, Nebraska, and plucked the tower supporting the K0RPT repeater's south region receiver from the ground. The tornado went on to demolish additional homes to the northeast. Its path of destruction finally ended south of the town of Bennet.

Once the SKYWARN Nets closed, the remainder of the K0RPT system was put into service to support Red Cross communications between the tornado scene, the chapter house and a shelter set up in a Lincoln high school for residents displaced by the storm. Two ARES nets were activated May 23rd to coordinate damage survey and assessment. They logged reports via K0EOC at the Lancaster County Emergency Operations Center.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Norm Seeley, KI7UP

--

Amateur Radio communications support continued for several days. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

More news after a break for you to identify your station. Cue the announcer, please:

"From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K2SBD repeater serving Long Island. New York."

(5 sec pause here)

**

WITH NEWSLINE: SEND US YOUR ID - PLEASE

The station I-D you just heard was recorded a few weeks ago at the Dayton Hamvention. And it has lead us to an idea.

Would you like to I-D your own repeater or bulletin station here on Amateur Radio Newsline? Well here is how you can do it.

Simply record on a cassette tape the following sentence and include the call sign and location you want to honor.

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the
"xxx"
repeater serving "yyy zzz." The "xxx" is the call
sign. The "yyy"
and "zzz" are the city and state.

Then, take the tape and mail it to Amateur Radio Newsline, Editorial Office, 28197 Robin Avenue, Santa Clarita, California, 91350. As time permits, we will select an audio I-D and include it in the newscast.

All tapes submitted become the property of the Amateur Radio Newsline and cannot be returned.

Again, the address to make yourself a part of this bulletin service is Amateur Radio Newsline, Editorial Office, 28197 Robin Avenue, Santa Clarita, California, 91350. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: FIRST EXPEDITION 9 QSO A BIG SUCCESS

AMSAT reports that the first ARISS contact with the Expedition 9 crew on the ISS took place on Tuesday, May 25th. During his first-ever amateur radio contact, Astronaut Mike Fincke, KE5AIT, answered 18 questions asked by the students who gathered at the Erie Planetarium in Pennsylvania.

The contact used the facilities of telebridge station, VK5ZAI, in Australia to assure high quality space to ground communications. It

was deemed very successful as the children applauded and thanked KE5AIT for taking the time to join them from space. We will have more ham radio space related news later on in this weeks newscast. (AMSAT, ARISS)

**

WORLDBEAT: HAM RADIO AND THE 2004 SUMMER OLYMPICS

If you are planning to attend the 2004 Summer Olympics in Greece, we have some good news for you. Foreign radio amateurs from CEPT countries or from countries with reciprocity can use the special prefix J42004 from August 1st to November 15th without any special license from Greek Authorities.

Not only that. Demetre Valaris, SV1UY, says all hams visiting Athens for the Olympics is more than welcome to give a shout on 145.425 MHz with a 88.5HZ access tone. Demetre says that this is so visitors can hook up with Greek hams and share hospitality.

What about visiting hams from non CEPT nations? They will have to contact Greek telecommunications regulators for special permission to operate. (Via E-Mail)

**

RADIO RESEARCH: MCRN TO TEST RADIATION ANGLES

The Marconi Radio Club of Newfoundland station VO1MRC will be conducting an antenna comparison experiment on the 19th and 20th of June and you are invited to take part. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PW, has more:

--

Each day during the experiment from 0000 to 2400 UTC station VO1MRC will operate a CW beacon on 5269.5 kilohertz. Its purpose will be to determine the relative performance of high and low radiation angles. The antenna in use will be identified by a code in each transmission.

VO1MRC will also be open briefly for 2 way contacts with stations authorized to transmit on 60 meters starting 0000 UTC each of these days and will operate simplex on 5260.5 kilohertz CW. Following this it will transmit on 5327.5 kilohertz upper sideband and receive 5346.5 kilohertz upper sideband and 3807.5 kilohertz on lower sideband.

The experiment was proposed by Marconi Radio Club of Newfoundland and is endorsed by Radio Amateurs of Canada. Its operated under an authorization issued by Industry Canada which is that nations telecommunicastions regulatory body.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

For further information, please check the Marconi Radio Club of Newfoundland web site. That U-R-L is http://www.ucs.mun.ca/~jcraig/5megex.html (RAC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TO MUCH RF

The licensee of FM station KWNZ, located in Carson City, Nevada, has been fined $10,000 by the FCC. This, for creating ground-level radiation in excess of the permissible public exposure level at KWNZ's McClellan Peak transmitter site.

The CGC Communicator says that the various excuses offered by the licensee were not impressive. For example, KWNZ contended that there was no evidence whatsoever of public use of the particularized ten square foot area where the station exceeded the RFR permitted radiation limits.

According to the FCC, it is not necessary to establish actual public use of the particular unfenced and unmarked]area where excessive power density occurs. The regulatory agency says that public use of an area nearby is sufficient.

(DO NOT READ: More is on-line at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-04-1533A1.doc (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR RADIO ACTIONS

Now with more enforcement news here's the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

Audio report only. Hear it on this weeks newscast at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

More on these issues as the FCC releases follow-up information. (FCC, RAIN)

**

BEST PRACTICES: EMERGENCY READINESS GUIDE FOR LOCAL MEDIA

The FCC's Media Security and Reliability Council has published a new booklet titled the "Readiness Guide for Local Media on How to Prepare for Emergencies." This colorful pamphlet is good for a quick overview of what the media should do in times of emergencies. Its available on the web in both Mocrosoft Word and PDF format. The PDF version is at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-

244522A1.pdf. Download the following doc version at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-244391A1.doc. Finally, the generic website for the Media Security and Reliability Council is http://www.fcc.gov/MSRC/. (CGC)

**

ON THE AIR: THE COLLINS COLLECTORS NETS

And if you own vintage ham gear, you might want to become a member of the Collins Collectors Association and join one of their monthly nets. The nets are held the first Wednesday of the month on 3.888 MHz beginning at 7:30 PM in the Eastern time zone and 8 PM in the Central, Mountain and Pacific time zones.

These nets draw hundreds of vintage stations from across the country and are anchored by a "tall ship" AM station in each time zone and you do not need to operate Collins gear to take part. For more information. just tune in. Comments go by e-mail to wa9vrh@mtco.com (Via e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United
States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: LLOYD "SIG" SIGMON W6LQ - S.K.

A ham radio operator who developed a public warning scheme that eventually carried his name, has died. This, with word that 95 year old Lloyd Sigmon, W6LQ, became a silent key on Wednesday, June 2nd, following a long illness.

Known to his ham radio buddies as Sig, in 1955 W6LQ perfected a method that allowed the Los Angeles Police Department to issue emergency warnings over local radio stations. At the time Sigmon was an executive with radio station KMPC and wanted to boost station ratings by providing traffic information.

Then Los Angeles Police Chief William H. Parker permitted use of Sigmon's device but only on the condition that it be made available
to any radio station that wanted to use it. He also is dubbed the bulletins as SigAlerts in honor of W6LQ.

The first SigAlert was broadcast on Sept. 5, 1955. It was carried by six radio stations and urged medical personnel to respond to a train derailment outside Los Angeles Union Station. The California Highway Patrol later took over freeway traffic warnings from the Los Angeles Police Department and handles SigAlerts, which now are computerized.

Lloyd Sigmon, W6LQ, was born in 1909 in Stigler, Oklahoma. He was fascinated by electronics and received his first Amateur Radio license at age 14. He died at Green County Assisted Living Center in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, where he had been residing the past four years. (Published news stories)

**

RADIOS LEGACY: THE HISTORIC KGFJ 1230 KHZ TRANSMITTER SITE HAS BEEN SHUT DOWN

The CGC Communicator reports the passing of a different sort. This with the announcement that on May 24th a historic AM broadcast transmitting site was turned off after 80 years of service.

In 1924, radio station KGFJ started broadcasting from the Odd Fellows Lodge Building on Oak Street near downtown Los Angeles. In more recent years, the station call sign was changed its call letters to KYPA.

Shortly after 4 PM on May 24th, Marvin Collins, W6OQI, turned on the new 1230 kHz transmitter. Its signal is diplexed into a tower at the KBLA 1580 kHz transmitter site.

Collins says that the old KGFJ "flat top" antenna had been in continuous use by since 1924. He adds that the old antenna may well have been the last full-time use of a flat top antenna anywhere in the country.

Marv took photos of the old KGFJ site and the new diplexed setup at KBLA, visit Marvin's web page at http://earthsignals.com/Collins/ and scroll to "KGFJ 1230." You can write to Marv at KFIam640@aol.com

(CGC)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: BIG LAUNCH DOLLARS RAISED AT DAYTON

AMSAT says that its Launch Fund campaign now has $93,0000 in it. This, thanks to donations received at the recent Dayton Hamvention including one anonymous donor who matched every dollar collected with another one.

AMSAT North America President Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, says that now is the time to make a final push to reach $110,000 goal. He adds four words that seem to come right out of the Mel Brooks musical the Producers. The four words are - "we can do it." And
Haighton is

confident that they will.

More about the fund and ham radio space exploration is on-line at www.amsat.org. (AMSAT-NA)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ECHO NEAR COMPLETION

And some more good news from on the ham radio satellite scene. It comes from Jim White, WD0E, who has been testing and performing final integration of the ECHO ham-sat.

White says that as far as he can tell the ECHO team is on track and the new satellite is looking good. He says that there are a few minor items have to be completed before the bird is sent to the Kazakhstan launch site. White says that he is confident that it will be 100% by the time it gets there for the launch. (AMSAT-NA)

**

WORLDBEAT: HFRADIO.NET TAKES LIGHTNING HIT

Due to a system failure caused by a recent lightning strike, the H-F-RADIO dot NET Canadian Amateur Radio Bulletin service has lost its database of subscribers. In order to rebuild it and for subscribers to continue receiving those weekly bulletins, hams across Canada are asked to send an e-mail to webmaster@hfradio.net with the word "subscribe" in the subject line. (RAC)

**

DX

IN DX, K8AQM, reports that his trip to Samoa will take place between July 7th to the 21st. While there he will operate as 5W0TR on 160 through 10 meters using CW, SSB, RTTY and PSK. Also, look for him as KH6BB from Hawaii July 5th and 6th and 22nd through he 24th. QSLs go via K-8-A-A as his Callbook address.

And members of the United Kingdoms Wrexham and District Amateur Radio Society will be on from the Isle of Man from September 1st to the 8th. Station location will be at the discontinued Coast Guard lookout tower at Scarlett Point. Activity will be on all High Frequency bands plus 50 MHz, 70MHz, 144MHz and 432 MHz, at full UK power on CW, SSB, RTTY, PSK and SSTV. More information is on-line at www.gb4iom.co.uk (Various DX sources)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: CELEBRATING NEWSCAST 1400

And finally this week its time for a bit of a celebration here at Amateur Radio Newsline. That's because this newscast marks 1,400 consecutive weeks that we have been bringing you news from the worlds

of Amateur Radio and personal communications. With some thoughts on this milestone, here's our producer Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF:

--

If you get out your calculator and do the math, you will find that 1400 weeks comes out to be 26 point 923 years. Close enough in our book to say 27. And in ham radio news, I guess we can say that's a
pretty long time.

Back when we still edited on tape I used to wonder how many splices that we made in a year. One day I sat down and figured out that there were about 30 in an average newscast. That was 120 a month or 1440 a year and an awful lot of Scotch splicing tape. Had we stayed on tape it would mean that we would have cut into a piece of audio tape 38,880 times as of today.

But we stopped putting the newscast together using tape almost 4 years ago. Now its done in the digital world using computers and programs like Goldwave and Cool Edit pro. Becoming part of the digital age early on is something we are kind of proud of. Being on your favorite repeater for the past 27 years and never missing a deadline is another.

As we enter year 27 and begin rolling on toward year 28, we pause and renew our simple pledge to you. The promise we made many years ago and which continues to guide our very being. Amateur Radio Newsline will be here as long as you want us and as long as you support us. We exist to serve you and we all consider it an honor to do so.

Speaking for all of the volunteers who make up the world-wide Amateur Radio Newsline team, I say "thank you." Thank you for sharing your
lives with us through the magic of Amateur Radio. Thank you for caring about us through your ongoing support. Most of all, we thank you for being a part of what we like to call the Amateur Radio Newsline family.

To paraphrase a line from the show Chicago. "We simply could not do
it alone."

Again, we thank you.

I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

Jim.

--

As one of the anchors who has been here almost from the start, I add my thank-you's as well.

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is now on. This program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. The cutoff
for
nominations this year is midnight on June 30th.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm
Jim
Davis, W2JKD, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

4969. The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 19:59:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616155953.06606.00000405@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93033

In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes (under "Re: Able Baker Charlie" thread):

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<snip>

> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>of text based adventure game.

Good precis, Mike. However, there's one group left out from this
venue, the Traditionalist-Fundamentalist who has adopted a very
rigid set of geas set out to cleanse a personal involvement with
an avocational radio activity. ("geas" refers to magical gimmicks
set to keep devils out of a local territory)

>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.

Agreed. But, the "MARS is amateur radio" statement is an
example of not only a Traditionalist-Fundamentalist but one who
wants to make a hobby into a surrogate of a military life, of
rigid obeyance of some kind of "orders" from a fantasy of what
a hobby really is...and then fails to note the existance and the
raison d'etre of that particular originally-military radio service.

MARS was originally conceived (under the previous AARS) to
get radio amateurs involved with the U.S. Army communications
of 1925. Comms of any radio service of 1925 were rather
simple. Even the Army admitted that. The AARS never grew to
be a big thing and WW2 put a halt on everything amateur insofar
as operations. There's not much about "phone patches" as a
goodwill effort to give servicemen a link with home through
amateur radio prior to 1942... :-)

During the Cold War times, phone patches, whether through
MARS or individual hams, were very good for boosting morale,
especially for those stuck in so many foreign places. It hit a
high point with the Vietnam War, the southeast Asian MARS
stations handling up to 42,000 phone patches a month up to
1970. That's referenced at the Army's Center For Military
History (CMH) and available for download by anyone. [I gave

the link in here]

But, the Vietnam War ended 29 years ago, almost a generation
and a half in the past. MARS still has the task of involving
civilians with military radio but MARS has, for a long time,
changed its mission to be a true auxilliary radio service in the
military, that of being an affiliate communications service with
other U.S. government radio services. The one-month exercise
two years ago of Grecian Firebolt 2002 showed that MARS
does function quite well on its own without civilian radio amateurs
to fulfill its mission.

The existance and definition of MARS is covered by publicly-
available documents. However, the image in the minds of many
is solely from amateur publications (who overemphasize ham
involvement relative to the bigger mission picture) and that
image is about three decades out of date.

> If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
>filtering or ignoring him or her.

Some have their minds made up and will never change. :-)

In here, several operate slightly differently in that perceived personal
"honor" is involved. They say something wrong or make an error and
then refuse to admit it until pinned against several walls and had it
rubbed all over them. :-)

That applies on any subject in any computer-modem venue, was so
even back in the late 1970s on ARPANET...then the original
USENET (probably the worst are academics not yet risen to their
full titled heights, heh heh)...continued on into BBSs and now the
Internet.

Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.

Most interesting, that conservatism. Radio communications involves
the sharing of information. Radio does it very fast, yet the technology
advancements are all coming from the designer-manufacturers.

> Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
>of willing participants in his game.

The regulars are a very, very tiny percentage of the entire hum radio licensees...and they seem to be staunchly, archly, embedded-in-old-concept holes in the ground on what amateur radio "should be." Not a good venue to discuss anything but hidebound status-quoism.

Those who aren't in agreement with keeping things absolutely the same as when those olde-tyme hammes got their beloved licenses is in for a rough go. :-)

> Face it, he is good at it. It may not be what you are in here for, but
>he succeeds in his game.

It may be a game to others, Mike, but it is a lunchtime amusement for me. :-)

In one way, it is fun to poke holes in others' faulty concepts such as telegraphy and the Absolute Need to test all licensees for that ability forever and ever into the end of time in order to invade their precious HF turf! :-)

51 years ago I lucked out in my military service and got stationed at a major communications facility. That changed my concepts of what radio communications was about. Practically a wholesale revision, having had little exposure prior, all from amateur publications. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force just didn't use any telegraphy then for fixed-point to fixed-point radio communications. They had not done so since WW2. The USN depended on on-line cryptographic communications in the fleet, on cruisers and heavier class ships back in 1940 (that's how the USN could coordinate movements to engage in the Battle of Midway). That crypto messaging was by RTTY, not manual telegraphy. The "Sigaba" crypto TTY system was never compromised.

The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST. Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in any big-time radio communications experience. As a result, many are openly antagonistic against anyone who has done so and try to divert the thread into claims that I "embellish" my "CV," tooting my own horn so to speak :-) Really no. I'm trying to point out that "CW" was already being downsized a half century ago and its use is constantly decreasing until it has virtually disappeared for communications everywhere but in amateur radio.

> Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

The true antagonistic poster seldom gets much response. Those get a large charge out of saying the worst things about another. That's part of the time-distance isolation "safety factor" for them in computer-modem communications. They can get away with it! :-)

What gets "weird" (or 'wired') is when another replies with correct facts and Strong response. The original antagonists almost go berserk. :-) [see the posts of the one who likes to use the word "putz"] The original antagonists Hate that sort of thing. It spoils their private little sociopathy game they so enjoy. :-)

>>>You
>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>irresistable.
>>
>> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>
> And yet you are now involved once more!

He can't help it. His "honor" is at stake...someone put a stake through a vital part back when he was trying to peddle Uber-status-quoism all about keeping amateur radio forever locked into the old standards and practices.

It may be an "evangelical" kind of thing. Or just brainwashed syndrome.

Ethnic cleansing must be done, impure concepts washed away.

>>> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>>
>> I don't.
>
> You don't have to, that much is true.

Life is tough and then you newsgroup... :-)

"Sine die" - someone turned off the audio oscillator...

QED is not one of the "Q codes" in telegraphy.

Back to trying to find out what's holding me down in my search for anti-gravity...

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4970. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 20:29:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406160757.c6a30a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93034

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of June 15, 2004:

Novice - 31,495 (decrease of 17,834)
Technician - 264,801 (increase of 59,407)
Technician Plus - 59,184 (decrease of 69,676)
General - 140,108 (increase of 27,431)
Advanced - 79,967 (decrease of 19,815)
Extra - 105,456 (increase of 26,706)
Total - 681,011 (increase of 6,219)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4971. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 20:56:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406160808.18c82c0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93035

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of June 15, 2004:

Novice - 31,495 (decrease of 17,834)
Technician - 264,801 (increase of 59,407)
Technician Plus - 59,184 (decrease of 69,676)
General - 140,108 (increase of 27,431)
Advanced - 79,967 (decrease of 19,815)
Extra - 105,456 (increase of 26,706)
Total - 681,011 (increase of 6,219)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4972. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 21:07:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406160809.55aaab7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93036

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of June 15, 2004:

Novice - 31,495 (decrease of 17,834)
Technician - 264,801 (increase of 59,407)
Technician Plus - 59,184 (decrease of 69,676)
General - 140,108 (increase of 27,431)
Advanced - 79,967 (decrease of 19,815)
Extra - 105,456 (increase of 26,706)
Total - 681,011 (increase of 6,219)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4973. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 21:48:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40D0C041.2000504@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93037

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
>
> In fact, the whole phonetic debate is a little funny, since
> despite the kvetching, an experienced operator can pick out the
> different phonetics without getting his/her knickers in a twist.
>
>

For some reason, my call "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Echo" comes back "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Tango" fairly often. Seems people hear the ends of the words better than the beginnings. "Echo" and Tango" rhyme somewhat,
which I thought the phonetic alphabet was to avoid. What's the most common alternate for "Echo" used on HF?

4974. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 23:18:53 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <xz4Ac.7819$0b.6522260@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 93038

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40D0C041.2000504@ix.netcom.com...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > In fact, the whole phonetic debate is a little funny, since
> > > despite the kvetching, an experienced operator can pick out the
> > > different phonetics without getting his/her knickers in a twist.
> > >
> > >
>
> For some reason, my call "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Echo" comes back
> "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Tango" fairly often. Seems people hear
the
> ends of the words better than the beginnings. "Echo" and Tango" rhyme
> somewhat,
> which I thought the phonetic alphabet was to avoid. What's the most
common
> alternate for "Echo" used on HF?

Edward.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4975. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-16 23:40:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040616194048.29277.00000419@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93039

In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:

>>>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>>>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>>>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>>>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>>>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>>>> :-)

>>>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....

>>>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>>>>been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
>>>>proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?

>>>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>>>>yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the
>point
>>>>of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>>>
>>>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>>>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>>>historical importance?
>>>>
>>>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
>>>>on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead
>refers to
>>>>the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender,
>license
>>>>class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>>>
>>> You forgot to add:
>>>
>>> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>>>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience

>>>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>>>
>> Well, if the shoe fits...
>
> Sorry for replies to some older posts. I've been through two weeks of
>hell at work, and didn't get to respond to everything. Now I'm taking a
>well deserved day off and can get back to it.

Good to have you back, Mike
>
> Yes, the shoe does fit.
>
Well, there you have it.

>>>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>>
>> I'm not.
>
> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>of text based adventure game.

Lots of other reasons, too. One can only speculate on Mr. Anderson's reasons.
;-)
>
>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.

No it isn't.*

>If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
>filtering or ignoring him or her.

In some cases, yes.
>
>Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
>of willing participants in his game.

Perhaps.
>
>Face it, he is good at it.

Not really. I have seen many other posters get the better of Mr. Anderson. It's
not hard to do at all.

All I've done is present a differing opinion than his, and point out some of
his mistakes. His responses have been - predictable.

It's fascinating how a few words of a different opinion can cause Mr. Anderson to produce volumes of verbiage. And how a calm, polite correction of even one of his errors brings such a torrent of anger and abuse.

>It may not be what you are in here for, but
>he succeeds in his game.

Sometimes.
>
>Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

Just different versions of the same game. And the "game" sometimes extends beyond the newsgroup. For example, some time back I and some others received several unsolicited emails from Mr. Anderson, with attachments that were allegedly pictures. I deleted them unopened, as is standard procedure for unsolicited attachments. I found out later they were supposedly a picture of his commercial radiotelephone license and a picture that included adult male nudity. Of course this is second hand information because I simply deleted the emails, but you have to kinda wonder why such Mr. Anderson would send me such things.

>>>You
>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>irresistable.
>>
>> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>
> And yet you are now involved once more!

Only by choice.
>
>>>Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
>>>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
>>>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.
>>
>> Nothing new there, Mike.
>>
>>> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>>
>> I don't.
>

>You don't have to, that much is true.
>
Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

* pop culture reference to "The Argument Clinic" - classic Monty Python sketch

4976. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 00:38:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040616203802.28114.00000410@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93040

In article <20040616194048.29277.00000419@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo ><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>>>N2EY wrote:

>> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>>of text based adventure game.
>
>Lots of other reasons, too. One can only speculate on Mr. Anderson's reasons.
>;-)

Speculate away, Rev. Jim, in the most "civil" negative connotations your lil imagination thunk up...:-)

Speculate until all you see are speckles...

Of course we can all speculate on Mr. Miccolis' reasons (to sound off like some latter-day "T.O.M.") when that ARRL president-for-life ceased mortal existance long before Rev. Jim got is first Good Book (ARRL Handbook, that is).

>>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
>
>No it isn't.*

If you are trying to be "with-it" (of two decades plus ago), try to remember that everyone is NOT a Monty Python fan... :-)

>>Face it, he is good at it.
>
>Not really. I have seen many other posters get the better of Mr. Anderson.
>It's not hard to do at all.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...your Python was gored and you think everyone else's was, too? :-)

>All I've done is present a differing opinion than his, and point out some of
>his mistakes. His responses have been - predictable.

BS, Rev. Jim. You've got a bad habit of trying to convince others
that you "know" things you can't verify. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>It's fascinating how a few words of a different opinion can cause Mr. Anderson
>to produce volumes of verbiage. And how a calm, polite correction of even one
>of his errors brings such a torrent of anger and abuse.

"Torrent of anger and abuse?!?!?" :-)

Poor baby. Wanting to be the hall monitor in here, ey?

Jimmah, da Google is NOT your friend in this case. :-)

>>It may not be what you are in here for, but
>>he succeeds in his game.
>
>Sometimes.

More times than not. I'm still here... :-)

>>Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.
>
>Just different versions of the same game. And the "game" sometimes extends
>beyond the newsgroup. For example, some time back I and some others received
>several unsolicited emails from Mr. Anderson, with attachments that were
>allegedly pictures. I deleted them unopened, as is standard procedure for
>unsolicited attachments. I found out later they were supposedly a picture of
>his commercial radiotelephone license and a picture that included adult male
>nudity. Of course this is second hand information because I simply deleted the
>emails, but you have to kinda wonder why such Mr. Anderson would send me such
>things.

Oh, dear. Isn't the nasty old Reverend getting out of hand with his
preachy moralizing? :-)

"Male nudity!" :-)

By accident, a JPG of an aerial photo of a converted B-26 with one of
the crew mooning the photo plane in the nose is considered "male
nudity!!!"

Several of the folks who are in here thought it was FUNNY.

But, the rigid moral majority, more self-righteous than mental
viagra overdosing, say it is "male nudity!!!" Good grief.
Grow up. Get a new fig leaf to cover your anguish...

If you had bothered to Google (your constant source of diss-material)
you would have found out the sequence of events was totally in public
in this venue.

By the way, I DID send the correct attachment which was, indeed, a
scan of my FIRST First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) license.
I've had several of those licenses, all the way to the change-over to
the General Radiotelephone Operator license class.

>>>>You
>>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>>irresistable.
>>>
>>> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>>
>> And yet you are now involved once more!
>
>Only by choice.

Yes, "Mr. Miccolis" wants to keep on beating dead horses until they
die all over again to prove his point that He was "correct," and all
must accept that lest they get caught in an endless loop of Rev. Jim
preaching his self-righteousness. "Mr. Miccolis" can do no wrong,
ever, and he is compelled to repeat old arguments forever and ever
to demonstrate that.

"Mr. Miccolis" will try to repeat many ancient arguments, discussions,
et al, long after they quit being topics. Why? Apparently "Mr. Miccolis"
can't let sleeping dogs lie nor can he let beaten horses die, either.

It's sort of like watching re-runs of "Wheel of Fortune" (or any other quiz
show on TV) and hoping a guest will come up with a different answer! :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk...such sore losers! :-)

LHA / WMD

4977. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 00:59:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <-qydnSsNb5dHcU3dRVn-uw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93041

N2EY wrote:

> In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>>>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>>>>
>>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>
>>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>>>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>>>>>find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>>>>>all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>>>>>how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>>>>>messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>>>>>:-)
>
>
>>>>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>
>
>>>>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>>>>>been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
>>>>>proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>
>
>>>>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
>>>>>yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the
>>
>>point
>>

>>>>>of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>>>>
>>>>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
>>>>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>>>>historical importance?
>>>>>
>>>>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
>>>>>on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead
>>
>>refers to
>>
>>>>>the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender,
>>
>>license
>>
>>>>>class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>>>>
>>>> You forgot to add:
>>>>
>>>> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>>>>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>>>>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Well, if the shoe fits...
>>
>> Sorry for replies to some older posts. I've been through two weeks of
>>hell at work, and didn't get to respond to everything. Now I'm taking a
>>well deserved day off and can get back to it.
>
>
> Good to have you back, Mike
>
>> Yes, the shoe does fit.
>>
>
> Well, there you have it.
>
>
>>>>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>>>
>>>I'm not.
>>
>> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>>of text based adventure game.
>
>
> Lots of other reasons, too. One can only speculate on Mr. Anderson's reasons.

> ;-)
>
>>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
>
>
> No it isn't.*

Yow - the Mostly Steve Brian MARS argument has gotten to the point
where I can hardly hack it. YMMV!

That was a good skit, though!

>
>>If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
>>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
>>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
>>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
>>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
>>filtering or ignoring him or her.
>
>
> In some cases, yes.
>
>>Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
>>of willing participants in his game.
>
>
> Perhaps.
>
>>Face it, he is good at it.
>
> Not really. I have seen many other posters get the better of Mr. Anderson. It's
> not hard to do at all.
>
> All I've done is present a differing opinion than his, and point out some of
> his mistakes. His responses have been - predictable.

I must not be getting my point across here. This isn't about being
right. It's about the discourse. Sometimes he's right, sometimes he's
wrong, and a lot of it is just neutral as in opinion.

> It's fascinating how a few words of a different opinion can cause Mr. Anderson
> to produce volumes of verbiage. And how a calm, polite correction of even one
> of his errors brings such a torrent of anger and abuse.

Yes, I've had that happen.

>
>>It may not be what you are in here for, but
>>he succeeds in his game.

>
>
> Sometimes.
>
>>Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.
>
>
> Just different versions of the same game.

Oh, that other one is some pretty severe stuff. Between the perverse
accusations, the threats, the obscenities and the stuff that just might
end up as courtroom evidence, this stuff is tame by comparison.

And the "game" sometimes extends
> beyond the newsgroup. For example, some time back I and some others received
> several unsolicited emails from Mr. Anderson, with attachments that were
> allegedly pictures. I deleted them unopened, as is standard procedure for
> unsolicited attachments. I found out later they were supposedly a picture of
> his commercial radiotelephone license and a picture that included adult male
> nudity. Of course this is second hand information because I simply deleted the
> emails, but you have to kinda wonder why such Mr. Anderson would send me such
> things.

I've heard about that one.

>>>>You
>>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>>irresistable.
>>>
>>>
>>>Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>>
>> And yet you are now involved once more!
>
>
> Only by choice.

Well, sure! Steve is involved by choice too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4978. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 03:57:02 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <car4qeihs04$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 93042

Hello and good morning,
I am following this very interesting and funny thread since it was initiated by ??? long ago.

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> schrieb im Newsbeitrag news:xz4Ac.7819$0b.6522260@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
| "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
| news:40D0C041.2000504@ix.netcom.com...
| > Mike Coslo wrote:
| >
| > >
| > >
| > > In fact, the whole phonetic debate is a little funny, since
| > > despite the kvetching, an experienced operator can pick out the
| > > different phonetics without getting his/her knickers in a twist.

Let me straighten out the whole phonetics discussion from the point of the DX side:

1. Standart ITU Phonetics are testet everywhere outside most english speaking countries, even in Great Britain as we where told by Alun. Thats neccesary because they all have their alternative set of phonetics in native language. If a US-ham now is useing a different set, there could be problems of understanding, because the properly pronounced ITU phonetics might be the ONLY english words, and the figures, the DX will be capable of.

2. As we are tested on the ITU-phonetics for ham-licence, in other instances (law enforcement, emergency response, military) we are bound to homeland phonetics. Despite that fact, hams are using the ITU-set even on VHF/UHF and even they dont have a CEPT licence (only national) instead of the logical native language one.

3. The use of alternative sets of phonetics, or even those funny replacements as they are in use in the US, like
"W4ZLY " Whisky for Zebras Like Yoghurt - sometimes would make it hard to accomplish a full QSO. BTW this is a real example.

| > >
| > >
| >
| > For some reason, my call "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Echo" comes back
| > "Whiskey Alpha Two India Sierra Tango" fairly often. Seems people hear
| the
| > ends of the words better than the beginnings. "Echo" and Tango" rhyme
| > somewhat,

| > which I thought the phonetic alphabet was to avoid. What's the most
| common
| > alternate for "Echo" used on HF?
|
| Edward.
|

England
Equador
Easy

| --
| 73 de Bert
WA2SI
|

73 de
Ocean Easy Eight Sugar Ocean Queen
Kay Gee Six Eee aR Zed
Helmut

4979. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 05:37:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617013716.22212.00000234@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 93043

In article <-qydnSsNb5dHcU3dRVn-uw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>>>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>>>>>
>>>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>>
>>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>>>>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
>>>>>>>find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
>>>>>>>all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
>>>>>>>how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
>>>>>>>messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
>>>>>>>:-)
>>
>>>>>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
>>
>>>>>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
>>>>>>been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
>>>>>>proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
>>
>>>>>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of
children,
>>>>>>yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the
point
>>>>>>of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly
and
>>>>>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
>>>>>>historical importance?

>>>>>>
>>>>>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
>>>>>>on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead
refers to
>>>>>>the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender,
license
>>>>>>class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
>>>>>
>>>>> You forgot to add:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
>>>>>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
>>>>>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
>>>>>
>>>>Well, if the shoe fits...
>>>
>>> Sorry for replies to some older posts. I've been through two weeks of
>>>hell at work, and didn't get to respond to everything. Now I'm taking a
>>>well deserved day off and can get back to it.
>>
>> Good to have you back, Mike
>>
>>> Yes, the shoe does fit.
>>>
>> Well, there you have it.
>>
>>>>>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
>>>>
>>>>I'm not.
>>>
>>> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>>>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>>>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>>>of text based adventure game.
>>
>> Lots of other reasons, too. One can only speculate on Mr. Anderson's
>reasons.
>> ;-)
>>
>>>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>>>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>>>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
>>
>> No it isn't.*

Rev. Jim must have gotten his shoes at Hobson's... :-)

[old Brit film, "Hobson's Choice" :-)]

> Yow - the Mostly Steve Brian MARS argument has gotten to the point
>where I can hardly hack it. YMMV!

>
> That was a good skit, though!

I doubt it is over. :-)

More one-sided name-calling and cussing from the hospital
PA...

>>>If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
>>>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
>>>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
>>>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
>>>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
>>>filtering or ignoring him or her.
>>
>> In some cases, yes.
>>
>>>Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
>>>of willing participants in his game.
>>
>> Perhaps.
>>
>>>Face it, he is good at it.
>>
>> Not really. I have seen many other posters get the better of Mr. Anderson.
It's
>> not hard to do at all.
>>
>> All I've done is present a differing opinion than his, and point out some of
>> his mistakes. His responses have been - predictable.
>
> I must not be getting my point across here. This isn't about being
>right. It's about the discourse. Sometimes he's right, sometimes he's
>wrong, and a lot of it is just neutral as in opinion.

Opinion is opinion.

Problem is, too many amateurs are totally inflexible and any
deviation, however slight, from established Newington
instructions is considered "perverse." :-)

>> It's fascinating how a few words of a different opinion can cause
Mr.Anderson
>> to produce volumes of verbiage. And how a calm, polite correction of even
one
>> of his errors brings such a torrent of anger and abuse.
>
>Yes, I've had that happen.

It's the nature of the computer-modem beast, Mike. You can't
escape it.

Neither are you assured of having the "last word." :-)

>>>It may not be what you are in here for, but
>>>he succeeds in his game.
>>
>> Sometimes.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Jimmie. :-)

>>>Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>>>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>>>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.
>>
>> Just different versions of the same game.
>
> Oh, that other one is some pretty severe stuff. Between the perverse
>accusations, the threats, the obscenities and the stuff that just might
>end up as courtroom evidence, this stuff is tame by comparison.

:-)

>> And the "game" sometimes extends
>> beyond the newsgroup. For example, some time back I and some others received
>> several unsolicited emails from Mr. Anderson, with attachments that were
>> allegedly pictures. I deleted them unopened, as is standard procedure for
>> unsolicited attachments. I found out later they were supposedly a picture of
>> his commercial radiotelephone license and a picture that included adult male
>> nudity. Of course this is second hand information because I simply deleted
the
>> emails, but you have to kinda wonder why such Mr. Anderson would send me
such
>> things.
>
> I've heard about that one.

I might have it on an old CD archive, available for e-mail attachment if so.

It's good for about 3 days as a private web page. :-)

>>>>>You
>>>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>>>irresistable.
>>>>
>>>>Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>>>
>>> And yet you are now involved once more!
>>
>> Only by choice.
>
> Well, sure! Steve is involved by choice too!

Not quite. There's an obsessive-compulsive disorder going on
there and he can't help jumping back in. Wait. Once time is
available, he will bring out the putz can and start polishing
some more insults. :-)

LHA / WMD

4980. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 15:40:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617114043.26583.00000172@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93044

>Subject: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/16/2004 2:59 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040616155953.06606.00000405@mb-m01.aol.com>

>>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
>
> Agreed. But, the "MARS is amateur radio" statement is an
> example of not only a Traditionalist-Fundamentalist...(SNIP TO...)

> MARS was originally conceived (under the previous AARS) to
> get radio amateurs involved with the U.S. Army communications
> of 1925....(SNIP TO....)

> During the Cold War times, phone patches, whether through
> MARS or individual hams...(SNIP TO.....)

> But, the Vietnam War ended 29 years ago, almost a generation
> and a half in the past. MARS still has the task of involving
> civilians with military radio but MARS has, for a long time,
> changed its mission to be a true auxilliary radio service in the
> military, that of being an affiliate communications service with
> other U.S. government radio services. The one-month exercise
> two years ago of Grecian Firebolt 2002 showed that MARS
> does function quite well on its own without civilian radio amateurs
> to fulfill its mission.

In order for PRESENT DAY MARS to continue to fulfil it's federal mission,
it is DEPENDANT upon volunteer civilian licensees of the Amatuer Radio Service.

Otherwise some nicely packaged editorializing by someone who is not active
in the program and has no practical experience on the subject he's
pontificating about.

> 51 years ago I lucked out in my military service...(SNIP)

Here we go again...."Back at ADA......"

> (UNSNIP)...and got stationed at
> a major communications facility. That changed my concepts of what
> radio communications was about.

No...that CEMENTED what your concepts of what radio communication was
about.

Very little in what you post here deviates from what you say you experienced in the 50's, yet YOU take every opportunity to denigrate any Amateur who has the temerity to suggest discussing ANYthing that happened more than a week ago as "traditionalist-fundamentalist".

> The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't
> about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST.

Well golly gee whiz, Your Putziness...Ya think it might be due to the fact that (a) it happened over FIVE decades ago, and (B) has NOTHING to do with AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!aphy.

> Back to trying to find out what's holding me down in my search for
> anti-gravity...

It could be the lead in your....head.

Putz..

Steve, K4YZ

4981. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 16:16:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406170816.7f80422e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93045

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<-qydnSsNb5dHcU3dRVn-uw@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
> >>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
> >>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
> >
> >
> > No it isn't.*
>
>
> Yow - the Mostly Steve Brian MARS argument has gotten to the point
> where I can hardly hack it. YMMV!

I don't read most of it.
>
> That was a good skit, though!

Exactly.
> >
> >>If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
> >>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
> >>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
> >>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
> >>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
> >>filtering or ignoring him or her.
>
> > In some cases, yes.
> >
> >>Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
> >>of willing participants in his game.
>
> > Perhaps.
> >
> >>Face it, he is good at it.
> >
> > Not really. I have seen many other posters get the better of Mr. Anderson. > > It's not
hard to do at all.
> >
> > All I've done is present a differing opinion than his, and point out some of
> > his mistakes. His responses have been - predictable.

Totally predictable, in fact.
>
> I must not be getting my point across here. This isn't about being

> right. It's about the discourse. Sometimes he's right, sometimes he's
> wrong, and a lot of it is just neutral as in opinion.

What isn't neutral is the undeserved abuse dealt out to others for
simply disagreeing or pointing out mistakes. But see below about the
"game".

> > It's fascinating how a few words of a different opinion can cause Mr.
> > Anderson
> > to produce volumes of verbiage. And how a calm, polite correction of even
> > one
> > of his errors brings such a torrent of anger and abuse.
>
> Yes, I've had that happen.
>
Exactly.

> >>It may not be what you are in here for, but
> >>he succeeds in his game.

> > Sometimes.
> >
> >>Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
> >>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
> >>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

> > Just different versions of the same game.

The game you describe is simple attention-getting behavior. It's
exactly the same as the small child who tries all sorts of behaviors
in order to get adult (typically parental) attention. That the
attention takes the form of punishments doesn't matter to the child as
much as the attention itself.

A variation is to get the adult/parent to lose control, start
screaming and yelling, etc., as a way of getting the child and adult
on the same behavioral level.

Much if not most of what Len does with his newsgroup postings here is
exactly the same thing.

You may think he is "good at it" but the reverse is true. Compare how
much response he gets for the amount of posting he does. Or if you
want to be specific, note how many of my posts elicit a response from
him, and how many of his posts elicit a response from me. Note also
the length, content and tone of the responses.

"Good at it"? Not at all.
>
> Oh, that other one is some pretty severe stuff. Between the perverse
> accusations, the threats, the obscenities and the stuff that just might
> end up as courtroom evidence, this stuff is tame by comparison.

> And the "game" sometimes extends
> > beyond the newsgroup. For example, some time back I and some others received
> > several unsolicited emails from Mr. Anderson, with attachments that were
> > allegedly pictures. I deleted them unopened, as is standard procedure for
> > unsolicited attachments. I found out later they were supposedly a picture of
> > his commercial radiotelephone license and a picture that included adult male
> > nudity. Of course this is second hand information because I simply deleted the
> > emails, but you have to kinda wonder why such Mr. Anderson would send me such
> > things.
>
> I've heard about that one.

Exactly.

> >>>>You
> >>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
> >>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
> >>>>irresistable.
>>>
> >>>Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
> >>
> >> And yet you are now involved once more!

> > Only by choice.

> Well, sure! Steve is involved by choice too!
>
Yep. There are good choices and not-so-good choices.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4982. Nobody cares about your ass stories

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 17:24:41 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <20040617172441.9AD41116FC@mail.cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 93046

When you are in QSO, just pass the
report, your name and QTH and go QRT.
Nobody cares about if you want either
the dick of your vietnams fellow in
your ass, or if you want to drink a cold
beer, or if your dog has dropped a shit
in the street, or you have not washed
your teeth for 15 years and smell bad,
etc ...

Ham-radio is not CB, for your delirium
turn your favorite transceiver to 11m
band, this is the right band for an ass
like you who want to talk about its lame
life by radio. DXers thank you.

4983. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 18:39:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D1E551.7070407@psu.edu>
Source record: 93047

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
> of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
> quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
> radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
> As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
> materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.

I'm so glad I re-read this one - I missed that pun the first
read-through. Simply excellent.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4984. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 21:37:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617173759.13519.00000196@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93048

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/17/2004 1:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40D1E551.7070407@psu.edu>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
>> of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
>> quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
>> radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
>> As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
>> materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.
>
> I'm so glad I re-read this one - I missed that pun the first
>read-through. Simply excellent.

It wasn't meant as a pun, Mike. He's being insulting. Again.

Not to mention that the paragraph you cited was yet another utterance of ignorance, in particularly the part about ".....(radio) hobbyists are quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services.".

He couldn't be MORE wrong....Well...Yes, he could, but it's hard to tell with him.

I like the part about "Amateur radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA".

First of all, they do. Regularly. Therefore Lennie's busted lying again. (I know...he makes a joke out being labelled a liar, but hey, if the shoe fits....)

Secondly, there are several "radio hobbyist" magazines available in the US, espcially "Popular Communications" and "Monitoring Times" that cover the "SWL" and scanning disciplines. If someone is interested in "other radio services", then they can go to those other sources.

Lastly, why would an Amateur Radio-specific publication spend an inordinate amount of time on "other" radio services? Where does this idiot (and I am being a bit liberal with praise there...) get the idea that an AMATEUR RADIO publication should discuss issues pertaining to Public Service, Common Carrier or military services when the topic does not correspondingly and directly affect Amateur Radio...?!?!

One has to wonder what Lennie could have REALLY amounted to if he'd been issued some grade-school level common sense.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4985. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 21:45:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93049

In article <40D1E551.7070407@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
>> of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
>> quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
>> radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
>> As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
>> materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.
>
> I'm so glad I re-read this one - I missed that pun the first
>read-through. Simply excellent.

Thank you. [there may be more... :-)]

I can't do too much of that in here. Rev. Jimmie's Bible Class
will have me in the corner for "demonstrating childlike
behavior" or something very un-serious. :-)

That, too, is very PREDICTABLE. :-)

Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
gravity invention, I will rise above it all... :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

4986. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 21:45:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617174535.22498.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93050

In article <20040617114043.26583.00000172@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/16/2004 2:59 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040616155953.06606.00000405@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>>>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>>>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>>>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.
>>
>> Agreed. But, the "MARS is amateur radio" statement is an
>> example of not only a Traditionalist-Fundamentalist...(SNIP TO...)
>
>> MARS was originally conceived (under the previous AARS) to
>> get radio amateurs involved with the U.S. Army communications
>> of 1925....(SNIP TO....)
>
>> During the Cold War times, phone patches, whether through
>> MARS or individual hams...(SNIP TO.....)
>
>> But, the Vietnam War ended 29 years ago, almost a generation
>> and a half in the past. MARS still has the task of involving
>> civilians with military radio but MARS has, for a long time,
>> changed its mission to be a true auxilliary radio service in the
>> military, that of being an affiliate communications service with
>> other U.S. government radio services. The one-month exercise
>> two years ago of Grecian Firebolt 2002 showed that MARS
>> does function quite well on its own without civilian radio amateurs
>> to fulfill its mission.
>
> In order for PRESENT DAY MARS to continue to fulfil it's federal mission,
>it is DEPENDANT upon volunteer civilian licensees of the Amatuer Radio
>Service.

No...MARS can and does function by itself. It is controlled by the
military and therefore run by the military using government
radio equipment. Getting civilians involved is only part of the task.

MARS has never involved "amatuer radio," only amateur radio.

For information on Army MARS, see the Fort Huachuca website
and follow the links there. While Huachuca is the Military
Intelligence School Hq, Army MARS is headquartered there off

to one side.

> Otherwise some nicely packaged editorializing by someone who is not
active
>in the program and has no practical experience on the subject he's
>pontificating about.

Now, now. I've been to Huachuca. :-)

I've controlled MARS transmissions. :-)

>> 51 years ago I lucked out in my military service...(SNIP)
>
> Here we go again...."Back at ADA......"

It could have been AGA (San Francisco) or AHA (Hawaii)
or Seattle or Manila or Okinawa or even Anchorage. :-)

What isn't realized is that the U.S. military did NOT
depend on fixed-point communications via manual
telegraphy, only teleprinter telegraphy (TTY on landline
or RTTY by radio). Did NOT depend as far back as a
half century ago. They don't even today.

>> (UNSNIP)...and got stationed at
>> a major communications facility. That changed my concepts of what
>> radio communications was about.
>
> No...that CEMENTED what your concepts of what radio communication was
>about.

Nursie did not exist a half century ago. He isn't in any way,
shape, or form able to conceptualize much of anything of
that time unless spoon-fed the information from some ARRL
publication.

Nursie should stop trying to dictate what others said long ago
or experienced long ago...or even what they say they thought
long ago...when nursie didn't exist. :-)

> Very little in what you post here deviates from what you say you
>experienced in the 50's, yet YOU take every opportunity to denigrate any
>Amateur who has the temerity to suggest discussing ANYthing that happened
>more than a week ago as "traditionalist-fundamentalist".

Nope. Only very specific amateurs. Principally those which
hang out in here trying to make noises like they are special
representatives from Newington. :-)

If anyone keeps harping on obeyance-adherence to the
standards and practices of the 1930s in amateuism of the
2000s, then they automatically join the "traditionalist-
fundamentalist" club. If anyone uses manual telegraphy
skill testing as a requirement for use of amateur HF bands

then they are automatically in the "traditionalist-fundamentalist"
club. Time can't be frozen but those club members all want to
freeze out anyone not thinking as they do.

>> The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't
>> about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST.
>
> Well golly gee whiz, Your Putziness...Ya think it might be due to the fact
>that (a) it happened over FIVE decades ago, and (B) has NOTHING to do with
>AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!aphy.

Poor nursie. Never did any big-time radio communications in
his military days...resents anyone who did.

Poor nursie...never did any radio-electronics engineering and
resents anyone who did.

Poor nursie...never could take an opposite opinion to his in
here and is bitterly resentful to anyone who had spoken out
in opposition to him.

ACAN (Army Command-Administration Network) of the late
1940s through all of the 1950s and into some of the 1960s
was worldwide on HF at 14 major communications centers
from Karlsruhe to Asmara to Taiwan to Tokyo to the Canal
Zone. The Signal Corps had plenty of royalty-free, non-
copyrighted pictures and information available to anyone who
cared to publish them. [by law, the U.S. government cannot
copyright its own works] Even though the USAF was given
responsibility of operation of the entire ADA station facilities
in 1963, it never ceased its 24/7 communications function
until the final 1978 U.S. military transmission from Camp
Tomlinson. Nothing of that was ever printed in U.S. amateur
radio publications.

The Army, again, was heavy into communications work in
Vietnam from 1962 on through 1970 as explained at the Army
Center for Military History on signal efforts in southeast Asia.
New concepts were introduced there, the first military satellite
relay operations began there, and troposcatter multi-channel
radio was put to the test in a war zone. I don't recall anything
of that effort published even as general interest items in any
U.S. amateur radio publication.

Is there ever any mention in U.S. amateur publications of the
U.S. government's own involvement in HF radio, through
SHARES? I don't think so. FEMA gets a passing mention
although FEMA is a small part of the whole of SHARES.
SHARES takes in MARS as a member. For an example of
the MARS-SHARES operation, read the Army Communicator
for operation Grecian Firebolt 2002 held over a four-week
period. Grecian Firebolt 2002 didn't involve civilian radio

amateurs of MARS.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor nursie wants to concentrate solely on
amateur RADIO as if it works by different physical principles
than other radio of other radio services. It doesn't. The
examples useful to amateur radio are neglected in the amateur
press, therefore nursie doesn't want to know anything except
what is spoon-fed him through hum radio magazines.

>> Back to trying to find out what's holding me down in my search for
>> anti-gravity...
>
> It could be the lead in your....head.

Poor nursie...bitter and resentful to the last. I'll bet nursie loves
to heckle entertainers from the audience while they are trying
to entertain an audience. :-)

Nursie can't lighten up. Always has to make fun of others. Not
a good mental health sign.

> Putz..

Well, back to nursie's name-calling again. "Meaningful discourse"
in the only way nursie can get along...dissing and cursing those
who won't agree with him.

Must be the "new" 'inherent good will of radio amateurs'...

LHA / WMD

4987. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 22:24:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040617182444.02583.00000344@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93051

In article <20040617173759.13519.00000196@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve the Grate Meaningful Communicator) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 6/17/2004 1:39 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40D1E551.7070407@psu.edu>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>> Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
>>> of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
>>> quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
>>> radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
>>> As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
>>> materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.
>>
>> I'm so glad I re-read this one - I missed that pun the first
>>read-through. Simply excellent.
>
> It wasn't meant as a pun, Mike. He's being insulting. Again.

Poor nursie...can't even take some simple word-play.

Note "dielectic materialism" v. "dielectric materialism."

See "dialectic" as "a logical test of ideas for validity" versus "dialectric" which is a fancy word for "insulator." :-)

Tsk, tsk...some are strung so tight that they are "insulated" from a little levity. :-)

> Not to mention that the paragraph you cited was yet another utterance of
>ignorance, in particularly the part about ".....(radio) hobbyists are quite
>unaware of what goes on in other radio services.".
>
> He couldn't be MORE wrong....Well...Yes, he could, but it's hard to tell
>with him.
>
> I like the part about "Amateur radio publications seldom mention other
>radio services in the USA".
>
> First of all, they do. Regularly.

Oh? Where? When? :-)

Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? A quarter million
of those radios have been produced since 1989 and are in standard
small-unit communications use of the U.S. military today. Made by
ITT, Fort Wayne, IN.

Has the PRC-104 HF manpack radio ever been mentioned? Dates back
before 1986, still in use today. The R/T module is standard in a variety
of ground radios, from the manpack through vehicular to the fixed-site
systems. Made by Hughes Ground Systems. Neat little antenna
tuner module in the manpack version...uses the same Bruene detector
first used on the USMC-contract T-195 HF transmitter back in 1955.

Has the AN/FRC-93 ever been mentioned? It should. Amateurs know
it as the ham version of the Collins KWM2. :-) Trouble is, the FRC-93
is the military-labeled version of the COMMERCIAL KWM2 which is
supplied with a quartz crystal pack covering much more than ham bands.

Ham publications have strummed HAARP and mentioned only the ham
involvement in MARS...and lots of ancient stuff of old radio stations
before most everyone's time. Just nothing in the last two decades.

>Therefore Lennie's busted lying again.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie getting all red in the face with rage again and
can't pull out any information from all those "secret" military radios
"he can't talk about." :-)

> Secondly, there are several "radio hobbyist" magazines available in the
>US, espcially "Popular Communications" and "Monitoring Times" that cover the
>"SWL" and scanning disciplines. If someone is interested in "other radio
>services", then they can go to those other sources.

Won't be much there, either. :-)

There's much more on the Internet, especially the military collector
sites...but those are about as behind the times as the boatanchor
and surplus sites.

Or, anyone that is interested in what is done today in the military
(or of two decades back) can just ask anyone in the defense
electronics industry. Very little of the "radios" built for the U.S.
military or government are classified or "sensitive" (for security
reasons, not receiver sensitivity).

> Lastly, why would an Amateur Radio-specific publication spend an
>inordinate amount of time on "other" radio services?

"Inordinate?!?" No one was asking for "inordinate." Even a minor
mention might draw some interest...except for those who wish to
remain insular, isolated from having to learn anything but the latest
DX contest scores. :-)

>Where does this idiot
>(and I am being a bit liberal with praise there...) get the idea that an
>AMATEUR RADIO publication should discuss issues pertaining to Public Service,

>Common Carrier or military services when the topic does not correspondingly
>and directly affect Amateur Radio...?!?!

Must be more of this "meaningful discourse" again. :-)

The "A" in APCO does NOT refer to Amateur.

The "A" in SHARES does NOT refer to Amateur.

The "A" in MARS does NOT refer to Amateur.

Nursie needs to know his "A" from a hole in the ground. :-)

> One has to wonder what Lennie could have REALLY amounted to if he'd been
>issued some grade-school level common sense.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Meaningful discourse?"

Poor nursie. Still resentful that someone took the time and trouble
to educate himself and keep working in radio-electronics in the
aerospace industry as a design engineer in radio-electronics and
then retire with a comfortable income. :-)

Sucks to be nursie? :-)

LHA / WMD

4988. Re: Call Area Etiquette

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 23:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040617190309.29277.00000427@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93053

In article <40C269B3.9080803@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Never quite understood it, but it used to be that a callsign belonged to
>the "station" and
>not the operator, or something like that.

Yep. That derives from the fact that in most other radio services, the station and the operator are/were completely independent licenses.

For example, consider maritime radio. A typical ship station has aseveral operators, but the ship's callsign stays with the ship. The operators, OTOH, change with the watch and from voyage to voyage. Same for broadcasting and many other services.

Amateur radio is almost unique in that it is a licensed service where, in the vast majority of cases, the station owner, engineer, operator and license holder are all the same person.

>Once it happened many years
>ago that two
>brothers got licenses but the FCC gave out only one callsign, as they
>used the same
>"station".

That must have been before WW2. Maybe even before the FCC, because there have long been OM/XYL and other ham family setups where everyone had their own callsign even though there was only one station.

>The FCC recently decided to change that theory to one that
>more closely
>matches the way hams think of their callsigns. That a ham "owns" a
>callsign and uses
>it on whatever ham equipment he happens to be using at the moment. If I
>borrow your
>ham shack, I would still use my callsign. Once I'm satisfied that your
>equipment works
>correctly. "Looks like a kenwood TS440SAT, receives like one, and seems
>to transmit
>like it should."

There was a time when using your callsign/portable at my station was not allowed by the rules. In fact, if you go back far enough, there was a time when mobile and portable operations by hams were not allowed by the rules.

It also used to be possible to get additional station licenses so you didn't have to sign portable or send in postcards. A typical situation would be one

where a ham had a vacation home where hamming would take place. Of course some hams used this provision to hang onto callsigns they didn't want to give up when moving out of a call district.

Portable operation was allowed first (early 1930s) but for a few years you needed a second station license with a special callsign. Oddly enough, mobile (land vehicle) operation came later - even after aeronauticla mobile operation by hams was allowed. US hams were not allowed to use mobile on the ham bands below 25 MHz until 1949.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4989. Re: Able Baker Charlie (or is that Avacado Bascule Cumquat?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-17 23:03:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040617190310.29277.00000428@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93052

In article <Xns950988873F77elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040614055809.18863.00000388@mb-m02.aol.com:
>
>> Y'know, with all this discussion about different phonetic alphabets,
>> people confusing "Papa" with "Japan" and DX/contest folks using a
>> completely different set and being cornfuzed by anything else, it makes
>> me wonder.
>>
>> Doesn't all this add up to 'phone modes being "slow", "limited" and
>> "error-prone"?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>I wondered when someone would pop up with that comment.

Didn't want to disappoint!

>I think CW is generally slower, though.

All depends on what's being done. With a clear channel and fast talkers, it
takes skilled CW/Morse operators to keep up with 'phone. OTOH, when actual
record "write it down" messages are being handled, the speed limit is often how
fast the receiving op can write legibly. Most people who don't know some form
of shorthand run out of steam at 20 to 40 wpm. Of course typing can be much
faster.

Under those conditions, CW/Morse is often *faster* and *more accurate* than
voice - if skilled operators are available.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4990. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 13:02:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93054

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>

> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.

You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?

Steve, K4YZ

4991. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 13:30:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93055

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040617174535.22498.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040617114043.26583.00000172@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> In order for PRESENT DAY MARS to continue to fulfil it's federal
>mission,
>>it is DEPENDANT upon volunteer civilian licensees of the Amatuer Radio
>>Service.
>
> No...MARS can and does function by itself. It is controlled by the
> military and therefore run by the military using government
> radio equipment. Getting civilians involved is only part of the task.

MARS is dependent upon Amateurs to do the bulk of it's traffic.

It was true during Viet Nam, it's true today.

> MARS has never involved "amatuer radio," only amateur radio.

Again your only defensible argument is that I transposed two letters.

> For information on Army MARS, see the Fort Huachuca website
> and follow the links there. While Huachuca is the Military
> Intelligence School Hq, Army MARS is headquartered there off
> to one side.

I know you'll find this hard to believe, but life exists beyond websites.

>> Otherwise some nicely packaged editorializing by someone who is not
>active
>>in the program and has no practical experience on the subject he's
>>pontificating about.
>
> Now, now. I've been to Huachuca.

I am sure you've been lot's of places. An active imagination allows for
that.
>
> I've controlled MARS transmissions.

Uh huh.

>>> 51 years ago I lucked out in my military service...(SNIP)
>>
>> Here we go again...."Back at ADA......"
>
> It could have been AGA (San Francisco) or AHA (Hawaii)
> or Seattle or Manila or Okinawa or even Anchorage.

Uh huh.

>> No...that CEMENTED what your concepts of what radio communication was
>>about.
>
> Nursie did not exist a half century ago. He isn't in any way,
> shape, or form able to conceptualize much of anything of
> that time unless spoon-fed the information from some ARRL
> publication.

Regardless of my birthdate, your rhetoric and spamming of the NG exists
TODAY, and it is rife with your tales of what you did five decades ago.

None of it has anything to do with Amateur Radio.

> Nursie should stop trying to dictate what others said long ago
> or experienced long ago...or even what they say they thought
> long ago...when nursie didn't exist.

"Dictating" what you said?

All I have to do is quote it. I couldn't invent some of the silly stuff
you come up with!

>> Very little in what you post here deviates from what you say you
>>experienced in the 50's, yet YOU take every opportunity to denigrate any
>>Amateur who has the temerity to suggest discussing ANYthing that happened
>>more than a week ago as "traditionalist-fundamentalist".
>
> Nope. Only very specific amateurs. Principally those which
> hang out in here trying to make noises like they are special
> representatives from Newington.

The ONLY people who have ever presented themselves as "representitives
from Newington" were Ed Hare and Jon Bloom, and even then they were quite clear
in stating that thier persoanlly held opinions did not represent the ARRL.

Only YOU make that assertion, and it's still a lie.

> If anyone keeps harping on obeyance-adherence to the
> standards and practices of the 1930s in amateuism of the
> 2000s, then they automatically join the "traditionalist-
> fundamentalist" club.

Then I guess we get to heap you into that pile, Your Scumminess, since YOU
are the ONLY one making any such assertion.

No one in this forum has made any such assertion. Even those who
staunchly support Morse Code testing have advocated advancement in the service.

I encourge you to provide even ONE quote that supports your assertion to
the contrary....

> If anyone uses manual telegraphy
> skill testing as a requirement for use of amateur HF bands
> then they are automatically in the "traditionalist-fundamentalist"
> club. Time can't be frozen but those club members all want to
> freeze out anyone not thinking as they do.

And again that would be you.

Everyone MUST be Lennie, otherwise they are
"traditionalist-fundamentalist, jack-booted Nazi thugs".

>>> The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't
>>> about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST.
>>
>> Well golly gee whiz, Your Putziness...Ya think it might be due to the
>fact
>>that (a) it happened over FIVE decades ago, and (B) has NOTHING to do with
>>AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!
>
> Poor nursie. Never did any big-time radio communications in
> his military days...resents anyone who did.

This is a forum about AMATEUR RADIO. And yes, I did "big time radio
communication" in the military.

> Poor nursie...never did any radio-electronics engineering and
> resents anyone who did.

I don't resent your alleged engineering career, Lennie. I know several
electronics engineers, and they are fine fellows who make meaningful
contributions.

You are NOT a fine fellow, and there's more than a few indicators that
your "contribution" to radio communications were limited to your few articles
sold to Ham Radio magazine. (No doubt a last resort in "getting published"
since I am sure the professional journals cut you off at the knees.)

Even then I can't find a single example where any of your "work" was
original, nor can I find any example of where your "contributions" were
complimentary to the advancement of ANY radio communications discipline.

> Poor nursie...never could take an opposite opinion to his in
> here and is bitterly resentful to anyone who had spoken out
> in opposition to him.

I am only "bitterly resentful" of pathological liars and persons who
proactively seek to cause

> ACAN (Army Command-Administration Network) of the late...(SNIP) has
NOTHING to do with Amateur Radio, then or now.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor nursie wants to concentrate solely on
> amateur RADIO as if it works by different physical principles
> than other radio of other radio services. It doesn't. The
> examples useful to amateur radio are neglected in the amateur
> press, therefore nursie doesn't want to know anything except
> what is spoon-fed him through hum radio magazines.

Another lie.

I have repeatedly stated it's not the physics.

It's the application.

And it's too bad YOU don't avail yourself of the "hum radio magazines".
(Your true colors are showing, Scumbag.)

> Poor nursie...bitter and resentful to the last. I'll bet nursie loves
> to heckle entertainers from the audience while they are trying
> to entertain an audience.

If I paid money to see someone who isn't, in my opionion, entertaining, I
do one better...I get up, go the manager and get my money back on the way out
the door.

> Nursie can't lighten up. Always has to make fun of others. Not
> a good mental health sign.

Untrue again.

I find it QUITE "enlightening" to keep an eye on you.

And I don't have to make fun of you. You do it yourself.

And I am still waiting for you to post your credentials to tell us what
qualified you to make determinations as to what is or isn't "good mental
health". Leafing through wifey's correspondence courses doesn't qulify.

>> Putz..
>
> Well, back to nursie's name-calling again. "Meaningful discourse"
> in the only way nursie can get along...dissing and cursing those
> who won't agree with him.

It's not name calling if it's true. And you ARE a putz.

Of course I could gobact through tons of YOUR "name calling" and recite
it...Or is Lennie the Liar ABOVE lving up to his own rhetoric...?!?!

> Must be the "new" 'inherent good will of radio amateurs'...

You're not an Amatuer and this forum isn't regulated by Part 97 of the FCC
Rules and Regulations.

Steve, K4YZ

4992. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 13:46:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93056

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/17/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040617182444.02583.00000344@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040617173759.13519.00000196@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>the Grate Meaningful Communicator) writes:

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...Leonard H.
Anderson

> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)

There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT mentioned in
Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT mentions in
a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !

Your point?

>>Therefore Lennie's busted lying again.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie getting all red in the face with rage again and
> can't pull out any information from all those "secret" military radios
> "he can't talk about."

Only you've tried to make it "secret".

>> Secondly, there are several "radio hobbyist" magazines available in the
>>US, espcially "Popular Communications" and "Monitoring Times" that cover the
>>"SWL" and scanning disciplines. If someone is interested in "other radio
>>services", then they can go to those other sources.
>
> Won't be much there, either.

Then you've not been reading any of THOSE publications either.

> There's much more on the Internet, especially the military collector
> sites...but those are about as behind the times as the boatanchor
> and surplus sites.

Then carry your rants THERE, Lennie. I am sure your spiteful wit and
willingness to be antagonistic will be as well received there as it is here.

At least it will be a bit more pertinent in those forums...Not by much,
but some.

>> Lastly, why would an Amateur Radio-specific publication spend an
>>inordinate amount of time on "other" radio services?
>
> "Inordinate?!?" No one was asking for "inordinate."

Sure "they" are....Well, at least YOU are.

> Even a minor
> mention might draw some interest...except for those who wish to
> remain insular, isolated from having to learn anything but the latest
> DX contest scores.

Perhaps the Amateur Radio magazines limit the scope of thier content for
the same reasons you don't find a whole lot of fly fishing technique articles
in "Cosmo"...?!?!

>>Where does this idiot
>>(and I am being a bit liberal with praise there...) get the idea that an
>>AMATEUR RADIO publication should discuss issues pertaining to Public
>Service,
>>Common Carrier or military services when the topic does not correspondingly
>>and directly affect Amateur Radio...?!?!
>
> Must be more of this "meaningful discourse" again.
>
> The "A" in APCO does NOT refer to Amateur.
>
> The "A" in SHARES does NOT refer to Amateur.
>
> The "A" in MARS does NOT refer to Amateur.

Sure it does...to what other radio service is MARS "affiliated"
with...?!?!

> Nursie needs to know his "A" from a hole in the ground.

Too bad YOU don't realize that all those "A"'s don't represent "Army
communications of ocer 50 years ago".

>> One has to wonder what Lennie could have REALLY amounted to if he'd
>been
>>issued some grade-school level common sense.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. "Meaningful discourse?"
>
> Poor nursie. Still resentful that someone took the time and trouble
> to educate himself and keep working in radio-electronics in the
> aerospace industry as a design engineer in radio-electronics and
> then retire with a comfortable income.

Too bad there weren't some human relations courses in that 14 years of
night school, Lennie.

And I don't resent your efforts to be an engineer. One day you may be one.

That you invested your money well was, as I have acknowleged before, one of your only positive acts in your adult life. Congratulations. My nest egg isn't quite as secure yet, but then I still have another 15-20 years to go before I think I'll be ready to stop wotking.

Unlike you, I DO have the pleasure of seeing a meaningful, positive impact on my chosen profession.

When I retire, I'll stop by your grave and see if all of YOUR "comfortable income" got you any farther than it does any other working person.

> Sucks to be nursie?

If there was a "nursie" here, it might.

But we KNOW it sucks to be Lennie!

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4993. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 15:34:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D30B93.2090504@psu.edu>
Source record: 93057

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 6/17/2004 1:39 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40D1E551.7070407@psu.edu>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
>>> of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
>>> quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
>>> radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
>>> As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
>>> materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.
>>
>> I'm so glad I re-read this one - I missed that pun the first
>>read-through. Simply excellent.
>
>
> It wasn't meant as a pun, Mike. He's being insulting. Again.

It's the "dielectric materialism" that's the pun, Steve. Whatever the other content of the post is, that was a great play on words, and was pretty hilarious.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4994. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 19:48:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618154844.15095.00000234@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 93058

In article <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
>> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.
>
> You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?

Jesus Christ, NO...

4995. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 19:48:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618154844.15095.00000233@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 93059

In article <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Putzcussionist of the Rock-head group Grateful Dood) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/17/2004 5:24 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040617182444.02583.00000344@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040617173759.13519.00000196@mb-m12.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve the Grate Meaningful Communicator) writes:
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...Leonard
>H. Anderson
>
>> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)
>
> There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT mentioned in
>Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT mentions
>in a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !

Hmmm...General Dynamics as well as ITT make a quarter million
radio sets over a period of 15 years and it is "not" mentioned in
any professional journals?!?!?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. SINCGARS has been in the news since Defense
Electronics monthly was published, is in SIGNAL, the monthly of
AFCEA, gets mentioned periodically in EDN, Electronics Design,
EE Times, RF Design, RF & Microwaves magazines, plus articles
in both Proceedings and some Transactions of the IEEE. It's in
the UK too since Harris is making SINCGARS-compatible radio
systems for them.

Those are all "professional journals" since they are non-
subscription "controlled" periodicals requiring identification of
the reader to the magazines as being in/part/associated with
the electronics industry. Decidedly professional.

Not only that, there are many subscription services which have
newsletters and periodicals and surveys, etc., of the defense
electronics contracts, awards, amounts, add-ons, etc. for those
who can't handle the free information from the government on
such things. Example of the latter is Central Electronics
Command at Fort Monmouth, NJ, which concerns itself with
procurement and overseeing of Army electronics contracts.

> Your point?

There's quite a bit of FREE information out there for anyone to find out about military or government radio systems and communications. Been there for a long time, even before the Internet went public such as the SINCGARS.

A QUARTER MILLION radio sets of one kind makes for some future surplus market, doesn't it? [that's the most of any one kind of radio system in government history...]

If poor nursie is annoyed at not being spoon-fed enough info through hum radio magazines, then he should not try to mean-mouth those who know about such things. Tsk, tsk.

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie getting all red in the face with rage again and
>> can't pull out any information from all those "secret" military radios
>> "he can't talk about."
>
> Only you've tried to make it "secret".

No, nursie did, way back when I first mentioned the SINCGARS in here plus the public availability of FM 24-24 of December 1994 (a compendium of signal equipment of all kinds, including HF radio sets, then in military inventory).

Nursie claimed then - in broad generalities - he had "worked in military communications" but could not name ONE SET by either nomenclature or familiar name ANY of them. Claimed he could not talk about them due to not revealing military secrets or some rationalistic reason. Which was all BS, of course, since the general information had long been publicly available through many government sources.

>>> Secondly, there are several "radio hobbyist" magazines available in the
>>>US, espcially "Popular Communications" and "Monitoring Times" that cover the
>>>"SWL" and scanning disciplines. If someone is interested in "other radio
>>>services", then they can go to those other sources.
>>
>> Won't be much there, either.
>
> Then you've not been reading any of THOSE publications either.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. I keep mentioning all those periodicals and controlled-subscription magazines and other information, write them in here, sometimes giving detailed information, and nursie keeps saying "I don't read them! :-)

I'm NOT a regular subscriber to PopComm or Monitoring Times, never did get every annual WRTH, don't buy every issue of CQ or QST, nor of the old 73. Got a free subscription to HR after becoming an Associate Editor there. Neither did I buy every issue of PopElectronics or Radio Communication (the RSGB monthly) nor of the old Radio Craft or Radio and Television News or many of the old newsstand monthlies of ancient history. Don't have to...I'm not interested in ham DX contest scoresheets or nostalgia articles of

old hum radio from the 1930s or building two-transistor transmitters
in discarded tuna tine cans nor of building super-duper state-of-the-
art one-tube regenerative receivers (all-band!).

Been IN the electronics industry, seen lots of stuff up close and
personal, designed a little bit of it, used it in the field. Radios.
Modern radios. Got into the guts of them behind the front panel,
know how they work...followed the contract awards, know who
did what on some of it, know the modern history of it instead of
concentrating on old history of one small part of radio related to
hobby activities.

>> There's much more on the Internet, especially the military collector
>> sites...but those are about as behind the times as the boatanchor
>> and surplus sites.
>
> Then carry your rants THERE, Lennie. I am sure your spiteful wit and
>willingness to be antagonistic will be as well received there as it is here.

Naw. I like the "meaningful discourse" of mighty gunnery nurse
and his liberal viewpoints of my-way-or-the-highway-you-putz!"

:-)

> Perhaps the Amateur Radio magazines limit the scope of thier content for
>the same reasons you don't find a whole lot of fly fishing technique articles
>in "Cosmo"...?!?!

Nursie get amateur radio info from Cosmopolitan or Field & Steam? :-)

>>>Where does this idiot
>>>(and I am being a bit liberal with praise there...) get the idea that an
>>>AMATEUR RADIO publication should discuss issues pertaining to Public
>>Service,
>>>Common Carrier or military services when the topic does not correspondingly
>>>and directly affect Amateur Radio...?!?!
>>
>> Must be more of this "meaningful discourse" again.
>>
>> The "A" in APCO does NOT refer to Amateur.
>>
>> The "A" in SHARES does NOT refer to Amateur.
>>
>> The "A" in MARS does NOT refer to Amateur.
>
> Sure it does...to what other radio service is MARS "affiliated"
>with...?!?!

FEMA, SHARES, several government agencies. :-)

See the Army Communicator write-up on Grecian Firebolt 2002
for a good example. :-)

> Too bad there weren't some human relations courses in that 14 years of
>night school, Lennie.

There were under California rules for the early 1960s. :-)

Some of those courses were done during the day. All for
college accreditation.

> And I don't resent your efforts to be an engineer. One day you may be
>one.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

Poor nursie resents the existance of anyone who has opinions
contrary to his own. The spirit of the "new amateur radio" of this
millenium. :-(

Get mental help.

Meanwhile, temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4996. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 19:48:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040618154849.15095.00000235@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 93060

In article <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
da CAP Ace with too much carburetor heat) sputters and foams:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040617174535.22498.00000335@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040617114043.26583.00000172@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> In order for PRESENT DAY MARS to continue to fulfil it's federal
mission,
>>>it is DEPENDANT upon volunteer civilian licensees of the Amatuer Radio
>>>Service.
>>
>> No...MARS can and does function by itself. It is controlled by the
>> military and therefore run by the military using government
>> radio equipment. Getting civilians involved is only part of the task.
>
> MARS is dependent upon Amateurs to do the bulk of it's traffic.

Military police direct military traffic.

Military communications uses wide-environment government radio
equipment and military personnel to do communications.

> It was true during Viet Nam, it's true today.

The Vietnam War ended in 1975. That was 29 years ago, senior.

The Internet went public in 1991. That was 13 years ago, senior.

Every government and military agency and most military units
now have websites. The modern U.S. military encourages
military personnel to use computer e-mail to message family
and friends.

The DSN (Digital Switched Network) tying U.S. installations and
government locations around the world allow easy dial-up from
the DSN to the outside telephone infrastructure.

Try to get with the modern times. Reality is all around you.

>> MARS has never involved "amatuer radio," only amateur radio.
>
> Again your only defensible argument is that I transposed two letters.

That transposition is a common thing with nursie. Usually done
when very angry and outraged that anyone dare talk back to the
gunnery nurse! :-)

>> For information on Army MARS, see the Fort Huachuca website
>> and follow the links there. While Huachuca is the Military
>> Intelligence School Hq, Army MARS is headquartered there off
>> to one side.
>
> I know you'll find this hard to believe, but life exists beyond
>websites.

I am well acquainted with life. :-)

Been to Fort Huachuca, seen the Army MARS headquarters.

Been to several modern military communications locations,
seen what they have, talked to individuals there.

Reality exists beyond the tattered, dog-eared pages of old QST
issues and ARRL handbooks.

Try to experience reality, not imaginations of long ago.

>>> Otherwise some nicely packaged editorializing by someone who is not
active
>>>in the program and has no practical experience on the subject he's
>>>pontificating about.
>>
>> Now, now. I've been to Huachuca.
>
> I am sure you've been lot's of places. An active imagination allows for
>that.

Fort Huachuca was okay in early spring but I've heard it is uncomfortable
in mid-summer, being in Arizona. Glad I wasn't there in mid-summer.
The Military Intelligence museum wasn't built or open to visitors when I
was there and that interesting place (like the CIA museum) can only be
visited on the Internet.

Sandia Laboratories is different. But, I can't talk much about that
except that visit concerned things like SID.

>> I've controlled MARS transmissions.
>
> Uh huh.

I'm glad you concede something factual. :-)

>>>> 51 years ago I lucked out in my military service...(SNIP)
>>>
>>> Here we go again...."Back at ADA......"
>>
>> It could have been AGA (San Francisco) or AHA (Hawaii)
>> or Seattle or Manila or Okinawa or even Anchorage.

>
> Uh huh.

Good. Another concession instead of brainless battering
against what happened before you existed.

Unless one is flag rank, it is difficult to pick and choose
where ordinary military folks get assigned. I was fortunate
in being assigned to a big-time communications center.

So was Eugene Rosenbaum. Part of the time. Gene
(N2JTV) got reassigned to Funabashi, TDY with the small
USAF radio communications station there which was not as
nice an assignment as the Hardy Barracks billet or ADA
duties.

>> Nursie did not exist a half century ago. He isn't in any way,
>> shape, or form able to conceptualize much of anything of
>> that time unless spoon-fed the information from some ARRL
>> publication.
>
> Regardless of my birthdate, your rhetoric and spamming of the NG exists
>TODAY, and it is rife with your tales of what you did five decades ago.

No, not "rife." :-) If you are trying a larger vocabulary, try to get
something somewhat close to correct...and in context.

You are trying to "poison the well" by singling out only specific
instances of what I've mentioned as to experiences and work over
the last 51+ years. Common tactic in computer-modem comms
but easily defeated in fact, made arduous only in the stubborn
insistence of the argumentative to ignore everything else and try
to beat on specifics.

Oddly, it is usually easier to reference military things of the past
due to easier access of reference information compared to civilian-
only occupations. That includes references of a public nature
such as the Pacific Stars & Stripes (see interview with staffer
Rick Chernitzer of their 10 November 2002 edition).

> None of it has anything to do with Amateur Radio.

Radio is radio, regardless of the differentiation that mere human
regulation makers make of its differences.

The Pacific Stars & Stripes did not include a nice photo I made
of the MARS antenna newly installed at Hardy Barracks in
1955 (Stripes used only 6 of my photos for that Hardy retro-
spective interview). One of the two GIs shown on the cover
sheet is/was Stan Peschel who was a ham and the son of the
founder of Hypotronics of New York.

>> Nursie should stop trying to dictate what others said long ago
>> or experienced long ago...or even what they say they thought

>> long ago...when nursie didn't exist.
>
> "Dictating" what you said?

Absolutely. You are outraged that anyone dare confront your
ideas and fantasies with actual, real-life experiences. The same
with several others in here.

The dictatorial attitude is fairly common, done with heckling
and name-calling and general denigration in an effort to make
a poster stop writing. Weak intimidation. Works sometimes,
but is not a guarantee of suppressing truth and reality.

> All I have to do is quote it. I couldn't invent some of the silly stuff
>you come up with!

It's a losing battle to keep dredging up old, lost arguments in a
newsgroup. Those can't be "won" by re-runs as if this were
summer television.

The military directives and regulations about MARS are not
"silly stuff." Those are real. The information published by the
various military branches on their MARS activities isn't "silly
stuff." Those are real.

"Silly stuff" is the exaggeration and over-emphasis on civilian
amateur radio participation - done by part-time participants in
MARS - and trying to make such "silly stuff" be the raison d'etre
(French for "reason for being") of the existance of MARS.

>> Nope. Only very specific amateurs. Principally those which
>> hang out in here trying to make noises like they are special
>> representatives from Newington.
>
> The ONLY people who have ever presented themselves as "representitives
>from Newington" were Ed Hare and Jon Bloom, and even then they were quite
clear
>in stating that thier persoanlly held opinions did not represent the ARRL.

You forgot Jim Haynie. :-)

Not a long series of messages from Haynie but here nonetheless.

[hint: Haynie is the elected president of the ARRL. :-)]

The PARROTING the Noble Goals as written/said by ARRL is the
very same thing as acting like League representatives.

> Only YOU make that assertion, and it's still a lie.

Jim Haynie wasn't elected president of the ARRL? :-(

>> If anyone keeps harping on obeyance-adherence to the
>> standards and practices of the 1930s in amateuism of the
>> 2000s, then they automatically join the "traditionalist-

>> fundamentalist" club.
>
> Then I guess we get to heap you into that pile, Your Scumminess, since
YOU
>are the ONLY one making any such assertion.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More of that "meaningful discourse" again!

:-)

So, trying to dictate what opinions others may have again?

Not nice.

> No one in this forum has made any such assertion. Even those who
>staunchly support Morse Code testing have advocated advancement in the
>service.

...by more and more manual telegraphy use, praising its supposed
qualities, and generally getting into silly stuff about how it's so much
"better" than any other mode. :-)

Note use of the word "service" again.

Military surrogate use. Desire to make amateur radio much
more than it is by trying to identify a hobby with military service.

Tsk, tsk. Lost focus.

> I encourge you to provide even ONE quote that supports your assertion to
>the contrary....

Heh heh heh. No, "encourage" is the wrong word. You
CHALLENGE. You DEMAND.

You all but hop up and down in spiteful hollering to try to
divert the discussion. :-)

> Everyone MUST be Lennie, otherwise they are
>"traditionalist-fundamentalist, jack-booted Nazi thugs".

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Obviously not a Jedi. Wrong connection of
metaphors. :-)

"Use the Metaphors, Luke, the Metaphors!" :-)

Nursie is into Mirror Time again, reflecting on the total
one-sided viewpoint all must have, the vista according
to Newgington. Tsk, tsk.

>>>> The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't
>>>> about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST.
>>>
>>> Well golly gee whiz, Your Putziness...Ya think it might be due to the
fact
>>>that (a) it happened over FIVE decades ago, and (B) has NOTHING to do with

>>>AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!

Nursie is an amateur. Nursie didn't exist 50 years ago.

Ergo, nursie is irrelevant? :-)

>> Poor nursie. Never did any big-time radio communications in
>> his military days...resents anyone who did.
>
> This is a forum about AMATEUR RADIO. And yes, I did "big time radio
>communication" in the military.

Yes...on par with those "hostile action" things...all conveniently
UNdetailed, no specifics, nothing but a CLAIM.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Fish story.

>> Poor nursie...never did any radio-electronics engineering and
>> resents anyone who did.
>
> I don't resent your alleged engineering career, Lennie. I know several
>electronics engineers, and they are fine fellows who make meaningful
>contributions.

I'm sure you have "Jewish best friends," too. :-)

They must have made "meaningful contributions" to your knowledge
of Yiddish. :-)

> You are NOT a fine fellow, and there's more than a few indicators that
>your "contribution" to radio communications were limited to your few articles
>sold to Ham Radio magazine. (No doubt a last resort in "getting published"
>since I am sure the professional journals cut you off at the knees.)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

You can check out McGraw-Hill's old biweekly Electronics and
Designer's Casebook. You can check out Microcomputing, a former
monthly for personal computerists. You can check out BYTE
magazine as well as BYTE Books on articles concerning
circuit simulation. All reviewed and accepted by others.

You want to make a Big Thing about Ham Radio Magainze
going "defunct" back in 1990...even though HR was considered a
leader in U.S. ham periodicals for technical information...which it
was. The "defunction" was due to a shrinking ham advertising
market already begun by 1990. That shrinking is even affecting
QST. It hit 73 Magazine big time. Unlike QST which can get
support from the ARRL membership monies, HR and 73 were
independent publications whose entire income was derived by
advertising. CQ is the same way and is barely hanging on.

> Even then I can't find a single example where any of your "work" was
>original, nor can I find any example of where your "contributions" were

>complimentary to the advancement of ANY radio communications discipline.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Having nursie as a critic is like having a blind
color coordinator for interior decoration. :-)

Try to differentiate between "compliment" and "complement."

Nursie struggles on understanding Ohm's Law of Resistance
and tries to mean-mouth things like explanations of timing
diagrams in phase-frequency detectors? :-)

>> Poor nursie...never could take an opposite opinion to his in
>> here and is bitterly resentful to anyone who had spoken out
>> in opposition to him.
>
> I am only "bitterly resentful" of pathological liars and persons who
>proactively seek to cause

What am I "seeking to cause?" Sentence unfinished. :-(

What are "pathological liars," nursie? Nursie no gots da
edumcation in sykology, sointanly ain't gots no certificates
(suitable for framing, hanging on da wall) as a licensed
shrink.

Nursie like to mean-mouth anyone who ain't love his one-
sided opinions. Tsk, tsk.

>> ACAN (Army Command-Administration Network) of the late...(SNIP) has
>NOTHING to do with Amateur Radio, then or now.

Just the same, MARS was allowed to use some of ACAN's
radio circuits on HF.

How about that? By nursie logic, MARS is then NOT
amateur radio!

Must be hell when a rant is stomped on... :-)

>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...poor nursie wants to concentrate solely on
>> amateur RADIO as if it works by different physical principles
>> than other radio of other radio services. It doesn't. The
>> examples useful to amateur radio are neglected in the amateur
>> press, therefore nursie doesn't want to know anything except
>> what is spoon-fed him through hum radio magazines.
>
> Another lie.

Nursie definition of "lie:" Anything against nursie's beliefs.

:-)

> I have repeatedly stated it's not the physics.

Radio works by magic, not laws of physics? Oh, my!

> It's the application.

"Rub into affected area once daily, as prescribed by
physician?" :-)

> And it's too bad YOU don't avail yourself of the "hum radio magazines".
>(Your true colors are showing, Scumbag.)

A long-time radio amateur used to say "hum radio." :-)

He is the same one that put tongue firmly in cheek and stated,
"Ham is the butchered meat of swine." :-)

Funny in context.

Probably a cause for thermonuclear war to nursie. :-)

>> Poor nursie...bitter and resentful to the last. I'll bet nursie loves
>> to heckle entertainers from the audience while they are trying
>> to entertain an audience.
>
> If I paid money to see someone who isn't, in my opionion, entertaining, I
>do one better...I get up, go the manager and get my money back on the way out
>the door.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie should read the entertainment reviews in
QST before going. Saves everyone time and trouble. :-)

>> Nursie can't lighten up. Always has to make fun of others. Not
>> a good mental health sign.
>
> Untrue again.
>
> I find it QUITE "enlightening" to keep an eye on you.

Nursie is OBSESSED. Is COMPELLED to mean-mouth
others who go against his opinions.

Sicko.

> And I am still waiting for you to post your credentials to tell us what
>qualified you to make determinations as to what is or isn't "good mental
>health". Leafing through wifey's correspondence courses doesn't qulify.

Sicko words are sicko words to lay people, nursie.

>>> Putz..
>>
>> Well, back to nursie's name-calling again. "Meaningful discourse"
>> in the only way nursie can get along...dissing and cursing those
>> who won't agree with him.
>
> It's not name calling if it's true. And you ARE a putz.

Tsk, tsk, nursie should have his Jewish best friends tell him
more about the Yiddish dialect-language. Needs more "meaningful

discourses" on Yiddish snarlies. :-)

> Of course I could gobact through tons of YOUR "name calling" and recite
>it...Or is Lennie the Liar ABOVE lving up to his own rhetoric...?!?!

First you need to explain what and how of "gobact."

Not in any dictionary I have. That word published in
QST?

>> Must be the "new" 'inherent good will of radio amateurs'...
>
> You're not an Amatuer and this forum isn't regulated by Part 97 of the
>FCC Rules and Regulations.

Nursie ain't no "amatuer" either. :-)

Newsgroup ain't regulated by nursie, either. [ain't that a bitch?]

:-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

4997. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-18 23:36:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <t0LAc.9584$Wr.5019@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93061

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
> any big-time radio communications experience.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4998. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 01:46:26 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <1k67d0p4qbdt7cg8vfvslc501q4mo9aakb@4ax.com>
Source record: 93062

On 18 Jun 2004 19:48:44 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> See the Army Communicator write-up on Grecian Firebolt 2002
> for a good example. :-)

For that matter, just turn on a shortwave receiver. Grecian Firebolt 2004 is being conducted as I type this, and will continue until some time in August.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

4999. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 02:35:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%DNAc.9744$Wr.6380@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93063

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
> any big-time radio communications experience.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

5000. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 02:37:51 UTC
From: emertxe@softhome.net
Message-ID: <eafcf30c.0406181837.7d6757e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93064

'X-No-archive: yes'
"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:<10cka5v1o58vsb1@corp.supernews.com>...
> Actually during a public service event or an actual emergency event, keeping
> some form of log or at least a "message log" is actually a good idea. If
> there is some type of problem discovered later on, at least having a record
> of what occurred can possibly help to save the proverbial posterior....
>
> Keeping a personal log is not required anymore, but can serve to help in
> some regards. I only log now new contacts/first time contacts. If I kept a
> log for each contact, regardless of how many times I chatted with each
> person, I would be killing a ton of trees.
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>

Absolutely. Net Control logs (and logs that folks on the net, or
listening to the net, may keep and donate) are a great way to see how
precise and effective the communication was during the net!

There used to be some logging software (don't remember the application
now) that was great for use by Net Control during a net. However, in
my opinion, it's always absolutely best to have Net Control dedicated
to conducting the net, with a true log of communication being kept by
another party(ies).

Kim W5TIT

5001. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 05:57:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619015747.18097.00000024@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93065

In article <%DNAc.9744$Wr.6380@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
>> any big-time radio communications experience.
>
>Sunuvagun!
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

...strange echo in here...must be very sporadic B layer again...:-)

LHA / WMD

5002. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 05:57:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619015747.18097.00000025@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93066

In article <1k67d0p4qbdt7cg8vfvslc501q4mo9aakb@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:

>On 18 Jun 2004 19:48:44 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> See the Army Communicator write-up on Grecian Firebolt 2002
>> for a good example. :-)
>
>For that matter, just turn on a shortwave receiver. Grecian Firebolt
>2004 is being conducted as I type this, and will continue until some
>time in August.

Interesting! :-)

Frequencies?

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5003. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 05:57:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619015748.18097.00000026@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93067

In article <t0LAc.9584$Wr.5019@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
>> any big-time radio communications experience.
>
>Sunuvagun!

One of the Armenian judges, who had a sore throat (couldn't chant) and who broke all the strings on his balalaika told me that... :-)

Better a Sunuvagun than a Son Of a Beeper... :-)

Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters, and all of them 1 KW or higher?

Beep beep.

LHA / WMD

5004. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 09:32:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619053227.26548.00000240@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93068

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/18/2004 6:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <t0LAc.9584$Wr.5019@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
>> any big-time radio communications experience.
>
>Sunuvagun!

Not true, but hey, if it makes an old man feel good, let him think it...

73

Steve, K4YZ

5005. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 09:36:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619053637.26548.00000242@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93069

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000234@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>
>>> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
>>> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.
>>
>> You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?
>
> Jesus Christ, NO...

I am not Jesus Christ, Lennie...It's "Steve".

Confused again...?!?! I am not surprised.

Steve, K4YZ

5006. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 10:03:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619060309.26548.00000245@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93070

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000233@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Putzcussionist of the Rock-head group Grateful Dood) writes:

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the
archived mistruths of an ex radio technician parading about as an engineer,
Leonard H. Anderson.

>>> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)
>>
>> There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT mentioned
>in
>>Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT mentions
>>in a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !
>
> Hmmm...General Dynamics as well as ITT make a quarter million
> radio sets over a period of 15 years and it is "not" mentioned in
> any professional journals?!?!?

I didn't say "ever", Your Wimpiness.

>> Your point?
>
> There's quite a bit of FREE information out there for anyone to
> find out about military or government radio systems and
> communications. Been there for a long time, even before the
> Internet went public such as the SINCGARS.

Great.

Then all those Amateurs who ARE interested in military communications
DON'T have to depend on QST, et al to discuss them.

> A QUARTER MILLION radio sets of one kind makes for some
> future surplus market, doesn't it? [that's the most of any one
> kind of radio system in government history...]

Sure it does. And "surplus" radio gear has NOT been the preferred method
of getting on the air by Amateurs for TWO DECADES....Not when folks can buy
brand new, under warranty equipment for under $200.

> If poor nursie is annoyed at not being spoon-fed enough info
> through hum radio magazines, then he should not try to mean-

> mouth those who know about such things. Tsk, tsk.

Perhaps if you HAD been reading those Amateur magazines you'd understand a bit more about what you are talking about.

But you go right on ahead, Lennie...
>
>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie getting all red in the face with rage again and
>>> can't pull out any information from all those "secret" military radios
>>> "he can't talk about."
>>
>> Only you've tried to make it "secret".
>
> No, nursie did, way back when I first mentioned the SINCGARS in
> here plus the public availability of FM 24-24 of December 1994 (a
> compendium of signal equipment of all kinds, including HF radio
> sets, then in military inventory).
>
> Nursie claimed then - in broad generalities - he had "worked in
> military communications" but could not name ONE SET by
> either nomenclature or familiar name ANY of them. Claimed
> he could not talk about them due to not revealing military
> secrets or some rationalistic reason.

Actually, my words then, as they are now, are that what I did in the Armed Forces have nothing to do with Amateur Communications. Just like YOUR "link" with Amateur Radio, Lennie, those "happenings" only shared the theoretical basics of radio wave generation and propagation.

It's the application...not the physics...that separates you from the rest of us, Sir Scummy.

Sucks to be you.

Steve, K4YZ

5007. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 11:02:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619070253.26548.00000246@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93071

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040618154849.15095.00000235@mb-m23.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>da CAP Ace with too much carburetor heat) sputters and foams:

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue". From the
archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

> That was 29 years ago, senior.
>
> That was 13 years ago, senior.

If you're going to parody Spanish, Lennie, you should at least spell it
correctly.

> The DSN (Digital Switched Network) ...(SNIP)

Even more completely unrealted, off topic trivia from one who must hide
behind it.

> Try to get with the modern times. Reality is all around you.

Yes, it is.

Too bad you can't share in it, eh...?!?!

> I am well acquainted with life.

Nop, you're not. You are well acquainted with your PERCEPTION of it from
behind textbooks and CRTs.

> Reality exists beyond the tattered, dog-eared pages of old QST
> issues and ARRL handbooks.

Yes, it does. I and others have pointed that out to you on numerous
occassions and invited you to come out and try it. You've declined. Too much
security in LennieLand.

> Fort Huachuca was okay in early spring but I've heard it is uncomfortable
> in mid-summer, being in Arizona. Glad I wasn't there in mid-summer.

I HAVE been there in mid-summer...and late summer when it's actually worse.
On several occassions.

> Sandia Laboratories is different. But, I can't talk much about that
> except that visit concerned things like SID.

Ahhhhhhhhhh.......I see.

Someone else suggests some "security" issues and you try to denigrate them
for it.

You think you're promoting your "insiderness" and you wave it like a flag.

> No, not "rife." :-) If you are trying a larger vocabulary, try to get
> something somewhat close to correct...and in context.

Yes...rife was correct and in context.

> You are trying to "poison the well" by singling out only specific
> instances of what I've mentioned as to experiences and work over
> the last 51+ years.

In other words, I hit the mark so close that you'll be dressing the wounds
from the "collateral damage" for days.

>> None of it has anything to do with Amateur Radio.
>
> Radio is radio, regardless of the differentiation that mere human
> regulation makers make of its differences.

Only in your mind, Lennie.

If that assertion was so true, you'd have no basis for your OTHER rants
that insist that Amateurs must spend thier time learning about "other" radio
services.

If "Radio is radio", your other assertions are baseless.

> The Pacific Stars & Stripes did not include a nice photo I made
> of the MARS antenna newly installed at Hardy Barracks in
> 1955.

And they didn't use the pictures I had of the Loch Ness monster either,
Lennie.

>> "Dictating" what you said?
>
> Absolutely. You are outraged that anyone dare confront your
> ideas and fantasies with actual, real-life experiences. The same
> with several others in here.

Why is it that all those "others" are focused on YOU, Lennie?

Perhaps YOU are the one with the perception problems?

That's a rhetorical question, of course. With absolutely NO experience in
Amateur Radio, we know you have no informed, valid expereicen from which to
base your comments.

> The dictatorial attitude is fairly common, done with heckling
> and name-calling and general denigration in an effort to make
> a poster stop writing. Weak intimidation. Works sometimes,
> but is not a guarantee of suppressing truth and reality.

And therein lies the bane of your existence...

Still having a hard time wondering why your "superior intellect" can't
squash all those "lesser beings" with your infinite wisdom.....

Too bad you can't objectively review what you just wrote against your
conduct over the last several years.

>> No one in this forum has made any such assertion. Even those who
>>staunchly support Morse Code testing have advocated advancement in the
>>service.
>
> ...by more and more manual telegraphy use, praising its supposed
> qualities, and generally getting into silly stuff about how it's so much
> "better" than any other mode.
>
> Note use of the word "service" again.

Hmmmmmm....The FCC uses it to describe Amateur Radio.

The Commissioners are not licensed Amateurs...Lord knows none of them hold
ANY form of licensure by the FCC.

YOU frequently point out the Commissioners status.

Are you NOW telling us that the language used by those very same
Commissioners is WRONG...?!?!

> Military surrogate use. Desire to make amateur radio much
> more than it is by trying to identify a hobby with military service.

That's YOUR schtick, Lennie.

> Tsk, tsk. Lost focus.

Nope. Never have.

>> I encourge you to provide even ONE quote that supports your assertion
>to
>>the contrary....
>
> Heh heh heh. No, "encourage" is the wrong word. You
> CHALLENGE. You DEMAND.

It would be a "challenge" to you, Lennie...In as much as the quotes you
need do not exist.

> You all but hop up and down in spiteful hollering to try to
> divert the discussion.

Nope...It's right on. You make all sorts of assinine assertions about
Amateur Radio in general and some Amateurs in particular, then can NEVER back
up your assertions.

You make assertions of fact.

I want you to validate them.

You never do. You CLAIM to be a "radio professional". You are not now
nor ever were anything of the kind.

>> I don't resent your alleged engineering career, Lennie. I know
>several
>>electronics engineers, and they are fine fellows who make meaningful
>>contributions.
>
> I'm sure you have "Jewish best friends," too.

I don't have to make such claims, Lennie.

You seem to make a lot of them, though.

>> You are NOT a fine fellow, and there's more than a few indicators that
>>your "contribution" to radio communications were limited to your few
>articles
>>sold to Ham Radio magazine. (No doubt a last resort in "getting published"
>>since I am sure the professional journals cut you off at the knees.)

> You can check out McGraw-Hill's old biweekly Electronics and
> Designer's Casebook. You can check out Microcomputing, a former
> monthly for personal computerists. You can check out BYTE
> magazine as well as BYTE Books on articles concerning
> circuit simulation. All reviewed and accepted by others.

But not accepted as "PROFESSIONAL" publishing.

If you tried to pass off "credentials" like some hobbyist periodicals as
"profesional publishing", you'd be laughed out of the IEEE.

> You want to make a Big Thing about Ham Radio Magainze
> going "defunct" back in 1990...even though HR was considered a
> leader in U.S. ham periodicals for technical information...which it
> was. The "defunction" was due to a shrinking ham advertising
> market already begun by 1990. That shrinking is even affecting
> QST. It hit 73 Magazine big time. Unlike QST which can get
> support from the ARRL membership monies, HR and 73 were
> independent publications whose entire income was derived by
> advertising. CQ is the same way and is barely hanging on.

The "shrinking ham advertising" was due to a lack of support of consumers.

No consumers = no advertising monies = defunct.

Corporate advertisers do not spend thier advertising monies where it is
not netting a reasonable return.

If "Ham Radio" had been the marvel of publishing accomplishment you'd care to have us beleive, it would still be actively published instead of being polished and repackaged as a CD novelty.

"73" lost it's readership because Wayne Green is a senile idiot who ran it into the ground...not once, but twice. And how many "QRP" and "antenna specials" can one magazine run in a year...?!?! And those "editiorials"...?!?! Sheeeesh! Talk about being the poster boy for "Paranoia Today"....

>> Even then I can't find a single example where any of your "work" was
>>original, nor can I find any example of where your "contributions" were
>>complimentary to the advancement of ANY radio communications discipline.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Having nursie as a critic is like having a blind
> color coordinator for interior decoration. :-)
>
> Try to differentiate between "compliment" and "complement."

In either use of either word, there is no professional historical documentation that would indicate that Leonard H. Anderson did anything other than sweep floors in ANY "aerospace" installation or facility.

And as far as your "contributions" to Amateur Radio via your HR pieces, I find no occassion where your work was footnooted, included or otherwise madse part-and-parcel of any other paper or work.

And I did look. Closely.

>>> Poor nursie...never could take an opposite opinion to his in
>>> here and is bitterly resentful to anyone who had spoken out
>>> in opposition to him.
>>
>> I am only "bitterly resentful" of pathological liars and persons who
>>proactively seek to cause
>
> What am I "seeking to cause?" Sentence unfinished.

Yep...I changed a sentence prior to "sending" and clipped it.

Here's the full sentence: "I am only 'bitterly resentful' of pathological liars who proactively seek to cause harm to Amateur Radio for no other purpsoe than to sate his own ego".

> What are "pathological liars," nursie?

You are a pathological liar, Lennie.

You can't tell or acknowledge the truth. Your lying is habitual. Even when you DO quote or recite factual information, who can trust you?

> Nursie no gots da
> edumcation in sykology, sointanly ain't gots no certificates
> (suitable for framing, hanging on da wall) as a licensed
> shrink.

No licensure as a mental health worker, Lennie. True.

However I DO have certifications in Emergency Nursing, in and among which is included managing psychiatric emergencies.

Which is one more than YOU have.

>> And it's too bad YOU don't avail yourself of the "hum radio magazines".
>
>>(Your true colors are showing, Scumbag.)
>
> A long-time radio amateur used to say "hum radio."

And you are not a "long time radio amateur". Never were, and God willing, never will be.

>> I find it QUITE "enlightening" to keep an eye on you.
>
> Nursie is OBSESSED. Is COMPELLED to mean-mouth
> others who go against his opinions.

Nope...not "mean-mouth".

Expose. As if it took any effort to do...

And if you didn't post such foolishness, I wouldn't have anything to work with. HARDLY "obsessed".

>> And I am still waiting for you to post your credentials to tell us what
>>qualified you to make determinations as to what is or isn't "good mental
>>health". Leafing through wifey's correspondence courses doesn't qulify.
>
> Sicko words are sicko words to lay people, nursie.

Well, Lennie, I am neither "lay people", nor am I the "sicko" that you insinuate.

And still waiting on your psychiatry credentials.

Steve, K4YZ

5008. CB and ham radio are the same.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 12:48:17 UTC
From: "R. F. Burns" <rfburns@160meter.cb.net>
Message-ID: <40d435f7_2@Opticon.100ProofNews.com>
Source record: 93072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes (under "Re: Able Baker Charlie" thread):

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<snip>

> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
>us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
>have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
>of text based adventure game.

Good precis, Mike. However, there's one group left out from this
venue, the Traditionalist-Fundamentalist who has adopted a very
rigid set of geas set out to cleanse a personal involvement with
an avocational radio activity. ("geas" refers to magical gimmicks
set to keep devils out of a local territory)

>With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
>interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
>repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.

Agreed. But, the "MARS is amateur radio" statement is an
example of not only a Traditionalist-Fundamentalist but one who
wants to make a hobby into a surrogate of a military life, of
rigid obeyance of some kind of "orders" from a fantasy of what
a hobby really is...and then fails to note the existance and the
raison d'etre of that particular originally-military radio service.

MARS was originally conceived (under the previous AARS) to
get radio amateurs involved with the U.S. Army communications
of 1925. Comms of any radio service of 1925 were rather
simple. Even the Army admitted that. The AARS never grew to
be a big thing and WW2 put a halt on everything amateur insofar
as operations. There's not much about "phone patches" as a
goodwill effort to give servicemen a link with home through
amateur radio prior to 1942... :-)

During the Cold War times, phone patches, whether through
MARS or individual hams, were very good for boosting morale,
especially for those stuck in so many foreign places. It hit a
high point with the Vietnam War, the southeast Asian MARS
stations handling up to 42,000 phone patches a month up to
1970. That's referenced at the Army's Center For Military

History (CMH) and available for download by anyone. [I gave
the link in here]

But, the Vietnam War ended 29 years ago, almost a generation
and a half in the past. MARS still has the task of involving
civilians with military radio but MARS has, for a long time,
changed its mission to be a true auxilliary radio service in the
military, that of being an affiliate communications service with
other U.S. government radio services. The one-month exercise
two years ago of Grecian Firebolt 2002 showed that MARS
does function quite well on its own without civilian radio amateurs
to fulfill its mission.

The existance and definition of MARS is covered by publicly-
available documents. However, the image in the minds of many
is solely from amateur publications (who overemphasize ham
involvement relative to the bigger mission picture) and that
image is about three decades out of date.

> If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
>to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
>she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
>would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
>course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
>filtering or ignoring him or her.

Some have their minds made up and will never change. :-)

In here, several operate slightly differently in that perceived personal
"honor" is involved. They say something wrong or make an error and
then refuse to admit it until pinned against several walls and had it
rubbed all over them. :-)

That applies on any subject in any computer-modem venue, was so
even back in the late 1970s on ARPANET...then the original
USENET (probably the worst are academics not yet risen to their
full titled heights, heh heh)...continued on into BBSs and now the
Internet.

Amateur radio in general seems to be one of the most conservative
of all radio services...plus the fact that most of the hobbyists are
quite unaware of what goes on in other radio services. Amateur
radio publications seldom mention other radio services in the USA.
As a result there is a great deal of insularity (a sort of "dielectric
materialism") which, in turns, breeds even more conservatism.

Most interesting, that conservatism. Radio communications involves
the sharing of information. Radio does it very fast, yet the technology
advancements are all coming from the designer-manufacturers.

> Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
>of willing participants in his game.

The regulars are a very, very tiny percentage of the entire hum radio licensees...and they seem to be staunchly, archly, embedded-in-old-concept holes in the ground on what amateur radio "should be." Not a good venue to discuss anything but hidebound status-quoism.

Those who aren't in agreement with keeping things absolutely the same as when those olde-tyme hammes got their beloved licenses is in for a rough go. :-)

> Face it, he is good at it. It may not be what you are in here for, but
>he succeeds in his game.

It may be a game to others, Mike, but it is a lunchtime amusement for me. :-)

In one way, it is fun to poke holes in others' faulty concepts such as telegraphy and the Absolute Need to test all licensees for that ability forever and ever into the end of time in order to invade their precious HF turf! :-)

51 years ago I lucked out in my military service and got stationed at a major communications facility. That changed my concepts of what radio communications was about. Practically a wholesale revision, having had little exposure prior, all from amateur publications. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force just didn't use any telegraphy then for fixed-point to fixed-point radio communications. They had not done so since WW2. The USN depended on on-line cryptographic communications in the fleet, on cruisers and heavier class ships back in 1940 (that's how the USN could coordinate movements to engage in the Battle of Midway). That crypto messaging was by RTTY, not manual telegraphy. The "Sigaba" crypto TTY system was never compromised.

The regulars in this venue don't want to hear of that. It wasn't about "amateur radio" and it hasn't been publicized in QST. Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in any big-time radio communications experience. As a result, many are openly antagonistic against anyone who has done so and try to divert the thread into claims that I "embellish" my "CV," tooting my own horn so to speak :-) Really no. I'm trying to point out that "CW" was already being downsized a half century ago and its use is constantly decreasing until it has virtually disappeared for communications everywhere but in amateur radio.

> Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
>be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
>some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

The true antagonistic poster seldom gets much response. Those get a large charge out of saying the worst things about another. That's part of the time-distance isolation "safety factor" for them in computer-modem communications. They can get away with it! :-)

What gets "weird" (or 'wired') is when another replies with correct facts and Strong response. The original antagonists almost go berserk. :-) [see the posts of the one who likes to use the word "putz"] The original antagonists Hate that sort of thing. It spoils their private little sociopathy game they so enjoy. :-)

>>>You
>>>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
>>>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
>>>irresistable.
>>
>> Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>
> And yet you are now involved once more!

He can't help it. His "honor" is at stake...someone put a stake through a vital part back when he was trying to peddle Uber-status-quoism all about keeping amateur radio forever locked into the old standards and practices.

It may be an "evangelical" kind of thing. Or just brainwashed syndrome.

Ethnic cleansing must be done, impure concepts washed away.

>>> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
>>
>> I don't.
>
> You don't have to, that much is true.

Life is tough and then you newsgroup... :-)

"Sine die" - someone turned off the audio oscillator...

QED is not one of the "Q codes" in telegraphy.

Back to trying to find out what's holding me down in my search for anti-gravity...

5009. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 13:00:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mbedndw1L64EpEndRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 93073

"Kim" <emertxe@softhome.net> wrote in message
news:eafcf30c.0406181837.7d6757e0@posting.google.com...
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:<10cka5v1o58vsb1@corp.supernews.com>...
> > Actually during a public service event or an actual emergency event,
keeping
> > some form of log or at least a "message log" is actually a good idea.
If
> > there is some type of problem discovered later on, at least having a
record
> > of what occurred can possibly help to save the proverbial posterior....
> >
> > Keeping a personal log is not required anymore, but can serve to help in
> > some regards. I only log now new contacts/first time contacts. If I
kept a
> > log for each contact, regardless of how many times I chatted with each
> > person, I would be killing a ton of trees.

I log all my HF activity even if they are repeat contacts but not VHF. The reason for not logging the latter is that most of my VHF activity is drive time chitchat and doesn't travel great distances. Unusual VHF or UHF contacts, I do log.

However there is another very good reason for keeping a log even though not required. If your call is ever "hijacked" (and this has happened to people) and you get cited for violations you never committed, you can use your log as supporting documentation that you were not on that frequency at that date and time. Although logs could be forged, when you show that you have habitually kept a log and that log appears to be undoctored, the FCC is inclined to decide in your favor.

I keep both a paper log and a computer log. I enter contacts in both. The paper log is a backup just in case the computer log becomes irretrievable. And I can sit on my sofa and thumb through my paper log just for the fun of looking at old contacts. The computer log lets me easily find how many times I've worked a person, state or country, track number of states worked, etc.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5010. BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 14:36:50 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <6cYAc.57431$2i5.31092@attbi_s52>
Source record: 93074

The ARRL Letter
Vol. 23, No. 25
June 18, 2004
[The ARRL has weighed in on behalf of Iowa amateur and ARRL member Jim Spencer, W0SR, of Cedar Rapids, who has suffered severe broadband over power line (BPL) interference for more than two months. A formal complaint to FCC Enforcement Bureau Chief David H. Solomon calls on the Commission not only to order Alliant Energy's BPL field trial system to shut down but to fine the utility $10,000 for violating the Communications Act of 1934 and FCC Part 15 rules. Alleging "ongoing harmful and willful interference to one or more licensed radio stations," the ARRL asked Solomon to intervene "on an emergency basis."]

http://www.uplc.utc.org/index.v3page?p=44489

http://www.uplc.utc.org/file_depot/0-10000000/0-10000/7966/folder/33324/UPLC%20Comments%205_3_2004.pdf

Power companies are in full denial! (Just saying it doesn't make it true.) If you believe what's being said by UPLC, I have some great land to sell you in Florida, and a wonderful bridge investment in New York. (When did the BPL interference spectrum drop to 1.7 MHz ??)

ak

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - THE UPLC STORY - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
SUMMARY
The UPLC generally supports the FCC's initiative to develop rules that will support the deployment of broadband over power line systems that will help achieve President Bush's goal of universal affordable broadband access by 2007.1 The President supports the development of technical standards for BPL towards that goal.2 Utilities and technology providers are poised to meet this ambitious goal and the UPLC appreciates the strong support of the FCC in its BPL proceedings.

The UPLC believes that the definition of Access BPL is potentially over-inclusive and should be slightly revised. The UPLC supports the proposal to retain the existing emission limits at the present time, recognizing that the FCC is proceeding cautiously, even though it has found that the interference potential from BPL is low.

Before the Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554
In the Matter of Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over Power Line Systems

ET Docket No. 03-104
ET Docket No. 04-37
Amendment of Part 15 regarding new requirements and measurement guidelines for Access Broadband over Power Lines Systems
COMMENTS OF THE UNITED POWER LINE COUNCIL

Pursuant to Section 1.415 of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") Rules, the United Power Line Council ("UPLC") hereby submits its comments in response to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making in the above referenced proceeding.3 The UPLC supports the proposal to retain the existing emission limits at this time, and suggests only slight changes to the operational limits proposed for Access BPL systems, as well as the proposed definition of Access BPL. Finally, the UPLC supports the proposed measurement guidelines, which will produce consistent and repeatable results that demonstrate compliance with the Part 15 rules. The UPLC heartily thanks the FCC for its support in developing these rules, which strike a very conservative and pragmatic.

. . . .

The UPLC is dismayed by the misinformation accepted as gospel by opponents of Access BPL systems. Despite apocalyptic predictions that "BPL is a Pandora's box of unprecedented proportions", the UPLC agrees with the FCC that Access BPL devices will not cause the power lines to "act as countless miles of transmission lines all radiating RF energy along their full length."6 These opponents have produced no scientific evidence to show otherwise, and all the measurements in the field contradict their abstract calculations. The industry continues to test and to address these concerns with licensees in areas where systems have been deployed, but there needs to be a rule of reason when it comes to allegations of BPL interference, and the UPLC applauds the FCC for making that message clear in this proceeding.

Definition of Access BPL
The proposed definition of Access BPL systems should be narrowly tailored to apply only to systems used to provide broadband access to the customer premises. As such, the UPLC recommends this slightly revised version of the FCC's language in the NPRM: Access Broadband over power line (Access BPL): A carrier current system that transmits high frequency (>1.7 MHz) radio frequency energy by conduction over electric power lines owned, operated, or controlled by an electric service provider for the purpose of delivering broadband data services. The electric power lines may be aerial or underground, but do not include power lines within the customer premises or in riser conduit within buildings. Access BPL does not include power line carrier systems, as defined in Section 15.113 of the Commission's rules.

. . . .

5011. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 14:58:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93075

In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <40CD10A1.69E891C8@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>> There's nothing to respect or admire able about being able to tear down,
>>>> insult, and destroy - or attempt to.
>>>>
>>>> Here's a classic for ya - I call it "the sphincter post":
>>>>
>>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000328122107.02129.00001001%40nso-f
>>p.aol.com&output=gplain
>>>
>>>I hear tell that those air raids on Tokyo in the fifties were exercises
>>>in sheer terror.
>>
>>I dunno, I've never been to Tokyo. Not even for 30 seconds.
>
> Troll, troll, troll your boat...madly down the steam (puffing away
> prodigiously).
>
>>Remember the exchanges about how far it is from air bases in North Korea and
>>Vladivostok to Tokyo, Bear bombers and such? Someone was very unhappy when
>it
>>was pointed out that the distance is well over 650 miles, not "about 500
>>miles". And that the statement "about an hour in a Bear bomber" meant little
>>because that aircraft did not enter service until the late 1950s.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Rev. Jim pulled out his Military Google-isms of the past
> and tried to make an amphibious bridge over his troubled waters. [he
> was all wet]
>
>>Pointing out the fact that any American *under* a certain age grew up with
>the
>>knowledge that hostile ICBMs could reach us in a matter of minutes sets off
>a
>>predictable response, too.
>

> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)

Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in service.

But in the '60s, when I was growing up, the Soviets had much more nuclear strike capability. I'm old enough to remember the Cuban missile crisis, even though I was only in elementary school at the time.
>
> Rev. Jim IS predictable.

Who?

> Lives in the PAST.

Well, you can't be referring to me.

I'm not the one who repeatedly brings up half-century-old military communications experience as some sort of qualification to determine amateur radio policy *today*. While neglecting to mention that the facility involved was entirely paid for by others, and utilized the full-time contributions of over 700 other personnel....

Now, *that's* "living in the past"

I don't "live in the past". But I do have a decent memory, and the skills to use reference resources. That obviously bothers the heck out of you, Len, judging by how you respond to my posts.

> He MUST keep on
> fighting the good fight over ancient postings, again and again and
> again and again and...<yawn>

You mean the like the one where you called another poster a "feldwebel" and told him to "shut the hell up"?
>
>>That sequence (in "34 Years Ago Today") was a classic. ;-)
>>
>>>I have to admit to being a little puzzled by what
>>>appears to be a reference to the writer's multiple sphincters (in the
>>>next to last paragraph).
>>>
>>Perhaps multiple ones are needed in order to handle his prodigious output
>;-)
>

5012. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 15:36:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <E3ZAc.6709$w07.3497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93076

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters,
> and all of them 1 KW or higher?
>

All "big-time radio communications experience" does not happen on HF,
30 transmitters is not a remarkable number of transmitters, and power
levels of a mere 1KW are distinctly small-time. But to satisfy your
criteria, here are a few examples of my assignments with more than 30
transmitters, 1KW or larger.

At NAVRADSTA(T) Barrigada 78 transmitters none smaller than 5KW
(AN/FRT-39). Largest was 200KW (AN/FRT-72).
At USS Annapolis AGMR-1 48 transmitters, none smaller than 1KW
(AN/URT-23). Largest was 40KW (AN/FRT-40).
At NAVRADSTA(T) Driver 55 transmitters none smaller than 10KW
(AN/FRT-39B). Largest was 600KW (AN/FRT-100).
At COMSECONDFLT, uncounted transmitters situated on more than 150 ships,
including 8 aircraft carriers.

How many 200 KW and 600KW transmitters did the super corporal of ADA
operate?

With all kind wishes,

Hans Brakob
Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

5013. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 16:58:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93077

In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
>
>> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>>
>>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>>>> you?
>>>
>>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>>> the claims he made, yes.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> He may know just where they are.
>>
>> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
>> another.
>>>
>>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>>>
>>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>>>
>> Can produce or will produce?
>>
>>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
>>> unit, his
>>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>>>is fact.
>>
>> So what's the problem?

>>
>> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
>> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
>> pretty much a given.
>>
>> So why bother about it?
>>>
>>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
>>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>>
>> Maybe.
>>
>> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
>> etc.
>>
>>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>>>"logbook" somewhere.
>>>
>> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
>> of wood.
>>
>>> It's just that it's empty.
>>>
>> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>>
>> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
>> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>>
>
>Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
>FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
>another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
>the local repeater in PJ7.

Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!

In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters, and at
least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite credible,
even with a very makeshift station.
>
>> *if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?
>>
>> And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked
>> T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the
>> alleged operation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5014. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 18:03:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Pd%Ac.3081$8d2.868@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93078

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:E3ZAc.6709$w07.3497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters,
> > and all of them 1 KW or higher?
> >
>
> All "big-time radio communications experience" does not happen on HF,
> 30 transmitters is not a remarkable number of transmitters, and power
> levels of a mere 1KW are distinctly small-time. But to satisfy your
> criteria, here are a few examples of my assignments with more than 30
> transmitters, 1KW or larger.
>
> At NAVRADSTA(T) Barrigada 78 transmitters none smaller than 5KW
> (AN/FRT-39). Largest was 200KW (AN/FRT-72).
> At USS Annapolis AGMR-1 48 transmitters, none smaller than 1KW
> (AN/URT-23). Largest was 40KW (AN/FRT-40).
> At NAVRADSTA(T) Driver 55 transmitters none smaller than 10KW
> (AN/FRT-39B). Largest was 600KW (AN/FRT-100).
> At COMSECONDFLT, uncounted transmitters situated on more than 150 ships,
> including 8 aircraft carriers.
>
> How many 200 KW and 600KW transmitters did the super corporal of ADA
> operate?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> Hans Brakob
> Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
>

Hello, Hans

Most interesting, indeed. Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of how much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff? Just curious. When you start talking 6 zeros in the power level, three zeroes *does* start to look pretty small time ;)

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5015. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 19:16:04 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <2629d0lc9pbhcintocmrb3t2tle3dudnfd@4ax.com>
Source record: 93079

On 19 Jun 2004 05:57:47 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <1k67d0p4qbdt7cg8vfvslc501q4mo9aakb@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
><kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:
>
>>On 18 Jun 2004 19:48:44 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>> See the Army Communicator write-up on Grecian Firebolt 2002
>>> for a good example. :-)
>>
>>For that matter, just turn on a shortwave receiver. Grecian Firebolt
>>2004 is being conducted as I type this, and will continue until some
>>time in August.
>
> Interesting! :-)
>
> Frequencies?

Among those that have been logged over the last week or so are:

14396.4 kHz (they were .1 low) 14/1800 Jun UTC:
SHARES exercise in support of GRECIAN FIREBOLT 2004.
Check-in window #1 of 4 scheduled, each day at 1800-1900 UTC.
Ctrl shared by: KGD34 (NCC/Shares liason, VA), AFA4BR (Shares
Coordination Station, Gulf Coast, Houston), DLA303 (SCS, Northwest,
Defense Logistics Agency, WA.); Working: KOQ434 (US Customs, NC,
possible SCS), KOQ636 (US Customs, ?), KDM52 (FAA, Memphis, TN),
KHA925 (NASA, Johnson Space Flight Ctr, Houston), WGY908 (SCS, FEMA
Region 8 Control, Denver, CO), KCR873 (USDA, Boise, ID, with traffic),
Puerto Rico CAP 20, WNIC426 (Phone company/ NTA, IL), among others
which were missed due to QSB.

KGD 34 went to 14995.0 at 1830 with KCR 873, to receive the traffic.
They were weak - message was copied by KGD 34 and passed successfully,
but no copy here. ALE and PACTOR BBS check-ins are 24 hours daily for
the duration.

5403.3 - Group HF with T, A and lots of others

8668.5 - This is a WHISKEY Air Defense battlegroup net with HOTEL
WHISKEY as NCS. Simulated air attacks, with carrier strike package
targeting track 3515, track 3515 being declared hostile, eventually
with "splash two". Later, VICTOR wkg HW re strike package is feet dry.

8252.0 - BRAVO FOXTROT Net (USB) USN FOXTROT battlegroup net with
BRAVO FOXTROT as NCS.

The U.S. Navy's current exercise is named SUMMER PULSE 04 and will conclude in August, this involves having simultaneous deployment of seven aircraft carrier strike groups.

The carriers involved are the Norfolk-based USS George Washington (CVN 73), the San Diego-based USS John C. Stennis (CVN 74), the Yokosuka, Japan-based USS Kitty Hawk (CV 63), the Mayport, Fla.-based USS John F Kennedy (CV 67), the Norfolk-based USS Harry S. Truman (CVN 75), the Norfolk-based USS Enterprise (CVN 65), and finally, the USS Ronald Reagan (CVN 76), which will conduct operations in the U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command theaters during the ship's interfleet transfer from Norfolk, Va., to its Pacific Fleet homeport of San Diego.

When you consider that no carrier goes anywhere alone but instead has various mixtures of destroyers, cruisers, attack subs, and at least one ammo/oiler/supply ship in its CSG (Carrier Strike Groups are formed and disestablished on an as-needed basis; but while one may be different from another, all are comprised of similar types of ships), that's a heck of a lot of radio traffic, so I'm sure the freqs listed above only skim the surface. Conspicuous by their absence from the above freqs are freqs for LINK-11 (TADIL-A) voice coordination nets, for example.

Needless to say, these guys can also change frequency at any time, and will according to mission requirements, propagation, QRM, and other considerations - including COMSEC.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5016. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 19:43:28 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <40D49764.90009@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 93080

Jim Hampton wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:E3ZAc.6709$w07.3497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>> Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters,
>>> and all of them 1 KW or higher?
>>>
>>
>>All "big-time radio communications experience" does not happen on HF,
>>30 transmitters is not a remarkable number of transmitters, and power
>>levels of a mere 1KW are distinctly small-time. But to satisfy your
>>criteria, here are a few examples of my assignments with more than 30
>>transmitters, 1KW or larger.
>>
>>At NAVRADSTA(T) Barrigada 78 transmitters none smaller than 5KW
>>(AN/FRT-39). Largest was 200KW (AN/FRT-72).
>>At USS Annapolis AGMR-1 48 transmitters, none smaller than 1KW
>>(AN/URT-23). Largest was 40KW (AN/FRT-40).
>>At NAVRADSTA(T) Driver 55 transmitters none smaller than 10KW
>>(AN/FRT-39B). Largest was 600KW (AN/FRT-100).
>>At COMSECONDFLT, uncounted transmitters situated on more than 150 ships,
>>including 8 aircraft carriers.
>>
>>How many 200 KW and 600KW transmitters did the super corporal of ADA
>>operate?
>>
>>With all kind wishes,
>>
>>Hans Brakob
>>Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
>>
>
>
>
> Hello, Hans
>
> Most interesting, indeed. Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of how
> much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff? Just curious. When you start
> talking 6 zeros in the power level, three zeroes *does* start to look pretty
> small time ;)
>

> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04
>
>
QST had a story many years ago when the VLF station in Maine was first
opened. I remember
a picture of a man standing up inside the coax. Power was in the 2
Megawatt range.
John

5017. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 20:49:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 93086

King Zulu wrote:

> The ARRL Letter
> Vol. 23, No. 25
> June 18, 2004
> [The ARRL has weighed in on behalf of Iowa amateur and ARRL member Jim
> Spencer, W0SR, of Cedar Rapids, who has suffered severe broadband over
> power line (BPL) interference for more than two months. A formal complaint
> to FCC Enforcement Bureau Chief David H. Solomon calls on the Commission
> not only to order Alliant Energy's BPL field trial system to shut down but
> to fine the utility $10,000 for violating the Communications Act of 1934
> and FCC Part 15 rules. Alleging "ongoing harmful and willful interference
> to one or more licensed radio stations," the ARRL asked Solomon to
> intervene "on an emergency basis."]

Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
they don't?

5018. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 21:17:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93082

In article <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>

>> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)
>
>Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in
>service.

Okay, on the basis for one wrong statement, you mount an "air"
assault? :-)

How does a mistaken NATO code name have a relation with the
adoption of the NATO phonetic alphabet in communications in
1955?

Ah! It doesn't. But, Rev. Jimmie is out to discipline "his flock"
for "inaccuracies!" [I sense another Sermon on the Antenna
Mount in preparation! :-)]

>But in the '60s, when I was growing up, the Soviets had much more nuclear
>strike capability. I'm old enough to remember the Cuban missile crisis, even
>though I was only in elementary school at the time.

...did you also think of U.S. military communications as consisting
of hundreds of radio operators with headsets and code keys busy
tapping out messages? :-)

>> Lives in the PAST.
>
>Well, you can't be referring to me.
>
>I'm not the one who repeatedly brings up half-century-old military
>communications experience as some sort of qualification to determine amateur
>radio policy *today*. While neglecting to mention that the facility involved
>was entirely paid for by others, and utilized the full-time contributions of
>over 700 other personnel....

Hmmm...let's see...Rev. Jimmie brings up all the morse code
ham stuff of the 50s and 60s (plus all sorts of tidbits of old

ham regulations which don't apply today) and I mention that
the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
communications in 1948. Now what kind of conclusion can we
draw from that?

Oh, yes, my mention is "wrong" since it fails to honor and
glorify the tradition of morse code in amateurism which must,
in the Belief system of Rev. you-know-who, be preserved
forever and ever in amateur radio regulations.

Okay, any positive statements about morse code are allowed
and even honored even though some of the individuals involved
are obviously fish stories. Those against morse code are evil,
wicked, mean, and nasty, are always incorrect and should never
be considered. :-)

So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
person is for morse code.

[someone's belly-button is undone...]

>Now, *that's* "living in the past"

Wasn't there some stuff by the good Rev. about "the past is
prologue?" :-)

>I don't "live in the past". But I do have a decent memory, and the skills to
>use reference resources. That obviously bothers the heck out of you, Len,
>judging by how you respond to my posts.

Yes, "obviously." So very serious! :-)

A regular World Sirius, "dogging" my thoughts! :-)

>> He MUST keep on
>> fighting the good fight over ancient postings, again and again and
>> again and again and...<yawn>
>
>You mean the like the one where you called another poster a "feldwebel" and
>told him to "shut the hell up"?

Right. The ROE of this newsgroup is:

1. Any kind of language or lack of civility by any morse code
proponent is perfectly acceptible, even encouraged.

2. Anything said by anyone who does not love, honor, cherish
morse code is to be denigrated, insulted, vilified, and looked
at nasty just because of what they think. All of those sub-
humans must always behave civilly and show respect for the
code lovers even if the code lovers are behaving as iceholes.

That pretty well sums it up. :-)

Rev. Jimmie, go back to Google where you live...

LHA / WMD

5019. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 21:17:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619171724.12940.00000259@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93083

In article <E3ZAc.6709$w07.3497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters,
>> and all of them 1 KW or higher?
>
>All "big-time radio communications experience" does not happen on HF,
>30 transmitters is not a remarkable number of transmitters, and power
>levels of a mere 1KW are distinctly small-time. But to satisfy your
>criteria, here are a few examples of my assignments with more than 30
>transmitters, 1KW or larger.
>
>At NAVRADSTA(T) Barrigada 78 transmitters none smaller than 5KW
>(AN/FRT-39). Largest was 200KW (AN/FRT-72).
>At USS Annapolis AGMR-1 48 transmitters, none smaller than 1KW
>(AN/URT-23). Largest was 40KW (AN/FRT-40).
>At NAVRADSTA(T) Driver 55 transmitters none smaller than 10KW
>(AN/FRT-39B). Largest was 600KW (AN/FRT-100).
>At COMSECONDFLT, uncounted transmitters situated on more than 150 ships,
>including 8 aircraft carriers.
>
>How many 200 KW and 600KW transmitters did the super corporal of ADA
>operate?

None. ADA was/is an ARMY callsign. :-)

ADA is presently the Headquarters call of the USARPAC (United
States Army, Pacific) located at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

I have no idea what USARPAC is running on HF now. Left ADA
in 1956...that's 48 years ago. The facilities of ADA were
transferred to the USAF in 1963 (callsign changed, equipment
the same) but the USAF closed that entire facility down in 1978.

There's an "HF Department" of the 78th Signal Service Battalion
stationed at Camp Zama, Japan, under the 516th Signal Brigade
at Fort Shafter. I don't have any details on what the 78th has
nor of any extensive "inventory." :-)

Back in late 1954 the 40 KW Collins transmitter hadn't yet been
given the military designation of AN/FRT-22. :-) For that matter,
the 24-voice-channel GE microwave terminals (commercial)
weren't given the "official" designation of AN/FRC-25...the
"credential" for such importance consisting of sticking on a label

on each of the six terminal racks' doors, thereby making it "military." :-) Those just kept on working into the USAF responsibility shift.

ADA was never the biggest Army station, those facilities probably never the biggest USAF station after 1963. The ADA receiver site at Camp Owada was shared with the USAF in the 1950s and was described as the largest receiver site in the world at the time with pairs of rhombics for each circuit (space diversity with multicouplers and diversity adapters) and the whole works running 24/7. TTY Relay at Chuo Kogyo (later at Building 898, North Camp Drake) handled 220 thousand messages a month in 1955. Not the biggest since WAR (Washington Army Radio) TTY Relay handled 1.2 million a month in that same year. Except for some trials of mods, all the rest of the TTYs ran at 60 WPM rates.

That was a half century ago. Times have changed. Some ideas of what the U.S. military does now, or even did back a half century ago are purely imaginary in the minds of those that weren't involved in military communications then or later.

Yes, I was a corporal back a half century ago, a PFC before that, and the equivalent of today's SSGT afterwards, that as an operating team leader and later as a supervisor of microwave relay operations and maintenance. All in three years of that assignment. Thank you for mentioning it. :-)

I could not dare to achieve any heights of greatness nor the nobility of purpose or excellence of the United States Navy in a short volunteer military active duty time of 4 years...not even in the reserves for 4 more...just army stuff, what an ex-murine called "radio clerk" things. :-)

Thank you for the rendition of "Rancors Away..." :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5020. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 21:17:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619171730.12940.00000260@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93085

In article <20040619070253.26548.00000246@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040618154849.15095.00000235@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve da CAP Ace with too much carburetor heat) sputters and foams:
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue". From the
>archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.

Nursie isn't touching the "morse code test issue" is she? :-)

Nursie wanna fight, curse, send nastygrams. :-)

Must be more of that "meaningful dialogue" nursie thinks she is
engaging in. :-)

>> That was 29 years ago, senior.
>>
>> That was 13 years ago, senior.
>
> If you're going to parody Spanish, Lennie, you should at least spell it
>correctly.

tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie lost focus again, desperately trying to invent
another nastygram. :-)

I know it is difficult, but TRY to stay within a few light-years of
the topics in context.

>> The DSN (Digital Switched Network) ...(SNIP)
>
> Even more completely unrealted, off topic trivia from one who must hide
>behind it.

The U.S. government doesn't have the DSN? tsk, tsk, tsk.

DSN works very well. The "government's own internet" as one in
government put it. I've communicated on it. [no license required]

>> Try to get with the modern times. Reality is all around you.
>
> Yes, it is.

Try to get out of the ham tunnel you inhabit.

> Too bad you can't share in it, eh...?!?!

? "Share" in your small tunnel? Your little imagination?

>> I am well acquainted with life.

More like death and destruction from appearances. You wish ill on
all who oppose your opinions, even to the point of wishing them dead.

Nursie wanna destroy anything anyone say about opposite
opinions as if they are heretical or perverse.

Not a healthy mind indicator to any lay person.

> Nop, you're not. You are well acquainted with your PERCEPTION of it from
>behind textbooks and CRTs.

...and behind radios. Actual radio communications.

Sunnuvagun, how about that?

Someone other than olde-tyme hammes using non-amateur radios
for communications! [who would have thought of it? :-)]

>> Reality exists beyond the tattered, dog-eared pages of old QST
>> issues and ARRL handbooks.
>
> Yes, it does. I and others have pointed that out to you on numerous
>occassions and invited you to come out and try it. You've declined. Too
>much security in LennieLand.

"Security?" Well, yes, I am secure but not in the sense of document
security. :-)

Ah yes, nursie's reality is rated "top sacred" in classification. :-)

>> Fort Huachuca was okay in early spring but I've heard it is uncomfortable
>> in mid-summer, being in Arizona. Glad I wasn't there in mid-summer.
>
> I HAVE been there in mid-summer...and late summer when it's actually
>worse. On several occassions.

Of course you have. You've been everywhere that I've been. :-)

It's all documented in this newsgroup. :-)

Nursie has been to an HRO store "with buddies" even when it did
not exist in a location. :-)

>> Sandia Laboratories is different. But, I can't talk much about that
>> except that visit concerned things like SID.
>
> Ahhhhhhhhhh.......I see.
>
> Someone else suggests some "security" issues and you try to denigrate

>them for it.

SID is an acronym for Seismic Intrusion Devices.

RCA Corporation made a bunch of them for the "McNamara Wall"
in Vietnam, circa 1973-1975. Neat little automatic devices
reporting back (unattended) by radio to a "Portatale" (familiar
name) receiver. Could sense footfalls and had internal sound
processing to differentiate between four-footed and two-footed
creatures. Did the two antennas for them, accurate pattern
measurements on the first model, redesign to a "whip" type
for the second model.

That design is rather outdated now but SIDs are still used by
the government. I really don't know how much information is
still classified. What I've reported is from the public-release
information from Defense Electronics magazine.

Would make a cool variant on a super-tough-to-find "fox hunt"
transmitter. :-) Transmitter stays silent until the stalker
comes close. Sort of "role reversal" of the traditional game.
It would make for very accurate "fox hunt" scoring, though. :-)

> You think you're promoting your "insiderness" and you wave it like a
>flag.

Poor baby. Came all unglued for using an old acronym? :-(

tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
Recon Marine intel patrolling?

>> No, not "rife." :-) If you are trying a larger vocabulary, try to get
>> something somewhat close to correct...and in context.
>
> Yes...rife was correct and in context.

"Rife: (adj) 1. Widespread 2. Abounding (as with error)"

Only in nursieworld where anything not according to nursie is
"rife." :-)

>> You are trying to "poison the well" by singling out only specific
>> instances of what I've mentioned as to experiences and work over
>> the last 51+ years.
>
> In other words, I hit the mark so close that you'll be dressing the
wounds
>from the "collateral damage" for days.

tsk, tsk, tsk...only in nursie's unhealthy imagination, still living
in the "hostile action" battlezone. :-)

Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from no
longer being issued a rifle to deal with "rife-ness."

>>> None of it has anything to do with Amateur Radio.
>>
>> Radio is radio, regardless of the differentiation that mere human
>> regulation makers make of its differences.
>
> Only in your mind, Lennie.

Hardly. :-) The FCC knows this, other nations' radio regulating
agencies know this, the rest of the radio world outside of olde-
tyme hum radio knows this, academic institutions teaching
physics knows this, etc., etc., etc.

Nursieworld is all by itself, "a dimension of sight and sound...
at the signpost up ahead...the Twilight Zone!" :-)

> If that assertion was so true, you'd have no basis for your OTHER rants
>that insist that Amateurs must spend thier time learning about "other" radio
>services.

First, amateurs ought to know "thier" own radios...something
beyond the front panel controls.

Amateur radios work by the same physics as other radios!

Sunnuvagun! A revelation to nursieworld!

> If "Radio is radio", your other assertions are baseless.

Nurise is "right" and everyone else is "wrong." :-)

Nursieworld still stuck in the Twilight Zone again. tsk, tsk.

>> The Pacific Stars & Stripes did not include a nice photo I made
>> of the MARS antenna newly installed at Hardy Barracks in
>> 1955.
>
> And they didn't use the pictures I had of the Loch Ness monster either,
>Lennie.

Nursie did an interview with Stars & Stripes?

Where, when, for the Sunday comics section?

[Stars & Stripes does have comic strips in case anyone wanted
to venture into nursieworld imagination]

>>> "Dictating" what you said?
>>
>> Absolutely. You are outraged that anyone dare confront your
>> ideas and fantasies with actual, real-life experiences. The same
>> with several others in here.
>
> Why is it that all those "others" are focused on YOU, Lennie?

"All?" :-) A few of the regulars in here who are of the same ilk
as nursie, wanting to fight to the bitter end to preserve and

protect olde-tyme hamme radio and manual telegraphy?

Wait for the next Sermon on the Antenna Mount...soon to be
preached by the good Rev.

> Perhaps YOU are the one with the perception problems?

I haven't gotten the rose-colored glasses yet. Don't use any
nursieworld kaleidoscopes...only oscilloscopes. :-)

> That's a rhetorical question, of course. With absolutely NO experience in
>Amateur Radio, we know you have no informed, valid expereicen from which to
>base your comments.

"Expereicen?" New word? From Newington?

Of course. Amateur radio is so vastly different from all other radio
that one must be licensed and experienced (and be tested in
manual telegraphy) to understand it. [according to nursie]

Nurise hasn't done jack in any other radio service, only amateur, so
that's her only basis. Oh wow, profound, that tunnel vision...

>> The dictatorial attitude is fairly common, done with heckling
>> and name-calling and general denigration in an effort to make
>> a poster stop writing. Weak intimidation. Works sometimes,
>> but is not a guarantee of suppressing truth and reality.
>
> And therein lies the bane of your existence...

"Bane (n) 1. ruin, death, harm, or their cause 2. poison"

So far, nursie is back on using quaint expressions involving all
that death and destruction.

Must be all that post-traumatic stress disorder from military
life again...?

> Still having a hard time wondering why your "superior intellect" can't
>squash all those "lesser beings" with your infinite wisdom.....

"Squash?" I'm not fond of squash. It's okay as food, but tasteless.

A more proper word would be 'quash.' Two meanings -

"Quash (vt) from the Latin 'cassus' To set aside (in law use)

"Quash (vt) from the Latin 'quatere' To quell as in an uprising."

[dictionary quoting a part of public service offered pro bono...]

> Too bad you can't objectively review what you just wrote against your
>conduct over the last several years.

tsk, tsk, tsk...confused on the differences between "objective" and
"subjective?"

The dictionary is your friend. Get acquainted.

Remember only nursie's alternate personalities live in nursieworld.
It's all subjective in there...

>>> No one in this forum has made any such assertion. Even those who
>>>staunchly support Morse Code testing have advocated advancement in the
>>>service.
>>
>> ...by more and more manual telegraphy use, praising its supposed
>> qualities, and generally getting into silly stuff about how it's so much
>> "better" than any other mode.
>>
>> Note use of the word "service" again.
>
> Hmmmmmm....The FCC uses it to describe Amateur Radio.

All throughout Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, the term
"service" is a regulatory word pertaining to a type and kind of radio
activity being regulated.

"Service" has many meanings (the dictionary IS your friend and
you really need one).

Amateur radio is no more of a military or national purpose
"service" than Citizens Band Radio Service (Part 95, Title 47 C.F.R.).

No one "enlists" in the amateur radio service although some
actually do feel compelled to treat it like some military service!

> The Commissioners are not licensed Amateurs...Lord knows none of them
>hold ANY form of licensure by the FCC.
>
> YOU frequently point out the Commissioners status.

tsk, tsk, tsk...why are you stoutly maintaining that anyone "involved"
in amateur radio "must be licensed?" :-)

> Are you NOW telling us that the language used by those very same
>Commissioners is WRONG...?!?!

All throughout Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, the term
"service" is a regulatory word pertaining to a type and kind of radio
activity being regulated.

>> Military surrogate use. Desire to make amateur radio much
>> more than it is by trying to identify a hobby with military service.
>
> That's YOUR schtick, Lennie.

? I've been a civilian for 44 years after receiving my honorable
discharge from the U.S. Army in 1960. [only one, honorable,
not typed in on any DD-214 which I received in 1956]

>> Tsk, tsk. Lost focus.
>
> Nope. Never have.

tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie keeps forgetting to take off the lens cap.

...and never loads any film. :-)

> Nope...It's right on. You make all sorts of assinine assertions about
>Amateur Radio in general and some Amateurs in particular, then can NEVER back
>up your assertions.
>
> You make assertions of fact.
>
> I want you to validate them.
>
> You never do. You CLAIM to be a "radio professional". You are not now
>nor ever were anything of the kind.

Do you need those documents verified by a notary public and
hand-delivered by bonded courier? :-)

tsk, tsk, tsk...I've given my short-form resume in here along with
living radio amateur references...and nursie never did check them
out, only issuing spiteful, hated nastygrams. :-)

"Professional (adj) Engaged in some sport or specific
occupation for pay."

[the dictionary can be your friend but nursie seems to want to fight
with everyone...]

> If you tried to pass off "credentials" like some hobbyist periodicals as
>"profesional publishing", you'd be laughed out of the IEEE.

Haven't been since first joining IEEE in 1973. One of my sponsors
was Jim Hall, KD6JG. :-)

["sunnavagun" as the super chief is fond of saying...:-)]

> The "shrinking ham advertising" was due to a lack of support of
>consumers.
>
> No consumers = no advertising monies = defunct.
>
> Corporate advertisers do not spend thier advertising monies where it is
>not netting a reasonable return.

You are close, but you've failed Business Economics 101.

The "shrinking ham advertising" is due to a lack of SPENDING
for advertising by manufacturers and services in periodicals.

Advertising is basically the same regardless of the product or
service. It is a means to induce potential buyers of a particular
product or service.

Most periodicals in the USA exist solely on the basis of advertising space sales income. When advertisers do not purchase advertising space in periodicals, that periodical has less revenue. [I hope you've understood that basic rule so far...] Note this carefully: The purchase of advertising space has little directly to do with "consumers." Some products and services can continue with an absolute minimal amount of advertising.

> If "Ham Radio" had been the marvel of publishing accomplishment you'd care
>to have us beleive, it would still be actively published instead of being
>polished and repackaged as a CD novelty.

HR existed for 22 years as an independent periodical, even spun off "Ham Radio Horizons." It started up as an independent, continued as an independent. No support was needed by any membership organization budget such as QST.

HR was considered the prime technical periodical for amateur radio by radio amateurs when it was in its 22 year span. That was stated by many, many radio amateurs.

>>> Even then I can't find a single example where any of your "work" was
>>>original, nor can I find any example of where your "contributions" were
>>>complimentary to the advancement of ANY radio communications discipline.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Having nursie as a critic is like having a blind
>> color coordinator for interior decoration. :-)
>>
>> Try to differentiate between "compliment" and "complement."
>
> In either use of either word, there is no professional historical
>documentation that would indicate that Leonard H. Anderson did anything other
>than sweep floors in ANY "aerospace" installation or facility.

tsk, tsk, tsk...personnel records of employees are not normally found in "professional historical documentation." :-) Those can be verified by personnel departments (now called "human resources").

> And as far as your "contributions" to Amateur Radio via your HR pieces, I
>find no occassion where your work was footnooted, included or otherwise madse
>part-and-parcel of any other paper or work.

"Footnoot?" "Madse?" :-)

> And I did look. Closely.

Total bullshit by nursie. :-) :-) :-)

On the other hand, maybe a sign of an impending vision problem.

Having to look closely at written text may be an indication that an eye examination is required, perhaps for corrective lenses. See

an opthalmologist or optometrist in addition to a mental therapist.

> Here's the full sentence: "I am only 'bitterly resentful' of
pathological
>liars who proactively seek to cause harm to Amateur Radio for no other
>purpsoe than to sate his own ego".

You'll hate yourself in the morning. :-) [every morning]

> You are a pathological liar, Lennie.
>
> You can't tell or acknowledge the truth. Your lying is habitual. Even
>when you DO quote or recite factual information, who can trust you?

Then how do you know anything I write is "factual" if everything
is a "lie?" :-)

Just another "meaningful discourse" nastygram from nursie.

> And you are not a "long time radio amateur". Never were, and God
>willing, never will be.

tsk, tsk, tsk...that's not the way to get a PR job with ARRL...:-)

> Expose. As if it took any effort to do...

tsk, tsk, tsk...remember the lens cap is still on and you didn't
load any film... :-)

> And if you didn't post such foolishness, I wouldn't have anything to
>work with. HARDLY "obsessed".

Your obsession was just admitted. Seek help with that disorder.

> Well, Lennie, I am neither "lay people", nor am I the "sicko" that you
>insinuate.

I didn't "insinuate." I stated it directly. You are obsessed with
trying to fight with newsgroup communicators who don't agree
with you. You defy social convention in acting the sociopath to
all who don't share your viewpoints.

That's a sick attitude to anyone, with or without "credentials."

Get help.

LHA / WMD

5021. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 21:17:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619171732.12940.00000261@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93084

In article <20040619060309.26548.00000245@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000233@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Putzcussionist of the Rock-head group Grateful Dood) writes:
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the
>archived mistruths of an ex radio technician parading about as an engineer,
>Leonard H. Anderson.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)

Nursie be here to just FIGHT anyone not thinking like nursie. :-)

>>>> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)
>>>
>>> There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT mentioned
>>in
>>>Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT
>mentions
>>>in a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !
>>
>> Hmmm...General Dynamics as well as ITT make a quarter million
>> radio sets over a period of 15 years and it is "not" mentioned in
>> any professional journals?!?!?
>
> I didn't say "ever", Your Wimpiness.

tsk, tsk, tsk. [lower-case comment as befits lower-case nursie]

>>> Your point?
>>
>> There's quite a bit of FREE information out there for anyone to
>> find out about military or government radio systems and
>> communications. Been there for a long time, even before the
>> Internet went public such as the SINCGARS.
>
> Great.
>
> Then all those Amateurs who ARE interested in military communications
>DON'T have to depend on QST, et al to discuss them.

...and nursie thinks amateur radio is exclusive, different from all
other radio. :-)

Did nursie ever bother to check out other radio services (other
than the CBs he saw shrink-wrapped at Wal-Mart)?

>> A QUARTER MILLION radio sets of one kind makes for some
>> future surplus market, doesn't it? [that's the most of any one
>> kind of radio system in government history...]
>
> Sure it does. And "surplus" radio gear has NOT been the preferred method
>of getting on the air by Amateurs for TWO DECADES....Not when folks can buy
>brand new, under warranty equipment for under $200.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. For a nearly-fifty "olde-tyme" hamme nursie sure
doesn't know much about surplus. :-)

>> If poor nursie is annoyed at not being spoon-fed enough info
>> through hum radio magazines, then he should not try to mean-
>> mouth those who know about such things. Tsk, tsk.
>
> Perhaps if you HAD been reading those Amateur magazines you'd understand
a
>bit more about what you are talking about.

tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie imagines others' worlds and doings instead
of finding out.

> But you go right on ahead, Lennie...

tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie getting on high horse again, forgetting which
end is head and which is tail. :-)

Nursie hasn't been able to stop many, despite his shouting,
hollering, cursing, and threatening. :-)

> Actually, my words then, as they are now, are that what I did in the
Armed
>Forces have nothing to do with Amateur Communications. Just like YOUR "link"
>with Amateur Radio, Lennie, those "happenings" only shared the theoretical
>basics of radio wave generation and propagation.

tsk, tsk, tsk...translated, nursie never did any military communications
at all (except maybe to use the day room telephone). :-)

Nursie was involved too much in those "hostile actions" in the
military. Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder thing showing
in his postings...

> It's the application...not the physics...that separates you from the rest
>of us, Sir Scummy.

tsk, tsk, tsk...more "meaningful discourse" from nursie? :-)

> Sucks to be you.

Only when I use either of the two Hoover appliances here. :-)

Or the solder-sucker on the bench. :-)

The melting point of solder is well below the temper temperature of nursie...easier to suck up melted solder than to put out the fires of outraged, angry egos such as nursie's... :-)

I guess this must be all of what modern U.S. amateur radio is about...a bunch of mad-as-hell extras berating all the "lower classes." Nice hobby. For Huns and other barbarians...?

LHA / WMD

5022. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 21:17:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619171733.12940.00000262@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93081

In article <20040619053637.26548.00000242@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000234@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>>
>>>> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
>>>> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.
>>>
>>> You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?
>>
>> Jesus Christ, NO...
>
> I am not Jesus Christ, Lennie...It's "Steve".

How about a close cousin to the Antichrist? :-)

> Confused again...?!?! I am not surprised.

Poor baby. Still angry, outraged, and mean-spirited?

A simple rejoinder about "walking on water" and nursie comes
unglued.

[there may not be an epoxy that will hold poor nursie together]

:-)

LHA / WMD

5023. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 22:17:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040619181700.23112.00000558@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93087

In article <2629d0lc9pbhcintocmrb3t2tle3dudnfd@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:

>When you consider that no carrier goes anywhere alone but instead has
>various mixtures of destroyers, cruisers, attack subs, and at least
>one ammo/oiler/supply ship in its CSG (Carrier Strike Groups are
>formed and disestablished on an as-needed basis; but while one may be
>different from another, all are comprised of similar types of ships),
>that's a heck of a lot of radio traffic, so I'm sure the freqs listed
>above only skim the surface. Conspicuous by their absence from the
>above freqs are freqs for LINK-11 (TADIL-A) voice coordination nets,
>for example.
>
>Needless to say, these guys can also change frequency at any time, and
>will according to mission requirements, propagation, QRM, and other
>considerations - including COMSEC.

Roger that, John, thanks.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5024. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 23:58:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93089

In article <20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>
>
>>> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)
>>
>>Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in
>>service.
>
> Okay, on the basis for one wrong statement, you mount an "air"
> assault? :-)

Nope.

On the basis of a whole pattern of your errors, I point them out. ;-)
>
> How does a mistaken NATO code name have a relation with the
> adoption of the NATO phonetic alphabet in communications in
> 1955?

It has the same relation as your experiences at ADA. ;-)
>
> Ah! It doesn't.

Neither does your experience at ADA. ;-)

> But, Rev. Jimmie is out to discipline "his flock"
> for "inaccuracies!" [I sense another Sermon on the Antenna
> Mount in preparation! :-)]

Who is "Rev. Jimmie", Len?
>
>>But in the '60s, when I was growing up, the Soviets had much more nuclear
>>strike capability. I'm old enough to remember the Cuban missile crisis, even
>>though I was only in elementary school at the time.
>

> ...did you also think of U.S. military communications as consisting
> of hundreds of radio operators with headsets and code keys busy
> tapping out messages? :-)

Nope. I knew they had teletype and voice and lots of other systems.

Even a kid of 7 or 8 knew that, in my time.
>
>>> Lives in the PAST.

You sure do ;-)
>>
>>Well, you can't be referring to me.
>>
>>I'm not the one who repeatedly brings up half-century-old military
>>communications experience as some sort of qualification to determine amateur
>>radio policy *today*. While neglecting to mention that the facility involved
>>was entirely paid for by others, and utilized the full-time contributions of
>>over 700 other personnel....
>
> Hmmm...let's see...Rev. Jimmie brings up all the morse code
> ham stuff of the 50s and 60s (plus all sorts of tidbits of old
> ham regulations which don't apply today)

Who is "Rev. Jimmie", Len?

> and I mention that
> the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
> communications in 1948.

They did? Everywhere?

Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?

And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?

> Now what kind of conclusion can we
> draw from that?

That you live in the past, Len. You've mentioned your ADA experience here many,
many times. How there were so many high powered transmitters, all kinds of RATT
systems, millions of messages, etc. And no Morse Code in use. ;-)

That's fine, we're all happy for ya. And the 700+ personnel who were also there
when you were. But what does it have to do with ham radio?

> Oh, yes, my mention is "wrong" since it fails to honor and
> glorify the tradition of morse code in amateurism which must,
> in the Belief system of Rev. you-know-who, be preserved
> forever and ever in amateur radio regulations.

Not at all. It's just completely irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
>
> Okay, any positive statements about morse code are allowed

> and even honored even though some of the individuals involved
> are obviously fish stories.

"some of the individuals involved are obviously fish stories."??

What does that mean?

> Those against morse code are evil,
> wicked, mean, and nasty, are always incorrect and should never
> be considered. :-)

Why should anyone be "against morse code"?

> So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
> intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
> person is for morse code.

Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it or not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.

Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
>
> [someone's belly-button is undone...]

Must be yours, Len ;-)
>
>>Now, *that's* "living in the past"
>
> Wasn't there some stuff by the good Rev. about "the past is
> prologue?" :-)

Look it up in Google and show us, Len ;-)
>
>>I don't "live in the past". But I do have a decent memory, and the skills to
>>use reference resources. That obviously bothers the heck out of you, Len,
>>judging by how you respond to my posts.
>
> Yes, "obviously." So very serious! :-)

When you yell and scream and carry on the way you do here, you sure seem upset. ;-)

>>> He MUST keep on
>>> fighting the good fight over ancient postings, again and again and
>>> again and again and...<yawn>
>>
>>You mean the like the one where you called another poster a "feldwebel" and
>>told him to "shut the hell up"?
>
> Right.

Do you think it's OK to tell someone else in a newsgroup to "shut up", Len?

> The ROE of this newsgroup is:
>
> 1. Any kind of language or lack of civility by any morse code
> proponent is perfectly acceptible, even encouraged.

No it isn't.

> 2. Anything said by anyone who does not love, honor, cherish
> morse code is to be denigrated, insulted, vilified, and looked
> at nasty just because of what they think.

Not at all.

> All of those sub-
> humans must always behave civilly and show respect for the
> code lovers even if the code lovers are behaving as iceholes.
>
> That pretty well sums it up. :-)
>
Really? ;-)

> Rev. Jimmie, go back to Google where you live...
>
WHO is "Rev. Jimmie", Len?

5025. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-19 23:58:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93088

In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:

>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
>they don't?

No.

I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be able to
compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5026. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 00:46:01 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191646.c11f208@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93090

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040616075805.10886.00000418@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <20040613162856.18863.00000383@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20040613090729.23322.00000293@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >(Rev. Jim puts on his Evangelistic robes for
> >a hellfire-and-brimstone Sermon On The Antenna Mount which is
> >really a nasty old Troll for his series of shouting and hollering in the
> >disguise of a "polite" reply) writes:
>
> "You can't have "meaningful exchanges" when you soil the
> communications environment with personal attacks of any kind
> on those who do not agree with you."

Soiling the environment is first nature for Steve, kind of like him
calling out cadence while he walks to the mail box.

5027. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 00:52:38 UTC
From: John Anderson <nobody@spamcop.net>
Message-ID: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
Source record: 93091

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
> <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:
>
> >Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
> >shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
> >they don't?
>
> No.
>
> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
able to
> compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will work
for the people,
not the rich corporations!

http://k0bkl.org/bpl.htm

John Anderson K0BKL

5028. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 00:56:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191656.3f5877d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93092

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<EPWdnQwqSLEI8U3d4p2dnA@adelphia.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <iLCdnbHe55Oo9FHdRVn-sA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >>>In article <20040612005606.23112.00000497@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> >>
> >>lenover21@aol.com
> >>
> >>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>After you've lived and experienced a few eras in anything, you'll
> >>> find lots and lots of "experts" in that anything, who either "know
> >>> all about (from reading a book or seeing a movie)" or are some-
> >>> how so gifted in their relative youth that they are divine
> >>> messengers sent to enlighten all the hoi polloi and the koi.
> >>> :-)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Gee, Len, that's interesting....
> >>>
> >>>You mean like someone who's never held any class of amateur license, nor
> >>>been involved in radio regulation in any way, yet loudly and repeatedly
> >>>proclaims what changes should be made to the amateur radio regulations?
> >>>
> >>>Or someone who has never been directly invoved in the raising of children,
> >>>yet proclaims what they can and cannot do at various ages - even to the point
> >>>of not allowing them to be amateur radio operators before a certain age?
> >>>
> >>>Or someone who has never really learned or used Morse Code, yet loudly and
> >>>repeatedly denies its usefulness - even to the point of denying its
> >>>historical importance?
> >>>
> >>>Or someone who claims a desire for "civil discussion", yet will not carry
> >>>on a civil discussion with someone of differing opinions, and instead refers to
> >>>the other parties by ad-hominem insults to their age, work, gender, license
> >>>class, education, name, ethnicity, and military service?
> >>

> >> You forgot to add:
> >>
> >> "Someone that has a main purpose here of antagonizing people into
> >>e-battles as a master troll." And in this case, his lack of experience
> >>in certain areas only serves as more bait.
> >>
> >
> > Well, if the shoe fits...
> >
>
> Sorry for replies to some older posts. I've been through two weeks of
> hell at work, and didn't get to respond to everything. Now I'm taking a
> well deserved day off and can get back to it.
>
> Yes, the shoe does fit.
>
> >>I for one, am impressed by just how GOOD Mr. Anderson is at this!
> >
> > I'm not.
>
> There are all sorts of reasons to be involved in a newsgroup. Some of
> us like to post to exchange knowledge, some to debate, and others to
> have an adventure - using other posters as pro or antagonists in a sort
> of text based adventure game.
>
> With the different personalities involved, the games can get pretty
> interesting and funny, or sometimes they can become boring and
> repetitive. The MARS is Ham radio stuff is a good example of the latter.

A simple retraction of the wrong statement, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<<
Amateur Radio," is all that is needed for it to end.

> If a poster is the type that is trying to antagonize others - that is
> to say one that is using the group in the text adventure mode - he or
> she does not want to get people so angry that they don't respond. That
> would be losing the game. This player will want to be antagonistic of
> course, but will want to allow other posters to stay just this side of
> filtering or ignoring him or her.

I have no need for others to see my posts. It is interesting that
others claim to have me filtered, but somehow are aware of everything
I type.

Filter away!

Hi, hi, hi.

> Some here filter Len, but enough do not that he finds a steady stream
> of willing participants in his game.

One replies unwittingly. He has no self-control. None at all. Hi,
hi, hi.

> Face it, he is good at it. It may not be what you are in here for, but
> he succeeds in his game.

Remember, at least one is an unwitting participant.

> Note this does not apply to the strange fringe postings that appear to
> be personal battles, such as the one that Dave seems involved in with
> some hams in his locale. That is just really wierd stuff.

Dave has the unique ability to make friends wherever he hams.

> >>You
> >>(or anyone here) know what will happen when you rise to the bait, you
> >>know pretty much what the resulting exchange will be, and yet it is
> >>irresistable.
> >
> > Naw, it's totally resistible. And predictable.
>
> And yet you are now involved once more!

The good Rev. is a willing participant.

> >>Whereas most antagonists eventually find no one to write to in a news
> >>group, Len has managed to generate enough interest to make himself and
> >>those who would spar with him into some of the leading posters.
> >
> >
> > Nothing new there, Mike.
> >
> >> This is no small accomplishment. I for one have to respect that.
> >
> > I don't.
>
>
> You don't have to, that much is true.

But he finds it irresistable. Kind of like the forbidden apple.

5029. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 01:10:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93093

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
> >
> >>> Nobody
> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
> >>
> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
> >
> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>
> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his stinger
> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>
> "Nothing to send."

100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.

Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.

> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.

"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."

Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."

(NCI = No Content Indicator)

> Nursie's big negative nothing. Less rest mass than a neutrino.

A black hole?

> Temper fry...

Tempura!

> LHA / WMD

bb

5030. Article on BPL from Google archives

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 01:14:50 UTC
From: John Anderson <nobody@spamcop.net>
Message-ID: <ey5Bc.120033$3x.32266@attbi_s54>
Source record: 93094

In searching Google for articles and postings
about BPL, I found an article from a website
no longer functioning in Google's archives:

http://k0bkl.org/bpl2.htm

I copied it and posted it above on my site.

K0BKL

5031. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 01:17:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4Mydnat575sMeEndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93095

N2EY wrote:

> In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
> <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:
>
>
>>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
>>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
>>they don't?
>
>
> No.
>
> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be able to
> compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.

So many times in history, Ideology has chosen to ignore everything but that ideology's belief. That is one of the reasons that idealogs hate science.

As absurd as it may seem, the BPL push is part of current ideology. As such, as long as the current ideology is in place, BPL WILL HAPPEN! Once it comes up against science and laws of nature, as well as the marketplace, it will quite simply fail.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5032. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 01:29:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191729.5c253a46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93096

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<t0LAc.9584$Wr.5019@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Except for Heil, none of the regulars were involved in
> > any big-time radio communications experience.
>
> Sunuvagun!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!

Hi, hi.

5033. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 03:17:08 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93097

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>,
> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> >>(N2EY) writes:
> >>
>
> >> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)
> >
> >Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in
> >service.
>
> Okay, on the basis for one wrong statement, you mount an "air"
> assault? :-)

Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].

BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
on HF?

And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?

Hi, hi.

These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.

5034. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 03:28:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uv7Bc.11589$Wr.3855@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93098

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

> Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of how
> much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff?

I don't know current QRO, but in the 70's the COMSUBLANT transmitter at Cutler was 1,700,000W on 15.9KHz and the COMSUBPAC transmitter at Jim Creek was 2,200,000W on 17.1KHz. The ELF site at Clam Lake is reportedly engineered for just under 1,000,000,000W at somewhere just above powerline QRG, 75Hz if I remember correctly. The antenna is just under 29 miles long.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5035. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 03:42:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93099

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040619171730.12940.00000260@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <20040619070253.26548.00000246@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040618154849.15095.00000235@mb-m23.aol.com>
> >>
> >>In article <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>(Steve da CAP Ace with too much carburetor heat) sputters and foams:
> > >
> > > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue". From the
> > >archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> Nursie isn't touching the "morse code test issue" is she? :-)

Len, please don't ask what he's touching.

> Nursie wanna fight, curse, send nastygrams. :-)

Count cadence, count!

> Must be more of that "meaningful dialogue" nursie thinks she is
> engaging in. :-)

"My boots are heavy, my chin strap's too tight..."

> >> That was 29 years ago, senior.
> >>
> >> That was 13 years ago, senior.
> > >
> > > If you're going to parody Spanish, Lennie, you should at least spell it
> > >correctly.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie lost focus again, desperately trying to invent
> another nastygram. :-)
>
> I know it is difficult, but TRY to stay within a few light-years of
> the topics in context.

Give him latinobonics, "senyor."

> >> The DSN (Digital Switched Network) ...(SNIP)
> > >
> > > Even more completely unrealted, off topic trivia from one who must hide

> >behind it.
>
> The U.S. government doesn't have the DSN? tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> DSN works very well. The "government's own internet" as one in
> government put it. I've communicated on it. [no license required]

...Battle Hiram of the Republic playing on the PA.

> >> Try to get with the modern times. Reality is all around you.
> >
> > Yes, it is.
>
> Try to get out of the ham tunnel you inhabit.
>
> > Too bad you can't share in it, eh...?!?!
>
> ? "Share" in your small tunnel? Your little imagination?
>
> >> I am well acquainted with life.
>
> More like death and destruction from appearances. You wish ill on
> all who oppose your opinions, even to the point of wishing them dead.
>
> Nursie wanna destroy anything anyone say about opposite
> opinions as if they are heretical or perverse.
>
> Not a healthy mind indicator to any lay person.

Not healthy at all.

> > Nop, you're not. You are well acquainted with your PERCEPTION of it from
> >behind textbooks and CRTs.
>
> ...and behind radios. Actual radio communications.
>
> Sunnuvagun, how about that?

Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!

Hi, hi.

> Someone other than olde-tyme hammes using non-amateur radios
> for communications! [who would have thought of it? :-)]

Just be sure that most of them are not LE. :))

> >> Reality exists beyond the tattered, dog-eared pages of old QST
> >> issues and ARRL handbooks.
> >
> > Yes, it does. I and others have pointed that out to you on numerous
> >occassions and invited you to come out and try it. You've declined. Too
> >much security in LennieLand.

>
> "Security?" Well, yes, I am secure but not in the sense of document
> security. :-)

Never heard of "DocSec."

> Ah yes, nursie's reality is rated "top sacred" in classification. :-)

Hiram has spoken.

> >> Fort Huachuca was okay in early spring but I've heard it is uncomfortable
> >> in mid-summer, being in Arizona. Glad I wasn't there in mid-summer.
> >
> > I HAVE been there in mid-summer...and late summer when it's actually
> >worse. On several occassions.
>
> Of course you have. You've been everywhere that I've been. :-)

I've never been there. What are their licensing requirements?

> It's all documented in this newsgroup. :-)

Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
the Security Detail with "proof."

See "Cinderella Liberty."

> Nursie has been to an HRO store "with buddies" even when it did
> not exist in a location. :-)

Magical. Maybe he got mushroom.

> >> Sandia Laboratories is different. But, I can't talk much about that
> >> except that visit concerned things like SID.
> >
> > Ahhhhhhhhhh.......I see.
> >
> > Someone else suggests some "security" issues and you try to denigrate
> >them for it.
>
> SID is an acronym for Seismic Intrusion Devices.
>
> RCA Corporation made a bunch of them for the "McNamara Wall"
> in Vietnam, circa 1973-1975. Neat little automatic devices
> reporting back (unattended) by radio to a "Portatale" (familiar
> name) receiver. Could sense footfalls and had internal sound
> processing to differentiate between four-footed and two-footed
> creatures. Did the two antennas for them, accurate pattern
> measurements on the first model, redesign to a "whip" type
> for the second model.
>
> That design is rather outdated now but SIDs are still used by
> the government. I really don't know how much information is
> still classified. What I've reported is from the public-release

> information from Defense Electronics magazine.
>
> Would make a cool variant on a super-tough-to-find "fox hunt"
> transmitter. :-) Transmitter stays silent until the stalker
> comes close. Sort of "role reversal" of the traditional game.
> It would make for very accurate "fox hunt" scoring, though. :-)

"The Hunt for Tight Chin Strap!"

> > You think you're promoting your "insiderness" and you wave it like a
> >flag.
>
> Poor baby. Came all unglued for using an old acronym? :-(
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
> Recon Marine intel patrolling?

Maybe he was a "box kicker."

> >> No, not "rife." :-) If you are trying a larger vocabulary, try to get
> >> something somewhat close to correct...and in context.
> >
> > Yes...rife was correct and in context.
>
> "Rife: (adj) 1. Widespread 2. Abounding (as with error)"
>
> Only in nursieworld where anything not according to nursie is
> "rife." :-)

1/2: Widespread Error.

> >> You are trying to "poison the well" by singling out only specific
> >> instances of what I've mentioned as to experiences and work over
> >> the last 51+ years.
> >
> > In other words, I hit the mark so close that you'll be dressing the
> wounds
> >from the "collateral damage" for days.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...only in nursie's unhealthy imagination, still living
> in the "hostile action" battlezone. :-)

"Fire for Effect!"

> Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from no
> longer being issued a rifle to deal with "rife-ness."

"My boots are heavy, My mind is rife..."

Welp, he still got a handle on reality.

> >>> None of it has anything to do with Amateur Radio.
> >>
> >> Radio is radio, regardless of the differentiation that mere human

> >> regulation makers make of its differences.
> >
> > Only in your mind, Lennie.
>
> Hardly. :-) The FCC knows this, other nations' radio regulating
> agencies know this, the rest of the radio world outside of olde-
> tyme hum radio knows this, academic institutions teaching
> physics knows this, etc., etc., etc.
>
> Nursieworld is all by itself, "a dimension of sight and sound...
> at the signpost up ahead...the Twilight Zone!" :-)
>
> > If that assertion was so true, you'd have no basis for your OTHER rants
> >that insist that Amateurs must spend thier time learning about "other" radio
> >services.
>
> First, amateurs ought to know "thier" own radios...something
> beyond the front panel controls.
>
> Amateur radios work by the same physics as other radios!
>
> Sunnuvagun! A revelation to nursieworld!
>
> > If "Radio is radio", your other assertions are baseless.
>
> Nurise is "right" and everyone else is "wrong." :-)
>
> Nursieworld still stuck in the Twilight Zone again. tsk, tsk.
>
> >> The Pacific Stars & Stripes did not include a nice photo I made
> >> of the MARS antenna newly installed at Hardy Barracks in
> >> 1955.
> >
> > And they didn't use the pictures I had of the Loch Ness monster either,
> >Lennie.
>
> Nursie did an interview with Stars & Stripes?
>
> Where, when, for the Sunday comics section?
>
> [Stars & Stripes does have comic strips in case anyone wanted
> to venture into nursieworld imagination]
>
> >>> "Dictating" what you said?
> >>
> >> Absolutely. You are outraged that anyone dare confront your
> >> ideas and fantasies with actual, real-life experiences. The same
> >> with several others in here.
> >
> > Why is it that all those "others" are focused on YOU, Lennie?

>
> "All?" :-) A few of the regulars in here who are of the same ilk
> as nursie, wanting to fight to the bitter end to preserve and
> protect olde-tyme hamme radio and manual telegraphy?
>
> Wait for the next Sermon on the Antenna Mount...soon to be
> preached by the good Rev.
>
> > Perhaps YOU are the one with the perception problems?
>
> I haven't gotten the rose-colored glasses yet. Don't use any
> nursieworld kaleidoscopes...only oscilloscopes. :-)
>
> > That's a rhetorical question, of course. With absolutely NO experience in
> >Amateur Radio, we know you have no informed, valid expereicen from which to
> >base your comments.
>
> "Expereicen?" New word? From Newington?
>
> Of course. Amateur radio is so vastly different from all other radio
> that one must be licensed and experienced (and be tested in
> manual telegraphy) to understand it. [according to nursie]
>
> Nurise hasn't done jack in any other radio service, only amateur, so
> that's her only basis. Oh wow, profound, that tunnel vision...
>
> >> The dictatorial attitude is fairly common, done with heckling
> >> and name-calling and general denigration in an effort to make
> >> a poster stop writing. Weak intimidation. Works sometimes,
> >> but is not a guarantee of suppressing truth and reality.
> >
> > And therein lies the bane of your existence...
>
> "Bane (n) 1. ruin, death, harm, or their cause 2. poison"
>
> So far, nursie is back on using quaint expressions involving all
> that death and destruction.
>
> Must be all that post-traumatic stress disorder from military
> life again...?
>
> > Still having a hard time wondering why your "superior intellect" can't
> >squash all those "lesser beings" with your infinite wisdom.....
>
> "Squash?" I'm not fond of squash. It's okay as food, but tasteless.
>
> A more proper word would be 'quash.' Two meanings -
>
> "Quash (vt) from the Latin 'cassus' To set aside (in law use)
>

> "Quash (vt) from the Latin 'quatere' To quell as in an uprising."
>
> [dictionary quoting a part of public service offered pro bono...]
>
> > Too bad you can't objectively review what you just wrote against your
> >conduct over the last several years.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...confused on the differences between "objective" and
> "subjective?"
>
> The dictionary is your friend. Get acquainted.
>
> Remember only nursie's alternate personalities live in nursieworld.
> It's all subjective in there...
>
> >>> No one in this forum has made any such assertion. Even those who
> >>>staunchly support Morse Code testing have advocated advancement in the
> >>>service.
> >>
> >> ...by more and more manual telegraphy use, praising its supposed
> >> qualities, and generally getting into silly stuff about how it's so much
> >> "better" than any other mode.
> >>
> >> Note use of the word "service" again.
> >
> > Hmmmmmm....The FCC uses it to describe Amateur Radio.
>
> All throughout Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, the term
> "service" is a regulatory word pertaining to a type and kind of radio
> activity being regulated.
>
> "Service" has many meanings (the dictionary IS your friend and
> you really need one).
>
> Amateur radio is no more of a military or national purpose
> "service" than Citizens Band Radio Service (Part 95, Title 47 C.F.R.).
>
> No one "enlists" in the amateur radio service although some
> actually do feel compelled to treat it like some military service!
>
> > The Commissioners are not licensed Amateurs...Lord knows none of them
> >hold ANY form of licensure by the FCC.
> >
> > YOU frequently point out the Commissioners status.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...why are you stoutly maintaining that anyone "involved"
> in amateur radio "must be licensed?" :-)
>
> > Are you NOW telling us that the language used by those very same
> >Commissioners is WRONG...?!?!

>
> All throughout Title 47 Code of Federal Regulations, the term
> "service" is a regulatory word pertaining to a type and kind of radio
> activity being regulated.
>
>
> >> Military surrogate use. Desire to make amateur radio much
> >> more than it is by trying to identify a hobby with military service.
> >
> > That's YOUR schtick, Lennie.
>
> ? I've been a civilian for 44 years after receiving my honorable
> discharge from the U.S. Army in 1960. [only one, honorable,
> not typed in on any DD-214 which I received in 1956]
>
> >> Tsk, tsk. Lost focus.
> >
> > Nope. Never have.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie keeps forgetting to take off the lens cap.
>
> ...and never loads any film. :-)
>
>
>
> > Nope...It's right on. You make all sorts of assinine assertions about
> >Amateur Radio in general and some Amateurs in particular, then can NEVER back
> >up your assertions.
> >
> > You make assertions of fact.
> >
> > I want you to validate them.
> >
> > You never do. You CLAIM to be a "radio professional". You are not now
> >nor ever were anything of the kind.
>
> Do you need those documents verified by a notary public and
> hand-delivered by bonded courier? :-)
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...I've given my short-form resume in here along with
> living radio amateur references...and nursie never did check them
> out, only issuing spiteful, hated nastygrams. :-)
>
> "Professional (adj) Engaged in some sport or specific
> occupation for pay."
>
> [the dictionary can be your friend but nursie seems to want to fight
> with everyone...]
>
>

> > If you tried to pass off "credentials" like some hobbyist periodicals as
> >"profesional publishing", you'd be laughed out of the IEEE.
>
> Haven't been since first joining IEEE in 1973. One of my sponsors
> was Jim Hall, KD6JG. :-)
>
> ["sunnavagun" as the super chief is fond of saying...:-)]
>
>
> > The "shrinking ham advertising" was due to a lack of support of
> >consumers.
> >
> > No consumers = no advertising monies = defunct.
> >
> > Corporate advertisers do not spend thier advertising monies where it is
> >not netting a reasonable return.
>
> You are close, but you've failed Business Economics 101.
>
> The "shrinking ham advertising" is due to a lack of SPENDING
> for advertising by manufacturers and services in periodicals.
>
> Advertising is basically the same regardless of the product or
> service. It is a means to induce potential buyers of a particular
> product or service.
>
> Most periodicals in the USA exist solely on the basis of
> advertising space sales income. When advertisers do not
> purchase advertising space in periodicals, that periodical has
> less revenue. [I hope you've understood that basic rule so
> far...] Note this carefully: The purchase of advertising space
> has little directly to do with "consumers." Some products and
> services can continue with an absolute minimal amount of
> advertising.
>
> > If "Ham Radio" had been the marvel of publishing accomplishment you'd
> care
> >to have us beleive, it would still be actively published instead of being
> >polished and repackaged as a CD novelty.
>
> HR existed for 22 years as an independent periodical, even
> spun off "Ham Radio Horizons." It started up as an independent,
> continued as an independent. No support was needed by any
> membership organization budget such as QST.
>
> HR was considered the prime technical periodical for amateur
> radio by radio amateurs when it was in its 22 year span. That
> was stated by many, many radio amateurs.
>
>

> >>> Even then I can't find a single example where any of your "work" was
> >>>original, nor can I find any example of where your "contributions" were
> >>>complimentary to the advancement of ANY radio communications discipline.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Having nursie as a critic is like having a blind
> >> color coordinator for interior decoration. :-)
> >>
> >> Try to differentiate between "compliment" and "complement."
> >
> > In either use of either word, there is no professional historical
> >documentation that would indicate that Leonard H. Anderson did anything other
> >than sweep floors in ANY "aerospace" installation or facility.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...personnel records of employees are not normally
> found in "professional historical documentation." :-) Those can
> be verified by personnel departments (now called "human
> resources").
>
> > And as far as your "contributions" to Amateur Radio via your HR pieces, I
> >find no occassion where your work was footnooted, included or otherwise madse
> >part-and-parcel of any other paper or work.
>
> "Footnoot?" "Madse?" :-)
>
> > And I did look. Closely.
>
> Total bullshit by nursie. :-) :-) :-)
>
> On the other hand, maybe a sign of an impending vision problem.
>
> Having to look closely at written text may be an indication that an
> eye examination is required, perhaps for corrective lenses. See
> an opthalmologist or optometrist in addition to a mental therapist.
>
>
> > Here's the full sentence: "I am only 'bitterly resentful' of
> pathological
> >liars who proactively seek to cause harm to Amateur Radio for no other
> >purpsoe than to sate his own ego".
>
> You'll hate yourself in the morning. :-) [every morning]
>
>
> > You are a pathological liar, Lennie.
> >
> > You can't tell or acknowledge the truth. Your lying is habitual. Even
> >when you DO quote or recite factual information, who can trust you?
>
> Then how do you know anything I write is "factual" if everything
> is a "lie?" :-)

>
> Just another "meaningful discourse" nastygram from nursie.
>
>
> > And you are not a "long time radio amateur". Never were, and God
> >willing, never will be.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...that's not the way to get a PR job with ARRL...:-)
>
>
> > Expose. As if it took any effort to do...
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...remember the lens cap is still on and you didn't
> load any film... :-)
>
> > And if you didn't post such foolishness, I wouldn't have anything to
> >work with. HARDLY "obsessed".
>
> Your obsession was just admitted. Seek help with that disorder.
>
>
> > Well, Lennie, I am neither "lay people", nor am I the "sicko" that you
> >insinuate.
>
> I didn't "insinuate." I stated it directly. You are obsessed with
> trying to fight with newsgroup communicators who don't agree
> with you. You defy social convention in acting the sociopath to
> all who don't share your viewpoints.
>
> That's a sick attitude to anyone, with or without "credentials."
>
> Get help.
>
> LHA / WMD

5036. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 05:34:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93102

In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040619171730.12940.00000260@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040619070253.26548.00000246@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040618154849.15095.00000235@mb-m23.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>In article <20040618093017.11031.00000183@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >>(Steve da CAP Ace with too much carburetor heat) sputters and foams:
>> >
>> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue". From
>the
>> >archived lies of Leonard H. Anderson.
>>
>> Nursie isn't touching the "morse code test issue" is she? :-)
>
>Len, please don't ask what he's touching.

I think we all know 'what' when he be posting here... :-)

>> Nursie wanna fight, curse, send nastygrams. :-)
>
>Count cadence, count!

A little close-order Dill on the quadrangle by the Dill Instructor.

We are all "maggots" but him. :-)

>> Must be more of that "meaningful dialogue" nursie thinks she is
>> engaging in. :-)
>
>"My boots are heavy, my chin strap's too tight..."

Not to mention getting a MILITARY handset for that SG-2020 in
a paramilitary configuration! :-)

>> >> That was 29 years ago, senior.
>> >>
>> >> That was 13 years ago, senior.
>> >

>> > If you're going to parody Spanish, Lennie, you should at least spell
it
>> >correctly.
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie lost focus again, desperately trying to invent
>> another nastygram. :-)
>>
>> I know it is difficult, but TRY to stay within a few light-years of
>> the topics in context.
>
>Give him latinobonics, "senyor."

Nah. His jump boots are laced too tight and the campaign hat
fits too snug. Insufficient blood flow to the brain to allow foreign
concepts.

[I used that term in here before, in reference to those "old farts"
that want to go on and on about glorious morse, the first love of
their lives...]

>> >> The DSN (Digital Switched Network) ...(SNIP)
>> >
>> > Even more completely unrealted, off topic trivia from one who must
hide
>> >behind it.
>>
>> The U.S. government doesn't have the DSN? tsk, tsk, tsk.
>>
>> DSN works very well. The "government's own internet" as one in
>> government put it. I've communicated on it. [no license required]
>
>...Battle Hiram of the Republic playing on the PA.

Har! :-)

>> >> Try to get with the modern times. Reality is all around you.
>> >
>> > Yes, it is.
>>
>> Try to get out of the ham tunnel you inhabit.
>>
>> > Too bad you can't share in it, eh...?!?!
>>
>> ? "Share" in your small tunnel? Your little imagination?
>>
>> >> I am well acquainted with life.
>>
>> More like death and destruction from appearances. You wish ill on
>> all who oppose your opinions, even to the point of wishing them dead.
>>
>> Nursie wanna destroy anything anyone say about opposite
>> opinions as if they are heretical or perverse.

>>
>> Not a healthy mind indicator to any lay person.
>
>Not healthy at all.

But nursie be a documented, certificated "extra" (with a license
suitable for framing), therefore "knows" all about hum radio.

>> > Nop, you're not. You are well acquainted with your PERCEPTION of it
from
>> >behind textbooks and CRTs.
>>
>> ...and behind radios. Actual radio communications.
>>
>> Sunnuvagun, how about that?
>
>Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio!
>
>Hi, hi.

Must be a homeland defense radio exercise going on...Tennessee
Thudbolt 2004.

Maybe John has heard some of that? [sorry, John, no offense...]

>> Someone other than olde-tyme hammes using non-amateur radios
>> for communications! [who would have thought of it? :-)]
>
>Just be sure that most of them are not LE. :))

:-)

>> >> Reality exists beyond the tattered, dog-eared pages of old QST
>> >> issues and ARRL handbooks.
>> >
>> > Yes, it does. I and others have pointed that out to you on numerous
>> >occassions and invited you to come out and try it. You've declined. Too
>> >much security in LennieLand.
>>
>> "Security?" Well, yes, I am secure but not in the sense of document
>> security. :-)
>
>Never heard of "DocSec."

The stuff with the pretty borders on the heavy cover sheet, always
kept in a secure filing cabinet with double locks on it. You know...
"Newington Confidential, Secret (because no one knows about it),
and Top Sacred (all about morse code being epitome, etc.)."

I didn't mention "Q Clearance" because that is NOT about Q Codes.

>> Ah yes, nursie's reality is rated "top sacred" in classification. :-)
>

>Hiram has spoken.

See? He got cleared for "top."

Problem is, to get a "top" requires a background check. Guvmint
ain't letting out info from the background investigation...

>> >> Fort Huachuca was okay in early spring but I've heard it is
uncomfortable
>> >> in mid-summer, being in Arizona. Glad I wasn't there in mid-summer.
>> >
>> > I HAVE been there in mid-summer...and late summer when it's actually
>> >worse. On several occassions.
>>
>> Of course you have. You've been everywhere that I've been. :-)
>
>I've never been there. What are their licensing requirements?

Intelligence needed. :-)

>> It's all documented in this newsgroup. :-)
>
>Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
>the Security Detail with "proof."
>
>See "Cinderella Liberty."

I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
"You can't handle the truth!!!"]

>> Nursie has been to an HRO store "with buddies" even when it did
>> not exist in a location. :-)
>
>Magical. Maybe he got mushroom.

Peyote.

>> >> Sandia Laboratories is different. But, I can't talk much about that
>> >> except that visit concerned things like SID.
>> >
>> > Ahhhhhhhhhh.......I see.
>> >
>> > Someone else suggests some "security" issues and you try to denigrate
>> >them for it.
>>
>> SID is an acronym for Seismic Intrusion Devices.
>>
>> RCA Corporation made a bunch of them for the "McNamara Wall"
>> in Vietnam, circa 1973-1975. Neat little automatic devices
>> reporting back (unattended) by radio to a "Portatale" (familiar
>> name) receiver. Could sense footfalls and had internal sound
>> processing to differentiate between four-footed and two-footed

>> creatures. Did the two antennas for them, accurate pattern
>> measurements on the first model, redesign to a "whip" type
>> for the second model.
>>
>> That design is rather outdated now but SIDs are still used by
>> the government. I really don't know how much information is
>> still classified. What I've reported is from the public-release
>> information from Defense Electronics magazine.
>>
>> Would make a cool variant on a super-tough-to-find "fox hunt"
>> transmitter. :-) Transmitter stays silent until the stalker
>> comes close. Sort of "role reversal" of the traditional game.
>> It would make for very accurate "fox hunt" scoring, though. :-)
>
>"The Hunt for Tight Chin Strap!"
>
>> > You think you're promoting your "insiderness" and you wave it like a
>> >flag.
>>
>> Poor baby. Came all unglued for using an old acronym? :-(
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
>> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
>
>Maybe he was a "box kicker."

:-)

>> >> No, not "rife." :-) If you are trying a larger vocabulary, try to
get
>> >> something somewhat close to correct...and in context.
>> >
>> > Yes...rife was correct and in context.
>>
>> "Rife: (adj) 1. Widespread 2. Abounding (as with error)"
>>
>> Only in nursieworld where anything not according to nursie is
>> "rife." :-)
>
>1/2: Widespread Error.

He have riferong mistakes.

>> >> You are trying to "poison the well" by singling out only specific
>> >> instances of what I've mentioned as to experiences and work over
>> >> the last 51+ years.
>> >
>> > In other words, I hit the mark so close that you'll be dressing the
wounds
>> >from the "collateral damage" for days.
>>

>> tsk, tsk, tsk...only in nursie's unhealthy imagination, still living
>> in the "hostile action" battlezone. :-)
>
>"Fire for Effect!"

BASS...breath, aim, sight, squeeeeeeze...

He a big shot. "A few ounces of pressure," etc. Not much needed
for him to shoot off his mouth...or keyboard.

>> Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from no
>> longer being issued a rifle to deal with "rife-ness."
>
>"My boots are heavy, My mind is rife..."
>
>Welp, he still got a handle on reality.

I think the handle came loose a long time ago.

LHA / WMD

5037. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 05:34:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620013452.22098.00000404@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93101

In article <4Mydnat575sMeEndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
>> <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:
>>
>>>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
>>>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
>>>they don't?
>>
>> No.
>>
>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be able
to
>> compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>
> So many times in history, Ideology has chosen to ignore everything but
>that ideology's belief. That is one of the reasons that idealogs hate
>science.
>
> As absurd as it may seem, the BPL push is part of current ideology. As
>such, as long as the current ideology is in place, BPL WILL HAPPEN! Once
>it comes up against science and laws of nature, as well as the
>marketplace, it will quite simply fail.

Sad to say, BPL (and PLC) already happened. Three areas now and
a fourth coming on-line soon in the USA.

According to NTIA and that wonderful Michael Gallagher (Asst.
something or other there) praising the snit out of BPL, BPL offers
some wonderful things ahead -

1. Powerline noise will actually DROP as a result of installing BPL
since untilies must fix that in order for BPL to get data through!

2. Existing BPL systems 'merely' raise the HF noise floor the
small amount of 10 db. Not a problem says them in Phase
2 study.

3. President Bush (the younger) says "the country needs BPL"
and the party faithfull followers reprise that throwaway mantra.
Ergo, if da Prez say 'we' need it, then 'we' need it. End msg.

"Idealogues?" Nah. "Take-the-lobbyist-handout-monies-and-run-logues."

Don't worry about any HF receiver sensitivity values in the future. Won't matter. Noise floor will have moved up 10 db and a Noise Factor of 20+ in a front end will do the job in that hash.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5038. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 05:34:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620013453.22098.00000405@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93100

In article <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >>> Nobody
>> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
>> >>
>> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>> >
>> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>stinger
>> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>>
>> "Nothing to send."
>
>100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.
>
>Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.

Nursie NEVER lie. Not allowed.

>> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.
>
>"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."
>
>Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."
>
>(NCI = No Content Indicator)

"I don't know, but I've been told, old old arguments are mighty
cold...hup, too, tree, Foah!" :-)

>> Nursie's big negative nothing. Less rest mass than a neutrino.
>

>A black hole?

Shhhh...don't mention Those things...the good Rev. might get
upset!

Steven wouldn't be caught Hawking one of them, either... :-)

>> Temper fry...
>
>Tempura!

"If you knew sushi, like I know sushi, oh, oh, pass me da Tums."

:-)

LHA / WMD

5039. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 05:34:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620013455.22098.00000406@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93103

In article <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>> n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> >>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)
>> >
>> >Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in
>> >service.
>>
>> Okay, on the basis for one wrong statement, you mount an "air"
>> assault? :-)
>
>Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
>(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
>that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].

I get a kick out of the "patriots" who never served in our military
making all kinds of big, important noises about "the war effort!"

Jimmie wants to support Katapult Kellie and his shooting bears
for naval intelligence...so he loves to pick on those who served
rather close to USSR territory.

Never mind that a major area headquarters had all kinds of radio
communications running 24/7 to the States and elsewhere or
that Joe had The Bomb or that the Cold War was anything but
cold in the fifties and sixties. Jimmie gotta drag out one of the
Jane's books and Lecture all about USSR aircraft instead. Like
Jimmie spent a lot of time on the flight line, of course. :-(

Then Jimmie is working up to a hissy-fit asking "who's Rev.
Jim?" After several Sermons on the Antenna Mount, he
doesn't know?!?

Heck, he may be doing a Gibson for a religious picture, drumming
up support?

[Hoot Gibson, not Mel...]

>BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
>on HF?

I'd heard that. :-)

Along with manual telegraphy skills are the epitome of excellence,
the heart and soul of U.S. amateur radio and "morse code is fast."

>And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?
>
>Hi, hi.
>
>These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.

Could be too much RF exposure? [or the UHF connector got
put into the wrong receptacle?}

All I bothered to mention was that the old military phonetic
alphabet ("able, baker, charlie") got replaced with the NATO
phonetic alphabet ("alpha, bravo, charlie") in 1955...my next
to the last year of active duty in the U.S. Army.

Jimmie wants to rehash old, old arguments in this newsgroup
rather than focus on the reality of now. I guess he figures that
repeating the old stuff over and over might allow him to "win"
one of the arguments...like watching re-runs of "Wheel of
Fortune" and hoping some contestant will guess diffeently and
win more...

Silly. Yeah.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5040. For all I have Mail Delivery Subsystem

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 08:43:56 UTC
From: Zoran Dimitrijevic <zorandi@EUnet.yu>
Message-ID: <cb3ink$b0$1@news.eunet.yu>
Source record: 93104

THIS WHOLE STORY IS OPENED AND PERMISSIVE FOR PUBLISH FOR EVERY WHO WISH ON WHATEVER WAY.
NO LIMIT, NOT CONTRACT
Likewise, is PERMISSIVE every my email and www address.

My self
Zoran Dimitrijevic

zorandi2002@yahoo.com
nikaca2000@yahoo.com
or
ICQ
263-211-512
or , but is email occasionally Blocked I can't send and receive
zorandi@EUnet.yu
nacom@EUnet.yu

http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom
http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom/Obrenovici.htm
or download
http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom/Obrenovici.zip

5041. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 12:58:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620085821.18097.00000029@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93105

In article <4Mydnat575sMeEndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
>> <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:

>>>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
>>>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
>>>they don't?

>> No.

>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.

>So many times in history, Ideology has chosen to ignore everything but
>that ideology's belief. That is one of the reasons that idealogs hate
>science.
>
Yep.

They also choose to ignore the past, which is why they also hate history. You see this in their cries of "Luddite" and "we're in a new era now" and "stop living in the past".

>As absurd as it may seem, the BPL push is part of current ideology.

Part of *some people's* current ideology.

And it may be more of a question of expediency than ideology.

The recent boom-dot-bust mess hit a lot of folks hard. While the economy slowly recovers and unemployment drops, a lot of good (read "manufacturing jobs with decent pay and benefits") jobs are being replaced by "service economy" jobs (read "do you want fries with that?").

With the election only months away, the incumbents want to be seen as doing and supporting things that will result in more "good" jobs and start another technoboom. The reality won't hit for at least a year, at which time it can be blamed on the "liberals" and the "antenna huggers" and such.

>As
>such, as long as the current ideology is in place, BPL WILL HAPPEN!

It's already in service at a few sites. The direct result of people wanting "less regulation" and "get the government off our backs".

>Once
>it comes up against science and laws of nature, as well as the
>marketplace, it will quite simply fail.
>
I hope so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5042. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:14:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620091421.11752.00000243@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93106

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>Date: 6/19/2004 2:16 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <2629d0lc9pbhcintocmrb3t2tle3dudnfd@4ax.com>
>
>On 19 Jun 2004 05:57:47 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>In article <1k67d0p4qbdt7cg8vfvslc501q4mo9aakb@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur
>KC2HMZ
>><kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:
>>
>>>On 18 Jun 2004 19:48:44 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>>
>>>> See the Army Communicator write-up on Grecian Firebolt 2002
>>>> for a good example. :-)
>>>
>>>For that matter, just turn on a shortwave receiver. Grecian Firebolt
>>>2004 is being conducted as I type this, and will continue until some
>>>time in August.
>>
>> Interesting! :-)
>>
>> Frequencies?
>
>Among those that have been logged over the last week or so are:...(SNIPPED)

Very interesting.

I note only one MARS callsign there, and it's NOT a facility callsign.
Rather it's one assigned to an individual (read that "licensed Amateur").

Guess all those "professional" MARS operators were taking a break.

I am curious about the German callsign that John attributes to being in
Washington state? A typo...?!?!

I see at least one reference to a Civil Air Patrol station.

I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices being
employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems. (Certain
posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess they
will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5043. My email is full blocked, I can`t receive ours mail, else are empty

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:26:10 UTC
From: Zoran Dimitrijevic <zorandi@EUnet.yu>
Message-ID: <cb43dt$6ku$8@news.eunet.yu>
Source record: 93110

My email is full blocked, I can`t receive ours mail, else are empty

Samps on I sent messages:

alt.personals
alt.personals.interracial
alt.personals.misc.
alt.personals.vancouver
alt.usage.English
news.answers
rec.tadio.amateur
rec.radio.amateur.antenna
rec,radio.amateur.boatanchors
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc.
rec.radio.amateur.dx
rec.radio.amateur.equipment
rec.radio.amateur.homebrew
rec.radio.amateur.misc.
rec.radio.amateur.policy
rec.radio.amateur.space
rec.radio.amateur.swap
rec.radio.info
uk.railway
yu.eunet.oglasi
yu.forum.politika

where not my answers, I not see ours questions

I have free space on

zorandi@EUnet.yu 30Mb
nacomp@EUnet.yu 30Mb
zorandi2002@yahoo.com 100Mb
nikaca2000@yahoo.com 100Mb

I not receive neither messages ours because are Blocked of telepathy master

But, I working and never desist
If Somebody that commit Redirection my addresses of own site, Please.

THIS WHOLE STORY IS OPENED AND PERMISSIVE FOR PUBLISH FOR EVERY WHO WISH ON
WHATEVER WAY.
NO LIMIT, NOT CONTRACT
Likewise, is PERMISSIVE every my email and www address.

My self
Zoran Dimitrijevic

zorandi2002@yahoo.com
nikaca2000@yahoo.com
or
ICQ
263-211-512
or , but is email occasionally Blocked I can't send and receive
zorandi@EUnet.yu
nacom@EUnet.yu

http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom
http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom/Obrenovici.htm
or download
http://www30.brinkster.com/aferatelekom/Obrenovici.zip

5044. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:31:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620093151.11752.00000244@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93107

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/19/2004 6:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:

>> and I mention that
>> the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> communications in 1948.
>
>They did? Everywhere?
>
>Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>
>And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?

I guess we can throw out as "irrelevent" the fact that there has been
rather thorough documentation of the Armed Forces' use of "manual telegraphy"
for routine communications right up to the 80's....And NOT "spoon fed by ARRL
publications".

Of course those are FACTS, and facts don't sit well with one who can't
stand the truth.

>> Okay, any positive statements about morse code are allowed
>> and even honored even though some of the individuals involved
>> are obviously fish stories.
>
>"some of the individuals involved are obviously fish stories."??
>
>What does that mean?

It means that if it ruins one of Lennie's rants it but be a fish story.

>> Those against morse code are evil,
>> wicked, mean, and nasty, are always incorrect and should never
>> be considered. :-)
>
>Why should anyone be "against morse code"?

Becasue to be "for" Morse Code is to be AGAINST Lennie...Can't have that
now!

>> So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>> intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as

>> person is for morse code.
>
>Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it or
>not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and
>photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.

Once again Lennie displays his colors with the "olde tyme hamme"
reference.

>>>> He MUST keep on
>>>> fighting the good fight over ancient postings, again and again and
>>>> again and again and...<yawn>
>>>
>>>You mean the like the one where you called another poster a "feldwebel" and
>>>told him to "shut the hell up"?
>>
>> Right.
>
>Do you think it's OK to tell someone else in a newsgroup to "shut up", Len?

Obviously he does. He does it frequently. Usually when he's got his tail
caught under yet another rocking chair, which is pretty frequently these days!

>> The ROE of this newsgroup is:
>>
>> 1. Any kind of language or lack of civility by any morse code
>> proponent is perfectly acceptible, even encouraged.
>
>No it isn't.

No more or no less than the use of blatant profanity by allegedly college
educated, "professional" engineers who are "against" Morse Code.

>> 2. Anything said by anyone who does not love, honor, cherish
>> morse code is to be denigrated, insulted, vilified, and looked
>> at nasty just because of what they think.
>
>Not at all.

No more or less than the insistence by certain alleged "professionals"
that Amateurs show awe and reverence to them as our "superiors"...Recent
suggestions by one of those alleged professionals that some in this forum are
"jealous" or otherwise despise them for BEING an (alleged) engineer is a prime
example.

>> All of those sub-
>> humans must always behave civilly and show respect for the
>> code lovers even if the code lovers are behaving as iceholes.
>>
>> That pretty well sums it up.
>>
>Really?

Again with the inference of profanity.

Some professional.

>> Rev. Jimmie, go back to Google where you live...
>>
>WHO is "Rev. Jimmie", Len?

Sheeesh, Jim...You don't expect Lennie will ever live up to his own rhetoric and treat others in the same way he demands that HE be treated...even when you ARE treating him the way he expects...?!?!

Almost seven years now and I STILL have yet to see him do as he professes or what he says he will do.

And I take the "...go back to Google" remark to be yet another "shut up" by someone who can't stand being made a fool of with his own words....Again.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5045. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:39:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93108

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
>
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...

>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
>able to
>> compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will work
>for the people,
>not the rich corporations!

And replace him with who? John Kerry? A guy who sat side-by-side with
this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!

Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with them...?!?!

George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
conviction and honesty. Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.

This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
electing another.

Steve, K4YZ

5046. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:42:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620094250.11752.00000246@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93109

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/19/2004 4:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040619171733.12940.00000262@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040619053637.26548.00000242@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000234@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
>>>>> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.
>>>>
>>>> You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?
>>>
>>> Jesus Christ, NO...
>>
>> I am not Jesus Christ, Lennie...It's "Steve".
>
> How about a close cousin to the Antichrist?

I am sure you wish it were true.

>> Confused again...?!?! I am not surprised.
>
> Poor baby. Still angry, outraged, and mean-spirited?

I am not being mean spirited by pointing out your errors, Lennie.

Why do you disdain them? They're yours, afterall!

Steve, K4YZ

5047. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:48:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620094803.11752.00000247@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93111

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/19/2004 4:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040619171732.12940.00000261@mb-m25.aol.com>

> The melting point of solder is well below the temper temperature
> of nursie...easier to suck up melted solder than to put out the
> fires of outraged, angry egos such as nursie's.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...Leonard H. Anderson, alleged engineer and proven pathological liar.

> I guess this must be all of what modern U.S. amateur radio is
> about...a bunch of mad-as-hell extras berating all the "lower
> classes." Nice hobby. For Huns and other barbarians...?

All the nicer without a lying, disgraceful ex-technician who thinks he knows better NOT in it, Lennie...

That would be you, byt the way...

Sucks to be you...again.

Steve, K4YZ

5048. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:52:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620095205.11752.00000248@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93112

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/19/2004 10:17 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>

>Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
>(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
>that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].

You made this up, right?

More over, do you BELIEVE what you wrote? I ask because there is more than a small amount of evidence to the contrary.

>BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
>on HF?
>
>And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?
>
>Hi, hi.
>
>These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.

Kinda like "Unlicensed devices play a major role in "emergency comms"...?!?!

Or..."I operated portable from Somalia"...?!?!

And let's not forget..."I consider Len to be my mentor and I admire him"...

Sheeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

5049. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 13:57:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620095712.11752.00000249@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93113

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/19/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>> Nobody
>> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
>> >>
>> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>> >
>> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>stinger
>> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>>
>> "Nothing to send."
>
>100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.

That you may have sent out "QSL" cards is not at issue. That you sent out
QSL cards confirming your activites from Somalia are.

What IS at issue is the validity of the operation (it wasn't) and whom you
may have had QSO's with (you refuse to state).

So far, you've not provided us with anything more than a claim that you
operated from Somalia.

Even if you DID "operate" from Somalia, from your own words in THIS forum
it's apparent that you did not have legal sanction to do what you allege to
ahve done, ergo the cards are invalid for ANY purpose other than a keepsake.

No Proof = Didn't Happen.

Steve, K4YZ

5050. Happy Father's Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 14:38:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <TjhBc.70272$V57.8989374@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 93114

Wishing everybody (...and I mean EVERYBODY!) on r.r.a.p a very warm and happy Father's Day. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5051. Re: Happy Father's Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 15:41:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620114117.05605.00000270@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93115

>Subject: Happy Father's Day
>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM
>Date: 6/20/2004 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <TjhBc.70272$V57.8989374@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
>
>Wishing everybody (...and I mean EVERYBODY!) on r.r.a.p a very warm and
>happy Father's Day. :-)
>

Dittos to all the Daddies!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5052. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 17:13:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950E861F4E118elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93116

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in
news:20040620095712.11752.00000249@mb-m11.aol.com:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>>> >
>>> >>> Nobody
>>> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged
>>> >>> operation.
>>> >>
>>> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>>> >
>>> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>>> >
>>> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>>> stinger got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good
>>> rash...
>>> :-)
>>>
>>> "Nothing to send."
>>
>>100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL
>>card.
>
> That you may have sent out "QSL" cards is not at issue. That you
> sent out
> QSL cards confirming your activites from Somalia are.
>
> What IS at issue is the validity of the operation (it wasn't) and
> whom you
> may have had QSO's with (you refuse to state).
>

> So far, you've not provided us with anything more than a claim
> that you
> operated from Somalia.
>
> Even if you DID "operate" from Somalia, from your own words in
> THIS forum
> it's apparent that you did not have legal sanction to do what you
> allege to ahve done, ergo the cards are invalid for ANY purpose other
> than a keepsake.
>
> No Proof = Didn't Happen.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
>
>
>

Don't forget, the requirements for DXCC are far more stringent than those of mere legality. I have seen threads before where people have argued past oneanother on this point, i.e. one of them has used the term 'legal' when they were really talking about DXCC eligibility, a big mistake.

For example, operation without the permission of the owner of the land or building is not valid for DXCC, but it is seldom illegal. More to the point in this case, perhaps(?), operation from a war zone is legal with permission of whoever appears to be in control, but good luck getting it approved for DXCC.

5053. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 18:47:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93117

Yes,

We got rid of Nixon. Now we need to dump Bush.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5054. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 18:51:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <e1lBc.3208$ph6.1562@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93118

It would seem prudent to have the ARRL petition the FCC to raise amateur power limits to partially recover that lost 10 dB. I think perhaps a 10 kw limit would be close enough. It might also make BPL communications a bit dicey too ;)

Seriously, however, it is going to be interesting when BPL lines are found adjacent to an active amateurs' property. BPL *will* be affected by rf. Fire up your gallons.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20040620013452.22098.00000404@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <4Mydnat575sMeEndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
> >> <radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:
> >>
> >>>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
> >>>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
> >>>they don't?
> >>
> >> No.
> >>
> >> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
able
> to
> >> compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
> >
> > So many times in history, Ideology has chosen to ignore everything but
> >that ideology's belief. That is one of the reasons that idealogs hate
> >science.
> >
> > As absurd as it may seem, the BPL push is part of current ideology. As
> >such, as long as the current ideology is in place, BPL WILL HAPPEN! Once
> >it comes up against science and laws of nature, as well as the
> >marketplace, it will quite simply fail.
>
> Sad to say, BPL (and PLC) already happened. Three areas now and
> a fourth coming on-line soon in the USA.
>

> According to NTIA and that wonderful Michael Gallagher (Asst.
> something or other there) praising the snit out of BPL, BPL offers
> some wonderful things ahead -
>
> 1. Powerline noise will actually DROP as a result of installing BPL
> since untilies must fix that in order for BPL to get data through!
>
> 2. Existing BPL systems 'merely' raise the HF noise floor the
> small amount of 10 db. Not a problem says them in Phase
> 2 study.
>
> 3. President Bush (the younger) says "the country needs BPL"
> and the party faithfull followers reprise that throwaway mantra.
> Ergo, if da Prez say 'we' need it, then 'we' need it. End msg.
>
> "Idealogues?" Nah. "Take-the-lobbyist-handout-monies-and-run-
> logues."
>
> Don't worry about any HF receiver sensitivity values in the future.
> Won't matter. Noise floor will have moved up 10 db and a Noise
> Factor of 20+ in a front end will do the job in that hash.
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5055. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 18:57:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93119

In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
>>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
>>
>>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
>
>>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
>>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>>>
>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will work
>>for the people, not the rich corporations!
>
> And replace him with who? John Kerry?

Why not?

>A guy who sat side-by-side with
>this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!

When did John Kerry sit side-by-side with Hanoi Jane?

And if such proximity disqualifies someone, how about Donald Rumsfeld shaking hands with, and warmly greeting, Saddam Hussein? How about the blind eye the Reagan Administration turned to SH's chemical warfare against the Kurds?
>
>Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
>aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with
>them...?!?!

Hanoi Jane's treasonous actions (not just words) are well documented (see www.snopes.com).

What actions of John Kerry do you refer to? He's a decorated veteran who served in Vietnam, then came back to the USA and opposed that war.

Was he wrong to follow his conscience in doing so? Is anyone who speaks out against a war - any war - automatically wrong?

Consider this, Steve: During WW2, FDR (a Democrat) ran for reelection in 1944, in the middle of the biggest armed conflict the world has ever seen - or hopefully ever will see. Yet the Republicans nominated someone to run against him. Was that giving "aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with them...?!?!"

Or how about when Richard Nixon (a Republican) ran for reelection in 1972, during the very war Mr. Kerry fought in. Mr. Nixon had won in 1968, in part on a platform that involved a "secret plan to end the war" - which was still going on 4 years later. The Democrats nominated George McGovern to run against him. Were either the 1968 or1972 campaigns giving "aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with them...?!?!"

> George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
>Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
>conviction and honesty.

How do you know?

He told us that SH had weapons of mass destruction. He told us that there were solid links between the 9-11 terrorism organizations and SH's regime. Yet up to now *no* credible evidence has been provided to back up those claims - in fact, just the opposite has surfaced.

This doesn't mean Mr. Bush is dishonest. He may have just been mistaken or misled.

>Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
>travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.

What message do you wish to send? That the USA will back its leaders no matter what? That the supply of oil is so important that we will look the other way while our suppliers do almost anything?

>This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
>electing another.

There's no shortage of those - on either side of the aisle.

I'm not saying Mr. K is any better or worse than Mr. B. What I *am* saying is that blind acceptance of any leader's pronouncements leads to trouble. And that condemning someone because of who they allegedly sat next to 30 years ago would lead to a lot of people being condemned...

73 de Jim, N2EY

5056. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 19:34:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201134.6b70e44b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93120

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620013453.22098.00000405@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >>> Nobody
> >> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
> >> >>
> >> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
> >> >
> >> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
> stinger
> >> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
> >>
> >> "Nothing to send."
> >
> >100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.
> >
> >Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.
>
> Nursie NEVER lie. Not allowed.

Congenital. Like Hillary

> >> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.
> >
> >"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."
> >
> >Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."
> >
> >(NCI = No Content Indicator)
>
```

> "I don't know, but I've been told, old old arguments are mighty
> cold...hup, too, tree, Foah!" :-)

I think he played a bit part in "Small Soldiers."

5057. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 19:55:52 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201155.59ab88cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93121

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040619171732.12940.00000261@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <20040619060309.26548.00000245@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000233@mb-m23.aol.com>
> >>
> >>In article <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>(Putzcussionist of the Rock-head group Grateful Dood) writes:
> > >
> > > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From the
> > >archived mistruths of an ex radio technician parading about as an engineer,
> > >Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)
>
> Nursie be here to just FIGHT anyone not thinking like nursie. :-)

Might makes right.

> >>>> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)
> >>>
> >>> There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT mentioned
> in
> >>>Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT
> mentions
> >>>in a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !
> >>
> >> Hmmm...General Dynamics as well as ITT make a quarter million
> >> radio sets over a period of 15 years and it is "not" mentioned in
> >> any professional journals?!?!?
> > >
> > > I didn't say "ever", Your Wimpiness.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk. [lower-case comment as befits lower-case nursie]

"Sorry Hans, Military Communications Journals >>>ARE NOT<<< Amateur
Radio Journals."

Hi, hi.

> >>> Your point?
> >>

> >> There's quite a bit of FREE information out there for anyone to
> >> find out about military or government radio systems and
> >> communications. Been there for a long time, even before the
> >> Internet went public such as the SINCGARS.
> >
> > Great.
> >
> > Then all those Amateurs who ARE interested in military communications
> >DON'T have to depend on QST, et al to discuss them.
>
> ...and nursie thinks amateur radio is exclusive, different from all
> other radio. :-)

Steve doesn't know what he thinks. One minute, just to disagree with
you he says one thing, another minute, just to disagree with Hans, he
says something else. Such as this little gem:

"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

> Did nursie ever bother to check out other radio services (other
> than the CBs he saw shrink-wrapped at Wal-Mart)?

But, but, but... He saw some radios in an EMS van, and he saw some
radios in a police car. But he most liked to run the siren and
blinking lights as they make him convulse.

> >> A QUARTER MILLION radio sets of one kind makes for some
> >> future surplus market, doesn't it? [that's the most of any one
> >> kind of radio system in government history...]
> >
> > Sure it does. And "surplus" radio gear has NOT been the preferred method
> >of getting on the air by Amateurs for TWO DECADES....Not when folks can buy
> >brand new, under warranty equipment for under $200.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. For a nearly-fifty "olde-tyme" hamme nursie sure
> doesn't know much about surplus. :-)

He's expert at wasting surplus bandwidth.

> >> If poor nursie is annoyed at not being spoon-fed enough info
> >> through hum radio magazines, then he should not try to mean-
> >> mouth those who know about such things. Tsk, tsk.
> >
> > Perhaps if you HAD been reading those Amateur magazines you'd understand
> a
> >bit more about what you are talking about.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie imagines others' worlds and doings instead
> of finding out.

Interesting that a person who has written for amateur radio magazines
has never read one.

Len, you otta be ashamed.

> > But you go right on ahead, Lennie...
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie getting on high horse again, forgetting which
> end is head and which is tail. :-)

Even on a regular horse, he needs to mount the horse while standing on
a stump. Can't imagine him ever getting on a high horse.

Maybe he should stick with ponies.

> Nursie hasn't been able to stop many, despite his shouting,
> hollering, cursing, and threatening. :-)

He will never run me off, as he has tried so many times before.

> > Actually, my words then, as they are now, are that what I did in the
> Armed
> >Forces have nothing to do with Amateur Communications. Just like YOUR "link"
> >with Amateur Radio, Lennie, those "happenings" only shared the theoretical
> >basics of radio wave generation and propagation.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...translated, nursie never did any military communications
> at all (except maybe to use the day room telephone). :-)

So that's what he was doing while assigned Bay Orderly. Typical.

> Nursie was involved too much in those "hostile actions" in the
> military. Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder thing showing
> in his postings...

You never know what will set him off.

> > It's the application...not the physics...that separates you from the rest
> >of us, Sir Scummy.
>
> tsk, tsk, tsk...more "meaningful discourse" from nursie? :-)

You apply physics differently in amateur radio? Hmmm?

> > Sucks to be you.
>
> Only when I use either of the two Hoover appliances here. :-)
>
> Or the solder-sucker on the bench. :-)
>
> The melting point of solder is well below the temper temperature
> of nursie...easier to suck up melted solder than to put out the
> fires of outraged, angry egos such as nursie's... :-)

He's like a phosphorous bomb. Lots of sparks and smoke.

> I guess this must be all of what modern U.S. amateur radio is
> about...a bunch of mad-as-hell extras berating all the "lower
> classes." Nice hobby. For Huns and other barbarians...?

>
> LHA / WMD

Len, they're not all that way.

5058. Re: AntiKeyClowns=Sparky???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 19:59:48 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <20040620195948.3DD6F1159D@mail.cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 93122
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thread worth reading

5059. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 20:02:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <9P6dnZod-7pKcEjd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93124

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
truth
> >>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
> >>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
> >>
> >>
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> >>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >
> >>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't
be
> >>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will
work
> >>for the people, not the rich corporations!
> >
> > And replace him with who? John Kerry?
>
> Why not?
>

Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet access (remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own statements) is a right so Kerry could be expected to push BPL even harder than Bush. After all the government should decide what is best for everyone and amateurs are too small a minority to watch out for. Economic reality be damned as far as the liberals are concerned. At least the "rich corporations" will, if BPL is not economical, kill it instead of sinking money into it. After all they want to stay rich.

To really make any inroads in the market, BPL will need to be as cheap as dialup and as fast and reliable as cable modem. I find it hard to believe this combination will happen. The investment is too large. Those who are willing to pay the price for high speed access have already switched to DSL or cable, etc. Even they are fighting to get people to leave dialup but it

is the price that people generally put ahead of speed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5060. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 20:03:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93123

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
> >the Security Detail with "proof."
> >
> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
>
> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]

"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."

> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
> >
> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>
> :-)

"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.

5061. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 20:18:34 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <l0qbd01vq5cc8hnca5qjj81lchqj3rumo2@4ax.com>
Source record: 93125

On 20 Jun 2004 13:14:21 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

> I am curious about the German callsign that John attributes to being in
>Washington state? A typo...?!?!

I presume you're referring to DLA303. Bear in mind that this was logged in reference to a SHARES exercise in support of GRECIAN FIREBOLT 2004. DLA303 is one of ten Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) sites that participate in SHARES. DLA303 is the site in Bremerton, Washington, which also serves as SHARES Coordination Station Northwest. They have HF voice and ALE as well as digital capabilities to support the SHARES BBS (PACTOR). DLA303 is the SHARES registered callsign for this facility, and is similar to tactical callsigns used by hams during ARES/RACES events.

The difference, of course, is that DLA sites are "licensed" by NTIA, not FCC, and thus operate under different rules than we do as regards station identification. They're under no requirement to identify using their NTIA-assigned callsign. DLA303 obviously is not their NTIA-issued callsign, since NTIA does follow a callsign allocation plan that conforms to ITU standards.

As far as I know, all ten of the DLA sites in SHARES use DLA ### calls (DLA303, DLA302, etc.) rather than their NTIA-issued callsigns. The DLA obviouly identifies it as a Defense Logistics Agency site. Wher the numerical part of the call comes from, I have no idea.

> I see at least one reference to a Civil Air Patrol station.

Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.

> I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices being
>employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems. (Certain
>posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess they
>will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!

In all fairness, the frequencies posted were in relation to a military exercise and to an exercise of a radio net oprated by the civilian government in support of said military exercise. This is far removed from the type of "emergency comms" in which GMRS, MURS, FRS, and Amateur stations would be involved.

In fact, GMRS, MURS, and ham stations have no more business checking into a SHARES net than they would have coming up on the military aircraft band and trying to raise Air Force One for a ragchew. However, all of them (along with CB, marine VHF, and any other radio

on which it is possible to establish communications with another station) are of potential value in emergency situations. This is especially true of CB, MURS, and FRS equipment when it is desirable to be able to directly contact by radio individuals who are not licensed in one of the other radio services such as GMRS or the ARS.

The emergency management department in Niagara County, NY keeps several GMRS/FRS portables on hand with just that in mind - which I did not know until the deputy commissioner of emergency management personally handed me one during an activation last year so that he could contact me directly when he wanted to do so.

This is not to say that regular users of GMRS, MURS, FRS, etc. are routinely written into contingency planning for communications during disasters, but the equipment used in those services most certainly can and is routinely procured by emergency management agencies for use during disasters.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5062. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 20:57:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FSmBc.6654$ln2.5418@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93126

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:9P6dnZod-7pKcEjd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
> > In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> > >>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
> truth
> > >>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
> > >>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
> > >>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > >>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >
> > >>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't
> be
> > >>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
> > >>>
> > >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >>
> > >>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who
will
> work
> > >>for the people, not the rich corporations!
> > >
> > > And replace him with who? John Kerry?
> >
> > Why not?
> >
>
> Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet access
> (remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own
> statements) is a right so Kerry could be expected to push BPL even harder
> than Bush. After all the government should decide what is best for
everyone
> and amateurs are too small a minority to watch out for. Economic reality
be
> damned as far as the liberals are concerned. At least the "rich
> corporations" will, if BPL is not economical, kill it instead of sinking
```

> money into it. After all they want to stay rich.
>
> To really make any inroads in the market, BPL will need to be as cheap as
> dialup and as fast and reliable as cable modem. I find it hard to believe
> this combination will happen. The investment is too large. Those who are
> willing to pay the price for high speed access have already switched to
DSL
> or cable, etc. Even they are fighting to get people to leave dialup but
it
> is the price that people generally put ahead of speed.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee,

My guess is that the investment costs will be reflected in power bills that we *have* to pay. Of course, large corporations will get breaks on these rates. Many utilities now charge an "access" fee so they can charge "lower" rates. This means that while my bill states a bit over 8 cents per kilowatt hour, I actually pay close to 13 cents per kilowatt hour. Meanwhile, folks in Fairport and Spencerport pay something like 3.5 or 4 cents per kilowatt hour.

All of this welfare to the wealthy (make 50 grand a year and you may well pay higher taxes than someone making a million a year - they aren't paying Social Insecurity, plus you have "unearned" income, capital gains ...) is slowly bringing this country down.

I am frankly tired of folks blaming "liberals", which, loosely defined is not agreeing with everything the Repooblican party says is gospel. It appears one cannot even be moderate without being called a card-carrying liberal. The last time *everyone* followed a leader without question led up to WWII.

Watch who pays for the infrastructure of BPL. Oh, the operating costs will be paid by the BPL users (assuming it succeeds), but stand by for who will pay the initial costs.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5063. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 21:23:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620172321.23112.00000568@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93127

In article <9P6dnZod-7pKcEjd4p2dnA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>truth
>> >>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
>> >>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> >>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> >
>> >>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't
>be
>> >>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>> >>>
>> >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >>
>> >>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will
>work
>> >>for the people, not the rich corporations!
>> >
>> > And replace him with who? John Kerry?
>>
>> Why not?
>>
>
>Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet access
>(remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own
>statements)

Whoa, hold it right there!

Show us where Algore actually claimed to have "invented the internet".

What he *did* claim, and rightfully so, is to have had a role in enacting the
legislation that made it possible. The record shows that to be a valid claim.

> is a right so Kerry could be expected to push BPL even harder
>than Bush.

OTOH, the "liberals" (a term never well defined) are big on environmental protection, resource conservation and pollution reduction. Since BPL pollutes the RF spectrum (a limited natural resource), it makes sense they would be *against* BPL.

>After all the government should decide what is best for everyone
>and amateurs are too small a minority to watch out for.

Isn't a major role of government that of protecting the minority?

>Economic reality be
>damned as far as the liberals are concerned.

Really?

What's the economic reality of BPL?

>At least the "rich
>corporations" will, if BPL is not economical, kill it instead of sinking
>money into it. After all they want to stay rich.

Is that how the oil industry works? Or the auto industry?
>
>To really make any inroads in the market, BPL will need to be as cheap as
>dialup and as fast and reliable as cable modem. I find it hard to believe
>this combination will happen.

Me too.

It also needs to be compatible. Take your DSL system anywhere in the US, and the hardware still works. That's not true of BPL.

>The investment is too large. Those who are
>willing to pay the price for high speed access have already switched to DSL
>or cable, etc. Even they are fighting to get people to leave dialup but it
>is the price that people generally put ahead of speed.

All true. In addition, the areas served by those nonspectrumpolluting technologies keeps growing and growing. Here in Radnor, PA, we can get dialup, DSL and/or cable service - not to mention satellite.

Then there's the whole issue of wireless access.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5064. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181937.18863.00000462@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93133

In article <Xns950E861F4E118elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>Don't forget, the requirements for DXCC are far more stringent than those
>of mere legality. I have seen threads before where people have argued past
>oneanother on this point, i.e. one of them has used the term 'legal' when
>they were really talking about DXCC eligibility, a big mistake.
>
>For example, operation without the permission of the owner of the land or
>building is not valid for DXCC, but it is seldom illegal. More to the point
>in this case, perhaps(?), operation from a war zone is legal with
>permission of whoever appears to be in control, but good luck getting it
>approved for DXCC.

Alun, if there be some etymology of that thread, no "DXCC" was
involved. No contesting at all was involved.

It began when Heil made some chance remark about "working
Frenchmen on 6m out of band." Brian Burke tossed that one
back to him with some mild ascerbicity which caused Heil to
go bananas. Nursie got out his rusty bayonet, locked and
loaded, and made like the Charge of Lite Brigade (which led
into the Valley of Death of his of today).

Nursie never got to Somalia, certainly not to any "hostile action"
there (or anyplace else with any proof) but Brian Burke did.
Brian earlier had made a chance remark about operating from
there on ham frequencies, getting permission from his
commanding officer. That resulted in a long, overdrawn word
battle and flame war with Heil who was resentful (to the max)
of anyone having the temerity to toss him a rejoinder. Nursie
jumped in on that with usual diss-and-cuss, trying to make
like a legal eagle with smarts instead of the hummingbird
with dumbth.

The PCTA of this newsgrope all seem to be self-righteous,
prissy puritans of perfection who will explode with outrage at
the slightest provocation of their beloved manual telegraphy
as being anything less than the ultimate skill of amateurs.

It's almost as Henry Ford put it on the color of the Model T:
"You can have any opinion you want, so long as its pro-
code."

That's the "new" freedom of speech in here. Enjoy.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5065. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93129

In article <20040620095712.11752.00000249@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Even if you DID "operate" from Somalia, from your own words in THIS forum
>it's apparent that you did not have legal sanction to do what you allege to
>ahve done, ergo the cards are invalid for ANY purpose other than a keepsake.
>
> No Proof = Didn't Happen.

Poor nursie. Kills a horse, then keeps trying to kill it all over again. The beat goes on...

Nursie said he was in "hostile actions" during his military days. Doesn't give ANY details on it, no when, no where.

Nursie claims his "DD-214" says he got an "honorable discharge" (not a medical) even though a DD-214 is a Release from Active Duty and NOT a discharge paper.

Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could verify his general claims.

"No Proof = Didn't Happen."

Under the Rules of Engagement in here, all PCTAs can say they do or have done anything and it is "the absolute truth." All NCTAs have to present proof, give names of references, file notarized legal papers, and probably publish it in the Newington press...and all that will be thoroughly dissed-and-cussed for years in here by the PCTA.

NCTAs can give government document references having full public access specifically about a specific matter and some PCTAs will still deny that such is proof. Hence -

"Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio."

Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5066. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181939.18863.00000464@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93134

In article <20040620095205.11752.00000248@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 10:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>
>
>>Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
>>(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
>>that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].
>
> You made this up, right?

No, nursie, Brian is correct.

The U.S. government stopped amateur radio transmissions
during WW2. Really. It was in all the ham magazines and
everything. Didn't you see it?

> More over, do you BELIEVE what you wrote? I ask because there is more
>than a small amount of evidence to the contrary.

I don't think Brian is old enough to be alive during WW2, but
I was and I believe the U.S. government shut down amateur
radio transmitting during WW2.

Even the ARRL acknowledges that. Really!

>>BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
>>on HF?
>>
>>And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?
>>
>>Hi, hi.
>>
>>These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.
>
> Kinda like "Unlicensed devices play a major role in "emergency
>comms"...?!?!

No, more like "CW gets through when nothing else will..."

Or, that morse testing has to continue for "traditional"
reasons (and because olde-tyme hammes are pished
out and insist all newcomers have to "work as hard" as
they did...because).

It might also be about 26 patents when only 1 exists or shooting bears from an aircraft carrier or some Chesty Puller wanna-be saying "I was in seven hostile actions" and never revealing the When or Where of those. It could also be those old-tyme hammes who made big noises about "I design and build my own ham radios" who, a few days later would talk a lot about his latest Kit project.

Of course, those same individuals have to misdirect a thread into their oh-so-very-important-personal-battles in order to diss-and-cuss those of opposite opinions.

This thread started out about Phonetic Alphabets. The "Able, Baker, Charlie..." U.S. phonetic alphabet is familiar to me because I learned it and used it in the U.S. Army. That set was replaced by the NATO phonetic alphabet ("Alpha, Bravo..") adopted in 1955. I am familiar with that since I was IN the U.S. Army at that time, learned it and used it in military communications. That's unalterable fact despite what those weren't born then or mere infants at the time say.

The NATO phonetic alphabet was adopted by the International Civil Aviation Organization shortly after the U.S. military adopted it. Some in here want to argue and argue that phonetic alphabet is called the "ICAO phonetic alphabet." That's rather petty. NATO had it first. That's unalterable fact. All the aggressive argumentation going on in here seems to be little more than a disguise to diss-and-cuss certain personalities, certainly not the subject matter.

LHA / WMD

5067. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181941.18863.00000465@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93135

In article <20040620093151.11752.00000244@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 6:58 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>> and I mention that
>>> the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>>> communications in 1948.
>>
>>They did? Everywhere?
>>
>>Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>
>>And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>
> I guess we can throw out as "irrelevent" the fact that there has been
>rather thorough documentation of the Armed Forces' use of "manual telegraphy"
>for routine communications right up to the 80's....And NOT "spoon fed by ARRL
>publications".

And what might those "documentation" be, big-time military communicator?

It couldn't be DoD Directive 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03) because nursie sure as heck doesn't understand that.

How about all the alleged uses in Vietnam, 1962 through 1970, as documented on the U.S. Army Center for Military History website? Can't be that one, nursie never saw it, let alone read it.

How about Field Manual FM 24-24, December 1994, the index of Signal Equipment? [available at the Gen. Dennis J. Reimer digital library, public distribution, even linked-to by several ham websites] It has all the land forces signal equipment in there, but, alas, no code keys. Tsk, tsk.

How about "From Flares To Satellites," a USAF history document available for public download from the USAF Communications Agency website (public distribution also, but large at ~14 MB but has pictures for those who can't understand words with more than

two capitalized letters such as "CW")?

Sunnuvagun! Not a single one of those predates the 1990s!

Must be a Big Conspiracy to "hide CW from the masses?"

Riiiight...the motion picture "Independence Day" showed us all
the REAL truth where "CW" is used to defeat alien space
invaders!!!!

> Of course those are FACTS, and facts don't sit well with one who can't
>stand the truth.

Riiiiiight. In nursieland there be only "FACTS" put there by nursie.

>>> Okay, any positive statements about morse code are allowed
>>> and even honored even though some of the individuals involved
>>> are obviously fish stories.
>>
>>"some of the individuals involved are obviously fish stories."??
>>
>>What does that mean?
>
> It means that if it ruins one of Lennie's rants it but be a fish story.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie added that nastygram just for the halibut.

>>> Those against morse code are evil,
>>> wicked, mean, and nasty, are always incorrect and should never
>>> be considered. :-)
>>
>>Why should anyone be "against morse code"?
>
> Becasue to be "for" Morse Code is to be AGAINST Lennie...Can't have that
>now!

Who is "becasue?" [spelled Becky Sue wrong, nursie]

So...the morse code TEST issue is not for U.S. amateur radio
licensing?!?!?

It is all about nursie's hatred and outrage over someone he calls
"Lennie?"

tsk, tsk. Nurise either gone bonkers or has mis-read Steinbeck's
"Of Mice And Men." [the character of Lenny does a murder in
that one...]

>>> So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>>> intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
>>> person is for morse code.
>>
>>Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it or
>>not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and

>>photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.

Riiiiiight. All the newsgroup readers have seen those "real pictures."

Suuurrrrre. :-)

Nursie done flipped out, big time. tsk, tsk.

Yup, like nursie believe Kellie has "26 patents?" :-)

[actually, only one, the other 25 are foreign filings for the same
thing...which doesn't beat mine (3,848,191) assigned to RCA
which has 27 foreign filings...:-)]

> Once again Lennie displays his colors with the "olde tyme hamme"
>reference.

Poor baby. Resent getting to be an OF? [pushing 50, nursie, quit
pretending to be under 30...get a toupee and get those teeth fixed]

>>Do you think it's OK to tell someone else in a newsgroup to "shut up", Len?
>
> Obviously he does. He does it frequently. Usually when he's got his
tail
>caught under yet another rocking chair, which is pretty frequently these
>days!

Riiiiiight. The OF diss-and-cusser wants to more of the same
because his license (engraved border, suitable for framing)
says it is "okay" for him to diss-and-cuss since he passed a
test! :-)

>>> The ROE of this newsgroup is:
>>>
>>> 1. Any kind of language or lack of civility by any morse code
>>> proponent is perfectly acceptible, even encouraged.
>>
>>No it isn't.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...VERY true by easily observed examples. :-)

For years. :-)

KH2D was a master at that. Learn from the master, grasshopper.

> No more or no less than the use of blatant profanity by allegedly college
>educated, "professional" engineers who are "against" Morse Code.

Well, heck and darn, gotta cut down on all those profane words
like "eliminate the morse code test," certainly those terrible
four-letter words like "code" and "test." :-)

Some sissies in here get into hissy-fits with strong language!

>>> 2. Anything said by anyone who does not love, honor, cherish
>>> morse code is to be denigrated, insulted, vilified, and looked

>>> at nasty just because of what they think.
>>
>>Not at all.
>
> No more or less than the insistence by certain alleged "professionals"
>that Amateurs show awe and reverence to them as our "superiors"...Recent
>suggestions by one of those alleged professionals that some in this forum are
>"jealous" or otherwise despise them for BEING an (alleged) engineer is a
>prime example.

Awe shucks, Maude, sissie inna hissy-fit again, him
laffin' an' carryin' on about superior intellect or somthin'...

tsk, tsk, tsk...

>>> All of those sub-
>>> humans must always behave civilly and show respect for the
>>> code lovers even if the code lovers are behaving as iceholes.
>>>
>>> That pretty well sums it up.
>>>
>>Really?
>
> Again with the inference of profanity.
>
> Some professional.

"Icehole" is profane? Nursie insulting Minnesotans' big winter
sport locations? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Well, maybe I should have split it into two words?

Ya know, like "Nursie is an ice hole."

Sound better?

>>> Rev. Jimmie, go back to Google where you live...
>>>
>>WHO is "Rev. Jimmie", Len?
>
> Sheeesh, Jim...You don't expect Lennie will ever live up to his own
>rhetoric and treat others in the same way he demands that HE be
>treated...even when you ARE treating him the way he expects...?!?!

Yup, Maude, sissie still got the hissy-fits...

> Almost seven years now and I STILL have yet to see him do as he
>professes or what he says he will do.

Well, I admit that trying to change the FCC's mind on eliminating
the morse code test from U.S. amateur radio licensing IS a
long, hard task. Been at that since 1988. Sooner or later, that
WILL happen... :-)

Yes, I did officially retire in 1997 and I AM enjoying that, as I said I would. :-)

This project of inventing anti-gravity IS VERY DIFFICULT.
Not going at all as good as I expected. Something is holding me down...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5068. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181942.18863.00000466@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93132

In article <20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
(N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040619171723.12940.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20040619105813.12940.00000256@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20040616134617.23857.00000369@mb-m18.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20040616055756.17843.00000299@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>>
>>
>>>> Not in the mid- to late-1950s, senior. :-)
>>>
>>>Exactly. When you were in Japan, there weren't even any Bear bombers in
>>>service.
>>
>> Okay, on the basis for one wrong statement, you mount an "air"
>> assault? :-)
>
>Nope.
>
>On the basis of a whole pattern of your errors, I point them out. ;-)

Sounds like nursie after the remedial English classes.

"WHOLE *PATTERN* OF ERRORS!!!"

:-)

Billions and billions served? Tsk, tsk, tsk...

Rev. Jimmie Who mounts the antenna and transmits a Sermon.

Meanwhile, I thought this thread to be about Phonetic Alphabets.

Must be the "new" English.

It's really about some angry extra trying to get even for losing
arguments in here years ago.

Yawn.

Rev. Jimmie Who is very predictable in that he WILL bring up old arguments time and again.

We readers aren't sure exactly WHAT will be brought up and WHEN...and that lends a bit of suspense to the proceedings.

Okay, so Rev. Jimmie Who says this thread is "not" about phonetic alphabets.

In that case, "Able Baker Charlie" (in the subject field) must be about some skilled baker with the given name of Charles.

THAT doesn't have much to do with amateur radio, let alone amateur radio policy, does it?

Rev. Jimmie Who, you are becoming more cryptic every day.

Reminder: FCC sayeth amateur communications must not contain encryption or anything intended to obscure meanings.

The 'mean' of "meanings" is obscured, but still visible.

So...tell us about YOUR days in military communications?

Or civilian communications (other than amateur)?

LHA / WMD

5069. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181943.18863.00000467@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93128

In article <20040620094803.11752.00000247@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 4:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040619171732.12940.00000261@mb-m25.aol.com>
>
>> The melting point of solder is well below the temper temperature
>> of nursie...easier to suck up melted solder than to put out the
>> fires of outraged, angry egos such as nursie's.
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...Leonard H.
>Anderson, alleged engineer and proven pathological liar.

Nursie should not be sending so many nastygrams.

That only reinforces the already-perceived-by-readers of her "Antichrist" character.

Neither is your posting any of the "meaningful discourse" you desire. You don't "discourse" when you diss and cuss.

>> I guess this must be all of what modern U.S. amateur radio is
>> about...a bunch of mad-as-hell extras berating all the "lower
>> classes." Nice hobby. For Huns and other barbarians...?
>
> All the nicer without a lying, disgraceful ex-technician who thinks he
>knows better NOT in it, Lennie...
>
> That would be you, byt the way...

Are you saying "byt" me?

> Sucks to be you...again.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...not only dissing and cussing, but very bad sentence structure. Try some remedial English classes. During the day since you abhor night classes. It would make a remarkable difference in improving your written communications.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5070. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181944.18863.00000469@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93130

In article <20040620091421.11752.00000243@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices being
>employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems. (Certain
>posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess they
>will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!

Why would unintentional emitters or very short-range emitters (Part 15) be used in medium-range communications? Doesn't make logical sense.

Personal communications devices (unlicensed, Part 95) CAN be used in such exercises, but for local use. Since they are unlicensed, there isn't much need for all the reporting of those, is there?

PLMRS (Public Land Mobile Radio Service) is licensed but most of that is for local civilian use such as by utilities and businesses and local city-to-state government communications. As far as PLMRS involved in emergency communications, they most certainly are and have been used so for over a decade. PLMRS was used by local governments and utilities over 10 years ago here for the 17 Jan 94 Northridge Earthquake emergency.

The Grecian Firebolt exercises are intended for GOVERNMENT use for emergency preparedness. Government takes those things seriously even though amateurs think they know more and better on everything.

You need some more study on which Parts of Title 47 C.F.R. apply to what civilian radio services. Then a lot more study on preparation of radio communications stations beyond what you've read in QST for winning radio contests.

Good luck on that...

LHA / WMD

5071. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:19:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620181944.18863.00000468@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93131

In article <20040620094250.11752.00000246@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 4:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040619171733.12940.00000262@mb-m25.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040619053637.26548.00000242@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000234@mb-m23.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040618090214.11031.00000181@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>>>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>>>>Date: 6/17/2004 4:45 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>>Message-id: <20040617174533.22498.00000334@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Meanwhile, if I ever find out what's holding me down on the anti-
>>>>>> gravity invention, I will rise above it all.
>>>>>
>>>>> You mean walking on water wasn't enough...?!?!?
>>>>
>>>> Jesus Christ, NO...
>>>
>>> I am not Jesus Christ, Lennie...It's "Steve".
>>
>> How about a close cousin to the Antichrist?
>
> I am sure you wish it were true.

I wish it was NOT true. Unfortunately, the evidence is against that.

>>> Confused again...?!?! I am not surprised.
>>
>> Poor baby. Still angry, outraged, and mean-spirited?
>

> I am not being mean spirited by pointing out your errors, Lennie.
>
> Why do you disdain them? They're yours, afterall!

Idiot. Or you need reading glasses.

I denied being Jesus the Christ.

If you cannot understand a sentence containing a name and one
word, then your mind has gone bye-bye.

Bye-bye and Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5072. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 22:57:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620185742.18863.00000470@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 93136

In article <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>, "John Anderson"
<nobody@spamcop.net> writes:
>
>http://k0bkl.org/bpl.htm
>
>John Anderson K0BKL

I will take a look...

Interesting thing about that name "John Anderson" - reminded me of the 3rd party candidate who helped defeat Carter in 1980.

One of the biggest reasons we got 8 years of Bill Clinton is that Ross Perot divided the anti-Clinton voters. And he did the the same trick twice!

Then in 2000, the shoe was on the other foot. Ralph Nader, the latter-day Harold Stassen, divided the anti-Bush voters enough so that Algore didn't win. (Exit polls of Nader voters showed that if Nader had dropped out of the race, about half of his support would have gone to Gore, a quarter to Bush and the rest would have either stayed home or voted for other 3rd party candidates.) The difference was enough that close states like Florida would have not been close at all. Gore would have won decisively.

So we have the amazing irony that the author of "Unsafe At Any Speed" and lifelong critic of Big Business was the key factor in putting a Texas oilman in the White House.

And he may do the same trick again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

So we had the

5073. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 23:17:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620191701.22984.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93137

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/20/2004 1:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com>

>I'm not saying Mr. K is any better or worse than Mr. B. What I *am* saying is
>that blind acceptance of any leader's pronouncements leads to trouble. And
>that
>condemning someone because of who they allegedly sat next to 30 years ago
>would
>lead to a lot of people being condemned...

Kerry is a chronic apologist. He will do nothing when this country is attacked but wring his hands, say "Oh, we're sorry, did something we do/say offend you?...P L E A S E forgive us"

Having been in the apologist-era Armed Forces of the late 70's, it is my freverent hope that we DON'T allow ourselve to regress to that stage, which is exactly what I fear will happen with this candidate.

Carter tried to castrate the Armed Forces in the 70's.

Bill Clinton didn't try to castrate them...he just made it possible for other guys to play with them....Oh yeah...he let a bunch of ragheads drag some of our guys through the streets of Mogandishu and them rewarded them by doing exactly what they wanted us to do.

Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news. He's already angry that the Republicans have done exactly what they said they'd do, and it's an embarrassment to Democrats.

Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke and mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the mirrors up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.

Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a slow and steady process. They were right.

Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them With Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".

We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark as loud as Kerry. Too bad.

Steve, K4YZ

5074. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 23:23:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93138

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> > and I mention that
> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
> > communications in 1948.
>
> They did? Everywhere?
>
> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>
> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?

And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.

>
> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
> > person is for morse code.
>
> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it or
> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and
> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.

Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
didn't ya? Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS. No
such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.

I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
aboard. The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
work for me for cheap.
Steerage dwellers.

>
> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.

End of.

w3rv

5075. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 23:42:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93139

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
> Yes,
>
> We got rid of Nixon. Now we need to dump Bush.
>
> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Nixon resigned.

We impeached Clinton because he didn't have the decency to resign.

5076. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-20 23:53:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93140

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
> > >
> > > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft some
> > >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts, Lennie!
>
> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?
>
> >> Bon apetit and temper fry...
> > >
> > > Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.
>
> Have you seen a doctor about your problem, puppetnursie?

He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
pretend they're thin when they're not.

> Or do you do your own diagnoses, like practicing medicine
> without the legal license? [a big no-no in most states]

He no do nuttin illegal. He one squared away marine. All his stuff
in one sock.

> Get some mental therapy, puppetnursie. That would help all
> those around you...if not yourself...

He no care 'bout others.

> Sociopathy CAN be cured.

I'll bet this case cannot.

5077. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:43:37 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ZaqBc.6688$wQ2.5058@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93141

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:uv7Bc.11589$Wr.3855@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
>
> > Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of how
> > much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff?
>
> I don't know current QRO, but in the 70's the COMSUBLANT transmitter at
> Cutler was 1,700,000W on 15.9KHz and the COMSUBPAC transmitter at Jim
> Creek was 2,200,000W on 17.1KHz. The ELF site at Clam Lake is
> reportedly engineered for just under 1,000,000,000W at somewhere just
> above powerline QRG, 75Hz if I remember correctly. The antenna is just
> under 29 miles long.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
Hello, Hans

And *we* are paying for it ;)
Those are *big* qro rigs LOL

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5078. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:44:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <gNmdnW8r_fWCrUvdRVn-jg@comcast.com>
Source record: 93143

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:FSmBc.6654$ln2.5418@news02.roc.ny...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:9P6dnZod-7pKcEjd4p2dnA@comcast.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
> > > In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>,
k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve
> > > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > >
> > > >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it
for
> > truth
> > > >From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
> > > >Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> > > >>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > > >
> > > > >>> I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply
won't
> > be
> > > > >>> able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > >>
> > > > >>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who
> > will
> > > work
> > > > >>for the people, not the rich corporations!
> > > > >
> > > > > And replace him with who? John Kerry?
> > > >
> > > > Why not?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet
access
> > (remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own

> > statements) is a right so Kerry could be expected to push BPL even
harder
> > than Bush. After all the government should decide what is best for
> everyone
> > and amateurs are too small a minority to watch out for. Economic
reality
> be
> > damned as far as the liberals are concerned. At least the "rich
> > corporations" will, if BPL is not economical, kill it instead of sinking
> > money into it. After all they want to stay rich.
> >
> > To really make any inroads in the market, BPL will need to be as cheap
as
> > dialup and as fast and reliable as cable modem. I find it hard to
believe
> > this combination will happen. The investment is too large. Those who
are
> > willing to pay the price for high speed access have already switched to
> DSL
> > or cable, etc. Even they are fighting to get people to leave dialup but
> it
> > is the price that people generally put ahead of speed.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Dee,
>
> My guess is that the investment costs will be reflected in power bills
that
> we *have* to pay. Of course, large corporations will get breaks on these
> rates. Many utilities now charge an "access" fee so they can charge
"lower"
> rates. This means that while my bill states a bit over 8 cents per
kilowatt
> hour, I actually pay close to 13 cents per kilowatt hour. Meanwhile,
folks
> in Fairport and Spencerport pay something like 3.5 or 4 cents per kilowatt
> hour.
>

Well keep in mind that the utility companies will have to go before the
state's public utilities commision and get their approval to raise electric
rates to pay for internet. This could be a hard sell.

> All of this welfare to the wealthy (make 50 grand a year and you may well
> pay higher taxes than someone making a million a year - they aren't paying
> Social Insecurity, plus you have "unearned" income, capital gains ...) is
> slowly bringing this country down.
>
> I am frankly tired of folks blaming "liberals", which, loosely defined is

> not agreeing with everything the Repooblican party says is gospel. It
> appears one cannot even be moderate without being called a card-carrying
> liberal. The last time *everyone* followed a leader without question led
up
> to WWII.
>

That's OK. I'm just as tired of folks blaming "conservatives" for the world's ills. It cuts both ways. Both groups have had good ideas and bad ideas.

> Watch who pays for the infrastructure of BPL. Oh, the operating costs
will
> be paid by the BPL users (assuming it succeeds), but stand by for who will
> pay the initial costs.
>
>

Again they will have to have the approval of the state's public utility commission and this could be difficult in some states. Just as people are unwilling to step up to the cost of cable modems, etc for high speed access, they will be just as irate or even more irate at proposals to increase electric rates.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5079. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:45:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%cqBc.6689$XQ2.4037@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93142

"John Siegel" <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:40D49764.90009@worldnet.att.net...
>
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
> > "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:E3ZAc.6709$w07.3497@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> >>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>> Which one of super chief's ships had over 30 HF transmitters,
> >>> and all of them 1 KW or higher?
> >>>
> >>
> >>All "big-time radio communications experience" does not happen on HF,
> >>30 transmitters is not a remarkable number of transmitters, and power
> >>levels of a mere 1KW are distinctly small-time. But to satisfy your
> >>criteria, here are a few examples of my assignments with more than 30
> >>transmitters, 1KW or larger.
> >>
<<snip>>
> >>
> >>How many 200 KW and 600KW transmitters did the super corporal of ADA
> >>operate?
> >>
> >>With all kind wishes,
> >>
> >>Hans Brakob
> >>Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> > Hello, Hans
> >
> > Most interesting, indeed. Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of
how
> > much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff? Just curious. When you
start
> > talking 6 zeros in the power level, three zeroes *does* start to look
pretty
> > small time ;)

> >
> > Best regards from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
> QST had a story many years ago when the VLF station in Maine was first
> opened. I remember
> a picture of a man standing up inside the coax. Power was in the 2
> Megawatt range.
> John
>
John,

I wouldn't want to be standing up inside the coax when they fire *that* baby
up :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5080. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:54:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620205410.14094.00000267@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 93146

In article <1e4e3692.0406201134.6b70e44b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620013453.22098.00000405@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >>> Nobody
>> >> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged
>operation.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>> >> >
>> >> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>> >>
>> >> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>> stinger
>> >> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>> >>
>> >> "Nothing to send."
>> >
>> >100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.
>
>> >
>> >Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.
>>
>> Nursie NEVER lie. Not allowed.
>
>Congenital. Like Hillary

Hillary never lied? :-)

>> >> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.
>> >
>> >"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."
>> >
>> >Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."
>> >
>> >(NCI = No Content Indicator)
>>
>> "I don't know, but I've been told, old old arguments are mighty
>> cold...hup, too, tree, Foah!" :-)
>
>I think he played a bit part in "Small Soldiers."

I didn't see that one.

Did he do the biting or was he the one that got bit?

:-)

"I will beep my key in a military manner, keeping always on the
alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those within sight and
hearing." - General Order #1 of the PCTA sentinels.

Some suggested phonetics for code-aholics for use in speech
since they don't seem to do much of that and may need an aid
in getting through - obviously picked for those in favor of morris
goad who like to Jerk around the NCTA about how Able and
Brave the Code men are and how Code is Dandy, Easy, Fast,
Great, a Hymn to all who hear it while they Insist, like Jerks
that Code is King and all must Love Morse because it is
Nifty and all Obey Morse with a Passion. We can Quote
them on Morse being Rapid, Safe, Tough, Uniting all of
the Morse Vice who must Win.

Able Brave Code Dandy Easy Fast Great
Hymn Insist Jerk King Love Morse Nifty Obey
Passion Quote Rapid Safe Tough Unite Vice
Win Xcellent* Yummy Zero

* had trouble there due to too few X words available...:-)

Dit dit

LHA / WMD

5081. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:54:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620205411.14094.00000268@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 93145

In article <e1lBc.3208$ph6.1562@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>It would seem prudent to have the ARRL petition the FCC to raise amateur
>power limits to partially recover that lost 10 dB. I think perhaps a 10 kw
>limit would be close enough. It might also make BPL communications a bit
>dicey too ;)

Har! :-) :-) :-)

I was totally flabbergasted at reading the Phase 2 report. They
boldly went where no technical person dared to go in saying
"BPL will 'improve' the electric power line noise problems!"

As of the end of the business day on Friday, 18 June 2004, the
Comment numbers in the FCC ECFS were -

docket 04-37 (NPRM) 1,399
docket 03-104 (NOI) 6,076

There's lots of more-than-one-page real technical problem
presentations there showing that Access BPL is full of snit
than there are for the BPL proponents. I don't think that will
matter much.

The writing seemed clear on the wall last year. BPL *will*
be started. The business folks are geared up for profits.
The President has made both BPL and Broadband a goal.
The good little Republican syncophants are synchronized
to The Word from on high.

It doesn't matter who wins a majority in the General Election.
BPL has started to deploy. Once it is IN, it becomes
legacy. Once the initial costs are taken care of, it is in the
regular profit time and the installers will fight tooth and nail
to keep it. The worm could turn.

With a legacy-status "utility" the BPLers could gain leverage
to actually STOP or cut down on all those nasty interfering
HF emitters...like amateur radio transmitters. Unknown, but
it is a spectre hovering in the background. Look at the troubles
some hams have in getting noisy electric power lines fixed.
Electric power distribution is very "legacy" by now and the
electric utility companies move slowly (if at all) on repairs.

>Seriously, however, it is going to be interesting when BPL lines are found
>adjacent to an active amateurs' property. BPL *will* be affected by rf.

>Fire up your gallons.

Seriously, that's not a good idea. Hams are conditioned now
to be legal. Deliberate interference is illegal. It is much easier
to pull the tickets of a few hams doing deliberate interference
than it is to remove or reduce a legal deliberate interference
source in the form of BPL with government-accepted regulations.

All in all, though, the FCC has NO POWER to proactively stop
Access BPL now. At best all it can do is set the incidental
RF radiation levels and then enforce those. Or, wait about 30
years or so until BPL is truly legacy service and then, like
land telephony, start drafting more stringent regulations. In 30
years from now, few of us will be in a position to do much.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5082. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:54:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 93144

In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
>> >the Security Detail with "proof."
>> >
>> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
>>
>> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
>> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
>> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
>
>"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
>crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."

I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
even Tom Cruise.

[I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
rupt." :-)]

>> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
>> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
>> >
>> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>>
>> :-)
>
>"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.

Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(

Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
when and where a Secret!

I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?

:-)

LHA / WMD

5083. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 00:54:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040620205416.14094.00000270@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 93147

In article <1e4e3692.0406201155.59ab88cc@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040619171732.12940.00000261@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040619060309.26548.00000245@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/18/2004 2:48 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040618154844.15095.00000233@mb-m23.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>In article <20040618094628.11031.00000184@mb-m02.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >>(Putzcussionist of the Rock-head group Grateful Dood) writes:
>> >
>> > "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...From
>the
>> >archived mistruths of an ex radio technician parading about as an
>engineer,
>> >Leonard H. Anderson.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. :-)
>>
>> Nursie be here to just FIGHT anyone not thinking like nursie. :-)
>
>Might makes right.

He "float like a bee, sting like a butterfly..." :-)

>> >>>> Was the SINCGARS family of radios ever mentioned? ...(SNIPPED)
>> >>>
>> >>> There are a LOT of military radio systems and equipment NOT
>mentioned
>> in
>> >>>Amateur media...and byt eh same token most of those systems are NOT
>> mentions
>> >>>in a great many professional journals, either...! ! ! ! !
>> >>
>> >> Hmmm...General Dynamics as well as ITT make a quarter million
>> >> radio sets over a period of 15 years and it is "not" mentioned in
>> >> any professional journals?!?!?
>> >
>> > I didn't say "ever", Your Wimpiness.

>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk. [lower-case comment as befits lower-case nursie]
>
>"Sorry Hans, Military Communications Journals >>>ARE NOT<<< Amateur
>Radio Journals."
>
>Hi, hi.

Heh, nursie would be surprised at the number of hams in AFCEA
or in the Association of Old Crows (real professional association
for electronic warfare engineering type, named after a pair of
legendary Norse ravens who flew ahead looking for land).

>> >>> Your point?
>> >>
>> >> There's quite a bit of FREE information out there for anyone to
>> >> find out about military or government radio systems and
>> >> communications. Been there for a long time, even before the
>> >> Internet went public such as the SINCGARS.
>> >
>> > Great.
>> >
>> > Then all those Amateurs who ARE interested in military communications
>> >DON'T have to depend on QST, et al to discuss them.
>>
>> ...and nursie thinks amateur radio is exclusive, different from all
>> other radio. :-)
>
>Steve doesn't know what he thinks. One minute, just to disagree with
>you he says one thing, another minute, just to disagree with Hans, he
>says something else. Such as this little gem:
>
>"Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Welp, he seems stuck on that one, refusing to budge an inch.

Once it sticks in the 16 working neurons of his, it's like mental
crazy glue. Next, he'll probably state "death before dishonor"
(of admitting a mistake).

>> Did nursie ever bother to check out other radio services (other
>> than the CBs he saw shrink-wrapped at Wal-Mart)?
>
>But, but, but... He saw some radios in an EMS van, and he saw some
>radios in a police car. But he most liked to run the siren and
>blinking lights as they make him convulse.

So THAT's the reason?!? Sounds valid to me.

>> >> A QUARTER MILLION radio sets of one kind makes for some
>> >> future surplus market, doesn't it? [that's the most of any one
>> >> kind of radio system in government history...]

>> >
>> > Sure it does. And "surplus" radio gear has NOT been the preferred
>method
>> >of getting on the air by Amateurs for TWO DECADES....Not when folks can
>buy
>> >brand new, under warranty equipment for under $200.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. For a nearly-fifty "olde-tyme" hamme nursie sure
>> doesn't know much about surplus. :-)
>
>He's expert at wasting surplus bandwidth.

Agreed. :-)

>> >> If poor nursie is annoyed at not being spoon-fed enough info
>> >> through hum radio magazines, then he should not try to mean-
>> >> mouth those who know about such things. Tsk, tsk.
>> >
>> > Perhaps if you HAD been reading those Amateur magazines you'd
>understand
>> a
>> >bit more about what you are talking about.
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie imagines others' worlds and doings instead
>> of finding out.
>
>Interesting that a person who has written for amateur radio magazines
>has never read one.
>
>Len, you otta be ashamed.

I know, I know. I go sit in corner.

>> > But you go right on ahead, Lennie...
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...nursie getting on high horse again, forgetting which
>> end is head and which is tail. :-)
>
>Even on a regular horse, he needs to mount the horse while standing on
>a stump. Can't imagine him ever getting on a high horse.
>
>Maybe he should stick with ponies.

Wouldn't matter. He still won't read DoD Directive 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03)
or USN-USMC Communications Instruction NCP 8 (C).

>> Nursie hasn't been able to stop many, despite his shouting,
>> hollering, cursing, and threatening. :-)
>
>He will never run me off, as he has tried so many times before.

Nursie no understand da Eengliss...

[which may explain not understanding 4650.2 or NCP 8 (C)...]

>> > Actually, my words then, as they are now, are that what I did in the
>> Armed
>> >Forces have nothing to do with Amateur Communications. Just like YOUR
>"link"
>> >with Amateur Radio, Lennie, those "happenings" only shared the theoretical
>> >basics of radio wave generation and propagation.
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...translated, nursie never did any military communications
>> at all (except maybe to use the day room telephone). :-)
>
>So that's what he was doing while assigned Bay Orderly. Typical.

Well, technically, the telephones in the military buildings
are government property or something like that. Since
telephones are communications instruments and, being
guvmint property, he DID "military communications!" :-)

That may be the line of reasoning that Rev. Jimmie Who
will present. Stay tuned.

>> Nursie was involved too much in those "hostile actions" in the
>> military. Must be the post-traumatic stress disorder thing showing
>> in his postings...
>
>You never know what will set him off.

I know! Isn't it exciting? - yawn -

>> > It's the application...not the physics...that separates you from the
>rest
>> >of us, Sir Scummy.
>>
>> tsk, tsk, tsk...more "meaningful discourse" from nursie? :-)
>
>You apply physics differently in amateur radio? Hmmm?

I don't, but others seem to.

You have to put yourself in nursie's frame of reference. In that,
he imagines that absolutely NO electron, field or wave will
operate at ham frequencies unless a person is absolutely
licensed, certified, framed, and hung on the wall as a federally-
tested servicemember. Not only that, below 30 MHz, the
licensed, certified, framed and hung person MUST test for
telegraphy. Absolute. No ifs or buts, not even in a butt can.

Those who disobey that are forever afloat on the charybdis,
or doomed to listen to the exhortations and general arm-
waving along with dissing and cussing in this newsgroup.

>> > Sucks to be you.
>>

>> Only when I use either of the two Hoover appliances here. :-)
>>
>> Or the solder-sucker on the bench. :-)
>>
>> The melting point of solder is well below the temper temperature
>> of nursie...easier to suck up melted solder than to put out the
>> fires of outraged, angry egos such as nursie's... :-)
>
>He's like a phosphorous bomb. Lots of sparks and smoke.

I keep thinking "pink smoke grenade" used in signalling.

Pink to match the horror of reading profane words (oh,
heavens!) or thinking that mooning is displaying "male
nudity!" [purity and no profanity in telegraphy...ptui]

Smoke grenades smell bad when all fired up...but don't
last long.

"Code," "test," and "nuts" are all 4-letter words.

>> I guess this must be all of what modern U.S. amateur radio is
>> about...a bunch of mad-as-hell extras berating all the "lower
>> classes." Nice hobby. For Huns and other barbarians...?
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Len, they're not all that way.

You ARE right. Most hams are good folks in their right minds.
Unfortunately, any human grouping has some nutsos.

Apparently, all the ham nutsos gravitated to in here after arthur
and his ritis slowed down their dizzying high-speed fists!

But, like the Big Hun (the other one who can spell in Hunnish)
said, "being interested means being licensed" so therefore
anybody without an official, nicely-engraved-border (suitable
for framing) amateur license can possibly "show any interest"
in radio. Nobody belongs in the RF world without that official,
certified, government-approved ham license...and those aren't
"real" unless a telegraphy test has been passed. Those are
the words from On High.

One last thing...PCTAs have so little sense of humor that
everything is done in an oh-so-serious (!) manner, keeping
always on the alert, ready to diss and cuss any NCTA in
sight or hearing. [sort of the General Order #1 here]*

* those who never went to basic or boot forget it...

PCTA want WAR! NCTA just want to end the code test.

PCTA are righteous, they are strong, hear them roar!

Breep, breep...

LHA / WMD

5084. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 01:37:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40D63BDA.4060206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93148

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>>
>>>
>>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will work
>>for the people,
>>not the rich corporations!
>>
>>
>
> And replace him with who? John Kerry? A guy who sat side-by-side with
>this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!
>
Did he? Heard that that photo was fake. And it's not like he was
touring Hanoi with her.
For all we know, Jane might have been a CIA spy.

>
> Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
>aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with them...?!?!
>
Vietnam was a stupid war. Now if we had a goal and a strategy that made
any sense, maybe we
could have achieved something...

>
> George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
>Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
>conviction and honesty. Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
>travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.
>
Problem is that he's trying to skip over that "separation of church and
state" thing.

>
> This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
>electing another.
>

But the economy wasn't in the toilet. I didn't care if Bill got a BJ or
not. But he should
have owned up to it in that court of law. "Okay, I did it. You happy
now? Don't
we have more important things to spend time on?" After a month it would
have
blown over...

Why does GW still claim that Saddam aided Al Queda? Or is it that
Saddam didn't
tell the USA ambassador in Bagdad (or elsewhere) that "Al Queda is
planning an
attack on you guys and I kicked them out of my palace"? Not telling the
cops
about someone hatching a crime conspiracy is illegal.

>
>
>
>
>
>

5085. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 01:59:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93150

In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...

>> > and I mention that
>> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> > communications in 1948.

>> They did? Everywhere?

>> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?

>> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?

>And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.

That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some spoofing and such.

However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same mission - or the same resources.

>> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
>> > person is for morse code.

>> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it
>> or
>> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and
>> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
>
>Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
>didn't ya?

Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and the subject.

>Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?

Oyez.

>Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.

Bad pun of "navel" noted.

>No
>such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
>snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.

That's true!

>I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
>of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
>aboard.

Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.

>The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
>work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
>
>> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
>
>End of.
>
roger that!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5086. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 01:59:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620215949.22498.00000353@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93149

In article <ZaqBc.6688$wQ2.5058@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:uv7Bc.11589$Wr.3855@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote
>>
>> > Just out of curiosity, do you have an idea of how
>> > much power the Navy uses on the VLF stuff?
>>
>> I don't know current QRO, but in the 70's the COMSUBLANT transmitter at
>> Cutler was 1,700,000W on 15.9KHz and the COMSUBPAC transmitter at Jim
>> Creek was 2,200,000W on 17.1KHz. The ELF site at Clam Lake is
>> reportedly engineered for just under 1,000,000,000W at somewhere just
>> above powerline QRG, 75Hz if I remember correctly. The antenna is just
>> under 29 miles long.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>
>Hello, Hans
>
>And *we* are paying for it ;)
>Those are *big* qro rigs LOL
>
Sort of.

2,200,000W looks like a lot -and it is a lot, in the world of radio
transmitters. 2.2 million watts!

But compare it to other technologies....

2.2 million watts is only 2200 kW. At 746 W per HP, that works out to just
under 2,950 HP. You could get more than that out of a single 1950s era diesel
electric railroad locomotive, or a WW2 bomber - or about a dozen SUVs.

Compared to the power of even a "small" USN ship or submarine...

The 1 gigawatt ELF system is a bit bigger, of course. Count the cars on the
Genessee Expressway where it crosses Jefferson Road at rush hour and see how
quickly you get to the million-horsepower mark...

73 de Jim, N2EY

5087. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:09:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93151

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
> > Yes,
> >
> > We got rid of Nixon. Now we need to dump Bush.
> >
> > Best regards from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> Nixon resigned.
>
> We impeached Clinton because he didn't have the decency to resign.

Nixon resigned after his friends on Capitol Hill told him they couldn't muster enough votes to avoid throwing him out of office. End of story.

Clinton was not removed from office. What Clinton did was terrible to his wife and daughter, but what damage to the country (other than a major distraction) did it do? Are you so naive as to think that this huge deficit Bush is running won't hurt us? Already some want to reduce social security more. It isn't that social security is broke (and it appears to be in a bit better shape than they thought, but as good jobs disappear and are replaced by near minimum-wage jobs, I wouldn't bet); it is that the federal government has tapped the funds and issued IOUs to social security. They don't want to pay back money to the folks that need it the most. Rob from the poor and give to the rich.

Go figure; make $1,000,000 on the stock market and you only pay $150,000 in tax (15%). Now, go get a $60,000 a year job and see what you pay in taxes. Don't forget that over 7.5% social security tax you pay (and my pension is reduced slightly due to my employer's social security contribution. Retirement based on income above the tax base results in higher percentage payment.) when you figure your tax load.

Well, we finally got our high-speed ferry here in Rochester. Like all other high-profile projects (the new soccer stadium, the baseball stadium), the owners paid *far* less than they were originally supposed to. The taxpayers picked up the tab. Now we pay for security here, but Canada won't pay over there. Net result, before the first outing, prices were raised on vehicles and occupants as the ferry operator had to pay for security in Canada. Now, yesterday, we found out that for some reason the ferry folks got to take over most of the paved parking in a *public* park close to the ferry. I wonder why, since they raised the cost per vehicle. A *public* park, but in

those spaces, they charge you $5.00 per day to park.

Where are all of the whiners that complain about welfare? Oh, I forgot;
that doesn't apply to *corporate* welfare.

Compassionate conservative *IS* an oxymoron. I don't need any more idiots
in Washington running *huge* deficits to benefit the rich.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5088. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:17:03 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <zyrBc.6699$7P2.6247@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93152

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:gNmdnW8r_fWCrUvdRVn-jg@comcast.com...
>
> Well keep in mind that the utility companies will have to go before the
> state's public utilities commision and get their approval to raise
electric
> rates to pay for internet. This could be a hard sell.
>
> That's OK. I'm just as tired of folks blaming "conservatives" for the
> world's ills. It cuts both ways. Both groups have had good ideas and bad
> ideas.
>
> Again they will have to have the approval of the state's public utility
> commission and this could be difficult in some states. Just as people are
> unwilling to step up to the cost of cable modems, etc for high speed
access,
> they will be just as irate or even more irate at proposals to increase
> electric rates.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Hello, Dee

I will absolutely agree with you that the sword cuts both ways. I am so *darn* tired of someone saying something and everyone jumping up and down and clapping their hands, whether BPL or weapons of mass destruction. Some argue that it is just the old hams that are fighting BPL. My problem is that just because the power company says it isn't interfering with anyone doesn't make that gospel.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5089. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:25:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201825.6296ab8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93153

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620181939.18863.00000464@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040620095205.11752.00000248@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/19/2004 10:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>
>
> >>Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
> >>(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
> >>that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].
> >
> > You made this up, right?
>
> No, nursie, Brian is correct.
>
> The U.S. government stopped amateur radio transmissions
> during WW2. Really. It was in all the ham magazines and
> everything. Didn't you see it?

Saw it in a magazine. It could have even been a defunct magazine.

> > More over, do you BELIEVE what you wrote? I ask because there is more
> >than a small amount of evidence to the contrary.
>
> I don't think Brian is old enough to be alive during WW2, but
> I was and I believe the U.S. government shut down amateur
> radio transmitting during WW2.
>
> Even the ARRL acknowledges that. Really!

Just like R.R.A.P. isn't Ham Radio, whatever those guys were doing
during WWII wasn't Ham Radio.

But there are some very confused folks here who think that "MARS
>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," so I guess they might also think that
"Military Radio >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Who really knows what they think. It's mostly incoherent, irrational
yelling.

> >>BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
> >>on HF?
> >>

> >>And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?
> >>
> >>Hi, hi.
> >>
> >>These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.
> >
> > Kinda like "Unlicensed devices play a major role in "emergency
> >comms"...?!?!
>
> No, more like "CW gets through when nothing else will..."

Actually, CW gets through when everything else will.

> Or, that morse testing has to continue for "traditional"
> reasons (and because olde-tyme hammes are pished
> out and insist all newcomers have to "work as hard" as
> they did...because).

An anachronism.

> It might also be about 26 patents when only 1 exists or
> shooting bears from an aircraft carrier or some Chesty
> Puller wanna-be saying "I was in seven hostile actions"
> and never revealing the When or Where of those. It could
> also be those old-tyme hammes who made big noises
> about "I design and build my own ham radios" who, a few
> days later would talk a lot about his latest Kit project.

I've never seen orders for the seven hostile actions. They must not have actually occurred. I've never seen the schematics for the home designed (by a PE) amateur radio station. Perhaps they don't exist. Perhaps they do.

> Of course, those same individuals have to misdirect a thread
> into their oh-so-very-important-personal-battles in order to
> diss-and-cuss those of opposite opinions.

One in particular.

> This thread started out about Phonetic Alphabets. The "Able,
> Baker, Charlie..." U.S. phonetic alphabet is familiar to me
> because I learned it and used it in the U.S. Army. That set
> was replaced by the NATO phonetic alphabet ("Alpha, Bravo..")
> adopted in 1955. I am familiar with that since I was IN the
> U.S. Army at that time, learned it and used it in military
> communications. That's unalterable fact despite what those
> weren't born then or mere infants at the time say.

Strange coincidence. I learned it in the U.S. military also.

> The NATO phonetic alphabet was adopted by the International
> Civil Aviation Organization shortly after the U.S. military adopted
> it. Some in here want to argue and argue that phonetic alphabet

> is called the "ICAO phonetic alphabet." That's rather petty.
> NATO had it first. That's unalterable fact. All the aggressive
> argumentation going on in here seems to be little more than a
> disguise to diss-and-cuss certain personalities, certainly not
> the subject matter.
>
> LHA / WMD

No Content in all of that agressive argumentation.

5090. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:36:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201836.4e701d8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93154

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620181937.18863.00000462@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns950E861F4E118elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >Don't forget, the requirements for DXCC are far more stringent than those
> >of mere legality. I have seen threads before where people have argued past
> >oneanother on this point, i.e. one of them has used the term 'legal' when
> >they were really talking about DXCC eligibility, a big mistake.
> >
> >For example, operation without the permission of the owner of the land or
> >building is not valid for DXCC, but it is seldom illegal. More to the point
> >in this case, perhaps(?), operation from a war zone is legal with
> >permission of whoever appears to be in control, but good luck getting it
> >approved for DXCC.
>
> Alun, if there be some etymology of that thread, no "DXCC" was
> involved. No contesting at all was involved.
>
> It began when Heil made some chance remark about "working
> Frenchmen on 6m out of band." Brian Burke tossed that one
> back to him with some mild ascerbicity which caused Heil to
> go bananas. Nursie got out his rusty bayonet, locked and
> loaded, and made like the Charge of Lite Brigade (which led
> into the Valley of Death of his of today).
>
> Nursie never got to Somalia, certainly not to any "hostile action"
> there (or anyplace else with any proof) but Brian Burke did.
> Brian earlier had made a chance remark about operating from
> there on ham frequencies, getting permission from his
> commanding officer. That resulted in a long, overdrawn word
> battle and flame war with Heil who was resentful (to the max)
> of anyone having the temerity to toss him a rejoinder. Nursie
> jumped in on that with usual diss-and-cuss, trying to make
> like a legal eagle with smarts instead of the hummingbird
> with dumbth.
>
> The PCTA of this newsgrope all seem to be self-righteous,
> prissy puritans of perfection who will explode with outrage at
> the slightest provocation of their beloved manual telegraphy
> as being anything less than the ultimate skill of amateurs.
>
> It's almost as Henry Ford put it on the color of the Model T:
> "You can have any opinion you want, so long as its pro-

> code."
>
> That's the "new" freedom of speech in here. Enjoy.
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

I got back from a week of aerial operations, drove by the storage unit, and checked that the lock wasn't jimmied ("jimmied" is a common use for B/E, not a slam against the Rev. Jim).

My T5 logs are safe and secure. One day they may have real historical value. I could divide them up and run some through Christie's and the others through Sothby's. Maybe I'll just make a run of numbered copies, suitable for framing.

5091. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:44:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93155

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040615195938.22498.00000308@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <20040615170855.23951.00000038@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >Date: 15 Jun 2004 21:08:55 GMT
> >
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >>Date: 6/15/2004 3:58 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com>
> >>
> >>In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>(Steve
> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
> >>>
> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
> >
> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't you?
> >>>
> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for the
> >>claims he made, yes.
> >>
> >>Why?
> >>
> >>He may know just where they are.
> >>
> > I have no doubt that he knows just where they are!
> >
> Then what's the problem?

First Steve says that he is going to insist that I lost my logs, then
he says that he has no doubt that I know where they are.

Somewhere in there is a deliberate falsehood.

Probably all of it.

> >>They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit another.
> >
> > Maybe...maybe not.
>
> And the problem with that is?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand anything. I have no need or desire to comply, and that infuriates the ex-Marine. I recommend stress management for him before that bulging artery in his neck explodes.

5092. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:47:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406201847.3863d24d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93156

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
> > >
> > > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft some
> > >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts, Lennie!
>
> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?

Wait till that bulging artery in his neck explodes. Wonder what the
temper management people would recommend?

5093. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:52:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DsudnRMCNfH00EvdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93157

N2EY wrote:
> In article <4Mydnat575sMeEndRVn-sw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <DLqdndIs8O29K0ndRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>, JJ
>>><radiobuff00@mailcity.moc> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>Now we will see if the FCC will abide by their own part 15 rules and
>>>>shut BPL down until when/if the problem is fixed. Anyone want to bet
>>>>they don't?
>
>
>
>>>No.
>
>
>>>I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
>>>able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>
>
>>So many times in history, Ideology has chosen to ignore everything but
>>that ideology's belief. That is one of the reasons that idealogs hate
>>science.
>>
>
> Yep.
>
> They also choose to ignore the past, which is why they also hate history. You
> see this in their cries of "Luddite" and "we're in a new era now" and "stop
> living in the past".
>
>
>>As absurd as it may seem, the BPL push is part of current ideology.
>
>
> Part of *some people's* current ideology.
>
> And it may be more of a question of expediency than ideology.

>
> The recent boom-dot-bust mess hit a lot of folks hard. While the economy slowly
> recovers and unemployment drops, a lot of good (read "manufacturing jobs with
> decent pay and benefits") jobs are being replaced by "service economy" jobs
> (read "do you want fries with that?").

C'mon, Jim! Burger flippin' is going to be moved from "service" to
"manufacturing"

> With the election only months away, the incumbents want to be seen as doing and
> supporting things that will result in more "good" jobs and start another
> technoboom. The reality won't hit for at least a year, at which time it can be
> blamed on the "liberals" and the "antenna huggers" and such.

Repeat after me:

All problems are the fault of Liberals...
All problems are the fault of Liberals....
All problems are the fault of Liberals...

It's great. As long as you can blame everything on the dreaded liberal,
you are absolved of any blame yourself. I personally know perhaps 1500
people. Maybe only 5 or 6 are actual Liberals. And no one that thinks
like they do has been running the show in a long time. How did they get
such power to make all the problems in the world?

>>As such, as long as the current ideology is in place, BPL WILL HAPPEN!
>
>
> It's already in service at a few sites. The direct result of people wanting
> "less regulation" and "get the government off our backs".

Actually, it's just a different group making the regulations. The
golden rule, as it were.

>>Once
>>it comes up against science and laws of nature, as well as the
>>marketplace, it will quite simply fail.
>>
>
> I hope so.

Hey, just to insert something good into this depressing topic, Mike
Melville has been tapped to pilot Burt Rutan's SpaceshipOne tomorrow at
0630 PDT. If successful and he reaches suborbital flight, this will be
just about as cool an event as I've seen in years.

CNN is covering the event. Dunno why Fox isn't. Seems like private
spaceflight would be right up their alley. Maybe Burt is a Leeberal? ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5094. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 02:57:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040620225732.07518.00000333@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93158

In article <20040620191701.22984.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 1:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>>I'm not saying Mr. K is any better or worse than Mr. B. What I *am* saying
>>is
>>that blind acceptance of any leader's pronouncements leads to trouble. And
>>that
>>condemning someone because of who they allegedly sat next to 30 years ago
>>would
>>lead to a lot of people being condemned...
>
> Kerry is a chronic apologist. He will do nothing when this country is
>attacked but wring his hands, say "Oh, we're sorry, did something we do/say
>offend you?...P L E A S E forgive us"

You know this how?

> Having been in the apologist-era Armed Forces of the late 70's, it is my
>freverent hope that we DON'T allow ourselve to regress to that stage, which
>is
>exactly what I fear will happen with this candidate.

Why?

The late 1970s were the immediate post-Vietnam, post-draft era. You can't blame all the problems of that era on who was in the White House - unless you want to include JFK, who got us into Vietnam, LBJ who escalated it from a small force of "advisors", Nixon, Ford....
>
> Carter tried to castrate the Armed Forces in the 70's.

How?
>
> Bill Clinton didn't try to castrate them...he just made it possible for
>other guys to play with them....Oh yeah...he let a bunch of ragheads drag
>some
>of our guys through the streets of Mogandishu and them rewarded them by doing
>exactly what they wanted us to do.

How did Clinton "let them" do what they did? Should the US have stayed out of that conflict? Or gotten more involved? What threat were they to US security?

What's the solution to the Iraq mess? Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation? Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>
> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.

Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam - a war in which he *personally* fought?

>He's already
>angry that the Republicans have done exactly what they said they'd do, and
>it's an embarrassment to Democrats.

I don't see that at all.

Bush & Co. told us that SH had weapons of mass destruction. None have surfaced. They told us SH was connected to 9-11. No evidence of that, either.

We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when? And that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the "near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space telescope or replace the shuttle.
>
> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke and
>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
>mirrors
>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.

How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies. Nor was Halliburton.
>
> Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have
>publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a
>slow
>and steady process. They were right.

And the good jobs keep getting exported. Ross Perot was right about that "giant sucking sound".
>
> Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them With
>Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".

As opposed to Reaganomics "Let The Deficits Pile Up - We Won't Be Around To Pay Them Back". Or Bush Sr.'s "Read My Lips".
>
>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.

Personally I am surprised that the Dems couldn't do better than JK. But you know the old saying about Democratic Party planning; "If you gave the DNC the job of organizing a firing squad, they'd put the riflemen in a circle with the condemned person in the center..."

But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:

When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi Jane?

If indeed such a thing happened, why is it any worse than Rumsfeld shaking hands with and warmly greeting Saddam Hussein?

When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's armed conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the president simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes the incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's policies and decisions aren't right.

Have you thanked Ralph Nader yet?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5095. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 03:31:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93159

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
> >
> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
> >>>
> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
> >
> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
> >>>> you?
> >>>
> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
> >>> the claims he made, yes.
> >>
> >> Why?
> >>
> >> He may know just where they are.
> >>
> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
> >> another.
> >>>
> >>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
> >>>
> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
> >>>
> >> Can produce or will produce?
> >>
> >>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
> >>> unit, his
> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
> >>>is fact.

> >>
> >> So what's the problem?
> >>
> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
> >> pretty much a given.
> >>
> >> So why bother about it?
> >>>
> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
> >>
> >> Maybe.
> >>
> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
> >> etc.
> >>
> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
> >>>
> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
> >> of wood.
> >>
> >>> It's just that it's empty.
> >>>
> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
> >>
> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
> >>
> >
> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
> >the local repeater in PJ7.
>
> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
>
> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters, and at
> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite credible,
> even with a very makeshift station.

Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.

Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the

Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.

In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.

Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to operate an amateur radio station in T5.

Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate ham radio operation. It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and did what they usually do.

T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.

The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's "T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.

> >
> >> *if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?
> >>
> >> And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked
> >> T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the
> >> alleged operation.
> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

5096. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 03:38:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EJOdnSqcgeu7xUvdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93160

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
>
>>In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>
> (Steve
>
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>
> truth
>
>>>>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
>>>>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>>>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>>I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't
>
> be
>
>>>>>able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will
>
> work
>
>>>>for the people, not the rich corporations!
>>>
>>> And replace him with who? John Kerry?
>>
>>Why not?
>>
>
>

> Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet access
> (remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own
> statements)

Produce those statements Dee. Show me that quote!

Or do you just repeat what you are told?

In case you want something other than NeoCon Propaganda What he said
was that:

"during my service in the United States Congress, I took the
initiative in creating the Internet".

Gore was instrumental along with other Congressmen and perhaps women in
paving the way for the internet as we know it today. Within the context
of the interview, the message was clear enough. Unfortunately, *some*
members of the (liberal?) press chose to not only take it out of
context, but deliberately misquoted him.

Suggesting Gore saying that he "invented the internet" is very, very
inaccurate.

> is a right so Kerry could be expected to push BPL even harder
> than Bush. After all the government should decide what is best for everyone
> and amateurs are too small a minority to watch out for. Economic reality be
> damned as far as the liberals are concerned.

Are liberals anyone that disagrees with the present administration?
People bandy that word about with such abandon that I'd like to examine it.

I like the idea that the government that governs least governs best. I
like the ability to have and express my own opinion. I like the ability
to get rich if I desire (or at least attempt to) I believe that all
people should know that they are expected to be contributing members of
society, and if they plan on being lazy and don't want to work for a
living, as far as I am concerned, they can exist off what private
charity gives them or else they are welcome to crawl off in a hole
somewhere. I like the idea that no one gets special consideration, (such
as farm subsidies) for simply doing their jobs. And I don't think any
government should be allowed to spend $.01 more than it takes in, except
for extraordinary circumstances, such as all out war.

That would seem to make me a conservative.

But that doesn't seem to be the way things are going, does it?

NeoCons are actually Liberals in disguise. Different details, but the
same results.

I apologize if I get a little testy on the subject, but I think that
Conservatives are straying as far from their original principles as the
Liberals strayed from theirs. The results will eventually be the same.

> At least the "rich
> corporations" will, if BPL is not economical, kill it instead of sinking
> money into it. After all they want to stay rich.

Thank heavens!

> To really make any inroads in the market, BPL will need to be as cheap as
> dialup and as fast and reliable as cable modem.

I doubt that will ever happen. It starts more expensive and slower than
cable, and if it gets more popular, it will probably get slower.

>I find it hard to believe this combination will happen.

Agreed!

> The investment is too large.

Yeah, that is the strange part. The companies are going to have to run
fiber *almost* to the house! This means that the people that are signing
up are just that close to fiber performance! Why on earth they wouldn't
just run it the whole way is beyond me.

> Those who are
> willing to pay the price for high speed access have already switched to DSL
> or cable, etc. Even they are fighting to get people to leave dialup but it
> is the price that people generally put ahead of speed.

Depends. I used to have a dedicated phone line, and Compuserve for ISP.
I switched to Cable modem, got rid of the second phone line, and after 1
year, I made back all the money I paid for the cable modem, and am now
paying about $15.00 less per month (fiscally conservative 'lil ol' me)
than I was before.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5097. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 03:51:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QaednYH5EJLUxkvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93161

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <e1lBc.3208$ph6.1562@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
>
>>It would seem prudent to have the ARRL petition the FCC to raise amateur
>>power limits to partially recover that lost 10 dB. I think perhaps a 10 kw
>>limit would be close enough. It might also make BPL communications a bit
>>dicey too ;)
>
>
> Har! :-) :-) :-)
>
> I was totally flabbergasted at reading the Phase 2 report. They
> boldly went where no technical person dared to go in saying
> "BPL will 'improve' the electric power line noise problems!"

Ideology trumps science! Yes, that was a shocking thing to read.

> As of the end of the business day on Friday, 18 June 2004, the
> Comment numbers in the FCC ECFS were -
>
> docket 04-37 (NPRM) 1,399
> docket 03-104 (NOI) 6,076
>
> There's lots of more-than-one-page real technical problem
> presentations there showing that Access BPL is full of snit
> than there are for the BPL proponents. I don't think that will
> matter much.
>
> The writing seemed clear on the wall last year. BPL *will*
> be started. The business folks are geared up for profits.
> The President has made both BPL and Broadband a goal.
> The good little Republican syncophants are synchronized
> to The Word from on high.

BPL = Ban Pretentious Liberals?

> It doesn't matter who wins a majority in the General Election.
> BPL has started to deploy. Once it is IN, it becomes
> legacy. Once the initial costs are taken care of, it is in the
> regular profit time and the installers will fight tooth and nail
> to keep it. The worm could turn.
>
> With a legacy-status "utility" the BPLers could gain leverage

> to actually STOP or cut down on all those nasty interfering
> HF emitters...like amateur radio transmitters. Unknown, but
> it is a spectre hovering in the background. Look at the troubles
> some hams have in getting noisy electric power lines fixed.
> Electric power distribution is very "legacy" by now and the
> electric utility companies move slowly (if at all) on repairs.
>
>
>
>>Seriously, however, it is going to be interesting when BPL lines are found
>>adjacent to an active amateurs' property. BPL *will* be affected by rf.
>>Fire up your gallons.
>
>
> Seriously, that's not a good idea. Hams are conditioned now
> to be legal. Deliberate interference is illegal. It is much easier
> to pull the tickets of a few hams doing deliberate interference
> than it is to remove or reduce a legal deliberate interference
> source in the form of BPL with government-accepted regulations.

Hoo, we are getting close to that strange discussion we had last year
with the fellow saying that if we know that it interferes, and we
transmit, we are purposely interfereing. That's enough to give a person
a headache!

But if a person is in a neighborhood with Access BPL, they won't need
to use that linear. Seems 100 watts will do just fine. I don't know the
frequency context of BPL/Amateur transmitter interference, but my guess
is that if you hear it on the band you are transmitting on, you'll do it
interference harm if you fire up.

> All in all, though, the FCC has NO POWER to proactively stop
> Access BPL now. At best all it can do is set the incidental
> RF radiation levels and then enforce those. Or, wait about 30
> years or so until BPL is truly legacy service and then, like
> land telephony, start drafting more stringent regulations. In 30
> years from now, few of us will be in a position to do much.
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

- Mike KB3EIA -

5098. Re: Happy Father's Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 03:55:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <q9CdnfCBl4-nwUvdRVn-hg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93162

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Happy Father's Day
>>From: "Bert Craig" wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM
>>Date: 6/20/2004 9:38 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <TjhBc.70272$V57.8989374@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
>>
>>Wishing everybody (...and I mean EVERYBODY!) on r.r.a.p a very warm and
>>happy Father's Day. :-)
>>
>
>
> Dittos to all the Daddies!

Same here! I had a nice canoe trip down Bald Eagle Creek into Raystown dam with the XYL. And she bought me a new Stainless Steel gas grill. So I cooked (hey! it's supposed to be Fathers day!) some ribs fer dinner.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5099. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 04:14:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621001446.10886.00000463@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93163

In article <1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
>> >
>> > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft
>some
>> >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts,
>Lennie!
>>
>> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?
>>
>> >> Bon apetit and temper fry...
>> >
>> > Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.
>>
>> Have you seen a doctor about your problem, puppetnursie?
>
>He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
>the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
>pretend they're thin when they're not.

Not to worry. CAP pays for all that avgas. They just load
an extra hundred pounds of avgas for the heavier payload.

>
>> Or do you do your own diagnoses, like practicing medicine
>> without the legal license? [a big no-no in most states]
>
>He no do nuttin illegal. He one squared away marine. All his stuff
>in one sock.
>
>> Get some mental therapy, puppetnursie. That would help all
>> those around you...if not yourself...

>
>He no care 'bout others.

I disagree. He has to keep all those personalities in order.
Must be quite a coordination session every day in there...

>> Sociopathy CAN be cured.
>
>I'll bet this case cannot.

I'm optimistic normally, but you may be right...

LHA / WMD

5100. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 04:19:39 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93164

In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...

>> > and I mention that
>> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> > communications in 1948.
>>
>> They did? Everywhere?
>>
>> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>
>> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>
>And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.

"Abiding?!?" Crock.

Fort Huachuca is the Military Intelligence center for the U.S. Army.

One duty of M.I. is to run intercepts on foreign communications.

Some foeign countries still think that manual telegraphy is
"effective" so the M.I. teach morse code to intercept
analysts. For LISTENING.

The only "use" for morse code is in LISTENING, of intercepts,
ELINT.

The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
radio communications. [USN blinker lights are not radio]

The Signal Corps is the communications branch of the Army.
The Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA. The Signal Center
doesn't teach any morse code receiving or sending.

Katapult Kellie should valve off all that steam and join the
rest of the world in this new millennium.

Good luck on that one, now...

LHA / WMD

5101. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 08:41:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93165

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>...

> He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
> the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
> pretend they're thin when they're not.

Wanna see what the "puffy" is, Brain?

Care to join me in the gym? Three mile run? Five? I'll make
you the same offer I did your scumbag friend and will add a rucksack
with some extra weight in it. Or you could make me REAL happy and
join me for a few minutes in the ring...(please! please!)

73

Steve, K4YZ

5102. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 09:57:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040621055754.09295.00000485@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93166

In article <40D63BDA.4060206@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will
>>>work for the people, not the rich corporations!

Does anyone besides me remember the quote "What's good for General Motors is
good for the USA"?

>>And replace him with who? John Kerry? A guy who sat side-by-side with
>>this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!
>>
>Did he? Heard that that photo was fake.

Not faked. Exaggerated. See:

http://www.snopes.com/photos/politics/kerry.asp

John Kerry and Hanoi Jane were, indeed, at one 1970 anti-Vietnam-was rally.
That rally was in Valley Forge, PA, only a few miles from here. They were not
together, and if you look closely at the picture you see that they were in
proximity but not "side-by-side".

For the important point about that picture, see below. I have met the man who
took it, btw.

>And it's not like he was
>touring Hanoi with her.

Exactly.

>For all we know, Jane might have been a CIA spy.

No. Her activities there during her 1972 trip and the results to American POWs
have been well documented:

http://www.snopes.com/military/fonda.htm

Note that not everything that has been written about HJ's trip to North Vietnam
is true. But there's enough that has been verified to make a strong case.

The important point is simply this: Kerry and Fonda attended the same antiwar
rally - in 1970. Fonda didn't go to North Vietnam until 1972 - *two years
later*!!

Are we supposed to condemn Mr. Kerry because he was sitting near someone who
would go on to commit arguably treasonous acts two years later?

>> Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
>>aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with
>>them...?!?!
>>
>Vietnam was a stupid war. Now if we had a goal and a strategy that made
>any sense, maybe we could have achieved something...

The goal, as I see it, was for LBJ to show he wasn't "soft on communism". But once involved heavily, he couldn't figure a way out.

Fact is, after WW2, Ho Chi Minh and his resistance fighters asked the USA for help. They'd been fighting the Japanese for years (since the fall of France) and wanted to be independent. He went to the USA in large part because he saw us as a former colony that had become independent and prospered. But the USA wasn't going to oppose France getting back her colonies, so he was turned away and "French Indo-China" turned right back to the French. (Never mind that France could neither protect nor liberate her colonies during WW2, and would not agree to Vietnamese independence).

So Ho looked elsewhere for help, and got it. From the Soviets. Also got a new ideology and a bunch of quid pro quos.
>
>>
>> George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
>>Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
>>conviction and honesty. Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
>>travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.
>>
>Problem is that he's trying to skip over that "separation of church and
>state" thing.

Isn't that an old concept?
>
>>This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
>>electing another.

>But the economy wasn't in the toilet. I didn't care if Bill got a BJ or
>not. But he should
>have owned up to it in that court of law. "Okay, I did it. You happy
>now? Don't
>we have more important things to spend time on?" After a month it would
>have blown over...

Yep.

In fact it would have been *really* neat if he'd simply up and said:

"Yeah. I shagged her. Many of you would have done the same thing. At least some of you *have* done the same thing. Now, all of you who have been 100% faithful to your spouses from the day you said your I dos until today, and who are willing to testify to that under oath, stand up."
>
>Why does GW still claim that Saddam aided Al Queda?

Because it would be political suicide to admit there was no evidence.

>Or is it that Saddam didn't
>tell the USA ambassador in Bagdad (or elsewhere) that "Al Queda is
>planning an
>attack on you guys and I kicked them out of my palace"? Not telling the
>cops about someone hatching a crime conspiracy is illegal.

See above.

The fact is that the alliance went into Iraq with a lot of misconceptions and bad information. Plus a much smaller force than was amassed for the first Gulf War. And without a well-formed exit plan.

It will be really interesting to see how June 30 turns out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5103. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 10:57:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040621065743.17756.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93168

In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Three mile run? Five?

If you ever get up to these parts, Steve, we can do that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5104. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 10:57:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040621065747.17756.00000570@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93167

In article <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
>> >
>> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>> >>>
>> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>> >>>> you?
>> >>>
>> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>> >>> the claims he made, yes.
>> >>
>> >> Why?
>> >>
>> >> He may know just where they are.
>> >>
>> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
>> >> another.
>> >>>
>> >>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>> >>>
>> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>> >>>
>> >> Can produce or will produce?
>> >>
>> >> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage

>> >>> unit, his
>> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>> >>>is fact.
>> >>
>> >> So what's the problem?
>> >>
>> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
>> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
>> >> pretty much a given.
>> >>
>> >> So why bother about it?
>> >>>
>> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
>> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>> >>
>> >> Maybe.
>> >>
>> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
>> >> etc.
>> >>
>> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
>> >>>
>> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
>> >> of wood.
>> >>
>> >>> It's just that it's empty.
>> >>>
>> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>> >>
>> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
>> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>> >>
>> >
>> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
>> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
>> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
>> >the local repeater in PJ7.
>>
>> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
>>
>> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters, and
>at
>> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
>> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite
>credible,
>> even with a very makeshift station.
>
>Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.

Absolutely.
>
>Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
>except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
>nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
>civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
>force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the
>Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically
>irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.

There seems to be some dispute as to what level in the military command
structure can authorize amateur operation, and what level of paperwork is
necessary.
>
>In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into
>PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being
>big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork
>right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing
>authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a
>legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.

Absolutely agree.
>
>Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame
>altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his
>tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on
>ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The
>ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of
>which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that
>expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to
>operate an amateur radio station in T5.
>
How do we know this for sure?

>Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another
>simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya
>wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate
>ham radio operation.

Again - how do we *know* that the required authorization wasn't obtained?

I agree 100% that if such authority wasn't obtained, it wasn't an amateur
operation at all.

In any event, the claimed operation allegedly took place on 10 meters and
allegedly involved at least two QSOs.

>It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac
>was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and
>did what they usually do.
>
>T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.
>

>The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's
>"T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the
>freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham
>radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his
>kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.

The thing I find interesting is the last paragraph of my post, below. *Nobody*
is claiming to have worked T5/N0IMD, nor complaining about not getting a QSL
card. In DX circles, that kinda says it all.

>> >> *if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?
>> >>
>> >> And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked
>> >> T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the
>> >> alleged operation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

I want to be slim, but I don't want to be a slim.

5105. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 13:22:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406210522.5fb05e8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93169

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
> >> > and I mention that
> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
> >> > communications in 1948.
>
> >> They did? Everywhere?
>
> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>
> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>
> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>
> That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some spoofing
> and such.

Sure, they'd be grossly negligent if they didn't. I'll just bet that
Osama Baby has at least looked at CW for his purposes and that since
9/11 our guys have ramped up their volume of poking around for it. So
yes, the feds certainly do have an ongoing and abiding interest in the
use of CW, one-way for their purposes and/or otherwise.

> However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same mission - or
> the same resources.

Even if we did I wouldn't go anywhere near it.

> >> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
> >> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
> >> > person is for morse code.
>
> >> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like it
> >> or
> >> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see - and
> >> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
> >

> >Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
> >didn't ya?
>
> Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and the
> subject.
>
> >Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
>
> Oyez.
>
> >Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.
>
> Bad pun of "navel" noted.

Another example of the Putz in his seven-yer-old mode. Which he
consistently drops into when he can't find an adult comment to post.

> >No
> >such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
> >snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.
>
> That's true!

Every time the Soviets buzzed a carrier it became a tourist event,
bloomin' hoot. Kodak could have made money with a flight deck photo
processing kiosk after those flybys.

> >I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
> >of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
> >aboard.
>
> Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.

Nah, it was just another bit of Naval tradition, DoD civilian
professionals were treated as officers and were expected to
reciprocate the courtesies received. I had to introduce myself to both
the skipper and the air boss and join them for dinner in officer's
mess on Friday evenings, etc. I knew nothing about any of it when I
logged aboard the first time. A crusty Chief Yeoman sat me down in his
office and went thru the list of what I had to do and not do.

> >The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
> >work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
> >
> >> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
> >
> >End of.
> >
> roger that!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

5106. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 13:33:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621093329.05916.00000394@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93170

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>Date: 6/20/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <l0qbd01vq5cc8hnca5qjj81lchqj3rumo2@4ax.com>
>
>On 20 Jun 2004 13:14:21 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>> I see at least one reference to a Civil Air Patrol station.
>
>Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like
>Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.

I'm not in Florida.

>> I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices
>being
>>employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems.
>(Certain
>>posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess
>they
>>will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!
>
>In all fairness, the frequencies posted were in relation to a military
>exercise and to an exercise of a radio net oprated by the civilian
>government in support of said military exercise. This is far removed
>from the type of "emergency comms" in which GMRS, MURS, FRS, and
>Amateur stations would be involved.

That one wasn't on you, John. Certain other posters have "insisted" that
those radio services are "major" contributors to "emergency comms".

They have yet to establish any validity for those claims.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5107. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 13:34:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621093451.05916.00000395@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93171

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
>Date: 6/20/2004 11:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>

> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
> radio communications.

Yes, they do.

Steve, K4YZ

5108. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 14:18:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93172

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/20/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040620225732.07518.00000333@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040620191701.22984.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Kerry is a chronic apologist. He will do nothing when this country is
>>attacked but wring his hands, say "Oh, we're sorry, did something we do/say
>>offend you?...P L E A S E forgive us"
>
>You know this how?

I know this in my heart.

Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.

>> Having been in the apologist-era Armed Forces of the late 70's, it is my
>>freverent hope that we DON'T allow ourselve to regress to that stage, which
>>is
>>exactly what I fear will happen with this candidate.
>
>Why?

Kerry.

Fonda.

Together.

>The late 1970s were the immediate post-Vietnam, post-draft era. You can't
>blame
>all the problems of that era on who was in the White House - unless you want
>to
>include JFK, who got us into Vietnam, LBJ who escalated it from a small force
>of "advisors", Nixon, Ford....
>>
>> Carter tried to castrate the Armed Forces in the 70's.
>
>How?

He diluted the chain of command. Part of the errors that occured in the
Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what should
have been an military operation.

He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with "warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave America blind and hog tied.

>> Bill Clinton didn't try to castrate them...he just made it possible for
>>other guys to play with them....Oh yeah...he let a bunch of ragheads drag
>>some
>>of our guys through the streets of Mogandishu and them rewarded them by
>doing
>>exactly what they wanted us to do.
>
>How did Clinton "let them" do what they did? Should the US have stayed out of
>that conflict? Or gotten more involved? What threat were they to US security?

Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?

The threats were there. We knew it. "Rules of Engagement" establish by Billary in Washington were not "real world functional".

>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?

Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.

> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?

Be danged if I know. The people of that region, as rich as their culture is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them for centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help, I don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.

We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both business and social, any better than what we did.

> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?

Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.

>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>
>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam - a
>war in which he *personally* fought?

Because he's an apologist.

The time to fight or protest that war is long past.

He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.

>>He's already
>>angry that the Republicans have done exactly what they said they'd do, and
>>it's an embarrassment to Democrats.
>
>I don't see that at all.

YMMV.

>Bush & Co. told us that SH had weapons of mass destruction. None have
>surfaced.
>They told us SH was connected to 9-11. No evidence of that, either.

"Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.

Bush is not the first president to act on less-than-adequate intelligence.

That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the intellignece
agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle East
after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
during/after WW2.

>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?

We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?

>And
>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits
>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
>telescope or replace the shuttle.

Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.

>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
>and
>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
>>mirrors
>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
>
>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies. Nor
>was Halliburton.

HOW...!?!?

Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that (then)
recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of "...America's
confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".

Never mind that the NYSE had been on a steady upward trend for the
previous 12 months.

The NYSE and all economic indicators are up now.

This "recession" suddenly appeared when Billary was no longer in office
and no longer able to keep up the charade.

>> Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have
>>publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a
>>slow
>>and steady process. They were right.

>
>And the good jobs keep getting exported. Ross Perot was right about that
>"giant
>sucking sound".

Until you and I (those "We The People" folks...) demand that the laws be
changed, they can legally do it.

>> Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them
>With
>>Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".
>
>As opposed to Reaganomics "Let The Deficits Pile Up - We Won't Be Around To
>Pay
>Them Back". Or Bush Sr.'s "Read My Lips".

I lived a lot more comfortably and had a lot more money in the bank in the
1980's and early 90's than I do now...Part due, in all honesty, to Bug's
expenses...but most due to the Clinton taxes of the 90's. Personally, I got
zinged in the Clinton era.

>>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
>>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.
>
>Personally I am surprised that the Dems couldn't do better than JK. But you
>know the old saying about Democratic Party planning; "If you gave the DNC the
>job of organizing a firing squad, they'd put the riflemen in a circle with
>the
>condemned person in the center..."

Yep.

The Dem's COULD do better. I would have had to think real hard about a
vote for Edwards. Too bad the loudest dog won rather than the better candidate.

>But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:
>
>When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi Jane?

The specific date? I don't recall. The articles from public media have
circulated the web.

>If indeed such a thing happened, why is it any worse than Rumsfeld shaking
>hands with and warmly greeting Saddam Hussein?

Who cares? Hanoi Jane is a documented traitor. How Kerry, a combat vet,
his opinions on the war itself notwithstanding, could sit next to a person who
openly gave comfort to the people who were trying to proactively kill him is
beyond me.

Those who protested the war had valid arguments.

Bill Clinton even had a valid RIGHT to PROTEST the war, even in Oxford,
England. Billary's error was at first saying he never did it then trying to

claim the pictures weren't him.

If the gutless liar had simply stated "Yes, I was against the war and I exercised my right to protest it in a legal demonstration", even the most right-winged Hawk would ahve had to give him due for being honest about it.

Kerry earned the additional right to speak out...practical experience. But to sit down next to a low life slut who intentionally betrayed her Countrymen was foolish. I would have shot her first. It's a testimony to America's professional, all-volunteer force that she hasn't been shot.

>When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's armed
>conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the president
>simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes the
>incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's policies
>and decisions aren't right.
>
>Have you thanked Ralph Nader yet?

Nope...but it looks like I might get a chance to.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

5109. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 14:24:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621102454.05916.00000397@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93173

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 6/20/2004 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>

>Clinton was not removed from office. What Clinton did was terrible to his
>wife and daughter, but what damage to the country (other than a major
>distraction) did it do?

He lied...repeatedly, under oath, looking Hillary and US directly in the
eyes.

That America kept looking the other way was the second biggest travesty.
Oh well...

>Are you so naive as to think that this huge deficit
>Bush is running won't hurt us? Already some want to reduce social security
>more. It isn't that social security is broke (and it appears to be in a bit
>better shape than they thought, but as good jobs disappear and are replaced
>by near minimum-wage jobs, I wouldn't bet); it is that the federal
>government has tapped the funds and issued IOUs to social security. They
>don't want to pay back money to the folks that need it the most. Rob from
>the poor and give to the rich.

Too bad folks didn't spend some more time reading Steve Forbes' plan for
restructuring the tax system in this country.

>Compassionate conservative *IS* an oxymoron. I don't need any more idiots
>in Washington running *huge* deficits to benefit the rich.

Why is it that we Americans always brag how anyone with the right
motivation and determination can become a millionaire, yet when they do it, we
take gleeful delight in doing/saying what we can to bring them down?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5110. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 14:39:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621103935.05916.00000399@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93174

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 6/20/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40D63BDA.4060206@ix.netcom.com>
>
>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>> And replace him with who? John Kerry? A guy who sat side-by-side with
>>this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!
>>
>Did he? Heard that that photo was fake. And it's not like he was
>touring Hanoi with her.
>For all we know, Jane might have been a CIA spy.

Uh huh.

>> Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
>>aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with
>them...?!?!
>>
>Vietnam was a stupid war. Now if we had a goal and a strategy that made
>any sense, maybe we could have achieved something...

The war wasn't stupid.

Our conduct of it was. You can't take the battle to the enemy, reach a
certain goal, then recede and expect to win.

Where would we have been if we just pushed the German's back to the Rhine,
or if we didn't

>> George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
>>Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
>>conviction and honesty. Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
>>travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.
>>
>Problem is that he's trying to skip over that "separation of church and
>state" thing.

Hardly, Robert. He's a man of strong moral conviction and I believe him
to be honest in his desire to see a moral reawakening in this country. While I
think that organized religion in it's own right is a scam, the basic tenents of
Christan belief are what built this nation and made it strong.

The ironic thing is that the basic tenents of ALL major religions profess
the same thing, yet all are at each others throats over who's more right or
more devout.

But no nation can exist for any length of time without some basis of faith and basic moral convictions.

We have already watered down each and every tenent of basic civility until only the force of law exists. And once we have removed the "roadblocks" of some basic moral standards, what's left?

>> This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
>>electing another.
>>
>
>But the economy wasn't in the toilet. I didn't care if Bill got a BJ or
>not. But he should
>have owned up to it in that court of law. "Okay, I did it. You happy
>now? Don't
>we have more important things to spend time on?" After a month it would
>have
>blown over...

The economy was held together by a ton of taxes, Robert. Reagonomics started us on the road to financial solvency. Clintonomics taxed the be-jeebers out of us.

>Why does GW still claim that Saddam aided Al Queda? Or is it that
>Saddam didn't
>tell the USA ambassador in Bagdad (or elsewhere) that "Al Queda is
>planning an
>attack on you guys and I kicked them out of my palace"? Not telling the
>cops
>about someone hatching a crime conspiracy is illegal.

I agree. That's what happens when you don't have an intelligence network you can trust in place and have to depend on third party sources. Thanks, Jimmy Carter.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5111. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 14:42:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621104247.05916.00000400@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93175

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/21/2004 5:57 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040621065743.17756.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com>
>
>In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>>Three mile run? Five?
>
>If you ever get up to these parts, Steve, we can do that.

You're on!

=)

73

Steve, K4YZ

5112. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 14:49:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621104944.05916.00000401@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93176

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/20/2004 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>

> Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without
> presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could
> verify his general claims.

The Veterans Administration is NOT "proof enough" form you, Scummy One?

> "No Proof = Didn't Happen."

The proof is in the phone call, Lennie.

You haven't made it.

Makes you look pretty stupid with that last claim.

Steve, K4YZ

5113. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 15:31:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406210731.3d0e7f17@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93177

averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
news:<20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
> >> > and I mention that
> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
> >> > communications in 1948.
> >>
> >> They did? Everywhere?
> >>
> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
> >>
> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
> >
> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>
> "Abiding?!?" Crock.
>
> Fort Huachuca is the Military Intelligence center for the U.S. Army.
>
> One duty of M.I. is to run intercepts on foreign communications.
>
> Some foeign countries still think that manual telegraphy is
> "effective" so the M.I. teach morse code to intercept
> analysts. For LISTENING.
>
> The only "use" for morse code is in LISTENING, of intercepts,
> ELINT.
>
> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
> radio communications. [USN blinker lights are not radio]
>
> The Signal Corps is the communications branch of the Army.
> The Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA. The Signal Center
> doesn't teach any morse code receiving or sending.
>
> Katapult Kellie should valve off all that steam and join the
> rest of the world in this new millennium.

>
> Good luck on that one, now...
>
> LHA / WMD

Even the FCC and VEC's quit administering a Morse sending test. They
only administered a receiving test.

Hmmmmm?

Maybe the sending test would have been a disincentive to CW use on HF.

5114. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 16:30:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <E2EBc.2$hj1.1@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93178

Steve,

I have no problem with someone being rich; I have a problem when I pay a higher percentage of my pay to taxes than they do.

Please don't tell me you are so naive that you think that the wealthy always pay a higher percentage in taxes. Fortunately, one overhaul in social security plugged one big hole. Social security used to be based on the highest three earning years in the last 10. I knew one businessman that paid himself quite poorly, taking most of the money as unearned income (thus exempt from social security). Fact is, I know a businesswoman doing the same thing. What happens is they start paying themselves handsomely the last few years (and paying those payroll taxes too). As a result, they pay over 20 or 30 years half what others pay and collect at 100% social security. Unfortunately for both of these folks, they changed social security so it is based on the 30 highest earning years, so now they get a lot less. But that loophole existed for years.

Why is it that these "compassionate" conservatives can stand by and watch school districts with 30 plus students in a classroom whilst a suburban school has only 20 per class and every 8th grader receives a *laptop computer* and honestly believe that everything is just fine? How did New York state, in calculating aid to school districts, manage to count every student in NYC as 0.7 student?

You are gullible at best. I'm not mad at you, just upset at priorities in this country. Remember too that the whole world is watching this country to see if our actions anywhere correspond to what we are saying. If I were a European nation, I'd not only be a bit skeptical, I'd be nervous too.

73,
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5115. Re: Net Control Policy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 19:16:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10dedi6os81iq1e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93179

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:mbedndw1L64EpEndRVn-gQ@comcast.com...
>
> "Kim" <emertxe@softhome.net> wrote in message
> news:eafcf30c.0406181837.7d6757e0@posting.google.com...
> > 'X-No-archive: yes'
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
> news:<10cka5v1o58vsb1@corp.supernews.com>...
> > > Actually during a public service event or an actual emergency event,
> keeping
> > > some form of log or at least a "message log" is actually a good idea.
> If
> > > there is some type of problem discovered later on, at least having a
> record
> > > of what occurred can possibly help to save the proverbial
posterior....
> > >
> > > Keeping a personal log is not required anymore, but can serve to help
in
> > > some regards. I only log now new contacts/first time contacts. If I
> kept a
> > > log for each contact, regardless of how many times I chatted with each
> > > person, I would be killing a ton of trees.
>
>
> I log all my HF activity even if they are repeat contacts but not VHF.
The
> reason for not logging the latter is that most of my VHF activity is drive
> time chitchat and doesn't travel great distances. Unusual VHF or UHF
> contacts, I do log.

I log the "first-time" contacts regardless of band or mode, as it serves as
a memory reinforcement. The second, third, fourth time etc., I do not log
usually, unless there is some compelling reason to.

>
> However there is another very good reason for keeping a log even though
not
> required. If your call is ever "hijacked" (and this has happened to
people)
> and you get cited for violations you never committed, you can use your log
> as supporting documentation that you were not on that frequency at that
date
> and time. Although logs could be forged, when you show that you have
> habitually kept a log and that log appears to be undoctored, the FCC is

> inclined to decide in your favor.

Definitely. As well as keeping other forms of time/date information. I take and photocopy my time sheet at work even, just so I will always have a record of where I have been. (Especially living in the Patriot Act era when they can f**k with you all they want and aren't liable for their actions.....)

>
> I keep both a paper log and a computer log. I enter contacts in both. The
> paper log is a backup just in case the computer log becomes irretrievable.
> And I can sit on my sofa and thumb through my paper log just for the fun of
> looking at old contacts. The computer log lets me easily find how many
> times I've worked a person, state or country, track number of states worked,
> etc.
>

Makes sense! :)

Ryan KC8PMX

5116. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174143.07368.00000266@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93183

In article <20040621104944.05916.00000401@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>
>
>> Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without
>> presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could
>> verify his general claims.
>
> The Veterans Administration is NOT "proof enough" form you, Scummy One?

No. Copies from NARA of nursie's "jacket" would do it.

>> "No Proof = Didn't Happen."
>
> The proof is in the phone call, Lennie.
>
> You haven't made it.

Don't have to. Military records of service are at NARA, not with the VA. VA will use NARA.

[National Archives and Records Administration, St.Louis]

Complete information is at NARA. That would show the when and where of "hostile actions." That would show MOS and where served. It's all there.

> Makes you look pretty stupid with that last claim.

Not at all. I know where the military service records are kept. I also know what establishes and defines MARS, posted that in here. Nursie didn't post that. Nursie still wanna claim:

"Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

Nursie has mental constipation problems (in addition to other mental problems). Nursie need help.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5117. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174144.07368.00000267@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93181

In article <20040621104247.05916.00000400@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/21/2004 5:57 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040621065743.17756.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>Three mile run? Five?
>>
>>If you ever get up to these parts, Steve, we can do that.
>
> You're on!

Oh, my! Will you have CNN and Fox News videotaping the Event?

Will the AR Newsletter publicize it?

Maybe it will make the "In Brief" section of the ARRL webpage.

Just think...fame, immortality, adulation, praise, maybe a
special medal for valor for another "hostile action!"

All about "amateur radio policy." Riiiiiight.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5118. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174146.07368.00000268@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93196

In article <20040621065747.17756.00000570@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>(Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>>> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
>>> >
>>> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>> >>
>>> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>>> >>>
>>> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>>> >>>
>>> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>>> >>>> you?
>>> >>>
>>> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>>> >>> the claims he made, yes.
>>> >>
>>> >> Why?
>>> >>
>>> >> He may know just where they are.
>>> >>
>>> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
>>> >> another.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>>> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>>> >>>

>>> >> Can produce or will produce?
>>> >>
>>> >>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
>>> >>> unit, his
>>> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>>> >>>is fact.
>>> >>
>>> >> So what's the problem?
>>> >>
>>> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
>>> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
>>> >> pretty much a given.
>>> >>
>>> >> So why bother about it?
>>> >>>
>>> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>>> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
>>> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>>> >>
>>> >> Maybe.
>>> >>
>>> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
>>> >> etc.
>>> >>
>>> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>>> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
>>> >>>
>>> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
>>> >> of wood.
>>> >>
>>> >>> It's just that it's empty.
>>> >>>
>>> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>>> >>
>>> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
>>> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>>> >>
>>> >>
>>> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
>
>>> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
>>> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
>
>>> >the local repeater in PJ7.
>>>
>>> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
>>>
>>> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters,
>and
>>at

>>> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
>>> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite
>>credible,
>>> even with a very makeshift station.
>>
>>Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.
>
>Absolutely.
>>
>>Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
>>except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
>>nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
>>civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
>>force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the
>>Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically
>>irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.
>
>There seems to be some dispute as to what level in the military command
>structure can authorize amateur operation, and what level of paperwork is
>necessary.

You two Veterans of the military can establish that, can't you?

After all, another PCTA has flattly stated "MARS >>IS<< amateur
radio."

Since MARS is rather obviously military, defined by DoD and not
the FCC, then it is a simple extension of such knowledge to
say that military communications is also amateur. :-)

Next time you two dine at the Captain's Table, bring it up.

>>In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into
>>PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being
>>big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork
>>right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing
>>authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a
>>legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.
>
>Absolutely agree.

PCTA extras always agree.

>>Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame
>>altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his
>>tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on
>>ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The
>>ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of
>>which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that
>>expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to
>>operate an amateur radio station in T5.
>>

>How do we know this for sure?

Kelly said so, therefore it be TRVTH!

>>Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another
>>simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya
>>wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate
>>ham radio operation.
>
>Again - how do we *know* that the required authorization wasn't obtained?

If Kelly say it be "freebanding or pirate," it BE so.

>I agree 100% that if such authority wasn't obtained, it wasn't an amateur
>operation at all.

"MARS is amateur radio." :-)

>In any event, the claimed operation allegedly took place on 10 meters and
>allegedly involved at least two QSOs.

Rev. Jimmie Who should write a big book expose' of this whole
thing.

>>It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac
>>was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and
>>did what they usually do.
>>
>>T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.
>>
>>The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's
>>"T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the
>>freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham
>>radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his
>>kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.
>
>The thing I find interesting is the last paragraph of my post, below. *Nobody*
>is claiming to have worked T5/N0IMD, nor complaining about not getting a QSL
>card. In DX circles, that kinda says it all.

Right. You two military veterans ought to go to the VA for help,
expose all that "illegal freebanding and piracy," even filing
charges with the USAF Judge Advocate General's office!

>>> >> *if* that were the case - wouldn't it make all of the claims true?
>>> >>
>>> >> And why get all upset about it? Nobody is claiming they worked
>>> >> T5/N0IMD. Nobody is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the
>>> >> alleged operation.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I want to be slim, but I don't want to be a slim.

You are PCTA, hear you ROAR!

LHA / WMD

5119. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174147.07368.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93184

In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>...
>
>> He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
>> the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
>> pretend they're thin when they're not.
>
> Wanna see what the "puffy" is, Brain?

It's on the QRZ site. Anyone can see it...

> Care to join me in the gym? Three mile run? Five? I'll make
>you the same offer I did your scumbag friend and will add a rucksack
>with some extra weight in it. Or you could make me REAL happy and
>join me for a few minutes in the ring...(please! please!)

Oooooo....macho emotional RAGE! Physical competition!!!

Blatant physical challenge of FIGHTING prowess!!!

All imporant attributes for radio amateurs? Or radio amateur policy? I think not.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Need for some approved (prescribed by a REAL MD) tranquilizer or other calming drug seems warranted.

Let's see...modern fighting tools (since at least 1700s) allow "just a few ounces of finger pressure" to allow reaching out and touching someone supersonically. No need for physical confrontation up close and personal. [wonder who mentioned "just a few ounces of pressure?" :-)]

All that proves that nursie don't wanna do anything but FIGHT in here. [sic...and sick]

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5120. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174150.07368.00000271@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93182

In article <1e4e3692.0406201847.3863d24d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
>> >
>> > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft
>some
>> >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts,
>Lennie!
>>
>> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?
>
>Wait till that bulging artery in his neck explodes. Wonder what the
>temper management people would recommend?

Recommendation: "Duck and cover!" :-)

LHA / WMD

5121. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174150.07368.00000270@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93195

In article <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
>> >
>> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>> >>>
>> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>> >>>> you?
>> >>>
>> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>> >>> the claims he made, yes.
>> >>
>> >> Why?
>> >>
>> >> He may know just where they are.
>> >>
>> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
>> >> another.
>> >>>
>> >>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
>> >>>
>> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>> >>>
>> >> Can produce or will produce?
>> >>
>> >> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage

>> >>> unit, his
>> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>> >>>is fact.
>> >>
>> >> So what's the problem?
>> >>
>> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
>> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
>> >> pretty much a given.
>> >>
>> >> So why bother about it?
>> >>>
>> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
>> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
>> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>> >>
>> >> Maybe.
>> >>
>> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
>> >> etc.
>> >>
>> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
>> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
>> >>>
>> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
>> >> of wood.
>> >>
>> >>> It's just that it's empty.
>> >>>
>> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>> >>
>> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
>> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>> >>
>> >
>> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
>> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
>> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
>> >the local repeater in PJ7.
>>
>> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
>>
>> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters, and
>at
>> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
>> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite
>credible,
>> even with a very makeshift station.
>
>Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.

>
>Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
>except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
>nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
>civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
>force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the
>Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically
>irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.
>
>In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into
>PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being
>big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork
>right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing
>authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a
>legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.
>
>Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame
>altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his
>tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on
>ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The
>ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of
>which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that
>expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to
>operate an amateur radio station in T5.

Kelly NEVER served in the armed forces of the United States.

Kelly does NOT understand the military chain of command.

Permission to do anything IN the military is granted by ranking
officers.

Didn't Kelly hear that at the Captain's Table while dining with
all that rank? No? Tsk, tsk.

>Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another
>simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya
>wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate
>ham radio operation. It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac
>was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and
>did what they usually do.

Amazing at the range and scope of rationalization for HATING
another newsgroup poster by the high-society ham extras.

Kelly should explain his "superiority" in not only radio but relative
to the rest of society. [Kelly is "superior" only because he claims
that while busy inflating past claims to a greatness never before
seen by hamkind]

>T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.

Kelly has taken on a new role...that of International Regulator
And Punisher of anything an NCTA says.

Yawn.

>The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's
>"T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the
>freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham
>radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his
>kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.

Kelly is allowed to inflate his single patent to 26. Kelly is PCTA.
[proof is with the U.S. Patent Office and several patent websites,
showing only one...and that one as co-inventor]]

Kelli is allowed to shoot bears from an aircraft carrier. Kelly is
PCTA. [there is no proof of this but Kelly will damn anyone who
disputes it]

Kelly claims knowledge of WW2 military vehicles and their radios
as absolute truths. Kelly is PCTA. [proof is in many places,
including old documents of the U.S. military disputing that]

Kelly has repeatedly damned others opposing his fish stories.
Kelly is PCTA. That is approved under the ROE of this news-
group trying to be dominated by PCTA.

They are PCTA, hear them ROAR! :-)

LHA / WMD

5122. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174152.07368.00000272@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93189

In article <1e4e3692.0406201836.4e701d8b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620181937.18863.00000462@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <Xns950E861F4E118elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >Don't forget, the requirements for DXCC are far more stringent than those
>> >of mere legality. I have seen threads before where people have argued past
>
>> >oneanother on this point, i.e. one of them has used the term 'legal' when
>> >they were really talking about DXCC eligibility, a big mistake.
>> >
>> >For example, operation without the permission of the owner of the land or
>> >building is not valid for DXCC, but it is seldom illegal. More to the
>point
>> >in this case, perhaps(?), operation from a war zone is legal with
>> >permission of whoever appears to be in control, but good luck getting it
>> >approved for DXCC.
>>
>> Alun, if there be some etymology of that thread, no "DXCC" was
>> involved. No contesting at all was involved.
>>
>> It began when Heil made some chance remark about "working
>> Frenchmen on 6m out of band." Brian Burke tossed that one
>> back to him with some mild ascerbicity which caused Heil to
>> go bananas. Nursie got out his rusty bayonet, locked and
>> loaded, and made like the Charge of Lite Brigade (which led
>> into the Valley of Death of his of today).
>>
>> Nursie never got to Somalia, certainly not to any "hostile action"
>> there (or anyplace else with any proof) but Brian Burke did.
>> Brian earlier had made a chance remark about operating from
>> there on ham frequencies, getting permission from his
>> commanding officer. That resulted in a long, overdrawn word
>> battle and flame war with Heil who was resentful (to the max)
>> of anyone having the temerity to toss him a rejoinder. Nursie
>> jumped in on that with usual diss-and-cuss, trying to make
>> like a legal eagle with smarts instead of the hummingbird
>> with dumbth.
>>
>> The PCTA of this newsgrope all seem to be self-righteous,
>> prissy puritans of perfection who will explode with outrage at

>> the slightest provocation of their beloved manual telegraphy
>> as being anything less than the ultimate skill of amateurs.
>>
>> It's almost as Henry Ford put it on the color of the Model T:
>> "You can have any opinion you want, so long as its pro-
>> code."
>>
>> That's the "new" freedom of speech in here. Enjoy.
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>I got back from a week of aerial operations, drove by the storage
>unit, and checked that the lock wasn't jimmied ("jimmied" is a common
>use for B/E, not a slam against the Rev. Jim).
>
>My T5 logs are safe and secure. One day they may have real historical
>value. I could divide them up and run some through Christie's and the
>others through Sothby's. Maybe I'll just make a run of numbered
>copies, suitable for framing.

A press run would be a non-good idea. That would start another
spate of Book Burning by the PCTA in general, sponsored by
the enemies of fantasy.

Some overweight stubbly-faced documentary film maker would
get publicity for his expose of Somalia, that it "never happened."
["Moore to come" as Variety put it...]

Denial of reality is the stock in trade of the olde-tyme hammes
who love, honor, and obey morsemanship. Everyone who speaks
against them "LIE!" :-)

LHA / WMD

5123. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174156.07368.00000273@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93186

In article <20040620095712.11752.00000249@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/19/2004 8:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >>Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>>> >
>>> > > > Nobody
>>> > > > is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged operation.
>>> > >
>>> > >Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>>> > >
>>> > > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>>> >
>>> > Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>>stinger
>>> > got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>>> >
>>> > "Nothing to send."
>>>
>>100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.
>>
>> That you may have sent out "QSL" cards is not at issue. That you sent
>>out
>>QSL cards confirming your activites from Somalia are.
>>
>> What IS at issue is the validity of the operation (it wasn't) and whom
>>you
>>may have had QSO's with (you refuse to state).
>>
>> So far, you've not provided us with anything more than a claim that you
>>operated from Somalia.

>
> Even if you DID "operate" from Somalia, from your own words in THIS
>forum
>it's apparent that you did not have legal sanction to do what you allege to
>ahve done, ergo the cards are invalid for ANY purpose other than a keepsake.
>
> No Proof = Didn't Happen.

Show us your "Proof" that manual telegraphy is still used for
U.S. military communications. NOW. Today. Confirm your
claim of another posting.

You have not yet proven that "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio."
Despite the real, true Proof established by DoD Directive
4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03).

The rest of the world lives in reality, not the fantasy imagination
of "The Last Hostile Action Hero."

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5124. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174158.07368.00000274@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93188

In article <1e4e3692.0406210731.3d0e7f17@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>news:<20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> > and I mention that
>> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> >> > communications in 1948.
>> >>
>> >> They did? Everywhere?
>> >>
>> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>> >>
>> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>> >
>> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>>
>> "Abiding?!?" Crock.
>>
>> Fort Huachuca is the Military Intelligence center for the U.S. Army.
>>
>> One duty of M.I. is to run intercepts on foreign communications.
>>
>> Some foeign countries still think that manual telegraphy is
>> "effective" so the M.I. teach morse code to intercept
>> analysts. For LISTENING.
>>
>> The only "use" for morse code is in LISTENING, of intercepts,
>> ELINT.
>>
>> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
>> radio communications. [USN blinker lights are not radio]
>>
>> The Signal Corps is the communications branch of the Army.
>> The Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA. The Signal Center

>> doesn't teach any morse code receiving or sending.
>>
>> Katapult Kellie should valve off all that steam and join the
>> rest of the world in this new millennium.
>>
>> Good luck on that one, now...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Even the FCC and VEC's quit administering a Morse sending test. They
>only administered a receiving test.
>
>Hmmmmm?
>
>Maybe the sending test would have been a disincentive to CW use on HF.

There must be some mental block induced by too much
morsemanship. The morsemen can't understand reality.

Or, they are so immersed in their only radio service active
in morsemenship that they are totally blind to all other radio
services. Might be a good project for some PhD candidate in
psychology as a Dissertation.

Time has stopped for the morsemen. They continue to live in
the past, imagining glories lives of navel high society, "hostile
actions," mighty titles of importance, all from morsemanship
credentialism.

Back some 49 years ago, NATO released their phonetic
alphabet. Phonetic alphabets are of no use for manual
telegraphy...apply only to voice communications. Just the
same, the morsemen keep insisting everyone still uses "CW"
(manual on-off carrier keying telegraphy) for military
communications.

Their minds are warped, living in fantasies of their own beeping.

LHA / WMD

5125. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:41:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174159.07368.00000275@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93180

In article <20040621093451.05916.00000395@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 11:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
>> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
>> radio communications.
>
> Yes, they do.

NO. They once did. No more.

Establish your PROOF before you blither out nonsense like that.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Temper fry.

LHA / WMD

5126. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174201.07368.00000276@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93193

In article <d22b54c3.0406210522.5fb05e8d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> > and I mention that
>> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> >> > communications in 1948.
>>
>> >> They did? Everywhere?
>>
>> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>
>> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>>
>> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>>
>> That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some
>spoofing
>> and such.
>
>Sure, they'd be grossly negligent if they didn't. I'll just bet that
>Osama Baby has at least looked at CW for his purposes and that since
>9/11 our guys have ramped up their volume of poking around for it. So
>yes, the feds certainly do have an ongoing and abiding interest in the
>use of CW, one-way for their purposes and/or otherwise.

Kelly, unable to admit what is happening since his bear-shooting
days as King of the Katapults, manufactures "knowing analyses"
of terrorists.

Kelly the putz-caller seems to forget a well-publicized video bite
of Osama bin Laden rather obviously using a hand-held transceiver
in earlier days. No code key was evident in that video bite seen
on major networks.

Kelly has NO information on "ramping up" on-off keying codes by
the U.S. government or anyone else. The Military Intelligence
School at Fort Huachuca has been active for years. All U.S.
government agencies involved in any way use that M.I. Center,
including those few needing any sort of skills with on-off codings
such as morse. That as an economic consideration, not any sort
of technical reason or alleged "importance of morse."

Reference: Fort Huachuca public affairs office.

>> However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same mission -
or
>> the same resources.
>
>Even if we did I wouldn't go anywhere near it.

Why not?

"Sorry Hans, MARS >> IS << amateur radio!" True or not true?

From someone "shooting bears for naval intelligence" and bragging
about "dining with the [aircraft carrier] captain," that sounds hollow.

>> >> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>> >> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
>> >> > person is for morse code.
>>
>> >> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like
>it
>> >> or
>> >> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see -
>and
>> >> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
>> >
>> >Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
>> >didn't ya?
>>
>> Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and the
>> subject.
>>
>> >Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
>>
>> Oyez.
>>
>> >Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.
>>
>> Bad pun of "navel" noted.
>
>Another example of the Putz in his seven-yer-old mode. Which he
>consistently drops into when he can't find an adult comment to post.

I have no problem being "adult" - even around children and the
immature. :-)

When I find some PCTA who are not children in here, I might alter
posting style.

>> >No
>> >such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
>> >snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.
>>
>> That's true!
>
>Every time the Soviets buzzed a carrier it became a tourist event,
>bloomin' hoot. Kodak could have made money with a flight deck photo
>processing kiosk after those flybys.

More "tales of the South Pacific?" :-)

>> >I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
>> >of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
>> >aboard.
>>
>> Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.
>
>Nah, it was just another bit of Naval tradition, DoD civilian
>professionals were treated as officers and were expected to
>reciprocate the courtesies received. I had to introduce myself to both
>the skipper and the air boss and join them for dinner in officer's
>mess on Friday evenings, etc. I knew nothing about any of it when I
>logged aboard the first time. A crusty Chief Yeoman sat me down in his
>office and went thru the list of what I had to do and not do.

Good ol' crusty chiefs. :-)

So, the dinner table talk was all about ham radio, morse, and
establishing valid QSLs for DXCC? :-)

Or did the talk involve ANY radio communications?

>> >The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
>> >work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
>> >
>> >> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
>> >
>> >End of.
>> >
>> roger that!
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Another installment of "Tales of The South Pacific" by the ancient
mariner-guest king of the katapults schmoosing with captains of
aircraft carriers. Real involvement with amateur radio! Not...

LHA / WMD

5127. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174203.07368.00000277@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93192

In article <1e4e3692.0406201825.6296ab8@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620181939.18863.00000464@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040620095205.11752.00000248@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/19/2004 10:17 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406191917.7aabb853@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>Ditto the number of active hams hamming it up for WWII [exactly zero
>> >>(0)]. But that does not stop some from revering the contributions
>> >>that hams hamming it up made in WWII [exactly zero (0)].
>> >>
>> > You made this up, right?
>>
>> No, nursie, Brian is correct.
>>
>> The U.S. government stopped amateur radio transmissions
>> during WW2. Really. It was in all the ham magazines and
>> everything. Didn't you see it?
>
>Saw it in a magazine. It could have even been a defunct magazine.

Nursie apparently didn't see it. No one sent him documented
proof, notarized. Everyone is LYING to nursie! Conspiracy!

>> > More over, do you BELIEVE what you wrote? I ask because there is more
>> >than a small amount of evidence to the contrary.
>>
>> I don't think Brian is old enough to be alive during WW2, but
>> I was and I believe the U.S. government shut down amateur
>> radio transmitting during WW2.
>>
>> Even the ARRL acknowledges that. Really!
>
>Just like R.R.A.P. isn't Ham Radio, whatever those guys were doing
>during WWII wasn't Ham Radio.

Their "spirits" were fully into it, busy beating the Huns and Japs
through mighty blows of their hand keys, air-dropping QSLs on

their homelands, fighting for truth, justice, mom's apple pie and
the glory of the League.

>But there are some very confused folks here who think that "MARS
>>>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," so I guess they might also think that
>"Military Radio >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
>Who really knows what they think. It's mostly incoherent, irrational
>yelling.

They are Extras, hear them Roar! :-)

>> >>BTW, did you know that a Morse Exam acts as a disincentive to CW use
>> >>on HF?
>> >>
>> >>And that MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio?
>> >>
>> >>Hi, hi.
>> >>
>> >>These guys keep getting sillier and sillier.
>> >
>> > Kinda like "Unlicensed devices play a major role in "emergency
>> >comms"...?!?!
>>
>> No, more like "CW gets through when nothing else will..."
>
>Actually, CW gets through when everything else will.

True enough, but the codeaholic says otherwise, that morse beats
all other modes, past or future. Compulsive morseodist behavior.

>> Or, that morse testing has to continue for "traditional"
>> reasons (and because olde-tyme hammes are pished
>> out and insist all newcomers have to "work as hard" as
>> they did...because).
>
>An anachronism.

Yes, but all newcomers MUST do so, to "demonstrate their
committment and dedication to all others." :-)

>> It might also be about 26 patents when only 1 exists or
>> shooting bears from an aircraft carrier or some Chesty
>> Puller wanna-be saying "I was in seven hostile actions"
>> and never revealing the When or Where of those. It could
>> also be those old-tyme hammes who made big noises
>> about "I design and build my own ham radios" who, a few
>> days later would talk a lot about his latest Kit project.
>
>I've never seen orders for the seven hostile actions. They must not
>have actually occurred. I've never seen the schematics for the home
>designed (by a PE) amateur radio station. Perhaps they don't exist.

>Perhaps they do.

Irrelevant. If nursie say so, it is so. All others "LIE!" :-)

>> Of course, those same individuals have to misdirect a thread
>> into their oh-so-very-important-personal-battles in order to
>> diss-and-cuss those of opposite opinions.
>
>One in particular.

Most readers realize this. That particular writer doesn't.

>> This thread started out about Phonetic Alphabets. The "Able,
>> Baker, Charlie..." U.S. phonetic alphabet is familiar to me
>> because I learned it and used it in the U.S. Army. That set
>> was replaced by the NATO phonetic alphabet ("Alpha, Bravo..")
>> adopted in 1955. I am familiar with that since I was IN the
>> U.S. Army at that time, learned it and used it in military
>> communications. That's unalterable fact despite what those
>> weren't born then or mere infants at the time say.
>
>Strange coincidence. I learned it in the U.S. military also.

Amazine coincidence, isn't it? :-)

>> The NATO phonetic alphabet was adopted by the International
>> Civil Aviation Organization shortly after the U.S. military adopted
>> it. Some in here want to argue and argue that phonetic alphabet
>> is called the "ICAO phonetic alphabet." That's rather petty.
>> NATO had it first. That's unalterable fact. All the aggressive
>> argumentation going on in here seems to be little more than a
>> disguise to diss-and-cuss certain personalities, certainly not
>> the subject matter.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>No Content in all of that agressive argumentation.

"No Content International" - the opponent group of the PCTA against
No Code International.

Beep beep uber alles.

LHA / WMD

5128. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174205.07368.00000278@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93191

In article <20040621103935.05916.00000399@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Chief of Stuff of the U.S. military) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>Date: 6/20/2004 8:37 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40D63BDA.4060206@ix.netcom.com>
>>
>>Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
>>> And replace him with who? John Kerry? A guy who sat side-by-side with
>>>this Nation's disgrace, Jane "Hanoi" Fonda...?!?!
>>>
>>Did he? Heard that that photo was fake. And it's not like he was
>>touring Hanoi with her.
>>For all we know, Jane might have been a CIA spy.
>
> Uh huh.
>
>>> Both of whom "support the troops" by making public statements that give
>>>aid and comfort to this Nation's foes WHILE we are in conflict with
>>them...?!?!
>>>
>>Vietnam was a stupid war. Now if we had a goal and a strategy that made
>>any sense, maybe we could have achieved something...
>
> The war wasn't stupid.
>
> Our conduct of it was. You can't take the battle to the enemy, reach a
>certain goal, then recede and expect to win.

Must have been the site of nursie's "hostile actions."

> Where would we have been if we just pushed the German's back to the
>Rhine, or if we didn't

Didn't the USMC do good in Yurp?

>>> George Bush is not the most eloquent speaker and like any other Human
>>>Being, doesn't always get things right...But he's a man of TRUE moral
>>>conviction and honesty. Replacing him with a creep like Kerry would be a
>>>travesty and would send the wrong message to the World.
>>>
>>Problem is that he's trying to skip over that "separation of church and
>>state" thing.
>

> Hardly, Robert. He's a man of strong moral conviction and I believe
him
>to be honest in his desire to see a moral reawakening in this country. While
I
>think that organized religion in it's own right is a scam, the basic tenents
of
>Christan belief are what built this nation and made it strong.

"tenents?" "Christan?" :-)

White power rules!

Strength! Combat! Kill! Destroy!

> The ironic thing is that the basic tenents of ALL major religions profess
>the same thing, yet all are at each others throats over who's more right or
>more devout.

Everbody gotta be "Christan!"

> But no nation can exist for any length of time without some basis of
faith
>and basic moral convictions.

Right...and therefore, amateur radio gotta have code test. :-)

> We have already watered down each and every tenent of basic civility
until
>only the force of law exists. And once we have removed the "roadblocks" of
>some basic moral standards, what's left?

Aren't the "tenents" paying rent or something?

>>> This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
>>>electing another.
>>
>>But the economy wasn't in the toilet. I didn't care if Bill got a BJ or not.
But he should
>>have owned up to it in that court of law. "Okay, I did it. You happy now?
Don't
>>we have more important things to spend time on?" After a month it would have
>>blown over...
>
> The economy was held together by a ton of taxes, Robert. Reagonomics
>started us on the road to financial solvency. Clintonomics taxed the
>be-jeebers out of us.

Riiiiight. :-) Whatever it is Democrats are the Antichrist!

>>Why does GW still claim that Saddam aided Al Queda? Or is it that Saddam
didn't
>>tell the USA ambassador in Bagdad (or elsewhere) that "Al Queda is planning
an
>>attack on you guys and I kicked them out of my palace"? Not telling the cops

>>about someone hatching a crime conspiracy is illegal.
>
> I agree. That's what happens when you don't have an intelligence network
>you can trust in place and have to depend on third party sources. Thanks,
>Jimmy Carter.

Democrats are the Antichrist!

I just luvvvv these informed diss and cuss sessions about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY matters done in a "meaningful discourse" manner. :-)

Well, best to let the Chief of Stuff go back to his Stuff duties and everyone else MIGHT get back to Access BPL. Maybe.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5129. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174206.07368.00000279@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93185

In article <20040621102454.05916.00000397@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (U.S. Military Chief of Stuff and former President) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>>Date: 6/20/2004 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>
>
>>Clinton was not removed from office. What Clinton did was terrible to his
>>wife and daughter, but what damage to the country (other than a major
>>distraction) did it do?
>
> He lied...repeatedly, under oath, looking Hillary and US directly in the
>eyes.
>
> That America kept looking the other way was the second biggest travesty.
>
>Oh well...

Nursie think Democrats be the Antichrist. Nursie also think:

All Democrats LIE, cheat, steal, and smell bad under arms.

>>Are you so naive as to think that this huge deficit
>>Bush is running won't hurt us? Already some want to reduce social security
>>more. It isn't that social security is broke (and it appears to be in a bit
>>better shape than they thought, but as good jobs disappear and are replaced
>>by near minimum-wage jobs, I wouldn't bet); it is that the federal
>>government has tapped the funds and issued IOUs to social security. They
>>don't want to pay back money to the folks that need it the most. Rob from
>>the poor and give to the rich.
>
> Too bad folks didn't spend some more time reading Steve Forbes' plan for
>restructuring the tax system in this country.

Riiiiiight.

>>Compassionate conservative *IS* an oxymoron. I don't need any more idiots
>>in Washington running *huge* deficits to benefit the rich.
>
> Why is it that we Americans always brag how anyone with the right
>motivation and determination can become a millionaire, yet when they do it, we
>take gleeful delight in doing/saying what we can to bring them down?

Cuz all nursie wanna do is FIGHT! [got no money...not enuf]

Well...there goes any hope for "meaningful discussion" on how
BROADBAND OVER POWER LINES is going to hurt/help
U.S. amateur radio.

Tune in next day for another brilliant thoughful reason for the decline
and fall of the world as nursie knows it...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5130. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174208.07368.00000280@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93197

In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Presidential candidate of the Fantasy Party) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040620225732.07518.00000333@mb-m26.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040620191701.22984.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Kerry is a chronic apologist. He will do nothing when this country is
>>>attacked but wring his hands, say "Oh, we're sorry, did something we do/say
>>>offend you?...P L E A S E forgive us"
>>
>>You know this how?
>
> I know this in my heart.
>
> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.

Invite him to a 3 or 5 mile run carrying weights in a rucksack,
then go a few rounds in the ring with him, big tiger.

Might makes right. [worked good for the Huns...for a while]

>>> Having been in the apologist-era Armed Forces of the late 70's, it is my
>>>freverent hope that we DON'T allow ourselve to regress to that stage, which
is
>>>exactly what I fear will happen with this candidate.
>>
>>Why?
>
> Kerry.
>
> Fonda.
>
> Together.

Nursie have "freverent" hopes dashed? Should have been dotted?

Dubya have as many "hostile actions" in his "jacket" as nursie.

>>The late 1970s were the immediate post-Vietnam, post-draft era. You can't
blame
>>all the problems of that era on who was in the White House - unless you want
to
>>include JFK, who got us into Vietnam, LBJ who escalated it from a small
>force
>>of "advisors", Nixon, Ford....
>>>
>>> Carter tried to castrate the Armed Forces in the 70's.
>>
>>How?
>
> He diluted the chain of command. Part of the errors that occured in the
>Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what should
>have been an military operation.

Chief of Stuff didn't read the report. MILITARY screwed up.

But...BPL wasn't involved, nor was amateur radio involved.

Maybe they didn't do morse good enough.

Yeah, that's the real reason! :-)

> He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with
>"warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave
>America blind and hog tied.
>
>>> Bill Clinton didn't try to castrate them...he just made it possible for
>>>other guys to play with them....Oh yeah...he let a bunch of ragheads drag
some
>>>of our guys through the streets of Mogandishu and them rewarded them by
doing
>>>exactly what they wanted us to do.
>>
>>How did Clinton "let them" do what they did? Should the US have stayed out of
>>that conflict? Or gotten more involved? What threat were they to US
>security?
>
> Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?

Tsk, tsk, look like nursie be sampling the "mogan david" wine again.

"Mogadishu," nursie.

> The threats were there. We knew it. "Rules of Engagement" establish by
>Billary in Washington were not "real world functional".

Nursie had a "hostile action" there?

All a result of not getting proper amateur authorization for "T5"
from the League, right.

>>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?
>

> Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.

Nursies take care of "messes." Get to work.

>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>
> Be danged if I know. The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them for
>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help, I
>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.

No doubt not enough marines there to keep order. :-)

> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>business and social, any better than what we did.

Way to go, Chief of Stuff! Show 'em who's boss!

>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>
> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.

What? No answers? !!!!

>>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>>
>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam - a
>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>
> Because he's an apologist.
>
> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.
>
> He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our
>tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.

"Cowing and beying?!?"

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Kerry was in REAL hostile actions, documented,
proved, with witnesses who were there.

Nursie "hostile actions" done at a NG dental center?

>>>He's already
>>>angry that the Republicans have done exactly what they said they'd do, and
>>>it's an embarrassment to Democrats.
>>
>>I don't see that at all.
>
> YMMV.
>
>>Bush & Co. told us that SH had weapons of mass destruction. None have
surfaced.

>>They told us SH was connected to 9-11. No evidence of that, either.
>
> "Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
>sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.
>
> Bush is not the first president to act on less-than-adequate
>intelligence.

Nursie got REAL intelligence.

> That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the intellignece
>agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle East
>after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
>during/after WW2.

Gotta love those terribly "meaningful discourses" from Chief of Station
Iraq who was there since WW2. Fantasy Island. Democrats are
the Antichrist!

>>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?
>
> We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?

Nursie exceptional child prodigy, read PopScience at age 5.

>>And
>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits
>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
>
> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.

Riiiiight...all the fault of Democrats, the Antichrist!

>>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
and
>>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
mirrors
>>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
>>
>>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
>>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies. Nor
>>was Halliburton.
>
> HOW...!?!?

Fried.

In nursie's case, not being able to follow, he wants his over HARD.

That's the Republican way to go... :-)

Now, what has all that uninformed very-one-sided diatribe to do
with amateur radio or broadband over power lines?

Absolutely NOTHING! :-)

The might-makes-right morsaholics have once more turned
this newsgroup into just-another-private-chatroom about subjects
they know zits about venting fury and vengence and retribution
on all who dare upset their cozy little klatsch place. :-)

Meanwhile, BPL sits there in 3 1/2 places, ready to raise holy
heck with HF signals and the mighty pundits are repeating
other pundits' words of damnation about opposite political
parties cries that "it's all the fault of the [opposite] party!!!"

Powerless prose from political pundits, pandering their own
egos.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5131. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174210.07368.00000281@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93194

In article <QaednYH5EJLUxkvd4p2dnA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <e1lBc.3208$ph6.1562@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
>> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>>
>>>It would seem prudent to have the ARRL petition the FCC to raise amateur
>>>power limits to partially recover that lost 10 dB. I think perhaps a 10 kw
>>>limit would be close enough. It might also make BPL communications a bit
>>>dicey too ;)
>>
>> Har! :-) :-) :-)
>>
>> I was totally flabbergasted at reading the Phase 2 report. They
>> boldly went where no technical person dared to go in saying
>> "BPL will 'improve' the electric power line noise problems!"
>
> Ideology trumps science! Yes, that was a shocking thing to read.
>
>> As of the end of the business day on Friday, 18 June 2004, the
>> Comment numbers in the FCC ECFS were -
>>
>> docket 04-37 (NPRM) 1,399
>> docket 03-104 (NOI) 6,076
>>
>> There's lots of more-than-one-page real technical problem
>> presentations there showing that Access BPL is full of snit
>> than there are for the BPL proponents. I don't think that will
>> matter much.
>>
>> The writing seemed clear on the wall last year. BPL *will*
>> be started. The business folks are geared up for profits.
>> The President has made both BPL and Broadband a goal.
>> The good little Republican syncophants are synchronized
>> to The Word from on high.
>
> BPL = Ban Pretentious Liberals?

Heh. No. It doesn't matter which political power is "in power"
in DC on Access BPL. It evolved from the initial trial in
Norway a decade ago and presents a "business ideology"
(of making money) and all that capitalism stuff.

Somehow, through whatever means, the BPL advocates in the
USA convinced the FCC that it was the greatest thing since
sliced bread to fit the "broadband super highway." It just
happened that the FCC has Republican-oriented commissioners
and the Acting Chief of the NTIA is sucking up to Bush's
speech statement in rather blatant politicalization.

> Hoo, we are getting close to that strange discussion we had last year
>with the fellow saying that if we know that it interferes, and we
>transmit, we are purposely interfereing. That's enough to give a person
>a headache!

Not quite. Amateurs have to understand that they are small-time
players in this particular game. All the rah-rah and we-are-the-
greatest internal pep-talking doesn't help the image presented to
the lawmakers. It boils down to a very few individuals trying to
"get even" for incidental interference by deliberate interference
with a communications service. That service is much bigger, in
both employees and affected customers than a few hams in any
particular locality. It would be a lopsided legal fight, despite all
the whoopdedo of "helping" by the League. If Access BPL spreads
to many more communities, the League would run out of legal and
moral resources to help.

Deliberate interference isn't necessary. Ordinary operating should
be sufficient to disrupt Access BPL in any one location. Hams
would just need to transmit more and on different HF bands...not
spending more of their free time on the Internet and then writing
that "they are very active on the bands" when they were not.

> But if a person is in a neighborhood with Access BPL, they won't need
>to use that linear. Seems 100 watts will do just fine. I don't know the
>frequency context of BPL/Amateur transmitter interference, but my guess
>is that if you hear it on the band you are transmitting on, you'll do it
>interference harm if you fire up.

Perhaps. Technical details of Access BPL systems have yet to
be released to the electronics industry. While that may be logical
to assume, it isn't proof positive.

>> All in all, though, the FCC has NO POWER to proactively stop
>> Access BPL now. At best all it can do is set the incidental
>> RF radiation levels and then enforce those. Or, wait about 30
>> years or so until BPL is truly legacy service and then, like
>> land telephony, start drafting more stringent regulations. In 30
>> years from now, few of us will be in a position to do much.
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org

I left that in on purpose. Just to emphasize that the FCC CANNOT
stop Access BPL right now. But, what can be done, is to demand
TESTING of any installed systems. LOTS of it to correspond with
a wide-area installation (a logical demand).

The FCC has NO power to stop BPL directly. It's not in the rules. [that's why docket 04-37 is concerned with an NPRM] But, by demanding appropriate TESTING with emphasis on PASSING all tests, THAT can make it economically infeasible.

Testing takes valuable manhours. BPL systems will be at many, many places in one community, therefore MUCH testing is needed for compliance. Not only does that affect the installation budget, but it takes TIME to complete. Businesses offering broadband services want to start making money as soon as possible (also logical) but lots of testing and test time would delay that.

That's a realistic way of looking at the problem and a possible way to make BPL economically difficult to sustain. However, remember that once BPL is in-place, it will quickly become a legacy service and damn difficult to remove.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5132. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174212.07368.00000282@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93190

In article <EJOdnSqcgeu7xUvdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>> news:20040620145729.29277.00000450@mb-m16.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <20040620093909.11752.00000245@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>
>> (Steve
>>
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>
>> truth
>>
>>>>From: "John Anderson" nobody@spamcop.net
>>>>Date: 6/19/2004 7:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <qd5Bc.119983$3x.87399@attbi_s54>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
>>>>news:20040619195807.07368.00000246@mb-m24.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>>I think/hope what will really kill BPL is economics. It simply won't be
>>>>>able to compete with DSL, cable and other technologies.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>Bush appointed Powell, lets boot Bush, replace him with anyone who will
work
>>>>for the people, not the rich corporations!
>>>>
>>>> And replace him with who? John Kerry?
>>>
>>>Why not?
>>>
>>
>> Very simple reason why not. According to liberals, cheap internet access
>> (remember it was Gore who "invented the internet" according to his own
>> statements)

>
> Produce those statements Dee. Show me that quote!
>
> Or do you just repeat what you are told?
>
> In case you want something other than NeoCon Propaganda What he said
>was that:
>
> "during my service in the United States Congress, I took the
>initiative in creating the Internet".
>
> Gore was instrumental along with other Congressmen and perhaps women in

>paving the way for the internet as we know it today. Within the context
>of the interview, the message was clear enough. Unfortunately, *some*
>members of the (liberal?) press chose to not only take it out of
>context, but deliberately misquoted him.
>
> Suggesting Gore saying that he "invented the internet" is very, very
>inaccurate.

The Internet went PUBLIC in 1991...under the Clinton-Gore
administration.

The Internet ALREADY EXISTED and was running. Some
may have been, as I was, already on USENET...which grew
out of ARPANET that existed in the 1970s.

Gore was instrumental in getting GOVERNMENT involved
in the Internet, starting the ball rolling so to speak. Every
U.S. government agency, nearly every U.S. community
government now has a website. The military picked up on
that and most large units have websites and promotes
both training and information exchanges through the web.

The electronics industry and academia as well as the
U.S. government were the creators of ARPANET through
the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA). With
more and more use, plus evolved increases in rate of
information exchange, that net split with USENET linking
industry and universities. Communications technologies
kept improving, advancing and by late 1990 there were
many who felt that this "new" Internet should be within
everyone's reach. That wasn't a political decision. It was
that of "idealogues" strangely enough. They had seen
the predecessor, BBSs, grow in the decade prior.

As of 2003, a mere dozen years after public opening of
the 'net, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that one in five
U.S. homes had some form of Internet access. That IS
explosive growth. It keeps on growing. The Internet is
now "legacy."

Politics had little to do with it. Technology was the spark.
Ideology and practicality and convenience did the trick
from then on.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5133. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:42:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621174213.07368.00000283@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93187

In article <20040621093329.05916.00000394@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>>Date: 6/20/2004 3:18 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <l0qbd01vq5cc8hnca5qjj81lchqj3rumo2@4ax.com>
>>
>>On 20 Jun 2004 13:14:21 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>>> I see at least one reference to a Civil Air Patrol station.
>>
>>Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like
>>Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.
>
> I'm not in Florida.

Of course. Florida is not part of Fantasyland.

>>> I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices
being
>>>employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems.
(Certain
>>>posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess
they
>>>will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!
>>
>>In all fairness, the frequencies posted were in relation to a military
>>exercise and to an exercise of a radio net oprated by the civilian
>>government in support of said military exercise. This is far removed
>>from the type of "emergency comms" in which GMRS, MURS, FRS, and
>>Amateur stations would be involved.
>
> That one wasn't on you, John. Certain other posters have "insisted" that
>those radio services are "major" contributors to "emergency comms".
>
> They have yet to establish any validity for those claims.

No need. There's a cellular telephone subscription for one
out of three U.S. citizens according to the U.S. Census
Bureau. (cellphones are not Part 15 devices) CB radios
number somewhere between 2 and 5 MILLION, estimated
by NTIA. (CB is not under Part 15) I don't know how
many FRS/GMRS HTs have been sold, but they are
regular consumer electronics items as consumer electronics

stores and are good for 5 to 10 miles communications
range. (FRS isn't under Part 15 either)

One-way communications has been provided in emergencies
for decades by broadcasting (also not under Part 15). In real
emergencies the Public Land Mobile Radio Service (PLMRS)
radios have been invaluable for local government and utility
and medical aid agencies. (PLMRS isn't under Part 15).

It is very inaccurate to state anyone has "insisted unlicensed
devices play a 'major' role" in emergencies. Those radios
ARE used by emergency communications groups in real
emergencies.

Try to get with reality instead of hiding in outrage in fantasy-
land over some perceived "insult" against your shouting
and arm-waving.

LHA / WMD

5134. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:45:35 UTC
From: ggg <loch-schwarz@bayern-mail.de>
Message-ID: <cb7ku1$pn7$1@svr7.m-online.net>
Source record: 93198

> This country got rid of one lying, deceiving creep and narrowly avoided
> electing another.

The supreme court appointed the current lying, deceiving creep, despite the fact we did not elect him.

5135. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 21:53:28 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <73led016d99ud7vt7rmsb9361g2hcdkpbv@4ax.com>
Source record: 93199

On 21 Jun 2004 13:33:29 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like
>>Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.
>
> I'm not in Florida.

Hmmm...okay, I stand corrected. I don't know why, but for some reason,
I thought you lived in Florida. <shrug>

>>> I DON'T see ANY reference to any Part 15 or other unlicensed devices
>>being
>>>employed or reported. Nor do I see any PLMRS, GMRS, or MURS systems.
>>(Certain
>>>posters here insist they play a "major" role in "emergency comms"...Guess
>>they
>>>will be in the NEXT exercise...?!?!
>>
>>In all fairness, the frequencies posted were in relation to a military
>>exercise and to an exercise of a radio net oprated by the civilian
>>government in support of said military exercise. This is far removed
>>from the type of "emergency comms" in which GMRS, MURS, FRS, and
>>Amateur stations would be involved.
>
> That one wasn't on you, John.

No problem, I didn't interpret it as being one on me, but as long as I
was replying to your post, I chipped in my $0.02 worth. Read on...

>Certain other posters have "insisted" that
>those radio services are "major" contributors to "emergency comms".
>
> They have yet to establish any validity for those claims.

I didn't see the original posts on that, but if you've accurately
summarized what was said, then I would also be interested in learning
of the specifics.

I'm personally aware of some areas where there are Neighborhood Watch
groups using FRS radios, and at least one where an ARES group uses
GMRS to communicate with the local NW group on FRS (the first seven
channels are the same freqs).

I'm also personally aware of instances where FRS radios are used by
ARES/RACES personnel or by government or emergency services personnel.

I am not personally aware of any instances where the regular users of FRS, GMRS, MURS, and the other Part 15 services are written into the disaster plans for a given locality, except in the case of REACT groups using equipment for those services. In the sense of having families who use FRS radios at the mall to help keep track of the kids being written into emergency communications contingency planning, or folks who use GMRS or MUR for similar purposes, no, I've never seen or heard of that being done. That of course doesn't mean it hasn't been done somewhere, just that if it has, I haven't heard of it - I'd like to hear about it if someone's got specifics on one or more cases where this has been done, though.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5136. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 22:00:42 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <5bmed0ljck6kp2a05no080ih1bilbhtup2@4ax.com>
Source record: 93200

On 21 Jun 2004 21:42:13 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> No need. There's a cellular telephone subscription for one
> out of three U.S. citizens according to the U.S. Census
> Bureau. (cellphones are not Part 15 devices) CB radios
> number somewhere between 2 and 5 MILLION, estimated
> by NTIA. (CB is not under Part 15) I don't know how
> many FRS/GMRS HTs have been sold, but they are
> regular consumer electronics items as consumer electronics
> stores and are good for 5 to 10 miles communications
> range. (FRS isn't under Part 15 either)
>
> One-way communications has been provided in emergencies
> for decades by broadcasting (also not under Part 15). In real
> emergencies the Public Land Mobile Radio Service (PLMRS)
> radios have been invaluable for local government and utility
> and medical aid agencies. (PLMRS isn't under Part 15).

I think maybe you're half right, Len. believe it or not, even my ham rigs are Part 15 devices and come with the usual Part 15 warning sticker on them.

The transmitter on cell phones (which are radios, not telephones), CB rigs, FRS/GMRS/PLMRS radios, and ham rigs are covered under those portions of FCC regulations that authorize the user to operate the transmitter (part 95 for CB, part 97 for ham, etc.).

However, the receiver portion of the device is covered under Part 15.

> It is very inaccurate to state anyone has "insisted unlicensed
> devices play a 'major' role" in emergencies. Those radios
> ARE used by emergency communications groups in real
> emergencies.

As I said, I did not see the original posts, but I am aware of instances where such equipment is used by governmental and emergency services personnel, as well as by ARES/RACES and other "civilian" EmComm groups (like REACT).

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5137. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 22:51:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621185148.04264.00000343@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93201

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 6/21/2004 11:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <E2EBc.2$hj1.1@news01.roc.ny>
>
>Steve,
>
>I have no problem with someone being rich; I have a problem when I pay a
>higher percentage of my pay to taxes than they do.

But who generates the economic base, Jim?

You and I? I don't know you beyond this forum, of course, and you very well may be a business owner for all I know. But very, VERY few of those "rich" are what we would call "idle rich". They got that way because of businesses they ran, which means people they employed, products they sold or services they delivered.

>Please don't tell me you are so naive that you think that the wealthy always
>pay a higher percentage in taxes.

I didn't say they didn't pay an appropriate ir INappropriate percentage, Jim. I just said we seem to spend a great deal of erroft tearing these folks down.

>Fortunately, one overhaul in social
>security plugged one big hole...(SNIP)

I agree with your summation about SS, Jim. Those who have more than six figure valuations should not have their hands in SS, period.

>Why is it that these "compassionate" conservatives can stand by and watch
>school districts with 30 plus students in a classroom whilst a suburban
>school has only 20 per class and every 8th grader receives a *laptop
>computer* and honestly believe that everything is just fine? How did New
>York state, in calculating aid to school districts, manage to count every
>student in NYC as 0.7 student?

On the otherhand I can attest to rather well funded public school programs in socioeconomically depressed areas here. Not every school system suffers such indignities, Jim. That you have to look to local school boards and state programs for as much as anything Washington generates.

>You are gullible at best.

Why? Because I believe that people ought to be allowed to reach that goal that we claim they can without penalizing them for it?

Jim, there ARE positive results from those folks' contributions OTHER than directly to the tax base. I'd rather they be paying less in direct taxes and more in infrastructure for the businesses they run!

>I'm not mad at you, just upset at priorities in
>this country. Remember too that the whole world is watching this country to
>see if our actions anywhere correspond to what we are saying. If I were a
>European nation, I'd not only be a bit skeptical, I'd be nervous too.

Are you now talking about Iraq or wether we tax the dickens out of the folks who provide our livelyhoods?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5138. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 22:52:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406211452.58ba03e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93202

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621001446.10886.00000463@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
> >
> >> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
> >> >
> >> > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to draft
> some
> >> >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts,
> Lennie!
> >>
> >> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?
> >>
> >> >> Bon apetit and temper fry...
> >> >
> >> > Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.
> >>
> >> Have you seen a doctor about your problem, puppetnursie?
> >
> >He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
> >the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
> >pretend they're thin when they're not.
>
> Not to worry. CAP pays for all that avgas. They just load
> an extra hundred pounds of avgas for the heavier payload.

They need to consult with a loadmaster on where he sould be seated on
the plane. We don't want a military jet to crab, yaw, and roll
because of a puffy load.

> >> Or do you do your own diagnoses, like practicing medicine
> >> without the legal license? [a big no-no in most states]
> >

> >He no do nuttin illegal. He one squared away marine. All his stuff
> >in one sock.
> >
> >> Get some mental therapy, puppetnursie. That would help all
> >> those around you...if not yourself...
> >
> >He no care 'bout others.
>
> I disagree. He has to keep all those personalities in order.
> Must be quite a coordination session every day in there...

No doubt he rules them with an iron fist. He's got a lot of trouble
makers in there.

> >> Sociopathy CAN be cured.
> >
> >I'll bet this case cannot.
>
> I'm optimistic normally, but you may be right...
>
> LHA / WMD

I'd hate to be right this once.

5139. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:08:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406211508.6cb46de0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93203

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
> >> >the Security Detail with "proof."
> >> >
> >> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
> >>
> >> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
> >> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
> >> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
> >>
> >"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
> >crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."
>
> I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
> low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
> even Tom Cruise.
>
> [I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
> rupt." :-)]

Bankrupt? Hopefully they will actually deliver on all of the pre-sold
Clinton's, "My Life."

> >> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
> >> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
> >> >
> >> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>
> >> :-)
> >>
> >"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.
>
> Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
> I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
> Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(
>

> Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
> when and where a Secret!
>
> I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?

One action figure, numerous interchangeable scowling faces.

> :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

5140. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:10:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621191017.07518.00000348@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93204

In article <5bmed0ljck6kp2a05no080ih1bilbhtup2@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:

>On 21 Jun 2004 21:42:13 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> No need. There's a cellular telephone subscription for one
>> out of three U.S. citizens according to the U.S. Census
>> Bureau. (cellphones are not Part 15 devices) CB radios
>> number somewhere between 2 and 5 MILLION, estimated
>> by NTIA. (CB is not under Part 15) I don't know how
>> many FRS/GMRS HTs have been sold, but they are
>> regular consumer electronics items as consumer electronics
>> stores and are good for 5 to 10 miles communications
>> range. (FRS isn't under Part 15 either)
>>
>> One-way communications has been provided in emergencies
>> for decades by broadcasting (also not under Part 15). In real
>> emergencies the Public Land Mobile Radio Service (PLMRS)
>> radios have been invaluable for local government and utility
>> and medical aid agencies. (PLMRS isn't under Part 15).
>
>I think maybe you're half right, Len. believe it or not, even my ham
>rigs are Part 15 devices and come with the usual Part 15 warning
>sticker on them.

Part 15 regulations apply to INCIDENTAL EMITTERS such as
receivers, data couplers (if you have software controlled anything
as a peripheral) and so forth.

The stickers are there by the manufacturer and are intended to
make the buying public believe in the sanctity of the product.
:-) Remember the radios and TV sets of old from brand [which]
which said "For best results always use [which] tubes?" :-)

The Parts of Title 47 C.F.R. that apply to various radio services
are listed after a link on the FCC Office of Engineering and
Technology page. Under those parts one gets a link to the GPO
which has the PDF repros of all the Parts of Title 47. The current
issue date at the GPO (Government Printing Office) for Title 47
is 1 October 2003. That facility is a lot better than buying the
same thing in hardcopy from the GPO. The last of five volumes
of Title 47 (Part 80 to end) cost more than $50 even if shipping
costs are free. The GPO does accept VISA and Mastercard
and can take orders over the phone for local GPO outlets.

>The transmitter on cell phones (which are radios, not telephones), CB
>rigs, FRS/GMRS/PLMRS radios, and ham rigs are covered under those
>portions of FCC regulations that authorize the user to operate the
>transmitter (part 95 for CB, part 97 for ham, etc.).
>
>However, the receiver portion of the device is covered under Part 15.

True enough. Problem is, nursie doesn't know which Part is
which and becomes emotionally unstable when opposed to
any of his postings.

>> It is very inaccurate to state anyone has "insisted unlicensed
>> devices play a 'major' role" in emergencies. Those radios
>> ARE used by emergency communications groups in real
>> emergencies.
>
>As I said, I did not see the original posts, but I am aware of
>instances where such equipment is used by governmental and emergency
>services personnel, as well as by ARES/RACES and other "civilian"
>EmComm groups (like REACT).

Nursie doesn't want to see that. The original ranting and raving
against anything "unlicensed" came from a mild comment by
Brian Burke in here over a month ago.

There's two worlds being discussed in here. The major one is
reality - where you and I live - and the fantasylands wherein all
the existing radio communication infrastructure fails in any
emergency, only ham radio being able to save the day.

Not only that, REACT grew through CB radio and the fantasyland
livers think that all CB is evil, wicked, mean, and nasty, unfit
for proper morsemen to ever approach let alone use. CB is
unlicensed, of course, therefore it isn't any good since no test
need be passed to operate one. :-)

You and I know that most real emergencies are very local in
nature and those can be aided by relatively short-range radios
having 2 to 15 mile ranges. Those can be any of the presently
unlicensed radios as well as licensed, such as PLMRS.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of messaging in here, other than
the "learned" pontificating of political pundits, involves arguing
the fantasyland worlds of the various angry PCTA or those who
wish to seek gurudom of the newsgroup (and whose words are
golden, never ever to be talked against). Unless one is a
regular reader in here it is difficult to follow some threads...even
those that don't evolve into the flame wars you see. :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5141. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:17:11 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93205

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20040621174158.07368.00000274@mb-m24.aol.com:

> In article <1e4e3692.0406210731.3d0e7f17@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>>news:<20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>>
>>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>>
>>> >> > and I mention that
>>> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>>> >> > communications in 1948.
>>> >>
>>> >> They did? Everywhere?
>>> >>
>>> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>> >>
>>> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between
>>> >> ships?
>>> >
>>> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>>> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>>> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>>>
>>> "Abiding?!?" Crock.
>>>
>>> Fort Huachuca is the Military Intelligence center for the U.S.
>>> Army.
>>>
>>> One duty of M.I. is to run intercepts on foreign communications.
>>>
>>> Some foeign countries still think that manual telegraphy is
>>> "effective" so the M.I. teach morse code to intercept
>>> analysts. For LISTENING.
>>>
>>> The only "use" for morse code is in LISTENING, of intercepts,
>>> ELINT.
>>>
>>> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for

>>> radio communications. [USN blinker lights are not radio]
>>>
>>> The Signal Corps is the communications branch of the Army.
>>> The Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA. The Signal Center
>>> doesn't teach any morse code receiving or sending.
>>>
>>> Katapult Kellie should valve off all that steam and join the
>>> rest of the world in this new millennium.
>>>
>>> Good luck on that one, now...
>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>Even the FCC and VEC's quit administering a Morse sending test. They
>>only administered a receiving test.
>>
>>Hmmmmm?
>>
>>Maybe the sending test would have been a disincentive to CW use on HF.
>
> There must be some mental block induced by too much
> morsemanship. The morsemen can't understand reality.
>
> Or, they are so immersed in their only radio service active
> in morsemenship that they are totally blind to all other radio
> services. Might be a good project for some PhD candidate in
> psychology as a Dissertation.
>
> Time has stopped for the morsemen. They continue to live in
> the past, imagining glories lives of navel high society, "hostile
> actions," mighty titles of importance, all from morsemanship
> credentialism.
>
> Back some 49 years ago, NATO released their phonetic
> alphabet. Phonetic alphabets are of no use for manual
> telegraphy...apply only to voice communications. Just the
> same, the morsemen keep insisting everyone still uses "CW"
> (manual on-off carrier keying telegraphy) for military
> communications.
>
> Their minds are warped, living in fantasies of their own beeping.
>
> LHA / WMD

Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the merits or otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has unquestionably moved on and they have not.

It brings me in mind of the Jethro Tull song "Too Old to Rock 'n' Roll, Too Young To Die", not just the title, but all the words. As any afficionado knows, this of course appeared on an album entitled "Living In The Past"!

This is the ultimate anthem to clinging to youth, which we all tend to do, even those of us who can't stand that d*mn bleeping!

If you listen to/read the lyrics of the whole song, you'll see that Ian Anderson saw it as no bad thing. What is truly pernicious, and constitutes the difference between him and them, is that so many morsemen want to drag others kicking and screaming into the past!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

5142. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:20:41 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950FC44947FA9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93206

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in
news:5bmed0ljck6kp2a05no080ih1bilbhtup2@4ax.com:

> On 21 Jun 2004 21:42:13 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> No need. There's a cellular telephone subscription for one
>> out of three U.S. citizens according to the U.S. Census
>> Bureau. (cellphones are not Part 15 devices) CB radios
>> number somewhere between 2 and 5 MILLION, estimated
>> by NTIA. (CB is not under Part 15) I don't know how
>> many FRS/GMRS HTs have been sold, but they are
>> regular consumer electronics items as consumer electronics
>> stores and are good for 5 to 10 miles communications
>> range. (FRS isn't under Part 15 either)
>>
>> One-way communications has been provided in emergencies
>> for decades by broadcasting (also not under Part 15). In real
>> emergencies the Public Land Mobile Radio Service (PLMRS)
>> radios have been invaluable for local government and utility and
>> medical aid agencies. (PLMRS isn't under Part 15).
>
> I think maybe you're half right, Len. believe it or not, even my ham
> rigs are Part 15 devices and come with the usual Part 15 warning
> sticker on them.
>

They are only under Part 15 for unwanted radiated emmissions, i.e. RF
leakage from the case.

> The transmitter on cell phones (which are radios, not telephones), CB
> rigs, FRS/GMRS/PLMRS radios, and ham rigs are covered under those
> portions of FCC regulations that authorize the user to operate the
> transmitter (part 95 for CB, part 97 for ham, etc.).
>
> However, the receiver portion of the device is covered under Part 15.
>
>> It is very inaccurate to state anyone has "insisted unlicensed
>> devices play a 'major' role" in emergencies. Those radios
>> ARE used by emergency communications groups in real emergencies.
>
> As I said, I did not see the original posts, but I am aware of
> instances where such equipment is used by governmental and emergency
> services personnel, as well as by ARES/RACES and other "civilian"
> EmComm groups (like REACT).
>

> 73 DE John D. Kasupski
> Tonawanda, New York, USA
> Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
> Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN
>
>

5143. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:23:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93207

In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 9:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040620225732.07518.00000333@mb-m26.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040620191701.22984.00000339@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Kerry is a chronic apologist. He will do nothing when this country is
>>>attacked but wring his hands, say "Oh, we're sorry, did something we do/say
>>>offend you?...P L E A S E forgive us"
>>
>>You know this how?
>
> I know this in my heart.

> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.
>
So it's emotional, not based on objective facts with supporting evidence.

>>> Having been in the apologist-era Armed Forces of the late 70's, it is my
>>>freverent hope that we DON'T allow ourselve to regress to that stage, which
>>>is
>>>exactly what I fear will happen with this candidate.
>>
>>Why?
>
> Kerry.
>
> Fonda.
>
> Together.

I'm glad you brought that up.

You are obviously referring to the picture taken in Valley Forge, PA, in 1970. This was at a rally by Vietnam Veterans Against the War. JK is three rows behind HJ and somewhat to the left in the picture. The bearded, sunglass wearing man to the right of HJ is not JK.

That picture and the story behind it are shown here:

http://www.snopes.com/photos/politics/kerry.asp

There is another picture in circulation that shows the two of them at a podium.
The second picture is fake, made by photoshopping two different pictures taken
at different times and places.

The first picture is real and unaltered. I have met the man who took it.

The problem is that Jane Fonda did not go to Hanoi until 1972 - two full years
after the Valley Forge picture was taken!

Do you see the problem?
>
>>The late 1970s were the immediate post-Vietnam, post-draft era. You can't
>>blame
>>all the problems of that era on who was in the White House - unless you want
>>to
>>include JFK, who got us into Vietnam, LBJ who escalated it from a small
>>force of "advisors", Nixon, Ford....
>>>
>>> Carter tried to castrate the Armed Forces in the 70's.
>>
>>How?
>
> He diluted the chain of command.

How, exactly?

>Part of the errors that occured in the
>Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what
>should have been an military operation.

Agreed.

But there were also errors that were the result of simple human error.
>
> He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with
>"warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave
>America blind and hog tied.

Carter left office almost a quarter century ago. How could his old orders
continue to cause such problems - particularly since 16 of the intervening
years were those of the Reagan and Bush administrations?

How could one president, in office for only four years, cause so much trouble?
>
>>> Bill Clinton didn't try to castrate them...he just made it possible
>>> for
>>>other guys to play with them....Oh yeah...he let a bunch of ragheads drag
>>>some
>>>of our guys through the streets of Mogandishu and them rewarded them by
>>doing
>>>exactly what they wanted us to do.
>>

>>How did Clinton "let them" do what they did? Should the US have stayed out
>>of
>>that conflict? Or gotten more involved? What threat were they to US
>>security?
>
> Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?

No. But you are avoiding the questions, Steve.

How did Clinton "let them"?

Should the US have stayed out of that conflict? Or gotten more involved?

What threat were they to US security?

> The threats were there. We knew it. "Rules of Engagement" establish by
>Billary in Washington were not "real world functional".

Agreed. But what about the rest of the questions?
>
>>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?
>
> Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.

1) How do we extract ourselves from there?

2) How do we avoid such involvements in the future?

>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>
> Be danged if I know.

How about these reasons:

1) They are embarrassed that their vaunted army fell apart so quickly - twice.

2) They are not really a country but a bunch of warring factions held together
by a strongman. With the strongman gone, the factions are at each others
throats again. This isn't anything new - it's Yugoslavia all over again. Say,
who was in charge during that war?

>The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them for
>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help, I
>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.

Yet the Bush Administration went in expecting to be greeted like the US Army
iberating Paris.
>
> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>business and social, any better than what we did.

How could that have been done? Why was it *our* responsibility?
>

>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>
> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.

For a start, there's those who gave the orders. And those who put those people
in charge. And those who didn't follow up.
>
>>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>>
Worse news than Al-Gharib?

>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam -
>a
>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>
> Because he's an apologist.

Evidence, please?
>
> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.

True. But the time to mend fences is still here. Is it wrong to apologize for
past mistakes?
>
> He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our
>tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.

Evidence, please?
>
>>>He's already
>>>angry that the Republicans have done exactly what they said they'd do, and
>>>it's an embarrassment to Democrats.
>>
>>I don't see that at all.
>
> YMMV.
>
>>Bush & Co. told us that SH had weapons of mass destruction. None have
>>surfaced.
>>They told us SH was connected to 9-11. No evidence of that, either.
>
> "Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
>sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.

Right. And other sources said there were none. The sources who said there were
had a vested personal interest in seeing SH overthrown.
>
> Bush is not the first president to act on less-than-adequate
>intelligence.

Agreed!
>

>That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the
>intellignece
>agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle East
>after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
>during/after WW2.

And none of them have been replaced in the 24 years since he left office?

Remember this: The main threat to the USA in Carter's time was perceived to be the Soviet Union. The new technology of spy satellites was thought to be adequate - and for many tasks it is. But it wasn't adequate for everything.
>
>>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?
>
> We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?

Simple: Rather than deal with the realities of energy policies, Bush tells us there is a cheap clean technological solution "just around the corner". Heck, he even had the governor of California fooled. (The Guvernator inquired about having a Hummer converted to hydrogen power. The cost was something like $250,000 - not including a source of fuel. Not exactly practical.)

Hydrogen *may* be a fuel of the future. But it's a long long way from being practical for today's problems or those of the near future.

Still, it sounds nice, makes for great photo ops and is a pleasant PopSci diversion from the reality that the US imports way too much oil, and pays way too much for it in the process. That payment isn't just in dollars per barrel.

>>And
>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits
>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
>
> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.

And it hasn't happened because of the enormous cost and dubious benefits. But now Bush talks about it like we should make it a national priority.
>
>>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
>>and
>>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
>>>mirrors
>>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
>>
>>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
>>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies. Nor
>>was Halliburton.
>
> HOW...!?!?

Yes, how did he try to make it look better than it was?
>
> Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that (then)
>recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of "...America's
>confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".

The rooster taking credit for the dawn. That's not using smoke and mirrors to
make things look better than they are.
>
>Never mind that the NYSE had been on a steady upward trend for the
>previous 12 months.

Of course. Still, what was the Dow the day Clinton took office? What was it the
day he left?
>
> The NYSE and all economic indicators are up now.

Still down from their peaks.
>
> This "recession" suddenly appeared when Billary was no longer in office
>and no longer able to keep up the charade.

What "charade"? How can the President fudge numbers like the NYSE?
>
>>> Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have
>>>publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a
>>>slow
>>>and steady process. They were right.
>>
>>And the good jobs keep getting exported. Ross Perot was right about that
>>"giant
>>sucking sound".
>
> Until you and I (those "We The People" folks...) demand that the laws be
>changed, they can legally do it.

Until Big Business steps in and says no.

The fact is, it's simply cheaper *in the short run* to manufacture things
elsewhere and ship them here. But *in the long run* it causes all sorts of
problems. Most of all, no *service* economy can prosper. People don't get rich
taking in each other's washing.
>
>>> Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them
>>With
>>>Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".
>>
>>As opposed to Reaganomics "Let The Deficits Pile Up - We Won't Be Around To
>>Pay
>>Them Back". Or Bush Sr.'s "Read My Lips".
>
> I lived a lot more comfortably and had a lot more money in the bank in
>the

>1980's and early 90's than I do now..

Are you better off now than 4 years ago?

>.Part due, in all honesty, to Bug's
>expenses...but most due to the Clinton taxes of the 90's. Personally, I got
>zinged in the Clinton era.

Think about *why*. Look at the deficit in 1980 and again in 1992. It wasn't Clinton who built that deficit. It was "trickle down" Reaganomics. But eventually the piper had to be paid.

And remember that it was Papa Bush who said "Read my lips...no new taxes" but then could not keep his promise because the numbers simply did not add up. Wasn't entirely his fault - he inherited the spiraling debt of his predecessor.

>
>>>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
>>>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.

You mean the National Ambulance Chaser? You might want to look into Mr. Edwards' record...
>>
>>Personally I am surprised that the Dems couldn't do better than JK. But you
>>know the old saying about Democratic Party planning; "If you gave the DNC
>the
>>job of organizing a firing squad, they'd put the riflemen in a circle with
>>the
>>condemned person in the center..."
>
> Yep.
>
> The Dem's COULD do better. I would have had to think real hard about a
>vote for Edwards. Too bad the loudest dog won rather than the better
>candidate.

You pay malpractice premiums?
>
>>But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:
>>
>>When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi Jane?
>
> The specific date? I don't recall. The articles from public media have
>circulated the web.

I suggest you look it up. The picture you refer to was taken in 1970. Jane Fonda went to Hanoi in 1972 - *TWO YEARS LATER*!!

Yet Kerry gets blamed and condemned because he was three rows behind and a few people to the right of a future possible traitor.

Do you see how the *facts* behind that picture completely change things? Had the picture been taken *after* the Hanoi trip, you might have a point. But it

was taken two years earlier!
>
>>If indeed such a thing happened, why is it any worse than Rumsfeld shaking
>>hands with and warmly greeting Saddam Hussein?
>
> Who cares?

I do. Rumsfeld was in the Reagan Cabinet at the time. The US *supported* SH in
those days, and turned a blind eye to his methods. You'd think we'd have
learned from the Shah and Iran.

>Hanoi Jane is a documented traitor.

Here's proof:

http://www.snopes.com/military/fonda.htm

>How Kerry, a combat vet, his opinions on the war itself notwithstanding,
>could sit next to a person who
>openly gave comfort to the people who were trying to proactively kill him is
>beyond me.

Simple:

1) He did not sit next to her
2) She did not go to Hanoi until *TWO YEARS* after the picture was taken.

See how just two little facts - dates - make all the difference?
>
> Those who protested the war had valid arguments.

Agreed.
>
> Bill Clinton even had a valid RIGHT to PROTEST the war, even in Oxford,
>England. Billary's error was at first saying he never did it then trying to
>claim the pictures weren't him.

He lied.
>
> If the gutless liar had simply stated "Yes, I was against the war and I
>exercised my right to protest it in a legal demonstration", even the most
>right-winged Hawk would ahve had to give him due for being honest about it.

He lied.
>
> Kerry earned the additional right to speak out...practical experience.

No, he didn't.

Everyone has the right to speak out. Kerry earned *credibility* because he
spoke from actual experience.

>But to sit down next to a low life slut who intentionally betrayed her
>Countrymen was foolish. I would have shot her first.

How would you have known what she would do two years in the future?

>It's a testimony to
>America's professional, all-volunteer force that she hasn't been shot.

It's no testimony to the justice system that she hasn't been brought up on
charges.
>
>>When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's
>>armed
>>conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the president
>>simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes the
>>incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's
>>policies and decisions aren't right.

Well?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5144. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:37:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621193705.17843.00000330@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93209

In article <1e4e3692.0406211452.58ba03e7@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621001446.10886.00000463@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040615152947.22498.00000299@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20040615040307.00101.00000622@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >>Date: 6/14/2004 11:31 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <20040615003136.19885.00000420@mb-m06.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >> >> This isn't Burger King and you cannot have it your way.
>> >> >
>> >> > As I am sure you have suffered many a sleepless night trying to
>draft
>> some
>> >> >witty "comeback" for yet another bloodletting of one of YOUR posts,
>> Lennie!
>> >>
>> >> "Bloodletting?" :-) Poor baby, so easily injured are you?
>> >>
>> >> >> Bon apetit and temper fry...
>> >> >
>> >> > Seems I am not the one with an appetite problem, Lennie.
>> >>
>> >> Have you seen a doctor about your problem, puppetnursie?
>> >
>> >He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
>> >the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
>> >pretend they're thin when they're not.
>>
>> Not to worry. CAP pays for all that avgas. They just load
>> an extra hundred pounds of avgas for the heavier payload.
>
>They need to consult with a loadmaster on where he sould be seated on
>the plane. We don't want a military jet to crab, yaw, and roll

>because of a puffy load.

Too much crab and roll input can make one puffy.

By saying "yaw" to more intake, it gets worse!

>> >> Or do you do your own diagnoses, like practicing medicine
>> >> without the legal license? [a big no-no in most states]
>> >
>> >He no do nuttin illegal. He one squared away marine. All his stuff
>> >in one sock.
>> >
>> >> Get some mental therapy, puppetnursie. That would help all
>> >> those around you...if not yourself...
>> >
>> >He no care 'bout others.
>>
>> I disagree. He has to keep all those personalities in order.
>> Must be quite a coordination session every day in there...
>
>No doubt he rules them with an iron fist. He's got a lot of trouble
>makers in there.

Too bad Fox News can't get in there and show it live.

Would be a fun show. Like the old Destruction Derby!

>> >> Sociopathy CAN be cured.
>> >
>> >I'll bet this case cannot.
>>
>> I'm optimistic normally, but you may be right...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I'd hate to be right this once.

Luck of the draw. Sometimes you win!

LHA / WMD

5145. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:37:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621193707.17843.00000331@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93210

In article <20040621185148.04264.00000343@mb-m15.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>>Date: 6/21/2004 11:30 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <E2EBc.2$hj1.1@news01.roc.ny>
>>
>>Steve,
>>
>>I have no problem with someone being rich; I have a problem when I pay a
>>higher percentage of my pay to taxes than they do.
>
> But who generates the economic base, Jim?
>
> You and I? I don't know you beyond this forum, of course, and you very
>well may be a business owner for all I know. But very, VERY few of those
>"rich" are what we would call "idle rich". They got that way because of
>businesses they ran, which means people they employed, products they sold or
>services they delivered.

If and only If they were Republican business folks. :-)

Democrats are idle rich evil people, money-grubbing tyrants
who can't do anything right... :-)

>>Please don't tell me you are so naive that you think that the wealthy always
>>pay a higher percentage in taxes.
>
> I didn't say they didn't pay an appropriate ir INappropriate percentage,
>Jim. I just said we seem to spend a great deal of erroft tearing these folks
>down.

"Erroft?" How does one "erroft?"

But, I DO see a lot of nursie's output tearing down any Democrat
within sight or hearing. Sort of like a General Order thing. :-)

>>Fortunately, one overhaul in social
>>security plugged one big hole...(SNIP)
>
> I agree with your summation about SS, Jim. Those who have more than six
>figure valuations should not have their hands in SS, period.

Are you trying to make all the "scum" homeless? :-)

Shouldn't you be ranting and raving about having all those
"six figure valuations" folks take a code test? :-)

>>Why is it that these "compassionate" conservatives can stand by and watch
>>school districts with 30 plus students in a classroom whilst a suburban
>>school has only 20 per class and every 8th grader receives a *laptop
>>computer* and honestly believe that everything is just fine? How did New
>>York state, in calculating aid to school districts, manage to count every
>>student in NYC as 0.7 student?
>
> On the otherhand I can attest to rather well funded public school
>programs in socioeconomically depressed areas here. Not every school system
>suffers such indignities, Jim. That you have to look to local school boards
>and state programs for as much as anything Washington generates.

Nursie must be suffering in a hotbed of democrats.

>>You are gullible at best.
>
> Why? Because I believe that people ought to be allowed to reach that
goal
>that we claim they can without penalizing them for it?

Properly accredited night classes would help...except nursie
thinks those are lowly, the scum of academia... :-)

> Jim, there ARE positive results from those folks' contributions OTHER
than
>directly to the tax base. I'd rather they be paying less in direct taxes and
>more in infrastructure for the businesses they run!

One way to begin cutting budget is to remove the pension for
those medically-discharged veterans who are physically fit
enough to fly airplanes, fly hang-gliders, do skating, jog 5+
miles with heavy rucksacks.

>>I'm not mad at you, just upset at priorities in
>>this country. Remember too that the whole world is watching this country to
>>see if our actions anywhere correspond to what we are saying. If I were a
>>European nation, I'd not only be a bit skeptical, I'd be nervous too.
>
> Are you now talking about Iraq or wether we tax the dickens out of the
>folks who provide our livelyhoods?

Nursie out of a job? No longer lively? Aw. Too bad.

Don't worry. Go fly an important CAP mission, run out the glider,
strap on the blades, do your physical thing to show everyone
who is the best barbarian of all.

By all means, forget entirely about broadband over power lines or
any of that technical stuff. Show everyone how damn good you
are in pin-pointing the cause of today's world woes after your long
political career and many terms of elected office.

And don't forget to harrass and denigrate each and every news-
group poster who disagrees with you. By any means possible.
That is your main mission in life. Don't shirk responsibility!

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5146. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-21 23:37:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621193708.17843.00000332@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93208

In article <1e4e3692.0406211508.6cb46de0@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
>> >> >the Security Detail with "proof."
>> >> >
>> >> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
>> >>
>> >> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
>> >> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
>> >> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
>> >
>> >"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
>> >crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."
>>
>> I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
>> low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
>> even Tom Cruise.
>>
>> [I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
>> rupt." :-)]
>
>Bankrupt? Hopefully they will actually deliver on all of the pre-sold
>Clinton's, "My Life."
>
>> >> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
>> >> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
>> >> >
>> >> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>>
>> >> :-)
>> >
>> >"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.
>>

>> Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
>> I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
>> Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(
>>
>> Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
>> when and where a Secret!
>>
>> I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?
>
>One action figure, numerous interchangeable scowling faces.

5147. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 00:14:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040621201408.28360.00000323@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93211

In article <Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>news:20040621174158.07368.00000274@mb-m24.aol.com:
>
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406210731.3d0e7f17@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>>>averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
>>>news:<20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>>> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>>>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>>>
>>>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>>>
>>>> >> > and I mention that
>>>> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>>>> >> > communications in 1948.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> They did? Everywhere?
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>>> >>
>>>> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between
>>>> >> ships?
>>>> >
>>>> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>>>> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>>>> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>>>>
>>>> "Abiding?!?" Crock.
>>>>
>>>> Fort Huachuca is the Military Intelligence center for the U.S.
>>>> Army.
>>>>
>>>> One duty of M.I. is to run intercepts on foreign communications.
>>>>
>>>> Some foeign countries still think that manual telegraphy is
>>>> "effective" so the M.I. teach morse code to intercept
>>>> analysts. For LISTENING.
>>>>
>>>> The only "use" for morse code is in LISTENING, of intercepts,

>>>> ELINT.
>>>>
>>>> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
>>>> radio communications. [USN blinker lights are not radio]
>>>>
>>>> The Signal Corps is the communications branch of the Army.
>>>> The Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA. The Signal Center
>>>> doesn't teach any morse code receiving or sending.
>>>>
>>>> Katapult Kellie should valve off all that steam and join the
>>>> rest of the world in this new millennium.
>>>>
>>>> Good luck on that one, now...
>>>>
>>>> LHA / WMD
>>>
>>>Even the FCC and VEC's quit administering a Morse sending test. They
>>>only administered a receiving test.
>>>
>>>Hmmmmm?
>>>
>>>Maybe the sending test would have been a disincentive to CW use on HF.
>>
>> There must be some mental block induced by too much
>> morsemanship. The morsemen can't understand reality.
>>
>> Or, they are so immersed in their only radio service active
>> in morsemenship that they are totally blind to all other radio
>> services. Might be a good project for some PhD candidate in
>> psychology as a Dissertation.
>>
>> Time has stopped for the morsemen. They continue to live in
>> the past, imagining glories lives of navel high society, "hostile
>> actions," mighty titles of importance, all from morsemanship
>> credentialism.
>>
>> Back some 49 years ago, NATO released their phonetic
>> alphabet. Phonetic alphabets are of no use for manual
>> telegraphy...apply only to voice communications. Just the
>> same, the morsemen keep insisting everyone still uses "CW"
>> (manual on-off carrier keying telegraphy) for military
>> communications.
>>
>> Their minds are warped, living in fantasies of their own beeping.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the merits or
>otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has unquestionably
>moved on and they have not.

>
>It brings me in mind of the Jethro Tull song "Too Old to Rock 'n' Roll, Too
>Young To Die", not just the title, but all the words. As any afficionado
>knows, this of course appeared on an album entitled "Living In The Past"!
>This is the ultimate anthem to clinging to youth, which we all tend to do,
>even those of us who can't stand that d*mn bleeping!

Alun, wait until you attend some anniversary thing, like my
wife and I did in 2001 for the 50th Reunion of our senior high
school class in the midwest. Not only was that fun, it was an
ice-water bath on "wanting" to recapture one's youth...or, for
some others, to desperately seek to return. :-)

>If you listen to/read the lyrics of the whole song, you'll see that Ian
>Anderson saw it as no bad thing. What is truly pernicious, and constitutes
>the difference between him and them, is that so many morsemen want to drag
>others kicking and screaming into the past!

I suggested Brainwashing was responsible some time ago.

I've also said it was an extension of the human territorial
imperative - their "turf." They MUST defend turf! What they
did was so awesome, so perfect, and so hard, that all must
exactly emulate their mighty and powerful accomplishments!

Funny in a way. I described my military assignment at ADA
a half century ago - which I wouldn't care to repeat at all - and
all the beepers in here went bonkers. They screamed and
hollered, called lots of bad names, made snarly comments
about "trying to be superior, etc." when all it did for me was
to convert me from the previous opinion of radio as "belonging
to amateur style (of pre-WW2 days) as shown in ham mags"
into the reality of big-leagues HF radio communications. ADA
was only about the third largest in the Army net but it was
impressive as heck in 1953 with three dozen HF transmitters
and doing 220 thousand messages a month traffic in 1955.

The general commentary was probably based on simple
envy because only Hans Brakob in here has any comparable
military communications experience. Jim Hampton comes
close. Brian Burke was in military meteorology not
communications but the met guys need radio communications.
State Department isn't strictly military and most of the postings
of that "foreign service" person weren't to massive messaging
embassies. Since the U.S. military hasn't used manual
telegraphy for fixed-point to fixed-point communications since
1948, the PCTA got all angry and frustrated about not not
loving morsemanship or pledging allegiance to the key.
[from time to time the Armenian judges chanted and
demanded a recount...]

It got worse after my initial posting about military radio experience. My whole career was labeled in the worst possible light, even to one saying all I said was a "lie" and so forth...that I "disgraced the IEEE" by existing. :-)

It even got to the point where another professional in the industry started sneering and nastygraming about my (actual radio) experience as a design engineer...all because of not loving and cherishing morse...and for not following up on "life promises (always to be kept)" which became to bizarre for words. :-)

Now there are long, lonnng, lonnnnng posts on politics and very one-sided emotional diatribes of presidential candidates where all that bandwidth could have been used for the actual subject heading (BPL) which is a direct threat to anyone who uses HF. Not one peep (except from me and Mike Coslo) on the subject of BPL.

I guess that Raging Against People Never Met is the whole parcel of what this newsgrope is about...

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5148. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 01:32:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <1f6dnb3FI_tjEUrdRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 93212

"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the merits
or
> otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has unquestionably
> moved on and they have not.
>

The merits of the CW mode have been presented many times and in depth.

It wasn't the "new" hams that came up with RTTY, packet, satellite, PSK31 and the many advances in ham radio communications. Instead, it was the experienced hams. The experienced hams have moved on while the new, inexperienced hams are too often afraid to experience the full range of ham activities and deny themselves the ability to make judgements based on personal experience. Too often they instead listen to other inexperienced hams and make decisions based on incomplete and inaccurate data.

It was not the new hams that I heard last fall several days after the major flares and auroras discussing on SSB how they had to shift from PSK31 to CW as the auroral activity was causing terrible phase shifts in the PSK31 and how they had to wait to establish SSB communications until the effects of the flares had passed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5149. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 01:47:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <TbudnWB43oHoDUrdRVn-vA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93214

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040621185148.04264.00000343@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
truth
> >From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> >Date: 6/21/2004 11:30 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <E2EBc.2$hj1.1@news01.roc.ny>
> >
> >Steve,
> >
> >I have no problem with someone being rich; I have a problem when I pay a
> >higher percentage of my pay to taxes than they do.
>

Just because some people are able to abuse the system, this doesn't mean everyone can succeed in doing so. There are some corrupt individuals at every level of society. It wasn't so many years ago when welfare fraud was making the news on a regular basis.

If you will check the IRS data, you will find that people in the top 5% of income provide over 50% of the income tax revenue collected by the government. The top 1% pay over 1/3 of the income taxes collected. The bottom 50% of the people pay less than 4% of the total tax revenues collected.

This is hardly letting the rich not pay. The ones who slip through the cracks or find ways to avoid paying are not representative. Unfortunately, they are news so we only hear the bad stuff.

> But who generates the economic base, Jim?
>
> You and I? I don't know you beyond this forum, of course, and you
very
> well may be a business owner for all I know. But very, VERY few of those
> "rich" are what we would call "idle rich". They got that way because of
> businesses they ran, which means people they employed, products they sold
or
> services they delivered.
>
> >Please don't tell me you are so naive that you think that the wealthy
always
> >pay a higher percentage in taxes.
>

There's always people who find ways around the system that does not mean they all do. To single out the rich smack based on a few frauds smacks of

class envy just as much as denigrating the poor because some of committed welfare fraud smacks of prejudice.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5150. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 01:48:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <wdMBc.62$Hv5.21@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93213

Hello, Len

Guess I get my dander up too at times. Certainly it is wrong to paint "all" Republicans or "all" Democrates or "all" of any one group with a wide brush. Not good at all. Besides, I've gotten led off-topic - not good at all.

I have figured it out, Len. The problem is we are dropping the Morse requirements. Dang, now my washing machine is going to over-suds again ;)

However, BPL should help the situation. If BPL is going to reduce power line noise (according to power companies), it should reduce my washer over-sudsing since it runs from the mains. LOL.

Have a good one!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5151. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 02:08:08 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93215

Hello, Steve

I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone finally told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but understood it better and was able to let it go.

In any case, somehow folks don't like Kerry voicing his opinion that Vietnam was wrong - they convieniently forget that Bush pretty much avoided the service.

This is one thing I don't care for - follow the leader, regardless. Don't think. If you do, you might be called "waffling". Jump right in and agree with everything that is occuring. This is how Hitler came into power. By the time any Germans realized what was happening, it was far too late to voice their opinion (unless, of course, they wanted to be shipped somewhere they didn't want to go).

We need a strong military; but Russia poured almost all of its' resources into its' military and ultimately fell apart. Somewhere, somehow, moderation has to come into play our there will be heck to pay.

Some one asked about "What's good for General Motors is good for America.". I remember "Lil Abner" and in there the quote was "What is good for Bull Moose is good for America.". That guy was good - really good (unless, of course, what he was saying went over one's head - which happens a lot with the blind followers of the faith.)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5152. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 02:46:47 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <507fd0peiv5ilboru04n3eku6vac5u5tjn@4ax.com>
Source record: 93216

On 20 Jun 2004 16:23:08 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

>And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest?

I don't know whether they're teaching CW courses there or not, but I suspect you're referring to Fort Huachuca, in Arizona, which is headquarters for Army Intelligence training.

Spelling it is admittedly a bitch. I had to double-check to make sure I had it right, and I worked 'em during the Armed Forces Day cross-band MARS/Amateur activity a few years back (Fort Huachuca is also Western Area Gateway for Army MARS).

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5153. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 02:48:52 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns950FE79211453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93217

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
news:1f6dnb3FI_tjEUrdRVn-hg@comcast.com:

>
> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the
>> merits or otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has
>> unquestionably moved on and they have not.
>>
>
> The merits of the CW mode have been presented many times and in depth.
>
> It wasn't the "new" hams that came up with RTTY, packet, satellite,
> PSK31 and the many advances in ham radio communications. Instead, it
> was the experienced hams. The experienced hams have moved on while the
> new, inexperienced hams are too often afraid to experience the full
> range of ham activities and deny themselves the ability to make
> judgements based on personal experience. Too often they instead listen
> to other inexperienced hams and make decisions based on incomplete and
> inaccurate data.
>
> It was not the new hams that I heard last fall several days after the
> major flares and auroras discussing on SSB how they had to shift from
> PSK31 to CW as the auroral activity was causing terrible phase shifts
> in the PSK31 and how they had to wait to establish SSB communications
> until the effects of the flares had passed.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

We have indeed debated the relative merits many times. I could make a case for other modes, but it isn't the issue. Nor is experience the issue here. If it were it would degenerate into analysing different kinds of experience. This in turn is entirely self-defeating, as usually only those who actually like CW have a lot of experience in using it. OTOH, I have held a ham licence for 24 years, which is a significant amount of time, but of course without using CW it doesn't count :-)

The issue is living in the past, harmless and perhaps even admirable in itself, but not something to force upon others if one has a proper sense of decency. Morse is an antiquarian mode, dropped by every other service. It does indeed have advantages, but then so does spark, and so does joining

two tin cans with a piece of string. Any self-respecting debater could make a good case for standing on hilltops waving semaphore flags.

In my musical analogy the aging rocker in the song 'wore his trouser cuffs too tight', but he didn't say we all have to dress that way. The 'morse forever' crew are effectively saying we all have to 'wear our trouser cuffs too tight' in the style of long ago. Ultimately, it's just an extremely silly point of view. However, if it weren't so deeply held we wouldn't be arguing about it. Unfortunately, it seems likely only to fade away along with those who beleieve in it.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

5154. Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 03:22:40 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com>
Source record: 93218

Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?

I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
(CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.

Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.

Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5155. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 04:01:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622000110.12940.00000267@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93221

In article <20040621193708.17843.00000332@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <1e4e3692.0406211508.6cb46de0@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
>>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>>
>>> >> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
>>> >> >the Security Detail with "proof."
>>> >> >
>>> >> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
>>> >>
>>> >> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
>>> >> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
>>> >> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
>>> >
>>> >"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
>>> >crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."
>>>
>>> I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
>>> low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
>>> even Tom Cruise.
>>>
>>> [I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
>>> rupt." :-)]
>>
>>Bankrupt? Hopefully they will actually deliver on all of the pre-sold
>>Clinton's, "My Life."
>>
>>> >> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
>>> >> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>>>
>>> >> :-)

>>> >
>>> >"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.
>>>
>>> Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
>>> I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
>>> Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(
>>>
>>> Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
>>> when and where a Secret!
>>>
>>> I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?
>>
>>One action figure, numerous interchangeable scowling faces.

[oops...didn't complete that message!]

I hope they have cute little interchangeable UNIFORMS to go
with them. Scrubs, cammies, poopysuits, etc. That would make
them "authentic." :-)

LHA / WMD

5156. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 04:01:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622000112.12940.00000268@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93222

In article <Xns950FE79211453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in
>news:1f6dnb3FI_tjEUrdRVn-hg@comcast.com:
>
>> "Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>
>>> Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the
>>> merits or otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has
>>> unquestionably moved on and they have not.
>>>
>>
>> The merits of the CW mode have been presented many times and in depth.
>>
>> It wasn't the "new" hams that came up with RTTY, packet, satellite,
>> PSK31 and the many advances in ham radio communications. Instead, it
>> was the experienced hams. The experienced hams have moved on while the
>> new, inexperienced hams are too often afraid to experience the full
>> range of ham activities and deny themselves the ability to make
>> judgements based on personal experience. Too often they instead listen
>> to other inexperienced hams and make decisions based on incomplete and
>> inaccurate data.
>>
>> It was not the new hams that I heard last fall several days after the
>> major flares and auroras discussing on SSB how they had to shift from
>> PSK31 to CW as the auroral activity was causing terrible phase shifts
>> in the PSK31 and how they had to wait to establish SSB communications
>> until the effects of the flares had passed.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>We have indeed debated the relative merits many times. I could make a case
>for other modes, but it isn't the issue. Nor is experience the issue here.
>If it were it would degenerate into analysing different kinds of
>experience. This in turn is entirely self-defeating, as usually only those
>who actually like CW have a lot of experience in using it. OTOH, I have
>held a ham licence for 24 years, which is a significant amount of time, but
>of course without using CW it doesn't count :-)
>
>The issue is living in the past, harmless and perhaps even admirable in
>itself, but not something to force upon others if one has a proper sense of
>decency. Morse is an antiquarian mode, dropped by every other service. It

>does indeed have advantages, but then so does spark, and so does joining
>two tin cans with a piece of string. Any self-respecting debater could make
>a good case for standing on hilltops waving semaphore flags.

Heh heh heh. The collar insignia of the U.S.Army Signal Corps
is a torch over crossed signal flags...for the visual semaphores
used before the American Civil War. Both sides used exactly
the same signalling protocols during that War...not a heckuvalot
of "communications security" then!

That high-tech, all-weather commo system called the "telegraph"
was used then, too, but both sides forbade its use for "secure"
(encrypted) messaging because "telegraph lines were too easy
to intercept!" [I kid you not]

Yeah, like with that high-tech landline morse, there were "high-
impedance taps" either side could use to bug the other side?
Anyone just listening to the sounders (with or without knowing
morse) could detect when a tap was put on a line...same
sounder types were used on both sides and putting two on the
same line made a significant change in the sounder sound.

But, the visual semaphoring, rather older than new-fangled
telegraphy, was good, familiar stuff and everyone felt warm and
fuzzy using that...in clear!

A small vignette to illustrate that older ain't necessarily better
and the first commo system (semaphore) wasn't at all the "best."

On-off keying telegraphy was the ONLY way the first radios
could be used for communications. So, on the basis of being
the "first," the morse-aholics want to force "CW" on everyone
forever and ever for "tradition sake!"

Brain-dead emotionalism!

'Scure me, I gonna call up Aurora and tell her to quit messing
around with phase-shifting all that PSK31! Not nice.

Beep, beep...

LHA / WMD

5157. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 04:01:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622000113.12940.00000269@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93220

In article <1f6dnb3FI_tjEUrdRVn-hg@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Alun" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns950FC3B15FCBFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> Yes, they are living in the past. This has nothing to do with the merits
>or
>> otherwise of their beloved mode, simply that the world has unquestionably
>> moved on and they have not.
>
>The merits of the CW mode have been presented many times and in depth.

As well as the demerits...

>It wasn't the "new" hams that came up with RTTY, packet, satellite, PSK31
>and the many advances in ham radio communications. Instead, it was the
>experienced hams.

Tsk, tsk. RTTY, packet, satellite, FAX, were all done by the
commercial radio services long before.

Peter Martinez, G3PLX, devised PSK31 in the UK and Yurp hams
did the trials and testings on the air. Took a while before the
"experienced hams" of the USA to try it out.

>The experienced hams have moved on while the new,
>inexperienced hams are too often afraid to experience the full range of ham
>activities and deny themselves the ability to make judgements based on
>personal experience. Too often they instead listen to other inexperienced
>hams and make decisions based on incomplete and inaccurate data.

Such as that old familiar, "CW gets through when nothing else will?"

Actually, Brian Burke had it correct: "CW gets through when
everything else will."

Sunnuvagun!

>It was not the new hams that I heard last fall several days after the major
>flares and auroras discussing on SSB how they had to shift from PSK31 to CW
>as the auroral activity was causing terrible phase shifts in the PSK31 and
>how they had to wait to establish SSB communications until the effects of
>the flares had passed.

Oh, that nasty old phase shift!

I guess that the shortwave radio broadcasters doing DRM (Digital Radio Mondial) are all technically inept because they've been doing DRM testing successfully for a bit over three years now!

Guess nobody told them about nasty old phase shifts from auroras and stuff!

12 KHz commercial-military multi-voice-channel SSB has been working on HF since the 1930s. Guess nobody told those many HF sidebanders that nasty old aurora phase shift would shut them down, ey?

Sunnuvagun! and How About That?! :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5158. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 04:01:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622000114.12940.00000270@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93219

In article <wdMBc.62$Hv5.21@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Guess I get my dander up too at times. Certainly it is wrong to paint "all"
>Republicans or "all" Democrates or "all" of any one group with a wide brush.
>Not good at all. Besides, I've gotten led off-topic - not good at all.

Some folks with opposite and contrary personal agendas WILL
do that! :-)

>I have figured it out, Len. The problem is we are dropping the Morse
>requirements. Dang, now my washing machine is going to over-suds again ;)

Har!

>However, BPL should help the situation. If BPL is going to reduce power
>line noise (according to power companies), it should reduce my washer
>over-sudsing since it runs from the mains. LOL.

There ya go! :-)

But, speaking seriously on BPL. A Cedar Rapids ham group got
motivated and really organized for a measurement of a small
BPL trial installation in Cedar Rapids, IA. [the city may be a
familiar one as Collins Radio is located there]

Darn good Comment under docket 03-47 under 21 June 2004 in
the FCC ECFS. First part is long at about 1.3 MB, being the
certified by PE test report, second part is shorter, the text
comment itself.

I will give that Cedar Rapids group a large hand of applause for
their effort. Complete and to the point.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5159. Kenwood TS 480 online?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 06:17:27 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <40dcce45.1638702@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 93223

Kenwood TS 480 online?

Anyone using a Kenwood TS 480 on line?

If so could I have the details to try it out remote.

73 Ian G3ZHI

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - many ham radio links
http://www.ukirlp.co.uk

G4NJI IRLP 5200 Echolink 135909
Rotherham simplex 145.2875mhz

GB3XN IRLP 5708 Echolink 153126
Langold 430.925 Mhz

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0783 338 0578

5160. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 07:11:26 UTC
From: Kim <mail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <yYQBc.7911$oK.636@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 93224

'X-No-archive: yes'
Plans, yes. But not related to Field Day; My husband and I will be
celebrating our 15th Wedding Anniversary with a housewarming and renewal of
vows!

Kim W5TIT

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
>
> I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
> Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
> (CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
> demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
> it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.
>
> Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
> the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.
>
> Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.
>
> 73 DE John D. Kasupski
> Tonawanda, New York, USA
> Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
> Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN
>

5161. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 08:27:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622042736.03961.00000246@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93225

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>Date: 6/21/2004 4:53 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <73led016d99ud7vt7rmsb9361g2hcdkpbv@4ax.com>
>
>On 21 Jun 2004 13:33:29 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:
>
>>>Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like
>>>Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.
>>
>> I'm not in Florida.
>
>Hmmm...okay, I stand corrected. I don't know why, but for some reason,
>I thought you lived in Florida. <shrug>

Nope....Other than working situations, have always been in Tennessee
(since joining the forum)

>>Certain other posters have "insisted" that
>>those radio services are "major" contributors to "emergency comms".
>>
>> They have yet to establish any validity for those claims.
>
>I didn't see the original posts on that, but if you've accurately
>summarized what was said, then I would also be interested in learning
>of the specifics.

Refer to Brain Burke, N0MIND...I mean Brian Burke, N0IMD...He's the
progentiator of that bit of silliness.

>I'm personally aware of some areas where there are Neighborhood Watch
>groups using FRS radios, and at least one where an ARES group uses
>GMRS to communicate with the local NW group on FRS (the first seven
>channels are the same freqs).

Yes, those services ARE used...The point here is "major role". Those are
great ancilliary tools for end-users. They do not play a "major role" in
"emergency comms".

>I'm also personally aware of instances where FRS radios are used by
>ARES/RACES personnel or by government or emergency services personnel.

The only instance I know of FRS/GMRS bveing used by them is as a liasion
with non-Amateur services...quite practical, actually.

>I am not personally aware of any instances where the regular users of
>FRS, GMRS, MURS, and the other Part 15 services are written into the

>disaster plans for a given locality, except in the case of REACT
>groups using equipment for those services. In the sense of having
>families who use FRS radios at the mall to help keep track of the kids
>being written into emergency communications contingency planning, or
>folks who use GMRS or MUR for similar purposes, no, I've never seen or
>heard of that being done. That of course doesn't mean it hasn't been
>done somewhere, just that if it has, I haven't heard of it - I'd like
>to hear about it if someone's got specifics on one or more cases where
>this has been done, though.

Colorado Wing, Civil Air Patrol logged a rescue of several stranded hikers last summer who were in a deep, tree covered ravine. One of the hikers made it to a road, but couldn't retrace his course. The FRS radios were used to contact them and locate them...Worked like a champ.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5162. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 09:47:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040622054740.07518.00000354@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93226

In article <cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
>didn't know how to get out of Vietnam.

I think it was Robert McNamara.

>Sometimes those things backfire
>(like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone finally
>told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
>understood it better and was able to let it go.

The biggest tragedy is if we don't learn from that experience.

>In any case, somehow folks don't like Kerry voicing his opinion that Vietnam
>was wrong - they convieniently forget that Bush pretty much avoided the
>service.

Combat service, anyway.
>
>This is one thing I don't care for - follow the leader, regardless.

"Waist deep in the Big Muddy - and the big fool says to push on!"

>Don't
>think. If you do, you might be called "waffling".

Or worse - disloyal.

>Jump right in and agree
>with everything that is occuring. This is how Hitler came into power. By
>the time any Germans realized what was happening, it was far too late to
>voice their opinion (unless, of course, they wanted to be shipped somewhere
>they didn't want to go).
>
>We need a strong military; but Russia poured almost all of its' resources
>into its' military and ultimately fell apart. Somewhere, somehow,
>moderation has to come into play our there will be heck to pay.

Whole lot of factors going on there. The Soviets bureaucracy weighed them down
to the point they couldn't even feed themselves. The USSR was severely
devastated by WW2 - at least 20 *million* dead, half of them civilians. And
this was in the wake of Stalin's purges in the '30s.

The USA gets itself in the situation of being the world's policeman - unpaid,
while other countries spend their money on infrastructure, education, etc. And
resentments are sown all over the world.

>
>Some one asked about "What's good for General Motors is good for America.".
>I remember "Lil Abner" and in there the quote was "What is good for Bull
>Moose is good for America.". That guy was good - really good (unless, of
>course, what he was saying went over one's head - which happens a lot with
>the blind followers of the faith.)

The original quote came from Charles Erwin Wilson ("Engine Charlie") who was CEO for GM and then Secretary of Defense from 1953 to 1957 under President Eisenhower. During his Senate confirmation hearing, he stated "What was good for our country was good for General Motors, and vice versa."

In the wake of the Korean War, he cut the defense budget significantly.

He should not be confused with the Charles E. Wilson ("Electric Charlie") who was the CEO of General Electric and served President Truman as the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5163. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 09:51:17 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220151.334e41b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93227

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174150.07368.00000270@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
> >> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
> >> >
> >> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
> >> >>>
> >> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
> >
> >> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
> >> >>>> you?
> >> >>>
> >> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
> >> >>> the claims he made, yes.
> >> >>
> >> >> Why?
> >> >>
> >> >> He may know just where they are.
> >> >>
> >> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
> >> >> another.
> >> >>
> >> >>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.
> >> >>>
> >> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
> >> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
> >> >>>
> >> >> Can produce or will produce?
```

> >> >>
> >> >>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
> >> >>> unit, his
> >> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
> >> >>>is fact.
> >> >>
> >> >> So what's the problem?
> >> >>
> >> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
> >> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
> >> >> pretty much a given.
> >> >>
> >> >> So why bother about it?
> >> >>>
> >> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it, it
> >> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain if
> >> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
> >> >>
> >> >> Maybe.
> >> >>
> >> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed away,
> >> >> etc.
> >> >>
> >> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a T5/N0IMD
> >> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
> >> >>>
> >> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some pieces
> >> >> of wood.
> >> >>
> >> >>> It's just that it's empty.
> >> >>>
> >> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
> >> >>
> >> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
> >> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on 2m
> >> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was with
> >> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was via
> >> >the local repeater in PJ7.
> >>
> >> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
> >>
> >> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters, and
> at
> >> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly made.
> >> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite
> credible,
> >> even with a very makeshift station.

> >
> >Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.
> >
> >Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
> >except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
> >nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
> >civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
> >force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the
> >Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically
> >irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.
> >
> >In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into
> >PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being
> >big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork
> >right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing
> >authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a
> >legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.
> >
> >Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame
> >altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his
> >tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on
> >ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The
> >ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of
> >which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that
> >expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to
> >operate an amateur radio station in T5.
>
> Kelly NEVER served in the armed forces of the United States.
>
> Kelly does NOT understand the military chain of command.
>
> Permission to do anything IN the military is granted by ranking
> officers.
>
> Didn't Kelly hear that at the Captain's Table while dining with
> all that rank? No? Tsk, tsk.
>
> >Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another
> >simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya
> >wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate
> >ham radio operation. It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac
> >was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and
> >did what they usually do.
>
> Amazing at the range and scope of rationalization for HATING
> another newsgroup poster by the high-society ham extras.
>
> Kelly should explain his "superiority" in not only radio but relative
> to the rest of society. [Kelly is "superior" only because he claims
> that while busy inflating past claims to a greatness never before

> seen by hamkind]
>
> >T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.
>
> Kelly has taken on a new role...that of International Regulator
> And Punisher of anything an NCTA says.
>
> Yawn.
>
> >The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's
> >"T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the
> >freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham
> >radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his
> >kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.
>
> Kelly is allowed to inflate his single patent to 26. Kelly is PCTA.
> [proof is with the U.S. Patent Office and several patent websites,
> showing only one...and that one as co-inventor]]
>
> Kelli is allowed to shoot bears from an aircraft carrier. Kelly is
> PCTA. [there is no proof of this but Kelly will damn anyone who
> disputes it]
>
> Kelly claims knowledge of WW2 military vehicles and their radios
> as absolute truths. Kelly is PCTA. [proof is in many places,
> including old documents of the U.S. military disputing that]
>
> Kelly has repeatedly damned others opposing his fish stories.
> Kelly is PCTA. That is approved under the ROE of this news-
> group trying to be dominated by PCTA.
>
> They are PCTA, hear them ROAR! :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

All that and more from a guy who was so confused that he thought I was putting up an antenna at -his- house. Yup, he's got "real" military experience and never been in uniform. Another Walter Mitty wannabe.

5164. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:00:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220200.707e8d04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93228

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620205410.14094.00000267@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406201134.6b70e44b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040620013453.22098.00000405@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >> >>> Nobody
> >> >> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged
> operation.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
> >> >>
> >> >> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
> stinger
> >> >> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
> >> >>
> >> >> "Nothing to send."
> >> >
> >> >100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL card.
>
> >> >
> >> >Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.
> >>
> >> Nursie NEVER lie. Not allowed.
> >
> >Congenital. Like Hillary
>

> Hillary never lied? :-)

Habitually.

> >> >> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.
> >> >
> >> >"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."
> >> >
> >> >Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."
> >> >
> >> >(NCI = No Content Indicator)
> >>
> >> "I don't know, but I've been told, old old arguments are mighty
> >> cold...hup, too, tree, Foah!" :-)
> >
> >I think he played a bit part in "Small Soldiers."
>
> I didn't see that one.

Animation. Toys. Like in "Buzz Light Year."

> Did he do the biting or was he the one that got bit?
>
> :-)

He always gets bit.

> "I will beep my key in a military manner, keeping always on the
> alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those within sight and
> hearing." - General Order #1 of the PCTA sentinels.

Sir, First General Order: "I will beep my key in a military manner,
keeping always on the alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those
within sight and
hearing." Sir!

> Some suggested phonetics for code-aholics for use in speech
> since they don't seem to do much of that and may need an aid
> in getting through - obviously picked for those in favor of morris
> goad who like to Jerk around the NCTA about how Able and
> Brave the Code men are and how Code is Dandy, Easy, Fast,
> Great, a Hymn to all who hear it while they Insist, like Jerks
> that Code is King and all must Love Morse because it is
> Nifty and all Obey Morse with a Passion. We can Quote
> them on Morse being Rapid, Safe, Tough, Uniting all of
> the Morse Vice who must Win.
>
> Able Brave Code Dandy Easy Fast Great
> Hymn Insist Jerk King Love Morse Nifty Obey
> Passion Quote Rapid Safe Tough Unite Vice
> Win Xcellent* Yummy Zero
>
> * had trouble there due to too few X words available...:-)

>
> Dit dit
>
> LHA / WMD

I like these new phonetic alphabets. I wonder if there's one for guys
with "real" military experience, but never who wore a uniform.

5165. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:06:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220206.79e4a2d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93229

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040622000110.12940.00000267@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <20040621193708.17843.00000332@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <1e4e3692.0406211508.6cb46de0@posting.google.com>,
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>news:<20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> >>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
> >>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>>
> >>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>> >news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
> >>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >>> >> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to provide
> >>> >> >the Security Detail with "proof."
> >>> >> >
> >>> >> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
> >>> >>
> >>> >> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also played
> >>> >> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
> >>> >> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
> >>> >
> >>> >"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
> >>> >crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."
> >>>
> >>> I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
> >>> low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
> >>> even Tom Cruise.
> >>>
> >>> [I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
> >>> rupt." :-)]
> >>
> >>Bankrupt? Hopefully they will actually deliver on all of the pre-sold
> >>Clinton's, "My Life."

Hmmmm. Maybe that's how it got on the best seller list already. They
never intended to deliver, and all of the orders thru Amazon just go
away.

Anyway, saying it is a best seller (without any actual delivieries)
just might make it sell better.

> >>> >> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did any
> >>> >> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
> >>> >> >
> >>> >> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>
> >>> >> :-)
> >>> >
> >>> >"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.
> >>>
> >>> Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
> >>> I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
> >>> Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(
> >>>
> >>> Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
> >>> when and where a Secret!
> >>>
> >>> I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?
> >>
> >>One action figure, numerous interchangeable scowling faces.
>
> [oops...didn't complete that message!]
>
> I hope they have cute little interchangeable UNIFORMS to go
> with them. Scrubs, cammies, poopysuits, etc. That would make
> them "authentic." :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

And all the little incitations and, errr, I meant citations and
medals. You don't have to earn them, just have your mom and dad buy
them, or get them free out of specially marked boxes of Froot Loops.

5166. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:07:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93230

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
>>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.
>>
>So it's emotional, not based on objective facts with supporting evidence.

Part emotional, yes, but based on past experience with the Demoncratic
Party.

>Do you see the problem?

I do.

I also know Kerry has made public remarks that supported Fonda. Someone
was a bit creative with a camera...OK...Kerry's words were his own.

>> He diluted the chain of command.
>
>How, exactly?

By trying to have everyone be IN the pot, that's how.

There can only be so many people "in charge" at one time.

>>Part of the errors that occured in the
>>Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what
>>should have been an military operation.
>
>Agreed.
>
>But there were also errors that were the result of simple human error.

Yes, there were. Letting Jimmy Carter be in charge was one of them. Oh
well...That's democracy.

>> He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with
>>"warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave
>>America blind and hog tied.
>
>Carter left office almost a quarter century ago. How could his old orders

>continue to cause such problems - particularly since 16 of the intervening
>years were those of the Reagan and Bush administrations?
>
>How could one president, in office for only four years, cause so much
>trouble?

Indeed. Ask any Southerner the same question.

You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.

Our Armed Forces were, if it's at all possible, in far worse condition
when he left office than when he entered.

We were humiliated in the Middle East, a reputation were have yet to
overcome.

We were saddled with double digit inflation.

Our intelligence services were cut off at the knees by Executive
Order...You asked how he could create so much havoc in four years...?!?! He
did this one in only a few days!

>> Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?
>
>No. But you are avoiding the questions, Steve.
>
>How did Clinton "let them"?

I am not avoiding the question, Jim.

I secifically stated that Clinton tried to manipulate field operations
from Washington.

>Should the US have stayed out of that conflict? Or gotten more involved?
>
>What threat were they to US security?

None.

As much compassion as I have for hungry, sick people, I have very LITTLE
compassion for people who are hungry BUT can afford AK47's, RPGs, etc etc etc.

>>>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?
>>
>> Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.
>
>1) How do we extract ourselves from there?

We keep the promise to restore soverignty as we promised and when we are
asked to leave, we leave.

>2) How do we avoid such involvements in the future?

We don't.

If you truly believe the basic tenets of our own freedom and our public rhetoric to defend against tyrrany, we will always find ourselves extended somewhere.

>>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>>
>> Be danged if I know.
>
>How about these reasons:
>
>1) They are embarrassed that their vaunted army fell apart so quickly -
>twice.

If they are pragmatic, they have nothing to be embarrassed about.

Those forces that did fight fought bravely. The rest were conscripts forced into trench warfare that had no hope of sustaining adefense against American force mobility.

>2) They are not really a country but a bunch of warring factions held
>together
>by a strongman. With the strongman gone, the factions are at each others
>throats again.

It's the way it's been for centuries. The current brood of Arabs blame the United States for thier plight, but anyone reading Middle Eastern history knows that is bunk.

>This isn't anything new - it's Yugoslavia all over again. Say,
>who was in charge during that war?

Bill Clinton.

The same Bill Clinton who insisted on "no ground troops" and got many of our folks killed because they could not maneuver with cover.

>>The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them for
>>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help,
>I
>>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.
>
>Yet the Bush Administration went in expecting to be greeted like the US Army
>iberating Paris.

Oh...?!?!

You can show me where this was stated by them, Jim?

>> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>>business and social, any better than what we did.
>
>How could that have been done? Why was it *our* responsibility?

We could ahve ID'd these landmarks and targeted them for immediate
security.

Yes, it was our responsibility. When we overthrew the Iraqi governmant by
force, WE became the force-of-law there.

>>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>>
>> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.
>
>For a start, there's those who gave the orders. And those who put those
>people
>in charge. And those who didn't follow up.
>>
>>>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>>>
>Worse news than Al-Gharib?

What happened at Al-Gharib was humiliating, Jim.

What's even more humiliating is that some American's have forgotten just
how badly WE were treaten in Desert Storm.

I don't hear those voices who are being apologetic for Al-Gharib
apologizing for the bruises on Iraqi fists when our POW's intentionally ran
themselves into them over and over.

>>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam -
>>a
>>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>>
>> Because he's an apologist.
>
>Evidence, please?

Read the papers, please.

>> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.
>
>True. But the time to mend fences is still here. Is it wrong to apologize for
>past mistakes?

Over and over and over and....?!?!

Do we hold present day Germany's feet to the fire over Nazi atrocities?

When was the last time we hung a Japanese warlord for the "care" they
delivered to our troops?

It's time to move on.

>> He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our
>>tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.
>
>Evidence, please?

Read the papers, please.

Listen to his speeches to the veterans organizations, please.

Listen to his speeches to any other number of liberal civil rights groups.

And before you jump on me about "Don't you support civil rights?", of course I do! What I DON'T support is the suggestion by some political "leaders" that we still hang our heads in shame almost a full generation out.

He was in-country. He killed North Vietnamese and VC. Let him travel to Hanoi and ofer himself as sacrifical lamb.

>> "Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
>>sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.
>
>Right. And other sources said there were none. The sources who said there
>were
>had a vested personal interest in seeing SH overthrown.

And some who said there were none also lied about other atrocities done by Hussein, because they stood to profit by playing THAT side of the coin.

>>That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the
>>intellignece
>>agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle East
>>after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
>>during/after WW2.
>
>And none of them have been replaced in the 24 years since he left office?

I am sure many have.

But ahve YOU read the memoirs and studies of Middle East relations since the end of WW2, Jim?

Carter's "withdrawl" from covert intelligence programs left hundreds of indigenous personnel hanging...literally...So why should they trust us now, only to watch us "pull the plug" when things get too dicey for the "current" admisnistration...?!?!

>Remember this: The main threat to the USA in Carter's time was perceived to
>be
>the Soviet Union. The new technology of spy satellites was thought to be
>adequate - and for many tasks it is. But it wasn't adequate for everything.

I disagree.

The state of political unrest in the Middle East was already of major policy concern two presidencies before Carter.

The OPEC oil embargo happened just before his "tour of duty". It was of major concern to all.

>>>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?
>>

>> We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?
>
>Simple: Rather than deal with the realities of energy policies, Bush tells us
>there is a cheap clean technological solution "just around the corner". Heck,
>he even had the governor of California fooled. (The Guvernator inquired about
>having a Hummer converted to hydrogen power. The cost was something like
>$250,000 - not including a source of fuel. Not exactly practical.)
>
>Hydrogen *may* be a fuel of the future. But it's a long long way from being
>practical for today's problems or those of the near future.

"Practical" is usually based upon mass production.

And President Bush is not the first to suggest that some scientific
breakthrough was close at hand. Billary made an announcement that there was a
breakthrough in AIDS research that was about to revolutionalize the care
delivered to those victims.

>Still, it sounds nice, makes for great photo ops and is a pleasant PopSci
>diversion from the reality that the US imports way too much oil, and pays way
>too much for it in the process. That payment isn't just in dollars per
>barrel.

Agreed. But as long as we insist on not harvesting OUR reserves yet are
willing to let the Arabs suck themselves dry, what are we to do.

This isn't news. This "crisis" has been in the wings for decades. People
a lot wiser than you or I have been promising this was coming, and they were
right.

I se this on the same par with the "drought" in the SW United States. To
whom is it a "surprise" that we are millions of acre-feet short of the needed
water supplies out there?

The proponents of desalianation were hushed up by politicos 20 years ago
who insisted that present infrastructure would support SW US needs well into
the 21st Century.

>>>And
>>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
>>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits
>>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
>>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
>>
>> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.
>
>And it hasn't happened because of the enormous cost and dubious benefits. But
>now Bush talks about it like we should make it a national priority.

And why shouldn't we?

In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology. We barely had the
technology to get to the moon in the 70s.

History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
happen in the wake of war.

RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
based on the Apollo program alone.

For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask WHERE
in space are you going to spend that money?

A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
technical advencement. I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.

So why not Mars? Why not research stations on the Moon? Unless you want
to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?

>>>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
>>>and
>>>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
>>>>mirrors
>>>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
>>>
>>>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
>>>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies.
>Nor
>>>was Halliburton.
>>
>> HOW...!?!?
>
>Yes, how did he try to make it look better than it was?

Jim, you really are kidding me, right?

>> Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that (then)
>>recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of
>"...America's
>>confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".
>
>The rooster taking credit for the dawn. That's not using smoke and mirrors to
>make things look better than they are.

Taking credit for something you didn't so is exactly that, Jim. He lied.

>>Never mind that the NYSE had been on a steady upward trend for the
>>previous 12 months.
>
>Of course. Still, what was the Dow the day Clinton took office? What was it
>the
>day he left?

What was it 90 days AFTER he left...?!?!

>> The NYSE and all economic indicators are up now.
>

>Still down from their peaks.

And the history of the NYSE has always been straight up...?!?!

>> This "recession" suddenly appeared when Billary was no longer in office
>>and no longer able to keep up the charade.
>
>What "charade"? How can the President fudge numbers like the NYSE?

He can artificially support the economy with promises of large tax
reserves.

>>>> Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have
>>>>publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a
>>>>slow
>>>>and steady process. They were right.
>>>
>>>And the good jobs keep getting exported. Ross Perot was right about that
>>>"giant
>>>sucking sound".
>>
>> Until you and I (those "We The People" folks...) demand that the laws
>be
>>changed, they can legally do it.
>
>Until Big Business steps in and says no.
>
>The fact is, it's simply cheaper *in the short run* to manufacture things
>elsewhere and ship them here. But *in the long run* it causes all sorts of
>problems. Most of all, no *service* economy can prosper. People don't get
>rich
>taking in each other's washing.

I agree about the cost of importing things...But what are you going to do
when we slap big tariffs on things people want, only to have them cry foul...Or
worse yet, have OUR goods likewise tariffed over there, making it hard to get
our good sold.

No...they get rich getting other people to take in other people's
washing...By providing a business infrastructure to do that in.

>>>> Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them
>>>With
>>>>Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".
>>>
>>>As opposed to Reaganomics "Let The Deficits Pile Up - We Won't Be Around To
>>>Pay
>>>Them Back". Or Bush Sr.'s "Read My Lips".
>>
>> I lived a lot more comfortably and had a lot more money in the bank in
>>the
>>1980's and early 90's than I do now..

>
>Are you better off now than 4 years ago?

As a matter of fact, I am.

>>.Part due, in all honesty, to Bug's
>>expenses...but most due to the Clinton taxes of the 90's. Personally, I got
>>zinged in the Clinton era.
>
>Think about *why*. Look at the deficit in 1980 and again in 1992. It wasn't
>Clinton who built that deficit. It was "trickle down" Reaganomics. But
>eventually the piper had to be paid.

Paid? I was ripped off by the taxes I got zapped with on what should have
been a very, very lucrative income.

>And remember that it was Papa Bush who said "Read my lips...no new taxes" but
>then could not keep his promise because the numbers simply did not add up.
>Wasn't entirely his fault - he inherited the spiraling debt of his
>predecessor.

That debt was due (mostly) to the military build up of the Cold War. We
had already started to "harvest" the "peace dividend" by the end of Bush Sr's
tour.

Also, much of the improvement in the economy at the end of Bush Sr's tour
was the result of technology advances made in 80's.

>>>>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
>>>>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.
>
>You mean the National Ambulance Chaser? You might want to look into Mr.
>Edwards' record...

And Clinton wasn't? Clinton wanted to put an ambulance in everyone's
back yard but had no plan to do that, either...Instead he let his wife play
with it, and when she failed, it wasn't "his" fault.

>> The Dem's COULD do better. I would have had to think real hard about a
>>vote for Edwards. Too bad the loudest dog won rather than the better
>>candidate.
>
>You pay malpractice premiums?

As a matter of fact I do.

>>>But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:
>>>
>>>When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi Jane?
>
>>
>> The specific date? I don't recall. The articles from public media have
>>circulated the web.
>

>I suggest you look it up. The picture you refer to was taken in 1970. Jane
>Fonda went to Hanoi in 1972 - *TWO YEARS LATER*!!

I stand corrected on it then, however it still doesn't excuse his comments
condoning her conduct.

>Yet Kerry gets blamed and condemned because he was three rows behind and a
>few
>people to the right of a future possible traitor.

Why not?

I put Gore as almost as equally responsible for the humiliation suffered
by the Clinton-Gore administration for having not taken a stand against
Clinton's lying...Excuse me..."misrepresentations"...

He could have gone a long way towards promoting his own credibility by
distancing himslef from that affair (pardon the pun)

>Do you see how the *facts* behind that picture completely change things? Had
>the picture been taken *after* the Hanoi trip, you might have a point. But it
>was taken two years earlier!

I do.

Do YOU see the facts that a well known and respected celebrity whom those
very soldiers looked up to and admired actually helped to get some of them
killed...?!?!

>>>If indeed such a thing happened, why is it any worse than Rumsfeld shaking
>>>hands with and warmly greeting Saddam Hussein?
>>
>> Who cares?
>
>I do. Rumsfeld was in the Reagan Cabinet at the time. The US *supported* SH
>in
>those days, and turned a blind eye to his methods. You'd think we'd have
>learned from the Shah and Iran.
>
>>Hanoi Jane is a documented traitor.
>
>Here's proof:
>
>http://www.snopes.com/military/fonda.htm
>
>>How Kerry, a combat vet, his opinions on the war itself notwithstanding,
>>could sit next to a person who
>>openly gave comfort to the people who were trying to proactively kill him is
>>beyond me.
>
>Simple:
>
>1) He did not sit next to her

>2) She did not go to Hanoi until *TWO YEARS* after the picture was taken.
>
>See how just two little facts - dates - make all the difference?
>>
>> Those who protested the war had valid arguments.
>
>Agreed.
>>
>> Bill Clinton even had a valid RIGHT to PROTEST the war, even in Oxford,
>>England. Billary's error was at first saying he never did it then trying to
>>claim the pictures weren't him.
>
>He lied.

Indeed...Over and over and over....

I believe the Oxford situation was the first item to hit the wires.

If he'd only had the intestinal fortitude to say "Yes, it was me...It was a legal protest and I broke no laws", then every other "story" that came along would have been dismissed...or at least given a more lenient "benefit of the doubt".

Overall, Clinton was an adequate president.

Unfortunately he couldn't seperate his duties from his ego, and he will be remembered as one of the most prolific liars in the office...He made a mockery of it.

>> If the gutless liar had simply stated "Yes, I was against the war and I
>>exercised my right to protest it in a legal demonstration", even the most
>>right-winged Hawk would ahve had to give him due for being honest about it.
>
>He lied.

He sure did.

>> Kerry earned the additional right to speak out...practical experience.
>
>No, he didn't.

Yes, he did.

>Everyone has the right to speak out. Kerry earned *credibility* because he
>spoke from actual experience.
>
>>But to sit down next to a low life slut who intentionally betrayed her
>>Countrymen was foolish. I would have shot her first.
>
>How would you have known what she would do two years in the future?

Point taken for the third time, Jim.

>>It's a testimony to
>>America's professional, all-volunteer force that she hasn't been shot.
>
>It's no testimony to the justice system that she hasn't been brought up on
>charges.
>>
>>>When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's
>>>armed
>>>conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the president
>>>simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes
>the
>>>incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's
>>>policies and decisions aren't right.
>
>Well?

Well indeed.

What precedent are you trying to set? Why are you trying to set it?

We still had elections during the Civil War, World War 2, Korea and Viet
Nam. How did you extrapolate some idea about when it's OK to run for president
against my hatred for Jane Fonda?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5167. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:16:02 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220216.334a73b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93231

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040620181943.18863.00000467@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20040620094803.11752.00000247@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> > Sucks to be you...again.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...not only dissing and cussing, but very bad
> sentence structure. Try some remedial English classes.
> During the day since you abhor night classes. It would
> make a remarkable difference in improving your
> written communications.
>
> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

It's all a part of his "tuff guy" self-image. The only problem is the
rest of us don't see a tough guy. He's just another Walter Mitty
wannabe.

"Sir, First General Order: I will beep my key in a military manner,
keeping always on the alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those
within sight and hearing. Sir!"

5168. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:39:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622063946.03855.00000260@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93232

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/21/2004 6:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040621191017.07518.00000348@mb-m26.aol.com>

>In article <5bmed0ljck6kp2a05no080ih1bilbhtup2@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
><kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:

>>I think maybe you're half right, Len. believe it or not, even my ham
>>rigs are Part 15 devices and come with the usual Part 15 warning
>>sticker on them.
>
> Part 15 regulations apply to INCIDENTAL EMITTERS such as
> receivers, data couplers (if you have software controlled anything
> as a peripheral) and so forth.

They also pertain to INTENTIONAL EMMITERS, including those who operate
license free walkie talkies, "broadcast transmitters", etc.

Of course you know this...You've "threatened" to get on 20 meters with a
Part 15 legal "station" before.

You never carried through, though...Just like a dozen other "promises"...

Steve, K4YZ

5169. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:45:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93233

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
> Hello, Steve
>
> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone finally
> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
> understood it better and was able to let it go.

I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
a valid opinion.

> In any case, somehow folks don't like Kerry voicing his opinion that Vietnam
> was wrong - they convieniently forget that Bush pretty much avoided the
> service.
>
> This is one thing I don't care for - follow the leader, regardless. Don't
> think. If you do, you might be called "waffling".

Like, "I voted for it before I voted against it."

Jump right in and agree
> with everything that is occuring. This is how Hitler came into power.

This is how the Dems operate. They gathered up all the stray cats and
dogs that have absolutely nothing in common, and tell them they must
vote as a block (no questions, no discourse, no disagreements) if any
one of them is to be given benefits. And it works. At least it did
for 50 years. But it's gone stale because the government cannot give
dignity with a benefit check. People need to actually work at
something that actually needs doing.

By
> the time any Germans realized what was happening, it was far too late to
> voice their opinion (unless, of course, they wanted to be shipped somewhere
> they didn't want to go).

Like social services?

> We need a strong military;

We need to stay way the hell out in front of everyone else. We don't
want a "fair fight." Just wait til China/Loral target the USA.

but Russia poured almost all of its' resources
> into its' military and ultimately fell apart. Somewhere, somehow,

> moderation has to come into play our there will be heck to pay.

We have been pouring most of our resources into education, social services, and prison systems for a long time. We now have the most highly educated foreign work force, and many of our "native" young men are in prison. Way to go, DEMs!

> Some one asked about "What's good for General Motors is good for America.".
> I remember "Lil Abner" and in there the quote was "What is good for Bull
> Moose is good for America.". That guy was good - really good (unless, of
> course, what he was saying went over one's head - which happens a lot with
> the blind followers of the faith.)

Thanks for the segway, which brings us right back to the Code Test argument (which happens a lot with the blind followers of the faith).

5170. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:50:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93234

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>

>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
>anything.

I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done) evidence of
your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.

> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)

You CAN'T comply.

And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own character
straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.

>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.

"Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of dirt
over their casket.

>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>artery in his neck explodes.

If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and Lennie
glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.

It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!

Keep up the good work!

Steve, K4YZ

5171. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:53:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622065328.03855.00000262@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93235

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/22/2004 5:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220200.707e8d04@posting.google.com>

>I like these new phonetic alphabets. I wonder if there's one for guys
>with "real" military experience, but never who wore a uniform.

(N)itwit ZERO (I)maginary (M)ogandishu (D)x

Steve, K4YZ

5172. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 10:56:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622065653.03961.00000248@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93236

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/22/2004 5:45 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
>
>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
>> Hello, Steve
>>
>> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
>> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
>> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
>finally
>> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
>> understood it better and was able to let it go.
>
>I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
>a valid opinion.

Who said that?

Heck, you invent stories about Somalia, what makes you think we'd be any
less entertained with stories about Viet Nam...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

5173. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 11:05:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220305.b6db4d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93237

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
> > > Yes,
> > >
> > > We got rid of Nixon. Now we need to dump Bush.
> > >
> > > Best regards from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim AA2QA
> >
> > Nixon resigned.
> >
> > We impeached Clinton because he didn't have the decency to resign.
>
> Nixon resigned after his friends on Capitol Hill told him they couldn't
> muster enough votes to avoid throwing him out of office. End of story.

No, not the end of the story. But there would be no point in
discussing it with a closed-minded person such as yourself.

> Clinton was not removed from office.

Then what was the purpose of impeaching him? He thwarted the efforts
of honest people by not having the decency to leave.

What Clinton did was terrible to his
> wife and daughter,
I really don't want to know what he did to his wife and daughter. The
details of what he did to Monica was bad enough.

> but what damage to the country (other than a major distraction) did it do?

Our government and our monetary system is a confidence game. When our
leaders go south, our confidence goes south, and our economy goes
south.

> Are you so naive as to think that this huge deficit
> Bush is running won't hurt us?

Are you so naive as to think that we haven't seen huge defecits
before, even when they were for unnecessary social spending?

> Already some want to reduce social security
> more. It isn't that social security is broke (and it appears to be in a bit

> better shape than they thought,

But, assuming that you are a Social Security recipient, you just got a prescription drug benefit.

but as good jobs disappear and are replaced
> by near minimum-wage jobs, I wouldn't bet);

Yes, swapping out our manufacturing jobs for service jobs is the wrong path.

it is that the federal
> government has tapped the funds and issued IOUs to social security. They
> don't want to pay back money

They'll just print more. Remember the "confidence game?"

> to the folks that need it the most. Rob from
> the poor and give to the rich.

I'm beginning to think that I'll never be able to retire and spend my Golden Years learning fast code like I have wanted to. Instead I'll be working to support people who no longer work or never did work.

> Go figure; make $1,000,000 on the stock market and you only pay $150,000 in
> tax (15%). Now, go get a $60,000 a year job and see what you pay in taxes.
> Don't forget that over 7.5% social security tax you pay (and my pension is
> reduced slightly due to my employer's social security contribution.
> Retirement based on income above the tax base results in higher percentage
> payment.) when you figure your tax load.

I have been pondering the concept of "individual" and that of "corporation."

I'm told that a corporation has the rights of an individual.

A corporation has inputs and outputs. When the outputs excede the inputs, it is called profit. The profit is taxed.

An individual has inputs and outputs. All inputs are taxed.

> Well, we finally got our high-speed ferry here in Rochester. Like all other
> high-profile projects (the new soccer stadium, the baseball stadium), the
> owners paid *far* less than they were originally supposed to. The taxpayers
> picked up the tab.

The Church of Sweat. Sports are a religion. Seperation of Church and State.

Now we pay for security here, but Canada won't pay over
> there. Net result, before the first outing, prices were raised on vehicles
> and occupants as the ferry operator had to pay for security in Canada. Now,
> yesterday, we found out that for some reason the ferry folks got to take
> over most of the paved parking in a *public* park close to the ferry. I
> wonder why, since they raised the cost per vehicle. A *public* park, but in

> those spaces, they charge you $5.00 per day to park.

I used to pay for parking in St. Louis. I can't deduct parking as
part of my costs to earn my income.

> Where are all of the whiners that complain about welfare? Oh, I forgot;
> that doesn't apply to *corporate* welfare.

It does.

> Compassionate conservative *IS* an oxymoron. I don't need any more idiots
> in Washington running *huge* deficits to benefit the rich.

Bush is spending money like a drunken sailor or marine. I'm tired of
it.

> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.708 / Virus Database: 464 - Release Date: 6/18/04

5174. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 12:04:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622080439.03961.00000249@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93238

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/22/2004 6:05 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220305.b6db4d9@posting.google.com>
>
>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:<xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>...
>> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
>> news:1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com...
>> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>> news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
>> > > Yes,
>> > >
>> > > We got rid of Nixon. Now we need to dump Bush.
>> > >
>> > > Best regards from Rochester, NY
>> > > Jim AA2QA
>> >
>> > Nixon resigned.
>> >
>> > We impeached Clinton because he didn't have the decency to resign.
>>
>> Nixon resigned after his friends on Capitol Hill told him they couldn't
>> muster enough votes to avoid throwing him out of office. End of story.
>
>No, not the end of the story. But there would be no point in
>discussing it with a closed-minded person such as yourself.

Brain-to-English Translation: "Uh oh...I'm getting backed into yet
another corner...Better make an excuse and bug-out while I am still ahead"

>> Clinton was not removed from office.
>
>Then what was the purpose of impeaching him? He thwarted the efforts
>of honest people by not having the decency to leave.

Yep.

>What Clinton did was terrible to his
>> wife and daughter,
>I really don't want to know what he did to his wife and daughter. The
>details of what he did to Monica was bad enough.
>
>> but what damage to the country (other than a major distraction) did it do?
>

>Our government and our monetary system is a confidence game. When our
>leaders go south, our confidence goes south, and our economy goes
>south.

Oh CRAP!....Brian and I are in complete agreement with something!

THIS is SCARY!

>> Are you so naive as to think that this huge deficit
>> Bush is running won't hurt us?
>
>Are you so naive as to think that we haven't seen huge defecits
>before, even when they were for unnecessary social spending?

THAT'S TWICE! I am getting a cold shivver!

>> Already some want to reduce social security
>> more. It isn't that social security is broke (and it appears to be in a
>bit
>> better shape than they thought,
>
>But, assuming that you are a Social Security recipient, you just got a
>prescription drug benefit.
>
> but as good jobs disappear and are replaced
>> by near minimum-wage jobs, I wouldn't bet);
>
>Yes, swapping out our manufacturing jobs for service jobs is the wrong
>path.

It's a DIFFERENT path. We can do both, it's just the transition that's
worrisome. We demand "change" but get paranoid and run scared when someone
actually does it!

>I'm beginning to think that I'll never be able to retire and spend my
>Golden Years learning fast code like I have wanted to. Instead I'll
>be working to support people who no longer work or never did work.

No one "learn(s)" "fast code"...One ACHIEVES it through practice and use.
You either know the Morse Code or you don't.

Otherwise I share some of the same concerns...Good thing to have other
money in the bank, but I wonder what scam will arise in order to get their
hands on THAT!

>> Compassionate conservative *IS* an oxymoron. I don't need any more idiots
>> in Washington running *huge* deficits to benefit the rich.
>
>Bush is spending money like a drunken sailor or marine. I'm tired of
>it.

And you expect WHAT to be different if a Demoncrat is elected?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5175. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 13:01:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D82D8E.309@psu.edu>
Source record: 93239

I'm FD Chairman for W3YA and W3GA (GOTA). We'll be doing a scaled down Field day this year, as many of the people that usually help are committed to other things this year. We won't be able to put the big effort that we have for the past several years.

We'll be 2A running 100 Watts all stations, some hombrew OCF wire antennas, and a half wave vertical on 20 meters where the GOTA will be spending a lot of it's time. We'll be right in the Center of PA in a beautiful location in a big field.

We'll be doing SSB, CW, and PSK31.

One of the volunteers will be doing the cooking for the operators. We'll be well fed and with good food.

I'm really looking forward to FD this year, as it will be so different for us.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5176. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 13:30:06 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <knagd0pt53ivc8a4blef5vbtkgeht562b1@4ax.com>
Source record: 93240

On 22 Jun 2004 08:27:36 GMT, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote:

>>>>Yep - Puerto Rico CAP is their correct State Wing callsign. Like
>>>>Florida CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am.
>>>
>>> I'm not in Florida.
>>
>>Hmmm...okay, I stand corrected. I don't know why, but for some reason,
>>I thought you lived in Florida. <shrug>
>
> Nope....Other than working situations, have always been in Tennessee
>(since joining the forum)

OK, modified statement to reflect your correct QTH would then read,
"Like Tennessee CAP where you are, or WHITE PEAK where I am."

>>I'm also personally aware of instances where FRS radios are used by
>>ARES/RACES personnel or by government or emergency services personnel.
>
> The only instance I know of FRS/GMRS bveing used by them is as a liasion
>with non-Amateur services...quite practical, actually.

With the ARES/RACES groups, that's the reason for having them, yes.
With government/emrgency services personnel there are of course other
reasons. Niagara County (NY) emergency management has GMRS portables
with the intent of using them for comms between the director and
assistant directors at the scene of an incident where they might be
called into action, or to hand to someone they themselves want to be
able to communicate with, as in the case of the one they handed to me
once last year (about five minutes after telling me not to come up on
their frequency with my own radio, hehe).

At the Thunder Over Niagara airshow a few years ago, members of one of
the local CAP groups (I believe it was a cadet wing) were using FRS
radios in the performance of their duties at the show (directing
traffic in parking lots, serving as gophers for the adults from the
composite wing at the info booth, and they also had a hamburger and
hotdog stand going). I asked one of them about it, and he told me they
used those little FRS radios a lot, even trained with them for SAR.

They were Motorola FRS radios fully loaded with all the bells and
whistles that were common on FRS radios circa 1999. At the time these
were going for about $150 each. There were about two dozen CAP members
around who had these clipped to the top shirt pockets on their BDUs.

> Colorado Wing, Civil Air Patrol logged a rescue of several stranded hikers
>last summer who were in a deep, tree covered ravine. One of the hikers made it
>to a road, but couldn't retrace his course. The FRS radios were used to
>contact them and locate them...Worked like a champ.

So the guys I met at NF aren't the only CAP personnel equipped with and using FRS. Motorola (or someone) must appreciate the business, because for SAR work they're probably NOT going out and buying the cheapest radios they can find (or at least I hope they aren't).

The other EmComm group I'm with (other than Erie County ARES/RACES), which is the public service and emcomm team sponsored by the ham radio club I am a member of, is also starting to equip with the combined FRS/GMRS portables that have been hitting the market recently. Our thinking is quite simply, if it is capable of maintaining comms (with hams and non-hams) it might come in handy, and at the inexpensive prices these can be had for, it's worth the investment since you never know when something like that will come in handy.

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5177. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 13:31:51 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@wzrd.com>
Message-ID: <f3dgd01jr2uh54snrloj5ap27g4cu4nprk@4ax.com>
Source record: 93241

On Tue, 22 Jun 2004 07:11:26 GMT, "Kim" <mail@nomail.com> wrote:

>'X-No-archive: yes'
>Plans, yes. But not related to Field Day; My husband and I will be
>celebrating our 15th Wedding Anniversary with a housewarming and renewal of
>vows!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Ah! Well, under the circumstances I guess we just have to excuse you
from Field Day duty - and wish the two of you a Happy Anniversary! :-)

73 DE John D. Kasupski
Tonawanda, New York, USA
Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

5178. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 13:32:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406220532.32fab047@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93242

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174159.07368.00000275@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <20040621093451.05916.00000395@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
> >>Date: 6/20/2004 11:19 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>
>
> >> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
> >> radio communications.
> >
> > Yes, they do.
>
> NO. They once did. No more.
>
> Establish your PROOF before you blither out nonsense like that.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Temper fry.
>
> LHA / WMD

Maybe he read it in a defunct magazine or a magazine that carries
articles about a defunct mode.

5179. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 13:55:10 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <3TWBc.7547$5t2.5621@fed1read01>
Source record: 93243

We will be a 5F station plus GOTA in CA. I have the GOTA station
responsibilities.

GOTA will be on 40M thru 144 MHz. Phone, Data, and some CW (if we can find a
CW op with no HF experience)

400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies how
to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.

For the GOTA station we will try PSK31 and RTTY for demo to newbies and of
course to make contacts.

Wonder if the 20M PSK31 segment will be jam packed and contacts will be
feasible ??
Any PSK31 activity besides 20M for FD ???

This will be our first year trying the digital modes.

Any comments on PSK31 during FD ???

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
>
> I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
> Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
> (CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
> demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
> it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.
>
> Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
> the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.
>
> Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.
>
> 73 DE John D. Kasupski
> Tonawanda, New York, USA
> Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
> Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN

>

5180. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 14:35:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <IlednUPRINfE2UXdRVn-hA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93244

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:wdMBc.62$Hv5.21@news02.roc.ny...
> Hello, Len
>
> Guess I get my dander up too at times. Certainly it is wrong to paint
"all"
> Republicans or "all" Democrates or "all" of any one group with a wide
brush.
> Not good at all. Besides, I've gotten led off-topic - not good at all.
>
> I have figured it out, Len. The problem is we are dropping the Morse
> requirements. Dang, now my washing machine is going to over-suds again ;)
>
> However, BPL should help the situation. If BPL is going to reduce power
> line noise (according to power companies), it should reduce my washer
> over-sudsing since it runs from the mains. LOL.

It's not that BPL will reduce power line noise but rather that the companies
must reduce the noise to get BPL to work!!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5181. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 14:41:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <bomdnW9js6M22EXd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93245

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
>
> I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
> Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
> (CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
> demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
> it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.
>
> Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
> the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.
>
> Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.

Well I hope to be participating in our club's Field Day activities but it's
iffy at this point. It depends on when my doctor schedules my surgery,
which I won't find out until Thursday. If he picks Friday, well there goes
Field Day weekend.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5182. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 15:01:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40D849DF.5040103@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93246

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

>Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
>
>
>
Nothing fancy. Operating a Kenwood TS440SAT off commercial power at home.
This gives the serious contesters someone to get a point with.

5183. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 15:02:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>
Source record: 93247

Da Shadow wrote:
> We will be a 5F station plus GOTA in CA. I have the GOTA station
> responsibilities.
>
> GOTA will be on 40M thru 144 MHz. Phone, Data, and some CW (if we can find a
> CW op with no HF experience)

Oops, GOTA stations aren't on VHF, Shadow. The rule is:

4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands.
Only one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time
(see Field Day rule 4).

So you are pretty much stuck to HF.

> 400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies how
> to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
> digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.

It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.

> For the GOTA station we will try PSK31 and RTTY for demo to newbies and of
> course to make contacts.
>
> Wonder if the 20M PSK31 segment will be jam packed and contacts will be
> feasible ??
> Any PSK31 activity besides 20M for FD ???
>
> This will be our first year trying the digital modes.
>
> Any comments on PSK31 during FD ???

PSK31 was a BIG hit last year for us. People are in general, very
receptive to the chat room type atmosphere on PSK31. A person that might
be shy to talk will often be happy to type to another op.

It was also a great way to contribute to the final score, since PSK
contacts are worth 2 points each. I'm glad to see another mode that can
get 2 points per QSO. Actually, I wish that all contacts were 1 point
each. That won't happen for a long time tho'.

PSK activity on 20 meters was pretty decent last year. There was enough
traffic that we just stayed on 20. And by the time the band was finished

for the night, the GOTA station was closed down.

You might try 40, but I've never made a PSK contact there. 80 meters at night is pretty fair for PSK31, so if you can rig an antenna there, you should make some QSO's.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5184. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 15:03:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mPadnWHDDfCQ1kXdRVn-jA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93248

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406220305.b6db4d9@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>...
> > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com...
> > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
>
> What Clinton did was terrible to his
> > wife and daughter,
> I really don't want to know what he did to his wife and daughter. The
> details of what he did to Monica was bad enough.
>
> > but what damage to the country (other than a major distraction) did it
do?
>
> Our government and our monetary system is a confidence game. When our
> leaders go south, our confidence goes south, and our economy goes
> south.
>

What bothered me is that since Clinton lied about something so unimportant,
what might he do to cover up something that was much more important.

At the time, I had several German friends and they were totally baffled
about why he bothered to lie. To some extent, this probably hurt his
standing with foreign leaders though my memory tells me that as a whole
Europe loved Clinton.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5185. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 15:08:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <IoGdnSkb3rKb0UXdRVn-hg@comcast.com>
Source record: 93249

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
news:3TWBc.7547$5t2.5621@fed1read01...
> We will be a 5F station plus GOTA in CA. I have the GOTA station
> responsibilities.
>
> GOTA will be on 40M thru 144 MHz. Phone, Data, and some CW (if we can find
a
> CW op with no HF experience)
>

The GOTA station is not limited to people with no HF experience. It is for
people with little experience or who have been off the air for a while.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5186. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 15:38:25 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <RnYBc.7835$5t2.2703@fed1read01>
Source record: 93250

Hi Mike -- well the FD rules read:

4.1.1. Any Class A group whose entry classification is two or more transmitters may also operate one additional HF station without changing its base entry category, known as the GET ON THE AIR (GOTA) station.

4.1.1.1. This station must operate using a different callsign from the primary Field Day station.

4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or under the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct supervision of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.

4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the station.

THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE THE VHF BANDS

4.1.1.4. The maximum transmitter output power for the GOTA station shall be 150 watts. If the primary Field Day group is claiming the QRP multiplier level of 5, the maximum transmitter output power of the GOTA station may not exceed 5 watts.

4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed for credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be claimed by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100 QSO level.

4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands. Only one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time (see Field Day rule 4).

THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE ON HF BANDS BUT NOT WARC BANDS

4.1.1.7. The GOTA station does not affect the additional VHF/UHF station provided for under Field Day rule 4.1.2.

4.1.1.8. Participants are reminded that non-licensed participants working under the direction of a valid control operator may only communicate with other W/VE stations or with stations in countries with which the US has entered a third-party agreement.

4.1.1.9. GOTA stations operate under a single callsign separate from the callsign of the main group.

4.1.1.10. The GOTA stations does not qualify as an additional transmitter when determining the number of transmitters eligible for the 100-point emergency power bonus under rule 7.3.1.

4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or under the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct supervision of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.

4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the station.

So I read that as we can operate VHF no problem.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu...
> Da Shadow wrote:
> > We will be a 5F station plus GOTA in CA. I have the GOTA station
> > responsibilities.
> >
> > GOTA will be on 40M thru 144 MHz. Phone, Data, and some CW (if we can
find a
> > CW op with no HF experience)
>
> Oops, GOTA stations aren't on VHF, Shadow. The rule is:
>
> 4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands.
> Only one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time
> (see Field Day rule 4).
>
> So you are pretty much stuck to HF.
>
>
>
> > 400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies
how
> > to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
> > digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
>
> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
> inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
> operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
> very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA

> removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.
>
>
>
> > For the GOTA station we will try PSK31 and RTTY for demo to newbies and
of
> > course to make contacts.
> >
> > Wonder if the 20M PSK31 segment will be jam packed and contacts will be
> > feasible ??
> > Any PSK31 activity besides 20M for FD ???
> >
> > This will be our first year trying the digital modes.
> >
> > Any comments on PSK31 during FD ???
>
>
>
> PSK31 was a BIG hit last year for us. People are in general, very
> receptive to the chat room type atmosphere on PSK31. A person that might
> be shy to talk will often be happy to type to another op.
>
> It was also a great way to contribute to the final score, since PSK
> contacts are worth 2 points each. I'm glad to see another mode that can
> get 2 points per QSO. Actually, I wish that all contacts were 1 point
> each. That won't happen for a long time tho'.
>
> PSK activity on 20 meters was pretty decent last year. There was enough
> traffic that we just stayed on 20. And by the time the band was finished
> for the night, the GOTA station was closed down.
>
> You might try 40, but I've never made a PSK contact there. 80 meters at
> night is pretty fair for PSK31, so if you can rig an antenna there, you
> should make some QSO's.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

5187. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 16:18:18 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <fZYBc.7900$5t2.6641@fed1read01>
Source record: 93251

Well the rule sez:
4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or under the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct supervision of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.

How one interprets "generally inactive hams" is beyond me.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows
"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:IoGdnSkb3rKb0UXdRVn-hg@comcast.com...
>
> "Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
> news:3TWBc.7547$5t2.5621@fed1read01...
> > We will be a 5F station plus GOTA in CA. I have the GOTA station
> > responsibilities.
> >
> > GOTA will be on 40M thru 144 MHz. Phone, Data, and some CW (if we can
find
> a
> > CW op with no HF experience)
> >
>
> The GOTA station is not limited to people with no HF experience. It is
for
> people with little experience or who have been off the air for a while.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

5188. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 18:15:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D87725.6070108@psu.edu>
Source record: 93252

Da Shadow wrote:
> Hi Mike -- well the FD rules read:
>
> 4.1.1. Any Class A group whose entry classification is two or more
> transmitters may also operate one additional HF station without changing its
> base entry category, known as the GET ON THE AIR (GOTA) station.
>
> 4.1.1.1. This station must operate using a different callsign from the
> primary Field Day station.
>
> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or under
> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct supervision
> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants
> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
>
> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As
> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if
> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
> station.
>
> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE THE VHF BANDS
>
> 4.1.1.4. The maximum transmitter output power for the GOTA station shall be
> 150 watts. If the primary Field Day group is claiming the QRP multiplier
> level of 5, the maximum transmitter output power of the GOTA station may not
> exceed 5 watts.
>
> 4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed for
> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be claimed
> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100 QSO
> level.
>
> 4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands. Only
> one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time (see
> Field Day rule 4).
>
> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE ON HF BANDS BUT NOT WARC BANDS
>
> 4.1.1.7. The GOTA station does not affect the additional VHF/UHF station
> provided for under Field Day rule 4.1.2.
>
> 4.1.1.8. Participants are reminded that non-licensed participants working

> under the direction of a valid control operator may only communicate with
> other W/VE stations or with stations in countries with which the US has
> entered a third-party agreement.
>
> 4.1.1.9. GOTA stations operate under a single callsign separate from the
> callsign of the main group.
>
> 4.1.1.10. The GOTA stations does not qualify as an additional transmitter
> when determining the number of transmitters eligible for the 100-point
> emergency power bonus under rule 7.3.1.
>
> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or under
> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct supervision
> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants
> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
>
> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As
> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if
> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
> station.
>
>
>
> So I read that as we can operate VHF no problem.

Your call.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5189. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 19:09:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D883F2.4010805@psu.edu>
Source record: 93253

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Da Shadow wrote:
>
>> Hi Mike -- well the FD rules read:
>>
>> 4.1.1. Any Class A group whose entry classification is two or more
>> transmitters may also operate one additional HF station without
>> changing its
>> base entry category, known as the GET ON THE AIR (GOTA) station.
>>
>> 4.1.1.1. This station must operate using a different callsign from the
>> primary Field Day station.
>>
>> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
>> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or
>> under
>> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
>> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct
>> supervision
>> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants
>> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
>>
>> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As
>> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if
>> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
>> station.
>>
>> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE THE VHF BANDS
>>
>> 4.1.1.4. The maximum transmitter output power for the GOTA station
>> shall be
>> 150 watts. If the primary Field Day group is claiming the QRP multiplier
>> level of 5, the maximum transmitter output power of the GOTA station
>> may not
>> exceed 5 watts.
>>
>> 4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed for
>> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
>> claimed
>> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100 QSO
>> level.
>>
>> 4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands. Only
>> one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time (see

>> Field Day rule 4).
>>
>> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE ON HF BANDS BUT NOT WARC BANDS
>>
>> 4.1.1.7. The GOTA station does not affect the additional VHF/UHF station
>> provided for under Field Day rule 4.1.2.
>>
>> 4.1.1.8. Participants are reminded that non-licensed participants working
>> under the direction of a valid control operator may only communicate with
>> other W/VE stations or with stations in countries with which the US has
>> entered a third-party agreement.
>>
>> 4.1.1.9. GOTA stations operate under a single callsign separate from the
>> callsign of the main group.
>>
>> 4.1.1.10. The GOTA stations does not qualify as an additional transmitter
>> when determining the number of transmitters eligible for the 100-point
>> emergency power bonus under rule 7.3.1.
>>
>> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
>> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or
>> under
>> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
>> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct
>> supervision
>> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and participants
>> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
>>
>> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode. As
>> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present if
>> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
>> station.
>>
>>
>>
>> So I read that as we can operate VHF no problem.
>
>
>
> Your call.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I just got off the phone to the ARRL. The fellow there confirms that
the GOTA station is HF only. No VHF or UHF. If you want to confirm:

860-594-0232

- mike KB3EIA -

5190. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 20:33:35 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <zI0Cc.394$hX6.30@fed1read01>
Source record: 93254

Thanks Mike -- scratch the 6M beam and 2M beam -- Thanks Mike

I called the ARRL and sure enough they sed no VHF for the GOTA station

Glad I posted here and got the ARRL rules figured out

Sincere thanks

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40D883F2.4010805@psu.edu...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> > Da Shadow wrote:
> >
> >> Hi Mike -- well the FD rules read:
> >>
> >> 4.1.1. Any Class A group whose entry classification is two or more
> >> transmitters may also operate one additional HF station without
> >> changing its
> >> base entry category, known as the GET ON THE AIR (GOTA) station.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.1. This station must operate using a different callsign from the
> >> primary Field Day station.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
> >> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or
> >> under
> >> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
> >> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct
> >> supervision
> >> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and
participants
> >> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode.
As
> >> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present
if
> >> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
> >> station.
> >>
> >> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE THE VHF BANDS
> >>

> >> 4.1.1.4. The maximum transmitter output power for the GOTA station
> >> shall be
> >> 150 watts. If the primary Field Day group is claiming the QRP
multiplier
> >> level of 5, the maximum transmitter output power of the GOTA station
> >> may not
> >> exceed 5 watts.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed for
> >> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
> >> claimed
> >> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
QSO
> >> level.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.6. The GOTA station may only operate on the Field Day HF Bands.
Only
> >> one transmitted signal is allowed from the GOTA station at any time
(see
> >> Field Day rule 4).
> >>
> >> THIS SEZ TO ME WE CAN OPERATE ON HF BANDS BUT NOT WARC BANDS
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.7. The GOTA station does not affect the additional VHF/UHF
station
> >> provided for under Field Day rule 4.1.2.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.8. Participants are reminded that non-licensed participants
working
> >> under the direction of a valid control operator may only communicate
with
> >> other W/VE stations or with stations in countries with which the US has
> >> entered a third-party agreement.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.9. GOTA stations operate under a single callsign separate from
the
> >> callsign of the main group.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.10. The GOTA stations does not qualify as an additional
transmitter
> >> when determining the number of transmitters eligible for the 100-point
> >> emergency power bonus under rule 7.3.1.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.2. The GOTA station may be operated by Novice, Technicians or
> >> generally inactive hams under their existing operating privileges, or
> >> under
> >> the direction of a Control Operator with appropriate privileges, as
> >> necessary. Non-licensed persons may participate under the direct
> >> supervision
> >> of an appropriate control operator. A list of operators and

participants
> >> must be included on the required summary sheet to ARRL HQ.
> >>
> >> 4.1.1.3. This station may operate on any valid Field Day band and mode.
As
> >> per FCC rules, this station must have a valid control operator present
if
> >> operating beyond the license privileges of the participant using the
> >> station.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> So I read that as we can operate VHF no problem.
> >
> >
> >
> > Your call.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> I just got off the phone to the ARRL. The fellow there confirms that
> the GOTA station is HF only. No VHF or UHF. If you want to confirm:
>
> 860-594-0232
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

5191. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 20:51:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D89BB4.5050706@psu.edu>
Source record: 93255

Da Shadow wrote:
> Thanks Mike -- scratch the 6M beam and 2M beam -- Thanks Mike
>
> I called the ARRL and sure enough they sed no VHF for the GOTA station
>
> Glad I posted here and got the ARRL rules figured out
>
> Sincere thanks

No problem Lamont - I'm just glad you folks didn't have to throw away a bunch of QSO's from your score!

- Mike KB3EIA

5192. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:05:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ta1Cc.129$eB4.92@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93256

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040622054740.07518.00000354@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
> >didn't know how to get out of Vietnam.
>
> I think it was Robert McNamara.
>
> >Sometimes those things backfire
> >(like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
finally
> >told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
> >understood it better and was able to let it go.
>
> The biggest tragedy is if we don't learn from that experience.
>
> >In any case, somehow folks don't like Kerry voicing his opinion that
Vietnam
> >was wrong - they convieniently forget that Bush pretty much avoided the
> >service.
>
> Combat service, anyway.
> >
> >This is one thing I don't care for - follow the leader, regardless.
>
> "Waist deep in the Big Muddy - and the big fool says to push on!"
>
> >Don't
> >think. If you do, you might be called "waffling".
>
> Or worse - disloyal.
>
> >Jump right in and agree
> >with everything that is occuring. This is how Hitler came into power.
By
> >the time any Germans realized what was happening, it was far too late to
> >voice their opinion (unless, of course, they wanted to be shipped
somewhere
> >they didn't want to go).
> >
> >We need a strong military; but Russia poured almost all of its' resources
> >into its' military and ultimately fell apart. Somewhere, somehow,

> >moderation has to come into play our there will be heck to pay.
>
> Whole lot of factors going on there. The Soviets bureaucracy weighed them
down
> to the point they couldn't even feed themselves. The USSR was severely
> devastated by WW2 - at least 20 *million* dead, half of them civilians.
And
> this was in the wake of Stalin's purges in the '30s.
>
> The USA gets itself in the situation of being the world's policeman -
unpaid,
> while other countries spend their money on infrastructure, education, etc.
And
> resentments are sown all over the world.
> >
> >Some one asked about "What's good for General Motors is good for
America.".
> >I remember "Lil Abner" and in there the quote was "What is good for Bull
> >Moose is good for America.". That guy was good - really good (unless, of
> >course, what he was saying went over one's head - which happens a lot
with
> >the blind followers of the faith.)
>
> The original quote came from Charles Erwin Wilson ("Engine Charlie") who
was
> CEO for GM and then Secretary of Defense from 1953 to 1957 under
President
> Eisenhower. During his Senate confirmation hearing, he stated "What was
good
> for our country was good for General Motors, and vice versa."
>
> In the wake of the Korean War, he cut the defense budget significantly.
>
> He should not be confused with the Charles E. Wilson ("Electric Charlie")
who
> was the CEO of General Electric and served President Truman as the head of
the
> Office of Defense Mobilization.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Thanks, Jim

I like getting good information rather than a lot of arguements based on
"hot air" (of course, I've never done that LOL sure ... believe that and
I've got some prime ocean front property in North Dakota to sell you - or a
bridge in New York).

I've gotten so irritated over some happenings that I tend to sputter a bit.
Thanks for a good reply.

Kind regards,
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.709 / Virus Database: 465 - Release Date: 6/22/04

5193. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:08:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%c1Cc.130$fC7.75@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93257

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
> > Hello, Steve
> >
> > I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
> > didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
> > (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
finally
> > told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
> > understood it better and was able to let it go.
>
> I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
> a valid opinion.
>
> > In any case, somehow folks don't like Kerry voicing his opinion that
Vietnam
> > was wrong - they convieniently forget that Bush pretty much avoided the
> > service.
> >
> > This is one thing I don't care for - follow the leader, regardless.
Don't
> > think. If you do, you might be called "waffling".
>
> Like, "I voted for it before I voted against it."
>
> Jump right in and agree
> > with everything that is occuring. This is how Hitler came into power.
>
> This is how the Dems operate. They gathered up all the stray cats and
> dogs that have absolutely nothing in common, and tell them they must
> vote as a block (no questions, no discourse, no disagreements) if any
> one of them is to be given benefits. And it works. At least it did
> for 50 years. But it's gone stale because the government cannot give
> dignity with a benefit check. People need to actually work at
> something that actually needs doing.
>
> By
> > the time any Germans realized what was happening, it was far too late to
> > voice their opinion (unless, of course, they wanted to be shipped
somewhere
> > they didn't want to go).
>

> Like social services?
>
> > We need a strong military;
>
> We need to stay way the hell out in front of everyone else. We don't
> want a "fair fight." Just wait til China/Loral target the USA.
>
> but Russia poured almost all of its' resources
> > into its' military and ultimately fell apart. Somewhere, somehow,
> > moderation has to come into play our there will be heck to pay.
>
> We have been pouring most of our resources into education, social
> services, and prison systems for a long time. We now have the most
> highly educated foreign work force, and many of our "native" young men
> are in prison. Way to go, DEMs!
>
> > Some one asked about "What's good for General Motors is good for
America.".
> > I remember "Lil Abner" and in there the quote was "What is good for Bull
> > Moose is good for America.". That guy was good - really good (unless,
of
> > course, what he was saying went over one's head - which happens a lot
with
> > the blind followers of the faith.)
>
> Thanks for the segway, which brings us right back to the Code Test
> argument (which happens a lot with the blind followers of the faith).

A couple of questions beg to be answered; perhaps you'd be kind enough to do
so.

1) Why do we have the highest rate of incarceration in the world?
2) What does Morse code have to do with it (other than, of course, causing
my washing machine to over-suds?)

Best regards from Rochester, NY - and don't strain the brain

Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.709 / Virus Database: 465 - Release Date: 6/22/04

5194. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:09:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <He1Cc.131$VA7.119@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93258

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040622065653.03961.00000248@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
truth
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/22/2004 5:45 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
> >
> >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> >news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
> >> Hello, Steve
> >>
> >> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the
administration
> >> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
> >> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
> >finally
> >> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
> >> understood it better and was able to let it go.
> >>
> >I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
> >a valid opinion.
>
> Who said that?
>
> Heck, you invent stories about Somalia, what makes you think we'd be
any
> less entertained with stories about Viet Nam...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hello, Steve

It isn't Vietnam or Samolia per se; the question is "did we learn
anything?".

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.709 / Virus Database: 465 - Release Date: 6/22/04

5195. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172601.09069.00000292@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93259

In article <yYQBc.7911$oK.636@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>, "Kim"
<mail@nomail.com> writes:

>Plans, yes. But not related to Field Day; My husband and I will be
>celebrating our 15th Wedding Anniversary with a housewarming and renewal of
>vows!

L'chaim! Happy for you, Kim. Many more!

Len Anderson

5196. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172603.09069.00000293@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93261

In article <1e4e3692.0406220532.32fab047@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174159.07368.00000275@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040621093451.05916.00000395@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman)
>> >>Date: 6/20/2004 11:19 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040621001939.22498.00000354@mb-m29.aol.com>
>>
>> >> The U.S. military does NOT use manual telegraphy for
>> >> radio communications.
>> >
>> > Yes, they do.
>>
>> NO. They once did. No more.
>>
>> Establish your PROOF before you blither out nonsense like that.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Temper fry.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Maybe he read it in a defunct magazine or a magazine that carries
>articles about a defunct mode.

With his defunct intellect I can understand it...

LHA / WMD

5197. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172609.09069.00000294@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93270

In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Gonad the Librarian) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
>>>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a
>spine.
>>>
>>So it's emotional, not based on objective facts with supporting evidence.
>
> Part emotional, yes, but based on past experience with the Demoncratic
>Party.
>
>>Do you see the problem?
>
> I do.
>
> I also know Kerry has made public remarks that supported Fonda. Someone
>was a bit creative with a camera...OK...Kerry's words were his own.

"A bit creative with a camera!" Photo fraud is more correct

That's like someone who claims "hostile action" experience in
the military and NEVER reveals the when or where those took
place.

>>> He diluted the chain of command.
>>
>>How, exactly?
>
> By trying to have everyone be IN the pot, that's how.
>
> There can only be so many people "in charge" at one time.

Nursie was THERE, day to day, saw it all, testified, etc.

>>>Part of the errors that occured in the
>>>Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what

>>>should have been an military operation.
>>
>>Agreed.
>>
>>But there were also errors that were the result of simple human error.
>
> Yes, there were. Letting Jimmy Carter be in charge was one of them. Oh
>well...That's democracy.

Gotta love this nursie...total tunnel-vision linearity and absolute
incredible amnesia to actual, investigated causes of the
hostage rescue effort failure do to a combination of MISTAKES
IN THE FIELD.

>>> He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with
>>>"warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave
>>>America blind and hog tied.
>>
>>Carter left office almost a quarter century ago. How could his old orders
>>continue to cause such problems - particularly since 16 of the intervening
>>years were those of the Reagan and Bush administrations?
>>
>>How could one president, in office for only four years, cause so much
>>trouble?
>
> Indeed. Ask any Southerner the same question.
>
> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.

Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...

> Our Armed Forces were, if it's at all possible, in far worse condition
>when he left office than when he entered.

Yup. Definite. Nursie was passed over for promotion at that
time. :-)

> We were humiliated in the Middle East, a reputation were have yet to
>overcome.
>
> We were saddled with double digit inflation.
>
> Our intelligence services were cut off at the knees by Executive
>Order...You asked how he could create so much havoc in four years...?!?! He
>did this one in only a few days!

Tsk, tsk, tsk. We should have let nursie Run The Show!

Nursie know. Nursie do. Nursie veteran of "seven hostile actions!"

>>> Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?
>>

>>No. But you are avoiding the questions, Steve.
>>
>>How did Clinton "let them"?
>
> I am not avoiding the question, Jim.
>
> I secifically stated that Clinton tried to manipulate field operations
>from Washington.

Probably from trying to telephone "Mogandishu" instead of
Mogadishu? :-)

>>Should the US have stayed out of that conflict? Or gotten more involved?
>>
>>What threat were they to US security?
>
> None.
>
> As much compassion as I have for hungry, sick people, I have very LITTLE
>compassion for people who are hungry BUT can afford AK47's, RPGs, etc etc
>etc.

Nursie should DO something. Nursie FIT, can jog miles, roller,
hang-glide, incredible marksman ("just a few ounces pressure")
and should be able to assault and win (maybe with HALO drop).
Nursie need subscription address for "Soldier of Fortune"
magazine?

>>>>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?
>>>
>>> Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.
>>
>>1) How do we extract ourselves from there?
>
> We keep the promise to restore soverignty as we promised and when we are
>asked to leave, we leave.

[almost made it on sovereignity, but not quite...]

Ahem. The USA invaded Iraq. Really. It was in the papers.

This time the USA wasn't defending Kuwait.

Normally that is called INVASION. [bad guys do invasions]

Nobody asked the USA to INVADE Iraq.

Think about that. [if possible]

>>2) How do we avoid such involvements in the future?
>
> We don't.
>
> If you truly believe the basic tenets of our own freedom and our public

>rhetoric to defend against tyrrany, we will always find ourselves extended
>somewhere.

Tsk. Had hopes. Got "tenets" right, then blew it on tyranny.

"Extended?" Like in those "hostile actions" of nursie's?

Love that cribbing from the political handout sheets. :-)

>>>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>>>
>>> Be danged if I know.
>>
>>How about these reasons:
>>
>>1) They are embarrassed that their vaunted army fell apart so quickly -
>>twice.
>
> If they are pragmatic, they have nothing to be embarrassed about.
>
> Those forces that did fight fought bravely. The rest were conscripts
>forced into trench warfare that had no hope of sustaining adefense against
>American force mobility.

The Chief of Stuff reciting from his textbooks of the War Collage.

:-)

Walking poster boy.

>>2) They are not really a country but a bunch of warring factions held
>>together
>>by a strongman. With the strongman gone, the factions are at each others
>>throats again.
>
> It's the way it's been for centuries. The current brood of Arabs blame
>the United States for thier plight, but anyone reading Middle Eastern history
>knows that is bunk.

Gotta love these foreign policy holders, er, I mean experts who
KNOW all about the middle east. :-)

>>This isn't anything new - it's Yugoslavia all over again. Say,
>>who was in charge during that war?
>
> Bill Clinton.
>
> The same Bill Clinton who insisted on "no ground troops" and got many of
>our folks killed because they could not maneuver with cover.

Yup. Chief of Stuff lecturing. :-)

>>>The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>>>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them

>for
>>>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help,
>>I
>>>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.
>>
>>Yet the Bush Administration went in expecting to be greeted like the US Army
>>iberating Paris.
>
> Oh...?!?!
>
> You can show me where this was stated by them, Jim?
>
>>> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>>>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>>>business and social, any better than what we did.
>>
>>How could that have been done? Why was it *our* responsibility?
>
> We could ahve ID'd these landmarks and targeted them for immediate
>security.
>
> Yes, it was our responsibility. When we overthrew the Iraqi governmant
>by force, WE became the force-of-law there.

So...it is okay for the W administration to INVADE a country
just because W felt a "responsibility?"

Yup. We sure stopped those damn Weapons of Mass Destruction!

>>>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>>>
>>> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.
>>
>>For a start, there's those who gave the orders. And those who put those
>>people
>>in charge. And those who didn't follow up.
>>>
>>>>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>>>>
>>Worse news than Al-Gharib?
>
> What happened at Al-Gharib was humiliating, Jim.
>
> What's even more humiliating is that some American's have forgotten just
>how badly WE were treaten in Desert Storm.

"Treaten?" Which is it, Desert Shield or Desert Storm?

Desert Storm didn't last long enough to get American prisoners.
Desert SHIELD did. Tsk, tsk, tsk. The Chief of Stuff doesn't
know his important Operational code names!

> I don't hear those voices who are being apologetic for Al-Gharib
>apologizing for the bruises on Iraqi fists when our POW's intentionally ran
>themselves into them over and over.

Poor nursie. Getting entangled during his outrage rants. Tsk.

>>>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam
>-
>>>a
>>>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>>>
>>> Because he's an apologist.
>>
>>Evidence, please?
>
> Read the papers, please.

"Show us your papers!" :-)

>>> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.
>>
>>True. But the time to mend fences is still here. Is it wrong to apologize for
>>past mistakes?
>
> Over and over and over and....?!?!
>
> Do we hold present day Germany's feet to the fire over Nazi atrocities?
>
> When was the last time we hung a Japanese warlord for the "care" they
>delivered to our troops?
>
> It's time to move on.

Nursie know all about nasty NAZIs and South Pacific. From those
"hostile actions?"

>>> He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our
>>>tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.
>>
>>Evidence, please?
>
> Read the papers, please.
>
> Listen to his speeches to the veterans organizations, please.
>
> Listen to his speeches to any other number of liberal civil rights
>groups.

Riiiight. All "lies!" :-)

[you didn't say "please" on the third sentence...tsk]

> And before you jump on me about "Don't you support civil rights?", of
>course I do! What I DON'T support is the suggestion by some political

>"leaders" that we still hang our heads in shame almost a full generation out.

Nursie had "hostile action" in 'Nam?

> He was in-country. He killed North Vietnamese and VC. Let him travel
>to Hanoi and ofer himself as sacrifical lamb.

As long as W isn't getting his teeth examined, we could send W.

Another "hostile action" hero. :-)

>>> "Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
>>>sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.
>>
>>Right. And other sources said there were none. The sources who said there
>>were
>>had a vested personal interest in seeing SH overthrown.
>
> And some who said there were none also lied about other atrocities done
>by Hussein, because they stood to profit by playing THAT side of the coin.

[getting wayyyy too deep there... :-( ]

>>>That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the
>>>intellignece
>>>agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle
>East
>>>after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
>>>during/after WW2.
>>
>>And none of them have been replaced in the 24 years since he left office?
>
> I am sure many have.
>
> But ahve YOU read the memoirs and studies of Middle East relations since
>the end of WW2, Jim?
>
> Carter's "withdrawl" from covert intelligence programs left hundreds of
>indigenous personnel hanging...literally...So why should they trust us now,
>only to watch us "pull the plug" when things get too dicey for the "current"
>admisnistration...?!?!

[yup...Chief of Stuff up to his buzz cut in more fantasy...]

>>Remember this: The main threat to the USA in Carter's time was perceived to
>>be
>>the Soviet Union. The new technology of spy satellites was thought to be
>>adequate - and for many tasks it is. But it wasn't adequate for everything.
>
> I disagree.
>
> The state of political unrest in the Middle East was already of major
>policy concern two presidencies before Carter.

Nursie should lambast Truman (a Dem). He may not know that
1948 was important in the middle east...

> The OPEC oil embargo happened just before his "tour of duty". It was of
>major concern to all.

Nursie had interest in a gas station? Went poof?

>>>>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?
>>>
>>> We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?
>>
>>Simple: Rather than deal with the realities of energy policies, Bush tells
>us
>>there is a cheap clean technological solution "just around the corner".
>Heck,
>>he even had the governor of California fooled. (The Guvernator inquired
>about
>>having a Hummer converted to hydrogen power. The cost was something like
>>$250,000 - not including a source of fuel. Not exactly practical.)
>>
>>Hydrogen *may* be a fuel of the future. But it's a long long way from being
>>practical for today's problems or those of the near future.
>
> "Practical" is usually based upon mass production.
>
> And President Bush is not the first to suggest that some scientific
>breakthrough was close at hand. Billary made an announcement that there was
>a breakthrough in AIDS research that was about to revolutionalize the care
>delivered to those victims.

Automobiles and AIDS all begin with the letter "A" but it is an
elastomeric-breaking stretch to compare them. :-)

>>Still, it sounds nice, makes for great photo ops and is a pleasant PopSci
>>diversion from the reality that the US imports way too much oil, and pays
>way
>>too much for it in the process. That payment isn't just in dollars per
>>barrel.
>
> Agreed. But as long as we insist on not harvesting OUR reserves yet are
>willing to let the Arabs suck themselves dry, what are we to do.
>
> This isn't news. This "crisis" has been in the wings for decades.
>People
>a lot wiser than you or I have been promising this was coming, and they were
>right.
>
> I se this on the same par with the "drought" in the SW United States.
>To
>whom is it a "surprise" that we are millions of acre-feet short of the needed
>water supplies out there?
>

> The proponents of desalianation were hushed up by politicos 20 years ago
>who insisted that present infrastructure would support SW US needs well into
>the 21st Century.

"Desalianation?!?"

Well, next time I run out of salianate, I will know how to ask...:-)

>>>>And
>>>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
>>>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real
>benefits
>>>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
>>>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
>>>
>>> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.
>>
>>And it hasn't happened because of the enormous cost and dubious benefits.
>But
>>now Bush talks about it like we should make it a national priority.
>
> And why shouldn't we?
>
> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology. We barely had the
>technology to get to the moon in the 70s.

Try 1968, like 27 December. Circumnavigation.

Try 1969, like 16-24 July. First landing.

Ranger 7 went to the moon in 1964. Unmanned.

If you don't know what you are talking about, don't try to sound off
like Werner von Brawn.

> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
>happen in the wake of war.

Go for it, noted anthropologist and expert on socio-political whatsis!

Radio as a communications device first demonstrated in Italy
and Russia in 1896. A war there before that?

Morse-Vail Telegraph opened for commercial telegrams in 1844.
Three decades after War of 1812. "Wake" rather settled by then.

De Forrest invents "audion" the first triode tube in 1908. WW1
hadn't been ignited yet.

First SSB communications (Netherlands to Netherlands Antilles)
opened BETWEEN world wars.

> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>based on the Apollo program alone.

Such as?

Common, von Brawn, shows us your "scientific" side.

> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask WHERE
>in space are you going to spend that money?

Astronauts will "eat out." :-) [see Jimenez, Jose...]

Or, we will spend it all on filters to get rid of BPL noises.

In case herr doktor von Brawn has forgotten it, this thread is
supposed to be about Broadband over Power Lines.

> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>technical advencement. I think the recent events in the Mojave also show
>that a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.

AT Mojave airport, ace. [Kern County Airport #7 to be exact]

North of Edwards AFB. Been to both places. Ace, will, of course
say he's been there too! :-)

> So why not Mars? Why not research stations on the Moon? Unless you want
>to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
>conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?

Common, nursie, tell us your tales of aerospace and promoting
the space program! Show us what you got!

>>>>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
>>>>and
>>>>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
>>>>>mirrors
>>>>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
>>>>
>>>>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
>>>>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies.
>>Nor
>>>>was Halliburton.
>>>
>>> HOW...!?!?
>>
>>Yes, how did he try to make it look better than it was?
>
> Jim, you really are kidding me, right?
>
>>> Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that (then)
>>>recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of
>>"...America's
>>>confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".
>>
>>The rooster taking credit for the dawn. That's not using smoke and mirrors
>to
>>make things look better than they are.

>
> Taking credit for something you didn't so is exactly that, Jim. He
>lied.

[all Democrats LIE in nursieworld...]

...this has gotten too, too weird for more commentary. :-)

>
> Well indeed.
>
> What precedent are you trying to set? Why are you trying to set it?
>
> We still had elections during the Civil War, World War 2, Korea and Viet
>Nam. How did you extrapolate some idea about when it's OK to run for
>president against my hatred for Jane Fonda?

Poor nursie. Went to see "Barbarella" as a kid and got thrown out
for leering at the screen? Ever since, an intense hatred against
Jane Fonda?

Gots NO idea where the intense hatred of Democrats come from.

None of this involves Broadband over Power Lines... :-)

LHA / WMD

5198. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172610.09069.00000295@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93264

In article <20040622065653.03961.00000248@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/22/2004 5:45 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
>>
>>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>>news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
>>> Hello, Steve
>>>
>>> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the administration
>>> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
>>> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
>>finally
>>> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
>>> understood it better and was able to let it go.
>>
>>I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
>>a valid opinion.
>
> Who said that?
>
> Heck, you invent stories about Somalia, what makes you think we'd be any
>less entertained with stories about Viet Nam...?!?!

Who was it inventing stories about "seven hostile actions?"

Was it the seven dwarves?

Who was it claiming "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio?"

Despite the DoD Directive and three specific military branch regulations - and - the FCC not having any definition of MARS?

Poor baby. Keeps saying everyone else "lies" yet is the biggest LIAR in here.

The only persons "interested in radio" are licensed amateur radio operators according to the commissioned extra in here. One cannot be "interested" without that license...despite having spent a whole working career involved in radio-electronics as a pro and as a hobbyist.

Nursie keeps doing the insult thing over and over and over and over again...then demands "respect" and "honor" for being

such a terrific radio op (amateur). Nursie never in Army, never worked military radio comms, but he KNOW all about them. Amazing.

Nursie not saying much about BPL (this thread's subject). He too busy trying to ethnically cleanse political world of all evil, wicked, mean, and nasty Dems.

Republicans are trying to force BPL on the USA and thereby polluting HF for years to come. No problem, nursie will just point pudgy finger to some Democrat and blame BPL all on them.

Gotta love the "meaningful discourse" in here. Wish there was some... :-)

LHA / WMD

5199. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172611.09069.00000296@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93262

In article <lIednUPRINfE2UXdRVn-hA@comcast.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deeflint01@comcast.net> writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:wdMBc.62$Hv5.21@news02.roc.ny...
>> Hello, Len
>>
>> Guess I get my dander up too at times. Certainly it is wrong to paint
>"all"
>> Republicans or "all" Democrates or "all" of any one group with a wide
>brush.
>> Not good at all. Besides, I've gotten led off-topic - not good at all.
>>
>> I have figured it out, Len. The problem is we are dropping the Morse
>> requirements. Dang, now my washing machine is going to over-suds again ;)
>>
>> However, BPL should help the situation. If BPL is going to reduce power
>> line noise (according to power companies), it should reduce my washer
>> over-sudsing since it runs from the mains. LOL.
>
>It's not that BPL will reduce power line noise but rather that the companies
>must reduce the noise to get BPL to work!!

Dee, it's best you go into the FCC ECFS and look at the text of
NTIA's Phase 2 report. [you can also get it at the NTIA website]
Then look at the Iowa amateur club comment of 21 June 2004
where the test measurements indicated BOTH power line noise
and OFDM BPL signals.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5200. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172612.09069.00000297@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93260

In article <20040622065328.03855.00000262@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/22/2004 5:00 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220200.707e8d04@posting.google.com>
>
>>I like these new phonetic alphabets. I wonder if there's one for guys
>>with "real" military experience, but never who wore a uniform.
>
> (N)itwit ZERO (I)maginary (M)ogandishu (D)x

So, geographically-challenged nursie, just WHERE is this "Mogandishu?" [hint: it isn't in Somalia]

Is that one of those places where you had "hostile action?"

Or was that a location of MARS "amateur headquarters?"

Tell us all about the geography of nursieworld...

LHA / WMD

5201. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93263

In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>
>>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
>>anything.
>
> I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done) evidence of
>your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

That's a LIE right there, nursie...

>> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
>
> You CAN'T comply.

Yes, he can.

Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
"hostile actions" you claim you were in?

Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim of
"Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?

> And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own character
>straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.

...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.

:-)

>>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
>
> "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of dirt
>over their casket.

In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...

>>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>>artery in his neck explodes.
>

> If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and Lennie
>glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.

Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.

Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.

> It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!

Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

> Keep up the good work!

Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
"some messages just seem to write themselves!"

LHA / WMD

5202. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172616.09069.00000299@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93266

In article <1e4e3692.0406220200.707e8d04@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620205410.14094.00000267@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201134.6b70e44b@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040620013453.22098.00000405@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406191710.55087754@posting.google.com>,
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040616000328.00536.00000287@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> >> >> In article <20040615171039.23951.00000039@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >> >Date: 6/15/2004 9:36 AM Central Standard Time
>> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406150636.1387a708@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >> >> >>> Nobody
>> >> >> >>> is complaining they didn't get a QSL card from the alleged
>> operation.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >Correct. I QSL'd 100%.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > It's easy to do when there's nothing to send.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Tsk, tsk. Nursie still trying to invent a stinging rebuke and his
>> stinger
>> >> >> got broke so long ago that he can't even muster a good rash... :-)
>> >> >>
>> >> >> "Nothing to send."
>> >> >
>> >> >100% of nothing is zero (0). I sent out a few more than one (1) QSL
>card.
>>
>> >> >
>> >> >Steve is telling an "untruth." SOP.

>> >>
>> >> Nursie NEVER lie. Not allowed.
>> >
>> >Congenital. Like Hillary
>>
>> Hillary never lied? :-)
>
>Habitually.

"Pathologically?" :-)

>> >> >> That should be the sub-title of every post nursie makes.
>> >> >
>> >> >"My boots are heavy, My chin strap is tight..."
>> >> >
>> >> >Other than humorous jody songs, his posts earn a "NCI."
>> >> >
>> >> >(NCI = No Content Indicator)
>> >>
>> >> "I don't know, but I've been told, old old arguments are mighty
>> >> cold...hup, too, tree, Foah!" :-)
>> >
>> >I think he played a bit part in "Small Soldiers."
>>
>> I didn't see that one.
>
>Animation. Toys. Like in "Buzz Light Year."

Ach! Ja! Saw the reviews.

I think more animation is needed in here. :-)

>> Did he do the biting or was he the one that got bit?
>>
>> :-)
>
>He always gets bit.

Might be the first time the biter gets rabies instead of the other
way around....

>> "I will beep my key in a military manner, keeping always on the
>> alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those within sight and
>> hearing." - General Order #1 of the PCTA sentinels.
>
>Sir, First General Order: "I will beep my key in a military manner,
>keeping always on the alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those
>within sight and
>hearing." Sir!

I have to remember (again) to add the "sir."

All them PCTA commissioned extras get all hissy-fitting if
one doesn't salute or bow in their majestic presence.

>> Some suggested phonetics for code-aholics for use in speech
>> since they don't seem to do much of that and may need an aid
>> in getting through - obviously picked for those in favor of morris
>> goad who like to Jerk around the NCTA about how Able and
>> Brave the Code men are and how Code is Dandy, Easy, Fast,
>> Great, a Hymn to all who hear it while they Insist, like Jerks
>> that Code is King and all must Love Morse because it is
>> Nifty and all Obey Morse with a Passion. We can Quote
>> them on Morse being Rapid, Safe, Tough, Uniting all of
>> the Morse Vice who must Win.
>>
>> Able Brave Code Dandy Easy Fast Great
>> Hymn Insist Jerk King Love Morse Nifty Obey
>> Passion Quote Rapid Safe Tough Unite Vice
>> Win Xcellent* Yummy Zero
>>
>> * had trouble there due to too few X words available...:-)
>>
>> Dit dit
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>I like these new phonetic alphabets. I wonder if there's one for guys
>with "real" military experience, but never who wore a uniform.

Don't know. I once talked with a heraldrist, or whatever they call
those who work on insignia, patches, etc. I don't think there's
much relation of heraldry and bible things...such as an insignia
representing a "jawbone of an ass."

That would fit, though. :-)

Or, maybe, crossed swords on a field of dreams?

LHA / WMD

5203. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172620.09069.00000300@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93269

In article <1e4e3692.0406220151.334e41b5@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174150.07368.00000270@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406201931.4c81afa8@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040619125818.28360.00000308@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <Xns950A8731448D3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> >news:20040615045800.22098.00000361@mb-m15.aol.com:
>> >> >
>> >> >> In article <20040615035859.00101.00000620@mb-m22.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> >> >> (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>> >> >>>Date: 15 Jun 2004 07:58:59 GMT
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >>>>Date: 6/14/2004 11:17 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>>>Message-id: <20040615001727.22098.00000359@mb-m15.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >> >>>> You are still going to claim that Brian "lost" his logs, aren't
>> >> >>>> you?
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>> As long as he keeps refusing to post some sort of "evidence" for
>> >> >>> the claims he made, yes.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Why?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> He may know just where they are.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> They may have been in a garage at one time and in a storage unit
>> >> >> another.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>> You don't really know either way, do you? Tsk, tsk.

>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>It's not what I know or don't know, Your Putziness....It's what
>> >> >>>PuppetBoy can produce to substantiate his claims.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >> Can produce or will produce?
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> Regardless of wether they are in his garage, a rental storage
>> >> >>> unit, his
>> >> >>>bathroom reading rack, or his imagination, they are NOT "here"...THAT
>> >> >>>is fact.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So what's the problem?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Anyone who reads these exchanges knows that Mr. Burke will simply
>> >> >> avoid/refuse any sort of substantive answer on the subject. That's
>> >> >> pretty much a given.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> So why bother about it?
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>>Brain knows that even if he produces some log with callsigns in it,
>it
>> >> >>>becomes a simple matter to contact the various persons to ascertain
>if
>> >> >>>they really DID work T5/N0IMD.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Maybe.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Or maybe those people will have moved, changed callsigns, passed
>away,
>> >> >> etc.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>I am now sure that Jim was right. I am sure that Brain HAS a
>T5/N0IMD
>> >> >>>"logbook" somewhere.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >> IIRC, the exact calim was "logs", not "logbooks". Could be some
>pieces
>> >> >> of wood.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> It's just that it's empty.
>> >> >>>
>> >> >> Or maybe there's one entry. Or two. Or three.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Remember there were no claims as to number of QSOs, band, mode, rig,
>> >> >> etc. One local VHF/UHF QSO would count as "operation" wouldn't it?
>> >> >>
>> >> >>>
>> >> >Exactly. For example, I have operated from St Martin (FS) - one QSO on
>2m
>> >> >FM. I probably have a log of it somewhere. Ironically, that QSO was

>with
>> >> >another country, St Martin (PJ7), but it doesn't count because it was
>via
>> >> >the local repeater in PJ7.
>> >>
>> >> Perfect example! Thanks, Alun!
>> >>
>> >> In point of fact, the alleged /T5 operation was allegedly on 10 meters,
>and
>> at
>> >> least two QSOs (OD5 and somewhere in Eastern Europe) were reportedly
>made.
>> >> Given the state of 10 meters in 1993, such contact reports are quite
>> credible,
>> >> even with a very makeshift station.
>> >
>> >Good grief . . lotta burdensome worn out nonsense here.
>> >
>> >Ham radio is a licensed service everywhere on this particular planet
>> >except in the cases of some very rare spits of dry land over which no
>> >nation claims as it's soverign territory and/or, given the lack of
>> >civilian licensing authority, then it gets down to whatever military
>> >force happens to hold sway in the neighborhood, etc., etc., the
>> >Spratleys being a particulary oddball example. Which is basically
>> >irrelevant in this thread, we all know this. Apologies.
>> >
>> >In Alun's case he tripped to the isle of Saint Martin and worked into
>> >PJ7 as a G/FS or as a W/FS as a properly licsened alien. Alun being
>> >big on his alienism and all that. I'm assuming Alun had his paperwork
>> >right if any was required. The goverment of FS was/is the licensing
>> >authority when Alun operated there. Therefore his FS to PJ7 QSO was a
>> >legitimate amateur radio contact even if was a DXCC no-counter.
>> >
>> >Brainiac's alleged T5 operation is a whole different ballgame
>> >altogether. Giving him the benefit of the doubt and accepting his
>> >tales about having "worked" a couple "dx countries" from Somalia on
>> >ten meters while he was there was not an amateur radio operation. The
>> >ham radio licensing authority for members of the U.S. military of
>> >which he was a member was vested in the command structure of that
>> >expeditionary force. He did not have their explicit permission to
>> >operate an amateur radio station in T5.
>>
>> Kelly NEVER served in the armed forces of the United States.
>>
>> Kelly does NOT understand the military chain of command.
>>
>> Permission to do anything IN the military is granted by ranking
>> officers.
>>
>> Didn't Kelly hear that at the Captain's Table while dining with

>> all that rank? No? Tsk, tsk.
>>
>> >Therefore it's patently obvious that his "operation" was another
>> >simple case of freebanding, pirate radio, "extended CB" whatever ya
>> >wanna call it. For absolute certain he did not conduct a legitimate
>> >ham radio operation. It wasn't a T5 amateur radio station, Brainiac
>> >was just another unlicensed glom using some xcvr or another on 10M and
>> >did what they usually do.
>>
>> Amazing at the range and scope of rationalization for HATING
>> another newsgroup poster by the high-society ham extras.
>>
>> Kelly should explain his "superiority" in not only radio but relative
>> to the rest of society. [Kelly is "superior" only because he claims
>> that while busy inflating past claims to a greatness never before
>> seen by hamkind]
>>
>> >T5/Nï¿½mind's freebander logs and cards = ZIP everywhere.
>>
>> Kelly has taken on a new role...that of International Regulator
>> And Punisher of anything an NCTA says.
>>
>> Yawn.
>>
>> >The real reality of this ongoing twisted bafflegab about Brainiac's
>> >"T5 ops" BS has nothing at all to do with ham radio except for the
>> >freqs on which he done it (maybe, but we'll never know) let alone ham
>> >radio policy. So take it to alt.dot.radio. freebanding or wherever his
>> >kind lurk and quit wasting the bandwidth here folks.
>>
>> Kelly is allowed to inflate his single patent to 26. Kelly is PCTA.
>> [proof is with the U.S. Patent Office and several patent websites,
>> showing only one...and that one as co-inventor]]
>>
>> Kelli is allowed to shoot bears from an aircraft carrier. Kelly is
>> PCTA. [there is no proof of this but Kelly will damn anyone who
>> disputes it]
>>
>> Kelly claims knowledge of WW2 military vehicles and their radios
>> as absolute truths. Kelly is PCTA. [proof is in many places,
>> including old documents of the U.S. military disputing that]
>>
>> Kelly has repeatedly damned others opposing his fish stories.
>> Kelly is PCTA. That is approved under the ROE of this news-
>> group trying to be dominated by PCTA.
>>
>> They are PCTA, hear them ROAR! :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>

>All that and more from a guy who was so confused that he thought I was
>putting up an antenna at -his- house. Yup, he's got "real" military
>experience and never been in uniform. Another Walter Mitty wannabe.

But...he DID dine at the Captain's Table! :-) :-) :-)

He comes from a higher class than us "drudges!" :-)

Marie called me, offered a cake to send him. Maybe I will.

Trouble is, Marie is another snooty, emotional type. She
loses her head easily...

LHA / WMD

5204. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93268

In article <20040622063946.03855.00000260@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/21/2004 6:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040621191017.07518.00000348@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
>>In article <5bmed0ljck6kp2a05no080ih1bilbhtup2@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur >KC2HMZ
>><kc2hmz@wzrd.com> writes:
>
>>>I think maybe you're half right, Len. believe it or not, even my ham
>>>rigs are Part 15 devices and come with the usual Part 15 warning
>>>sticker on them.
>>
>> Part 15 regulations apply to INCIDENTAL EMITTERS such as
>> receivers, data couplers (if you have software controlled anything
>> as a peripheral) and so forth.
>
> They also pertain to INTENTIONAL EMMITERS, including those who operate >license free walkie talkies, "broadcast transmitters", etc.

Now, don't tell us you actually downloaded Part 15?!?

You had somebody help you navigate there, didn't you?
Fess up. You are too ANGRY and emotional to navigate
the web by yourself.

> Of course you know this...You've "threatened" to get on 20 meters with a >Part 15 legal "station" before.

No, not "threatened." DID it many times. All the HF ham bands
from 80m on up to 10m using an antenna impedance analyzer.
Radiating RF as all such analyzers do. Also at LEGAL RF power
levels.

You could have discerned this from a particular Ham Radio magazine
article that described programs for an HP-25 pocket scientific
calculator to measure antenna impedance, coaxial cable
characteristics, etc., using an RF Noise Bridge. Another Anderson
did translation of those HP-25 programs to Texas Instruments
(forward notation arithmetic, not RPN) and that was published.

But, in your usual warm, witty, nice-guy manner, you will diss and
cuss, call names, and generally come unglued all about a 22-year

independent ham publication being "defunct" and worthless and
then say I "cut-and-pasted from others' works." :-)

> You never carried through, though...Just like a dozen other "promises"...

What are those "dozen other promises" nursie?

Did I sign any "promisory note?" A contract? In lots of years of
existance, I've changed my mind several times. Back in 1952 I
was working as a commercial illustrator and decided to voluntarily
enlist the U.S. Army. That exposure - to really BIG HF comms -
changed my mind. After studying commercial illustration out here
(Art Center School of Design, old campus on 3rd Street, not the
present one in Pasadena) I changed to engineering. Never looked
back. Worked in aerospace here since 1956, got experience,
got schooling, got responsibilty in design work, had to do the
field engineering thing from time to time that forced attendance
in night classes (all properly accredited) to make up for day
class absences. Difficult to do that when having to work at
regular day jobs.

After my first wife died (brief marriage) I promised myself I would
never get married again, be a bachelor. Was one a long time.
Then I got re-acquainted with my high school sweetheart after a
long total absence and "broke that promise!" ["broke" in the
nursieworld term, a near capital crime in that strange fantasyland]
Best man at my wedding was Al Walston...he's still around, still
has callsign W6MJN. Sunnuvagun! How about that?

Nursie, you've dissed, cussed, called vile names on everything
I've written about in here. Problem you have - besides the angry,
rampant demonstrated sociopathy - is that all I've written is
factual, can be referenced by documents held by others or by
others still living who were there, with me at the times I've told
about. That's the terrible mountain of truth you cannot climb.

Life isn't established at birth with some ironclad specification
that all must, forever hold to some "promises" made long ago
or even yesterday. Events and experiences happen that will
change conditions, change opinions, change minds, and lots
of those happenings aren't in our control. We have to ride them
out, survive. We CAN survive WITHOUT being always angry at
others or trying to tear down others for having opposite opinions
or more wide-ranging experiences.

Sadly, you've chosen to remain angry, to insult others who've
expressed opposite opinions, tried to tear down what they've
accomplished (and been able to validly reference). You've tried
to bully, demoralize, denigrate others by some strange game
of newsgroup "conquest" game, yourself telling outright lies
and distortions of truth without being able to reference such.

That hasn't worked. Your perceived "enemies" are still here.

This should not be a forum to express personal hatred of others, but you do an observable job of turning it into one. You have NO authority to force anyone to your wishes, yet you continue to demand such while insulting everyone who does not "obey" you. For that, you get no respect, no honor, nothing but emptiness from readers who won't bother to come in as participants in this forum.

This newsgroup could cover some important issues in amateur radio. Access BPL is a spectre looming in the near future to inhibit the HF communications world. Is there any discussion of that? No, very little. Things segue to petty political polarization involving presidential candidates, shouting and hollering, each party calling the other an "evil" that must be eradicated or mankind is doomed. Silly stuff.

Docket 04-140 is being commented on for some (relatively) minor changes in Part 97. Any comments on that? No.
No less than 18 Petitions have been filed on much larger changes in Amateur regulations...yet all the "discussion" is one-sided insult fest of all the status-quoists desperately trying to maintain regulations as they were, at all costs, through personal insults against those advocating change.

Change WILL happen. All the vile name-calling, angry shouts and veiled threats won't stop it. Change can't be stopped, but it can be steered, directed into new vectors that are more navigable, better suited for the majority and those yet to enter the activity.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5205. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172624.09069.00000302@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93265

In article <1e4e3692.0406220216.334a73b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040620181943.18863.00000467@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040620094803.11752.00000247@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> > Sucks to be you...again.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...not only dissing and cussing, but very bad
>> sentence structure. Try some remedial English classes.
>> During the day since you abhor night classes. It would
>> make a remarkable difference in improving your
>> written communications.
>>
>> Temper fry...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>It's all a part of his "tuff guy" self-image. The only problem is the
>rest of us don't see a tough guy. He's just another Walter Mitty
>wannabe.
>
>"Sir, First General Order: I will beep my key in a military manner,
>keeping always on the alert for the NCI, dissing and cussing those
>within sight and hearing. Sir!"

Yes SIR! [geez, I forgot the "sir" part...been away too long from
the military (since 1989 and lovely Fort Irwin, heh heh)]

Gosh, Brian, we be "drudges" according to a high-society
civilian (king of the katapults) who dines with Captains and
then shoots bears for navel intelligence while on navel
maneuvers.

Got an extra frag grenade? I think I need some practice there,
too. Need to prune down the wild growth on the chain of
command in here. :-)

No sweat on BASS...had that down just dandy a long time ago
when the sight picture steadied down and "a few ounces of
finger pressure" reached out and touched the bull. Lots of
"bull" in here. All paper tigers, too, just like paper targets.

Too bad you "were not in Somalia" and I was just a "rear area radio clerk" but ol grizzled gunnery nurse did "seven hostile actions!" [he "has it in his wallet"] {probably along with that elastomeric thing that is ready for more "action"]

I wonder where "Mogandishu" is? I don't think it is in Somalia. I've heard of Mogadishu" but nursie keeps mumbling about "Mogandishu"...

Sorry, I meandered. Forgot this newsgroup is supposed to concentrate on presidential politics and how evil, wicked, mean and nasty them Dems are. Too bad this newsgroup couldn't discuss amateur radio matters or serious issues like Broadband over Power Lines or the upcoming rules changes in Part 97.

I think this newsgrope is only for licensed political amateur operators, all of whom have credentials in economics, politics, and statesmanship, plus much experience IN office! Yeah, that's it: Rec.republican.amateur.professionals!

Beep, beep

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5206. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:26:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622172626.09069.00000303@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93267

In article <1e4e3692.0406220206.79e4a2d9@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040622000110.12940.00000267@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040621193708.17843.00000332@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> >In article <1e4e3692.0406211508.6cb46de0@posting.google.com>,
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >
>> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >>news:<20040620205413.14094.00000269@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>> >>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201203.592f95a2@posting.google.com>,
>> >>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>>
>> >>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >>>news:<20040620013451.22098.00000403@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> >>>> In article <1e4e3692.0406191942.6b004098@posting.google.com>,
>> >>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>
>> >>>> >Best of luck - you're going to have to google everything up to
>provide
>> >>>> >the Security Detail with "proof."
>> >>>> >
>> >>>> >See "Cinderella Liberty."
>> >>>>
>> >>>> I didn't. Jack Nicholson is in that one as an SP. Jack also
>played
>> >>>> Colonel Jessup in "A Few Good Men." [famous line in that pic...
>> >>>> "You can't handle the truth!!!"]
>> >>>
>> >>>"You can't tell the truth!!!" would be more appropriate. And that
>> >>>crazy glint in his eye, as in "The Shining."
>> >>>
>> >>> I'm going to watch Amazon and Hollywood Video (the chain) for
>> >>> low-cost CDs of that movie. Darn good acting by all involved,
>> >>> even Tom Cruise.
>> >>>
>> >>> [I hope that Amazon has it on sale soon...before they go "bank-
>> >>> rupt." :-)]
>> >>
>> >>Bankrupt? Hopefully they will actually deliver on all of the pre-sold

>> >>Clinton's, "My Life."
>
>Hmmmm. Maybe that's how it got on the best seller list already. They
>never intended to deliver, and all of the orders thru Amazon just go
>away.
>
>Anyway, saying it is a best seller (without any actual delivieries)
>just might make it sell better.

Dunno about "My Life," but Rev. Jimmie Who said a few years
back that Amazon was going bankrupt or something about
"no profit."

Amazon sure does a LOT of advertising for a "non-profit"
company.

I'm glad my wife got her order delivered last week before
Amazon went under. [free shipping again...too bad the
League couldn't do that when commercial companies did]
>
>> >>> >> >> tsk, tsk, tsk...all that "hostile action" stuff and never did
>any
>> >>> >> >> Recon Marine intel patrolling?
>> >>> >> >
>> >>> >> >Maybe he was a "box kicker."
>>
>> >>> >> :-)
>> >>> >
>> >>> >"How I Kicked Seven Hostile Boxes," coming to a theater near you.
>> >>>
>> >>> Oh, heck and darn, Brian, now you have me curious and
>> >>> I have to start cadging copies of Daily Variety and Hollywood
>> >>> Reporter to find out the expected release date! :-(
>> >>>
>> >>> Action-filled scenes at night, no lights...as befits keeping the
>> >>> when and where a Secret!
>> >>>
>> >>> I wonder if someone will market little scowling action figures?
>> >>
>> >>One action figure, numerous interchangeable scowling faces.
>>
>> [oops...didn't complete that message!]
>>
>> I hope they have cute little interchangeable UNIFORMS to go
>> with them. Scrubs, cammies, poopysuits, etc. That would make
>> them "authentic." :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>And all the little incitations and, errr, I meant citations and
>medals. You don't have to earn them, just have your mom and dad buy

>them, or get them free out of specially marked boxes of Froot Loops.

"Supply Sergeant" has a website. Anyone can get those
geegaws. And uniforms. Even if they didn't, anyone can join
the good 'ol boys in the TN STATE guard, meet once a month
and act like sojers in da woods.

Gunnery nurse said "I couldn't possibly have one of my four
ribbons" because those weren't issued after WW2. Strange,
I just looked in the closet and there it was, still with the other
three just like it was in 1956.

Well, nursie say you weren't in Somalia, either. Not nice thing
to say. His fantasyland apparently doesn't have such a territory
but reality does. Fantasyland has lots and lots of "credentials"
all with lovely flowery borders on nice paper (suitable for framing)
but it don't got a First Phone (commercial) there in light blue.
Commercial licenses must not exist in nursieworld.

Wonder if nursie ever got that "military handset" to go with the
paramilitary pack special from SGC on an SG-2020 kit? Would
be real boss to have him do GOTA in cammies, helmet, with a
real (first time) military handset that can slide up inside the
helmet when pressed to the ear. He can do "military comms"
almost for real on FD!

Maybe Amazon will have a special DVD on that event...before
they go bankrupt (again)?

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5207. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 21:44:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406221344.c6515d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93271

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
> >>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.
> >>
> >So it's emotional, not based on objective facts with supporting evidence.
>
> Part emotional, yes, but based on past experience with the Demoncratic
> Party.

So it's really not about John Kerry as it is about Democrats vs.
Republicans.

That's not necessarily "wrong" or "right". In the end, what an
election comes down to is "who do you trust more?" Because regardless
of somebody's record, once they're in office it's a matter of trust
because you can't watch every issue and action. And you can't stop
them in time anyway.

That's why folks are/were so ticked off at Clinton and Nixon. They
betrayed the trust.
>
> >Do you see the problem?
>
> I do.
>
> I also know Kerry has made public remarks that supported Fonda.

Where? When? What exactly were the remarks?

> Someone was a bit creative with a camera...OK...

No, they weren't.

The picture at the Valley Forge VVAW rally is real. (Another photo is
faked, but the one most often seen is real). Kerry is there, three
rows behind Hanoi Jane.

The point is that the surrounding information (date of the picture and
HJ's trip) are left out, and the picture presented as being *after*
that trip, rather than 2 years before.

You fell for it. Many others did, too. That's the problem.

>Kerry's words were his own.

Which words?

Remember that when Fonda got back from Hanoi, nobody here really knew
the whole story. It was only when the POWs got back, years later, and
told of what she'd done and the consequences that the whole mess
became public.

Going to Hanoi wasn't the problem, it's what she did there.

> >> He diluted the chain of command.
> >
> >How, exactly?
>
> By trying to have everyone be IN the pot, that's how.
>
> There can only be so many people "in charge" at one time.

Just like what LBJ did.
>
> >>Part of the errors that occured in the
> >>Iranian desert were directly the result of White House meddling in what
> >>should have been an military operation.
> >
> >Agreed.
> >
> >But there were also errors that were the result of simple human error.
>
> Yes, there were. Letting Jimmy Carter be in charge was one of them.

There were others that had nothing to do with him.

> Oh wll...That's democracy.

We live in a republic.
>
> >> He further diluted the Nation's overt and cover security services with
> >>"warm-fuzzy" Executive Orders that have, to this day, continued to leave
> >>America blind and hog tied.
> >
> >Carter left office almost a quarter century ago. How could his old orders
> >continue to cause such problems - particularly since 16 of the intervening
> >years were those of the Reagan and Bush administrations?
> >
> >How could one president, in office for only four years, cause so much
> >trouble?
>

> Indeed. Ask any Southerner the same question.

It wasn't Lincoln who fired on Fort Sumter.
>
> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
> decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.

Nope.

Carter was the inheritor of what his predecessors hadn't dealt with:

LBJ started the mess by getting the USA committed to the "space race", Vietnam and his "Great Society" social programs all at once - without raising taxes enough to pay for them.

Nixon continued the game, and tried to tame the problem with wage and price controls. Worked for a while - until the wage and price controls came off.

Ford - remember "WIN" buttons and catchy slogans like "Whip Inflation Now" and "Let's all be a little less piggy"? Didn't work, because the root causes weren't being addressed.

On top of this, OPEC caused the price of oil to jump twice - 1973 and 1979. The first time, gasoline went from around a quarter to around a half-dollar, and the second time it went over a dollar. (At least in the Northeast). Diesel and fuel oil had similar jumps. Worse, the supply was limited.

Meanwhile, American products suddenly found themselves competing with foreign imports in a number of areas - cars, electronics, clothing, even steel.

All of that pushed inflation and interest rates through the roof. Which made the deficit situation that much worse.

None of that was Carter's fault.

How would YOU have dealt with it?
>
> Our Armed Forces were, if it's at all possible, in far worse condition
> when he left office than when he entered.
>
> We were humiliated in the Middle East, a reputation were have yet to
> overcome.

You mean Iran? Think about why that happened. We supported a tyrant because he was friendly to us and not the Soviets. Same story as in the Phillipines and elsewhere. The Iranians finally got so ticked off they toppled him.
>
> We were saddled with double digit inflation.

See above for why that happened.
>
> Our intelligence services were cut off at the knees by Executive
> Order...You asked how he could create so much havoc in four years...?!?! He
> did this one in only a few days!
>
> >> Jim, did you study any of the after-action reports out of Mogandishu?
> >
> >No. But you are avoiding the questions, Steve.
> >
> >How did Clinton "let them"?
>
> I am not avoiding the question, Jim.
>
> I secifically stated that Clinton tried to manipulate field operations
> from Washington.

OK.
>
> >Should the US have stayed out of that conflict? Or gotten more involved?
> >
> >What threat were they to US security?
>
> None.

Agreed.
>
> As much compassion as I have for hungry, sick people, I have very LITTLE
> compassion for people who are hungry BUT can afford AK47's, RPGs, etc etc etc.

Such actions are what the UN is for.

Will answer the rest later.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5208. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 22:39:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406221439.78273f9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93272

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174152.07368.00000272@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406201836.4e701d8b@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >
> >I got back from a week of aerial operations, drove by the storage
> >unit, and checked that the lock wasn't jimmied ("jimmied" is a common
> >use for B/E, not a slam against the Rev. Jim).
> >
> >My T5 logs are safe and secure. One day they may have real historical
> >value. I could divide them up and run some through Christie's and the
> >others through Sothby's. Maybe I'll just make a run of numbered
> >copies, suitable for framing.
>
> A press run would be a non-good idea. That would start another
> spate of Book Burning by the PCTA in general, sponsored by
> the enemies of fantasy.

Farenheit 911.

> Some overweight stubbly-faced documentary film maker would
> get publicity for his expose of Somalia, that it "never happened."
> ["Moore to come" as Variety put it...]

He's gotta shave that stubble before squeezing into that CAP flight suit.

> Denial of reality is the stock in trade of the olde-tyme hammes
> who love, honor, and obey morsemanship. Everyone who speaks
> against them "LIE!" :-)

Battle Cry: "Liar, Liar, Pants on Fire!"

5209. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-22 23:26:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <u8SdnTlLT5NoXUXdRVn-hA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93273

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
news:zI0Cc.394$hX6.30@fed1read01...
> Thanks Mike -- scratch the 6M beam and 2M beam -- Thanks Mike
>
> I called the ARRL and sure enough they sed no VHF for the GOTA station
>
> Glad I posted here and got the ARRL rules figured out
>
> Sincere thanks
>

You could still set up a separate VHF/UHF station though. Our club often does and anyone with a Tech license or higher could be a control op of that station.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5210. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 00:57:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040622205750.02583.00000404@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93274

In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>>>What's the solution to the Iraq mess?
>>>
>>> Which one? I see several "messes" here...not just one.
>>
>>1) How do we extract ourselves from there?
>
> We keep the promise to restore soverignty as we promised and when we are
>asked to leave, we leave.

June 30 is just a week away. Do you think American troops will start leaving on July 1? If they want us to hand over SH, will that happen?

>
>>2) How do we avoid such involvements in the future?
>
> We don't.
>
Why is the USA's responsibility to be the world's policeman?

> If you truly believe the basic tenets of our own freedom and our public
>rhetoric to defend against tyrrany, we will always find ourselves extended
>somewhere.

Yet in many cases what really happens is that we replace one tyrant with another.

Look at Iraq. We *supported* the tyrant SH all through the '80s, because he sold us cheap oil, bought weapons and other goods from the West rather than the Soviets, and opposed the Iranians. Said Iranians used to be our friends until they overthrew their tyrant....

>
>>>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>>>
>>> Be danged if I know.
>>
>>How about these reasons:
>>
>>1) They are embarrassed that their vaunted army fell apart so quickly -
>>twice.
>
> If they are pragmatic, they have nothing to be embarrassed about.

They're obviously not pragmatic, then.

>

> Those forces that did fight fought bravely.

I don't know if they were "brave" or not.

>The rest were conscripts
>forced into trench warfare that had no hope of sustaining adefense against
>American force mobility.

Point is, they could have overthrown SH any time they wanted to.
>
>>2) They are not really a country but a bunch of warring factions held
>>together
>>by a strongman. With the strongman gone, the factions are at each others
>>throats again.
>
> It's the way it's been for centuries. The current brood of Arabs blame
>the United States for thier plight, but anyone reading Middle Eastern history
>knows that is bunk.

It's always easy to blame somebody else rather than to look hard at complex
problems. Americans do the same thing - see below.
>
>>This isn't anything new - it's Yugoslavia all over again. Say,
>>who was in charge during that war?
>
> Bill Clinton.
>
>The same Bill Clinton who insisted on "no ground troops" and got many of
>our folks killed because they could not maneuver with cover.
>
Bingo.

>>>The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>>>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them
>for
>>>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our help,
>>I
>>>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.
>>
>>Yet the Bush Administration went in expecting to be greeted like the US Army
>>iberating Paris.
>
> Oh...?!?!
>
> You can show me where this was stated by them, Jim?

It's obvious. See below about infrastructure protection.

>>> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>>>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>>>business and social, any better than what we did.
>>

>>How could that have been done? Why was it *our* responsibility?
>
>We could ahve ID'd these landmarks and targeted them for immediate
>security.

But we didn't. That's proof that those in charge thought we'd be welcomed as liberators, and that the people would behave as Iraqis, not as factions.

>Yes, it was our responsibility. When we overthrew the Iraqi governmant
>by force, WE became the force-of-law there.

Yep. So a mistake was made at the highest levels, not realizing that the civil order would fall apart so quickly.

You're ready to blame Carter and Clinton for mistakes that happened on their watch, but not Bush for far more severe mistakes that happened on *his* watch.
>
>>>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>>>
>>> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.
>>
>>For a start, there's those who gave the orders. And those who put those
>>people in charge. And those who didn't follow up.

Right up to the top. Did you know that the White House has had *civilian* lawyers overruling JAG lawyers as to interpretations of the Geneva Convention?

>>>>> Kerry? He IS bad news and he'll continue to be bad news.
>>>>
>>Worse news than Al-Gharib?
>
> What happened at Al-Gharib was humiliating, Jim.

Yep. It was a serious mistake. It undermines the whole mission.
>
> What's even more humiliating is that some American's have forgotten just
>how badly WE were treaten in Desert Storm.

That's not the point.

Abuse of our prisoners 13 years go does not validate our abuse of prisoners today. If we really are on a higher moral plane that SH, then we cannot stoop to his level.
>
> I don't hear those voices who are being apologetic for Al-Gharib
>apologizing for the bruises on Iraqi fists when our POW's intentionally ran
>themselves into them over and over.

Two wrongs don't make a right. Al-Gharib simply tells the other side that we're as nasty as they are - and validates them doing even worse.
>
>>>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam
>-

>>>a
>>>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>>>
>>> Because he's an apologist.
>>
>>Evidence, please?
>
> Read the papers, please.

No Evidence = Didn't Happen
>
>>> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.
>>
>>True. But the time to mend fences is still here. Is it wrong to apologize
>for
>>past mistakes?
>
> Over and over and over and....?!?!

How many times has he apologized - and to whom?
>
> Do we hold present day Germany's feet to the fire over Nazi atrocities?

Actually, yes. Germany was kept divided for decades for that reason. The German
constitution had to be approved by the Allies before it could be ratified by
the German parliament.
>
> When was the last time we hung a Japanese warlord for the "care" they
>delivered to our troops?

They're all dead. Yet there are still apologies and compensations being made by
the Japanese.
>
> It's time to move on.

Does that include forgiving Hanoi Jane?

>>> He's one of those who STILL thinks we should be going around with our
>>>tails between our legs, cowing and beying for forgiveness.
>>
>>Evidence, please?
>
> Read the papers, please.
>
> Listen to his speeches to the veterans organizations, please.
>
> Listen to his speeches to any other number of liberal civil rights
>groups.
>
> And before you jump on me about "Don't you support civil rights?", of
>course I do! What I DON'T support is the suggestion by some political
>"leaders" that we still hang our heads in shame almost a full generation out.

Apologizing for mistakes is a sign of strength, not weakness.
>
> He was in-country. He killed North Vietnamese and VC. Let him travel
>to
>Hanoi and ofer himself as sacrifical lamb.

Why? He was following orders. The real blame belongs to those who gave the
orders.
>
>>> "Bush & Co." told us that based upon information gleaned from "inside
>>>sources" that TOLD him there were weapons.
>>
>>Right. And other sources said there were none. The sources who said there
>>were
>>had a vested personal interest in seeing SH overthrown.
>
>And some who said there were none also lied about other atrocities done
>by Hussein, because they stood to profit by playing THAT side of the coin.

Sure. But it turns out that no WMD have surfaced, nor connections to terrorist
groups.

Bush listened to the wrong people. Carter did the same thing when he listened
to Henry Kissinger (who said we should allow the shah to enter the US) rather
than his other advisers (who said such an act would enrage the Iranians).
Allowing the shah to enter the USA is what caused the embassy takeover and
hostage taking.

btw, remember the Iran/Contra and weapons for hostages deals? Gues who did
those.....
>
>>>That intelligence is not there due to the undermining of the
>>>intellignece
>>>agencies by Jimmy Carter. We lost hundreds of operatives in the Middle
>East
>>>after he reined in the CIA. It took us 30 years to set those sources up
>>>during/after WW2.
>>
>>And none of them have been replaced in the 24 years since he left office?
>
> I am sure many have.
>
> But ahve YOU read the memoirs and studies of Middle East relations since
>the end of WW2, Jim?

Some of them. But you have to go all the way back to 1919 to get the full
picture.
>
> Carter's "withdrawl" from covert intelligence programs left hundreds of
>indigenous personnel hanging...literally...So why should they trust us now,
>only to watch us "pull the plug" when things get too dicey for the "current"
>admisnistration...?!?!

It wasn't Carter who abandoned the Kurds and ignored chemical warfare against them.
>
>>Remember this: The main threat to the USA in Carter's time was perceived to
>>be
>>the Soviet Union. The new technology of spy satellites was thought to be
>>adequate - and for many tasks it is. But it wasn't adequate for everything.
>
> I disagree.

The main threat *wasn't* the Soviet Union?
>
> The state of political unrest in the Middle East was already of major
>policy concern two presidencies before Carter.

But the policies didn't change.

More to come.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5211. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 01:30:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93275

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>Date: 6/22/2004 8:30 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <knagd0pt53ivc8a4blef5vbtkgeht562b1@4ax.com>

>At the Thunder Over Niagara airshow a few years ago, members of one of
>the local CAP groups (I believe it was a cadet wing) were using FRS
>radios in the performance of their duties at the show (directing
>traffic in parking lots, serving as gophers for the adults from the
>composite wing at the info booth, and they also had a hamburger and
>hotdog stand going). I asked one of them about it, and he told me they
>used those little FRS radios a lot, even trained with them for SAR.

CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is "civilian" and
we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of it.

Part of the argument has been cooled off by CAP's acceptance of the use of
FRS for non-USAF missions and "public service" activites.

The other half has been cooled off by NTIA's authorization of our access
to ISR. Altho still pricy by FRS standards (About $80/piece) CAP units can buy
the ICOM ISR radio and use it without any restrictions for CAP purposes.

Some Wings are allowing individuals to buy thier own and even have a
buy-back program for those who decide to leave the program. It's illegal for
private use.

>So the guys I met at NF aren't the only CAP personnel equipped with
>and using FRS. Motorola (or someone) must appreciate the business,
>because for SAR work they're probably NOT going out and buying the
>cheapest radios they can find (or at least I hope they aren't).

I'm not sure if the CO event was with a CAP-owned device or if it was one
borrowed for the purpose. Communications with persons in distress is the only
time a CAP unit can communicate via FRS while on-mission.

>The other EmComm group I'm with (other than Erie County ARES/RACES),
>which is the public service and emcomm team sponsored by the ham radio
>club I am a member of, is also starting to equip with the combined
>FRS/GMRS portables that have been hitting the market recently. Our
>thinking is quite simply, if it is capable of maintaining comms (with
>hams and non-hams) it might come in handy, and at the inexpensive
>prices these can be had for, it's worth the investment since you never
>know when something like that will come in handy.

Yep.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5212. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 01:36:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LM2dneBxJ5kmQ0XdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93276

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
> the Librarian) writes:

<snippage>

>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>
>
> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...

Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time here, Len.

If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
the consequences of that action.

I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5213. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:00:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622220002.11752.00000412@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93277

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/22/2004 7:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040622205750.02583.00000404@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>June 30 is just a week away. Do you think American troops will start leaving
>on
>July 1? If they want us to hand over SH, will that happen?

I have no idea, Jim.

You asked me what I thought it would take to meet the expectations of the
Iraqis. G.W. hasn't called me and briefed me on what he plans to do.

>>>2) How do we avoid such involvements in the future?
>>
>> We don't.

>Why is the USA's responsibility to be the world's policeman?

I didn't say it was our responsibilty, Jim.

I said it will happen.

But personally I'd rather be "policed" by people who let you have the
right to remain silent, rather than by a tyrant who has the right to make you
silent.

>> If you truly believe the basic tenets of our own freedom and our public
>>rhetoric to defend against tyrrany, we will always find ourselves extended
>>somewhere.
>
>Yet in many cases what really happens is that we replace one tyrant with
>another.

One man's peacekeeper is another man's tyrant.

>Look at Iraq. We *supported* the tyrant SH all through the '80s, because he
>sold us cheap oil, bought weapons and other goods from the West rather than
>the
>Soviets, and opposed the Iranians. Said Iranians used to be our friends until
>they overthrew their tyrant....

No argument there.

>>>>> Why aren't the Iraqis grateful for their liberation?
>>>>
>>>> Be danged if I know.
>>>
>>>How about these reasons:
>>>
>>>1) They are embarrassed that their vaunted army fell apart so quickly -
>>>twice.
>>
>> If they are pragmatic, they have nothing to be embarrassed about.
>
>They're obviously not pragmatic, then.
>>
>> Those forces that did fight fought bravely.
>
>I don't know if they were "brave" or not.

I wasn't there but I had collegues who were.

They assure me the guys who put up more than a token resistence fought
bravely. I'll take their word for it.

>>The rest were conscripts
>>forced into trench warfare that had no hope of sustaining adefense against
>>American force mobility.
>
>Point is, they could have overthrown SH any time they wanted to.

Oh? Under threat of being shot by anyone next to you?

Most of those forced into conscription knew that the man next to them may
be an Agent of the govenment.

Would YOU make so bold an act not knowing if the person right next to you
might shoot you when you did?

>>>2) They are not really a country but a bunch of warring factions held
>>>together
>>>by a strongman. With the strongman gone, the factions are at each others
>>>throats again.
>>
>> It's the way it's been for centuries. The current brood of Arabs blame
>>the United States for thier plight, but anyone reading Middle Eastern
>history
>>knows that is bunk.
>
>It's always easy to blame somebody else rather than to look hard at complex
>problems. Americans do the same thing - see below.
>>
>>>This isn't anything new - it's Yugoslavia all over again. Say,
>>>who was in charge during that war?
>>
>> Bill Clinton.

>>
>>The same Bill Clinton who insisted on "no ground troops" and got many of
>>our folks killed because they could not maneuver with cover.
>>
>Bingo.
>
>>>>The people of that region, as rich as their culture
>>>>is (was?) is rife with despotic leaders who have been doing this to them
>>for
>>>>centuries. If they weren't willing to shake the yoke off without our
>help,
>>>I
>>>>don't think our intervening was any more welcomed.
>>>
>>>Yet the Bush Administration went in expecting to be greeted like the US
>Army
>>>iberating Paris.
>>
>> Oh...?!?!
>>
>> You can show me where this was stated by them, Jim?
>
>It's obvious. See below about infrastructure protection.
>
>>>> We lost our chance to really show who/what we were all about when the
>>>>looting and rioting started and we didn't protect the infrastructure, both
>>>>business and social, any better than what we did.
>>>
>>>How could that have been done? Why was it *our* responsibility?
>>
>>We could ahve ID'd these landmarks and targeted them for immediate
>>security.
>
>But we didn't. That's proof that those in charge thought we'd be welcomed as
>liberators, and that the people would behave as Iraqis, not as factions.

How do you make this assumption, Jim?

It could ALSO mean that we considered ourselves to not have the resources
to spread out and just took a chance that the local police forces would hold
together.

However if it was my neighborhood that just had foreign tanks roll up on
it, the last thing I, as a non-combatant, would do is brandish a weapon, law
enforcement officer or not.

>>Yes, it was our responsibility. When we overthrew the Iraqi governmant
>>by force, WE became the force-of-law there.
>
>Yep. So a mistake was made at the highest levels, not realizing that the
>civil

>order would fall apart so quickly.

At the highest levels?

You know this?

>You're ready to blame Carter and Clinton for mistakes that happened on their
>watch, but not Bush for far more severe mistakes that happened on *his*
>watch.

Every president is ultimately "responsible" for the acts of those junior
to him.

Shall I demand President Bush's resignation since the local FBI Resident
Agent double parks or because the local post office has terrible service?

>>>>> Who is responsible for the Al-Gharib abuses?
>>>>
>>>> Who indeed. I don't have any answers any more than you do.
>>>
>>>For a start, there's those who gave the orders. And those who put those
>>>people in charge. And those who didn't follow up.
>
>Right up to the top. Did you know that the White House has had *civilian*
>lawyers overruling JAG lawyers as to interpretations of the Geneva
>Convention?

And your point is?

The fact that one lawyer holds a commission as an Officer in the Armed
Forces and the other one doesn't that the one who does knows more about the
Geneva Convention?

>> What's even more humiliating is that some American's have forgotten
>just
>>how badly WE were treaten in Desert Storm.
>
>That's not the point.

To me it is.

>Abuse of our prisoners 13 years go does not validate our abuse of prisoners
>today. If we really are on a higher moral plane that SH, then we cannot stoop
>to his level.

I agree. But have any of the Iraqi soldiers suffered the kind of injuries
our folks did?

Yes, we did some humiliating, even degrading things.

>> I don't hear those voices who are being apologetic for Al-Gharib
>>apologizing for the bruises on Iraqi fists when our POW's intentionally ran
>>themselves into them over and over.
>
>Two wrongs don't make a right. Al-Gharib simply tells the other side that

>we're
>as nasty as they are - and validates them doing even worse.
>>
>>>>>Why? Because he's not a Republican? Because he opposed the war in Vietnam
>>-
>>>>a
>>>>>war in which he *personally* fought?
>>>>
>>>> Because he's an apologist.
>>>
>>>Evidence, please?
>>
>> Read the papers, please.
>
>No Evidence = Didn't Happen

READ THE PAPERS, JIM! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! !

>>>> The time to fight or protest that war is long past.
>>>
>>>True. But the time to mend fences is still here. Is it wrong to apologize
>>for
>>>past mistakes?
>>
>> Over and over and over and....?!?!
>
>How many times has he apologized - and to whom?

READ THE PAPERS, JIM!

>> Do we hold present day Germany's feet to the fire over Nazi atrocities?
>
>Actually, yes. Germany was kept divided for decades for that reason. The
>German
>constitution had to be approved by the Allies before it could be ratified by
>the German parliament.

Jim, Germany was kept "seperate" because part of it was held hostage by
the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

When the Berlin Wall (and other man-made obstructions) were removed,
Germany was reunited.

>> When was the last time we hung a Japanese warlord for the "care" they
>>delivered to our troops?
>
>They're all dead. Yet there are still apologies and compensations being made
>by
>the Japanese.
>>
>> It's time to move on.
>

>Does that include forgiving Hanoi Jane?

Has she apologized to the soldiers she betrayed?

>> And before you jump on me about "Don't you support civil rights?", of
>>course I do! What I DON'T support is the suggestion by some political
>>"leaders" that we still hang our heads in shame almost a full generation
>out.
>
>Apologizing for mistakes is a sign of strength, not weakness.

Yes, it is.

But not over and over and over and.....

>> He was in-country. He killed North Vietnamese and VC. Let him travel
>>to
>>Hanoi and ofer himself as sacrifical lamb.
>
>Why? He was following orders. The real blame belongs to those who gave the
>orders.

"I was following orders..."

We hanged a lot of Germans and Japanese that said the very same thing.

>> But ahve YOU read the memoirs and studies of Middle East relations
>since
>>the end of WW2, Jim?
>
>Some of them. But you have to go all the way back to 1919 to get the full
>picture.

Try going back to about 650AD, Jim.

>> Carter's "withdrawl" from covert intelligence programs left hundreds of
>>indigenous personnel hanging...literally...So why should they trust us now,
>>only to watch us "pull the plug" when things get too dicey for the "current"
>>admisnistration...?!?!
>
>It wasn't Carter who abandoned the Kurds and ignored chemical warfare against
>them.

No, it wasn't.

>>>Remember this: The main threat to the USA in Carter's time was perceived to
>>>be
>>>the Soviet Union. The new technology of spy satellites was thought to be
>>>adequate - and for many tasks it is. But it wasn't adequate for everything.
>
>>
>> I disagree.
>
>The main threat *wasn't* the Soviet Union?

I disagree that it was the ONLY threat, Jim.

Military stategists of the seventies were already forcasting that future
wars would be the "low intensity conflict" we are seening now.

>> The state of political unrest in the Middle East was already of major
>>policy concern two presidencies before Carter.
>
>But the policies didn't change.
>
>More to come.

I am sure.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5214. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:03:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622220313.11752.00000413@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93278

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/22/2004 5:39 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406221439.78273f9b@posting.google.com>

>> >My T5 logs are safe and secure. One day they may have real historical
>> >value. I could divide them up and run some through Christie's and the
>> >others through Sothby's. Maybe I'll just make a run of numbered
>> >copies, suitable for framing.

Suitable only if they ever create a museum for falsified documents.

Steve, K4YZ

5215. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:05:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 93279

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>

> Change WILL happen. All the vile name-calling, angry
> shouts and veiled threats won't stop it. Change can't be
> stopped, but it can be steered, directed into new vectors
> that are more navigable, better suited for the majority and
> those yet to enter the activity.

Yes, it will.

Too bad it's happening despite you instead of with you, eh...????

Steve, K4YZ

5216. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:10:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <yvydnSFAA_7me0XdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93280

N2EY wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>> Do I have some sort of "evidence"...?!?! No. But he's already set the
>>>>pace and I see no likelyhood he'd get into office then suddenly get a spine.
>>>>
>>>
>>>So it's emotional, not based on objective facts with supporting evidence.
>>
>>Part emotional, yes, but based on past experience with the Demoncratic
>>Party.
>
>
> So it's really not about John Kerry as it is about Democrats vs.
> Republicans.

> That's not necessarily "wrong" or "right". In the end, what an
> election comes down to is "who do you trust more?" Because regardless
> of somebody's record, once they're in office it's a matter of trust
> because you can't watch every issue and action. And you can't stop
> them in time anyway.
>
> That's why folks are/were so ticked off at Clinton and Nixon. They
> betrayed the trust.
>
>>>Do you see the problem?
>>
>> I do.
>>
>> I also know Kerry has made public remarks that supported Fonda.
>
>

> Where? When? What exactly were the remarks?
>
>
>>Someone was a bit creative with a camera...OK...
>
>
> No, they weren't.
>
> The picture at the Valley Forge VVAW rally is real. (Another photo is
> faked, but the one most often seen is real). Kerry is there, three
> rows behind Hanoi Jane.

I don't think that Political Photoshopping is a small deal.

> The point is that the surrounding information (date of the picture and
> HJ's trip) are left out, and the picture presented as being *after*
> that trip, rather than 2 years before.
>
> You fell for it. Many others did, too. That's the problem.

Another version of Gore's "Invention of the Internet" lie.

I have an logical disconnect with this sort of thing.

Why is it wrong for a president to lie about having gotten fellatio (
Which I agree is wrong)

YET!

It is perfectly acceptable to continue the LIE about Gore saying he
invented the internet, or showing a faked picture of Kerry and Jane
Fonda together coupled with another LIE about the date on which the
picture was taken - even though that picture was never taken in the
first place. It's perfectly to do a smear campaign on the patriotis

And that is just three examples I can call up without thinking too hard
about it.

Seriously folks, Think for yourself. If you are willing to accept every
story that your "group" sends down the wire, you will be hoodwinked.
Lying to advance your parties agenda is not moral or right. I've lived
around some people that have ruined their lives by lies, starting small,
then turning compulsive. It's where we are today, when so-called
Liberals are the cause of every problem on the face of the planet. They
aren't.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5217. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:35:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406221835.6b680368@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93281

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040622172620.09069.00000300@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406220151.334e41b5@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >All that and more from a guy who was so confused that he thought I was
> >putting up an antenna at -his- house. Yup, he's got "real" military
> >experience and never been in uniform. Another Walter Mitty wannabe.
>
> But...he DID dine at the Captain's Table! :-) :-) :-)

Arrrgh! Without photographic evidence, it never happened.

> He comes from a higher class than us "drudges!" :-)

Highly doubtful. He talks pretty low class most of the time, which I
find amazing for someone who'se supposed to be an engineer.

> Marie called me, offered a cake to send him. Maybe I will.

He prefers the Dolly Madison cakes, especially the crumb cakes.

> Trouble is, Marie is another snooty, emotional type. She
> loses her head easily...

"Hup, twoah, treah, fourah. My boots are heavy, My head is Lite..."

5218. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 02:38:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406221838.243a86db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93282

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621193705.17843.00000330@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406211452.58ba03e7@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040621001446.10886.00000463@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> >> I disagree. He has to keep all those personalities in order.
> >> Must be quite a coordination session every day in there...
> >
> >No doubt he rules them with an iron fist. He's got a lot of trouble
> >makers in there.
>
> Too bad Fox News can't get in there and show it live.
>
> Would be a fun show. Like the old Destruction Derby!

Imagine playing Hollywood Squares all by yourself.

> >> >> Sociopathy CAN be cured.
> >> >
> >> >I'll bet this case cannot.
> >>
> >> I'm optimistic normally, but you may be right...
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >I'd hate to be right this once.
>
> Luck of the draw. Sometimes you win!

Rarely, but this one's a ringer.

5219. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 03:00:18 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93283

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>
> >>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
> >>anything.
> >
> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done) evidence of
> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>
> That's a LIE right there, nursie...

I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.

> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
> >
> > You CAN'T comply.
>
> Yes, he can.

Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
some shoebox full of unearned medals.

> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?

I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.

> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim of
> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
Amateur Radio?"

hi, hi.

> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?

He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.

> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own character
> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
>
> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
>
> :-)

Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.

;^)

> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
> >
> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of dirt
> >over their casket.
>
> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...

"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"

> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
> >>artery in his neck explodes.
> >
> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and Lennie
> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
>
> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.

His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.

Hi, hi.

Is that personality #4650.3?

> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.

Off the scale on the spasometer, too.

> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
>
> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

He simply doesn't know what "is" is.

> > Keep up the good work!
>
> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"

So they do!

5220. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 03:09:46 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406221909.170c49d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93284

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174147.07368.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >news:<1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >> He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
> >> the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
> >> pretend they're thin when they're not.
> >
> > Wanna see what the "puffy" is, Brain?
>
> It's on the QRZ site. Anyone can see it...

He could use a Jane Fonda workout video.

> > Care to join me in the gym? Three mile run? Five? I'll make
> >you the same offer I did your scumbag friend and will add a rucksack
> >with some extra weight in it. Or you could make me REAL happy and
> >join me for a few minutes in the ring...(please! please!)
>
> Oooooo....macho emotional RAGE! Physical competition!!!
>
> Blatant physical challenge of FIGHTING prowess!!!
>
> All imporant attributes for radio amateurs? Or radio amateur
> policy? I think not.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Need for some approved (prescribed by a REAL
> MD) tranquilizer or other calming drug seems warranted.
>
> Let's see...modern fighting tools (since at least 1700s) allow
> "just a few ounces of finger pressure" to allow reaching out
> and touching someone supersonically. No need for physical
> confrontation up close and personal. [wonder who mentioned
> "just a few ounces of pressure?" :-)]
>
> All that proves that nursie don't wanna do anything but FIGHT
> in here. [sic...and sick]
>
> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

Did you see him begging, "(please! please!)?"

He wants me real bad.

What's this about a "few ounces of pressure?" Backchannel stuff?

5221. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 03:22:46 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <cp6Cc.97840$0y.72568@attbi_s03>
Source record: 93285

>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?

Ahh it's the time of year when I wake up Monday morning with CW in my head ..... I only do this once a year as I don't really like to put my hand on an anvil and hit it with 5 lb mallet. But like I always say what ever floats one's boat. The W3CSL ..Monessen Club will be on the air from the Mon-Valley YMCA picnic grove. Catch those who are so inclined on the air.

Good luck .. Be safe ...God Bless ...

Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

5222. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 05:13:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93287

In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>> Change WILL happen. All the vile name-calling, angry
>> shouts and veiled threats won't stop it. Change can't be
>> stopped, but it can be steered, directed into new vectors
>> that are more navigable, better suited for the majority and
>> those yet to enter the activity.
>
> Yes, it will.
>
> Too bad it's happening despite you instead of with you, eh...????

Nursie be idiot. Still.

Idiot just doesn't understand my original purpose about amateur radio policy. Nursie never will, too determined to FIGHT with anyone who disagrees (even the slightest) with him. Tsk, tsk.

Those who want to FIGHT all the time just aren't right in the head...aren't like average, normal folks. No "degree" or pretty license document needed to see that.

Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio, only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by visual or audible means,

Despite your FIGHT-challenging Phrazors, no one needs to be some kind of federal merit badge in amaterism to talk, discuss, or consider laws and regulations on radio subjects. That sort of demand is for weak-minded idiots who can't debate anything requiring intellect above and beyond 16 neurons.

Nursie, you don't show any evidence of being able to intellectualize a damn thing. You can be shown government documents defining describing and detailing a radio service and you still REFUSE to accept that. You call all who disagree with you for "liars." You want to have physical confrontations with some who disagree with you. In short, all you want to do in here is FIGHT. That's insane.

Get some help. Get some tranquilizers. Whatever. It's tiring to come into this forum and finding you FIGHTING with others all the time, talking crazy things. Nuts.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5223. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 05:13:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623011338.29277.00000464@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93288

In article <1e4e3692.0406221909.170c49d@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174147.07368.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> >news:<1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >> He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
>> >> the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
>> >> pretend they're thin when they're not.
>> >
>> > Wanna see what the "puffy" is, Brain?
>>
>> It's on the QRZ site. Anyone can see it...
>
>He could use a Jane Fonda workout video.

Best I could do is offer a DVD of "Klute" (Jane plays "Bree Daniels"
in that one, a hooker). I can only hope that nursie takes the part
of "Tom Bannerman." :-)

[only movie buffs will get that one...:-)]

>> > Care to join me in the gym? Three mile run? Five? I'll make
>> >you the same offer I did your scumbag friend and will add a rucksack
>> >with some extra weight in it. Or you could make me REAL happy and
>> >join me for a few minutes in the ring...(please! please!)
>>
>> Oooooo....macho emotional RAGE! Physical competition!!!
>>
>> Blatant physical challenge of FIGHTING prowess!!!
>>
>> All imporant attributes for radio amateurs? Or radio amateur
>> policy? I think not.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Need for some approved (prescribed by a REAL
>> MD) tranquilizer or other calming drug seems warranted.
>>
>> Let's see...modern fighting tools (since at least 1700s) allow
>> "just a few ounces of finger pressure" to allow reaching out
>> and touching someone supersonically. No need for physical

>> confrontation up close and personal. [wonder who mentioned
>> "just a few ounces of pressure?" :-)]
>>
>> All that proves that nursie don't wanna do anything but FIGHT
>> in here. [sic...and sick]
>>
>> Temper fry...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Did you see him begging, "(please! please!)?"
>
>He wants me real bad.

Hmmm...I wonder what exactly for?

>What's this about a "few ounces of pressure?" Backchannel stuff?

Nah. Been out in public in here twice, few months ago and a few
years ago.

Nursie wanna posture and threaten wid sojer skills, like shooting.
"A few ounces of pressure" refers to the trigger squeeze force.
Tuff macho tawk.

Poor nursie don' know I qualified expert on the range against
paper targets...paper tigers are about the same. [more dang
gun ranges out here, folks would be surprised at how strong
the NRA be in this neck of the woods]

It's kind of bad in here when these non-commissioned extras
want to turn all the "meaningful discourse" into a macho
shouting and hollering match over personal grudges. This
forum MIGHT be useful to actually talk about amateur radio,
even radio in general, and regulation issues and the like.

Nope. Idiot nursie gotta play schoolyard games accusing
all his "opponents" of "lying." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Maybe he wants to be six years old so he can set a record
of becoming the youngest extra in the USA? :-) :-(

LHA / WMD

5224. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 05:13:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93289

In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
>> >>anything.
>> >
>> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done) evidence
>of
>> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>>
>> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
>
>I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
>four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.

Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."

He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
of having an intellect..

>> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
>> >
>> > You CAN'T comply.
>>
>> Yes, he can.
>
>Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
>some shoebox full of unearned medals.

He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)

>> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
>> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?

>
>I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.

Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...

>> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim of
>> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>
>I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
>Amateur Radio?"
>
>hi, hi.

:-)

>> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?
>
>He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
>it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
>the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.

Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.

Not much chance as it is...

>> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
>character
>> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
>>
>> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
>>
>> :-)
>
>Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
>
>;^)
>
>> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
>> >
>> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of
>dirt
>> >over their casket.
>>
>> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
>
>"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"

Mark those words... :-)

>> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>> >>artery in his neck explodes.
>> >

>> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
>Lennie
>> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
>>
>> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
>
>His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
>
>Hi, hi.
>
>Is that personality #4650.3?

Battle of the Bulge, take 2...

>> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
>
>Off the scale on the spasometer, too.

I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
on it...

>> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
>>
>> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
>> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>
>He simply doesn't know what "is" is.

That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.

>> > Keep up the good work!
>>
>> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
>> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
>
>So they do!

I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)

"Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few
days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.

LHA / WMD

5225. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 05:13:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623011341.29277.00000466@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 93286

In article <1e4e3692.0406221439.78273f9b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174152.07368.00000272@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406201836.4e701d8b@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>> >I got back from a week of aerial operations, drove by the storage
>> >unit, and checked that the lock wasn't jimmied ("jimmied" is a common
>> >use for B/E, not a slam against the Rev. Jim).
>> >
>> >My T5 logs are safe and secure. One day they may have real historical
>> >value. I could divide them up and run some through Christie's and the
>> >others through Sothby's. Maybe I'll just make a run of numbered
>> >copies, suitable for framing.
>>
>> A press run would be a non-good idea. That would start another
>> spate of Book Burning by the PCTA in general, sponsored by
>> the enemies of fantasy.
>
>Farenheit 911.

Ray Bradbury might sue nursie, too. :-)

>> Some overweight stubbly-faced documentary film maker would
>> get publicity for his expose of Somalia, that it "never happened."
>> ["Moore to come" as Variety put it...]
>
>He's gotta shave that stubble before squeezing into that CAP flight suit.

Michael Moore gonna be a CAP co-pilot?!? :-)

>> Denial of reality is the stock in trade of the olde-tyme hammes
>> who love, honor, and obey morsemanship. Everyone who speaks
>> against them "LIE!" :-)
>
>Battle Cry: "Liar, Liar, Pants on Fire!"

I think some other idiot already used that old schoolyard taunt in
here...as an adult! Probably the Adell-pated one. :-)

Unimportant.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5226. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 07:41:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623034122.23053.00000542@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93290

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/22/2004 10:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406221909.170c49d@posting.google.com>

>He wants me real bad.

What I "want" is for you to own up to your manufactured DX claims.

Just be a man, admit you made it up...Or prove me wrong and get some
details that can be verified in here.

Otherwise...still lying.

Steve, K4YZ

5227. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 08:17:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93291

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>

> Idiot just doesn't understand my original purpose about amateur
> radio policy. Nursie never will, too determined to FIGHT with
> anyone who disagrees (even the slightest) with him. Tsk, tsk.

I understand fine, Lennie.

You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly obvious.

Some Amateur made a fool out of you at some point in time (not that THAT is hard to do...) and you are determined to antagonize the rest of us as long as you can.

No problem. I understand fine.

Here's MY "purpose"...It's a proven fact that those who bark the loudest or longest are usually the one's who get the most attention.

You have taken it upon yourself to try and discredit ANY contributions to technology, public service, emergency communications or education and training that Amateur Radio offers.

It's vile, repugnant, and untruthful.

As long as you deem it your "purpose" to do so, I will do MY best to expose you for the antagonist and mistruthful putz that you are. It's not fighting, Lennie. It's self defense.

It really is THAT simple.

> Those who want to FIGHT all the time just aren't right in the
> head...aren't like average, normal folks. No "degree" or
> pretty license document needed to see that.

Then you're admitting you have a problem, Lennie?

You're up to YOUR neck in fighting. You intentionally harass a group of people involved in a practice that you clearly have no vested interest in nor do you have anything constructive to offer.

> Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
> only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
> been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
> a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by

> visual or audible means.

Seems to me you're the one who brought the fight in, Lennie.

You were offered SEVERAL apologies and offers to move on, but your answers were clearly designed to simply perpetuate an argument.

You have nothing to offer. Never did...never will...Your only "argument" is that other radio services don't use Morse Code, ergo Amateur Radio should not.

Proof once again that you dont understand a lot of what Amateur Radio is about.

But that's just par for the course.

> Despite your FIGHT-challenging Phrazors, no one needs to be
> some kind of federal merit badge in amaterism to talk, discuss,
> or consider laws and regulations on radio subjects. That sort of
> demand is for weak-minded idiots who can't debate anything
> requiring intellect above and beyond 16 neurons.

The difference here, Lennie, is that I have experience in Amateur Radio.

You don't.

You are still determined to see that Amateur Radio heels to your barked order despite having no real idea of what Amateur Radio is or what it's really all about, save for what you read on websites.

Amateur Radio is NOT the "aerospace industry".

Amatuer Radio is NOT PLMRS, GMRS, FRS or MURS.

Amateur Radio is NOT military communications.

Amateur Radio is NOT "commercial" or "professional" communications.

I'd dare say that everyone else in this forum EXCEPT you knows those things and accepts them, yet you keep trying to force Amateur Radio into one of those molds.

It won't work.

> Nursie, you don't show any evidence of being able to intellectualize
> a damn thing. You can be shown government documents defining
> describing and detailing a radio service and you still REFUSE to
> accept that. You call all who disagree with you for "liars." You
> want to have physical confrontations with some who disagree with
> you. In short, all you want to do in here is FIGHT. That's insane.

The only thing here "insane", Lennie, is your refusal to act your age. And that's considerable.

I already acknowledged the enabling directives of MARS. They are not in question. YOU are the idiot for trying to argue that they are.

MARS, without the thousands of volunteer Amateurs who man it, would not be able to carry out those duties those directives require. Period. Only a major manpower restructuring in the Armed Forces would allow it, and under present circumstances, that is highly unlikely.

And I don't need to "intellectualize" anything.

(Nice touch, byt the way, Lennie...lamenting my allegedged inability to "intellectualize" with yet more profanity...THAT was truly "intellectual")

As for being a liar, Lennie, if you would tell the truth and stop your antgonistic constructs, I wouldn't have anything to work with.

You have been repeatedly caught not telling the truth.

You make accusations and assertions you cannot/will not substantiate.

You assert that you intend to do things, but then never do them.

> Get some help. Get some tranquilizers. Whatever. It's tiring to
> come into this forum and finding you FIGHTING with others all the
> time, talking crazy things. Nuts.

Then stop posting obviously inflammatory, profane, obnoxious and incorrect stuff, Lennie.

We don't care how well you can candy coat your rants with cut-and-pastes from other websites. Life DOES exist outside of websites, although you seem to insist that if it's "on the website", that's the end of it. How foolish.

We don't care about how many messages you watched flash across the teleprinter in 1953, or how many jobs you held. We don't care about some articles you had published in a magazine that failed, nor do we care about your manufactured experiences in aviation or emergency communications.

You have zero-point-zero experience in Amateur Radio. None.

You accuse ME of doing nothing but "fighting", yet name calling, accusations and harrassment is ALL you have rendered up, even to those who treat you with respect or patience.

Sorry you can't be happy, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

5228. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 11:09:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040623070956.22098.00000432@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93292

In article <yvydnSFAA_7me0XdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> The picture at the Valley Forge VVAW rally is real. (Another photo is
>> faked, but the one most often seen is real). Kerry is there, three
>> rows behind Hanoi Jane.
>
> I don't think that Political Photoshopping is a small deal.

Nor I. You can see both photos and the surrounding story on the snopes.com
website. The real photo is from the VVAW rally, the faked one shows Kerry and
Fonda at a podium.

>> The point is that the surrounding information (date of the picture and
>> HJ's trip) are left out, and the picture presented as being *after*
>> that trip, rather than 2 years before.
>>
>> You fell for it. Many others did, too. That's the problem.
>
> Another version of Gore's "Invention of the Internet" lie.

Yep.
>
> I have an logical disconnect with this sort of thing.
>
> Why is it wrong for a president to lie about having gotten fellatio (
>Which I agree is wrong)
>
>YET!
>
> It is perfectly acceptable to continue the LIE about Gore saying he
>invented the internet, or showing a faked picture of Kerry and Jane
>Fonda together coupled with another LIE about the date on which the
>picture was taken - even though that picture was never taken in the
>first place.

It's not OK. And as bad as Clinton's lie was, it wasn't as bad as Nixon's "I am
not a crook" lie and surrounding coverup.

Note that there are *two* Kerry/Fonda photographs. One is real, the other
faked. The real one seems to prove a point until you find out it was taken 2
years before Fonda went to Hanoi - then it proves a very different point.

> It's perfectly to do a smear campaign on the patriotis

Something got cut off there, Mike.
>

> And that is just three examples I can call up without thinking too hard

>about it.
>
> Seriously folks, Think for yourself. If you are willing to accept every

>story that your "group" sends down the wire, you will be hoodwinked.
>Lying to advance your parties agenda is not moral or right. I've lived
>around some people that have ruined their lives by lies, starting small,
>then turning compulsive. It's where we are today, when so-called
>Liberals are the cause of every problem on the face of the planet. They
>aren't.
>
Neither are conservatives the cause of every problem.

Your advice is right on, Mike. But remember that it's a natural human trait to want easy, quick answers to complex problems, And it's even more attractive if someone else or some other group can be blamed for a problem.

And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to sell it as a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of the '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying to tie it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those who oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'

Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5229. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 11:25:30 UTC
From: AB2RC <AB2RC@localhost.localdomain>
Message-ID: <slrncdiq9t.6fg.AB2RC@homer.linux1.lan>
Source record: 93293

On 2004-06-22, Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net> wrote:
> Wonder if the 20M PSK31 segment will be jam packed and contacts will be
> feasible ??
> Any PSK31 activity besides 20M for FD ???
>
> This will be our first year trying the digital modes.
>
> Any comments on PSK31 during FD ???
>

I will be running a GOTA station using my call along with club call W2ZQ
(2A SNJ). The GOTA station will be on 20/40 psk & RTTY, possibly 15 also.

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

5230. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 12:41:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <j9idnbvEV6vc5kTdRVn-tA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93294

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040622220002.11752.00000412@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/22/2004 7:57 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040622205750.02583.00000404@mb-m07.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >Point is, they could have overthrown SH any time they wanted to.
>
> Oh? Under threat of being shot by anyone next to you?
>
> Most of those forced into conscription knew that the man next to them
may
> be an Agent of the govenment.
>
> Would YOU make so bold an act not knowing if the person right next to
you
> might shoot you when you did?
>

Even worse was that SH would rape, torture and then kill the family of the suspected person in front of him before then killing him. How many would risk that?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5231. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 13:22:15 UTC
From: Kim <mail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <bufCc.8223$yg7.4693@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 93295

'X-No-archive: yes'
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:40D89BB4.5050706@psu.edu...
> Da Shadow wrote:
> > Thanks Mike -- scratch the 6M beam and 2M beam -- Thanks Mike
> >
> > I called the ARRL and sure enough they sed no VHF for the GOTA station
> >
> > Glad I posted here and got the ARRL rules figured out
> >
> > Sincere thanks
>
>
> No problem Lamont - I'm just glad you folks didn't have to throw away a
> bunch of QSO's from your score!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>

Well, Field Day presents many opportunities and I think it's great to capture as many as possible. Least of all, Field Day is "competition." Now, this isn't to say that the concept of competition isn't a good one to inspire and encourage folks to really get involved and be innovative with their ideas for communications on Field Day. BUT, Field Day is also the one time of year when as much exposure--related to competition, scoring, or not--is afforded to the non-amateur community.

So, just because your plans for using a VHF GOTA station aren't embraced by the ARRL Rules for Field Day; if you have enough team members to commit to taking care of the responsibilities of a VHF GOTA station--go for it! I think it's a great idea to have as many modes as can possibly be presented; again, IF one has the personpower to still take care of Field Day AND include some non-sanctioned stations on Field Day!

Kim W5TIT

5232. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 14:45:41 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <pIgCc.1555$hX6.593@fed1read01>
Source record: 93296

Thanks Kim -- we will have the GOTA station operate 10M, 15M, 20M, and 40M. Modes -- phone, CW, Digital - PSK31 and RTTY.

Our setup will feature demos such as QRP projects, Magnetic loop antennas, a bicycle generator, solar panels, and a test station for HT evaluation. We will have demos of aftermarket improved antennas for HT's and several homebrew 2M -- 440 MHz projects.

In addition we will have the ARRL video on Ham radio. Another video shows our repeater site and antennas and the inner workings of the repeater - duplexers etc.

Also we will have a demo computer loaded with popular Ham software -- four PSK31 programs, RTTY programs, DX Atlas, code practice, DX4WIN, NCDXF/IARU beacon program and several more for folks to try in the demo mode.

Booklets are prepared for Echolinlk, IRLP, and a booklet on "What is Ham Radio" and how to obtain a license.

Ham classes are held here periodically and we will have a handout sheet giving signup details.

Our PR person has distributed posters all over town and we have alerted the media of the FD event -- both TV and newspaper.

Last year we had a prime spot on local TV showing our FD activities including our participation in the Southern California fires.

So we are ready to go --expect well over 100 plus folks to show up.

Am disappointed that the GOTA station can not operate VHF. Would be a great opportunity to demonstrate 2M SSB and 6M operation if we had some sporadic E propagation.

But the main stations setup will include a VHF/UHF/Satellite station. ATV and APRS will demo as well.

Thanks to the group for the help and suggestions.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

"Kim" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:bufCc.8223$yg7.4693@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

> news:40D89BB4.5050706@psu.edu...
> > Da Shadow wrote:
> > > Thanks Mike -- scratch the 6M beam and 2M beam -- Thanks Mike
> > >
> > > I called the ARRL and sure enough they sed no VHF for the GOTA station
> > >
> > > Glad I posted here and got the ARRL rules figured out
> > >
> > > Sincere thanks
> >
> >
> > No problem Lamont - I'm just glad you folks didn't have to throw away a
> > bunch of QSO's from your score!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA
> >
>
> Well, Field Day presents many opportunities and I think it's great to
> capture as many as possible. Least of all, Field Day is "competition."
> Now, this isn't to say that the concept of competition isn't a good one to
> inspire and encourage folks to really get involved and be innovative with
> their ideas for communications on Field Day. BUT, Field Day is also the
one
> time of year when as much exposure--related to competition, scoring, or
> not--is afforded to the non-amateur community.
>
> So, just because your plans for using a VHF GOTA station aren't embraced
by
> the ARRL Rules for Field Day; if you have enough team members to commit to
> taking care of the responsibilities of a VHF GOTA station--go for it! I
> think it's a great idea to have as many modes as can possibly be
presented;
> again, IF one has the personpower to still take care of Field Day AND
> include some non-sanctioned stations on Field Day!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

5233. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 15:57:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D9A852.2050109@psu.edu>
Source record: 93297

N2EY wrote:
> In article <yvydnSFAA_7me0XdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>The picture at the Valley Forge VVAW rally is real. (Another photo is
>>>faked, but the one most often seen is real). Kerry is there, three
>>>rows behind Hanoi Jane.
>>
>> I don't think that Political Photoshopping is a small deal.
>
>
> Nor I. You can see both photos and the surrounding story on the snopes.com
> website. The real photo is from the VVAW rally, the faked one shows Kerry and
> Fonda at a podium.
>
>
>>>The point is that the surrounding information (date of the picture and
>>>HJ's trip) are left out, and the picture presented as being *after*
>>>that trip, rather than 2 years before.
>>>
>>>You fell for it. Many others did, too. That's the problem.
>>
>> Another version of Gore's "Invention of the Internet" lie.
>
>
> Yep.
>
>> I have an logical disconnect with this sort of thing.
>>
>> Why is it wrong for a president to lie about having gotten fellatio (
>>Which I agree is wrong)
>>
>>YET!
>>
>> It is perfectly acceptable to continue the LIE about Gore saying he
>>invented the internet, or showing a faked picture of Kerry and Jane
>>Fonda together coupled with another LIE about the date on which the
>>picture was taken - even though that picture was never taken in the
>>first place.
>
>
> It's not OK. And as bad as Clinton's lie was, it wasn't as bad as Nixon's "I am
> not a crook" lie and surrounding coverup.

>
> Note that there are *two* Kerry/Fonda photographs. One is real, the other
> faked. The real one seems to prove a point until you find out it was taken 2
> years before Fonda went to Hanoi - then it proves a very different point.
>
>
>>It's perfectly to do a smear campaign on the patriotis
>
>
> Something got cut off there, Mike.
>
>> And that is just three examples I can call up without thinking too hard
>
>
>>about it.
>>
>> Seriously folks, Think for yourself. If you are willing to accept every
>
>
>>story that your "group" sends down the wire, you will be hoodwinked.
>>Lying to advance your parties agenda is not moral or right. I've lived
>>around some people that have ruined their lives by lies, starting small,
>>then turning compulsive. It's where we are today, when so-called
>>Liberals are the cause of every problem on the face of the planet. They
>>aren't.
>>
>
> Neither are conservatives the cause of every problem.

No they are not. But I see that as the difference these days. Everyone
makes mistakes, every group can have a problem and a plan that simply
won't work. I would never blame all the problems on Conservatives or
Republicans. I share too many of their values. (mostly fiscal and
smaller government) But it isn't the other side blaming everything on
them. They (mostly NeoCons) are blaming *everything* on *everyone* else.

> Your advice is right on, Mike. But remember that it's a natural human trait to
> want easy, quick answers to complex problems, And it's even more attractive if
> someone else or some other group can be blamed for a problem.

Simple answers for simple minds. Sounds great until you try to apply it
to the problem at hand.

> And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to sell it as
> a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The
> administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of the
> '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying to tie
> it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those who
> oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'

> Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!

Yup!

- mike KB3EIA -

5234. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 16:00:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D9A91B.7040201@psu.edu>
Source record: 93298

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>> k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
>> the Librarian) writes:
>
>
> <snippage>
>
>
>>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>> decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>>
>>
>>
>> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...
>
>
> Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time
> here, Len.
>
> If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
> policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
> historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
> the consequences of that action.
>
>
> I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.

Nobody have it yet? Jim, you're usually good at this sort of thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5235. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 18:43:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <feOdnTFejqtrUkTd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93299

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> wrote in message
news:pIgCc.1555$hX6.593@fed1read01...
> [snip]
> Am disappointed that the GOTA station can not operate VHF. Would be a
great
> opportunity to demonstrate 2M SSB and 6M operation if we had some sporadic
E
> propagation.
>
> But the main stations setup will include a VHF/UHF/Satellite station. ATV
> and APRS will demo as well.
>
> Thanks to the group for the help and suggestions.

I suggest putting your VHF etc station close to the GOTA station. That way people will see it and check it out. People are also intrigued by seeing a Morse code operator so you might have your overall layout designed to lead people from station to station.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5236. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:14:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406231114.3257747b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93300

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>...
> Da Shadow wrote:
>
> > 400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies how
> > to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
> > digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
>
> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
> inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
> operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
> very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
> removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.

I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
misunderstand this rule:

"4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
for
credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
claimed
by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
QSO
level."

The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.

I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
focused on the truly inexperienced.

If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
beyond the QSO points themselves.

So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3
minutes per QSO.

The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
same band....

Of course there are rigs and techniques that can handle all that RF.
But that's another subject...

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

5237. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:40:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93301

In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ kc2hmz@wzrd.com
>>Date: 6/22/2004 8:30 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <knagd0pt53ivc8a4blef5vbtkgeht562b1@4ax.com>
>
>>At the Thunder Over Niagara airshow a few years ago, members of one of
>>the local CAP groups (I believe it was a cadet wing) were using FRS
>>radios in the performance of their duties at the show (directing
>>traffic in parking lots, serving as gophers for the adults from the
>>composite wing at the info booth, and they also had a hamburger and
>>hotdog stand going). I asked one of them about it, and he told me they
>>used those little FRS radios a lot, even trained with them for SAR.
>
> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is "civilian" and
>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of it.

"Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?

Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.

No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

:-)

Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5238. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:40:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623154007.23112.00000585@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93304

In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>
>> Idiot just doesn't understand my original purpose about amateur
>> radio policy. Nursie never will, too determined to FIGHT with
>> anyone who disagrees (even the slightest) with him. Tsk, tsk.
>
> I understand fine, Lennie.

Nursie not understand.

> You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
>obvious.

No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
with great technological learning capabilities.

Except to a few, such as nursie.

Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
amateur radio. Nursie only represent himself. Nursie is also
obsessive-compulsive personality hater unable to control himself
in here when opposed by anyone.

> Some Amateur made a fool out of you at some point in time (not that THAT
>is hard to do...) and you are determined to antagonize the rest of us as long
>as you can.

I do not "antagonize the rest of 'you'" unless the "rest" are just
alternate personalities of nursie.

I DO antagonize the conservative traditionalists, the status-quoists
who demand everything in a hobby conform to their personal
desires.

I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.

> No problem. I understand fine.

Nursie not have enough neurons to connect "understanding."

Nursie just wanna FIGHT.

> Here's MY "purpose"...It's a proven fact that those who bark the loudest
>or longest are usually the one's who get the most attention.

Nursie just wanna FIGHT. Nursie FIGHT anyone who have opposite
opinions of nursie's.

Bark, bark, bark, little nursie.

> You have taken it upon yourself to try and discredit ANY contributions to
>technology, public service, emergency communications or education and training
>that Amateur Radio offers.

Praising Peter Martinez for innovating PSK31 isn't "discrediting."
An excellent adaptation of coding theory and hardware to produce
a minimal-bandwidth on-line teleprinting in the same bandspace
as manual telegraphy.

Praising Dan Tayloe for his novel mixer excellent for minimal-parts
DC receiver use isn't "discrediting." [patent is still pending but it
has been written up in industry journals - RF Design magazine]

Praising Mike Gingell for his polyphase network that enables
SSB generation-demodulation with excellent unwanted sideband
suppression using relatively coarse-tolerance components is not
"discrediting." [Mike Gingell earned a PhD for that work back in
the UK, now lives in the USA]

There is nothing at all "discrediting" about showing FANTASIES
to be fantasies of the imagination.

Nursieworld is full of fantasies.

Education in the radio arts is not accomplished by pretending that
amateur radio is some paramilitary service organization or that
memorizing the advertisements and radio reviews in QST is
"learning" what happens behind the front panels...or that amateur
radio "always comes to the rescue during emergencies when all
the other radio infrastructure 'fails.'"

> It's vile, repugnant, and untruthful.

Living a life of fantasy is simply delusional. It serves no one, not
even the fantasy believer.

> As long as you deem it your "purpose" to do so, I will do MY best to
>expose you for the antagonist and mistruthful putz that you are.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie back into name-calling mode, trying to "win"
newsgrope arguments by some kind of "show of force."

Every issue under discussion has many sides. One side, the one
nursie believes, is NOT divinely ordained to be only the True one.
Sad for nursie, but true.

Nursie abhors opposition, wants to dominate, wants to win at all
costs, wants to FIGHT.

United States amateur radio is not a military organization whose
purpose is to fight for the country.

United States amateur radio is a non-pecuniary avocational activity
involving radio. It is a hobby, an enjoyable hobby for most
participants...but a substitute military service for a very few such
as nursie.

>It's not fighting, Lennie. It's self defense.

Nursie only FIGHTING for his own twisted ego.

> It really is THAT simple.

True, except nursie no see own obsessive-compulsive behavior
syndrome.

>> Those who want to FIGHT all the time just aren't right in the
>> head...aren't like average, normal folks. No "degree" or
>> pretty license document needed to see that.
>
> Then you're admitting you have a problem, Lennie?

No "problem" here except nursie wasting everyone's time by
pretending to be a "representative" of U.S. amateur radio and
"defending it" against all nursie-perceived "enemies of the
state." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Nursie on bad route to self-righteousness. Very bumpy for
nursie, hope she is wearing an athletic bra for safety...

> You're up to YOUR neck in fighting.

...by entering this newsgroup, EVERYONE enters an arena of
outraged PCTAs busy trying to preserve the honor and glory of
a soon-to-be DEFUNCT communications mode. It is a FIGHT
arena inhabited by punch-drunk olde-fahrts thinking they are
all Rocky running up the museum steps to stirring music. :-)

Nursie be outraged, very bent out of shape when encountering
strong personalities who don't agree with him/her. Poor nursie.
Nursie go to signpost, point to Twilight Zone and say he/she is
representing all amateurs, therefore any opposition to nursie be
dishonor, discredit, evil, wicked, mean, and nasty to every
single 700+ thousand U.S. amateur radio licensees!

Nursie got bad, bad obsessive-compulsive disorder. Must be
post-traumatic stress disorder from all those "hostile actions"
in the service. Nursie is nuts.

>You intentionally harass a group of
>people involved in a practice that you clearly have no vested interest in nor
>do you have anything constructive to offer.

Poor nursie, still bent out of shape.

Nursie not playing well with others.

Typical traditionalist-conservative status-quoists with an ego complex larger than Cheyenne Mountain. They not understand that amateur radio cannot remain in the shape it was when all those olde-fahrts were young. OFs out of shape but pretending they are still young.

> Seems to me you're the one who brought the fight in, Lennie.

Only to those poor ego-driven souls who abhor change is there any "fight." Only to those traditionalist-conservative status-quoists does change represent some kind of "fight" that must be done to preserve their fantasies. To anyone else it is simply debate.

Amateur radio regulations were established by people, not gods or chiefs of stuff of some paramilitary organization. Regulations, standards and procedures all evolved, changed with time. That will continue to change as time goes on. There is NO divine purpose to stop change.

Change is opposed by those who managed to meet OLD standards and procedures of long ago. They cannot, will not adjust. They fear change. Change manifests insecurity for them. Or, they are so ego-driven that they fantasize their individual accomplishments as so mighty and noble that they think of themselves as role-models for all.

> You were offered SEVERAL apologies and offers to move on, but your answers
>were clearly designed to simply perpetuate an argument.

No. Not on record. Nursie has not admitted that either of his statements about MARS being amateur radio are wrong, nor has he/she ever admitted to reading any of the military documents defining and explaining MARS...nor has nursie identified any part of Title 47 C.F.R. defining MARS as a civilian radio service.

Nursie has never revealed the when and where of any claimed military "hostile action" yet demands full and complete disclosure of all others...for any claim. Nursie be a hypocrite.

Nursie continually insults others' private and professional lives clearly designed to induce word FIGHTING and then tries to say "others did it first!" Nursie be an insulter and hypocrite.

Nursie want to be center of attention. Ego drive. Uses all palaver in here to divert from real debate he cannot handle, will not handle if it is against his own precious opinions.

> You have nothing to offer.

Nursie make imperious demand. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Nursie not moderator in here. Nursie not moderate.

Nursie stuck on one train of thought, not understand derailment
of long ago.

>Never did...never will...Your only "argument"
>is that other radio services don't use Morse Code, ergo Amateur Radio should
>not.

Quite incorrect. Error. False.

Arguments against retaining the amateur radio code test have been
multiple and many. They are on file with the FCC and may be
viewed by any of the public. Over 90 filings there concerning the
manual telegraphy test elimination.

> Proof once again that you dont understand a lot of what Amateur Radio is
>about.

Nursie have personal fantasy of "what amateur radio is all about."

Few understand nursie's fantasy. I do not...can only describe
symptoms of nursie's obsessive-compulsive behavior and
constant activity of personally insulting all who disagree with
nursie.

Amateur radio is well explained in many places, not a secret thing
revealed only to a hierarchy of nobles. Nursie not noble, is his own
hierarchy. Amateur radio is many many things to many many
people. Nursie not only one, not nobly or godly to say nursie
"represent" all those many.

> But that's just par for the course.

Amateur radio is not golf.

Amateur radio doesn't have the balls for it. :-)

> The difference here, Lennie, is that I have experience in Amateur Radio.

...and a very large fantasy in addition to pretty certificates (suitable
for framing).

FCC not require staff or commissioners to be radio amateurs in
order to regulate amateur radio in USA.

Nursie have god-like fantasies of control, to have nursie opinions
that of all amateur radio. Nursie be nuts.

> You don't.

Never said I did. :-)

Just the same, I was on the staff of Ham Radio magazine after
being an author-contributor.

At the mention of that, nursie will go immediately into ATTACK
mode, all safeties off, insulting all the staff of HR for being a
"defunct" publication...even after 22 years of existance as a

self-sustaining independent periodical for radio amateurs.

Nursie will then change gears and say I cribbed all information
("cut and paste" in his words) and had "none of my own."
Nursie not understand any of the articles, too much intellect
for him, therefore author become "enemy of state" to be
destroyed (by any means possible). Poor nursie.

> You are still determined to see that Amateur Radio heels to your barked
>order despite having no real idea of what Amateur Radio is or what it's
>really all about, save for what you read on websites.

"Heels to my barked orders?!?!?" :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie do word-phrase stealing. Plagiarism from
my postings. :-)

Nursie think amateur radio all about manual telegraphy or code
testing? Not so. Elimination of code test is my main concern.
That is happening. Very slowly but it is happening. First break
in mighty Amateur damn was in 1990. Small trickle of no-coders
entered ham radio in 1991, are now the largest class group in
U.S. amateur radio.

Sunnuvagun! How about that?

2003 saw another break at the WRC. 18 Petitions concerning
code testing now awaiting an NPRM at the FCC. Change IS
happening. Nursie hates that, upsets fantasy. Poor nursie.

> Amateur Radio is NOT the "aerospace industry".
>
> Amatuer Radio is NOT PLMRS, GMRS, FRS or MURS.

Not even amateur? :-)

> Amateur Radio is NOT military communications.

NO?!? Which is it? Is MARS amateur radio or is it military radio?

> Amateur Radio is NOT "commercial" or "professional" communications.

Amateur radio operates by the same physics as every other radio
service. True. It's in all the textbooks.

Amateur radio is the last venue for manual telegraphy.

Pity the OFs whose world is coming to an end with elimination
of the code test. Boo hoo.

> I'd dare say that everyone else in this forum EXCEPT you knows those
>things and accepts them, yet you keep trying to force Amateur Radio into one
>of those molds.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Electrons, fields, and waves don't respect human
egos nor government licenses. They keep on truckin to their own

laws. Won't work in nursieworld fantasies. Poor nursie.

> It won't work.

Electrons, fields, and waves DO work in reality. Regulations are
needed BECAUSE they don't obey human laws. Tsk, tsk.

> The only thing here "insane", Lennie, is your refusal to act your age.
>And that's considerable.

Poor baby. Can't argue with grown-ups anymore? :-)

Nursie imagine being a six-year old extra? :-)

Difficult for me to act six years old. But, a lot of folks in here do.

Too bad.

> I already acknowledged the enabling directives of MARS.

And how was that done? Must have been by private courier or
other means "obscuring the information." :-)

If amateur radio goes away, MARS can remain. All that is
required of DoD is then to update Directive 4650.2. :-)

>They are not in question.

Yes they are. Nursie gotta ADMIT he was wrong.

[unlikely to happen, but it might be an Event if so... :-)]

>YOU are the idiot for trying to argue that they are.

No. If anything nasty be said about me, it is because I keep on
opposing fantasies blabbered by nursie. :-)

> MARS, without the thousands of volunteer Amateurs who man it, would not
be
>able to carry out those duties those directives require. Period.

MARS has done well WITHOUT those volunteers in exercise
Grecian Firebolt 2002. They are still doing so in 2004.

Sunnuvagun! How about that?

>Only a major
>manpower restructuring in the Armed Forces would allow it, and under present
>circumstances, that is highly unlikely.

Okay, Chief of Stuff, explain THAT gem?

The U.S. military has a very large communications organization
that is done by military personnel. Doesn't involve MARS at all.
Does all the tactical and strategic communications for the military.
Very big. Army Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA.

MARS can go away today and not impact any missions of the
U.S. military.

> And I don't need to "intellectualize" anything.

You don't seem to be able to do that. All the readers see is you
personally insulting others who differ with your godlike opinions.

> As for being a liar, Lennie, if you would tell the truth and stop your
>antgonistic constructs, I wouldn't have anything to work with.
>
> You have been repeatedly caught not telling the truth.

"Truth" in nursieworld definition is 'anything nursie thinks.'
That's not of reality, but then neither is nursie intellect.

> You make accusations and assertions you cannot/will not substantiate.

Another redefinition. Tsk, tsk. Anything, however slight, against
nursie opinions are considered "accusations and assertions" in
nursieworld. Yawn.

> You assert that you intend to do things, but then never do them.

I'm still working on anti-gravity, still being held down by something.

> Then stop posting obviously inflammatory, profane, obnoxious and
>incorrect stuff, Lennie.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursieworld must be a strange place, glad I can't
enter it to see such redefinitions of words! :-)

> We don't care how well you can candy coat your rants with cut-and-pastes
>from other websites. Life DOES exist outside of websites, although you seem
>to insist that if it's "on the website", that's the end of it. How foolish.

Nursieworld must not have an Internet. Has lots of fantasies, though.

> We don't care about how many messages you watched flash across the
>teleprinter in 1953, or how many jobs you held. We don't care about some
>articles you had published in a magazine that failed, nor do we care about
>your manufactured experiences in aviation or emergency communications.

Nursie just doesn't want opposite opinions!

Everyone with opposite opinions LIES! :-)

Nursie = nuts.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5239. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:40:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623154008.23112.00000587@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93302

In article <20040623034122.23053.00000542@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/22/2004 10:09 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406221909.170c49d@posting.google.com>
>
>>He wants me real bad.
>
> What I "want" is for you to own up to your manufactured DX claims.

No, nursie just wanna FIGHT.

Nursie should use all that "ability" from "seven hostile actions" and show us how newsgrope supremacy is achieved through brute-force barbarianism.

> Just be a man, admit you made it up.

Nursie should show own "manliness" and prove that his "hostile actions" claim is true or just a bunch of LIES made up for the purposes of trying to win message points..

>Or prove me wrong and get some details that can be verified in here.

Nursie has been given the source of MARS definitions and purpose, yet still clings forlornly to the nonsense of "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

> Otherwise...still lying.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Anything said against nursie is a LIE.

Nursie = nuts.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5240. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:40:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623154009.23112.00000588@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93303

In article <40D9A852.2050109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to sell it as
>> a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The
>> administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of the
>> '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying to tie
>> it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those who
>> oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'
>
>> Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!

Not complicated at all.

BPL will be the demise of low-level-signal HF communications in
urban areas. Kiss off any thoughts of signal-to-noise ratios
required in modern receivers. All that advanced technology will
go to waste. Hams can go back to using one-tube regenerative
receivers, those being as "low-signal-level" as any other in an
RF cesspool of noise on HF.

If BPL makes inroads as a legacy system, it will be very difficult
to remove, let alone stop.

BPL system companies will make money, the whole purpose of
that kind of thing. The rest of the HF communications world can
go away. Simple. A no-brainer.

Michael Powell will have made his small mark on history, unable
to complete his military career or emulate his father much.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5241. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:44:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40D9DD99.5040709@psu.edu>
Source record: 93305

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>...
>
>>Da Shadow wrote:
>>
>>
>>>400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies how
>>>to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
>>>digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
>>
>> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
>>inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
>>operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
>>very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
>>removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.
>
>
> I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
> misunderstand this rule:
>
> "4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
> for
> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
> claimed
> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
> QSO
> level."

Nope, no misunderstanding. I just mean that 400 QSO's is a very high
number to pick up on the GOTA station. I doubt many clubs get there.

> The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
> count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.
>
> I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
> can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
> focused on the truly inexperienced.
>
> If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
> beyond the QSO points themselves.

Kerect!

> So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
> per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3

> minutes per QSO.

True, but I'd expect no GOTA stations will be in solid use. I've been supervising our club GOTA station since the concept started, and at least our typical day goes similar to a few people here, and a few there. I think only one person at our station ever went beyond 25 QSO's. And those QSO's aren't super quick. In addition, there is often an instructional period, where they learn about the exchange, and pertinent operating technique, that sort of stuff.

> The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> same band....

Yup. I would highly suggest a 5F group try to put up a Beverage antenna as their common receive antenna, and get it as far away as the FD rules allow 1000 foot circle that all the equipment has to be in. Don't know if that EOC center will accommodate that or not.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5242. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:54:34 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <_dICc.1579$hX6.324@fed1read01>
Source record: 93306

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0406231114.3257747b@posting.google.com...
>
> I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
> misunderstand this rule:

NOPE UNDERSTAND THE RULES
>
> "4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
> for
> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
> claimed
> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
> QSO
> level."

ROGER

> The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
> count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.

ROGER
>
> I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
> can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
> focused on the truly inexperienced.
>
> If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
> beyond the QSO points themselves.

ROGER

> So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
> per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3
> minutes per QSO.

NO PROBLEM FOR AN EXPERIENCED OP -- FOR NEWBIES TIS A SLOW GO
WE HAD A SHEET TO TUTOR HOW TO CALL CQ AND SEARCH AND POUNCE
WE HAD A LIST OF THE ARRL SECTION ABBREVIATIONS __ THESE HELPED
WE HAD 287 QSO's LAST YEAR OVER THE 24 HOUR PERIOD
BANDS MAY BE POOR AT 10M and 15M.

> The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> same band....

INDEED WE HAD THAT PROBLEM BUT USED FILTERS WHICH HELPED

> Of course there are rigs and techniques that can handle all that RF.
> But that's another subject...
>
> 73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

5243. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 19:58:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406231158.7a60301c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93307

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>
> The OPEC oil embargo happened just before his "tour of duty". It was of
> major concern to all.

There were *two* OPEC oil actions/embargoes/pricehikes/whatever. The
first was in 1973 (three years before Carter was elected) and the
second in 1979 (IIRC). Both were *major* factors in pushing inflation
up and prosperity down. Neither was Carter's fault.

I think one of the reasons people dislike Carter and his time so much
was the general mood caused by the OPEC mess. Up until then, "the
future" had always been pitched to us Americans as being a
techno-wonderland of more, more, more. Faster, more powerful cars.
Supersonic airliners would replace jets the way jets had replaced
piston-engine prop planes. Our houses would be bigger, more luxurious,
and further out in the 'burbs. Yet our commutes would be fast and
relaxing in George Jetson vehicles. And we could buy it all on
inexpensive credit because interest rates would be low and our incomes
growing much faster than inflation.

The reality was just the opposite. And Carter told us we'd have to
settle for less, turn down our thermostats, wear sweaters, carpool,
take transit, etc.

Who wanted a future like that?
>
> >>>We've been told by Bush that we'll all be driving hydrogen cars - by when?
> >>
> >> We were told that in Popular Science in the 60's. Again, So what?
> >
> >Simple: Rather than deal with the realities of energy policies, Bush tells us
> >there is a cheap clean technological solution "just around the corner". Heck,
> >he even had the governor of California fooled. (The Guvernator inquired about
> >having a Hummer converted to hydrogen power. The cost was something like

> >$250,000 - not including a source of fuel. Not exactly practical.)
> >
> >Hydrogen *may* be a fuel of the future. But it's a long long way from being
> >practical for today's problems or those of the near future.
>
> "Practical" is usually based upon mass production.

That's just one of the factors.

A hydrogen car is, of necessity, more complex and therefore more
expensive than an equivalent petrol car. Storing enough hydrogen to
get a reasonable range is a big techno problem.

But the bigger problem is "where will all the hydrogen come from?"
Hydrogen does not occur naturally in large quantities. It can be
derived from many sources but they all require serious new
infrastructure that will cost years and billions to install. And the
result may not be any cheaper than oil.

Meanwhile, US oil imports continue to rise and the money keeps flowing
away from the USA.

> And President Bush is not the first to suggest that some scientific
> breakthrough was close at hand. Billary made an announcement that there was a
> breakthrough in AIDS research that was about to revolutionalize the care
> delivered to those victims.

One mistake doesn't justify another. And as terrible as AIDS is, we
are not dependent on foreign imports in order to deliver care to AIDS
patients.

> >Still, it sounds nice, makes for great photo ops and is a pleasant PopSci
> >diversion from the reality that the US imports way too much oil, and pays way
> >too much for it in the process. That payment isn't just in dollars per
> >barrel.
>
> Agreed. But as long as we insist on not harvesting OUR reserves yet are
> willing to let the Arabs suck themselves dry, what are we to do.

First off, our reserves are not that large. Nor are they easy or
inexpensive to reach. Look up how much oil we'd get if we allowed
unrestricted drilling in Alaska. It's not nearly enough for us to tell
OPEC to stuff it.

What needs to be done is simply to become more efficient and wiser in
our energy use. But that's a complex set of problems that requires
discipline and longterm investment.
>
> This isn't news. This "crisis" has been in the wings for decades. People
> a lot wiser than you or I have been promising this was coming, and they were
> right.

Yet our leaders since then simply ignore it. That's one reason Reagan
was so popular - he told us it was OK to have big fast cars, consume,
and not worry about where it all came from.
>
> I se this on the same par with the "drought" in the SW United States. To
> whom is it a "surprise" that we are millions of acre-feet short of the needed
> water supplies out there?
>
> The proponents of desalianation were hushed up by politicos 20 years ago
> who insisted that present infrastructure would support SW US needs well into
> the 21st Century.

Well, it's the 21st century now...

The problem is technological disconnect. Too many people just don't
think about what keeps everything running, or what it really costs.
And the political leadership keeps them insulated from it.

For example, it is much more safe, clean and efficient to travel by
modern electric railways like France's TGV than by air or car. For
distances up to several hundred miles it's actually faster. But
building such systems costs time and money, plus a commitment from
govt. that just isn't there. (Amtrak's entire capital budget would
build a few new runways at a major airport).

Or another example: There *used to be* considerable tax credits for
installing energy saving equipment in your home. Replace the old HVAC
with more efficient hardware, insulate, replace the windows, etc., and
document it, and the IRS gave you a break. That was in Carter's time.
Reagan's "get the government off your back" tax simplification dumped
it.

> >>>And
> >>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in the
> >>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real benefits
> >>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble space
> >>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
> >>
> >> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.
> >
> >And it hasn't happened because of the enormous cost and dubious benefits. But
> >now Bush talks about it like we should make it a national priority.
>
> And why shouldn't we?

Because it's simply not worth what it will cost to do it.

For example, consider the fact that it is estimated to cost $26,000
per pound to deliver freight to the moon. That's based on mass
production of next-generation rockets specifically designed to do the
job. Maybe that price can be shaved a bit, but it is fundamentally
governed by the physics of the situation.

Now figure how many *tons* of equipment and supplies need to be shipped to the moon in order to set up a permanent base. Remember that the temperature on the lunar surface varies more than 400 degrees from day to night, and that each is 2 weeks long. Also remember that the moon has no significant magnetic field or atmosphere, so there is absolutely no protection from any of the various forms of solar and cosmic radiation that constantly bombard it. Satellites in low earth orbit are afforded some protection by the earth's magnetic field, and if things get really bad humans in orbit can get back to the earth's surface in minutes. The moon is a totally different story.

How many tons of equipment would it take to establish a permanent moon colony of any size? How many pounds of supplies per year to keep it stocked?

Or look at how much even the scaled-down ISS has cost so far - and it's only in earth orbit.

More to come.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5244. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 20:05:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40D9E2B9.2686BD6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93308

N2EY wrote:

> The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> same band....
>
> Of course there are rigs and techniques that can handle all that RF.
> But that's another subject...

The tag team of N8NN and K8MN will participate in the Marshall County ARES group's effort from Grandview Park, overlooking Moundsville, WV. Bert and I will make up a CW team, operating one of the five or six stations. We've already done some scouting of the old driving range where the group will set up and have found a place a little removed from the rest of the stations so as to minimize interference to/from them. It also has a couple of nice trees for use in draping that 200' flattop fed with open wire line. The call will be W8CAL.

Dave K8MN

5245. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 20:32:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93309

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>

> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> >obvious.
>
> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> with great technological learning capabilities.

Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?

> Except to a few, such as nursie.

How would you know, Leonard? I think Steve enjoys amateur radio. I
know that Jim Miccolis and Brian Kelly enjoy amateur radio. I'm still
filled with enthusiasm for amateur radio. How are you enjoying all that
amateur radio has to offer?

> Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
> amateur radio. Nursie only represent himself.

If Steve has an amateur radio license, he certainly represents at least
a part of amateur radio in the U.S. It is a cinch that you don't
represent amateur radio. You don't hold an amateur license.

> Nursie is also
> obsessive-compulsive personality hater unable to control himself
> in here when opposed by anyone.

The name "Leonard" could easily be substituted above.

> > Some Amateur made a fool out of you at some point in time (not that THAT
> >is hard to do...) and you are determined to antagonize the rest of us as long
> >as you can.
>
> I do not "antagonize the rest of 'you'" unless the "rest" are just
> alternate personalities of nursie.
>
> I DO antagonize the conservative traditionalists, the status-quoists
> who demand everything in a hobby conform to their personal

> desires.

So anyone who holds a conservative view or who supports or respects amateur radio's traditions becomes a target for your silliness.

> I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
> familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
> means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.

Thus anyone who doesn't agree with your views of how amateur radio should be regulated becomes a control freak dictator. On the other hand, we have you, a non-participant in amateur radio, who'd like to tell us who should be able to become a radio amateur and what areas should be tested. What descriptive term can you come up with for an individual with your characteristics?

> Living a life of fantasy is simply delusional. It serves no one, not
> even the fantasy believer.

I tend to agree with you, Len. So what do we do about your fantasy that you're somehow involved in amateur radio?

> Every issue under discussion has many sides. One side, the one
> nursie believes, is NOT divinely ordained to be only the True one.
> Sad for nursie, but true.

Not every issue has many sides, Len. Let's take the following as an example: Leonard H. Anderson is not a participant in amateur radio. That one seems divinely ordained as truth.

> Nursie abhors opposition, wants to dominate, wants to win at all
> costs, wants to FIGHT.

If we sub "Leonard" for "Nursie", we'd have a fairly accurate view of your puerile behavior.

> United States amateur radio is not a military organization whose
> purpose is to fight for the country.

It matters not, Len. Whatever amateur radio is or is not, you have nothing to do with it.

> ...by entering this newsgroup, EVERYONE enters an arena of
> outraged PCTAs busy trying to preserve the honor and glory of
> a soon-to-be DEFUNCT communications mode. It is a FIGHT
> arena inhabited by punch-drunk olde-fahrts thinking they are
> all Rocky running up the museum steps to stirring music. :-)

And there we have it, your view of the situation. As the oldest fart present and, to my knowledge, the only non-radio amateur, you'd best go into training. You might want to start with some Mantovani and work your way up to the stirring music.

> Nursie want to be center of attention. Ego drive. Uses all
> palaver in here to divert from real debate he cannot handle, will

> not handle if it is against his own precious opinions.

Seems to me that the above is quite descriptive of your actions, Len.

> Amateur radio is not golf.

> Amateur radio doesn't have the balls for it. :-)

Apparently, neither do you.

> > The difference here, Lennie, is that I have experience in Amateur Radio.
>
> ...and a very large fantasy in addition to pretty certificates (suitable
> for framing).
>
> FCC not require staff or commissioners to be radio amateurs in
> order to regulate amateur radio in USA.

As has been pointed out to you on numerous occasions, FCC staffers and commissioners are paid to regulate amateur radio. You don't regulate amateur radio. You aren't an FCC staffer or commissioner. You aren't a participant in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

5246. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 22:33:50 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231433.31f0a456@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93310

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040623011338.29277.00000464@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406221909.170c49d@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040621174147.07368.00000269@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> In article <5c01b95b.0406210041.6a71b326@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >> >news:<1e4e3692.0406201553.48f9d11e@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> >> He did appear a little "puffy" in his CAP flight suit. I wonder if
> >> >> the CAP has a "weight management" program for those that like to
> >> >> pretend they're thin when they're not.
> >> >
> >> > Wanna see what the "puffy" is, Brain?
> >>
> >> It's on the QRZ site. Anyone can see it...
> >
> >He could use a Jane Fonda workout video.
>
> Best I could do is offer a DVD of "Klute" (Jane plays "Bree Daniels"
> in that one, a hooker). I can only hope that nursie takes the part
> of "Tom Bannerman." :-)
>
> [only movie buffs will get that one...:-)]

I think he's along the lines of Slim Pickens. Riding out the bad
times with only one expected outcome.

> >> > Care to join me in the gym? Three mile run? Five? I'll make
> >> >you the same offer I did your scumbag friend and will add a rucksack
> >> >with some extra weight in it. Or you could make me REAL happy and
> >> >join me for a few minutes in the ring...(please! please!)
> >>
> >> Oooooo....macho emotional RAGE! Physical competition!!!
> >>
> >> Blatant physical challenge of FIGHTING prowess!!!
> >>
> >> All imporant attributes for radio amateurs? Or radio amateur
> >> policy? I think not.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Need for some approved (prescribed by a REAL

> >> MD) tranquilizer or other calming drug seems warranted.
> >>
> >> Let's see...modern fighting tools (since at least 1700s) allow
> >> "just a few ounces of finger pressure" to allow reaching out
> >> and touching someone supersonically. No need for physical
> >> confrontation up close and personal. [wonder who mentioned
> >> "just a few ounces of pressure?" :-)]
> >>
> >> All that proves that nursie don't wanna do anything but FIGHT
> >> in here. [sic...and sick]
> >>
> >> Temper fry...
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Did you see him begging, "(please! please!)?"
> >
> >He wants me real bad.
>
> Hmmm...I wonder what exactly for?

Steve wants to beat me up. Kellie wanted me to "bend-over." Maybe I should introduce those two.

> >What's this about a "few ounces of pressure?" Backchannel stuff?
>
> Nah. Been out in public in here twice, few months ago and a few
> years ago.

Welp, unlike the others who claim to have me blocked yet know every word I've ever posted...

I've actually not read every Steve posting out there. So I actually missed his references to reaching out and touching someone. Spooky dude that Steve.

> Nursie wanna posture and threaten wid sojer skills, like shooting.
> "A few ounces of pressure" refers to the trigger squeeze force.
> Tuff macho tawk.

I've never not shot expert in sojer skills. Even when I fired the Army course in Korea. 'Course, there's a rule against having the AF Marksman award and also claiming an Army Marksman award. You wear whichever you earned first. Unlike my ARCOM and my AFCOM with clusters. I get to wear them both, with the AFCOM taking precedence, of course.

> Poor nursie don' know I qualified expert on the range against
> paper targets...paper tigers are about the same. [more dang
> gun ranges out here, folks would be surprised at how strong
> the NRA be in this neck of the woods]

I was our commander's gunner on his trip from the former U.S. Embassy
to the
M-O-G-A-D-I-S-H-U airfield when George H. Bush flew in. Luckily the
trip was early AM or it would have been a paperless environment.

> It's kind of bad in here when these non-commissioned extras
> want to turn all the "meaningful discourse" into a macho
> shouting and hollering match over personal grudges. This
> forum MIGHT be useful to actually talk about amateur radio,
> even radio in general, and regulation issues and the like.

"Hupa twoah treeah fower, ..

My boots are heavy, My head is Lite..."

> Nope. Idiot nursie gotta play schoolyard games accusing
> all his "opponents" of "lying." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

"Liar, Liar, Pants on Fiah!"

> Maybe he wants to be six years old so he can set a record
> of becoming the youngest extra in the USA? :-) :-(

Emotionally, he is. ;^(

5247. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:12:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231512.46210506@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93311

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>
> >> >>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
> >> >>anything.
> >> >
> >> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done) evidence
> of
> >> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >>
> >> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
> >
> >I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
> >four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.
>
> Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."

He'll just have to laugh a long time. My wife was just reading where
parents of autistic children are often highly intelligent. So there
are downsides.

> He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
> of having an intellect..

I'm actually crying at his dearth of it.

> >> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
> >> >
> >> > You CAN'T comply.
> >>

> >> Yes, he can.
> >
> >Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
> >some shoebox full of unearned medals.
>
> He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)

If it would help, but I'm not the one filing for a benefit. He'll
just have to have the right credentials, or its "no show."

What's he always saying? "Sucks to be you?" Til he's got those
credentials...

> >> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
> >> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?
> >
> >I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.
>
> Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
> wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...

Whoo boy! Talk about perverse. Kelly has requested that I "bend
over" for him. While I don't want to judge what two consenting adults
want to do in private, I'm just not interested in taking that path.

And now Steve wants to beat me up...

There's a couple of Extra's we could use a break from.

> >> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim of
> >> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >
> >I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
> >Amateur Radio?"
> >
> >hi, hi.
>
> :-)

I wonder when the TN State MARS Director learned that he had an idiot
for a volunteer?

> >> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?
> >
> >He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
> >it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
> >the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.
>
> Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.
>
> Not much chance as it is...

Lithium?

> >> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
> character
> >> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
> >>
> >> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
> >>
> >> :-)
> >
> >Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
> >
> >;^)
> >
> >> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
> >> >
> >> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of
> dirt
> >> >over their casket.
> >>
> >> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
> >
> >"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"
>
> Mark those words... :-)

That was very Cutie.

> >> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
> >> >>artery in his neck explodes.
> >> >
> >> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
> Lennie
> >> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
> >>
> >> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
> >
> >His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
> >
> >Hi, hi.
> >
> >Is that personality #4650.3?
>
> Battle of the Bulge, take 2...

If he exhales before trying to zip up that flight suit...

> >> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
> >
> >Off the scale on the spasometer, too.
>
> I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
> on it...

Is that the seismo that's shown in the MoveOn.Org anti-Bush
commercial?

> >> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
> >>
> >> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
> >> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >
> >He simply doesn't know what "is" is.
>
> That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.

Good thing I didn't step in any.

> >> > Keep up the good work!
> >>
> >> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
> >> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
> >
> >So they do!
>
> I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
> this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)

You've exceeded Four point Oh.

> "Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
> does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
> businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few
> days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
> neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.
>
> LHA / WMD

I enjoy Four O'Clocks in the garden. It has nothing to do with
amateur radio policy. Sounds ripe for discussion.

;^)

5248. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:17:55 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231517.64783fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93312

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174143.07368.00000266@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <20040621104944.05916.00000401@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/20/2004 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>
> >
> >> Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without
> >> presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could
> >> verify his general claims.
> > >
> > > The Veterans Administration is NOT "proof enough" form you, Scummy One?
> >
> > No. Copies from NARA of nursie's "jacket" would do it.
> >
> >> "No Proof = Didn't Happen."
> > >
> > > The proof is in the phone call, Lennie.
> > >
> > > You haven't made it.
> >
> > Don't have to. Military records of service are at NARA, not with
> > the VA. VA will use NARA.
> >
> > [National Archives and Records Administration, St.Louis]
> >
> > Complete information is at NARA. That would show the when
> > and where of "hostile actions." That would show MOS and
> > where served. It's all there.
> >
> > > Makes you look pretty stupid with that last claim.
> >
> > Not at all. I know where the military service records are kept.
> > I also know what establishes and defines MARS, posted that
> > in here. Nursie didn't post that. Nursie still wanna claim:
> >
> > "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >
> > Nursie has mental constipation problems (in addition to other
> > mental problems). Nursie need help.
> >

> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

God only knows what he's told the VA to put in his medical records...
maybe that shoebox full of medals.

5249. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:30:31 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231530.4340c22f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93313

```
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040621174201.07368.00000276@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0406210522.5fb05e8d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com
> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >>
> >> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
> >> >> > and I mention that
> >> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
> >> >> > communications in 1948.
>
> >> >> They did? Everywhere?
>
> >> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>
> >> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>
> >> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
> >> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
> >> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
> >>
> >> That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some
> spoofing
> >> and such.
> >
> >Sure, they'd be grossly negligent if they didn't. I'll just bet that
> >Osama Baby has at least looked at CW for his purposes and that since
> >9/11 our guys have ramped up their volume of poking around for it. So
> >yes, the feds certainly do have an ongoing and abiding interest in the
> >use of CW, one-way for their purposes and/or otherwise.
>
> Kelly, unable to admit what is happening since his bear-shooting
> days as King of the Katapults, manufactures "knowing analyses"
> of terrorists.

He be the intelligence failure...
```

> Kelly the putz-caller seems to forget a well-publicized video bite
> of Osama bin Laden rather obviously using a hand-held transceiver
> in earlier days. No code key was evident in that video bite seen
> on major networks.

Dammit! And I thought all the important guys carried cell phones.

> Kelly has NO information on "ramping up" on-off keying codes by
> the U.S. government or anyone else. The Military Intelligence
> School at Fort Huachuca has been active for years. All U.S.
> government agencies involved in any way use that M.I. Center,
> including those few needing any sort of skills with on-off codings
> such as morse. That as an economic consideration, not any sort
> of technical reason or alleged "importance of morse."
>
> Reference: Fort Huachuca public affairs office.

Nice. The Fort WhaChewKah PA Office had to spell it out for those
that are smitten by the myth. I can only imagine all of the telephone
calls and letters from all of the morseodists that couldn't believe
that morse code was not at the crux of modern communications for them
to have to put such a notice in their publications.

> >> However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same mission -
> or
> >> the same resources.
> >
> >Even if we did I wouldn't go anywhere near it.
>
> Why not?
>
> "Sorry Hans, MARS >> IS << amateur radio!" True or not true?
>
> From someone "shooting bears for naval intelligence" and bragging
> about "dining with the [aircraft carrier] captain," that sounds hollow.

You know he has to remain silent on the "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<<
Amateur Radio" issue. Wouldn't be PCTA if he didn't.

> >> >> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
> >> >> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
> >> >> > person is for morse code.
>
> >> >> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real. Like
> it
> >> >> or
> >> >> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see -
> and
> >> >> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
> >> >
> >> >Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
> >> >didn't ya?
> >>

> >> Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and the
> >> subject.
> >>
> >> >Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
> >>
> >> Oyez.
> >>
> >> >Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.
> >>
> >> Bad pun of "navel" noted.
> >
> >Another example of the Putz in his seven-yer-old mode. Which he
> >consistently drops into when he can't find an adult comment to post.
>
> I have no problem being "adult" - even around children and the
> immature. :-)
>
> When I find some PCTA who are not children in here, I might alter
> posting style.

Best of Luck.

> >> >No
> >> >such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
> >> >snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.
> >>
> >> That's true!
> >
> >Every time the Soviets buzzed a carrier it became a tourist event,
> >bloomin' hoot. Kodak could have made money with a flight deck photo
> >processing kiosk after those flybys.
>
> More "tales of the South Pacific?" :-)

I hope it's a musical.

> >> >I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
> >> >of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
> >> >aboard.
> >>
> >> Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.
> >
> >Nah, it was just another bit of Naval tradition, DoD civilian
> >professionals were treated as officers and were expected to
> >reciprocate the courtesies received. I had to introduce myself to both
> >the skipper and the air boss and join them for dinner in officer's
> >mess on Friday evenings, etc. I knew nothing about any of it when I
> >logged aboard the first time. A crusty Chief Yeoman sat me down in his
> >office and went thru the list of what I had to do and not do.
>
> Good ol' crusty chiefs. :-)

>
> So, the dinner table talk was all about ham radio, morse, and
> establishing valid QSLs for DXCC? :-)
>
> Or did the talk involve ANY radio communications?

Rubber Band Man. I just knew it would be a musical.

> >> >The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
> >> >work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
> >> >
> >> >> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio policy.
> >> >
> >> >End of.
> >> >
> >> roger that!
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Another installment of "Tales of The South Pacific" by the ancient
> mariner-guest king of the katapults schmoosing with captains of
> aircraft carriers. Real involvement with amateur radio! Not...
>
> LHA / WMD

Hey, how else could he earn his GI Bill?

5250. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:48:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231548.310c1c74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93314

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<%c1Cc.130$fC7.75@news02.roc.ny>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Thanks for the segway, which brings us right back to the Code Test
> > argument (which happens a lot with the blind followers of the faith).
>
> A couple of questions beg to be answered; perhaps you'd be kind enough to do
> so.
>
> 1) Why do we have the highest rate of incarceration in the world?

Good question - I hope you have the answer.

Maybe because we don't hold youngsters accountable, at an age when
they might actually learn a life-long lesson. Then when they become
adults, their behavior is just not cute anymore. We incarcerate them
at that point.

Prison jobs are about the only growth industry in Ohio, even with the
Gov trying to close prisons.

> 2) What does Morse code have to do with it (other than, of course, causing
> my washing machine to over-suds?)

I thought we were talking about what was good for America -and- the
blind followers of the faith. It was a natural turning point to
discuss the Morse Code Exam.

So, is the Morse Code Exam good for America?

> Best regards from Rochester, NY - and don't strain the brain
>
> Jim AA2QA

No sweatty-dah.

That's "no sweat" in Korean.

(;^) thought I'd give the peanut gallery some intellect to laugh at.)

5251. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:57:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040623195753.15095.00000255@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 93315

In article <40D9DD99.5040709@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>...
>>
>>>Da Shadow wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies
>how
>>>>to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
>>>>digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
>>>
>>> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
>>>inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
>>>operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
>>>very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
>>>removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.
>>
>>
>> I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
>> misunderstand this rule:
>>
>> "4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
>> for
>> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
>> claimed
>> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
>> QSO
>> level."
>
> Nope, no misunderstanding. I just mean that 400 QSO's is a very high
>number to pick up on the GOTA station. I doubt many clubs get there.

OK!

>> The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
>> count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.
>>
>> I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
>> can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
>> focused on the truly inexperienced.
>>
>> If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
>> beyond the QSO points themselves.

>
> Kerect!
>
>> So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
>> per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3
>> minutes per QSO.
>
> True, but I'd expect no GOTA stations will be in solid use. I've been
>supervising our club GOTA station since the concept started, and at
>least our typical day goes similar to a few people here, and a few
>there. I think only one person at our station ever went beyond 25 QSO's.
>And those QSO's aren't super quick. In addition, there is often an
>instructional period, where they learn about the exchange, and pertinent
>operating technique, that sort of stuff.

Sure. Point is, though, that by setting the number at 400, we don't have the
problem of having to shut the GOTA station down because the quota has been
reached.
>
>> The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
>> It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
>> same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
>> same band....
>
> Yup. I would highly suggest a 5F group try to put up a Beverage antenna

>as their common receive antenna, and get it as far away as the FD rules
>allow 1000 foot circle that all the equipment has to be in. Don't know
>if that EOC center will accommodate that or not.
>
Why a Beverage? It receives well in one direction only, but in most of the USA
you need more than one direction.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5252. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-23 23:58:59 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406231558.52e6bd52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93316

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<mPadnWHDDfCQ1kXdRVn-jA@comcast.com>...
> "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:1e4e3692.0406220305.b6db4d9@posting.google.com...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:<xrrBc.6698$nA2.5997@news02.roc.ny>...
> > > "William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:1e4e3692.0406201542.2a6b2d43@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<4ZkBc.3207$6E6.2731@news01.roc.ny>...
> > >
> > > What Clinton did was terrible to his
> > > > wife and daughter,
> > > I really don't want to know what he did to his wife and daughter. The
> > > details of what he did to Monica was bad enough.
> > >
> > > > but what damage to the country (other than a major distraction) did it
> > do?
> > >
> > > Our government and our monetary system is a confidence game. When our
> > > leaders go south, our confidence goes south, and our economy goes
> > > south.
> > >
> >
> > What bothered me is that since Clinton lied about something so unimportant,
> > what might he do to cover up something that was much more important.

He was a security risk. His whole executive branch was a security risk.

> At the time, I had several German friends and they were totally baffled
> about why he bothered to lie. To some extent, this probably hurt his
> standing with foreign leaders though my memory tells me that as a whole
> Europe loved Clinton.

There are no Puritans left in Europe. They all left on the Mayflower.

5253. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 00:29:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <y4udnbXwP8PhvUfdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93317

N2EY wrote:

>>It's perfectly to do a smear campaign on the patriotis
>
>
> Something got cut off there, Mike.

Oops, sorry about that. That's what I get when I get interrupted and
don't do a spell check,

I was just going to say that I would caution people about how a person
that I consider a patriot - Max Cleland - was attacked as unpatriotic
in a recent election.

Max lost 2 legs and an arm in the service of our country. Problem was,
he didn't have the "correct" politics. If you don't like the man's
political leanings, fine. Challenge his voting record.

But not his patriotism. That makes me want to puke.

All those that serve our country honorably are patriots in my book. Too
bad there is a new breed that ties patriotism to "goodthink" in addition
to the willingness to lay down your life for your country.

Seems political correctness has been reincarnated!

>>story that your "group" sends down the wire, you will be hoodwinked.
>>Lying to advance your parties agenda is not moral or right. I've lived
>>around some people that have ruined their lives by lies, starting small,
>>then turning compulsive. It's where we are today, when so-called
>>Liberals are the cause of every problem on the face of the planet. They
>>aren't.
>>
>
> Neither are conservatives the cause of every problem.

Of course not. I never said they were, nor will I ever. But most I know
now admit to no shortcoming *ever*.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5254. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 00:51:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sLednYTQc849uEfdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93318

N2EY wrote:

> In article <40D9DD99.5040709@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Da Shadow wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies
>>
>>how
>>
>>>>>to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
>>>>>digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
>>>>
>>>> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
>>>>inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
>>>>operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
>>>>very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
>>>>removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.
>>>
>>>
>>>I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
>>>misunderstand this rule:
>>>
>>>"4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
>>>for
>>>credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
>>>claimed
>>>by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
>>>QSO
>>>level."
>>
>> Nope, no misunderstanding. I just mean that 400 QSO's is a very high
>>number to pick up on the GOTA station. I doubt many clubs get there.
>
>
> OK!

>
>
>>>The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
>>>count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.
>>>
>>>I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
>>>can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
>>>focused on the truly inexperienced.
>>>
>>>If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
>>>beyond the QSO points themselves.
>>
>> Kerect!
>>
>>
>>>So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
>>>per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3
>>>minutes per QSO.
>>
>> True, but I'd expect no GOTA stations will be in solid use. I've been
>>supervising our club GOTA station since the concept started, and at
>>least our typical day goes similar to a few people here, and a few
>>there. I think only one person at our station ever went beyond 25 QSO's.
>>And those QSO's aren't super quick. In addition, there is often an
>>instructional period, where they learn about the exchange, and pertinent
>>operating technique, that sort of stuff.
>
>
> Sure. Point is, though, that by setting the number at 400, we don't have the
> problem of having to shut the GOTA station down because the quota has been
> reached.

Well true, but in that vein of thought, we might as well not have a
limit at all.

FWIW, I don't mind limits on the GOTA station, mainly because I'm the
control op for our club. I sit with the newbies and hams getting back
into the fold all day, and then after the station closes down, I can
kick in the afterburners on the night shift. I've made good friends
working the overnight. (yeah, us crazies gotta stick together!)

>>>The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
>>>It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
>>>same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
>>>same band....
>>
>> Yup. I would highly suggest a 5F group try to put up a Beverage antenna
>>as their common receive antenna, and get it as far away as the FD rules
>>allow 1000 foot circle that all the equipment has to be in. Don't know
>>if that EOC center will accommodate that or not.
>>

>
> Why a Beverage? It receives well in one direction only, but in most of the USA
> you need more than one direction.

When you use a multiple wavelength Beverage the directivity isn't quite
as bad. (or good - depending on what you are trying to achieve) I don't
recall the length of ours, but it was at least 2 wavelengths on 80 meters.

In any event, it quieted the interference between the rigs, and I don't
recall any significant losses to the east of us, since we still heard
the stations in that direction.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5255. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 01:45:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <inqCc.97686$Sw.5617@attbi_s51>
Source record: 93319

> Well I hope to be participating in our club's Field Day activities but
it's
> iffy at this point. It depends on when my doctor schedules my surgery,
> which I won't find out until Thursday. If he picks Friday, well there
goes
> Field Day weekend.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

The best there Dee .....I'll put a good word in for you tonight ....

God Bless .....

Tom KI3R

5256. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 03:12:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623231208.00536.00000341@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93321

In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
>> >obvious.
>>
>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>
>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>
>> Except to a few, such as nursie.
>
>How would you know, Leonard? I think Steve enjoys amateur radio. I
>know that Jim Miccolis and Brian Kelly enjoy amateur radio. I'm still
>filled with enthusiasm for amateur radio. How are you enjoying all that
>amateur radio has to offer?
>
>> Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
>> amateur radio. Nursie only represent himself.
>
>If Steve has an amateur radio license, he certainly represents at least
>a part of amateur radio in the U.S. It is a cinch that you don't
>represent amateur radio. You don't hold an amateur license.
>
>> Nursie is also
>> obsessive-compulsive personality hater unable to control himself
>> in here when opposed by anyone.
>
>The name "Leonard" could easily be substituted above.
>
>> > Some Amateur made a fool out of you at some point in time (not that
>THAT

>> >is hard to do...) and you are determined to antagonize the rest of us as
>long
>> >as you can.
>>
>> I do not "antagonize the rest of 'you'" unless the "rest" are just
>> alternate personalities of nursie.
>>
>> I DO antagonize the conservative traditionalists, the status-quoists
>> who demand everything in a hobby conform to their personal
>> desires.
>
>So anyone who holds a conservative view or who supports or respects
>amateur radio's traditions becomes a target for your silliness.
>
>> I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
>> familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
>> means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.
>
>Thus anyone who doesn't agree with your views of how amateur radio
>should be regulated becomes a control freak dictator. On the other
>hand, we have you, a non-participant in amateur radio, who'd like to
>tell us who should be able to become a radio amateur and what areas
>should be tested. What descriptive term can you come up with for an
>individual with your characteristics?
>
>> Living a life of fantasy is simply delusional. It serves no one, not
>> even the fantasy believer.
>
>I tend to agree with you, Len. So what do we do about your fantasy that
>you're somehow involved in amateur radio?
>
>> Every issue under discussion has many sides. One side, the one
>> nursie believes, is NOT divinely ordained to be only the True one.
>> Sad for nursie, but true.
>
>Not every issue has many sides, Len. Let's take the following as an
>example: Leonard H. Anderson is not a participant in amateur radio.
>That one seems divinely ordained as truth.
>
>> Nursie abhors opposition, wants to dominate, wants to win at all
>> costs, wants to FIGHT.
>
>If we sub "Leonard" for "Nursie", we'd have a fairly accurate view of
>your puerile behavior.
>
>> United States amateur radio is not a military organization whose
>> purpose is to fight for the country.
>
>It matters not, Len. Whatever amateur radio is or is not, you have
>nothing to do with it.

>
>
>> ...by entering this newsgroup, EVERYONE enters an arena of
>> outraged PCTAs busy trying to preserve the honor and glory of
>> a soon-to-be DEFUNCT communications mode. It is a FIGHT
>> arena inhabited by punch-drunk olde-fahrts thinking they are
>> all Rocky running up the museum steps to stirring music. :-)
>
>And there we have it, your view of the situation. As the oldest fart
>present and, to my knowledge, the only non-radio amateur, you'd best go
>into training. You might want to start with some Mantovani and work
>your way up to the stirring music.
>
>
>> Nursie want to be center of attention. Ego drive. Uses all
>> palaver in here to divert from real debate he cannot handle, will
>> not handle if it is against his own precious opinions.
>
>Seems to me that the above is quite descriptive of your actions, Len.
>
>> Amateur radio is not golf.
>
>> Amateur radio doesn't have the balls for it. :-)
>
>
>Apparently, neither do you.
>
>> > The difference here, Lennie, is that I have experience in Amateur
>Radio.
>>
>> ...and a very large fantasy in addition to pretty certificates (suitable
>> for framing).
>>
>> FCC not require staff or commissioners to be radio amateurs in
>> order to regulate amateur radio in USA.
>
>As has been pointed out to you on numerous occasions, FCC staffers and
>commissioners are paid to regulate amateur radio. You don't regulate
>amateur radio. You aren't an FCC staffer or commissioner. You aren't a
>participant in amateur radio.

5257. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 03:12:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623231210.00536.00000342@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93323

In article <1e4e3692.0406231530.4340c22f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174201.07368.00000276@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0406210522.5fb05e8d@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>> kelly@dvol.com
>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> >> > and I mention that
>> >> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>> >> >> > communications in 1948.
>>
>> >> >> They did? Everywhere?
>>
>> >> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>
>> >> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between ships?
>>
>> >> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>> >> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>> >> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>> >>
>> >> That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some
>> spoofing
>> >> and such.
>> >
>> >Sure, they'd be grossly negligent if they didn't. I'll just bet that
>> >Osama Baby has at least looked at CW for his purposes and that since
>> >9/11 our guys have ramped up their volume of poking around for it. So
>> >yes, the feds certainly do have an ongoing and abiding interest in the
>> >use of CW, one-way for their purposes and/or otherwise.
>>
>> Kelly, unable to admit what is happening since his bear-shooting
>> days as King of the Katapults, manufactures "knowing analyses"

>> of terrorists.
>
>He be the intelligence failure...
>
>> Kelly the putz-caller seems to forget a well-publicized video bite
>> of Osama bin Laden rather obviously using a hand-held transceiver
>> in earlier days. No code key was evident in that video bite seen
>> on major networks.
>
>Dammit! And I thought all the important guys carried cell phones.
>
>> Kelly has NO information on "ramping up" on-off keying codes by
>> the U.S. government or anyone else. The Military Intelligence
>> School at Fort Huachuca has been active for years. All U.S.
>> government agencies involved in any way use that M.I. Center,
>> including those few needing any sort of skills with on-off codings
>> such as morse. That as an economic consideration, not any sort
>> of technical reason or alleged "importance of morse."
>>
>> Reference: Fort Huachuca public affairs office.
>
>Nice. The Fort WhaChewKah PA Office had to spell it out for those
>that are smitten by the myth. I can only imagine all of the telephone
>calls and letters from all of the morseodists that couldn't believe
>that morse code was not at the crux of modern communications for them
>to have to put such a notice in their publications.
>
>> >> However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same
>mission -
>> or
>> >> the same resources.
>> >
>> >Even if we did I wouldn't go anywhere near it.
>>
>> Why not?
>>
>> "Sorry Hans, MARS >> IS << amateur radio!" True or not true?
>>
>> From someone "shooting bears for naval intelligence" and bragging
>> about "dining with the [aircraft carrier] captain," that sounds hollow.
>
>You know he has to remain silent on the "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<<
>Amateur Radio" issue. Wouldn't be PCTA if he didn't.
>
>> >> >> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>> >> >> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
>> >> >> > person is for morse code.
>>
>> >> >> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real.
>Like

>> it
>> >> >> or
>> >> >> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do see
>-
>> and
>> >> >> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
>> >> >
>> >> >Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
>> >> >didn't ya?
>> >>
>> >> Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and
>the
>> >> subject.
>> >>
>> >> >Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
>> >>
>> >> Oyez.
>> >>
>> >> >Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.
>> >>
>> >> Bad pun of "navel" noted.
>> >
>> >Another example of the Putz in his seven-yer-old mode. Which he
>> >consistently drops into when he can't find an adult comment to post.
>>
>> I have no problem being "adult" - even around children and the
>> immature. :-)
>>
>> When I find some PCTA who are not children in here, I might alter
>> posting style.
>
>Best of Luck.
>
>> >> >No
>> >> >such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
>> >> >snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.
>> >>
>> >> That's true!
>> >
>> >Every time the Soviets buzzed a carrier it became a tourist event,
>> >bloomin' hoot. Kodak could have made money with a flight deck photo
>> >processing kiosk after those flybys.
>>
>> More "tales of the South Pacific?" :-)
>
>I hope it's a musical.
>
>> >> >I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department
>> >> >of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
>> >> >aboard.

>> >>
>> >> Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.
>> >
>> >Nah, it was just another bit of Naval tradition, DoD civilian
>> >professionals were treated as officers and were expected to
>> >reciprocate the courtesies received. I had to introduce myself to both
>> >the skipper and the air boss and join them for dinner in officer's
>> >mess on Friday evenings, etc. I knew nothing about any of it when I
>> >logged aboard the first time. A crusty Chief Yeoman sat me down in his
>> >office and went thru the list of what I had to do and not do.
>>
>> Good ol' crusty chiefs. :-)
>>
>> So, the dinner table talk was all about ham radio, morse, and
>> establishing valid QSLs for DXCC? :-)
>>
>> Or did the talk involve ANY radio communications?
>
>Rubber Band Man. I just knew it would be a musical.
>
>> >> >The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
>> >> >work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
>> >> >
>> >> >> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio
>policy.
>> >> >
>> >> >End of.
>> >> >
>> >> roger that!
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Another installment of "Tales of The South Pacific" by the ancient
>> mariner-guest king of the katapults schmoosing with captains of
>> aircraft carriers. Real involvement with amateur radio! Not...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Hey, how else could he earn his GI Bill?

5258. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 03:12:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623231211.00536.00000343@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93320

In article <1e4e3692.0406231517.64783fd@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040621174143.07368.00000266@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040621104944.05916.00000401@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/20/2004 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>
>>
>> >> Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without
>> >> presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could
>> >> verify his general claims.
>> >
>> > The Veterans Administration is NOT "proof enough" form you, Scummy
>One?
>>
>> No. Copies from NARA of nursie's "jacket" would do it.
>>
>> >> "No Proof = Didn't Happen."
>> >
>> > The proof is in the phone call, Lennie.
>> >
>> > You haven't made it.
>>
>> Don't have to. Military records of service are at NARA, not with
>> the VA. VA will use NARA.
>>
>> [National Archives and Records Administration, St.Louis]
>>
>> Complete information is at NARA. That would show the when
>> and where of "hostile actions." That would show MOS and
>> where served. It's all there.
>>
>> > Makes you look pretty stupid with that last claim.
>>
>> Not at all. I know where the military service records are kept.
>> I also know what establishes and defines MARS, posted that
>> in here. Nursie didn't post that. Nursie still wanna claim:
>>

>> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>
>> Nursie has mental constipation problems (in addition to other
>> mental problems). Nursie need help.
>>
>> Temper fry...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>God only knows what he's told the VA to put in his medical records...
>maybe that shoebox full of medals.

5259. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 03:12:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040623231214.00536.00000344@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93322

In article <1e4e3692.0406231512.46210506@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
>> >> >>anything.
>> >> >
>> >> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done)
>evidence
>> of
>> >> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
>> >>
>> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>> >>
>> >> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
>> >
>> >I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
>> >four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.
>>
>> Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."
>
>He'll just have to laugh a long time. My wife was just reading where
>parents of autistic children are often highly intelligent. So there
>are downsides.
>
>> He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
>> of having an intellect..
>
>I'm actually crying at his dearth of it.

>
>> >> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
>> >> >
>> >> > You CAN'T comply.
>> >>
>> >> Yes, he can.
>> >
>> >Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
>> >some shoebox full of unearned medals.
>>
>> He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)
>
>If it would help, but I'm not the one filing for a benefit. He'll
>just have to have the right credentials, or its "no show."
>
>What's he always saying? "Sucks to be you?" Til he's got those
>credentials...
>
>> >> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
>> >> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?
>> >
>> >I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.
>>
>> Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
>> wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...
>
>Whoo boy! Talk about perverse. Kelly has requested that I "bend
>over" for him. While I don't want to judge what two consenting adults
>want to do in private, I'm just not interested in taking that path.
>
>And now Steve wants to beat me up...
>
>There's a couple of Extra's we could use a break from.
>
>> >> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim
>of
>> >> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >
>> >I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
>> >Amateur Radio?"
>> >
>> >hi, hi.
>>
>> :-)
>
>I wonder when the TN State MARS Director learned that he had an idiot
>for a volunteer?
>
>> >> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?
>> >

>> >He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
>> >it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
>> >the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.
>>
>> Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.
>>
>> Not much chance as it is...
>
>Lithium?
>
>> >> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
>> character
>> >> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
>> >>
>> >> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
>> >>
>> >> :-)
>> >
>> >Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
>> >
>> >;^)
>> >
>> >> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
>> >> >
>> >> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of
>> dirt
>> >> >over their casket.
>> >>
>> >> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
>> >
>> >"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"
>>
>> Mark those words... :-)
>
>That was very Cutie.
>
>> >> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>> >> >>artery in his neck explodes.
>> >> >
>> >> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
>> Lennie
>> >> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
>> >>
>> >> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
>> >
>> >His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
>> >
>> >Hi, hi.
>> >
>> >Is that personality #4650.3?

>>
>> Battle of the Bulge, take 2...
>
>If he exhales before trying to zip up that flight suit...
>
>> >> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
>> >
>> >Off the scale on the spasometer, too.
>>
>> I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
>> on it...
>
>Is that the seismo that's shown in the MoveOn.Org anti-Bush
>commercial?
>
>> >> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
>> >>
>> >> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
>> >> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >
>> >He simply doesn't know what "is" is.
>>
>> That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.
>
>Good thing I didn't step in any.
>
>> >> > Keep up the good work!
>> >>
>> >> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
>> >> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
>> >
>> >So they do!
>>
>> I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
>> this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)
>
>You've exceeded Four point Oh.
>
>> "Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
>> does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
>> businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few
>> days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
>> neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>
>I enjoy Four O'Clocks in the garden. It has nothing to do with
>amateur radio policy. Sounds ripe for discussion.

5260. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:05:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624000536.02583.00000409@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93327

```
>In article <1e4e3692.0406231512.46210506@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>>> In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
>>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> (Steve
>>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>> >> >>Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>>>
>>> >> >>The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to
>demand
>>> >> >>anything.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done)
>>evidence
>>> of
>>> >> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
>>> >>
>>> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>>> >>
>>> >> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
>>> >
>>> >I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
>>> >four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.
>>>
>>> Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."
>>
>>He'll just have to laugh a long time. My wife was just reading where
>>parents of autistic children are often highly intelligent. So there
>>are downsides.
>>
>>> He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
>>> of having an intellect..
>>
```

>>I'm actually crying at his dearth of it.
>>
>>> >> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
>>> >> >
>>> >> > You CAN'T comply.
>>> >>
>>> >> Yes, he can.
>>> >
>>> >Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
>>> >some shoebox full of unearned medals.
>>>
>>> He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)
>>
>>If it would help, but I'm not the one filing for a benefit. He'll
>>just have to have the right credentials, or its "no show."
>>
>>What's he always saying? "Sucks to be you?" Til he's got those
>>credentials...
>>
>>> >> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
>>> >> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?
>>> >
>>> >I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.
>>>
>>> Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
>>> wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...
>>
>>Whoo boy! Talk about perverse. Kelly has requested that I "bend
>>over" for him. While I don't want to judge what two consenting adults
>>want to do in private, I'm just not interested in taking that path.
>>
>>And now Steve wants to beat me up...
>>
>>There's a couple of Extra's we could use a break from.
>>
>>> >> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim
>>of
>>> >> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>> >
>>> >I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
>>> >Amateur Radio?"
>>> >
>>> >hi, hi.
>>>
>>> :-)
>>
>>I wonder when the TN State MARS Director learned that he had an idiot
>>for a volunteer?
>>
>>> >> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?

>>> >
>>> >He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
>>> >it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
>>> >the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.
>>>
>>> Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.
>>>
>>> Not much chance as it is...
>>
>>Lithium?

I would prescribe nitroglycerine along with instructions to go on
the label, "Shake well after using."
:-)

>>> >> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
>>> character
>>> >> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
>>> >>
>>> >> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
>>> >>
>>> >> :-)
>>> >
>>> >Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
>>> >
>>> >;^)
>>> >
>>> >> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet
>of
>>> dirt
>>> >> >over their casket.
>>> >>
>>> >> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
>>> >
>>> >"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"
>>>
>>> Mark those words... :-)
>>
>>That was very Cutie.
>>
>>> >> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>>> >> >>artery in his neck explodes.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
>>> Lennie
>>> >> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
>>> >>
>>> >> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
>>> >

>>> >His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
>>> >
>>> >Hi, hi.
>>> >
>>> >Is that personality #4650.3?
>>>
>>> Battle of the Bulge, take 2...
>>
>>If he exhales before trying to zip up that flight suit...
>>
>>> >> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
>>> >
>>> >Off the scale on the spasometer, too.
>>>
>>> I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
>>> on it...
>>
>>Is that the seismo that's shown in the MoveOn.Org anti-Bush
>>commercial?
>>
>>> >> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
>>> >>
>>> >> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
>>> >> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>> >
>>> >He simply doesn't know what "is" is.
>>>
>>> That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.
>>
>>Good thing I didn't step in any.
>>
>>> >> > Keep up the good work!
>>> >>
>>> >> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
>>> >> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
>>> >
>>> >So they do!
>>>
>>> I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
>>> this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)
>>
>>You've exceeded Four point Oh.

Careful, Hans might meander in here, all huffy and mumbling
about "swab-Oh." :-)

>>> "Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
>>> does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
>>> businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few
>>> days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
>>> neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.

>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>
>>I enjoy Four O'Clocks in the garden. It has nothing to do with
>>amateur radio policy. Sounds ripe for discussion.

Not much going on for amateur radio discussions in an amateur
radio policy forum...except FD. Might as well talk about something
other than Presidential Politics and how evil, wicked, mean, and
nasty the opposition candidate is. :-)

The Comment period on docket 04-37 (NPRM for Access BPL)
is over. [some will probably continue sending in Comments for
another two years...heh heh] A VERY important subject for
anyone using HF...those who still can, that is, before BPL comes
to their neighborhood. Nobody wants to discuss that. "Too
complicated" a couple of others in here thought.

Those would rather blabber about presidential politics and very
important events of the past...nothing of which pertains to ham
radio or even ham meat.

There's the matter of 18 (!) Petitions on some major makeovers
of Part 97 that are waiting for FCC come-back. The PCTA must
not dare talk about code testing anymore.

I think the comment period on docket 04-140 (minor restructuring
of Part 97) is over. Not much response there, sort of tepid at the
ECFS and nobody serving tea.

Some clowns in here want to rewrite history of 1955 on phonetic
alphabets. Crazy. Been done by NATO 49 years ago. Can't
call it that, though, has to be the ICAO phonetic alphabet.
Prolly cuz too many of those PCTA regulars didn't serve...but
they do like to fly around squawking when any NCTA happens by.

I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)

LHA / WMD

5261. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:05:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624000537.02583.00000410@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93325

```
>In article <1e4e3692.0406231517.64783fd@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040621174143.07368.00000266@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20040621104944.05916.00000401@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>> >>Date: 6/20/2004 5:19 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >>Message-id: <20040620181938.18863.00000463@mb-m02.aol.com>
>>>
>>> >> Nursie has made numerous general claims in here without
>>> >> presenting one bit of proof or names of persons who could
>>> >> verify his general claims.
>>> >
>>> > The Veterans Administration is NOT "proof enough" form you, Scummy
>>One?
>>>
>>> No. Copies from NARA of nursie's "jacket" would do it.
>>>
>>> >> "No Proof = Didn't Happen."
>>> >
>>> > The proof is in the phone call, Lennie.
>>> >
>>> > You haven't made it.
>>>
>>> Don't have to. Military records of service are at NARA, not with
>>> the VA. VA will use NARA.
>>>
>>> [National Archives and Records Administration, St.Louis]
>>>
>>> Complete information is at NARA. That would show the when
>>> and where of "hostile actions." That would show MOS and
>>> where served. It's all there.
>>>
>>> > Makes you look pretty stupid with that last claim.
>>>
>>> Not at all. I know where the military service records are kept.
>>> I also know what establishes and defines MARS, posted that
>>> in here. Nursie didn't post that. Nursie still wanna claim:
>>>
```

>>> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>>
>>> Nursie has mental constipation problems (in addition to other
>>> mental problems). Nursie need help.
>>>
>>> Temper fry...
>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>God only knows what he's told the VA to put in his medical records...
>>maybe that shoebox full of medals.

One of them might be an Air Medal.

Lots of that "air" around here from all that claiming...

"Claim chowder." Most of it fishy.

There's the Battle of Bunker Hill medal, a forgery. It says only
"Battle of Bunk" on it. He must wear that most of the time.

Altogether now to sing the Marines Him.

LHA / WMD

5262. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:05:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624000539.02583.00000411@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93326

>In article <1e4e3692.0406231530.4340c22f@posting.google.com>,
>billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040621174201.07368.00000276@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>> In article <d22b54c3.0406210522.5fb05e8d@posting.google.com>,
>>kelly@dvol.com
>>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>>
>>> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20040620215948.22498.00000352@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <d22b54c3.0406201523.117d8a16@posting.google.com>,
>>> kelly@dvol.com
>>> >> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
>>> >> >news:<20040619195806.07368.00000245@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>> >
>>> >> >> > and I mention that
>>> >> >> > the U.S. military quit using manual telegraphy for fixed-point
>>> >> >> > communications in 1948.
>>> >
>>> >> >> They did? Everywhere?
>>> >
>>> >> >> Or did they simply start phasing it out in 1948?
>>> >
>>> >> >> And what about non-fixed-point communications, such as between
>ships?
>>> >
>>> >> >And what about the CW courses still being taught at Fort
>>> >> >Huncha-something somewhere in the southwest? Ohyez, the feds still
>>> >> >have an abiding and ongoing interest in the use of CW.
>>> >>
>>> >> That's for intel intercept. Listening to others use it, and maybe some
>>> spoofing
>>> >> and such.
>>> >
>>> >Sure, they'd be grossly negligent if they didn't. I'll just bet that
>>> >Osama Baby has at least looked at CW for his purposes and that since
>>> >9/11 our guys have ramped up their volume of poking around for it. So
>>> >yes, the feds certainly do have an ongoing and abiding interest in the
>>> >use of CW, one-way for their purposes and/or otherwise.
>>>
>>> Kelly, unable to admit what is happening since his bear-shooting

>>> days as King of the Katapults, manufactures "knowing analyses"
>>> of terrorists.
>>
>>He be the intelligence failure...
>>
>>> Kelly the putz-caller seems to forget a well-publicized video bite
>>> of Osama bin Laden rather obviously using a hand-held transceiver
>>> in earlier days. No code key was evident in that video bite seen
>>> on major networks.
>>
>>Dammit! And I thought all the important guys carried cell phones.
>>
>>> Kelly has NO information on "ramping up" on-off keying codes by
>>> the U.S. government or anyone else. The Military Intelligence
>>> School at Fort Huachuca has been active for years. All U.S.
>>> government agencies involved in any way use that M.I. Center,
>>> including those few needing any sort of skills with on-off codings
>>> such as morse. That as an economic consideration, not any sort
>>> of technical reason or alleged "importance of morse."
>>>
>>> Reference: Fort Huachuca public affairs office.
>>
>>Nice. The Fort WhaChewKah PA Office had to spell it out for those
>>that are smitten by the myth. I can only imagine all of the telephone
>>calls and letters from all of the morseodists that couldn't believe
>>that morse code was not at the crux of modern communications for them
>>to have to put such a notice in their publications.
>>
>>> >> However, amateur radio isn't the military. We don't have the same
>>mission -
>>> or
>>> >> the same resources.
>>> >
>>> >Even if we did I wouldn't go anywhere near it.
>>>
>>> Why not?
>>>
>>> "Sorry Hans, MARS >> IS << amateur radio!" True or not true?
>>>
>>> From someone "shooting bears for naval intelligence" and bragging
>>> about "dining with the [aircraft carrier] captain," that sounds hollow.
>>
>>You know he has to remain silent on the "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<<
>>Amateur Radio" issue. Wouldn't be PCTA if he didn't.
>>
>>> >> >> > So, some olde-tyme hamme can say he "shot bears for navel
>>> >> >> > intelligence" and that be okay. Navel intel is fine as long as
>>> >> >> > person is for morse code.
>>>
>>> >> >> Do you mean the pictures taken by W3RV? Guess what - they're real.

>>Like
>>> it
>>> >> >> or
>>> >> >> not, civilian contractors do go out on US Navy ships. And they do
>see
>>-
>>> and
>>> >> >> photograph - some pretty unusual stuff.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Har, I forgot about that, you did see some of those shots I took
>>> >> >didn't ya?
>>> >>
>>> >> Yep. Some of them. Quite impressive, actually, both the photography and
>>the
>>> >> subject.
>>> >>
>>> >> >Geez that pile of old photos was a real trip back huh?
>>> >>
>>> >> Oyez.
>>> >>
>>> >> >Gotta love the way the Putz has twisted 'em into "Naval intel" BS.
>>> >>
>>> >> Bad pun of "navel" noted.
>>> >
>>> >Another example of the Putz in his seven-yer-old mode. Which he
>>> >consistently drops into when he can't find an adult comment to post.
>>>
>>> I have no problem being "adult" - even around children and the
>>> immature. :-)
>>>
>>> When I find some PCTA who are not children in here, I might alter
>>> posting style.
>>
>>Best of Luck.
>>
>>> >> >No
>>> >> >such thing, they were typical on-the-road personal unclassified
>>> >> >snapshots and I never claimed otherwise.
>>> >>
>>> >> That's true!
>>> >
>>> >Every time the Soviets buzzed a carrier it became a tourist event,
>>> >bloomin' hoot. Kodak could have made money with a flight deck photo
>>> >processing kiosk after those flybys.
>>>
>>> More "tales of the South Pacific?" :-)
>>
>>I hope it's a musical.
>>
>>> >> >I wasn't a contractor, I was a direct employee of the U.S. Department

>>> >> >of Defense and an offical civilian guest of the skipper while I was
>>> >> >aboard.
>>> >>
>>> >> Always nice to be friends with the guy in charge.
>>> >
>>> >Nah, it was just another bit of Naval tradition, DoD civilian
>>> >professionals were treated as officers and were expected to
>>> >reciprocate the courtesies received. I had to introduce myself to both
>>> >the skipper and the air boss and join them for dinner in officer's
>>> >mess on Friday evenings, etc. I knew nothing about any of it when I
>>> >logged aboard the first time. A crusty Chief Yeoman sat me down in his
>>> >office and went thru the list of what I had to do and not do.
>>>
>>> Good ol' crusty chiefs. :-)
>>>
>>> So, the dinner table talk was all about ham radio, morse, and
>>> establishing valid QSLs for DXCC? :-)
>>>
>>> Or did the talk involve ANY radio communications?
>>
>>Rubber Band Man. I just knew it would be a musical.
>>
>>> >> >The Putz never managed to be either, his types did my drudge
>>> >> >work for me for cheap. Steerage dwellers.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >> Of course such activities are also irrelevant to amateur radio
>>policy.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >End of.
>>> >> >
>>> >> roger that!
>>> >>
>>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> Another installment of "Tales of The South Pacific" by the ancient
>>> mariner-guest king of the katapults schmoosing with captains of
>>> aircraft carriers. Real involvement with amateur radio! Not...
>>>
>>> LHA / WMD
>>
>>Hey, how else could he earn his GI Bill?

He got a GI bill? Did he buy something from a GI?

A naval intelligence bear-shooter's camera?

:-)

LHA / WMD

5263. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:05:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624000540.02583.00000412@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93324

>In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>>> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
>>> >obvious.
>>>
>>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
>>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>>
>>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?

Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.

Say goodnight, Dave.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5264. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:09:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DA540F.1A180FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93328

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0406231512.46210506@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve
> >> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >> >> >Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
> >> >>
> >> >> >The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to demand
> >> >> >anything.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done)
> >evidence
> >> of
> >> >> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
> >> >>
> >> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
> >> >>
> >> >> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
> >> >
> >> >I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
> >> >four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.
> >>
> >> Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."
> >
> >He'll just have to laugh a long time. My wife was just reading where
> >parents of autistic children are often highly intelligent. So there
> >are downsides.
> >
> >> He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
> >> of having an intellect..

> >
> >I'm actually crying at his dearth of it.
> >
> >> >> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > You CAN'T comply.
> >> >>
> >> >> Yes, he can.
> >> >
> >> >Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
> >> >some shoebox full of unearned medals.
> >>
> >> He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)
> >
> >If it would help, but I'm not the one filing for a benefit. He'll
> >just have to have the right credentials, or its "no show."
> >
> >What's he always saying? "Sucks to be you?" Til he's got those
> >credentials...
> >
> >> >> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
> >> >> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?
> >> >
> >> >I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.
> >>
> >> Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
> >> wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...
> >
> >Whoo boy! Talk about perverse. Kelly has requested that I "bend
> >over" for him. While I don't want to judge what two consenting adults
> >want to do in private, I'm just not interested in taking that path.
> >
> >And now Steve wants to beat me up...
> >
> >There's a couple of Extra's we could use a break from.
> >
> >> >> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the claim
> >of
> >> >> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >> >
> >> >I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
> >> >Amateur Radio?"
> >> >
> >> >hi, hi.
> >>
> >> :-)
> >
> >I wonder when the TN State MARS Director learned that he had an idiot
> >for a volunteer?
> >

> >> >> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?
> >> >
> >> >He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
> >> >it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
> >> >the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.
> >> >
> >> Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.
> >> >
> >> Not much chance as it is...
> >
> >Lithium?
> >
> >> >> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
> >> character
> >> >> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
> >> >> >
> >> >> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
> >> >> >
> >> >> :-)
> >> >
> >> >Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
> >> >
> >> >;^)
> >> >
> >> >> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet of
> >> dirt
> >> >> >over their casket.
> >> >> >
> >> >> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
> >> >
> >> >"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"
> >> >
> >> Mark those words... :-)
> >
> >That was very Cutie.
> >
> >> >> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
> >> >> >>artery in his neck explodes.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
> >> Lennie
> >> >> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
> >> >> >
> >> >> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
> >> >
> >> >His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
> >> >
> >> >Hi, hi.

> >> >
> >> >Is that personality #4650.3?
> >>
> >> Battle of the Bulge, take 2...
> >
> >If he exhales before trying to zip up that flight suit...
> >
> >> >> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
> >> >
> >> >Off the scale on the spasometer, too.
> >>
> >> I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
> >> on it...
> >
> >Is that the seismo that's shown in the MoveOn.Org anti-Bush
> >commercial?
> >
> >> >> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
> >> >>
> >> >> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
> >> >> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >> >
> >> >He simply doesn't know what "is" is.
> >>
> >> That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.
> >
> >Good thing I didn't step in any.
> >
> >> >> > Keep up the good work!
> >> >>
> >> >> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
> >> >> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
> >> >
> >> >So they do!
> >>
> >> I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
> >> this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)
> >
> >You've exceeded Four point Oh.
> >
> >> "Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
> >> does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
> >> businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few
> >> days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
> >> neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >
> >I enjoy Four O'Clocks in the garden. It has nothing to do with

> >amateur radio policy. Sounds ripe for discussion.

There appears to have been another mishap in the Anderson home communications center.

Dave K8MN

5265. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:10:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DA5431.C6E5A302@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93329

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >>
> >> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> >> >obvious.
> >>
> >> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> >> with great technological learning capabilities.
> >>
> >Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> >
> >> Except to a few, such as nursie.
> >>
> >How would you know, Leonard? I think Steve enjoys amateur radio. I
> >know that Jim Miccolis and Brian Kelly enjoy amateur radio. I'm still
> >filled with enthusiasm for amateur radio. How are you enjoying all that
> >amateur radio has to offer?
> >
> >> Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
> >> amateur radio. Nursie only represent himself.
> >>
> >If Steve has an amateur radio license, he certainly represents at least
> >a part of amateur radio in the U.S. It is a cinch that you don't
> >represent amateur radio. You don't hold an amateur license.
> >
> >> Nursie is also
> >> obsessive-compulsive personality hater unable to control himself
> >> in here when opposed by anyone.
> >>
> >The name "Leonard" could easily be substituted above.
> >

> >> > Some Amateur made a fool out of you at some point in time (not that
> >THAT
> >> >is hard to do...) and you are determined to antagonize the rest of us as
> >long
> >> >as you can.
> >>
> >> I do not "antagonize the rest of 'you'" unless the "rest" are just
> >> alternate personalities of nursie.
> >>
> >> I DO antagonize the conservative traditionalists, the status-quoists
> >> who demand everything in a hobby conform to their personal
> >> desires.
> >
> >So anyone who holds a conservative view or who supports or respects
> >amateur radio's traditions becomes a target for your silliness.
> >
> >> I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
> >> familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
> >> means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.
> >
> >Thus anyone who doesn't agree with your views of how amateur radio
> >should be regulated becomes a control freak dictator. On the other
> >hand, we have you, a non-participant in amateur radio, who'd like to
> >tell us who should be able to become a radio amateur and what areas
> >should be tested. What descriptive term can you come up with for an
> >individual with your characteristics?
> >
> >> Living a life of fantasy is simply delusional. It serves no one, not
> >> even the fantasy believer.
> >
> >I tend to agree with you, Len. So what do we do about your fantasy that
> >you're somehow involved in amateur radio?
> >
> >> Every issue under discussion has many sides. One side, the one
> >> nursie believes, is NOT divinely ordained to be only the True one.
> >> Sad for nursie, but true.
> >
> >Not every issue has many sides, Len. Let's take the following as an
> >example: Leonard H. Anderson is not a participant in amateur radio.
> >That one seems divinely ordained as truth.
> >
> >> Nursie abhors opposition, wants to dominate, wants to win at all
> >> costs, wants to FIGHT.
> >
> >If we sub "Leonard" for "Nursie", we'd have a fairly accurate view of
> >your puerile behavior.
> >
> >> United States amateur radio is not a military organization whose
> >> purpose is to fight for the country.
> >

> >It matters not, Len. Whatever amateur radio is or is not, you have
> >nothing to do with it.
> >
> >
> >> ...by entering this newsgroup, EVERYONE enters an arena of
> >> outraged PCTAs busy trying to preserve the honor and glory of
> >> a soon-to-be DEFUNCT communications mode. It is a FIGHT
> >> arena inhabited by punch-drunk olde-fahrts thinking they are
> >> all Rocky running up the museum steps to stirring music. :-)
> >
> >And there we have it, your view of the situation. As the oldest fart
> >present and, to my knowledge, the only non-radio amateur, you'd best go
> >into training. You might want to start with some Mantovani and work
> >your way up to the stirring music.
> >
> >
> >> Nursie want to be center of attention. Ego drive. Uses all
> >> palaver in here to divert from real debate he cannot handle, will
> >> not handle if it is against his own precious opinions.
> >
> >Seems to me that the above is quite descriptive of your actions, Len.
> >
> >> Amateur radio is not golf.
> >
> >> Amateur radio doesn't have the balls for it. :-)
> >
> >
> >Apparently, neither do you.
> >
> >> > The difference here, Lennie, is that I have experience in Amateur
> >Radio.
> >>
> >> ...and a very large fantasy in addition to pretty certificates (suitable
> >> for framing).
> >>
> >> FCC not require staff or commissioners to be radio amateurs in
> >> order to regulate amateur radio in USA.
> >
> >As has been pointed out to you on numerous occasions, FCC staffers and
> >commissioners are paid to regulate amateur radio. You don't regulate
> >amateur radio. You aren't an FCC staffer or commissioner. You aren't a
> >participant in amateur radio.

I guess you told me, Len.

Dave K8MN

5266. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 04:14:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93330

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>(Steve
> >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>>
> >>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >>> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >>
> >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> >>> >obvious.
> >>>
> >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> >>
> >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>
> Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.

It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.

If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
is....
or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...

You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

5267. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 07:50:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624035009.29831.00000518@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93331

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/23/2004 2:58 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406231158.7a60301c@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...

>> And President Bush is not the first to suggest that some scientific
>> breakthrough was close at hand. Billary made an announcement that there
>was a
>> breakthrough in AIDS research that was about to revolutionalize the care
>> delivered to those victims.
>
>One mistake doesn't justify another. And as terrible as AIDS is, we
>are not dependent on foreign imports in order to deliver care to AIDS
>patients.

Oh?

Do you know where much of the "unapproved" but wide used and effeective
drugs for AIDS treatment come from,. Jim?

There's a major influx of theraputics from "illegal" sources" that are
getting to folks...Not that it's a bad thing since most of them are
working...That's why there's been a big move on FDA to loosen it's standards on
AIDS treatments.

Afterall...what can they do? Kill them?

>> >Still, it sounds nice, makes for great photo ops and is a pleasant PopSci
>> >diversion from the reality that the US imports way too much oil, and pays
>way
>> >too much for it in the process. That payment isn't just in dollars per
>> >barrel.
>>
>> Agreed. But as long as we insist on not harvesting OUR reserves yet
>are
>> willing to let the Arabs suck themselves dry, what are we to do.
>
>First off, our reserves are not that large. Nor are they easy or
>inexpensive to reach. Look up how much oil we'd get if we allowed
>unrestricted drilling in Alaska. It's not nearly enough for us to tell
>OPEC to stuff it.

Jim, there are a LOT of things that are not that easy to get to, nor are they that "Inexpensive" to harvest...UNLESS we just bite the bone and spend the money on the new infrastructure.

Imagine where we'd be in space travel if we'd continued our push out in the 70's and 80's, instead of still debating it in the 21st Century...

Imagine where we might be as far as our own oil reserves might be if we weren't so preoccupied with what it would "cost"...?!?!

>What needs to be done is simply to become more efficient and wiser in
>our energy use. But that's a complex set of problems that requires
>discipline and longterm investment.

I agree.

I am the first one to support greater mass transit and re-invigorating our railroads in support of this...I'd gladly spend my morning commute to work reading the paper and sipping coffee rather than dodging Granny and worrying about how wet the roads are.

Now if we can get the other 299,999,999 Americans to do the same. But do you think the lobbyists in Detroit, Tokyo and Bonn will go along...?!?!

>> This isn't news. This "crisis" has been in the wings for decades.
>People
>> a lot wiser than you or I have been promising this was coming, and they
>were
>> right.
>
>Yet our leaders since then simply ignore it. That's one reason Reagan
>was so popular - he told us it was OK to have big fast cars, consume,
>and not worry about where it all came from.

Our leaders are not "ignoring" it, Jim.

They are mirrors of thier consituencies. And the lobbys are spending billions of dollars to tell everyone to buy more cars and trucks...And they are doing it.

>> I se this on the same par with the "drought" in the SW United States.
>To
>> whom is it a "surprise" that we are millions of acre-feet short of the
>needed
>> water supplies out there?
>>
>> The proponents of desalianation were hushed up by politicos 20 years
>ago
>> who insisted that present infrastructure would support SW US needs well
>into
>> the 21st Century.
>
>Well, it's the 21st century now...
>

>The problem is technological disconnect. Too many people just don't
>think about what keeps everything running, or what it really costs.
>And the political leadership keeps them insulated from it.
>
>For example, it is much more safe, clean and efficient to travel by
>modern electric railways like France's TGV than by air or car. For
>distances up to several hundred miles it's actually faster. But
>building such systems costs time and money, plus a commitment from
>govt. that just isn't there. (Amtrak's entire capital budget would
>build a few new runways at a major airport).
>
>Or another example: There *used to be* considerable tax credits for
>installing energy saving equipment in your home. Replace the old HVAC
>with more efficient hardware, insulate, replace the windows, etc., and
>document it, and the IRS gave you a break. That was in Carter's time.
>Reagan's "get the government off your back" tax simplification dumped
>it.
>
>> >>>And
>> >>>that we'll have permanent moon colonies and manned missions to Mars in
>the
>> >>>"near future". No mention of how it will be paid for, or what real
>benefits
>> >>>will accrue. Heck, there isn't even a commitment to save the Hubble
>space
>> >>>telescope or replace the shuttle.
>> >>
>> >> Again...all of this "forecasted" in the 50's and 60's.
>> >
>> >And it hasn't happened because of the enormous cost and dubious benefits.
>But
>> >now Bush talks about it like we should make it a national priority.
>>
>> And why shouldn't we?
>
>Because it's simply not worth what it will cost to do it.

Oh?

>For example, consider the fact that it is estimated to cost $26,000
>per pound to deliver freight to the moon. That's based on mass
>production of next-generation rockets specifically designed to do the
>job. Maybe that price can be shaved a bit, but it is fundamentally
>governed by the physics of the situation.

You're assuming that all we are going to do is go up there and look back
at Eart and play moongolf.

>Now figure how many *tons* of equipment and supplies need to be
>shipped to the moon in order to set up a permanent base.

And it get's MORE expensive to send that stuff up every day.

>Remember that
>the temperature on the lunar surface varies more than 400 degrees from
>day to night, and that each is 2 weeks long. Also remember that the
>moon has no significant magnetic field or atmosphere, so there is
>absolutely no protection from any of the various forms of solar and
>cosmic radiation that constantly bombard it. Satellites in low earth
>orbit are afforded some protection by the earth's magnetic field, and
>if things get really bad humans in orbit can get back to the earth's
>surface in minutes. The moon is a totally different story.

We already have the technology to build adequate shelter for them.

And as crass as it may sound, more Americans are killed in automobile accidents every MONTH than have been killed in the space program since it's INCEPTION.

In the tri-county area of Southern Tennessee where I live alone, we've had enough fatal MVA's since June 1st to staff ISS for the next couple of years.

>How many tons of equipment would it take to establish a permanent moon
>colony of any size? How many pounds of supplies per year to keep it
>stocked?

So we sit around and say "what if" until the sun goes nova?

As for what it "costs", Jim, what about it's rewards? The advancement of computing technology alone, spurred on by technological developments in the space program, have moved you and I, the little guys" ahead quantum leaps.

>Or look at how much even the scaled-down ISS has cost so far - and
>it's only in earth orbit.

And think of what it could accomplish if we'd quit trying to do band-aid financing of the programs...?!?! Medical research alone could pay for the thing in less than a decade.

But I guess we'll just sit around and pout about how much it costs "today"...

73

Steve, K4YZ

5268. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 08:08:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93332

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is "civilian"
>and
>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of it.
>
> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?

Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us, Lennie.

FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and Regulations.

CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department of
Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the United
States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.

The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are not
authorized either.

These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply to all
other federal entities also.

> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.

Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to operate
in Air Force MARS, Lennie.

> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>
> :-)
>
> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.

No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
operational knowledge.

Putz..

Steve, K4YZ

5269. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 08:47:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624044740.29831.00000520@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93333

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000585@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
>>obvious.
>
> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> with great technological learning capabilities.
>
> Except to a few, such as nursie.

I have enjoyed Amateur Radio since 1972, Lennie.

It has been a great tool, a source of recreation, and a social gathering
place.

And as of today, youa re still not a part of it, save for being a
sidelined scufflaw.

> Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
> amateur radio.

Sure I do...At least 1/675,000 part of it.

Which is 1/675,000 more than you are.

I dare say that judging by many of the other responses in this forum, than
some of my opinions are also held by others.

Google refers.

> I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
> familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
> means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.

There is only one "control freak" here, Lennie.

You see him in the mirror every morning.

>> Here's MY "purpose"...It's a proven fact that those who bark the
>loudest
>>or longest are usually the one's who get the most attention.

>
> Nursie just wanna FIGHT. Nursie FIGHT anyone who have opposite
> opinions of nursie's.
>
> Bark, bark, bark, little nursie.

Seems I'm the little doggie that got ahold of YOU, Lennie!

Sucks to be you.

> There is nothing at all "discrediting" about showing FANTASIES
> to be fantasies of the imagination.

The only fantasy in this forum, Lennie, is that you are a person of
respectable character, or that you are making some sort of "constructive"
participation in it.

> Education in the radio arts is not accomplished by pretending that
> amateur radio is some paramilitary service organization or that
> memorizing the advertisements and radio reviews in QST is
> "learning" what happens behind the front panels...or that amateur
> radio "always comes to the rescue during emergencies when all
> the other radio infrastructure 'fails.'"

You are the one with such fantasies, Lennie.

You are the one who makes denigrating comments about parallels between the
Armed Forces and Amateur Radio. And no one here has said "...amateur radio
'always comes to the rescue' ..."'

The FACTS are that Amateur Radio DOES "come to the rescue" in a great many
instances, and it CONTINUES to do so in the 21st Century, cellular and Internet
technology notwithsatnding.

>> As long as you deem it your "purpose" to do so, I will do MY best to
>>expose you for the antagonist and mistruthful putz that you are.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie back into name-calling mode, trying to "win"
> newsgrope arguments by some kind of "show of force."

It's no "show of force".

It's the truth.

> Amateur radio regulations were established by people, not gods
> or chiefs of stuff of some paramilitary organization. Regulations,
> standards and procedures all evolved, changed with time. That
> will continue to change as time goes on. There is NO divine
> purpose to stop change.

Yes, those regulations were established by "people"...

People who have a vested, practical experience in the radio service they
are a PART of...

It was true in 1912...it's true in 2004...

Except for you.

Go figure.

> Change is opposed by those who managed to meet OLD
> standards and procedures of long ago. They cannot, will not
> adjust. They fear change. Change manifests insecurity for
> them. Or, they are so ego-driven that they fantasize their
> individual accomplishments as so mighty and noble that they
> think of themselves as role-models for all.

A rant of monumental proportion, put to rest by any one who cares to
review any of the posts made by any of those persons you refer to as "PCTA's",
myself included.

>> You were offered SEVERAL apologies and offers to move on, but your
>answers
>>were clearly designed to simply perpetuate an argument.
>
> No. Not on record.

Yes, on record.

In Google and Deja before it...

> Nursie has not admitted that either of his
> statements about MARS being amateur radio are wrong, nor has
> he/she ever admitted to reading any of the military documents
> defining and explaining MARS...nor has nursie identified any
> part of Title 47 C.F.R. defining MARS as a civilian radio service.

I have read many of those records, Lennie.

None of them dispute my assertion of No Amateur Radio = No MARS.

Recent posts by others here validate the activites of those
MARS-authorized Amateurs in federal communications exercises.

> Nursie has never revealed the when and where of any claimed
> military "hostile action" yet demands full and complete disclosure
> of all others...for any claim. Nursie be a hypocrite.

So far, my unweillingness to disclose whena nd where I was involved in
hostile contact is your ONLY argument, Lennie.

So far, that means you are about 30-1 behind on unansweed questions.

> Nursie continually insults others' private and professional lives
> clearly designed to induce word FIGHTING and then tries to
> say "others did it first!" Nursie be an insulter and hypocrite.

It's not an insult if it's true.

> Nursie want to be center of attention. Ego drive. Uses all
> palaver in here to divert from real debate he cannot handle, will

> not handle if it is against his own precious opinions.
>
>> You have nothing to offer.
>
> Nursie make imperious demand.

It was not a demand. It was an observation. So far, one you've not been
able to disprove.

> Just the same, I was on the staff of Ham Radio magazine after
> being an author-contributor.

Yes...you were...

A magazine that is now defunct due to a lack of readership and
circulation.

So much for your editorial and leadership skills, Lennie.

> At the mention of that, nursie will go immediately into ATTACK
> mode, all safeties off, insulting all the staff of HR for being a
> "defunct" publication...even after 22 years of existance as a
> self-sustaining independent periodical for radio amateurs.

I am not "attacking" the staff at HR, Lennie.

Just you.

I am sure Jim Fisk and the other folks were

> Nursie will then change gears and say I cribbed all information
> ("cut and paste" in his words) and had "none of my own."
> Nursie not understand any of the articles, too much intellect
> for him, therefore author become "enemy of state" to be
> destroyed (by any means possible). Poor nursie.

Poor Lennie.

There's no facts to substantiate any of your CLAIMS about them, either.

> Nursie think amateur radio all about manual telegraphy or code
> testing? Not so. Elimination of code test is my main concern.
> That is happening. Very slowly but it is happening. First break
> in mighty Amateur damn was in 1990.

Yep. And it happened WITHOUT Lennie. Sunnuvagun!

> Small trickle of no-coders
> entered ham radio in 1991, are now the largest class group in
> U.S. amateur radio.

"Small"...?!?!

>> I already acknowledged the enabling directives of MARS.
>
> And how was that done? Must have been by private courier or

> other means "obscuring the information."

No blinder are those who will NOT see.....

> If amateur radio goes away, MARS can remain. All that is
> required of DoD is then to update Directive 4650.2.

Sure it can.

Just like there are Jim Crow laws on the books in many southern states.

And until the Department of Defense decides that MARS needs to be staffed
to a level that would make it operationally viable WITHOUT all those Amateur
Radio volunteers, my assertion that NO Amateur Radio = No MARS is accurate.

> No. If anything nasty be said about me, it is because I keep on
> opposing fantasies blabbered by nursie.

Anything that is said about you is in response to what YOU have said.

Afterall, this exchange wouldn't be possible without you, Lennie. You ARE
your own worse enemy.

>> MARS, without the thousands of volunteer Amateurs who man it, would not
>be
>>able to carry out those duties those directives require. Period.
>
> MARS has done well WITHOUT those volunteers in exercise
> Grecian Firebolt 2002. They are still doing so in 2004.
>
> Sunnuvagun! How about that?

Sunnuvagun...how about all the resports of MARS stations participating
being MOSTLY from "individual" stations...?!?!

You need to participate in forums other than this one, Lennie.

>>Only a major
>>manpower restructuring in the Armed Forces would allow it, and under present
>>circumstances, that is highly unlikely.
>
> Okay, Chief of Stuff, explain THAT gem?
>
> The U.S. military has a very large communications organization
> that is done by military personnel. Doesn't involve MARS at all.
> Does all the tactical and strategic communications for the military.
> Very big. Army Signal Center is at Fort Gordon, GA.

Nice try for a change of tangent, Lennie.

We are not discussing operational military traffic, Lennie.

We are discussing MARS. Not ADA, AIR, WAR, SINCGARS, or equipment
nomenclature...Just the MARS program.

I'd suggest you try and stay focused, but you can't and keep an "edge" in the arguments.

> MARS can go away today and not impact any missions of the
> U.S. military.

Yep....I never said anything else.

>> And I don't need to "intellectualize" anything.
>
> You don't seem to be able to do that. All the readers see is you
> personally insulting others who differ with your godlike opinions.

"Godlike"...?!?!

You are not an Amateur Radio licensee. You never have been.

You've made countless assertions and "observations" to and about Amateur Radio, most of which have been easily rebuked by fact, and certainly NOT substantiated by any fact from you.

(Shall we once again revisit YOUR assertions of "dishonesty" by ARRL officials...?!?!)

> Everyone with opposite opinions LIES!

Nope.

> Nursie = nuts.

Still waiting on you to provide those documents that will demonstrate your qualifications in mental health education or training, Lennie.

Until then...You're still a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

5270. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 08:49:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624044958.29831.00000521@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93334

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>Date: 6/24/2004 3:08 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>

> The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
>services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
>conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
>Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
>inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are not
>authorized either.

Excuse me...

"Opertational" and "interoperabiltiy".

Steve, K4YZ

5271. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 09:39:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624053903.09069.00000327@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93336

In article <inqCc.97686$Sw.5617@attbi_s51>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> Well I hope to be participating in our club's Field Day activities but
>> it's
>> iffy at this point. It depends on when my doctor schedules my surgery,
>> which I won't find out until Thursday. If he picks Friday, well there
>> goes
>> Field Day weekend.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>The best there Dee .....I'll put a good word in for you tonight ....
>
>God Bless .....
>
That goes for me too, Dee.

Get Well Soon

73 de Jim, N2EY.

5272. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 09:39:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624053903.09069.00000326@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93337

In article <sLednYTQc849uEfdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Sure. Point is, though, that by setting the number at 400, we don't have
>the
>> problem of having to shut the GOTA station down because the quota has been
>> reached.
>
> Well true, but in that vein of thought, we might as well not have a
>limit at all.

If we didn't, it becomes like another station only without being put in the
totals.
>
> FWIW, I don't mind limits on the GOTA station, mainly because I'm the
>control op for our club. I sit with the newbies and hams getting back
>into the fold all day, and then after the station closes down, I can
>kick in the afterburners on the night shift. I've made good friends
>working the overnight. (yeah, us crazies gotta stick together!)
>
Oyez!First time I did that was...1968?

>>>>The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
>>>>It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
>>>>same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
>>>>same band....
>>>
>>> Yup. I would highly suggest a 5F group try to put up a Beverage antenna

>>>as their common receive antenna, and get it as far away as the FD rules
>>>allow 1000 foot circle that all the equipment has to be in. Don't know
>>>if that EOC center will accommodate that or not.
>>>
>>
>> Why a Beverage? It receives well in one direction only, but in most of the
>> USA you need more than one direction.
>
> When you use a multiple wavelength Beverage the directivity isn't quite

>as bad. (or good - depending on what you are trying to achieve) I don't
>recall the length of ours, but it was at least 2 wavelengths on 80 meters.

2 wavelenghts on 80 is over 500 feet...
>
> In any event, it quieted the interference between the rigs, and I don't

>recall any significant losses to the east of us, since we still heard
>the stations in that direction.

Thye physical separation alone may have been the trick.

Seems to me the optimum setup for a multi is to put the stations on the rim of a circle and the generator in the center. Adjacent stations are on widely different bands and modes. Antennas are just inside the 1000 foot line.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

5273. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 09:39:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624053904.09069.00000328@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93335

In article <40DA540F.1A180FD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>There appears to have been another mishap in the Anderson home
>communications center.
>
To quote from the "Star Wars" movies:

"It's a trap!"

73 de Jim, N2EY

also see:

http://www.fark.com

5274. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 11:16:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624071653.17843.00000359@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93339

In article <20040623154009.23112.00000588@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <40D9A852.2050109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>>> And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to sell
>it
>as
>>> a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The
>>> administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of the
>>> '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying
>to
>tie
>>> it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those
>who
>>> oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'
>>
>>> Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!
>
> Not complicated at all.

It's too complicated for the politiicans and regulators.
>
> BPL will be the demise of low-level-signal HF communications in
> urban areas.

FCC and NTIA say differently

> Kiss off any thoughts of signal-to-noise ratios
> required in modern receivers. All that advanced technology will
> go to waste. Hams can go back to using one-tube regenerative
> receivers, those being as "low-signal-level" as any other in an
> RF cesspool of noise on HF.

Never used a regenerative receiver, have you, Len? That's obvious from your
statement. A good one is as sensitive as a modern superhet on HF.
>
> If BPL makes inroads as a legacy system, it will be very difficult
> to remove, let alone stop.

The Iowa case will set a precedent.
>
> BPL system companies will make money, the whole purpose of
> that kind of thing.

Maybe. Or maybe not - many technologies that were highly touted never made a dime and faded away. How many billions were lost on the Iridium system?

> The rest of the HF communications world can
> go away. Simple. A no-brainer.

President Bush and Commissioner Powell say it's not a problem. NTIA says BPL can reduce line noise. A lot of "professionals" say we amateurs don't know what we're talking about. Folks like ARRL have produced voluminuous documentation and measurements of what BPL interference is like, yet that has not been convincing to FCC.

How does anyone argue against that?
>
> Michael Powell will have made his small mark on history, unable
> to complete his military career or emulate his father much.

You mean his father who presented evidence before the UN that turned out not to be very accurate? He didn't want to, but his boss insisted. Same thing is going on with BPL. Shrub wants *anything* that looks good in the techno-world. And he's goit highly paid *professionals* telling him BPL and HF radio can coexist peacefully.

So what else can be done? Thousands of hams and others saying "BPL is bad" hasn't stopped it. FCC doesn't have to go with the majority, or even interpret its own rules the same way all the time.

devil's advocate mode = ON

Besides, Len, who really uses HF radio much anymore? The important military stuff all goes by satellite, right? You don't see the Pentagon making trouble about BPL. Ships use GMDRSS and EPIRB and satellites and such. SWBC is being replaced by satellites and netcasting. All that's really left on HF are hams, cbs, freebanders and some backup systems. HF is unreliable at best and useless at worst. It's slow, error prone and inadequate for things like streaming video and broadband connectivity. The few services still using it are "living in the past", aren't they?

Besides, why are *you* upset, Len? You're not a ham.

5275. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 11:16:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624071654.17843.00000360@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 93338

In article <40D9A91B.7040201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>> In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>> k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
>>> the Librarian) writes:
>>
>>
>> <snippage>
>>
>>
>>>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>>> decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...
>>
>>
>> Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time
>> here, Len.
>>
>> If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
>> policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
>> historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
>> the consequences of that action.

>> I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.

> Nobody have it yet? Jim, you're usually good at this sort of thing.
>
I thought I'd let others have a crack at it.

August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.

Guess who was president.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

5276. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 12:22:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406240422.18bbb4cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93340

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > >writes:
> > >
> > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > >>>
> > >>> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > >>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >>> >Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> > >>> >Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >
> > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> > >>> >obvious.
> > >>>
> > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> > >>
> > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> > >
> > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
> >
> It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>
> If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> is....
> or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>
> You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>
> Dave K8MN

Interesting. I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
ham to become a ham. Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
dogs that you are, telling me of acts of heroism how you got the book

and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a ham. No sir! No help from no one.

So Len could tell the kid to get a book. Which according to your comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.

You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and jiving.

Best of Luck.

5277. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 13:31:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406240531.d2df4a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93341

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>
> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.

(to send people to the moon)

> We barely had the
> technology to get to the moon in the 70s.

Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
about a decade earlier.
>
> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
> happen in the wake of war.

Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most". In many cases those
"jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
peacetime. Or they're the result of government programs that are done
to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.

In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>
> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
> based on the Apollo program alone.

Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.

No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
to be reinvented.
>
> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask WHERE
> in space are you going to spend that money?

We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
here. And address problems long-term.

>
> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
> technical advencement.

Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"

Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of government spending".

It was in the Nixon/Ford years that the big NASA cutbacks took place. Too much money, they said. There was supposed to be an Apollo 18 lunar mission - it was cut and the Saturn V for it became a museum piece. Literally.

All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure. The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown verifies the reliability analysis.

The reason the USA made the big space commitments was because JFK and LBJ (guess what party) pushed for them. They were essentially done to compete with the Soviets for the "high ground" of space. Recall that practically all of the important early space firsts (first earth satellite, first animal in space, first human in space and in orbit, first woman in space, first mission to another heavenly body, first pictures of the far side of the Moon...) were done by the Soviet Union. And most of their early accomplishments were complete surprises in the West. The USA played catch-up for years. JFK and LBJ knew that if the Rooskies could orbit a man and bring him back safely, doing the same with a nuclear weapon would be a piece of cake for them.

Today there is no such need or competition.

The cost was staggering but they had the political clout to do it. They could sell it to everyone on the national security agenda. And it didn't hurt that a lot of the money was spent in states like LBJ's own Texas. (Why is the control center for manned flights in Houston when the launch facility is in Florida?)

Billions were spent on the space program in the '60s but when Americans needed quality fuel-efficient cars in the '70s they had to go to Germany and Japan for them.

> I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
> a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.

As exciting as that effort is, all of it was done more than 35 years ago with the X-15.

And it was done without government funding. So why do we need NASA for manned flights at all? Let the private folks do it on a self-funded basis.

> So why not Mars?

Because the cost and risk is simply too much for the benefits. Do you have any idea what a mission to Mars would require in terms of how big and complex the ship(s) would have to be, how long they'd be gone, and how completely on their own they would be?

Mars is orders of magnitude more difficult than the moon. Apollo missions were no more than two weeks, Mars missions would be over a year long. The Martian surface is in some ways more hostile than the lunar surface and the landing physics much more difficult (Martian gravity is stronger). Look how many unmanned Mars missions have failed completely.

Heck, figure out radio propagation delay to Mars....

What benefits would a manned mission to Mars give that could not be had any other way?

And how much all of it would cost?

> Why not research stations on the Moon?

How much are *you* willing to pay for them in tax dollars? That's really the bottom line. People are all for space exploration and such until the bills for it show up.

> Unless you want
> to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
> conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?

Simple: The costs outweigh the benefits. There are easier, cheaper, faster ways to get the benefits and solve the problems we have on earth.

Space and war may help with some things but they are horribly inefficient means of progress.

None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5278. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 13:35:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624093559.19398.00000481@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 93342

```
>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/24/2004 7:22 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406240422.18bbb4cf@posting.google.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >writes:
>> > >
>> > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >>>
>> > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> > >>>
>> > >>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > >>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > >>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>> > >>> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>> > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's
>blatantly
>> > >>> >obvious.
>> > >>>
>> > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
>> > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>> > >>
>> > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>> >
>> > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
>> > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
>>
>> It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>>
>> If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
>> be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
>> can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
>> able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
>> is....
```

>> or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>>
>> You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Interesting. I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
>ham to become a ham. Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
>dogs that you are, telling me of acts of heroism how you got the book
>and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
>ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>
>So Len could tell the kid to get a book. Which according to your
>comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
>to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>
>You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
>down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
>contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
>jiving.
>
>Best of Luck.

The POINT, Your Junior Putziness, is that Lennie doesn't HAVE the
experience to help the kid OTHER than the theory part.

He can't help with testing, other than to refer him to someone else.

He can't help with the Code (should "the kid" desire to learn it), other
than to refer him to someone else.

He can't help with tutoring "the kid" on proper Amateur Radio operating
technique, other than to refer him to someone else.

He can't help with...well....I can go on and on....

It's NOT about working "both ends against the middle".

It's about what contributions Lennie has alledgedly made to Amateur Radio.

Easily summated, it's ZERO. His only "professional" affiliation with
Amateur Radio went belly-up a long time ago. Furthermore there's not a single
reference, footnote or other attribution of an LHA-authored HR article in ANY
technical text outside of that defunct magazine, and even then, that's 20+ year
old information.

As you can see, no luck was needed...just facts.

Steve, K4YZ

5279. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 13:39:30 UTC
From: Kim <mail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <mQACc.8449$5O5.5006@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 93343

'X-No-archive: yes'
"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:inqCc.97686$Sw.5617@attbi_s51...
>
>
> > Well I hope to be participating in our club's Field Day activities but
> it's
> > iffy at this point. It depends on when my doctor schedules my surgery,
> > which I won't find out until Thursday. If he picks Friday, well there
> goes
> > Field Day weekend.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> The best there Dee .....I'll put a good word in for you tonight ....
>
> God Bless .....
>
> Tom KI3R
>
>
>

Haven't been here much, Dee and I'm sure I missed anything about what's going on. Hope all's well, will be well, and that you'll have a speedy recovery!

Kim W5TIT

5280. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 15:01:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93344

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > >writes:
> > > >
> > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >>>
> > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve
> > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > > >>>
> > > >>> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > >>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > >>> >Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >>> >Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> > >
> > > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> > > >>> >obvious.
> > > >>>
> > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> > > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> > > >>
> > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> > > >
> > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
> > >
> > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
> >
> > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> > is....
> > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
> >
> > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Interesting.

I think so.

> I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
> ham to become a ham.

I don't recall that.

> Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
> dogs that you are...

Which "you guys" would that be?

> ...telling me of acts of heroism...

Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.

> how you got the book
> and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
> ham. No sir! No help from no one.

Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a stelly-eyed examiner. K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse to increase my speed.

> So Len could tell the kid to get a book.

Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn Lenhorn pontifications.

> Which according to your
> comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
> to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.

A book can provide information to an extent. No good golfer became one by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book. No good radio op became one by reading a book. Practice and experience are the keys. Len has neither.

> You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
> down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
> contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
> jiving.

I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you don't fully understand them.

"You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind blows"

Dave K8MN

5281. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 15:04:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93345

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)

That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.

Dave K8MN

5282. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 15:11:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93346

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>

> Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
> only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
> been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
> a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
> visual or audible means,

Why does it always have to be about you, Len? Radio amateurs are free
to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
of venues. Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
"larger world of radio". If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.

Dave K8MN

5283. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 15:11:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40DAEF20.3030105@psu.edu>
Source record: 93347

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40D9A91B.7040201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
>>>>the Librarian) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>><snippage>
>>>
>>>
>>>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>>>decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...
>>>
>>>
>>> Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time
>>>here, Len.
>>>
>>> If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
>>>policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
>>>historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
>>>the consequences of that action.
>>
>
>
>>> I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.
>>
>
>> Nobody have it yet? Jim, you're usually good at this sort of thing.
>>
>
> I thought I'd let others have a crack at it.
>
> August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.

>
> Guess who was president.....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Good guess, but not quite. We were moving away from the Gold Standard at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level - something considered intolerable.

We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.

The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal conservative!

Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?

- Mike KB3EIA -

5284. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 16:13:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10dm0bg23r0fu19@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93348

Shoot.... the power line noise around here is horrendous !!! AM broadcast radio is spotty at best when driving around and that includes stations that are actually close (25 miles or less) and the intereference makes listening to talk radio almost impossible unless you find that "magic spot" to park and listen. What really burns my bum is that one of the stations I DO like is WJR!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I can only imagine what might happen if BPL happens here.....

Ryan KC8PMX

> It's not that BPL will reduce power line noise but rather that the
companies
> must reduce the noise to get BPL to work!!
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

5285. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 16:20:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93349

Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands. Decided to run on my own as a matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner. Field day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.

Not sure which classification I will be running yet, but will be using 3 transmitters, on battery power, occasionally charged by a vehicle's electrical system, but the batteries won't be located in the vehicle. And I will be operating from our fire department's parking lot of which I am a member of.

Now, would I be a B, C, or F station, and also, does the number mean persons or transmitters?? I am thinking if it means number of transmitters, I might be a 3B, 3C, or 3F possibly..... If it means persons, then I might be a 1B, 1C, or 1F station..... Any suggestions? A little confused with the field day rules.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
>
> I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
> Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
> (CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
> demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
> it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.
>
> Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
> the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.
>
> Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.
>
> 73 DE John D. Kasupski
> Tonawanda, New York, USA
> Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
> Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN
>

5286. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 16:20:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10dm0bgod57kr1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93400

Happy Anniversary Kim!

Ryan KC8PMX

"Kim" <mail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:yYQBc.7911$oK.636@newssvr24.news.prodigy.com...
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
> Plans, yes. But not related to Field Day; My husband and I will be
> celebrating our 15th Wedding Anniversary with a housewarming and renewal
of
> vows!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> "Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
> news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
> >
> > Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?
> >
> > I'll be on the air with the Amateur Radio Association of the
> > Tonawandas as one of the W2SEX ops. We'll be running four stations
> > (CW, HF Phone, HF Digital, and VHF/UHF) plus doing SSTV, ATV, and APRS
> > demo modes, and we may also satellite contacts through SaudiSat I if
> > it makes a pass at a good time and we fall into its footprint.
> >
> > Here's hoping we get to work some of you or your clubs' stations over
> > the weekend. 73 and good luck during Field Day.
> >
> > Needless to say, I'll be absent from the NG over the weekend.
> >
> > 73 DE John D. Kasupski
> > Tonawanda, New York, USA
> > Amateur Radio (KC2HMZ), HF/VHF/UHF Monitoring (KNY2VS)
> > Member ARATS, ARES, RACES, WUN
> >
>
>

5287. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 17:10:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93401

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>>> Clinton and his bunch tried to make the economy look good with smoke
> and
> >>>>mirrors, and as soon as he was no longer in office and able to hold the
> >>>>mirrors
> >>>>up, the true nature of his economics became apparent.
> >>>
> >>>How? The stock market was up, unemplyment and inflation were low, and the
> >>>expansion kept going on and on. Ken Lay wasn't one of Clinton's buddies.
> Nor
> >>>was Halliburton.
> >>
> >> HOW...!?!?
> >
> >Yes, how did he try to make it look better than it was?
>
> Jim, you really are kidding me, right?

No, I want to know.

The president can't fudge the Dow, can he? He can't fudge unemployment
numbers.

He may be able to exert some influence on the Fed on interest rates.

> >> Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that (then)
> >>recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of
> "...America's
> >>confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".
> >
> >The rooster taking credit for the dawn. That's not using smoke and mirrors to
> >make things look better than they are.
>
> Taking credit for something you didn't so is exactly that, Jim. He lied.

That's NOT "using smoke and mirrors to make things look better than
they are". It's "the rooster taking credit for the dawn".

Two very different things.
>
> >>Never mind that the NYSE had been on a steady upward trend for the
> >>previous 12 months.
> >
> >Of course. Still, what was the Dow the day Clinton took office? What was it
> >the day he left?
>
> What was it 90 days AFTER he left...?!?!

I dunno. Point is, for his 8 years...8 *years*... in office, the trend
was up up up.

> >> The NYSE and all economic indicators are up now.
> >
> >Still down from their peaks.
>
> And the history of the NYSE has always been straight up...?!?!

In the long term, yes.

> >> This "recession" suddenly appeared when Billary was no longer in office
> >>and no longer able to keep up the charade.
> >
> >What "charade"? How can the President fudge numbers like the NYSE?
>
> He can artificially support the economy with promises of large tax
> reserves.

How is that artificial? If there's a budget surplus, tax rates can be
lowered *and* the debt reduced, thereby helping the economy.

Was the budget surplus real or faked?
>
> >>>> Bush Jr, just like his dad and President Reagan before him, have
> >>>>publically stated that economic recovery, if it is to remain viable, is a
> >>>>slow
> >>>>and steady process. They were right.
> >>>
> >>>And the good jobs keep getting exported. Ross Perot was right about that
> >>>"giant
> >>>sucking sound".
> >>
> >> Until you and I (those "We The People" folks...) demand that the laws
> be
> >>changed, they can legally do it.
> >
> >Until Big Business steps in and says no.
> >
> >The fact is, it's simply cheaper *in the short run* to manufacture things

> >elsewhere and ship them here. But *in the long run* it causes all sorts of
> >problems. Most of all, no *service* economy can prosper. People don't get
> >rich
> >taking in each other's washing.
>
> I agree about the cost of importing things...But what are you going to do
> when we slap big tariffs on things people want, only to have them cry
> foul...Or
> worse yet, have OUR goods likewise tariffed over there, making it hard to get
> our good sold.

It's a matter of thinking long-term rather than short-term. Education
rather than legislation. Gradual changes on a broad front rather than
narrowly focused quick fixes that ultimately don't work.

For example, suppose there were tax incentives to use transit? As in
getting a tax credit for money spent on transpasses or organized
carpools?

Ultimately it comes down to asking people what they *really* want,
what they're willing to pay, and what they're willing to do without.
That's not an easy task, and the last president to try it was Jimmy
Carter. That's a big reason folks dislike him so much.

Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
without anything. But it's just not true.

> No...they get rich getting other people to take in other people's
> washing...By providing a business infrastructure to do that in.

In the short term. That's the problem.

> >>>> Kerry will be more of the same "Tax 'Em To The Bone Then Flash Them
> With
> >>>>Great Entitlement Programs Made With Thier Own Money".
> >>>
> >>>As opposed to Reaganomics "Let The Deficits Pile Up - We Won't Be Around To
> >>>Pay
> >>>Them Back". Or Bush Sr.'s "Read My Lips".
> >>
> >> I lived a lot more comfortably and had a lot more money in the bank in
> >>the
> >>1980's and early 90's than I do now..
> >
> >Are you better off now than 4 years ago?
>
> As a matter of fact, I am.

> >>.Part due, in all honesty, to Bug's
> >>expenses...but most due to the Clinton taxes of the 90's. Personally, I got
> >>zinged in the Clinton era.
> >
> >Think about *why*. Look at the deficit in 1980 and again in 1992. It wasn't

> >Clinton who built that deficit.

Correction: Look at the *debt*.

> >It was "trickle down" Reaganomics. But
> >eventually the piper had to be paid.
>
> Paid?

Yes. The debt eventually has to be paid - or at least the interest on
it.

> I was ripped off by the taxes I got zapped with on what should have
> been a very, very lucrative income.

How were you ripped off? When?

What I have seen happening is that the tax laws are set up so that
changes happen years after the enacting legislation so that you don't
feel the pain until down the road a bit. And rather than simply
raising tax rates, they tinker with the details so that you pay more
tax around the edges.

For example, the minimums for deductions go up a little bit. And then
a little more. And certain things are cut out.
>
> >And remember that it was Papa Bush who said "Read my lips...no new taxes" but
> >then could not keep his promise because the numbers simply did not add up.
> >Wasn't entirely his fault - he inherited the spiraling debt of his
> >predecessor.
>
> That debt was due (mostly) to the military build up of the Cold War.

And Reagan's buildup. And "Star Wars".

> We
> had already started to "harvest" the "peace dividend" by the end of Bush Sr's
> tour.

But the budget wasn't balanced until.....

> Also, much of the improvement in the economy at the end of Bush Sr's tour
> was the result of technology advances made in 80's.

Which also put a lot of people out of work.

The *biggest* factor was that oil prices stabilized and interest rates
dropped.
>
> >>>>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
> >>>>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.
> >
> >You mean the National Ambulance Chaser? You might want to look into Mr.
> >Edwards' record...

>
> And Clinton wasn't?

Nope. Look at what John Edwards built his career on.

> Clinton wanted to put an ambulance in everyone's
> back yard but had no plan to do that, either...Instead he let his wife play
> with it, and when she failed, it wasn't "his" fault.

Do you see the current president taking any real blame for *his*
failures?

> >> The Dem's COULD do better. I would have had to think real hard about a
> >>vote for Edwards. Too bad the loudest dog won rather than the better
> >>candidate.
> >
> >You pay malpractice premiums?
>
> As a matter of fact I do.

Why do you think they're so high?

Heck, here in PA some docs and other medical folks are simply shutting
down or packing up and leaving because medical malpractice insurance
is simply too expensive. Sure there are some bad docs out there, but a
lot of it is fueled by a lawsuit system that has nothing to do with
medical reality.
>
> >>>But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:
> >>>
> >>>When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi Jane?

> >> The specific date? I don't recall. The articles from public media have
> >>circulated the web.
> >
> >I suggest you look it up. The picture you refer to was taken in 1970. Jane
> >Fonda went to Hanoi in 1972 - *TWO YEARS LATER*!!
>
> I stand corrected on it then, however it still doesn't excuse his comments
> condoning her conduct.

Where are those comments? When were they given?

The reason I ask is that the picture which was supposed to prove
something turned out to prove something quite different when all the
facts are presented. The same may be true of the alleged comments.

> >Yet Kerry gets blamed and condemned because he was three rows behind and a
> >few
> >people to the right of a future possible traitor.
>
> Why not?

Are you *really* asking that question, Steve?

> I put Gore as almost as equally responsible for the humiliation suffered
> by the Clinton-Gore administration for having not taken a stand against
> Clinton's lying...Excuse me..."misrepresentations"...

Did he know they were lies? Heck, Clinton lied to his own staff on the
whole Monica thing.

> He could have gone a long way towards promoting his own credibility by
> distancing himslef from that affair (pardon the pun)

Had he known about it in time.
>
> >Do you see how the *facts* behind that picture completely change things? Had
> >the picture been taken *after* the Hanoi trip, you might have a point. But it
> >was taken two years earlier!
>
> I do.
>
> Do YOU see the facts that a well known and respected celebrity whom those
> very soldiers looked up to and admired actually helped to get some of them
> killed...?!?!

Yep. In fact I pointed you to documentation of what Fonda actually did
and did not do in Hanoi.
>
> >>>If indeed such a thing happened, why is it any worse than Rumsfeld shaking
> >>>hands with and warmly greeting Saddam Hussein?
> >>
> >> Who cares?
> >
> >I do. Rumsfeld was in the Reagan Cabinet at the time. The US *supported* SH
> >in
> >those days, and turned a blind eye to his methods. You'd think we'd have
> >learned from the Shah and Iran.
> >
> >>Hanoi Jane is a documented traitor.
> >
> >Here's proof:
> >
> >http://www.snopes.com/military/fonda.htm

Did you bother to read that stuff?
> >
> >>How Kerry, a combat vet, his opinions on the war itself notwithstanding,
> >>could sit next to a person who
> >>openly gave comfort to the people who were trying to proactively kill him is
> >>beyond me.
> >
> >Simple:
> >
> >1) He did not sit next to her
> >2) She did not go to Hanoi until *TWO YEARS* after the picture was taken.
> >

> >See how just two little facts - dates - make all the difference?
> >>
> >> Those who protested the war had valid arguments.
> >
> >Agreed.
> >>
> >> Bill Clinton even had a valid RIGHT to PROTEST the war, even in Oxford,
> >>England. Billary's error was at first saying he never did it then trying to
> >>claim the pictures weren't him.
> >
> >He lied.
>
> Indeed...Over and over and over....

Just like Nixon...

> I believe the Oxford situation was the first item to hit the wires.
>
> If he'd only had the intestinal fortitude to say "Yes, it was me...It was a
> legal protest and I broke no laws", then every other "story" that came along
> would have been dismissed...or at least given a more lenient "benefit of the
> doubt".

Of course.

And if he'd said of the whole ML mess: "Sure, I did it. So what? Many
of you have done similar things."

> Overall, Clinton was an adequate president.

In many areas, yes. In others, no.

> Unfortunately he couldn't seperate his duties from his ego, and he will be
> remembered as one of the most prolific liars in the office...He made a mockery
> of it.

Sure. And what burns the most is that *he got away with it*! He was
impeached but not convicted. He was caught in lie after lie but never
lost his job, marriage or freedom because of them. I couldn't get away
with that and I doubt you could either.

And now he comes out with a book that documents all of it, and he'll
make a bundle because millions of folks will pony up $$ to read about
it.

> >> If the gutless liar had simply stated "Yes, I was against the war and I
> >>exercised my right to protest it in a legal demonstration", even the most
> >>right-winged Hawk would ahve had to give him due for being honest about it.
> >
> >He lied.
>
> He sure did.

>
> >> Kerry earned the additional right to speak out...practical experience.
> >
> >No, he didn't.
>
> Yes, he did.

Someone cannot earn more of something that everyone already has.
>
> >Everyone has the right to speak out. Kerry earned *credibility* because he
> >spoke from actual experience.
> >
> >>But to sit down next to a low life slut who intentionally betrayed her
> >>Countrymen was foolish. I would have shot her first.
> >
> >How would you have known what she would do two years in the future?
>
> Point taken for the third time, Jim.

I only repeated it because you kept repeating the false conclusion.
>
> >>It's a testimony to
> >>America's professional, all-volunteer force that she hasn't been shot.
> >
> >It's no testimony to the justice system that she hasn't been brought up on
> >charges.
> >>
> >>>When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's
> >>>armed
> >>>conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the president
> >>>simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes
> the
> >>>incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's
> >>>policies and decisions aren't right.
> >
> >Well?
>
> Well indeed.
>
> What precedent are you trying to set? Why are you trying to set it?

What I'm saying is this:

It has been said by some that things like demonstrations and protests
during armed conflicts are disloyal. That they "give aid and comfort
to the enemy" and do not "support our troops".

This line of argument is sometimes extended to any talk against the
war in Iraq or Afghanistan. It comes down to "if you don't support
what the President says we must do militarily, you're not a loyal
American".

So what I did was simply extend the line of reasoning a little
further.
>
> We still had elections during the Civil War, World War 2, Korea and Viet
> Nam. How did you extrapolate some idea about when it's OK to run for president
> against my hatred for Jane Fonda?

See above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5288. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1401 June 18, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 17:10:19 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624131019.23018.00000523@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93402

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1401 June 18, 2004

Now, Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1401 with a release date of Friday, June 18 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A new ham-sat is made ready for launch and the B-P-L struggle continues. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1401 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ECHO PREPARED FOR LAUNCH

The soon to be launched ECHO ham radio satellite has arrived safely at the launch complex in Russia and is being made ready for launch. This, according to Chuck Green, N0ADI, who is traveling with the bird to the launch facility. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is here with more:

--

According to Green, once he and the team arrived at the launch site, the satellite shipping containers were opened and placed in the clean room. ECHO was taken out of it's shipping case and set up for completion. The bottom antennas were then installed.. So was the bottom solar panel, magnets, and corner reflectors.

ECHO was then powered on and the team successfully communicated with it over a hard wire connection from a computer. The four two meter receivers and the two 70 cm transmitters were all successfully tested. And that's good news for everyone waiting for the new hamsat
to take its ride into space.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles.

--

Currently the planned launch period for ECHO is four weeks beginning June 28th. Once in orbit the command teams will be working together to assure everything is working OK and get ECHO into its initial 'normal' modes as quickly as possible. After that it will be open to the users in the ham radio community. (AMSAT)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: AN UPDATE ON WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE USA

The fight to keep Broadband Over Powerlines from going nationwide continues. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, is here
with the latest:

--

With summer now here, expect the Broadband over Power Line Internet access issue to heat up - especially as more people get a chance to look over the latest filing from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

The federal agency, which advises the White House on telecommunications policies and oversees radio spectrum used by government agencies, weighed in with more BPL comments in a June 4 filing with the Federal Communications Commission.

And the American Radio Relay League and others who've analyzed the comments say it's clear the political considerations are overshadowing the engineering data which raises many questions about the viability of BPL.

In its filing with the FCC, the N-T-I-A's policy makers now call BPL a win-win situation for all and make what some call an outlandish claim - that deployment of the technology could actually lead to reduction, that's right, reduction of power line noise.

Now, the engineering types who've been studying the BPL and doing all kinds of test measurements are really scratching their heads trying to make sense out of that. The N-T-I-A filing also contains this comforting assertion for BPL opponents. It says that the current power line system is responsible for even greater local interference risks than what BPL would bring.

And, it says, B-P-L operators would implement procedures to eliminate any harmful interference.

The stack of complaints about BPL test sites and assertions by a lawyer representing one of the large utilities testing the technology might lead some to question that reassurance.

A source tells Amateur Radio Newsline the FCC has failed to "properly direct" BPL complaints to the appropriate FCC regulatory office for action. And, the source says, commissioners questioned about that haven't offered any explanation.

And a lawyer who has commented in writing to the FCC about some of the BPL complaints his utility company received claimed there was no basis for them, essentially saying the amateur radio operators making them don't know what they're talking about.

One thing the NTIA did suggest in its filing is the exclusion of certain bands and frequencies in specific geographical areas to protect critical government systems.

Does that suggest an agency confident BPL won't be an interference source?

The American Radio Relay League and others who've been vocal in this fight suggest otherwise.

They say BPL is far from a done deal and they're hopeful that the FCC's extension of reply comments to June 22 will net some helpful information. And, they say, they're not giving up or going away quietly.

In the meantime, there is a sense BPL is on a fast-track at the FCC where the majority of the commissioners view it as an engine to help stimulate the economy.

Could the FCC act on the BPL issue before the November election?

Anything is possible. And some close to the BPL debate say if the Bush administration believes it will generate a much-need bump in the public opinions polls or at the ballot box...well, you get the idea.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

Mark will continue to monitor the B-P-L situation and report back in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARRL, CQ, Repeater Journal, Published news reports, others)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: AUSTRALIA REACTS TO THE BPL CHALLENGE

The United States is not the only place planning to introduce this controversial Internet access technology. Proposals for Power Line Communications or Broadband over Power Lines in Australia have become a concern many spectrum users down-under. This includes the Wireless Institute of Australia which is that nations Amateur Radio national society. From Brisbane, Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, reports:

--

WIA President, Michael Owen, VK3KI has said that the WIA's position in relation to B-P-L is that it supports increasing broadband access and broadband competitiveness in Australia, but in a way that does not cause interference to legitimate users of the High Frequency spectrum. The WIA supports the development by the ACA of policies for BPL that protect existing users.

The WIA believes that one of the problems associated with B-P-L is that trials on a limited basis are not good indicators, and that the full effects of a problematic technology will not be seen with such trials. The WIA considers that B-P-L will not really serve the community's long run needs because of its limited bandwidth. A deep fibber network is to be preferred to using long runs of power lines.

The WIA has appointed a team to deal with this issue. WIA President has appointed Phil Wait, VK2DKN the director responsible for developing and advocating the WIA's position in relation to BPL. He has asked Owen Duffy, VK1OD Barry White, VK2AAB and David Wardlaw, VK3ADW to assist Phil, as the WIA's BPL Team.

--

A report on a recent small trial of B-P-L in the city of Hobart to some 4 houses and 2 floors of one building is on the WIA website. (Q-News)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the VE9BSQ repeater serving St. John, New Brunswick, Canada.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO RULES: COMMISSION ADOPTS SPECTRUM SHARING PLAN FOR L AND S BAND

The Federal Communications Commission adopted a spectrum sharing plan for low earth orbit satellite systems in the 1.6 GHz and 2.4 GHz bands. The so-called Big Leo birds. And here's how it will work

In the 1.6 GHz or "L-band," mobile-satellite service operators with satellite systems that utilize code division multiple access and time division multiple access technologies will share 3.1 megahertz of spectrum at 1618.25 to 1621.35 MHz. At "S-band," the Commission allocated the 2495 to 2500 MHz band to fixed and mobile except aeronautical mobile services, in order to provide additional spectrum and to accommodate the relocation of Multipoint Distribution Service channels 1 and 2.

The commission says that its new spectrum sharing plan will further the agency's goal of efficient frequency utilization by increasing the number of providers offering services to consumers over the same spectrum. It will promote the deployment of more innovative services to consumers. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: COUNTY HAS DONE NOTHING WRONG

The FCC says that a complaint that a county is using ham radio for its routine business is without merit. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, is here with more:

--

Duckworth: "A complaint concerning Bell County Communications
Center
and club license W5BEC was dismissed. There is no showing that this
station is operated by anyone other than amateurs, nor is there a
showing that it is there a showing that it is used or intended to be
used for routine county business."

--

W5BEC is the club station license issued to the Bell County Emergency
Operations Center in Belton, Texas. Its also the call sign of a wide
area two meter repeater that covers much of central Texas. (FCC,
RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: STAY OFF 10 METERS

Meantime, the FCC's crackdown on 10 meter unlicensed intruders
continues. This time the agency acts in a New Jersey case. Again,
the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

Duckworth: Auto Elite Transportation of Morristown, New Jersey, has
been sent a warning notice about a vehicle of theirs; truck number
2113, as being the source of unlicensed radio transmissions on 28.085
Mhz."

--

Auto Elite was warned that continued unlicensed operation of radio
transmitting equipment without is a violation of Section 301 of the
Communications Act. That it could subject the operator to fine or
imprisonment, as well as seizure of any non-certified radio
transmitting equipment. Monetary forfeitures for this kind of
violation normally ranges from $7,500 to $10,000. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: SAN DIEGO'S 96.9 MHZ PIRATE REACTIVATES

According to a news bulletin from Chris Carmichael appearing in the
CGC Communicator, San Diego's 96.9 MHz pirate is back on the air.
Chris says that there is no news on the location of the transmitter,
but he believes that will only take the Commission a short time to
figure out. (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: SPAMMER GOES TO JAIL

A New York state man who sent out millions of "spam" e-mails has been
sentenced to three and a half to seven years in prison. This

according to a May 27th news release from that states Attorney General's office which said that Howard Carmack, known as the "Buffalo Spammer," received the maximum sentence for 14 counts of identity theft and forgery.

A spokesman for New York Attorney General Eliot Spitzer said that Carmack sent out hundreds of millions of bulk e-mail messages. That he flooded inboxes and saddled Internet providers with millions of dollars in costs. But it was his use of stolen identities and forged addresses that caused action by state prosecutors. New York has no state laws specifically dealing with spam. Carmack was found guilty of violating state forgery and identity-theft laws in April.

Internet provider EarthLink Inc. won a $16.5 million judgment against Carmack last year, and EarthLink officials testified in the criminal trial as well. (Published news reports)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: EARTHLINK VS. PHISHERS

Meantime, EarthLink claims that it has developed a program to fight phony websites like this,. The sites, called phishers are those designed to deceive e-mail users into providing personal information such as passwords and credit card or Social Security numbers.

Phisher sites pronounced "fishers" but with a leading "p" are called
that because they "fish" for personal information that can be used in identity theft. They work by telling an Internet user via e-mail that there is a problem with the service-provider account and providing directions to a Web site for clarification. The link takes the user to a hoax Web site that may be a perfect copy of a real page used by Earthlink, eBay or another legitimate business. That is where the user is deceived into providing personal information.

EarthLink's anti-phisher program will rely on a list of known fraudulent sites. When a subscriber responds to the e-mail message, he will be linked instead to a special Web page that warns the e-mail is a fraud. The site also will provide a chance to report the hoax attempt.

EarthLink says that it receives about 40,000 telephone calls or e-mails each month from subscribers who have received one of the fraudulent e-mails. (Earthlink)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: A SEARCHABLE CQ MAGAZINE ARCHIVE

Finding an article or an advertisement in a back issue of CQ Magazine is about to become only a mouse click away. This, as CQ Communications and Buckmaster Publishing announce plans to create a searchable on-line archive of CQ magazines back issues.

Buckmaster, which produces the Hamcall CD has for decades filmed issues of CQ onto microfiche for use by researchers and hobbyists. Buckmaster also provides advanced scanning and searching technology for on-line posting of documents for major corporations. Now this same technology will be applied to back issues of CQ.

As currently envisioned, searches will be free, while access to reading and printing specific pages will require a subscription at a nominal fee. Eventually Buckmaster plans to have every issue of CQ available dating back to the magazine's first issue in January 1945.

A beta test version covering CQ from 1990 to 2002 is already on-line. The archive may be accessed at http://hamcall.net/cgi-bin/cqcgi. (CQ)

**

WITH ARNEWSLINE: YHOTY NOMINATIONS CLOSE JUNE 30TH

And a reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award closes midnight on Wednesday, June 30th. If you are planning to nominate a youngster for this years award or, if you want to update a previous years nomination -- and have not yet done so -- you have only about two weeks left to do so.

The Young Ham of the Year Award program is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states. He or she must have made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org.

Again, the cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on June 30th. The award presentation takes place in August at the Huntsville Hamfest in Alabama. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United
States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: INSTANT MESSAGING EXPANDING WORLDWIDE

Wonder where some of your ham radio buddies are these days? Maybe they are now using Instant messaging instead of 2 meter FM. Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has more:

--

According to Tech Web News, Instant Message use is growing steadily among corporate workers who use free services from companies like America Online, Microsoft, and Yahoo to send quick text messages to coworkers, family, and friends. And by 2008 closer to 80 percent of corporations worldwide are expected to use either public or private Instant Messaging networks.

A recent study by The Radicati Group says that by 2008 the number of Instant Message users worldwide is expected to reach 670 million. Business wise, this equates to revenues in the $413 million range.

Even so, the percentage of people using public networks and private networks is expected to remain the same. That's at 88 percent public and 12 percent private, respectively. The reason: Its hard to get people to pay for what someone else is giving away for free.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Norm Seeley, KI7UP, reporting.

--

Ham radio groups are also turning to Instant Messaging. According to Internet postings, it comes in handy when there is a net to be held and propagation goes away. (TechWeb Online)

**

HAM INTERNET NEWS: THE VHF REFLECTOR BACK ON LINE

And speaking about instant messaging, or almost instant messaging, news that the VHF Reflector is back on line. This, according to Bob Vaughan, KC6SXC, who oversees the systems operation.

In a posting, Vaughn explained that the W6YX server that hosts the VHF Reflector suffered a disk failure and was off line for the past month. Vaughn says that the team has now recovered the data from the failed disk and has put the system and the Reflector back on-line. (VHF Reflector)

**

ON THE AIR: KY REPEATER NEEDS A NEW HOME

The Repeater Journal reports that the Danville, Kentucky, 146 point 655 WD4DZC repeater is looking for a new site. According to trustee George Griebe, WQ4Z, the tower supporting the systems antenna is to be taken down and will not be replaced.

Griebe says that the Wilderness Road Amateur Radio club which sponsors the repeater plans to keep it on the air from a temporary location with reduced coverage. Meantime the club is continuing its

search for a suitable, high level, wide coverage permanent site. (Repeater Journal)

**

THE SOCIAL SCENE: OHIO IN JULY

Turning to the ham radio social circuit, the 7th annual OH-KY-IN hamfest is slated for the July 24th at the Diamond Oaks Career Development Center in Cincinnati Ohio. The event will feature commercial vendors, a flea market and much more. Information is on line at www.ohkyin.org or by e-mail to n8bv@juno.com. (OH-KY-IN)

**

THE SOCIAL SCENE: COLORADO IN JULY

And the Northern Colorado Amateur Radio Club will hold its 2004 Superfest at the Budweiser Events Center in the Larimer County Fairgrounds on July 17th. Talk-in is on the 145.115 Mhz repeater with a 100 hertz tone access. For information on this one contact Willis Whatley, WA5RVL, at his Callbook address. (E-mail)

**

INTERNATIONAL - GREECE: HAM RADIO AT THE SUMMER OLYMPICS

Some more good news for foreign radio amateurs visiting Greece for the Summer Olympic Games. From the August 1st through September 15th hams from CEPT signatory nations will be permitted to operate in Greece without the need to submit any papers for a license. They will also be allowed to use the special prefix J42004. Meantime, Greek radio amateurs can use the special prefixes SX2004 or SY2004 through the 15th of November in celebration of the games. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that MM0AFJ will be on the air from the Island of Harris. This, from the 27th of June until the 2nd of July, mainly in the mornings on 80 to 10 meters CW and SSB. There may be some activity on 160 meters in the evenings. Requests for skeds should be sent via e-mail to m0afj@tiscali.co.uk. QSL direct to MM0AFJ at his Callbook address. (RSGB)

Also, IK4RUX reports he will operate portable IF9 on HF SSB from Favignana between the 19th and the 26th of June. Side trips to other islands in the Egadis group as well as some lighthouse operations are also possible. QSL to the operators home call or via the bureau. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO HONORS THE MEMORY OF PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

And finally this week, ham radio finds a way to honor the memory former President Ronald Reagan. Here's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW with the
rest of the story:

--

Two suburban Los Angeles area radio clubs are joing forces to honor the memory former President Ronald Wilson Reagan. This, by operating Field Day in his honor from the Reagan Library in Simi Valley, California.

According to Peter Heins, N6ZE, the two groups joing forces to honor the late United States president are the Ventura County Amateur Radio Society and the Conejo Valley Amateur Radio Club. The Ventura County group has operated Field Day before from the Reagan Library. This year, the Conejo Valley club will be joining with them for the first time.

Heins says that 2004 is the fourth year a special event will have been held at the Reagan Library using the special N-6-R call sign. The previous three were dedicated to all members of the former first family. This years Field Day operation will be specific in its remembrance of President Reagan who died of Alzheimer's disease
on
June 5th at age 93.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

Field Day 2004 is the weekend of June 26th and 27th. Visitors to the Reagan Library will be able to listen in on amateur radio communication, talk to amateur radio stations located in other countries, and find out more about obtaining an FCC Amateur Radio License of their very own.

Also, the complete Field Day rules are on-line at the ARRL website. Its in cyberspace at www.arrl.org (N6ZE)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937,

Arcadia, California 91066.

Again, the cutoff for submitting nominations for this years Young Ham of the Year Award is midnight on June 30th. The award presentation takes place in August at the Huntsville. Full details are on our website at www.arnewsline.org

Also, don't forget Field Day the weekend of June 26th and 27th. We'll see you on the air.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don
Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

<*> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to:
http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/

5289. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 18:05:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 93403

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/24/2004 8:31 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240531.d2df4a4@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>truth
>> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>> >
>> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >(Steve
>> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>
>> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.
>
>(to send people to the moon)
>
>> We barely had the
>> technology to get to the moon in the 70s.
>
>Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
>about a decade earlier.

Well, Jim, if you want to get THAT specific we were actually crashing
RANGER probes into the moon in the early 60's...

I thought that "...in the 70's" was fairly generic since we landed there
in 1969 and all of the rest of the landings occured before we were out ov Viet
Nam.

>> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
>> happen in the wake of war.
>
>Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most".

Then some review of American History is in order.

With the exception of the Revolution, most technological advances were
during or immediately after some major conflict, especially since 1860.
(Please note the use of the word "advancements", not necessarily inception)

Civil War: Creation of the present ambulance services, advances in trauma medicine, advancement of the railroads and wireline telegraphy. Photography becomes popular.

World War 1: The airplane was just a motor driven kite in 1914, and is ready to span the Atlantic in 1919. The radio comes of age. New advances in the treatment of diseases (from the study of sanitation in the trenches).

World War 2: Mass production of antibiotics (developed in the 30's, but not considered a priority until the war), development of RADAR, the jet engine, further advancements in air travel as a result of the development of pressurization. Missle technology emerges. Microwave and X-Ray technology skyrockets.

Korea: Use of the helicopter for medical evacuation. Proliferation of the television. Satellite communications.

Viet Nam/Moon Missions: Advancements in microprocessors, additional advancements in trauma care (MAST pants, use of helicopters in civilian MEDEVAC, previously considered too expensive due to limitied manufacture of helos) IR/NVG technology.

SDI/Cold War: Space imaging, proliferation of LASER devices, especially into medical field.

> In many cases those
>"jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
>investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
>peacetime.

Oh..."would have happened anyway"...?!?!

I don't think so, Jim. All of the major developments of other technologies or services only happened where there was major subsidies by governments. Some, such as the expansion of oil refining, etc, only happened after the development of the automobile, one of the few exceptions to the above.

>Or they're the result of government programs that are done
>to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.

Uh huh...government subsidies. Again, big influx of cash from taxes. MAY have happened otherwise, but it didn't.

>In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.

Oh?

How much do you pay for a calculator these days?

How much did you pay for the last Amateur transceiver you bought?

Have you ever had an X-Ray or CT scan?

All of those technologies have benefited from government spending in order to advance military or space technology.

>> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>> based on the Apollo program alone.
>
>Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.

And most mathematical or engineering calculations were performed with a
slide rule or pencil and paper.

>No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
>plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
>to be reinvented.

Why? Did we get stupid in the last 30+ years?

Quick/Cheap/Dirty plan...A lunar lander configured to ride in the Shuttle
bay. The Shuttle carries it to the Moon, the mission drops in, and brings at
least part of the lander home for re-use itself.

>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask
>WHERE
>> in space are you going to spend that money?
>
>We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
>here. And address problems long-term.

Oh?

NASA doesn't need people who are less-than-engineering qualified...?!?!
If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that every
company that contracts with it would be able to

And WHAT problems are NOT being addressed long term BECAUSE of the space
program?

>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>> technical advencement.
>
>Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
>those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"
>
>Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
>government spending".

But we can also defer that with cooperation with business against futures
for mining, technology development, etc. The opportunities are there...We just
need to have the gonads to take them.

>It was in the Nixon/Ford years that the big NASA cutbacks took place.
>Too much money, they said. There was supposed to be an Apollo 18 lunar
>mission - it was cut and the Saturn V for it became a museum piece.
>Literally.

Yep...the public lost interest since there was no "obvious" return on thier
investment other than national pride. However the long terms benefits have
been overwhelming.

NOW...if we were to take the chance on an expedition or perm/semi-perm base on the Moon to determine it's value to be harvested...?!?!

>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>verifies the reliability analysis.

Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables are bound to go boom.

As for your "reliability analysis" try the numbers based on miles flown...(Just proof that you can make any set of numbers look good/bad)

>The reason the USA made the big space commitments was because JFK and
>LBJ (guess what party) pushed for them.

Do you think it would have been different with Nixon in the White House in 1960? He was an avowed anit-Communist. Do you think he might not ahve made the same challenge, faced with the same circumstances...?!?! I bet he would have made the challenge earlier than JFK did.

>They were essentially done to
>compete with the Soviets for the "high ground" of space. Recall that
>practically all of the important early space firsts (first earth
>satellite, first animal in space, first human in space and in orbit,
>first woman in space, first mission to another heavenly body, first
>pictures of the far side of the Moon...) were done by the Soviet
>Union. And most of their early accomplishments were complete surprises
>in the West. The USA played catch-up for years. JFK and LBJ knew that
>if the Rooskies could orbit a man and bring him back safely, doing the
>same with a nuclear weapon would be a piece of cake for them.
>
>Today there is no such need or competition.

There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim. No..we don't need to build a bigger, more deadly nuke, but a bit of friendly rivalry goes a long way towards building a better and cheaper mouse trap.

>The cost was staggering but they had the political clout to do it.
>They could sell it to everyone on the national security agenda. And it
>didn't hurt that a lot of the money was spent in states like LBJ's own
>Texas. (Why is the control center for manned flights in Houston when
>the launch facility is in Florida?)

I am sure that having been in LBJ's home state had soemthing to do with it...But being more-or-less half way between FL and CA helped. Much of America's space program is out of Edwards and Vandenberg, if you will recall.

>Billions were spent on the space program in the '60s but when
>Americans needed quality fuel-efficient cars in the '70s they had to
>go to Germany and Japan for them.

Because American unions demanded wages that pushed the cost of American cars through the roof. Also, American tastes in automobiles up until then were

for bigger, heavier and faster..."Small" was not a generally popular concept in the 50's and 60's, if you'll recall. The Germans and the Japanese were forced by economics, infrastructure and geography to do "small".

>> I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
>> a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.
>
>As exciting as that effort is, all of it was done more than 35 years
>ago with the X-15.

Not by a private entrepreneur and not with the expectation of being able to carry two passengers.

Also, despite the similarities in delivery techniques (parasite lifter), the control and recovery techniques are different.

It took the USAF hundreds of millions of (1960's) dollars to do what these guys did for under $30M...I wonder what the 1960-to-2004 cost comparisons look like?

>And it was done without government funding. So why do we need NASA for
>manned flights at all? Let the private folks do it on a self-funded
>basis.

OK...so we sit out manned space flight until private investors can get up-to-speed with governmental levels of service...?!?!

>> So why not Mars?
>
>Because the cost and risk is simply too much for the benefits. Do you
>have any idea what a mission to Mars would require in terms of how big
>and complex the ship(s) would have to be, how long they'd be gone, and
>how completely on their own they would be?

Yes, as a matter of fact I do.

And I cannot see those costs getting any less impressive if we wait until 2014 or 2024 to do it.

>Mars is orders of magnitude more difficult than the moon. Apollo
>missions were no more than two weeks, Mars missions would be over a
>year long. The Martian surface is in some ways more hostile than the
>lunar surface and the landing physics much more difficult (Martian
>gravity is stronger). Look how many unmanned Mars missions have failed
>completely.

So again...we bring human exploration and technology to a screaming halt due to our fear of the cash register?

And as for the failed Mars missions, do you think that maybe if there had been someone there to fix the problem that the mission could have proceeded?

>Heck, figure out radio propagation delay to Mars....

Yep...same 186,000MPS that wew ahve here on Earth...

>What benefits would a manned mission to Mars give that could not be
>had any other way?

Having a Human Being actually stand on it, for one.

>And how much all of it would cost?

Who cares? We poor billions into pork barrel projects that DON'T provide
ANY return every year...why not spend it on something that will...?!?!

>> Why not research stations on the Moon?
>
>How much are *you* willing to pay for them in tax dollars? That's
>really the bottom line. People are all for space exploration and such
>until the bills for it show up.

See above. Imagine what the communications possibilites alone would be by
using the moon for alternative wireless technologies...

>> Unless you want
>> to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
>> conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?
>
>Simple: The costs outweigh the benefits. There are easier, cheaper,
>faster ways to get the benefits and solve the problems we have on
>earth.

Oh? They are...?!?!

>Space and war may help with some things but they are horribly
>inefficient means of progress.

So we just wait until a more efficient way is developed? Until they
develop the "transporter"...?!?! Until Zephraim Cochrane develops warp drive?

>None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do
>so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.

So we just mark time until...when...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5290. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 22:06:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624180619.05745.00000458@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93404

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/24/2004 10:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
>> Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
>> only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
>> been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
>> a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
>> visual or audible means,
>
>Why does it always have to be about you, Len? Radio amateurs are free
>to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>of venues. Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>"larger world of radio". If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.

It HAS to be about him, Dave...It's all he REALLY knows...other than what
he can cut-and-paste from all those websites that are THE most ABSOLUTE
authority on EVERYTHING, bar none!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5291. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 22:14:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93405

>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
>From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
>Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
>
>Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.

I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those phonetics thru my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather prominent.

>Decided to run on my own as a
>matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner. Field
>day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is
>nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.

How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?

>Not sure which classification I will be running yet, but will be using 3
>transmitters, on battery power, occasionally charged by a vehicle's
>electrical system, but the batteries won't be located in the vehicle. And I
>will be operating from our fire department's parking lot of which I am a
>member of.

I had hoped to not be working this weekend, however I'm stuck.

Quite a few years ago I had built a small wind generator and had it on the roof of the barracks I was in. It charged two marine (no pun intended) deep cycle trolling motor batteries and those in turn ran my ICOM IC-730.

I ran it at 35-50 watts CW and >>I<< ran out beofre the batteries did!

I've been wanting to build another, and perhaps I will before next Field Day.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5292. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 22:17:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624181754.05745.00000460@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93406

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>Date: 6/24/2004 10:11 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40DAEF20.3030105@psu.edu>
>
>N2EY wrote:

>> August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.
>>
>> Guess who was president.....
>
> Good guess, but not quite. We were moving away from the Gold Standard
>at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted
>Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level -
>something considered intolerable.

And please remember that these were the conditions passed to him by a...

(drum roll, please....)

A Demoncrat!

And a Demoncrat before THAT one!

> We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The
>initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that
>soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate
>dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an
>economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an
>inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.
>
> The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal
conservative!
>
> Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?

And the last President to have a balanced budget...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5293. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 22:21:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624182136.05745.00000461@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93407

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/24/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>

>Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
>without anything. But it's just not true.

I snipped the rest becasue I really wanted to highlight this one item,
Jim. I'll answer the rest in turn.

When did President Reagan ever make such a statement?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5294. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:53:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195355.07368.00000290@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93414

In article <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Goman the Librarian) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 8:31 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240531.d2df4a4@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>truth
>>> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>> >
>>> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> >(Steve
>>> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.
>>
>>(to send people to the moon)
>>
>>> We barely had the
>>> technology to get to the moon in the 70s.
>>
>>Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
>>about a decade earlier.
>
> Well, Jim, if you want to get THAT specific we were actually crashing
>RANGER probes into the moon in the early 60's...

Not quite. :-) What was launched 27 Aug 62?

> I thought that "...in the 70's" was fairly generic since we landed there
>in 1969 and all of the rest of the landings occured before we were out ov
>Viet Nam.

Might have happened in nursieworld but not in reality.

What was launched 5 May 61?

Official USA involvement in Vietnam War was 1962 to 1975.

Apollo 17 (last manned moon mission) was December 1972.

Did your might aerospace involvement in nursieworld have
different dates?

>>> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
>>> happen in the wake of war.
>>
>>Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most".
>
> Then some review of American History is in order.

Ah, all sorts of cribs from an almanac? :-)

Nursie was THERE, very INVOLVED since Revolutionary War?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. NOT about amateur radio, is it?

Morse-Vail Telegraph first operated in 1844. Landline.

Radio as communications means first demonstrated in Italy
and Russia 1896.

Amateur radio not there by definition of amateur radio. Had to
wait until 1912 and first U.S. radio regulating agency start, also
first radio amateur licensed.

Nursie need MUCH help from his buddies in aerospace, those
INVOLVED there. No "amateurs" in space biz...until 2004,
then NOT amateur by definition, but "private" developers.
[nursie need to tell tales of Kern County Airport #7 from which
SpaceShipOne was launched and landed?]

Amateurs NOT make launch vehicles to put up ham sats.
Keep that in mind. Ham sats just lab curiosities until launch
vehicle available to put them in orbit.

<remaining cut-and-paste omitted...partly for accuracy>

> I don't think so, Jim. All of the major developments of other
>technologies or services only happened where there was major subsidies by
>governments. Some, such as the expansion of oil refining, etc, only happened
>after the development of the automobile, one of the few exceptions to the
>above.

Nursie say in other message that ham radio "different" physics than
all other radio. Must be New Development, only nursie know.

Amateur radio NOT oil drilling/refining, vehicular technology.

Nursie need stick to subject...at least within a light-year.

> How much do you pay for a calculator these days?

Hewlett-Packard HP-32 SII is $60 off the shelf, consumer
item. Scientific, programmable.

Nursie have pocket-size calculator of scientific notation?

> How much did you pay for the last Amateur transceiver you bought?

Rev. Jimmie Who "builds his own." :-)

Can nursie build his own?

> Have you ever had an X-Ray or CT scan?

Ham radio parts might need X-raying, but Computer Tomography
only used on hams.

Nursieworld need Magnetic Resonance Imaged...find all bad
resonances, make resonances stay WITHIN ham bands as
legally approved and licensed by FCC.

> All of those technologies have benefited from government spending in
order
>to advance military or space technology.

Riiiiight. Nursie describe his many years in aerospace biz?

Nursie INVOLVED in space biz? Properly licensed as rocket
man?

Nursie CANNOT be "interested" in space biz without being
properly licensed by FCC. Heilian logic. Applicable this
newsgrope.

>
>>> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>>> based on the Apollo program alone.
>>
>>Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.
>
> And most mathematical or engineering calculations were performed with a
>slide rule or pencil and paper.

In nursieworld, yes. In REAL world, NO.

Do astrogation problems, nursie. 3-digit accuracy on slide-rule
NOT GOOD ENOUGH.

>>No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
>>plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
>>to be reinvented.
>
> Why? Did we get stupid in the last 30+ years?

Nursie, yes. :-)

> Quick/Cheap/Dirty plan...A lunar lander configured to ride in the Shuttle
>bay. The Shuttle carries it to the Moon, the mission drops in, and brings at
>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.

What part of mighty nursie plan involves AMATEUR RADIO? :-)

Mission Control moved to Tennessee? To Newington? :-)

<more nonsense from "involved" rocketman deleted for sanity>

> So we just wait until a more efficient way is developed? Until they
>develop the "transporter"...?!?! Until Zephraim Cochrane develops warp
>drive?

Rocketman nursie watch too many episodes of Star Trek. Star
Trek FICTION, not reality.

Star Trek NOT about amateur radio or ham radio policy.

Nursieworld is defunct for logic, analogies.

>>None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do
>>so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.

Nursie already spaced out. Need help, grounding.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5295. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:53:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195356.07368.00000291@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93412

In article <20040624071653.17843.00000359@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <20040623154009.23112.00000588@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com >(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <40D9A852.2050109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>>> And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to sell it as
>>>> a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The
>>>> administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of the
>>>> '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying to tie
>>>> it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those who
>>>> oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'
>>>
>>>> Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!
>>
>> Not complicated at all.
>
>It's too complicated for the politiicans and regulators.

Then educate them. You have the mighty certificates, you have the technology..."train" them.

Choo choo. :-)

>> BPL will be the demise of low-level-signal HF communications in
>> urban areas.
>
>FCC and NTIA say differently

The FCC has NOT said much technically on Access BPL.

Docket 03-104 asked for input on BPL.

Docket 04-37 asks for comment for a proposed R&O.

NTIA said "A 10 db increase in background noise is acceptible!!!!"

>> Kiss off any thoughts of signal-to-noise ratios
>> required in modern receivers. All that advanced technology will
>> go to waste. Hams can go back to using one-tube regenerative
>> receivers, those being as "low-signal-level" as any other in an
>> RF cesspool of noise on HF.

>
>Never used a regenerative receiver, have you, Len? That's obvious from your
>statement. A good one is as sensitive as a modern superhet on HF.

Poor baby. Joining in an attempted gang-bang of an NCTA?

My first receiver, built in 1947, was a regenerative. What did
you build in 1947, senior?

Last regenerative receiver I checked out (for son of friend) was in
1968 (give or take). Had an RF stage ahead of detector, too.
Had MAYBE 5 uV input "sensitivity" at best (if one squinted their
ears), was terrible in selectivity, full of intermods from other
strong signals adjacent. Didn't tell friend or son it was that bad,
made nice-nice, gave only technical figures (they were impressed).

Are you going to make a case FOR widespread Access BPL,
Rev. Jimmie Who?!?

Did we see your pearls of technical and economic wisdom in
multi-page Comments on docket 04-37?

Say goodnight.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5296. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:53:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195357.07368.00000292@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93409

In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
>
>That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.

I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.

Strike "unable" and substitute "haven't bothered."

Why are all your postings in here concerning me? :-)

Say goodnight, Colonel.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5297. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195400.07368.00000293@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93416

In article <40DA540F.1A180FD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406231512.46210506@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040623011340.29277.00000465@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406221900.39189e37@posting.google.com>,
>> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20040622172613.09069.00000298@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> >> >> In article <20040622065001.03855.00000261@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> >> (Steve
>> >> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >> >> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >> >> >Date: 6/20/2004 9:44 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406201844.3715f9f4@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >> >The problem is that Steve demands evidence, but has no right to
>demand
>> >> >> >anything.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > I have just as much right to "demand" (which I haven't done)
>> >evidence
>> >> of
>> >> >> >your claims as you have to lie in public, Brain.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> That's a LIE right there, nursie...
>> >> >
>> >> >I count at least three lies within just that one sentence, possibly
>> >> >four if you count his intentional misspelling of my name.
>> >>
>> >> Nursie might be "laughing at your intellect."
>> >
>> >He'll just have to laugh a long time. My wife was just reading where

>> >parents of autistic children are often highly intelligent. So there
>> >are downsides.
>> >
>> >> He laughs a lot about that. Too bad he's not given any evidence
>> >> of having an intellect..
>> >
>> >I'm actually crying at his dearth of it.
>> >
>> >> >> >> I have no need or desire to comply...(SNIP)
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > You CAN'T comply.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Yes, he can.
>> >> >
>> >> >Yup, all he has to do is show me some authentic credentials, and not
>> >> >some shoebox full of unearned medals.
>> >>
>> >> He will tell you to "call the VA!" :-)
>> >
>> >If it would help, but I'm not the one filing for a benefit. He'll
>> >just have to have the right credentials, or its "no show."
>> >
>> >What's he always saying? "Sucks to be you?" Til he's got those
>> >credentials...
>> >
>> >> >> Now, gunnery nurse, tell us the WHEN and WHERE of all those
>> >> >> "hostile actions" you claim you were in?
>> >> >
>> >> >I'd rather not hear blow by blow accounts of self-abuse.
>> >>
>> >> Good point. It's bad enough we have the perversity of the PCTA
>> >> wanting to bring the 1930s into the new millennium...
>> >
>> >Whoo boy! Talk about perverse. Kelly has requested that I "bend
>> >over" for him. While I don't want to judge what two consenting adults
>> >want to do in private, I'm just not interested in taking that path.
>> >
>> >And now Steve wants to beat me up...
>> >
>> >There's a couple of Extra's we could use a break from.
>> >
>> >> >> Don't forget, we are still waiting for your retraction on the
>claim
>> >of
>> >> >> "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >> >
>> >> >I wonder if the TN State MARS Director knows that, "MARS >>>IS<<<
>> >> >Amateur Radio?"
>> >> >
>> >> >hi, hi.

>> >>
>> >> :-)
>> >
>> >I wonder when the TN State MARS Director learned that he had an idiot
>> >for a volunteer?
>> >
>> >> >> Are you going to challenge DoD Directive 4650.2 or not?
>> >> >
>> >> >He challenges all "statements of fact." His reputation is built on
>> >> >it. Of course, I wouldn't want the reputation of being wrong most of
>> >> >the time, but he doesn't seem to mind.
>> >>
>> >> Well, if he had some intellect, we might be able to laugh at it.
>> >>
>> >> Not much chance as it is...
>> >
>> >Lithium?
>> >
>> >> >> > And the "need", if you care to call it that, is to set your own
>> >> character
>> >> >> >straight. You don't want to do that, and that's your choice.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> ...and here's the latest score from the colliseum: 4650.2 to 1.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> :-)
>> >> >
>> >> >Steve's got too many characters to set straight. 4650.2 to 1.
>> >> >
>> >> >;^)
>> >> >
>> >> >> >>...and that infuriates the ex-Marine.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > "Ex-Marine(s)" either have a dishonorable discharge or six feet
>of
>> >> dirt
>> >> >> >over their casket.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> In that case, this is a day and night of the living dead...
>> >> >
>> >> >"Morgan, I'll get you for this!"
>> >>
>> >> Mark those words... :-)
>> >
>> >That was very Cutie.
>> >
>> >> >> >>I recommend stress management for him before that bulging
>> >> >> >>artery in his neck explodes.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > If the artery is bulging, it's from laughing so hard at you and
>> >> Lennie

>> >> >> >glad-handing each other back and forth, Brain.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Poor baby. Type A behavior out of control. Still.
>> >> >
>> >> >His bulging artery is laughing at you and me.
>> >> >
>> >> >Hi, hi.
>> >> >
>> >> >Is that personality #4650.3?
>> >>
>> >> Battle of the Bulge, take 2...
>> >
>> >If he exhales before trying to zip up that flight suit...
>> >
>> >> >> Probably doesn't have a sphygometer with that high a scale.
>> >> >
>> >> >Off the scale on the spasometer, too.
>> >>
>> >> I'll go over to Cal Tech Seismo lab...they might have a reading
>> >> on it...
>> >
>> >Is that the seismo that's shown in the MoveOn.Org anti-Bush
>> >commercial?
>> >
>> >> >> > It's a stress reliever, NOT a stress inducer!
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Still with the definition problem. Sort of, like, "Sorry, Hans,
>> >> >> MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >> >
>> >> >He simply doesn't know what "is" is.
>> >>
>> >> That would make him a Democrat!!! Woooeee.
>> >
>> >Good thing I didn't step in any.
>> >
>> >> >> > Keep up the good work!
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Not a problem. As one commissioned extra once said in here,
>> >> >> "some messages just seem to write themselves!"
>> >> >
>> >> >So they do!
>> >>
>> >> I know. I feel like Dashan in China studying under a master by
>> >> this correspondence. So far I'm doing straight-As. :-)
>> >
>> >You've exceeded Four point Oh.
>> >
>> >> "Dashan" is a Canadian who is fluent in colloquial Chinese and
>> >> does contract work there for Chinese government and Chinese
>> >> businesses on their national TV. Was in the national press a few

>> >> days ago. That has nothing to do with amateur radio policy, but
>> >> neither is all the political blabber about presidential candidates.
>> >>
>> >> LHA / WMD
>> >
>> >
>> >I enjoy Four O'Clocks in the garden. It has nothing to do with
>> >amateur radio policy. Sounds ripe for discussion.
>
>
>There appears to have been another mishap in the Anderson home
>communications center.

Yes there was. :-)

Now what is der oberst going to do about it?

Make that a "central issue" or something? Recite the UCAJ at
an Court-Amateur? [UCAJ = Unimportant Case of Amateur
Juxtaposition]

Hey! Let's make that a New Thread! Make it Several New
Threads! Use all the vile epithets and nastygrams your nasty
lil mind can think up. Vomit all over those who don't agree with
you!

In other words, you will act the same as you have for years.

Sieg Heil and Temper Fry...

LHA / WMD

5298. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195401.07368.00000295@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93408

In article <40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
>don't fully understand them.

Neither do others...

>"You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
>blows"

It all BLOWS from K8MN QTH.

Say goodnight herr robust.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5299. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195401.07368.00000294@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93410

In article <40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Why does it always have to be about you, Len?

About "me?!?"

Herr Robust getting adalpated again. Too many oriongasms?

Nursie all obsessed with hating me...has to bring me up in
usual barf messages nearly all the time.

Are you getting as bad as nursie? [if so, get help pronto...]

>Radio amateurs are free
>to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>of venues.

Feel free. So, when are you going to do that?

> Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>"larger world of radio".

I've worked with some of those longer than herr robust has
been a ham.

They not behave like Big Dave, the officious pompous
authoritity figure telling all what to do and how to do it.

>If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.

"Impressing" big dave is NOT in my life's plan. :-)

Big Dave can only be impressed by looking at his own image
in a mirror. :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5300. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195404.07368.00000296@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93415

In article <20040624093559.19398.00000481@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 7:22 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406240422.18bbb4cf@posting.google.com>
>>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
>>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> >
>>> > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> > >writes:
>>> > >
>>> > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> > >>>
>>> > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
>>k4yz@aol.com
>>> (Steve
>>> > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>> > >>>
>>> > >>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>> > >>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>> > >>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>>> > >>> >>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>> >
>>> > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's
>>blatantly
>>> > >>> >obvious.
>>> > >>>
>>> > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine
>recreation
>>> > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>>> > >>
>>> > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>>> > >
>>> > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
>>> > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
>>> >
>>> It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>>>
>>> If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should

>>> be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
>>> can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
>>> able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
>>> is....
>>> or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>>>
>>> You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>>>
>>> Dave K8MN
>>
>>Interesting. I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
>>ham to become a ham. Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
>>dogs that you are, telling me of acts of heroism how you got the book
>>and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
>>ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>>
>>So Len could tell the kid to get a book. Which according to your
>>comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
>>to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>>
>>You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
>>down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
>>contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
>>jiving.
>>
>>Best of Luck.
>
> The POINT, Your Junior Putziness, is that Lennie doesn't HAVE the
>experience to help the kid OTHER than the theory part.

Riiiight...just five-plus decades of experience beginning around 1947.

OH! Maybe the gunnery nurse is going to address the troops at
morning assembly again:

"Amateur radio WORKS DIFFERENT that all other radio services!"

Right..."amateur electrons" instead of commercial ones. Uh huh.

Poor nursie...thinks the FCC can regulate Laws of Physics too!

> He can't help with testing, other than to refer him to someone else.

Riiiight...amateur radio WORKS DIFFERENT than all other radio.

Unca Stevie da gunnery nursie gave us the command orders!

> He can't help with the Code (should "the kid" desire to learn it), other
>than to refer him to someone else.

Riiiiight...no amateur radio transmitter can WORK on HF without
the "opertator" being tested for manual telegraphy. :-)

Da gubmint and da Army use COMPUTER PROGRAMS to
teach morse code cognition at Fort Huachuca, AZ. Do dat mean
da computers gotta be LICENSED IN HAM RADIO?

> He can't help with tutoring "the kid" on proper Amateur Radio operating
>technique, other than to refer him to someone else.

Riiiight. PROPER PROCEDURE AND PRACTICE ON THE HAM
BANDS IS MOST IMPORTANT! Hams and hamsters can get
fired if they screw up on procedure, lose their social status, be
taken out and shot in the AM...and then be chewed out by the
Super Chief Master Gunnery Nurse!

A fate worse than death.

Those that don't use proper procedure might never OPERTATE
again!!!

> He can't help with...well....I can go on and on....

Poor nursie, still obsessed with hate.

> It's NOT about working "both ends against the middle".

Riiiight...it is capitulation to the loudmouths like gunnery nurse
and herr robust and like-minded self-righteous control freaks of
olde-tyme hamme raddio.

> It's about what contributions Lennie has alledgedly made to Amateur
>Radio.

WOW! New requirement!

All newcomers MUST CONTRIBUTE to ham radio BEFORE they
get licensed!

Hits a new high in the extra nobility snob category...all serve the
might lords of telegraphy FIRST...then they MIGHT let one come
into "their kingdom" if one groveled well enough to suit their
noble blue-blooded righteousness.

> Easily summated, it's ZERO.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie done expressed all kinds of "informed
opinions" on national and world economy, the socio-political
climate, ad nauseum, and has ZERO credentials or smarts in
that!

NOTHING. NADA. ZIP.

Subject didn't touch ham radio within a light-year but here his
mightyness be sitting, spittle shooting out in rage of denigration
of others, and then NOT knowing radio physics.

>His only "professional" affiliation with
>Amateur Radio went belly-up a long time ago. Furthermore there's not a single
>reference, footnote or other attribution of an LHA-authored HR article in ANY

>technical text outside of that defunct magazine, and even then, that's 20+
year
>old information.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Nursie need to read more. :-)

Nursie not know radio theory, certainly not electronics in general.

Nursie need to check out UK website having listings of
radio articles.

Nursie think FCC can make electrons, fields, and waves "act
different" by law if they separate "amateur" radio from all other
radio!

Nursie gots to get more education in theory to UNDERSTAND
technical subjects written up in publications. Memorizing the
sales phrases and jargon in QST advertisements not enough.

Nursie are not right in head.

> As you can see, no luck was needed...just facts.

"Facts" in nursieworld much different than reality.

Nursie "facts" not same as real-world facts.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5301. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195405.07368.00000297@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93413

In article <1e4e3692.0406240422.18bbb4cf@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > >writes:
>> > >
>> > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >>>
>> > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> > >>>
>> > >>> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > >>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > >>> >Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>> > >>> >Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>>
>> > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's
>blatantly
>> > >>> >obvious.
>> > >>>
>> > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
>> > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>> > >>
>> > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>> >
>> > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
>> > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
>>
>> It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>>
>> If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
>> be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
>> can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
>> able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
>> is....
>> or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>>

>> You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Interesting. I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
>ham to become a ham. Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
>dogs that you are, telling me of acts of heroism how you got the book
>and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
>ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>
>So Len could tell the kid to get a book. Which according to your
>comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
>to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>
>You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
>down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
>contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
>jiving.

Big Dave - better known as Herr Robust for his military rank - shucks
and jives more than a jazz band let loose in an Iowa corn field at
harvest time.

He might have been "opertating" his new transceiver and is suffering
from too many oriongasms. He might need Vigoro from Canada for
his mental erectile dysfunction? [he might find out that there's been
an electronics world definition of "software" and "firmware" and
"hardware" for over three decades...but never saw it in QST so
therefore doesn't apply]

Heil wastes everyone's time. :-)

LHA / WMD

5302. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195406.07368.00000298@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93411

In article <20040624044958.29831.00000521@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 3:08 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>> The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
>>services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
>>conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
>>Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
>>inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are
>not
>>authorized either.
>
> Excuse me...
>
> "Opertational" and "interoperabiltiy".

Oh, my...nursie be amateur radio OPERTATOR! :-)

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5303. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195411.07368.00000299@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93419

In article <20040624044740.29831.00000520@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000585@mb-m04.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
>>>obvious.
>>
>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>>
>> Except to a few, such as nursie.
>
> I have enjoyed Amateur Radio since 1972, Lennie.

It's the ONLY radio you know, nursie.

> It has been a great tool, a source of recreation, and a social gathering
>place.

Nursie regular bon vivant, trashed bakeries with visitors, etc.

> And as of today, youa re still not a part of it, save for being a
>sidelined scufflaw.

Mea not bother. Mea been in lots of places youa nevah be in
radio. Tsk, tsk. :-)

>> Nursie does NOT "represent" all or even a part of United States
>> amateur radio.
>
> Sure I do...At least 1/675,000 part of it.

Less of a fraction than that. Over 700 thousand U.S. amateur
licenses granted and on the books, nursie, all still valid.

> Which is 1/675,000 more than you are.

Nursie have strange mathematic in nursieland. :-)

> I dare say that judging by many of the other responses in this forum,
than
>some of my opinions are also held by others.
>
> Google refers.

Nursie bad speller. Spelled "google reefers" wrong.

Nursie get one response in favor, exaggerates that. Just like
the Katapult King exaggerated his single patent into 26! :-)

>> I DO antagonize those who have a compulsive disorder known
>> familiarly as "control freaks" who seek to dominate others by any
>> means possible. Those are simply wanna-be dictators.
>
> There is only one "control freak" here, Lennie.

Incorrect. SEVERAL control freaks busy with industrial-strength
ethnic cleanser trying to brush away all NCTAs.

Scrub scrub scrub, three men in a tubie. Nursery rhymes
by the nannies. [nano-technology trying to replace brains]

>> Nursie just wanna FIGHT. Nursie FIGHT anyone who have opposite
>> opinions of nursie's.
>>
>> Bark, bark, bark, little nursie.
>
> Seems I'm the little doggie that got ahold of YOU, Lennie!

Bark, bark, bark, little nursie.

Nursie not "get" anyone. Nursie get worse.

Nursie got nuts with nursieworld facts and ZERO INVOLVEMENT
in space biz trying to make like Weiner von Brawn.

This not "meaningful discourse," only diss and cuss time by
nursie. Not normal. Not sane. Nursie need help.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5304. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195412.07368.00000301@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93417

In article <40DA5431.C6E5A302@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I guess you told me, Len.

Say goodnight, Dave...

LHA / WMD

5305. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-24 23:54:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93418

In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is "civilian"
>>and
>>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
>it.
>>
>> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>
> Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us, Lennie.
>
> FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and Regulations.

...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)

Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)

> CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department of
>Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the United
>States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.

Wow! That sounds so OFFICIAL!!!

I'll bet all the CAP aces have cute uniforms with pretty patches
and salute one another on or off the flight line...

> The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
>services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
>conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
>Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
>inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are not
>authorized either.

"...where inoperability?!?" :-)

> These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply to all
>other federal entities also.

You sound like the JIG...Judicial Inoperability Group.

Lots of word dancing. Doesn't mean much because the tune is
off key.

>> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.
>
> Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to operate
>in Air Force MARS, Lennie.

Nursie say "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"

If MARS be amateur radio, it can't be "Air Force." Air Force be
military.

>> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>
>> :-)
>>
>> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.
>
> No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
>operational knowledge.

Nursie be stuck on "inoperability" with most things here. :-)

DoD 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03). Ever hear of it?

> Putz..

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discourse?"

No, just nursie's dissing and cussing.

Perfect example of the best that ham radio can be?

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5306. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 00:19:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040624201910.00536.00000357@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 93420

In article <20040624180619.05745.00000458@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Why does it always have to be about you, Len? Radio amateurs are free
>>to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>>of venues. Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>>"larger world of radio". If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>>radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>
> It HAS to be about him, Dave...It's all he REALLY knows...other than what
>he can cut-and-paste from all those websites that are THE most ABSOLUTE
>authority on EVERYTHING, bar none!

DoD authority on U.S. military matters. DoD define MARS. MARS is a military radio service.

FCC not military radio regulator. FCC not define MARS. FCC define U.S. amateur radio.

Nursie state, "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio."

Nursie make error, refuses to admit it directly.

Nursie mad as "heck" about making errors and having others show them in public. Tsk, tsk. Nursie not play well with others.

Nursie write snit about others who disagree with his opinions, sends personal insult and nastygrams about them. Not good behavior. Nursie say he have freedom to cuss and diss others. Nursie not able to play well with others.

Nursie just wanna FIGHT.

Nursie should learn about OPERTATING radios. Suggest good book, "Ham Radio for Dummies."

Nursie wanna be ultimate authority on ham radio in newsgrope, along with all PCTA. Nursie wanny scrub with ethnic cleanser, but can't come clean on own dirty errors. Bad, nursie, bad. Go sit in corner.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5307. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 01:48:00 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406241748.58cd4f16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93421

```
"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<He1Cc.131$VA7.119@news02.roc.ny>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040622065653.03961.00000248@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
> truth
> > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > >Date: 6/22/2004 5:45 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > >news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
> > >> Hello, Steve
> > >>
> > >> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the
> administration
> > >> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things backfire
> > >> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that someone
> finally
> > >> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy, but
> > >> understood it better and was able to let it go.
> > >
> > >I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
> > >a valid opinion.
> >
> > Who said that?
> >
> > Heck, you invent stories about Somalia, what makes you think we'd be
> any
> > less entertained with stories about Viet Nam...?!?!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Hello, Steve
>
> It isn't Vietnam or Samolia per se; the question is "did we learn
> anything?".

Yep. We didn't kill enough of the bad guys in either place.
```

5308. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:12:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406241812.4aabe4d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93422

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040623195753.15095.00000255@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <40D9DD99.5040709@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<40D84A0F.70104@psu.edu>...
> >>
> >>>Da Shadow wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>400 GOTA QSOs seems a bit high considering we will try and teach newbies
> how
> >>>>to operate. I think it is more important to tutor folks on HF and the
> >>>>digital modes than to run the 400 QSOs. Perhaps we can do both.
> >>>
> >>> It is high. The nice thing about the GOTA is that newbies and the
> >>>inexperienced can hone their skills without affecting the more seasoned
> >>>operators. My first field day was before the days of GOTA, and I knew
> >>>very well that I was holding the score down a bit with my slowness. GOTA
> >>>removes that. It's a great way to get started or get back in action.
> >>
> >>
> >> I agree 100% on the purpose of GOTA but I think you guys both
> >> misunderstand this rule:
> >>
> >> "4.1.1.5. A maximum of 400 QSOs made by this station may be claimed
> >> for
> >> credit by its primary Field Day operation. A 100-point bonus may be
> >> claimed
> >> by the primary Field Day operation if the GOTA station reaches the 100
> >> QSO
> >> level."
> >
> > Nope, no misunderstanding. I just mean that 400 QSO's is a very high
> >number to pick up on the GOTA station. I doubt many clubs get there.
>
> OK!
>
> >> The GOTA station is limited to a *maximum* of 400 QSOs. You cannot
> >> count GOTA QSOs for credit beyond 400.
> >>
> >> I think the reason for this rule, and the very loose definition of who
> >> can run the GOTA station, is to keep the GOTA stations busy yet
> >> focused on the truly inexperienced.

> >>
> >> If you work *at least* 100 GOTA QSOs, you get 100 additional points
> >> beyond the QSO points themselves.
> >
> > Kerect!
> >
> >> So the strategy is to work exactly 400 GOTA QSOs. That's less than 17
> >> per hour if you go straight through. 17 per hour is more than 3
> >> minutes per QSO.
> >
> > True, but I'd expect no GOTA stations will be in solid use. I've been
> >supervising our club GOTA station since the concept started, and at
> >least our typical day goes similar to a few people here, and a few
> >there. I think only one person at our station ever went beyond 25 QSO's.
> >And those QSO's aren't super quick. In addition, there is often an
> >instructional period, where they learn about the exchange, and pertinent
> >operating technique, that sort of stuff.
>
> Sure. Point is, though, that by setting the number at 400, we don't have the
> problem of having to shut the GOTA station down because the quota has been
> reached.
> >
> >> The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> >> It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> >> same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> >> same band....
> >
> > Yup. I would highly suggest a 5F group try to put up a Beverage antenna
>
> >as their common receive antenna, and get it as far away as the FD rules
> >allow 1000 foot circle that all the equipment has to be in. Don't know
> >if that EOC center will accommodate that or not.
> >
> Why a Beverage? It receives well in one direction only,

Which is his whole point.

> but in most of the USA
> you need more than one direction.

A FD listening Beverage is basically a very good idea. Yes, they're
directional but from here on the east coast where Mike is located
beverage patterns can cover most of the country if they're done right.
The big advantage Beverages bring to the game is very high
front-to-back ratios. I suspect that what he's talking about here is
stringing a Beverage generally west of the transmiting antennas thus
reducing the levels of the recieved energies of the harmonics (and
other assorted crud) from the other FD stations operating on the lower
bands. IF the near end of the Beverage is some significant distance
from the transmitting antennas in terms of wavelength.

The problem I see with Mike's plan is that a one thousand foot Beverage on, say 15M, is gonna have a pattern like a pencil and would be basically useless because of it's very narrow beamwidth. A more better idea might be optimized Beverages per band, compromise designs between beamwith and length.

In the end isn't it a bit late in the game for this discussion . . ?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5309. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:17:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406241817.6ef700fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93423

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40D9E2B9.2686BD6A@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> > It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> > same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> > same band....
> >
> > Of course there are rigs and techniques that can handle all that RF.
> > But that's another subject...
>
> The tag team of N8NN and K8MN will participate in the Marshall County
> ARES group's effort from Grandview Park, overlooking Moundsville, WV.
> Bert and I will make up a CW team, operating one of the five or six
> stations. We've already done some scouting of the old driving range
> where the group will set up and have found a place a little removed from
> the rest of the stations so as to minimize interference to/from them.
> It also has a couple of nice trees for use in draping that 200' flattop
> fed with open wire line. The call will be W8CAL.

Watch for N2EY/W3RV . . .

>
> Dave K8MN

5310. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:17:27 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406241817.a730a47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93424

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > >writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > > >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > > >>>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > >>>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >
> > > > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> > > > >>> >obvious.
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> > > > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> > > > >
> > > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> > > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
> > > >
> > > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
> > >
> > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> > > is....
> > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
> > >
> > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

> >
> > Interesting.
>
> I think so.

I think so.

> > I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
> > ham to become a ham.
>
> I don't recall that.

There's that famous Heil selective memory at work. Next thing you
know you'll forget all about those out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.

> > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
> > dogs that you are...
>
> Which "you guys" would that be?

PCTA. Know any?

> > ...telling me of acts of heroism...
>
> Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.

Yup. And because they display bravery and heroism in the face of the
old-timey exams and examiners, all who wish to enter the Kingdom must
also face those same exams and examiners. But since those old-timey
exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.

> > how you got the book
> > and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
> > ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>
> Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a
> stelly-eyed examiner.

Steely-eyed.

> K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked
> my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me
> and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse
> to increase my speed.

So you knew hams prior to being licensed. That fits my story. So
what are you disagreeing with now?

> > So Len could tell the kid to get a book.
>
> Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn Lenhorn
> pontifications.

Or he could drag out a box of out of band QSL cards...

> > Which according to your
> > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
> > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>
> A book can provide information to an extent.

A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.

No good golfer became one
> by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.

Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
list?

> No good radio op became one by reading a book.

Now you wish to qualify your statement with the word, "good," and
change the subject matter from amateur radio operator to
undifferentiated radio operator.

You have substantially changed the subject matter. Previously, the
subject was a young, unlicensed person wanted to know about Amateur
Radio. Have it your way.

One can become licensed in amateur radio simply by reading a -single-
book and taking an exam. Unless you are saying that those PCTA's who
told me so are liars.

> Practice and experience are the keys.

Of course, now that you've substantially changed the subject.

> Len has neither.

Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
has formal education in the subject matter.

> > You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
> > down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
> > contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
> > jiving.
>
> I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
> don't fully understand them.

Of course. Heil knows all. He is the very definition of Omniscient.

And all others are ignorant.

> "You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
> blows"

Apparently, you do. I'd suggest you stop pissing in the wind.

Best of Luck.

5311. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:30:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406241830.73b5f212@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93425

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
> > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
> > Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
> > only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
> > been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
> > a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
> > visual or audible means,
>
> Why does it always have to be about you, Len?

It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
discussion, would there?

Radio amateurs are free
> to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
> of venues.

And Len disagrees?

You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
which he claims to be a participant.

> Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
> "larger world of radio".

One in particular also participates in MARS and CAP communications,
but apparently has never been trained. He cannot differentiate
between the Amateur Service and MARS, repeatedly backing his statement
that "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Hi, hi!

If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
> radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.

What tales?

Steely-eyed FCC examiners?

Taking an exam on a lark, without studying, scoring perfectly, in under 8 minutes, and collecting $200 for passing go?

Naw, sounds too much like PCTA tales.

5312. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:36:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406241836.4ddda0bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93426

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DA540F.1A180FD@earthlink.net>...
>
> There appears to have been another mishap in the Anderson home
> communications center.
>
> Dave K8MN

Welcome back. Must have been one helluva bender.

5313. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:40:48 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406241840.7432552b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93427

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040624000539.02583.00000411@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >In article <1e4e3692.0406231530.4340c22f@posting.google.com>,
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

> >>Hey, how else could he earn his GI Bill?
>
> He got a GI bill? Did he buy something from a GI?
>
> A naval intelligence bear-shooter's camera?
>
> :-)
>
> LHA / WMD

Welp, he claims "real military experience."

Unless he got a dishonorable discharge, he's got the GI Bill.

...Tall Tales of the PCTA.

5314. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 02:52:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040624225233.06606.00000488@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93428

In article <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 8:31 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240531.d2df4a4@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>>> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>truth
>>> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>> >Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>> >
>>> >In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> >(Steve
>>> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.
>>
>>(to send people to the moon)
>>
>>> We barely had the
>>> technology to get to the moon in the 70s.
>>
>>Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
>>about a decade earlier.
>
> Well, Jim, if you want to get THAT specific we were actually crashing
>RANGER probes into the moon in the early 60's...

Yup - trying to catch up to the Soviets...
>
> I thought that "...in the 70's" was fairly generic since we landed there
>in 1969 and all of the rest of the landings occured before we were out ov
>Viet Nam.
>
>>> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and
>>> society happen in the wake of war.
>>
>>Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most".
>

> Then some review of American History is in order.
>
> With the exception of the Revolution, most technological advances were
>during or immediately after some major conflict, especially since 1860.
>(Please note the use of the word "advancements", not necessarily inception)
>
> Civil War: Creation of the present ambulance services, advances in
>trauma
>medicine, advancement of the railroads and wireline telegraphy. Photography
>becomes popular.

Bloodiest war in USA's history, fought in large part to decide whether it is OK for the country to split tiself in half so that some people (with light colored skin) can continue own other people (with dark colored skin). The fact that the dark colored skin people's ancestors were dragged from their homes by brute force is conveniently ignored by those who want to continue to own them.

Ambulance service and trauma medicine yes - because of so many wounded.
Railroads were well established before 1861. The main "advancement" was the standardization of lines in the South when they were rebuilt after beying heavily damaged during the war.
Wire telegraph had pretty much connected the developed world. The transatlantic cable was in service *before* Fort Sumter.
Photography was driven by a number of factors, not just the war.

> World War 1: The airplane was just a motor driven kite in 1914, and is
>ready to span the Atlantic in 1919. The radio comes of age. New advances in
>the treatment of diseases (from the study of sanitation in the trenches).

Chemical warfare advances. Unbalance of offensive and defensive weaponry leads to enormous death toles in trench warfare. Submarine technology increases hazards of sea travel.

Advances in flight and radio technology are logical outcomes of increased demand for those technologies.

>World War 2: Mass production of antibiotics (developed in the 30's, but
>not considered a priority until the war), development of RADAR, the jet
>engine,
>further advancements in air travel as a result of the development of
>pressurization. Missle technology emerges. Microwave and X-Ray technology
>skyrockets.

Genocide technology rapidly advanced by Germans. Atomic weapons developed, permitting both cities and their inhabitants to be incinerated at lower cost and effort. Digital electronic computer is developed to improve aiming of guns. 50 million dead, entire countries devastated, permitting massive rebuilding and modernization efforts postwar. War also facilitates Soviet expansion into much of Europe.

> Korea: Use of the helicopter for medical evacuation. Proliferation of
>the television. Satellite communications.

Satellite communications? Where?

> Viet Nam/Moon Missions: Advancements in microprocessors, additional
>advancements in trauma care (MAST pants, use of helicopters in civilian
>MEDEVAC, previously considered too expensive due to limitied manufacture of
>helos) IR/NVG technology.

Microprocessors first appeared in the early 1970s - developed for civilian
applications.
>
> SDI/Cold War: Space imaging, proliferation of LASER devices, especially
>into medical field.

>> In many cases those
>>"jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
>>investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
>>peacetime.
>
> Oh..."would have happened anyway"...?!?!

Yes. There is a logical progression of most technologies. It's called
engineering. You don't need a war to do it.
>
> I don't think so, Jim.

It's true.

>All of the major developments of other
>technologies or services only happened where there was major subsidies by
>governments.

Even if true, why does it take a war? Why not simply solve the problems?

>Some, such as the expansion of oil refining, etc, only happened
>after the development of the automobile, one of the few exceptions to the
>above.

There are *lots* of exceptions. The automobile is one. PCs are another. Modern
construction practices. Fiber optic communications. Lots of others.
>
>>Or they're the result of government programs that are done
>>to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.
>
>Uh huh...government subsidies. Again, big influx of cash from taxes.

Which those "tax and spend democrats" are usually pushing...

>MAY have happened otherwise, but it didn't.

Why spend your own money if Uncle will give you some?
>
>>In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>
> Oh?
>

Yes.

> How much do you pay for a calculator these days?

Nothing. Last calculator I bought was in the mid 1980s. I use the Windows calculator function. Free.

> How much did you pay for the last Amateur transceiver you bought?

$589 for the basic Elecraft K2 kit, which I assembled. Also has the ATU and audio filter options, which I assembled.

The Southgate Type 7 (completed 1995) was built from recycled parts and cost less than $100. The Type 6 (1985) cost a bit more. I've never owned any non-US made ham gear.
>
> Have you ever had an X-Ray or CT scan?

Dental Xrays since I was a kid. Never a CT scan. Had my first up-periscope last year....

>All of those technologies have benefited from government spending in
>order to advance military or space technology.

Wouldn't it make more sense to just develop the technologies straight out? If you need better medical Xray machines, develop them.

>>> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>>> based on the Apollo program alone.
>>
>>Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.
>
> And most mathematical or engineering calculations were performed with a
>slide rule or pencil and paper.

The PC was not developed for the space program. Nor for the military.

And the Saturn V worked pretty good, didn't it?

>>No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
>>plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
>>to be reinvented.
>
> Why? Did we get stupid in the last 30+ years?

Actually, yes. Much of the manufacturing technology no longer exists. Anyone who worked on those systems above a certain level is now retired, or close to it.
>
>Quick/Cheap/Dirty plan...A lunar lander configured to ride in the
>Shuttle bay.

That could work. I had the same idea years ago.

>The Shuttle carries it to the Moon,

Won't work. Shuttle system does not have enough fuel to leave Earth orbit, let alone enter lunar orbit and leave it again. And that's with the cargo bay *empty*.

If it could be done, NASA would have done it already.

The Shuttle has enough fuel to reach orbits of a few hundred miles but no more. Going to the moon is a lot more. That's why a Saturn V is so big yet the LM/CSM combo is so small.

>the mission drops in, and brings at
>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.

Only ways such a system could work is if the Shuttle stayed in earth orbit and the lunar package went from there.

And the result would be a short-term visit by a few astronauts, like the Apollo missions, not a long term base.

>>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask
>>WHERE
>>> in space are you going to spend that money?
>>
>>We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
>>here. And address problems long-term.
>
> Oh?

Yes.
>
> NASA doesn't need people who are less-than-engineering qualified...?!?!

Not really. They need highly skilled people, mostly. You might check into how much money it costs to create one NASA job.

>If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that >every company that contracts with it would be able to

Sure - at a price.

But why not solve our problems directly?
>
>And WHAT problems are NOT being addressed long term BECAUSE of the >space program?

Surface transportation, for one. Energy efficiency and independence. Education.

>>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>>> technical advencement.
>>
>>Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
>>those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"
>>
>>Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
>>government spending".

>
> But we can also defer that with cooperation with business against futures
>for mining, technology development, etc. The opportunities are there...We
>just need to have the gonads to take them.

What opportunities? The only really profitable parts of the space program have been the Earth-imaging satellites and communications satellites. All unmanned, and they look back at Mother Earth. And the role of satcomms is dwindling with the development of fiber optics.

>>It was in the Nixon/Ford years that the big NASA cutbacks took place.
>>Too much money, they said. There was supposed to be an Apollo 18 lunar
>>mission - it was cut and the Saturn V for it became a museum piece.
>>Literally.
>
>Yep...the public lost interest since there was no "obvious" return on
>thier
>investment other than national pride. However the long terms benefits have
>been overwhelming.

While there have been some benefits, they have not been overwhelming. Most of them did not require the space program. Or war.
>
>NOW...if we were to take the chance on an expedition or perm/semi-perm
>base on the Moon to determine it's value to be harvested...?!?!

What do you think could be harvested from the Moon that can't be had for much less right here on earth?

>>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>>verifies the reliability analysis.
>
>Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables
>are bound to go boom.

CNG tankers don't. Railroad tank cars don't.

Sorry, 1 in 75 is simply not good enough reliability.
>
>As for your "reliability analysis" try the numbers based on miles
>flown...(Just proof that you can make any set of numbers look good/bad)

Not a valid comparison. In the history of shuttle missions, the result is binary. Either everybody gets back safe and sound from a mission, or everyone dies and the mission is a total loss. Doesn't matter how many miles or flown - the important variable is how many missions are flown. Challenger blew up before going 100 miles of its last mission, Columbia burned up after going all but about 2000 miles of its last mission.

The important fact is that about 1 of 75 missions has been a complete loss.

>>The reason the USA made the big space commitments was because JFK and
>>LBJ (guess what party) pushed for them.
>
>Do you think it would have been different with Nixon in the White House
>in 1960?

Yes. But that's not the point.

>He was an avowed anit-Communist. Do you think he might not ahve made
>the same challenge, faced with the same circumstances...?!?! I bet he would
>have made the challenge earlier than JFK did.

Nope. JFK needed to save face after the Bay of Pigs embarrassment. There was serious talk of scrapping the whole manned program, maybe even all of NASA, after the various problems of exploding rockets and the Popped Cork fiasco, while the Russians were orbiting dogs and taking pictures of the far side of the moon. (The Rooskies had lots of failures too - they just didn't talk about them).

There were more than a few people who thought that the Air Force should do manned space flight. There were plans for followups to the X-15 that would reach orbit at far less cost and complexity than the ballistic-missile spam-in-a-can NASA approach. In fact, the X-15 did reach "space" - it exceeded 62.2 miles altitude.
>
>>They were essentially done to
>>compete with the Soviets for the "high ground" of space. Recall that
>>practically all of the important early space firsts (first earth
>>satellite, first animal in space, first human in space and in orbit,
>>first woman in space, first mission to another heavenly body, first
>>pictures of the far side of the Moon...) were done by the Soviet
>>Union. And most of their early accomplishments were complete surprises
>>in the West. The USA played catch-up for years. JFK and LBJ knew that
>>if the Rooskies could orbit a man and bring him back safely, doing the
>>same with a nuclear weapon would be a piece of cake for them.
>>
>>Today there is no such need or competition.
>
>There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim.

Who is there to compete with for space?

>No..we don't need to build a
>bigger, more deadly nuke, but a bit of friendly rivalry goes a long way
>towards
>building a better and cheaper mouse trap.

The race to the moon wasn't friendly. And it didn't build better mouse traps.
>
>>The cost was staggering but they had the political clout to do it.
>>They could sell it to everyone on the national security agenda. And it
>>didn't hurt that a lot of the money was spent in states like LBJ's own
>>Texas. (Why is the control center for manned flights in Houston when

>>the launch facility is in Florida?)
>
> I am sure that having been in LBJ's home state had soemthing to do with
>it...But being more-or-less half way between FL and CA helped. Much of
>America's space program is out of Edwards and Vandenberg, if you will recall.

The *only* reason was to put high paying jobs in LBJ's home state.

The launch facility is in Florida for physics reasons. The ideal launch location would be on the equator, but the continental US doesn't go that far south. And there should be water or desert to the east of the launch pad so failed launches don't land on people.

The Houston facility could be anywhere there is communications.
>
>>Billions were spent on the space program in the '60s but when
>>Americans needed quality fuel-efficient cars in the '70s they had to
>>go to Germany and Japan for them.
>
>Because American unions demanded wages that pushed the cost of American
>cars through the roof.

That's pure BS.

Union workers built the spacecraft. If we could afford to have them build rockets, we could afford to have them build cars.

>Also, American tastes in automobiles up until then
>were for bigger, heavier and faster..."Small" was not a generally popular
>concept in the 50's and 60's, if you'll recall.

That's because the car companies wanted it that way. Here's why:

After WW2, American car manufacturers thought that the way to maximize profits was simply to sell more and more cars. One way to do that was to have this year's model be bigger, faster, more powerful or simply 'more' than last year's. Safety, economy, and pollution were minor concerns - the important thing was to plant in the public's mind the idea that this year's car was somehow a lot better - and at the same time, keep manufacturing costs down.

So body styles changed every year - sheet metal is cheap. Fundamental research into engine design and such was not a high priority at all. The result was cars that were big, heavy, inefficient, dirty and fell apart or rusted out in a relatively short time.

Most of all, the focus was short-term. Sell more cars next quarter! Where we'd get all the fuel to run them wasn't a concern.

>The Germans and the Japanese were
>forced
>by economics, infrastructure and geography to do "small".

Not really - look at Mercedes. What they did was look at *quality* first. They set out to design cars that were efficient and well built. They improved the

basic technologies, not just the sheet metal.

Ever hear of a guy named Deming? He wound up in Japan because US manufacturers didn't want him.

The USA could have been developing better surface transportation systems in the '50s and '60s and '70s. But we didn't because those things weren't given any priority. That myopia continues today.

Imagine if the commitment had been made back in 1973 for the USA to become energy independent by the end of the 20th century. Do you doubt that it could have been done? Imagine being able to tell OPEC to take a hike.
>
>>> I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
>>> a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.
>>
>>As exciting as that effort is, all of it was done more than 35 years
>>ago with the X-15.
>
>Not by a private entrepreneur and not with the expectation of being able
>to carry two passengers.

Very true. But the X-15 was designed with slide rules. No computers aboard, either.
>
>Also, despite the similarities in delivery techniques (parasite lifter),
>the control and recovery techniques are different.
>
>It took the USAF hundreds of millions of (1960's) dollars to do what
>these
>guys did for under $30M...I wonder what the 1960-to-2004 cost comparisons
>look
>like?
>
>>And it was done without government funding. So why do we need NASA for
>>manned flights at all? Let the private folks do it on a self-funded
>>basis.
>
> OK...so we sit out manned space flight until private investors can get
>up-to-speed with governmental levels of service...?!?!

Why not? You just pointed out that they did it for $30 million compared to many times that for the X-15. Why *not* let the private folks do it?
>
>>> So why not Mars?
>>
>>Because the cost and risk is simply too much for the benefits. Do you
>>have any idea what a mission to Mars would require in terms of how big
>>and complex the ship(s) would have to be, how long they'd be gone, and
>>how completely on their own they would be?
>
> Yes, as a matter of fact I do.

OK - let's have the details.
>
>And I cannot see those costs getting any less impressive if we wait
>until 2014 or 2024 to do it.
>
>>Mars is orders of magnitude more difficult than the moon. Apollo
>>missions were no more than two weeks, Mars missions would be over a
>>year long. The Martian surface is in some ways more hostile than the
>>lunar surface and the landing physics much more difficult (Martian
>>gravity is stronger). Look how many unmanned Mars missions have failed
>>completely.
>
> So again...we bring human exploration and technology to a screaming halt
>due to our fear of the cash register?

Nope.

We set out a reasonable budget for manned space flight and do what can be done
with that budget. And we focus more on real-world problems.
>
>And as for the failed Mars missions, do you think that maybe if there
>had been someone there to fix the problem that the mission could have
>proceeded?
>
Nobody knows. Most of the failures were mission-ending. The probe went silent
and was never heard from again.

Heck, even if the Columbia astronauts had known about the problem that caused
the loss of their ship, there was nothing they could have done about it.

>>Heck, figure out radio propagation delay to Mars....
>
> Yep...same 186,000MPS that wew ahve here on Earth...

I mean how much time it takes.

>>What benefits would a manned mission to Mars give that could not be
>>had any other way?
>
> Having a Human Being actually stand on it, for one.

Besides that.
>
>>And how much all of it would cost?
>
>Who cares?

Those of us who have to pay for it.

>We poor billions into pork barrel projects that DON'T
>provide ANY return every year

Like what? What are you willing to cut in order to fund a Mars mission?

>...why not spend it on something that will...?!?!

Sorry - the ROI of a Mars mission just isn't there.
>
>>> Why not research stations on the Moon?
>>
>>How much are *you* willing to pay for them in tax dollars? That's
>>really the bottom line. People are all for space exploration and such
>>until the bills for it show up.
>
>See above.

You're avoiding the question. How much additional tax are *YOU* willing to pay?

>Imagine what the communications possibilites alone would be
>by using the moon for alternative wireless technologies...

There aren't any. The moon isn't a good platform for such things. In short, it sucks.

Geostationary orbit is the way to do that job.

Ham radio connection: Back in the '70s there was something called "Project Moonray" that was supposed to go on the last Apollo lunar mission. The idea was that a small package would be deployed on the moon to repeat amateur signals the way OSCARs did. Except that by being on the moon, it would be easy to track.

Sounded good at first. But the problems were many. Size and weight were severely limited, and the package had to be rated for manned flight.

But the big problem was that the results were not worth the requirements. For example, the moon is roughly 10 times farther away than geostationary and roughly 100 to 1000 times farther away than low earth orbit. You do the math on what that does to path loss.

Also, the package would be bked by the sun for 2 weeks, then in darkness for 2 weeks. Temperature variations of over 400 degrees.

It didn't happen.
>
>>> Unless you want
>>> to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
>>> conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?
>>
>>Simple: The costs outweigh the benefits. There are easier, cheaper,
>>faster ways to get the benefits and solve the problems we have on
>>earth.
>
> Oh? They are...?!?!
>
Yes. It's simple: If you want a better mouse trap, study mouse behavior and trap design, and build one. Don't go off building racecars, hoping that some development of race car technology will somehow spill over into mouse trap technology.

>>Space and war may help with some things but they are horribly
>>inefficient means of progress.
>
> So we just wait until a more efficient way is developed?

No. We address the problems directly. On a budget.

>Until they
>develop the "transporter"...?!?! Until Zephraim Cochrane develops warp
>drive?

Those are all fantasies, Steve.

>>None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do
>>so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.
>
> So we just mark time until...when...?!?!
>
We don't mark time. We make a long term plan and reasonable budget.

Heck, let's fund space exploration the way so many other things are funded. We'll have bake sales and walkathons. Solicit donations of parts and supplies from manufacturers, and use volunteer labor. Sell advertising space on the outside of the space vehicles. Lots of ideas like that in use by groups ranging from Indy 500 racers to the Girl Scouts.

And we'll put real money into education, infrastructure development, transportation, and energy independence.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5315. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:31:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93429

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
> >
> >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
>
> I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.

Who is "der Oberst"?

> Strike "unable" and substitute "haven't bothered."

For now, "unable" will have to stand as written. You are unable to
participate in amateur radio. You are not a licensed radio amateur.
>
> Why are all your postings in here concerning me? :-)

You read something concerning you into my Field Day posting?

Dave K8MN

5316. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:33:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DB9D0F.2F66D8EF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93430

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >There appears to have been another mishap in the Anderson home
> >communications center.
>
> Yes there was. :-)
>
> Now what is der oberst going to do about it?

If you want me to fix it, you'll have to put me on retainer.

Dave K8MN

5317. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:40:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DB9EB7.572DB4F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93431

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
>
> About "me?!?"

Yeah, Len, about you. Why'd you snip the crud about your vast
experience?

> Herr Robust getting adalpated again. Too many oriongasms?

Who is "Herr Robust"?

> Nursie all obsessed with hating me...has to bring me up in
> usual barf messages nearly all the time.
>
> Are you getting as bad as nursie? [if so, get help pronto...]

Who is "Nursie"?

> >Radio amateurs are free
> >to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
> >of venues.
>
> Feel free. So, when are you going to do that?

Probably after you get your "Extra right out of the box".

> > Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
> >"larger world of radio".
>
> I've worked with some of those longer than herr robust has
> been a ham.

Wonderful. Now if you'd only been a ham as long as I've been a ham...

> They not behave like Big Dave, the officious pompous
> authoritity figure telling all what to do and how to do it.

You must have me confused with yourself, Big Len. You're all
officious. You're certainly pompous and long-winded and you've spent
years here attempting to outline how amateur radio should be regulated.
Fact is, you have nothing to do with amateur radio.

> >If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
> >radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>
> "Impressing" big dave is NOT in my life's plan. :-)

Then you'll likely want to knock off the countless retellings of your
fifty years experience in whatever.

> Big Dave can only be impressed by looking at his own image
> in a mirror. :-)

I beg to differ. I'm impressed by a great many people, both famous and
unknown. You didn't make the list.

Dave K8MN

5318. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:45:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DBA002.3CB278C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93432

Len Over 21 wrote:

> [he might find out that there's been
> an electronics world definition of "software" and "firmware" and
> "hardware" for over three decades...but never saw it in QST so
> therefore doesn't apply]

I provided a definition from several sources, even providing the urls so
you could confirm those definitions on your own. You continue to argue
the point in the face of cold, hard fact. You're simply wrong, Bozoo.

> Heil wastes everyone's time. :-)

You aren't everyone and you have nothing but time.

Dave K8MN

5319. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:48:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DBA088.CC6E31D3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93433

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <40DA5431.C6E5A302@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I guess you told me, Len.
>
> Say goodnight, Dave...

" ", Len added.

Dave K8MN

5320. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 03:51:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DBA159.3B975DA9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93434

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40D9E2B9.2686BD6A@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > The big problem with the GOTA station in a 5F group is interference.
> > > It's bad enough when two stations of different modes try to use the
> > > same band at the same time, but when the GOTA folks show up on the
> > > same band....
> > >
> > > Of course there are rigs and techniques that can handle all that RF.
> > > But that's another subject...
> >
> > The tag team of N8NN and K8MN will participate in the Marshall County
> > ARES group's effort from Grandview Park, overlooking Moundsville, WV.
> > Bert and I will make up a CW team, operating one of the five or six
> > stations. We've already done some scouting of the old driving range
> > where the group will set up and have found a place a little removed from
> > the rest of the stations so as to minimize interference to/from them.
> > It also has a couple of nice trees for use in draping that 200' flattop
> > fed with open wire line. The call will be W8CAL.
>
> Watch for N2EY/W3RV . . .

I have no doubt that we'll work you fellas. I don't think we'll hear a
peep from the California Halfwatt though.

Dave K8MN

5321. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 04:13:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93435

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
> > William wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > >writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >>>
> > > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve
> > > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > > > > >>>
> > > > > >>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > > > >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > > > >>>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > > >>>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> > >
> > > > > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> > > > > >>> >obvious.
> > > > > >>>
> > > > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> > > > > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> > > > > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
> > > > >
> > > > > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
> > > > >
> > > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> > > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> > > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> > > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> > > > > is....
> > > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
> > > > >

> > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > Interesting.
> >
> > I think so.
>
> I think so.
>
> > > I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
> > > ham to become a ham.
> >
> > I don't recall that.
>
> There's that famous Heil selective memory at work. Next thing you
> know you'll forget all about those out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.

I know this'll come as a real disappointment to you, "William", but I
don't hang on your every word. I have only so much space available for
mental storage and I like to reserve it for the really important
matters.

> > > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
> > > dogs that you are...
> >
> > Which "you guys" would that be?
>
> PCTA. Know any?

I know several. Are you telling us that everyone who is for morse
testing and who posts here "set upon you like a pack of wild dogs" and
that everyone who is for morse testing and who posts here is a part of a
pack of wild dogs? I don't believe you.

> > > ...telling me of acts of heroism...
> >
> > Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.
>
> Yup. And because they display bravery and heroism in the face of the
> old-timey exams and examiners, all who wish to enter the Kingdom must
> also face those same exams and examiners.

The above is a perfect example of why I don't hang on your every word.
It isn't factual and is certainly less than memorable.

> But since those old-timey
> exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
> worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.

Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?

> > > how you got the book
> > > and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
> > > ham. No sir! No help from no one.
> >
> > Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a
> > stelly-eyed examiner.
>
> Steely-eyed.
>
> > K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked
> > my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me
> > and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse
> > to increase my speed.
>
> So you knew hams prior to being licensed. That fits my story. So
> what are you disagreeing with now?

Re-read the exchange above and get back to me.

> > > So Len could tell the kid to get a book.
> >
> > Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn Lenhorn
> > pontifications.
>
> Or he could drag out a box of out of band QSL cards...

Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
or would belong to someone else.

> > > Which according to your
> > > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
> > > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
> >
> > A book can provide information to an extent.
>
> A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.
>
> No good golfer became one
> > by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.
>
> Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
> list?

No, but I'd like you to take my list as a whole because it illustrates
precisely the idea that I'm attempting to convey.

> > No good radio op became one by reading a book.
>
> Now you wish to qualify your statement with the word, "good," and
> change the subject matter from amateur radio operator to
> undifferentiated radio operator.

You can add the word "amateur" before radio and the meaning is still the same.

> You have substantially changed the subject matter. Previously, the
> subject was a young, unlicensed person wanted to know about Amateur
> Radio. Have it your way.

Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.

> One can become licensed in amateur radio simply by reading a -single-
> book and taking an exam. Unless you are saying that those PCTA's who
> told me so are liars.

You're quite right. Someone can pass an exam and become a radio amateur. Absent practice and experience, that person can be a complete lid.

> > Practice and experience are the keys.
>
> Of course, now that you've substantially changed the subject.

Not really, Brian. You have Len suggesting a book.

> > Len has neither.
>
> Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
> don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
> operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
> reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
> has formal education in the subject matter.

So Len is a good golfer?

> > > You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
> > > down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
> > > contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
> > > jiving.
> >
> > I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
> > don't fully understand them.
>
> Of course. Heil knows all. He is the very definition of Omniscient.

How would you know that unless you are (no cap necessary) omniscient?

> And all others are ignorant.

Not at all. I've made no such statement. We have on occasion, found some areas where you have exhibited ignorance.

> > "You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
> > blows"
>
> Apparently, you do. I'd suggest you stop pissing in the wind.

One of my favorite country song titles, yet to be recorded:
"If I Had It To Do All Over Again, I'd Do It All Over You".

Dave K8MN

5322. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 04:18:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DBA7A9.7BDDE366@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93436

William wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > >
> > > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
> > > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
> > >
> > > Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
> > > only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
> > > been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
> > > a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
> > > visual or audible means,
> > >
> > Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
>
> It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
> discussion, would there?

No, there wouldn't. I'm not all that forgetful.

> Radio amateurs are free
> > to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
> > of venues.
>
> And Len disagrees?

Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?

> You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
> information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
> which he claims to be a participant.

Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?
"Free to" does not equate to "forced to".

> > Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
> > "larger world of radio".
>
> One in particular also participates in MARS and CAP communications,

> but apparently has never been trained. He cannot differentiate
> between the Amateur Service and MARS, repeatedly backing his statement
> that "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."

Without amateur radio ops, there'd be no MARS program.

> Hi, hi!

What are you, OSCAR I?

> > If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
> > radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>
> What tales?

Read the material, "William".

Dave K8MN

5323. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 04:58:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hpednbKmoLJoLUbdRVn-gg@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93437

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: Mike Coslo mjc5@psu.edu
>>Date: 6/24/2004 10:11 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40DAEF20.3030105@psu.edu>
>>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>>August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.
>>>
>>>Guess who was president.....
>>
>> Good guess, but not quite. We were moving away from the Gold Standard
>>at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted
>>Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level -
>>something considered intolerable.
>
>
> And please remember that these were the conditions passed to him by a...
>
> (drum roll, please....)
>
> A Demoncrat!
>
> And a Demoncrat before THAT one!

And Before that, a Republican that set the wheels in motion for big
deficit spending. And so on and so on...

Been waiting for you to weigh in on this one Steve.

You are 100 percent correct.

Nothing occurs in a vacuum, and life is a continuum. Democrats make
mistakes, and so do Republicans. As time goes on, the groups don't stand
still. They morph and change until some of the old definitions gert a
little muddy. So called conservatives now stand for big government with
more power, and spend money quite easily.

>
>> We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The
>>initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that
>>soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate
>>dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an
>>economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an

>>inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.
>>
>> The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal
>
> conservative!
>
>> Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?
>
>
> And the last President to have a balanced budget...?!?!

You see Steve, you're trying to put everything into this Republican good/Democrat bad state.

I'm not either. I'm an independent conservative. I vote for Republican candidates around 60 percent of the time. Frankly, both parties piss me off.

But you might ask why I seem to be busting Republican chops a lot. It's because the Pubs have been in power for most of the last 50 years, and increasingly so in the last 20.

And yet, the blame for all the problems is heaped variously on the Democrats, and the elusive "liberal".

I say spend less time blaming, and more time fixing.

But of course that takes us back to what I said earlier about Republicans making mistakes too. Now if they owned up to them. It's a pity - when you never admit a mistake, you won't learn from the ones you do make.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5324. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012432.13325.00000465@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93442

In article <40DBA7A9.7BDDE366@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>William wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> > > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> > >
>> > > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>> > > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>> > >
>> > > Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
>> > > only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
>> > > been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
>> > > a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
>> > > visual or audible means,
>> >
>> > Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
>>
>> It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
>> discussion, would there?
>
>No, there wouldn't. I'm not all that forgetful.

Big Dave not remember this be public forum, all see messages.

Why Dave continue to talk about me? I no talk about me here.

Dave have obsessive-compulsive dysfunction, too? Nusie have
that. Spreading to all PCTA. May be terminal.

>> Radio amateurs are free
>> > to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>> > of venues.
>>
>> And Len disagrees?
>
>Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?

Big Dave get "Ham Radio for Dummies" yet?

>> You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
>> information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
>> which he claims to be a participant.
>
>Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?
>"Free to" does not equate to "forced to".

Big Dave have vision problem? He pick nits alla time.

Dave the nit-picker. "Metaphors be with him." :-)

>> > Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>> > "larger world of radio".
>>
>> One in particular also participates in MARS and CAP communications,
>> but apparently has never been trained. He cannot differentiate
>> between the Amateur Service and MARS, repeatedly backing his statement
>> that "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
>Without amateur radio ops, there'd be no MARS program.

Big Dave not read DoD Directive 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03).

Big Dave not read of Grecial Firebolt.

MARS work fine by itself. Proved. MARS be military
radio service.

>> Hi, hi!
>
>What are you, OSCAR I?

Big Dave be Oscar Hammernail II?

>> > If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>> > radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>>
>> What tales?
>
>Read the material, "William".

Read DoD Directive 4650.2, Big Dave. DoD define MARS.

ARRL not define MARS. FCC not define MARS.

Big Dave be outer-spaced again. Needs more O-two.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5325. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012435.13325.00000466@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93443

In article <40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>William wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
>> > William wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > > > >writes:
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > > > >>>
>> > > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> > (Steve
>> > > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> > > > > >>>
>> > > > > >>> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > > > > >>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > > > > >>> >Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>> > > > > >>> >Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>> > >
>> > > > > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees.
>That's blatantly
>> > > > > >>> >obvious.
>> > > > > >>>
>> > > > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine
>recreation
>> > > > > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
>> > > > > >>
>> > > > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
>> > > > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
>> > > > >
>> > > > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>> > > >

>> > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe
>should
>> > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says,
>"What
>> > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll
>be
>> > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur
>radio
>> > > > is....
>> > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>> > > >
>> > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dave K8MN
>> > >
>> > > Interesting.
>> >
>> > I think so.
>>
>> I think so.
>>
>> > > I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
>> > > ham to become a ham.
>> >
>> > I don't recall that.
>>
>> There's that famous Heil selective memory at work. Next thing you
>> know you'll forget all about those out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.
>
>I know this'll come as a real disappointment to you, "William", but I
>don't hang on your every word.

Big Dave manage to hang hisself by his OWN words! :-)

>I have only so much space available for
>mental storage and I like to reserve it for the really important
>matters.

Riiiiight. For song titles "yet to be published."

Are ASCAP and BMI chomping at the bit on that? Or have
they been bit. :-)

>> > > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
>> > > dogs that you are...
>> >
>> > Which "you guys" would that be?
>>
>> PCTA. Know any?
>
>I know several. Are you telling us that everyone who is for morse
>testing and who posts here "set upon you like a pack of wild dogs" and

>that everyone who is for morse testing and who posts here is a part of a
>pack of wild dogs? I don't believe you.

"Use the metaphors, Luke, the metaphors."

May the metaphors be with you, Luke Skyhawker.

Big Dave be lissen to nursie too much...

>> > > ...telling me of acts of heroism...
>> >
>> > Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.
>>
>> Yup. And because they display bravery and heroism in the face of the
>> old-timey exams and examiners, all who wish to enter the Kingdom must
>> also face those same exams and examiners.
>
>The above is a perfect example of why I don't hang on your every word.
>It isn't factual and is certainly less than memorable.

Big Dave not see "hostile action" outside of newsgroup?

Tsk.

>> But since those old-timey
>> exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
>> worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.
>
>Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?

Big Dave feed his end too much?

>> > > how you got the book
>> > > and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
>> > > ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>> >
>> > Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a
>> > stelly-eyed examiner.
>>
>> Steely-eyed.
>>
>> > K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked
>> > my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me
>> > and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse
>> > to increase my speed.
>>
>> So you knew hams prior to being licensed. That fits my story. So
>> what are you disagreeing with now?
>
>Re-read the exchange above and get back to me.

Why? Big Dave no understand it? Tsk.

>> > > So Len could tell the kid to get a book.
>> >
>> > Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn Lenhorn
>> > pontifications.
>>
>> Or he could drag out a box of out of band QSL cards...
>
>Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
>or would belong to someone else.

This sub-thread NOT about me.

Why Big Dave want to concentrate on personal attacks?

>> > > Which according to your
>> > > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
>> > > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>> >
>> > A book can provide information to an extent.
>>
>> A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.
>>
>> No good golfer became one
>> > by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.
>>
>> Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
>> list?
>
>No, but I'd like you to take my list as a whole because it illustrates
>precisely the idea that I'm attempting to convey.

Attempt failed. Try again. :-)

Hint: "Use the metaphors, Luke." :-)

>> > No good radio op became one by reading a book.
>>
>> Now you wish to qualify your statement with the word, "good," and
>> change the subject matter from amateur radio operator to
>> undifferentiated radio operator.
>
>You can add the word "amateur" before radio and the meaning is still the
>same.

"Amateur amateur radio operator" oxymoron.

Valve open your cannula, Big Dave...O-two not enough there.

>> You have substantially changed the subject matter. Previously, the
>> subject was a young, unlicensed person wanted to know about Amateur
>> Radio. Have it your way.
>
>Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
>is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.

Riiiight...all newcomers to ham radio MUST have "practical
experience" BEFORE getting ham license! :-)

All newcomers thus become illegal. :-)

>> One can become licensed in amateur radio simply by reading a -single-
>> book and taking an exam. Unless you are saying that those PCTA's who
>> told me so are liars.
>
>You're quite right. Someone can pass an exam and become a radio amateur.
>Absent practice and experience, that person can be a complete lid.

Riiiiight...close all lids on amateur radio! Nothing open!

>> > Practice and experience are the keys.
>>
>> Of course, now that you've substantially changed the subject.
>
>Not really, Brian. You have Len suggesting a book.

What's wrong with "Ham Radio for Dummies?" :-)

This looks like ready reading audience for same...

>> > Len has neither.
>>
>> Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
>> don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
>> operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
>> reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
>> has formal education in the subject matter.
>
>So Len is a good golfer?

Why are you always referring to me? You obsessed with civilians,
mighty amateur? Tsk.

BTW...I used to shoot in the low 80s until the club made me
give up my firearms...

>> > > You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
>> > > down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
>> > > contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
>> > > jiving.
>> >
>> > I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
>> > don't fully understand them.
>>
>> Of course. Heil knows all. He is the very definition of Omniscient.
>
>How would you know that unless you are (no cap necessary) omniscient?

Heil know everything. He tell others he do. Redefines computer
terms, knows all about software defined radios. Godlike. Gods
are all omniscient. Very smart too.

>> And all others are ignorant.
>
>Not at all. I've made no such statement. We have on occasion, found
>some areas where you have exhibited ignorance.

Ignorance be capital crime in hum radio?

Hum radio be closed to lids.

Etc.
>
>> > "You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
>> > blows"
>>
>> Apparently, you do. I'd suggest you stop pissing in the wind.
>
>One of my favorite country song titles, yet to be recorded:
>"If I Had It To Do All Over Again, I'd Do It All Over You".

Big Dave already piss in wind.

Very unsanitary. Not couth. Vulgar.

Clean up and say good night, Dave.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5326. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012436.13325.00000467@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93440

In article <40DBA002.3CB278C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> [he might find out that there's been
>> an electronics world definition of "software" and "firmware" and
>> "hardware" for over three decades...but never saw it in QST so
>> therefore doesn't apply]
>
>I provided a definition from several sources, even providing the urls so
>you could confirm those definitions on your own. You continue to argue
>the point in the face of cold, hard fact. You're simply wrong, Bozoo.

Riiiiight. Big Dave be long-time computerist, hardware expert,
yarns and yarns of experience in digital stuff. Knows all, sees all,
can tell ACM to go stuff it. :-)

>> Heil wastes everyone's time. :-)
>
>You aren't everyone and you have nothing but time.

Why Big Dave talk allatime on personalities? :-)

Is this Insult Fest newsgrope or about hum radio policy?

Say goodnight, Dave.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5327. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012437.13325.00000469@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93439

In article <40DB9D0F.2F66D8EF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>If you want me to fix it, you'll have to put me on retainer.

Sorry, that's a medical procedure. See nursie about that.

Put the bite on someone else...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5328. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012437.13325.00000468@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93441

In article <40DB9EB7.572DB4F1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
>>
>> About "me?!?"
>
>Yeah, Len, about you. Why'd you snip the crud about your vast
>experience?

Snip what?

Heil is pissing in the wind in here...

>> Herr Robust getting adalpated again. Too many oriongasms?
>
>Who is "Herr Robust"?

A fignewton of your imagination, complete with monocle.

>> Nursie all obsessed with hating me...has to bring me up in
>> usual barf messages nearly all the time.
>>
>> Are you getting as bad as nursie? [if so, get help pronto...]
>
>Who is "Nursie"?

Nursie be da gunnery nurse, superham and hero of "seven
hostile actions." Someplace, at some time.

>> >Radio amateurs are free
>> >to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>> >of venues.
>>
>> Feel free. So, when are you going to do that?
>
>Probably after you get your "Extra right out of the box".

I have extra boxes. Nothing in there for Heil. Except air.

Heil have much air.

>> > Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>> >"larger world of radio".
>>
>> I've worked with some of those longer than herr robust has
>> been a ham.
>
>Wonderful. Now if you'd only been a ham as long as I've been a ham...

Well, that must mean you are cured. Or well-preserved.

You have an FDA stamping?

>> They not behave like Big Dave, the officious pompous
>> authoritity figure telling all what to do and how to do it.
>
>You must have me confused with yourself, Big Len. You're all
>officious. You're certainly pompous and long-winded and you've spent
>years here attempting to outline how amateur radio should be regulated.
>Fact is, you have nothing to do with amateur radio.

Poor Heil, not with FCC. Not with ARRL BoD. BooHoo.

Puff, puff, puff is der Oberst. Air. Hot. Much.

>> >If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>> >radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>>
>> "Impressing" big dave is NOT in my life's plan. :-)
>
>Then you'll likely want to knock off the countless retellings of your
>fifty years experience in whatever.

This is talking of years of personal existance?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Only seems like "countless" to all readers of
Heil's "foreign service" duries on rediscovering the superiority
of morse goad in his last years.

>> Big Dave can only be impressed by looking at his own image
>> in a mirror. :-)
>
>I beg to differ. I'm impressed by a great many people, both famous and
>unknown. You didn't make the list.

Not a list anyone wants to be on... :-)

Now you go ahead and chew those Guinea-Bisseau cashews and
keep working them out-of-band Frenchmen. That's a good boy.

Say goodnight, Dave.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5329. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 05:24:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625012438.13325.00000470@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 93438

In article <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Who is "der Oberst"?

No, Who is Rev. Jimmie...Rev Jimmie Who.

I think he plays first base.

I dunno plays viola.

Say goodnight, Dave

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5330. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 09:23:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625052342.05811.00000590@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93444

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/24/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...

>> >Yes, how did he try to make it look better than it was?
>>
>> Jim, you really are kidding me, right?
>
>No, I want to know.

The president can influence the reporting of numbers, Jim, especially
"employment", etc...And while he may not be able to change the Dow Jones or
NYSE, he can again certainly "influence" those persons who direct the market.

>The president can't fudge the Dow, can he? He can't fudge unemployment
>numbers.
>
>He may be able to exert some influence on the Fed on interest rates.

Yep. Been done.

Strange how the leadining economic indicators were already rising when
Clinton took office, yet when he LEFT office, all of a sudden things dropped
like a rock...

>> >> Jim, Billy wasn't in office 90 days when he tried to claim that
>(then)
>> >>recent improvements in the stock market were a direct result of
>> "...America's
>> >>confidence in my administration to lead them to economic recovery".
>> >
>> >The rooster taking credit for the dawn. That's not using smoke and mirrors
>to
>> >make things look better than they are.
>>
>> Taking credit for something you didn't so is exactly that, Jim. He lied.
>
>That's NOT "using smoke and mirrors to make things look better than
>they are". It's "the rooster taking credit for the dawn".

He did it the entire time he was in office.

Bill Clinton was a master at manipulation and deceit.

>Two very different things.

Are they? He manipulated people and industries to get what he wanted, or
to at least make it LOOK like he was getting what he wanted.

>> >>Never mind that the NYSE had been on a steady upward trend for the
>> >>previous 12 months.
>> >
>> >Of course. Still, what was the Dow the day Clinton took office? What was
>it
>> >the day he left?
>>
>> What was it 90 days AFTER he left...?!?!
>
>I dunno. Point is, for his 8 years...8 *years*... in office, the trend
>was up up up.

Yes, Jim...I know how long he was in office.

And in less than 90 days after he left we were suddenly "on the
rocks"...?!?!?

>> >> The NYSE and all economic indicators are up now.
>> >
>> >Still down from their peaks.
>>
>> And the history of the NYSE has always been straight up...?!?!
>
>In the long term, yes.

Long term...Jim, has the market NEVER had an abrupt downturn? There's
NEVER been a lull or otherwise bothersome negative trend?

>> >> This "recession" suddenly appeared when Billary was no longer in
>office
>> >>and no longer able to keep up the charade.
>> >
>> >What "charade"? How can the President fudge numbers like the NYSE?
>>
>> He can artificially support the economy with promises of large tax
>> reserves.
>
>How is that artificial? If there's a budget surplus, tax rates can be
>lowered *and* the debt reduced, thereby helping the economy.

But when that tax surplus is used only to temporarily mask an larger
problem, what was accomplished?

>Was the budget surplus real or faked?

Oh, it was quite real...Trust me, I know from expereicen where a lot of
that "surplus" came from!

>> I agree about the cost of importing things...But what are you going to
>do

>> when we slap big tariffs on things people want, only to have them cry
>> foul...Or
>> worse yet, have OUR goods likewise tariffed over there, making it hard to
>get
>> our good sold.
>
>It's a matter of thinking long-term rather than short-term. Education
>rather than legislation. Gradual changes on a broad front rather than
>narrowly focused quick fixes that ultimately don't work.

MY POINT EXACTLY!

The President's Bush and President Reagan before them cautioned us on
EXACTLY that point...That no "quick fix" was possible, and that any "bandaid"
thrown on the problem would be expensive and marginally effective.

>For example, suppose there were tax incentives to use transit? As in
>getting a tax credit for money spent on transpasses or organized
>carpools?

You'd be preaching to the choir on that one, Jim...I have already
expressed my support for mass transit.

>Ultimately it comes down to asking people what they *really* want,
>what they're willing to pay, and what they're willing to do without.
>That's not an easy task, and the last president to try it was Jimmy
>Carter. That's a big reason folks dislike him so much.

People disliked him so much because he gutted this country's honor. He's
been working hard to make up for it ever since.

>Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
>without anything. But it's just not true.
>
>> No...they get rich getting other people to take in other people's
>> washing...By providing a business infrastructure to do that in.
>
>In the short term. That's the problem.

Getting the people with the money to create opportunities for business is
a "problem", Jim...?!?!

>> >It was "trickle down" Reaganomics. But
>> >eventually the piper had to be paid.
>>
>> Paid?
>
>Yes. The debt eventually has to be paid - or at least the interest on
>it.

And that in and of itself is a multi-billion dollar industry.

>> I was ripped off by the taxes I got zapped with on what should have
>> been a very, very lucrative income.

>
>How were you ripped off? When?

Every Arpil 15th.

>> That debt was due (mostly) to the military build up of the Cold War.
>
>And Reagan's buildup. And "Star Wars".

OK.

So we go back to Eurpoe, put the Iron Curtain back up, push all of those
people back behind it, and re-install the Soviets.

>> We
>> had already started to "harvest" the "peace dividend" by the end of Bush
>Sr's
>> tour.
>
>But the budget wasn't balanced until.....
>
>> Also, much of the improvement in the economy at the end of Bush Sr's
>tour
>> was the result of technology advances made in 80's.
>
>Which also put a lot of people out of work.

Technology is STILL putting people out of work, Jim...If we had the most
lucrative economy possible, the use of technology to supplant human resources
will continue to force people out of work.

>The *biggest* factor was that oil prices stabilized and interest rates
>dropped.

Guess we need to depend on the Gold Standard instead of Standard Oil,
eh...?!?!

>> >>>>We don't need Kerry. John Edwards had a chance...he just didn't bark
>> >>>>as loud as Kerry. Too bad.
>> >
>> >You mean the National Ambulance Chaser? You might want to look into Mr.
>> >Edwards' record...
>>
>> And Clinton wasn't?
>
>Nope. Look at what John Edwards built his career on.
>
>> Clinton wanted to put an ambulance in everyone's
>> back yard but had no plan to do that, either...Instead he let his wife play
>> with it, and when she failed, it wasn't "his" fault.
>
>Do you see the current president taking any real blame for *his*
>failures?

Which president sat in the Oval Office and "admitted' any "errors" for
national policy, Jim?

Clinton's only "apologies" were for having got caught in a lie over some
recreational booty.

>> >> The Dem's COULD do better. I would have had to think real hard
>about a
>> >>vote for Edwards. Too bad the loudest dog won rather than the better
>> >>candidate.
>> >
>> >You pay malpractice premiums?
>>
>> As a matter of fact I do.
>
>Why do you think they're so high?

Don't even go there, Jim...

Those "premiums" are high because tort laws, written a looooooooong time
before John Edwards was a factor in politics, allows it to happen.

Furthermore, it's organizations like the Trial Lawyers Association that
lobby long, hard and loud to prevent tort reform.

Lastly, it comes down to juries that are willing to remit large awards
based upon emotion over common sense. Like the jury that awarded a homeless 45
year old man over 5 million dollars because he was drunk and trespassing in the
middle of the night on a closed parking lot, tripped and suffered a broken arm.

YOU tell ME how John Edwards is responsible for that...

>Heck, here in PA some docs and other medical folks are simply shutting
>down or packing up and leaving because medical malpractice insurance
>is simply too expensive. Sure there are some bad docs out there, but a
>lot of it is fueled by a lawsuit system that has nothing to do with
>medical reality.

Absolutely.

And it's a syndrome that's been occuring since long before John Edwards
took ANY office.

>> >>>But you still didn't answer my questions, Steve:
>> >>>
>> >>>When and under what circumstances was Kerry "side-by-side" with Hanoi
>Jane?
>
>> >> The specific date? I don't recall. The articles from public media
>have
>> >>circulated the web.
>> >
>> >I suggest you look it up. The picture you refer to was taken in 1970. Jane
>> >Fonda went to Hanoi in 1972 - *TWO YEARS LATER*!!
>>

>> I stand corrected on it then, however it still doesn't excuse his
>comments
>> condoning her conduct.
>
>Where are those comments? When were they given?
>
>The reason I ask is that the picture which was supposed to prove
>something turned out to prove something quite different when all the
>facts are presented. The same may be true of the alleged comments.
>
>> >Yet Kerry gets blamed and condemned because he was three rows behind and a
>> >few
>> >people to the right of a future possible traitor.
>>
>> Why not?
>
>Are you *really* asking that question, Steve?

No less than you asking me about malpractice stuff, Jim.

>> I put Gore as almost as equally responsible for the humiliation
>suffered
>> by the Clinton-Gore administration for having not taken a stand against
>> Clinton's lying...Excuse me..."misrepresentations"...
>
>Did he know they were lies? Heck, Clinton lied to his own staff on the
>whole Monica thing.

=) Yeah...he was the Second-in-Command of the most powerful nation in the
world and was COMPLETELY unaware that the one and only person in the world more
powerful than he was not being truthful...! ! ! ! !

Guess we can expect that from the guy who was asking who the busts were in
the museum...

>> >He lied.
>>
>> Indeed...Over and over and over....
>
>Just like Nixon...

Yep.

The difference being that Richard Nixon took responsibility for what he
did and surrendered the Presidency rather than further taint it.

>> I believe the Oxford situation was the first item to hit the wires.
>>
>> If he'd only had the intestinal fortitude to say "Yes, it was me...It
>was a
>> legal protest and I broke no laws", then every other "story" that came
>along
>> would have been dismissed...or at least given a more lenient "benefit of

>the
>> doubt".
>
>Of course.
>
>And if he'd said of the whole ML mess: "Sure, I did it. So what? Many
>of you have done similar things."

Had he taken responsibility for his LEGAL actions in the beginning, I seriously doubt that PJ, GF, or ML would ahve ever come to light...Or if they had, they would have been laughed out of town.

>Sure. And what burns the most is that *he got away with it*! He was
>impeached but not convicted. He was caught in lie after lie but never
>lost his job, marriage or freedom because of them. I couldn't get away
>with that and I doubt you could either.

Nope.

I could fly to deepest, darkest Africa, find a deaf, mute tribal woman, have my way withe her, and before I could get home, Amy would know who, where, when, and wether I liked it or not!

>And now he comes out with a book that documents all of it, and he'll
>make a bundle because millions of folks will pony up $$ to read about
>it.

From what I read of his legal obligations, he'll need it to pay them off.

>> >> If the gutless liar had simply stated "Yes, I was against the war
>and I
>> >>exercised my right to protest it in a legal demonstration", even the most
>> >>right-winged Hawk would ahve had to give him due for being honest about
>it.
>> >
>> >He lied.
>>
>> He sure did.
>>
>> >> Kerry earned the additional right to speak out...practical
>experience.
>> >
>> >No, he didn't.
>>
>> Yes, he did.
>
>Someone cannot earn more of something that everyone already has.

So...

You give "even weight" to the words of someone with no practical experience over someone who has "been there-done that"...?!?!

I'd have to say that, as a result of our mutual experiences in THIS forum,
that that is not an accurate assertion!

>> >Everyone has the right to speak out. Kerry earned *credibility* because he
>> >spoke from actual experience.
>> >
>> >>But to sit down next to a low life slut who intentionally betrayed her
>> >>Countrymen was foolish. I would have shot her first.
>> >
>> >How would you have known what she would do two years in the future?
>>
>> Point taken for the third time, Jim.
>
>I only repeated it because you kept repeating the false conclusion.

That the picture was ficticious is acknowledged.

That Jane Fonda is a cowardly traitor that gave comfort and aid to what
was then our foe is not. She deserves to be in jail.

>> >>It's a testimony to
>> >>America's professional, all-volunteer force that she hasn't been shot.
>> >
>> >It's no testimony to the justice system that she hasn't been brought up on
>> >charges.
>> >>
>> >>>When is it OK to be against a war one's country is fighting? If there's
>> >>>armed
>> >>>conflict going on, should we still have elections? Or should the
>president
>> >>>simply serve until the conflict is over? After all, *anyone* who opposes
>> the
>> >>>incumbent is, in some way or other, saying that the current leader's
>> >>>policies and decisions aren't right.
>> >
>> >Well?
>>
>> Well indeed.
>>
>> What precedent are you trying to set? Why are you trying to set it?
>
>What I'm saying is this:
>
>It has been said by some that things like demonstrations and protests
>during armed conflicts are disloyal. That they "give aid and comfort
>to the enemy" and do not "support our troops".
>
>This line of argument is sometimes extended to any talk against the
>war in Iraq or Afghanistan. It comes down to "if you don't support
>what the President says we must do militarily, you're not a loyal
>American".
>

>So what I did was simply extend the line of reasoning a little
>further.

There's no "extend(ing) the line of reasoning", Jim.

The time for the debate is over. Until our guys are home safely, we do NOT need to utter ONE word that gives the insurgents or any other combatant any reason to think we are anything less than 100% committed to fulfilling our mission.

Don't "support" the president if you don't want to, but don't let our enemies think we are able to be had. That's partially how the North Vietnamese were able to accomplish what they did.

>> We still had elections during the Civil War, World War 2, Korea and
>Viet
>> Nam. How did you extrapolate some idea about when it's OK to run for
>president
>> against my hatred for Jane Fonda?
>
>See above.

I did. See mine.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5331. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 09:39:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040625053929.06606.00000491@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93445

In article <20040624195356.07368.00000291@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20040624071653.17843.00000359@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <20040623154009.23112.00000588@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <40D9A852.2050109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>>> And there *is* a tie to BPL in all this. BPL advocates are trying to
>sell
>it as
>>>>> a cheap, easy, quick solution to the broadband access problem. The
>>>>> administration is trying to sell it as a way back to the technoboom of
>the
>>>>> '90s, without a lot of tedious mucking about with infrastructure. Trying
>to tie
>>>>> it in with homeland security is a classic example of adhomineming those
>who
>>>>> oppose it. 'Those dern pinko liberal antenna-huggers!'
>>>>
>>>>> Interference? Reliability? Spectrum pollution? Too complicated!
>>>
>>> Not complicated at all.
>>
>>It's too complicated for the politiicans and regulators.
>
> Then educate them.

I tried, Len. They just don't get it. I'm just a poor dumb old amateur anyway.
You've told me time and time again how unqualified I am, how I "live in the
past", how I don't know anything about "big time radio" and such, and how
you're a "professional in radio". I still work regular hours and then some -
I'm not retired like you. I'm not a wordsmith like you. I don't even make up
names to call other people in newsgroups like you. I'm only 50 years old. If
they won't listen to you, why should they listen to me?

My main interests in HF amateur radio are operating Morse code and building ham
radio equipment - either from kits or from my own designs. Three years ago I
bought a kit from a little company in California and built it. Rest of my
projects are what we hams call "homebrew". You've made fun of them so many
times that they must be of no account, right?

>>> BPL will be the demise of low-level-signal HF communications in
>>> urban areas.
>>
>>FCC and NTIA say differently
>
> The FCC has NOT said much technically on Access BPL.

That's different from saying "BPL will be the demise of low-level-signal HF communications in urban areas."

They're the professionals and the regulators and the military, Len. I'm just a poor dumb old amateur anyway. What do I know? Who am I to contradict professionals who know what's best for me?

FCC has said a Morse code test "serves no regulatory purpose". FCC has reduced the requirements for a ham radio license again and again for more than 25 years. The same FCC now refuses to interpret Part 15 the same way I do.
>
> Docket 03-104 asked for input on BPL.

I gave them plenty. I also contributed to the ARRL fund to fight BPL.

> NTIA said "A 10 db increase in background noise is acceptible!!!!"

Does it say "acceptible" or "acceptable", Len? How do you know it isn't acceptable? How much communicating on the HF amateur bands have you done in the past month?
>
>>> Kiss off any thoughts of signal-to-noise ratios
>>> required in modern receivers. All that advanced technology will
>>> go to waste. Hams can go back to using one-tube regenerative
>>> receivers, those being as "low-signal-level" as any other in an
>>> RF cesspool of noise on HF.
>>
>>Never used a regenerative receiver, have you, Len? That's obvious from your
>>statement. A good one is as sensitive as a modern superhet on HF.
>
> Poor baby. Joining in an attempted gang-bang of an NCTA?

No. I'm just commenting on you lack of receiver knowledge and skill. That's understandable - professionals gave up on regenerative receivers decades ago.
>
> My first receiver, built in 1947, was a regenerative.

Couldn't get it to work, huh? Here's a hint: The tickler coil has to be connected the right way to get the detector to regenerate. Even I know that.

> What did you build in 1947, senior?

Nothing, Len. I wasn't around. I wasn't bootlegging an unlicensed transmitter, either.

But 20 years later, in 1967, I got an amateur radio license. And began to use it. Today it's 57 years later than 1947 and you haven't done any of that. .

Senior? Guess what - yesterday I got an application to join AARP. They want me as a member. So I guess I'm a senior citizen now, huh? Maybe I'll join.

I've built regenerative and superheterodyne receivers. Also transmitters, transceivers, power supplies, antennas, antenna tuners, station control systems, test equipment and much more. Most of it from scratch, some kits. But none of that counts for anything, does it, Len? Homebrewing is "living in the past", according to you, isn't it? We hams all just buy our factory made equipment, right?

> Last regenerative receiver I checked out (for son of friend) was in
> 1968 (give or take). Had an RF stage ahead of detector, too.

Then it wasn't "one tube". was it?

> Had MAYBE 5 uV input "sensitivity" at best (if one squinted their
> ears), was terrible in selectivity, full of intermods from other
> strong signals adjacent.

Poorly designed and built, then. Or maybe you couldn't get that one to work either, huh? Too 'primitive' for you, I suppose.

> Didn't tell friend or son it was that bad,
> made nice-nice, gave only technical figures (they were impressed).

So you lied to a child. That must be the "professional" thing to do, eh? Couldn't you do anything to improve it? You're a "professional in radio".

Here's a hint, Len: It's possible to build a very good regenerative receiver and possible to build a very bad one. And everything in between. A regen that can't hear the noise level is very bad indeed.

> Are you going to make a case FOR widespread Access BPL,
> Rev. Jimmie Who?!?

I don't know anyone by that name. To whom do you refer, Len? It can't be me - Reverends are professionals in religion. I'm just an amateur.

5332. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 09:39:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040625053929.06606.00000492@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93446

In article <20040624182136.05745.00000461@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>
>
>>Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
>>without anything. But it's just not true.
>
> I snipped the rest becasue I really wanted to highlight this one item,
>Jim. I'll answer the rest in turn.
>
> When did President Reagan ever make such a statement?
>
It's not a quote, Steve. It's a general idea that was front-and-center in Reagan's campaign and administration.

Remember the theme "Morning in America" from his campaign? Remember yuppies? "Supply side economics"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5333. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 10:17:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93447

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/24/2004 9:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040624225233.06606.00000488@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>>Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
>>>about a decade earlier.
>>
>> Well, Jim, if you want to get THAT specific we were actually crashing
>>RANGER probes into the moon in the early 60's...
>
>Yup - trying to catch up to the Soviets...

And "nothing" we did had ANYthing to do with science, technology or
research...?!?!

You are saying we spent those funds and that effort SOLELY to "catch up
with the Soviets"...?!?!

>> Civil War: Creation of the present ambulance services, advances in
>>trauma
>>medicine, advancement of the railroads and wireline telegraphy. Photography
>>becomes popular.
>
>Bloodiest war in USA's history, fought in large part...(SNIP)

Yes, Jim...I think we all know WHY the war was fought.

HOW did that negate anything I said?

>Ambulance service and trauma medicine yes - because of so many wounded.
>Railroads were well established before 1861. The main "advancement" was the
>standardization of lines in the South when they were rebuilt after beying
>heavily damaged during the war.
>Wire telegraph had pretty much connected the developed world. The
>transatlantic
>cable was in service *before* Fort Sumter.
>Photography was driven by a number of factors, not just the war.

So...you are telling me that NONE of the advancements and improvements
occured asa a result of the war.

OK. If you say so.

>> World War 1: The airplane was just a motor driven kite in 1914, and is
>>ready to span the Atlantic in 1919. The radio comes of age. New advances
>in
>>the treatment of diseases (from the study of sanitation in the trenches).
>
>Chemical warfare advances. Unbalance of offensive and defensive weaponry
>leads
>to enormous death toles in trench warfare. Submarine technology increases
>hazards of sea travel.
>
>Advances in flight and radio technology are logical outcomes of increased
>demand for those technologies.

And the advancement of submarine technology increased our ability to do further marine research in the following years.

Commercial radio for the masses follows developments of new technology during the war.

Commercial aviation blossoms after the war.

>>World War 2: Mass production of antibiotics (developed in the 30's, but
>>not considered a priority until the war), development of RADAR, the jet
>>engine,
>>further advancements in air travel as a result of the development of
>>pressurization. Missle technology emerges. Microwave and X-Ray technology
>>skyrockets.
>
>Genocide technology rapidly advanced by Germans. Atomic weapons developed,
>permitting both cities and their inhabitants to be incinerated at lower cost
>and effort. Digital electronic computer is developed to improve aiming of
>guns.
>50 million dead, entire countries devastated, permitting massive rebuilding
>and
>modernization efforts postwar. War also facilitates Soviet expansion into
>much
>of Europe.

So what you're telling me is that NONE of the POSITIVE things that came from this era are valid, and that since a lot of bad things DID occur, we should shun the good ones too...?!?!

>> Korea: Use of the helicopter for medical evacuation. Proliferation of
>>the television. Satellite communications.
>
>Satellite communications? Where?

Jim...

We developed new technologies DURING the conflict.

The increased spending and military build-up incidental to the Korean Conflict and the ensuing "Cold War" DID spur on "satellite" communications...Did it not?

>> Viet Nam/Moon Missions: Advancements in microprocessors, additional
>>advancements in trauma care (MAST pants, use of helicopters in civilian
>>MEDEVAC, previously considered too expensive due to limitied manufacture of
>>helos) IR/NVG technology.
>
>Microprocessors first appeared in the early 1970s - developed for civilian
>applications.

Applicaitons that were incidental to military spending and research.

>> SDI/Cold War: Space imaging, proliferation of LASER devices,
>especially
>>into medical field.
>
>>> In many cases those
>>>"jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
>>>investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
>>>peacetime.
>>
>> Oh..."would have happened anyway"...?!?!
>
>Yes. There is a logical progression of most technologies. It's called
>engineering. You don't need a war to do it.

No, you don't.

It's just that we have developed a pattern of spurts of development
coincidental to military spending or conflict. This is a documented fact. It
happens.

>> I don't think so, Jim.
>
>It's true.
>
>>All of the major developments of other
>>technologies or services only happened where there was major subsidies by
>>governments.
>
>Even if true, why does it take a war? Why not simply solve the problems?

I agree. Now, what better to way to spur the development of newer
technologies than to advance the space program...?!?!

>>Some, such as the expansion of oil refining, etc, only happened
>>after the development of the automobile, one of the few exceptions to the
>>above.
>
>There are *lots* of exceptions. The automobile is one. PCs are another.
>Modern
>construction practices. Fiber optic communications. Lots of others.

Jim...Jim...Jim...

The rapid development of automotive technologies came after WW2...As did developments in aviation and communications.

>>>Or they're the result of government programs that are done
>>>to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.
>>
>>Uh huh...government subsidies. Again, big influx of cash from taxes.
>
>Which those "tax and spend democrats" are usually pushing...
>
>>MAY have happened otherwise, but it didn't.
>
>Why spend your own money if Uncle will give you some?
>>
>>>In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>>
>> Oh?
>>
>Yes.

You've not proven it, Jim.

We are presently exchanging these comments via a medium that was developed incidental to yet other military programs.

The proliferation of the Internet has driven communication costs to all time lows. Cellular technology, based in part on techniques developed for secure communications for...you-know-who...have put a telephone on the hip of almost every American.

>> How much do you pay for a calculator these days?
>
>Nothing. Last calculator I bought was in the mid 1980s. I use the Windows
>calculator function. Free.

And you paid how much for your Windows program...Or the computer it was installed on when you got it?

I remember simple function calculators costing $40 or more when I was in high school. I can get a decent full function scientific calculator for less than that now.

>> How much did you pay for the last Amateur transceiver you bought?
>
>$589 for the basic Elecraft K2 kit, which I assembled. Also has the ATU and
>audio filter options, which I assembled.

Uh huh.

And how much will that radio do compared to kit radios of only a decade earlier, and at what cost comparison...?!?!?!

>The Southgate Type 7 (completed 1995) was built from recycled parts and cost
>less than $100. The Type 6 (1985) cost a bit more. I've never owned any
>non-US

>made ham gear.
>>
>> Have you ever had an X-Ray or CT scan?
>
>Dental Xrays since I was a kid. Never a CT scan. Had my first up-periscope
>last
>year....

TMI, Jim...Waaaaaaay, waaaaaaaaaay TMI... ! ! !

>>All of those technologies have benefited from government spending in
>>order to advance military or space technology.
>
>Wouldn't it make more sense to just develop the technologies straight out? If
>you need better medical Xray machines, develop them.

You can argue what OUGHT to be as opposed to WHAT IS all day, Jim.

All you'll do is waste time.

>> And most mathematical or engineering calculations were performed with a
>>slide rule or pencil and paper.
>
>The PC was not developed for the space program. Nor for the military.

Who said anything about PC's, Jim?

>And the Saturn V worked pretty good, didn't it?

Yep.

Paid for by...?!?!

In pursuit of...?!?!

>>>No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
>>>plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
>>>to be reinvented.
>>
>> Why? Did we get stupid in the last 30+ years?
>
>Actually, yes. Much of the manufacturing technology no longer exists. Anyone
>who worked on those systems above a certain level is now retired, or close to
>it.

So...there's NO technology that exisits today that would allow us to land a
man on the moon in say...two years...if we really wanted to...?!?!

>>Quick/Cheap/Dirty plan...A lunar lander configured to ride in the
>>Shuttle bay.
>
>That could work. I had the same idea years ago.
>
>>The Shuttle carries it to the Moon,

>
>Won't work. Shuttle system does not have enough fuel to leave Earth orbit,
>let
>alone enter lunar orbit and leave it again. And that's with the cargo bay
>*empty*.

(sheeeesh)

So we can't configue an auxiliary fuel system?

It will take an extra 30 years to figure out how to install the fuel tanks
necessary to do it?

I'll bet you a nickle to a C-Note that Burt Rutan could rough out a
workable method on a napkin in a Mojave restaurant and have itr working in that
two years.

>If it could be done, NASA would have done it already.

Oh?

Why?

Just because?

They've had to fight Congress and ignorant laymen for 30 years just to
stay in LEO.

>The Shuttle has enough fuel to reach orbits of a few hundred miles but no
>more.
>Going to the moon is a lot more. That's why a Saturn V is so big yet the
>LM/CSM
>combo is so small.

Again, We can't figure out a piggyback fuel tank?

We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?

We've already proven that on-orbit rendevous, docking and EVA construction
is a no-brainer.

So again...WHAT new technology do we ahve to develop to go back to the
Moon?

HARDWARE, yes...we need new machines. but so far, Jim, your "arguments"
have not swayed me that we could do it if we wanted to...

>>the mission drops in, and brings at
>>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.
>
>Only ways such a system could work is if the Shuttle stayed in earth orbit
>and
>the lunar package went from there.

Why?

>And the result would be a short-term visit by a few astronauts, like the
>Apollo
>missions, not a long term base.

As long as you keep thinking that, then that's all we'll do.

If you think in terms of "what can this ONE sortie accomplish", you'd be
right. But that's already been addressed by countless suggestions of what we
COULD do if we wanted to.

>>>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask
>>>WHERE
>>>> in space are you going to spend that money?
>>>
>>>We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
>>>here. And address problems long-term.
>>
>> Oh?
>
>Yes.
>>
>> NASA doesn't need people who are less-than-engineering qualified...?!?!
>
>Not really. They need highly skilled people, mostly. You might check into how
>much money it costs to create one NASA job.

So...NASA doesn't hire drivers, janitors, security personel, health care
workers, mechanics, etc?

>>If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that
>>every
>company that contracts with it would be able to
>
>Sure - at a price.

Sheeesh.

>But why not solve our problems directly?

Sure...Why not.

Let's just go ahead and drop a billion dollars into social welfare
programs to feed and house the poor.

Let's NOT do something to advance our technologies that will create
entirely new classes of jobs, promote our wellness and, hopefully, ultimately
develope technologies that might "liberate" us from poverty.

>>And WHAT problems are NOT being addressed long term BECAUSE of the >space
>program?
>
>Surface transportation, for one. Energy efficiency and independence.
>Education.

Uh huh.

>>>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>>>> technical advencement.
>>>
>>>Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
>>>those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"
>>>
>>>Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
>>>government spending".
>>
>> But we can also defer that with cooperation with business against futures
>>for mining, technology development, etc. The opportunities are there...We
>>just need to have the gonads to take them.
>
>What opportunities? The only really profitable parts of the space program
>have
>been the Earth-imaging satellites and communications satellites. All
>unmanned,
>and they look back at Mother Earth. And the role of satcomms is dwindling
>with
>the development of fiber optics.

Fiber optics = interruptable infrastructure.

>>>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>>>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>>>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>>>verifies the reliability analysis.
>>
>>Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables
>>are bound to go boom.
>
>CNG tankers don't. Railroad tank cars don't.

ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! !

>Sorry, 1 in 75 is simply not good enough reliability.

And we'll improve that reliability by just not doing it anymore...?!?!

>>There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim.
>
>Who is there to compete with for space?

The Red Chinese for one. They just flew a manned mission a year or so
ago, and they certainly have the resources and the wherewithall to exploit it.

And considering thier track record for flooding markets with cheap
alternatives that have, quite literally, put hundred of thousands if not
millions of Americans out of work, I don't doubt they can do it there, too.

I'd rather know that bright, fast moving light in the sky was carrying
Americans.

>Heck, let's fund space exploration the way so many other things are funded.
>We'll have bake sales and walkathons. Solicit donations of parts and supplies
>from manufacturers, and use volunteer labor. Sell advertising space on the
>outside of the space vehicles. Lots of ideas like that in use by groups
>ranging from Indy 500 racers to the Girl Scouts.
>
>And we'll put real money into education, infrastructure development,
>transportation, and energy independence.

I don't see a whole lot of likelyhood that anything further will be forthcoming from this exchange, Jim. If you believe that "all that money" is going to no good use and that it's not a benefit in your daily life today, well then there's just no use doing it.

I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And as both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and take advantage of the opportunities "out there".

Unfortunatley GETTING there will be neither cheap or without risk, but I for one think the benefits will ultimately be enormous.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5334. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 10:22:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93448

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/24/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
>> >
>> >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
>>
>> I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.
>
>Who is "der Oberst"?

I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up" on
him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie was
never more than a buck sergeant.

Quite a promotion!

Steve, K4YZ

5335. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 10:24:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625062431.05811.00000593@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93449

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/25/2004 4:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040625053929.06606.00000492@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040624182136.05745.00000461@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>>Date: 6/24/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>
>>
>>>Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
>>>without anything. But it's just not true.
>>
>> I snipped the rest becasue I really wanted to highlight this one item,
>>Jim. I'll answer the rest in turn.
>>
>> When did President Reagan ever make such a statement?
>>
>It's not a quote, Steve. It's a general idea that was front-and-center in
>Reagan's campaign and administration.
>
>Remember the theme "Morning in America" from his campaign? Remember yuppies?
>"Supply side economics"?

So...

Promoting consumer confidence and spending (witch ultimately drives the
economy) was wrong?

Steve, K4YZ

5336. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 10:33:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625063324.05811.00000594@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93350

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/24/2004 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040624195404.07368.00000296@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040624093559.19398.00000481@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> The POINT, Your Junior Putziness, is that Lennie doesn't HAVE the
>>experience to help the kid OTHER than the theory part.

> "Amateur radio WORKS DIFFERENT that all other radio services!"
>
> Right..."amateur electrons" instead of commercial ones. Uh huh.
>
> Poor nursie...thinks the FCC can regulate Laws of Physics too!

In your rush to try and make more of your own "newsgroup messaging points", you tripped right over the part where I said "...OTHER than the theory part."...

Oh well.

Speaking of which...

You created this "newsgroup messaging points" farce, yet have never availed us with the scoring system.

What's up with that?

That was a rhetorical question, by the way...WE all know you are deeply "into" not finishing ANYthing...

Maybe that's why there were never any Mini-Lennie's for you to nurture and gain some practical experience upon which to base your "there ought to be an age limit" suggestion for Amateur Radio...?!?!

Yet ANOTHER unaccomplished task.

Steve, K4YZ

5337. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 10:57:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040625065719.10886.00000506@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 93351

In article <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> just doesn't understand my original purpose about amateur
> radio policy.

Say, Len - for those of us who have only gotten online since 1997....

what is/was your "original purpose about amateur radio policy"?

5338. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 11:17:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040625071711.22498.00000409@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93352

In article <40DAEF20.3030105@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <40D9A91B.7040201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
>>>>>the Librarian) writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>><snippage>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>>>>>decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time
>>>>here, Len.
>>>>
>>>> If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
>>>>policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
>>>>historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
>>>>the consequences of that action.
>>>
>>
>>
>>>> I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.
>>>
>>
>>> Nobody have it yet? Jim, you're usually good at this sort of thing.
>>>
>>
>> I thought I'd let others have a crack at it.

>>
>> August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.
>>
>> Guess who was president.....
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
> Good guess, but not quite.

Dang.

>We were moving away from the Gold Standard
>at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted
>Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level -
>something considered intolerable.

Yep.

And Nixon was a Republican, who you would think would be a staunch supporter of a free market and completely opposed to trying to control the economy byu government fiat.
>
> We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The
>initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that
>soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate
>dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an
>economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an
>inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.

I was there, I remember. Interest rates went up even higher - I recall friends paying 17% for home mortgages.

Of course back in those days you could deduct *all* consumer interest payments so there was a silver lining come tax time.

From all I read, it's clear to me that the sudden jump in oil prices was a major factor driving that inflation.
>
>The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal conservative!
>
> Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?

Nope.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5339. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 11:17:36 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93353

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
> > > William wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > >writes:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > > > >>>
> > > > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> > > > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > > > > > >>>
> > > > > > >>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > > > > >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > > > > >>>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> > > > > > >>>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
> >
> > > > > > >>> > You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees. That's blatantly
> > > > > > >>> >obvious.
> > > > > > >>>
> > > > > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine recreation
> > > > > > >>> with great technological learning capabilities.
> > > > > > >>
> > > > > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
> > > > > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
> > > > > >
> > > > > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
> > > > >
> > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> > > > is....
> > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...

> > > > >
> > > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Interesting.
> > >
> > > I think so.
> >
> > I think so.
> >
> > > > > I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
> > > > > ham to become a ham.
> > >
> > > I don't recall that.
> >
> > There's that famous Heil selective memory at work. Next thing you
> > know you'll forget all about those out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.
>
> I know this'll come as a real disappointment to you, "William", but I
> don't hang on your every word. I have only so much space available for
> mental storage and I like to reserve it for the really important
> matters.

Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.

The second part is memorable.

> > > > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
> > > > dogs that you are...
> > >
> > > Which "you guys" would that be?
> >
> > PCTA. Know any?
>
> I know several. Are you telling us that everyone who is for morse
> testing and who posts here "set upon you like a pack of wild dogs" and
> that everyone who is for morse testing and who posts here is a part of a
> pack of wild dogs? I don't believe you.

If you disagree, you've had years to correct it. But instead, the
PCTA give each other passes all day long. Hell, after six years of
idiotic posts from Bruce, the Rev Jim finally got cornered and had to
agree that Bruce was an idiot and his postings were abusive.

> > > > ...telling me of acts of heroism...
> > >
> > > Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.
> >
> > Yup. And because they display bravery and heroism in the face of the
> > old-timey exams and examiners, all who wish to enter the Kingdom must

> > also face those same exams and examiners.
>
> The above is a perfect example of why I don't hang on your every word.
> It isn't factual and is certainly less than memorable.

You'd work the out of band Frenchmen if you had to do it over again.

> > But since those old-timey
> > exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
> > worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.
>
> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?

I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?

> > > > how you got the book
> > > > and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became a
> > > > ham. No sir! No help from no one.
> > >
> > > Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a
> > > stelly-eyed examiner.
> >
> > Steely-eyed.
> >
> > > K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked
> > > my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me
> > > and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse
> > > to increase my speed.
> >
> > So you knew hams prior to being licensed. That fits my story. So
> > what are you disagreeing with now?
>
> Re-read the exchange above and get back to me.

You knew two hams prior to being licensed.

> > > > So Len could tell the kid to get a book.
> > >
> > > Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn Lenhorn
> > > pontifications.
> >
> > Or he could drag out a box of out of band QSL cards...
>
> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
> or would belong to someone else.

So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
each other as human beings.

> > > > Which according to your
> > > > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
> > > > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
> > >

> > > A book can provide information to an extent.
> >
> > A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.
> >
> > No good golfer became one
> > > by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.
> >
> > Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
> > list?
>
> No, but I'd like you to take my list as a whole because it illustrates
> precisely the idea that I'm attempting to convey.

Perhaps Steven Hawking read a book about basketball.

> > > No good radio op became one by reading a book.
> >
> > Now you wish to qualify your statement with the word, "good," and
> > change the subject matter from amateur radio operator to
> > undifferentiated radio operator.
>
> You can add the word "amateur" before radio and the meaning is still the
> same.

They all became good radio ops by sarting with a book.

> > You have substantially changed the subject matter. Previously, the
> > subject was a young, unlicensed person wanted to know about Amateur
> > Radio. Have it your way.
>
> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.

Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.

Len has plenty of experience.

> > One can become licensed in amateur radio simply by reading a -single-
> > book and taking an exam. Unless you are saying that those PCTA's who
> > told me so are liars.
>
> You're quite right. Someone can pass an exam and become a radio amateur.
> Absent practice and experience, that person can be a complete lid.

Even the most learned of amateurs may find himself working out of band
Frenchmen on 6 meters. The shame of it is that he could have learned
something from it, but didn't.

> > > Practice and experience are the keys.
> >
> > Of course, now that you've substantially changed the subject.
>
> Not really, Brian. You have Len suggesting a book.

insert snippet from above

> > > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe should
> > > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says, "What
> > > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best you'll be
> > > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur radio
> > > > > is....
> > > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
> > > > >
> > > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.

It would appear that you took the book idea and ran with it.

> > > Len has neither.
> >
> > Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
> > don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
> > operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
> > reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
> > has formal education in the subject matter.
>
> So Len is a good golfer?

Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?

I wonder why there are so many golfing books written and sold?

> > > > You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've worked
> > > > down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
> > > > contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
> > > > jiving.
> > >
> > > I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
> > > don't fully understand them.
> >
> > Of course. Heil knows all. He is the very definition of Omniscient.
>
> How would you know that unless you are (no cap necessary) omniscient?

I should have said that you are "The Omniscient!"

> > And all others are ignorant.
>
> Not at all. I've made no such statement. We have on occasion, found
> some areas where you have exhibited ignorance.

Natch.

> > > "You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
> > > blows"
> >
> > Apparently, you do. I'd suggest you stop pissing in the wind.
>

> One of my favorite country song titles, yet to be recorded:
> "If I Had It To Do All Over Again, I'd Do It All Over You".

Sounds like a tune by "Slim Chance and the Crying Cowboys." ;^)

5340. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 12:19:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <1fqdnY3eXKqPhEHd4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 93354

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:hpednbKmoLJoLUbdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
>
> [snip]
> But you might ask why I seem to be busting Republican chops a lot. It's
> because the Pubs have been in power for most of the last 50 years, and
> increasingly so in the last 20.
>

Not really true. Although we've had several Republican presidents, most of
the time the House and Senate had a majority of Democrats.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5341. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 14:57:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Gc-dnV5FFIagoEHdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93355

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:hpednbKmoLJoLUbdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
>
>>[snip]
>>But you might ask why I seem to be busting Republican chops a lot. It's
>>because the Pubs have been in power for most of the last 50 years, and
>>increasingly so in the last 20.
>>
>
>
> Not really true. Although we've had several Republican presidents, most of
> the time the House and Senate had a majority of Democrats.

Lets go back to 1981 Using the Senate webpages as a reference, the majority leaders are chosen on a two year basis. 7 times there was a Republican Majority leader, and 4 times a Democrat.

There is a small complication from 2001-2003, as a republican switched parties, giving a temporary Democratic majority.

So if you like, you can make that 6.5 to 3.5 ratio

The house of representatives has been solidly Republican since 1995. Before that it was indeed, majority Democrat for a good while. Reference House webpages.

Since 1980, we have had 16 years of Republican Presidents, and 8 years of a Democratic President.

We are looking at a 2:1 ratio of who's in power when. My advice is to use that conservative infallibility, and fix the nation's problems instead of blaming all on the minority.

I could research more, but I think I made my point, and Field day looms. I hope you can participate, and wish you the best with any surgery you may need to have.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5342. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 15:29:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93356

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040625062431.05811.00000593@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/25/2004 4:39 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040625053929.06606.00000492@mb-m01.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040624182136.05745.00000461@mb-m14.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
> >>>Date: 6/24/2004 12:10 PM Central Standard Time
> >>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406240910.2604ae61@posting.google.com>
>
> >>>Ronald Reagan pushed the idea that we could have it all and not do
> >>>without anything. But it's just not true.
> >>
> >> I snipped the rest becasue I really wanted to highlight this one item,
> >>Jim. I'll answer the rest in turn.
> >>
> >> When did President Reagan ever make such a statement?
> >>
> >It's not a quote, Steve. It's a general idea that was front-and-center in
> >Reagan's campaign and administration.
> >
> >Remember the theme "Morning in America" from his campaign? Remember yuppies?
> >"Supply side economics"?
>
> So...
>
> Promoting consumer confidence and spending (witch ultimately drives the
> economy) was wrong?

Promoting the idea that consumption does not have any responsibility
connected to it is wrong.

Promoting the idea that 'consumers' should not be concerned about the
future is wrong.

Promoting consumption that increases our dependence on imported raw
and finished products, upsets the trade balance and funnels enormous
wealth to governments that are hostile to our basic values is wrong.

Until Iraq invaded Kuwait, the USA was a major customer of Iraqi oil. Which funneled billions into SH's hands, and was used by him to build an enormous miitary, live lavishly and enslave his people. Also to repress folks he didn't like, such as Kurds and Iranians. We turned a blind eye to all this horror because the oil was cheap, he bought a lot of US stuff and he opposed the Iranians - whose oil we used to buy until they overthrew *their* Western-installed tyrant.

Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.

How much mass transit got built in those years? How much government funded research and investment in energy independence? What tax incentives (particularly for individuals) were created to promote energy efficiency during the Reagan/Bush years?

Here's another little tidbit:

The income tax tables are set up so that married couples pay a penalty compared to nonmarried couples making the same income. It's been that way for as long as I've been paying income taxes.

Back in the 1970s, the Carter Administration got the rules changed so that married folks got at least half of the penalty back. But in the Reagan/Bush years, that repayment was one of the first things eliminated in the "tax simplification".

Those administrations loved the phrase "family values" but when April 15 came around they made it better for your wallet not to be hitched.

Some "family values", huh?

I recall reading about a married couple (two lawyers, IIRC) who would get a divorce each December and get remarried each January. (Your marital status at midnight Dec. 31 is what counts for tax purposes for the entire year. It's not pro-rated). Their tax savings alone paid for all the costs and a nice vacation. IRS finally went after them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5343. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 16:45:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625124545.10848.00000399@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93357

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/25/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>

>Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things
>makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.

Jim, try this on for size...

Go through your closet.

Flip up the lables.

Then go through most of your consumer electronics, appliances, dushes,
etc.

What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

5344. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 17:00:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625130034.10848.00000400@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 93358

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/25/2004 6:17 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...

>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.

I'd be interested in seeing your cite of where in the rules it says that
Dave, or anyone else for that matter, is responsible for making sure the OTHER
station is operating within his/her nations regulatory requirements.

>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
>
>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?

Well...are you?

You KNOW my answer.

>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
>> or would belong to someone else.
>
>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
>each other as human beings.

The question is was DAVE out of band.

So far, nothing he or you has indicated he was.

>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
>
>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.
>
>Len has plenty of experience.

Dave was quite accuarate.

Lennie has NO practical experience in AMATEUR Radio.

No one disputes Lennie's "experience" in "radio". I am sure after all the
websites he's cut and pasted from he HAS actually learned SOMETHING about
Amateur Radio too, but as I am sure you know for yourself, that which one
learns in a book as opposed to "how it is" is not always the same.

>> So Len is a good golfer?
>
>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?

I for one have no doubt that if Lennie reads a golfing book, he will be quick to let us know just how smart he is about golfing wether he's been on the links or not.

Most likely not, but we'll give him the benefit of the doubt on this one.

Personally, I find golfing no more interesting than providing an adequate length of turf as an alternative runway in an emergency. It also provides me with plenty of professional opportunities since a lot of cardiac arrests are taken off the 9th hole. Usually physicians, bankers and stock brokers.

Now...we await to find out just how much Lennie knows about golfing. I am sure he worked with someone in "the aerospace industry" who played golf and shared enough stories with Lennie so that he could regale us with some reasonably accurate sounding tales.. Maybe he caddy'd some while on that rear-area tour of duty in 1953....

Steve, K4YZ

5345. UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 17:16:58 UTC
From: Chris <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net>
Message-ID: <3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>
Source record: 93359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams as "throwbacks to an earlier age." Read the UPLC comments at

http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh

5346. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 18:14:22 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <2YZCc.110985$HG.61447@attbi_s53>
Source record: 93360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Good troll job, Chris.

" Moreover, these systems will incorporate adaptive interference mitigation capabilities that will effectively remedy any interference that might result to fixed and mobile operations in the High Frequency (HF) band (1.7-80 MHz)."

The "effective remedy" claim reminds me of the meeting I attended years ago before Texas Gulf started its phosphate mining operation in Beaufort County, NC. Everyone was pleased when the company categorically stated that the little fishing creek near their mine would not be affected and would remain "pristine" after their operations began. Yes, I do remember that Texas Gulf liked to use that word "pristine" in describing the results of their wastewater filtration!Within a year of operation, they had destroyed all fishing in the little fishing tributary to Pamlico sound, and soon they were destroying even the commercial fishing in the sound itself. But by then, Beaufort County had become dependent on their business, so little was done about it. "Abatement" and "adaptive interference mitigation" has the very same ring as the empty promise to maintain the purity of our nice fishing stream. But we sure would like to believe you Chris; trouble is, existing tests have already proven it's a lie. The mitigation just won't work. It's just a radio communications vs. big-business backed misuse of the power lines for profit option. And the truth is, the vast majority of people in this country don't need it and won't use it. A very bad trade-off; only the greedy could love it.

ak

Read the UPLC lies at http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh

5347. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1402 June 25, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 18:30:16 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625143016.19278.00000583@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 93361

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1402 June 25, 2004

The following is an advisory and not necessarily for air. Ladies and gentlemen, Amateur Radio Newslines' Support Fund Administrator, Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--

This is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Newsline Support Fund Administrator, getting caught up with our supporters. In the month of September of last year we heard from Benton Bonney, W4PE of Orlando; monthly contributor Joseph Bartzi, Jr., KC8DKF of Columbus, OH; the St. Charles, MO ARC, WB0HSI; monthly contributor William Walters, WA2IBM, of San Jose; monthly contributor Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, also in San Jose and the Anchorage ARC.

Of special mention was support received in memory of the late Roy Neal, K6DUE, by the Brackett family of Cerritos, CA. Our thanks to Sharyn, Jim, KE6FVN, David, KE6OPK, and Lynn, WA6HBS.

Thank you to everyone, and we promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. That address will be repeated at the end of the newscast.

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

--

Thank you Andy. Now, Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1402 with a release date of Friday, June 25 2004 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Changes coming to ham radio in New Zealand and maybe to the 40 meter band here in the United States. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1402 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: A NEW HAM RADIO IN ZED-L

Big changes appear to be in store for ham radio in New Zealand. This, as the current licensing system is replaced by one test and one class of ham radio operator. ,Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, is in Auckland

where its all taking place:

--

Here's the bottom line. Our current New Zealand Amateur Radio licensing system is being renovated. We now have only one class of ham radio license in Zed-L called the General Amateur Radio License. This is just one of many changes coming to ham radio down-under as New Zealand radio amateurs discover the full outcome of their regulatory authority's review of the Amateur Radio service. It's all good!

The changes started on June 17th when a new revised Schedule attached to the Zed-L license came into effect. A Schedule here in New Zealand is kind of like a new set of rules. That's the first step. Other changes will take effect over the next 18 months or more. Many long standing problems are being eliminated and some of the changes are believed to be world firsts. Under the new structure there will be only one grade of Amateur operator license in New Zealand. That's the General Radio License that I mentioned earlier. One license means only one test needs to be administered.

A newly-licensed amateur will have immediate access to all amateur bands below 5 MHz and to all amateur bands above 25 MHz. After getting experience over 3 months and with at least 50 contacts logged, access is then permitted to all amateur radio bands.

All existing Limited Amateur licensees automatically became General Amateur licensees on June 17th irrespective of what is written on their existing licenses. There being only one license grade, callsigns will no longer indicate a class. There is already an established procedure to request a change of callsign if a licensee so wishes.

All amateur bands remain the same but a newly-extended Low Frequency band 130 to 190 kHz is being listed for the first time as an amateur allocation.

The permitted maximum transmitter power output for an amateur station on all bands is 500 watts P-E-P. With only one figure, the maximum power level in New Zealand is now mode-independent.

How about visitors to New Zealand? Touring hams holding a current amateur certificate of competency, authorization, or license issued by another administration, may operate an amateur station in New Zealand under a General User Radio License for visitors. A licensed visitor will be granted similar privileges to a New Zealand resident station for a period not exceeding 90 days. The present country-to-country reciprocal license agreements will disappear in time as more countries directly recognize the licenses issued by other administrations. This will make cross-border travel by radio amateurs a lot easier than it is today.

There are now minimum rules and restrictions for Amateur Radio in New Zealand and the future is positive.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, reporting from Auckland.

--

With one license exam, one license grade, and with new and simplified procedures, New Zealand telecommunications regulators say that they have positioned that nations Amateur Radio Service for an exciting future. (ARNewsline(tm), ZL2BHF, Q-News)

**

RESTRUCTURING: FCC RELEASES NPRM ON 40-METER CHANGES

The FCC says pending changes in the 40-meter amateur band as a result of the 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference will improve spectrum efficiency. It said so in a rule making notice dealing with the 40 meter band. Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the latest:

--

The ARRL Letter reports that this remark came in an FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket 04-139. This is an inquiry that seeks public comments on proposed rule changes to complete domestic implementation of various World Radiocommunication Conference allocation decisions made in 2003. Among them the future of the Amateur Service 40 meter allocation.

The regulatory agency says that it anticipates that administrations in I-T-U Regions 1 and 3 will, in the near future, authorize phone emissions in the 7 point 150 to 7 point 200 MHz band segment. The FCC notes that the ARRL has requested that the United States frequency segment for phone emissions be expanded to 7 point 125 to 7 point 300 MHz. The FCC says that authorizing voice operations in this band segment would permit same-frequency US-to-DX contacts, resulting in increased spectrum efficiency.

The N-P-R-M also addresses the deployment of Earth Exploration Satellite Service-Active spacecraft in the 70-cm band. The Commission says that this operation should not cause harmful interference to, nor claim protection from, any other services allocated in the band in the United States. This includes the Amateur Satellite service as well as any others.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Norm Seeley, KI7UP, in Scottsdale, Arizona.

--

Comments in the proceeding are due July 16, with reply by August 2. Interested parties may view the entire NPRM, file comments and view comments filed in ET Docket 04-139 via the FCC's Electronic Comment

Filing System at www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/ (ARRL)

**

RESTRUCTURING: NO VANITY CALLS IN THE UK RIGHT NOW

Vanity callsigns 'are unlikely to be introduced in the United Kingdom before March of 2006. This, according to the Radio Society of Great Britain which says that for the last three years it has been in discussion with licensing authorities over the introduction of such a program for U-K amateurs.

The latest word is that telecommunications regulators have informed the RSGB that due to software issues it is unlikely that vanity callsigns can be introduced before March 2006. In other words, the waiting goes on. (RSGB)

**

More news in a moment, but right now its time for you to identify your station. Linda Reader, N-7-H-V-F, if you please: "From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W7FP repeater serving Salt Lake City, Utah."

(5 sec pause here)

**

THE BPL FIGHT: ARRL JOINS IOWA HAM IN BPL INTERFERENCE STRUGGLE

The ARRL has joined in the fight on behalf of Iowa amateur and ARRL member. This, following complaints from Jim Spencer, W0SR, of Cedar Rapids, that he has suffered severe Broadband Over Powerline interference for more than two months.

According to the ARRL Letter, a formal complaint to FCC Enforcement Bureau Chief David H. Solomon calls on the Commission to order Alliant Energy's B-P-L field trial system to shut down. It also demands that the agency fine the utility $10,000 for violating the Communications Act of 1934 and FCC's Part 15 rules.

Alleging that the ongoing interference is both harmful and willful to one or more licensed radio station the ARRL asked Solomon to intervene on an emergency basis. ARRL Chief Executive Officer David Sumner, K1ZZ, who signed the letter of complaint, said Alliant Energy has been aware since March 30th. Thats the date it installed Amperion BPL equipment in Spencer's neighborhood and the interference began. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: EX-KG6IRO FINED $10000 FOR UNLICENSED OPERATION

A man who challenged the FCC and the southern California ham radio community has been fined $10,000. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the latest on a person who the F-C-C has told to stay off the air:

--

The FCC has issued a $10,000 Notice of Apparent Liability to Monetary Forfeiture -- that's a fancy way of saying a fine -- to Jack Gerritsen, the at least temporarily former KG6IRO. This, for operating a radio station in the Amateur Radio Service without the authorization from the FCC to do so.

In a June 15th letter to the Bell, California, former licensee, the regulatory agency notes his past record of non compliance with, among other things, its orders to keep off the air. It also notes his previous conviction for interfering with police radio communications in 2000 and the November 14, 2001 decision by the FCC to set aside his ham radio ticket based on complaints about the operation of his stations. Kit also raises questions regarding his qualifications to be a Commission licensee in light of his 1999 arrest and 2000 conviction on the police radio jamming charges.

At the time of the license set aside Gerritsen was warned that he has no authority to operate radio transmitting equipment. That doing so would be considered to be a violation of Section 301 of the Communications Act and could subject him to monetary penalties or imprisonment.

But on December 9th 2001, the Bell, California Police Department notified the FCC that it had received complaints against Gerritsen for making radio transmissions. On December 28th of 2001 the FCC's Los Angeles Office issued a warning letter to Gerritsen for unlicensed operation, and basically told him to get off the air. On January 2, 2002 Gerritsen replied and asserted that the set aide of his license was improper. On January 29th, the Bell Police and the California Highway Patrol arrested Gerritsen on a probation violation charge. On May 7th of 2002 he was found guilty of the parole violation and sentenced.

Soon after his release on July 28th of 2003 the FCC began getting complaints of unauthorized transmissions over local Los Angeles area amateur, business band and public safety repeaters. The complaints alleged that the person making the transmissions identified using the call letters KG6IRO. An investigation was launched. This lead to an agent positively identifying Gerritsen on November 6, 2003 as a person holding a transceiver while the investigator recorded the radio transmissions he was making. The investigation continued with the FCC identifying Gerritsen as the interference source on November 7th 2003 and on February 9th of this year.

Now, based on what the FCC cites as conclusive evidence it has levied the $10,000 fine against Gerritsen for willful and repeated

violations of Section 301. As usual, Gerritsen was given the customary 30 days to pay up or to file an appeal.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

Word is that Gerritsen has responded to the FCC with a demand that the agency rescind the fine. He reportedly claims that his license granted on November 14th 2001 has not been terminated, revoked or in any way modified to prevent him from being on the air. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: THE FCC ENFORCEMENT LOG

Gerritsen is not the only ham radio enforcement story making news this week. With more, heres the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

DO NOT READ: Audio report only. Hear it in the newscast at www.arnewsline.org

--

More ham radio enforcement news in upcoming Amateur Radio Newsline reports.

--

ENFORCEMENT VICTORVILLE CA PIRATE STILL ON THE AIR

A pirate broadcaster in Victorville, California, is still operating full time on AM 660 and FM 91.3. This, in defiance of FCC actions to shut it down.

Back on March 31st, the FCC issued a $20,000 fine to alleged station owner Stanley Mark Mayo. This, for willful and repeated violation of Section 301 of the Act for operating radio transmitting equipment without the required Commission authorization.

None the less, the stations remain on the air leading to speculation that another level of enforcement action might be taken. One that could lead to seizure of the broadcast equipment and jailing of those who put the stations on the air.

For a look at the Commission's action on these stations, see www.fcc.gov/eb/FieldNotices/2003/DOC-246123A1.html (CGC, others)

**

RESCUE RADIO: A 100 WATT TRAVELERS INFORMATION STATION AT LAX

The FCC has granted a request by the managers of Los Angeles International Airport for a ten fold power increase to their Travelers Radio Information Radio service. On December 4, 2002, managers filed the application that asked to increase power from 10 to 100 watts. The reason for the increase was to facilitate the airport's efforts to provide emergency communications to the traveling public in the event of a terrorist attack. The FCC has now granted the 100 watt request, due, it says, to the circumstances involved. More on this story is on-line http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-3843A1.doc (CGC)

**

THE SOCIAL SCENE: NEBRASKA IN JULY

Turning to the ham radio social scene, Nerbraska's Pioneer Amateur Radio Club will hold its flea market on Sunday, June 11th. The venue is the St. Charles Parish Center in North Bend. For more information e-mail mehaffey@dtnsped.net (E-mail)

**

THE SOCIAL SCENE: MARYLAND IN JULY

And the BRATS Hamfest and Computer Fest will take place July 25th at the Timonium Fairgrounds in Timonium, Maryland. This is one of the biggies that features more than 500 outdoor flea market spaces, hundreds of indoor vendors, free ham radio exams and much more. There is lots of information on this one on-line. You will find it in cyberspace at www.bratsatv.org (Press release)

**

HAM RADIO AND THE 2004 OLYMPICS: THE ATHENS 2004 AWARD

Athens 2004 Olympic Games Awards will available for all radio amateurs and short-wave listeners who make or log a requisite number of contacts with stations in Greece. This, during the period of the 15th of May until the 30th of September.

Special prefixes J4, SX and SY count 10 points each, normal SV stations count 5 points each and the Radio Amateur Association of Greece's HQ station SZ1SV counts 50 points. A total of 250 points is required for the Bronze Award, 350 for the Silver and 500 points for the Gold Award.

The address for applications is RAAG Award Manager, PO Box 3564, 102 10 Athens, Greece, or see the RAAG web site: www.araag.org/award2004.html (RSGB)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**
AN ARNEWSLINE FOLLOW-UP: MILITARY APPRECIATION DAY

A follow-up to a story we ran several weeks ago. Thanks to the efforts of several amateur radio operators in Ft. Wayne, Indiana a message of hope and appreciation was sent via the airwaves to our military personnel around the world. Newsline's Jack Parker W8ISH has the details:

It's official. By proclamation, May 29th, is officially Amateur Radio Military Appreciation Day in Fort Wayne, Indiana. The event was organized to honor and show appreciation to those that serve and have served in the military and related auxiliary groups. Planning for the event started last spring and quickly grew into a nationwide effort as organizer Emery McClendon KB9IBW spread the word to amateurs and MARS operators in the US and around the world.

The key to success centered on what Amateur Radio could do to let our Military members know that people supported them. Unlike written letters, amateur radio allowed Americans, in their own voice and words, tell the troops how much they care.

To get lots of public input, event organizers searched for a special event location. The Fort Wayne Wizards baseball team got into the game by offering up a spot at their stadium and a home game crowd. The effort grew momentum when radio volunteers from three Allen county amateur radio groups joined the ranks to spread the good word.

The amateurs ran three Echolink stations, IRLP, and two HF stations along with PSK31. The event scored local media coverage from newspapers, radio and network TV stations. Indiana Governor Joe Kernan, a former Vietnam POW and Indiana's senior Senator Dick Lugar both sent proclamations. They were just two of several proclamations read in a special ceremony before the first pitch of the baseball game. Many of the 65-hundred fans on hand, took advantage of the amateur radio connection to express their support to the military stationed around the world.

Reporting for Amateur Radio Newsline, this is Jack Parker W8ISH

--

The Fort Wayne hams say their mission was a success. They now plan to make Amateur Radio Military Appreciation Day an annual event. (ARNewsline(tm), KB9IBW)

**

HAM RADIO ON THE INTERNET: THE AOL RADIO COMMUNICATIONS FORUM

If you use America Online to get your e-mail and have never explored the Radio Communications forum pages, then you are missing half the fun. Almost since the day AoL took to Internet, the Radio Communications Forum has been a part of the service, and its not just limited to ham radio operators either. No matter what you radio hobby interest, there is probably a board for you. C-B. Scanners. You name it. There's a place for you.

So the next time you sign on and hear the famous words -- "you've got mail" -- type in the keywords radio communications and join the other radio hobbyists around the world who make this area of AoL their cyberspace home." (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AN ORBITAL FIELD DAY

Ham radio space travelers Mike Fincke, KE5AIT, and Gennady Padalka, RN3DT, may participate in Field Day from the International Space Station if time permits. ISS Ham Radio Project Engineer Ken Ransom, N5VHO, sent Field Day operating instructions and pass times to the ISS support team at Johnson Space Center. If they were on, Fincke should have been operating as NA1SS. Padalka would likely have signed RS0ISS. Both stations would be classified as 1 Alpha operations. (ARISS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ITS A GIRL

And less we forget, a word of congratulations to Astronaut Mike Fincke and his wife Renita on the birth of their second child. Tarali Fincke was born on Friday June 18th with KE5AIT himself making the announcement from the orbiting I-S-S. (N1ORC)

**

THE EDUCATION FILE: THE 2004 TAPR - ARRL DCC

On the educational agenda, the 2004 TAPR and ARRL Digital Communications Conference will be held September 10th to the 12. The venue is the Airport Holiday Inn in Des Moines, Iowa and the planners say that are now accepting papers for the conference proceedings. You do not have to be present at the conference to have your paper included in the proceedings.

Submissions are due before August 10th. Send them to Maty Weinberg at ARRL Headquarters, 225 Main Street, Newington, Connercticut. The zipcode is 06111 and you will find more conference information on the web at www.tapr.org/dcc (TAPR)

**

WORLDBEAT - INDIA: A NEW HAM RADIO INITIATIVE

In world news. India's national Amateur Radio society says that it plans to conduct various programs to promote Amateur Radio as part of a disaster mitigation program in many venues across that country. Many local radio amateurs and clubs across India plan to back this National Institute of Amateur Radio initiative and also take part in this program. (NIAR via Q-NEWS)

**

WORLDBEAT - SCOTLAND: RSGB DISTRICT NAME CHANGES

And some major changes to the two Radio Society of Great Britain Scottish Regions have been announced. Region 1, previously known as Scotland West and the Western Isles, becomes Scotland South and the Western Isles Region 2, previously known as Scotland East and the Highlands becomes Scotland North and the Northern Isles.

As a result of these changes, two new RSGB districts will be added to Region 1. These are District 15 to be called Lothians and District 16, the Borders. The Deputy Regional Manager for District 15 is Dave Stockton, GM4ZNX. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that IZ3EFL is currently active as S79DF from the Seychelles. Look for him during his evening hours on 20 meters SSB. He expects to remain there for quite some time so QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

And PA5M is now in Sudan and will be active in his spare time as ST2DX. He will be there for about one month. QSL is via PA7FM. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: D-DAY AND HAM RADIO - NEW ORLEANS STYLE

And finally this week, the story of ham radio helping to celebrate a national holiday, southern style. It took place in New Orleans and Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, is there with the rest of the story:

--

The weekend of June 5th and 6th the Jefferson Amateur Radio Club, based in Metairie, Louisiana operated W5D, a special event station to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the D-Day invasion at the National D-Day Museum located in downtown New Orleans.

Event co-chairman Keith Barnes, W5KB reports that by all measures it was a rousing success. Just over 600 contacts were made and the station display was very well received by visitors and Veterans alike. The hams manning the booth didn't miss many opportunities to

talk up amateur radio.

The display, prominently located in the main entrance hall just past the front door, featured a large collection of World War II vintage military radio gear. Among the visitors to the station were former New Orleans Archbishop Philip Hannan, himself a World War II vet and member of the 82nd Airborne. The Archbishop actually jumped with the 82nd on D-Day.

Also stopping by was Louisiana governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco. She even sat at the radio and made a contact.

Both Archbishop Hannan and Governor Blanco signed the commemorative poster along with World War II veteran radio operators and World War II veteran hams. The poster will be made into the commemorative certificate for those stations making contact with W5D.

For more information on the special event, along with pictures of the station and vintage radio display, take your web browser to the Jefferson Amateur Radio Club's website at www.w5gad.org. To find out more about the National D-Day Museum visit www.ddaymuseum.org.

From New Orleans, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

-- credit: JARC --

--

A job well done by the Jefferson Amateur Radio Club in New Orleans. (AE5DW)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

A final reminder that the nominating period for the 2004 Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award closes at midnight Eastern time this Wednesday, June 30th. If you have not yet nominated a youngster this is your last chance to do so for this years judging.

This Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham of the Year Award is open to any FCC licensed young radio amateur age 18 or younger residing in the contiguous 48 states and who has made a significant contribution to the community, the nation or ham radio though the United States

Amateur Radio Service.

More information and a downloadable on-line nominating form is at our website. That's in cyberspace at www.arnewsline.org. Again, the cutoff for nominations this year is midnight on June 30th.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2004. All rights reserved.

Yahoo! Groups Links

<*> To visit your group on the web, go to:
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/arnewsline/

<*> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
arnewsline-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

5348. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 19:56:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <laednSe2e-n4D0Hd4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 93364

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>
>
>
>>Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things
>>makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.
>
>
> Jim, try this on for size...
>
> Go through your closet.
>
> Flip up the lables.
>
> Then go through most of your consumer electronics, appliances, dushes,
> etc.
>
> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Or go to your local Home Depot or just about any store, and see how many
items you can find that aren't manufactured in China.

5349. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 20:03:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Z6WdnRe9A7qCGEHdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93362

N2EY wrote:
> In article <40DAEF20.3030105@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <40D9A91B.7040201@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>,
>>>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Gonad
>>>>>>the Librarian) writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>><snippage>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>> You lived through the 70's...Jimmy Carter's economics and political
>>>>>>>decisions almost bankrupted this nation, both financially and in fact.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sounds like gunnery nursie didn't get promotion that time...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Sorry to break in on a comment that I didn't see the first time
>>>>>here, Len.
>>>>>
>>>>> If a person believes that President Carter's economic and political
>>>>>policies almost bankrupted the country, I would suggest looking up the
>>>>>historical date of August 15, 1971. See what happened on that date, and
>>>>>the consequences of that action.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>>>> I'll see if anyone knows this one before giving it away.
>>>>
>>>> Nobody have it yet? Jim, you're usually good at this sort of thing.
>>>>
>>>
>>>I thought I'd let others have a crack at it.
>>>
>>>August 15, 1971: USA abandoned the gold standard.
>>>
>>>Guess who was president.....
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>> Good guess, but not quite.
>
>
> Dang.
>
>
>>We were moving away from the Gold Standard
>>at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted
>>Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level -
>>something considered intolerable.
>
>
> Yep.
>
> And Nixon was a Republican, who you would think would be a staunch supporter of
> a free market and completely opposed to trying to control the economy byu
> government fiat.

That was one of the most curious things I can remember in politics. At
the time, I was just out of school, so I didn't think much one way or
the other. But the results got my attention. The next deveral years were
just about impossible for me to get a job. 18 years old and single made
me almost unenployable for the next several years. The jobs that were
available were going to people with families, vets, etc I was on the
bottom of the list.

>> We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The
>>initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that
>>soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate
>>dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an
>>economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an
>>inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.
>
>
> I was there, I remember. Interest rates went up even higher - I recall friends
> paying 17% for home mortgages.

They must have had jobs too! 8^)

> Of course back in those days you could deduct *all* consumer interest payments
> so there was a silver lining come tax time.
>
> From all I read, it's clear to me that the sudden jump in oil prices was a
> major factor driving that inflation.
>
>>The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal conservative!
>>
>> Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?
>
>
> Nope.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

5350. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 20:29:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <sZWdnTnvQf6eEUHdRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 93363

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Gc-dnV5FFIagoEHdRVn-hQ@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:hpednbKmoLJoLUbdRVn-gg@adelphia.com...
> > >
> >>[snip]
> >>But you might ask why I seem to be busting Republican chops a lot. It's
> >>because the Pubs have been in power for most of the last 50 years, and
> >>increasingly so in the last 20.
> >>
> > >
> > >
> > Not really true. Although we've had several Republican presidents, most
of
> > the time the House and Senate had a majority of Democrats.
>
>
> Lets go back to 1981 Using the Senate webpages as a reference, the
> majority leaders are chosen on a two year basis. 7 times there was a
> Republican Majority leader, and 4 times a Democrat.

Since you said 50 years (see your comment above), you ought to do your
calculation back to 1954.

>
> There is a small complication from 2001-2003, as a republican switched
> parties, giving a temporary Democratic majority.
>
> So if you like, you can make that 6.5 to 3.5 ratio
>
> The house of representatives has been solidly Republican since 1995.
> Before that it was indeed, majority Democrat for a good while. Reference
> House webpages.
>

Since all budget bills must originate in the House, that put the Democrats
in a powerful position for a long time regardless of what party the
President or even the Senate leader belonged to. The Dems had control of
the House for decades.

"Golden Rule: He who has the gold makes the rules."

Actually it's necessary to have parties with opposing views as it keeps
either one from going overboard in their approach.

>
> Since 1980, we have had 16 years of Republican Presidents, and 8 years
> of a Democratic President.

Again since you said 50 years, you ought to take it back to 1954.

>
> We are looking at a 2:1 ratio of who's in power when. My advice is to
> use that conservative infallibility, and fix the nation's problems
> instead of blaming all on the minority.
>

The party in power always blames the other party. That's par for the
course.

> I could research more, but I think I made my point, and Field day
> looms. I hope you can participate, and wish you the best with any
> surgery you may need to have.
>
>

Who's in power is often not as clear as we would like to fool ourselves into
believing. If the President is one party and either house of Congress is
the other, who is really in control? Neither can get much done unless the
other cooperates with them. During the Reagan and Bush Sr. years, the House
was controlled by the Democrats. While Reagan was fairly successufl in
working with the Democrats to get things done, Bush Sr. was not. One could
not really say that either party was "in control." Our government, with
it's division of power, was designed to prevent hasty actions on the part of
the government.

Yup should make Field Day if I feel up to it. Right now I am planning to go
but can't help with the setup. Surgery is scheduled for July 7th.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5351. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 21:49:35 UTC
From: mr microphone 909 <vvrap3000dc@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <765e8$40dc9dff$d1cc57d6$7472@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 93365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> as "throwbacks to an earlier age."

...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
of tobacco smoke and/or booze.

5352. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 22:36:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251436.6e523adc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93366

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DBA7A9.7BDDE366@earthlink.net>...
> William wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> > > > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> > > > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > > > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
> > > > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>
> > > > Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
> > > > only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
> > > > been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
> > > > a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
> > > > visual or audible means,
> > > >
> > > Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
> > >
> > It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
> > discussion, would there?
>
> No, there wouldn't. I'm not all that forgetful.

It is because of your forgetfulness that there is very little to talk
about with you.

> > Radio amateurs are free
> > > to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
> > > of venues.
> > >
> > And Len disagrees?
>
> Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?

Let me check my documentation.

Yes, I read it.

> > You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
> > information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
> > which he claims to be a participant.

>
> Do you actually read any of the material before posting a reply?

Let me check my notes.

Yes, I actually read the material.

> "Free to" does not equate to "forced to".

There you go trying to change the subject matter again. It never was
about "forced to." Steve does not avail himself to the facts. He
continually spouts false statements. He will continue to do so until
he freely avails himself to factual information, which Len has nicely
provided a clickable link for his use. It couldn't be simpler. So,
Len does wish more ignorant amateurs would freely seek out information
about the "larger world of radio." It would certainly save the rest
of a lot of trouble.

> > > Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
> > > "larger world of radio".
> >
> > One in particular also participates in MARS and CAP communications,
> > but apparently has never been trained. He cannot differentiate
> > between the Amateur Service and MARS, repeatedly backing his statement
> > that "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
> Without amateur radio ops, there'd be no MARS program.

The program would exist with no volunteers whatsoever.

> > Hi, hi!
>
> What are you, OSCAR I?

Noted.

> > > If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
> > > radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
> >
> > What tales?
>
> Read the material, "William".

I mostly enjoyed your tales of working out of band Frenchmen on 6
meters.

5353. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 22:53:41 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251453.2a4a641b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93367

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040624195406.07368.00000298@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <20040624044958.29831.00000521@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP)
> >>Date: 6/24/2004 3:08 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
> >> The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
> >>services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
> >>conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
> >>Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
> >>inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are
> not
> >>authorized either.
> >
> > Excuse me...
> >
> > "Opertational" and "interoperabiltiy".
>
> Oh, my...nursie be amateur radio OPERTATOR! :-)

Nope. He just a disaBiltiy Tater!

> Temper fry...

Make French Fry!

> LHA / WMD

If DoD not allowed non-NTIA communication, why dey got cell phone on lip?

If "Sorry Hans, MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio," then NTIA is FCC.

So what the problem?

Hi, hi.

5354. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 22:58:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251458.6faa85bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93368

n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20040625065719.10886.00000506@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > just doesn't understand my original purpose about amateur
> > radio policy.
>
> Say, Len - for those of us who have only gotten online since 1997....
>
> what is/was your "original purpose about amateur radio policy"?

Len the Unforgiven.

Like original sin. No baptism by fire, No forgiveness.

5355. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 23:02:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251502.75c4bbc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93369

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
> > >
> > >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
> >
> > I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.
>
> Who is "der Oberst"?

Second cousin to Oscar I.

5356. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 23:08:14 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251508.339b2ba6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93370

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DBA159.3B975DA9@earthlink.net>...
>
> I have no doubt that we'll work you fellas. I don't think we'll hear a
> peep from the California Halfwatt though.
>
> Dave K8MN

I thought you were some kind of significat DXer? Forget how to pull
the weak ones through?

A half watt should make the trip without problem.

5357. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-25 23:44:37 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <FN2Dc.95246$2i5.64356@attbi_s52>
Source record: 93371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"mr microphone 909" <vvrap3000dc@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:765e8$40dc9dff$d1cc57d6$7472@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
> news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> > The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> > the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> > as "throwbacks to an earlier age."
>
> ...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
> or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
> men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
> of tobacco smoke and/or booze.

A bigot troll, no less!
```

5358. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 00:51:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251651.4a533204@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93372

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625012436.13325.00000467@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <40DBA002.3CB278C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> [he might find out that there's been
> >> an electronics world definition of "software" and "firmware" and
> >> "hardware" for over three decades...but never saw it in QST so
> >> therefore doesn't apply]
> >
> >I provided a definition from several sources, even providing the urls so
> >you could confirm those definitions on your own. You continue to argue
> >the point in the face of cold, hard fact. You're simply wrong, Bozoo.
>
> Riiiiight. Big Dave be long-time computerist, hardware expert,
> yarns and yarns of experience in digital stuff. Knows all, sees all,
> can tell ACM to go stuff it. :-)
>
> >> Heil wastes everyone's time. :-)
> >
> >You aren't everyone and you have nothing but time.
>
> Why Big Dave talk allatime on personalities? :-)
>
> Is this Insult Fest newsgrope or about hum radio policy?
>
> Say goodnight, Dave.
>
> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

It all 'bout mean discourse (and wasting one's time).

Probably not much different than working out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.

5359. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 00:59:09 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251659.426d9d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93373

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625012432.13325.00000465@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <40DBA7A9.7BDDE366@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >William wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...

> >> > Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
> >>
> >> It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
> >> discussion, would there?
> >
> >No, there wouldn't. I'm not all that forgetful.
>
> Big Dave not remember this be public forum, all see messages.
>
> Why Dave continue to talk about me? I no talk about me here.
>
> Dave have obsessive-compulsive dysfunction, too? Nusie have
> that. Spreading to all PCTA. May be terminal.

Maybe UN fly in spetchal immunization. Get on Ham Radio with
Permission. Work out of band Frenchmen. Get Monkey on Back.

5360. "It's all good!" was: Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1402 June 25, 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 01:07:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406251707.62f21c7b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93374

radionews@aol.com (Radionews) wrote in message
news:<20040625143016.19278.00000583@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1402 June 25, 2004
snip
>
> **
>
>
> RESTRUCTURING: A NEW HAM RADIO IN ZED-L
>
> Big changes appear to be in store for ham radio in New Zealand.
> This, as the current licensing system is replaced by one test and one
> class of ham radio operator. ,Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, is in Auckland
> where its all taking place:
>
>
> --
>
>
> Here's the bottom line. Our current New Zealand Amateur Radio
> licensing system is being renovated. We now have only one class of
> ham radio license in Zed-L called the General Amateur Radio License.
> This is just one of many changes coming to ham radio down-under as
> New Zealand radio amateurs discover the full outcome of their
> regulatory authority's review of the Amateur Radio service. It's all
> good!
>
>
> The changes started on June 17th when a new revised Schedule attached
> to the Zed-L license came into effect. A Schedule here in New Zealand
> is kind of like a new set of rules. That's the first step. Other
> changes will take effect over the next 18 months or more. Many long
> standing problems are being eliminated and some of the changes are
> believed to be world firsts. Under the new structure there will be
> only one grade of Amateur operator license in New Zealand. That's the
> General Radio License that I mentioned earlier. One license means
> only one test needs to be administered.
>
>
> A newly-licensed amateur will have immediate access to all amateur
> bands below 5 MHz and to all amateur bands above 25 MHz. After
> getting experience over 3 months and with at least 50 contacts
> logged, access is then permitted to all amateur radio bands.
>

> All existing Limited Amateur licensees automatically became General
> Amateur licensees on June 17th irrespective of what is written on
> their existing licenses. There being only one license grade,
> callsigns will no longer indicate a class. There is already an
> established procedure to request a change of callsign if a licensee
> so wishes.
>
>
> All amateur bands remain the same but a newly-extended Low Frequency
> band 130 to 190 kHz is being listed for the first time as an amateur
> allocation.
>
>
> The permitted maximum transmitter power output for an amateur station
> on all bands is 500 watts P-E-P. With only one figure, the maximum
> power level in New Zealand is now mode-independent.
>
>
> How about visitors to New Zealand? Touring hams holding a current
> amateur certificate of competency, authorization, or license issued
> by another administration, may operate an amateur station in New
> Zealand under a General User Radio License for visitors. A licensed
> visitor will be granted similar privileges to a New Zealand resident
> station for a period not exceeding 90 days. The present country-to-
> country reciprocal license agreements will disappear in time as more
> countries directly recognize the licenses issued by other
> administrations. This will make cross-border travel by radio amateurs
> a lot easier than it is today.
>
>
> There are now minimum rules and restrictions for Amateur Radio in New
> Zealand and the future is positive.
>
>
> For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, reporting
> from Auckland.
>
>
> --
>
>
> With one license exam, one license grade, and with new and
> simplified procedures, New Zealand telecommunications regulators say
> that they have positioned that nations Amateur Radio Service for an
> exciting future. (ARNewsline(tm), ZL2BHF, Q-News)

Mega-dittos!

5361. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 01:41:55 UTC
From: mdd <mdd@trip.net>
Message-ID: <10dpkire15gjr93@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> as "throwbacks to an earlier age." Read the UPLC comments at
>
> http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh
Chris, You are wrong and your daddies at UPLC are wrong. But then you knew
that.

5362. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 01:44:07 UTC
From: mdd <mdd@trip.net>
Message-ID: <10dpkmvr15uhf5d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"mr microphone 909" <vvrap3000dc@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:765e8$40dc9dff$d1cc57d6$7472@snip.allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
> news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> > The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> > the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> > as "throwbacks to an earlier age."
>
> ...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
> or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
> men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
> of tobacco smoke and/or booze.
>
>
Mr. megaphone, You are a troll. You do not know anything about radio. Why
don't you go back to playing in the street? Better yet, go play on the
freeway.

5363. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 02:10:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wW4Dc.13940$w07.2338@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93377

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@wzrd.com> wrote in message
news:p59fd0p4ombdprgb1ka0qui7qhvng0furk@4ax.com...
>
> Field Day is next weekend. Anybody in the group here have plans?

Look for W0EF 2A MN and K0RT 7A MN

5364. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230632.23857.00000452@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93380

In article <1e4e3692.0406241840.7432552b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040624000539.02583.00000411@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> >In article <1e4e3692.0406231530.4340c22f@posting.google.com>,
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
>> >>Hey, how else could he earn his GI Bill?
>>
>> He got a GI bill? Did he buy something from a GI?
>>
>> A naval intelligence bear-shooter's camera?
>>
>> :-)
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Welp, he claims "real military experience."
>
>Unless he got a dishonorable discharge, he's got the GI Bill.
>
>...Tall Tales of the PCTA.

Kellie not drudge. Kellie dine at captain's table. Very posh.
Superior. Knows morse. Morse Isley. [a Star War place]

Kellie know all. Kellie spits on inferior drudges. When not
spitting, Kellie inflate numbers 26 times original size. QED.

LHA / WMD

5365. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230632.23857.00000453@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93381

In article <20040625124545.10848.00000399@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>
>
>>Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things
>>makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.
>
> Jim, try this on for size...
>
> Go through your closet.
>
> Flip up the lables.
>
> Then go through most of your consumer electronics, appliances, dushes,
>etc.
>
> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!

Nursie bought bulk cleanser. Ethnic cleanser.

Nursie starts scrubbing. Scrub, nursie, scrub.

Ho, ho, soon all be "white" again. Clean. American white.

Nursie be red in face but not blue.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5366. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230633.23857.00000454@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93378

In article <20040625062431.05811.00000593@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Promoting consumer confidence and spending (witch ultimately drives the >economy) was wrong?

Nursie practice magic? Not good.

Get witches barefoot and in kitchen where belong.

Nursie need spell? Call Mavis Bacon.

Nursie nuts.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5367. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230633.23857.00000455@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93379

In article <20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And as
>both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of
>adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and take
>advantage of the opportunities "out there".

Nursie see space every day. Nursie spaced-out.

Nursie full of adventure, needs "hostile actions" in space.

Nursie need opportunity to unite personalities, seek unity not have, end hate inside.

Nursie wanna be Weiner von Brawn. Yawn.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5368. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230634.23857.00000456@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93382

In article <20040625053929.06606.00000491@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>I tried, Len. They just don't get it. I'm just a poor dumb old amateur anyway. >You've told me time and time again how unqualified I am, how I "live in the >past", how I don't know anything about "big time radio" and such, and how >you're a "professional in radio". I still work regular hours and then some - >I'm not retired like you. I'm not a wordsmith like you. I don't even make up >names to call other people in newsgroups like you. I'm only 50 years old. If >they won't listen to you, why should they listen to me?

Poor Jimmie. Got inferiority complex. Tsk.

Cannot help Jimmie. Jimmie gots to learn, use the force.

Jimmie not get told he unqualified. Jimmie morseman,
superior to all radio of 1930s. Jimmie do good but still
gots great depression.

Jimmie see nursie, get meds from Dr. Killgore. Will help.
Lose depression, learn hollering and yelling. Keeps nursie
going, keeps Heil going.

BPL make more depress for Jimmie. Not good. Boo hoo.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5369. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230635.23857.00000457@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93386

In article <20040625130034.10848.00000400@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 6:17 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
>>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
>
>>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
>>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.
>
> I'd be interested in seeing your cite of where in the rules it says that
>Dave, or anyone else for that matter, is responsible for making sure the OTHER
>station is operating within his/her nations regulatory requirements.

Irrelevant. Nursie get "cite" will disagree, no matter what.

Nursie not play well with "cites." :-)

>>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
>>
>>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?
>
> Well...are you?

Nursie know antenna theory? Nursie learn in nursie school,
get fancy certificate with elaborate border (suitable for
framing?).

Nursie know which way Vector is Poynting? :-)

> You KNOW my answer.

Nursie answer: Garbage-mouth reply, insulting person.

Nursie know squat about theory. Can only squat.

>>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
>>> or would belong to someone else.
>>
>>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
>>each other as human beings.
>
> The question is was DAVE out of band.

Heil out of reality. Heil have godlike powers, never wrong.

> So far, nothing he or you has indicated he was.

Irrelevant. Godlike creatures no need to explain anything,
always right, always superior to inferior beings.

>>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
>>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
>>
>>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.
>>
>>Len has plenty of experience.
>
> Dave was quite accuarate.

Heil is everything but always right. Even when "accuarate"
(whatever that is...).

> Lennie has NO practical experience in AMATEUR Radio.

Nursie astound all with obviousness...of obtuseness.

Nursie godlike being also, always right, never wrong, can
insult "inferior beings" at whim. His whim always hanging
out in here.

> No one disputes Lennie's "experience" in "radio". I am sure after all
the
>websites he's cut and pasted from he HAS actually learned SOMETHING about
>Amateur Radio too, but as I am sure you know for yourself, that which one
>learns in a book as opposed to "how it is" is not always the same.

Nursie say Hum Radio allatime different other radio.

Nursie godlike, never wrong...can direct, correct DoD.

Nursie write own book, "Book of Facts!" Book not
available outside of nursieland.

>>> So Len is a good golfer?
>>
>>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
>
> I for one have no doubt that if Lennie reads a golfing book, he will be
>quick to let us know just how smart he is about golfing wether he's been on
>the links or not.

No have golfing book. Got balls.

Nursie nutso.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5370. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230639.23857.00000458@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93387

In article <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
>> William wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
>> > > William wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > > > > >writes:
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > > > > >>>
>> > > > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> > > > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> > > > > > >>>
>> > > > > > >>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > > > > > >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > > > > > >>>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
>> > > > > > >>>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>
>> >
>> > > > > > >>> You hate Amateur Radio and Amateur Radio licensees.
>That's blatantly
>> > > > > > >>>obvious.
>> > > > > > >>>
>> > > > > > >>> No. Amateur radio is a fine hobby, interesting, a fine
>recreation
>> > > > > > >>>with great technological learning capabilities.
>> > > > > > >>
>> > > > > > >>Aside from hearsay or SWLing, how would you know, Leonard?
>> > > > > > >
>> > > > > > Heil, you've done that schtick already. It doesn't apply. It
>> > > > > > doesn't work. Give up on that ploy.
>> > > > > >

>> > > > > It isn't schtick and it is no ploy, Leonard.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe
>should
>> > > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says,
>"What
>> > > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best
>you'll be
>> > > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur
>radio
>> > > > > is....
>> > > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave K8MN
>> > > >
>> > > > Interesting.
>> > >
>> > > I think so.
>> >
>> > I think so.
>> >
>> > > > I once said that a prospective ham almost had to know a
>> > > > ham to become a ham.
>> > >
>> > > I don't recall that.
>> >
>> > There's that famous Heil selective memory at work. Next thing you
>> > know you'll forget all about those out of band Frenchmen on 6 meters.
>>
>> I know this'll come as a real disappointment to you, "William", but I
>> don't hang on your every word. I have only so much space available for
>> mental storage and I like to reserve it for the really important
>> matters.
>
>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.
>
>The second part is memorable.

Heil have godlike powers, never wrong, ever.

>> > > > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
>> > > > dogs that you are...
>> > >
>> > > Which "you guys" would that be?
>> >
>> > PCTA. Know any?
>>
>> I know several. Are you telling us that everyone who is for morse

>> testing and who posts here "set upon you like a pack of wild dogs" and
>> that everyone who is for morse testing and who posts here is a part of a
>> pack of wild dogs? I don't believe you.
>
>If you disagree, you've had years to correct it. But instead, the
>PCTA give each other passes all day long. Hell, after six years of
>idiotic posts from Bruce, the Rev Jim finally got cornered and had to
>agree that Bruce was an idiot and his postings were abusive.

Rev. Jimmie Who is turning, has now reverted to old self,
slyly snarling.

Expect another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from Jimmie,
soon after Field Day (in the park).

>> > > > ...telling me of acts of heroism...
>> > >
>> > > Acts of heroism? I don't believe you.
>> >
>> > Yup. And because they display bravery and heroism in the face of the
>> > old-timey exams and examiners, all who wish to enter the Kingdom must
>> > also face those same exams and examiners.
>>
>> The above is a perfect example of why I don't hang on your every word.
>> It isn't factual and is certainly less than memorable.
>
>You'd work the out of band Frenchmen if you had to do it over again.

Maybe Heil get french kiss from orion, get oriongasm?

:-)

>> > But since those old-timey
>> > exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
>> > worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.
>>
>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
>
>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?

EVERYONE not agreeing with Heil be "not worthy!" :-)

>> > > > how you got the book
>> > > > and read it and went down to the steely-eyed fcc examiner and became
>a
>> > > > ham. No sir! No help from no one.
>> > >
>> > > Novice exams weren't taken in front of any FCC examiner, much less a
>> > > stelly-eyed examiner.
>> >
>> > Steely-eyed.
>> >
>> > > K8CFT wasn't steely-eyed at all. SK W8MN sparked

>> > > my interest in becoming a ham but he couldn't learn the theory for me
>> > > and I'd moved to a different town by the time I began practicing morse
>> > > to increase my speed.
>> >
>> > So you knew hams prior to being licensed. That fits my story. So
>> > what are you disagreeing with now?
>>
>> Re-read the exchange above and get back to me.
>
>You knew two hams prior to being licensed.

He buy one in market? :-)

>> > > > So Len could tell the kid to get a book.
>> > >
>> > > Oh, he wouldn't likely do that. He'd go into one of his Foghorn
>Lenhorn
>> > > pontifications.
>> >
>> > Or he could drag out a box of out of band QSL cards...
>>
>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
>> or would belong to someone else.
>
>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
>each other as human beings.

Heh heh heh. Ordinary mortals cannot get along with radio
gods...must all be subservient to godlike creatures doing bad
imitations of Otto Preminger. :-)

>> > > > Which according to your
>> > > > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
>> > > > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
>> > >
>> > > A book can provide information to an extent.
>> >
>> > A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.
>> >
>> > No good golfer became one
>> > > by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.
>> >
>> > Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
>> > list?
>>
>> No, but I'd like you to take my list as a whole because it illustrates
>> precisely the idea that I'm attempting to convey.
>
>Perhaps Steven Hawking read a book about basketball.

Not good to pin Heil to mat so many times. He will
complain to the Armenian judges and they chant

something awful. So does Heil, come to think of it. :-)

>> > > No good radio op became one by reading a book.
>> >
>> > Now you wish to qualify your statement with the word, "good," and
>> > change the subject matter from amateur radio operator to
>> > undifferentiated radio operator.
>>
>> You can add the word "amateur" before radio and the meaning is still the
>> same.
>
>They all became good radio ops by sarting with a book.

Impossible in Heil fantasyland.

All who are "interested" in radio MUST get ham license.
Cannot be "interested" in radio without that license in Heil
fantasyland.

>> > You have substantially changed the subject matter. Previously, the
>> > subject was a young, unlicensed person wanted to know about Amateur
>> > Radio. Have it your way.
>>
>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
>
>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.

Heil never make mistake. Heil godlike, always right.

When Heil make actual mistake, is merely "clarification"
for the inferior. :-)

>Len has plenty of experience.

Not at all in Heil fantasyland. Heil issue orders.

All "interested" in radio MUST get amateur license.

No amateur license, not "interested' in radio, be inferior,
unworthy, beneath royal burple of godlike nobility. So
be it in Heil fantasyland.

>> > One can become licensed in amateur radio simply by reading a -single-
>> > book and taking an exam. Unless you are saying that those PCTA's who
>> > told me so are liars.
>>
>> You're quite right. Someone can pass an exam and become a radio amateur.
>> Absent practice and experience, that person can be a complete lid.
>
>Even the most learned of amateurs may find himself working out of band
>Frenchmen on 6 meters. The shame of it is that he could have learned
>something from it, but didn't.

Heil not need to "Learn" anything. Heil already godlike,
never wrong. He be superior. Always, anything.

>> > > Practice and experience are the keys.
>> >
>> > Of course, now that you've substantially changed the subject.
>>
>> Not really, Brian. You have Len suggesting a book.
>
>insert snippet from above
>--------------
>> > > > > If some kid, assuming that he is above the age which you believe
>should
>> > > > > be the minimum for amateur radio licensing, comes to you and says,
>"What
>> > > > > can you tell me about amateur radio, Mr. Anderson?", the best
>you'll be
>> > > > > able to do is tell him that you heard from a friend that amateur
>radio
>> > > > > is....
>> > > > > or that you read in a book that amateur radio is...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > You're shucking and jiving, Leonard.
>--------------
>
>It would appear that you took the book idea and ran with it.

Heil infuriated that book "Ham Radio for Dummies" exists?

tsk, tsk. Demeans his Royal Court. Makes him jester.

That bad.

>> > > Len has neither.
>> >
>> > Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
>> > don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
>> > operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
>> > reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
>> > has formal education in the subject matter.
>>
>> So Len is a good golfer?
>
>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?

Len play golf. Gave up. Had to pay Heil greens fee.

Heil green that others have bigger outside-of-hum-radio
experience. Big greens fee!

Heil are hole in one.

>I wonder why there are so many golfing books written and sold?

[golf world will sell anything not nailed down...:-)]

>> > > > You guys play both ends against the middle, and now that you've
>worked
>> > > > down to the middle, your arguments fail because they are
>> > > > contradictory. Go argue with yourself. You, K8MN, are shucking and
>> > > > jiving.
>> > >
>> > > I'd say that they appear contradictory to you, "William", because you
>> > > don't fully understand them.
>> >
>> > Of course. Heil knows all. He is the very definition of Omniscient.
>>
>> How would you know that unless you are (no cap necessary) omniscient?
>
>I should have said that you are "The Omniscient!"

Heil have godlike powers, allowed to strike dunder and blitzen
on all inferior beings.

Santa Claus need new team. Dunder and blitzen on strike.

>> > And all others are ignorant.
>>
>> Not at all. I've made no such statement. We have on occasion, found
>> some areas where you have exhibited ignorance.
>
>Natch.

All disagreeing with Heil are inferior. Radio god has spoken,
defined such.

>> > > "You don't need a former military weatherman to know which way the wind
>> > > blows"
>> >
>> > Apparently, you do. I'd suggest you stop pissing in the wind.
>>
>> One of my favorite country song titles, yet to be recorded:
>> "If I Had It To Do All Over Again, I'd Do It All Over You".
>
>Sounds like a tune by "Slim Chance and the Crying Cowboys." ;^)

Boo hoo. Rainy weather.

Grand old Opry go dark when Heil sing. Radio gods have no
godlike power in C&W.

LHA / WMD

5371. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230640.23857.00000459@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93384

In article <20040625063324.05811.00000594@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 6:54 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040624195404.07368.00000296@mb-m24.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040624093559.19398.00000481@mb-m17.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> The POINT, Your Junior Putziness, is that Lennie doesn't HAVE the
>>>experience to help the kid OTHER than the theory part.
>
>> "Amateur radio WORKS DIFFERENT that all other radio services!"
>>
>> Right..."amateur electrons" instead of commercial ones. Uh huh.
>>
>> Poor nursie...thinks the FCC can regulate Laws of Physics too!
>
> In your rush to try and make more of your own "newsgroup messaging
points",
>you tripped right over the part where I said "...OTHER than the theory
part."...
>
> Oh well.

Poor nursie. Still thinking ham radio works DIFFERENT than all other radio. According to nursie, ham radio have "special" operating techniques, ability to "tune a signal so very carefully" and lots of other bullshit.

Poor nursie will come unglued at what he thinks is a "profane word" like bullshit. Must be sissy marine no longer on any active duty.

> Speaking of which...
>
> You created this "newsgroup messaging points" farce, yet have never
>availed us with the scoring system.

What "farce?" Nursie statements? THAT be a farce!

Nursie badly need to talk to DoD on MARS, get straight.

> What's up with that?

Yes, WHY doesn't nursie agree with DoD? Should...

> That was a rhetorical question, by the way...WE all know you are deeply
>"into" not finishing ANYthing...

? Nursie go nuts again. Imagine things.

> Maybe that's why there were never any Mini-Lennie's for you to nurture
and
>gain some practical experience upon which to base your "there ought to be an
>age limit" suggestion for Amateur Radio...?!?!

Nursie VERY nuts. Thinks this is still 5 years ago.

Time marches on but nursie can't hear cadence or keep in step.

> Yet ANOTHER unaccomplished task.

Nursie need help. Not get it in newsgroup.

Nursie try reading "Ham Radio for Dummies?" Apt.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5372. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230642.23857.00000461@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93383

In article <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>Date: 6/24/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
>><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> >
>>> >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
>>> >
>>> >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
>>>
>>> I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.
>>
>>Who is "der Oberst"?
>
> I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up" on
>him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie was
>never more than a buck sergeant.
>
> Quite a promotion!

Oh, bullshit, nursie. Heil has been called both "Oberst" and, for those who are 'with it' and can associate things "herr robust" for his steadfast imitation of an SS colonel lecturing the troops. A rather bad imitation of Otto Preminger in the film "Stalag 17."

The only "promoting" Heil has done is a reverse form. That of knocking down (actually trying to do so) those he considers "inferiors." That has been consistent for years. Heil, like yourself, just can't play well with a diverse group of people.

Seig Heil...

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5373. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:06:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040625230642.23857.00000460@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93385

In article <1e4e3692.0406241830.73b5f212@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >
>> > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>> > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>>
>> > Poor nursie. Never been involved with the larger world of radio,
>> > only other amateurs and posturing, always FIGHTING. I've
>> > been in the larger world of radio for half a century. Radio is not
>> > a magical mystery to me nor is communications of any sort by
>> > visual or audible means,
>>
>> Why does it always have to be about you, Len?
>
>It could be about your forgetfulness, but then there wouldn't be much
>discussion, would there?
>
> Radio amateurs are free
>> to seek out information about the "larger world of radio" in any number
>> of venues.
>
>And Len disagrees?

Herr robust thinks so. Why else would he drop in an waste so
much time?

>You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
>information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
>which he claims to be a participant.

Heil could always get nursie a copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies."

:-)

>> Many radio amateurs have been or are participants in the
>> "larger world of radio".

>
>One in particular also participates in MARS and CAP communications,
>but apparently has never been trained. He cannot differentiate
>between the Amateur Service and MARS, repeatedly backing his statement
>that "MARS >>>IS<<< Amateur Radio."
>
>Hi, hi!

Nursie say "No HAM Radio, no MARS." Still wrong, still trying to
foist that off on folks. Maybe Heil will support him on that?

> If you'd like to impress us, obtain an amateur
>> radio license of any class and regale us with those tales.
>
>What tales?
>
>Steely-eyed FCC examiners?

Oh, wow, just like a "hostile action!" :-)

>Taking an exam on a lark, without studying, scoring perfectly, in
>under 8 minutes, and collecting $200 for passing go?

Would be easier to take it at a table. Larks are fidgety, like
to flap their wings and make noise. Like PCTAs.

>Naw, sounds too much like PCTA tales.

"Tales of the Souse Pacific." :-)

LHA / WMD

5374. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 03:11:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93388

JJ wrote:
> Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>
>>> Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>> truth
>>> From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>> Date: 6/25/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>>> Message-id: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>> Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things
>>> makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.
>>
>>
>>
>> Jim, try this on for size...
>>
>> Go through your closet.
>>
>> Flip up the lables.
>>
>> Then go through most of your consumer electronics, appliances,
>> dushes,
>> etc.
>>
>> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Or go to your local Home Depot or just about any store, and see how many
> items you can find that aren't manufactured in China.

What amazes me is how willingly (and some enthusiastically) we approach
this "brave new world".

The shift of the US to a "you want fries with that" economy is perhaps
the scariest thing I've ever heard of.

Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
ruled by others.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5375. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 04:38:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <7_KdnbRQ09v7kEDdRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 93392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

mr microphone 909 wrote:
> "Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
> news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
>
>>The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
>>the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
>>as "throwbacks to an earlier age."
>
>
> ...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
> or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
> men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
> of tobacco smoke and/or booze.
>
>

So why do you go to hamfests? Oh, you must be one of them.

5376. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 04:46:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff88@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <89edndJGC4gMkkDdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 93393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Chris wrote:

> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> as "throwbacks to an earlier age." Read the UPLC comments at
>
> http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh

And their statement, "armchair amateurs that still use vacuum tube transmitters" shows their stupidy and ignorance. First, only a very small percentage of amateurs use vaccum tube transmitters, and second, it what does that have to do with the problem of BPL interference, which does exists even if the idiots at UPLC says it dosen't. As far as the FCC chairman, he wouldn't know a transistor from a doorknob and is probably just waiting for BPL to get rolling so he and other top FCC officials can move on to cushy, high paying, do nothing jobs in the BPL industry as payback for pushing this crap down our throats.

5377. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 05:11:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DD05AF.ECB3311D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93389

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0406241830.73b5f212@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >> >
> >> > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
> >> > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>

> >And Len disagrees?
>
> Herr robust thinks so. Why else would he drop in an waste so
> much time?

Who thinks so? I drop in because this is an amateur radio newsgroup. I
have plenty of time to be here. Why are you here?

> >You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
> >information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
> >which he claims to be a participant.
>
> Heil could always get nursie a copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies."
>
> :-)

Steve has the top amateur radio license one can obtain. If I'd get the
book for anyone, you'd be a good candidate. After all, after several
decades of declared interest, you've still not managed to come up with
an amateur license, sport.

Dave K8MN

5378. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 05:16:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93390

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >>Date: 6/24/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>
> >>
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> >><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>> >
> >>> >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
> >>> >
> >>> >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
> >>>
> >>> I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.
> >>
> >>Who is "der Oberst"?
> >
> > I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up" on
> >him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie was
> >never more than a buck sergeant.
> >
> > Quite a promotion!
>
> Oh, bullshit, nursie. Heil has been called both "Oberst" and, for
> those who are 'with it' and can associate things "herr robust" for
> his steadfast imitation of an SS colonel lecturing the troops. A
> rather bad imitation of Otto Preminger in the film "Stalag 17."

You've stuck to the Nazi stuff for quite some time, Leonard. Meanwhile
you and number one son continue your bad Charlie Chan theatre.

> The only "promoting" Heil has done is a reverse form. That of
> knocking down (actually trying to do so) those he considers
> "inferiors."

One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke, would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio neophyte.

> That has been consistent for years. Heil, like
> yourself, just can't play well with a diverse group of people.

You're certainly a diverse group of people, Leonid.

Dave K8MN

5379. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 05:39:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40DD0C1E.1C44B9A6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93391

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
> >> William wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40DAECF1.9219F48E@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > William wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40DA5554.8331255@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > >In article <40D9E900.32DB95FE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > > > > > >writes:
> >> > > > > > > >
> >> > > > > > > >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> > > > > > > >>>
> >> > > > > > > >>> In article <20040623041752.23053.00000543@mb-m07.aol.com>,
> >k4yz@aol.com
> >> (Steve
> >> > > > > > > >>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >> > > > > > > >>>
> >> > > > > > > >>>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> > > > > > > >>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> > > > > > > >>>>Date: 6/23/2004 12:13 AM Central Standard Time
> >> > > > > > > >>>>Message-id: <20040623011336.29277.00000463@mb-m16.aol.com>

> >The second part is memorable.
>
> Heil have godlike powers, never wrong, ever.

You and the diverse group of personalities inhabiting the tired shell of
Leonard Anderson don't seem to be able to reach a consensus on the issue
of whether I am a radio god or not.

> >> > > > Then you guys set upon me like the pack of wild
> >> > > > dogs that you are...
> >> > >
> >> > > Which "you guys" would that be?

> >> >
> >> > PCTA. Know any?
> >>
> >> I know several. Are you telling us that everyone who is for morse
> >> testing and who posts here "set upon you like a pack of wild dogs" and
> >> that everyone who is for morse testing and who posts here is a part of a
> >> pack of wild dogs? I don't believe you.
> >
> >If you disagree, you've had years to correct it. But instead, the
> >PCTA give each other passes all day long. Hell, after six years of
> >idiotic posts from Bruce, the Rev Jim finally got cornered and had to
> >agree that Bruce was an idiot and his postings were abusive.
>
> Rev. Jimmie Who is turning, has now reverted to old self,
> slyly snarling.
>
> Expect another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from Jimmie,
> soon after Field Day (in the park).

Does this mean that the California Halfwatt won't be a Field Day
participant? Most FD groups welcome visitors. You may even get an ARRL
pamphlet, Leonard.

> >> > But since those old-timey
> >> > exams and examiners have gone away, all the new hammies are just not
> >> > worthy. Common theme throughout R.R.A.P.
> >>
> >> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
> >
> >I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?
>
> EVERYONE not agreeing with Heil be "not worthy!" :-)

Not at all, Leonard, but you don't seem to be able to come up with that
"Extra right out of the box" and Number One Son can't seem to figure out
that end fed antenna.

> >> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
> >> or would belong to someone else.
> >
> >So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
> >each other as human beings.
>
> Heh heh heh. Ordinary mortals cannot get along with radio
> gods...must all be subservient to godlike creatures doing bad
> imitations of Otto Preminger. :-)

Am I radio god or not? Your earlier posts on the subject reveal some
indecision on your part. Meanwhile, feel free to continue your
pretend-radio-amateur game.
>
> >> > > > Which according to your

> >> > > > comment above, a book just isn't going to give sufficient information
> >> > > > to be able to answer questions about amateur radio.
> >> > > >
> >> > > A book can provide information to an extent.
> >> > >
> >> > A book can provide everything needed to become an amateur.
> >> > >
> >> > No good golfer became one
> >> > > by reading a book. No good fisherman became one by reading a book.
> >> > >
> >> > Would you like to add a few more non-radio related categories to your
> >> > list?
> >>
> >> No, but I'd like you to take my list as a whole because it illustrates
> >> precisely the idea that I'm attempting to convey.
> >
> >Perhaps Steven Hawking read a book about basketball.
>
> Not good to pin Heil to mat so many times.

Pipsquawk's record on his attempts is even worse than yours.

> >They all became good radio ops by sarting with a book.
>
> Impossible in Heil fantasyland.
>
> All who are "interested" in radio MUST get ham license.
> Cannot be "interested" in radio without that license in Heil
> fantasyland.

You haunt an amateur radio newsgroup and expound on your peculiar ideas
about how best to regulate something in which you are not involved and
you think I live in a fantasyland? That's rich, Foghorn.

> >Len has plenty of experience.
>
> Not at all in Heil fantasyland. Heil issue orders.

You believe that any comment becomes a "demand" or an "order. Which of
us lives in a fantasyland?

> All "interested" in radio MUST get amateur license.

I've written "interested in amateur radio" on numerous occasions. You
conveniently make the same error over and over and over.

> No amateur license, not "interested' in radio, be inferior,
> unworthy, beneath royal burple of godlike nobility. So
> be it in Heil fantasyland.

No amateur license. Not interest enough in amateur radio to even
attempt an exam. You have no need to write of unworthiness, royal
anything or godlike nobility. You're simply irrelevant to amateur

radio.

> Heil infuriated that book "Ham Radio for Dummies" exists?

Am I? I think it would make the perfect gift for a fellow like
yourself.
I already have an amateur radio license.

> tsk, tsk. Demeans his Royal Court. Makes him jester.
>
> That bad.
>
> >> > > Len has neither.
> >> >
> >> > Above you say, "No good radio op became one by reading a book." You
> >> > don't differentiate between amateur radio operators and military radio
> >> > operators. Using your changed subject matter, Len has plenty of book
> >> > reading, training, practice, and experience. I might add that he also
> >> > has formal education in the subject matter.
> >>
> >> So Len is a good golfer?
> >
> >Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
>
> Len play golf. Gave up. Had to pay Heil greens fee.

So you'd have Heil to pay.

> Heil green that others have bigger outside-of-hum-radio
> experience. Big greens fee!

I have experience both in and out of amateur radio. You are not involved
in amateur radio in any capacity.

> Heil are hole in one.

...and you are a hole in here.

> Heil have godlike powers, allowed to strike dunder and blitzen
> on all inferior beings.

Which one of you is Dunder and which is Blitzen?

Dave K8MN

5380. Packet Radio Bulletins

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 07:22:03 UTC
From: Ken Williams <gw3tmh@gb7abc.net>
Message-ID: <cbj86i$s5e$1@news7.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 93394

You can read the latest packet radio bulletins at www.hamserv.net

--
Ken Williams

http://www.gb7abc.net

5381. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:25:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626052530.25561.00000775@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93395

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/26/2004 12:39 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40DD0C1E.1C44B9A6@earthlink.net>
>
>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:

>> Heil have godlike powers, never wrong, ever.
>
>You and the diverse group of personalities inhabiting the tired shell of
>Leonard Anderson don't seem to be able to reach a consensus on the issue
>of whether I am a radio god or not.

Yeah...What's up with that?

One post he's decrying you as a god.

Then't you're "god-like".

Then "you're not an amateur radio god".

>> Expect another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from Jimmie,
>> soon after Field Day (in the park).
>
>Does this mean that the California Halfwatt won't be a Field Day
>participant? Most FD groups welcome visitors. You may even get an ARRL
>pamphlet, Leonard.

"Halfwatt" is good...as in the maximum allowable power for an FRS device.

Of course we COULD allow him the benefit of the MAXIMUM allowable power
that he can presently run...FIVE watts. I am sure Lennie can find any of his
"I am an engineer but I refuse to get an Amateur License because of the code
test" cronies on 11 meters.

>> EVERYONE not agreeing with Heil be "not worthy!"
>
>Not at all, Leonard, but you don't seem to be able to come up with that
>"Extra right out of the box" and Number One Son can't seem to figure out
>that end fed antenna.

Getting close to four years...If I had a box of cereal sitting here open
that long you cold play tiddly-winks with them...Or they'd be powder.

>> Heh heh heh. Ordinary mortals cannot get along with radio
>> gods...must all be subservient to godlike creatures doing bad

>> imitations of Otto Preminger.
>
>Am I radio god or not? Your earlier posts on the subject reveal some
>indecision on your part. Meanwhile, feel free to continue your
>pretend-radio-amateur game.

Actually Otto Preminger is JUST who I think of when I think of Lennie.
And the Otto that makes me think of him MOST is when he is playing the
Kommandant in "Stalag 17", getting dressed to talk to "Herr General", clicking
his heels at the orders and thinking he has Lt Dunbar by the nads...

Of course it doesn't turn out that way...

It never does for people like Lennie....

>> Not good to pin Heil to mat so many times.
>
>Pipsquawk's record on his attempts is even worse than yours.

What's really funny is Lennie thinking he's even in a ring!

Funny to see Lennie making suggestions of "pin(ning) Heil to the mat",
when it's Lennie who has, in just the last few days, amdae so many attempts to
"diss" me by alledging that all >>I<< want to do is "fight".

It's another one of those "I hope nobody notices" things.

Problem is, like the King With New Clothes", EVERYONE notices.

>> >They all became good radio ops by sarting with a book.
>>
>> Impossible in Heil fantasyland.
>>
>> All who are "interested" in radio MUST get ham license.
>> Cannot be "interested" in radio without that license in Heil
>> fantasyland.
>
>You haunt an amateur radio newsgroup and expound on your peculiar ideas
>about how best to regulate something in which you are not involved and
>you think I live in a fantasyland? That's rich, Foghorn.

But of COURSE, Dave! EVERYONE except Lennie is "nuts" or "lives in a
fantasyland" when thier views don't coincide with The Great Professional".

>> No amateur license, not "interested' in radio, be inferior,
>> unworthy, beneath royal burple of godlike nobility. So
>> be it in Heil fantasyland.
>
>No amateur license. Not interest enough in amateur radio to even
>attempt an exam. You have no need to write of unworthiness, royal
>anything or godlike nobility. You're simply irrelevant to amateur
>radio.

Uhhhhh.....I woulnd't quite say "irrelevant", Dave...

Lennie is the benchmark against which I personally grade "cheat", "liar", "antagonist", and "incompetent".

>> Heil infuriated that book "Ham Radio for Dummies" exists?
>
>Am I? I think it would make the perfect gift for a fellow like
>yourself.
>I already have an amateur radio license.

And mention in every Amateur Radio publication over the last 10 years or more on more than one occassion.

Lennie's name only appeared in one, and after it did, they went toes-up. What's THAT tell ya...?!?!

>> >Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
>>
>> Len play golf. Gave up. Had to pay Heil greens fee.
>
>So you'd have Heil to pay.

I knew we'd get SOME suggestion that he now knows golf.

>> Heil green that others have bigger outside-of-hum-radio
>> experience. Big greens fee!
>
>I have experience both in and out of amateur radio. You are not involved
>in amateur radio in any capacity.

I'd rather hear about Heil's non-Amateur experiences than Lennie's.

And I know I'd have a long time getting to them if I took time to hear his IN-Amateur experiences first...

>> Heil are hole in one.
>
>...and you are a hole in here.

Dare we say EVERYwhere...?!?! I think this is one we can pretty much grant Lennie without need for further proof. He's done a pretty good job.

>> Heil have godlike powers, allowed to strike dunder and blitzen
>> on all inferior beings.
>
>Which one of you is Dunder and which is Blitzen?

Lennie's Dunder...Brain is Blitzen.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5382. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:28:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93396

>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
>transmitters
>From: "mr microphone 909" vvrap3000dc@yahoo.com
>Date: 6/25/2004 4:49 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <765e8$40dc9dff$d1cc57d6$7472@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
>
>
>"Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
>news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
>> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
>> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
>> as "throwbacks to an earlier age."
>
>...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
>or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
>men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
>of tobacco smoke and/or booze.

Uh huh...

As opposed to the beer-drinking, yellow-fingered truck drivers with echo
boxes, "Moonrakers" and harmonically enriched KW amps on Channel 19...

Nice try, Scumbag Troll.

Steve, K4YZ

5383. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:34:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93397

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>Date: 6/25/2004 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>

> Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>ruled by others.

Ironic, eh, that we started this "shift" about the same time our Lunar program wrapped up, isn't it?

It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started slipping. That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.

Sheeeesh.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5384. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:43:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626054337.25561.00000778@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93398

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 6/26/2004 12:16 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve

>> > I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up"
>on
>> >him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie
>was
>> >never more than a buck sergeant.
>> >
>> > Quite a promotion!
>>
>> Oh, bullshit, nursie. Heil has been called both "Oberst" and, for
>> those who are 'with it' and can associate things "herr robust" for
>> his steadfast imitation of an SS colonel lecturing the troops. A
>> rather bad imitation of Otto Preminger in the film "Stalag 17."
>
>You've stuck to the Nazi stuff for quite some time, Leonard. Meanwhile
>you and number one son continue your bad Charlie Chan theatre.

And once again we have the "intellectual" engineer reverting to name
calling and blatant profanity in order to try and express himself. Weak minded
fool.

I've talked with Dave on two occassions that I recall...(Both of them on
Amateur Radio, Lennie, so you were naturally excluded).

Dave has a rich, smooth voice. Nothing like the "scratching glass" of
Otto. Never heard him bark or otherwise issue "an order". Had a signal and
audio "to die for".

>> The only "promoting" Heil has done is a reverse form. That of
>> knocking down (actually trying to do so) those he considers
>> "inferiors."
>
>One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
>in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
>would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
>neophyte.

He'd just adopt the tactic of hanging out at the radio club meetings
talking about "ADA", and how he used a garage door opener to make some remore
device on the Moon go "beep".

>> That has been consistent for years. Heil, like
>> yourself, just can't play well with a diverse group of people.
>
>You're certainly a diverse group of people, Leonid.

Isn't he, though.

English professor, psychiatrist, aerospace technologist, expert R/C
modeller, child development expert, aviator,
every-other-radio-service-in-the-world-EXCEPT-Amateur-Radio guru...

Sheeesh.

So where do you think he buys a hat for THAT head, Dave...?!?!

Or the BELT...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

5385. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:49:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626054939.25561.00000779@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93399

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/25/2004 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040625230640.23857.00000459@mb-m18.aol.com>

> Poor nursie will come unglued at what he thinks is a "profane
> word" like bullshit. Must be sissy marine no longer on any
> active duty.

Nope.

Just college educated with a bit better vocabulary than you, "Mr
Professional Engineer".

Steve, K4YZ

5386. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 09:53:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626055319.25561.00000780@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93450

>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/25/2004 6:08 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406251508.339b2ba6@posting.google.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DBA159.3B975DA9@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> I have no doubt that we'll work you fellas. I don't think we'll hear a
>> peep from the California Halfwatt though.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>I thought you were some kind of significat DXer? Forget how to pull
>the weak ones through?
>
>A half watt should make the trip without problem.

The problem here, Brain, is that there is NO allocation, other than 11 meters, where your "mentor" can run a half watt in ANY mode that will travel more than line-of-sight.

I see "Dollar General" has a nice little FRS radios for $8.00 each. Maybe wecan get one for you and one for Lennie and see if you two can "hook up"...?!?!

I am sure the "radio professional" can make it happen...

Steve, K4YZ

5387. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 13:01:36 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <QseDc.184224$Ly.64821@attbi_s01>
Source record: 93451

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com...
> As opposed to the beer-drinking, yellow-fingered truck drivers with
> echo boxes, "Moonrakers" and harmonically enriched KW amps
> on Channel 19...
>
> Nice try, Scumbag Troll.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

"harmonically enriched" - well said.

Andy, K4YKZ

5388. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 14:37:58 UTC
From: Kim <mail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <aTfDc.8521$2V1.2118@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 93452

'X-No-archive: yes'
"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:10dm0bgod57kr1b@corp.supernews.com...
> Happy Anniversary Kim!
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
>

Well, thank you, Ryan! It's been a terrific 15 years!

Kim W5TIT

5389. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 16:43:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93453

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625230635.23857.00000457@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <20040625130034.10848.00000400@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/25/2004 6:17 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
>
> >>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
> >>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.
> >
> > I'd be interested in seeing your cite of where in the rules it says that
> >Dave, or anyone else for that matter, is responsible for making sure the OTHER
> >station is operating within his/her nations regulatory requirements.
>
> Irrelevant. Nursie get "cite" will disagree, no matter what.
>
> Nursie not play well with "cites." :-)

Lacks sight for "cite" at site.

> >>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
> >>
> >>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?
> >
> > Well...are you?
>
> Nursie know antenna theory? Nursie learn in nursie school,
> get fancy certificate with elaborate border (suitable for
> framing?).
>
> Nursie know which way Vector is Poynting? :-)

Ex-marine always point at someone else.

> > You KNOW my answer.
>
> Nursie answer: Garbage-mouth reply, insulting person.
>
> Nursie know squat about theory. Can only squat.

>
> >>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
> >>> or would belong to someone else.
> >>
> >>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
> >>each other as human beings.
> >
> > The question is was DAVE out of band.
>
> Heil out of reality. Heil have godlike powers, never wrong.

'Cept when Reilly say "poor amateur practice" a violation. Gud thing
Dave not in USA for Reilly opinion.

> > So far, nothing he or you has indicated he was.
>
> Irrelevant. Godlike creatures no need to explain anything,
> always right, always superior to inferior beings.

He want do it again.

> >>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
> >>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
> >>
> >>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.
> >>
> >>Len has plenty of experience.
> >
> > Dave was quite accuarate.
>
> Heil is everything but always right. Even when "accuarate"
> (whatever that is...).

No question ex-marine. He yell and yell til veins pop out. No matter
Dave only say "radio" not "amateur radio."

> > Lennie has NO practical experience in AMATEUR Radio.
>
> Nursie astound all with obviousness...of obtuseness.
>
> Nursie godlike being also, always right, never wrong, can
> insult "inferior beings" at whim. His whim always hanging
> out in here.

He convene courts martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury. He yell
and yell til vein pop out.

> > No one disputes Lennie's "experience" in "radio". I am sure after all
> the
> >websites he's cut and pasted from he HAS actually learned SOMETHING about
> >Amateur Radio too, but as I am sure you know for yourself, that which one
> >learns in a book as opposed to "how it is" is not always the same.
>

> Nursie say Hum Radio allatime different other radio.
>
> Nursie godlike, never wrong...can direct, correct DoD.

Donny Rummy better watch out. Ex-marine make Donny obsolete.

> Nursie write own book, "Book of Facts!" Book not
> available outside of nursieland.

Sub-title, "Chicken Soup for the Insane."

> >>> So Len is a good golfer?
> >>
> >>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
> >
> > I for one have no doubt that if Lennie reads a golfing book, he will be
> >quick to let us know just how smart he is about golfing wether he's been on
> >the links or not.
>
> No have golfing book. Got balls.

Why golf books sell so well? Nobody ever learn a thing from golfing
book. All bout pro-golf. Not help amateur golf.

> Nursie nutso.

Ask VA. Dey have record open for public see.

> Temper fry...

He yell and yell til vein pop out. Sumpin bad might happen him keep
doin dat.

> LHA / WMD

Why we talk like marine go native?

5390. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 16:59:45 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406260859.47905c46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93454

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625230635.23857.00000457@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <20040625130034.10848.00000400@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/25/2004 6:17 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
>
> >>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
> >>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.
> >
> > I'd be interested in seeing your cite of where in the rules it says that
> >Dave, or anyone else for that matter, is responsible for making sure the OTHER
> >station is operating within his/her nations regulatory requirements.
>
> Irrelevant. Nursie get "cite" will disagree, no matter what.
>
> Nursie not play well with "cites." :-)

Ex-marine no have sight for cite at site. Want not know truth.

> >>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
> >>
> >>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?
> >
> > Well...are you?
>
> Nursie know antenna theory? Nursie learn in nursie school,
> get fancy certificate with elaborate border (suitable for
> framing?).
>
> Nursie know which way Vector is Poynting? :-)

Always point at other people, never at him.

> > You KNOW my answer.
>
> Nursie answer: Garbage-mouth reply, insulting person.
>
> Nursie know squat about theory. Can only squat.

Learn squat at Radio School. No chair.

> >>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
> >>> or would belong to someone else.
> >>
> >>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
> >>each other as human beings.
> >
> > The question is was DAVE out of band.
>
> Heil out of reality. Heil have godlike powers, never wrong.
>
> > So far, nothing he or you has indicated he was.
>
> Irrelevant. Godlike creatures no need to explain anything,
> always right, always superior to inferior beings.
>
> >>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
> >>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
> >>
> >>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.
> >>
> >>Len has plenty of experience.
> >
> > Dave was quite accuarate.
>
> Heil is everything but always right. Even when "accuarate"
> (whatever that is...).

He change premise. Make always right.

> > Lennie has NO practical experience in AMATEUR Radio.
>
> Nursie astound all with obviousness...of obtuseness.

Obvious not full deck.

> Nursie godlike being also, always right, never wrong, can
> insult "inferior beings" at whim. His whim always hanging
> out in here.

He different . Not change premise same Heil. He ignore fact. He
ignore fact again and again. He yell and yell til vein pop out. He
make fact change.

> > No one disputes Lennie's "experience" in "radio". I am sure after all
> the
> >websites he's cut and pasted from he HAS actually learned SOMETHING about
> >Amateur Radio too, but as I am sure you know for yourself, that which one
> >learns in a book as opposed to "how it is" is not always the same.
>
> Nursie say Hum Radio allatime different other radio.

Heil change premise. Not hum radio anymore. He say all radio.

> Nursie godlike, never wrong...can direct, correct DoD.

Better Donny Rummy watchout. Ex-marine make Donny obsolete.

> Nursie write own book, "Book of Facts!" Book not
> available outside of nursieland.

Sub-title: "Chicken Soup for the Hum Nuts."

> >>> So Len is a good golfer?
> >>
> >>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
> >
> > I for one have no doubt that if Lennie reads a golfing book, he will be
> >quick to let us know just how smart he is about golfing wether he's been on
> >the links or not.
>
> No have golfing book. Got balls.

Why golf book sell and sell? No good to learn from golf book. Only
about pro-golf. Have nothing for amateur golf. Amateur golf berry
different.

> Nursie nutso.

He vegemite.

> Temper fry...

He yell and yell til vein pop out. He need calm down sumpin bad
happen mad all time.

> LHA / WMD

Why we talk like marine gone native?

5391. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 17:25:54 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93455

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
> >>
> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >>(Steve
> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is "civilian"
> and
> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
> it.
> >>
> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
> >
> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us, Lennie.
> >
> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and Regulations.
>
> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>
> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)

"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"

> > CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department of
> >Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the United
> >States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.
>
> Wow! That sounds so OFFICIAL!!!

Why he say "defacto?" Like fact? Fact-like? Maybe new fact?

CAP belong Air Force. Air Force not Federal. It Defense Department.

> I'll bet all the CAP aces have cute uniforms with pretty patches
> and salute one another on or off the flight line...

Make Michilin Man think Pillsbury Dough-Boy a Cutie-Pie.

> > The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
> >services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
> >conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
> >Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
> >inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are not
> >authorized either.
>
> "...where inoperability?!?" :-)

Might mean interoperability. Who know?

Federal agency operate on FCC "regualted radio."

Defense agency operate on NTIA "regualted radio."

> > These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply to all
> >other federal entities also.
>
> You sound like the JIG...Judicial Inoperability Group.

He make Court Martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury, he jailer,
he executioner, he undertaker, he worm.

> Lots of word dancing. Doesn't mean much because the tune is
> off key.

He have on-key music in head.

> >> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.
> >
> > Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to operate
> >in Air Force MARS, Lennie.
>
> Nursie say "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>
> If MARS be amateur radio, it can't be "Air Force." Air Force be
> military.

Uh, oh. Now he yell and yell til vein pop out. He say dat not fact.
He know fact.

> >> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >>
> >> :-)
> >>
> >> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.
> >
> > No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
> >operational knowledge.
>
> Nursie be stuck on "inoperability" with most things here. :-)

He head inoperable.

> DoD 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03). Ever hear of it?

No fact! No fact! He yell and yell til vein pop out. He mad.

> > Putz..
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discourse?"

He only mean discourse.

> No, just nursie's dissing and cussing.
>
> Perfect example of the best that ham radio can be?

He Ham Radio Icon.

> Temper fry...

He clickable so easy.

> LHA / WMD

5392. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 17:34:29 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406260934.6e6defa1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93456

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625230642.23857.00000461@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >>Date: 6/24/2004 10:31 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <40DB9C82.51D8799E@earthlink.net>
> >>
> >>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>> In article <40DAED83.71C9CE0B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>> >
> >>> >> I have to laugh at their intellect in here. :-)
> >>> >
> >>> >That's right. You are unable to do so on the ham bands.
> >>>
> >>> I am laughing at der Oberst's literary intellect.
> >>
> >>Who is "der Oberst"?
> >
> > I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up" on
> >him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie was
> >never more than a buck sergeant.
> >
> > Quite a promotion!
>
> Oh, bullshit, nursie. Heil has been called both "Oberst" and, for
> those who are 'with it' and can associate things "herr robust" for
> his steadfast imitation of an SS colonel lecturing the troops. A
> rather bad imitation of Otto Preminger in the film "Stalag 17."

Steve no understand "Stalag 17." He like "Gumper Pyle." Shazaam!

5393. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 17:37:43 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406260937.5586476f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93457

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>...
>
> One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
> in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
> would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
> neophyte.

Radio professionals pass radio exams on enormous fluke?

Only from the mind of Heil.

5394. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:47:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <5xjDc.88$Kt6.43@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93458
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message
news:2YZCc.110985$HG.61447@attbi_s53...
> Good troll job, Chris.
>
> " Moreover, these systems will incorporate adaptive interference
mitigation
> capabilities that will effectively remedy any interference that might
result
> to fixed and mobile operations in the High Frequency (HF) band (1.7-80
> MHz)."
>
> The "effective remedy" claim reminds me of the meeting I attended years
ago
> before Texas Gulf started its phosphate mining operation in Beaufort
County,
> NC. Everyone was pleased when the company categorically stated that the
> little fishing creek near their mine would not be affected and would
remain
> "pristine" after their operations began. Yes, I do remember that Texas
Gulf
> liked to use that word "pristine" in describing the results of their
> wastewater filtration!Within a year of operation, they had destroyed all
> fishing in the little fishing tributary to Pamlico sound, and soon they
were
> destroying even the commercial fishing in the sound itself. But by then,
> Beaufort County had become dependent on their business, so little was done
> about it. "Abatement" and "adaptive interference mitigation" has the very
> same ring as the empty promise to maintain the purity of our nice fishing
> stream. But we sure would like to believe you Chris; trouble is, existing
> tests have already proven it's a lie. The mitigation just won't work. It's
> just a radio communications vs. big-business backed misuse of the power
> lines for profit option. And the truth is, the vast majority of people in
> this country don't need it and won't use it. A very bad trade-off; only
the
> greedy could love it.
>
> ak
>
> Read the UPLC lies at http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh
>
George Bush and his followers love all of that stuff. They also appreciate
the Chineese workers living under guard in concrete block dormatories where

they work 18 hours a day for 15 to 30 cents per hour - and then often aren't paid (hey, pay for your own housing and food at 15 cents per hour). Over 400,000 Chineese workers killed by industrial accidents or from disease caused by industrial work in 2003. Some commit suicide, but, what's good for Bull Moose is good for America.

I wonder what country is going to be accused of "weapons of mass distruction" next to divert attention. You can bet it won't be North Korea. Follow the money trail.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.711 / Virus Database: 467 - Release Date: 6/25/04

5395. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145213.06606.00000534@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93461

In article <20040626055319.25561.00000780@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 6:08 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406251508.339b2ba6@posting.google.com>
>>
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:<40DBA159.3B975DA9@earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>> I have no doubt that we'll work you fellas. I don't think we'll hear a
>>> peep from the California Halfwatt though.
>>>
>>> Dave K8MN
>>
>>I thought you were some kind of significat DXer? Forget how to pull
>>the weak ones through?
>>
>>A half watt should make the trip without problem.
>
> The problem here, Brain, is that there is NO allocation, other than 11
>meters, where your "mentor" can run a half watt in ANY mode that will travel
>more than line-of-sight.

Nursie no see, no LOS. Poor nursie. Skip class, skip propagation.

> I see "Dollar General" has a nice little FRS radios for $8.00 each.
Maybe
>wecan get one for you and one for Lennie and see if you two can "hook
up"...?!?!

Nursie do magic again. Spell "wiccan" wrong.

> I am sure the "radio professional" can make it happen...

Nursie snarl. Too much drool. Snarl spoiled.

Nursie show hum radio all about hating other radio.

Nursie not play well other people.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5396. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93460

In article <20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
>>transmitters
>>From: "mr microphone 909" vvrap3000dc@yahoo.com
>>Date: 6/25/2004 4:49 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <765e8$40dc9dff$d1cc57d6$7472@snip.allthenewsgroups.com>
>>
>>"Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
>>news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
>>> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
>>> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
>>> as "throwbacks to an earlier age."
>>
>>...and they are 100% correct also. Just goto any hamfest
>>or ham club meeting. All you see is a bunch of retired old white
>>men in dirty rags who are incredible tightwads that reek
>>of tobacco smoke and/or booze.
>
> Uh huh...
>
> As opposed to the beer-drinking, yellow-fingered truck drivers with echo
>boxes, "Moonrakers" and harmonically enriched KW amps on Channel 19...

Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.

Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.

Nursie wanna FIGHT!

> Nice try, Scumbag Troll.

Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.

Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5397. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145216.06606.00000537@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93459

In article <20040626054939.25561.00000779@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:06 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040625230640.23857.00000459@mb-m18.aol.com>
>
>> Poor nursie will come unglued at what he thinks is a "profane
>> word" like bullshit. Must be sissy marine no longer on any
>> active duty.
>
> Nope.
>
> Just college educated with a bit better vocabulary than you, "Mr
>Professional Engineer".

NOT P.E. Just professional. Perform service for money.

Good, honest money. Make enough be happy.

Nursie go collitch? Heap edumcated? Have nice certificates?

Nursie not make enough money be happy? Tsk. Nursie angry,
much hate. Not good. Nursie curse, snarl. Veins go pop soon.

Nursie need hobby to ease out hate, anger. Suggest working
DX from outer space. Nursie must be there. Nurse spaced out.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5398. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145216.06606.00000536@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93465

In article <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040625230635.23857.00000457@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040625130034.10848.00000400@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/25/2004 6:17 AM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406250317.e66dd0c@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >>news:<40DBA665.E05523E7@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> >>Just don't forget that the world's greatest DXer worked out of band
>> >>frenchmen on 6 meters, and if he had to do it over again, he would.
>> >
>> > I'd be interested in seeing your cite of where in the rules it says
>that
>> >Dave, or anyone else for that matter, is responsible for making sure the
>OTHER
>> >station is operating within his/her nations regulatory requirements.
>>
>> Irrelevant. Nursie get "cite" will disagree, no matter what.
>>
>> Nursie not play well with "cites." :-)
>
>Lacks sight for "cite" at site.

Nursie big murine, got good "eye cite."

Nursie not read 4650.2, say MARS >>IS<< amateur radio.

>> >>> Did you figure out that end-fed antenna yet?
>> >>
>> >>I think you're telling me I'm not worthy. Are you?
>> >
>> > Well...are you?
>>
>> Nursie know antenna theory? Nursie learn in nursie school,
>> get fancy certificate with elaborate border (suitable for
>> framing?).

>>
>> Nursie know which way Vector is Poynting? :-)
>
>Ex-marine always point at someone else.

Nursie point with one finger, forget four other point back to him.

Nursie top banana hum radio, know all fields and waves
personally.

Nursie think Maxwell's Equations describe Jack Benny auto.

>> > You KNOW my answer.
>>
>> Nursie answer: Garbage-mouth reply, insulting person.
>>
>> Nursie know squat about theory. Can only squat.
>>
>> >>> Any amateur radio QSLs Len could produce would be either "out of band"
>> >>> or would belong to someone else.
>> >>
>> >>So you and Len do have something in common. Now maybe you can treat
>> >>each other as human beings.
>> >
>> > The question is was DAVE out of band.
>>
>> Heil out of reality. Heil have godlike powers, never wrong.
>
>'Cept when Reilly say "poor amateur practice" a violation. Gud thing
>Dave not in USA for Reilly opinion.

Hollingsworth one of few at FCC have hum radio license.

Heil, nursie superior to FCC, all others, never make violation.

>> > So far, nothing he or you has indicated he was.
>>
>> Irrelevant. Godlike creatures no need to explain anything,
>> always right, always superior to inferior beings.
>
>He want do it again.

Headmaster think all inferiors be schoolboys, he whip them
into submission. Not play well with others.

>> >>> Actually, you have done so. You have Len suggesting a book. The fact
>> >>> is, Len has no practical experience in amateur radio.
>> >>
>> >>Ooops. You forgot to remove the word "amateur" from your statement.
>> >>
>> >>Len has plenty of experience.
>> >
>> > Dave was quite accuarate.

>>
>> Heil is everything but always right. Even when "accuarate"
>> (whatever that is...).
>
>No question ex-marine. He yell and yell til veins pop out. No matter
>Dave only say "radio" not "amateur radio."

Snarl, top-bananas, snarl. Pop, vein, pop.

Anger, hate from top-banana hum radio extras. Not good sign.

At entrance nursieworld, signpost up ahead, "Entering the
Twilight Zone, a dimension of sight and sound signifying not
much."

>> > Lennie has NO practical experience in AMATEUR Radio.
>>
>> Nursie astound all with obviousness...of obtuseness.
>>
>> Nursie godlike being also, always right, never wrong, can
>> insult "inferior beings" at whim. His whim always hanging
>> out in here.
>
>He convene courts martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury. He yell
>and yell til vein pop out.

Yell, nursie, yell. Pop, vein, pop.

Noise, hate, anger from nursieworld.

>> > No one disputes Lennie's "experience" in "radio". I am sure after
>all
>> the
>> >websites he's cut and pasted from he HAS actually learned SOMETHING about
>> >Amateur Radio too, but as I am sure you know for yourself, that which one
>> >learns in a book as opposed to "how it is" is not always the same.
>>
>> Nursie say Hum Radio allatime different other radio.
>>
>> Nursie godlike, never wrong...can direct, correct DoD.
>
>Donny Rummy better watch out. Ex-marine make Donny obsolete.

Ex-murine Chief of Stuff. All salute. Heil.

>> Nursie write own book, "Book of Facts!" Book not
>> available outside of nursieland.
>
>Sub-title, "Chicken Soup for the Insane."

Andy Warhol doing portrait. Not good. Warhol SK.

No problem. Nursie anger, hate gonna make him SK.

Type A behavior. Classic.

>> >>> So Len is a good golfer?
>> >>
>> >>Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
>> >
>> > I for one have no doubt that if Lennie reads a golfing book, he will
be
>> >quick to let us know just how smart he is about golfing wether he's been on
>> >the links or not.
>>
>> No have golfing book. Got balls.
>
>Why golf books sell so well? Nobody ever learn a thing from golfing
>book. All bout pro-golf. Not help amateur golf.

Country need ham golf league. Organize, put Hq in New England.
Publish magazines, books, charge shipping. Big thing. Lobby
DC, make important noise. Yell hate, anger against pros.

Pros have balls. For sport.

Hum radio contesters sit at desk, never get up, have very wet
wastebaskets. Not physical sport. Hum radio think so,
therefore be sport.

>> Nursie nutso.
>
>Ask VA. Dey have record open for public see.

Not bother. Ask about nursie, VA have pre-recorded message,
"this individual is pre-recorded, monitored for safety."

>> Temper fry...
>
>He yell and yell til vein pop out. Sumpin bad might happen him keep
>doin dat.

Like small cherry bomb go off. Shut-down switch finally thrown.

>Why we talk like marine go native?

Short-talk like CW, improve rate, make 20 WPM look like 200, reduce
bandwidth. Minimize humor. Hum radio very serious. No humor
allowed. All be to procedure, fill out forms proper, make like
big-shot radio pros of 1930.

Hum radio important have narrow, narrow bandwidth. Always was,
always so. Tradition. Venerate tradition, keep on Mt. Olympus to
please radio gods. Short-talk use minimal bandwidth. Easy to
understand by collitch edumcated nursies, ex foreign office high-
livers.

Why word "abbreviation" so long? :-)

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5399. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93466

In article <20040626052530.25561.00000775@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>Date: 6/26/2004 12:39 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40DD0C1E.1C44B9A6@earthlink.net>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> Heil have godlike powers, never wrong, ever.
>>
>>You and the diverse group of personalities inhabiting the tired shell of
>>Leonard Anderson don't seem to be able to reach a consensus on the issue
>>of whether I am a radio god or not.
>
> Yeah...What's up with that?
>
> One post he's decrying you as a god.
>
> Then't you're "god-like".
>
> Then "you're not an amateur radio god".

Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.

>>> Expect another Sermon on the Antenna Mount from Jimmie,
>>> soon after Field Day (in the park).
>>
>>Does this mean that the California Halfwatt won't be a Field Day
>>participant? Most FD groups welcome visitors. You may even get an ARRL
>>pamphlet, Leonard.
>
> "Halfwatt" is good...as in the maximum allowable power for an FRS
>device.

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Of course we COULD allow him the benefit of the MAXIMUM allowable power
>that he can presently run...FIVE watts. I am sure Lennie can find any of his
>"I am an engineer but I refuse to get an Amateur License because of the code
>test" cronies on 11 meters.

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

>>> EVERYONE not agreeing with Heil be "not worthy!"
>>
>>Not at all, Leonard, but you don't seem to be able to come up with that
>>"Extra right out of the box" and Number One Son can't seem to figure out
>>that end fed antenna.
>
> Getting close to four years...If I had a box of cereal sitting here open
>that long you cold play tiddly-winks with them...Or they'd be powder.

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>>> Heh heh heh. Ordinary mortals cannot get along with radio
>>> gods...must all be subservient to godlike creatures doing bad
>>> imitations of Otto Preminger.
>>
>>Am I radio god or not? Your earlier posts on the subject reveal some
>>indecision on your part. Meanwhile, feel free to continue your
>>pretend-radio-amateur game.
>
> Actually Otto Preminger is JUST who I think of when I think of Lennie.
>And the Otto that makes me think of him MOST is when he is playing the
>Kommandant in "Stalag 17", getting dressed to talk to "Herr General", clicking
>his heels at the orders and thinking he has Lt Dunbar by the nads...

Nursie watch too much TV, DVDs. TV, DVD not hum radio.

Things different in nursieworld. Nursieworld have snarlies all over.

> Of course it doesn't turn out that way...
>
> It never does for people like Lennie....

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

>>> Not good to pin Heil to mat so many times.
>>
>>Pipsquawk's record on his attempts is even worse than yours.
>
> What's really funny is Lennie thinking he's even in a ring!

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Funny to see Lennie making suggestions of "pin(ning) Heil to the mat",
>when it's Lennie who has, in just the last few days, amdae so many attempts to
>"diss" me by alledging that all >>I<< want to do is "fight".

Nursie invent new word again. "Amdae." Like Amway?

> It's another one of those "I hope nobody notices" things.
>
> Problem is, like the King With New Clothes", EVERYONE notices.

Nursieworld have style show? Like Paris? Work Frenchmen
out of band for style?

Nursie, Heil radio gods. Are superior. All else inferior.

>>> >They all became good radio ops by sarting with a book.
>>>
>>> Impossible in Heil fantasyland.
>>>
>>> All who are "interested" in radio MUST get ham license.
>>> Cannot be "interested" in radio without that license in Heil
>>> fantasyland.
>>
>>You haunt an amateur radio newsgroup and expound on your peculiar ideas
>>about how best to regulate something in which you are not involved and
>>you think I live in a fantasyland? That's rich, Foghorn.
>
> But of COURSE, Dave! EVERYONE except Lennie is "nuts" or "lives in a
>fantasyland" when thier views don't coincide with The Great Professional".

Nursie, Heil radio gods. Must make hum radio safe, secure for
radio gods, keep as gods like it. Gods not happy, snarl at others.

>>> No amateur license, not "interested' in radio, be inferior,
>>> unworthy, beneath royal burple of godlike nobility. So
>>> be it in Heil fantasyland.
>>
>>No amateur license. Not interest enough in amateur radio to even
>>attempt an exam. You have no need to write of unworthiness, royal
>>anything or godlike nobility. You're simply irrelevant to amateur
>>radio.
>
> Uhhhhh.....I woulnd't quite say "irrelevant", Dave...
>
> Lennie is the benchmark against which I personally grade "cheat", "liar",
>"antagonist", and "incompetent".

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>>> Heil infuriated that book "Ham Radio for Dummies" exists?

>>
>>Am I? I think it would make the perfect gift for a fellow like yourself.
>>I already have an amateur radio license.
>
> And mention in every Amateur Radio publication over the last 10 years or
>more on more than one occassion.

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Lennie's name only appeared in one, and after it did, they went toes-up.
>
>What's THAT tell ya...?!?!

Nursie big, important in hum radio publishing world. Nursie snarl,
hate others. Nursie still nutso with hate. Tsk.

>>> >Dunno? Did Len read a golfing book?
>>>
>>> Len play golf. Gave up. Had to pay Heil greens fee.
>>
>>So you'd have Heil to pay.
>
> I knew we'd get SOME suggestion that he now knows golf.

Was attempt at quip by Heil. Humor, nursie, humor.

Nursie full of hate, anger. No sense humor. Bad sign.

>>> Heil green that others have bigger outside-of-hum-radio
>>> experience. Big greens fee!
>>
>>I have experience both in and out of amateur radio. You are not involved
>>in amateur radio in any capacity.
>
> I'd rather hear about Heil's non-Amateur experiences than Lennie's.

Nursie show much hate, anger. Not play well with others.

Nursie have mucho hostile action in here. All by self.

> And I know I'd have a long time getting to them if I took time to hear
his
>IN-Amateur experiences first...

Nursie have much hate, anger. Not good. Vein go pop. SK.

>>> Heil are hole in one.
>>
>>...and you are a hole in here.
>
> Dare we say EVERYwhere...?!?! I think this is one we can pretty much
grant

>Lennie without need for further proof. He's done a pretty good job.

Vein ready to go pop.

>>> Heil have godlike powers, allowed to strike dunder and blitzen
>>> on all inferior beings.
>>
>>Which one of you is Dunder and which is Blitzen?
>
> Lennie's Dunder...Brain is Blitzen.

Both nursie and headmaster not Sanity Clause.

Merry Christmas and Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5400. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145219.06606.00000539@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93463

In article <40DD05AF.ECB3311D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406241830.73b5f212@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<40DAEF2C.CABEB0ED@earthlink.net>...
>> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > In article <20040622220523.11752.00000414@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> >(Steve
>> >> > Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >> >
>> >> > >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >> > >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> > >>Date: 6/22/2004 4:26 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> > >>Message-id: <20040622172623.09069.00000301@mb-m17.aol.com>
>>
>> >And Len disagrees?
>>
>> Herr robust thinks so. Why else would he drop in an waste so
>> much time?
>
>Who thinks so? I drop in because this is an amateur radio newsgroup. I
>have plenty of time to be here. Why are you here?

Headmaster Heil act as moderator. Heil not moderate. Heil
angry, hate for inferiors, punish them with nastygrams.

Headmaster want to feature personalities above subjects,
punish all not think as he.

>> >You ought to take it up with Steve as he refuses to seek out
>> >information about the "larger world of radio," specifically MARS in
>> >which he claims to be a participant.
>>
>> Heil could always get nursie a copy of "Ham Radio for Dummies."
>>
>> :-)
>
>Steve has the top amateur radio license one can obtain.

Nursie top-banana hum radio licensee, big radio god. Heil
bigger radio god. All worship gods. Yawn.

>If I'd get the
>book for anyone, you'd be a good candidate. After all, after several
>decades of declared interest, you've still not managed to come up with
>an amateur license, sport.

Am working pro in engineering, not sport. Hum radio license
not necessary.

Headmaster say "all 'interested' in radio MUST be hum radio
licensee." Radio god spoke. Heil nutso too.

Headmaster wanna control newsgrope. Heil not authority, not
moderator, not big-shot (only shoot blanks). Heil need control
of newsgrope, have control-freak personna. Not good. Heil
not play well with others.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5401. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145220.06606.00000540@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93464

In article <20040626054337.25561.00000778@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>Date: 6/26/2004 12:16 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>
>>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <20040625062206.05811.00000592@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>
>>> > I think it's Lennie's one and only way of admitting you are "one up"
>>on
>>> >him on MORE than one subject, Dave....An "Oberst" is a Colonel...Lennie
>>was
>>> >never more than a buck sergeant.
>>> >
>>> > Quite a promotion!
>>>
>>> Oh, bullshit, nursie. Heil has been called both "Oberst" and, for
>>> those who are 'with it' and can associate things "herr robust" for
>>> his steadfast imitation of an SS colonel lecturing the troops. A
>>> rather bad imitation of Otto Preminger in the film "Stalag 17."
>>
>>You've stuck to the Nazi stuff for quite some time, Leonard. Meanwhile
>>you and number one son continue your bad Charlie Chan theatre.
>
> And once again we have the "intellectual" engineer reverting to name
>calling and blatant profanity in order to try and express himself. Weak
>minded fool.

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> I've talked with Dave on two occassions that I recall...(Both of them on
>Amateur Radio, Lennie, so you were naturally excluded).

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
> Dave has a rich, smooth voice. Nothing like the "scratching glass" of
>Otto. Never heard him bark or otherwise issue "an order". Had a signal and

>audio "to die for".

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

>>> The only "promoting" Heil has done is a reverse form. That of
>>> knocking down (actually trying to do so) those he considers
>>> "inferiors."
>>
>>One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
>>in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
>>would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
>>neophyte.
>
> He'd just adopt the tactic of hanging out at the radio club meetings
>talking about "ADA", and how he used a garage door opener to make some remore
>device on the Moon go "beep".

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

>>> That has been consistent for years. Heil, like
>>> yourself, just can't play well with a diverse group of people.
>>
>>You're certainly a diverse group of people, Leonid.
>
> Isn't he, though.
>
> English professor, psychiatrist, aerospace technologist, expert R/C
>modeller, child development expert, aviator,
>every-other-radio-service-in-the-world-EXCEPT-Amateur-Radio guru...

Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Sheeesh.
>
> So where do you think he buys a hat for THAT head, Dave...?!?!
>
> Or the BELT...?!?!

Nursie indulge happy hour again? Too many under belt?

Nursie too much anger, hate. Not good. Vein ready to pop.

Hum radio all about saying nasty to others? Not good PR
for hum radio. Hate, nursie, hate. See nursie snarl. Yawn.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5402. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 18:52:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040626145221.06606.00000541@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93462

In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
>
>> Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>>ruled by others.
>
> Ironic, eh, that we started this "shift" about the same time our Lunar
>program wrapped up, isn't it?

Nursie work in aerospace? Or just spaced out?

Nursie looney? [looney rhyme w/Clooney, ER hero...]

> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started
slipping.
> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.

Nursie disconnect dots, tell tales of coincidence of time nursie got first car? Nursie not happy?

Nurise automotive expert? Nursie are radio god, superior to all inferiors (those not in hum radio)?

Nursie be maverick gremlin? Have a pint'o at happy hour? Need trip Vegas to tell all about radio? Must be. Nursie know all, hate many. Not good. Vein ready for pop. Vroom, vroom.

> Sheeeesh.

Shush, nursie, shush. Nursie not have mind neutralized, go into parasitic oscillation, not good for final. Final at any time, vein ready to pop.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5403. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-26 20:22:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <geWcnW6Dh5zbRkDdUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 93467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Chris" <cjones23@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3daecd1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> The United Power Line Council (UPLC) just blew the ARRL's comments to
> the FCC out of the water. No wonder the Chairman of the FCC sees hams
> as "throwbacks to an earlier age." Read the UPLC comments at
>
> http://tinyurl.com/yqxbh

Read them ... what a pile of falsehoods and total crap. The UPLC should be
challenged under the
Commission's rules about making untruthful statements to the Commission.

Carl - wk3c

5404. Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 00:40:01 UTC
From: Charles Brabham <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 93468

HamBlog http://www.hamblog.com is a weblog host exclusively for amateur radio operators. The hosting service is free of charge.

Many hams have questions about blogging. If you are wondering what the bloggosphere is all about, there is a definition of blogging on our main page, along with a link to a very good blogging FAQ list. (Frequently Asked Questions) The information there will give you a solid footing as you step into the blogging world.

Why a "HamBlog"?

Hams have a lot of information to pass on to each other that traditional information systems such as magazine articles or speaking engagements at fests have proven to be unsuitable for. Weblogs are highly flexible and highly individualistic. It is our hope that the public weblogs at HamBlog will provide a wellspring of knowledge about Amateur Radio that would be impossible to access or distribute by traditional methods. Perhaps in some way HamBlog will expand the capabilities of our present "Elmering" setup, which many feel has suffered and diminished in recent decades.

As is the case outside of the Amateur Radio community, word gets around about outstandingly informative and useful weblogs. There is a global syndication system for weblogs that HamBlog,Com participates in, just as other blog hosts do. What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that makes it special.... It's all Hams!

If you are an Amateur Radio operator who would like to post a weblog of your activity for the benefit of your fellow Hams, where would you go?

HamBlog.Com, of course!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL
Administrator: HamBlog.Com
http://www.hamblog.com
admin@hamblog.com

5405. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 05:23:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aRsDc.2491$lh4.929@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93469

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote

>
> Air Force not Federal.
>

Sunuvagun?

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB

5406. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 10:42:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406270242.45913bbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93470

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040626145220.06606.00000540@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> In article <20040626054337.25561.00000778@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> > And once again we have the "intellectual" engineer reverting to name
> >calling and blatant profanity in order to try and express himself. Weak
> >minded fool.

> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.

> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.

> Nursie indulge happy hour again? Too many under belt?

> Hum radio all about saying nasty to others? Not good PR
> for hum radio. Hate, nursie, hate. See nursie snarl. Yawn.

As I was saying...

(Thanks for proving me right once again, Lennie.)

Leonard, YOU are in sincere need of assistance.

Unlike you, I >>DO<< have the credentials to make an assessment
and to cause intervention to occur, wether you like it or not.

Shall I make a referal?

Steve, K4YZ

5407. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 10:44:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406270244.d02a85f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93471

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.

> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.

> Nursie wanna FIGHT!

> Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.

> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.

Does anyone else besides me find it really heartbreaking to see a
person of Lennie's alleged education and accomplishments to have
fallen to this...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

5408. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 11:14:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406270314.501df4a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93472

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040626145213.06606.00000534@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> Nursie no see, no LOS. Poor nursie. Skip class, skip propagation.

> > I see "Dollar General" has a nice little FRS radios for $8.00 each.
> Maybe
> >wecan get one for you and one for Lennie and see if you two can "hook
> up"...?!?!
>
> Nursie do magic again. Spell "wiccan" wrong.

I wasn't spelling "wiccan", but since you mentioned it, it seems
it's on YOUR mind...

Sure would answer a lot of questions about why you act the way
you do....

> Nursie snarl. Too much drool. Snarl spoiled.

> Nursie show hum radio all about hating other radio.
>
> Nursie not play well other people.

You really need to read what YOU write, Lennie.

Any "benefit of the doubt" about your "professionalism" or
philanthropy towards radio in ANY discipline is pretty much a wash...

Pitiful.

Steve, K4YZ

5409. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 12:22:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406270422.7679721@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93473

"Charles Brabham" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>...

> What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that
> makes it special.... It's all Hams!

Rev Jim finally get wish. Have place to chogie without Len. More
meaningful discussion now. Len bad.

5410. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:32:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627093232.05775.00000460@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93474

>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
>transmitters
>From: "King Zulu" k4ykz@mchsi.com
>Date: 6/26/2004 8:01 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <QseDc.184224$Ly.64821@attbi_s01>
>
>
>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> As opposed to the beer-drinking, yellow-fingered truck drivers with
>> echo boxes, "Moonrakers" and harmonically enriched KW amps
>> on Channel 19...
>>
>> Nice try, Scumbag Troll.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>"harmonically enriched" - well said.

Thanks...(taking bow).

Nice call, BTW ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

5411. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:39:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627093904.05775.00000461@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93475

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/26/2004 11:43 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>

>Why we talk like marine go native?

Perhaps because you're a narrow minded, pathological, lying bigot?

But that's just a guess on my part. Of course it's pretty well established that you ARE a narrow minded, pathological lying bigot, so I guess that's accurate afterall!

Leave us not forget those words of wisdom that you yourself uttered: "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue.".

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

5412. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:42:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627094200.05775.00000462@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93476

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/26/2004 12:25 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>
>
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >>(Steve
>> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
>"civilian"
>> and
>> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
>> it.
>> >>
>> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>> >
>> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
>Lennie.
>> >
>> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
>Regulations.
>>
>> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>>
>> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
>
>"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"

I guess it is lost upon you two that you are both acting like idiots...

But then too, better here than on the air...

However it's exactly how I have described the two of you in the recent past.

Too bad the two of you can't, JUST ONCE, prove me wrong about how off-the-wall the two of you are.

(sigh)....

Steve, K4YZ

5413. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:45:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627094533.05775.00000463@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93477

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040626145216.06606.00000537@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040626054939.25561.00000779@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Just college educated with a bit better vocabulary than you, "Mr
>>Professional Engineer".
>
> NOT P.E. Just professional. Perform service for money.

You are not a professional, Lennie.

Not in this forum.

Not in Amateur Radio.

And certainly not in any "professional" communicaitons realm.

> Good, honest money. Make enough be happy.
>
> Nursie go collitch? Heap edumcated? Have nice certificates?
>
> Nursie not make enough money be happy? Tsk. Nursie angry,
> much hate. Not good. Nursie curse, snarl. Veins go pop soon.
>
> Nursie need hobby to ease out hate, anger. Suggest working
> DX from outer space. Nursie must be there. Nurse spaced out.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

What a loser you are, Lennie...What a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

5414. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:48:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627094829.05775.00000464@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93478

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>

> Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie
> snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with
> others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very
> important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak
> to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use
> hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.

Hey Dave...I say we start sending this stuff direct to Mrs. Lennie via
snail-mail and see how much longer this silliness keeps up.

I can't believe that a woman with her alledged credentials would allow it
to go on, knowing it could get him involuntarily commited.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5415. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:50:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627095055.05775.00000465@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93479

>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
>transmitter
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>

> Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.

> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.

> Nursie wanna FIGHT!

> Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.

> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.

> Temper fry...

The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
"professional" engineer.

One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".

No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Steve, K4YZ

5416. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:52:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627095215.05775.00000466@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93480

>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040626145213.06606.00000534@mb-m01.aol.com>

> Nursie no see, no LOS. Poor nursie. Skip class, skip propagation.

> Nursie do magic again. Spell "wiccan" wrong.

> Nursie snarl. Too much drool. Snarl spoiled.

> Nursie show hum radio all about hating other radio.

> Nursie not play well other people.

The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
"professional" engineer.

One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".

No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Steve, K4YZ

5417. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:53:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627095334.05775.00000467@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93481

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040626145221.06606.00000541@mb-m01.aol.com>

> Nursie work in aerospace? Or just spaced out?

> Nursie looney? [looney rhyme w/Clooney, ER hero...]

> Nursie disconnect dots, tell tales of coincidence of time nursie
> got first car? Nursie not happy?

> Nurise automotive expert? Nursie are radio god, superior to all
> inferiors (those not in hum radio)?

> Nursie be maverick gremlin? Have a pint'o at happy hour? Need
> trip Vegas to tell all about radio? Must be. Nursie know all, hate
> many. Not good. Vein ready for pop. Vroom, vroom.

> Shush, nursie, shush. Nursie not have mind neutralized, go into
> parasitic oscillation, not good for final. Final at any time, vein
> ready to pop.

> Temper fry...

The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
"professional" engineer.

One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".

No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Steve, K4YZ

5418. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 13:55:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627095537.05775.00000468@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93482

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/26/2004 12:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260934.6e6defa1@posting.google.com>

>Steve no understand "Stalag 17." He like "Gumper Pyle." Shazaam!

Don't ask me why, Brain, but I >>DID<< expect better from you.

Not much...but I did expect better.

Perhaps from hanging around too many prepubescent children, I bet....

Steve, K4YZ

5419. The BPL Man

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 14:47:54 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <u6BDc.9095$x9.2013@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 93483

Frank Dresser wrote:
> There's been alot of poor journalism in the BPL story, especially
from the
> financial press. The financial press has accepted the BPL provider's
story
> that their technology is good and their only problem is Cranky Old Hams.
> When the FCC started allowing full scale BPL, columns started appearing
> touting BPL as the wave of the future. I'd like to think these guys
would
> have been especially careful after the dot com bust.

This kind of thing has happened in the past.
There is a name for it in psychology, but I don't remember it.
It's the same sort of group-think and greed
that lead to Gold Rush and the Dot-Com-Bust:

A few "experts" put forth an idea (the "McGuffin") that sounds like
a sure money-maker. People start whispering to their buddies,
each one trying to sound like he's just a little bit smarter
and more informed about the McGuffin than the other guy.
Before long, there is a general, though specious, knowledge about
the wonders and glories of the McGuffin and the money to be made
if one gets in on it.

Next comes our old friend, Professor Harold Hill from "The Music Man-"
in fact, a whole bunch of him. They smell a mob with money ready
to throw it at anyone who can give them a piece of the McGuffin.
Professor Hill swoops in, smiles, makes grand promises and then
treks to that great house of prostitution on the hill, Congress.
After purchasing the requisite number of congressmen, senators
and committee men, congress hands them "The Golden Condom,"
with which he/they proceed to "do business" with the mob (investors).

Pronouncements are made, great trumpets are blown, artisans hired
and systems installed. The mob gathers round the grand banquet
table, festooned with gorgeous press releases, colorful brochures
and served by handsome young MBAs in expensive suites.
Slavering in anticipation of gorging themselves on the
sweets and cakes, and on the roast suckling pig that
will be the centerpiece of their repast, the mob watches
as four tall MBAs bring forth a massive serving tray,
it's cover of burnished brass engraved with a likeness
of Reedy Kilowatt using a computer.
They place the tray in the center of the table.
The mob leans forward, eyes wide and glistening,

forks and knives in hand.
Trumpets blow a glorious fanfare.
The MBAs, in one smooth move, lift the lid to reveal...

...a turkey.
A rather small turkey.
A rather small, very over-done turkey.
A hush falls over the assembled company for about five seconds,
wherein we will wisely make our escape.
And as we hear the sudden tidal wave of pandemonium
break behind us, as some of the "investors" dive for
a tiny morsel of the turkey, others start forking
their tablemates and still others turn their knives on
the hapless MBA servers, we see Professor Hill,
bags bulging with money, his convertable freshly
slicked with wax, cruising off into the sunset.
If we listen closely,
we can hear him singing to a familiar tune:

"Seventy Six bone heads paid for my parade,
with a hundred and ten poor fools right behind...."

David S.

5420. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 17:53:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10du2dc47qumk57@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93484

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
> >From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
> >Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
> >
> >Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.
>
> I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those phonetics
thru
> my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather
> prominent.

It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call of
K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi hi

>
> >Decided to run on my own as a
> >matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner.
Field
> >day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is
> >nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.
>
> How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?

No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree with
the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am not
the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been chosen
solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county (as
opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends (passing
by the school that is).

Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
simulation. Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we set
up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications. Yes
there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know when
our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond and
deal with it as best as we can.

In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that to be
desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that emergency
would occur.....

Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director decides the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far outwieghs any other aspect of field day.

>
> >Not sure which classification I will be running yet, but will be using 3
> >transmitters, on battery power, occasionally charged by a vehicle's
> >electrical system, but the batteries won't be located in the vehicle. And
I
> >will be operating from our fire department's parking lot of which I am a
> >member of.
>
> I had hoped to not be working this weekend, however I'm stuck.

I can relate.... have had to work weekends in the past too on that same weekend.

>
> Quite a few years ago I had built a small wind generator and had it on
the
> roof of the barracks I was in. It charged two marine (no pun intended)
deep
> cycle trolling motor batteries and those in turn ran my ICOM IC-730.
>
> I ran it at 35-50 watts CW and >>I<< ran out beofre the batteries
did!
>
> I've been wanting to build another, and perhaps I will before next
Field
> Day.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I have been contemplating some type of solar charging system, but will be looking into various costs of doing so. Since my operation will be operating at a park picnic table, with my car near by, solar panels small enough to transport but large enough to provide adequate surface charging/and usage for daytime, so that when the evening comes, I can start will full batteries would be nice. Well, I have a whole year now to work on that! :)

Ryan KC8PMX

5421. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144808.19470.00000334@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93485

In article <20040627095215.05775.00000466@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040626145213.06606.00000534@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>> Nursie no see, no LOS. Poor nursie. Skip class, skip propagation.
>
>> Nursie do magic again. Spell "wiccan" wrong.
>
>> Nursie snarl. Too much drool. Snarl spoiled.
>
>> Nursie show hum radio all about hating other radio.
>
>> Nursie not play well other people.
>
> The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
>"professional" engineer.
>
> One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
>
> No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Tsk. Nursie repeat twice. Not nice.

Nursie allatime do hate, rage, mean diss and curse. Not hum raddio.
Not good.

Pop, vein, pop. Pop go da weasel.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5422. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144808.19470.00000333@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93486

In article <1e4e3692.0406270422.7679721@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>"Charles Brabham" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>news:<BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>> What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that
>> makes it special.... It's all Hams!
>
>Rev Jim finally get wish. Have place to chogie without Len. More
>meaningful discussion now. Len bad.

Rev. Jimmie Who? :-)

LHA / WMD

5423. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144810.19470.00000335@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93494

In article <5c01b95b.0406270314.501df4a7@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040626145213.06606.00000534@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>> Nursie no see, no LOS. Poor nursie. Skip class, skip propagation.
>
>> > I see "Dollar General" has a nice little FRS radios for $8.00 each.
>> Maybe
>> >wecan get one for you and one for Lennie and see if you two can "hook
>> up"...?!?!
>>
>> Nursie do magic again. Spell "wiccan" wrong.
>
> I wasn't spelling "wiccan", but since you mentioned it, it seems
>it's on YOUR mind...

"Wecan" not magic? Nursie is "communicaiton opertator?"

Strange spell nursie under. Need Mavis Bacon help, do rap
with shrink, get shrink-rapped.

> Sure would answer a lot of questions about why you act the way
>you do....

How act, nursie? Nursie big actor? Nursie win Oscar I?

>> Nursie snarl. Too much drool. Snarl spoiled.
>
>> Nursie show hum radio all about hating other radio.
>>
>> Nursie not play well other people.
>
> You really need to read what YOU write, Lennie.

Can read as writing. Multi-task. No problem.

Nursie spell good? Or nursie under spell?

Nursie allatime write "amatuer" (think nursieworld home of Heath?).
Nursie write "communicaitons" and "opertator."

Nursie under spell. Whichcraft. We not know which.

> Any "benefit of the doubt" about your "professionalism" or
>philanthropy towards radio in ANY discipline is pretty much a wash...
>

> Pitiful.

"Philanthropy?" Nursie think I give money away? Nursie nuts. Is professional, do services for money. Accept money, not give. That called "professional."

Nursie wash disciplines? Is same brain-washing? Strange.

Nursie need consultation with Poirot, find out about "little grey cells." Nursie not using them proper.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5424. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144811.19470.00000336@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93488

In article <20040627095055.05775.00000465@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
>>transmitter
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>> Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.
>
>> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.
>
>> Nursie wanna FIGHT!
>
>> Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.
>
>> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.
>
>> Temper fry...
>
> The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
>"professional" engineer.
>
> One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
>
> No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Nursie repeat self. Nursie obsessed with hate, rage, do mean diss and curse. Forget time and space. Tsk. Not good.

Nursie not work in aerospace? TS. Nursie make big intercontinental BM in newsgrope...is Dr. Weiner von Brawn.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5425. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144811.19470.00000337@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93489

In article <5c01b95b.0406270244.d02a85f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040626052829.25561.00000776@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.
>
>> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.
>
>> Nursie wanna FIGHT!
>
>> Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.
>
>> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.
>
> Does anyone else besides me find it really heartbreaking to see a
>person of Lennie's alleged education and accomplishments to have
>fallen to this...?!?!

Nursie not like newsgrope style? Tsk. Is short, to point, not
waste time. LIke hum raddio CW is abbreviated.

Nursie allatime hate, hate, snarl, snarl, mean diss and curse.

Vein go pop soon. Pop go the weasel.

Nursie not in spirit of hum raddio, not use hamateur's code.
Nursie do mean diss and curse. Not nice.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5426. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144812.19470.00000338@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93491

In article <20040627094829.05775.00000464@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>> Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie
>> snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with
>> others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very
>> important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak
>> to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use
>> hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.
>
> Hey Dave...I say we start sending this stuff direct to Mrs. Lennie via
>snail-mail and see how much longer this silliness keeps up.

Nursie nuts. Nursie now challenge USPS inspectors, LAPD stalking-crimes unit. Not mention all shrinks in area. Nursie be shrink-rapped yet?

Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.

> I can't believe that a woman with her alledged credentials would allow it
>to go on, knowing it could get him involuntarily commited.

Nursie smoke too many refers. Bend mind more than ever.

Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate. Obsession. Tsk. Bad.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5427. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144813.19470.00000339@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93493

In article <20040627094533.05775.00000463@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040626145216.06606.00000537@mb-m01.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040626054939.25561.00000779@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Just college educated with a bit better vocabulary than you, "Mr
>>>Professional Engineer".
>>
>> NOT P.E. Just professional. Perform service for money.
>
> You are not a professional, Lennie.

Nursie say wrong. Nursie disagree with IRS, franchise tax board, FBI, DECAS, USA, USAF, USN, USCG, DoD. Not good.

> Not in this forum.

All must change entering here? Strange. Same here as elsewhere.

Nursie not like? TS.

> Not in Amateur Radio.

Amateur radio not professional by definition.

> And certainly not in any "professional" communicaitons realm.

Nursie know allabout other radio? Tsk.

Nursie have short job as purchasing agent of set-top box maker. Not have experience or expertise at pro "communicaitons."

Nursie expert "communicaiton opertator?"

>> Good, honest money. Make enough be happy.
>>
>> Nursie go collitch? Heap edumcated? Have nice certificates?
>>
>> Nursie not make enough money be happy? Tsk. Nursie angry,
>> much hate. Not good. Nursie curse, snarl. Veins go pop soon.
>>

>> Nursie need hobby to ease out hate, anger. Suggest working
>> DX from outer space. Nursie must be there. Nurse spaced out.
>
> "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

Nursie angry more. Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate.

Obsession. Must destroy, kill all not think like nursie. Not good.

> What a loser you are, Lennie...What a putz.

Nursie do mean diss and curse. Not nice.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5428. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144815.19470.00000340@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93497

In article <20040627094200.05775.00000462@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 12:25 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>
>>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>>> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>>> >>
>>> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>> >>(Steve
>>> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
>>"civilian"
>>> and
>>> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities
>of
>>> it.
>>> >>
>>> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>>> >
>>> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
>>Lennie.
>>> >
>>> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
>>Regulations.
>>>
>>> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>>>
>>> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
>>
>>"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"
>

> I guess it is lost upon you two that you are both acting like idiots...

Tsk. Nursie more angry. Nursie do more mean diss and curse?

Nursie think newsgrope all about hate, hate, hate all enemies?

Nursie show hate, hate, hate allatime here. Not good.

> But then too, better here than on the air...
>
> However it's exactly how I have described the two of you in the recent
>past.

Nursie not like critique? Nursie big radio god, be superior over all
others? Nursie be big mother superior? Tsk. Not catholic think.

> Too bad the two of you can't, JUST ONCE, prove me wrong about how
>off-the-wall the two of you are.

Nursie think all enemies are all around, not on walls? Unique.

Paranoia be popular in nursieworld? Must be.

Nursieworld forbid independent thought. All are created equal to
nursie by nursieworld constitution. All thoughts against nursie
are evil, wicked, mean, nasty, also have bad breath. All thoughts
against nursie must be killed, destroyed, forbidden.

No discourse for nursie. All diss and curse. Too bad.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5429. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144816.19470.00000341@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93490

In article <20040627093904.05775.00000461@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 11:43 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>
>
>>Why we talk like marine go native?
>
> Perhaps because you're a narrow minded, pathological, lying bigot?

Snarl, nursie, snarl. Nurse hate, hate, hate. Obsession.

Not nice. Nursie forgot inference of homosexuality and abuse of youngsters. Nursie not in self-control.

Nursie not good PR for extra super special class hum radio opertator.

> But that's just a guess on my part. Of course it's pretty well
>established that you ARE a narrow minded, pathological lying bigot, so I
>guess that's accurate afterall!

Nursie go nuts with hate.

Nursie have mean diss and curse. Not same "meaningful discourse."

Nursie have too many refers?

> Leave us not forget those words of wisdom that you yourself uttered: "I
>am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue.".

Nursie need help, tranquilizers, padded cell, form-fitting jacket?

Nursie allatime do mean diss and curse. Not good.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5430. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144818.19470.00000342@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93498

In article <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> >>(Steve
>> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
>"civilian"
>> and
>> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
>> it.
>> >>
>> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>> >
>> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
>Lennie.
>> >
>> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
>Regulations.
>>
>> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>>
>> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
>
>"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"

Pop goes the weasel.

>> > CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department of
>> >Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the
>United
>> >States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.
>>

>> Wow! That sounds so OFFICIAL!!!
>
>Why he say "defacto?" Like fact? Fact-like? Maybe new fact?

Nursie expert on Latin, use much as Dr. Killgore. Nursie got
MD at nursieland collitch.

>CAP belong Air Force. Air Force not Federal. It Defense Department.

Super chief shows on radar, full of sound and fury. Expect
navel engagement as super chief opens up big 'uns.

"Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" (nursienote)

>> I'll bet all the CAP aces have cute uniforms with pretty patches
>> and salute one another on or off the flight line...
>
>Make Michilin Man think Pillsbury Dough-Boy a Cutie-Pie.

Not appetizing. Where ghostbusters when need them?

>> > The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
>> >services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
>> >conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
>> >Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
>> >inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are
>not
>> >authorized either.
>>
>> "...where inoperability?!?" :-)
>
>Might mean interoperability. Who know?
>
>Federal agency operate on FCC "regualted radio."
>
>Defense agency operate on NTIA "regualted radio."

Nursie be extra super special ham radio "opertator" too!

>> > These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply to
all
>> >other federal entities also.
>>
>> You sound like the JIG...Judicial Inoperability Group.
>
>He make Court Martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury, he jailer,
>he executioner, he undertaker, he worm.

Nursie big hostile action hero, have box medals.

Nursie not at field day making megapoints for Homeland Security
and striking blow for morse freedom everywhere.

Temper frying like overdone bacon.

>> Lots of word dancing. Doesn't mean much because the tune is
>> off key.
>
>He have on-key music in head.

"Seventy-six bone heads led his big parade..." (borrowed good line)

He have enuf personalities make big parade, have medal
ceremony for awards.

>> >> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.
>> >
>> > Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to
operate
>> >in Air Force MARS, Lennie.
>>
>> Nursie say "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>>
>> If MARS be amateur radio, it can't be "Air Force." Air Force be
>> military.
>
>Uh, oh. Now he yell and yell til vein pop out. He say dat not fact.
>He know fact.

Pop, vein, pop. Nursie allatime angry, much hate. Tsk.

>> >> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >>
>> >> :-)
>> >>
>> >> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.
>> >
>> > No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
>> >operational knowledge.
>>
>> Nursie be stuck on "inoperability" with most things here. :-)
>
>He head inoperable.

He need Dr. Killgore to opertate, fix.

>> DoD 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03). Ever hear of it?
>
>No fact! No fact! He yell and yell til vein pop out. He mad.

Pop heard round the world...

>> > Putz..
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discourse?"
>
>He only mean discourse.

Mean. Diss. Curse. Nursieworld.

>> No, just nursie's dissing and cussing.
>>
>> Perfect example of the best that ham radio can be?
>
>He Ham Radio Icon.

Yae-suu, brother Kenwood...gimme Ten-(Tec)!

>> Temper fry...
>
>He clickable so easy.

Click, click, pop, pop...oh, what a relief it is...Alka-nursie! :-)

LHA / WMD

5431. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144819.19470.00000343@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93492

In article <20040627095537.05775.00000468@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 12:34 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260934.6e6defa1@posting.google.com>
>
>>Steve no understand "Stalag 17." He like "Gumper Pyle." Shazaam!
>
> Don't ask me why, Brain, but I >>DID<< expect better from you.

"Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< ham radio!"

Nursie need relax, watch old re-runs on tube, see documentary on murine corpse suggested by Brian.

> Not much...but I did expect better.

All expect nursie be hostile action hero on field day. Nursie not do that, be on-line shooting blanks, yelling, cussing, making bad noises at enemies.

Nursie not get military handset for paramilitary SG-2020? No? Too bad. Nursie not play radio god as sojer in da woods?

> Perhaps from hanging around too many prepubescent children, I bet..

Tsk. Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate all enemies. Obsession. Nursie call boy scout leaders homosexual? Not good. Not nice.

Nursie not get merit badge as boy? Nursie get hum radio merit badge from gubmint, be very proud, he be all that he can be. Nursie very superior (old pale). Put down all inferior allatime. Nursie hostile action hero. Got medal box. Got documentation in wallet. VA knows all about that.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5432. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144820.19470.00000344@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93496

In article <5c01b95b.0406270242.45913bbf@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040626145220.06606.00000540@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>> In article <20040626054337.25561.00000778@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > And once again we have the "intellectual" engineer reverting to name
>> >calling and blatant profanity in order to try and express himself. Weak
>> >minded fool.
>
>> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.
>
>> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.
>
>> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.
>
>> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.
>
>> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>> Snarl, Heil, snarl. Snarl, nursie, snarl. See dick and jane snarl.
>
>> Not good PR for hum radio. Not play well with others.
>
>> Nursie indulge happy hour again? Too many under belt?
>
>
>> Hum radio all about saying nasty to others? Not good PR
>> for hum radio. Hate, nursie, hate. See nursie snarl. Yawn.
>
> As I was saying...
>
> (Thanks for proving me right once again, Lennie.)
>

> Leonard, YOU are in sincere need of assistance.

Nursie new personality: Hunk Humanitarian!

Nursie wanna help all think like Hunk, be superior extra
morseman, message motor-mouth, hate all enemies, kill,
destroy them allatime.

Nursie get conference with other personality Weiner von
Brawn. Combined credentials very important, impressive,
can practice medicine with many licenses.

Only in nursieworld.

> Unlike you, I >>DO<< have the credentials to make an assessment
>and to cause intervention to occur, wether you like it or not.

Nursie new wetherman. "Film at eleven." Stay tuned.

Nursie have film over eyes. Glazed film like Krispy Kreme but
not sweet.

> Shall I make a referal?

Nursie smoke refers? Smoking not good. Nursie smoke, on fire
with hate, hate, hate allatime. Not good.

Nursie not show good PR for extra class super special morseman
hum raddio opertator.

Nursie nuts, think is real MD. Too many refers.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5433. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144821.19470.00000345@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93495

In article <20040627095334.05775.00000467@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040626145221.06606.00000541@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
>> Nursie work in aerospace? Or just spaced out?
>
>> Nursie looney? [looney rhyme w/Clooney, ER hero...]
>
>> Nursie disconnect dots, tell tales of coincidence of time nursie
>> got first car? Nursie not happy?
>
>> Nurise automotive expert? Nursie are radio god, superior to all
>> inferiors (those not in hum radio)?
>
>> Nursie be maverick gremlin? Have a pint'o at happy hour? Need
>> trip Vegas to tell all about radio? Must be. Nursie know all, hate
>> many. Not good. Vein ready for pop. Vroom, vroom.
>
>> Shush, nursie, shush. Nursie not have mind neutralized, go into
>> parasitic oscillation, not good for final. Final at any time, vein
>> ready to pop.
>
>> Temper fry...
>
> The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
>"professional" engineer.
>
> One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
>
> No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.

Nursie have new personality! Weiner von Brawn.

Nursie big name aerospace, be purchasing agent at set-top box maker less than half year. Very important. Knows all about electronic engineering. Good job, Weiner!

Nursie got lots hate, angers, repeat lines often. Obsession by nursie. Nursie can't do field day, must be on-line to hate, hate, hate "enemy." Bad nursie, bad. Tsk.

Nursie not speak of BPL. BPL not aerospace where he
Dock-torr. (physics pun)

Nursie hate, hate, hate. Nursie angry. All posts must kill all
enemies. Destroy enemies. Way of hero hostile action ham.

Not good PR for ham radio.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5434. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 18:48:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040627144822.19470.00000346@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93487

In article <1e4e3692.0406260937.5586476f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>...
>>
>> One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
>> in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
>> would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
>> neophyte.
>
>Radio professionals pass radio exams on enormous fluke?

Whales have flukes. This big whale of a tale.

Heil angry, festering hate. Try put down all inferiors, make fun
of non-amateurs, make him feel very superior.

>Only from the mind of Heil.

Use Minolta, take picture of Heil. Heil emperor. Have new
clothes, want all to see.

Heil think he have enemies. Needs put-down all enemies.
Take pot shots. Lack aim. Pot very black. Pot very loud.
Pot snarl and snarl.

Heil have insult field day. League not design field day for that.

Heil feel superior by put-down of others, make him big man.

LHA / WMD

5435. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 19:38:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <LmFDc.163$sh4.141@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93499

```
"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406241748.58cd4f16@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<He1Cc.131$VA7.119@news02.roc.ny>...
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040622065653.03961.00000248@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
> > truth
> > > >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> > > >Date: 6/22/2004 5:45 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220245.19d5852f@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > >"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > > >news:<cwMBc.69$kv5.41@news02.roc.ny>...
> > > >> Hello, Steve
> > > >>
> > > >> I forget who wrote a book, but in it he admitted that the
> > administration
> > > >> didn't know how to get out of Vietnam. Sometimes those things
backfire
> > > >> (like, possibly, Iraq?). Boy, a lot of folks got upset that
someone
> > finally
> > > >> told the truth. I finally felt better about Vietnam; not happy,
but
> > > >> understood it better and was able to let it go.
> > > >
> > > >I didn't go to Vietnam, so according to the PCTA Rules, I cannot have
> > > >a valid opinion.
> > >
> > > Who said that?
> > >
> > > Heck, you invent stories about Somalia, what makes you think we'd
be
> > any
> > > less entertained with stories about Viet Nam...?!?!
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > Hello, Steve
> >
> > It isn't Vietnam or Samolia per se; the question is "did we learn
> > anything?".
```

>
> Yep. We didn't kill enough of the bad guys in either place.

The lesson is either get in or get out. Somehow we manage to do things
neither fast nor slow; half-fast is more like it :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.711 / Virus Database: 467 - Release Date: 6/25/04

5436. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 20:01:20 UTC
From: King Zulu <k4ykz@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <kIFDc.101499$2i5.459@attbi_s52>
Source record: 93500

> Nice call, BTW ! ! ! !
> 73 Steve, K4YZ

Fortunately, no one else thought so. It was still around as a "vanity" call when I finally got back to the "4" district. HI

Well, three things on the predicted 10dB (under estimated?) additional noise floor when BPL gets rolling full steam:
1) Every ham will need to run the maximum power they can, since the "minimum power necessary" will have to overcome the high and ever-present BPL noise.
2) Although PSK works great with low power right now, maybe running big power with PSK will be one way to get through for those not interested in CW. Yep, high power PSK may be what most amateurs will go to.
3) We should all start working on our handles when the FCC is told to clamp down on the hams interfering with BPL transmissions. Actually, once those radios interfering with BPL are taken off the air, the power companies might want to try "wireless" transmission into homes. They still will have to keep their power line BPL sigs somewhat down so Duke Power doesn't interfere with Cinergy up in Cincinnati. I'm sure they can mitigate that sort of problem, however.

ak

5437. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 23:16:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271516.2617406b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93501

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144810.19470.00000335@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0406270314.501df4a7@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > You really need to read what YOU write, Lennie.
>
> Can read as writing. Multi-task. No problem.

Think me bi-lingual. English as first language and english as second
language. Hi, hi.

How I do?

5438. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 23:31:26 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271531.2e14db56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93502

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040626145216.06606.00000536@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Why we talk like marine go native?
>
> Short-talk like CW, improve rate, make 20 WPM look like 200, reduce
> bandwidth. Minimize humor. Hum radio very serious. No humor
> allowed. All be to procedure, fill out forms proper, make like
> big-shot radio pros of 1930.

I claim bi-lingual. Speak english as first language and speak english
as second language. Hi, hi. I go claim benefit. Where VA?

> Hum radio important have narrow, narrow bandwidth. Always was,
> always so. Tradition. Venerate tradition, keep on Mt. Olympus to
> please radio gods. Short-talk use minimal bandwidth. Easy to
> understand by collitch edumcated nursies, ex foreign office high-
> livers.

Oooh. Nosay liver. Might be VA disbilitater. Seben hostile action
with Jack Danyell.

> Why word "abbreviation" so long? :-)

Me no no.

Make up Q-word for abbreviation. QABBREVIATION.

I so smart. Hi, hi.

5439. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-27 23:44:32 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271544.5856ebc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93503

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040627094200.05775.00000462@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >Date: 6/26/2004 12:25 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>
> >
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
> >> >>
> >> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> >>(Steve
> >> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
> "civilian"
> and
> >> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
> it.
> >> >>
> >> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
> >> >
> >> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
> Lennie.
> >> >
> >> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
> Regulations.
> >>
> >> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
> >>
> >> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
> >
> >"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"
>
> I guess it is lost upon you two that you are both acting like idiots...

We not want you be alone. Need others.

> But then too, better here than on the air...

Me hope you not pop vein on radio. Be bad for all to hear you yell
and yell and yell, then hear nothing. Everybody say, "What happen to
yell and yell marine?"

All about "Mean" discourse. You trademark.

> However it's exactly how I have described the two of you in the recent
> past.

You say Liar, Liar.

> Too bad the two of you can't, JUST ONCE, prove me wrong about how
> off-the-wall the two of you are.

You be wrong most days but say not.

5440. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:02:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271602.483c9577@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93504

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144818.19470.00000342@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
> >> >>
> >> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >> >>(Steve
> >> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
> "civilian"
> and
> >> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities of
> it.
> >> >>
> >> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
> >> >
> >> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
> Lennie.
> >> >
> >> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
> Regulations.
> >>
> >> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
> >>
> >> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
> >
> >"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"
>
> Pop goes the weasel.

Wonder if weasel register with county animal control? He have new
license with pretty border for his wall.

> >> > CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department of
> >> >Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the
> United
> >> >States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.
> >>
> >> Wow! That sounds so OFFICIAL!!!
> >
> >Why he say "defacto?" Like fact? Fact-like? Maybe new fact?
>
> Nursie expert on Latin, use much as Dr. Killgore. Nursie got
> MD at nursieland collitch.

I scared. Somebody with disabiltity to understand fact give people
medicine.

> >CAP belong Air Force. Air Force not Federal. It Defense Department.
>
> Super chief shows on radar, full of sound and fury. Expect
> navel engagement as super chief opens up big 'uns.
>
> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" (nursienote)

So sad. I begin think it true.

> >> I'll bet all the CAP aces have cute uniforms with pretty patches
> >> and salute one another on or off the flight line...
> >
> >Make Michilin Man think Pillsbury Dough-Boy a Cutie-Pie.
>
> Not appetizing. Where ghostbusters when need them?

Not slime yet.

> >> > The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
> >> >services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
> >> >conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
> >> >Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
> >> >inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical, are
> not
> >> >authorized either.
> >>
> >> "...where inoperability?!?" :-)
> >
> >Might mean interoperability. Who know?
> >
> >Federal agency operate on FCC "regualted radio."
> >
> >Defense agency operate on NTIA "regualted radio."
>
> Nursie be extra super special ham radio "opertator" too!

He no Opertator. He just Tater.

> >> > These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply to
> all
> >> >other federal entities also.
> >>
> >> You sound like the JIG...Judicial Inoperability Group.
> >
> >He make Court Martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury, he jailer,
> >he executioner, he undertaker, he worm.
>
> Nursie big hostile action hero, have box medals.
>
> Nursie not at field day making megapoints for Homeland Security
> and striking blow for morse freedom everywhere.
>
> Temper frying like overdone bacon.

Oh, oh! And burnt microwave popcorn.

> >> Lots of word dancing. Doesn't mean much because the tune is
> >> off key.
> >
> >He have on-key music in head.
>
> "Seventy-six bone heads led his big parade..." (borrowed good line)
>
> He have enuf personalities make big parade, have medal
> ceremony for awards.

He Majorette.

> >> >> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.
> >> >
> >> > Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to
> operate
> >> >in Air Force MARS, Lennie.
> >>
> >> Nursie say "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >>
> >> If MARS be amateur radio, it can't be "Air Force." Air Force be
> >> military.
> >
> >Uh, oh. Now he yell and yell til vein pop out. He say dat not fact.
> >He know fact.
>
> Pop, vein, pop. Nursie allatime angry, much hate. Tsk.

He need angioplasty of large bowel. Sumptin stuck there.

> >> >> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
> >> >>
> >> >> :-)
> >> >>
> >> >> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.

> >> >
> >> > No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
> >> >operational knowledge.
> >>
> >> Nursie be stuck on "inoperability" with most things here. :-)
> >
> >He head inoperable.
>
> He need Dr. Killgore to opertate, fix.

Dr. Killgore pull head from rectum. He fix.

> >> DoD 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03). Ever hear of it?
> >
> >No fact! No fact! He yell and yell til vein pop out. He mad.
>
> Pop heard round the world...

Me not want hear that pop. Hope he get help.

> >> > Putz..
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discourse?"
> >
> >He only mean discourse.
>
> Mean. Diss. Curse. Nursieworld.
>
> >> No, just nursie's dissing and cussing.
> >>
> >> Perfect example of the best that ham radio can be?
> >
> >He Ham Radio Icon.
>
> Yae-suu, brother Kenwood...gimme Ten-(Tec)!
>
> >> Temper fry...
> >
> >He clickable so easy.
>
> Click, click, pop, pop...oh, what a relief it is...Alka-nursie! :-)

That the ticket.

5441. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:04:02 UTC
From: Keith Hosman KC8TCQ <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <40DF6072.B1C707FB@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 93510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Chris wrote:
>

Path:

internal1.nntp.dca.giganews.com!border2.nntp.dca.giganews.com!nntp.giganews.com!cyclone1.gnilink.net!gnilink.net!newsfeed2.telusplanet.net!newsfeed.telus.net!cyclone.bc.net!news.alt.net!usenet
From:
"Chris" <johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net>
Newsgroups:
rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy,
rec.radio.shortwave
Subject:
CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads
listen?
Date:
27 Jun 2004 21:33:42 GMT
Organization:
Alabama Village Broadband Cable
Lines:
24
Message-ID:
<3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>
NNTP-Posting-Host:
10.102.33.25
X-Priority:
3
X-MSMail-Priority:
Normal
X-Newsreader:
Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1409
X-MimeOLE:
Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1409
X-No-Archive:
yes
Xref:
number1.nntp.dca.giganews.com
rec.radio.amateur.misc:194595 rec.radio.amateur.policy:269540
rec.radio.shortwave:379948

> Every time another IE hole is discovered, the shit heads say things
> like "It isn't the browser; it's the user," and then they go right on
> using IE. Now the Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) has joined

> the chorus of people which includes places like TechTV and has said
> that IE is just plain insecure. See
>
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A6746-2004Jun25.html,
>
> and be sure to read all of the way to the bottom of the article.
>
> It's not that I care about the shit heads themselves, it's that they
> allow themselves to be compromised, and then the rest of us have to
> pay for it in some way.
>
> Are you getting too much spam? Blame the infected shit heads whose
> computers are acting as spam relays.
>
> Is your ISP putting restrictions on email that really hurt? Blame the
> infected shit heads again for overloading your ISP's servers or
> networks.
>
> So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
> reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.

BWAHAHAHAHAHA you are using Outlook Express yourself moron
--
KC8TCQ

Know thyself. If you need
help, call the C.I.A.

5442. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:06:12 UTC
From: Keith Hosman KC8TCQ <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <40DF60F4.A7CDB026@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 93511

Kim wrote:
>
> 'X-No-archive: yes'
> Plans, yes. But not related to Field Day; My husband and I will be
> celebrating our 15th Wedding Anniversary with a housewarming and renewal of
> vows!
>
> Kim W5TIT

happy anniversary

73 de Keith KC8TCQ

5443. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:12:39 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271612.45a116bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93505

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144820.19470.00000344@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> > Unlike you, I >>DO<< have the credentials to make an assessment

Marine need reach around back feel if head up buttox.

> >and to cause intervention to occur, wether you like it or not.

He now say he practice medicine in California? Maybe Arnie like to
know that.

> Nursie new wetherman. "Film at eleven." Stay tuned.

No, no. Not weather man. He spitting sport announce man.

> Nursie have film over eyes. Glazed film like Krispy Kreme but
> not sweet.

He dipped in sumptin. Not smell good.

> > Shall I make a referal?
>
> Nursie smoke refers? Smoking not good. Nursie smoke, on fire
> with hate, hate, hate allatime. Not good.

He yell and yell. His vein gonna pop.

> Nursie not show good PR for extra class super special morseman
> hum raddio opertator.

Maybe him want to keep amateur radio small. Maybe he think big fish
small pond. No need competatershun from new radio guy might show him
up.

> Nursie nuts, think is real MD. Too many refers.

If not so sad, he very funny.

5444. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:16:06 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271616.1df1ed11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93506

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144822.19470.00000346@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406260937.5586476f@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>...
> >>
> >> One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
> >> in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
> >> would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
> >> neophyte.
> >
> >Radio professionals pass radio exams on enormous fluke?
>
> Whales have flukes. This big whale of a tale.
>
> Heil angry, festering hate. Try put down all inferiors, make fun
> of non-amateurs, make him feel very superior.
>
> >Only from the mind of Heil.
>
> Use Minolta, take picture of Heil. Heil emperor. Have new
> clothes, want all to see.
>
> Heil think he have enemies. Needs put-down all enemies.
> Take pot shots. Lack aim. Pot very black. Pot very loud.
> Pot snarl and snarl.
>
> Heil have insult field day. League not design field day for that.
>
> Heil feel superior by put-down of others, make him big man.
>
> LHA / WMD

Nother think he big fish but pond so small. Must keep pond small.

5445. had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:27:27 UTC
From: Keith Hosman KC8TCQ <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <40DF65EF.BFEC112A@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 93512

I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.

Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup. But the icing on the cake was Christian 3D2EA in Fiji, wow that amazed me, Shelby WA8FVT was on the mic for this contact, but it effected me just the same.

I am forever hooked, and now have even more incentive to upgrade come hell or high water heheh.

73 de Keith

--
KC8TCQ

Know thyself. If you need
help, call the C.I.A.

5446. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:28:40 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93507

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144819.19470.00000343@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040627095537.05775.00000468@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/26/2004 12:34 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260934.6e6defa1@posting.google.com>
>
> >>Steve no understand "Stalag 17." He like "Gumper Pyle." Shazaam!
> >
> > Don't ask me why, Brain, but I >>DID<< expect better from you.
>
> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< ham radio!"
>
> Nursie need relax, watch old re-runs on tube, see documentary
> on murine corpse suggested by Brian.

He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
from me.

Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.

> > Not much...but I did expect better.
>
> All expect nursie be hostile action hero on field day. Nursie not
> do that, be on-line shooting blanks, yelling, cussing, making bad
> noises at enemies.

He noisy. He yell and yell.

> Nursie not get military handset for paramilitary SG-2020? No?
> Too bad. Nursie not play radio god as sojer in da woods?

Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.

> > Perhaps from hanging around too many prepubescent children, I bet..
>
> Tsk. Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate all enemies. Obsession.
> Nursie call boy scout leaders homosexual? Not good. Not nice.

Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.

> Nursie not get merit badge as boy? Nursie get hum radio
> merit badge from gubmint, be very proud, he be all that he can
> be.

No badge as boy. Must compensate now.

> Nursie very superior (old pale). Put down all inferior allatime.
> Nursie hostile action hero. Got medal box. Got documentation
> in wallet. VA knows all about that.

Feel sorry for VA. All the time he yell and yell. Maybe they have
medicine for him.

> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

5447. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:35:11 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271635.3c604067@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93508

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144808.19470.00000333@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406270422.7679721@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >"Charles Brabham" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> >news:<BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> >> What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that
> >> makes it special.... It's all Hams!
> >
> >Rev Jim finally get wish. Have place to chogie without Len. More
> >meaningful discussion now. Len bad.
>
> Rev. Jimmie Who? :-)

Jimmie Who? Horton hears a Who. Maybe Horton in Whoville? Maybe
Jimmie in Whoville, too. Maybe Jimmie in "Tommy," the Who Rock Opera.
Steve maybe Pinhead Wizard. Or maybe bad uncle. Or maybe acid
queen. Or maybe he all of them.

5448. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 00:38:51 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406271638.f966e0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93509

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144811.19470.00000336@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040627095055.05775.00000465@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube
> >>transmitter
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040626145214.06606.00000535@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
> >> Nursie snarl nasty at own QTH. Describe good, though.
>
> >> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Good boy.
>
> >> Nursie wanna FIGHT!
>
> >> Nursie sound like "collitch edumcated" hum radio god.
>
> >> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Show how be hero radio god.
>
> >> Temper fry...
> >
> > The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
> >"professional" engineer.
> >
> > One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
> >
> > No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.
>
> Nursie repeat self. Nursie obsessed with hate, rage, do mean
> diss and curse. Forget time and space. Tsk. Not good.
>
> Nursie not work in aerospace? TS. Nursie make big
> intercontinental BM in newsgrope...

He need angioplasty of large bowel. Make pop heard round the world.

5449. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:13 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406271736.c006f3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93513

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/24/2004 9:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040624225233.06606.00000488@mb-m01.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>
> So...there's NO technology that exisits today that would allow us to land a
> man on the moon in say...two years...if we really wanted to...?!?!

Probably not. Not in two years, anyway.

> >>Quick/Cheap/Dirty plan...A lunar lander configured to ride in the
> >>Shuttle bay.
> >
> >That could work. I had the same idea years ago.
> >
> >>The Shuttle carries it to the Moon,
> >
> >Won't work. Shuttle system does not have enough fuel to leave Earth orbit,
> >let
> >alone enter lunar orbit and leave it again. And that's with the cargo bay
> >*empty*.
>
> (sheeeesh)
>
> So we can't configue an auxiliary fuel system?

I doubt it can be done in two years. Do you really think a lunar
lander that will fit in the Shuttle cargo bay and be compatible with
its systems could be designed, built, tested, integrated and ready for
launch to the Moon in less than two years? Including all the other
facilities that would be needed to support it? I don't.

They didn't start designing the LEM in 1967.

Now about the auxiliary fuel system:

It would have to be installed in the cargo bay, reducing the space and
weight available for the lander. It would have to carry enough fuel to
enable the shuttle and lander to leave earth orbit, enter lunar orbit,

leave lunar orbit and then configure for reeentry. That's a lot of
fuel and oxidizer.
>
> It will take an extra 30 years to figure out how to install the fuel tanks
> necessary to do it?

It may not be possible at all even if the entire cargo bay is used for
the tanks.

Look at the design of a Saturn V. Note how much of it is fuel tank and
how little is CSM and LEM. Note how much it weighs at launch, how much
of it goes to the moon, how much comes back from the moon and how much
is left for reentry.

Those numbers are determined by the basic physics of how much energy
it takes to escape the earth's and the moon's gravity.

The shuttle's liquid fuel engines are not radically more efficient
than those in a Saturn V. Their biggest claim to fame is that they are
more controllable and last longer.
>
> I'll bet you a nickle to a C-Note that Burt Rutan could rough out a
> workable method on a napkin in a Mojave restaurant and have itr working in that
> two years.

You would lose.
>
> >If it could be done, NASA would have done it already.
>
> Oh?

Yes.
>
> Why?
>
Because it would be a great way to push the shuttle program. That's
what the "teacher in space" fiasco was about. Also the reason
Congresscritters have taken shuttle rides.

> Just because?

The physics of the problem is the key to all of it.
>
> They've had to fight Congress and ignorant laymen for 30 years just to
> stay in LEO.

So has every other program.

No bucks, no Buck Rogers.

> >The Shuttle has enough fuel to reach orbits of a few hundred miles but no
> >more.
> >Going to the moon is a lot more. That's why a Saturn V is so big yet the
> >LM/CSM

> >combo is so small.
>
> Again, We can't figure out a piggyback fuel tank?

Go ahead. Show me the numbers. How much does a shuttle weigh? How
small and light can a lander be made? How much fuel is needed to do
the jobs?

> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?

Do you know what a Lagrange point is?

The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
a supply container there?

> We've already proven that on-orbit rendevous, docking and EVA >construction
> is a no-brainer.

Not a no-brainer at all. What has been shown is that it can be done.
In low earth orbit.
>
> So again...WHAT new technology do we ahve to develop to go back to the
> Moon?

- New lunar lander
- New heavy lift rockets
- New systems to get to lunar orbit and back

that's a short list.

Or we could just build more Saturn Vs.

> HARDWARE, yes...we need new machines. but so far, Jim, your "arguments"
> have not swayed me that we could do it if we wanted to...

Of course it could be done. We know that; it was done almost 40 years
ago using rockets designed with slide rules and controlled with
computers that make a pocket calculator look smart.

The question is - could it be done in two years? The answer is no.

> >>the mission drops in, and brings at
> >>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.
> >
> >Only ways such a system could work is if the Shuttle stayed in earth orbit
> >and the lunar package went from there.
>
> Why?

Basic physics. The energy required to send the whole shuttle to lunar
orbit and back again is simply too great.
>
> >And the result would be a short-term visit by a few astronauts, like the
> >Apollo missions, not a long term base.
>

> As long as you keep thinking that, then that's all we'll do.

What's your solution, Steve? How many tons of supplies and equipment
are needed to establish a permanent lunar base? How much money to
build everything needed, and to get it to the moon? How many years and
launches to do it?
>
> If you think in terms of "what can this ONE sortie accomplish", you'd be
> right. But that's already been addressed by countless suggestions of what we
> COULD do if we wanted to.

With reasonable timelines and a sound program, yes.
>
> >>>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask
> WHERE
> >>>> in space are you going to spend that money?
> >>>
> >>>We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
> >>>here. And address problems long-term.
> >>
> >> Oh?
> >
> >Yes.
> >>
> >> NASA doesn't need people who are less-than-engineering qualified...?!?!
> >
> >Not really. They need highly skilled people, mostly. You might check into how
> >much money it costs to create one NASA job.
>
> So...NASA doesn't hire drivers, janitors, security personel, health care
> workers, mechanics, etc?

Not nearly so many as they hire highly trained and educated people.

It sounds to me like you are trying to justify a larger manned space
program by pitching it as a jobs program for Ph.Ds.

> >>If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that
> >>every
> >company that contracts with it would be able to
> >
> >Sure - at a price.
>
> Sheeesh.

You're the one complaining about getting ripped off every April 15.

> >But why not solve our problems directly?
>
> Sure...Why not.
>
> Let's just go ahead and drop a billion dollars into social welfare

> programs to feed and house the poor.

Who said anything about that?

I'm talking about solving problems like education, infrastructure, and
energy independence.

> Let's NOT do something to advance our technologies that will create
> entirely new classes of jobs, promote our wellness and, hopefully, ultimately
> develope technologies that might "liberate" us from poverty.

The space program of the '60s didn't liberate us from poverty. Nor did
it promote our wellness. It created some jobs and some new
technologies but at enormous cost.

> >>And WHAT problems are NOT being addressed long term BECAUSE of the >space
> >program?
> >
> >Surface transportation, for one. Energy efficiency and independence.
> >Education.
>
> Uh huh.

Yep. Haven't you seen how US education ranks against other countries
in the developed world? Or how much of our oil is imported? Or any of
a host of other things that need fixing?

Why can't the USA have the best educational systems in the world? The
best surface transportation systems? The best energy systems? Energy
independence?

This doesn't mean we shouldn't have a space program - we should. But
it has to stand on its own merits. Going into space is worth doing for
its own sake, not as a jobs program.

> >>>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
> >>>> technical advencement.

> >>>Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
> >>>those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"
> >>>
> >>>Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
> >>>government spending".
> >>
> >> But we can also defer that with cooperation with business against futures
> >>for mining, technology development, etc. The opportunities are there...We
> >>just need to have the gonads to take them.
> >
> >What opportunities? The only really profitable parts of the space program
> >have
> >been the Earth-imaging satellites and communications satellites. All
> >unmanned,
> >and they look back at Mother Earth. And the role of satcomms is dwindling

> >with
> >the development of fiber optics.
>
> Fiber optics = interruptable infrastructure.

Fiber optics = what makes the modern communications world tick.

Satellites are interruptible infrastructure too. Heck, it's easy: Just
build a high power ground jammer transmitter with a big dish (designed
for the right frequencies) and point it at the satellite you wish to
interrupt. Jam away. With good design, the jamming signal won't even
be detected on earth.

> >>>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
> >>>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
> >>>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
> >>>verifies the reliability analysis.
> >>
> >>Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables
> >>are bound to go boom.
> >
> >CNG tankers don't. Railroad tank cars don't.
>
> ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! !

When's the last time a CNG tanker or railroad tank car in the USA
exploded and killed people? How many of them do you think are in use
in the continental USA in the course of a year?
>
> >Sorry, 1 in 75 is simply not good enough reliability.
>
> And we'll improve that reliability by just not doing it anymore...?!?!

Not by doing it the same way over and over again.

> >>There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim.
> >
> >Who is there to compete with for space?
>
> The Red Chinese for one. They just flew a manned mission a year or so
> ago, and they certainly have the resources and the wherewithall to exploit it.

Right. They orbited one guy. The Soviets did it first - 43 years ago.
>
> And considering thier track record for flooding markets with cheap
> alternatives that have, quite literally, put hundred of thousands if not
> millions of Americans out of work, I don't doubt they can do it there, too.

By that logic, we should let them do it, and then buy the rockets from
them.
>
> I'd rather know that bright, fast moving light in the sky was carrying
> Americans.

I'd rather that there were more products I could buy that said "Made
in USA".
>
> >Heck, let's fund space exploration the way so many other things are funded.
> >We'll have bake sales and walkathons. Solicit donations of parts and supplies
> >from manufacturers, and use volunteer labor. Sell advertising space on the
> >outside of the space vehicles. Lots of ideas like that in use by groups
> >ranging from Indy 500 racers to the Girl Scouts.
> >
> >And we'll put real money into education, infrastructure development,
> >transportation, and energy independence.
>
> I don't see a whole lot of likelyhood that anything further will be
> forthcoming from this exchange, Jim.

Why not? Do you think I'm joking? I'm not.

> If you believe that "all that money" is
> going to no good use and that it's not a benefit in your daily life today,
> well then there's just no use doing it.

I've not said that. What I have said is that the space and military
programs are not the best way to solve our problems here on earth.
Those problems need to be addressed directly. You want a better
mousetrap, study mouse behavior and
trap design.
>
> I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And as
> both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of
> adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and take
> advantage of the opportunities "out there".

So would I. But at the same time, I realize how big space is, and how
empty. And the basic physics of the problems inherent in space travel.
>
> Unfortunatley GETTING there will be neither cheap or without risk, but I
> for one think the benefits will ultimately be enormous.

How much of *your* money are you willing to spend? Because that's what
will fund it.

And consider this: President Bush made *another* speech where he
supported BPL and said it was up to NTIA to figure out how to avoid
interference. How come our president and those BPL folks don't know
that BPL is a bad idea from the get-go? Anybody with even a basic
engineering education can see the problems staring you in the face.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5450. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213638.28114.00000498@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93514

In article <5c01b95b.0406270244.d02a85f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Does anyone else besides me find it really heartbreaking to see a
>person of Lennie's alleged education and accomplishments to have
>fallen to this...?!?!
>
Steve,

Here's a hint: It's an act.

Len is doing a bad impression of Hashafisti Scratchi.

He's simply trying to get you riled up. Also wasting your time.

Why do you bother with someone who behaves that way?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5451. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213640.28114.00000499@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93518

In article <Z6WdnRe9A7qCGEHdRVn-gQ@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>We were moving away from the Gold Standard
>>>at that time. It was the date that President Richard Nixon instituted
>>>Wage and Price controls. At that time, inflation was at the 4% level -
>>>something considered intolerable.
>>
>>
>> Yep.
>>
>> And Nixon was a Republican, who you would think would be a staunch
>supporter of
>> a free market and completely opposed to trying to control the economy byu
>> government fiat.
>
> That was one of the most curious things I can remember in politics. At
>the time, I was just out of school, so I didn't think much one way or
>the other. But the results got my attention.

It was "smoke and mirros" by a *REPUBLICAN* White House to cover up what was
really going on economically.

>The next deveral years were
>just about impossible for me to get a job. 18 years old and single made
>me almost unenployable for the next several years. The jobs that were
>available were going to people with families, vets, etc I was on the
>bottom of the list.

Around here that was less true - but the good jobs went to vets, those with
families or experience, and those with education.
>
>>> We soon found out just how "nice" a measly 4% inflation rate was. The
>>>initial 90 day freeze turned into around 1000 days of "adjustments" that
>>>soon saw the inflation rate at 13 percent in December of 1974. The rate
>>>dropped after that, but what was handed to President Carter was an
>>>economic train wreck, to put it mildly. This all culminated in an
>>>inflation rate of 15 percent in March of 1980.

>> I was there, I remember. Interest rates went up even higher - I recall
>> friends paying 17% for home mortgages.
>
> They must have had jobs too! 8^)
>
Yep - in every case I knew, both the husband and wife worked full time and
delayed having kids because of it. This was a time when a major shift in

American society happened, and it's very un-PC to talk about: We went from a society where millions of women, particularly those with small children, went from 'wanting to work' to 'having to work'.

>> Of course back in those days you could deduct *all* consumer interest
>> payments so there was a silver lining come tax time.
>>
>> From all I read, it's clear to me that the sudden jump in oil prices was a
>> major factor driving that inflation.
>>
>>>The Wage and price freeze was what turned me into an fiscal conservative!
>>>
>>> Now, was that a "leeberal" mistake?

>> Nope.

It was smoke and mirrors. And it didn't work. And it was made necessary by the fact that the USA in the '60s was preoccupied with other things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5452. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213641.28114.00000500@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93517

In article <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!
>> Or go to your local Home Depot or just about any store, and see how many
>> items you can find that aren't manufactured in China.
>
>What amazes me is how willingly (and some enthusiastically) we approach
>this "brave new world".

I'm not part of that "we".
>
>The shift of the US to a "you want fries with that" economy is perhaps
>the scariest thing I've ever heard of.

Economically, I agree. We will not prosper by taking in each other's washing.
Economics doesn't work that way.
>
>Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>ruled by others.
>
Economically, anyway.

OTOH, the ideology of *some* socialist countries is being affected by exposure
to capitalism and Western-style development. The Soviet Union didn't fall apart
because of SDI or steely-eyed glares across the Berlin Wall. It had more to do
with rock'n'roll, blue jeans and a McDonald's in Red Square. China is slowly
going the same way. Look at Hong Kong.

Remember the student vs. tank episode in Tianamen Square? Look up how long ago
that was. I was shocked by how much time has passed.

Cheap foreign imports are a short-term coverup of real problems. Domestic
industry withers away, and good jobs with it. Then the infrastructure (trained
people as well as facilities) are lost.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5453. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213643.28114.00000501@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93519

In article <20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/24/2004 9:52 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040624225233.06606.00000488@mb-m01.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040624140507.26512.00000557@mb-m03.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Yup - trying to catch up to the Soviets...
>
> And "nothing" we did had ANYthing to do with science, technology or
>research...?!?!

Not much. The manned missions were all about catching up with, and beating, the Soviet Union.
>
>You are saying we spent those funds and that effort SOLELY to "catch up
>with the Soviets"...?!?!

Most of it. The manned missions were the bulk of the spending, and were primarily (not solely, but primarily) about catching up to the Rooskies and eventually beating them. We did.

In those years, the question posed to NASA was "can it be done?" not "can it be done for less than this much money?" NASA effectively had a blank check for manned missions.

>>>Civil War: Creation of the present ambulance services, advances in
>>>trauma
>>>medicine, advancement of the railroads and wireline telegraphy.
>>>Photography
>>>becomes popular.
>>
>>Bloodiest war in USA's history, fought in large part...(SNIP)
>
> Yes, Jim...I think we all know WHY the war was fought.

There's actually a lot of disagreement on that. Some folks like to say it was about slavery. Others like to say it's about "states rights".

It's interesting that you snipped out the part I wrote about people wanting to continue to own other people.
>

> HOW did that negate anything I said?

I'm just saying that the price paid for those advances was horrific.
>
>>Ambulance service and trauma medicine yes - because of so many wounded.
>>Railroads were well established before 1861. The main "advancement" was the
>>standardization of lines in the South when they were rebuilt after beying
>>heavily damaged during the war.
>>Wire telegraph had pretty much connected the developed world. The
>>transatlantic
>>cable was in service *before* Fort Sumter.
>>Photography was driven by a number of factors, not just the war.
>
> So...you are telling me that NONE of the advancements and improvements
>occured asa a result of the war.

Nope.

I'm telling you that you are exaggerating the benefits of the war.

>>> World War 1: The airplane was just a motor driven kite in 1914, and
>is
>>>ready to span the Atlantic in 1919. The radio comes of age. New advances
>>in
>>>the treatment of diseases (from the study of sanitation in the trenches).
>>
>>Chemical warfare advances. Unbalance of offensive and defensive weaponry
>>leads
>>to enormous death toles in trench warfare. Submarine technology increases
>>hazards of sea travel.
>>
>>Advances in flight and radio technology are logical outcomes of increased
>>demand for those technologies.
>
> And the advancement of submarine technology increased our ability to do
>further marine research in the following years.

Not really. Between the world wars, most submarine development was military.
>
> Commercial radio for the masses follows developments of new technology
>during the war.
>
> Commercial aviation blossoms after the war.

Sure - because civilians wanted it. Real airline service took about a decade.
>
>>>World War 2: Mass production of antibiotics (developed in the 30's, but
>>>not considered a priority until the war), development of RADAR, the jet
>>>engine,
>>>further advancements in air travel as a result of the development of
>>>pressurization. Missle technology emerges. Microwave and X-Ray technology
>>>skyrockets.

>>
>>Genocide technology rapidly advanced by Germans. Atomic weapons developed,
>>permitting both cities and their inhabitants to be incinerated at lower cost
>>and effort. Digital electronic computer is developed to improve aiming of
>>guns.
>>50 million dead, entire countries devastated, permitting massive rebuilding
>>and
>>modernization efforts postwar. War also facilitates Soviet expansion into
>>much
>>of Europe.
>
> So what you're telling me is that NONE of the POSITIVE things that came
>from this era are valid, and that since a lot of bad things DID occur, we
>should shun the good ones too...?!?!

Nope. Not at all.

I'm saying that the advances weren't worth the price paid.

>>> Korea: Use of the helicopter for medical evacuation. Proliferation
>of
>>>the television. Satellite communications.
>>
>>Satellite communications? Where?
>
> Jim...
>
> We developed new technologies DURING the conflict.

Not satellites during the fighting in Korea. Yes, I know the "war" in Korea
hasn't officially ended but the fighting stopped before you and I were born.
Satellites came much later.
>
> The increased spending and military build-up incidental to the Korean
>Conflict and the ensuing "Cold War" DID spur on "satellite"
>communications...Did it not?

No.
>
>>> Viet Nam/Moon Missions: Advancements in microprocessors, additional
>>>advancements in trauma care (MAST pants, use of helicopters in civilian
>>>MEDEVAC, previously considered too expensive due to limitied manufacture of
>>>helos) IR/NVG technology.
>>
>>Microprocessors first appeared in the early 1970s - developed for civilian
>>applications.
>
> Applicaitons that were incidental to military spending and research.

No.
>
>>> SDI/Cold War: Space imaging, proliferation of LASER devices,

>>especially
>>>into medical field.
>>
>>>> In many cases those
>>>>"jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
>>>>investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
>>>>peacetime.
>>>
>>> Oh..."would have happened anyway"...?!?!
>>
>>Yes. There is a logical progression of most technologies. It's called
>>engineering. You don't need a war to do it.
>
> No, you don't.

That's my point. You seem to be selling the idea that we must have war and an enormous space program in order to advance technologically. That's simply not the case.

Unless human beings learn to evolve beyond armed conflict, they will become extinct.
>
> It's just that we have developed a pattern of spurts of development
>coincidental to military spending or conflict. This is a documented fact.
>It happens.

Of course - because during such conflicts, enormous amounts of resources are poured into technological development. It becomes an emergency response. But it's enormously inefficient.
>
>>> I don't think so, Jim.
>>
>>It's true.
>>
>>>All of the major developments of other
>>>technologies or services only happened where there was major subsidies by
>>>governments.
>>
>>Even if true, why does it take a war? Why not simply solve the problems?
>
> I agree. Now, what better to way to spur the development of newer
>technologies than to advance the space program...?!?!

Simple: Work on those technologies directly. Want better medical imaging technologies? Work on them - don't say we must fund trillion-dollar manned Mars missions because we *might* get better medical imaging technology years afterward.
>
>>>Some, such as the expansion of oil refining, etc, only happened
>>>after the development of the automobile, one of the few exceptions to the
>>>above.

>>
>>There are *lots* of exceptions. The automobile is one. PCs are another.
>>Modern
>>construction practices. Fiber optic communications. Lots of others.
>
> Jim...Jim...Jim...
>
> The rapid development of automotive technologies came after WW2...As did
>developments in aviation and communications.

No it didn't. Remember the Model T? There were millions of cars before WW2.

You forget that there was enormous demand after WW2 because of the depression
and the war-long diversion of auto production to war production. No new cars
for several years in the early '40s. None!
>
>>>>Or they're the result of government programs that are done
>>>>to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.
>>>
>>>Uh huh...government subsidies. Again, big influx of cash from taxes.
>>
>>Which those "tax and spend democrats" are usually pushing...
>>
>>>MAY have happened otherwise, but it didn't.
>>
>>Why spend your own money if Uncle will give you some?
>>>
>>>>In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>>>
>>> Oh?
>>>
>>Yes.
>
> You've not proven it, Jim.

It's an opinion, Steve. I don't think the benefits of the advances were worth
the cost.
>
>We are presently exchanging these comments via a medium that was
>developed incidental to yet other military programs.

Only part of it.
>
> The proliferation of the Internet has driven communication costs to all
>time lows. Cellular technology, based in part on techniques developed for
>secure communications for...you-know-who...have put a telephone on the hip of
>almost every American.

Only in part.

All of the basic concepts of the PC you look at (distributed computing,
networking, graphical user interface, even the mouse) were developed at Xerox

Palo Alto in the 1960s and early 1970s. Xerox was looking to the office of the future, and how computing could be integrated into the office environment. Much of what they envisioned has come to pass. None of it was powered by the space progrm or war - it was just plain old civilian capitalism and private money.

The internet would not be of any use to you or me if there weren't affordable PCs or similar hardware to let us access it. That hardware didn't come from war or space.

Let me make my position clear, Steve:

I think a manned space program is a good idea. But it must stand on its own merits and be consistently funded at a sustainable level. It should not be sold as a jobs program for Ph.Ds that will somehow solve all our Earth problems, or some sort of emergency that simply has to happen *now*.

I think we need to focus more on long term solutions to problems here on earth - and solve those problems directly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5454. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213644.28114.00000502@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93515

In article <20040625124545.10848.00000399@mb-m25.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:29 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406250729.369150a@posting.google.com>
>
>>Buying stuff from a tyrant who then uses the money to do bad things
>>makes you a party to the bad things. That's just wrong.
>
> Jim, try this on for size...
>
> Go through your closet.
>
> Flip up the lables.
>
> Then go through most of your consumer electronics, appliances, dushes,
>etc.
>
> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!

Not many, Steve. I try to buy "Made In USA" whenever possible. Of course it's becoming less and less possible.

But what's your point, Steve? If I have a shirt made in China, how does that make it OK to have bought oil from SH's regime? China isn't Iraq.

I think the USA should focus more on building up our industrial and economic independence, and less on propping up tyrants who happen to be sell us things cheap.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5455. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 01:36:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 93516

In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started slipping.
> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.

Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary investment in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not small efficient ones.

For example, the Pinto was cobbled together from parts used in the base model Mustang of years earlier. Ford didn't have a decent domestically made 4 cylinder engine so they borrowed from their European affiliate. The transmissions were borrowed from bigger cars. Still used the ancient concept of front-engine, rear wheel drive. End result was that the first models were unnecessarily heavy, slow, and gas-hungry.

Meanwhile foreign carmakers like VW had cars with front wheel drive and transverse engines. No drive shaft. Less weight, less space, better traction, less total manufacturing cost once you get the bugs worked out. They'd already learned how to build efficient, clean small engines. Heck, when Chrysler came out with their Omni/Horizon cars (which were clones of the VW Rabbit/Golf/Scirocco) they actually bought the engines from VW for the first few years.

The probelm wasn't that Americans can't build good small cars - we can. The problem was that American car manufacturers didn't do their homework for years, then had to cram to catch up.

Recall that Chrysler almost went under, and was rescued by federal government loan guarantees.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5456. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 02:03:25 UTC
From: Brenda Ann Dyer <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <cbnr7g$i2v$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 93520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Keith Hosman KC8TCQ" <logdshr@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
news:40DF6072.B1C707FB@bnnorth.net...
> Know thyself. If you need
> help, call the C.I.A.

Go placidly amid the noise & waste, & remember what comfort there may be in
owning a piece thereof.
Avoid quiet & passive persons unless you are in need of sleep.
Rotate your tires.
Speak glowingly of those greater than yourself and heed well their advice
even though they be turkeys;
know what to kiss and when.
Consider that two wrongs never make a right but that three lefts do.
Wherever possible, put people on hold.
Be comforted that in the face of all aridity & disillusionment and despite
the changing fortunes of time, there will always be a big future in computer
maintenance.
Remember the Pueblo.
Strive at all times to bend, fold, spindle, & mutilate.
Know yourself; if you need help, call the FBI.
Exercise caution in your daily affairs, especially with those persons
closest to you.
That lemon on your left, for instance.
Be assured that a walk through the ocean of most souls would scarcely get
your feet wet.
Fall not in love therefore; it will stick to your face.
Gracefully surrender the things of youth, birds, clean air, tuna, Taiwan;
and let not the sands of time get in your lunch.
Hire people with hooks.
For a good time, call 606-4311; ask for Ken.
Take heart amid the deepening gloom that your dog is finally getting enough
cheese; and reflect that whatever misfortune may be your lot, it could only
be worse in Milwaukee.
You are a fluke of the universe; you have no right to be here,
and whether you can hear it or not, the universe is laughing behind your
back.
Therefore make peace with your God whatever you conceive Him to be:
Hairy Thunderer or Cosmic Muffin.
With all its hopes, dreams, promises & urban renewal, the world continues to
deteriorate.
Give up.

5457. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 02:15:52 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1b491f2f5484c2ba989749@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 93521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>, johnson38
@nospam.alvillage.net says...

<snippety>

> So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
> reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.

So... Instead of wasting energy cussing at 'them,' why not HELP
someone, in a nice way, to migrate AWAY from IE and into something like
Opera or Firefox?

Oh, I forgot... It's easier and quicker to simply swear at someone
than it is to do something constructive.

--
Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
with surreal ports?"

5458. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 03:06:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BsCdnXQ9UbrXFkLdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93522

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: Mike Coslo mcoslo@adelphia.net
>>Date: 6/25/2004 10:11 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>
>
>
>> Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>>ruled by others.
>
>
> Ironic, eh, that we started this "shift" about the same time our Lunar
> program wrapped up, isn't it?

For whatever reasons the lunar program was serving, I was inspired by it. Not by beating the Russkies - although that leant some competitive excitement - but by the sheer excitement, the adventure, and the prospect of something great and new. I wanted to GO there!

I still do. I'm the wierdo. Normal regular people now want to sit at home and watch "The Simple Life".

> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started slipping.
> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>
> Sheeeesh.

Hehe, don't forget the AMC Pacer, Steve!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5459. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 03:08:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BsCdnXc9UboOFkLdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93523

N2EY wrote:
> In article <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!
>>>
>>>Or go to your local Home Depot or just about any store, and see how many
>>>items you can find that aren't manufactured in China.
>>
>>What amazes me is how willingly (and some enthusiastically) we approach
>>this "brave new world".
>
>
> I'm not part of that "we".
>
>>The shift of the US to a "you want fries with that" economy is perhaps
>>the scariest thing I've ever heard of.
>
>
> Economically, I agree. We will not prosper by taking in each other's washing.
> Economics doesn't work that way.
>
>>Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>>ruled by others.
>>
>
> Economically, anyway.

We could be brought to our knees.

> OTOH, the ideology of *some* socialist countries is being affected by exposure
> to capitalism and Western-style development. The Soviet Union didn't fall apart
> because of SDI or steely-eyed glares across the Berlin Wall. It had more to do
> with rock'n'roll, blue jeans and a McDonald's in Red Square. China is slowly
> going the same way. Look at Hong Kong.

Better hope that change comes before they are the only game in town!

Sometimes I think that people equate capitalism with the freedoms we
enjoy. My point is tha not too far underneath their glossy "new
surface", they are philosophically quite different than us. One does not

need to believe in democracy to belive in making money.

> Remember the student vs. tank episode in Tianamen Square? Look up how long ago
> that was. I was shocked by how much time has passed.
>
> Cheap foreign imports are a short-term coverup of real problems. Domestic
> industry withers away, and good jobs with it. Then the infrastructure (trained
> people as well as facilities) are lost.

Agreed!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5460. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 03:45:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93524

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com...
>
>>>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
>>>From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
>>>Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
>>>
>>>Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.
>>
>> I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those phonetics
>
> thru
>
>>my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather
>>prominent.
>
>
> It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
> when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call of
> K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi hi
>
>
>
>
>>>Decided to run on my own as a
>>>matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner.
>
> Field
>
>>>day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is
>>>nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.
>>
>> How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?
>
>
> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree with
> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am not
> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been chosen
> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county (as
> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends (passing
> by the school that is).

That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way, I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.

And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!

Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD Chairman?

> Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> simulation. Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
> clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we set
> up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications. Yes
> there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know when
> our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond and
> deal with it as best as we can.
>
> In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that to be
> desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
> antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that emergency
> would occur.......

Sure. You may need to be operating while ill from something or be putting your life at serious risk at the time. You may be up for several days without sleep. You may be injured.

Heck, even the person you are trying to communicate with may only have a CW rig. So you can't even begin to simulate truly accurate emergency condx.

Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or anything.

The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops. Dunno where tha hyper accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.

> Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director decides
> the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> outwieghs any other aspect of field day.

Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?

Related item. I was in a club years ago where I was in charge of our biggest fund raiser. Some of the club members didn't like how I was doing things (specifically, my methods required some work) But we made a LOT of money for a small club. So they led a revolt against me, supported by the club prez of refusing to help me or work for me. My only option that didn't make me look like an idiot was to resign from my position and chairmanship and the club. I was ironically the Vice president.

The result? Remember how they thought that my working demands were too much? I wanted 4 hours of work per year per club member. Well, no one wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't they?

Point is, be good to the volunteers, and if you don't like what they are doing, do better.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5461. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 03:47:42 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yxMDc.202$xy3.186@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Chris,

You are the one who is displaying ignorance. There are constant holes and security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as well. Apple is probably the only one with little or no viruses being written to attack it as it has a small presence. Unix (Linux) has holes. As far as browsers, Netscape, Opera, you name it, have security flaws. The reason O.E. is mentioned so much as it has a large following and is, therefore, an ideal target for worm/virus writers.

Everyone needs good antivirus software (updated *daily*) on their system as well as a good firewall (also updated). Everyone also needs a good anti-spyware running on their system - and it is also a good idea to have one that runs in background and blocks incoming spyware off the internet as you browse. I'm seeing quite a bit of blocking from Yahoo Groups (attempted incoming spyware).

Last, but most to the point of your post, everyone should be checking daily (whether automatically or manually) for updates to their operating system and browser. These are constantly brought out and if you bother to check (why don't I think you are well informed?), you will find patches coming out almost constantly for many different browsers and operating systems.

If you don't do this, you will eventually get bit regardless of what operating system you use.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Chris" <johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
> Every time another IE hole is discovered, the shit heads say things
> like "It isn't the browser; it's the user," and then they go right on
> using IE. Now the Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) has joined
> the chorus of people which includes places like TechTV and has said
> that IE is just plain insecure. See
>
> http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A6746-2004Jun25.html,
>
> and be sure to read all of the way to the bottom of the article.
>
> It's not that I care about the shit heads themselves, it's that they
> allow themselves to be compromised, and then the rest of us have to
> pay for it in some way.
>

> Are you getting too much spam? Blame the infected shit heads whose
> computers are acting as spam relays.
>
> Is your ISP putting restrictions on email that really hurt? Blame the
> infected shit heads again for overloading your ISP's servers or
> networks.
>
> So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
> reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.711 / Virus Database: 467 - Release Date: 6/25/04

5462. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 03:48:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OO6dnQUUO9u6CELdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93526

Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:

> I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.

Fulton County PA?

> Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup. But the icing on the
> cake was Christian 3D2EA in Fiji, wow that amazed me, Shelby WA8FVT was
> on the mic for this contact, but it effected me just the same.

Tis very cool. FD is what really got me started. Sounds like you are in
with a good group that is encourageing you to operate.

> I am forever hooked, and now have even more incentive to upgrade come
> hell or high water heheh.

There ya go!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5463. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 04:01:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <KKMDc.204$Eh3.94@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
news:MPG.1b491f2f5484c2ba989749@192.168.42.131...
> In article <3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>, johnson38
> @nospam.alvillage.net says...
>
> <snippety>
>
> > So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> > defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
> > reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.
>
> So... Instead of wasting energy cussing at 'them,' why not HELP
> someone, in a nice way, to migrate AWAY from IE and into something like
> Opera or Firefox?
>
> Oh, I forgot... It's easier and quicker to simply swear at someone
> than it is to do something constructive.
>
>
> --
> Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
> (Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
> kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
> "If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
> with surreal ports?"

Yes. Opera. Foxfire. I think I just got an alert last week that Foxfire
has been found to have a security hole for which there is no known fix (as
of yet). Opera? It has holes. You can subscribe to these government
alerts and see for yourself.

BTW, we point fingers at browsers .... uh ... do you know that Real Player
has problems? Didn't think so. How about file sharing programs? Hehehe
HAR DE HAR HAR.

The list is virtually endless. Various instant messaging programs. Some
stuff that you wouldn't think could even cause a security problem.

I fixed a PC a few weeks ago. Some alleged tech "fixed" the computer.
Returned it sans anti-virus and firewall. Also didn't do updates. It got
hijacked. It took me quite a bit of effort which included removing spyware,
getting a firewall in place, anti-virus in place, and an on-line scan to
remove the last pieces of that nasty thing. I had even been locked out of
regedit! Finally, everything was working except I couldn't get the home

page back. Since I could get into regedit by this time, I simply edited the registry and it is finally working fine. The problem, in this case, wasn't with Microsoft or the users. It was a lazy tech that didn't want to do the whole job.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.711 / Virus Database: 467 - Release Date: 6/25/04

5464. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitter

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012409.22098.00000455@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93533

In article <20040627213638.28114.00000498@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY) writes:

>In article <5c01b95b.0406270244.d02a85f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> Does anyone else besides me find it really heartbreaking to see a
>>person of Lennie's alleged education and accomplishments to have
>>fallen to this...?!?!
>>
>Steve,
>
>Here's a hint: It's an act.
>
>Len is doing a bad impression of Hashafisti Scratchi.

Len not in Feenix. Not in CQ.

Jimmie in old CQ?

>He's simply trying to get you riled up. Also wasting your time.

Tsk. Jimmie's precious time WASTED! Terrible.

That why Jimmie talk all fancy economics, national policy,
know everything in aerospace? In ham forum?

Jimmie rocket man? Have impulse to something specific?

Jimmie tell all about STS, rocket engine testing? In ham
forum? Tell of doings at The Cape? Michoud? Huntsvile?

>Why do you bother with someone who behaves that way?

Nursie big on ham aesepsis. He into ethnic cleansing. Got
industrial strength ethnic cleanser, busy say filth then clean
up others he call filthy names. Slobodan 2nd. He drive Yugo?

Nursie multi-lingual, can diss and cuss in Yiddish but not
speak Yiddish, German, or Hebrew. Very talented.

Not good example for "demonstrated international good will"
which FCC say hams have.

Sermon on Antenna Mount coming soon? Missed it today.
Was busy in SAG meeting discussing acting. Not hear full
text of sermon. Must atone. Need join musician union too.

Acting not enough.

Mellisa G. sends regards, also Ed A.

30

LHA / WMD

5465. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012410.22098.00000456@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93529

In article <1e4e3692.0406271635.3c604067@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144808.19470.00000333@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406270422.7679721@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >"Charles Brabham" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>...
>> >
>> >> What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that
>> >> makes it special.... It's all Hams!
>> >
>> >Rev Jim finally get wish. Have place to chogie without Len. More
>> >meaningful discussion now. Len bad.
>>
>> Rev. Jimmie Who? :-)
>
>Jimmie Who? Horton hears a Who. Maybe Horton in Whoville? Maybe
>Jimmie in Whoville, too. Maybe Jimmie in "Tommy," the Who Rock Opera.
> Steve maybe Pinhead Wizard. Or maybe bad uncle. Or maybe acid
>queen. Or maybe he all of them.

Thought Rev. Jimmie said he surname "Who." Maybe mistake.

Sermon on Antenna Mount coming up soon.

Jimmie gonna preach about actors and acting. His method.

LHA / WMD

5466. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012411.22098.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93534

In article <1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144819.19470.00000343@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040627095537.05775.00000468@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >>Date: 6/26/2004 12:34 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260934.6e6defa1@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >>Steve no understand "Stalag 17." He like "Gumper Pyle." Shazaam!
>> >
>> > Don't ask me why, Brain, but I >>DID<< expect better from you.
>>
>> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< ham radio!"
>>
>> Nursie need relax, watch old re-runs on tube, see documentary
>> on murine corpse suggested by Brian.
>
>He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
>from me.
>
>Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.
>
>> > Not much...but I did expect better.
>>
>> All expect nursie be hostile action hero on field day. Nursie not
>> do that, be on-line shooting blanks, yelling, cussing, making bad
>> noises at enemies.
>
>He noisy. He yell and yell.
>
>> Nursie not get military handset for paramilitary SG-2020? No?
>> Too bad. Nursie not play radio god as sojer in da woods?
>
>Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.
>
>> > Perhaps from hanging around too many prepubescent children, I bet..
>>
>> Tsk. Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate all enemies. Obsession.

>> Nursie call boy scout leaders homosexual? Not good. Not nice.
>
>Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.
>
>> Nursie not get merit badge as boy? Nursie get hum radio
>> merit badge from gubmint, be very proud, he be all that he can
>> be.
>
>No badge as boy. Must compensate now.
>
>> Nursie very superior (old pale). Put down all inferior allatime.
>> Nursie hostile action hero. Got medal box. Got documentation
>> in wallet. VA knows all about that.
>
>Feel sorry for VA. All the time he yell and yell. Maybe they have
>medicine for him.

VA nice state, got many things. VA got medical schools.

Nursie need rap with shrink. Get shrink-rapped.

LHA / WMD

5467. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012412.22098.00000458@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93530

In article <1e4e3692.0406271616.1df1ed11@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144822.19470.00000346@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406260937.5586476f@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>...
>> >>
>> >> One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
>> >> in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
>> >> would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
>> >> neophyte.
>> >
>> >Radio professionals pass radio exams on enormous fluke?
>>
>> Whales have flukes. This big whale of a tale.
>>
>> Heil angry, festering hate. Try put down all inferiors, make fun
>> of non-amateurs, make him feel very superior.
>>
>> >Only from the mind of Heil.
>>
>> Use Minolta, take picture of Heil. Heil emperor. Have new
>> clothes, want all to see.
>>
>> Heil think he have enemies. Needs put-down all enemies.
>> Take pot shots. Lack aim. Pot very black. Pot very loud.
>> Pot snarl and snarl.
>>
>> Heil have insult field day. League not design field day for that.
>>
>> Heil feel superior by put-down of others, make him big man.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Nother think he big fish but pond so small. Must keep pond small.

Heil allatime carp, too. :-)

LHA / WMD

5468. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012413.22098.00000459@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93531

In article <1e4e3692.0406271612.45a116bf@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144820.19470.00000344@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>
>> > Unlike you, I >>DO<< have the credentials to make an assessment
>
>Marine need reach around back feel if head up buttox.
>
>> >and to cause intervention to occur, wether you like it or not.
>
>He now say he practice medicine in California? Maybe Arnie like to
>know that.

Oh no, not mister I'm-so-important-you-don't -dare-object-to-
anything-I-say?

>> Nursie new wetherman. "Film at eleven." Stay tuned.
>
>No, no. Not weather man. He spitting sport announce man.

Nursie wetherman, not weather man. Wether or not.

>> Nursie have film over eyes. Glazed film like Krispy Kreme but
>> not sweet.
>
>He dipped in sumptin. Not smell good.
>
>> > Shall I make a referal?
>>
>> Nursie smoke refers? Smoking not good. Nursie smoke, on fire
>> with hate, hate, hate allatime. Not good.
>
>He yell and yell. His vein gonna pop.

Too bad. QRO temper.

>> Nursie not show good PR for extra class super special morseman
>> hum raddio opertator.
>
>Maybe him want to keep amateur radio small. Maybe he think big fish
>small pond. No need competatershun from new radio guy might show him
>up.

Nursie allatime carp.

>> Nursie nuts, think is real MD. Too many refers.
>
>If not so sad, he very funny.

So is grafitti.

LHA / WMD

5469. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012416.22098.00000460@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93536

In article <1e4e3692.0406271602.483c9577@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144818.19470.00000342@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> >> >>(Steve
>> >> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
>> "civilian"
>> and
>> >> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities
>of
>> it.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>> >> >
>> >> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
>> Lennie.
>> >> >
>> >> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
>> Regulations.
>> >>
>> >> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>> >>
>> >> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)
>> >
>> >"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"

>>
>> Pop goes the weasel.
>
>Wonder if weasel register with county animal control? He have new
>license with pretty border for his wall.

If licenseable, nursie will have one. Very legal. Nursie don't
like illegal, wants to make full ethnic cleansing of anyone not
think like nursie.

>> >> > CAP, as a defacto federal agency (as attested to by the Department
>of
>> >> >Defense, Department of the Air Force and the Attorney General of the
>> United
>> >> >States...) is obligated to operate under NTIA.
>> >>
>> >> Wow! That sounds so OFFICIAL!!!
>> >
>> >Why he say "defacto?" Like fact? Fact-like? Maybe new fact?
>>
>> Nursie expert on Latin, use much as Dr. Killgore. Nursie got
>> MD at nursieland collitch.
>
>I scared. Somebody with disabiltity to understand fact give people
>medicine.

Nursie called VA. Got all answers. VA full smart pepole.

Big eastern state, many people.

>> >CAP belong Air Force. Air Force not Federal. It Defense Department.
>>
>> Super chief shows on radar, full of sound and fury. Expect
>> navel engagement as super chief opens up big 'uns.
>>
>> "Sorry, Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!" (nursienote)
>
>So sad. I begin think it true.

Flame war on high seas anytime. Super chief on the way.

>> >> I'll bet all the CAP aces have cute uniforms with pretty patches
>> >> and salute one another on or off the flight line...
>> >
>> >Make Michilin Man think Pillsbury Dough-Boy a Cutie-Pie.
>>
>> Not appetizing. Where ghostbusters when need them?
>
>Not slime yet.

Beg to differ. :-) Extra slime in here.

>> >> > The criteria for federal agencies operating on FCC regualted radio
>> >> >services is very narrow. "Routine" communications and communications
>> >> >conducting the business of the organization are NOT "authorized" uses.
>> >> >Opertional missions are not "legitimate" uses either, except where
>> >> >inoperability or coordination with other rescue agencies is critical,
>are
>> not
>> >> >authorized either.
>> >>
>> >> "...where inoperability?!?" :-)
>> >
>> >Might mean interoperability. Who know?
>> >
>> >Federal agency operate on FCC "regualted radio."
>> >
>> >Defense agency operate on NTIA "regualted radio."
>>
>> Nursie be extra super special ham radio "opertator" too!
>
>He no Opertator. He just Tater.

But nursie do communicaitons. Very important, patriotic whatever
it is!

>> >> > These "restrictions" are not solely applicable to CAP. They apply
>to
>> all
>> >> >other federal entities also.
>> >>
>> >> You sound like the JIG...Judicial Inoperability Group.
>> >
>> >He make Court Martial. He judge, he prosecutor, he jury, he jailer,
>> >he executioner, he undertaker, he worm.
>>
>> Nursie big hostile action hero, have box medals.
>>
>> Nursie not at field day making megapoints for Homeland Security
>> and striking blow for morse freedom everywhere.
>>
>> Temper frying like overdone bacon.
>
>Oh, oh! And burnt microwave popcorn.

QRO in the kitchen. Maybe new ARRL novel at their website?

>> >> Lots of word dancing. Doesn't mean much because the tune is
>> >> off key.
>> >
>> >He have on-key music in head.
>>
>> "Seventy-six bone heads led his big parade..." (borrowed good line)
>>

>> He have enuf personalities make big parade, have medal
>> ceremony for awards.
>
>He Majorette.

Nursie got promotion to Chief of Stuff, NAF.

>> >> >> Maybe nursie suggest using MARS.
>> >> >
>> >> > Actually Civil Air Patrol has quite a few stations authorized to
>> operate
>> >> >in Air Force MARS, Lennie.
>> >>
>> >> Nursie say "Sorry Hans, MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >>
>> >> If MARS be amateur radio, it can't be "Air Force." Air Force be
>> >> military.
>> >
>> >Uh, oh. Now he yell and yell til vein pop out. He say dat not fact.
>> >He know fact.
>>
>> Pop, vein, pop. Nursie allatime angry, much hate. Tsk.
>
>He need angioplasty of large bowel. Sumptin stuck there.

Quick, call Army Corps of Engineers! They fix, can dredge
Mississippi river, clear away all snit.

>> >> >> No, can't do that, nursie say "MARS >>IS<< amateur radio!"
>> >> >>
>> >> >> :-)
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Nursie made an "ace" of himself again.
>> >> >
>> >> > No...you did, Lennie. By your lack of practical experience and
>> >> >operational knowledge.
>> >>
>> >> Nursie be stuck on "inoperability" with most things here. :-)
>> >
>> >He head inoperable.
>>
>> He need Dr. Killgore to opertate, fix.
>
>Dr. Killgore pull head from rectum. He fix.

All personalities of nursie need spelling fix.

>> >> DoD 4650.2 (eff. 21 Nov 03). Ever hear of it?
>> >
>> >No fact! No fact! He yell and yell til vein pop out. He mad.
>>
>> Pop heard round the world...

>
>Me not want hear that pop. Hope he get help.
>
>> >> > Putz..
>> >>
>> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk. More "meaningful discourse?"
>> >
>> >He only mean discourse.
>>
>> Mean. Diss. Curse. Nursieworld.
>>
>> >> No, just nursie's dissing and cussing.
>> >>
>> >> Perfect example of the best that ham radio can be?
>> >
>> >He Ham Radio Icon.
>>
>> Yae-suu, brother Kenwood...gimme Ten-(Tec)!
>>
>> >> Temper fry...
>> >
>> >He clickable so easy.
>>
>> Click, click, pop, pop...oh, what a relief it is...Alka-nursie! :-)
>
>That the ticket.

Front row center.

LHA / WMD

5470. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012417.22098.00000461@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93535

In article <1e4e3692.0406271544.5856ebc9@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040627094200.05775.00000462@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>> >Date: 6/26/2004 12:25 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260925.57589927@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20040624195412.07368.00000300@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20040624040856.29831.00000519@mb-m18.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve
>> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >>Date: 6/23/2004 2:40 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >>Message-id: <20040623154007.23112.00000586@mb-m04.aol.com>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>In article <20040622213010.11752.00000411@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>k4yz@aol.com
>> >> >>(Steve
>> >> >>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >>> CAP has had a lot of in-fighting about FRS. Since FRS is
>> "civilian"
>> and
>> >> >>>we are under NTIA, there's been a lot of arguing about the legalities
>of
>> it.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> "Legalities?!?" :-) For an unlicensed radio service?!?
>> >> >
>> >> > Don't show more ignorance than what you have already shown us,
>> Lennie.
>> >> >
>> >> > FRS is regulated under Part 95 of the >>FCC'S<< Rules and
>> Regulations.
>> >>
>> >> ...and NO LICENSE is required to use one. :-)
>> >>
>> >> Not in "Part 15" that nursie keeps bringing up...:-)

>> >
>> >"No, No! Not Fact! Yell and Yell til Vein Pop Out!"
>>
>> I guess it is lost upon you two that you are both acting like
>idiots...
>
>We not want you be alone. Need others.

He need all personalities get own radios, plenty action, be
own network!

>> But then too, better here than on the air...
>
>Me hope you not pop vein on radio. Be bad for all to hear you yell
>and yell and yell, then hear nothing. Everybody say, "What happen to
>yell and yell marine?"
>
>All about "Mean" discourse. You trademark.

Also good buddy of Pat Pending.

>> However it's exactly how I have described the two of you in the recent
>> past.
>
>You say Liar, Liar.

Nursie pants on fiar.

>> Too bad the two of you can't, JUST ONCE, prove me wrong about how
>> off-the-wall the two of you are.
>
>You be wrong most days but say not.

Nursie want proof. Nursie get Jack Daniels. Proof enough, not
maximum 190.

Len

5471. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012418.22098.00000462@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93532

In article <1e4e3692.0406271531.2e14db56@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040626145216.06606.00000536@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>,
>> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>>
>> >Why we talk like marine go native?
>>
>> Short-talk like CW, improve rate, make 20 WPM look like 200, reduce
>> bandwidth. Minimize humor. Hum radio very serious. No humor
>> allowed. All be to procedure, fill out forms proper, make like
>> big-shot radio pros of 1930.
>
>I claim bi-lingual. Speak english as first language and speak english
>as second language. Hi, hi. I go claim benefit. Where VA?

VA in east, one of original 13 states. :-)

>> Hum radio important have narrow, narrow bandwidth. Always was,
>> always so. Tradition. Venerate tradition, keep on Mt. Olympus to
>> please radio gods. Short-talk use minimal bandwidth. Easy to
>> understand by collitch edumcated nursies, ex foreign office high-
>> livers.
>
>Oooh. Nosay liver. Might be VA disbilitater. Seben hostile action
>with Jack Danyell.

Gulp, gulp, bang, bang. That be two hostile actions.

So long liver.......sing "Liver come back to me..."

>> Why word "abbreviation" so long? :-)
>
>Me no no.

Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain. - anon.

>Make up Q-word for abbreviation. QABBREVIATION.
>
>I so smart. Hi, hi.

Careful, Brian become movie star in 007 laboratory as "Q." :-)

Len

5472. Re: Field Day Plans and the GOTA station ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:24:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628012419.22098.00000463@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93528

In article <1e4e3692.0406271516.2617406b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144810.19470.00000335@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0406270314.501df4a7@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> > You really need to read what YOU write, Lennie.
>>
>> Can read as writing. Multi-task. No problem.
>
>Think me bi-lingual. English as first language and english as second
>language. Hi, hi.
>
>How I do?

Two good to be true. :-)

Two? The deuce you say!

Len

5473. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 05:26:36 UTC
From: Brenda Ann Dyer <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <cbo74f$ms5$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 93537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:yxMDc.202$xy3.186@news01.roc.ny...
> Chris,
>
> You are the one who is displaying ignorance. There are constant holes and
> security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as
> well. Apple is probably the only one with little or no viruses being
> written to attack it as it has a small presence. Unix (Linux) has holes.
> As far as browsers, Netscape, Opera, you name it, have security flaws.
The
> reason O.E. is mentioned so much as it has a large following and is,
> therefore, an ideal target for worm/virus writers.
>
> *Everyone* needs good antivirus software (updated *daily*) on their system
> as well as a good firewall (also updated). Everyone also needs a good
> anti-spyware running on their system - and it is also a good idea to have
> one that runs in background and blocks incoming spyware off the internet
as
> you browse. I'm seeing quite a bit of blocking from Yahoo Groups
(attempted
> incoming spyware).
>
> Last, but most to the point of your post, everyone should be checking
daily
> (whether automatically or manually) for updates to their operating system
> and browser. These are constantly brought out and if you bother to check
> (why don't I think you are well informed?), you will find patches coming
out
> almost constantly for many different browsers and operating systems.
>
> If you don't do this, you will eventually get bit regardless of what
> operating system you use.
>
>

Three cheers for Mr. Hampton. Spear a few elitists. :) I know for a fact that *nix systems are every bit as vulnerable as Windoze systems, since my spouse does computer repairs for the US military, and almost everything they use is a *nix based system. They have problems with hackers on a regular basis, even through their substantial firewalls.

Point being, the only way you can begin to be sure you are protected is to have a good firewall and A/V, and keep them running and up to date. The only times I have EVER had problems with unauthorized ingress to my system have

been when both my firewall and A/V have been down (after a hardware failure usually)...

5474. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 06:49:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406272249.7e1cbc4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93538

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625230632.23857.00000452@mb-m18.aol.com>...

> Kellie not drudge. Kellie dine at captain's table. Very posh.
> Superior. Knows morse. Morse Isley. [a Star War place]

> Kellie know all. Kellie spits on inferior drudges. When not
> spitting, Kellie inflate numbers 26 times original size. QED.

Sure is a shame to see a person of Lennie's alleged education and
"experience" lowering himself to neonate babble.

Should have expected it, though...

Steve, K4YZ

5475. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 06:54:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406272254.3e52433b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93539

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406271635.3c604067@posting.google.com>...

> Jimmie Who? Horton hears a Who. Maybe Horton in Whoville? Maybe
> Jimmie in Whoville, too. Maybe Jimmie in "Tommy," the Who Rock Opera.
> Steve maybe Pinhead Wizard. Or maybe bad uncle. Or maybe acid
> queen. Or maybe he all of them.

For someone who makes frequent assertions that OTHERS need
"mental help", you sure don't fall far from the same tree, Brain.

Unlike you and your "mentor", I >>DO<< have the credentials to
make an assessment of aborant behaviour, and Son, the above tract
DEFINES "aborant behaviour".

If you'd like, I have professional contacts in Ohio who can see
to your timely and compassionate commitment to a reputable facility.

Otherwise, you need to reassess your public behaviour before it
comes to the attention of someone who CAN have you put someplace safe
WITHOUT your consent.

Steve, K4YZ

5476. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 06:58:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406272258.25ac5b75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93540

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>...

> He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
> from me.

> Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.

> He noisy. He yell and yell.

> Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.

> Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.

> No badge as boy. Must compensate now.

I re-extend my offer to use my professional contacts to help you,
Brain. It always looks better on your record to appear as having been
aware you ahve a problem and taking steps to fix it, than to be
involuntarilly commited in order to force the issue.

I can make that happen for you, Brain. Shall I make the
call....?!?!?

Steve, K4YZ

5477. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 07:03:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406272303.5883c586@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93541

billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
news:<1e4e3692.0406271602.483c9577@posting.google.com>...

> Wonder if weasel register with county animal control? He have new
> license with pretty border for his wall.

> I scared. Somebody with disabiltity to understand fact give people
> medicine.

> So sad. I begin think it true.

> Not slime yet.

> He no Opertator. He just Tater.

Tater died. 16 May 1999.

> Oh, oh! And burnt microwave popcorn.

> He Majorette.

> He need angioplasty of large bowel. Sumptin stuck there.

I'd point out that there is no such thing as "angioplasty" of a
bowel, however it would be lost on you. Requires an education to
under stand.

> Me not want hear that pop. Hope he get help.

Dialing.....

Steve, K4YZ

5478. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube transmitters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 07:12:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0406272312.1c632a44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93542

"King Zulu" <k4ykz@mchsi.com> wrote in message news:<kIFDc.101499$2i5.459@attbi_s52>...
> > Nice call, BTW ! ! ! !
> > 73 Steve, K4YZ
>
> Fortunately, no one else thought so. It was still around as a "vanity" call
> when I finally got back to the "4" district.

My "YZ" worked for two reasons...First was that "YZ" in CW has a
nice swing to it.

Second is that one of the USMC units I belonged to had a tail
modex of "YZ". (Marine Heavy Helicopter Squadron 363). My first
choice was "YF", (HMH-462), but as it worked out, the "YZ" is better
on CW, methinks.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5479. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 10:11:25 UTC
From: Keith Hosman KC8TCQ <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <40DFEECD.B39794AE@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 93546

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:
>
> > I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
>
> Fulton County PA?
>
> > Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> > operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> > alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> > Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup. But the icing on the
> > cake was Christian 3D2EA in Fiji, wow that amazed me, Shelby WA8FVT was
> > on the mic for this contact, but it effected me just the same.
>
> Tis very cool. FD is what really got me started. Sounds like you are in
> with a good group that is encourageing you to operate.
>
> > I am forever hooked, and now have even more incentive to upgrade come
> > hell or high water heheh.
>
> There ya go!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Fulton County Ohio

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ

Know thyself. If you need
help, call the C.I.A.

5480. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 10:14:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93544

In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree with
>> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am not
>> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been chosen
>> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county (as
>> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends (passing
>> by the school that is).
>
>That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for
>your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way,
>I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.

Comes down to "do you plan FD for what will bring out the most people, or what
will make the most points, or what will be the most realistic emergency
simulation. or what will get the most publicity?" Or any of a bunch of other
goals.
>
> And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!
>
> Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his
>absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD Chairman?

Classic "bell the cat" problem.
>
>> Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
>> simulation.

That's your vision of it, Ryan. Others see FD very differently.

The good thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's why
it's so popular - brings out more hams than any other domestic operating
activity.

The bad thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's why
it can be such a source of disagreement.

>> Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
>> clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we
>> set
>> up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications.

It's fundamentally a skills and planning exercise. It's one thing to talk about
setting up a station quickly in an unprepared location, and another thing to
actually *do* it. Operating skills get practiced. Teamwork and learning to deal
with volunteers, both as a leader and as a team member.

>> Yes
>> there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know
>> when
>> our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond and
>> deal with it as best as we can.

But you guys have training sessions, right?

>> In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that to
>> be
>> desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
>> antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that emergency
>> would occur.......
>
> Sure. You may need to be operating while ill from something or be
>putting your life at serious risk at the time. You may be up for several
>days without sleep. You may be injured.
>
>Heck, even the person you are trying to communicate with may only have
>a CW rig. So you can't even begin to simulate truly accurate emergency
>condx.

You can't simulate all of them by any means, but FD simulates some of them.

>Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
>going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
>transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or anything.

Maybe. Or it might go the other way - you may be asked to go to a certain
location and bring everything you need along.
>
>The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about
>emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops.

Bingo!

> Dunno where tha hyper
>accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.
>
>> Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
>> gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director decides
>> the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
>> outwieghs any other aspect of field day.

The trick is to balance all the different aspects.

Here's a scenario for ya:

Months in advance, everyone who wants to participate is required to fill out a
form listing what equipment, time, and skills they can volunteer for FD.
Everyone is responsible for keeping their FD forms updated of changes
(equipment /schedule changes, license upgrades, etc.)

The forms are collected and the FD committee of no more than 3 people puts
together a Field Day master plan.

48-72 hours before FD, everyone who is signed up gets their "sealed orders" which detail where they are to go, what they are expected to bring with them and what they are expected to do for FD. It could be as simple as "show up at X on or before time T and operate station S" or as complex as "head the team running station S, bring a this list of equipment..."

Included could be things bringing like foul-weather gear even though the forecast is perfect. You don't have to wear it but you have to have it with you. Could also simulate equipment breakdowns and unavailability - although that sort of thing often happens anyway.

Except for the FD committee, nobody knows what they're going to be doing until shortly before FD. To more realistically simulate, some very good resources (rigs, antennas, generators, etc.) might be left completely unused while less than perfect substitutes are pressed into service.

You'd probably love a Field Day like that, Ryan. Would be a great learning experience for all. But I can guarantee you that more than half (probably more than 3/4) of the FD regulars in your club would walk away if the club tried such a plan cold turkey.

>Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can
>do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?

And if you are, how will you deal with the inevitable disputes that will arise? Remember, these folks are all volunteers, bringing their own equipment with them.
>
>Related item. I was in a club years ago where I was in charge of our
>biggest fund raiser. Some of the club members didn't like how I was
>doing things (specifically, my methods required some work) But we made a
>LOT of money for a small club. So they led a revolt against me,
>supported by the club prez of refusing to help me or work for me. My
>only option that didn't make me look like an idiot was to resign from my
>position and chairmanship and the club. I was ironically the Vice president.
>
>The result? Remember how they thought that my working demands were too
>much? I wanted 4 hours of work per year per club member.

You said the big bad C word - commitment.

>Well, no one
>wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they
>ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for
>nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make
>absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money
>every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't
>they?

bwaahaahaa - great story, Mike.
>
>Point is, be good to the volunteers, and if you don't like what they
>are doing, do better.
>

Most of all, understand that FD is very different things to very different people.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5481. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 10:14:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628061419.02583.00000462@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93543

Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major foulups.

Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1B EPA

5482. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 11:07:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628070753.19885.00000534@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 93545

In article <BsCdnXc9UboOFkLdRVn-hA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <aPSdnaqZ5-vgdEHdRVn-uA@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>>> What percentage say "Made in China"...?!?!

>>>>Or go to your local Home Depot or just about any store, and see how many
>>>>items you can find that aren't manufactured in China.
>>>
>>>What amazes me is how willingly (and some enthusiastically) we approach
>>>this "brave new world".
>>
>> I'm not part of that "we".
>>
>>>The shift of the US to a "you want fries with that" economy is perhaps
>>>the scariest thing I've ever heard of.
>>
>> Economically, I agree. We will not prosper by taking in each other's
>> washing.
>> Economics doesn't work that way.
>>
>>>Lessee, when the US is busy doing whatever it is shifting it's economy
>>>to, and the rest of the world is *making* things, especially One Real
>>>Big part of the rest of the world, (namely China) guess who is gonna be
>>>the boss? Countries with service economies aren't the leaders, they are
>>>ruled by others.
>>
>> Economically, anyway.
>
>We could be brought to our knees.
>
It's being done a little at a time.

>> OTOH, the ideology of *some* socialist countries is being affected by
>> exposure
>> to capitalism and Western-style development. The Soviet Union didn't fall
>> apart
>> because of SDI or steely-eyed glares across the Berlin Wall. It had more to
>> do
>> with rock'n'roll, blue jeans and a McDonald's in Red Square. China is
>> slowly going the same way. Look at Hong Kong.
>

>Better hope that change comes before they are the only game in town!
>
>Sometimes I think that people equate capitalism with the freedoms we
>enjoy.

That's because the freedom to develop capitalism is one of the biggies.

> My point is tha not too far underneath their glossy "new
>surface", they are philosophically quite different than us. One does not
>need to believe in democracy to belive in making money.

BINGO!

And suppose China does become democratized and completely embraces capitalism. Why should they consider the needs of the USA over their own? We could simply become an *economic* colony of China. We supply them with raw materials and some specialized labor/products, and become dependent on them for most manufactured goods. Wealth flows across the Pacific as it once did across the Atlantic. Why should China *economically* view the USA any differently than England did 250 years ago?
>
>> Remember the student vs. tank episode in Tianamen Square? Look up how long
>>ago
>> that was. I was shocked by how much time has passed.
>>
>> Cheap foreign imports are a short-term coverup of real problems. Domestic
>> industry withers away, and good jobs with it. Then the infrastructure
>>(trained people as well as facilities) are lost.
>
> Agreed!
>
That's how a country becomes economically dependent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5483. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 12:08:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <L4udnfYqFo5xl33dRVn-vg@comcast.com>
Source record: 93547

"Keith Hosman KC8TCQ" <logdshr@bnnorth.net> wrote in message
news:40DF65EF.BFEC112A@bnnorth.net...
> I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
>
> Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup. But the icing on the
> cake was Christian 3D2EA in Fiji, wow that amazed me, Shelby WA8FVT was
> on the mic for this contact, but it effected me just the same.
>
> I am forever hooked, and now have even more incentive to upgrade come
> hell or high water heheh.
>

Go for it. Field Day is a blast. You might also enjoy other contests throughout the year. There are the International DX voice and CW contests (I got Iceland on the latter one year). I'm not sure of the dates though but check the ARRL website. The 10 meter contest in December nets a lot of good DX too.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5484. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 12:35:30 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406280435.1d43d1c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93548

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628012410.22098.00000456@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406271635.3c604067@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040627144808.19470.00000333@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406270422.7679721@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >"Charles Brabham" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<BHoDc.4140$NK2.3600@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> >
> >> >> What is different about HamBlog is also the thing that
> >> >> makes it special.... It's all Hams!
> >> >
> >> >Rev Jim finally get wish. Have place to chogie without Len. More
> >> >meaningful discussion now. Len bad.
> >>
> >> Rev. Jimmie Who? :-)
> >
> >Jimmie Who? Horton hears a Who. Maybe Horton in Whoville? Maybe
> >Jimmie in Whoville, too. Maybe Jimmie in "Tommy," the Who Rock Opera.
> > Steve maybe Pinhead Wizard. Or maybe bad uncle. Or maybe acid
> >queen. Or maybe he all of them.
>
> Thought Rev. Jimmie said he surname "Who." Maybe mistake.
>
> Sermon on Antenna Mount coming up soon.
>
> Jimmie gonna preach about actors and acting. His method.
>
> LHA / WMD

This stuph is hilarious. Too bad some take it too seriously. 8(

5485. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 13:01:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <zZidnZDA5sDlin3dRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 93549

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree
with
> >> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
not
> >> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
chosen
> >> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county
(as
> >> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
(passing
> >> by the school that is).
> >

Perhaps he/she couldn't get permission to set up anywhere else. Although if
that was the case, they should have communicated better.

> >That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for
> >your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way,
> >I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.
>
> Comes down to "do you plan FD for what will bring out the most people, or
what
> will make the most points, or what will be the most realistic emergency
> simulation. or what will get the most publicity?" Or any of a bunch of
other
> goals.
> >

Absolutely true. To me FD is mainly can you actually get a GOOD station or
stations set up at a location that has no existing facilities? Everything
else is a secondary function of FD.

> > And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!
> >
> > Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his
> >absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD
Chairman?
>
> Classic "bell the cat" problem.
> >

> >> Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> >> simulation.
>
> That's your vision of it, Ryan. Others see FD very differently.
>
> The good thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways.
That's why
> it's so popular - brings out more hams than any other domestic operating
> activity.
>
> The bad thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's
why
> it can be such a source of disagreement.
>

As I said above, for me it's all about getting a good station setup and then verifying (through the contest portion) that it is indeed a good station. Now we do some other things too. For example, we have people assigned to do advance promotional work (publicity), people assigned to handle food, etc. But without stations, there's no FD.

[big snip]

> >Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
> >going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
> >transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or
anything.
>

Maybe or maybe not. Depending on how much the local EC knows about hams and their abilities, he/she may just say set up stations that will cover area X. It would be more common that the EC talks to the leader of the ham group and then puts that ham in charge of communications.

> Maybe. Or it might go the other way - you may be asked to go to a certain
> location and bring everything you need along.
> >
> >The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about
> >emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops.
>
> Bingo!
>

Also to me it is to see what can you do with the resources available to you or your group. Small groups for example may not have a lot of resources. In past years, our club set up, from scratch, 3 towers of 50 feet each with beams in about two hours plus some wire antennas and ran 4A. This year, due to illness of several members and the possible poor turn out due to last year's poor band conditions, we put up one tower with beam and a couple of loops and ran 2A. It worked out very well despite the fact that some of us had our reservations about it (me for one).

> > Dunno where tha hyper
> >accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.
> >
> >> Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> >> gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director
decides
> >> the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> >> outwieghs any other aspect of field day.
>
> The trick is to balance all the different aspects.
>
> Here's a scenario for ya:
>

[snipped long description of scenario]

Here's another possible scenario. You are in a county with a low population perhaps you are the only ham in the county and there is no emergency coordinator. A disaster has smashed everything flat including your home and YOU and only YOU are even a possible source of communications. It will be up to you to salvage the equipment from the rubble and get it set up and on the air. Don't say this scenario can't happen because it or something similar has happened.

Point is: You can't duplicate real emergencies that ham radio would be involved in. Who would have expected the WTC to be attacked and their subsequent collapse?

As amateurs, our FD exercise (to me) is to learn what we can and cannot do as individuals and as a group.

Actually it is probably good to try something a little different each year. Next year I and the OM may choose to try a FD by ourselves NOT because we don't want to participate with the club but just to do something different and see how well we can do without the larger resources available through the club.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5486. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 15:14:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <RBWDc.3856$lh4.3445@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chris" <johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote

>
> Truly, that's a shithead response.
>

For more response, point your non-IE browser to
http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

5487. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:17:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93551

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406271736.c006f3b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>...

>> So...there's NO technology that exisits today that would allow us to
>land a
>> man on the moon in say...two years...if we really wanted to...?!?!
>
>Probably not. Not in two years, anyway.

I bet there is!

Like I said..."If we wanted to..."

Tomorrow, a lunar orbiter discovers what appears to be deposits of "X".
We need "X" really bad, and we know if we don't have a quonset hut sitting on
it, it's fair game. Betcha we could have a Shuttle-loadable lander in two
years.

>> So we can't configue an auxiliary fuel system?
>
>I doubt it can be done in two years. Do you really think a lunar
>lander that will fit in the Shuttle cargo bay and be compatible with
>its systems could be designed, built, tested, integrated and ready for
>launch to the Moon in less than two years? Including all the other
>facilities that would be needed to support it? I don't.

OK...four years. And I would not be surprised if a design isn't setting
around in a drawer for just such a project somewhare.

>They didn't start designing the LEM in 1967.
>
>Now about the auxiliary fuel system:
>
>It would have to be installed in the cargo bay, reducing the space and
>weight available for the lander. It would have to carry enough fuel to
>enable the shuttle and lander to leave earth orbit, enter lunar orbit,
>leave lunar orbit and then configure for reeentry. That's a lot of
>fuel and oxidizer.

Why?

We could use an Arianne to boost the tanks into orbit and the Shuttle
could mate with it. Or the extra tanks could be boosted into trans-lunar
eliptical orbit as an orbiting tanker.

>> It will take an extra 30 years to figure out how to install the fuel
>tanks
>> necessary to do it?
>
>It may not be possible at all even if the entire cargo bay is used for
>the tanks.

That's only if you think in terms of the dimensions of the Shuttle.
Again, there's nothing that says we can't piggyback the extra stuff to orbit.

>Look at the design of a Saturn V. Note how much of it is fuel tank and
>how little is CSM and LEM. Note how much it weighs at launch, how much
>of it goes to the moon, how much comes back from the moon and how much
>is left for reentry.

The Saturn V was designed to be a one-booster-lifts all flight.

I am not suggesting we do this all in one lift.

>Those numbers are determined by the basic physics of how much energy
>it takes to escape the earth's and the moon's gravity.

So we get it to orbit, get "the package" together on orbit, then loft it
into TLI from there.

For every "but how do we..." there are at least a dozen options...It's
just a matter of starting with one and getting the ball rolling.

>The shuttle's liquid fuel engines are not radically more efficient
>than those in a Saturn V. Their biggest claim to fame is that they are
>more controllable and last longer.

>> I'll bet you a nickle to a C-Note that Burt Rutan could rough out a
>> workable method on a napkin in a Mojave restaurant and have itr working in
>that
>> two years.
>
>You would lose.

Oh?

>> >If it could be done, NASA would have done it already.
>>
>> Oh?
>
>Yes.

Why only NASA?

And what makes you think that NASA may not have already penciled this
mission out? You HAVE told me of reasons why you think it won't work one
certain way, Jim, but you've NOT shown me or caused me to believe it CAN'T be

done under ANY circumstances.

>> Why?
>>
>Because it would be a great way to push the shuttle program. That's
>what the "teacher in space" fiasco was about. Also the reason
>Congresscritters have taken shuttle rides.

Well right there's a darn good reason TO "push" the shuttle!

Jim, the first Boeing 747's carried under 300 people about 6K to 7K miles.
Now almost 40 years later it can carry over 500 in some configurations and fly
non-stop over 20 hours (London to Sydney...What's that...12K miles?

Other than just "not wanting to", what's holding us back?

>> Just because?
>
>The physics of the problem is the key to all of it.

I don't think physics is the problem.

We just need to start issuing "round to-it's" to the folks who make these
programs (pardon the pun) fly.

>> They've had to fight Congress and ignorant laymen for 30 years just to
>> stay in LEO.
>
>So has every other program.
>
>No bucks, no Buck Rogers.

Exactly.

And that's the ONLY thing holding us back.

And that's only from actually building the things...The engineering could
be done now in CAD with a minimum of expense.

>Go ahead. Show me the numbers. How much does a shuttle weigh? How
>small and light can a lander be made? How much fuel is needed to do
>the jobs?

The lander can be as small and as light as the mission dictates, or as big
as we think we need it to be for the mission.

No, I don't have "the numbers"...But I know we (yes, Lennie...The "Royal
We") can do it if we wanted to.

>> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?
>
>Do you know what a Lagrange point is?

Sure I do.

>The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
>a supply container there?

The same way we got RANGER, "Lunar Orbiter", Apollo and who knows how
manyn other lunar exploration packages there.

>> We've already proven that on-orbit rendevous, docking and EVA >construction
>> is a no-brainer.
>
>Not a no-brainer at all. What has been shown is that it can be done.
>In low earth orbit.

CM/LM rendevous was done after TLI and after LM ascension in lunar orbit.
Both waaaaaaay outside Earth orbit!

>> So again...WHAT new technology do we ahve to develop to go back to the
>> Moon?
>
>- New lunar lander
>- New heavy lift rockets
>- New systems to get to lunar orbit and back
>
>that's a short list.
>
>Or we could just build more Saturn Vs.

And I still say we could CAD these things now and have them on orbit in a
relatively short time. My two years may be too optimistic, but I bet if we
said "do this" today, it wouldn't take another 10 years to do like Apollo.

>> HARDWARE, yes...we need new machines. but so far, Jim, your "arguments"
>> have not swayed me that we could do it if we wanted to...
>
>Of course it could be done. We know that; it was done almost 40 years
>ago using rockets designed with slide rules and controlled with
>computers that make a pocket calculator look smart.
>
>The question is - could it be done in two years? The answer is no.

OK...I defer to your suggestion of "not in 2 years"...

So what would be your assessment on a reasonable timeline?

>> >>the mission drops in, and brings at
>> >>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.
>> >
>> >Only ways such a system could work is if the Shuttle stayed in earth orbit
>> >and the lunar package went from there.
>>
>> Why?
>
>Basic physics. The energy required to send the whole shuttle to lunar
>orbit and back again is simply too great.

"Too great"...?!?! Or too expensive...?!?!

>> >And the result would be a short-term visit by a few astronauts, like the
>> >Apollo missions, not a long term base.
>>
>> As long as you keep thinking that, then that's all we'll do.
>
>What's your solution, Steve? How many tons of supplies and equipment
>are needed to establish a permanent lunar base? How much money to
>build everything needed, and to get it to the moon? How many years and
>launches to do it?

Well there's the rub. Again, "how much money" as opposed to the logistics of getting it done.

(1) Define the mission. How's this...A "permanent" manned base on the Moon with a staff of at least four.

(2) Define the human need since that's really the biggest "consumable". That part's not really hard, though, since there are reams of texts on human physiology and what it takes to support a human in terms of nuourishment, hydration, etc.

(3) Define short term and long term mission objectives. Again, Not too difficult to do since the first priority is going to be getting the base in place and getting it habitable.

My solution (idea?) is to have prefab'ed modules lofted via unmanned missions. They are remotely soft landed within small radius of the intended base site. The modules are fitted with wheels from in the package and a "tow vehicle" is landed. The units are then towed to the site, lowered to a sitting position and mated together. "Instant" base.

(Ironic that the fist colony on the Moon would be a trailer park, eh...?!?!)

>> So...NASA doesn't hire drivers, janitors, security personel, health
>care
>> workers, mechanics, etc?
>
>Not nearly so many as they hire highly trained and educated people.
>
>It sounds to me like you are trying to justify a larger manned space
>program by pitching it as a jobs program for Ph.Ds.

No...Although I am sure there are a few Ph.D's out there who would gladly relinquish thier janitor's garb for a suit and tie again.

But if you get into ANY "aerospace" town, there are legions of businesses not DIRECTLY associated with aerospace, but very important...Groceries, gas stations, spas, markets, etc etc etc.

I am in Huntsville at least once a month. "Aerospace" is the "big business", but all those other countless places are needed to support the PEOPLE in "aerospace". (The 99% who get stuff done, and the 1% [ie:Lennie] who

go along for the ride and milk it for what they can...But they ALL make money
and spend money)

>> >>If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that
>> >>every
>> >company that contracts with it would be able to
>> >
>> >Sure - at a price.
>>
>> Sheeesh.
>
>You're the one complaining about getting ripped off every April 15.
>
>> >But why not solve our problems directly?
>>
>> Sure...Why not.
>>
>> Let's just go ahead and drop a billion dollars into social welfare
>> programs to feed and house the poor.
>
>Who said anything about that?
>
>I'm talking about solving problems like education, infrastructure, and
>energy independence.

Of course.

And how do we "solve" those problems, Jim?

With the exception of recreational technologies and the Internet, almost
every "advancement" has been in entertainment and recreation.

We've not had any "research" technologies to speak of change, and we
certainly won't without some sort of impetus to get them going.

In the mean time, we "solve" problems by throwing money at them. That's
the root reason we decry the space program..."Let's spend the money on Earth!"

Well...I never DID see where Mickey D's was on orbit yet, so where ELSE is
the money being spent...?!?!

>The space program of the '60s didn't liberate us from poverty. Nor did
>it promote our wellness. It created some jobs and some new
>technologies but at enormous cost.

Space HAS promoted our wellness, Jim! I can attest to that!

And we will NEVER be free of poverty. The Demoncrats thrive on it!

>> >>And WHAT problems are NOT being addressed long term BECAUSE of the >space
>> >program?
>> >
>> >Surface transportation, for one. Energy efficiency and independence.
>> >Education.

>>
>> Uh huh.
>
>Yep. Haven't you seen how US education ranks against other countries
>in the developed world? Or how much of our oil is imported? Or any of
>a host of other things that need fixing?

And not a single one of those has been impeded BY the space program,
Jim...If nothing else a lot of that has been IMproved...

There's hardly a single aspect of human endeavor outside of Somalia and
Ethiopia that ISN'T touched by the space program.

Space technology has helped prospect for oil, helps find safer routes for
ships at sea and has helped in the development of new processes for medication
manufacture.

Those "aluminized" ballons that are so popular now are a spin-off of the
technology to make polymerized plastics for NASA, as are the discs that make
CD's.

If you want, we can trash all of that, go back to pencil, paper and slide
rules, and "Movietone" newsreels for "audio visuals" at school...?!?!

>Why can't the USA have the best educational systems in the world? The
>best surface transportation systems? The best energy systems? Energy
>independence?

Money.

We could have done all of those things 30 or more years ago (or at least
been positioned to be there by now...) but everything was "fine" then, so why
spend the money...?!?!

Things are NOT so fine now, but not yet to disaster proportions, but that
light at the end of the tunnel is NOT salvation! It's the on-coming train!

Here's a quick one...Desalination. Plants were designed in the 60's for
SoCal that would have used solar heating to help desalt seawater for LA, SFO
and SDG.

Now the news on several internet sites is that the LA reserves are down
by 5 to 7 million acre-feet of water.

>This doesn't mean we shouldn't have a space program - we should. But
>it has to stand on its own merits. Going into space is worth doing for
>its own sake, not as a jobs program.

If we want it to "stand on it's own merits' (I assume you mean 'make a
profit') then we might as well just forget anything beyond LEO and sell NASA to
the Red Chinese. Unless they find oil on the Moon, I don't ever see space
travel as being able to produce it's own direct profit.

>> Fiber optics = interruptable infrastructure.
>

>Fiber optics = what makes the modern communications world tick.

I understand this. So do those who would like to do us harm.

>Satellites are interruptible infrastructure too. Heck, it's easy: Just
>build a high power ground jammer transmitter with a big dish (designed
>for the right frequencies) and point it at the satellite you wish to
>interrupt. Jam away. With good design, the jamming signal won't even
>be detected on earth.

Sure it will....Some idiot did it to TBN (not that they didn't NEED
jamming.....) and the guy responsible was collared in a day.

And I bet with some simple programming we can defeat jamming of our
commercial satellites...and I am willing to bet that c-note to the nickle that
the military birds are a bit more sophisticated already!

>> >>>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>> >>>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>> >>>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>> >>>verifies the reliability analysis.
>> >>
>> >>Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables
>> >>are bound to go boom.
>> >
>> >CNG tankers don't. Railroad tank cars don't.
>>
>> ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! !
>
>When's the last time a CNG tanker or railroad tank car in the USA
>exploded and killed people? How many of them do you think are in use
>in the continental USA in the course of a year?

Oh...NOW you add the modifier "and killed people"... ! ! !

Heck, Jim...QST alone carries several articles a year of ARES groups that
were active at various derailed tanker cars a year...I bet there were even more
than that by a magnitude!

>> >Sorry, 1 in 75 is simply not good enough reliability.
>>
>> And we'll improve that reliability by just not doing it anymore...?!?!
>
>Not by doing it the same way over and over again.

The boosters for the Shuttle exploded once, we fixed that problem.

This time it was FOD to the leading edges of the wings.

Not the same...certainly not "over and over".

>> >>There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim.
>> >
>> >Who is there to compete with for space?

>>
>> The Red Chinese for one. They just flew a manned mission a year or so
>> ago, and they certainly have the resources and the wherewithall to exploit
>it.
>
>Right. They orbited one guy. The Soviets did it first - 43 years ago.

One today.

They DO have a Lunar plan in place, according to TIME, Scientific American
and several other folks commenting on the issue. So it was one guy this time.
When do you consider it a credible "threat"..?!?! Three? Five? Two dozen?

If they land ONE man on the Moon in the next decade, that will be one more
than WE have done in the last forty years ! ! !

>> And considering thier track record for flooding markets with cheap
>> alternatives that have, quite literally, put hundred of thousands if not
>> millions of Americans out of work, I don't doubt they can do it there, too.
>
>By that logic, we should let them do it, and then buy the rockets from
>them.

And put MORE Americans out of work? Flying payloads on rockets WE don't
have control over?

I'd rather not!

>> I'd rather know that bright, fast moving light in the sky was carrying
>> Americans.
>
>I'd rather that there were more products I could buy that said "Made
>in USA".

Me too. I'd like to have an all-US Amateur Station...

>> I don't see a whole lot of likelyhood that anything further will be
>> forthcoming from this exchange, Jim.
>
>Why not? Do you think I'm joking? I'm not.

That's the thing...I DON'T think you're joking, and every suggestion of
what we MIGHT do in the space program is met with "we can't because..."

I'm about HOW we can do things.

>> If you believe that "all that money" is
>> going to no good use and that it's not a benefit in your daily life today,
>> well then there's just no use doing it.

>I've not said that. What I have said is that the space and military
>programs are not the best way to solve our problems here on earth.
>Those problems need to be addressed directly. You want a better
>mousetrap, study mouse behavior and

>trap design.

That's not how I've read it.

>> I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And as
>> both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of
>> adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and
>take
>> advantage of the opportunities "out there".

>So would I. But at the same time, I realize how big space is, and how
>empty. And the basic physics of the problems inherent in space travel.
>>
>> Unfortunatley GETTING there will be neither cheap or without risk, but
>I
>> for one think the benefits will ultimately be enormous.
>
>How much of *your* money are you willing to spend? Because that's what
>will fund it.

Better funding American space programs than leasing others!

>And consider this: President Bush made *another* speech where he
>supported BPL and said it was up to NTIA to figure out how to avoid
>interference. How come our president and those BPL folks don't know
>that BPL is a bad idea from the get-go? Anybody with even a basic
>engineering education can see the problems staring you in the face.

I for one don't think the IDEA of BPL is bad. I think the technology for
it isn't up to par and warrants more research.

The recent deployments only bear that out.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5488. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:20:47 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406280820.7aedeb75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93552

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:<10du2dc47qumk57@corp.supernews.com>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com...
> > >Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
> > >From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
> > >Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
> > >Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
> > >
> > >Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.
> >
> > I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those phonetics
> thru
> > my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather
> > prominent.
>
> It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
> when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call of
> K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi hi

Can't we all just get along?

> > >Decided to run on my own as a
> > >matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner.
> Field
> > >day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is
> > >nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.
> >
> > How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?
>
> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree with
> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am not
> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been chosen
> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county (as
> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends (passing
> by the school that is).

Let me guess. He's an Extra?

> Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> simulation. Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
> clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we set
> up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications. Yes
> there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know when
> our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond and

> deal with it as best as we can.

Should be points for real emergency locations rather than setting up
at KOA.

> In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that to be
> desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
> antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that emergency
> would occur.......

Hmmmm.

> Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director decides
> the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> outwieghs any other aspect of field day.

Elevate this idea to ARRL. County EC selects operating locations.
Keeps secret. Makes the assignment 2 hours before test starts.

Extra points, of course.

5489. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:21:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E0457E.3000807@psu.edu>
Source record: 93554

N2EY wrote:
> In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree with
>>>the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am not
>>>the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been chosen
>>>solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county (as
>>>opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends (passing
>>>by the school that is).
>>
>>That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for
>>your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way,
>>I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.
>
>
> Comes down to "do you plan FD for what will bring out the most people, or what
> will make the most points, or what will be the most realistic emergency
> simulation. or what will get the most publicity?" Or any of a bunch of other
> goals.

Sure. And will the local mall allow you to run ops all night?

I'm a firm believer in a balanced approach. Our FD site is in a
stunningly beautiful field with plenty of trees and a million dollar
view. There is a picnic area about 1500 feet away, and ball fields
tennis courts and soccer fields east and west. It's a huge site,
probably bigger than a square mile. We get a fair amount of onlookers
that were out for a walk with the family or boyfriend/girlfriend. We
could possibly get more exposure by running it downtown or in the City
high school parking lot, but no thanks.

>> And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!
>>
>> Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his
>>absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD Chairman?
>
>
> Classic "bell the cat" problem.

Yup.

>>>Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
>>>simulation.
>>

>
> That's your vision of it, Ryan. Others see FD very differently.
>
> The good thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's why
> it's so popular - brings out more hams than any other domestic operating
> activity.
>
> The bad thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's why
> it can be such a source of disagreement.
>
>
>>>Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
>>>clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we
>>>set
>>>up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications.
>>
>
> It's fundamentally a skills and planning exercise. It's one thing to talk about
> setting up a station quickly in an unprepared location, and another thing to
> actually *do* it. Operating skills get practiced. Teamwork and learning to deal
> with volunteers, both as a leader and as a team member.
>
>
>>>Yes
>>>there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know
>>>when
>>>our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond and
>>>deal with it as best as we can.
>>
>
> But you guys have training sessions, right?
>
>
>>>In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that to
>>>be
>>>desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
>>>antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that emergency
>>>would occur.......
>>
>> Sure. You may need to be operating while ill from something or be
>>putting your life at serious risk at the time. You may be up for several
>>days without sleep. You may be injured.
>>
>>Heck, even the person you are trying to communicate with may only have
>>a CW rig. So you can't even begin to simulate truly accurate emergency
>>condx.
>
>
> You can't simulate all of them by any means, but FD simulates some of them.

Yeah, and it's also fun. Want people to come out? let 'em have some
fun. That's why so many clubs have picnics for FD. That isn't a
realistic emergency scenario for sure!

>>Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
>>going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
>>transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or anything.
>
>
> Maybe. Or it might go the other way - you may be asked to go to a certain
> location and bring everything you need along.
>
>>The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about
>>emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops.
>
>
> Bingo!
>
>
>>Dunno where tha hyper
>>accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.
>>
>>
>>>Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
>>>gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director decides
>>>the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
>>>outwieghs any other aspect of field day.
>>
>
> The trick is to balance all the different aspects.
>
> Here's a scenario for ya:
>
> Months in advance, everyone who wants to participate is required to fill out a
> form listing what equipment, time, and skills they can volunteer for FD.
> Everyone is responsible for keeping their FD forms updated of changes
> (equipment /schedule changes, license upgrades, etc.)
>
> The forms are collected and the FD committee of no more than 3 people puts
> together a Field Day master plan.
>
> 48-72 hours before FD, everyone who is signed up gets their "sealed orders"
> which detail where they are to go, what they are expected to bring with them
> and what they are expected to do for FD. It could be as simple as "show up at X
> on or before time T and operate station S" or as complex as "head the team
> running station S, bring a this list of equipment..."
>
> Included could be things bringing like foul-weather gear even though the
> forecast is perfect. You don't have to wear it but you have to have it with
> you. Could also simulate equipment breakdowns and unavailability - although
> that sort of thing often happens anyway.

>
> Except for the FD committee, nobody knows what they're going to be doing until
> shortly before FD. To more realistically simulate, some very good resources
> (rigs, antennas, generators, etc.) might be left completely unused while less
> than perfect substitutes are pressed into service.
>
> You'd probably love a Field Day like that, Ryan. Would be a great learning
> experience for all. But I can guarantee you that more than half (probably more
> than 3/4) of the FD regulars in your club would walk away if the club tried
> such a plan cold turkey.

That would be kind of fun. But you're right, too many people would hate it.

>>Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can
>>do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?
>
>
> And if you are, how will you deal with the inevitable disputes that will arise?
> Remember, these folks are all volunteers, bringing their own equipment with
> them.

Yaknow, those disputes are part of the training too! The frayed nerves
are part of the training, even. I note a short frayed nerve session
about 10 minutes before FD or any other big event. Player a gets a
little irritated with player B. Knowing about that allows us to smooth
it over before it gets big.

There are so many things about FD that are training us without us even
consciously thinking about them.

>>Related item. I was in a club years ago where I was in charge of our
>>biggest fund raiser. Some of the club members didn't like how I was
>>doing things (specifically, my methods required some work) But we made a
>>LOT of money for a small club. So they led a revolt against me,
>>supported by the club prez of refusing to help me or work for me. My
>>only option that didn't make me look like an idiot was to resign from my
>>position and chairmanship and the club. I was ironically the Vice president.
>>
>>The result? Remember how they thought that my working demands were too
>>much? I wanted 4 hours of work per year per club member.
>
>
> You said the big bad C word - commitment.
>
>
>>Well, no one
>>wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they
>>ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for
>>nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make
>>absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money
>>every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't
>>they?

>
>
> bwaahaahaa - great story, Mike.

Zey haz no money to buy zee toyz they dezire no more!

I'm not one to gloat, but this was such a case of poetic justice and
Karma that I have to, just a teeny tiny bit. But I have to balance that
with sympathy for their plight now. They were willingly stupid, and are
paying the price.

I did want to note that there were a few people in the club that *were*
willing helpers. They were my core supporters. And when I left, they
left too. So all that were left were the lazy ones. Evolution will
extrat it's price eventually.

>>Point is, be good to the volunteers, and if you don't like what they
>>are doing, do better.
>>
>
> Most of all, understand that FD is very different things to very different
> people.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

- Mike KB3EIA -

5490. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:21:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93553

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started slipping.
>> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>
>Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary investment
>in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not small
>efficient ones.

My point exactly, Jim.

We need to move the technology of our space program out of the 70/80's.
If we continue to set our sights on LEO, that's all we'll ever do, save for the
occassional cutsie-robot pushing sand around and drilling a whopping 6 inches
into the soil. THERE was a waste of money. They didn't accomplish anything
that on-orbit RADAR and spectral imaging couldn't accomplish.

But it looked cute on CNN.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5491. Field Day Results

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:27:16 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <EFXDc.4336$z81.203@fed1read01>
Source record: 93555

Our GOTA station managed 220 QSO's for 271 points -- no biggie -- but all ops were inexperienced non HFers including several kids and "civilians"

Also our GOTA had 44 PSK31 QSO's
The rest were Phone on 40M, 20M, and 15M

We built a 32 foot vertical with four elavated radials -- worked back to the east coast on 40M and used it as a 3/4 vertical on 15M
Vertical radiator was three swimming pool poles held together with hose clamps.
20M antenna was a Cushcraft R8. 10M was zilch out here in the west

One of the main stations worked over 70 6M QSO's

Other main stations are being tallied
although I heard one CW station was at the 980 QSO point

Located at an EOC in Carlsbad Ca

Thanks to all for the advice on PSK31 FD operation and to Mike for the "No VHF at the GOTA" input

We gave our 6M antenna to a main VHF station.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

5492. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:27:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628122716.23777.00000744@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93556

>Subject: Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?
>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>Date: 6/27/2004 10:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <yxMDc.202$xy3.186@news01.roc.ny>
>

>There are constant holes and
>security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as
>well.

I can't help but wonder if Microsoft and the others don't engineer these
things in, just so they can "come to the rescue" with a patch.

Munchausen's By Proxy Server...?!?!

(ducking ! ! !)

73

Steve, K4YZ

5493. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 16:34:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628123430.23777.00000748@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 93557

>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/28/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406280820.7aedeb75@posting.google.com>
>
>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
>news:<10du2dc47qumk57@corp.supernews.com>...

>> It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
>> when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call of
>> K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi hi
>
>Can't we all just get along?

"WE" can.

You and your mentor are the one's bantering in baby-babble.

>Should be points for real emergency locations rather than setting up
>at KOA.

What KOA had a Field Day set-up?

>Elevate this idea to ARRL. County EC selects operating locations.
>Keeps secret. Makes the assignment 2 hours before test starts.

Well, well...Brain manages an idea that doesn't insult anyone and actually
has some merit.

Put THIS day on the calendar!

Steve, K4YZ

5494. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 17:25:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <kwYDc.17$6R7.1@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chris" <johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote in message
news:3dcoesuy234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net...
<<snip>>
>
> And you are changing the subject in typical shithead fashion. The
> inescapable fact remains that CERT - people who collectively know more
> about security than you ever did in your best times - has recommended
> that IE be DROPPED.
>
> They didn't say anything about operating systems.
>
> They didn't say a thing about anything other than Internet Explorer,
> but like the shithead you are, you are going to stubbornly cling to
> your religious icons, including IE, and so you change the subject.
>
> And it IS a religion, shithead, because there is no logic at all
> behind ignoring all of the security experts.
>
> 99% of all zombied machines were zombied through IE and OE security
> holes - many of them YET TO BE FIXED BY MICROSOFT! And you worry
> about obscure holes elsewhere?
>
> If the dam is broken, shithead, you patch the biggest hole first
> before you tend to the little leaks. The biggest hole has been
> identified by CERT and by TechTV, and yet you rattle on about all of
> the little holes you imagine you can see, while ignoring the giant
> one?
>
> Truly, that's a shithead response.
>
> No wonder the net is going to hell. It's full of shitheads who think
> the way you do.

I am *not* changing the subject. There are a *ton* of security holes in
other software too - including Real Player and others.

If everyone changed to Linux, you can bet the virus and worm writers would
be writing most of the stuff for Unix systems.

As to CERT .... that is where I am getting my information about all of those
other "secure" systems and browsers. The fact remains that Internet
Explorer, Outlook, and Outlook Express are popular, thus the huge number of
viruses written for them - not that they are more or less secure than other
browsers. If one keeps a firewall in place, anti-virus in place,

anti-spyware in place, updates them daily, and *uses* them properly, one is as protected as one can be.

BTW, please ZBM-2. I suspect I'm dealing with someone with a very modest double-digit IQ here.

With all due regards,
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/27/04

5495. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 17:25:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93559

N2EY wrote:
>
> Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major foulups.
>
> Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> 1B EPA

It was pleasant days and a chilly night for the Marshall County WV ARES bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about 950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and Hawaii.

W8CAL - 5A WV

Dave K8MN

5496. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 18:20:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628142004.07518.00000380@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93560

In article <5c01b95b.0406272249.7e1cbc4b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040625230632.23857.00000452@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>
>> Kellie not drudge. Kellie dine at captain's table. Very posh.
>> Superior. Knows morse. Morse Isley. [a Star War place]
>
>> Kellie know all. Kellie spits on inferior drudges. When not
>> spitting, Kellie inflate numbers 26 times original size. QED.
>
> Sure is a shame to see a person of Lennie's alleged education and
>"experience" lowering himself to neonate babble.

"Neonate?" That be noun, mean newborn infant. Newborn not have Internet access. Motor control for hands not yet complete, no typing ability. FCC license newborn as ham op? Not think so but maybe. Alla olde-tyme hammes think age not barrier to ham license.

Nursie want newborn have ham license? Newborn pass test? Do morse code cognition? Good...can have new category of ham as "extra out of birth canal!" Make news for ARRL web page. All cheer...hammes superior...support ARRL.

Nursie use magic, have bad spell. Nursie bring home Mavis Bacon and dictionary, learn typing, proper word use. Get some.

> Should have expected it, though...

Nursie angry, enraged. No sense humor, no wordplay cognition. All serious in hamme radio. Nursie be NCOIC, Dill Instructor hamme radio. Not kosher dill but know putzim.

Nursie try play red-dog in newsgrope, run into Big Yellow Dogs instead. Nursie little chihuahua, yip yip yip allatime [nursie not know old shaggy dog story of Big Yellow Dog?]

Nursie do mean diss and curse. Not good. Bad PR for hum radio. Nursie not able have sense of humor except make fun of others. Not good humor. Nursie no like opposite argument in discussion, wanna commit all opposition as crazy. Nursie be fruitcake. Left over from 1972 Christmas. Stale but have many certificates of ripeness. Nursie way too ripe.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5497. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 18:20:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628142006.07518.00000381@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93561

In article <5c01b95b.0406272303.5883c586@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406271602.483c9577@posting.google.com>...
>
>> Wonder if weasel register with county animal control? He have new
>> license with pretty border for his wall.
>
>> I scared. Somebody with disabiltity to understand fact give people
>> medicine.
>
>> So sad. I begin think it true.
>
>> Not slime yet.
>
>> He no Opertator. He just Tater.
>
> Tater died. 16 May 1999.

"Tater" common slang in southern states USA for POTATO since before nursie born.

Nursie write word OPERTATOR. Others make wordplay of gaffe, make TATER = TATOR. Nursie not understand, just stand under word play and get hit. Nursie angry. Make noise about personal tragedy. Demand others' sympathy by inference.

>> Oh, oh! And burnt microwave popcorn.
>
>> He Majorette.
>
>> He need angioplasty of large bowel. Sumptin stuck there.
>
> I'd point out that there is no such thing as "angioplasty" of a
>bowel, however it would be lost on you. Requires an education to
>under stand.

Normal mind understand wordplay. Nursie not understand, just stand under, see humor go over head very fast, not perceive.

Nursie very educated. Study sick-iatry in UK, learn spelling of "-iour" words. Dr. Killgore graduate with honiours.

Nursie very spay-shul. No, nursie not understand SNL talk. Nursie be special, allatime wanna have focus on him in rage,

how he victim, have worst troubles anyone.

>> Me not want hear that pop. Hope he get help.
>
> Dialing.....

[transcript of recording]

"Hello? This is the Ohio State Professional Contacts Association for the Committment of All Who Don't Think Like Nursies, how may I help you?"

" # $ % ^ & ! ! ! ! ! ! "

"Sir, calm down, it is hard to understand you cursing in British accents."

" #$%^&!! "

"That's better, I can understand you now. For purposes of indentification, I need your Contact Ass member number."

"k4cap"

"Sorry sir, that's an amateur radio call sign, not the Commit Ass number..."

"k4yz?"

"Sorry sir, that's also an amateur radio number, not a Commit Ass number. Can you give me your legal name and address?"

"i am in conference with personalities now and we are deciding."

"Sir, we don't have time for this. Please identify yourself. We do have caller-ID and can tell you are calling from Tennessee."

"WE HAVEN'T DECIDED YET!!!"

"Sir, calm down, you are shouting again..."

"C R E E P !!!! P U T Z !!!!

"Sir! Please calm yourself. We have your Tennessee address and have alerted your state's medical professionals...you will receive help very soon. Look for two men in white uniforms carrying a nice form-fitting jacket......thank you for calling the Ohio State Professional Contacts Association for the Committment of All Who Don't Think Like Nursies...Contact Ass is open twenty-four seven for the benefit of all who cannot take normal debate on the Internet...our hotline is always open at 1-800-HAM-KILL."

<click> <dial tone>

[end transcript]

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5498. Re: Introducing HamBlog.Com

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 18:20:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628142007.07518.00000382@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93563

In article <5c01b95b.0406272254.3e52433b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406271635.3c604067@posting.google.com>...
>
>> Jimmie Who? Horton hears a Who. Maybe Horton in Whoville? Maybe
>> Jimmie in Whoville, too. Maybe Jimmie in "Tommy," the Who Rock Opera.
>> Steve maybe Pinhead Wizard. Or maybe bad uncle. Or maybe acid
>> queen. Or maybe he all of them.
>
> For someone who makes frequent assertions that OTHERS need
>"mental help", you sure don't fall far from the same tree, Brain.
>
> Unlike you and your "mentor", I >>DO<< have the credentials to
>make an assessment of aborant behaviour, and Son, the above tract
>DEFINES "aborant behaviour".

Nursie be Dr. Killgore, MD and sick-iatrist. Have credentials from Nursieland Stool of Medicine?

Nursie, bring home the Mavis Bacon and dictionary. Nursie make ass-S? Try spelling "aberrant" correct.

"Tract?" This not real estate, not reality. That not system of organs like digestive tract. Nursie too hard to swallow as real. Not tract like propagandizing pamphlet. Nursie do agit-prop. Prop not turn over, his motor not run right.

> If you'd like, I have professional contacts in Ohio who can see
>to your timely and compassionate commitment to a reputable facility.

Ohio mafia on call? Ace make call to Ohio CAP wing? Have them fly "hot" mission to "drop in" on Brian?

Nursie make big threats, feel self very pro, very big. Nursie get pro kit, think it credential?

> Otherwise, you need to reassess your public behaviour before it
>comes to the attention of someone who CAN have you put someplace safe
>WITHOUT your consent.

Nursie study sick-iatry in UK? Spell with Brit English "iour?"

Nursie call out the guard every hiour, on the hiour? Good show.

Nursie go retail mail, sell good at Chirstmas. Nursie fruitcake.

Nursie make big big threats. All behave nursie rules or he commit. Nursie very powerful, have pro contacts. Nursie have paper saying he shrink...came in shrink-wrapped K-Mart box.

Nursie lose touch with reality. Vein go pop inside? Tsk.

This not ham radio talk, nursie talk tuff amateur MD talk with bad magic spelling. Nursie confused reality v. nursieland.

Stay tuned for other threads about ham radio...Dr. Weiner von Brawn speak on spaceflight while doing moonwalk. Not ham radio but von Brawn know all, tell all of Nursieland Air and Space Amateurism (NASA).

Nursie spaced out.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5499. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 18:20:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628142008.07518.00000383@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 93562

In article <5c01b95b.0406272258.25ac5b75@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>news:<1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>...
>
>> He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
>> from me.
>
>> Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.
>
>> He noisy. He yell and yell.
>
>> Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.
>
>> Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.
>
>> No badge as boy. Must compensate now.
>
> I re-extend my offer to use my professional contacts to help you,
>Brain. It always looks better on your record to appear as having been
>aware you ahve a problem and taking steps to fix it, than to be
>involuntarilly commited in order to force the issue.

Ooooooooo! Return of the Psi Corps! Mind Police!

Chief of Stuff have "contacts?" Think contacts corroded...that not Law of Ohm.

Nursie make Threat! Oooooo. Commit all not think like nursie.

Nursie not crazy. All not think like nursie crazy.

Nursieland is certainly NOT like reality where all others live.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

>
> I can make that happen for you, Brain. Shall I make the
>call....?!?!?

5500. Re: Field Day Results

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 19:04:55 UTC
From: Helmut <MyCallSign@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <cbpq4d$6n3$00$1@news.t-online.com>
Source record: 93564

Hi, Shadow, and the group,

congrats to your GOTA results, worked them on PSK 31 around 4am your time. The crew on duty did a great job, though the band was not opened up fully then. I was operating the W7DXX Internet Remote Base near Boston, MA, from my home-QTH near Stuttgart in Germany, as W1/OE8SOQ.

I put about 80 QSOs in my log, about double the count from the previous year. Most of them in PSK31 and Phone.

I am informed about the intentions of your - and in my heart still my - club in Southern California to win the 5F Class, and I wish you and Charlie and all the others, that you have done it. Keep me informed.

Great idea to setup the whole thing at the Carlsbad EOC, its a nice place, easy to be reached and setup. I still remember the FD 2000 at the Sweetwater-Swimmingpool near Stan's, way in the outback of San Diego County. But it was a great impression, and never to be forgotten.

Keyboard to you, Mr. Lamont Cranston, DaShadow ;-))

73 de OE8SOQ
Helmut

"Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:EFXDc.4336$z81.203@fed1read01...
| Our GOTA station managed 220 QSO's for 271 points -- no biggie -- but all
| ops were inexperienced non HFers including several kids and "civilians"
|
| Also our GOTA had 44 PSK31 QSO's
| The rest were Phone on 40M, 20M, and 15M
|
| We built a 32 foot vertical with four elavated radials -- worked back to
the
| east coast on 40M and used it as a 3/4 vertical on 15M
| Vertical radiator was three swimming pool poles held together with hose
| clamps.
| 20M antenna was a Cushcraft R8. 10M was zilch out here in the west
|
| One of the main stations worked over 70 6M QSO's
|
| Other main stations are being tallied
| although I heard one CW station was at the 980 QSO point
|
| Located at an EOC in Carlsbad Ca
|

| Thanks to all for the advice on PSK31 FD operation and to Mike for the "No
| VHF at the GOTA" input
|
| We gave our 6M antenna to a main VHF station.
|
| --
| Lamont Cranston
|
| The Shadow Knows
|
|
|

5501. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 19:14:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628151457.22498.00000443@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 93565

In article <20040628123430.23777.00000748@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/28/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406280820.7aedeb75@posting.google.com>
>>
>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
>>news:<10du2dc47qumk57@corp.supernews.com>...
>
>>> It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
>>> when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call of
>>> K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi hi
>>
>>Can't we all just get along?
>
> "WE" can.
>
> You and your mentor are the one's bantering in baby-babble.

Poor nursie imagining things again. Must have day off in nursieland and nothing to do.

"Short-talk" just style for quick communication. Like "CW" abbreviations...which, when written verbatim, look like childish almost-gibberish to anyone. Tsk. That statement offends nursie? Too bad. Is true. Been so long time.

Nursie want no age limit on ham radio license? No age limit now. Why Jimmie argue and diss on age limit suggestion of five years ago? No real reason. Nursie and Jimmie wanna do FIGHT over newsgrope suppremacy?

Nursie babble stuff on aerospace in other thread. Nursie not understand mass ratios, specific impulse, planetary system characteristics like "Lagrange Point." Nursie big on emotion, short on smarts. Nursie work in aerospace? Think all simple, big boondoggle? Nursie nuts, no knowledge or experience in spaceflight, just wanna-be ace in military-sounding civil air thing.

Nursie should TRY to listen to those with more knowledge than he. Nursie doesn't do that. Nursie overrides dumbness with EMOTION writ large. He thinks will-and-idea will conquer all problems, not understanding that emotional desires don't

mean squat to physical world.

Typical, when nursie confronted with ANY opposition, he gets
angry, yells and disses without thinking problem through. When
others make fun of yelling and sissing, nursie goes berserk.
Not normal behavior. Nursie have sick-iatry credentials? If so,
he not recognize his own aberrant behavior. Tsk.

>>Should be points for real emergency locations rather than setting up
>>at KOA.
>
> What KOA had a Field Day set-up?

Matters not. Field Day always touted as "emergency exercise"
by League. Seldom so. Most have field day in park, do CONTEST
FUN. Real emergencies no fun. Hypocrisy of League saying FD
is "emergency exercise."

Kampgrounds Of America (KOA) is a combination trailer park and
motel for those with RVs. Some have parkland adjoining, some not.
Not in midst of urban centers. City park better. Central. Easy to
get to to hold CONTEST. Field Day is really a contest thing. Admit
it, be man.

Nursie now goes into rage saying bad things of those not considering
Field Day to be patriotic thing, showing how ham radio is ready for
all emergencies! [predictable] Nursie gets offended to the max at
others not touting hum raddio as super patriotism, homeland security,
etc. Nursie get fruitcake.

>>Elevate this idea to ARRL. County EC selects operating locations.
>>Keeps secret. Makes the assignment 2 hours before test starts.
>
> Well, well...Brain manages an idea that doesn't insult anyone and
>actually has some merit.
>
> Put THIS day on the calendar!

Snarl, nursie, snarl. Nursie manages to sneer insults at others
with ideas. Good boy. Sic 'em.

Nursie have problem playing well with others. He demand all others
think like him. Not think like nursie? Bad. Do ethnic cleansing,
using scrub brush of nastygrams, mean dissing and cussing.

Nursie wanna commit all who not think like him. Nursie think
he sane. Probably not. Old fruitcake.

Not good PR for hum raddio. Nursie not learn what means
phrase "let it be."

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5502. Rumsfeld and DoD Secede from Federal Government

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 19:35:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Wp_Dc.4076$lh4.3426@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93566

LHA(Jg) wrote:

> Air Force not Federal. It Defense Department.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

5503. Re: Field Day Results

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 20:29:05 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <lc%Dc.4361$z81.620@fed1read01>
Source record: 93567

Helmut by golly -- Ragged Old Dog here aka The Shadow.

Wow -- I thought that psk contact might be you but the W1 threw me off
track.

I will pass regards to the club and thanks for the PSK QSO.

Dennis wants to know if you have a website for where u work and some folks
here may visit DK land

You can e-mail me by going to my web page for the address.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

The Shadow Knows
"Helmut" <MyCallSign@qsl.net> wrote in message
news:cbpq4d$6n3$00$1@news.t-online.com...
> Hi, Shadow, and the group,
>
> congrats to your GOTA results, worked them on PSK 31 around 4am your time.
> The crew on duty did a great job, though the band was not opened up fully
> then. I was operating the W7DXX Internet Remote Base near Boston, MA, from
> my home-QTH near Stuttgart in Germany, as W1/OE8SOQ.
>
> I put about 80 QSOs in my log, about double the count from the previous
> year. Most of them in PSK31 and Phone.
>
> I am informed about the intentions of your - and in my heart still my -
> club in Southern California to win the 5F Class, and I wish you and
Charlie
> and all the others, that you have done it. Keep me informed.
>
> Great idea to setup the whole thing at the Carlsbad EOC, its a nice place,
> easy to be reached and setup. I still remember the FD 2000 at the
> Sweetwater-Swimmingpool near Stan's, way in the outback of San Diego
County.
> But it was a great impression, and never to be forgotten.
>
> Keyboard to you, Mr. Lamont Cranston, DaShadow ;-))
>
> 73 de OE8SOQ
> Helmut
>

> "Da Shadow" <DAS@cat.net> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
> news:EFXDc.4336$z81.203@fed1read01...
> | Our GOTA station managed 220 QSO's for 271 points -- no biggie -- but
all
> | ops were inexperienced non HFers including several kids and "civilians"
> |
> | Also our GOTA had 44 PSK31 QSO's
> | The rest were Phone on 40M, 20M, and 15M
> |
> | We built a 32 foot vertical with four elavated radials -- worked back to
> the
> | east coast on 40M and used it as a 3/4 vertical on 15M
> | Vertical radiator was three swimming pool poles held together with hose
> | clamps.
> | 20M antenna was a Cushcraft R8. 10M was zilch out here in the west
> |
> | One of the main stations worked over 70 6M QSO's
> |
> | Other main stations are being tallied
> | although I heard one CW station was at the 980 QSO point
> |
> | Located at an EOC in Carlsbad Ca
> |
> | Thanks to all for the advice on PSK31 FD operation and to Mike for the
"No
> | VHF at the GOTA" input
> |
> | We gave our 6M antenna to a main VHF station.
> |
> | --
> | Lamont Cranston
> |
> | The Shadow Knows
> |
> |
> |
>
>

5504. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 21:23:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406281323.8282a28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93568

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<zZidnZDA5sDlin3dRVn-sw@comcast.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > >> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree
> with
> > >> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
> not
> > >> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
> chosen
> > >> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county
> (as
> > >> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
> (passing
> > >> by the school that is).
> > >
>
> Perhaps he/she couldn't get permission to set up anywhere else. Although if
> that was the case, they should have communicated better.

Getting a site has become more difficult around here, mostly because
of development. Running generators all night requires some room. What
were once open fields are now McMansions. There's also the liability
issues.

In the '80s, radio club I belonged to did FD at what used to be a Nike
missile radar site. Off Delchester Road and West Chester Pike. Lots of
ready-made ham antenna structures and shelter. All gone now.

Good times.

> To me FD is mainly can you actually get a GOOD station or
> stations set up at a location that has no existing facilities? Everything
> else is a secondary function of FD.

Yep. What constitutes a "good" station varies all over the place.
>
> As I said above, for me it's all about getting a good station setup and then
> verifying (through the contest portion) that it is indeed a good station.
> Now we do some other things too. For example, we have people assigned to do
> advance promotional work (publicity), people assigned to handle food, etc.
> But without stations, there's no FD.

"Without stations, there's no FD." That's a keeper quote!
>
> [big snip]
>
> > >Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
> > >going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
> > >transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or
> anything.
>
> Maybe or maybe not. Depending on how much the local EC knows about hams and
> their abilities, he/she may just say set up stations that will cover area X.
> It would be more common that the EC talks to the leader of the ham group and
> then puts that ham in charge of communications.

And it all depends what kind of comms are needed. In some cases, the
need is strictly local. In others, it may be long-distance.
>
> Also to me it is to see what can you do with the resources available to you
> or your group. Small groups for example may not have a lot of resources.
> In past years, our club set up, from scratch, 3 towers of 50 feet each with
> beams in about two hours plus some wire antennas and ran 4A. This year, due
> to illness of several members and the possible poor turn out due to last
> year's poor band conditions, we put up one tower with beam and a couple of
> loops and ran 2A. It worked out very well despite the fact that some of us
> had our reservations about it (me for one).

One thing that I've seen way too much of are the groups who try to do
too much with too little. Somebody gets a bug in their ear to do 5A,
and it doesn't matter to them that the site isn't big enough for 3A,
or that there won't be enough ops to keep 5 rigs on the air full
time. Or even most of the time.
>
> Here's another possible scenario. You are in a county with a low population
> perhaps you are the only ham in the county and there is no emergency
> coordinator. A disaster has smashed everything flat including your home and
> YOU and only YOU are even a possible source of communications. It will be
> up to you to salvage the equipment from the rubble and get it set up and on
> the air. Don't say this scenario can't happen because it or something
> similar has happened.

All sorts of variations. Maybe your area is untouched except that the
power is off and land communications out. Or maybe a critical bridge
is washed away.

Remember the San Franscisco earthquake of some years back, when that
upper roadway section of the Bay Bridge partially fell? It took a
bunch of telco cable with it. Very little long-distance capacity was
left, and most of that was needed for emergency comms. So hams handled
a lot of health-and-welfare traffic. Which doesn't sound like a big
deal unless you have a loved one there and haven't heard from them in
a few days, and the TV news shows their neighborhood on fire or the
multilevel freeway they use twice a day has collapsed....

>
> Point is: You can't duplicate real emergencies that ham radio would be
> involved in. Who would have expected the WTC to be attacked and their
> subsequent collapse?

Exactly. Or that a shuttle would burn up on reentry and scatter itself
over thousands of square miles?

> As amateurs, our FD exercise (to me) is to learn what we can and cannot do
> as individuals and as a group.

Yep. And to expand our skills.
>
> Actually it is probably good to try something a little different each year.
> Next year I and the OM may choose to try a FD by ourselves NOT because we
> don't want to participate with the club but just to do something different
> and see how well we can do without the larger resources available through
> the club.
>
Good advice. I've done big groups, medium groups, small groups and
singlehanded. All kinds of sites, too. Lots of fun. Don't think I've
missed one since 1968.

364 days till the next one...

73 de Jim, N2EY

5505. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 21:42:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40E090C5.10301@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93569

Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:

>I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
>
>Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
>operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
>alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
>Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup.
>
For some reason I had trouble getting heard when responding to CQs.
Might have been
too much QRM. Was running about 50 watts into a multiband vertical.

5506. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 21:55:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <26udndzc76AXCX3dRVn-gw@comcast.com>
Source record: 93570

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40E090C5.10301@ix.netcom.com...
> Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:
>
> >I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
> >
> >Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> >operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> >alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> >Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup.
> >
> For some reason I had trouble getting heard when responding to CQs.
> Might have been
> too much QRM. Was running about 50 watts into a multiband vertical.
>

That will make it more difficult to break through. But part of FD is to
learn how to deal with the QRM, different power settings, different
antennas, etc.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5507. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 22:11:06 UTC
From: Da Shadow <DAS@cat.net>
Message-ID: <_H0Ec.4370$z81.1397@fed1read01>
Source record: 93571

We built a 32 foot 1/4 wave vertical out of swimming pool poles -- with four 32 foot elavated radials -- it was a screamer on the 40 meter band -- SWR was 1.15 to 1 across the band. Worked the western USA from San Diego area -- no problem.

It also tuned to 15M (3/4 vertical) and swr was 2.5 to 1 which the rig tuner compensated for. Worked all across country on 15M.

--
Lamont Cranston

The Shadow Knows

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:40E090C5.10301@ix.netcom.com...
> Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:
>
> >I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
> >
> >Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> >operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> >alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> >Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup.
> >
> For some reason I had trouble getting heard when responding to CQs.
> Might have been
> too much QRM. Was running about 50 watts into a multiband vertical.
>

5508. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 22:18:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281418.d380b3e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93572

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144821.19470.00000345@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040627095334.05775.00000467@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040626145221.06606.00000541@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
> >> Nursie work in aerospace? Or just spaced out?
>
> >> Nursie looney? [looney rhyme w/Clooney, ER hero...]
>
> >> Nursie disconnect dots, tell tales of coincidence of time nursie
> >> got first car? Nursie not happy?
>
> >> Nurise automotive expert? Nursie are radio god, superior to all
> >> inferiors (those not in hum radio)?
>
> >> Nursie be maverick gremlin? Have a pint'o at happy hour? Need
> >> trip Vegas to tell all about radio? Must be. Nursie know all, hate
> >> many. Not good. Vein ready for pop. Vroom, vroom.
>
> >> Shush, nursie, shush. Nursie not have mind neutralized, go into
> >> parasitic oscillation, not good for final. Final at any time, vein
> >> ready to pop.
>
> >> Temper fry...
> >
> > The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
> >"professional" engineer.
> >
> > One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
> >
> > No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.
>
> Nursie have new personality! Weiner von Brawn.
>
> Nursie big name aerospace, be purchasing agent at set-top box
> maker less than half year. Very important. Knows all about
> electronic engineering. Good job, Weiner!

He bwame shuttle disaster on you. He delerious.

> Nursie got lots hate, angers, repeat lines often. Obsession by
> nursie. Nursie can't do field day, must be on-line to hate, hate,
> hate "enemy." Bad nursie, bad. Tsk.

He hate Dr. Soos. He no like Horton Who. He no like Whoville.
Million and million of kid in America grow up with Dr. Soos. But
noooo. He no like.

He no like The Who. Who no like Who? Who?

Him, dat who.

Wonder what he think Jimmie Who?

> Nursie not speak of BPL. BPL not aerospace where he
> Dock-torr. (physics pun)

He wan turn me in to Da Athorities! He say he make call and cause
trouble. Like make threts. He forget dey close all insane psyllums
and people hap no place cept under bridge or stinky shelter. He mean
man and he forget histerry.

Hate people.

> Nursie hate, hate, hate. Nursie angry. All posts must kill all
> enemies. Destroy enemies. Way of hero hostile action ham.

He yell and yell alla time. He have sigh Kologee problem. He
speshally hate someone say that. Sorry.

> Not good PR for ham radio.
>
> Temper fry...

Dip him in tempura batter. He almost done.

> LHA / WMD

5509. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 22:27:15 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281427.38543b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93573

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040625230634.23857.00000456@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <20040625053929.06606.00000491@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >I tried, Len. They just don't get it. I'm just a poor dumb old amateur anyway.
> >You've told me time and time again how unqualified I am, how I "live in the
> >past", how I don't know anything about "big time radio" and such, and how
> >you're a "professional in radio". I still work regular hours and then some -
> >I'm not retired like you. I'm not a wordsmith like you. I don't even make up
> >names to call other people in newsgroups like you. I'm only 50 years old. If
> >they won't listen to you, why should they listen to me?
>
> Poor Jimmie. Got inferiority complex. Tsk.

Jimmie Who much too humble. He do CW. He make schematic and radio.
He best kind ham. He post portant numbers bout ham radio every month.

> Cannot help Jimmie. Jimmie gots to learn, use the force.

Mebbe Steve and Dave pump him up.

> Jimmie not get told he unqualified. Jimmie morseman,
> superior to all radio of 1930s. Jimmie do good but still
> gots great depression.

Me no understan. He best kind ham.

> Jimmie see nursie, get meds from Dr. Killgore. Will help.
> Lose depression, learn hollering and yelling. Keeps nursie
> going, keeps Heil going.

No no no. Steve turn him in for clinical deprishun. Lock Jimmie Who
up. Now no one live Whoville cept Horton.

> BPL make more depress for Jimmie. Not good. Boo hoo.

hoo.

> Temper fry...

Maybe Jimmie Who want tempura batter.

5510. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 22:51:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281451.43cf693f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93574

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144812.19470.00000338@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040627094829.05775.00000464@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
> >> Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie
> >> snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with
> >> others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very
> >> important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak
> >> to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use
> >> hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.
> >
> > Hey Dave...I say we start sending this stuff direct to Mrs. Lennie via
> >snail-mail and see how much longer this silliness keeps up.
>
> Nursie nuts. Nursie now challenge USPS inspectors, LAPD
> stalking-crimes unit. Not mention all shrinks in area. Nursie
> be shrink-rapped yet?

Why he aways want be with your wife, my wife???

I no like that. I wish he just mind his own wife. No bother other
people wifes. He not right in head.

> Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals
> awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.

He yell and yell. Too much noise. Youssa be funny. Jus hedake now.

> > I can't believe that a woman with her alledged credentials would allow it
> >to go on, knowing it could get him involuntarily commited.
>
> Nursie smoke too many refers. Bend mind more than ever.
>
> Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate. Obsession. Tsk. Bad.

Always want talk other wifes. I no like that. Very suspishus.

Maybe Jimmie Who and Great DXer wifes talk to him. Say not nice he
want talk other pople wifes. Tell him some edikette. He probby jus
yell and yell more.

> Temper fry...

He need fork. He done.

5511. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 22:54:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628185404.19885.00000539@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 93575

In article <20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started
>slipping.
>>> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>>
>>Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary
>investment
>>in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not small
>>efficient ones.
>
> My point exactly, Jim.
>
> We need to move the technology of our space program out of the 70/80's.

Why?

Is science and exploration market-driven? I think not.

[Docktor Weiner von Brawn personality of nursie acting up...]

1. The subject title doesn't involve spacecraft, space travel, or
von Brawn's PhD dissertation on What To Do About NASA.

2. Von Brawn want unreliable man-rated space stuff with men
on board? Not good. Nursie not get to ride in spaceship,
only imagines himself hero astronaut.

3. Nursie count all failures of rocket flight. Begin with
Peenemunde. Von Brawn must know, was member
VfR (Verein fur Raumschfahrt)? Nursie go to White Sands,
then Cape Canaveral, see allatime boom-boom there before
Mercury. Spectacular. Reliability very hard work. Nursie
not do that work. Nursie shout orders MAKE WORK! All
pop-to when nursie shout. Nursie big noise.

4. First man on moon almost didn't make it. Neil was in
command on the Gemini that had a stuck-open 100-pound
(222 Newton) thruster made by Rocketdyne. Nursie ask
von Brawn personality what that mean. Nursie goona say
I "cut-and-paste" but no, see film copy from Gemini soon
after recovery okay, FAST roll-rates two degrees freedom.
Neil in "flying bedstead" next, lunar lander trainer. Loses
control at about 200 feet, has to punch out (simulator have
ejection seat with zero-altitude rocket motor). Was okay
but bit tongue in process. Armstrong quit NASA soon
after Apollo 11 recovery. Good idea. Stay alive.

5. Space Shuttle Main Engine (SSME) has strap-on computer
for thrust, thrust vector controls. Intense vibration, almost
impossible to believe levels next to engine. Minneapolis-
Honeywell design, make computer. All original parts now
obsolete for pin-pin replacements but very reliable computer.
Rocketdyne had to work for replacement, difficult, reliability
test very costly. Computer have same design architecture
now as 30 years ago, basic stuff. SSMEs (3 in each STS)
not cause of Challenger or Columbia fatal accidents. Nursie
and von Brawn chorus together I "cut-and-paste from web"
on that. Not so. Was working at Rocketdyne, touched SSME
on test stand at Coca site (very small for 350 Kpounds thrust),
was at test firings in blockhouse at Santa Su. (Santa Su be
Santa Susannah Field Test Laboratory of Rocketdyne)

>If we continue to set our sights on LEO, that's all we'll ever do, save for
the
>occassional cutsie-robot pushing sand around and drilling a whopping 6 inches
>into the soil. THERE was a waste of money.

Basic science "waste of money?" Why nursie say that?

Ben Franklin quote on such things, "What use is a newborn baby?"

Nurse have personality talk to Ben, ask same. Report back.

Mars NOT "LEO" (Low Earth Orbit). Nursie or some personality
fruitcake if think so. Nursie check almanac get figures for
distances.

>They didn't accomplish anything
>that on-orbit RADAR and spectral imaging couldn't accomplish.

Nursie go to Pasadena, talk to JPL team responsible. Ask
questions, get von Brawn personality to present alternate data.
Nursie think JPL receptive to suggestion? Think again.

JPL security will put nursie outside quick. Fruitcake display.

> But it looked cute on CNN.

Nursie think all space things "show biz?" Nursie more fruitcake.

Brits at Mars first, fail in landing. Unknown reason. Yanks next with bouncy balloon lander idea. Works. Both times. Look crazy but science and much testing proved concept viable. Lots of good data gathered by both robot explorers so far. Nursie not understand? TS. Nursie go learn about space, then put keyboard on safe before shooting it off in here.

How far to Mars, nursie. Wanna do QSO with Martian? Can use VERY slow morse since two-way time very long. Nursie see almanac, figure out radio wave travel time. Nursie can do math, figure path loss, needed power at Tx, needed sensitive at Rx? Long distances. 1 KW RTTY FSK with dish antenna work okay (calculated 50 years ago by George O. Smith, engineer and author of "Venus Equilateral" story series). Nursie argue with JPL still? Not good.

JPL helped do radar imaging of Venus over three decades ago from earth. Very LOW resolution return, hardly worth trouble, only proved possible. Earth to Mars distance close to that. JPL know how to do space things better than nursie.

Nursie do post-graduate science study via CNN? Not best. Too bad NASA channel programs cut back a few years ago. Channel may be "defunct" now. [favorite derisive nursie word is "defunct"] Mercury defunct. Gemini defunct. Apollo defunct. Skylab defunct. tsk. All worked. All got data. Basic data not available before. Nursie sneer and smirk at basic science data?

Maybe STS soon defunct? So be it. Nursie not help Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, Skylab, or STS (Shuttle Transport System) or any unmanned space mission. Nursie blabber on like Big Expert but not know basics. Big mouth. Defunct brain.

Nursie go to Clear Lake (suburb of Houston), take MSFC tour. Sundays best, not need guides. See museum of "defunct" vehicles, capsule, real moon rocks. Get rocks off? Nursie get in argument with NASA folks, sneer, yell at them, diss and curse them, examine Texas hospitality for visiting fruitcakes. Not good.

Nursie go argue with Ben Franklin about newborns. Have fun in nursieland with imaginations. Nursie stay out of real world.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5512. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 23:07:44 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281507.11e7fc96@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93576

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628012418.22098.00000462@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406271531.2e14db56@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040626145216.06606.00000536@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >Why we talk like marine go native?
> >>
> >> Short-talk like CW, improve rate, make 20 WPM look like 200, reduce
> >> bandwidth. Minimize humor. Hum radio very serious. No humor
> >> allowed. All be to procedure, fill out forms proper, make like
> >> big-shot radio pros of 1930.
> >
> >I claim bi-lingual. Speak english as first language and speak english
> >as second language. Hi, hi. I go claim benefit. Where VA?
>
> VA in east, one of original 13 states. :-)

I like VA. Have ocean and sand. I go claim benefit. 8^)

> >> Hum radio important have narrow, narrow bandwidth. Always was,
> >> always so. Tradition. Venerate tradition, keep on Mt. Olympus to
> >> please radio gods. Short-talk use minimal bandwidth. Easy to
> >> understand by collitch edumcated nursies, ex foreign office high-
> >> livers.
> >
> >Oooh. Nosay liver. Might be VA disbilitater. Seben hostile action
> >with Jack Danyell.
>
> Gulp, gulp, bang, bang. That be two hostile actions.

Jack Danyell no allow in combat zone. Why do that? Make danger for fellow sojer.

> So long liver.......sing "Liver come back to me..."
>
> >> Why word "abbreviation" so long? :-)
> >
> >Me no no.
>
> Mankind invented language to satisfy his need to complain. - anon.

Too bad marine alway compwane. He very loud.

> >Make up Q-word for abbreviation. QABBREVIATION.
> >
> >I so smart. Hi, hi.
>
> Careful, Brian become movie star in 007 laboratory as "Q." :-)

I like Jackie Chan movie. No yell yell marine allatime.

5513. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 23:14:49 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281514.6d67ea83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93577

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628012411.22098.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>
> Nursie need rap with shrink. Get shrink-rapped.
>
> LHA / WMD

Yess yess. Wrap him mouth so noone hear him yell and yell.

He say he have professional contact hewp me. He need use them
riteaway for himsewf. So much to do wid him. Haff no time for me.

5514. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 23:39:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628193940.22098.00000468@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93578

In article <1e4e3692.0406281427.38543b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040625230634.23857.00000456@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040625053929.06606.00000491@mb-m01.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >I tried, Len. They just don't get it. I'm just a poor dumb old amateur
anyway.
>> >You've told me time and time again how unqualified I am, how I "live in the
>> >past", how I don't know anything about "big time radio" and such, and how
>> >you're a "professional in radio". I still work regular hours and then some
>-
>> >I'm not retired like you. I'm not a wordsmith like you. I don't even make
up
>> >names to call other people in newsgroups like you. I'm only 50 years old.
>If
>> >they won't listen to you, why should they listen to me?
>>
>> Poor Jimmie. Got inferiority complex. Tsk.
>
>Jimmie Who much too humble. He do CW. He make schematic and radio.
>He best kind ham. He post portant numbers bout ham radio every month.

Numbers not kosher. Not agree with Hamradio website totals.

Jimmie need examination of ability to use ham license after
expiration but before end of grace period.

Real ham licenses up higher than Jimmie postings. But, Jimmie
argue and argue and argue and argue his numbers are "accurate"
(only ones) and all others "in error."

>> Cannot help Jimmie. Jimmie gots to learn, use the force.
>
>Mebbe Steve and Dave pump him up.

Pump, Steve. Pump, Dave. See Steve and Dave pumping!

:-)

>> Jimmie not get told he unqualified. Jimmie morseman,
>> superior to all radio of 1930s. Jimmie do good but still
>> gots great depression.
>

>Me no understan. He best kind ham.

He have stamping of FDA?

>> Jimmie see nursie, get meds from Dr. Killgore. Will help.
>> Lose depression, learn hollering and yelling. Keeps nursie
>> going, keeps Heil going.
>
>No no no. Steve turn him in for clinical deprishun. Lock Jimmie Who
>up. Now no one live Whoville cept Horton.

Yup. Nursie have "professional contacts!" Wow!

Nutsos need company in TN? Must be.

Horton da Ham. Good name.

>> BPL make more depress for Jimmie. Not good. Boo hoo.
>
>hoo.
>
>> Temper fry...
>
>Maybe Jimmie Who want tempura batter.

Butter still rancid from nursie dipping. Not good.

Even better batter bitter. Ptui.

Len

5515. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-28 23:39:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628193942.22098.00000469@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93579

In article <1e4e3692.0406281418.d380b3e@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144821.19470.00000345@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040627095334.05775.00000467@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>truth
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040626145221.06606.00000541@mb-m01.aol.com>
>>
>> >> Nursie work in aerospace? Or just spaced out?
>>
>> >> Nursie looney? [looney rhyme w/Clooney, ER hero...]
>>
>> >> Nursie disconnect dots, tell tales of coincidence of time nursie
>> >> got first car? Nursie not happy?
>>
>> >> Nurise automotive expert? Nursie are radio god, superior to all
>> >> inferiors (those not in hum radio)?
>>
>> >> Nursie be maverick gremlin? Have a pint'o at happy hour? Need
>> >> trip Vegas to tell all about radio? Must be. Nursie know all, hate
>> >> many. Not good. Vein ready for pop. Vroom, vroom.
>>
>> >> Shush, nursie, shush. Nursie not have mind neutralized, go into
>> >> parasitic oscillation, not good for final. Final at any time, vein
>> >> ready to pop.
>>
>> >> Temper fry...
>> >
>> > The following post was published by an allegedly college educated
>> >"professional" engineer.
>> >
>> > One who claims to have worked "in the aerospace industry".
>> >
>> > No wonder NASA is down two shuttles.
>>
>> Nursie have new personality! Weiner von Brawn.
>>

>> Nursie big name aerospace, be purchasing agent at set-top box
>> maker less than half year. Very important. Knows all about
>> electronic engineering. Good job, Weiner!
>
>He bwame shuttle disaster on you. He delerious.

Blame-tossing never-did-any-space-work nursie would have had
a total orgasm with early spaceflight days. So many go boom.
Nursie laff and laff at NASA folks, all dummies. Nursie feel very
smart when laffing at others. That pump up Weiner von Brawn.

Nursie know all about BPL, OFDM, technical stuff on method of
moments. Very schmardt. No sign of Comments on docket
04-37 from nursie. Nursie have depression too?

Docket 04-37 on the BPL NPRM now has 1,554 Comment on
ECFS. Many are multi-page filings (ARRL has 5 attachments,
ARINC has 3). Docket 03-104 on the BPL NOI is now at 6,108.
That's over 7500 filings on BPL alone.

Nursie and Jimmie wanna talk about space and economy, be
big gurus on What To Do. No talk about BPL. BPL gonna be
death of noise floor on HF if approved. Not matter. Nursie and
Jimmie live virtual lives on HF in here, be big shots with high
words on non-amateur subjects. Not understand. This not
private chat room for national politics, science, economics, or
space flight. Must figure that their extra class will work right on
through all QRM. Class will tell. Class dismissed.

>> Nursie got lots hate, angers, repeat lines often. Obsession by
>> nursie. Nursie can't do field day, must be on-line to hate, hate,
>> hate "enemy." Bad nursie, bad. Tsk.
>
>He hate Dr. Soos. He no like Horton Who. He no like Whoville.
>Million and million of kid in America grow up with Dr. Soos. But
>noooo. He no like.

While not expecting to, I did get a chance to see the actual,
working Whoville vehicles made for the movie. Peterson Auto
Museum in L.A., just off Sunset Blvd close to La Brea. Four
floors of cars. Most interesting "Cars of the Stars" exhibit.
Three-four years ago.

Of course, not mentioning hum raddio will turn on the mean
diss and curse side, nursie and jimmie lecturing on newsgrope
subjects...while they go merrily on with politics, economics,
science, and spaceflight. :-)

>He no like The Who. Who no like Who? Who?
>
>Him, dat who.
>
>Wonder what he think Jimmie Who?

Amazing wonder that the anglophile didn't mention "Dr. Who," a
so-called Sci-Fi series from the UK. Very tongue-in-cheek in
places but not science. Just fun. Jimmie no like?

>> Nursie not speak of BPL. BPL not aerospace where he
>> Dock-torr. (physics pun)
>
>He wan turn me in to Da Athorities! He say he make call and cause
>trouble. Like make threts. He forget dey close all insane psyllums
>and people hap no place cept under bridge or stinky shelter. He mean
>man and he forget histerry.
>
>Hate people.

Obsessive-compulsive psychosis manifesting itself in rage and
sociopathy. [Psych 101 at El Camino for undergraduate
required engineering major credits in California of 1959] Nursie
gonna mention my wife on that, say I "cut-and-paste" from her
books. Wife only had MSci in Education then, would get MSci
in Social Work later, work for state of Illinois. Wife's old school
books destroyed by water damage while in storage in Washington
years ago. Nursie MUST diss wife if I write something. Nursie
fruitcake, all nuts with hate.

>> Nursie hate, hate, hate. Nursie angry. All posts must kill all
>> enemies. Destroy enemies. Way of hero hostile action ham.
>
>He yell and yell alla time. He have sigh Kologee problem. He
>speshally hate someone say that. Sorry.

Compulsive-obsessive psychosis syndrome known a long time.
Nursie need all kinds certificates and licenses to show proof of
that but still nutso to anybody else.

>> Not good PR for ham radio.
>>
>> Temper fry...
>
>Dip him in tempura batter. He almost done.

Don't think will work. Butter turn rancid on dipping. Bad taste.

Have bad taste of nursie in here. Not good. Ptui.

This not amateur radio subject. No problem. Only other hum
raddio talk is all about field day. Field day nice outing in park,
fun. Not emergency training if scheduled years in advance.
Real emergencies not scheduled.

Len

5516. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 00:01:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628200151.18097.00000060@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93580

In article <1e4e3692.0406281514.6d67ea83@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040628012411.22098.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>
>> Nursie need rap with shrink. Get shrink-rapped.
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>
>Yess yess. Wrap him mouth so noone hear him yell and yell.
>
>He say he have professional contact hewp me. He need use them
>riteaway for himsewf. So much to do wid him. Haff no time for me.

Nursie fruitcake. But, EXTRA fruitcake. Morse nuts.

Len

5517. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 00:01:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040628200151.18097.00000059@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93581

In article <1e4e3692.0406281451.43cf693f@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040627144812.19470.00000338@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20040627094829.05775.00000464@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
>> >>Message-id: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>
>>
>> >> Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie
>> >> snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with
>> >> others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very
>> >> important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak
>> >> to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use
>> >> hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.
>> >
>> > Hey Dave...I say we start sending this stuff direct to Mrs. Lennie
>via
>> >snail-mail and see how much longer this silliness keeps up.
>>
>> Nursie nuts. Nursie now challenge USPS inspectors, LAPD
>> stalking-crimes unit. Not mention all shrinks in area. Nursie
>> be shrink-rapped yet?
>
>Why he aways want be with your wife, my wife???
>
>I no like that. I wish he just mind his own wife. No bother other
>people wifes. He not right in head.

Nursie hot hero hostile actions. We see where... :-)

This be way of New hum raddio in Hew-Hess-Haye?

Not good sign.

>> Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals
>> awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.
>
>He yell and yell. Too much noise. Youssa be funny. Jus hedake now.

Nursie get fun laffing other peoples. He have good time.

He make others mad, laff even more. Tsk.

>> > I can't believe that a woman with her alledged credentials would allow
it
>> >to go on, knowing it could get him involuntarily commited.
>>
>> Nursie smoke too many refers. Bend mind more than ever.
>>
>> Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate. Obsession. Tsk. Bad.
>
>Always want talk other wifes. I no like that. Very suspishus.

Nursie got hots for something fer sure.

>Maybe Jimmie Who and Great DXer wifes talk to him. Say not nice he
>want talk other pople wifes. Tell him some edikette. He probby jus
>yell and yell more.

Nursie strange. He diss anyone around not agree wid him.
Diss family, spouses. Allasame nursie.

>> Temper fry...
>
>He need fork. He done.

Nursie fork around too much. Get in trouble. Get #3 wife?

Got better butter. No help.

Better butter batter still bitter. Ptui.

Len

5518. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 00:09:20 UTC
From: Alex V Flinsch <avflinsch@att.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.06.29.00.12.37.549105@att.net>
Source record: 93582
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On or about Sun, 27 Jun 2004 21:33:42 +0000, "Chris"
<johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote about the following in article
<3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>:

> So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond reason.
> YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.

From your own news headers --
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1409
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1409

Please take your own advice

--
Alex / AB2RC
Yaesu FT100 software for Linux http://www.qsl.net/kc2ivl
Why do they call Radio "Wireless", between my shack and antennas
I must have over 1500 feet of wire!

5519. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 00:47:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628204721.07368.00000335@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93584

In article <20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <c2356669.0406271736.c006f3b@posting.google.com>
>>
>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>news:<20040625061758.05811.00000591@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
>>> So...there's NO technology that exisits today that would allow us to
>>land a
>>> man on the moon in say...two years...if we really wanted to...?!?!
>>
>>Probably not. Not in two years, anyway.
>
> I bet there is!

You'd lose the bet.

> Like I said..."If we wanted to..."

How much of your money are you willing to put up to make it happen?
>
> Tomorrow, a lunar orbiter discovers what appears to be deposits of "X".
>We need "X" really bad, and we know if we don't have a quonset hut sitting on
>it, it's fair game.

The moon has been under such observation for almost 40 years. Nothing of that sort of value has been found.

What would you say to someone who said that we must not drill for oil in any new areas because doing so *might* destroy some rare species - and we might have an unforeseen need to that rare species?

>Betcha we could have a Shuttle-loadable lander in two years.

You'd lose the bet.
>
>>> So we can't configue an auxiliary fuel system?
>>
>>I doubt it can be done in two years. Do you really think a lunar
>>lander that will fit in the Shuttle cargo bay and be compatible with
>>its systems could be designed, built, tested, integrated and ready for
>>launch to the Moon in less than two years? Including all the other
>>facilities that would be needed to support it? I don't.

>
> OK...four years.

That's a completely different game. You just doubled the available time.

>And I would not be surprised if a design isn't setting
>around in a drawer for just such a project somewhare.

That's a long way from a workable system.

>>Now about the auxiliary fuel system:
>>
>>It would have to be installed in the cargo bay, reducing the space and
>>weight available for the lander. It would have to carry enough fuel to
>>enable the shuttle and lander to leave earth orbit, enter lunar orbit,
>>leave lunar orbit and then configure for reeentry. That's a lot of
>>fuel and oxidizer.
>
> Why?

Because the orbiter and lander weigh quite a bit, that's why.
>
> We could use an Arianne to boost the tanks into orbit and the Shuttle
>could mate with it.

How much can an Ariane take to orbit?

If you're willing to contract out part of the job to the ESA, why not China?
Either way, it won't be "US" (as in "USA") going to the moon.

The Ariane would have to put the tanks into an orbit that the shuttle could
reach easily. And a docking system that would make fuel and oxidizer
connections would have to be developed to make the hookup. That's a new
technology right there.

>Or the extra tanks could be boosted into trans-lunar
>eliptical orbit as an orbiting tanker.

By what launch vehicle?

If you did have a launch vehicle capable of putting tanks into a translunar
orbit, that doesn't solve the problem of how the shuttle is supposed to get out
of earth orbit and meet them. And since the orbital period would be much
longer, the chances of not being able to catch up would be much greater.
>
>>>It will take an extra 30 years to figure out how to install the fuel
>>>tanks necessary to do it?
>>
>>It may not be possible at all even if the entire cargo bay is used for
>>the tanks.
>
> That's only if you think in terms of the dimensions of the Shuttle.
>Again, there's nothing that says we can't piggyback the extra stuff to orbit.

Then you need another launch vehicle and a new technology.

>>Look at the design of a Saturn V. Note how much of it is fuel tank and
>>how little is CSM and LEM. Note how much it weighs at launch, how much
>>of it goes to the moon, how much comes back from the moon and how much
>>is left for reentry.
>
>The Saturn V was designed to be a one-booster-lifts all flight.

Yep. Because after looking at all the alternatives, that was the best way to
go.

> I am not suggesting we do this all in one lift.

Then the problems and the cost multiply.

>>Those numbers are determined by the basic physics of how much energy
>>it takes to escape the earth's and the moon's gravity.
>
>So we get it to orbit, get "the package" together on orbit, then loft it
>into TLI from there.

Yep. But you need at least one new technology, and at least two carefully-timed
launches. Can be done but it's harder and more costly.
>
> For every "but how do we..." there are at least a dozen options...It's
>just a matter of starting with one and getting the ball rolling.

How much of your own money are you willing to lay out to make it happen?

>>> I'll bet you a nickle to a C-Note that Burt Rutan could rough out a
>>> workable method on a napkin in a Mojave restaurant and have itr working in
>>that
>>> two years.
>>
>>You would lose.
>
> Oh?

Yes.
>
>>> >If it could be done, NASA would have done it already.
>>>
>>> Oh?
>>
>>Yes.
>
> Why only NASA?

The political ramifications of a military (USAF) lunar mission would be a big
problem.
>
> And what makes you think that NASA may not have already penciled this
>mission out?

Nobody says they haven't. But that's a long way from doing it.

>You HAVE told me of reasons why you think it won't work one
>certain way, Jim, but you've NOT shown me or caused me to believe it CAN'T be
>done under ANY circumstances.

You're changing the boundary conditions, Steve. And you ignore basic physics.

>>> Why?
>>>
>>Because it would be a great way to push the shuttle program. That's
>>what the "teacher in space" fiasco was about. Also the reason
>>Congresscritters have taken shuttle rides.
>
> Well right there's a darn good reason TO "push" the shuttle!

If it was practical, they would have done it for just that reason. Which tells you it's not.
>
>Jim, the first Boeing 747's carried under 300 people about 6K to 7K
>miles.

So? They're not spacecraft.

> Now almost 40 years later it can carry over 500 in some configurations and
>fly non-stop over 20 hours (London to Sydney...What's that...12K miles?

Right - after decades of continuous development and upgrades, the range has been increased. And by eliminating features and making seats smaller, more people have been crammed aboard.

Better engines are one big reason. Those engines weren't a result of the space or military programs. They were the result of companies like GE working to sell civilian aircraft engines. If they could show enough fuel saving with a new design, the airlines would buy the new engines.

On top of all that, you don't push a new airliner to the limits of performance right away.

> Other than just "not wanting to", what's holding us back?

Money! How much of *your* money are you willing to spend on a new series of moon missions? Mars missions?
>
>>> Just because?
>>
>>The physics of the problem is the key to all of it.
>
> I don't think physics is the problem.

Then you don't understand physics as it relates to space travel.
>
>We just need to start issuing "round to-it's" to the folks who make
>these
>programs (pardon the pun) fly.

That means ...money. No bucks, no Buck Rogers. How much....
>
>>> They've had to fight Congress and ignorant laymen for 30 years just
>to
>>> stay in LEO.
>>
>>So has every other program.
>>
>>No bucks, no Buck Rogers.
>
> Exactly.
>
> And that's the ONLY thing holding us back.

That's enough.
>
> And that's only from actually building the things...The engineering
>could
>be done now in CAD with a minimum of expense.

Not true. CADD helps but you still need to build the thing.
>
>>Go ahead. Show me the numbers. How much does a shuttle weigh? How
>>small and light can a lander be made? How much fuel is needed to do
>>the jobs?
>
>The lander can be as small and as light as the mission dictates, or as
>big as we think we need it to be for the mission.

You're forgetting the physics again.

> No, I don't have "the numbers"...But I know we (yes, Lennie...The "Royal
>We") can do it if we wanted to.

Only if the resources are allocated. Which means $$ out of everyone's pockets.

>>> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?
>>
>>Do you know what a Lagrange point is?
>
> Sure I do.

Then you should know that you can't "park" ships along the way to the moon.
>
>>The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
>>a supply container there?
>
> The same way we got RANGER, "Lunar Orbiter", Apollo and who knows how
>manyn other lunar exploration packages there.

Big one-use rockets.
>
>>> We've already proven that on-orbit rendevous, docking and EVA
>>construction

>>> is a no-brainer.
>>
>>Not a no-brainer at all. What has been shown is that it can be done.
>>In low earth orbit.
>
>CM/LM rendevous was done after TLI and after LM ascension in lunar
>orbit. Both waaaaaaay outside Earth orbit!

Sure. But the initial move wasn't really a rendezvous - it was just the CSM
separating, turning around, docking and pulling the LM out.

The only really tricky rendezvous was when the LM came back up from the lunar
surface to meet the CSM.
>
>>> So again...WHAT new technology do we ahve to develop to go back to the
>>> Moon?
>>
>>- New lunar lander
>>- New heavy lift rockets
>>- New systems to get to lunar orbit and back
>>
>>that's a short list.

Add "zero g fuel tank connection system"
>>
>>Or we could just build more Saturn Vs.
>
>And I still say we could CAD these things now and have them on orbit in
>a relatively short time.

Suppose it takes one worker with a manual post hole digger 10 minutes to dig
one post hole. That does not mean ten workers with the same tools can do the
job in one minute.

There's a lot more to engineering than simply drawing plans.

>My two years may be too optimistic, but I bet if we
>said "do this" today, it wouldn't take another 10 years to do like Apollo.

Apollo took only about 8 years. With slide rules. And an enormous price tag.

>>> HARDWARE, yes...we need new machines. but so far, Jim, your
>>> "arguments"
>>> have not swayed me that we could do it if we wanted to...
>>
>>Of course it could be done. We know that; it was done almost 40 years
>>ago using rockets designed with slide rules and controlled with
>>computers that make a pocket calculator look smart.
>>
>>The question is - could it be done in two years? The answer is no.
>
> OK...I defer to your suggestion of "not in 2 years"...

That changes the whole game.

> So what would be your assessment on a reasonable timeline?

That depends on the funding.

What needs to be done is for there to be a *long term* commitment. That means a dependable, sustainable budget for the next couple of decades, dedicated to certain goals. Then the timelines are derived from the resources.

The programs of the '60s were rush jobs with essentially a blank check for funding. That sort of thing simply could not be sustained indefinitely.
>
>>> >>the mission drops in, and brings at
>>> >>least part of the lander home for re-use itself.
>>> >
>>> >Only ways such a system could work is if the Shuttle stayed in earth
>orbit
>>> >and the lunar package went from there.
>>>
>>> Why?
>>
>>Basic physics. The energy required to send the whole shuttle to lunar
>>orbit and back again is simply too great.
>
> "Too great"...?!?! Or too expensive...?!?!

Too great.
>
>>> >And the result would be a short-term visit by a few astronauts, like the
>>> >Apollo missions, not a long term base.
>>>
>>> As long as you keep thinking that, then that's all we'll do.
>>
>>What's your solution, Steve? How many tons of supplies and equipment
>>are needed to establish a permanent lunar base? How much money to
>>build everything needed, and to get it to the moon? How many years and
>>launches to do it?
>
>Well there's the rub. Again, "how much money" as opposed to the
>logistics of getting it done.

I included the logistics.
>
> (1) Define the mission. How's this...A "permanent" manned base on the
>Moon with a staff of at least four.

OK. Now, how many tons of equipment are needed to build the base, and how much in supplies per year?
>
> (2) Define the human need since that's really the biggest "consumable".
>
>That part's not really hard, though, since there are reams of texts on human

>physiology and what it takes to support a human in terms of nuourishment,
>hydration, etc.

Sure. But recall that for an unknown amount of time, *everything* has to come
from earth. And unlike LEO, there's no quick easy escape home if things go
wrong.
>
> (3) Define short term and long term mission objectives. Again, Not too
>difficult to do since the first priority is going to be getting the base in
>place and getting it habitable.

Tons?

> My solution (idea?) is to have prefab'ed modules lofted via unmanned
>missions. They are remotely soft landed within small radius of the intended
>base site. The modules are fitted with wheels from in the package and a "tow
>vehicle" is landed. The units are then towed to the site, lowered to a
>sitting
>position and mated together. "Instant" base.

Well, sort of.

First off, there must be a system that can get the modules there intact -
including landing them on the lunar surface. Building the ISS has been tough
enough - the trip to the moon is much more difficult.
>
> (Ironic that the fist colony on the Moon would be a trailer park,
>eh...?!?!)

Nope!

Second part: The modules must be buried in the lunar surface, or contain heavy
shielding. Lunar radiation is much worse than LEO - no lunar magnetic field.

Also need people and supplies.

>>> So...NASA doesn't hire drivers, janitors, security personel, health
>>care
>>> workers, mechanics, etc?
>>
>>Not nearly so many as they hire highly trained and educated people.
>>
>>It sounds to me like you are trying to justify a larger manned space
>>program by pitching it as a jobs program for Ph.Ds.
>
> No...Although I am sure there are a few Ph.D's out there who would
>gladly
>relinquish thier janitor's garb for a suit and tie again.

Anybody who was in their 30s when Apollo was active is now retirement age. Or
dead.
>
>But if you get into ANY "aerospace" town, there are legions of

>businesses
>not DIRECTLY associated with aerospace, but very important...Groceries, gas
>stations, spas, markets, etc etc etc.

That's true of any company town.
>
> I am in Huntsville at least once a month. "Aerospace" is the "big
>business", but all those other countless places are needed to support the
>PEOPLE in "aerospace". (The 99% who get stuff done, and the 1% [ie:Lennie]
>who
>go along for the ride and milk it for what they can...But they ALL make money
>and spend money)

Only because the money is imported from elsewhere.

>>> >>If we pump up NASA for a new deep space or lunar program, it means that
>>> >>every
>>> >company that contracts with it would be able to
>>> >
>>> >Sure - at a price.
>>>
>>> Sheeesh.
>>
>>You're the one complaining about getting ripped off every April 15.

How much of *your* money...

>>> >But why not solve our problems directly?
>>>
>>> Sure...Why not.
>>>
>>> Let's just go ahead and drop a billion dollars into social welfare
>>> programs to feed and house the poor.
>>
>>Who said anything about that?
>>
>>I'm talking about solving problems like education, infrastructure, and
>>energy independence.
>
> Of course.
>
> And how do we "solve" those problems, Jim?

Just as you described:

1) We describe the problem to be solved. Example: Energy independence. We
define what it means and what has to change.

2) We gather pertinent data. Look at how much is being imported, where it comes
from, how it is used, and how it could be reduced or replaced.

3) We set up adequately funded and properly run programs to make it happen.
Won't happen overnight but it can be done.

> With the exception of recreational technologies and the Internet, almost
>every "advancement" has been in entertainment and recreation.

Not true at all!
>
> We've not had any "research" technologies to speak of change, and we
>certainly won't without some sort of impetus to get them going.

Then create the impetus. How about tax credits for installing energy-saving hardware? We had that under Carter - and Reagan tossed it away.

How about an ongoing program to improve transit so that people have a reasonable alternative to driving everywhere? Sustainable communities where you don't have to drive everywhere.

As for technologies, note this:

- The efficiency of air-conditioning and refrigeration is now far greater than it was 20 years ago - even without old fashioned CFC refrigerants.

- More efficient lighting technologies reduce both the energy used and the resulting AC load in summertime.

- Automobile technology has advanced on so many fronts it's hard to list them all.
- Building techniques and materials have advanced - better insulation, more efficient heating, even low-flush toilets all add up.
>
> In the mean time, we "solve" problems by throwing money at them.

That's what you want to do in space....

>That's
>the root reason we decry the space program..."Let's spend the money on
>Earth!"

But we're not doing it.

> Well...I never DID see where Mickey D's was on orbit yet, so where ELSE
>is the money being spent...?!?!

What's needed is to spend the money fixing Earth's problems.
>
>>The space program of the '60s didn't liberate us from poverty. Nor did
>>it promote our wellness. It created some jobs and some new
>>technologies but at enormous cost.
>
> Space HAS promoted our wellness, Jim! I can attest to that!

How? Americans are fatter and less fit now than ever before.
>
> And we will NEVER be free of poverty.

If we take that attitude, we won't be.

>The Demoncrats thrive on it!
>
Pure BS.

>>Yep. Haven't you seen how US education ranks against other countries
>>in the developed world? Or how much of our oil is imported? Or any of
>>a host of other things that need fixing?
>
> And not a single one of those has been impeded BY the space program,
>Jim...

Yes, they have. By diverting resources and attention away from those problems.

>If nothing else a lot of that has been IMproved...
>
How?

> There's hardly a single aspect of human endeavor outside of Somalia and
>Ethiopia that ISN'T touched by the space program.

Sure. But that doesn't mean we must go back to the moon in a big hurry.
>
> Space technology has helped prospect for oil, helps find safer routes
>for
>ships at sea and has helped in the development of new processes for
>medication manufacture.

Sure - but all of that was from unmanned satellites. Many are of commercial
origin. Heck, OSCAR 1 was launched over 40 years ago.
>
> Those "aluminized" ballons that are so popular now are a spin-off of the
>technology to make polymerized plastics for NASA, as are the discs that make
>CD's.

I remember ECHO 1.

> If you want, we can trash all of that, go back to pencil, paper and
>slide rules, and "Movietone" newsreels for "audio visuals" at school...?!?!

Many schools are at about that level today because the commitment is not there
to fund them adequately. Heck, some schools don't have enough books!
>
>>Why can't the USA have the best educational systems in the world? The
>>best surface transportation systems? The best energy systems? Energy
>>independence?
>
> Money.

Exactly. It gets spent on giving congresscritters joyrides and in replacing
destroyed orbiters.

>We could have done all of those things 30 or more years ago (or at least
>been positioned to be there by now...) but everything was "fine" then, so why
>spend the money...?!?!

Everything wasn't fine then.
>
>Things are NOT so fine now, but not yet to disaster proportions, but
>that
>light at the end of the tunnel is NOT salvation! It's the on-coming train!

What *are* you talking about?
>
>Here's a quick one...Desalination. Plants were designed in the 60's
>for
>SoCal that would have used solar heating to help desalt seawater for LA, SFO
>and SDG.

Sounds like a good idea.

>Now the news on several internet sites is that the LA reserves are down
>by 5 to 7 million acre-feet of water.

Were the plants built?
>
>>This doesn't mean we shouldn't have a space program - we should. But
>>it has to stand on its own merits. Going into space is worth doing for
>>its own sake, not as a jobs program.
>
> If we want it to "stand on it's own merits' (I assume you mean 'make a
>profit') then we might as well just forget anything beyond LEO and sell NASA
>to
>the Red Chinese.

I don't mean make a profit. Not at all.

>Unless they find oil on the Moon, I don't ever see space
>travel as being able to produce it's own direct profit.

It's not about profit.
>
>>> Fiber optics = interruptable infrastructure.
>>
>>Fiber optics = what makes the modern communications world tick.
>
> I understand this. So do those who would like to do us harm.

So what's the solution? Satellites are just as vulnerable.
>
>>Satellites are interruptible infrastructure too. Heck, it's easy: Just
>>build a high power ground jammer transmitter with a big dish (designed
>>for the right frequencies) and point it at the satellite you wish to
>>interrupt. Jam away. With good design, the jamming signal won't even
>>be detected on earth.
>
>Sure it will....Some idiot did it to TBN (not that they didn't NEED
>jamming.....) and the guy responsible was collared in a day.

How did they find him? Was he in the USA? Did he do it continually?

>And I bet with some simple programming we can defeat jamming of our
>commercial satellites...

Not against RF overload.

>and I am willing to bet that c-note to the nickle
>that
>the military birds are a bit more sophisticated already!

Sure. But they don't keep the economy going.

Fiber is the future.

>>> >>>All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>>> >>>marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>>> >>>The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>>> >>>verifies the reliability analysis.
>>> >>
>>> >>Things that are filled with hundreds of tons of volatile combustables
>>> >>are bound to go boom.
>>> >
>>> >CNG tankers don't. Railroad tank cars don't.
>>>
>>> ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! ! !
>>
>>When's the last time a CNG tanker or railroad tank car in the USA
>>exploded and killed people? How many of them do you think are in use
>>in the continental USA in the course of a year?
>
> Oh...NOW you add the modifier "and killed people"... ! ! !

Yes. That's what the shuttle did when it blew up. Level the playing field.
>
>Heck, Jim...QST alone carries several articles a year of ARES groups
>that
>were active at various derailed tanker cars a year...I bet there were even
>more than that by a magnitude!

Nope. But that's not the point! Even derailed, the tank cars didn't blow up.
The ARES activations are about precautions.

>>> >Sorry, 1 in 75 is simply not good enough reliability.
>>>
>>> And we'll improve that reliability by just not doing it anymore...?!?!
>>
>>Not by doing it the same way over and over again.
>
> The boosters for the Shuttle exploded once, we fixed that problem.

Then another problem surfaced. Is it really fixed?
>
> This time it was FOD to the leading edges of the wings.

> Not the same...certainly not "over and over".

Dead is dead. Two orbiters and their crews a total loss.
>
>>> >>There's ALWAYS a need for competition, Jim.
>>> >
>>> >Who is there to compete with for space?
>>>
>>> The Red Chinese for one. They just flew a manned mission a year or
>so
>>> ago, and they certainly have the resources and the wherewithall to exploit
>>it.
>>
>>Right. They orbited one guy. The Soviets did it first - 43 years ago.
>
> One today.
>
> They DO have a Lunar plan in place, according to TIME, Scientific
>American
>and several other folks commenting on the issue.

So did the Russians. They never got there.

So it was one guy this
>time.
>When do you consider it a credible "threat"..?!?! Three? Five? Two dozen?
>
> If they land ONE man on the Moon in the next decade, that will be one
>more
>than WE have done in the last forty years ! ! !

So? The moon isn't ours.
>
>>> And considering thier track record for flooding markets with cheap
>>> alternatives that have, quite literally, put hundred of thousands if not
>>> millions of Americans out of work, I don't doubt they can do it there,
>too.
>>
>>By that logic, we should let them do it, and then buy the rockets from
>>them.
>
> And put MORE Americans out of work? Flying payloads on rockets WE don't
>have control over?

> I'd rather not!

You suggested the Ariane earlier.

Why is it OK to buy consumer goods from China but not rockets?
>
>>> I'd rather know that bright, fast moving light in the sky was
>carrying
>>> Americans.
>>
>>I'd rather that there were more products I could buy that said "Made

>>in USA".
>
> Me too. I'd like to have an all-US Amateur Station...

I have one. In fact I've never had anything else.
>
>>> I don't see a whole lot of likelyhood that anything further will be
>>> forthcoming from this exchange, Jim.
>>
>>Why not? Do you think I'm joking? I'm not.
>
> That's the thing...I DON'T think you're joking, and every suggestion of
>what we MIGHT do in the space program is met with "we can't because..."

Part of engineering is recognizing the problems beforehand, and not going off
on wild or wasteful tangents.
>
> I'm about HOW we can do things.

Me too. I'm an engineer.

Other people dream of doing great things. Engineers do them.
>
>>> If you believe that "all that money" is
>>> going to no good use and that it's not a benefit in your daily life today,
>
>>> well then there's just no use doing it.
>
>>I've not said that. What I have said is that the space and military
>>programs are not the best way to solve our problems here on earth.
>>Those problems need to be addressed directly. You want a better
>>mousetrap, study mouse behavior and
>>trap design.
>
> That's not how I've read it.

Read it again without couching it in "liberal/conservative" or
"democrat/republican" terms.
>
>>> I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And as
>>> both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of
>>> adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and
>>take
>>> advantage of the opportunities "out there".
>
>>So would I. But at the same time, I realize how big space is, and how
>>empty. And the basic physics of the problems inherent in space travel.
>>>
>>> Unfortunatley GETTING there will be neither cheap or without risk,
>but
>>I
>>> for one think the benefits will ultimately be enormous.

>>
>>How much of *your* money are you willing to spend? Because that's what
>>will fund it.
>
> Better funding American space programs than leasing others!

You're still avoiding that simple question....
>
>>And consider this: President Bush made *another* speech where he
>>supported BPL and said it was up to NTIA to figure out how to avoid
>>interference. How come our president and those BPL folks don't know
>>that BPL is a bad idea from the get-go? Anybody with even a basic
>>engineering education can see the problems staring you in the face.
>
> I for one don't think the IDEA of BPL is bad. I think the technology for
>it isn't up to par and warrants more research.

The basic idea is simply wrong. Power lines are simply not meant for RF. They are pretty good antennas, though. That's why the BPL systems need so many repeaters - the "line loss" at RF is largely from radiation!

Here's a simple analogy:

Let's say we lived (decades ago) in an area prone to heavy downpours. So along the backs of everyone's property we dig a stormwater ditch. The grading is such that when it rains, the excess water runs into the ditch and off to lower ground. The ditch is lined to prevent erosion but it's open to the air.

Then we decide to connect to a sewage system. Which means a lot of digging to put in big pipes to everyone's property. Expensive.

So somebody says "why not just use the stormwater ditch for sewage?" Technology is developed to pump the raw sewage to the ditch, and to divert it at the end of the ditch to the sewage system. The system "works" to the extent that the sewage winds up in the sewage system, and yet the stormwater doesn't. And it's arguably cheaper and faster than all those sewer pipes.

But the folks downwind have to smell it! And they complain.

That's BPL in a nutshell.

> The recent deployments only bear that out.
>
They prove the technology is no damn good. It's a spectrum polluter. It's just plain stupid.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5520. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 00:47:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628204722.07368.00000336@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93583

In article <40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major
>foulups.
>>
>> Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> 1B EPA
>
>It was pleasant days and a chilly night for the Marshall County WV ARES
>bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
>Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
>the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
>950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
>Hawaii.

Excellent!
>
I worked you guys on CW. What were you running?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5521. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 01:37:51 UTC
From: Keith Hosman KC8TCQ <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <40E0C7EF.E1102BD8@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 93590

Robert Casey wrote:
>
> Keith Hosman KC8TCQ wrote:
>
> >I went up and worked with the Fulton County club(K8BXQ) for Field Day.
> >
> >Man I think I got bit by the DX bug, worked 20 meters all the time I was
> >operating, until about 4:30 (EDT) AM this morning(Sunday). Worked a few
> >alaska stations, a few stations in the Virgin Islands, tried to work a
> >Hawaii station but he was working a huge pileup.
> >
> For some reason I had trouble getting heard when responding to CQs.
> Might have been
> too much QRM. Was running about 50 watts into a multiband vertical.

We went through 2 radios for 20m before we finally got one that worked decently, 100W into a tribander at 70 ft? that was mounted to the bucket of a cherry picker.

Adam KB8MDF had a cool idea to build a 160m loop, and then split part of it off for 40m, last I talked to him saturday night when he left to get some sleep he and Dave had around 100 contacts on 40 and I can't recall how many on 160.

The only station we really had any problems working was the Hawaii, the rest came back pretty fast, amazingly the Fiji station came back after only one call.

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ

Know thyself. If you need
help, call the C.I.A.

5522. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 01:41:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40E0C8C6.4090202@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Chris wrote a troll.

I use Nutscrape myself..... :-)

5523. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 01:53:21 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281753.57380d38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93586

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628012412.22098.00000458@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406271616.1df1ed11@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040627144822.19470.00000346@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> In article <1e4e3692.0406260937.5586476f@posting.google.com>,
> >> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
> >>
> >> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<40DD06BC.7CFD1E5E@earthlink.net>...
> >> >>
> >> >> One of your problems is that you can't stand to be considered a beginner
> >> >> in anything. Any way you slice it, if you, through an enormous fluke,
> >> >> would ever pass an amateur radio exam, you'd become an amateur radio
> >> >> neophyte.
> >> >
> >> >Radio professionals pass radio exams on enormous fluke?
> >>
> >> Whales have flukes. This big whale of a tale.
> >>
> >> Heil angry, festering hate. Try put down all inferiors, make fun
> >> of non-amateurs, make him feel very superior.
> >>
> >> >Only from the mind of Heil.
> >>
> >> Use Minolta, take picture of Heil. Heil emperor. Have new
> >> clothes, want all to see.
> >>
> >> Heil think he have enemies. Needs put-down all enemies.
> >> Take pot shots. Lack aim. Pot very black. Pot very loud.
> >> Pot snarl and snarl.
> >>
> >> Heil have insult field day. League not design field day for that.
> >>
> >> Heil feel superior by put-down of others, make him big man.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Nother think he big fish but pond so small. Must keep pond small.
>
> Heil allatime carp, too. :-)
>

Carp nasty fish. Allatime make water muddy for no good reason. Not use branchwater where carp live.

5524. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 01:57:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040628215750.07368.00000337@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93587

In article <40E0457E.3000807@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> "do you plan FD for what will bring out the most people, or
>>what
>> will make the most points, or what will be the most realistic emergency
>> simulation. or what will get the most publicity?" Or any of a bunch of
>> other goals.
>
> Sure. And will the local mall allow you to run ops all night?

Not around here!
>
> I'm a firm believer in a balanced approach. Our FD site is in a
>stunningly beautiful field with plenty of trees and a million dollar
>view. There is a picnic area about 1500 feet away, and ball fields
>tennis courts and soccer fields east and west. It's a huge site,
>probably bigger than a square mile. We get a fair amount of onlookers
>that were out for a walk with the family or boyfriend/girlfriend. We
>could possibly get more exposure by running it downtown or in the City
>high school parking lot, but no thanks.

Exactly.

>> Here's a scenario for ya:
>>
>> Months in advance
....
>>
>> You'd probably love a Field Day like that, Ryan. Would be a great learning
>> experience for all. But I can guarantee you that more than half (probably
>more
>> than 3/4) of the FD regulars in your club would walk away if the club tried
>> such a plan cold turkey.
>
> That would be kind of fun. But you're right, too many people would hate
it.

Unless it were brought about very gradually.

>>>Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can
>>>do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?
>>

>>
>> And if you are, how will you deal with the inevitable disputes that will
>>arise?
>> Remember, these folks are all volunteers, bringing their own equipment with
>> them.
>
> Yaknow, those disputes are part of the training too! The frayed nerves
>are part of the training, even. I note a short frayed nerve session
>about 10 minutes before FD or any other big event. Player a gets a
>little irritated with player B. Knowing about that allows us to smooth
>it over before it gets big.

Excellent point!
>
>There are so many things about FD that are training us without us even
>consciously thinking about them.

Even something as basic as exactly what to bring along to set up a complete
station. ("Coax? I thought *you* brought the coax!")

>>>Well, no one
>>>wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they
>>>ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for
>>>nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make
>>>absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money
>>>every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't
>>>they?
>>
>>
>> bwaahaahaa - great story, Mike.
>
> Zey haz no money to buy zee toyz they dezire no more!
>
> I'm not one to gloat, but this was such a case of poetic justice and
>Karma that I have to, just a teeny tiny bit. But I have to balance that
>with sympathy for their plight now. They were willingly stupid, and are
>paying the price.

Reality doesn't care what they believe.
>
> I did want to note that there were a few people in the club that *were*

>willing helpers. They were my core supporters. And when I left, they
>left too. So all that were left were the lazy ones. Evolution will
>extrat it's price eventually.
>
When I was a small child, the local parish had bingo night, raffles and an
annual fair. People came - including non-Catholics! - and dropped some dollars
and had a good time.

Then a new monsignor showed up and put an end to all of it. Thought people
should just drop the money in the basket every week. Guess what - they didn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5525. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 02:07:33 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281807.139465fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93588

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628012413.22098.00000459@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406271612.45a116bf@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040627144820.19470.00000344@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >
> >> > Unlike you, I >>DO<< have the credentials to make an assessment
> >
> >Marine need reach around back feel if head up buttox.
> >
> >> >and to cause intervention to occur, wether you like it or not.
> >
> >He now say he practice medicine in California? Maybe Arnie like to
> >know that.
>
> Oh no, not mister I'm-so-important-you-don't -dare-object-to-
> anything-I-say?

Yes yes that the one. The very one. I see him do dat again again.
He master it. He bewieve it.

I no bewieve it.

> >> Nursie new wetherman. "Film at eleven." Stay tuned.
> >
> >No, no. Not weather man. He spitting sport announce man.
>
> Nursie wetherman, not weather man. Wether or not.

I think he conphused. Wether at 10.

> >> Nursie have film over eyes. Glazed film like Krispy Kreme but
> >> not sweet.
> >
> >He dipped in sumptin. Not smell good.
> >
> >> > Shall I make a referal?
> >>
> >> Nursie smoke refers? Smoking not good. Nursie smoke, on fire
> >> with hate, hate, hate allatime. Not good.
> >
> >He yell and yell. His vein gonna pop.
>
> Too bad. QRO temper.

Put resister in series. Maybe contientious resister. Splain lot.

> >> Nursie not show good PR for extra class super special morseman
> >> hum raddio opertator.
> >
> >Maybe him want to keep amateur radio small. Maybe he think big fish
> >small pond. No need competatershun from new radio guy might show him
> >up.
>
> Nursie allatime carp.

Oh oh. Not nother carp. Nasty fish eat stuph on bottom make water
all muddy for nice fish. Not nice fish like koi.

> >> Nursie nuts, think is real MD. Too many refers.
> >
> >If not so sad, he very funny.
>
> So is grafitti.

Grafeeti not loud. Can close my eyes. Cannot close my hears.

Mebbe he know professional wid hearplug can help.

5526. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 02:37:04 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406281837.4227fadf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93589

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040627144816.19470.00000341@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20040627093904.05775.00000461@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/26/2004 11:43 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406260843.46701533@posting.google.com>
>
> >>Why we talk like marine go native?
> > >
> > > Perhaps because you're a narrow minded, pathological, lying bigot?
>
> Snarl, nursie, snarl. Nurse hate, hate, hate. Obsession.
>
> Not nice. Nursie forgot inference of homosexuality and abuse
> of youngsters. Nursie not in self-control.

He say bad thing bout people not true. He make repulsive inference
bout people not true. He awful being.

> Nursie not good PR for extra super special class hum radio
> opertator.

He just starchy tater too much couch time.

> > But that's just a guess on my part. Of course it's pretty well
> >established that you ARE a narrow minded, pathological lying bigot, so I
> >guess that's accurate afterall!
>
> Nursie go nuts with hate.
>
> Nursie have mean diss and curse. Not same "meaningful discourse."
>
> Nursie have too many refers?

He only know mean discourse, not meaningful

> > Leave us not forget those words of wisdom that you yourself uttered: "I
> >am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue.".
>
> Nursie need help, tranquilizers, padded cell, form-fitting jacket?
>
> Nursie allatime do mean diss and curse. Not good.
>

> Temper fry...

Now he call number again. He yell and yell so mean, not meaningful.

5527. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 02:47:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <40E0D86E.45344142@earthlink.net>
Source record: 93591

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major
> >foulups.
> >>
> >> Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> 1B EPA
> >>
> >It was pleasant days and a chilly night for the Marshall County WV ARES
> >bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
> >Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
> >the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
> >950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
> >Hawaii.
>
> Excellent!
> >
> I worked you guys on CW. What were you running?

Same rig/antenna as the last two years from here on the hill--FT-1000MP
"Field and Stream", Johnson Matchbox and 200 foot skywire fed with open
wire. It seems I'm never the guy to work you on FD. N8NN was the op
you worked.

My math skills are showing in the comments above. Score should read
"2.6 to 2.7 k points".

We were one of those stations which should not have been running 5A. In
the middle of the night, we had only two stations running. We would have
been better candidates for 3A.

Members of a local Boy Scout troop visited and were given an overview of
amateur radio by the county EC. They then visited all of the stations
in operation. They spent the most time and showed the most interest at
the CW tent. The ancient mode users had the only station doing computer
logging (TR).

The old ops using the old mode were responsible for about 2000 of the points and that from a single station.

Dave K8MN

5528. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 02:55:05 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <dS4Ec.132071$Sw.16148@attbi_s51>
Source record: 93592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
> Go placidly amid the noise & waste, & remember what comfort there may be
in
> owning a piece thereof.
> Avoid quiet & passive persons unless you are in need of sleep.
> Rotate your tires.
> Speak glowingly of those greater than yourself and heed well their advice
> even though they be turkeys;
> know what to kiss and when.
> Consider that two wrongs never make a right but that three lefts do.
> Wherever possible, put people on hold.
> Be comforted that in the face of all aridity & disillusionment and despite
> the changing fortunes of time, there will always be a big future in
computer
> maintenance.
> Remember the Pueblo.
> Strive at all times to bend, fold, spindle, & mutilate.
> Know yourself; if you need help, call the FBI.
> Exercise caution in your daily affairs, especially with those persons
> closest to you.
> That lemon on your left, for instance.
> Be assured that a walk through the ocean of most souls would scarcely get
> your feet wet.
> Fall not in love therefore; it will stick to your face.
> Gracefully surrender the things of youth, birds, clean air, tuna, Taiwan;
> and let not the sands of time get in your lunch.
> Hire people with hooks.
> For a good time, call 606-4311; ask for Ken.
> Take heart amid the deepening gloom that your dog is finally getting
enough
> cheese; and reflect that whatever misfortune may be your lot, it could
only
> be worse in Milwaukee.
> You are a fluke of the universe; you have no right to be here,
> and whether you can hear it or not, the universe is laughing behind your
> back.
> Therefore make peace with your God whatever you conceive Him to be:
> Hairy Thunderer or Cosmic Muffin.
> With all its hopes, dreams, promises & urban renewal, the world continues
to
> deteriorate.
> Give up.

Brenda ....you must have stayed up and listened to the National Lampoon Radio Hour as I did ..... too bad such things are not on the radio anymore. I always liked the one about the fellow looking for his grandfather in the cryogenics storage facility and finding him stuck to the pipes after a power outage.

Take care ..... 73 Tom KI3R

5529. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 02:58:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <LV4Ec.132091$Sw.39758@attbi_s51>
Source record: 93593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
> defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
> reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.

Yepper the bum society rears its head again ..... over 400k words in the English language, or so I 've heard, and the universal sentence enhancer is always to be found .... pity ...

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa.

5530. FA: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 03:43:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%z5Ec.18165$bs4.16028@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93594

I'm getting out of Ham Radio, so selling my radio equipment. Everything must go!

Title: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver w/More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706982695

All auctions end Sunday, July 4th, 2004.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

By the way, while you're looking, you may want to check out the Yaesu handhelds:

Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706980318

If you don't like that one, a second, identical, Yaesu is available at...

Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5707014692

5531. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 03:44:42 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86hdsvkoyd.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 93596

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "N2EY" == n2ey <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> writes:

[...]

N2EY> Here's a scenario for ya:

[... a fabulous scenario elided ...]

N2EY> Except for the FD committee, nobody knows what they're going to
N2EY> be doing until shortly before FD. To more realistically
N2EY> simulate, some very good resources (rigs, antennas, generators,
N2EY> etc.) might be left completely unused while less than perfect
N2EY> substitutes are pressed into service.

Oh, I would so totally sign up for this. Wow. I wish my club were
brave enough to try this.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.4 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQFA4OWvGPFSfAB/ezgRAgRTAJ9UfkHHfjXiCZ+rGZEq74zH33swfQCdFFgW
ADyIpSlIKt0z8tsFDmCeY1c=
=/QpJ
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5532. FA: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 03:44:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PA5Ec.18166$bs4.3401@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93595

I'm getting out of Ham Radio, so selling my radio equipment. Everything must go!

Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706980318

If you don't like that one, a second, identical, Yaesu is available at...

Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5707014692

All auctions end Sunday, July 4th, 2004.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

By the way, while you're looking, you may want to check out the Kenwood base station:

Title: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver w/More

URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706982695

5533. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the smart people listen? Of course not!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 04:28:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <fe6Ec.72$on6.25@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hello, Dan

True enough, but the fact is that the problem is the screwball folks that get their jollies writing the darn things in the first place.

Yes, I.E. is a major problem - mostly because it is popular and your comparison with cars and trucks makes sense.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, I'm having fits getting my dial-up to work properly and still have the DSL.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan" <abc@def.ghi> wrote in message news:s8i1e0ha83u2i91si7golbfb07mr2bucv9@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 28 Jun 2004 17:25:36 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >If everyone changed to Linux, you can bet the virus and worm writers would
> >be writing most of the stuff for Unix systems.
>
> Indeed. This whole notion of "everyone should switch so all of these
> problems go away" is naieve at best, plain stupid at worst.
>
> It's like looking at stats for fuel usage of passenger cars and
> trucks, noting that cars make up most of the usage of gas, and trucks
> use a small percentage, then saying "Gee, we should all start driving
> trucks to save gas"!
>
> Hell-o!
>
> Dan
>
> Grundig S800, S650, S700, YB400, YB550PE
> Degen DE1102, Kaito KA1102
> Drake R8, Radio Shack DX-440
> E. H. Scott 23 tube Imperial Allwave in Tasman cabinet (1936)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/28/04

5534. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 04:34:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10e1sb3lrb1tk8c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93598

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com...
> > >
> > >>>Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
> > >>>From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
> > >>>Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
> > >>>Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
> > >>>
> > >>>Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.
> > >>
> > >> I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those phonetics
> > >
> > > thru
> > >
> > >>my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather
> > >>prominent.
> > >
> > >
> > > It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
> > > when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call
of
> > > K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi
hi
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >>>Decided to run on my own as a
> > >>>matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner.
> > >
> > > Field
> > >
> > >>>day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there is
> > >>>nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.
> > >>
> > >> How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?
> > >
> > >

> > No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree
with
> > the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
not
> > the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
chosen
> > solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county
(as
> > opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
(passing
> > by the school that is).
>
> That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for
> your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way,
> I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.
>
> And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!

Believe me, that is in the works.

>
> Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his
> absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD Chairman?

No, apparently only the vice-pres can do that....

>
> > Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> > simulation. Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
> > clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we
set
> > up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications.
Yes
> > there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know
when
> > our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond
and
> > deal with it as best as we can.
> >
> > In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that
to be
> > desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
> > antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that
emergency
> > would occur.......
>
> Sure. You may need to be operating while ill from something or be
> putting your life at serious risk at the time. You may be up for several
> days without sleep. You may be injured.

Now thats going to extremes, but in reality, still, right now we have up to
a year to choose the sites we operate for F.D., and like I said, some places

might be less than desired.....

>
> Heck, even the person you are trying to communicate with may only have
> a CW rig. So you can't even begin to simulate truly accurate emergency
> condx.
>
> Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
> going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
> transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or
anything.
>
> The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about
> emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops. Dunno where tha hyper
> accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.
>

Well hell, I can *think* about emergency ops all day/year long..... but it
is NOT a simulation at this point from what I have seen locally of at least
a dozen local area groups..... Its merely a "contest" but doing it from
outside instead of indoors.

>
>
> > Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> > gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director
decides
> > the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> > outwieghs any other aspect of field day.
>
> Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can
> do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?
>

Yep, and an assistant EC right now.

>
> Related item. I was in a club years ago where I was in charge of our
> biggest fund raiser. Some of the club members didn't like how I was
> doing things (specifically, my methods required some work) But we made a
> LOT of money for a small club. So they led a revolt against me,
> supported by the club prez of refusing to help me or work for me. My
> only option that didn't make me look like an idiot was to resign from my
> position and chairmanship and the club. I was ironically the Vice
president.
>

> The result? Remember how they thought that my working demands were too
> much? I wanted 4 hours of work per year per club member. Well, no one
> wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they
> ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for
> nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make

> absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money
> every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't
> they?
>
> Point is, be good to the volunteers, and if you don't like what they
> are doing, do better.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yeah, unfortunately we have our own set of problems..... including lack of participation..... I feel your pain brother.

Ryan KC8PMX

5535. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 04:39:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10e1sk185t0ib1a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93599

"Dee D. Flint" <deeflint01@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:zZidnZDA5sDlin3dRVn-sw@comcast.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > >> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not
agree
> with
> > >> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
> not
> > >> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
> chosen
> > >> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the
county
> (as
> > >> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
> (passing
> > >> by the school that is).
> > >
>
> Perhaps he/she couldn't get permission to set up anywhere else. Although
if
> that was the case, they should have communicated better.

Actually, there were a ton of possibilities..... Including many more
"optimum" spots than where it was.

Ryan KC8PMX

5536. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 04:46:27 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10e1t1etbq0dl54@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93650

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
news:20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree
with
> >> the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
not
> >> the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
chosen
> >> solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county
(as
> >> opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
(passing
> >> by the school that is).
> >
> >That you disagree is one thing. No problem there. But field day is for
> >your club, and it seems that there is an "if things aren't done my way,
> >I'm not going to play. Not too teamlike.
>
> Comes down to "do you plan FD for what will bring out the most people, or
what
> will make the most points, or what will be the most realistic emergency
> simulation. or what will get the most publicity?" Or any of a bunch of
other
> goals.
> >
> > And if you all seriously want to do it differently, vote the dude out!
> >
> > Of course, will someone step up to the plate and run field day in his
> >absence? Is there a clamor and a rush of people wanting to be FD
Chairman?
>
> Classic "bell the cat" problem.
> >
> >> Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> >> simulation.
>
> That's your vision of it, Ryan. Others see FD very differently.
>
> The good thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways.
That's why
> it's so popular - brings out more hams than any other domestic operating

> activity.
>
> The bad thing is that FD has many facets and can be done many ways. That's
why
> it can be such a source of disagreement.
>
> >> Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
> >> clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where
we
> >> set
> >> up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications.
>
> It's fundamentally a skills and planning exercise. It's one thing to talk
about
> setting up a station quickly in an unprepared location, and another thing
to
> actually *do* it. Operating skills get practiced. Teamwork and learning to
deal
> with volunteers, both as a leader and as a team member.
>
> >> Yes
> >> there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know
> >> when
> >> our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond
and
> >> deal with it as best as we can.
>
> But you guys have training sessions, right?

Twice a month as required by law, and also sometimes more than that.

>
> >> In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that
to
> >> be
> >> desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
> >> antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that
emergency
> >> would occur.......
> >
> > Sure. You may need to be operating while ill from something or be
> >putting your life at serious risk at the time. You may be up for several
> >days without sleep. You may be injured.
> >
> >Heck, even the person you are trying to communicate with may only have
> >a CW rig. So you can't even begin to simulate truly accurate emergency
> >condx.
>
> You can't simulate all of them by any means, but FD simulates some of
them.

I wasn't saying that we can simulate all but I do think we should be
simulating in more realistic locations. That is provided that we can get
permission to set up there, as it is not actually during an emergency.

>
> >Under most real emergency circumstances, some emergency personell is
> >going to tell you to go to a certain place, and operate a certain
> >transciever. You won't set up a tent or put together a station or
anything.
>
> Maybe. Or it might go the other way - you may be asked to go to a certain
> location and bring everything you need along.
> >
> >The purpose of FD is to in large prt get peopl simply *thinking* about
> >emergency ops, and *doing* some simulated ops.
>
> Bingo!
>
> > Dunno where tha hyper
> >accurate emergency scenario that I hear about came from.
> >
> >> Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> >> gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director
decides
> >> the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> >> outwieghs any other aspect of field day.
>
> The trick is to balance all the different aspects.
>
> Here's a scenario for ya:
>
> Months in advance, everyone who wants to participate is required to fill
out a
> form listing what equipment, time, and skills they can volunteer for FD.
> Everyone is responsible for keeping their FD forms updated of changes
> (equipment /schedule changes, license upgrades, etc.)
>
> The forms are collected and the FD committee of no more than 3 people puts
> together a Field Day master plan.
>
> 48-72 hours before FD, everyone who is signed up gets their "sealed
orders"
> which detail where they are to go, what they are expected to bring with
them
> and what they are expected to do for FD. It could be as simple as "show up
at X
> on or before time T and operate station S" or as complex as "head the team
> running station S, bring a this list of equipment..."
>
> Included could be things bringing like foul-weather gear even though the
> forecast is perfect. You don't have to wear it but you have to have it

with
> you. Could also simulate equipment breakdowns and unavailability -
although
> that sort of thing often happens anyway.
>
> Except for the FD committee, nobody knows what they're going to be doing
until
> shortly before FD. To more realistically simulate, some very good
resources
> (rigs, antennas, generators, etc.) might be left completely unused while
less
> than perfect substitutes are pressed into service.
>
> You'd probably love a Field Day like that, Ryan. Would be a great learning
> experience for all. But I can guarantee you that more than half (probably
more
> than 3/4) of the FD regulars in your club would walk away if the club
tried
> such a plan cold turkey.

Actually, with a little bit of fine tuning, I believe that would be even
better than my idea. My idea was that we WILL know which weekend, but the
location won't be announced till either that morning OR the night before,
and we have to adapt. And that location being decided (where possible) by
the county EC/RO. Actually in our specific case, we hold a regular net on
Thursdays, so that would be the best I would imagine......

>
> >Best way to control where the site is is to become an EC. The you can
> >do as YOUR philosophical desires dictate. Are you willing to do that?
>
> And if you are, how will you deal with the inevitable disputes that will
arise?
> Remember, these folks are all volunteers, bringing their own equipment
with
> them.
> >
> >Related item. I was in a club years ago where I was in charge of our
> >biggest fund raiser. Some of the club members didn't like how I was
> >doing things (specifically, my methods required some work) But we made a
> >LOT of money for a small club. So they led a revolt against me,
> >supported by the club prez of refusing to help me or work for me. My
> >only option that didn't make me look like an idiot was to resign from my
> >position and chairmanship and the club. I was ironically the Vice
president.
> >
> >The result? Remember how they thought that my working demands were too
> >much? I wanted 4 hours of work per year per club member.
>
> You said the big bad C word - commitment.
>

> >Well, no one
> >wanted to work even after they got ride of the bastard - me, so they
> >ended up hiring three people to do my job (keeping in mind, I did it for
> >nuttin'), subbed out the most lucrative part of the job, and now make
> >absolutely no money on a fund raiser that was bringing in a lot of money
> >every year. They are actually in money trouble now. Smart people weren't
> >they?
>
> bwaahaahaa - great story, Mike.
> >
> >Point is, be good to the volunteers, and if you don't like what they
> >are doing, do better.
> >
> Most of all, understand that FD is very different things to very different
> people.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Ryan
KC8PMX

5537. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 04:55:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net>
Message-ID: <10e1tibjnjrnh1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 93651

"William" <billybeeper@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1e4e3692.0406280820.7aedeb75@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:<10du2dc47qumk57@corp.supernews.com>...
> > "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20040624181437.05745.00000459@mb-m14.aol.com...
> > > >Subject: Re: Field Day Plans?
> > > >From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net
> > > >Date: 6/24/2004 11:20 AM Central Standard Time
> > > >Message-id: <10dm0bgbatvdl1a@corp.supernews.com>
> > > >
> > > >Will be running KC8PMX on 50Mhz-450Mhz bands.
> > >
> > > I was thinking a shorter call would help, but I ran those
phonetics
> > thru
> > > my mind a couple times, and "PAPA MIKE X-RAY" seems to me to be rather
> > > prominent.
> >
> > It's not too bad, although I wished I would have gotten a different call
> > when originally assigned. I might purposefully go for the vanity call
of
> > K8KEA, just to be a pain in the ass because our club call is W8KEA. hi
hi
>
> Can't we all just get along?

Well, I guess I have never been a conformist, or one to be a "bump on the
log" type as I see so many are..... LOL

I just hate my suffix.... never liked it from the start, but never gotten
around to changing it either through vanity call process or simple
reassignment through the pool.

>
> > > >Decided to run on my own as a
> > > >matter of passive resistance to the local club's field day planner.
> > Field
> > > >day is supposed to be an emergency preparedness scenario, and there
is
> > > >nothing close to that from what I see of the plans locally here.
> > >
> > > How's that, Ryan...??? Too much of the picnic-in-the-park thing?
> >
> > No, just a kind of passive resistance thing. I seriously do not agree

with
> > the person who is our field day planner and club vicepresident. I am
not
> > the only one boycotting the club field day either.... It has been
chosen
> > solely by him to be placed at one of the high schools out in the county
(as
> > opposed to the city) where there is little traffic on the weekends
(passing
> > by the school that is).
>
> Let me guess. He's an Extra?

Nope, but license class has nothing to do with it.....

>
> > Field Day should be at least 50% PROMOTIONAL as well as 50% emergency
> > simulation. Since it is not an actual emergency simulation since we all
> > clearly know when it is going to be, AND of course get to chose where we
set
> > up, just how does that qualify as emergency planning/communications.
Yes
> > there is the PREPLANNING but on our fire department we dont get to know
when
> > our next medical call or car accident or house fire is, we just respond
and
> > deal with it as best as we can.
>
> Should be points for real emergency locations rather than setting up
> at KOA.

Well, we can speculate as to "where" a potential emergency will happen till
the cows come home. The issue I had at hand was merely the choice of
location.... its SO buried from the general public, the PR value was not
worth a damn for our FD.

>
> > In a real emergency, we may be required to set up in an area less that
to be
> > desired, such as a parking lot. Or an open field without those natural
> > antenna supports..... Also, we would not normally know when that
emergency
> > would occur.......
>
> Hmmmm.

Yeah.... its not like you can plan for when your house will burn down or you
get into a bad wreck, or whatever. :)

>
> > Maybe, at least if it was changed to where we DO know the weekend it is
> > gonna be, BUT each countie's EC/RO or emergency services director

decides
> > the location??? I still believe that the PR value of Field Day far
> > outwieghs any other aspect of field day.
>
> Elevate this idea to ARRL. County EC selects operating locations.
> Keeps secret. Makes the assignment 2 hours before test starts.
>

The only glitch I could see there, is obviously for counties without an EC.
Someone else would have to be qualified to choose then..... Not sure who,
but I am sure someone could figure that one out.

> Extra points, of course.

If that plan is followed, of course. :)

Ryan KC8PMX

5538. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 09:34:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629053444.12238.00000905@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93652

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>Date: 6/28/2004 7:47 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040628204721.07368.00000335@mb-m24.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>> Tomorrow, a lunar orbiter discovers what appears to be deposits of "X".
>
>>We need "X" really bad, and we know if we don't have a quonset hut sitting
>on
>>it, it's fair game.
>
>The moon has been under such observation for almost 40 years. Nothing of that
>sort of value has been found.

And tommorow an orbiter scanning FOR "X" shows up, Jim...

Maybe that 1/1000 chance that we see something from "just the right angle"
happens...

>> OK...four years.
>
>That's a completely different game. You just doubled the available time.

And it's still four yeas less than the "usual" development time for
aviation projects (The F22's been in the works for a decade already and is just
now about readu to start manufacture).

Again...>>IF<< we wanted to get it now "now", I think we could do it.

>The Ariane would have to put the tanks into an orbit that the shuttle could
>reach easily. And a docking system that would make fuel and oxidizer
>connections would have to be developed to make the hookup. That's a new
>technology right there.

Why?

What do we not already know about fuel line connections that we don't
already know? What other magic is there to getting a fuel from one tank into
another? The Russians were doing it for over a decade with MIR.

>>The Saturn V was designed to be a one-booster-lifts all flight.
>
>Yep. Because after looking at all the alternatives, that was the best way to

>go.

That was the best way to go THEN.

>Yep. But you need at least one new technology, and at least two
>carefully-timed
>launches. Can be done but it's harder and more costly.

We know exactly where the moon's going to be for the next 2000 years. We
can, with a handheld science calculator, do almost the same thing for earth
launches. It >>IS<< "rocket science", but one that's been thoroughly developed
and proven.

It's a wheel that doesn't require re-invention.

>The political ramifications of a military (USAF) lunar mission would be a big
>problem.

How many civilians have walked on the moon, Jim?

>> And what makes you think that NASA may not have already penciled this
>>mission out?
>
>Nobody says they haven't. But that's a long way from doing it.
>
>>You HAVE told me of reasons why you think it won't work one
>>certain way, Jim, but you've NOT shown me or caused me to believe it CAN'T
>be
>>done under ANY circumstances.
>
>You're changing the boundary conditions, Steve. And you ignore basic physics.

I am not ignoring any physics, Jim.

>Right - after decades of continuous development and upgrades, the range has
>been increased. And by eliminating features and making seats smaller, more
>people have been crammed aboard.

Yes, seats can be made smaller...

But the aircraft is 40% larger today than it was in 1969.

>Better engines are one big reason. Those engines weren't a result of the
>space
>or military programs. They were the result of companies like GE working to
>sell
>civilian aircraft engines. If they could show enough fuel saving with a new
>design, the airlines would buy the new engines.

Hmmmmmmm....

"...compnies like GE..."

Now..I WONDER who it was that made (or were major contractors on) the
engines that presently put the shuttle in orbit, as well as about every other

rocket or aeronautical project since the 30's...?!?!

Ya think they learned anything in the process...?!?! I certainly do.

>> And that's only from actually building the things...The engineering
>>could
>>be done now in CAD with a minimum of expense.
>
>Not true. CADD helps but you still need to build the thing.

Eventually, but not like we used to.

The F-22 and the Boeing 777 were both aircraft that were CAD'd right into
a first flying prototype.

>You're forgetting the physics again.

No. I'm not.

I know it takes a lot of fuel to get on-orbit.

I know it takes even more to get that magical 17,500+MPH to break orbit.

And I know it costs money to get them there.

As for your repeated reminders about "physics", Jim, I'll point out that
ALL of the deep space flights were NOT launched on Saturn 5's...They went up on
Atlas-Centaurs, Arrianes, ot Titan-3C's.

>> No, I don't have "the numbers"...But I know we (yes, Lennie...The
>"Royal
>>We") can do it if we wanted to.
>
>Only if the resources are allocated. Which means $$ out of everyone's
>pockets.
>
>>>> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?
>>>
>>>Do you know what a Lagrange point is?
>>
>> Sure I do.
>
>Then you should know that you can't "park" ships along the way to the moon.

No, but you CAN park them in Earth orbit or you can park them in lunar
orbit.

>>>The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
>>>a supply container there?
>>
>> The same way we got RANGER, "Lunar Orbiter", Apollo and who knows how
>>manyn other lunar exploration packages there.
>
>Big one-use rockets.

Atlas was a "big one-use rocket"...?!?!

>>CM/LM rendevous was done after TLI and after LM ascension in lunar
>>orbit. Both waaaaaaay outside Earth orbit!
>
>Sure. But the initial move wasn't really a rendezvous - it was just the CSM
>separating, turning around, docking and pulling the LM out.
>
>The only really tricky rendezvous was when the LM came back up from the lunar
>surface to meet the CSM.

How tricky, Jim?

In one case (TLI) only one of the craft was under manned control. In the
case of CSM/LM rendevous, there were two craft under manned control.

Starting with Gemini-Agena up trough Shuttle-ISS, don't you think we've
gotten the technique pretty well down pat...???

>Add "zero g fuel tank connection system"

How did the Russians "refuel" MIR for oover a decade? Swap out propane
tanks at the convienience store?

>Apollo took only about 8 years. With slide rules. And an enormous price tag.

Becasue we'd never done it before. Now it's software you can download in
a couple minutes.

>> So what would be your assessment on a reasonable timeline?
>
>That depends on the funding.

Sheeeeesh.

>>>Basic physics. The energy required to send the whole shuttle to lunar
>>>orbit and back again is simply too great.
>>
>> "Too great"...?!?! Or too expensive...?!?!
>
>Too great.

Earlier in this same exchange you said too expensive, Jim.

>>Well there's the rub. Again, "how much money" as opposed to the
>>logistics of getting it done.
>
>I included the logistics.

The logisitics is the money!

>Anybody who was in their 30s when Apollo was active is now retirement age. Or
>dead.

What?

NASA didn't keep any archives? These guys "learned" all that stuff then
kept it to themselves?

>> I am in Huntsville at least once a month. "Aerospace" is the "big
>>business", but all those other countless places are needed to support the
>>PEOPLE in "aerospace". (The 99% who get stuff done, and the 1% [ie:Lennie]
>>who
>>go along for the ride and milk it for what they can...But they ALL make
>money
>>and spend money)
>
>Only because the money is imported from elsewhere.

Uh huh.

And why is that money "imported" fro "elsewhere", Jim?

>>>You're the one complaining about getting ripped off every April 15.
>
>How much of *your* money...

Of "MY" money, we just spent over $100B invading another country that was
of dubious danger to us (certainly less than the old USSR was at one time), and
will continue to spend billions on for another decade.

Now...If that $100B were allocated to a new lunar colony project...?!?!

>1) We describe the problem to be solved. Example: Energy independence. We
>define what it means and what has to change.
>
>2) We gather pertinent data. Look at how much is being imported, where it
>comes
>from, how it is used, and how it could be reduced or replaced.
>
>3) We set up adequately funded and properly run programs to make it happen.
>Won't happen overnight but it can be done.

Sure it can be done.

It COULD have been done 30+ years ago but "we" were too cheap to open our
wallets then to avoid the costs today.

Well...today is here, and now it's going to be a quantum more expensive to
do the things we need to do, but STILL haven't done.

Again...it's the wallet problem...not the space problem that keeps us from
these things.

>Then create the impetus. How about tax credits for installing energy-saving
>hardware? We had that under Carter - and Reagan tossed it away.

But wait, Jim!

Weren't you the same one decrying that certain persons get tax breaks that
you and I don't get...?!?!

Aren't those "tax credits" that encourage the Forbes 500 folks to USE those billions to keep industry going...?!?!

What we HAD under Carter were stifling inflation.

Science and industry MOVED under Reagan. Not a boast on my part...archived historical facts.

>>That's
>>the root reason we decry the space program..."Let's spend the money on
>>Earth!"
>
>But we're not doing it.

Then if we're not spending the money now with no more than we're doing in space, how could this make it any worse?

The move forward in industry and technology would be perpetuating in and of itself...

>> Well...I never DID see where Mickey D's was on orbit yet, so where ELSE
>>is the money being spent...?!?!
>
>What's needed is to spend the money fixing Earth's problems.

I've heard that same argument used to finish off Apollo.

We KO'd Apollo, yet schools are (in your estimation) no better off.

Why is that?

>> If you want, we can trash all of that, go back to pencil, paper and
>>slide rules, and "Movietone" newsreels for "audio visuals" at school...?!?!
>
>Many schools are at about that level today because the commitment is not
>there
>to fund them adequately. Heck, some schools don't have enough books!

And NASA is manhandling those school board members to the ground and stealing the money from them?

>>>Why can't the USA have the best educational systems in the world? The
>>>best surface transportation systems? The best energy systems? Energy
>>>independence?
>>
>> Money.
>
>Exactly. It gets spent on giving congresscritters joyrides and in replacing
>destroyed orbiters.

We'll spend more money trying to defeat gay marriage than what replacing Columbia and Challenger would cost.

Besides...we HAVEN'T replaced them...Challenger splashed 18 years ago now. Where's >>IT'S<< replacement...?!?!?

>>We could have done all of those things 30 or more years ago (or at least
>>been positioned to be there by now...) but everything was "fine" then, so
>why
>>spend the money...?!?!
>
>Everything wasn't fine then.

I agree.

That's why I put it in " " brackets.

It WAS a problem then. It's a worse one now.

>>Things are NOT so fine now, but not yet to disaster proportions, but
>>that
>>light at the end of the tunnel is NOT salvation! It's the on-coming train!
>
>What *are* you talking about?

Drought.

Declining oil reserves.

Internal security of our own borders.

>>Here's a quick one...Desalination. Plants were designed in the 60's
>>for
>>SoCal that would have used solar heating to help desalt seawater for LA, SFO
>>and SDG.
>
>Sounds like a good idea.
>
>>Now the news on several internet sites is that the LA reserves are down
>>by 5 to 7 million acre-feet of water.
>
>Were the plants built?

Nope.

They "cost" too much.

I wonder what they'd cost today to build? I wonder what the cost of the
decaying cities will be when those cities can no longer sustain thier
populations, and the people go elsewhere to live?

We will force the building of NEW infrastructure wherever these people
wind up, and the old cities will have to be refurbished somehow.

Ultimately I think they will have to still build the plants that should
ahve started in the 70's, and it will cost even more then.

>>Sure it will....Some idiot did it to TBN (not that they didn't NEED
>>jamming.....) and the guy responsible was collared in a day.
>
>How did they find him? Was he in the USA? Did he do it continually?

As I understand it he was found using the satellite itself to narrow him down. He was then found by the "usual" terran techniques. No, he didn't do it continually.

>>And I bet with some simple programming we can defeat jamming of our
>>commercial satellites...
>
>Not against RF overload.

That would take a system capable of putting a massive amount of RF across an extremely wide range of frequencies for a significant amount of time, Jim. Like from 400MHZ to over 5GHZ.

THAT would be expensive, and would NOT be the kind of technology you could load into a Ryder truck.

>>>When's the last time a CNG tanker or railroad tank car in the USA
>>>exploded and killed people? How many of them do you think are in use
>>>in the continental USA in the course of a year?
>>
>> Oh...NOW you add the modifier "and killed people"... ! ! !
>
>Yes. That's what the shuttle did when it blew up. Level the playing field.

Ahhhhhhhh....I see......

Well, I still see the Manned Space Program as beiong over forty years old, and only 17 Americans have died in direct space flight operations or preparations.

>> The boosters for the Shuttle exploded once, we fixed that problem.
>
>Then another problem surfaced. Is it really fixed?
>>
>> This time it was FOD to the leading edges of the wings.
>
>> Not the same...certainly not "over and over".
>
>Dead is dead. Two orbiters and their crews a total loss.

Yes. Dead is dead. They were tragedies, and we learned from them. I do not consider thier sacrifices as a "total loss".

>> They DO have a Lunar plan in place, according to TIME, Scientific
>>American
>>and several other folks commenting on the issue.
>
>So did the Russians. They never got there.

They never got there because they quit. They spent thier money elsewhere. It wasn't that they couldn't.

>> If they land ONE man on the Moon in the next decade, that will be one
>>more
>>than WE have done in the last forty years ! ! !

>
>So? The moon isn't ours.

The Gulf of Siddra isn't "ours" either yet we patrol it with a Carrier
Battle Group regularly.

The differene with the Moon is that anyone who can get there can make use
of what ever resources they find there. If it isn't us, it will be someone
else. I would rather it BE us.

>> I'd rather not!
>
>You suggested the Ariane earlier.

Lacking a US alternative, I'd spend our monies with ESA before I'd send
any more of it to the Pacific Rim..especially a PacRim controlled by the Red
Chinese.

>Why is it OK to buy consumer goods from China but not rockets?

Because I am not worried about the Red Chinese using the technology used
to make rubber duckies and t-shirts to overwhem us.

>> I'm about HOW we can do things.
>
>Me too. I'm an engineer.

Then instead of tellingus what "can't" be done because of a lack of
funding, tell us what CAN be done WITH adequate funding...And money spent
SMARTLY, not just thrown into the pot and done with as you will.....

>Other people dream of doing great things. Engineers do them.

Engieneers do them when adequately funded!

DaVinci dreamed of a great many things that have only been made practical
in the last 100 years...Because we spent the money on research to develop the
materials to let the enginees make it happen!

>>>> If you believe that "all that money" is
>>>> going to no good use and that it's not a benefit in your daily life
>today,
>>
>>>> well then there's just no use doing it.
>>
>>>I've not said that. What I have said is that the space and military
>>>programs are not the best way to solve our problems here on earth.
>>>Those problems need to be addressed directly. You want a better
>>>mousetrap, study mouse behavior and
>>>trap design.
>>
>> That's not how I've read it.
>
>Read it again without couching it in "liberal/conservative" or

>"democrat/republican" terms.
>>
>>>> I see the benefits of our space and technology programs every day. And
>as
>>>> both an American and as a human with a bit more than average sense of
>>>> adventure, I'd like to see us reach out beyond our own celestial home and
>>>take
>>>> advantage of the opportunities "out there".
>>
>>>So would I. But at the same time, I realize how big space is, and how
>>>empty. And the basic physics of the problems inherent in space travel.
>>>>
>>>> Unfortunatley GETTING there will be neither cheap or without risk,
>>but
>>>I
>>>> for one think the benefits will ultimately be enormous.
>>>
>>>How much of *your* money are you willing to spend? Because that's what
>>>will fund it.
>>
>> Better funding American space programs than leasing others!
>
>You're still avoiding that simple question....

I am not "avoiding" anything Jim.

I point blank said earlier that I didn't have all the answers.

I just know that we are NOT doing ANYthing to move the program forward
today.

>> The recent deployments only bear that out.
>>
>They prove the technology is no damn good. It's a spectrum polluter. It's
>just
>plain stupid.

They proved that THIS method is a spectrum polluter. Can there NEVER be a
development that might work?

73

Steve, K4YZ

5539. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 09:39:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629053938.12238.00000906@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93653

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/28/2004 5:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406281451.43cf693f@posting.google.com>

>Why he aways want be with your wife, my wife???
>
>I no like that. I wish he just mind his own wife. No bother other
>people wifes. He not right in head.

Why can you not speak like an adult? (Don't sweat it...that was a
rhetorical question)

I think I hit a nerve. I wouldn't want MY wife knowing how I acted in
public if I were either of you two.

>> Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals
>> awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.
>
>He yell and yell. Too much noise. Youssa be funny. Jus hedake now.

Why can you not speak like an adult? (Don't sweat it...that was a
rhetorical question too)

Rest deleted. Usual nothing to say.

Steve, K4YZ

5540. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 09:42:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629054259.12238.00000907@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93654

>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/28/2004 1:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040628142004.07518.00000380@mb-m26.aol.com>

>> Sure is a shame to see a person of Lennie's alleged education and
>>"experience" lowering himself to neonate babble.
>
> "Neonate?" That be noun, mean newborn infant. Newborn not
> have Internet access. Motor control for hands not yet complete,
> no typing ability. FCC license newborn as ham op? Not think
> so but maybe. Alla olde-tyme hammes think age not barrier to
> ham license.

And your present childish babble is like that of a one month old...

Not that it's much different from what usually transpires.

Of course it's ALL you presently have to offer, especially when one
remembers it follows on the heels of your now infamous "I am only here to
civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

Sheeeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

5541. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 09:51:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629055155.12238.00000909@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 93655

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/28/2004 5:54 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040628185404.19885.00000539@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started
>>slipping.
>>>> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>>>
>>>Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary
>>investment
>>>in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not
>small
>>>efficient ones.
>>
>> My point exactly, Jim.
>>
>> We need to move the technology of our space program out of the 70/80's.
>
>
> Why?
>
> Is science and exploration market-driven? I think not.
>
> [Docktor Weiner von Brawn personality of nursie acting up...]

Lots of baby-babble deleted.

> Brits at Mars first, fail in landing. Unknown reason.

No, the Brits were not first on Mars.

> Yanks next with bouncy balloon lander idea. Works. Both times.

Yes, it did.

But we had already soft-landed on Mars quite a while ago, Sir Putzy. And not with the "bouncy bloon lander idea".

And you're STILL a putz. Now you're just a baby-babbling putz. I don't know which was worse.

I'd ask you to contribute something meaningful, but I know it will just be so laced with your ususal "I've got to show them I AM the superior intellect" spitefulness that anything you DO manage to say will be lost in the hate and the baby-babble.

Steve, K4YZ

5542. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 10:52:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406290252.59dc86c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93656

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major foulups.
> >
> > Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > 1B EPA
>
> It was pleasant days and a chilly night

Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
alternative though.

> for the Marshall County WV ARES
> bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
> Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
> the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
> 950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
> Hawaii.

This year was a sort of "shakedown cruise" for us'ns. Unfamiliar
little FT-847 xcvr (MP? Not!), untried antennas, untried team, etc. so
we just sorta dabbled at it for the jollies and educations. We were on
the air for only 10-11 hours out of the 24 but still managed to garner
over S&P 400 Qs. And that included some SSB ops too by golly.

Most memorable scene:

Late Sunday morning I'm milking 40 ssb at a great rate. Handed the mic
and chair to Jim. I wish I'd taken a photo of the look on his face.
But he sallied forth and kept the rate going. Yes he did. I asked him
when it was that he last operatd phone in a contest. "Six meters AM
days
. . . "

Worked KP4, KP2 and that ZF1 9A station. That one was a bit of a jolt.
They must have had a real blast.

Figger a demonstrated 40 per hour station potential here and we gwan
go after you guys for *serious* next year so heads up Heil.

Did anybody around here work Burke?

>
> W8CAL - 5A WV
>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

5543. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 12:18:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406290418.5654f22b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93657

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628142008.07518.00000383@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0406272258.25ac5b75@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
> >news:<1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >> He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
> >> from me.
>
> >> Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.
>
> >> He noisy. He yell and yell.
>
> >> Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.
>
> >> Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.
>
> >> No badge as boy. Must compensate now.
> >
> > I re-extend my offer to use my professional contacts to help you,
> >Brain. It always looks better on your record to appear as having been
> >aware you ahve a problem and taking steps to fix it, than to be
> >involuntarilly commited in order to force the issue.
>
> Ooooooooo! Return of the Psi Corps! Mind Police!
>
> Chief of Stuff have "contacts?" Think contacts corroded...that not
> Law of Ohm.
>
> Nursie make Threat! Ooooooo. Commit all not think like nursie.
>
> Nursie not crazy. All not think like nursie crazy.
>
> Nursieland is certainly NOT like reality where all others live.
>
> Temper fry...
>
> LHA / WMD

He malajust to werld. No like Charlie Chan, no like Docter Soos.
Think Horton hear a Who lying allatime. Not like boy who cry woof.

So he yell and yell. So what. Like boy who cry woof, nobody hear him
ennymore.

Mebbe he think he Lorax?

> >
> > I can make that happen for you, Brain. Shall I make the
> >call....?!?!?

He so funny sometime. Now not time.

5544. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 12:34:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629083415.29831.00000792@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 93658

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/29/2004 7:18 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406290418.5654f22b@posting.google.com>

>He malajust to werld. No like Charlie Chan, no like Docter Soos.
>Think Horton hear a Who lying allatime. Not like boy who cry woof.

Hmmmmmmmm.

An allegedly adult man who likes to babble-talk with another allegedly
adult engineer professional...

And he insinuates that others are "maladjusted".

Of course it's the same allegedly adult male who repeatedly makes
assertions that he's done thngs, yet can't/won't prove them. Even lies about
them on his QRZ profile.

>So he yell and yell. So what. Like boy who cry woof, nobody hear him
>ennymore.

I guess you have a hearing problem, Brain.

No one here's yelling. Laughing a lot, but certainly not yelling.

>Mebbe he think he Lorax?
>
>> >
>> > I can make that happen for you, Brain. Shall I make the
>> >call....?!?!?
>
>He so funny sometime. Now not time.

No one is trying to be funny. At least not me.

Shall I include these posts to Mrs. Brain, Brain? Or does she already
KNOW just what kind of an idiot you are?

Steve, K4YZ

5545. Re: Echo

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 14:06:55 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <3IeEc.794$yy1.354@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"DC" <drewcarey@godmail.com> wrote in
news:d8563d8243a964569cdb07ab0df23a7f@news.teranews.com:

> Did Echo launch today?

From: VEFRH@aol.com
Subject: [amsat-bb] President's Message - Special Edition -
To: amsat-bb@AMSAT.Org, bod@AMSAT.Org, Advisors@AMSAT.Org,

1 - ECHO
It is with very great pleasure that I acknowledge the ANS news release
concerning the successful launch of ECHO and the other related satellites
from Baikonur this morning.
This achievement is due to many individuals around the world, who have
helped in the design, building, integration, testing and launching of
this satellite. Also the members of AMSATs in many countries who have
helped us by funding this "Electronic Adventure".
Without your financial support the satellite could not have been
completed, and would never have been launched, Give yourselves a "pat on
the back" for a job well done. Lee McLamb, KU4OS, Senior Editor of the
AMSAT News Service will be issuing up dated bulletins over the next few
days to advise you on the progress being made during commissioning.
At the proper time, when sufficient data has been confirmed, Past
President Bill Tynan will issue a bulletin giving the AO-XX designation,
updated Keplerian Elements will be issued as soon as they are received.
MEANWHILE please DO NOT Transmit to the satellite - commissioning must
take priority. A bulletin will be released when the satellite is open
for general use.

From Amsat-BB

5546. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 14:38:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E17EEA.3010603@psu.edu>
Source record: 93660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Chris,
>
> You are the one who is displaying ignorance. There are constant holes and
> security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as
> well. Apple is probably the only one with little or no viruses being
> written to attack it as it has a small presence. Unix (Linux) has holes.
> As far as browsers, Netscape, Opera, you name it, have security flaws. The
> reason O.E. is mentioned so much as it has a large following and is,
> therefore, an ideal target for worm/virus writers.

The so called integration that IE and Outlook have with the operating system makes for more security flaws than other systems. All the bad guys have to have is access to the machine - Internet Explorer - then access to the OS - that integration, through either a door put in there purposely or inadvertently, and there you have it. It isn't a good system security wise. And we should demand more. The typical PC user apparently doesn't have very high expectations.

Other systems have the occasional flaw, just not so darn many of them.

BUT!

The real disservice that computer geeks have foisted on the world is the idea of "one platform, one OS".

The PC world is going to treat us to the computer equivalent of the Irish Potato Famine one of these days. We are inbred, we are monoculture. We all have the same vulnerabilities.

What we need is machines that are enough different that what takes one out does not take all the others out. We also need operators that are not so far into the woods that they can't see the trees.

> *Everyone* needs good antivirus software (updated *daily*) on their system
> as well as a good firewall (also updated).

I need that on my PC's. My Mac doesn't.

> Everyone also needs a good
> anti-spyware running on their system - and it is also a good idea to have
> one that runs in background and blocks incoming spyware off the internet as
> you browse.

I need that on my PC's for sure.

> I'm seeing quite a bit of blocking from Yahoo Groups (attempted
> incoming spyware).

Oh yes. It is amazing the source of some of the spyware.

> Last, but most to the point of your post, everyone should be checking daily
> (whether automatically or manually) for updates to their operating system
> and browser. These are constantly brought out and if you bother to check
> (why don't I think you are well informed?), you will find patches coming out
> almost constantly for many different browsers and operating systems.

Here is another problem though. These updates not only protect your computer by patching security holes, they sometimes protect your computer by causing it to cease operating. (a computer that doesn't work catches no virii) On my PC, I will usually wait a few days in order to hear what problems the "updates" are causing.

> If you don't do this, you will eventually get bit regardless of what
> operating system you use.

I get bit regardless. My Norton's finds a virus here and there despite my running a proxy server, 2 firewalls, and updating the virus def's all the time.

I use both PC's and Macs extensively, so I feel I can comment knowledgeably. Using a PC is getting to be operations under siege. What the PC users consider to be normal operations is not what normal operations should be. Meanwhile, I just use my Mac and do the work I need to do without all the fuss and muss. (p.s. - you should see all the cool ham radio software that is out for OSX!)

And my final note is that you have done just what the original poster noted in his post. (albeit his more crudely) That is to blame it on the user. That doesn't flush. Don't blame the victim. We can't expect all users to be IT professionals or even highly competent.

If the manufacturers produce software that has gaping security flaws, it is their fault, not mine.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5547. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:05:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18530.8060903@psu.edu>
Source record: 93661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:
> "Dr. Anton T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@dev.null> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1b491f2f5484c2ba989749@192.168.42.131...
>
>>In article <3dcoesux234d1b6e.991075257@alvillage.net>, johnson38
>>@nospam.alvillage.net says...
>>
>><snippety>
>>
>>>So I just want to say "fuck you!" to the ignorant IE and OE users who
>>>defend their use of that hole-ridden, abominable software beyond
>>>reason. YOU are one of the major problems with today's Internet.
>>
>>So... Instead of wasting energy cussing at 'them,' why not HELP
>>someone, in a nice way, to migrate AWAY from IE and into something like
>>Opera or Firefox?
>>
>>Oh, I forgot... It's easier and quicker to simply swear at someone
>>than it is to do something constructive.
>>
>>
>>--
>>Dr. Anton T. Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute.
>>(Known to some as Bruce Lane, ARS KC7GR,
>>kyrrin (a/t) bluefeathertech[d=o=t]calm -- www.bluefeathertech.com
>>"If Salvador Dali had owned a computer, would it have been equipped
>>with surreal ports?"
>
>
> Yes. Opera. Foxfire. I think I just got an alert last week that Foxfire
> has been found to have a security hole for which there is no known fix (as
> of yet). Opera? It has holes. You can subscribe to these government
> alerts and see for yourself.
>
> BTW, we point fingers at browsers .... uh ... do you know that Real Player
> has problems? Didn't think so. How about file sharing programs? Hehehe
> HAR DE HAR HAR.

You use Real Player? Just using it is a security issue.

> The list is virtually endless. Various instant messaging programs. Some
> stuff that you wouldn't think could even cause a security problem.

Instant messaging services is a leading source of spyware. Don't use it.

> I fixed a PC a few weeks ago. Some alleged tech "fixed" the computer.
> Returned it sans anti-virus and firewall. Also didn't do updates. It got
> hijacked. It took me quite a bit of effort which included removing spyware,
> getting a firewall in place, anti-virus in place, and an on-line scan to
> remove the last pieces of that nasty thing. I had even been locked out of
> regedit! Finally, everything was working except I couldn't get the home
> page back. Since I could get into regedit by this time, I simply edited the
> registry and it is finally working fine. The problem, in this case, wasn't
> with Microsoft or the users. It was a lazy tech that didn't want to do the
> whole job.

Blaming the victim again, Jim. Like blaming a sexual assault victim
because she was pretty and dressed nice.

You seem to accept the flaws as inevitable and a normal part of
operating. you would never accept a car that has as many flaws as a
typical PC OS.

Browsers and mail readers should never never ever be integrated with
OS's. Ports should be inaccessible unless you tell it to be accessible.
Address books should be encrypted (although there is a chicken and egg
thing going on in that case) The list goes on and on.

Demand competent software!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5548. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:06:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18583.90905@psu.edu>
Source record: 93662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Brenda Ann Dyer wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:yxMDc.202$xy3.186@news01.roc.ny...
>
>>Chris,
>>
>>You are the one who is displaying ignorance. There are constant holes and
>>security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as
>>well. Apple is probably the only one with little or no viruses being
>>written to attack it as it has a small presence. Unix (Linux) has holes.
>>As far as browsers, Netscape, Opera, you name it, have security flaws.
>
> The
>
>>reason O.E. is mentioned so much as it has a large following and is,
>>therefore, an ideal target for worm/virus writers.
>>
>>*Everyone* needs good antivirus software (updated *daily*) on their system
>>as well as a good firewall (also updated). Everyone also needs a good
>>anti-spyware running on their system - and it is also a good idea to have
>>one that runs in background and blocks incoming spyware off the internet
>
> as
>
>>you browse. I'm seeing quite a bit of blocking from Yahoo Groups
>
> (attempted
>
>>incoming spyware).
>>
>>Last, but most to the point of your post, everyone should be checking
>
> daily
>
>>(whether automatically or manually) for updates to their operating system
>>and browser. These are constantly brought out and if you bother to check
>>(why don't I think you are well informed?), you will find patches coming
>
> out
>
>>almost constantly for many different browsers and operating systems.
>>
>>If you don't do this, you will eventually get bit regardless of what

>>operating system you use.
>>
>>
>
>
>
> Three cheers for Mr. Hampton. Spear a few elitists. :) I know for a fact
> that *nix systems are every bit as vulnerable as Windoze systems, since my
> spouse does computer repairs for the US military, and almost everything they
> use is a *nix based system. They have problems with hackers on a regular
> basis, even through their substantial firewalls.
>
> Point being, the only way you can begin to be sure you are protected is to
> have a good firewall and A/V, and keep them running and up to date. The only
> times I have EVER had problems with unauthorized ingress to my system have
> been when both my firewall and A/V have been down (after a hardware failure
> usually)...

Point is, you are willing to accept software that has the problems in
the first place. Demand competently written software.

- mike -

5549. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:15:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18779.7050108@psu.edu>
Source record: 93663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Chris wrote:
> On Mon, 28 Jun 2004 03:47:42 GMT, Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>> Chris,
>>
>> You are the one who is displaying ignorance. There are constant holes and
>> security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as

<snip>

> 99% of all zombied machines were zombied through IE and OE security
> holes - many of them YET TO BE FIXED BY MICROSOFT! And you worry
> about obscure holes elsewhere?

Yup. Blame the victim and shift the argument. The fact is that the Unix machines and the obscure browsers are *not* the machines that fill up my mailbox with virus laden attachments. The infected machines are running the microsoft stuff. Game set match.

And the expectation that all PC users attached to the net should have to become minor IT experts is ludicrous. blaming the victim again.

Demand competently written software!

<rest snipped>

- Mike KB3EIA -

5550. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:16:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E187CA.3050400@psu.edu>
Source record: 93664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Chris" <johnson38@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote
>
>
>
>>Truly, that's a shithead response.
>>
>
>
> For more response, point your non-IE browser to
> http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

He doesn't express himself all that well....

but his basic premise is spot-on!

- mike KB3EIA -

5551. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the smart people listen? Of course not!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:17:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hKfEc.126$436.45@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 93665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hello, Dan

Oh yeah .... I've gotten a lot of pings from colleges. Must be those kids
don't have anything better to do either ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan" <abc@def.ghi> wrote in message
news:n142e0l63eakimpld5b5nl8g2tsgk35phb@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 29 Jun 2004 04:28:59 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
> >Hello, Dan
> >
> >True enough, but the fact is that the problem is the screwball folks that
> >get their jollies writing the darn things in the first place.
> >
> >Yes, I.E. is a major problem - mostly because it is popular and your
> >comparison with cars and trucks makes sense.
>
> The people who get off on seeing their "handiwork" in the news would
> certainly switch to Linux or OS X or whatever we all "switch" to. If
> the numbers were there, these systems would already have this crap.
>
> Windows/IE/OE gets the viruses because Windows/IE/OE has the users.
> It's that simple.
>
> Yet, I don't get *any* of this crap on my Windows systems, and I have
> several. It's all down to common sense. I don't post here with my
> real name and email address (check my headers!), I keep my systems
> up-to-date, and I have a good firewall running. I get scanned,
> pinged, poked and probed all the time, but nothing gets thru.
>
> Dan
>
> Grundig S800, S650, S700, YB400, YB550PE
> Degen DE1102, Kaito KA1102
> Drake R8, Radio Shack DX-440
> E. H. Scott 23 tube Imperial Allwave in Tasman cabinet (1936)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/27/04

5552. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:18:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18828.7080509@psu.edu>
Source record: 93669

Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:
>>Subject: Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?
>>From: "Jim Hampton" aa2qa@frontiernet.net
>>Date: 6/27/2004 10:47 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <yxMDc.202$xy3.186@news01.roc.ny>
>>
>
>>There are constant holes and
>>security problems with not only many browsers, but operating systems as
>>well.
>
>
> I can't help but wonder if Microsoft and the others don't engineer these
> things in, just so they can "come to the rescue" with a patch.
>
> Munchausen's By Proxy Server...?!?!
>
> (ducking ! ! !)

HOWL!!!!! Good one, Steve!

Some holes probably were there on purpose. Not all though. Don't
underestimate poor programming! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5553. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:20:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E188D3.7030106@psu.edu>
Source record: 93667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Groom Lake wrote:
> In Message-ID:<kwYDc.17$6R7.1@news02.roc.ny> posted on Mon, 28 Jun 2004
> 17:25:36 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:
>
>
>>The fact remains that Internet
>>Explorer, Outlook, and Outlook Express are popular, thus the huge number of
>>viruses written for them - not that they are more or less secure than other
>>browsers.
>
>
> That's not entirely correct;
> The fact that they are immensely more insecure, coupled with their
> popularity makes them such an irresistible target of exploitation.

100 percent correct. That OS/Broswer/Mail integration is a doing half
the work for the bad guys.

>>If one keeps a firewall in place, anti-virus in place,
>>anti-spyware in place, updates them daily, and *uses* them properly, one is
>>as protected as one can be.

Love my dual processor G5!!....8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5554. Re: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:21:45 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <dOfEc.39899$OT6.17261121@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 93666

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:PA5Ec.18166$bs4.3401@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I'm getting out of Ham Radio, so selling my radio equipment. Everything
must
> go!
>
> Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More
>
> URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706980318
>
>
> If you don't like that one, a second, identical, Yaesu is available at...
>
> Title: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver+More
>
> URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5707014692
>
>
> All auctions end Sunday, July 4th, 2004.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
> By the way, while you're looking, you may want to check out the Kenwood
base
> station:
>
> Title: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver w/More
>
> URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706982695
>

Dwight, you and I have had our differences, but I'd hate to see Amateur Radio lose you. Hope you'll reconsider.

That said, how is the VX-7R? I am going on vacation late July and have a few friends that want to keep me company during the drive. (Their QTH's are right along my route.) So I am in the market for another handheld since my Alinco DJ-V5TH didn't seem to make the move to our new QTH intact. <hihi>

Stay safe and have a great summer.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

5555. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:22:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18942.8050008@psu.edu>
Source record: 93668
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey wrote:
> Chris wrote a troll.
>
> I use Nutscrape myself..... :-)
>
>

I use it on my PC's for Browser, mail and newsgroups. A good choice for some better security.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5556. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:23:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cQfEc.4960$lh4.1029@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93670
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote

>
> Yepper the bum society rears its head again ..... over 400k words in
the
> English language, or so I 've heard, and the universal sentence
enhancer is
> always to be found .... pity ...
>

Tom,

I think it's just become fashionable to be a self-righteous bitcher
against "Them"!

Here in reality computing has advanced light years in just a couple of
decades. My first computer (a Heath H89) had an amazing 48KB of RAM
which I upgraded all the way to 64K for the princely sum of $129, dual
boot (HDOS or CPM), a single floppy drive, no hard drive, no CD drive,
no DVC drive and an upgrade to a 12" amber screen (none of those
primitive green CRT's for me!). Processor (Zilog Z80) speed was
measured in KHz. Total price for the whole thing was just under $2,500.
Software was scarce and expensive, and web crawlers, usenet, and email
were Buck Rogers stuff. Not available to me at home, but
forward-looking companies were willing to pay $2,500/mo for 9.6KHz DDS
connectivity!

My current 'hobby' computer came with a measly 512MB of RAM which I
upgraded to 1GB for $92. It still has only one floppy drive, but 120GB
hard drive, a DVD (r/w) drive, a CD (r/w) drive. Processor speed is
2.5GHz, I have fulltime broadband connectivity to the world-wide-web for
under $50/mo, and more choices of reasonably priced software than I can
count. All thanks to those assholes at Microsoft and Intel. Ain't it
just awful?

73, de Hans, K0HB

5557. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the smart people listen? Of course not!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:30:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E18B26.5040105@psu.edu>
Source record: 93671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan wrote:
> On Mon, 28 Jun 2004 17:25:36 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>
>>If everyone changed to Linux, you can bet the virus and worm writers would
>>be writing most of the stuff for Unix systems.
>
>
> Indeed. This whole notion of "everyone should switch so all of these
> problems go away" is naieve at best, plain stupid at worst.

1. Who said that?

2. Can you let us know specifically what the Linux flaws are, and how
they compare numerically and in severity with the integrated systems in
the Microsoft applications?

Their integration with the OS is one of those concepts that sound good,
but unless you have incredibly competent software writing, will be a
constant source of security problems.

> It's like looking at stats for fuel usage of passenger cars and
> trucks, noting that cars make up most of the usage of gas, and trucks
> use a small percentage, then saying "Gee, we should all start driving
> trucks to save gas"!

But aren't you doing the same thing by telling us that Linux and other
systems have as many flaws as the Microsoft systems?

> Hell-o!

Yo, wassup?

- mike KB3EIA -

5558. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:48:13 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <1bgEc.13820$DT5.7457@nwrddc03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 93672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Coslo wrote:
>> Last, but most to the point of your post, everyone should be checking
>> daily
>> (whether automatically or manually) for updates to their operating system
>> and browser...

.... and herein lies another problem: Microsoft
won't keep any of the old updates available. I had to reload
Windows 98 (you can KEEP XP) and now I find
that almost none of the older "security upgrades" are available.
Or at least, I can't find them. Not only that, but this stupid OS
is probably telling the database I still have the upgrades
when I don't. This seriously sucks. Or I may just not know
how to go about it. That's certainly possible.

5559. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 15:59:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290759.17c3d74a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93673

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406290252.59dc86c@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>...
> > N2EY wrote:
>
> Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
> alternative though.

roger roger!!
>
> > for the Marshall County WV ARES
> > bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
> > Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
> > the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
> > 950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
> > Hawaii.
>
> This year was a sort of "shakedown cruise" for us'ns. Unfamiliar
> little FT-847 xcvr (MP? Not!), untried antennas, untried team, etc. so
> we just sorta dabbled at it for the jollies and educations. We were on
> the air for only 10-11 hours out of the 24 but still managed to garner
> over S&P 400 Qs. And that included some SSB ops too by golly.

Iron Man style. No computer, not even a memory keyer. Paper
log'n'dupe.
>
> Most memorable scene:
>
> Late Sunday morning I'm milking 40 ssb at a great rate. Handed the mic
> and chair to Jim. I wish I'd taken a photo of the look on his face.
> But he sallied forth and kept the rate going. Yes he did.

Points is points, and I knew it was a setup anyway when I saw the
camera.

> I asked him
> when it was that he last operatd phone in a contest. "Six meters AM
> days . . . "

Ya misunderstood - I meant "last time on Field Day". Which was 6 meter
AM - 1968 or thereabouts. Ol' Lafayette HA-460 and five elements at 50
feet at WA3CCP. Bacton Hill, PA - not far from where we were,
actually.

I've done 'phone SS since then.

And ya saw my SSB rate....

> Worked KP4, KP2 and that ZF1 9A station. That one was a bit of a jolt.
> They must have had a real blast.

Some serious setups out there. Saw a report of 1093 CW QSOs *just on
40 meters* by one of the 3A groups. K2/100 and a dipole IIRC. Yeah, we
worked 'em.

Didja like my QSK/CQ trick?
>
> Figger a demonstrated 40 per hour station potential here and we gwan
> go after you guys for *serious* next year so heads up Heil.

lessee...computer, some minor antenna work, a few odds'n'ends.....
>
> Did anybody around here work Burke?
>
Burke who?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> w3rv

1B EPA

that call just rolls off the bug and cuts through the Donald Duck
noises like a knife...

5560. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 16:20:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290820.76769ed9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93674

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<40E0D86E.45344142@earthlink.net>...
>
> Same rig/antenna as the last two years from here on the hill--FT-1000MP
> "Field and Stream", Johnson Matchbox and 200 foot skywire fed with open
> wire. It seems I'm never the guy to work you on FD. N8NN was the op
> you worked.

You would have recognized our call.
>
> My math skills are showing in the comments above. Score should read
> "2.6 to 2.7 k points".

do the math again! I've done better than that single-handed.
>
> We were one of those stations which should not have been running 5A. In
> the middle of the night, we had only two stations running. We would have
> been better candidates for 3A.

Been there, done that! Also had the situation where 2-3 ops in the CW
tent made more points for a 4A + GOTA station than all the rest of the
effort combined.
>
> Members of a local Boy Scout troop visited and were given an overview of
> amateur radio by the county EC. They then visited all of the stations
> in operation. They spent the most time and showed the most interest at
> the CW tent.

That's typical. Did you see my post where the middle-school teacher
recounted how young people today react to Morse when properly
presented? I'll repost it if you like.

> The ancient mode users had the only station doing computer
> logging (TR).
>
Which ancient mode you talking about? Reginald A. Fessenden was on AM
in 1900 and later, and working 2 way transatlantic AM by 1906. AT&T
hsd SSB was on LF for the transatlantic telephone by 1927, and hams
were on HF SSB by the early 1930s.

> The old ops using the old mode were responsible for about 2000 of the
> points and that from a single station.

If all the rigs ran low power and you made 950 CW QSOs, that's 3800
points right there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5561. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 16:33:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290833.6ebe38d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93675

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >
> >> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started slipping.
> >> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
> >
> >Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary investment
> >in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not small
> >efficient ones.
>
> My point exactly, Jim.

Exactly. The USA should lead the world in surface transportation
research and development, not be playing catch-up all the time.

Ford is coming out with hybrid cars that get very good gas mileage -
almost as good as my old diesel Rabbit. They're buying the technology
from Toyota.

> We need to move the technology of our space program out of the 70/80's.

That's being done every day.

> If we continue to set our sights on LEO, that's all we'll ever do, save for
> the
> occassional cutsie-robot pushing sand around and drilling a whopping 6 inches
> into the soil. THERE was a waste of money.

How can you say that? It proved out a bunch of new technologies and
gathered lots of data. And did it on schedule and within budget. If
any part of the space program leads to earth-bound advances in
technology, the Mars rover missions do.

> They didn't accomplish anything
> that on-orbit RADAR and spectral imaging couldn't accomplish.

I disagree!

Can orbital radar and imaging resolve features as small as the rovers can? Can they do the kind of analysis and sampling? Can they even do things like report surface temperature, wind, dust, etc.?

If people are ever to go to Mars, we need lots of data on what the Martian surface is really like. The Moon is easier in some ways - no wind, no dust blown by the wind, no frigid night atmosphere to cool things down.

> But it looked cute on CNN.

More than cute. It did the job.

Note also that Mars has been a graveyard of failed missions. Yes, there were spectacular successes from Mariner IV to Viking to the rovers, but also many that were simply lost. Given the failure rate, a Mars trip with people is simply too risky right now. And remember that a mission with people has to come back!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5562. Re: Field Day Plans?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 16:51:27 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290851.7c0701d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93676

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <NOSPAMkc8pmx@NOSPAMcharter.net> wrote in message
news:<10e1t1etbq0dl54@corp.supernews.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO> wrote in message
> news:20040628061418.02583.00000461@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <bMSdneaKd_f8CULdRVn_iw@adelphia.com>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> > But you guys have training sessions, right?
>
> Twice a month as required by law, and also sometimes more than that.

Well, there you go. For a lot of hams, Field Day is their only and/or
first training.

> > You can't simulate all of them by any means, but FD simulates some of
> >them.
>
> I wasn't saying that we can simulate all but I do think we should be
> simulating in more realistic locations. That is provided that we can get
> permission to set up there, as it is not actually during an emergency.

The question is, what constitutes a "realistic" location? Depending on
the type of emergency, all sorts of sites are realistic.

For example, look at the search for shuttle parts. People were spread
out over a large area, and needed communications over relatively short
paths but in many directions - in rural areas, mostly.

One of the biggest challenges of FD has become finding a site.
Consider what we want to do:

- Make noise all night long

- Put wires and tubing high in the air during a time of year when
thunderstorms are common

- Pound things into the ground, set up tents, cook food, etc.

- Be away from noise generators like power lines.

Plus there's the whole liability question...

> > Here's a scenario for ya:
> >
> > Months in advance, everyone who wants to participate is required to fill
> > out a
> > form listing what equipment, time, and skills they can volunteer for FD.

> > Everyone is responsible for keeping their FD forms updated of changes
> > (equipment /schedule changes, license upgrades, etc.)
> >
> > The forms are collected and the FD committee of no more than 3 people puts
> > together a Field Day master plan.
> >
> > 48-72 hours before FD, everyone who is signed up gets their "sealed
> orders"
> > which detail where they are to go, what they are expected to bring with
> them
> > and what they are expected to do for FD. It could be as simple as "show up
> at X
> > on or before time T and operate station S" or as complex as "head the team
> > running station S, bring a this list of equipment..."
> >
> > Included could be things bringing like foul-weather gear even though the
> > forecast is perfect. You don't have to wear it but you have to have it
> with
> > you. Could also simulate equipment breakdowns and unavailability -
> although
> > that sort of thing often happens anyway.
> >
> > Except for the FD committee, nobody knows what they're going to be doing
> until
> > shortly before FD. To more realistically simulate, some very good
> resources
> > (rigs, antennas, generators, etc.) might be left completely unused while
> less
> > than perfect substitutes are pressed into service.
> >
> > You'd probably love a Field Day like that, Ryan. Would be a great learning
> > experience for all. But I can guarantee you that more than half (probably
> more
> > than 3/4) of the FD regulars in your club would walk away if the club
> tried
> > such a plan cold turkey.
>
> Actually, with a little bit of fine tuning, I believe that would be even
> better than my idea.

Thanks!

> My idea was that we WILL know which weekend, but the
> location won't be announced till either that morning OR the night before,
> and we have to adapt.

That's in my idea too. The date would be about the only thing known in
advance outside of the planning committee.

> And that location being decided (where possible) by
> the county EC/RO. Actually in our specific case, we hold a regular net on

> Thursdays, so that would be the best I would imagine......

There ya go. And the committee could toss in all sorts of surprises: Somebody brings a nice new rig, makes 100 contacts, and then a committee person suddenly slaps a red post-it on the thing. Which means it's busted and cannot be used for X hours. Team has to improvise another rig and get back on the air ASAP.

Or maybe the announcement is made on Thursday night that *all* antennas have to be homebrewed at the site, starting no earlier than 24 hours before FD. Bring all the coax, wire, rope, connectors, line, insulators, tubing and PVC you want, but everything in the antennas has to be built from-scratch.

As I said before, if you drop something like this on most people cold-turkey they'll rebel or simply vote with their feet. But if they're brought to it gradually...

73 de Jim, N2EY

5563. BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 16:55:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93677

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1

Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5564. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 17:24:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406290924.5d8d5c8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93678

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040629053444.12238.00000905@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
> >From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
> >Date: 6/28/2004 7:47 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <20040628204721.07368.00000335@mb-m24.aol.com>
> >
> >In article <20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> >(Steve
> >Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> And tommorow an orbiter scanning FOR "X" shows up, Jim...

What is X that we need so bad that it would be worth mining the moon?

>(The F22's been in the works for a decade already and is just
> now about readu to start manufacture).

And it has cost how much? Each copy will cost how much? And it can't
even get to orbit...

> What do we not already know about fuel line connections that we don't
> already know? What other magic is there to getting a fuel from one tank into
> another? The Russians were doing it for over a decade with MIR.

With rocket fuel? Some of them are cryogenic, others highly corrosive.
And you're talking about a system that would be retrofit to the
shuttle.

Anything is easy for the person who doesn't have to do the work.

(like getting an Extra license out of the box, I suppose).

> That was the best way to go THEN.

Sure. And the shuttle's cost, complexity and failures have shown that
it may still be the way.

I recall that when the shuttle was being proposed and developed it was
supposed to be a "space truck" that would be *less expensive* than
one-time rockets, and would be *cost competitive* for putting unmanned
satellites up. Hasn't happened - the Ariane is the price leader for
that job.
>
> >Yep. But you need at least one new technology, and at least two
> >carefully-timed
> >launches. Can be done but it's harder and more costly.

>
> We know exactly where the moon's going to be for the next 2000 years. We
> can, with a handheld science calculator, do almost the same thing for earth
> launches. It >>IS<< "rocket science", but one that's been thoroughly
> developed and proven.

I didn't say it couldn't be done. I said it's harder and more costly.

"Engineering is doing for a shilling what any fool can do for a
pound."
>
> It's a wheel that doesn't require re-invention.

You could say that about the Saturn V approach.
>
> >The political ramifications of a military (USAF) lunar mission would be a big
> >problem.
>
> How many civilians have walked on the moon, Jim?

What did it say on the side of the LM, Steve? "NASA", not "USAF".

And remember the words on the plaque:

"We came in peace, for all mankind"

Not as warriors. Not just for the USA. "In peace, for all mankind"

> >You're changing the boundary conditions, Steve. And you ignore basic physics.
>
> I am not ignoring any physics, Jim.

Yes, you are.
>
> >Right - after decades of continuous development and upgrades, the range has
> >been increased. And by eliminating features and making seats smaller, more
> >people have been crammed aboard.
>
> Yes, seats can be made smaller...
>
> But the aircraft is 40% larger today than it was in 1969.

Sure - it's undergone 35 years of continuous development and
improvement, funded not by government but (mostly) by civilian sales
to airlines.
>
> >Better engines are one big reason. Those engines weren't a result of the
> >space
> >or military programs. They were the result of companies like GE working to
> >sell
> >civilian aircraft engines. If they could show enough fuel saving with a new
> >design, the airlines would buy the new engines.
>

> Hmmmmmmm....
>
> "...compnies like GE..."

Yep.
>
> Now..I WONDER who it was that made (or were major contractors on) the
> engines that presently put the shuttle in orbit, as well as about every other
> rocket or aeronautical project since the 30's...?!?!

The shuttle doesn't have any jet engines.
>
> Ya think they learned anything in the process...?!?! I certainly do.

I think they learned how to make better jet engines by making jet
engines, not by making rocket engines.

Which do you think would be the most effective way to learn how to
make a better ham rig - by building stereos or by building ham rigs?

> >>And that's only from actually building the things...The engineering
> >>could
> >>be done now in CAD with a minimum of expense.
> >
> >Not true. CADD helps but you still need to build the thing.
>
> Eventually, but not like we used to.
>
> The F-22 and the Boeing 777 were both aircraft that were CAD'd right into
> a first flying prototype.

I know a bit about CADD, Steve. It's a great tool - I have over 21
years experience with it. But it does not do the thinking and creating
for you.

> >You're forgetting the physics again.
>
> No. I'm not.
>
> I know it takes a lot of fuel to get on-orbit.
>
> I know it takes even more to get that magical 17,500+MPH to break orbit.

It also takes fuel to slow them down once they get there.
>
> And I know it costs money to get them there.

How much of your own are you willing to pony up?

> As for your repeated reminders about "physics", Jim, I'll point out that
> ALL of the deep space flights were NOT launched on Saturn 5's...They went up on
> Atlas-Centaurs, Arrianes, ot Titan-3C's.

Sure - one-use rockets. And they were relatively small packages that
were not coming back. Many of them spend *years* in transit because of
the limited rocket power that launched them.
>
> >> No, I don't have "the numbers"...But I know we (yes, Lennie...The
> "Royal
> >>We") can do it if we wanted to.
> >
> >Only if the resources are allocated. Which means $$ out of everyone's
> >pockets.
> >
> >>>> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?
> >>>
> >>>Do you know what a Lagrange point is?
> >>
> >> Sure I do.
> >
> >Then you should know that you can't "park" ships along the way to the moon.
>
> No, but you CAN park them in Earth orbit or you can park them in lunar
> orbit.

Sure - but you said "park them along the way".
>
> >>>The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
> >>>a supply container there?
> >>
> >> The same way we got RANGER, "Lunar Orbiter", Apollo and who knows how
> >>manyn other lunar exploration packages there.
> >
> >Big one-use rockets.
>
> Atlas was a "big one-use rocket"...?!?!

You ever see one reused after it boosted something to orbit?

How much can an Atlas get to LEO, anyway? How much could it get to the
moon?
>
> >Anybody who was in their 30s when Apollo was active is now retirement age. Or
> >dead.
>
> What?
>
> NASA didn't keep any archives? These guys "learned" all that stuff then
> kept it to themselves?

A lot of stuff gets thrown out over time, or given away to museums.
And merely having a set of plans doesn't mean you know how to make
something, or use it.
> >
> >Only because the money is imported from elsewhere.

>
> Uh huh.
>
> And why is that money "imported" fro "elsewhere", Jim?

Taxes. The government takes money from everyone and sends it to
certain places.
>
> >>>You're the one complaining about getting ripped off every April 15.
> >
> >How much of *your* money...
>
> Of "MY" money, we just spent over $100B invading another country that was
> of dubious danger to us (certainly less than the old USSR was at one time),
> and will continue to spend billions on for another decade.

Exactly. Yet we were told it had to be done by the same leader who
says BPL is needed and we need to go to Mars.

>Now...If that $100B were allocated to a new lunar colony
project...?!?!

How much did Apollo cost in 2004 dollars?
>
> >1) We describe the problem to be solved. Example: Energy independence. We
> >define what it means and what has to change.
> >
> >2) We gather pertinent data. Look at how much is being imported, where it
> >comes
> >from, how it is used, and how it could be reduced or replaced.
> >
> >3) We set up adequately funded and properly run programs to make it happen.

> >Won't happen overnight but it can be done.
>
> Sure it can be done.
>
> It COULD have been done 30+ years ago but "we" were too cheap to open our
> wallets then to avoid the costs today.

BINGO!

And it wasn't just "cheap". It was a lack of long-term commitment. For
example, reducing oil consumption by 50% in 2 years would cause major
problems. But if we'd done just 2% a year starting 30 years ago....

Recall that the president who tried to make progress in the area ("the
moral equivalent of war") was not reelected.
>
> Well...today is here, and now it's going to be a quantum more expensive to
> do the things we need to do, but STILL haven't done.
>
> Again...it's the wallet problem...not the space problem that keeps us from

> these things.

I say it's the long-term commitment problem.
>
> >Then create the impetus. How about tax credits for installing energy-saving
> >hardware? We had that under Carter - and Reagan tossed it away.
>
> But wait, Jim!
>
> Weren't you the same one decrying that certain persons get tax breaks that
> you and I don't get...?!?!

Not me.

And almost everyone could get those energy tax breaks - back before
Reagan "got the government off our backs" by throwing them away.

> Aren't those "tax credits" that encourage the Forbes 500 folks to USE those
> billions to keep industry going...?!?!

Not to solve basic problems.

And if they're OK for the Forbes 500, why not for me?
>
> What we HAD under Carter were stifling inflation.

Not because of anything he did.
>
> Science and industry MOVED under Reagan. Not a boast on my
> part...archived historical facts.

And the programs were started when?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5565. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the smart people listen? Of course not!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 17:26:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E1A648.8020409@psu.edu>
Source record: 93679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Hello, Dan
>
> True enough, but the fact is that the problem is the screwball folks that
> get their jollies writing the darn things in the first place.

There is that. We just have to quit making their dirty work so easy.

> Yes, I.E. is a major problem - mostly because it is popular and your
> comparison with cars and trucks makes sense.

If IE was a car, you would have to put new lug nuts on it every day because the wheels would fall off otherwise. No one would put up with a vehicle built like PC's are run.

> Meanwhile, back at the ranch, I'm having fits getting my dial-up to work
> properly and still have the DSL.

Hey, I just spent around 30 hours cumulative time working on a laptop computer to get a logging program that the writers insisted would work to work on it. First it said that the .ocx files for the program weren't registered. I went in to manually register them, and one would register but the other wouldn't. So I upgraded the OS, then found out my bios was behind and needed upgraded then I got a VFAT error, and the machine wouldn't respond to anything. In the meantime I'm troubleshooting all the error messages, and being led down blind alleys and getting nowhere. Applying all kinds of updates and "security" patches. Finally, I could get the computer to boot up in safe mode, and verified that the software would run. But the video wouldn't work correctly then. Oops, the VFAT problem comes back.

So I gave up and recovered the original OS on the laptop, and used my home desktop for Field day. Now I have a video problem with the home computer that showed up probably from operating it in the great out-of-doors. My opinion of PC's is oddly poor right now

I love my G5 dual processor. My Macs have never ever given me problems like what PC users seem to take for granted as part of the territory. Upgrades, software installation, it's all good.

A big part of my job is to whip PC's into submission, so I think I can give an informed opinion between the two systems.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

>
> "Dan" <abc@def.ghi> wrote in message
> news:s8i1e0ha83u2i91si7golbfb07mr2bucv9@4ax.com...
>
>>On Mon, 28 Jun 2004 17:25:36 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
>><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>If everyone changed to Linux, you can bet the virus and worm writers
>>
> would
>
>>>be writing most of the stuff for Unix systems.
>>
>>Indeed. This whole notion of "everyone should switch so all of these
>>problems go away" is naieve at best, plain stupid at worst.
>>
>>It's like looking at stats for fuel usage of passenger cars and
>>trucks, noting that cars make up most of the usage of gas, and trucks
>>use a small percentage, then saying "Gee, we should all start driving
>>trucks to save gas"!
>>
>>Hell-o!
>>
>>Dan
>>
>>Grundig S800, S650, S700, YB400, YB550PE
>>Degen DE1102, Kaito KA1102
>>Drake R8, Radio Shack DX-440
>>E. H. Scott 23 tube Imperial Allwave in Tasman cabinet (1936)
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/28/04
>
>

5566. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the smart people listen? Of course not!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 17:32:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E1A792.6060303@psu.edu>
Source record: 93680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan wrote:
> On Tue, 29 Jun 2004 04:28:59 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Hello, Dan
>>
>>True enough, but the fact is that the problem is the screwball folks that
>>get their jollies writing the darn things in the first place.
>>
>>Yes, I.E. is a major problem - mostly because it is popular and your
>>comparison with cars and trucks makes sense.
>
>
> The people who get off on seeing their "handiwork" in the news would
> certainly switch to Linux or OS X or whatever we all "switch" to. If
> the numbers were there, these systems would already have this crap.

So you are stating that Linux has the same number of security flaws as
the triumvirate of IE/Outlook/and whatever Windows OS?

Might want to check that out.

> Windows/IE/OE gets the viruses because Windows/IE/OE has the users.
> It's that simple.

No it isn't.

> Yet, I don't get *any* of this crap on my Windows systems, and I have
> several. It's all down to common sense. I don't post here with my
> real name and email address (check my headers!), I keep my systems
> up-to-date, and I have a good firewall running. I get scanned,
> pinged, poked and probed all the time, but nothing gets thru.

You don't get spam or viruses? Not even the scattershot address stuff?
You should be giving computer security seminars! 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

5567. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 19:47:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <40E1C764.6060109@psu.edu>
Source record: 93681

N2EY wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>
>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.
>
>
> (to send people to the moon)
>
>
>>We barely had the
>>technology to get to the moon in the 70s.
>
>
> Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
> about a decade earlier.
>
>> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
>>happen in the wake of war.
>
>
> Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most". In many cases those
> "jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
> investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
> peacetime. Or they're the result of government programs that are done
> to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.
>
> In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>
>> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>>based on the Apollo program alone.
>
>
> Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.

Ahh, but can you say the same for Tang flavored Teflon?

> No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
> plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
> to be reinvented.

Couldn't build more Saturns, as the tooling is gone, as well as the
supply path.

I wouldn't say reinvented, but it would need to be re-done. I suspect
that a new moon mission would be much much different. I would guess
in-orbit assembly for the propulsion system, possibly the ship.

>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask WHERE
>>in space are you going to spend that money?
>
>
> We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
> here. And address problems long-term.

Well, that leaves the field wide open. Some would have us believe that
we would be better to spend the money feeding the world's poor. Of
course, then you end up with a lot of fat poor people that will continue
eating your food until you run out, then you can starve along with 'em! 8^)

>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>>technical advencement.
>
>
> Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
> those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"

As opposed to the "Don't tax but spend like a drunken sailor" other types?

> Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
> government spending".

> It was in the Nixon/Ford years that the big NASA cutbacks took place.
> Too much money, they said. There was supposed to be an Apollo 18 lunar
> mission - it was cut and the Saturn V for it became a museum piece.
> Literally.

We found out we could make more money selling our hats to each
other.... for a little while anyhoo.

> All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
> marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
> The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
> verifies the reliability analysis.
>
> The reason the USA made the big space commitments was because JFK and
> LBJ (guess what party) pushed for them. They were essentially done to
> compete with the Soviets for the "high ground" of space. Recall that
> practically all of the important early space firsts (first earth
> satellite, first animal in space, first human in space and in orbit,

> first woman in space, first mission to another heavenly body, first
> pictures of the far side of the Moon...) were done by the Soviet
> Union. And most of their early accomplishments were complete surprises
> in the West. The USA played catch-up for years. JFK and LBJ knew that
> if the Rooskies could orbit a man and bring him back safely, doing the
> same with a nuclear weapon would be a piece of cake for them.

I know I'm in my post field day weird move, but I wonder which country
posted the first bowel movement in space?

> Today there is no such need or competition.

Just wait 5 years.

> The cost was staggering but they had the political clout to do it.
> They could sell it to everyone on the national security agenda. And it
> didn't hurt that a lot of the money was spent in states like LBJ's own
> Texas. (Why is the control center for manned flights in Houston when
> the launch facility is in Florida?)
>
> Billions were spent on the space program in the '60s but when
> Americans needed quality fuel-efficient cars in the '70s they had to
> go to Germany and Japan for them.
>
>
>>I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
>>a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.
>
>
> As exciting as that effort is, all of it was done more than 35 years
> ago with the X-15.

But that X-15 took a monumental effort and support structure. That is
the take away I get from the SpaceShipOne effort. By comparison, the
Rutan effort is almost easy. Did you see the pix of the technicians
working on the plane? Jeans, T-Shirts and sneakers, and done in a
workshop, not a humongous facility with cleanrooms and scary nasty
chemicals sitting around. then they push it out of the "garage" hook it
up to the White Knight and off they go.

Despite the goal, I don't see the real lesson as getting to space, but
the way they are doing it.

> And it was done without government funding. So why do we need NASA for
> manned flights at all? Let the private folks do it on a self-funded
> basis.
>
>
>> So why not Mars?
>
>
> Because the cost and risk is simply too much for the benefits. Do you

> have any idea what a mission to Mars would require in terms of how big
> and complex the ship(s) would have to be, how long they'd be gone, and
> how completely on their own they would be?
>
> Mars is orders of magnitude more difficult than the moon. Apollo
> missions were no more than two weeks, Mars missions would be over a
> year long. The Martian surface is in some ways more hostile than the
> lunar surface and the landing physics much more difficult (Martian
> gravity is stronger). Look how many unmanned Mars missions have failed
> completely.
>
> Heck, figure out radio propagation delay to Mars....
>
> What benefits would a manned mission to Mars give that could not be
> had any other way?

Ahh, now we are getting close to what I think you are trying to say. As much as I enjoy the martian rovers, and as excited as I get about their discoveries, and in general, all the wonderful things that we get from the unmanned side of space exploration, if the basic purpose isn't to put people somewhere - I don't support it.

AND, as we see from Hubble, they aren't taking care of the toys we are giving them now.

The Hubble deserves to live out it's full lifetime.

At the end of it's useful life, it should be visited by a shuttle, packed up, and returned to earth to take an honored place in the Smithsonian Air and Space museum. Getting to see THAT would give me goosebumps and get me all excited. And what's more, it helps cement my support for all of this. The people at NASA should be concerned that ubergeeks like me don't support them at this time.

Once upon a time, we built the thing. It was important enough to take the risks and send it into space.

It got there - it had problems. We considered it important enough to go back into space and repair it. That was a technological triumph by the way. It turned that ugly duckling into a a beautiful swan of optical imaging.

We felt it was important enough to send servicing missions to.

Now "we" don't any more. At one time, we were going to retrieve it, but now it is too "dangerous" to even do a maintenance run on it.

My how we have changed. We aren't inspired. We demand that our explorers have the same safety factor as our automobiles. We are now pussies.

If they told me that a servicing or retrieval mission to the shuttle wouldn't take place unless I was on board, I'd be on my way down there

right now.

> And how much all of it would cost?

I think there is a psychological and social cost to *not* do it.

>
>>Why not research stations on the Moon?
>
>
> How much are *you* willing to pay for them in tax dollars? That's
> really the bottom line. People are all for space exploration and such
> until the bills for it show up.
>
>
>>Unless you want
>>to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
>>conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?
>
>
> Simple: The costs outweigh the benefits. There are easier, cheaper,
> faster ways to get the benefits and solve the problems we have on
> earth.

Actually, I don't think there is a way to solve those problems.

> Space and war may help with some things but they are horribly
> inefficient means of progress.
>
> None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do
> so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.

Ahh, but whose balance, Jim? I think that humankind badly NEEDS the sense of exploration and adventure and the frontier effect of space. My price tag of balance is a lot higher than yours, which is in turn a lot higher than a lot of other people's

If we're not their, and it isn't humans there, maybe it's just time to sit down and watch the history channel. We might see a story about us there some day.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5568. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 20:03:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0406291203.28795e88@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93682

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>
> Jim, the first Boeing 747's carried under 300 people about 6K to 7K miles.
> Now almost 40 years later it can carry over 500 in some configurations and
> fly non-stop over 20 hours (London to Sydney...What's that...12K miles?

Without refueling? Are you sure?

http://edition.cnn.com/2004/BUSINESS/06/28/singapore.airline/

10,000 miles in an Airbus A340-500 with Rolls Royce engines

billed as longest airline flight.

What airline flies London to Sydney nonstop?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5569. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 21:03:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629170328.04194.00000783@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93683

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/29/2004 3:03 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406291203.28795e88@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>...
>>
>> Jim, the first Boeing 747's carried under 300 people about 6K to 7K miles.
>> Now almost 40 years later it can carry over 500 in some configurations and
>
>> fly non-stop over 20 hours (London to Sydney...What's that...12K miles?
>
>Without refueling? Are you sure?
>
>http://edition.cnn.com/2004/BUSINESS/06/28/singapore.airline/
>
>10,000 miles in an Airbus A340-500 with Rolls Royce engines
>
>billed as longest airline flight.
>
>What airline flies London to Sydney nonstop?

Note the date...this was news to me.

The London to Sydney flight was on Quantas.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5570. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 21:16:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629171608.04194.00000784@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93684

>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY)
>Date: 6/29/2004 12:24 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <c2356669.0406290924.5d8d5c8d@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message

>> What do we not already know about fuel line connections that we don't
>> already know? What other magic is there to getting a fuel from one tank
>into
>> another? The Russians were doing it for over a decade with MIR.
>
>With rocket fuel? Some of them are cryogenic, others highly corrosive.
>And you're talking about a system that would be retrofit to the
>shuttle.

Yes...That's how they had adequate fuel for the attitude control rockets
to reposition the station.

>Anything is easy for the person who doesn't have to do the work.

I never said it was easy!

>(like getting an Extra license out of the box, I suppose).

Yep!

>> >The political ramifications of a military (USAF) lunar mission would be a
>big
>> >problem.
>>
>> How many civilians have walked on the moon, Jim?
>
>What did it say on the side of the LM, Steve? "NASA", not "USAF".
>
>And remember the words on the plaque:
>
>"We came in peace, for all mankind"
>
>Not as warriors. Not just for the USA. "In peace, for all mankind"

But the crews (with one exception) WERE all warriors. None laess than a
Lieutenant Colonel, as I recall.

>> >You're changing the boundary conditions, Steve. And you ignore basic
>physics.
>>

>> I am not ignoring any physics, Jim.
>
>Yes, you are.

OK...if you say so. But I reiterate the only "physics" being ignored here
are the one's involving the movement of the arm to the wallet.

>> >Right - after decades of continuous development and upgrades, the range
>has
>> >been increased. And by eliminating features and making seats smaller, more
>> >people have been crammed aboard.
>>
>> Yes, seats can be made smaller...
>>
>> But the aircraft is 40% larger today than it was in 1969.
>
>Sure - it's undergone 35 years of continuous development and
>improvement, funded not by government but (mostly) by civilian sales
>to airlines.

The Boeing project was a spin-off of of their entry to what became the C-5
Galaxy.

>> Atlas was a "big one-use rocket"...?!?!
>
>You ever see one reused after it boosted something to orbit?

But you said "big"...

(You've 'set the parameters' on me based on one word, Jim...my turn!)

>> NASA didn't keep any archives? These guys "learned" all that stuff
>then
>> kept it to themselves?
>
>A lot of stuff gets thrown out over time, or given away to museums.
>And merely having a set of plans doesn't mean you know how to make
>something, or use it.

And I bet that a lot of the technical data is still out there that we
wouldn't have to completely re-engineer the wheel again.

>>Now...If that $100B were allocated to a new lunar colony
>project...?!?!
>
>How much did Apollo cost in 2004 dollars?

So we wait and see how much it costs in 2014 dollars? Or 2024 dollars?
Or 2034 dollars?

>> It COULD have been done 30+ years ago but "we" were too cheap to open
>our
>> wallets then to avoid the costs today.
>

>BINGO!
>
>And it wasn't just "cheap". It was a lack of long-term commitment. For
>example, reducing oil consumption by 50% in 2 years would cause major
>problems. But if we'd done just 2% a year starting 30 years ago....
>
>Recall that the president who tried to make progress in the area ("the
>moral equivalent of war") was not reelected.

All he had to do is hike the skirt of a woman 20+ years his junior then
lie about it, and he would've been re-elected.

>> Science and industry MOVED under Reagan. Not a boast on my
>> part...archived historical facts.
>
>And the programs were started when?

A >>LOT<< of programs were started before the Regan era...AND languished.
RR pulled out the stops.

73

Steve, K4YZ

5571. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 21:32:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WdlEc.19445$bs4.5973@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93685

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com...
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
>
> Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Excellent. Good first shot victory. This is probably how we are going to have to fight this monster. Piece by piece.

Dan/W4NTI

5572. Re: FA: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 21:56:17 UTC
From: WA3MOJ <WA3MOJ@home.com>
Message-ID: <cbsoi1028vt@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 93692

Those make decent cb's. You should post it in the cb group.

>

In article <%z5Ec.18165$bs4.16028@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dwight
Stewart says...
>
>I'm getting out of Ham Radio, so selling my radio equipment. Everything must
>go!
>
> Title: Kenwood TS-430s HF Amateur/Ham Radio Transceiver w/More
>
> URL: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=5706982695
>

5573. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180627.18097.00000067@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93686

In article <c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
>
>Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.

The major "kudos" ought to go to the Cedar Rapids team that put together an excellent picture of a detailed example of their BPL test system. One can see it in several Comments on docket 04-37 at the FCC ECFS.

"Kudos to ARRL?" Why? The Cedar Rapids amateur club did all the work...had the calibrated instruments for valid data collection. No computer simulations there. Actual on-air tests.

If someone wants to express gratitude to "all involved," the names and callsigns are in the several 04-37 Comments of the last week. Write them DIRECT, don't assume that "all" read this din of inequity called a newsgroup.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5574. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180628.18097.00000068@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93689

In article <1e4e3692.0406290418.5654f22b@posting.google.com>,
billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20040628142008.07518.00000383@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0406272258.25ac5b75@posting.google.com>, >>
k4yz@aol.com (Sigmund Fraud, sick-iatrist) writes:
>>
>> >billybeeper@juno.com (William) wrote in message
>> >news:<1e4e3692.0406271628.48681889@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> >> He yell and yell, he hate me and hate me. Now he say he spect better
>> >> from me.
>>
>> >> Maybe trap or lie. I no trust.
>>
>> >> He noisy. He yell and yell.
>>
>> >> Why he want military gear? I 'member. He say he militia.
>>
>> >> Why he fixated with boys? He need get help. Take somekinda sumptin.
>>
>> >> No badge as boy. Must compensate now.
>> >
>> > I re-extend my offer to use my professional contacts to help you,
>> >Brain. It always looks better on your record to appear as having been
>> >aware you ahve a problem and taking steps to fix it, than to be
>> >involuntarilly commited in order to force the issue.
>>
>> Ooooooooo! Return of the Psi Corps! Mind Police!
>>
>> Chief of Stuff have "contacts?" Think contacts corroded...that not
>> Law of Ohm.
>>
>> Nursie make Threat! Ooooooo. Commit all not think like nursie.
>>
>> Nursie not crazy. All not think like nursie crazy.
>>
>> Nursieland is certainly NOT like reality where all others live.
>>
>> Temper fry...
>>
>> LHA / WMD
>

>He malajust to werld. No like Charlie Chan, no like Docter Soos.
>Think Horton hear a Who lying allatime. Not like boy who cry woof.
>
>So he yell and yell. So what. Like boy who cry woof, nobody hear him
>ennymore.
>
>Mebbe he think he Lorax?
>
>> >
>> > I can make that happen for you, Brain. Shall I make the
>> >call....?!?!?
>
>He so funny sometime. Now not time.

Brian, if nursie ever had the moronic intent to do that "call," he would be in for the legal ride of his life with NO soft landing. Not on Earth, not on Mars, and he would definitely NOT be moonwalking anywhere.

Nursie went psychotic some time ago, drifting between reality and his imagination, his "logic" working more from emotion than any reasoning. He makes BRAGS of a grande scale, brags which have no validity, can't be referenced because they are fictional. When confronted with government regulations, he refuses to accept them and relies on his imaginary "definitions." He is fruitcake, hear him roar.

Nutsos surface from time to time on the Internet as they did in the BBS world. They shoot off their keyboards as they shoot off their mouths and make momentous brags, then become enraged and worse when confronted with reality and exposing their lies for what they are.

A sure sign of "nutso-ism" is the "mirror" syndrome...that of repeating what others say of them as meaning the accuser. Like the infamous Col. Jessup character in the movie, they mentally holler about "truth" and yet cannot accept the truth about themselves. They refuse to submit yet they must make others submit to their weird imaginations.

At best, all we can do is try to make some humor of the situation faced by all readers in here. That doesn't help cure the fruitcakes but it makes life a bit bearable for others.

I happen to personally like fruitcake, all the candied stuff and the nuts in that, tasty to me. I find the non-holiday human fruitcakes with candied morse nuts to be indigestible. Ptui.

Happy Fourth.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5575. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180629.18097.00000069@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93687

In article <20040629054259.12238.00000907@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: Able Baker Charlie
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/28/2004 1:20 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040628142004.07518.00000380@mb-m26.aol.com>
>
>>> Sure is a shame to see a person of Lennie's alleged education and
>>>"experience" lowering himself to neonate babble.
>>
>> "Neonate?" That be noun, mean newborn infant. Newborn not
>> have Internet access. Motor control for hands not yet complete,
>> no typing ability. FCC license newborn as ham op? Not think
>> so but maybe. Alla olde-tyme hammes think age not barrier to
>> ham license.
>
> And your present childish babble is like that of a one month old...

Nursie be "man who never was." :-)

Nursie do mean diss and cuss allatime. Not nice. Not ham way.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5576. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180630.18097.00000070@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93688

In article <20040629053938.12238.00000906@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>>Date: 6/28/2004 5:51 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406281451.43cf693f@posting.google.com>
>
>>Why he aways want be with your wife, my wife???
>>
>>I no like that. I wish he just mind his own wife. No bother other
>>people wifes. He not right in head.
>
> Why can you not speak like an adult? (Don't sweat it...that was a
>rhetorical question)

Why waste time with nursie? Nursie not worth it.

> I think I hit a nerve. I wouldn't want MY wife knowing how I acted in
>public if I were either of you two.

Which wife, nursie?

>>> Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals
>>> awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.
>>
>>He yell and yell. Too much noise. Youssa be funny. Jus hedake now.
>
> Why can you not speak like an adult? (Don't sweat it...that was a
>rhetorical question too)

Why can't nursie act like a reasoning human being? Too hard?

Must be post-traumatic stress disorder from all those "hostile
actions" making nursie act like a compulsive-obsessive psycho.
Too bad for rest of us.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5577. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180631.18097.00000071@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93690

In article <20040629055155.12238.00000909@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>Date: 6/28/2004 5:54 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040628185404.19885.00000539@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>truth
>>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>
>>>>> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started
>>>slipping.
>>>>> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>>>>
>>>>Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary
>>>investment
>>>>in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not
>>small
>>>>efficient ones.
>>>
>>> My point exactly, Jim.
>>>
>>> We need to move the technology of our space program out of the
>>70/80's.
>>
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> Is science and exploration market-driven? I think not.
>>
>> [Docktor Weiner von Brawn personality of nursie acting up...]
>

> Lots of baby-babble deleted.
>
>> Brits at Mars first, fail in landing. Unknown reason.
>
> No, the Brits were not first on Mars.
>
>> Yanks next with bouncy balloon lander idea. Works. Both times.
>
> Yes, it did.
>
> But we had already soft-landed on Mars quite a while ago, Sir Putzy.
>And not with the "bouncy bloon lander idea".

Tsk. Nursie make mean diss and cuss again. Not nice.

"Bouncy balloon," nursie, not "bouncy bloon." Quit tawking
baby tawk. :-)

Brits first on Mars in 2003-2004 time frame.

JPL Viking Lander (Viking 1) was first surviving Mars landed
payload, launched 20 Aug 75, landed Mars on 20 Jul 76, worked
for 6 years. Viking 2 launched 9 Sep 75, landed Mars 3 Sep 76
and functioned for 3 years. Big things for USA Bicentennial.
Also very expensive.

New Mars probes cost much less, do the same job, are more
mobile, have newer instruments. Proved balloon landing
concept was feasible with minimal cost compared to rocket
retrofire "soft" landing.

Nursie do work on either JPL program? No? Tsk. Either
Viking worked longer on Mars by remote control than nursie
did as purchasing agent at set-top box company. Difference
maybe that JPL had control of Vikings. No control possible
on nursie.

> And you're STILL a putz. Now you're just a baby-babbling putz. I don't
>know which was worse.

Tsk. More mean diss and cuss. Not nice.

Nursie tell all his mighty accomplishments in aerospace? All
want to hear? Must be important to "know" all those things he
tell.

> I'd ask you to contribute something meaningful, but I know it will just
be
>so laced with your ususal "I've got to show them I AM the superior intellect"
>spitefulness that anything you DO manage to say will be lost in the hate and
>the baby-babble.

I do REAL work on some space programs. Nursie do NONE.
Nursie never at JPL, Santa Su, Michoud, Cape, Clear Lake.

Nursie read "space comics" and be space guru? Must be.
Nursie spaced out. Tsk.

Nursie not talk about BPL or PLC. Tsk. Big spectre for all HF communications in USA if Access BPL happen. Bye-bye HF ham bands for DX. Too much noise in all HF receivers from BPL. Nursie not say anything against BPL. Why that? Nursie want BPL to happen in USA? If so, nursie HATE all other hams, want to stop them from fun. Bad.

Nursie fruitcake. This not close to Christmas. Fruitcake not gift.

Temper fry...

LHA / WMD

5578. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:06:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629180637.18097.00000072@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 93691

In article <20040629053444.12238.00000905@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Weiner
von Brawn, hero of space) writes:

>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>Date: 6/28/2004 7:47 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <20040628204721.07368.00000335@mb-m24.aol.com>
>>
>>In article <20040628121740.23777.00000742@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve
>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>> Tomorrow, a lunar orbiter discovers what appears to be deposits of
>"X".
>>
>>>We need "X" really bad, and we know if we don't have a quonset hut sitting
on
>>>it, it's fair game.
>>
>>The moon has been under such observation for almost 40 years. Nothing of that
>>sort of value has been found.
>
> And tommorow an orbiter scanning FOR "X" shows up, Jim...
>
> Maybe that 1/1000 chance that we see something from "just the right
>angle" happens...

Weiner been reading "X Men" comics again? :-)

>>> OK...four years.
>>
>>That's a completely different game. You just doubled the available time.
>
> And it's still four yeas less than the "usual" development time for
>aviation projects (The F22's been in the works for a decade already and is
just
>now about readu to start manufacture).

Tell us all about Weiner's aeronautic work. Easy to do with one
word. :-)

Weiner spent time at Edwards or Nellis? Go zoom-zoom in sky?

Or just go zoom-zoom with imagination?

The Harrier has been "operational" for three decades with USMC.
Highest flight failure rates of any US military aircraft. But, it does
insure a capability of commissioned officer advancement...through
pilot attrition.

> Again...>>IF<< we wanted to get it now "now", I think we could do it.
>
>>The Ariane would have to put the tanks into an orbit that the shuttle could
>>reach easily. And a docking system that would make fuel and oxidizer
>>connections would have to be developed to make the hookup. That's a new
>>technology right there.
>
> Why?
>
> What do we not already know about fuel line connections that we don't
>already know? What other magic is there to getting a fuel from one tank into
>another? The Russians were doing it for over a decade with MIR.

We all know what happened to MIR. :-)

>>>The Saturn V was designed to be a one-booster-lifts all flight.
>>
>>Yep. Because after looking at all the alternatives, that was the best way to
>>go.
>
> That was the best way to go THEN.

Weiner on decision board THEN? NOW? Don't think so.

>>Yep. But you need at least one new technology, and at least two
carefully-timed
>>launches. Can be done but it's harder and more costly.
>
> We know exactly where the moon's going to be for the next 2000 years. We
>can, with a handheld science calculator, do almost the same thing for earth
>launches. It >>IS<< "rocket science", but one that's been thoroughly
developed
>and proven.
>
> It's a wheel that doesn't require re-invention.

Tsk. Tsk. Tsk. Ritta mistake.

Launching requires "insertion" between existing satellites and assorted
space junk. Those satellites and junk aren't a constant for very long.
Certainly not for a decade let alone millenia.

The launch "window" referred to so glibly by TV "science commentators"
is governed by a launch trajectory missing all those other objects in
orbit. There isn't a pocket calculator built anywhere, not a palm pilot or
similar that can hold all that information and then calculate it.

>>The political ramifications of a military (USAF) lunar mission would be a big
>>problem.

>
> How many civilians have walked on the moon, Jim?

The very first one was. :-)

>>> And what makes you think that NASA may not have already penciled this
>>>mission out?
>>
>>Nobody says they haven't. But that's a long way from doing it.
>>
>>>You HAVE told me of reasons why you think it won't work one
>>>certain way, Jim, but you've NOT shown me or caused me to believe it CAN'T
be
>>>done under ANY circumstances.

Weiner, us readers know YOU can't be persuaded anywhichway,
not by us, not by DoD, and certainly not by NASA. :-)

>>You're changing the boundary conditions, Steve. And you ignore basic
>physics.
>
> I am not ignoring any physics, Jim.

You don't mention any...:-) All you have is Will and Idea.

>>Right - after decades of continuous development and upgrades, the range has
>>been increased. And by eliminating features and making seats smaller, more
>>people have been crammed aboard.
>
> Yes, seats can be made smaller...
>
> But the aircraft is 40% larger today than it was in 1969.

Strange. I had a flight on a Continental Airlines Boeing 707
in 1958. Had another flight on a 707 around 1992. Didn't
notice any aircraft size expansion at all. Seemed the same.
Sunnuvagun! Maybe Boeing fed them some kind of aluminum
hormone in the last dozen years? Must be... :-)

>>Better engines are one big reason. Those engines weren't a result of the
space
>>or military programs. They were the result of companies like GE working to
sell
>>civilian aircraft engines. If they could show enough fuel saving with a new
>>design, the airlines would buy the new engines.
>
> Hmmmmmmm....
>
> "...compnies like GE..."
>
> Now..I WONDER who it was that made (or were major contractors on) the
>engines that presently put the shuttle in orbit, as well as about every other
>rocket or aeronautical project since the 30's...?!?!

The F-1 engines (five) on the Apollo mission Saturn first stage were designed and built by Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation...which, after purchase by Rockwell International, became (on legal paper) Rocketdyne Division of Rockwell International. Rocketdyne has since been purchased by Boeing Aircraft Company.

The SSME (Space Shuttle Main Engine) is used in a triad on the shuttle itself. SSME is designed and built by Rocketdyne. The SRBs (solid rocket booster) are reuseable only if they don't suffer damage on return to Earth. Rocketdyne doesn't build the SRBs which are only good for about a minute of the seven-plus long launch phase.

Sunnuvagun! How about that? :-)

> Ya think they learned anything in the process...?!?! I certainly do.

Did what? Learn something? I doubt that.

Weiner go to any rocket test firings? Michoud? Santa Su? Cape?

Not likely. Weiner gets his PhuD dissertation from cadging used copies of AW&ST. :-)

>>> And that's only from actually building the things...The engineering could
>>>be done now in CAD with a minimum of expense.
>>
>>Not true. CADD helps but you still need to build the thing.
>
> Eventually, but not like we used to.
>
> The F-22 and the Boeing 777 were both aircraft that were CAD'd right into
>a first flying prototype.

CADD = Computer Aided Design and DRAFTING.

Weiner, you have NEVER "bent tin" (worked with sheet metal) or "laid lead" (did drawings on paper) in any aerospace company. You don't know squat about "configuration management" (the big buzzword for "drawing control" of the last 3 decades).

Weiner, you have NEVER checked drawings in any aero company, let alone an electronics one, and have NEVER signed the "approved" block on any paper or mylar drawings. Don't give us this song and dance about "CAD right into the first flying prototype." The CADD is PRINCIPALLY DONE TO REDUCE THE ENORMOUS QUANTITY OF DRAWINGS that pile up to make all the parts. A sidelight is that, by using IT skills, the CADD can be configured to do "fit" tests on major assemblies for the physical assembly of a craft. Boeing proved that with the triple-seven, made it a holy thing in their documentary film for PR purposes.

The F-17 Nighthawk, then the B-2, were first modeled with CAD, just the DESIGN part, in order to get the best compromise

planform for minimal RF reflection and for minimal IR radiation.
CADD entered later when the final planform was solidified. The
man-hours cost for the CAD (just the Design part) was staggering
because it took a long time to get close to optimum.

>>You're forgetting the physics again.
>
> No. I'm not.

That may be true. One can't forget what one hasn't learned.
:-)

>>>>> We can't park "re-supply" ships along the way or in lunar orbit?
>>>>
>>>>Do you know what a Lagrange point is?
>>>
>>> Sure I do.
>>
>>Then you should know that you can't "park" ships along the way to the moon.
>
> No, but you CAN park them in Earth orbit or you can park them in lunar
>orbit.

Weiner von Brawn, explain "Lagrange Point" to the studio audience.
Use only one solar system pair for simplicity, give numbers.

Explain "space parking." Synchronous orbit only synchronous in
terms of observer on object being orbited...thing in orbit is still going
around and around and around...like nursie faking knowledge.

>>>>The only practical point would be lunar orbit. Now, how would you get
>>>>a supply container there?
>>>
>>> The same way we got RANGER, "Lunar Orbiter", Apollo and who knows how
>>>manyn other lunar exploration packages there.
>>
>>Big one-use rockets.
>
> Atlas was a "big one-use rocket"...?!?!

Absolutely. Convair designed it as an ICBM lifter. A weapons
platform first...then a THROWAWAY sat launch vehicle.

Atlas had thin skin. Nursie have thin skin. Nursie = Atlas?

>>>CM/LM rendevous was done after TLI and after LM ascension in lunar
>>>orbit. Both waaaaaaay outside Earth orbit!
>>
>>Sure. But the initial move wasn't really a rendezvous - it was just the CSM
>>separating, turning around, docking and pulling the LM out.
>>
>>The only really tricky rendezvous was when the LM came back up from the lunar
>>surface to meet the CSM.

>
> How tricky, Jim?
>
> In one case (TLI) only one of the craft was under manned control. In the
>case of CSM/LM rendevous, there were two craft under manned control.
>
> Starting with Gemini-Agena up trough Shuttle-ISS, don't you think we've
>gotten the technique pretty well down pat...???

Only basic principles. That's not enough for "all." Get with it.

>>Add "zero g fuel tank connection system"
>
> How did the Russians "refuel" MIR for oover a decade? Swap out propane
>tanks at the convienience store?

Weiner tell studio audience how that was done? Weiner big guru
in space, knowitall, been there, but got no T-shirts.

>>Apollo took only about 8 years. With slide rules. And an enormous price tag.
>
> Becasue we'd never done it before. Now it's software you can download in
>a couple minutes.

Weiner tell studio audience links to software sites? MSN? Adobe?
Which ftp site, Weiner? Give details. No shooting from lip.

>>>Well there's the rub. Again, "how much money" as opposed to the
>>>logistics of getting it done.
>>
>>I included the logistics.
>
> The logisitics is the money!

Weiner show pie chart to studio audience? Explain where costs go?
Weiner only make big log as part of icy BM, not do for real...

>>Anybody who was in their 30s when Apollo was active is now retirement age. Or
>>dead.
>
> What?
>
> NASA didn't keep any archives? These guys "learned" all that stuff then
>kept it to themselves?

Technologies change with time, acquisition of new data on physics
of solar system (mascons, etc.), requirements of manufacturing,
trying to push "performance envelope."

NASA have plenty archives. Found in "configuration management"
warehouses. :-)

NASA do many boo-boos in later years. See Challenger and ice,
freezing of SRB assembly O-rings, blow-through. See Columbia

and plastic foam used to prevent ice build-up, come loose like
done before, make hole in wing. O-ring problem, main tank foam
fall-off in archives, was ignored. Tsk.

>>> I am in Huntsville at least once a month. "Aerospace" is the "big
>>>business", but all those other countless places are needed to support the
>>>PEOPLE in "aerospace". (The 99% who get stuff done, and the 1% [ie:Lennie]
>>>who go along for the ride and milk it for what they can...But they ALL make
money
>>>and spend money)
>>
>>Only because the money is imported from elsewhere.
>
> Uh huh.

Why Weiner von Brawn in Huntsville, AL? Do consulting? On
what? Why LPN go to rocket town? Put band-aids on fool
tanks? Nursie make big brag.

> It COULD have been done 30+ years ago but "we" were too cheap to open
>our wallets then to avoid the costs today.

We not have Weiner von Brawn, expert on space, to tell us how.

:-)

> What we HAD under Carter were stifling inflation.
>
> Science and industry MOVED under Reagan. Not a boast on my
>part...archived historical facts.

Archived political party SPIN! :-)

> And NASA is manhandling those school board members to the ground and
>stealing the money from them?

Only under Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, and Clinton...they make "hostile
actions" orders for murine corpse do school board fights. :-)

>
>>>>Why can't the USA have the best educational systems in the world? The
>>>>best surface transportation systems? The best energy systems? Energy
>>>>independence?
>>>
>>> Money.
>>
>>Exactly. It gets spent on giving congresscritters joyrides and in replacing
>>destroyed orbiters.
>
> We'll spend more money trying to defeat gay marriage than what replacing
>Columbia and Challenger would cost.
>
> Besides...we HAVEN'T replaced them...Challenger splashed 18 years ago

>now. Where's >>IT'S<< replacement...?!?!?

Endeavor, first flight in 1992.

>>>We could have done all of those things 30 or more years ago (or at least
>>>been positioned to be there by now...) but everything was "fine" then, so
>>why
>>>spend the money...?!?!
>>
>>Everything wasn't fine then.
>
> I agree.
>
> That's why I put it in " " brackets.
>
> It WAS a problem then. It's a worse one now.

We not have Weiner von Brawn as guru 30 years ago. Now we
have nursieland spaced-out guru mumbling in ham radio news-
grope about spaceflight. :-)

>>>And I bet with some simple programming we can defeat jamming of our
>>>commercial satellites...
>>
>>Not against RF overload.
>
> That would take a system capable of putting a massive amount of RF across
>an extremely wide range of frequencies for a significant amount of time, Jim.
>
>Like from 400MHZ to over 5GHZ.
>
> THAT would be expensive, and would NOT be the kind of technology you
>could load into a Ryder truck.

Nursie study solar flare characteristics, effects of EMP nuke, get
back to us.

Nursie then study REAL band space of comm sats and maximum
power input values, do math for RF path loss, find narrow beam
antenna gain and power needed from terrestrial location. Nursie
have little calculator? Slide rule? [can do with slide rule]

What nursie come up with?

>>Why is it OK to buy consumer goods from China but not rockets?
>
> Because I am not worried about the Red Chinese using the technology used
>to make rubber duckies and t-shirts to overwhem us.

Nursie tawk baby tawk with "rubber duckies" gonna "overwhem" us?

:-)

Nursie get newer copies of Time, see China now have equivalent
astronauts and launch vehicles. In all the papers...

>>Other people dream of doing great things. Engineers do them.
>
> Engieneers do them when adequately funded!

"Engieneers?" They use "engien values" in math? :-)

> DaVinci dreamed of a great many things that have only been made practical
>in the last 100 years...Because we spent the money on research to develop the
>materials to let the enginees make it happen!

Now we be "enginees?" :-)

Nursie show us "practical" model of SCREW DRIVE helicopter?
DaVinci show drawing of same. We not do dat yet.

>>You're still avoiding that simple question....
>
> I am not "avoiding" anything Jim.
>
> I point blank said earlier that I didn't have all the answers.

No? Not all answers? Looks to readers like Weiner have all
answers for everything. Just have Republican in White House
and solve all problems! :-)

> I just know that we are NOT doing ANYthing to move the program forward
>today.

What "program," nursie? Magellan "nothing?"

Nursie and shrink go to JPL and discuss. Get shrink rapped
and both go in fruitcake display.

>>They prove the technology is no damn good. It's a spectrum polluter. It's
>>just plain stupid.
>
> They proved that THIS method is a spectrum polluter. Can there NEVER be
>a development that might work?

Nursie need look at latest ARRL Comment on 04-37. Open-wire electric
power line using only ONE phase as distribution line WILL BE A SPECTRUM
POLLUTER REGARDLESS OF MODULATION TYPE.

Nursie fruitcake with morse nuts. No think.

LHA / WMD

5579. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 22:56:08 UTC
From: Fred Garvin <Garv@truss.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.06.29.23.03.37.337142@truss.net>
Source record: 93693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 29 Jun 2004 11:15:05 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Demand competently written software!

I do, I use Linux. Good luck getting it from Microsuck.

5580. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 23:03:35 UTC
From: Fred Garvin <Garv@truss.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2004.06.29.23.08.01.19511@truss.net>
Source record: 93694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Tue, 29 Jun 2004 10:38:34 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:

> If the manufacturers produce software that has gaping security flaws,
> it is their fault, not mine.

Mike, it's your fault for CONTINUING TO USE IT.

If you've bought 2 Monkeytime wrenches and the handles both snapped and
broke will you go out and buy ANOTHER Monkeytime wrench????

Get it?

5581. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 23:54:10 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406291554.16b8dafa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93695

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628200151.18097.00000060@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406281514.6d67ea83@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040628012411.22098.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Nursie need rap with shrink. Get shrink-rapped.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Yess yess. Wrap him mouth so noone hear him yell and yell.
> >
> >He say he have professional contact hewp me. He need use them
> >riteaway for himsewf. So much to do wid him. Haff no time for me.
>
> Nursie fruitcake. But, EXTRA fruitcake. Morse nuts.
>
> Len

He go moldy. Need more rum in frootcake kepp mold away. Say Hi Capn Morgan.

5582. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-29 23:55:34 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406291555.711f1360@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93696

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628200151.18097.00000060@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406281514.6d67ea83@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040628012411.22098.00000457@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >>
> >> Nursie need rap with shrink. Get shrink-rapped.
> >>
> >> LHA / WMD
> >
> >Yess yess. Wrap him mouth so noone hear him yell and yell.
> >
> >He say he have professional contact hewp me. He need use them
> >riteaway for himsewf. So much to do wid him. Haff no time for me.
>
> Nursie fruitcake. But, EXTRA fruitcake. Morse nuts.
>
> Len

He fruitcake moldy. Need Extra splash rum make mold goway. Say Hi Capn Morgan.

5583. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 00:03:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040629200316.22098.00000476@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 93697

In article <40E1C764.6060109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20040622060735.03961.00000247@mb-m19.aol.com>...
>>
>>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>truth
>>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>>Date: 6/21/2004 6:23 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>Message-id: <20040621192357.02583.00000398@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>>>
>>>>In article <20040621101841.05916.00000396@mb-m05.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>(Steve
>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>> In the 50's and 60's we didn't have the technology.
>>
>>
>> (to send people to the moon)
>>
>>
>>>We barely had the
>>>technology to get to the moon in the 70s.
>>
>>
>> Had it by 1969, to be exact. The Soviets sent unmanned probes there
>> about a decade earlier.
>>
>>> History has shown us that most major "jumps" in technology and society
>>>happen in the wake of war.
>>
>>
>> Some jumps, yes, but I don't know about "most". In many cases those
>> "jumps" would have happened anyway, or are the result of massive
>> investment by governments that would be considered "socialistic" in
>> peacetime. Or they're the result of government programs that are done
>> to soften the conversion to a peacetime economy.
>>
>> In any event the cost far exceeds the benefits.
>>
>>> RECENT history has shown that we made some pretty significant strides
>>>based on the Apollo program alone.
>>

>>
>> Such as? Tang and Teflon existed before NASA.
>
> Ahh, but can you say the same for Tang flavored Teflon?

Heh heh heh. Kind of slides right off the taste buds, don't it?

>
>> No one has been back to the moon in 32 years and there are no serious
>> plans to do so anytime soon. The technology to do it would almost have
>> to be reinvented.
>
> Couldn't build more Saturns, as the tooling is gone, as well as the
>supply path.

Configuration Management still has the drawings. "Tooling" is
largely jigs and fixtures which aren't on the scale of Jo-blocks.
Test data still exists.

The VAB and Mover still exist at the Cape, now modified for STS.
"We can unmodify it...we have the technology..." :-)

> I wouldn't say reinvented, but it would need to be re-done. I suspect
>that a new moon mission would be much much different. I would guess
>in-orbit assembly for the propulsion system, possibly the ship.

Not as logical as the sci-fi writers think. There's a large fuel cost
in leaving the gravity well of Earth for an orbit. Easier to make it as
a whole and have all parts go up together. For in-orbit assembly
one needs to put the assemblers in-orbit first.

>>> For those who insist that "we need to spend the money here", I ask
>WHERE
>>>in space are you going to spend that money?
>>
>>
>> We need to spend the money in ways that will directly benefit people
>> here. And address problems long-term.
>
> Well, that leaves the field wide open. Some would have us believe that
>we would be better to spend the money feeding the world's poor. Of
>course, then you end up with a lot of fat poor people that will continue
>eating your food until you run out, then you can starve along with 'em! 8^)

Put the money into investment trusts to promote McDonalds or
KFC?

>>> A bit of government subsidising would promote yet another wave of
>>>technical advencement.
>>
>> Agreed - spent in the right places. That's the principle that drives
>> those "Tax and Spend Democrats!!!"
>

> As opposed to the "Don't tax but spend like a drunken sailor" other
types?

Please, no insults at the USN, the super chief is monitoring...

>> Trips to the Moon and Mars will require a lot more than "a bit of
>> government spending".
>
>
>
>> It was in the Nixon/Ford years that the big NASA cutbacks took place.
>> Too much money, they said. There was supposed to be an Apollo 18 lunar
>> mission - it was cut and the Saturn V for it became a museum piece.
>> Literally.
>
> We found out we could make more money selling our hats to each
>other.... for a little while anyhoo.

Not quite. The "hats" are largely the backwards baseball caps
of the last decade.

My hat is off to you for making that comment, though... :-)

But, siriusly, the politicians cut the tail off of Apollo during Nixon's
first term. An appeasement of the Republicans was the exchange
of the last flights of Apollo for the prototype space station called
Skylab (1973-1974) and the first try at an "international" thing with
Apollo-Soyuz of 1975. Much publicity and NASA supplied
school information on Apollo-Soyuz here but the Cold War was
still on and the USSR was going their own way. [I was at MSFC
in 1974, just before Easter...the control room was modifying a
few things for the Apollo-Soyuz link even then, Skylab ending]

>> All of NASA's manned budget went into the shuttle, which is a
>> marvelous system with a 1 in 75 chance of complete mission failure.
>> The number of shuttles lost compared to the number of missions flown
>> verifies the reliability analysis.

Quite true but there was a large hiatus (at least four years) of
manned spaceflight before any serious money went to shuttle.
Any significant amounts spent were done by prospective
contractors, eventually won by Rockwell...and then for the air-
drop-only Enterprise (never space-fitted) shuttle vehicle.

>> The reason the USA made the big space commitments was because JFK and
>> LBJ (guess what party) pushed for them. They were essentially done to
>> compete with the Soviets for the "high ground" of space. Recall that
>> practically all of the important early space firsts (first earth
>> satellite, first animal in space, first human in space and in orbit,
>> first woman in space, first mission to another heavenly body, first
>> pictures of the far side of the Moon...) were done by the Soviet
>> Union. And most of their early accomplishments were complete surprises
>> in the West. The USA played catch-up for years. JFK and LBJ knew that

>> if the Rooskies could orbit a man and bring him back safely, doing the
>> same with a nuclear weapon would be a piece of cake for them.
>
> I know I'm in my post field day weird move, but I wonder which country
>posted the first bowel movement in space?

The one with the icy BM, of course... :-)

>> Today there is no such need or competition.
>
> Just wait 5 years.

For what?

>> The cost was staggering but they had the political clout to do it.
>> They could sell it to everyone on the national security agenda. And it
>> didn't hurt that a lot of the money was spent in states like LBJ's own
>> Texas. (Why is the control center for manned flights in Houston when
>> the launch facility is in Florida?)

The weather being better? :-)

Actually, as a CONTROL center for anything that orbits people,
the MSFC would ideally be in the midwest or mountain regions
as getting the communications relay connections. Of the late
1960s, that is. That it went to Texas IS a favor to LBJ at the
time.

>> Billions were spent on the space program in the '60s but when
>> Americans needed quality fuel-efficient cars in the '70s they had to
>> go to Germany and Japan for them.
>>
>>
>>>I think the recent events in the Mojave also show that
>>>a bit of entrepenurial spirit and investment can go a long way.
>>
>>
>> As exciting as that effort is, all of it was done more than 35 years
>> ago with the X-15.
>
> But that X-15 took a monumental effort and support structure.

Nope. Nowhere on the scale of say, Mercury. The X-15 development
was done by North American Aviation (later to be bought by Rockwell).
X-15 was and is an AIR vehicle flying out of Edwards.

>That is
>the take away I get from the SpaceShipOne effort. By comparison, the
>Rutan effort is almost easy. Did you see the pix of the technicians
>working on the plane? Jeans, T-Shirts and sneakers, and done in a
>workshop, not a humongous facility with cleanrooms and scary nasty
>chemicals sitting around. then they push it out of the "garage" hook it
>up to the White Knight and off they go.

Sorry, but that's exaggeration. The first dozen-plus flights of the X-15 were done from half a hangar at Edwards with some testing at a nearby engine test stand...lifted by a modified B-52 (which later lifted lots and lots of odd aircraft, especially the "lifting bodies" that were prototype re-entry vehicles). B-52 was handy and available, already had a big hard point for hanging air-drop things. "High-tech-space" it was NOT in appearance.

SpaceShipOne can no more reach space than the X-15 or the X-1 before it. It MUST have an airborne launch vehicle. Since few B-52s are sold surplus to prize contesters, Scaled Composites at Kern County Airport #7 designed and built their own. [that's called "Mojave" as a familiar name, is a common place for avionics flight testing by many for decades, located just north of Edwards AFB] [some call it "Mojave International" for fun but it is really a "surplus" WW2 air training base and does have long runways which look good for auto commercials on TV]

> Despite the goal, I don't see the real lesson as getting to space, but
>the way they are doing it.

"Getting into space" via either X-15 or SSOne is barely making it. Topping the stratosphere isn't in the low-earth-orbit category and way away from geosynchronous orbit.

Edwards was into many different "X" planes from during WW2 on through now, a very long time doing many different things, only a few of which were "space" related. Edwards had some rocket-assisted F-104s, too, for astronaut training in rocket-thruster control almost to space, but there isn't much PR on that. NAA made sure it got PR for the X-15 to gain visibility for future aircraft contracts, etc. All the aircraft makers were, those that are left still do. Edwards had a couple B-52s for various air-drop projects (one still remains, maybe) and there's no problem on getting crews for that support or the tracking and guidance and telemetry. But, man-rated NASA spaceflight clean-room humongous working areas it no had like you said. Open-hangar environment for ground work beginning shortly after Oh-dark-thirty, lift off ground at crack of doom and get up there before the desert air gets too bumpy from heat. Few air tests go past 10 AM. Gotta be "morning person" to sustain work at Edwards Flight Test Center. Those in the hangar are mostly civilians in common airport work clothes, few company insignia.

Scaled Composites, I think at the NE corner of "Mojave," has about the same size facilities as Edwards had during X-15 times. Since they are also in the high desert, air flights are for early morning. A half-century of time hasn't changed much and the "used airplane lot" somewhat close to SSOne's home is still there, still as large. The civilian flight test companies gather at the SW corner of "Mojave," all in "hangar environments" to do avionics systems flight testing...chaff dispensers were big customers when I was there, using the south-of-Edwards China Lake Research Center

as radar checker. Most of the upper desert is Restricted Airspace,
so it is a good area for these "X" things of unknown safety.

>> And it was done without government funding. So why do we need NASA for
>> manned flights at all? Let the private folks do it on a self-funded
>> basis.
>>
>>
>>> So why not Mars?
>>
>>
>> Because the cost and risk is simply too much for the benefits. Do you
>> have any idea what a mission to Mars would require in terms of how big
>> and complex the ship(s) would have to be, how long they'd be gone, and
>> how completely on their own they would be?
>>
>> Mars is orders of magnitude more difficult than the moon. Apollo
>> missions were no more than two weeks, Mars missions would be over a
>> year long. The Martian surface is in some ways more hostile than the
>> lunar surface and the landing physics much more difficult (Martian
>> gravity is stronger). Look how many unmanned Mars missions have failed
>> completely.
>>
>> Heck, figure out radio propagation delay to Mars....
>>
>> What benefits would a manned mission to Mars give that could not be
>> had any other way?
>
> Ahh, now we are getting close to what I think you are trying to say. As

>much as I enjoy the martian rovers, and as excited as I get about their
>discoveries, and in general, all the wonderful things that we get from
>the unmanned side of space exploration, if the basic purpose isn't to
>put people somewhere - I don't support it.

Okay, so do your "DXpeditions" and re-pioneer radio until 2050. :-)

The "basic purpose" of exploring the New World back in the
1400s was to GET GOLD, GET GOODIES...for the folks back
in Yurp. That included what would eventually become the USA.

GPSS is expressly designed for "putting people somewhere"
but is very unmanned. A whole two dozen obiters, in fact.
You support? They don't take people...people have to take
themselves.

>AND, as we see from Hubble, they aren't taking care of the toys we are
>giving them now.

I not see much Earth photos from Hubble space telescope. Plenty
other sats to photo Earth. First Hubble was big screw-up in main
scope optics, courtesy ground test crew. Hubble not there to "put

people anyplace."

> The Hubble deserves to live out it's full lifetime.
>
> At the end of it's useful life, it should be visited by a shuttle,
>packed up, and returned to earth to take an honored place in the
>Smithsonian Air and Space museum. Getting to see THAT would give me
>goosebumps and get me all excited. And what's more, it helps cement my
>support for all of this. The people at NASA should be concerned that
>ubergeeks like me don't support them at this time.

? Why not be "mailgeek" and support Hubble through congress-
person? Would do more. Mike support Access BPL by not saying
anything against BPL to FCC?

> Once upon a time, we built the thing. It was important enough to take
>the risks and send it into space.
>
> It got there - it had problems. We considered it important enough to go

>back into space and repair it. That was a technological triumph by the
>way. It turned that ugly duckling into a a beautiful swan of optical
>imaging.

Should have been "beautiful swan" first time around. Wasn't. Big
screw-up on ground by optical people on calibration. Tsk.

> We felt it was important enough to send servicing missions to.

DESIGNED INTO Hubble from word go on contract. Nobody knew
what effects space would have on all the different imaging systems
in Hubble...had to plan ahead. Service missions NOT any kind of
afterthought.

> Now "we" don't any more. At one time, we were going to retrieve it, but

>now it is too "dangerous" to even do a maintenance run on it.
>
> My how we have changed. We aren't inspired. We demand that our
>explorers have the same safety factor as our automobiles. We are now
>pussies.

Mike send Weiner von Brawn to rescue. He fix! :-)

> If they told me that a servicing or retrieval mission to the shuttle
>wouldn't take place unless I was on board, I'd be on my way down there
>right now.

Mike have mega-dollar insurance premium check? :-)

Ride in space not ride in park.

>> And how much all of it would cost?
>
>

>I think there is a psychological and social cost to *not* do it.
>
>>
>>>Why not research stations on the Moon?
>>
>>
>> How much are *you* willing to pay for them in tax dollars? That's
>> really the bottom line. People are all for space exploration and such
>> until the bills for it show up.
>>
>>
>>>Unless you want
>>>to ressurect the "world is flat" or the "we never went to the Moon"
>>>conspiracies, what other legit reasons can you think of to NOT do it?
>>
>>
>> Simple: The costs outweigh the benefits. There are easier, cheaper,
>> faster ways to get the benefits and solve the problems we have on
>> earth.
>
> Actually, I don't think there is a way to solve those problems.

Give up? No solution? Say not so!

>> Space and war may help with some things but they are horribly
>> inefficient means of progress.
>>
>> None of this means we shouldn't go into space, just that we need to do
>> so in a way that is balanced with other needs and programs.
>
>
> Ahh, but whose balance, Jim? I think that humankind badly NEEDS the
>sense of exploration and adventure and the frontier effect of space. My
>price tag of balance is a lot higher than yours, which is in turn a lot
>higher than a lot of other people's
>
> If we're not their, and it isn't humans there, maybe it's just time to
>sit down and watch the history channel. We might see a story about us
>there some day.

Okay, Mike, you watch TV. I go to contract work someplace on
REAL space stuff, report back. :-) Those not be spaced-out brag
tawks others have.

Thirty.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5584. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 00:16:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040629201659.27012.00000508@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 93698

In article <89edndJGC4gMkkDdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff88@mailcity.moc> writes:

>their statement, "armchair amateurs that still use vacuum tube
>transmitters" shows their stupidy and ignorance. First, only a very
>small percentage of amateurs use vaccum tube transmitters, and second,
>it what does that have to do with the problem of BPL interference, which
>does exists even if the idiots at UPLC says it dosen't.

It's called "ad hominem" and "distraction". By focusing on irrelevant things,
they hope to draw attention away from the simple facts.

In some ways it may be an encouraging sign (!) in that they cannot refute the
interference claims and other evidence, so they resort to the above tactics.

>As far as the
>FCC chairman, he wouldn't know a transistor from a doorknob and is
>probably just waiting for BPL to get rolling so he and other top FCC
>officials can move on to cushy, high paying, do nothing jobs in the BPL
>industry as payback for pushing this crap down our throats.

Don't stop to the same tactics as UPLC.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5585. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 00:27:24 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406291627.2d3507b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93699

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628200151.18097.00000059@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <1e4e3692.0406281451.43cf693f@posting.google.com>,
> billybeeper@juno.com (William) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040627144812.19470.00000338@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20040627094829.05775.00000464@mb-m27.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve
> >> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
> >>
> >> >>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
> >> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >> >>Date: 6/26/2004 1:52 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >>Message-id: <20040626145218.06606.00000538@mb-m01.aol.com>
>
> >> >> Me not god. Never claim. Nursie angry, show hate. Nursie
> >> >> snarl much, Heil snarl much. Nursie, Heil not play well with
> >> >> others. Nursie, Heil top-banana hum radio ops, very
> >> >> important, show others how hum radio done. Gods speak
> >> >> to inferiors. Gods do bad PR. Not be evangelism to use
> >> >> hate, anger, snarlies for motivation.
> >> >
> >> > Hey Dave...I say we start sending this stuff direct to Mrs. Lennie
> via
> >> >snail-mail and see how much longer this silliness keeps up.
> >>
> >> Nursie nuts. Nursie now challenge USPS inspectors, LAPD
> >> stalking-crimes unit. Not mention all shrinks in area. Nursie
> >> be shrink-rapped yet?
> >
> >Why he aways want be with your wife, my wife???
> >
> >I no like that. I wish he just mind his own wife. No bother other
> >people wifes. He not right in head.
>
> Nursie hot hero hostile actions. We see where... :-)
>
> This be way of New hum raddio in Hew-Hess-Haye?
>
> Not good sign.

Not good sign atall.

> >> Nursie hostile action hero only in newsgrope, win big medals
> >> awarded by Chief of Stuff, nursieworld murine corpse.
> >
> >He yell and yell. Too much noise. Youssa be funny. Jus hedake now.
>
> Nursie get fun laffing other peoples. He have good time.
>
> He make others mad, laff even more. Tsk.

He pool wings off fly. Laff and laff.

> >> > I can't believe that a woman with her alledged credentials would allow
> it
> >> >to go on, knowing it could get him involuntarily commited.
> >>
> >> Nursie smoke too many refers. Bend mind more than ever.
> >>
> >> Nursie allatime hate, hate, hate. Obsession. Tsk. Bad.
> >
> >Always want talk other wifes. I no like that. Very suspishus.
>
> Nursie got hots for something fer sure.

Eeeeew. Dat what he upto?

> >Maybe Jimmie Who and Great DXer wifes talk to him. Say not nice he
> >want talk other pople wifes. Tell him some edikette. He probby jus
> >yell and yell more.
>
> Nursie strange. He diss anyone around not agree wid him.
> Diss family, spouses. Allasame nursie.

Poor baby. If I Jimmie Who, I not want my wife tawk him.

> >> Temper fry...
> >
> >He need fork. He done.
>
> Nursie fork around too much. Get in trouble. Get #3 wife?

He fork up.

> Got better butter. No help.

He need Extra budder like popcorn. Extra napkin too.

> Better butter batter still bitter. Ptui.

pahtooti right.

5586. Re: UPLC on BPL: ignore armchair amateurs who still use vacuum tube

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 00:41:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040629204115.07368.00000347@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 93600

In article <89edndJGC4gMkkDdRVn-uw@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff88@mailcity.moc> writes:

>their statement, "armchair amateurs that still use vacuum tube
>transmitters" shows their stupidy and ignorance. First, only a very
>small percentage of amateurs use vaccum tube transmitters, and second,
>it what does that have to do with the problem of BPL interference, which
>does exists even if the idiots at UPLC says it dosen't.

It's called "ad hominem" and "distraction". By focusing on irrelevant things,
they hope to draw attention away from the simple facts.

In some ways it may be an encouraging sign (!) in that they cannot refute the
interference claims and other evidence, so they resort to the above tactics.

>As far as the
>FCC chairman, he wouldn't know a transistor from a doorknob and is
>probably just waiting for BPL to get rolling so he and other top FCC
>officials can move on to cushy, high paying, do nothing jobs in the BPL
>industry as payback for pushing this crap down our throats.

Don't stop to the same tactics as UPLC.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5587. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:01:13 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406291609.5a3f245e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93601

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040622172612.09069.00000297@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <20040622065328.03855.00000262@mb-m19.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
> >>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
> >>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
> >>Date: 6/22/2004 5:00 AM Central Standard Time
> >>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406220200.707e8d04@posting.google.com>
>
> >>I like these new phonetic alphabets. I wonder if there's one for guys
> >>with "real" military experience, but never who wore a uniform.
> >>
> > (N)itwit ZERO (I)maginary (M)ogandishu (D)x
>
> So, geographically-challenged nursie, just WHERE is this
> "Mogandishu?" [hint: it isn't in Somalia]
>
> Is that one of those places where you had "hostile action?"
>
> Or was that a location of MARS "amateur headquarters?"
>
> Tell us all about the geography of nursieworld...
>
> LHA / WMD

Sumtime I tell about Mombasa. It in suthern hemisfere. It anoder
place I go. No Yell Yell marine there. Nobody say fawslee "Woof,
Woof." Nice place. No carp there so werld gratest dxer not muddy da
waters make it hard to see udder fish.

5588. Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:01:22 UTC
From: billybeeper@juno.com
Message-ID: <1e4e3692.0406291619.4fc77ceb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93602

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20040628142004.07518.00000380@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0406272249.7e1cbc4b@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20040625230632.23857.00000452@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Kellie not drudge. Kellie dine at captain's table. Very posh.
> >> Superior. Knows morse. Morse Isley. [a Star War place]
>
> >> Kellie know all. Kellie spits on inferior drudges. When not
> >> spitting, Kellie inflate numbers 26 times original size. QED.
> >
> > Sure is a shame to see a person of Lennie's alleged education and
> >"experience" lowering himself to neonate babble.
>
> "Neonate?" That be noun, mean newborn infant. Newborn not
> have Internet access. Motor control for hands not yet complete,
> no typing ability. FCC license newborn as ham op? Not think
> so but maybe. Alla olde-tyme hammes think age not barrier to
> ham license.

How he spect us beweeve he DXer wen he has no hear for accent?

Hesay "9VA stop neobaby babble. Speek Engrish! I cawl 911 and they take you way."

He big dummy like Gumper Pyle.

5589. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:10:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WdqdncOkXptqj3_dRVn-hw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Fred Garvin wrote:
> On Tue, 29 Jun 2004 10:38:34 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>
>> If the manufacturers produce software that has gaping security flaws,
>>it is their fault, not mine.
>
>
>
> Mike, it's your fault for CONTINUING TO USE IT.
>
> If you've bought 2 Monkeytime wrenches and the handles both snapped and
> broke will you go out and buy ANOTHER Monkeytime wrench????

I got taken out of context there, Fred. I was responding to the blame the victim comments. I do use Microsoft's OS's from XP to Win95 (Yet!) Mostly because it's part of my job. But I don't use the triumvirate. I only use the OS. If you are using IE and Outlook in addition to the OS, then you're asking for trouble.

5590. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:16:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <vvoEc.140$ON3.89@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 93604

Len,

The purpose was, obviously, to let eveyone know what we knew in the first
place - BPL *will* cause interference. Whatever you may think, this will
also cause interference to low band VHF users as well. I shan't get into
who uses that.

Best regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20040629180627.18097.00000067@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
> >
> >Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.
>
> The major "kudos" ought to go to the Cedar Rapids team that put
> together an excellent picture of a detailed example of their BPL
> test system. One can see it in several Comments on docket
> 04-37 at the FCC ECFS.
>
> "Kudos to ARRL?" Why? The Cedar Rapids amateur club
> did all the work...had the calibrated instruments for valid data
> collection. No computer simulations there. Actual on-air tests.
>
> If someone wants to express gratitude to "all involved," the names
> and callsigns are in the several 04-37 Comments of the last week.
> Write them DIRECT, don't assume that "all" read this din of
> inequity called a newsgroup.
>
> LenAnderson@ieee.org

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/27/04

5591. Re: Field Day Results

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:25:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AY-dnbnQELXhi3_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93605

Da Shadow wrote:

> Our GOTA station managed 220 QSO's for 271 points -- no biggie -- but all
> ops were inexperienced non HFers including several kids and "civilians"
>
> Also our GOTA had 44 PSK31 QSO's
> The rest were Phone on 40M, 20M, and 15M

That's a successful GOTA station, Lamont. One of the fellows I work with cam out to operate this weekend. He is an inactive ham. He was intrigued by the PSK setup on GOTA, and I told him about setting up a station. I saw him today at the University salvage operatin here on campus. He told me he was bit by the bug, is purchasing an HF rig, and was looking at and probably going to buy one of their old laptops to use to drive it. This is the second inactive ham that I've worked back into the fold with the GOTA station. I'll probably drop a note to ARRL. The concept is sound.

> We built a 32 foot vertical with four elavated radials -- worked back to the
> east coast on 40M and used it as a 3/4 vertical on 15M
> Vertical radiator was three swimming pool poles held together with hose
> clamps.
> 20M antenna was a Cushcraft R8. 10M was zilch out here in the west
>
> One of the main stations worked over 70 6M QSO's
>
> Other main stations are being tallied
> although I heard one CW station was at the 980 QSO point
>
> Located at an EOC in Carlsbad Ca
>
> Thanks to all for the advice on PSK31 FD operation and to Mike for the "No
> VHF at the GOTA" input
>
> We gave our 6M antenna to a main VHF station.

Sounds like a good and enjoyable effort.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5592. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:27:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AY-dnbjQELWNin_dRVn-sA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93606

Dave Heil wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>>Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major foulups.
>>
>>Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>1B EPA
>
>
> It was pleasant days and a chilly night for the Marshall County WV ARES
> bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
> Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
> the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
> 950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
> Hawaii.

It was cool enough to see our breath in the middle of the night. We got some pizza, and one of the ops brought chili to warm us up. What a combination.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5593. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:35:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <r-GdnakhF5t5hX_dRVn-vA@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93607

Dave Heil wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>>In article <40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major
>>>
>>>foulups.
>>>
>>>>Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>1B EPA
>>>
>>>It was pleasant days and a chilly night for the Marshall County WV ARES
>>>bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
>>>Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
>>>the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
>>>950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
>>>Hawaii.
>>
>>Excellent!
>>
>>I worked you guys on CW. What were you running?
>
>
> Same rig/antenna as the last two years from here on the hill--FT-1000MP
> "Field and Stream", Johnson Matchbox and 200 foot skywire fed with open
> wire. It seems I'm never the guy to work you on FD. N8NN was the op
> you worked.
>
> My math skills are showing in the comments above. Score should read
> "2.6 to 2.7 k points".

Okay, I was in awe there for a moment. But that's still okay.

> We were one of those stations which should not have been running 5A. In
> the middle of the night, we had only two stations running. We would have
> been better candidates for 3A.

>
> Members of a local Boy Scout troop visited and were given an overview of
> amateur radio by the county EC. They then visited all of the stations
> in operation. They spent the most time and showed the most interest at
> the CW tent. The ancient mode users had the only station doing computer
> logging (TR).
>
> The old ops using the old mode were responsible for about 2000 of the
> points and that from a single station.

We were not certain how many CW ops were coming out. Fortunately, we had a CW op for about 75 percent of the time. The final tally was pretty close between CW and Phone. The GOTA station probably tipped things in favor of the Non-voice modes. I'll know in a little bit when I add up the scores.

I had one of those pucker string moments when I had computer trouble after the event. But I got it fixed, and am doing newsgroup to relax before diving into the scores again.

I think we were around 3500 points altogether. WE were running 2a plus the GOTA.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5594. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:53:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nrednZAcvaBggX_dRVn-ug@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93608

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>Yep, it really was a blast. Excellent wx, good conditions, no major foulups.
>>>
>>>Now to recopy the logs and get the final score.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>1B EPA
>>
>>It was pleasant days and a chilly night
>
>
> Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
> alternative though.
>
>
>>for the Marshall County WV ARES
>>bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
>>Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
>>the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
>>950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
>>Hawaii.
>
>
> This year was a sort of "shakedown cruise" for us'ns. Unfamiliar
> little FT-847 xcvr (MP? Not!), untried antennas, untried team, etc. so
> we just sorta dabbled at it for the jollies and educations. We were on
> the air for only 10-11 hours out of the 24 but still managed to garner
> over S&P 400 Qs. And that included some SSB ops too by golly.

Gotta train those new operators! We had some new ops, and they aren't as
fast as some of the OT'ers, but so what. They will be one day.

> Most memorable scene:
>
> Late Sunday morning I'm milking 40 ssb at a great rate. Handed the mic
> and chair to Jim. I wish I'd taken a photo of the look on his face.
> But he sallied forth and kept the rate going. Yes he did. I asked him
> when it was that he last operatd phone in a contest. "Six meters AM

> days

HAR! I hope you got a picture of Jim with a mic in his hands!

> Worked KP4, KP2 and that ZF1 9A station. That one was a bit of a jolt.
> They must have had a real blast.
>
> Figger a demonstrated 40 per hour station potential here and we gwan
> go after you guys for *serious* next year so heads up Heil.
>
> Did anybody around here work Burke?

- Mike KB3EIA -

5595. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 01:57:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040629215713.02583.00000478@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 93609

In article <WdlEc.19445$bs4.5973@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com...
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
>>
>> Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Excellent. Good first shot victory. This is probably how we are going to
>have to fight this monster. Piece by piece.

Note that it was a test program, and that the BPL folks shut down voluntarily.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5596. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 02:43:11 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3NpEc.1046$MB3.57@attbi_s04>
Source record: 93610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> Tom,
>
> I think it's just become fashionable to be a self-righteous bitcher
> against "Them"!

Hans .... yes you are right ...it's easy to bitch at the fellows who for what ever reason made things the way they are. If all the other systems were that good then by golly we all would have them and their inherent faults. I think it is base envy of those that brought what ever to the unwashed masses that gets some upset and made a whole bunch of money in the mean time. I was hooked when ever I saw those old "kits" back in the 60's but couldn't afford the freight. The first computer I ever had a hand in working with was a Burroghs (sp?) in 1965 which was used by the Port Vue-Liberty school district for payroll. We managed to get to use the unit with the guidence of the "special math" instructor. It used pins in sets of 3 per step in a program ...K-1-1 et al. and the problem was that the darn exponent had "floated" and had to be reset within the program lest all was lost. The Commodore units of the early 80's provided my impetus. Again look what 2K $ got you then ... and now ...all at the expense of those "greedy" risk takers.

Take care ...Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

5597. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 02:47:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <40E229B3.6060106@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 93611

N2EY wrote:

>In article <WdlEc.19445$bs4.5973@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
><w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>>news:c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com...
>>
>>
>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
>>>
>>>Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>Excellent. Good first shot victory. This is probably how we are going to
>>have to fight this monster. Piece by piece.
>>
>>
>
>Note that it was a test program, and that the BPL folks shut down voluntarily.
>
>
>

They may heve decided that they were not going to make enough money with it
to make it worthwhile doing. And not worth the trouble, as they know
that hams
don't put up with powerline noise, much less BPL crud....

>
>

5598. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 02:47:56 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wRpEc.1649$IQ4.1060@attbi_s02>
Source record: 93612

> > It was pleasant days and a chilly night
>
> Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
> alternative though.

Boy it was cold ...went down to 45 here and the 2 sweatshirts didn't cut it.
Went out in the parking lot at sunrise to sort of regain some heat
.....reptillian ????

Take care ...73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa ...

5599. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 03:08:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <886dneVUw-ZUs3_dRVn_iw@adelphia.com>
Source record: 93613
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

garigue wrote:

>>Tom,
>>
>>I think it's just become fashionable to be a self-righteous bitcher
>>against "Them"!
>
>
> Hans .... yes you are right ...it's easy to bitch at the fellows who for
> what ever reason made things the way they are. If all the other systems
> were that good then by golly we all would have them and their inherent
> faults.

Not really Tom. My experience in computers has been that whatever gets adopted as a "standard" is related to the golden rule. He who has the gold makes the rules - and the standards.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5600. Re: CERT says to stop using IE, but will the shit heads listen?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 06:54:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <2ttEc.2269$yy1.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I get bit regardless. My Norton's finds a virus
> here and there despite my running a proxy
> server, 2 firewalls, and updating the virus def's
> all the time.

Then you must be involved in a high-risk activity (such as downloading illegal software from questionable sources), because I have not seen any of that on my computers.

> (snip) I use both PC's and Macs extensively,
> so I feel I can comment knowledgeably. Using
> a PC is getting to be operations under siege.
> What the PC users consider to be normal
> operations is not what normal operations should
> be. Meanwhile, I just use my Mac and do the
> work I need to do without all the fuss and muss.
> (p.s. - you should see all the cool ham radio
> software that is out for OSX!)

I also use both extensively and feel you're not being entirely forthright. The Mac is certainly not without its own "fuss and muss." The sheer volume of problem-related questions in the Mac newsgroups is clear testament to that. And the amount and quality of radio related software for a Windows-based computer dwarfs that available for the Macintosh (the same with most any catagory of software, or hardware).

> If the manufacturers produce software that has
> gaping security flaws, it is their fault, not mine.

Yet my experience suggests users are a large part of the problem - everything from engaging in high-risk activities to not maintaining, and even by-passing, the installed security features. I manage the IT department at a local college. I cannot even count how many computers I've seen with virus problems that also have illegally obtained software installed and security features disabled to allow the download of that software.

Stewart

5601. Re: Yaesu VX-7R Amateur/Ham Radio Handheld Transceiver

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 07:08:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <TFtEc.2270$yy1.4@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 93615

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> Dwight, you and I have had our
> differences, but I'd hate to see Amateur
> Radio lose you. Hope you'll reconsider.

It's been fun, but time to move on.

> That said, how is the VX-7R? I am going
> on vacation late July and have a few
> friends that want to keep me company
> during the drive. (Their QTH's are right
> along my route.) So I am in the market for
> another handheld since my Alinco DJ-V5TH
> didn't seem to make the move to our new
> QTH intact. <hihi>

They're about as close to new as one can perhaps get. I bought them several months ago, but an injury shortly after that has kept me confined to the house since. Because of that, these radios have sat in a drawer, taken out only to be charged up about once every couple of months. Neither have even been outside the front door (after all this time, they'll probably get a sunburn the first time outdoors). And most of the accessories have never even been used.

> Stay safe and have a great summer.

Same for you, Bert

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5602. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 10:48:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406300248.375dc14e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93616

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0406290759.17c3d74a@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0406290252.59dc86c@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<40E054A1.6757CFF2@earthlink.net>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
> > alternative though.
>
> roger roger!!
> >
> > > for the Marshall County WV ARES
> > > bunch, atop the hill at Grandview Park overlooking the burg of
> > > Moundsville. I'm not sure of the final tally yet but it should be in
> > > the neighborhood of 26 to 27 k points. The CW duo was good for about
> > > 950 QSOs. We didn't manage a WAS on CW though--missed Alaska and
> > > Hawaii.
> > >
> > This year was a sort of "shakedown cruise" for us'ns. Unfamiliar
> > little FT-847 xcvr (MP? Not!), untried antennas, untried team, etc. so
> > we just sorta dabbled at it for the jollies and educations. We were on
> > the air for only 10-11 hours out of the 24 but still managed to garner
> > over S&P 400 Qs. And that included some SSB ops too by golly.
>
> Iron Man style. No computer, not even a memory keyer. Paper
> log'n'dupe.

Pure 1960 contesting. Whatta pair of Luddites we is . .

> > Most memorable scene:
> >
> > Late Sunday morning I'm milking 40 ssb at a great rate. Handed the mic
> > and chair to Jim. I wish I'd taken a photo of the look on his face.
> > But he sallied forth and kept the rate going. Yes he did.
>
> Points is points, and I knew it was a setup anyway when I saw the
> camera.
>
> > I asked him
> > when it was that he last operatd phone in a contest. "Six meters AM
> > days . . . "
>
> Ya misunderstood - I meant "last time on Field Day". Which was 6 meter

> AM - 1968 or thereabouts. Ol' Lafayette HA-460 and five elements at 50
> feet at WA3CCP. Bacton Hill, PA - not far from where we were,
> actually.
>
> I've done 'phone SS since then.
>
> And ya saw my SSB rate....

Yeah, now your goal for next year is 400 phone Qs. I'll help you
uncurl from your fetal position after it's over.

> > Worked KP4, KP2 and that ZF1 9A station. That one was a bit of a jolt.
> > They must have had a real blast.
>
> Some serious setups out there. Saw a report of 1093 CW QSOs *just on
> 40 meters* by one of the 3A groups. K2/100 and a dipole IIRC. Yeah, we
> worked 'em.
>
> ---
>
> Didja like my QSK/CQ trick?

It's older 'n dirt, don't do it in real contests.

> > Figger a demonstrated 40 per hour station potential here and we gwan
> > go after you guys for *serious* next year so heads up Heil.
>
> lessee...computer, some minor antenna work, a few odds'n'ends.....
> >
> > Did anybody around here work Burke?
> >
> Burke who?

Thought so. Based on other threads around here he apparently spent the
weekend working the Put . . ah, never mind . .

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > w3rv
>
> 1B EPA
>
> that call just rolls off the bug and cuts through the Donald Duck
> noises like a knife...

Sure does. I spent around the first quarter century of my career in
hamdom bumbling along with one of the lousiest callsigns ever issued.
So I put a lot of thought into what constituted a really punchy
callsign when the opportunity to came up grab one in 1977 or so. I'm
just now coming up on the breakeven point.

w3rv/3
Radio Free Royersford PA

5603. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 10:53:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0406300253.16a34add@posting.google.com>
Source record: 93617

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message news:<wRpEc.1649$IQ4.1060@attbi_s02>...
> > > It was pleasant days and a chilly night
> >
> > Froze me butt off I did even before sundown too. Better than the
> > alternative though.
>
> Boy it was cold ...went down to 45 here and the 2 sweatshirts didn't cut it.
> Went out in the parking lot at sunrise to sort of regain some heat
> .....reptillian ????

That's hideous. In PA? You guys were at 5,000 feet on some uncharted
mountaintop in WPA or what?

> Take care ...73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa ...

w3rv

5604. Re: had a blast on Field Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 11:20:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO
Message-ID: <20040630072055.19470.00000366@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 93618

In article <d22b54c3.0406300248.375dc14e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> Iron Man style. No computer, not even a memory keyer. Paper
>> log'n'dupe.
>
>Pure 1960 contesting. Whatta pair of Luddites we is . .

Imagine if we'd actually read the FT-847 manual.....

>> And ya saw my SSB rate....
>
>Yeah, now your goal for next year is 400 phone Qs.

No thanks.

>I'll help you uncurl from your fetal position after it's over.

No sweat. Working 6 meter sidbanders with an AM only rig was more of a challenge.
>
>> Didja like my QSK/CQ trick?
>
>It's older 'n dirt, don't do it in real contests.

It was right for the situation. Saved time and raised both rates.
>
>> > Figger a demonstrated 40 per hour station potential here and we gwan
>> > go after you guys for *serious* next year so heads up Heil.
>>
>> lessee...computer, some minor antenna work, a few odds'n'ends.....
>> >
>> > Did anybody around here work Burke?
>> >
>> Burke who?
>
>Thought so. Based on other threads around here he apparently spent the
>weekend working the Put . . ah, never mind . .

'zactly.

CW SS is only four months away....

73 de Jim, N2EY

5605. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 14:48:15 UTC
From: Alun <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns95186DE03BCDAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 93619

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
news:vvoEc.140$ON3.89@news02.roc.ny:

> Len,
>
> The purpose was, obviously, to let eveyone know what we knew in the
> first place - BPL *will* cause interference. Whatever you may think,
> this will also cause interference to low band VHF users as well. I
> shan't get into who uses that.
>

I don't know who you have in mind, but the state police use it here. That
may be enough to kill BPL right there.

>
> Best regards from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20040629180627.18097.00000067@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> In article <c2356669.0406290855.6cbe7b41@posting.google.com>,
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/06/28/2/?nc=1
>> >
>> >Kudos to W0SR, ARRL, and all involved.
>>
>> The major "kudos" ought to go to the Cedar Rapids team that put
>> together an excellent picture of a detailed example of their BPL
>> test system. One can see it in several Comments on docket
>> 04-37 at the FCC ECFS.
>>
>> "Kudos to ARRL?" Why? The Cedar Rapids amateur club
>> did all the work...had the calibrated instruments for valid data
>> collection. No computer simulations there. Actual on-air tests.
>>
>> If someone wants to express gratitude to "all involved," the names
>> and callsigns are in the several 04-37 Comments of the last week.
>> Write them DIRECT, don't assume that "all" read this din of
>> inequity called a newsgroup.
>>
>> LenAnderson@ieee.org
>
>

> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.712 / Virus Database: 468 - Release Date: 6/27/04
>
>
>

5606. Re: The Game's Afoot!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 16:20:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040630122045.06789.00000830@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 93620

>Subject: Re: The Game's Afoot!
>From: billybeeper@juno.com (William)
>Date: 6/29/2004 7:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <1e4e3692.0406291627.2d3507b@posting.google.com>

>Not good sign atall.

>He pool wings off fly. Laff and laff.

>Eeeeew. Dat what he upto?

>Poor baby. If I Jimmie Who, I not want my wife tawk him.

>He fork up.

>He need Extra budder like popcorn. Extra napkin too.

>pahtooti right.

What a shame.

You act like this around those Scouts?

Maybe a letter to your wife about your conduct is the wrong way to go...

I am sure the BSA Council in your area would be interested in how some of thier "adult leaders" act in public.

Perhaps I can run some of your greater postings by them, including your affirmation of respect and admiration for a known antagonist and pathological liar.

Or perhaps some of your "revelations" about things you alleged to have done in the Armed Forces, but, on inspection, are blatant lies...?!?!

The package could get really thick. Maybe I'll use FedEx...

Steve, K4YZ

5607. Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 16:23:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040630122356.06789.00000831@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 93621

>Subject: Re: Temper Fry, Was Re: Able Baker Charlie
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/29/2004 5:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040629180628.18097.00000068@mb-m27.aol.com>

> I happen to personally like fruitcake, all the candied stuff and the
> nuts in that, tasty to me. I find the non-holiday human fruitcakes
> with candied morse nuts to be indigestible. Ptui.

This from a "man" who has been posting in baby-babble all week.

Uh huh.

That's why the name "Leonard H. Anderson" carries no credibility with it.

> Happy Fourth.

Maybe while you are watching the fire works, Your Scumminess, you can come
with with a new ADA story, and regale us with how your signal batallion was
responsible for saving Seoul from certain devastation.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

5608. Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 16:34:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040630123438.06789.00000832@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 93622

```
>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 6/29/2004 5:06 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20040629180631.18097.00000071@mb-m27.aol.com>
>
>In article <20040629055155.12238.00000909@mb-m01.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>(Steve
>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for truth
>>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>>Date: 6/28/2004 5:54 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <20040628185404.19885.00000539@mb-m06.aol.com>
>>>
>>>In article <20040628122125.23777.00000743@mb-m28.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>(Steve
>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: BPL - UPLC ->Repeat the lie three times and claim it for
>>truth
>>>>>From: n2ey@aol.comSPAMNO (N2EY)
>>>>>Date: 6/27/2004 8:36 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <20040627213644.28114.00000503@mb-m10.aol.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>In article <20040626053403.25561.00000777@mb-m29.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>>>>(Steve
>>>>>Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>> It was the early 70's when Detroit and the others really started
>>>>slipping.
>>>>>> That was the era of the Gremlins, the Mavericks, Pintos and Vegas.
>>>>>
>>>>>Yep. The main reason was simple: Detroit hadn't made the necessary
>>>>investment
>>>>>in basic R&D. They knew how to make big heavy inefficient cars but not
>>>small
>>>>>efficient ones.
>>>>
>>>> My point exactly, Jim.
>>>>
>>>> We need to move the technology of our space program out of the
>>70/80's.
>>>
>>>
```

>>> Why?
>>>
>>> Is science and exploration market-driven? I think not.
>>>
>>> [Docktor Weiner von Brawn personality of nursie acting up...]
>>
>> Lots of baby-babble deleted.
>>
>>> Brits at Mars first, fail in landing. Unknown reason.
>>
>> No, the Brits were not first on Mars.
>>
>>> Yanks next with bouncy balloon lander idea. Works. Both times.
>>
>> Yes, it did.
>>
>> But we had already soft-landed on Mars quite a while ago, Sir Putzy.
>>And not with the "bouncy bloon lander idea".
>
> Tsk. Nursie make mean diss and cuss again. Not nice.
>
> "Bouncy balloon," nursie, not "bouncy bloon." Quit tawking
> baby tawk. :-)
>
> Brits first on Mars in 2003-2004 time frame.

Uh huh.

Got caught with your britches down (again) and now you change the
parameters.

Too late.

> JPL Viking Lander ...(SNIP)

Another history lesson that we already knew...Thanks Lennie. Too late.

> I do REAL work on some space programs. Nursie do NONE.
> Nursie never at JPL, Santa Su, Michoud, Cape, Clear Lake.
> Nursie read "space comics" and be space guru? Must be.
> Nursie spaced out.

From the personal background I gleaned on you from NADC, and
"contributions" you made to "aerospace" were made on the days you didn't show
up.

That's why the name of Leonard H. Anderson does not bear any
credibility...In this forum or any other.

> Nursie fruitcake. This not close to Christmas. Fruitcake not gift.

Still waiting for your credentials in mental health.

Also now awaiting your credentials in law for making the assertion that any referal I make would put me on a "legal roller coaster". Yet another venue you venture into without any experience, Lennie.

In the meantime, we are still subjugated to your mistruths, antagonisms and overall misrepresentations of Amateur Radio...all in the name of "freedom of speech".

Luckily for you, lying is protected speech.

Steve, K4YZ

5609. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 17:04:07 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <16b173ed575201370d9c1bde609fcbbc@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 93623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Please come and get your lid kc8ldo from rec.radio.cb. Since being identified as a source of mayhem and a troublemaker on 6 meter he has taken his circus act to the internet. We dont want him.

5610. Re: Damn Code!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 20:06:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff00@mailcity.com>
Message-ID: <EdudnWOFauNpsX7dRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 93625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tarapia Tapioco wrote:
> Please come and get your lid kc8ldo from rec.radio.cb. Since being identified as a source of mayhem and a troublemaker on 6 meter he has taken his circus act to the internet. We dont want him.
>
He dose act a lot like a cber dosen't he?

5611. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 20:56:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040630165608.14094.00000334@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 93624

In article <vvoEc.140$ON3.89@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>The purpose was, obviously, to let eveyone know what we knew in the first
>place - BPL *will* cause interference. Whatever you may think, this will
>also cause interference to low band VHF users as well. I shan't get into
>who uses that.

BPL *will* cause an HF noise level increase of at least
10 db. NTIA say so. NTIA also say we can "afford that"
because BPL be super-service broadband and W say
broadband good for country. Hooray for Republicans!

I'm not sure if the Access BPL signals WILL affect VHF
hammers. NTIA wasn't measuring there much, were they?

Let's face it, as Dan remarked, BPL is going to HAVE to
be fought "piece by piece" like the Cedar Rapids IA ham
club did. It's also nice if a major radio corporation
division is also in the city. :-) [Collins Radio]

Big article in L.A. Times business section today about
Mike Powell's plans. He not say direct but large speculation
is that Mikey will go off to big pay in corporate world. He
being dangled worm on gold-plated hook. Meanwhile, THE
Chairman of FCC is off on another rural America trip to see
"firsthand" how good BPL is in hinterlands. Whoopee.

I can only see BPL as already there and waiting. Big, Big
BIG antenna for noise-making on HF. Those who say
nothing, do nothing can kiss their S (meter) units goodbye.
You all deserve what you root for by not saying anything.
Enjoy.

LenAnderson@ieee.org

5612. Re: BPL Pilot Project In Cedar Rapids Shuts Down

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2004-06-30 22:20:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20040630182034.19885.00000582@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 93626

In article <Xns95186DE03BCDAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
>news:vvoEc.140$ON3.89@news02.roc.ny:
>
>> Len,
>>
>> The purpose was, obviously, to let eveyone know what we knew in the
>> first place - BPL *will* cause interference. Whatever you may think,
>> this will also cause interference to low band VHF users as well. I
>> shan't get into who uses that.
>
>I don't know who you have in mind, but the state police use it here. That
>may be enough to kill BPL right there.

Not enough in my viewpoint. Nearly all states use the 30-50 MHz
bands for highway patrol communications as well as 150+ MHz.
Access BPL is not described (so far) as having radiated RF
byproducts above 88 MHz so the first, oldest, and now least-
used PLMRS bands at 30 to 50 MHz will be the only ones
(supposedly) affected.

Fringe-area "low band" TV receivers for channels 2 through 6
would be affected by BPL. That's a few hundred thousand plus
in the rural areas that are supposed to be the BPL broadband
treat. [Damocles' sword again, cutting two ways]

The majority of those affected by BPL would be the HF users.
The federal government has a whole potfull of fixed frequency
assignments in HF...as can be seen in the tabulations of the
NTIA Phase 1 study and in the Comments of ARINC on docket
04-37. [50,000+ or somewhere in that number region] ARINC,
true to its founding prior to WW2, is a private aviation service
running some of the HF comm facilities for long distance flights.
ARINC is very big in other areas such as acting as the
standards Hq for commercial air carriers, including the US (and,
by adoption, ICAO) radionavigation systems technical standards.

Note: Cedar Rapids, IA, has long been the home town of Collins
Radio. Collins is still busy making civil as well as military
avionics although they've been out of the amateur radio market
area for years. It shouldn't hurt a bit to have a major avionics
corporation in the area with a strong amateur radio identification
and HF commercial radio identification to help the fight against
BPL.

The USA broadcast industry is against BPL even though the major money income comes from AM and FM BC band ad sales...neither band expected to be interfered with by BPL. There's support in the industry for RF-pollution-free bandspace for US SW BC band broadcasters even though they are a drop in the program bucket for broadcasting. BPL will make about a third of all SW BC band listening impossible in the USA due to RFI.

There's all sorts of objections to BPL from the ESTABLISHED radio services, amateur included. Nonetheless, Access BPL is still going to exist...at least for a while. The Chairman of the FCC loves it (politically, certainly not for technical or legal reasons) and the Acting Secretary of the NTIA politically loves it because the USA President (for now) loves it. Both have made public statements to that regard.

Oddly enough, despite the urban myth of some objecting to BPL, the FCC does NOT have any power to stop Access BPL!

All the FCC can do is put limits on the incidental RF radiation from a BPL system, then enforce it. The FCC already does that with other communications service providers (cable TV in main but also telephone cable and incidental RF radiation from electric power lines). The enforcement is going to be a total bitch of a job for BPL. The FCC is way, way down on facilities to test and measure BPL installations and is going to have to really pork up its budget to come close to good measurements in urban areas especially. It will be a HUGE task.

There's no good signs evident that the FCC is coming even close to realizing the gargantuan task of monitoring BPL of the future. Mikey Powell and company have been sold on BPL "for the masses" and that's that...a big mass.

The only perceivable way to fight BPL is now after-the-fact, like the Cedar Rapids group did, apparently successfully. But, that takes a concerted group effort in each amateur radio locality. ARRL can't be dependent as the "big gun" to fight BPL. They aren't staffed or budgeted to oversee all the possible BPL installation testing in the USA. The League's budget would have to quadruple or quintuple to approach being able to do that...and still not be enough.

Individual industry and local government (state on down) groups haven't shown they have enough clout to make a difference in the Commission's enthusiasm for BPL. Pandora's Box has already been opened. Lots of such Boxes in all of the 50 states. It's going to be one helluva big task to close them.

Say goodbye to low-level HF signals if BPL comes to your QTH, at least for a while. Remember which administration brought out the spectre of Access BPL to this nation while you and everyone

else are at it.

LenAnderson@ieee.org